DEC 2 1947

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 93—PART 3

MARCH 31, 1947, TO APRIL 29, 1947
(PAGES 2843 TO 4250)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we seek Thy blessing, remind us that we cannot deceive Thee, though we may deceive ourselves. We dare not devise our own plans and draft our own schemes and then have the nerve to ask Thee to bless them, for we know that there are some things Thou wilt not and cannot bless. And unless Thy blessing accompanies what we do here, we waste our time. So guide us in what we propose, so that Thou canst bless us in what we produce. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday last, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has the floor on the question of the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for the transaction of routine business.

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of March 28, 1947,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 29, 1947, signed the enrolled bill (S. 918) to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRICE OF COPIES OF RECORDS FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488) fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CREDIT OPERATIONS ON LOANS MADE TO INDIAN CHARTERED CORPORATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing credit operations through June 30, 1946, on loans made to Indian chartered corporations for the purpose of promoting the economic development of such tribes and of their members (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

IMPROVEMENT OF POULTRY, POULTRY PRODUCTS, AND HATCHERIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C., Supp. V, 429) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOVEMBER 1946 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the month of November 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Whereas legislation known as the Hill-Taylor bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States proposing the establishment of additional national cemeteries in each of the several States; and

"Whereas previous study of such a proposal made by the Quartermaster General, Army Service Forces, has resulted in the recommendation that a national cemetery be established in the capital district of the State of New York; and

"Whereas the territory embraced in such capital district contains a population of nearly a million two hundred thousand inhabitants; and

"Whereas the city of Troy, N. Y., with its rich historical background, its ideal location in the beautiful foothills of the Adirondacks, its easy accessibility by rail, water, and air makes it an ideal site; and

"Whereas such city of Troy, N. Y., was the home of two Congressional Medal of Honor awardees, Lt. Col. William J. O'Brien and Sgt. Thomas A. Baker, both of whom paid the supreme sacrifice on Saipan Island; and

"Whereas the origin of the cognomen 'Uncle Sam' by which the United States of America is affectionately known throughout the world, is attributed to the city of Troy, N. Y.; and

"Whereas the several national veterans' organizations, including among others, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans of America, the Cootiette Club, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, through their New York State departments, have endorsed the city of Troy, N. Y., as a site for a national cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the legislation heretofore designated as the Hill-Taylor bill or the embodying provisions thereof and to adopt the same without delay and give to the city of Troy, N. Y., favorable consideration as a proposed site for a national cemetery; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from the State of New York."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers, and military attachés in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

"Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

"Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its Foreign Service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the Foreign Service of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Resolution 36

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct with Government funds

"Whereas the city of San Diego, which normally has a 10-year water supply on hand, now has only a 9 months' supply of such water, due to the tremendous diversion of water from its water supply in past months to the military and naval bases in the area; and

"Whereas in 1944 the United States Navy undertook to increase the water supply of the city of San Diego by the construction of an aqueduct running from the San Jacinto Reservoir to the San Vicente Reservoir but was forced to cancel the construction contracts at the end of the war due to slashes in the budget of the Navy Department: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and requested to pass legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct project with Government funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to grant to the State of California acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco for establishing the new San Francisco State College

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that a new San Francisco State College be established in the San Francisco metropolitan area, for the primary purpose of training teachers and offering educational opportunities to veterans; and

"Whereas the housing shortage has made it impossible to acquire buildings within which to house such an educational institution, nor is there available any publicly or privately owned land upon which necessary buildings could be erected; and

"Whereas the present need to establish a new San Francisco State College is based upon facts which affect the welfare of the entire State. More school facilities are needed in order to grant to veterans the education to which they are entitled. More school facilities are needed to train additional teachers, so as to meet the critical need for more trained teachers in California.

"San Francisco is the center, geographically, and from the point of ease of transportation to and from the city, for a large, closely populated section of the State of California; and

"Whereas the State of California is ready to establish a new San Francisco State College to meet these needs, if land is made available for that purpose; and

"Whereas there is acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco, which would appear not to be essential to the Federal uses of the Presidio, and which would be most appropriate as the site for the new San Francisco State College: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That Congress is hereby respectfully memorialized to take whatever action is necessary to grant to the State of California sufficient acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco for the establishment of the new San Francisco State College; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President, the Secretary of War, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GEORGE:

Two resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That—

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States enacted a measure sponsored by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, and Congressman GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, to authorize increased appropriations to States for the further development of vocational education; and

"Whereas there is great need for expanding this phase of education throughout Georgia; and

"Whereas there is tremendous demand on the part of the people of this State for expanding this phase of our educational program; and

"Whereas the State and local school systems have made provisions for matching in full funds that will be available to Georgia should Congress appropriate the full amount authorized by the George-Barden Act; and

"Whereas any funds made available to the State under the George-Barden Act will be distributed through established State and local educational channels without Federal domination and control: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of Georgia commend the Georgia delegation in National Congress for the active support they gave in securing passage of the George-Barden Act and request that they continue their efforts to get Congress to appropriate the full amount authorized by the George-Barden Act; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Georgia delegation in National Congress.

"Read and unanimously adopted March 17, 1947."

"Whereas the Congress did return the public employment service to the respective States as of November 16, 1946, and provided for payment of all operation expenses by the Federal Government only through June 30, 1948; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated funds to meet the full cost of operating the public employment services since January of 1942; and

"Whereas the Federal unemployment compensation tax collected on pay rolls of employers has greatly exceeded the entire cost of the operation of the public employment service and unemployment compensation programs; and

"Whereas the States were required under the Wagner-Peyser Act to appropriate a portion of the expense for the operation of the public employment service from its general fund up to and prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Georgia State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be, and it hereby is memorialized to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eightieth Congress, and to each United States Senator and Representative from Georgia.

"Read and unanimously adopted March 19, 1947."

By Mr. AIKEN:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Derby Line, Newport, Island Pond, Morgan, West Charleston, Springfield, and Morrisville, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an excellent letter from Dr. Ormal L. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans., taking a stand against universal military training. I ask unanimous consent to present this letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., March 6, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am becoming increasingly concerned with the intensive drive which is being made for the establishment of universal military training. As you know, I am very definitely opposed to militarization of our country and it seems to me that this proposal is one of the most vicious that we have confronted. It would be a very serious change of national policy if we should require all our young men to go through a period of compulsory training. I do not believe that with modern methods of warfare such training would have any military value. I certainly think it would be very detrimental from a moral standpoint and an unwarranted interruption of the plans of young men who had their future rather definitely outlined. Surely from an international standpoint it would be a very serious gesture of unfriendliness toward the other nations of the world. I believe we can maintain adequate defenses and protect our interests without engaging on this program of wholesale militarization of all our youth. I hope we may count on you to do everything in your power to oppose this trend and to see that what military force we have is on a strictly volunteer basis.

Best wishes to you in the very difficult task which you confront these days. We appreciate the good leadership which you have been giving us.

Cordially yours,

ORMAL L. MILLER.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING—LETTER FROM M. E. FORD

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a letter from Hon. M. E. Ford, of Maryville, Mo.

Judge Ford was a prominent member of the convention which framed the Missouri Constitution, and has long been highly respected as a jurist, lawyer, and public-spirited citizen.

I am asking to have this letter printed in the RECORD, not only for its own value, but because it is typical of a large number that I have received and am receiving from people in every walk of life in my State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYVILLE, MO., *March 28, 1947.*

Senator JAMES P. KEM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The stand you have taken on Government spending is meeting with general approval. You are on the right track and in my opinion the people are going to be with you. But they will not be satisfied with halfway measures. All Government subsidies, bonuses, and grants-in-aid must be discontinued. And I mean all and not all except some pet project that affects a certain class or group.

The most insidious of these schemes is the 50–50 proposition that is made to States and other public corporations. Not all of the people are fools and most of them know that both 50's come out of the same pockets. Grants of various kinds to agriculture, business and other classes of enterprise are now mounting to astronomical proportions, and education, health services, and so-called welfare groups are now demanding reservations on the gravy train. And each and every one of the groups and many others will continue to insist on sticking its respective snout into the public feed trough as long as any particular class is enjoying that privilege. But the squealing will soon cease if each knows that all of the others have been fenced out.

It is my firm conviction that Congress has no right to collect money from the people in the form of taxes and then loan that money to individuals and corporations. Yet, right here in this little city there are so many Government agencies that I have not been able to keep track of them all. And each is dishing out money that has been collected from the people. And they are doing it under what is, in my judgment, usurped and unconstitutional authority. I am aware of the fact that the Supreme Court has, by its construction of the commerce and general welfare clauses, transformed what was, originally, a government of limited and delegated powers, into a government of unlimited authority. But it is the duty of Congress, as well as that of the Supreme Court, to not only protect, but to observe the limitations of the Constitution.

Being an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrat, I want to get back to the Constitution. And I am ready to support any man who is traveling in that direction, regardless of the party banner under which he is marching. Today, this is a government of the people, by pressure groups, for pressure groups. Congress is responsible, for Congress has yielded to the pressure. And it is now the responsibility of Congress to lead the people back to "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." This is the responsibility of the Congress. It is the responsibility of Congress because the only power that can do it is the hand that holds the purse strings. And the Constitution, wisely, or unwisely, put the purse strings in the hands of Congress. I have always been of the opinion that it was a wise provision and hope that it will prove so.

There is another subject on which I desire to express my sentiments. It has always been my belief that one of the primary duties of every individual was to pay his debts. If that is right, then it is the primary duty of all of the citizens, in their collective capacity, to pay their collective debts. And it is the duty of this generation to pay its own debts and not pass it on to the next or future generations, for future generations will have their own burdens to bear and they may be much greater than ours. If we are to pay our debts the time to begin is now. It is a herculean task, but the people will undertake it if they know the money they pay out is to be used for that purpose. But they are not going to pay out money to support a vast bureaucracy that is pretending to do something for the people that they can do much better for themselves. Congress must stand on its feet and lead and not lie on its belly with its ear to the ground, trying to find out how to successfully follow.

Very truly yours,

M. E. FORD.

FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from W. J. Krencewicz, of Shenandoah, Pa., together with resolutions adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, Pa., relating to the freedom and independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHENANDOAH, PA., *March 4, 1947.*

The Honorable EDWARD S. MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Enclosed herewith is a set of resolutions, self-explanatory, passed by the (Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, Pa.), on whose behalf I am herewith presenting the same to you in accordance with my directions.

If at all possible, your cooperation in having the resolutions read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be most gratefully appreciated by all of the Lithuanian societies and clubs, not only locally but throughout Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

Respectfully yours,

W. J. KRENCEWICZ,
Attorney-at-Law.

"Whereas the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed on the 16th day of February 1918, and thereafter, following admission to the League of Nations in 1921, its independence was recognized by the great powers of the world; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania having thus emerged once more as a free and independent country after having been oppressed since the late eighteenth century by the Russian monarchy; and

"Whereas the Soviet states of Russia proclaimed to the world in 1920 its belief in freedom and independence and the right of a free people to govern themselves by, inter alia, entering into a treaty with Lithuania wherein we read these binding words, "relying on the strength of a declaration made by the Federal Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia to the effect that all peoples of every nationality have the right of self-determination and complete separation from the state to which they belonged previously, Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will, renounces all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian Nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her. The fact that Lithuania for some time was under Russian sovereignty does not impose on the Lithuanian people and their territory any obligations toward Russia; and

"Whereas having thus had a new birth of freedom, establishing a republican form of government with universal and equal suffrage, Lithuania, as a nation, dedicated itself to the task of peace, industry, commerce, and learning, and thereafter the nation and its people lived in peaceful, free, and harmonious relations in the community of nations of the world; and

"Whereas the Government of Lithuania, eager to preserve its freedom and happiness and with prophetic guidance as to the source of danger to its newly acquired independence and freedom, entered into a Lithuanian-Soviet nonaggression pact on September 28, 1926, which by mutual consent was to be effective until December 31, 1945, read in part: 'Article 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other'; and

"Whereas the Government and people of Lithuania have no national, religious, economic, political, or cultural interests similar or akin to the Russian Government or its people, but differ therefrom in every conceivable aspect, yet, nevertheless, the Republic of Lithuania was annexed by Russia in violation of the existing treaties, and in violation of international law, by the overpowering force and subterfuge of the Russian Government, whereby through the vehicle of a sham election, controlled and dominated by the communistic government, the Republic of Lithuania was incorporated into the United Soviet States of Russia against the will of all of the Lithuanian inhabitants; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States being interested, in accordance with its avowed declaration in the Atlantic Charter, to permit other peoples of the world desiring freedom to remain free and independent; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States declared war against Germany and Japan to thwart and prevent aggression and tyranny to spread its evil forces; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, following World War I, emerged as a free and independent nation and since demonstrated its ability of capable self-government, and now, following World War II, finds itself deprived of its freedom by a communistic Russia, and its people living under a government alien and differing in every respect from the desires of its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, loyal citizens of the United States of Lithuanian birth or descent, meeting at the Shenandoah High School this 2d day of March A. D. 1947, do hereby express our united voices in urging the President and the State Department of the United States and the agencies of the United States Government to exert fully the courageous efforts of this Government in doing its utmost to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania; and be it further

"Resolved, That we beseech the President of the United States and the State Department to request forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupational forces from Lithuanian territory, and to further request of the United Soviet States of Russia that the Lithuanian people who have been deported from their country to slave-labor camps in Siberia and elsewhere be returned to their homes and families in Lithuania; and be it further

"Resolved, That we petition the President, the State Department of the United States, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to refrain from signing or ratifying any treaty involving the Baltic region of Europe

which fails to embody the free and independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to present the pleas and supplications for justice and humaneness contained herein to the proper authorities of the United Nations for appropriate action as may be necessary to effect such results of independence and justice; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Senators of the United States from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to our Representatives in Congress from this district, with a hope and trust that each one, in such manner as he or it may choose, lend every effort toward fostering, aiding, and achieving the independence of a people who wish to be free to govern themselves and loosening them from the shackles of communism."

The foregoing resolutions were passed by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa., at a meeting held this 2d day of March A. D. 1947, at the Shenandoah High School, located in Schuylkill County, Pa., by acclamation and unanimous vote.

Witness my hand this 2d day of March A. D. 1947.

ANTHONY STANISKIS,
Chairman.

Attest:

LEONARD J. CHAIKOWSKY,
Secretary.

ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL OF GERMANY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relating to the government and control of Germany, adopted by the National Conference on the German Problem, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Conference on Germany, declaring that the purposes and conduct of Germany have been contrary to all basic rules of religion, decency, and international order, as recognized by the general conscience of mankind and as embodied in the basic laws of humanity; regards the events now taking place in Germany and any plans to resurrect the economic and political power of Germany as dangerous to the security of the world; believes a Germany capable of dominating Europe economically will again dominate it politically; and, therefore, resolves that Germany must not again be permitted to become powerful enough to wage war, nor to be used as a pawn in the game of power politics; and with due allowance to the fact that the inhabitants and economy of Germany cannot be ignored in planning the future of Europe, recommends to the Government of the United States and to the United States delegation at the Moscow Conference, the following concrete measures:

1. A civilian Control Commission to be established to control Germany, politically and economically.

2. The Commission is to allow Germany only such political autonomy as is consistent with general security and the development of a democratic government.

3. The French claim to the Saar Basin be recognized. The present Polish-German boundaries should be made permanent. All navigable waterways within Germany should be free to international navigation.

4. The ownership and management of the German steel, coal, and chemical industries of the Ruhr and Rhineland—Germany's war arsenal—should be immediately vested in a consortium of foreign government, including the Big Four Powers and such additional nations as they may determine.

5. The German general staff should be effectively and permanently dissolved.

6. The promised trial and punishment of the great mass of German war criminals—political, industrial, and military—who have hitherto gone untried and unpunished, should be immediately carried out by an international tribunal.

7. The task of the complete de-nazification which has seriously lagged, must be promptly carried through to completion by the removal of all Nazis and militarists from any position of influence or authority in the political, economic, or educational life of Germany.

8. Allied efforts to bring about the re-education of German youth should concentrate on eliminating the ideologies of nazism, pan-Germanism, master-race obsession and lust for power and conquest, which made war a religion.

9. Heavy industries should be limited to peacetime needs, in accordance with the Potsdam agreement, and as recommended in detail in the final report of the enemy branch of the American Foreign Economic Administration.

10. All cartels, trusts, and cartellike devices should be permanently dissolved in Germany. German participation in international organizations of these types should be forbidden.

11. The policy of deliberately withholding reparations of German factories and coal—thus preventing the economic recovery of the Allies—should be put to an end. Adequate reparations should be immediately allocated to Germany's victims. The rehabilitation of non-German European industry should have preference over the rehabilitation of German industry.

12. Germany should be given the opportunity to develop her own peaceful economy, but the revival of German prosperity constitutes the primary duty of the Germans and is in no way an obligation of the American taxpayer.

13. The privileged position of the Junkers' estates which enable the Junkers to continue as a political factor should be ended by expropriation, except in the case of proved anti-Nazis. These lands should be made available to peasants and other landless Germans with a view to maximize the production of food and other agricultural products.

14. Supervision of Germany's imports should be administered in order that Germany may never again be in a position to use her foreign trade as an instrument for the preparation of war.

15. Public or private loans or subsidies to German entities, public or private, should be prohibited, at least until the conclusion of a peace with Germany.

16. German assets in all United Nations and neutral countries shall be unearthed, marshalled, and vested in a reparation commission. The assets of Nazi victims shall be excepted. An inter-Allied and international agreement shall void all and every rule, law, and treaty which disposes otherwise. The proceeds of the liquidation of the German property shall be used in the first instance to compensate Nazi victims.

17. Allied nationals who have had, or still have, business or financial interests in Germany, directly or indirectly, or who have represented them as attorneys, should be eliminated from all posts in the Allied administration of Germany or any official capacity relating thereto.

18. In order to thwart the reestablishment of fifth columns, the infiltration of Nazi or German Fascist elements into other countries should be prevented by adequate screening of persons immigrating from Germany or from other countries and by controls imposed by individual countries on the admission of Germans. Specifically, the United States should suspend the immigration quota from Germany for 12 years, save for victims or exiles from the Hitler regime.

19. In recognition of the fact that the democratization of Germany depends in the last analysis on German democratic forces, it is urged that the occupation powers screen out and appoint to all important positions Germans who first showed opposition to the Nazi regime.

That particular emphasis be placed on screening Germans in the intellectual professions and that known anti-Nazi intellectuals from Germany and countries formerly occupied by Germany be represented on the screening commission.

20. The decisions on Germany should be embodied in a statute to be imposed on Germany. The Germans should be permitted to sign a treaty only after Allied recognition of the democratization of the German people.

The National Conference on the German Problem makes these recommendations recognizing the urgent necessity at this time to support the implementation of those principles which were originally established by the Allies at the Crimean and Potsdam Conferences and illuminated by subsequent experience—as the basis for continued Allied unity.

The conference agreed to constitute itself a permanent body.

MONOPOLIES—ARTICLES BY RICHARD L. STROUT AND THOMAS L. STOKES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the basis of local self-government and of the existence of free competitive enterprise is being steadily undermined by the progress of economic concentration.

I have in my hand an article entitled "Mergers Through a Loophole," written by Richard L. Strout for the Christian Science Monitor, and an article entitled "Threat From the Right," written by Thomas L. Stokes. I ask that both these be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has before it proposed legislation which would go far to correct the defects mentioned.

There being no objection, the articles were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

MERGERS THROUGH A LOOPHOLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The United States was built by men who believed in individualism and competitive enterprise. For that reason, the concentration of economic power into great corporations has always caused concern. Big business almost inevitably means big labor unions and big government. Where the competition of free enterprise does not police an economic system, it is inevitable that Government should step in to preserve a democracy.

The Federal Trade Commission recently issued a special report showing that since 1940, 18,000 companies were swallowed up by big corporations through purchase and merger. One big drug concern, for example, absorbed 38 smaller companies, the companies swallowed including manufacturers of baby food, floor wax, paint, spaghetti, and insecticides. A loophole in the Clayton Antitrust Act permits such a process which Congress intended to make illegal.

The Clayton Act passed in 1914. It was hailed as the doom of trusts. But trusts haven't been doomed. In fact, the process of building bigger and bigger corporations has gone on. This is because of a convenient loophole in the act. Congress believed that

monopolistic corporate mergers would be accomplished by one corporation purchasing the capital stock of another. Section 7 prohibited this. But this section was bypassed, and the plain intent of Congress defeated by another corporate device: The purchase of the physical assets of competitors, rather than their capital stock.

Company B sells its plant, machines, and facilities to Company A, and it then doesn't matter much whether it sells its stock certificates or not. The whole thing was legalized by a Supreme Court decision in 1926, in the Western Meat Co. case. It was a 5-to-4 decision, with Justices Brandeis, Taft, Holmes, and Stone all dissenting. Later the loophole was further widened by another decision, also 5 to 4.

The bipartisan Federal Trade Commission has unanimously recommended, every year since 1927, that this loophole be plugged. Congress hasn't acted. And the process of corporate expansion by merger has gone on. On March 4, the Federal Trade Commission, in a special report, pointed out with all the urgency at its command, the tremendous growth of corporate agglutination. President Truman, in his economic report to Congress made a specific recommendation for this amendment to section 7. Congress hasn't acted. The temporary National Economic Commission studied the matter carefully and made the same recommendation: Congress didn't act then either.

Now two Congressmen, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Democrat), of Wyoming, and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat), of Tennessee, have again introduced a bill to plug the loophole. Only a sense of the way the old American tradition of free competition, free enterprise, and individual initiative is being endangered will make Congress act now.

Here is how the system works. A Chicago grocery corporation has just become the largest wholesale grocer in the United States, with total assets of $20,000,000, and annual sales of $100,000,000. It did so by acquiring the assets of three competing corporations.

The Federal Trade Commission brought suit under the Clayton Act. It wanted to protect the small grocers of the Nation. But it was shown that the big corporation had surrendered to the three competing corporations all of the capital stock which it has acquired from them, and received in lieu thereof an unconditional transfer of all their assets. After that, there was nothing for the FTC to do. It was all perfectly legal. It dismissed the complaint.

There is little chance of permanently reducing the size of the Federal Government in Washington, its bureaucracy and its police powers, so long as competition is reduced and corporations get bigger and bigger. For example, if there is one big interstate grocery wholesaler instead of several local ones, the pressure for comparable Federal control is almost inevitable, and so it goes. There is danger, too, for any democracy which allows economic concentration of power to spread at the expense of small business.

[From the Washington Daily News]

THREAT FROM THE RIGHT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The Republican Congress faces a real challenge to do something about the increasing concentration of industrial control into fewer hands.

This represents a threat from the right, from ever-encroaching monopoly, that goes to the very basis of our democratic free-enterprise system. Too little attention has been paid to it thus far in the noisy clamor about the threat from the left.

Freedom can be lost more easily, probably, from the right, and less visibly, since it is already so well entrenched in business and politics from precinct to National Government. Its powerful influence is plain in the current campaigns in Congress to restrict labor, not only directly in revision of the Wagner Act but indirectly in other ways. These include weakening the Wages and Hours Act, as well as attacks in spheres where the Government has set up protective devices for the consumer, among them public-power projects.

An object lesson in the growth of the economic power of big industry came in the recent Federal Trade Commission report showing that 1,000 smaller companies had been gobbled up by larger companies between 1940 and 1946. Concentration increased during the war and is expected to proceed at a greater pace, unless checked, as it did in the boom years after World War I.

Inconsistency in the approach to monopoly in Congress is revealed most glaringly in the proposal, for example, to forbid industry-wide bargaining. Labor was forced to this to meet the power of great industrial empires stretching over many States. No comparable plan to check the growth of monopoly is offered by those who are pressing for an end of industry-wide bargaining by labor.

There is, however, a proposal sponsored by two Democrats, Representative ESTES KEFAUVER (Tennessee) and Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Wyoming), to plug one loophole in our antimonopoly statutes. It was recommended, as well, by President Truman at the beginning of this Congress.

This is for amendment of the Clayton Act to forbid monopolistic mergers by purchase of assets as well as by purchase of stock. Purchase of stock was forbidden in the original act. But this was bypassed by mergers through purchase of assets. Every year since 1927 the Federal Trade Commission has recommended closing this loophole. In his appearance before the House Judiciary Committee, Representative KEFAUVER went to the root of the present alarming monopoly trend in urging his measure, now before that committee:

"The increased concentration of economic power is dooming free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is the antithesis of meritorious competitive development.

"It is no accident now that we have a big Government, big unions, and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily leads to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily leads to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them.

"Through monopolistic mergers," the Congressman said, "the people are losing power to direct their own economic welfare.

"I am not an alarmist, but the history of what has taken place in other nations where mergers and concentrations have placed economic control in the hands of a few people is too clear to pass over easily. A point eventually is reached, and we are rapidly reaching it in this country, where the public steps in to take over when concentration and monopoly gain too much power.

"The taking over by the public through its Government always follows one or two methods and has one or two political results. It either results in a Fascist state or the nationalization of industries and thereafter a Communist state. Most businessmen realize this inevitable result. Certain monopolistic interests are being short-sighted in not appreciating the plight to which they are forcing the Government."

This is a timely warning.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 723) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 82) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1000. A bill to confer civil rights upon Indian veterans of World Wars I and II; to remove restrictions on the property of such Indians; and for other purposes; and

S. 1001. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1002. A bill to establish the effective date of certain death pensions and death compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Nuzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill 1004, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1006. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1007. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to permit assignments of insurance benefits by widows or widowers who have remarried; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1008. A bill to amend title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1009. A bill to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate Joint Resolution 94, to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

I might say that I have discussed this matter with War Department officials and the Secretary of War, and they are very agreeable to it. I ask that the chairman of the committee to which the joint resolution will be referred will expedite it as much as possible.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution expressing the conviction of Congress that there should be created a United Democratic States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

I request that a statement I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the creation of a United Democratic States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations, to consist of nations which respect the political, economical, social, and religious liberties of their respective citizens.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

I am introducing today a concurrent resolution to express the conviction of Congress that there be formed a United Democratic States of Europe within the United Nations.

The resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the creation of a United Democratic States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations, to consist of nations which respect the political, economical, social, and religious liberties of their respective citizens."

I propose that if this resolution be passed, it not be a dead letter but rather that the United States State Department policy lend every encouragement to this resolution's realization. This is not idealism nor mere verbalism; it is realism, as I see it, required by our times—realism for peace, progress, and plenty.

In introducing this resolution, I am merely renewing a recommendation which I have repeatedly made over the years to the effect that the time is long overdue for those countries of Europe which are economically, politically and socially democratic in spirit and in practice to unite in order to realize progressively the great advantages of union enjoyed by the United States of America. Such a union would consist basically, as I see it, of England, France, Switzerland, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, and Denmark, as well as possibly other countries.

WHY UNITED STATES ADVICE

It is not, of course, for the United States to tell or order any of these European nations what should be their national policy. However, in view of the fact that we have already spent some 400,000 lives of our young men and several hundred billion dollars of our resources (to mention the cost of but one of two world wars) for the preservation of European democracy, it seems to me we do have a right to submit our respectful recommendations along this line to these nations.

WHY NOT A UNION OF ALL EUROPE?

My resolution differs from one previously introduced, which would invite the establishment of a United Nations of Europe. I do not feel that if all the nations of Europe, in their present heterogeneous stage of development, were simply to combine together, the interests of peace and progress would be served.

Thus, in view of the fact that Europe is so sharply divided between the camps of democracy and dictatorship, with all sorts of shadings in between, it is a farce to speak of any effective union between, for example, the people of Scandinavia and the foreign-dominated peoples of the Soviet satellite states. A democratic-dictator hodge-podge of United Nations of Europe would experience the same frustrations and stumbling blocks that we are experiencing in the United Nations.

It is my deep and honest hope, however, that all the nations of Europe may be eventually brought into the United Democratic States of Europe through gradual changes in their political and economic processes.

REASONS FOR UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

The basic reasons for my resolution are the following:

1. If these nations are to join in political union, with common citizenship, without losing their respective governments, although surrendering some of their separate prerogatives, they would be helping to assure their common political defense against the ideological warfare waged against them by dictator states. They would evidence to Russia the vitality of democracy.

2. If we are to extend some $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey as a step to halt the spread of communism, it seems to me that a movement for political union of democracies begun from within the respective states involved would be entirely consistent with and would be of aid to our loan program.

3. They could formulate military plans against any potential aggressor.

4. If these countries will strive toward a customs union, that is, toward the breaking down of trade barriers between them, (which cannot, of course, be accomplished overnight), European recovery will be furthered as well as the recovery of these separate nations.

5. If these countries are to unite, they will set an inspiring example, not only for the peoples of all Allied countries from which freedom has been driven, but particularly for a former enemy people such as Germany.

CONCLUSION

I know and deeply respect the pride of the various democratic nations of Europe in their own institutions. But because of their perilous collective condition, it seems to me that this proposal is not inconsistent with such pride but is to their own self-advantage.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment intended to be proposed by me to S. 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that it be printed for the information of the Senate. The amendment is very short, and I shall read it:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act which shall have the object (a) of promoting the continuance or expansion of any totalitarian purpose or goal, whether communistic or fascistic; or (b) of rejecting the proposition that individuals have inalienable rights and must be both free and the masters of their government.

This amendment does three things:

First. It makes it crystal clear that the aid provided in this bill will not be used to promote ideologies which are hateful to us. Many Americans resented the aid extended last year to countries under Communist domination who were in some cases receiving our aid while shooting and killing American personnel.

Second. It shows that we are against fascism, which is but another type of totalitarianism which some persons fear to see raise its head in the Near East.

Third. It proclaims our intention at least to do no violence to the ideals of democracy. Although we shall naturally not attempt to force democracy down anyone's throat, we do hope that it will prosper in these countries. We have a basically idealistic purpose in adopting this policy. We would be neither fair to ourselves nor frank with the world if our idealism were not given specific recognition in the terms of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have modified one of the amendments which I submitted last week, and I offer a new draft of the same amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, because I think it is important, in view of the nature of the discussion in the country in respect to Senate bill 938, entitled "A bill to aid Greece and Turkey," I wish to submit an amendment, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and for the information of the Senate and the country, I wish to read it:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances: (1) if requested by any government of Greece or Turkey representing a majority of the people of either such nation; (2) if requested by a procedural vote—

Which, I interpolate, is a vote without veto—

if requested by a procedural vote in the Security Council or a majority vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations; (3) if the President finds that the purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished or are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit, by way of preliminary comment, that if such an amendment is put into the bill there can be no further remote suggestion, on the one hand, of any violation of the autonomy of either of these particular countries, or, on the other hand, any violation of the authority of the United Nations, or any disposition to elude its authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received, as in legislative session, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted an amendment, Mr. LODGE submitted two amendments, and Mr. MURRAY submitted nine amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were severally referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

SECRET TREATIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Secret Treaties," from the March 26, 1947, edition of the Omaha Evening World Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SECRET TREATIES

Now we know.

The commitments made in our names at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam have been revealed.

In full, the State Department says. The secret drawers which contained them have been opened all the way.

Free Americans will hope that this action, belated as it is, may be accepted as tacit assurance that the practice of entering into secret treaties has been abandoned, that since Potsdam the Government at Washington has followed constitutional processes in its dealings with other nations.

The Constitution is quite explicit about the handling of such matters.

It says:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur * * *"

Nothing there about "pacts" negotiated by the Chief Executive, nothing about "protocols" which would make the United States a party to scheme to plunder the riches of other nations.

"By and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Thirty Presidents had understood the meaning of that passage and had followed its bidding. Franklin Roosevelt, the thirty-first, and Harry Truman, the thirty-second, chose to ignore it.

It has been the contention of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman and their inner-circle friends that the "pacts," "protocols," etc., which they made were military agreements among Allies and were not treaties in the ordinary sense.

With respect to some of the agreements made, there is validity to that argument. At Tehran, for example, there was talk of trying to get Turkey into the war, and discussion of the impending invasion of Europe by Eisenhower's armies. That was military stuff and it was rightly kept secret.

But at Tehran it was also decided that the Western Allies would sacrifice Mihailovich in Yugoslavia and throw their support to Stalin's man, Tito. And while legalistically that may have been presented as a military decision, in actuality it was a political concession. In effect Churchill and Roosevelt were saying to Stalin, "You can take Yugoslavia to have and to hold, now and forever. If they received anything in return, it has not yet been revealed.

Whether the United States has the right to dispose of the sovereign power of another, and friendly, nation under any circumstances is a most serious problem. But certainly the Constitution does not confer any such right on the President alone, acting on his own motion without conferring with the Senate.

The most spectacular flouting of the American Constitution, however, took place at Yalta.

There the three Chiefs of State—Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin—agreed:

1. The status quo of Outer Mongolia (a Communist status quo) should be maintained.

2. Russia's rights in Asia, as they existed prior to the war of 1904, should be restored.

3. Russia should take all of Sakhalin Island.

4. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

And then came the most heavy-handed example of power politics to be found anywhere in the pacts:

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin."

The words are Roosevelt's, Churchill's, and Stalin's.

It has been said that, in making these lavish promises, President Roosevelt was trying to purchase Marshal Stalin's help in the closing phases of the war against Japan.

But if that was the case the President overlooked and failed to use the bargaining power that had been placed in his hands by lend-lease.

We were shipping war materials by the billions of dollars' worth to Russia. In response to Stalin's repeated demands we were planning an invasion of the Continent. We could have demanded in return that Russia eventually do whatever might be necessary to bring about the defeat of Japan.

But we didn't. Instead, the President, acting secretly in our name, made commitments which he had no constitutional right to make and which today cynically make us a party to Communist seizure of populations and resources on two continents.

There is one honorable way of escape from the predicament in which we have been placed. That is to serve notice on the other signatories that, under the American Constitution, we are obliged to repudiate all international agreements made secretly by a President, save only those agreements which actually were germane to the fighting of the war and are now facts accomplished.

Such a notice, if given now, probably would not greatly change the map of the world. Soviet Russia is already entrenched in the areas which were ceded to her by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

But at least such an action would advise the smaller nations of the earth, those whose friends we say we are, that as a people we regret having been a party to an imperialistic division of the world. And that henceforth we propose to conduct our foreign affairs in public, in accordance with our Constitution and the ideals of free men.

METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Right Way," published in the Boston Post, of March 21, 1947, and an editorial entitled "Mr. LODGE's Amendment," published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, of March 23, 1947, both relating to the proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by popular vote, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL MILITARY POTENTIALS—ARTICLE BY DR. LEIFUR MAGNUSSON

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Comparative Industrial Military Potential of Different Countries," by Dr. Leifur Magnusson, Assistant Director of the Department of Research, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE—LETTER FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to the reduction of appropriations for the United States Conciliation Service, published in the New York Times, of March 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TARIFF PROTECTION ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ARTICLE FROM THE FARMERS GUILD NEWS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator BUTLER Fights Farm Tariff Cuts," published in the Farmers Guild News for February–March 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. LEWIS' MEMORIAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Lewis' Memorial," published in the Washington Star, of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEORY AND COMPOSITION OF OUR ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM ARMY ORDNANCE MAGAZINE

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the theory and composition of our armed forces, published in the Army Ordnance magazine for March–April 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACTIVITIES OF THE GREEK ROYALISTS—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Monarchists Ruined Greek Economy," published in the March 31, 1947, issue of PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

COST OF POSTWAR AID—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to American expenditures for postwar aid, written by Bertram D. Hulen, and published in the New York Times of March 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to Communist activities in the United States, published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE LAKE COUNTY (TENN.) BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Aid and Hot Lunches,"

published in the March 28, 1947, issue of the Lake County Banner, of Tiptonville, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

END OF SUGAR CONTROLS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Takes a Long-Shot Bet on Sugar," published in the Washington Daily News of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRAIN SITUATION

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter and an analysis sent to him by the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, dealing with the current grain situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title II, of the Second War Powers Act.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, at the recess of the Senate on Friday afternoon I had not completed my remarks relative to the confirmation of the nominees of the President of the United States for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. It is not my intention to repeat the information which I presented then, but for the benefit of those who were not here at that time, I shall briefly review the situation and then proceed to cover the ground that I had not yet touched upon. For those who desire more complete information, I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday.

The development of atomic power is one of the most important subjects with which our people have been faced during the entire period of our history. Never before have we had a problem in our hands which if mishandled could result in the destruction of civilization as we know it. For better or for worse we are in the atomic age and there can be no turning back of the hands of the clock. There should be no procrastination in meeting the very urgent problems with which we are confronted.

This is not information which can be locked in a safe-deposit box and permanently withheld from the rest of the world. What one nation and one group of scientists can discover and develop, other nations given time, resources, and industrial capacity will develop. The only thing that we have is the atomic bomb, the industrial capacity for the production of atomic power, plus an unknown amount of time.

Those who are best informed on the subject agree that our exclusive possession, if indeed it is exclusive now, of the first two factors I have mentioned, is limited by the amount of time which remains to us before some other nation or nations shall have closed the gap. This time element may be 2 years or it may be 10 years or some period in between, but at some place within those relatively narrow limits we can be almost certain that what we like to think of now as an exclusive possession will no longer be such.

Once other nations have developed this source of power and this weapon of destruction, neither we nor our children will have any real tranquillity, nor do I believe that a world engaged in an atomic armament race could be a world in which freedom and free enterprise as we know it could exist. By the very nature of our Government and our people we would not use the weapon against others in aggressive warfare. I have no such confidence that others once having gained the power would not use it against us.

Of one thing we can be relatively certain. If the world is so unfortunate as to have a war in the atomic age where this terrible weapon of destruction will be used, there will be no period of several years for the United States to prepare itself and to arm our allies overseas. Twice in my generation the world has seen the United States furnish the logistical and manpower support which enabled our allies and ourselves to change the tide from the ebb of defeat to the flood of victory.

Any future potential aggressor nation with world-wide lust for power will first deliver a super Pearl Harbor attack against this Nation, its industrial capacity, and its means of communications. It is conceivable that such a blow might be so devastating that if it did not become a complete knockout, it would at least incapacitate us from recovering sufficiently and soon enough to be a determining factor in preventing our allies or potential allies from being engulfed.

Hence it seems clear that during the time that is left, this Nation should make every effort to secure adequate international control of atomic energy. Adequate control requires not only the most complete type of inspection and control over the raw materials that go into the development of atomic power but over the industrial facilities which are part of the development. In addition to this it should be obvious to every American as well as to all others interested in a sound system of international law and order that should a potential aggressor nation violate in any degree the inspection and regulatory system, there must be no obstacle to immediate action against the violator. As long as a veto exists in its present form in the United Nations, no such action could be taken by the forces supporting international law and order. Mr. Bernard Baruch who represented us on the United Nations agency dealing with this subject fully recognized this fundamental fact.

Until and unless these adequate and complete international safeguards are established, this Nation must not surrender either the secrets of atomic energy which we still possess or the industrial know-how without which the blueprints and calculations cannot be turned into atomic energy or the atomic bomb.

Once a nation has embarked upon a program of the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, it is 80 percent on the road to the production of the atomic bomb. Of this fact sight has been lost by many, including Mr. Henry Wallace.

We have made a generous and a far-reaching proposal to the other nations of the world relative to the international control of this vast and destructive power. It is not something that some can accept and others reject. It is not something that we can disclose to some and withhold from others. We must know soon, very soon, whether it is to be accepted or rejected.

It is my opinion that the Government will not and must not compromise the essential protective features of the Baruch proposal. If the Administration should do so—and I do not believe the executive branch of the Government will—it would not have the support of the Congress. If the Congress should permit any such compromise—and I am sure that it will not—it would not have the approval of the Nation.

Hence we come inevitably to the point relative to the security of our Nation where the only alternative to adequate international safeguards will be in this Nation keeping far ahead of all other nations in the field of nuclear science and in the development of atomic power in all its phases.

This brings us face to face with the matter now pending before the Senate.

When VJ-day came, this country had an efficient atomic organization and tremendous resources in scientists and in other necessary manpower available not only to continue the production of that which was known but also to follow the old American custom of not being satisfied with what we had already accomplished. We shall go on to explore and develop unknown fields.

The natural let-down that came with VJ-day, the long debate relative to the type of atomic control which this Nation would have, and the subsequent uncertainties growing out of the nonconfirmation to date of the members of the Commission who were appointed last October, has caused delays which are detrimental to this Nation's security and which if continued could be fatal.

The members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the general managers were appointed last October by the President of the United States under authority of legislation passed by the Congress. The Congress recognized that this great potential source of power for good or evil by its very nature would have to be under the control of the Government even in this land of free enterprise. There was not then, and by the nature of things there cannot be now, an alternative to such domestic control of atomic power.

Since midnight on December 31 the entire facilities of the Manhattan district with all its ramifications have been turned over to the Atomic Energy Commission. Most, if not all, of the secrets that were in the hands of General Groves and his associates of the Manhattan

project are now and have been in the hands of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission. Pursuant to Public Law 585 (the Atomic Energy Act), the President on December 31, 1946, by Executive Order 9816, directed the transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission of all fissionable material, atomic weapons, facilities for producing fissionable material or atomic-energy devices, and all Government-owned records concerning atomic energy. No rejection by the Senate can change this fact.

In order to correct what I believe to be a serious defect in the existing law, I have had prepared and today will introduce a bill amending the Atomic Energy Act by providing that in the future the President shall not submit to the Senate for confirmation for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission the name of any individual until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made and submitted to the President a full report on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

Should the Senate reject these nominations or approve of the flank attack motion to recommit to committee, which is tantamount to rejection, irreparable damage to this nation would, in my opinion, result in at least three major respects: First, it would result in a considerable additional loss of time and we have not much time to spare. Second, the damage to the morale of the scientists working in the atomic project directly and cooperating with it on the outside would be tremendous—far greater than one cares to speak or even think about. Third, atomic energy is not only a major domestic problem but by its very nature is world wide in scope. Our action on the floor of the Senate is being closely followed by every nation on the face of the earth. A repudiation by the Senate of the United States of the President's appointments would do such incalculable harm that I have grave doubt whether the subsequent passage of the Greek loan legislation, the peace treaties, or any other action which we might later take could offset the damage.

These reasons alone are sufficient to cause me not only to vote for confirmation but to make such contribution as is within my power to assure confirmation by this body.

As I pointed out on Friday last, if there had been any question in my mind as to the loyalty of any of these men to the Government of the United States or to the Constitution of our country, I would not have supported them in committee or on the floor of the Senate. I reiterate that there is not one bit of evidence that supports directly or indirectly any such theory. These men are not Communists or Communist sympathizers. They are patriotic American citizens.

For approximately 5 weeks the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee, consisting of five Republicans and four Democrats, listened to the testimony of the nominees themselves and of other witnesses. During that period of time we were able to examine and cross examine all who appeared before us. We had additional sources of information open to us.

I reiterate that to date no new evidence of a substantial nature has been presented to the Senate that was not available to the committee when the nominations were before it. By a vote of 8 to 1 the committee recommends the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal.

In a matter of this kind it is fitting and proper that the Senate should proceed with diligence. I have previously cited some overwhelming reasons which seem to me to warrant prompt confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, I believe that David Lilienthal is well qualified for the position of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There has been the question raised on the floor of the Senate by one or more of my colleagues on this side of the aisle as to whether Mr. Lilienthal is the most qualified man for the position. I do not know that any man could honestly answer that question in either the affirmative or the negative. This is a new field of activity in which no man, by the very nature of things, has had experience.

I have no hesitation in saying, however, that I believe that Mr. Lilienthal has qualities which would place him in the top category of the candidates for the position in the field that the President had available to choose from.

Under the act itself it is provided that those who serve on the Commission must disassociate themselves from all business activities. The exact language is:

> No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

It has been reported to me—and I believe the information is reliable—that the President sought to interest several other high-caliber men and was not successful in so doing.

It is understandable how, during wartime, men with other responsibilities will make the necessary sacrifices to take on Government positions, and yet, when peace comes, they are reluctant to do so. Part of this, of course, is due to the fact that positions carrying equal or less responsibility pay much better in private industry than in government. Part of it, we must be frank to admit, grows out of a perfectly natural reluctance to go through the harassment that we in Congress sometimes put our public officials up against.

I make no criticisms of the Congress and its committees in making searching inquiries. We understand that it is a necessary part of our responsibilities. We must get factual information on which to base our decisions on legislation or on national policy. Yet, from the point of view of a busy executive, it is understandable how he can sometimes question the necessity for the duplication of committee hearings which we sometimes inflict upon those who also have their jobs to do.

At any rate, the President of the United States did appoint Mr. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Commission. In his letter to the chairman of our committee, the President, in his reply of March 1, 1947, had this to say:

> For your information, be advised that the records of the investigation agencies of the executive branch of the Government were checked at the time the appointees in question were named to the Commission. No derogatory information was contained in any report. Before answering your letter of February 25, I have had a current check made of the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments, and the intelligence section of the Manhattan District, and I wish to advise you that no derogatory information with reference to any of their appointments to the Commission, or with reference to the general management of the Commission, is contained in the files of these agencies.

Now this is the statement of the President of the United States, an able and distinguished former Member of the Senate. Upon him had been placed the terrible final decision on the dropping of the atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Unless one wants to raise a question as to whether the President of the United States would be careless in appointments of this kind when he has full knowledge not only of the destructive capacity of the atomic bomb, but also full knowledge of the efforts and resources that went into its development and use, it would seem to me that his word should be sufficient.

Mr. Lilienthal as Chairman of the TVA has had more experience than any other available man in operating a Government agency of the general type and character of the Atomic Energy Commission. I refer to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The qualifications that make him objectionable to some make him appear to me to be a man who would be well suited for the tremendous task at hand.

Very often businessmen or attorneys coming into Government for the first time from private life are lost in the maze of what we sometimes call Government bureaucracy, or they become discouraged from what seems to be and often is an endless amount of red tape; or after being in Government for a relatively short period of time they take themselves and their experience into private business where the remuneration is many times greater.

To the contrary, in Mr. Lilienthal we have a man who has devoted a considerable period of his adult life to the public service as a member of the Wisconsin utilities commission, as a member and later Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and now as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He has demonstrated an interest in and a willingness to serve his country. He has demonstrated that he is a real public servant who feels that in Government he can make a contribution to the public welfare.

Now what are some of these qualifications. Friday I pointed out that Mr. Baruch said:

> Mr. Lilienthal I have known for some time and I think he is a well-qualified man. He is a man of prodigious energy, of driving force. I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty he drives exceedingly hard.

Mr. President, I submit that this is just the type of man one needs in order to restimulate the development of atomic power and to bring this activity back to its high degree of productivity and to advance research in unexplored fields.

My capable colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in a speech on the floor of the Senate on March 26, read into the RECORD some quotations from the philosophy of Mr. Lilienthal relative to management. Among the quotes read at that time was the following:

> The tradition and climate of the skill of management, however, are remote from all such negation. Management is affirmative and initiatory. This is to be done. It is in the process of defining, with skill and sense, what is to be done, and with it the fixing of responsibility for results, with wide freedom of judgment in the managers as to how it may best be done, that you have the essence of the best form of modern management.

What apparently my distinguished colleague from Michigan thinks is derogatory to Mr. Lilienthal I feel is a distinct asset. If there was ever a place where we needed someone with the capacity to say "This is to be done" and who would push on to get results, this is certainly the place and it appears to be that this is the man.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the language "this shall be done"?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly American business has developed over the years because management in private enterprise has developed along the same lines.

I certainly mean no disrespect to the Congress of the United States when I say that few if any businesses could survive the bickering and the delay which often result from some of our activities.

Private enterprise could not survive the wide changes of policy for which we in the Government are sometimes responsible. One year we expand Government activities and Government services. The next year we make such drastic curtailments that we not only are apt to destroy the morale of loyal public employees but also to disrupt completely the services we have established resulting in a loss of investments already made. How many businesses could stand such wide sweeps of the pendulum of policy? I know of none.

Last November I went down into Tennessee Valley to see that activity for myself. I had heard a great deal about it in the past, and had read much about it. I was favorably impressed with the high caliber of the men I met in the Tennessee Valley Authority organization. I was even more impressed with the high regard the public had for the job that was and is being done.

The people in the Tennessee Valley were in no sense captivated by ideas of a super State or of the control by Government of our free enterprise system. To the contrary they were as stout believers in the American system of free enterprise as will be found in any part of the Nation.

Far from trying to control their community life or their individual businesses, the TVA had in effect thrown them the ball, and it was the job of the local community and the individual citizens to carry it.

The TVA had aided in the development of waterways, flood control and new sources of power. It had assisted in the development of fertilizers and in the demonstration of the effectiveness of their constructive use. It had been alive to the possibilities of the development of demonstration projects for a range of activities from quick freezing to the development of new uses for wood products. But the important thing to keep in mind is that these studies and developments were made available to private capital and private enterprise that established themselves throughout the valley. This not only resulted in diversified industries but it furnished new markets for the farmers so that agriculture would not be dependent upon one or two major crops for the economic health of the Tennessee Valley. Along with the other activities a great deal of work has been done relative to the prevention of soil erosion—again with encouragement given to the individual to carry the ball once he had the best information available to him as to how it could be done.

In carrying on his obligations as Chairman of the TVA, I believe that Mr. Lilienthal made a great contribution to the American way of life. What he accomplished was within the letter and the spirit of the TVA Act. But the energy of the man and the inspiration that he gave to his associates transformed legal phrases and policies on paper into a dynamic actuality which meant better farms, more industries, more jobs and a better way of life.

While some may feel that his experience in the TVA disqualifies him for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, I feel that it is one of the strong points in his favor.

By this I do not mean that I see eye to eye with Mr. Lilienthal on all his beliefs, economic or political. To the contrary, we no doubt are in disagreement at many places along the line.

As a member of the Atomic Energy Committee I have vigorously expressed myself as being in disagreement with certain of the policies of the Commission.

From time to time, as a member of the joint committee charged with the responsibility of liaison between the Commission and the Congress, I shall not hesitate to oppose any policy or contemplated action which I believe to be not in line with the congressional will or sound national policy. Without pretending to speak for the other members of the committee, I am certain that they will not hesitate to likewise vigorously express their views to the Commission and to the Congress.

This will be done under section 15 (b) of the act which states:

> The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind as to the necessity for adequate safeguards of information. Section 10 of the act provides:

> Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully, having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with, any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, instrument, appliance, note, or information involving or incorporating restricted data (A) communicates, transmits, or discloses the same to any individual or person, or attempts or conspires to do any of the foregoing, with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by death or imprisonment for life.

The law further provides:

> (ii) Except as authorized by the Commission in case of emergency, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

To carry out this provision and other security regulations an initial transfer of $1,000,000 from the Atomic Energy Commission's funds to the Federal Bureau of Investigation was made in November 1946, and later an additional $4,000,000 was transferred to the FBI for the same purpose.

The acting members of the Atomic Energy Commission are fully alive to the grave responsibilities that rest upon them, not only in the vital field of security but also in the operation of existing facilities and in research and development. Within a very short time the budget requests and appropriations will have to be provided if the United States is to maintain its position in the field of atomic power.

For the reasons I have cited Friday and today and for others I cannot now discuss, I believe that the facts are overwhelming on the side of prompt confirmation of the Presidential nominees.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am confused by the issue presented by the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If I am correctly informed, the committee of which the Senator from California is a member met for a period of more than five consecutive weeks?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And the members of the committee attended all its sessions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And all the charges which have been suggested on the floor were aired before that committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And at the conclusion of the examination of all the witnesses the vote was 8 to 1 for confirmation, as I recall.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the Lilienthal nomination.

Mr. SMITH. I am wondering what is the significance of the motion that the whole matter be recommitted to the committee and also that the FBI be asked to investigate the nominees, when apparently the committee has gone into the subject fully. I understood from the Senator's statement that the President had assured him that these names had

been cleared by the FBI; and unless the Senator wishes to repudiate the President's statement to him, that would seem to be the controlling factor in the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The communication from the President of the United States stated that prior to the time they were appointed a check had been made from the files of the FBI, the Army and Navy Intelligence, and the other agencies which he had at his disposal, and that after receiving the letter from the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a recheck of the files had been made and that no derogatory information had been included in any of those files.

Mr. SMITH. What troubles me is this: It seems to me that the motion of the Senator from Ohio is an appeal to the Senate from the committee which held the hearings, and from the evidence before the committee. It is asking the Senate to refer the matter back as though it had no confidence in the committee. I am bound to say that when I read the names of the distinguished members of the committee I should hesitate a long time before I would vote lack of confidence in the ability, judgment, and sincerity of the members of the committee, who are as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Only the Senator from Ohio voted in the negative.

On the particular issue of the motion that is what troubles me. It seems to me that recommitting the nominations could only delay the settlement of a matter which is demanding immediate attention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. As I pointed out in my remarks, I believe that a vote to recommit is tantamount to a vote for rejection.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that I feel there is perhaps a loophole in the Senate's practice relative to appointments of members of commissions, including the Atomic Energy Commission, which has concerned me greatly, and I tried to point it out during the course of my remarks. The Commission was appointed, under the law, in October and November of last year. On December 31 the Manhattan Project, with all its ramifications and all the information, was turned over to the Commission, so that actually the nominees have been operating as a commission during the intervening period from January until this time, approximately the 1st of April, without Senate confirmation. I had requested the Legislative Counsel to draft legislation which I thought would close the loophole so that the Commission could not operate until the nominations of its members had been confirmed by the Senate, which I think would be a far better procedure, especially in the field of atomic power.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But we ran up against the Constitution of the United States. Of course, at the time the Constitution was drafted and adopted the country had no knowledge of atomic power and its ramifications. In article II of the Constitution we find this language:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

The Legislative Counsel advises that there is no way to require confirmation prior to their taking over.

Then it seemed to me it would be wise to apply—and I am presenting such an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act—to the members of the Commission the same rule which is now applied to employees of the Commission; that is, to make it mandatory that an investigation shall be made by the FBI, the results of which shall be turned over to the President and to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy prior to any appointment being made. I believe that from a constitutional standpoint, that can be done.

Mr. SMITH. To amplify my point, that would mean that all officers and employees heretofore appointed by the Commission would be checked by the FBI automatically?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as employees are concerned, they are now covered by the existing statute; but the statute does not provide for a mandatory check by the FBI of Presidential appointees.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to introduce the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a copy of the bill I introduced earlier today proposing an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 2 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the second sentence in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No individual shall be appointed as a member of the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the President on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee and shall make available to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report of such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."
>
> (b) Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No individual shall be appointed as General Manager until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the President on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee and shall make available to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report of such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask a question. At the close of the Senator's remarks he gave this citation from the law:

> No individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

I ask whether or not the record shows that after this Commission was appointed and organized, all its present employees, or employees at any time, were investigated by the FBI and reports thereon were made to the Commission?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator's question I wish to point out that in the first place, the Senator must examine the whole problem with which they were faced. They took over from the Army the Manhattan project in all its ramifications. There is a specific provision further on in the act that those who were in the Manhattan project could be continued in their employment. As to the other employees, it is my information that in conformity with the act, the FBI was asked to report on all of them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the FBI so report; and if so, has the Senate committee seen the reports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it was very clearly pointed out the other day by my colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that it was not the job of the committee to go through the many hundreds or ultimately thousands of reports on individual employees of the Manhattan project, because that is an administrative job; but he did request certain information regarding certain of the employees; and those reports were, at his request, furnished to the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were they put into the record?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me? I can clear up this point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to know whether the reports were put into the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, they were not put into the record, and the committee never contemplated putting into the record reports of such a confidential nature as were made by that agency. The committee did ask for the full investigatory reports on approximately 15 or 20 of the key personnel of the Commission. In each case the complete report was furnished to the committee. The committee still has in its possession those original reports, and the committee examined the original reports and asked that a short digest be made of some of the reports in which some matters of interest might be developed. That was done.

I say to the Senator from Michigan that I think it is completely inadvisable, and would defeat the very purpose of the investigatory agency of the Government, to have confidential and extensive reports on the minutiae of the past, present, and future of every person employed, made a matter of public record. For one reason, certain sources of information would immediately be closed if those reports were made public. It would be practically impossible for the FBI or the Army Intelligence Service or the Navy Intelligence Service to acquire information about various persons if the sources of the information were to be made public and were to be spread all over the public records of this body.

Therefore the committee had to assume the responsibility, and did and does assume the responsibility, of saying to the Senate that a thorough combing of those reports was made, and that reports and digests were prepared only in the case of certain instances involving matters which the committee was quite certain would be of interest to the committee, or matters that might not have been clearly established as being above criticism and objection. We have the complete reports. I forget the exact number of them, but they relate to 16 or 17 of the key, controlling administrative officials of the Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] inserted in the RECORD a paraphrase of those reports. I assume that the Senator from Iowa is familiar with that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; as to about four or five persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the committee make any further search to ascertain why Mr. Marks was not able to obtain a commission in the Navy? He is the chief counsel for the Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the circumstances are these, and they were discussed the other day: Our special committee has no authority, I am convinced, to command the services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As I pointed out the other day, the joint committee does have such authority, beyond any question. But the matter we are now discussing is not a joint committee action. When the question concerning Mr. Marks came up, the material was digested and submitted, along with other matters which might have raised some doubt in the minds of the members of the committee. The committee asked that this file be sent back for recheck and reexamination. It was so sent back, through the proper channels.

The report came back to us with about 10 or 12 additional pages, but in the language or the conclusions or the ultimate statements contained in the new review there was no change from the old review. It stands now as it did then, with substantially the same language, and that is the language in the record.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask whether the committee saw fit to call or did call anyone from the Navy, to ascertain why the general counsel of the Commission was not permitted to obtain a Navy commission. I should like to have the RECORD show that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The answer is "No," Mr. President. We did not call anyone from the Navy on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from California if he knows whether other appointments to high positions in the Government are customarily investigated by the FBI before the nominations are acted upon by the Senate. Was the recent appointment to the Securities and Exchange Commission investigated by the FBI, or was the recent appointment to the Maritime Commission investigated by the FBI? Are the American representatives on the international organizations set up within the United Nations investigated by the FBI? If they are not, I should like to know why there is this sudden demand for an FBI investigation of one David E. Lilienthal. Why should such a demand happen to come at this time, although there has been no open demand for such an investigation of other appointees, such as the ones I have mentioned, any one of whom could do irreparable harm to our country if he were so minded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that in respect to judicial appointments of Federal district judges and United States attorneys, I believe it is customary for the Department of Justice to make an examination and investigation of the appointees, and its report resulting therefrom is made available, at times, I understand, if not to the full committee, at least to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not believe it is the customary practice to make an investigation of the type the Senator has suggested, in regard to other high Government officials and employees.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. However, in all fairness, I should say that, of course, we are dealing here with a subject the very nature of which might well warrant, and in my opinion would warrant, a more thorough investigation than perhaps would be given in the case of most Presidential appointees.

Mr. AIKEN. But it is apparent that any one of a dozen appointees of the President could do a great deal of harm to their country if they were so minded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. AIKEN. I see no reason why they should not be subject to investigation, just as much as Mr. Lilienthal and his associates are. I cannot see any comparison between 50 percent of loyalty to one's country and 100 percent loyalty. If they are disloyal in any degree, or if they are in a position to be disloyal in any degree, they should be subjected to a special investigation, just as much as the appointees now being considered by the Senate should be. I do not understand why there is this sudden demand for investigation by the FBI, and why that demand is directed at Mr. Lilienthal as if he were potentially the greatest traitor the country could ever have, when, so far as the committee could find, not a vestige of disloyalty was indicated by the testimony which came before the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator agree with me that, in view of the fact that the Senate of the United States and its Members have to pass on Mr. Lilienthal and all major appointments, it might be a good plan to have the FBI investigate the Senate of the United States first—each individual Senator?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and while they are investigating, should we not have the FBI investigate the President of the United States, who makes such appointments?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only difference is that both the President and the Senate of the United States are elected by the people and the others are appointees coming up for confirmation. However, the danger to the Nation of a disloyal person might be as great in one instance as in the other.

Mr. AIKEN. No elected official has a right to appoint disloyal persons to positions of such great importance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. This discussion about the FBI and the investigation of officials, more or less political in nature, raises in my mind a most serious question. No person has a higher regard for the FBI, in the discharge of its proper functions, than I have. But I wish to point out to Senators that the FBI is a police organization. It is more or less in the nature of a secret police organization, and I wonder if Senators are standing on the floor of the Senate advocating that the time has come when the Senate of the United States, in the exercise of its constitutional functions, has to have reports from a police agency. I think there is grave danger in what is being suggested here today.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand the Senator from California, the bill which he has introduced this morning would require the same investigation of those who may be appointed in the future to the Atomic Energy Commission as my motion of last Friday would require of those who have already been appointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact is, as I pointed out in my remarks, that since October the present members of the Commission have been serving as members of the Commission, and since December 31 the present members of the Commission have been de facto the Commission, with all the power, all the responsibilities, all the control over the Manhattan project, with all its secrets and all its ramifications. So that they have all the knowledge which General Groves and his assistants had, and no action which the Senate could take in rejecting these nominations could change that fact in the slightest. However, I believe there is legitimate criticism as to a loophole in the law, and the bill introduced by me would require in the future, prior to the time the President makes the appointments, a complete investigation by the FBI of any Presidential appointee, as is now required in the case of employees of the Commission, and a complete report would have to be furnished to the Senate section of the joint committee.

Mr. BRICKER. Is there any inference in the statement of the Senator that those who have been appointed already and who know the secrets, although the Senate has not passed on their nominations, would in any way reveal those secrets?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe any of these men would, and if I had thought for a moment that any of the members of the Commission, who had been appointed by the President of the United States, or the General Manager, was in the least degree disloyal to this Nation, or was a Communist, or a Communist sympathizer to the least extent, I would have voted against him in the committee, and I would be making a fight against him on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe they are anything but loyal American citizens, and that is why I am going to vote for their confirmation.

Mr. BRICKER. If there is any doubt in the mind of anyone that these men would get into any of the classifications the Senator has described, certainly they were not the men to be appointed in the first instance. Is not that true?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume that the President would not have appointed them had there been such a doubt.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to make one more suggestion. I am advised that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] asked two or three questions of the Senator from California in regard to whether or not there had been an investigation by the full committee. These records did not come to the committee until the day before the final meeting, and it was then in executive session. It was at that time that I asked that there be a complete hearing on all the appointees, that counsel be employed to make the investigation, and that there be brought to the attention of the Senate all the details of the investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I point out to the Senate, as I did on Friday, that my distinguished colleague from Ohio was a regular attendant at the meetings, and was very sincere in his belief, just as the other eight of the nine members are very sincere in their beilef, that the information which has been brought to the Senate to date is not information additional to what the committee had before it. The Senator is correct in saying that that information did not come in public hearings, but by the very nature of the Atomic Energy Act, and the very nature of the joint committee, and the Senate section of the committee which has been set up, there have been in the past times when we had to hold executive sessions and there will in the future be many more times when we will have to do so. The Senator is correct that this matter came up in executive session. My point was that information had been brought to the attention of the Senate section of the joint committee relative to the names of four or five persons.

Mr. BRICKER. It was my motion before the committee that a complete investigation be made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], has pointed out that at the request of the Senator from Ohio the executive director of the committee went through the records we had, and did make the analysis or résumé to which the Senator from Ohio has referred.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the analysis or synopsis I filed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I propounded a question when the Senator from Ohio, I think, was out of the Chamber. My question was whether he was basing his motion, which is before us, on the fact that some newly discovered evidence had come in which the committee had not discovered.

Mr. BRICKER. It is information which in my judgment should be brought to the attention of the Senate before confirmation is had.

Mr. SMITH. It had been brought before the committee?

Mr. BRICKER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH. When the committee voted they knew it was there. That is my point.

Mr. BRICKER. Substantially the same information. There was one further question, I think, asked by the Senator from New Jersey, that is, whether the President had cleared these appointments. There was no investigation made by the FBI and there was no request made by the President for an investigation by the FBI.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator says all this evidence was before the Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. BRICKER. A report was made. I do not think any member of the committee read the report. I do not know that they did. They might have. There was a report substantially along the lines I brought to the attention of the Senate last Friday, made by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I can clear that up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me to ask a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to have the Senator permit me to make the answer, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Reports on the key employees of the Commission were requested upon the order or direction of the committee. As chairman of the committee, I was directed to request the reports. I did so. The reports came to my office. On two or three occasions, at least two that I know of, I took the entire files of the reports to the committee meeting. Each report was available for the complete and unhampered inspection of every member of the committee.

Mr. JENNER. Is that true also——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me go a step further. The committee instructed me to have these reports examined by the executive director and by myself, that a résumé of any matters we felt might be submitted to the committee as matters in question should be made, that we should make that sort of a digest. That was done. The reports were always open and available to every member of the committee. The Senator from Ohio had some of them.

Mr. BRICKER. I had three of them, and I read three of them completely.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thought it was perhaps four, but, anyway, it was three. Any member of the committee had full access to them.

I may say to the Senator from Indiana that only in four or five instances were there matters which were not completely clear, matters which as chairman I thought it my duty to call to the attention of the committee for whatever judgment they wanted to pass upon them, and with the files available for a detailed examination of these reports by the members of the committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether or not the committee also had the information that was produced on the floor last Friday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Delaware appeared before our committee in executive session. I thought I explained that last Friday. The Senator from Delaware appeared before our committee and had information with

regard to two or three cooperative corporations. As it was clearly pointed out by him last Friday, and agreed to by those who were there, he did not at that time have so complete and detailed information as he presented last Friday on certain matters, and it was generally agreed that at that time it was not such a matter as created any particular furor. We asked Mr. Lilienthal to give an explanation, and that was given. That explanation was turned over to the Senator from Delaware, and is a part of the executive meeting records.

Mr. JENNER. As I understand, Mr. Lilienthal in his duties as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is supposed to devote all his time to the Commission, and is to have no other outside interests. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not read the law on that point. I will take the Senator's word about it.

Mr. JENNER. I think the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to it. Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator referring to the TVA?

Mr. JENNER. No; I am referring to his present position.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall, the law requires him to give his full time to the duties of the office.

Mr. JENNER. Then has anyone on the committee investigated whether or not Mr. Lilienthal has given up his activities with the various corporations, in the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President; it has been very clearly established, that, I think in 1936, Mr. Lilienthal gave up his activities with such corporations. The Senator from Delaware could give us more information on that, but we cleared that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I cannot yield interminably, because I owe an obligation to the House to have a conference report acted on by the Senate. If it be agreeable to the Senators, I suggest that I be permitted to proceed, and that when I have concluded with this matter, they may then continue their discussion.

TERMINATION OF WAR POWERS AND CONTROLS UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

(See conference report printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILEY, on March 28, 1947, p. 2828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conferees met and worked all Saturday afternoon, and agreed to their report, about 6 o'clock. What we agreed upon is set forth, I think, quite succinctly in section 1501, of the conference report, which I shall take the liberty of reading:

SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes—

This is the important part of it—

(a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what the materials or facilities are that will be covered under paragraph (a) and upon which international commitments have been made?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall have to read in connection with (e) the subsequent language, and then I will come back to the question and try to answer it:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

I take it that what the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana wishes to know is, what is going to happen to rice, meat and meat products, fats and oils, grain and grain products, which are not mentioned in the language of the bill that I have quoted.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. There is no way of telling by reading section (e).

Mr. WILEY. Let us go back to the subdivision (e) and see if we cannot understand just what that means:

Allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments.

It must be realized, first, that what happened on this was that the House accepted our version, that controls should continue until the 30th of June. Under their bill it was continued into October, so they accepted our philosophy in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in the House bill most of these articles were excepted, particularly rice, that the Senator has just mentioned, and that are now included under (e) by way of commitments?

Mr. WILEY. I will have to answer one question before I proceed to argue another. If it is understood that the conferees agreed first that all those controls that are not mentioned should be lifted as of March 31, which is today, those that are mentioned extend until the 30th of June, only; so we come down to the Senator's question of what controls are mentioned. In order to reach that conclusion we had to realize that this Government has, in the international food arrangement, certain commitments or understandings relative to the feeding of the world, but it is also necessary to understand that we, of the Senate and of the House, have not been fully advised by the executive branch of the Government in regard to this matter, though for months we have been trying to obtain information, and the information we received came to us only after the 14th of March; so all the conferees agreed that it was advisable to extend the period of necessary control until the 30th of June.

Now what are these controls? First, let us consider rice. The rice control is only a set-aside order transferring it for Government use.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that whatever set-aside order has already been made in regard to rice will cover all commitments made for the future? In other words, will the Government be able to obtain a greater amount of rice or other grains or commodities to ship abroad than have already been set aside by way of commitments already made?

Mr. WILEY. I would say that the meaning of paragraph (e) is that if the Secretaries of State and Commerce both certify that between now and June 30 it is imperatively necessary to set aside additional amounts in order to meet our foreign commitments, even the set-aside order which has been in effect in the past would not limit the power of Government to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the Senator interprets the language to relate to additional commitments as well as to commitments already made? I believe the Senator is in error or he may misunderstand what I am driving at.

Mr. WILEY. We have not interfered with the power which now exists in Government to meet an emergency that might arise between now and the 30th of June. I know what the Senator has in mind. During the period the set-aside order was in existence sometimes the Government set aside 50 percent, sometimes 60 percent, and sometimes 30 percent of the rice production.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the case of rice there has been as much as 40 percent set aside and——

Mr. WILEY. There has been as much as 70 percent set aside.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greatest percentage has escaped my mind at the moment. The world production of rice is now within 4 percent of the average produced from the 1935–36 season to the 1939–40 season. The rice crop in the United States for 1946 is officially estimated at 70,000,000 bushels, which is 40 percent larger than the 1937–41 average, and approximately 57½ percent

larger than the average of the 10 prewar years.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the amount of rice produced in the United States is less than 1 percent of the world's normal production, and is twice as much as is consumed in the United States. For that reason I feel that rice should be taken entirely from all controls. Our production makes such a small dent on world consumption that our rice producers and millers should be left to expand their own markets here in this country and abroad, particularly to its traditionally good customers such as Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Mr. WILEY. I can say to the distinguished Senator that other Members of Congress felt the same way, but after all we have to have a basis on which minds in both the House and the Senate could meet, and it was finally agreed to have controls under title 3 of the Second War Powers Act and the Export Control Act expire on the same date. Recognizing the fact that neither the House nor the Senate, because of the Executive failure to give us full information, had the information that was necessary, we had to provide a stopgap.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin know the reason for taking the determination of controls away from the Department of Agriculture and placing them in the Departments of State and Commerce. I understand this is a House proviso. The Department of Agriculture, as I understand, has been the agency of the Government of the United States which has represented us on the Food and Agricultural Organization and also on the International Food Council. I was wondering why the right to make these determinations was lodged with the State and Commerce Departments rather than with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say again that rice, about which we have been speaking, is included in the International Emergency Food Council agreement, and my recollection of what was stated in the conference is that none of the controls we have in mind was exercised by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as that goes, the Department of Agriculture advises me that they intend to take controls off rice within a very short time anyway.

Mr. WILEY. Then, that answers this part of the report that has been brought into question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the control of rice was continued by the Senate bill for 90 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, Mr. President, but my question had to do with——

Mr. TAFT. It was also continued by the House bill for 90 days. Therefore the conference could do nothing about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, no, Mr. President, when we agreed in haste to the Senate bill I was aware of the fact that the House had stricken out rice as well as wheat and other grains, and I did not desire to raise the issue on the floor and thereby precipitate debate, but hoping that the conferees could get together and agree to strike out rice and grain and other commodities from the Senate bill.

Mr. TAFT. The House may have stricken those particular grains, but the House bill contained the provision:

(e) Allocation of materials or equipment for export which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce are necessary to meet international commitments.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand that language applies to commitments already made. It would not mean the increase of commitments already made, would it?

Mr. TAFT. No; that language expressly provides that if the commodities were not already allocated on March 24, 1947, no allocation could be made. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to again ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin a question similar to that I propounded to him, last Friday, when the Senate bill was up for consideration: The compromise does not in any wise deal with price control, but it simply attempts to provide that the allocation and rationing authority as to certain named articles and the commitment of materials and facilities already made shall expire at the same time—that is, on June 30—as price controls? Is that not a correct summary of what will be done should the report be adopted?

Mr. WILEY. The reason the House agreed to that provision was, I think, they saw the logic of making the date June 30, because the so-called export controls under the Export Act expire at that time unless we extend them, and we felt in evaluating the whole picture that the only way to do was to bring them both to a joint expiration date, and then we could determine between now and then those controls that could safely be allowed to expire and those that should be continued.

Mr. ELLENDER. And what I previously indicated is, to a large extent, what the compromise provides?

Mr. WILEY. That is what the bill does.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know the reason why the House bill transferred these controls from the Department of Agriculture to the Departments of Commerce and State? I do not really think it makes any difference in the exercise of the controls, but it would be interesting to know why it was done.

Mr. WILEY. My recollection of what was stated in the conference is that in relation to the International Emergency Food Council agreement the Departments of Commerce and State really had the matters in charge.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The reason those words are found in the bill is that they were in the bill sent to the House by the President. He wrote those words in the bill, and the House never changed them. The provision does not transfer the control to the Departments of State and Commerce. It merely permits the Departments of State and Commerce to certify the fact that certain commodities are connected with international commitments. After that the Department of Agriculture continues controlling just as in the past.

Mr. AIKEN. The provision really transfers the determination of the matter, however.

Mr. TAFT. The determination of whether certain items are included in the provisions of the bill or not.

Mr. AIKEN. Then I understand we have to look to the President for an answer to that question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I was going to ask the Senator in charge of the conference report if the remarks made during the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana pertaining to rice are not also applicable in exactly the same way to grain and grain products, and the milling of grain and grain products.

Mr. WILEY. That raises a somewhat different question. The present control in relation to grain and grain products under this particular act is an importation control, but I feel——

Mr. BUTLER. Importation or exportation control?

Mr. WILEY. No; importation control. It happens to be War Food Order 63. On the other hand, I do not think there need be any fear that between now and June 30 the Government is going to alter the picture by extending its controls in that direction. However, I want to be frank about the matter. There was no intention between now and June 30 to limit the Government in fulfilling its obligations under the International Emergency Food Council agreement.

Mr. BUTLER. That would refer to exports.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that would come under the Export Act, anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. In that connection subdivision (e) and, in fact, the entire section, refers to the power of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce in making certain certifications. I assume they certify to the President. To whom do they certify?

Mr. WILEY. To the President. This is really a limitation in relation to all future controls, some of which I have mentioned, including those on rice, Cheddar cheese, meats, fats, beans, peas, proteins, grain, and grain products.

Mr. BUTLER. That limitation is to meet international commitments already made, is it not?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Not international commitments that may be made hereafter. As I understand, it does not refer to new international commitments, but to commitments which are now on the books.

Mr. WILEY. I do not believe that that exact question arose. I presume

that what we had in mind was that between now and June 30, in this world of crises and troubles, the power was still lodged in the President to do that which he thought was necessary to meet international commitments. Or let us put it this way—to meet commitments in the International Emergency Food Council agreements.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike reopening the question, but the purpose is simply and solely to carry out commitments already made. The provision is not to apply to additional future commitments.

Mr. BUTLER. That was my impression, and I wanted that fact brought out.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding; and I am sure that is the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. During the past—I believe under the War Powers Act—certain controls over the milling industry have been in effect. The industry was required to grind a certain percentage of the wheat into flour. Instead of grinding 60 percent flour it had to make 70 or 80 percent flour from wheat. Is that power extended under this measure, or is it dropped?

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator in mind any particular control? The Senator was talking about grain and grain products.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. We asked the President to submit to us—which he did—a list of the controls still in existence under title III. The only order I find anywhere in relation to grain and grain products is War Food Order 63, which is an importation control. That is all the authority that was exercised under title III of the Second War Powers Act. That is all the authority that is now being exercised. Of course there is no intent by this conference report to interfere with any other laws under which the President may exercise certain authority.

Mr. BUTLER. If I correctly understand the chairman of the committee, this provision applies only to commitments which have already been made.

Mr. WILEY. This is the language:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

Counsel for the committee has stated that the language of the bill limits the commodities in all respects to such as were under allocation on March 24, 1947.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, as I understand, it is the Senator's opinion that it does not affect the grinding order. The Senator knows what 50 percent flour, 60 percent flour, and 80 percent extraction mean. I am anxious to know if under this provision the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce could require that the extraction orders which were issued to the mills shall not be renewed.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think I can answer that question, because the subject is not covered in the bill one way or the other. What we are trying to do is to maintain the status quo of existing orders, with the possible exception, under subclause (e), of "materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments." The Government is not limited except as stated in the proviso:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

A further proviso is:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof.

The first proviso, as I have already stated, is:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

That is a limitation with respect to title III. But there may be other authority; and I believe that subclause (e) does not limit the President if a certificate is forthcoming from the Secretaries of State and Commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must insist that, as I understand the language, under subclause (e) it refers to commitments already made, and does not apply to any future commitments. The language as to March 24, to which the Senator refers, names the articles which were then under allocation requirements.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I again repeat, subclause (e) refers simply to the fulfillment of promises by way of commitments, made by the Government in the past. It is limited to that. It cannot mean anything else. Will the Senator read the language again, and tell us, as chairman of the committee, if he does not agree with us?

Mr. WILEY. I think I have covered the subject three or four times, and given my understanding of the meaning of "e."

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not answered the question specifically.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My opinion is that the word "commitments" refers to something to which we are now committed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is my position.

Mr. TAFT. That is what it must mean. Otherwise we would say "contracts hereafter made, undertaken, or entered into." It seems to me that when we talk about commitments in a temporary bill we mean the things to which we are already committed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding; and that view is what I was trying to elicit from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for the conference report to extend the Second War Powers Act, because I believe that certain commodities such as tin and fibers and other strategic materials are in scarce supply. For that reason I voted to extend sugar controls until October 31, 1947.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I desire to make it known, however, that rice which is not mentioned in the extension of the Second War Powers Act, remains under controls only by way of commitments already made, by reason of subparagraph (e) which we fully discussed in the course of this debate. I do not desire to take exception to this portion of the conference report since I am not in a position to know what these international commitments have been and how binding they are; but I want it distinctly understood that in voting for this report I do so, insofar as rice is concerned, because of the definite information which I have secured this day from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that an order, which has already been signed, is being circulated to the effect that all producers and millers who have already complied with their commitments will not be required to set aside any more rice from the present crop, and that in the future no further set-aside will be required of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Green
Ball	Cooper	Gurney
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bricker	Donnell	Hawkes
Brooks	Downey	Hayden
Buck	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bushfield	Ecton	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Byrd	Ferguson	Holland
Cain	Flanders	Ives
Capper	Fulbright	Jenner
Chavez	George	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Stewart
Kem	Moore	Taft
Kilgore	Morse	Taylor
Knowland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Langer	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Lodge	O'Conor	Tobey
Lucas	O'Daniel	Tydings
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Umstead
McCarthy	Overton	Vandenberg
McClellan	Pepper	Watkins
McFarland	Reed	Wherry
McGrath	Revercomb	White
McKellar	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
McMahon	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Magnuson	Russell	Wilson
Malone	Saltonstall	Young
Martin	Smith	
Maybank	Sparkman	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate so that I may say without interruption what I have in mind to say in the next 20 minutes about the proposed Lilienthal appointment. At the conclusion I shall gladly attempt to answer any questions which Senators on either side of the aisle may care to ask me.

Several weeks ago the President of the United States sent to the Senate the nomination of George Catlett Marshall to become the Secretary of State. A very few minutes later every Senator present, on both sides of the aisle, had voted for the nominee. It is, therefore, worth while, particularly today as we consider another Presidential nomination, to reflect on the qualities which made Mr. Marshall so conclusively and rapidly acceptable to the Senate.

I think the Senate felt as America did about Mr. Marshall; namely, that there was nothing about his character, integrity, purpose, courage, ability, or Americanism which was open to a shadow or a glimmer of a doubt. We shared with America the feeling that Mr. Marshall, as Secretary of State, would be neither too tough nor too soft in his dealings with Russia and the other nations of the world. We thought he would do the right thing for and with everybody. We had no reason to second-guess one whom we felt with conviction was completely disinterested and unselfish. We had no cause to feel that the nomination was political in any degree. The Senate considered Mr. Marshall to be, to the extent that a mortal man can be without weakness, the perfect choice. Both Democrats and Republicans applauded the President's wisdom in recommending General Marshall.

Mr. President, now the Senate is considering another Presidential nomination, that of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, to become Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In his nomination we have a classic contrast to the example I have just referred to. Rightly or wrongly, we are confronted by a nomination which many Senators will never vote to confirm.

Who and what is Mr. David E. Lilienthal? I am certain that I do not know, for the record is so contradictory. By some he has been called a Communist, by others a Socialist, a collectivist, an opportunist, a prophet of the world to be, a New Dealer, a great administrator, a great American, and simply a genius.

My own opinion, and a very positive one, is that he is neither a Communist nor a Socialist, although if a man can be judged by the company which supports and applauds his conduct he could too easily be held suspect on these counts. When Mr. Lilienthal denies any knowledge that the Southern Conference of Human Welfare, for which he was a sponsor, possesed a communistic tinge, I do not think him guilty of having some connection with the Communist Party, but I do think him politically innocent and naive. If he did not know that Earl Browder had testified before a committee of the Congress that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was a party transmission belt, he should have made it his business to know it.

What Mr. Lilienthal is, outside of not being a Communist or Socialist, all of us are trying to find out. In a 1944 volume of current biography there is the following description of the man which appears to have been approved by Mr. Lilienthal:

Mr. Lilienthal is a good speaker who understands modern publicity and its value; a thoroughgoing realist, he is not very sensitive to personal criticism. He likes to refer to himself as an amateur athlete, an amateur author, and an amateur administrator. Although his salary is $10,000 a year, he is particularly insistent on the last mentioned designation. One of the very few agency heads named in the early days of the New Deal who is still in the same post, he says that he always keeps his suitcase packed. "I'm not keen about a career in public service. It gives some people a desire for security that weakens their ability to stand up to things."

The only two things of interest to me in this 1944 description are the references to "amateur administrator" and the expressed desire to return to private life. I shall refer to both in a few minutes.

But now, Mr. President, I want to talk out loud to myself and to any who care to reflect and listen, about my respect for and understanding of the potential and promise of atomic energy and the requirements demanded of the individual to be chosen Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. We all grant that the Secretary of State has a tremendous responsibility and that he must be, as he currently is, outstanding in every respect. Important, however, as is the Secretary of State's assignment, it may well turn out to be insignificant when compared to the task assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman.

On November 17, 1946, Mr. R. L. Duffers, of the New York Times, described the issue before us all. He wrote:

The world's greatest problem today is the control of atomic energy. America's share of that problem lies in the hands of five men who sit in temporary offices in Washington and compose the United States Atomic Energy Commission—AEC for short. These men have vast power. They recognize that a revolution in human affairs came about when the atom was split and the basis forces of the universe were released. What they do is certain to affect, not only the future of America, but of all nations—of mankind at large. They are not authorized to lay down rules for other nations, but to frame our policy on atomic energy, and our domestic policy may be decisive.

The AEC is not just another regulatory body. It takes over a tremendous physical plant—Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.—names associated with the production of the atomic bomb—and many laboratories; it also takes over our supplies of fissionable material. It holds, moreover, the world's most portentous secret. It has been entrusted by Congress with nothing less than the supervision of an economic, social, and technological revolution. Nothing like this has ever happened before in history. The AEC is unique. Its ultimate mandate is found in the preamble of the Atomic Energy Act—

Mr. President, all of us should think about that constantly. Mr. Duffers then quotes from that act, as follows:

It is reasonable to anticipate that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life. Accordingly it is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that, subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security, the development and utilization of atomic energy shall, so far as practicable, be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise and promoting world peace.

Thus the AEC is first, a business—the most stupendous business in the world; second, it is by all odds the most important single unit in the national defense; third, it is a great research agency; fourth, it is an educational institution; paradoxically instructed not to exchange information with other nations but nevertheless to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticisms which is essential to scientific progress; fifth, it is a welfare agency, of dimensions never before conceived outside of a Utopian's dream.

The man who will guide the fortunes of the AEC is David E. Lilienthal, former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, there we have a statement of the scope of the terrifying job and a reference to the man who has been recommended to design our destiny.

Is Mr. Lilienthal the right man for that job? If he is, no single vote should be cast against him. If he is not, no set of pressures, however strong, should be permitted to secure the confirmation of his nomination. There must be no doubt or question about his fitness, purposes, or motives.

I have followed the public Lilienthal hearings, not in person, for time would not permit that, but as closely as I could through reading the transcripts. I was completely fascinated and absorbed by what I read. I was led to believe that there was a struggle—not a struggle by a Senate committee in its search to determine if Mr. Lilienthal was the best of all possible persons for the atomic post, but a struggle between the nominee and a senior Senator who was not a member of

the committee. The further I read, the more I became convinced that the committee was sitting more in judgment on the Senator than on the nominee. I do not know when or why the long enduring quarrel between the two men began, and it is none of my business. That they had no respect for each other was obvious. That some of what passed between them had nothing to do with the question at issue was just as clear. But, to my mind, the committee spent too much of its precious time deciding that the nominee was being persecuted by the Senator. If anyone thinks me wrong, I can but urge that he study the transcript.

To my mind the Senator had a right to speak as he saw fit, regardless of what his motives might have been; but the committee had little cause to be influenced by his accusations, charges, and attack if the committee considered them to be valueless or irrelevant. From my point of view, it was the committee's task to return again and again to the single, only question, "Is the nominee the one man, above all question, for the appointment?"

The committee heard the nominee constantly referred to as a great administrator. This fact, if it is a fact, materially influenced the decision in his favor. But what steps did the committee take to determine Mr. Lilienthal's excellence as an administrator? Did it call as witnesses those Congressmen, admittedly serious critics of the nominee, before whom Mr. Lilienthal had often appeared in the past? Did it examine Mr. Lilienthal's philosophy toward government and economics through his written works? Did it evidence any curiosity about an article in the Harvard Law Review of February 1941 in which Lilienthal argues for public corporations operating for profit and free of congressional control over income and expenditures and personnel? Did the committee bother to investigate the 20 serious charges made against Mr. Lilienthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Congressmen and Senator, all of whom are presently available, whose views represent the minority portion of the congressional joint committee report resulting from an investigation of the TVA which was authorized by the Seventy-sixth Congress? No, Mr. President; none of these reasonable and logical steps were taken. Instead, the committee heard a number of witnesses who could only say that Mr. Lilienthal had spent unheard-of sums of Government money, and that, therefore, he must stand forth as an acknowledged, great administrator. Until the criticisms included in the joint congressional committee report are fully answered, I, for one, shall refuse to recognize any greatness about Lilienthal's public-administrative ability; and if there is room for doubt over what he has accomplished in the past, there is small reason to believe that he is properly or fully equipped to fill the post he seeks at this time. His record is that of a man whose thirst for power and authority is unquenchable. To confirm him would be to give him power beyond his ability to absorb or control.

I would gather from the opinion held by some Senators, and by many Americans, that Mr. Lilienthal is an indispensable man. It is said by these advocates that the Commission will fail utterly unless the nominee is appointed and encouraged to proceed. I know of no single reason which gives substance to this contention.

That Mr. Lilienthal is an able man in many ways appears to be beyond question. That he has any valid claim to greatness, I strongly doubt. That the Commission must either have him as its Chairman, or suffer dire consequences, is an unwarranted assumption.

To say that Mr. Lilienthal is indispensable is to assume that his knowledge of atomic energy, its origin, uses, and problems is limitless. I dare say many persons in America take Mr. Lilienthal to be the foremost atomic-energy authority in the world. But he was not when he was nominated, and I do not think he is now.

How many Americans know that Mr. Lilienthal was not the President's first choice? Or his second or third choice for the post? I do not know what numbered choice he was, but I very much doubt that he was even considered when the President initially became concerned over what ought to be done with atomic energy.

I know that the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, which was established on October 29, 1945, less than 18 short months ago, to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation with respect to problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy, had never heard of Mr. Lilienthal in connection with atomic energy, and they did not know anything about him 4 or 5 months later. This committee held hearings over a period of many weeks, in which every phase of atomic-energy legislation was discussed. The committee heard from more than 70 witnesses. Included among them were industrialists and engineers; Cabinet members and qualified Government officials; War and Navy Department leaders; scientists and lay persons, both men and women. But Mr. Lilienthal was not a witness at the hearings, the reason being, I suppose, that he had little to offer. Yet people by the thousands in this land will be surprised to hear that Mr. Lilienthal was not among those who struggled so hard and long to produce the Commission whose head the Senate ponders over now.

It is my personal opinion, but one which is shared by many, that the President, had he delayed his selection of Mr. Lilienthal for as much as 2 weeks, would never again have considered the name of David Lilienthal for the post of Atomic Energy Chairman. Not that the President would not have continued to hold his TVA Chairman in high regard; not that he would have thought Mr. Lilienthal to be less talented and/or able, but he would have known in November what he did not quite understand in October—that America once more wanted to place its faith and confidence in men, either Democrats or Republicans, who understand that the authoritarian philosophy and concept and ultimate reactionary procedures of the new order—call it New Deal, if you will—had been sincerely and vigorously tried and found wanting.

It is not being unreasonable to say that the Lilienthal appointment was largely political in character.

Interestingly enough, it was announced at the height of the preelection excitement. It gave promise of holding in line the radical fringe, the left wing, and the tread softly with Russia advocates. Up until the last few days much of my Lilienthal mail has been in favor of his confirmation, and 85 per cent of it has expressed the fear that Russia would somehow suffer an affront were Lilienthal to suffer defeat in the Senate. One wonders how these supporters reacted to the President's recent speech about the threat of communism abroad.

I know of no friend or foe of Mr. Lilienthal who does not consider him to be a leading pleader and apostle of the New Deal. By way of example, I refer the Senate to an interview Doris Fleeson, of the Washington Star, recently had with Mr. Robert Hannegan, Postmaster General. With respect to New Dealers, Mr. Hannegan said that those who had stayed on the reservation were getting the same consideration they always did. Illustratively, he cited Mr. Truman's appointment of David Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The President would not intentionally nominate an individual for any post if he thought his nominee would promptly become a controversial figure, and particularly he would not want to encounter trouble with his Atomic Energy Chairman selection, in whom there must be almost national faith and confidence if the latter's efforts are to be understood, supported, and approved. Obviously the President did not judge the temper of many people when he thought of Mr. Lilienthal.

In knowing now what he did not know before, the President cannot expect any measure of full support from those on both sides of the aisle who are in lasting opposition to bureaucratic paternalism, nor from those Senators who have so recently come from extended, thoughtful, difficult, and even bitter campaigns which were basically waged against what they conceived the big Government radicalism of the New Deal to be.

The President could not, on reflection, ask us to support his present choice. We trust that, on further reflection, he will not ask us to embarrass him more, for none of us have any such desire or intention in mind. We merely and sincerely hope to eventually vote unanimously for an individual, any individual, who has the complete confidence of this body and the Nation.

Is it not fair to raise the question publicly; why does not Mr. Lilienthal step aside? It is said by some, though I do not believe it, that he resisted the proposed Presidential appointment. He so testified in the recent extended hearings. As a public servant, his only interest can be the best interests of our country. If he is not wanted by a segment of the people, I should think he would bow out in favor of another.

He knows, as well as any man alive, how imperatively important and necessary public and official confidence will

be to his job. He knows now that, without fear of contradiction, and for reasons which may even be unfair to him as a person, he will never benefit from the public faith his task would demand.

He knows, too, for I am trying to make it clear, that a majority of those who have just come to the Senate from every grass-root region in the land are positive and firm in our opposition to his proposed appointment.

If Mr. Lilienthal steps aside, or is defeated, it will not mark the first time this has happened. Presidential nominees by the score, through the years, have failed to be confirmed by the Senate. Between the terms of George Washington and Franklin Roosevelt more than 150 major executive nominations have been rejected by the United States Senate. Six of George Washington's nominations were turned down, and 11 of Thomas Jefferson's proposed appointments were rejected. A number of able and good men must have been among the many who were rejected, but it is safe to feel that in a majority of the cases the recommended individual was not the right man for the job he sought.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist, said, "It will be the office of the President to nominate, and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint." Gouverneur Morris thought this arrangement would assure responsibility through nomination by the President and security through the Senate's concurrence.

It is proper, therefore, that we think in terms of advice to the President regarding his present nominee. My advice, at least, is that his nominee is unacceptable because of a score of reasons laid before the Senate, and that he, the President, should withdraw the name of David E. Lilienthal and submit another.

This advice is not given lightly or disrespectfully, because one does not differ with the President except for solid and sound cause. That our willingness to differ with a Presidential wish must seem strange and unexplainable to some goes without saying. To them I can only point out that the day of rubber-stamp confirmations and rubber-stamp Congresses is over and done with. It should not any longer be expected that we should agree with what we do not agree with. The sooner this fact is taken for granted the sooner the legislative and executive branches of the Government will harmonize their efforts for the ultimate good of all citizens.

Does a single Member of the Senate have any right to assume that America is so lacking in and devoid of leadership that we must accept a controversial contradictory, cloudy figure as our selection to head the most powerful organization the mind of man has ever conceived? If we accept the premise that David Lilienthal, or any other individual, is, in spite of the serious doubts held by some of us, indispensable, we shall do the American Nation an irreparable injustice. If we confirm the nominee, as the Senate has the power to do, we are doing Mr. Lilienthal no favor. We leave the Nation confused and uncertain about the choice. We withhold from the Chairman what he needs most—a sympathetic, devoted, understanding public. Unless the Chairman maintains this relationship with the people of this land, his efforts are foredoomed to suspicion, argument, and failure.

I would automatically vote against any man who sought to secure appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission. Of all appointments the one in question ought to seek the man. There is no qualified man alive who should feel that he was fully qualified. The very nature of the assignment would prevent any save the power seeker from feeling that he possessed what was required. But I feel, though I may be wrong, that Mr. Lilienthal took particular steps and pains to secure the nomination.

He became, almost overnight, a self-admitted authority on atomic energy. His public speeches on the subject sounded as though he was looking for the job which not long after came his way. As a member of the State Department's own atomic committee, Mr. Lilienthal handled the consultants who did the work resulting in what became known as the Lilienthal report, released on March 28, 1946. A chief contributor to this report appears to have been Herbert S. Marks, a former assistant to Mr. Lilienthal at TVA, and now general counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission. I suppose every Senator is thoroughly familiar with the basic and fundamental differences between this plan and the plan as it was drastically revised by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. The Baruch proposals were violently opposed by Mr. Henry Wallace. We might just as well recall that the CIO Political Action Committee, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and the National Citizens Political Action Committee were among those who roared approval of the Wallace concept while raging against the realistically reasonable protective measures Mr. Baruch had in mind.

While the furor between Baruch and Wallace was absorbing public attention, the Atomic Enery Commission was being quietly put together. Mr. Baruch recommended several national figures to the President, but I understand they turned down their proposed appointments to the Commission. I think this action took place in September of last year.

In October of 1946 the Commission was announced by the President. It is my understanding that the announcement came as a complete and disappointing surprise to Mr. Baruch and to Secretary of State Byrnes, neither of whom had been consulted.

Mr. Lilienthal might have been surprised by the announcement of his appointment, for he has testified that he struggled against being the President's choice, but he was not caught napping. Within 24 hours of his appointment he publicly announced that the Atomic Energy Commission would take over the Army's atomic project. Immediately following this declaration he named a temporary staff which included Herbert S. Marks, and Carroll L. Wilson, both of whom had served on the original State Department board.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, it needed no prodding to force Mr. Lilienthal to accept a post on the Commission. He is there by design and desire, and will remain where he is if he can. If this contention was not true he would have retired when his nomination first encountered serious opposition.

In recognizing the brilliant design of the finest propaganda campaign I have ever encountered I would reply only to that portion of it which comes from my own northwest section of America. The story is being told in that area that private power interests are making a many-pronged attack against the extension of public power and the Valley Authority principle, and that a smoke screen for the private-power attack is the present congressional resistance to the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal. The only answer I have to this misrepresentation, Mr. President, is that it constitutes premeditated maliciousness on the part of those who are unwilling to admit that Mr. Lilienthal is something less than a saint, and who are unwilling to agree that any proposed further extension of the Valley Authority principle should be exposed to additional study, research, and analysis, leading to a determination based on fact, need, and conclusive proof. I come, Mr. President, from a public-power State. I believe in the development which comes from a wise and reasonable use of public power. But this does not mean that I or any other thinking person should automatically assume that Lilienthal, the TVA experimenter, is qualified to become Lilienthal, the atomic-energy experimenter, nor does it provide excuse to assume that if one questions Mr. Lilienthal's fitness for the atomic energy chairmanship he is trying to hamstring and sabotage the development of public power throughout America. The curse of public power today is in the activities of those who crusade without thinking, who trample the rights of others underfoot, who will use any means, legitimate or foul, to secure their end result. That very small but articulate minority in the Northwest which does not tell the truth in its assertions of bad faith and evil purposes on the part of those who oppose Mr. Lilienthal is an example of what I mean.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am not unmindful of what the able chairman of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee said the other day about the imperative need for action in confirming the nomination of a chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I share his distress over the fact that so little has been accomplished since the decision was made to place the future of atomic energy in the hands of a civilian commission. I recognize that atomic energy will help to keep America secure for as long a time as our research leads the world. There is need for action and confirmation by this Senate, but it must be action and confirmation of a character that all of America will approve, respect, and support. Anything short of this will represent no lasting progress at all. We must be right in what we are doing now.

A great contest is sweeping this earth. It engages the energies and ambitions and abilities of those who strive mightily to make the universe either slave or free. All of us hope that freedom will survive.

None of us are yet satisfied that it will. The struggle to determine the final decision has just begun. Yet in the face of this political fact and reality there is an intention to turn to a political innocent for guidance and leadership in the unexplored field of atomic energy. We consider an individual who must count among his supporters nearly all of those who believe in a managed economy, an unrealistic and unreasonable softer attitude toward the Soviet Union, and the surrender of our national sovereignty to a world super state. That America wants to cooperate with the world is obvious. That America has no reason to surrender its right to live in the world of tomorrow is no less clear.

Whatever the excellence of this man's ability, sincerity, and good intentions, it is offset a thousand times by the encouragement and stimulus his appointment would give to a host of those who believe in a world of make-believe.

Every Senator in this Chamber speaks his own mind. I have spoken mine in trying to prove that Mr. Lilienthal is a casual and haphazard choice for the job he seeks. It is not that he suffers from either a lack of ability or good intentions. It is simply a case where the job in question demands more than he has to give. My respect for the land and world in which I live will never permit me to vote for a compromise, and Mr. David E. Lilienthal can be considered to be nothing more.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR CONTROLS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House Joint Resolution 146, providing for the extension of sugar controls, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the conference report for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls over other than household users may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however,* That—

"(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any provision of law referred to above, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (i) in any proceeding, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction or other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (ii) in any proceeding, under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and

"(5) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of this Act—

"(1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 767);

"(2) shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than thirty-five pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals fifty pounds of refined sugar per capita; and

"(3) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available, for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this Act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

"SEC. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this Act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

"SEC. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby; (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation, relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this Act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property, available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions, and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this Act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this Act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than one year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or

legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other Government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

"(b) The term 'sugar' means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Surplus Property Act of 1944;' the following: 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947;'

"(b) This Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAS. W. TOBEY,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the conferees met and finished their work on last Friday, and their report is now before the Senate. The House adopted it about an hour ago.

The substitute agreed to in conference—

First. Adopts the provisions of the joint resolution as passed by the House making the Emergency Court of Appeals, protest, and license procedures under sections 203, 204 (d) and (e), and 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 inapplicable to regulations with respect to sugar;

Second. Adopts the provisions of the joint resolution as passed by the House imposing criminal penalties, making such penalties exclusive, and eliminating civil liability such as that for triple damages.

Third. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment guaranteeing the housewife 35 pounds per year, and additional amounts in the event of increased supplies.

Fourth. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to new users in lieu of the provisions for such users in the joint resolution as passed by the House. The quantity to be made available to such users is reduced, however, to 25,000 tons (in view of the fact that controls are extended only to October 31, 1947), of which 12,500 tons is to be made available between the enactment of the joint resolution and June 30, 1947, and 12,500 tons is to be made available between July 1, 1947, and October 31, 1947. Included with new users are hardship cases and the allocation to these users is to be made as was provided in the joint resolution passed by the House "in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program."

Fifth. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to the rights of the personnel to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture in lieu of the provisions of the bill as passed by the House.

Sixth. Gives the act a short title, "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947," and exempts it from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Seventh. Omits subsection (c) of the first section of the bill as passed by the House which would have exempted from the effect of the resolution the importation of products in consumer-size containers upon certification by the exporting country that such products had been produced out of domestic quota sugar; and

Eighth. Omits the savings clause, section 3 (d) of the Senate amendment, which was not considered necessary, there being nothing in the act which would be considered to terminate any criminal liability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Ball	Hill	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Pepper
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lodge	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Magnuson	Umstead
Fulbright	Malone	Vandenberg
George	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Gurney	Millikin	Wiley
Hatch	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Wilson
Hayden	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, most if not all of the material information appearing of record bearing upon the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal has, in the course of approximately a week's debate, been presented on the floor of the Senate. It is not my intention, therefore, to discuss the evidence with respect to the advisability of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal or of his comembers on the Atomic Energy Commission, or of its manager, except as testimony of record may bear on the issues on which I desire to express my views at this time.

I shall confine my remarks, for the most part, to the motion made on Friday, March 28, by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. This motion is to recommit the question of the confirmation of the Presidential appointees on the Atomic Energy Commission to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for further study, investigation, and report.

Mr. President, we are not considering the confirmation of individuals for appointment to ordinary office. We are considering the proper men for the most important Commission ever created by any act of the Congress since the organization of our Government.

I doubt that anyone will controvert the suggestion that the Senate of the United States has never had, under their advisory capacity to the President of the United States, any office of graver import, of more far-reaching implications, of more stupendous power than the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. There has been no nomination to any office under the Executive power of appointment, whether it be of a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, an Ambassador to the Court of St. James, a Secretary of War or Navy, even while our Nation was engaged in war, that rivals, nay equals, in magnitude the head and front of a commission that will hold within its grasp, for peace or for war, the destiny of our Nation.

The reality of atomic energy was beyond the ken and knowledge of anyone in all the world up to a few years ago. Its realism to this date is the gravest, most cataclysmic, and most tragic event in human history. Its potentialities even now lie beyond the utmost bounds of the human imagination.

The other day the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] gave a graphic picture of the ruin and desolation of Hiroshima, transformed instantaneously in a single blast, from hundreds of thousands of human souls and homes and buildings into mere ashes and dust blown hither and thither by the restless winds of the earth.

Yet, Mr. President, if Dame Rumor is to be credited, the blast that shattered Hiroshima is, in comparison with the destructive force of the atomic bomb today, as the noise of the pop gun to the blast of a cannon. The corporate body that will have control of the secrets of nuclear energy will have control of the life and death, not only of this Nation, but, in all probability, of all the habitable globe.

Shall we not then, in the exercise of our constitutional mandate to consent

and advise with the President on the appointment of various officers of our Government, exercise every possible precaution and take advantage of every avenue of information?

Mr. President, I digress for a moment from the theme of my discourse to pay a just tribute to the chairman of the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee, the Junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. He has, with some possible exceptions which I may note later, undertaken to place before the committee and the Senate the most pertinent facts concerning these appointments. While ardently advocating the cause of Mr. Lilienthal and the remaining appointees to the Commission, he has presented the case in their favor fairly. So far as the junior Senator from Iowa dealt with the record, he has been factually correct.

But, sir, the dominating conclusion that must leap into the senatorial mind after reading the record is that the most important avenues of information regarding the nominees have been left uncharted and unexplored. And, again, sir, fault cannot be ascribed to the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the absence of this information. Under date of February 25, as will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1947, the junior Senator from Iowa addressed a letter to the President of the United States wherein he said the committee would be asked on the floor of the Senate whether it had secured all available information. He pointed out that the importance of these appointments was so great that the committee felt obligated to request authority from the President to any investigating agencies of the executive or administrative branches of the Government to supply all information possessed by such agencies bearing upon each of the appointees, and he urges the President to make available to the committee such information and reports on these appointees, if any be possessed by the Chief Executive.

A refusal by the President was the response to the request of the committee. Rightly or wrongly, the President considered it would be best to follow the traditional course of keeping secret within the archives of the executive department information of such a character.

But, sir, the response of the President does not relieve us from our own responsibility to the American people. The obligation that rests upon us is too far-reaching in its import for us to stand upon the tradition which withholds from us the possibility, nay, the probability, of information vital to the discharge of our duties.

It is this thought, if I interpret correctly the motive of the junior Senator from Ohio, that prompted him to introduce the motion to recommit. Congress itself is, perhaps, not free from blame in this particular phase of the matter. When we enacted the Atomic Energy Commission law we provided for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to report on the qualifications, character, and loyalty of all employees under the Commission and its management. If it be important for the Congress to be advised with respect to subordinates, it seems to me that it is far more important that the Congress should be advised as to the qualifications, character, and loyalty of those who control, employ, discharge, and exercise managerial control.

Mr. President, is there anything to be lost by conducting such an inquiry? May there not be much to be gained? Could not or would not the Senate be justly criticized for failure to supply itself with the information that the trained agencies of our Government—the FBI, Military Intelligence of the Army, and Office of Naval Intelligence—can supply us? It may be objected that such an investigation and report would result in delaying selection of the Commission. If any error is committed, it is far better for us to err on the safe side, on the side of caution and prudence, than to rush pell-mell, as it were, into the selection of appointees without having before us the best sources of information of which this great Government is capable of providing.

Let me point out in this connection that one of the greatest fallacies is the claim so often asserted that unless David Lilienthal is confirmed promptly, the atomic-energy work will be retarded. Before Mr. Lilienthal had any connection with the Atomic Energy Commission or with the problem of nuclear energy, these developments happened and were performed by the old Manhattan District under military control with General Groves at its head: First, the authorized distribution nationally of beneficial radioactive isotopes for use in medical and biological fields. Second, the authorized construction of a huge laboratory, namely, Brookhaven Laboratory, at the former Camp Upton site on Long Island for atomic energy developments in which universities of the Northeast will participate. Third, the authorized enlargement of the Argonne Laboratory in Chicago for atomic-energy work in which the universities of the Midwest will participate. Fourth, the authorized construction of a tremendous laboratory at Schenectady to be operated by General Electric for atomic-energy research. Has Mr. Lilienthal done anything more than what has already been done under military control and under the supervision of General Groves?

Mr. President, the inescapable truth is that at the present time the sole practical use of atomic energy is as a weapon of war. It can be developed and will be put to industrial use for peacetime purposes. But according to the best information available to me, at least 3 years will elapse before scientific research will have advanced sufficiently far to apply atomic energy to industrial purposes. On the other hand, I make bold to say that we do need, as a nation, for our self-preservation now—right now—the atomic bomb as a weapon of war. The need for the weapon has not been growing less since the creation of the United Nations. The need is, in truth, growing apace and too rapidly, I fear, for the maintenance of the peace of the world. If war should come, I should want this mighty weapon under the control of those most experienced and best able to handle it in the hour of national peril. I believe that atomic energy should be under military control until there is an assurance that the threat of war is ended and that we have won the fight for peace. Then, but not until then, we may return it to a civilian commission which will consider it mainly, if not altogether, as an instrumentality of peace and not of war. Therefore, Mr. President, I very eagerly joined with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in the introduction of a bill to amend the atomic energy law so as to place atomic energy under the control of the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, the office of the Secretary of War, who is now Robert P. Patterson, and the office of the Secretary of the Navy, who is now James Forrestal, with two civilians to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, is there any question whatsoever in the mind of any Senator that the patriotism, ability, loyalty, and character of George C. Marshall, if appointed the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, will ever be questioned? On the other hand, does anyone entertain the thought that if there were any serious question raised as to the qualifications of George C. Marshall, he would permit his name to remain for confirmation before the United States Senate?

General Marshall would know that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission cannot serve in this exalted post of duty without having the unalloyed confidence of the Congress of the United States. The law creating the Commission requires that it shall be in constant cooperation with the Congress and that the Congress shall cooperate with the Commission.

Does Mr. Lilienthal enjoy this unqualified confidence of either the Congress or the American people? Is there not a very substantial number of the Members of the Senate, as well as of the House, who seriously and conscientiously object to confirmation of the Lilienthal nomination?

If Mr. Lilienthal possessed the high and noble character which his advocates claim for him, would he not, in the face of so strong an opposition, in the midst of a world crisis growing more and more critical hour by hour, repair to the White House and insist on having the President withdraw his nomination?

More than a month ago I stated in the public press that Mr. Lilienthal is not the indispensable man. There is not only George Marshall; there are scores of other men standing high in the confidence of the people of the United States who could head the Atomic Energy Commission, and with respect to whose nomination there would be neither doubt nor dispute.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], speaking to his motion, has given us sufficient reliable information to warrant the adoption of his motion. He has shown that one-fifth of the key employees so far selected by the Atomic En-

ergy Commission under Mr. Lilienthal possess questionable backgrounds. Fuller information should be had with respect to those employees, and information could be had with respect to every other key employee. Above all, Mr. President, the Senate should have before it the reports of the skilled and seasoned investigating authorities of our Federal Government with reference to the Chairman and other members of the Commission.

Mr. President, we must rise to the height of this great argument. We must act with the deliberation, the calmness, and the care that befit our high office. It is true of nations, as it is of men, that there is a tide in their affairs, "which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, and then I wish to discuss the Greek situation for a time.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the opposition to Mr. Lilienthal is just part of the general hysteria which appears to have gripped the country and which is similar to the hysteria which swept our Nation after World War I, when there arose a great fear of communism and of persons who might be Communists or Reds. A year or so ago those who wished to discredit a man completely called him a Communist. But now, Mr. President, the day has come—some may call it a happy day, although I do not regard it in that light—when some of the Members of this body say they are going to vote against Mr. Lilienthal because he is a New Dealer. They have bracketed the New Dealers with the "Commies" and pretty soon they will do the same with all Democrats, regardless of whether they are New Dealers. A little later in my remarks I should like to point out that even the Republicans are becoming involved in this process to such an extent that they find they cannot oppose certain measures for fear they will be called Communists.

Today the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has asked whether the committee called before it, to testify, the Members of Congress who were severe critics of Mr. Lilienthal—Members of Congress before whom Mr. Lilienthal has appeared at committee hearings in the past. Those are not the exact words of the Senator from Washington, but I have stated them as nearly as I was able to note them at the time.

Perhaps I may give a general example of the attitude of the Congressmen before whom Mr. Lilienthal has appeared in the past—when he appeared, I assume, seeking appropriations for the TVA or in connection with other matters relating to the administration of that greatest of all governmental agencies, I believe, at least insofar as certain undertakings are concerned. In 1945, Mr. President, I made a trip to the Tennessee Valley Authority. We were contemplating, and still are, having a Columbia Valley Authority in the Northwest, and I wished to see how the Tennessee Valley Authority was functioning. So I made a trip there, at my own expense, to see for myself. On the way down I had a lower berth, near the rear end of the car. From stateroom A, near the front of the car, came noises of loud singing. From the general tone and contour of the music, Mr. President, as it emerged from the stateroom, I could tell that the singers were feeling quite happy. I wondered who they might be; because, strange as it may seem, although, as I have said, it was obvious judging from the sounds which emerged from the room, that the singers were a little overly joyful, at the same time most of the songs were hymns. I had never heard a mixture of that kind before, and I wondered who they might be. In a short time a gentleman came out of the stateroom and started down the aisle toward me. I recognized him as a very prominent Republican Congressman and it later developed that he was one of those to whom the Senator from Washington has referred as having had Mr. Lilienthal before them for questioning at various times. He came down the aisle, and I recognized him; and when he got within 10 or 15 feet of me he recognized me, and stopped and said to me, "Well, well. There is the very fellow we are looking for, the singing cowboy from Idaho. Come on up here, TAYLOR, come on. Come up here and help us sing some songs. You're just the man we want."

So I got up and went with him to the stateroom—and there they were, about a dozen gentlemen, lined up on both sides of a long table, and the bottles were lined up shoulder to shoulder—square bottles, none of the plain old round ones. I sat down with them and partook of their merriment and helped them sign hymns. Mr. President, I like to sing hymns. My father was a minister of the gospel. They were going down to Tennessee, also, but they were not going to see the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. President, it seems that the Aluminum Corp. of America has a great establishment in Tennessee, sort of a resort where it takes folks whom it likes to impress, and entertains them at the expense of the corporation. These gentlemen were heading down there, not to see the TVA, but to enjoy a vacation at the expense of the Aluminum Corp. of America. Everything was very cozy. There was a young chap, with a fine personality, from the Aluminum Corp., and he was shepherding them along. He was opening the bottles, and he had a towel over his arm to keep them shipshape and to wipe off lapels, and to do one thing and another; and, Mr. President, he even had a pitchpipe to give the boys the key to sing the hymns.

I sat there and listened. I do not think I violate any confidence—because there was no secret about what they were saying—when I state that the whole subject of their conversation was Lilienthal. Not once on the whole trip did I hear one of them question Mr. Lilienthal's ability. Not once did I hear them say that he was an incompetent nincompoop, and that we should get rid of him for that reason. But they kept harping on the statement that they must get rid of Lilienthal. This was about the tone of their conversation:

"Do you remember, Bill"—

If any of them was named Bill, I apologize. If I give a name resembling anyone's real name it is purely coincidental.

"Do you remember, Bill, when we had that son of a gun up before us and you asked him the question about such and such? I thought you had him there. But you remember he came right back and had the answer on the tip of his tongue. He is the smartest son of a gun I ever saw."

Except that they used stronger language than that. [Laughter.]

That went on for hours on end. We would sing awhile and then we would get back to Lilienthal, and they would reminisce about how they had had him before their committee, how they tried to question him, tried to prove he was incompetent, and every time he got the best of them. They hated him bitterly, and they kept repeating, "He is the smartest so-and-so I ever saw, and we have got to get rid of him."

Mr. President, I believe that same feeling of envious hatred is behind a great deal of the desire to get rid of Mr. Lilienthal. Atomic power is going to be a great thing in the future of this country, a source of power possibly much more profitable than electrical energy, which has certainly proven profitable to some private interests. As now constituted, the Atomic Energy Act proposes that the Government shall control atomic energy. I feel that there are those who would like to see it turned over to private enterprise for exploitation. Some do not want Mr. Lilienthal because he has administered the TVA in a manner to carry out the mandate of the Congress, to furnish a yardstick, to supply cheap power to the people of the Tennessee Valley region. So, Mr. President, I feel that here is a very good example of much of the enmity toward Mr. Lilienthal, not that he is incapable, but that he is too capable, and his opponents are afraid they will not be able to get atomic energy away from him if he ever is placed in control, and that he will really carry out the wishes of the people of the country. I think there are many others who feel as those gentlemen on the train, that he is just too smart, and they do not want him in the position to which he has been appointed. He is too smart and too honest.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 31, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 918) to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting

sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland, vice August Klecka, deceased.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like now to discuss the proposal to aid Greece and Turkey. I feel this matter is being rushed through the Congress, that is, that there is an attempt to rush it through with altogether too much haste and too little consideration of such an important question. I feel it is one of the most important matters ever to come before the Congress, certainly since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Is the Senator talking now about Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator spoke of rushing things with haste. I thought he was talking about Lilienthal.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have left the discussion of Mr. Lilienthal. I am now going to Greece and Turkey.

I believe the question of aid to Greece and Turkey should have the fullest consideration and discussion. Some of us would like to know whether this is a humanitarian undertaking, whether we are doing it to aid the Greek people. We would like to know perhaps whether we are doing it to pull British chestnuts out of the fire, to preserve British investments in Greece. Some of us would like to know whether this commits us irrevocably to a policy of imperialism.

That question was raised in my mind very forcibly a few days ago when I happened to pick up a copy of the United States News. I would not say that the United States News is the organ of the National Association of Manufacturers, or anything of that kind, but it is edited by David Lawrence, a reactionary gentleman, to my way of thinking. He is closely associated with the big fellows who have a great deal to do with formulating our national policies whether we like it or not. So word coming from the United States News should have a certain amount of authenticity.

On the first page of the United States News is the Newsgram, the secret news, the inside dope of what is going on in Washington. There is so much of this secret news that four pages are needed to carry it. But it starts out like this:

It isn't to be so bad—this job of trying to run the world. It seems that somebody has to run it. Britain can't, Russia will, if United States doesn't.

I wonder, Mr. President, if Mr. Lawrence knows anything about what he is talking of when he say we are setting out to run the world. That is what he says. He proceeds:

If Russia is ready to stop her foolishness, the United Nations could function and United States in that way could let a world organization do more of the job.

I am sure it would be very kind of us to let the United Nations have a little more to say as to how the world should be run. They would appreciate it, I am sure. Mr. Lawrence sets forth a program which he says is going to be our foreign policy. It is a blueprint for imperialism if I ever saw one.

He says:

A $31,885,000,000 United States-aid and development program is in the works. Most of that program has had Congress approval. You get the story on page 11.

He says capital equipment is to be supplied in large volume, food and clothing are to continue to pour out of the United States——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I hear the figures correctly—$31,000,000,000?

Mr. TAYLOR. Thirty-one billion eight hundred and eighty-five million dollars. He forgot the cents.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the article show where it is to be spent?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; he has not a breakdown of it, but I read what he said. I do not know whether he knows what he is talking about or not. I am merely reading it, because this is a reputable magazine, and Mr. Lawrence is a very reputable reporter—on the conservative side.

Mr. WHERRY. One would not think that was very conservative—$31,000,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. It probably is conservative. Perhaps it is more than that; I do not know.

Mr. Lawrence says further:

Dollars, on loan, to be translated into goods are supplied liberally by government, and private capital for foreign investment soon is to be tapped.

Brains, engineering brains, financing brains, administrative brains, are to be exported in large quantities. Some military brains will go, too.

Thank God for that, Mr. President. We should keep a few brains here, but there are lots of them of that type that we could send abroad, so far as I am concerned.

United States has about everything to offer if the outside world will cooperate. Big figures, big jobs no longer awe Americans. There is a $341,000,000,000 investment already made in war, a $31,885,000,000 war investment already either set or about to be set. United States couldn't pull back now, if it wanted to.

We have gone so far, he says, that we are sunk, we cannot hold back, we are committed to imperialism, and that ends the matter. He goes on to say:

Russia, by contrast, offers these things for export:

Revolution—a technique for Communist Party members to gain power.

Police to advise on terror and methods of dealing with opponents.

Requisition teams to drain away available supplies to Russia.

He says that is what the Russians have to offer. That does not sound to me very inviting. If that is what they have to offer, I should not think we would worry very much.

Against that background, these conclusions seem evident.

He says:

Europe, outside the Russian sphere, will be set up in business again.

I should like to have this entire article printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. TAYLOR. He says further, Mr. President:

Taxes need not be higher for the United States venture in world leadership. Tax reduction, in any event, is tied to the level of prosperity. Prosperity levels will relate directly to United States postwar investment in world development, to the very large flow of dollars and goods abroad, and to the large flow of foreign goods into United States. A profit is possible, in the end, on United States venturing abroad. Profit, however, will come only if United States can figure out how to let other nations pay the interest and principal on their loans by selling goods in the United States market. That is a problem that can be deferred during the period ahead when the big-scale investment will be in capital equipment to produce goods. New loans in this period will greatly exceed the scheduled payments.

In other words, we are just going to pour out the money, and then we will worry about some scheme to try to get it back after a while. He says:

What does seem more probable for United States is this:

Universal military training will probably become inevitable.

They are going to get us so deep in involvements that we will have universal military training, whether we like it or not.

Training at the start—

Very subtle—

is likely to be for 6 months, not a year.

We will just start easy and sneak up on the folks, so to speak, as we go along.

Army-Navy-Air Forces size will remain far above prewar.

Now, Mr. President, this is the best thing I have read in a long time. A week ago Sunday, in the Associated Press Round-Up in the Washington Post, I believe it was, it was stated that very few Senators would dare vote against the Greek proposition because they were afraid of being smeared with the Communist label. Well, sir, here it is, a little more specific. It says:

Congress cannot easily back out of commitments made and being made. A Republican-Communist axis in United States seems very unlikely.

Well, they have got it down to the point where the poor Republicans cannot vote their convictions for fear of being called Communists. We are in the same boat together; the Red hunt has got us all. We have got to go along here,

and go out and embark on this imperialistic course, because if we do not, we will all be Communists, Republicans and Democrats alike. It is a great technique, one followed by Adolf Hitler. He called all of his opponents Communists, and he got rid of all of them, finally, and just ran things to suit himself. The article continues:

Isolationists now find themselves alined with United States Communists, now find that their position, politically, is not wnat it once was. A crisis in far-off Greece thus is fixing United States postwar foreign policy.

May I say, Mr. President, that a crisis in Germany was the excuse to do away with civil liberties, and brought on the reign of Adolf Hitler. They had to have a crisis, so they set the Reichstag on fire and burned it down, and then they blamed the Communists, and got rid of them. Then they got rid of the Socialists, then they got rid of the labor unions, and then Adolf had everything his own way, and everybody lived happily ever after.

It looks to me, Mr. President, whether we realize it, whether those who are guiding our destinies realize it or not, as though we are being jockeyed into the very same position here, getting into a crisis on this Greek question, where nobody can speak up for fear of being called a Communist, practically a traitor to our country, subversive, trying to help Russia. They will get us in that position, face to face with Russia, snarling at each other, and they can do anything—take our civil liberties away from us, and deprive us of the very things that we claim we are going out to fight for.

Oh, yes. I mentioned that they had four pages of this secret news here. The section in the back of the publication has an interesting item or two in it. Let us go over to one in the back. Here is a very interesting statement:

United States business is to be affected directly by United States decision to underwrite world rebuilding, to take leadership in reorganizing the world.

Dollars are to flow out faster on loan and as gifts.

Trade will be high and active, wherever the dollars flow.

Price levels will tend to be supported by heavy world demand for many types of goods, sale of which will be financed by United States loans.

Mr. President, we have not been able to figure out how to give the American people enough money to buy all the things we can produce in this country, so we are going to loan the money, give it away, throw it all over the world, and let them buy the goods, our workers will produce them, and then we will give away half of it. That is what it amounts to, so we can consume the other half here at home.

Taxes will remain relatively high to support the military establishment required to assure order in the world and to underwrite the loan program. Businessmen will do well to get deeply interested in world trade, to find where they may fit into what obviously is to be an expanding field of United States interest and activity abroad.

I hope the Senate will listen to this statement, Mr. President:

It's to be settled now that the flag will follow the dollar into the far reaches of many areas in the world.

We have heard about that all our lives, how the flag has followed Standard Oil and these other boys into the far reaches of the world. Here it is, in this publication, which caters to businessmen and pretends to have the inside dope on what the business future of this Nation may be. Well, we have read enough of that, Mr. President.

I would like to read a clipping I tore out of the paper last night. It is about Judge Goldsborough. We all remember him. He is the gentleman that gave John L. Lewis such a sock on the jaw a while back. It says:

GOLDSBOROUGH URGES ACTION TO DEFEAT DEPRESSION

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 29.—Justice T. Alan Goldsborough, of the District of Columbia, suggests establishment of permanent consumer credit to help defeat the depression he says is inevitable in this country.

Justice Goldsborough, who enjoined John L. Lewis and his AFL United Mine Workers from striking against the Government, predicted also that the United States would not become prosperous from foreign trade.

Addressing the eighth annual meeting of the Maryland Society of Pennsylvania last night, Justice Goldsborough said that to his knowledge the United States has been lending money to foreign governments for more than a quarter of a century to buy our goods and return nothing for it.

"In other words, we have been trying to get rich by giving our wealth away. Expressed in another way, we do not know enough to distribute to our own people, so we just give it away," Justice Goldsborough said.

Well, I think the justice stated the case very well, Mr. President. We all know that during the war we expanded our production very greatly. About half of our production roughly was in consumer goods, things that people could eat and wear and use. The other half was in guns and planes and tanks that were destroyed. And yet the consumers of this country, the workers principally, who produced this 100 percent of goods, received only sufficient money to buy the 50 percent that was turned out in consumer goods. They did not save a great deal. They saved some money, but not much.

So, Mr. President, we are faced with this situation: The war is over, and now instead of 50 percent consumer goods, we are going to produce 100 percent consumer goods. Who is going to buy the additional 50 percent? During the war 50 percent of production was financed by borrowing from the Government. That money went to the workers who produced the goods, and still they could buy only half of the total amount of goods produced. The other half went for destruction. Who is now going to buy the additional 50 percent, which, during the war represented production for the purpose of destruction?

The wages, the actual take-home pay of workers is less than it was during the war. We have barely turned our production machine around on the track. It is hardly out of the roundhouse. It is just getting up steam and already surpluses are appearing in certain lines, although the production machine has just begun moving. From one side of the machine comes 100 percent of consumer goods and out of the other side comes the same old amount of wages, only sufficient to buy 50 percent of those goods. What is going to happen? The goods are going to pile up along the tracks and pretty soon the engineers, the boys who operate the economy of the country for us, the big fellows, will look back and find that these goods are not being taken up, and they will shut down the factory, throwing its employees out of work, and they will not be able to buy consumer goods, and that will result in the shutting down of another factory, and that will be followed by the shutting down of another factory, and like a line of 10 pins 10 miles long they will fall down one after the other. Then they just padlock the doors of our wonderful productive machine. Some of the fat boys who made sufficient money during the war will go to Palm Beach and sun themselves, but not so the American workers, Mr. President.

We can face this problem squarely, and endeavor to find ways and means to make our private enterprise, our capitalistic economy, function here at home, or we can take this phoney way of loaning money, or rather giving it away all over the world, to buy our surplus goods, and it seems to me Mr. President, that that is what the Greek situation is the beginning of. It seems we are throwing money around the world so those who receive it can come to us and buy the goods which we do not have sense enough to figure out how to distribute to our own people at home.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. I want to help the Greek people. I want to help people anywhere who need help, and I want to help democratic governments to stay in power and become strong. But when I say I want to help democratic governments, that statement by no stretch of the imagination applies to the present government of Greece, and much less to the present government of Turkey.

Mr. President, as each day passes, the crisis in our foreign relations grows more acute. Last week's headlines spoke of military intervention in Greece and Turkey. This week's headlines speak of Korea, and of giving naval vessels to Greece and Turkey. Where are we traveling, and how fast? Why are we proposing to give naval vessels to Greece? As I understand, their problem is that of driving the guerrillas out of the mountains, and I do not believe any naval vessels could proceed up into the mountains and help drive the guerrillas from them.

I am deeply concerned over the apparent attempt which is being made in some sections of the press so to whip up hysteria, so to awaken the fears and dreads of the American people, that careful and thorough deliberation by Congress on the whole question of our foreign policy will be impossible.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator think the American people are at all disturbed about the attitude which the

Russian Government has taken respecting the atomic situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not received any letters from them bearing on that situation, because it really has not been brought to a head. I imagine they are disturbed. I am.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator disturbed at all over the Russian attitude on the atomic situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I am. I should like to see an agreement reached in some way. But I do not think we are going to make the Russians agree to anything, I may say——

Mr. McMAHON. Whose fault does the Senator think it is that we have not reached the agreement?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is probably the Russians' fault. I am not an expert on the matter. I have had my hands full here, and have not been able to keep up with all that is going on in the UN.

Mr. McMAHON. There is nothing probable about it. It is a fact that it is the Russians' fault. Is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will take the Senator's word for it. He is more of an expert in that field than I am.

Mr. McMAHON. Greece and other nations who are members of the UN have agreed to atomic-energy control—all except Russia and Poland. Whether or not it is Russia's fault that we have not reached an agreement, that is the record, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume so, yes; I am quite certain of that fact; but I do not think that giving the Greeks warships is going to settle the atomic question, Mr. President. I am happy, however, to announce that, so far as I can observe, the public has retained its ability to analyze the situation coolly and objectively. My mail is running 95 percent against the Turkey-Greece unilateral military intervention plan, as opposed to pure relief and rehabilitation. I may say that at least 95 percent urge that this question be handled through the United Nations. They do not know how it is to be done. They simply are afraid that the UN is being crippled, and they do not want that to happen. I have never received as many letters from my own State of Idaho on any subject as I have on this, and, with just a few exceptions, my fellow Idahoans agree with me that the plan is an unwise and dangerous one.

The Turkey-Greece plan has been presented in various costumes. On some occasions it wears the wings of an angel of mercy—it is a plan for aid to the war victims in devastated lands. This costume is not a comfortable one, however, for it does not fit the Turkish situation at all. Turkey is fat with war profits. It played both sides during the war, and it played them very profitably. It sold critical supplies to us and to the Germans at exorbitant prices, and it received a great deal of aid for good will.

On other occasions, the plan is dressed in the armor of a protector of Greece against the advancing hordes of communism. The gallant warriors of the State Department, with their well-polished attaché cases bravely borne by well-manicured fingers, come riding down to the caucus room like the gallant 300 who held the pass at Thermopylae. But the anti-Communist guise hardly fits either, for the Greek Government bears no relationship whatever to democracy, and it is not combating communism. Indeed, for every Greek who was converted to communism by Russian propaganda last week, 100 have been converted to it by the present Greek regime, and by our State Department's insistence that the only alternative to that regime is communism.

Mr. President, that assertion is simply not true. Greece need not choose between a tyrannical, repressive monarchy on the Fascist pattern on the one hand, and a Communist dictatorship on the other. The Greek people, if given a free choice, might well—and I am convinced they would—decide upon a government on the democratic pattern of the western world, a government of, by, and for the people, a government which would look after the well-being of its subjects and still preserve and protect the civil liberties of the individual and retain the benefits of a free enterprise economy.

It is to our everlasting shame that we are not helping them make that free choice. And it is to the everlasting shame of the British Empire—a shame that stands not alone, but rather following a long list of shames and infamies, a list long enough to extend from the top of London Tower to the Black Hole of Calcutta—that the government of Winston Churchill deliberately, maliciously, and intentionally set about to wreck Greek freedom and to subject Greece to a selfish clique of rulers headed by a dissolute puppet king who has not one drop of Greek blood coursing through his veins. And all to protect British investments.

Let me briefly trace the history of that shame.

When the British first landed in Athens in October 1944 they were wildly hailed as liberators. British flags and Churchill's picture adorned the streets. Greeks expected the British to follow the Germans and wipe them out. Instead, the British stayed in Athens while the Germans slowly retreated, intact and unmolested, westward across Greece into Yugoslavia, burning and pillaging Greek towns and destroying the year's harvest as they went.

The British had more important business in Athens. They had to subjugate their allies, the Greeks, instead of their enemies, the Germans. During the summer of 1944, the British had established in Cairo a puppet Greek government of royalist flavor headed by a petty politician named Papandreou. The EAM resistance leaders, fighting an underground warfare against the Germans in Greece, smuggled out some leaders, who asked for representation in the new government for the Greek patriots fighting and dying in Greece valiantly and effectively enough to pin down 15 German divisions for 4 years. But the British met the EAM delegates with harsh words and handcuffs.

During the summer of 1944, there were reported to be 9,000 Greek servicemen held by the British in concentration camps because they had been overheard expressing sentiments derogatory to the King of Greece. I have heard of a young Greek lieutenant who had been imprisoned and stripped of his rank because he had said in the hearing of a Britisher that he hoped Greece would have a democracy, not a monarchy, after the war. In late 1945 these prisoners were still in British concentration camps.

Recently I talked with a young lady who was in Greece with UNRRA. She was there when the British came. She saw the joy of the people at the arrival of their saviors, so-called. Then the British insisted that the heroic resistance fighters lay down their arms but let the royalist collaborators keep theirs. The fighters who had been fighting the Germans did not want to lay down their arms unless the others did, and they planned a large mass meeting in protest. They obtained the consent of the British general—I have forgotten what his name was—and then he decided to call the mass meeting off. He called it off at 10 o'clock at night. There were few newspapers and few radio sets, so the word did not get around and the next morning the people congregated in the square. This girl said she was there with them, circulating around to see what was going on. The British had stationed royalist Greeks on housetops surrounding the square. The people did not know that the meeting had been called off. When the first speaker rose to speak machine guns started rattling from the tops of the buildings, mowing down the people in the square. She said there were two correspondents in American uniforms standing there, and after the first burst of gunfire the Greeks saw the American soldiers and ran over toward them, falling down on their knees and shouting "Roosevelt! Roosevelt!" The royalists continued to strafe the people, shooting at them until the crowd was dispersed.

This girl then stated that a 7 o'clock curfew was imposed. The next night she was in her room. Across from her on the corner was a Greek peddler who sold little knickknacks from an orange crate. The hour of 7 o'clock approached and about 2 minutes before 7 o'clock he made a sale. He did not have his wares in order to close business promptly at 7. He was trying to get his wares gathered up as fast as he could, and a British tank came down the street. She saw it coming. At about 5 after 7, without one word of warning, the Greek peddler was mowed down by machine-gun fire. She said she talked with many Greeks she knew who were not Communists, and when they saw these things they said, "We cannot go for this." They fled to the mountains, and they are probably there to this day, fighting the unholy regime and the alliance which Great Britain has set up to protect her investments or her lifeline.

The British were determined to bring back the monarchy. Only through the twice-exiled George could the British hope to keep their heavy investments in Greece tax-free and profitable. George II, King of the Greeks, has not one drop of Greek blood in him. His full name is George Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Gluckburg. His people have twice exiled him, assassinated his grandfather and twice exiled his great grandfather, who was the first of the dynasty,

a German princeling whom the British forced on the Greeks after helping them to throw off Turkish rule 100 years ago.

The British proceeded with dispatch after they entered Athens. First, a British proclamation ordered all Greek resistance fighters to turn over their arms to the British. But the British had: The Third Armored Division equipped with heavy tanks; the RAF using bombers and strafers; the Greek Mountain Brigade, organized by the British in Egypt by enlisting Greek royalists and antirepublicans; the X-ites, the fanatical secret band of royalist ruffians and terrorists; and the security battalions, the Greek quisling internal police formed by the Germans and used to hunt down Greek patriots under the Nazi occupation. The British took over these collaborationist security battalions unpurged, and rearmed with American lend-lease weapons. All the Greek royalist and British forces remained armed to the teeth with heavy weapons. The resistance leaders countered the British order with the suggestion that all the Greek forces be dissolved. This was rejected by the British.

A second proclamation lowered wages and raised prices. Athens was a city of a million and a half, but only 20,000 wage earners were working. The average wage was the equivalent of $1.40 a day. The British raised the price of food to the point where the daily relief ration cost 80 cents a day. The ration cost the British about a tenth of this. The food was American food.

The reason for the British profiteering on relief supplies is clear. There were to be no large revenue-producing taxes levied by the new Greek Government. Most of the income-producing property in Greece is British-owned or controlled. The streetcar company, the railroad, the public utilities, the dock facilities, the rich tobacco lands, the olive presses, and the oil company, are all British.

There are very few wealthy Greeks, and these few are the royalists who collaborate with the British. Consequently, the Greek Government does not levy taxes which will seriously burden these holdings. To this day it finances itself largely through the sale of relief supplies—supplies which American citizens taxed themselves to lend-lease to the British to give to the poor of Greece. The poor in Greece cannot afford to buy relief rations at the prices at which they are sold.

Why are the Greeks so poor today? Part of the tragedy, of course, is due to the German invasion and occupation, but only a part. Much of it is due to the corruption and dishonesty of the Greek Government.

Against the advice of American advisers, the Greek Government began selling gold sovereigns in February 1946. By July 1946 UNRRA reported the Greek gold supply as $21,200,000. Today, Mr. President, there is very little of that gold left.

In the United States it is illegal to possess and hoard gold. In Greece it is not. Indeed, hoarding was made possible by the Greek Government, and today most of Greece's gold is in private hands—mostly in the hands of speculators and black-market traders. There is no way of telling how much of it has been exported out of the country.

Mr. President, is there any wonder that the Greek Government lacks credit in the world markets? Is there any wonder that Greece suffers from a shortage of foreign exchange?

The second great factor in the loss of Greek foreign exchange was the policy of permitting virtually unrestricted sale of foreign exchange for importation. This took place between February and December 1946, when it had to be stopped because there was no more foreign exchange to sell.

Much of this foreign money went into needed imports. But a great percentage of it, certainly more than a desperately impoverished country seeking to rebuild its economy could afford, went into so-called luxury goods.

This was the type of goods that could be sold profitably on the black market at huge profits. This did not set the wheels of real economic recovery in motion.

In December controls were established, but when the barn door was closed, the horse had already run a long way down the road to ruin.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wondered whether the able Senator from Idaho had noticed an item in, I believe, a newspaper yesterday purporting to quote, I think, the Prime Minister, or one of the members of the Government of Greece, commenting upon some suggestions which Mr. Paul Porter had made to the effect that there would have to be certain conditions imposed upon the funds which this Nation would advance to Greece, and that the Greek Government hoped that it would be American policy, if we advanced the funds, to cooperate with them in the very informal and very friendly way which the British Economic Mission had employed, and not to lay down too many conditions regarding the use of the funds.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not read that item, but of course, Mr. President, I will say, and I feel it is no breach of confidence, that the Senator from Florida, some others, and myself talked to Mr. Acheson about this matter, and he said plainly that we could not lay down conditions as to what form the Greek Government should take, for instance whether it should become more democratic, because then we would be interfering in the internal affairs of a foreign nation and would indeed find ourselves squarely athwart the United Nations. So, all we can do is to make polite suggestions about the matter, and if, as the Senator from Florida says, they are not kindly disposed, they are under no obligation whatever to do anything that this Nation may suggest.

American banking experts who opposed the sale of Greece's gold to private individuals believed that the only possible answer to Greece's inflation, in addition to the prime one of production, was a capital levy and heavy taxation of war and postwar profits.

Mr. President, permit me to read from the official report on Greece of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which was issued earlier in this month. The restrained and objective language of this report conveys a devastating picture of the nature of the Greek Government today. I read as follows:

> At the present time, the civil service as a whole and the agricultural sections of it to which the Mission has given special attention suffer from several shortcomings, including the exclusive reliance on seniority in promotions; excessive centralization of control in Athens; frequent political interference, both in the appointment and the discharge of personnel; an exceedingly inadequate scale of civil-service pay, especially for the more responsible officials; unduly short working hours; and conflicting and duplicating allocation of administrative responsibility.
>
> Elements in the reform of civil service: To correct these conditions, the reform of the Greek civil service should include measures along lines such as the following:
>
> Discharge of all unnecessary and supernumerary employees, possibly with a year's separation pay in lieu of pension.
>
> Introduction of a strict merit system, rating the efficiency of employees, discharging inefficient employees, and giving rapid promotion to superior employees.
>
> Raising public salary rates toward prewar purchasing power levels, and widening the range between lower and higher positions.

Further on the report states:

> The mission recommends that the Greek Government adopt a policy of reforming its tax system, with the objective of shifting as rapidly as possible from taxes which bear heavily on low-income farmers and workers toward more emphasis on taxes which bear on those better able to pay, such as taxes on income, inheritances, property rents, luxuries, and so forth.

Mr. President, I think it might be pertinent to ask at this point: What do we intend to do about these recommendations? Has there been any indication, from administration sources, that any of these much needed reforms are to take place? Beyond the bare mention of a plan to send "experts," I have not heard of any. Indeed, I have not even heard any official spokesman publicly concede that the present Greek Government is corrupt and venal. It is constantly pictured as a "democracy."

Mr. President, until we make the healthy decision to face facts about Greece, we cannot even begin to make a start toward solving the Greek problem.

We have good reason to be suspicious of the atmosphere of crisis and the fanfare which surrounds this demand for a radical change in our foreign policy. I call attention to an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of March 23. Mr. Krock states that it was decided as long ago as the London Conference of Foreign Ministers—that was in September 1945—that there was no real hope for enduring peace in the continued "policy of appeasement and official treatment of Russia as a government friendly to the United States."

According to Mr. Krock, the President "made up his mind then that, when a fitting opportunity arose and one which Congress and the people would recognize as such, he would proclaim the new doctrine. On several occasions he thought

the time had come, but some of his important advisers talked him out of it.

"The British note of economic and military withdrawal from Greece, culminating a situation of which Washington had been wholly aware as it developed, pointed to a vacuum which the President found suited to the long-held purpose," Mr. Krock concludes.

The Greek situation, then, seems to be simply a convenient peg on which to hang a policy decided upon long ago. This is clearly a policy believed to be too unpopular to propose before this and too unpopular to offer at the present moment except in an atmosphere of crisis when people are apt to act rashly, without much thought.

Several dispatches by the well-informed diplomatic correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston, bear this out:

There is very little new in the situation in Greece—

Mr. Reston wrote in the Times March 7. He reported that the British Cabinet's decision last year to cut its overseas commitments was described at length to former Secretary of State Byrnes in Paris last summer. And he stated frankly that—

The executive branch of the Government feels it cannot get the cooperation of the legislature unless it places before it a specific proposal about a specific country in an atmosphere of crisis.

In later dispatches, Mr. Reston explained how the Greek crisis was being built up by the State Department through unofficial talks in which key correspondents were impressed with the so-called Russian danger, and its connection with the Greek problem.

Both Mr. Krock and Mr. Reston emphasize in their dispatches—as have many commentators—that the President's new policy is a global one, with no limits put on the type or scope of our proposed support, and no definition made of free peoples. As Mr. Krock says, it—

commits the United States to unlimited expenditures for an unlimited future and to whatever economic and military consequences may accrue.

A more complete appraisal of the true cost of the program, according to Mr. Reston, writing in the New York Times of March 16, would be $5,000,000,000 a year. However, the State Department, Mr. Reston says, was afraid that if it asked for so large an immediate appropriation, it would run the risk of being repudiated altogether. So it adopted, in Reston's words, the "one-step-at-a-time technique."

The State Department felt, and again I quote Mr. Reston, that—

the Congress would not face up to the kind of fundamental long-range expensive program necessary * * * and had to be nursed along a step at a time.

Mr. Reston emphasized that the State Department feels—

that the most successful way to introduce a foreign policy in Congress is to oversell it piecemeal in an atmosphere of crisis. * * * The same technique of overstatement in time of crisis is being applied on Capitol Hill on the Greek and Turkish loan.

Mr. President, neither we in Congress, nor the people in this country are children to be nursed along, one step at a time, on a dangerous path whose ending we cannot see. We must not let ourselves be deceived by the artificial crisis that has been created. We must not be driven to rash action by the false urgency that has been injected into this question.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I regret very much that we must rely for our information about the real intentions and purposes of our policy makers on newspaper writers who have very close ties to the State Department. The real objectives of our foreign policy are the concern of Congress and the people, and should be clear and above-board at all times. Instead, they are more and more cloaked in a veil of secrecy, which is lifted only occasionally—sometimes opportunely and sometimes accidentally—by favored writers who increasingly tend to become propagandists for the official view. This is the way to stifle the expression of opposition views and to block informed discussion. We are being subjected to a "propaganda by leaks," which is not unlike the traditional Chinese water torture.

In the present instance, we must insist upon a clear and specific statement of the objectives of this program and all that it includes, and a careful study of all that it implies, both at home and abroad.

Let me ask at this point whether we are, in fact, going to be committed to a $31,885,000,000 program, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator given Mr. Reston's qualifications? I do not understand what they are.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a foreign affairs and diplomatic correspondent for the New York Times.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he in contact with the Under Secretary of State?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know with whom he has been in contact; but he seems to have special sources of information and the New York Times is a reputable newspaper and it is usually conceded that his words should have some basis of fact.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not quite understand the Senator's observation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, I should much prefer to quote the State Department, but we cannot get anything from the State Department directly.

Mr. WHERRY. Did Mr. Reston obtain from the State Department his figures about the $5,000,000,000 program?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know where he got his figures, but his advance announcements have often been proved to be authoritative.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has just stated that he cannot get any information from the State Department. Let me inquire whether the Senator has found time to read what Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs William Clayton have said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee upon this question.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I have not read the full testimony. I have read the rather full reports that appeared in the newspapers. That is all the information which the American people have on which to base their conclusions.

Mr. LUCAS. I commend their testimony to the Senator, in view of the fact that he has made much ado about an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News. I am sure that after the Senator from Idaho reads the testimony of both those gentlemen—as I have had an oppotunity to do—he will find that the Senators on the committee were rather thorough and exhaustive in their questions and the Under Secretaries were frank and forthright in their explanations and replies. In short, it seems to me that a full disclosure of everything of material value was submitted to the committee by Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Clayton. I also understand that additional witnesses are to appear before the hearings are over. I hope the Senator will read all the testimony. If he does, I believe he may wish to change some of the statements he has made about the State Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I find that I am wrong, I certainly shall be glad to change my statements. I was never one to be dogmatic or to stick to something when I found it was wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. The point which I desire to emphasize is that testimony has come to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations from the Office of the Secretary of State; yet the Senator from Idaho has not seen fit to obtain that testimony. The Senator takes the United States News as his authority. This is being done before all the evidence has been submitted to the committee and before all the witnesses have been heard. With all due deference to my good friend, I think he might have waited until the hearings were over and until he had the benefit of all the testimony before making the present argument. I submit that would have been the better course for the Senator to pursue, rather than to present to the Senate at this time his conclusion based upon some newspaper or magazine article. I am sure the writers therein do not know as much about the subject matter at hand as do those who are in the Office of the Secretary of State. It is the business of Secretaries of State to keep up with world affairs affecting the security of this Nation. Theirs is a peculiar knowledge—a thorough understanding, and should be received with great solemnity and respect. Their opinions should be given great weight by Members of the Senate in reaching their final decision.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the distinguished Senator to understand that I was not questioning the figures in any way, but I was interested in the Senator's quotation of a statement by Mr. Reston regarding a program of $5,000,000,000 a year, which, as I understood, was to extend into the future. Did I correctly understand the statement?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know whether Mr. Reston had a source of information in the State Department, or whether he gave the basis for the figures he cited. Or were they simply his own estimates?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the statement of a gentleman who is a diplomatic writer for the New York Times, and he has a reputation for veracity and reliability, and many of his fellow reporters complain that he has special access to information in the State Department. That is all I know about the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there is no reason to disbelieve that the true cost of this program would be at least $5,000,000,000 a year. We are already hearing about proposed loans to such countries as Korea and China. The new doctrine would seem to be an invitation to any regime that wants to call itself anti-Soviet to blackmail us for help.

The five billion or more dollars a year that this new policy might cost us would be in addition to the some $6,000,000,000 provided for international obligations in the current budget.

Mr. President, a very revealing article has appeared in the United States News, the same publication from which I have quoted earlier this afternoon. I should like to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD, for it states the various countries we are expected to help. Of course, the United States News is a highly conservative organ which is circulated mostly among members of the business community. The article gives us a very good idea of what is behind this move and what its implications are.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE'LL GUARD WORLD AREAS WHERE THE BRITISH PULL BACK—DOLLARS, EXPERTS, AND WEAPONS FOR KEY COUNTRIES IN RUSSIA'S PATH—COSTS AND LACK OF POLITICAL EXPERIENCE AS OBSTACLES TO SHOULDERING LOAD EVERYWHERE

If the United States, as planned, takes over from the British in Greece, results that follow will gradually be felt over much of the world.

Dollars, in that event, will be used in Greece on a rather lavish scale to supply food, to restore currency values, to underwrite imports, to restore a basis for orderly trade. As much as $250,000,000 may be poured into Greece in the year ahead.

United States troops, at least initially, will not be provided to put down resistance to the established government.

Military supplies will be furnished on a moderate scale at first.

Experts, advisers on currency problems, trade problems, industrial problems, will be supplied to guide the expenditure and investment of dollars.

That is the broad pattern of policy as it is shaped for Greece, subject to approval by Congress. Greece, however, is just a small guinea pig for experiments in policy that then may be applied more widely, with dollars as the spearhead of a venture aimed at moving in as the British pull out of world commitments. At the very least, the United States Navy will be called on to guard the security of the world's oceans—a job that Britain once had.

Britain, running at a heavy loss in her world business, is withdrawing from unprofitable ventures and putting it up to the United States to take her place. The alternative is to let some situations go by default to groups that might be tied to Russia.

In the event that Congress agrees to shoulder British obligations in Greece, including some tough problems, other decisions will follow.

Turkey is second in line to get aid. If Greece falls into the Russian sphere, Turkey and the Dardanelles will be outflanked by the Soviets. In any event, Turkey's position is as much endangered by Russia as that of Greece. Thus, if Greece is helped in her effort to remain outside the Russian orbit, Turkey will be in a position to insist upon aid too.

A Turkish army of nearly 600,000 men stands ready to defend the Dardanelles—the gateway from the Black Sea to the Aegean and Mediterranean that Russia insists should be under her dominance. A recent secret White House conference dealt more with the problems of Turkey, now that British support is about to be withdrawn, than with those of Greece. The Turkish Government wants large-scale aid in the form of military supplies, and maybe dollar loans.

Palestine comes next. In Palestine, the British are involved in a situation that is requiring 100,000 British troops to manage. Britain is indicating to this Government that she may be forced to shift some of the responsibility for that area to the United States, if not the United Nations.

Any move by the United States to take over from Britain would probably involve large loans to Arab states to quiet opposition to large-scale Jewish immigration.

Egypt already is being turned loose by Britain. If Palestine is given up by the British, if Greece slips into the Russian sphere, and Turkey does the same, the effective defense of the whole eastern Mediterranean is lost, and the Suez Canal outlet to the Indian Ocean is jeopardized.

Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, in that event, become major problems. United States oil companies have rights to vast oil reserves in this region, reserves that are expected to exceed those in the United States itself and to represent some 42 percent of the world's oil resources. A $100,000,000 United States investment in a pipe line to carry Saudi Arabian oil to the Mediterranean is agreed upon.

Oil in this area is regarded as a major United States war resource, and its defense is viewed as important. Russia, with only 9 percent of the world's oil resources, is trying to get a foothold here. Whoever controls the eastern Mediterranean can dominate ready accessibility to this oil area, which accounts for the fact that the United States Navy, even now, is maintaining a fleet of three cruisers and six destroyers in the Mediterranean.

Basically, the foreign policy of the United States, as it has evolved, calls for resistance to expansion of Russian influence wherever that influence is exerted. Britain, to date, has cooperated in that policy despite the cost. The British, however, are seriously squeezed financially and are letting this country know that it will have to assume much more of the world burden or accept a further expansion of influence by Russia.

ECHOES

This means that the policy decision the United States makes with regard to taking over British commitments will have its repercussion over much of the world.

Italy, for example, is being held together now only by large-scale aid from this country. Communist influences in Italy are growing. The Russian sphere extends now to Yugoslavia and Albania, across the Adriatic from Italy. If United States policy is to stop the expansion of Russia's sphere, Italy will be in a position to demand new loans, more aid, further United States intervention as a condition of more resistance to Communist influence.

France will call for continued help. The French already have had large United States dollar loans. They are applying for a $500,000,000 advance from the World Bank when that institution starts to function. Communist Party representatives now serve in the French Cabinet and their presence inclines the United States to be liberal in dollar advances to try to bolster the French economy and thereby avoid incentive to further Communist Party gains.

Germany is to be an increasing burden on the United States under the policy line now being proposed. The British are letting this Government know that they are not able to match the United States funds that Herbert Hoover has suggested as a minimum to provide a food dole to the German people. In a merger of British and American zones in Germany, the United States is taking over the major expense of sustaining a minimum diet for Germans of both zones. It will not be surprising if the United States soon is given the task of supplying troops to carry out more occupational duties in the British zone.

EASTERN PROBLEM

It is the same story on the other side of the world, where the United States undertook the burden of stabilization from the start:

In Japan, United States food and United States dollars are being spent on a large scale to try to bolster and rebuild Japan along a non-Communist line. General of the Army Douglas MacArthur warns that these expenses may increase, not lessen, in the period ahead.

In China, this country already has poured in large amounts of money, relief supplies, and surplus Army material, but now is holding back, temporarily at least, and accepting the chance of an overthrow by Chinese Communists. That is one situation where the cost of supporting the established Government is regarded as being too high for the returns.

In the Philippines, where rebels hold big areas, the United States may be called upon to resume some of its former responsibility, if the regime of President Manuel Roxas proves too weak to govern.

In India, Indochina, Indonesia, the British, French, and Dutch are unable to maintain their former authority, and the job of preserving order may be passed to the United States if order is to be preserved.

What the United States is up against all over the world is the fact that the British Empire is breaking apart at a time when Europe and Asia both are in chaos. The French and Dutch Empires are cracking, too. Immediate decisions to be made by the United States concern Greece and Turkey, but the emergencies in those countries are only samples of what is happening in many widely scattered parts of the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the Turkey-Greece proposal means, for one thing, an increasingly crushing tax load for the American people. For the most part, our money would be spent unproductively, for we would largely be—in Mr. Reston's words—"buying security by arming mercenaries to fight communism."

We will also have to maintain armed forces sufficient to police a large part of

the world. This will certainly require, among other things, a drastic cutting down of the Federal Government's expenditures on public health, social services, education, and, let me add, reclamation projects, flood control, and highways. Some newspapers have already pointed out editorially that it may be necessary to cut down on veterans' benefits as a result of the proposed loans for Greece and Turkey and what will follow.

But this is not all. We ought to be building a peace economy. But this program bids fair to set off an artificial boom which will result in a major depression.

The very conservative business writer of the New York Times, Russell Porter, writing in support of what he called the Pax Americana, on March 16 nonetheless admitted that the result of the new State Department policy may be to step up inflationary pressures. If the tendency to inflation continues, he said, "it may destroy the country's hopes of controlling the post-war boom well enough to keep it from eventually collapsing in a major depression, with widespread business failures and mass unemployment."

So the new imperialism may, according to Mr. Porter, very well end in the break-down of free enterprise and democracy and the very triumph of totalitarianism that we are seeking to forestall.

This is only one type of problem raised by the State Department's proposals.

Mr. President, these implications are of enormous importance, and they cannot be ignored. We must take the time to inform ourselves and the people back home about them, and must consider these factors in making our decision.

There is another aspect of this so-called crisis which I should like to discuss. It is being widely said that Congress cannot turn down the Greek and Turkish recommendations without creating the appearance of a dangerous division of American opinion at a crucial point in history. The New York Times correspondent, James Reston, pointed out, March 19:

> The one fact that is generally stressed by both the Congressmen and the officials of the executive branch is that Congress does not now have an absolutely free choice.

I say, Mr. President, that this raises the most serious question as to why the whole business was precipitated in this manner in the first place.

The State Department claims that the British informed them only at the end of February that Britain could not support Greece after March 31. It has been widely reported, however, that the State Department was informed about the proposed British withdrawal as long ago as October 1946. The State Department has denied this. However, it can be assumed as certain that the British Government knew at a much earlier date than late February that it could not continue to support Greece. It is fair to assume, therefore, that the State Department was in fact informed much earlier.

The New York Times reports, to which I have already directed attention, state clearly that the American Government has been kept informed of the Greek situation and British intentions there all along.

The New York Times on March 17 headlined a dispatch from Paris: "Europeans uneasy on new United States policy." The dispatch said that reaction in high places throughout Europe may surprise many Americans. The correspondent, Harold Callender, declared, on the basis of conversations with Frenchmen and other Europeans:

> To a striking extent professional diplomatic quarters, and other non-Communist or anti-Communist quarters, echoed in an only slightly attenuated form the Moscow charge of a new and expanding American imperialism.

In Italy, too, there was an uneasy reaction from all parties. The Times reported from Rome, March 14, that the independent and moderate Italian press clearly reveals its anxiety lest President Truman's move should lead to complications that might involve Italy in war. The Times quoted Swedish papers as declaring that the President's speech has only served to increase the difficulties and deepen the disagreement between east and west.

Nor has the President's policy aroused enthusiasm in England, except from Winston Churchill and his friends. The New York Herald Tribune reported March 21 that Mr. Churchill speaks for a minority. According to the Tribune correspondent, Jack Tait:

> The shots fired in the House (of Commons) at the Truman program appear to come from fear and suspicion of the United States rather than from love of Russia.

He reported that some members of Parliament see Americans as sinister planners, bent on propagating the capitalist system in Europe as opposed either to Russian communism or British socialism, and that others see the United States dragging Britain into a ghastly show-down war with Russia.

"Still others," he said, "shy away from American dominance in Greece on the grounds that it will not permit the evolution of a true people's government in that country. The United States is clearly associated with the forces of the right in the British mind."

The British paper, the Manchester Guardian, declared editorially:

> One feels that, faced with the same situation, President Roosevelt would first have tried to do the same things through the United Nations by enlisting the support of other nations, including Russia if possible. Peace, the status quo, the integrity of nations—these are not exclusive American interests, but the interests of us all.

The New York Herald Tribune has reported that the most prevalent fear aroused in Britain by the Greece-Turkey program is that the United States is tending toward individual rather than collective action in international affairs. It is not only in England that this fear prevails. There has been overwhelming protest here in the United States, because people feel that we have bypassed the United Nations. As a result, it is now said that the United Nations may be informed about our action; it has been informed since I prepared these remarks. Others are proposing statements or preambles to the bills stating that the proposed action does not violate the UN charter.

I find this, Mr. President, a strange idea of the United Nations. The United Nations was created not to be informed about actions taken by any one of its members in the sphere of international relations, but to decide itself whether action should be taken, particularly when a threat of war is involved.

There can be no doubt that the United Nations has adequate power to meet this crisis. Paragraph 1 of article 1 of the UN Charter defines the purposes of the United Nations, among other things, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Article 33 provides the several methods for settlement and adjudication of disputes and gives the Security Council authority, whenever it deems necessary, to call upon the parties to settle their disputes by such means.

Article 34 gives the Security Council authority to "investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

The questions of Greece and Turkey must be submitted to the United Nations so that the United Nations can itself decide what action should, or should not, be taken. If the problem is not submitted to the United Nations, no matter how much information we may choose to give that Organization, or how many preambles we may choose to write, the United Nations will have been weakened by our hands. Indeed, Mr. President, Mr. Trygve Lie himself, in his recent speech, was suggesting politely that the UN possibly should have the matter to consider.

Mr. President, we live in a perilous age. The atomic bomb threatens the entire earth with destruction. The people of the world must learn, and learn soon, to get along together. Our only hope is in international friendship and cooperation. Let us not deceive ourselves about that. Let us not delude ourselves with a false notion of security based upon arms superiority. Let us not believe—because none of our scientists believe—that the manufacture of the atomic bomb is a secret forever hidden from the view of scientists who do not work in United States laboratories.

Our last best hope, our only hope, Mr. President, is the United Nations. We must build the UN, and we must strengthen it until it becomes the world's great bulwark against men's warlike insanity. We must go further; we must give it the strength and sinews to enable it to prevent wars for all time, by developing the United Nations into a true world government, Mr. President. We

must make the United Nations a parliament of men, the legislature of a peaceful world. The United Nations has already proved its worth in settling disputes between nations. It has successfully settled disputes involving Iran, Syria, and Lebanon. We have every reason to be confident it can handle this situation also.

The problem of Greece and Turkey is clearly one for the United Nations. If we bypass the United Nations today, we have scuttled it just as surely as we scuttled the League of Nations by our refusal to join it after the last war.

The senior Senator from Florida and myself have introduced a resolution which recognizes the great relief needs of the Greek people, but would solve them through the operation of the machinery of the United Nations. I urge every one of my colleagues to give his close attention to that bill and to realize that it is not necessary to scuttle the United Nations to achieve the relief of the Greek people. It is possible to give the United Nations its great opportunity to show its effectiveness. When this body votes on the program for Greece and Turkey, it will make a momentous decision. It will decide whether the old system of unilateral power politics is to be continued to its ultimate hopeless end, or whether it is to be replaced by the orderly processes of an international body. It will decide whether the old and vicious system of imperialism is forever dead, or whether this great and free country will take over the loathsome burdens of the dying British Empire.

I have made very strenuous attempts during the last several weeks to learn what public opinion is on this matter. I have talked to people wherever I went. I have sought out dozens of men and women who visited Greece on relief and journalistic missions. I have closely read the public opinion polls, and I have read the mail which has come in from my own and other States. I have decided, Mr. President, that the American people are in accord with the views I have set forth here today. The public does not wish to hide its head in the sand, it does not wish to return to isolationism, and finally, the public is willing to make generous sacrifices for reasonable relief needs, but it wants to be sure the money is prudently spent by honest and efficient agents, and not by a corrupt king.

The resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Florida and myself meets exactly these requirements. It is a genuine attempt to protect American interests and to preserve and to protect the people of Greece, to aid them.

I fully realize the necessity of the United Nations taking action. I submit that it is the safest and most effective policy to protect democracy and world peace.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an article from today's Cincinnati Enquirer under the headline "Chinese 'terrorist' troops killed 5,000 in attempting to halt Formosa rebellion; oppression is worst ever, editor avers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE "TERRORIST" TROOPS KILLED 5,000 IN ATTEMPTING TO HALT FORMOSA REBELLION; OPPRESSION IS WORST EVER, EDITOR SAYS

SHANGHAI, March 30.—John W. Powell declared today in an article in his newspaper, China Weekly Review, that Chinese troops sent to Formosa to quell riots which started there February 28, had perpetrated "some of the most unimaginable atrocities."

Powell, son of the late famed editor, J. B. Powell, wrote that a conservative estimate placed the number of Formosans killed at 5,000, with thousands more imprisoned. He has newly returned from a visit to Formosa.

So far as is known, Powell is the only American correspondent who has succeeded in going to and returning from the big island province off China's east coast since rioting began.

No immediate comment was forthcoming from Chinese Government sources, but the Government previously had depreciated the extent of the scantily reported Formosan disorders.

On March 14, Peng Hsueh-Pei, Chinese Minister of Information, told foreign newsmen in Nanking that the Formosan "incident will soon be closed." He declined to assist reporters in going there, saying that the government was "too busy" to look after them.

On March 10 a Formosan delegation arrived in Nanking and charged that authorities up to that time had killed 3,000 to 4,000 Formosans. Pro-Government Chinese press reports on the first day had placed the death toll at 500.

Pro-Government sources and the Formosans agreed that the Government's monopoly system in various businesses, particularly tobacco, had touched off what the Chinese Central News Agency—an official Government organ—said was open and widespread rebellion.

Powell added the disorders culminated a year and a half of flagrant Chinese misrule which he said had squeezed and oppressed the Formosans far worse than when they were ruled by the Japanese.

China lost Formosa in 1895; it was restored to her in 1945 after the Japanese surrender.

Powell's article, entitled "Blood Bath in Taiwan," said the administration of Gov. Chen Yi had coupled trickery with a reign of terror which he said was probably unequaled in the history of Kuomin-tang China and thus had virtually suppressed the rebellion.

Powell wrote that the riots were preceded by extremely severe searches of shops and peddler stands by police who, he said, were trying to enforce new economic regulations which virtually abolished private trade. These regulations, he said, directly violated Central Government laws in China proper.

The proverbial last straw came on February 27, he declared, when police killed a 40-year-old woman in Taipei (Taihoku), the capital, when she protested seizure of her cigarette tray. He said a man died from a shot fired by another policeman into the crowd of onlookers.

Mr. TAYLOR. We turned Formosa back to the Government of Chiang Kai-shek, another of the supposed and so-called democracies that we are attempting to bolster round the world, and his Government is so corrupt, this newspaper says, that the Formosans were forced to rebel, and the most terrible atrocities in the history of China, a country noted for atrocities, are being perpetrated upon the people of Formosa with lend-lease weapons furnished by the United States.

In Greece, the very people who fought Adolf Hitler are being hunted down with guns furnished by us. I contend, Mr. President, we will not bring peace to the world, we will not build confidence in the United States, in the institution of democracy, by simply supporting every broken-down reactionary Fascist government in the world, simply because it happens to be opposed to communism.

EXHIBIT A

TOMORROW—FROM THE NATION'S CAPITAL—A LOOK AHEAD

NEWSGRAM

It isn't to be so bad—this job of trying to run the world. It seems that somebody has to run it. Britain can't. Russia will, if United States doesn't.

War is not part of the job. A willingness to go to war if challenged, however, is part of it. War won't come if United States accepts idea of possible war.

War would come if United States let Russia go on picking off choice corners in the world; if this country backed away as Russia pushed out. Russia could get strong that way, as Hitler got strong, through fear by others. At some point it then would be a matter of fighting or losing by default with Russia strong.

War is far less likely with Russia checkmated; a long peace more likely.

Russia cannot, and will not, challenge a United States willing to fight. If Russia cannot go on picking off strategic bits of real estate without a fight she will pull back. If Russia is convinced that United States is ready to run the world if it must, then Russia will be interested in a functioning United Nations. In that way she could get a voice in what goes on. Otherwise she's out. If Russia is ready to stop her foolishness, the United Nations could function and United States in that way could let a world organization do more of the job.

That's the long and short of it.

United States is equipped to guide the world if that's what Russia forces.

A $31,885,000,000 United States aid and development program is in the works. Most of that program has had Congress approval.

Capital equipment is to be supplied in big volume.

Food and clothing are to continue to pour out of United States.

Dollars, on loan, to be translated into goods, are supplied liberally by Government, and private capital for foreign investment soon is to be tapped.

Brains, engineering brains, financing brains, administrative brains, are to be exported in large quantities. Some military brains will go, too.

United States has about everything to offer if the outside world will cooperate. Big figures, big jobs no longer awe Americans. There is a $341,000,000,000 investment already made in war, a $31,885,000,000 postwar investment already either set or about to be set. United States couldn't pull back now if it wanted to.

Russia, by contrast, offers these things for export:

Revolution—a technique for Communist Party members to gain power.

Police to advise on terror and methods of dealing with opponents.

Requisition teams to drain away available supplies to Russia.

Against that background, these conclusions seem evident:

Europe, outside the Russian sphere, will be set up in business again.

Russian-dominated areas will continue in poverty, unless ready to join with the West in meeting terms of the plans for world cooperation.

Western Germany will be revived, either on a basis Russia now will be ready to accept, or independent of Russia. That will be settled in Moscow.

Japan probably will be revived, so people can go to work again.

Russia will either mend her ways or be isolated. Russian weakness at this time is profound. Internal strains are greater than at any other time in the experience of the regime. Industrial revival is far behind schedule. The poverty of Russian people is acute and growing, rather than being relieved.

Any idea that Russia, in the foreseeable future, could challenge this country in a military way, with any hope of success, is absurd.

What Russia has sought, however, is to gain strategic victories without fighting, to maneuver with fifth columns and political weapons against weak nations, hoping thereby to gain strength. United States is calling that game.

Cost of world leadership for United States need not be too high.

Loans make up $20,774,000,000 of a $31,885,000,000 program.

Private loans are to represent $7,200,000,000 of that total.

Surplus property already paid for adds another $5,760,000,000.

Relief is down for $5,351,000,000, but more than half of that is already spent and not a new expense. The only funds not yet budgeted are $950,000,000 for Turkey and Greece, for Germany and for Austria. That's $950,000,000 in a $37,500,000,000 budget. It isn't enough to upset the financial apple cart.

The idea is that United States industry soon will be making heavy investments in foreign industries. Industry of this country invested $7,120,000,000 abroad after World War I, and, by 1940, had drawn income of $7,428,000,000 on that investment. Plans now shaping don't concern only taxpayers.

Taxes need not be higher for the United States' venture in world leadership.

Tax reduction, in any event, is tied to the level of prosperity.

Prosperity levels will relate directly to United States postwar investment in world development, to the very large flow of dollars and goods abroad and to the large flow of foreign goods into United States.

A profit is possible, in the end, on United States venturing abroad.

Profit, however, will come only if United States can figure out how to let other nations pay the interest and principal on their loans by selling goods in the United States market. That is a problem that can be deferred during the period ahead when the big-scale investment will be in capital equipment to produce goods. New loans in this period will greatly exceed the scheduled payments.

What does seem more probable for United States is this:

Universal military training probably will become inevitable.

Training, at the start, is likely to be for 6 months, not a year.

Army-Navy-Air Forces size will remain far above prewar.

Merger of armed forces, in the end, will be forced by economy demands.

A double budget—a budget that will separate outright spending from loans, seems likely to be forced in years ahead, if lending operations grow.

Americans are to be forced to take an interest in the outside world. It is probable that careers related to service abroad will become as important in United States as they have been in Britain, where brains were exported on a big scale.

Congress cannot easily back out of commitments made and being made.

A Republican-Communist axis in United States seems very unlikely.

Isolationists now find themselves alined with United States Communists, now find that their position, politically, is not what it once was.

A crisis in far-off Greece, thus, is fixing United States postwar foreign policy.

George Marshall, United States Secretary of State, favored a show-down with Russia.

General Marshall balked at the idea of United States on the defensive, insisted that in peace as in war the one strategy that succeeds is an offensive strategy, a strategy that United States always has insisted upon. Idea that a weak Russia could go on pushing this country around simply didn't make sense to the Secretary.

Secretary Marshall is inclined to imagination and daring, not drift.

TREND OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

United States business is to be affected directly by United States decision to underwrite world rebuilding, to take leadership in reorganizing the world.

Dollars are to flow out faster on loan and as gifts.

Trade will be high and active wherever the dollars flow.

Price levels will tend to be supported by heavy world demand for many types of goods, sale of which will be financed by United States loans.

Tariffs will tend to come down to permit service on loans.

Taxes will remain relatively high to support the Military Establishment required to assure order in the world and to underwrite the loan program.

Businessmen will do well to get deeply interested in world trade, to find where they may fit into what obviously is to be an expanding field of United States interest and activity abroad. It's to be settled now that the flag will follow the dollar into the far reaches of many areas in the world.

What's happening now isn't something brand new for United States. This country went out on a big scale with loans abroad after the last war.

Private loans abroad after World War I totaled above $11,000,000,000.

Government loans totaled another $7,500,000,000.

That was an $18,500,000,000 pump-priming program for the first postwar. It went sour when United States balked at taking full repayment in foreign goods. About all of the Government's loans were defaulted, and $3,372,000,000 of principal was lost on private loans. Of private loans still unpaid at 1944's end 81.7 percent of European issues were in default, 60.7 percent of Latin-American, and 55.7 percent of far eastern. There was no default on loans to Canada.

United States after World War I provided dollars but no considered plan by which dollars could be repaid. Tariffs were raised, not lowered. Loans often were made for nonproductive purposes. The end result was trouble.

Loans and gifts now projected for the world exceed $31,000,000,000.

Machinery for lending this time is more elaborate, more studied.

A world bank, with some Government guaranty of returns on loans made by private investors, will direct the over-all program of investment.

A monetary fund will seek to establish some stability in currencies.

A United States Export-Import Bank will direct some Government investment.

A negotiated dollar loan is to help out the British.

This country at the same time is preparing to reduce tariffs, to get some of the wartime controls over trade removed, to set up an international trade organization within which broad trade policies can be set. If planning will straighten out the world, experience after World War II will differ from experience after World War I. That remains to be seen.

The fact of heavy pump priming through loans and gifts is very real.

Food will remain in heavy demand. United States agriculture is to be bolstered by heavy commitments to help feed the world out of 1947 crops.

Machinery will be in heavy demand. World Bank loans, other loans, and use of exchange earned in trade will be spent for United States machinery. It is becoming highly probable that Germany and Japan will be permitted to restore industry on a broader scale than indicated earlier.

Steel and other raw materials face big markets.

Farm machinery is to be in heavy demand. The same is true of autos. It is probable that business machines are to be sought after.

Engineering services will be expected from United States as countries set about to rebuild or to industrialize. Financial advisers may find big jobs, too.

Industry in United States, alone of all industry, is equipped to turn out the goods needed abroad in the volume needed to restore war damage. Russia as well as other nations must look to United States for the equipment that rebuilding requires. There isn't any question about a large export trade financed by loans. What is not so clear, however, is exactly how borrowing nations are to pay for what they buy when the time comes to get back on a cash basis.

Nothing that is happening changes the outlook for business in months ahead. There still is the prospect of a downward adjustment in prices and production.

Prices are out of line with one another. Living costs have outstripped income increases. Building costs have shot up to nearly prohibitive heights. It is to be necessary to restore some balance before prolonged prosperity.

A turn downward in many prices is likely to be apparent by or soon after midyear, with production to show some decline not much later.

A bottom in the corrective move probably will be reached in early 1948.

A new rise into the period of postwar prosperity probably will be under way by midyear, 1948, or soon after that time. A period of 12 to 15 months is likely to be required for any correction that occurs in this period.

Downward adjustment, roughly, will be around 20 percent.

Even so, activity in business, profits, incomes will remain very high by any prewar standards. There will not be a real depression at this stage in the broad turn of the business cycle.

Tax reduction is not likely to be upset seriously by world developments.

A tax cut of at least 10 percent still seems likely for 1947 income.

Taxes obviously are going to remain far higher than before the war even after there is a broad tax adjustment in 1948. When the major tax cutting of postwar is undertaken next year individuals will be favored, with corporations to get rather modest relief. Excises will be reduced substantially then.

A budget in balance at around $41,300,000,000 is probable for this year.

A balanced budget at around $35,000,000,000 is probable for next year, for the year that starts next July 1. That's about $2,500,000,000 under the level that Mr. Truman estimated and represents probable savings.

A balance in this years budget will leave the Government $2,300,000,000 better off than the President figured and will increase the prospect that tax reduction will be applied to 1947 individual incomes.

Corporations should notice that Treasury is insisting upon explanation when less than 70 percent of 1946 earnings are distributed as dividends.

Despite ambiguous statements, section 102 of the revenue act, requiring that earnings

retained in business be "reasonable," is to get closer application than in war years, is to be applied more definitely. Treasury interest is in forcing income into the hands of individuals where it can be taxed at the high prevailing rates, after first being taxed at the corporation tax rate.

Rent control is being killed, but almost surely will be revived in a modified form. Present controls die definitely on June 30.

Sugar rationing is to be extended, with prices controlled.

Building controls run through 1947, but very probably are to be modified before long. Builders are blaming the effort to allocate materials for many of their present troubles. Veterans' housing is as good as dead.

The economy is relatively free from controls at this time. Prices are continuing to move steadily higher in the postcontrol inflation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; and

H. J. Res. 146, Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

As in legislative session,

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On March 29, 1947:

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the Selective Service records, and for other purposes; and

On March 31, 1947:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Green
Ball	Cooper	Gurney
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bricker	Donnell	Hawkes
Brooks	Downey	Hayden
Buck	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bushfield	Ecton	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Byrd	Ferguson	Holland
Cain	Flanders	Ives
Capper	Fulbright	Jenner
Chavez	George	Johnson, Colo.
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Smith
Kem	Millikin	Sparkman
Kilgore	Moore	Stewart
Knowland	Morse	Taft
Langer	Murray	Taylor
Lodge	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	O'Conor	Thomas, Utah
McCarran	O'Daniel	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Mahoney	Tydings
McClellan	Overton	Umstead
McFarland	Pepper	Vandenberg
McGrath	Reed	Watkins
McKellar	Revercomb	Wherry
McMahon	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
Magnuson	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Malone	Russell	Wilson
Martin	Saltonstall	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to discuss primarily the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to recommit the Atomic Energy Commission nominations to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Before doing so I think I should say that I am not one of those who know all about atomic energy. I believe I read something about splitting the atom when I was a boy, but that was a long time ago.

The first I ever knew of the United States having a will to split the atom or to bring about the discovery of atomic energy was in 1941. I shall take the liberty of telling briefly about that experience.

In 1941 Mr. Stimson was Secretary of War. He had been Secretary of State in another administration. He called me on the telephone one morning and said, "I should like to come to see you in about an hour." I told him I would be delighted to see him. In about half an hour he called again and stated that there were two or three other Senators whom he wanted to see at the same time, and he wondered if I would meet with him and the other Senators in the Democratic caucus room so that we could talk about the same matter at the same time and save a great deal of time. I laughed and said jokingly, "Why is it that you want to meet in the Democratic caucus room?" He laughed a little at that; but in half an hour five of us met in the caucus room. There were: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whom I do not see present in the Chamber at the moment; the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is not in the Chamber; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and myself. At that time the Senator from Kentucky was the majority leader and the Senator from Maine was the minority leader.

After the usual formalities Secretary Stimson told us that he had a group of scientists working on a new proposal. He stated that they had been working for quite a while. He had obtained an appropriation the previous year, and he believed that those scientists would be able to discover the secret of atomic energy. Everyone laughed. I said, "I remember reading when I was a boy that 2,300 years ago Alexander the Great undertook to have Macedonian scientists discover the splitting of the atom." He said, "Yes; but I think we can succeed." Then I told him that I remembered some very hard Latin which I learned when I was in college. Three or four hundred years after Alexander, Lucretius, a Latin poet, had had a great deal to say about the atom. Secretary Stimson said, "Yes." I said, "Everyone has been talking about it ever since. Scientists all over the world have been talking about discovering how to split the atom, and at the beginning of one of the greatest wars in history you talk about spending a large sum of money to split the atom."

He then made one of the best arguments in favor of following up that research that I have ever listened to in my life. I believe that the other Senators who heard him would say that he made a wonderful argument. The first one to be convinced was the Senator from Maine. The next one to be convinced was the Senator from Kentucky. The third one to be convinced was the Senator from New Hampshire; and the fourth was myself. At that time the Senator from New Hampshire was the ranking member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee and I was the acting chairman of the committee, and had been for some time. That was why we were invited to the conference. That was why we were given the information and consulted on the problem. Secretary Stimson wanted money. When I asked him how much money he wanted, he said he would like to have $1,000,000,000 the first year, but that if we could not give him $1,000,000,000, it would be necessary to have at least $800,000,000.

I said, "Mr. Secretary, you swore all four of us to secrecy a while ago, and you told us that you swore the four Members of the House to whom you submitted the same information. For heaven's sake, how do you expect us to keep it a secret and get an appropriation of a billion dollars for this purpose through the Congress? We are going into a great war. There is no telling how much it will cost. If I should suggest an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for an unstated purpose, I know Members of the Senate so well that I know they will never agree to it."

He said, "We have that figured out." As I recall, he had already figured it out with the President, and perhaps one or two others. The appropriation was to be placed in several different proposals—covered up, so to speak—and it was believed that it would go through in the face of the great war. We placed most of it in the emergency fund for the President. I told Secretary Stimson that I would be willing to do that but that if any Senator asked me, when I had charge of the bill on the floor, what the billion-dollar appropriation was for, I would not be willing to agree to tell a falsehood about it. Secretary Stimson said he was sure that no inquiry would be made about it. I told him that I would stop the bill until I had discussed the question further with the executive department—principally with himself. He agreed.

The bill was introduced in the House, and it passed the House and came to the Senate. It was reported by the Senate committee and considered on the floor of

the Senate. Not a single Member of either House asked about the appropriation. We were not asked about it in committee, and we were not asked about it on the floor of the Senate.

The next year exactly the same thing occurred. There was an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 the second year. With all the necessity for money in the third year we got by with an appropriation of $600,000,000, as members of the Appropriations Committee will probably recall, although we did not even tell the members of the committee about it. The total appropriations were $2,600,000,000.

Several years afterward, toward the close of the war, when the war with Germany was over, I ate ham for supper one night—we still call dinner supper in my part of the country—and could not sleep. I lay awake thinking about what we had done. We had spent $2,600,000,000; the war with Germany was over, and we had not heard a word about the atomic bomb. I remembered that on that day one of the important political leaders of Tennessee, from Chattanooga, Tenn., had been in my office and wished to know whether I would run for the Senate again. I told him I did not know; that I thought probably I had been in the Senate long enough, but that if the people wanted me to remain in the Senate it would be all right with me. Then I began to think what effect that sort of a proposition would have on my Senatorial aspirations for the sixth time, and I came to the conclusion that if it were said that I, as chairman of the Committe on Appropriations, had joined in spending $2,600,000,000 when a great war was going on, I need never expect to be again elected Senator from Tennessee.

I made up my mind that I would call Mr. Stimson the first thing next morning, which I did. I called him and asked him if he would see me, and he said he would. I said, "Will you be kind enough not to send someone to pin one of those big saucers on me?" We all remember the big identification "saucers," they used to pin on people who visited the Department.

He said at once he would meet me at the door, and he did. When we arrived at his office—it was up one flight of stairs, and we walked up—I told him what I wanted. He said, "Senator, by the strangest coincidence, yesterday I promised two gentlemen that I would not tell what the atomic-energy situation is at this time." I said, "Mr. Secretary, I wish you would get released from that promise." He said, "I will. I will see those two gentlemen today, and I will communicate with you before 12 o'clock tomorrow."

The next day I waited in my office for some word from Mr. Stimson. I waited until 5 minutes before 12. At that time I held the place which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] now holds. Then I came here to open the Senate. About 15 minutes after I arrived here—to be exact, it was 17½ minutes, I recall—a page came to me and said that a military gentleman wished to see me in the Vice President's office. I went there, and there was the personal military secretary of the Secretary of War. He said he had been delayed; that his car had got out of repair and it had delayed him a little while; that Mr. Stimson had taken a plane to New York at 10 o'clock and had instructed him to deliver a message to me. I said, "All right. What is the message?" He said, "It is in two parts. Mr. Stimson told me to tell you the first part. He has received permission from the two gentlemen who were in the secret to give you the first part of it. He said that if you insisted, I was to give you the second part, but that if you did not insist, I was not to give you the second part."

I said, "I want to hear the first part, and then I can tell you whether I want to hear the second part."

Thereupon he proceeded to tell me that the atomic bomb was one of the greatest successes in the world, far surpassing anything they ever believed would take place. He said they had bought three towns, if I remember correctly. I would have to go back to the record in order to be accurate about it, but that is my recollection; possibly the Senator from New Mexico could tell us. My recollection is that he said, "Senator, we have bought three towns and an enormous quantity of land. We have constructed experimental stations and have tried out the bomb, first removing every living human being and every tame animal and as many of the wild animals as possible. We have tried the bomb, and it has been an entire success, and we shall use it in this war."

I said, "And then what?" He said, "That is the second part, and I cannot tell you that unless you insist." I said, "I am afraid I shall have to insist, because I should like to know." He said, "There are three planes"—he told me what kind they were, but I have forgotten—"at this very moment on their way to Japan, loaded with atomic bombs, and we are expecting to hear from them at any time. The Secretary told me to inform you that if I told you this part of it he would let you know as soon as he heard from those bombs. He believes that they are going to work a great miracle."

As I recall—my memory is not so good as it was when I was younger—that very night, as I recall, before 8 or 9 o'clock, the whole world knew what had been done with those bombs. They cost us $2,600,000,000; indeed, much more than that. Of course we are all proud of them.

I think that was the best-kept secret I ever heard of in my life. There were four men in the House and four in the Senate who knew about it. I doubt that there were many others besides the executive officers in charge. General Groves had charge. It was under his general management, control and operation that the great success came of it.

I wish to be perfectly frank and say that I never was more astonished in all my days—and they have been many—than when I learned that General Groves had been relieved of that position, that many of the men who had brought about this great discovery had been dismissed and set aside, and that people who knew absolutely nothing about it and had never heard of it before, as the testimony shows, had been appointed in their places.

We have taken a great deal of proof. On Friday the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], entered a motion to recommit these nominations to the committee, and he gave magnificent reasons for taking that action. They were vital reasons. Statements were made by him which should be answered before the Senate consents to the nominations, because, under the Constitution, in the matter of appointments the power of the Senate is not confined to a mere formal authority, as some people sometimes seem to think, but is equal with that of the Executive.

The newspapers have described me lately as a man who opposes all nominations. I shall in a moment state what my record is in that regard. I have not examined the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in detail about it; but I have examined my memory to the best of my ability. I have been here through seven administrations. I first came here in the Taft administration; I served through the Wilson administration, through the Harding administration, through the Coolidge administration, through the Hoover administration, through the Roosevelt administration, and thus far in the Truman administration; and this is only the second nomination which I have disapproved in all that time—nearly 31 years.

The first was the nomination of Aubrey Williams, 2 years ago. Mr. Williams came from Tennessee, too. My colleague and I declined to endorse his appointment. It was sent to the Senate under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. We declined to support that nomination. All the newspapers said there was nothing whatever wrong with Mr. Williams; but he belonged to at least one and possibly two Communist-front organizations and was associated with Communists all the time. On that ground, my colleague and I, who were familiar with the facts, just as we are familiar with the facts in the case now before the Senate, opposed the nomination of Mr. Williams. We did so on the ground of his Communist leanings. We did not know whether he was a Communist; we had no evidence of his actual membership in the Communist Party. If he was a Communist, he kept it secret, just as Mr. Lilienthal is keeping it secret if he is a Communist. We do not know that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist; we have no papers which show that he is.

Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall present to the Senate some of the details relative to the action taken by the Senate on the nomination of Mr. Williams. Forty of the present Members of the Senate were Members of this body 2 years ago when the Senate voted on the nomination of Mr. Williams. Those 40 Senators voted against confirmation of his nomination, because he was associated with Communists. I was one of those 40 Senators. My colleague from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] was another of them, and most of the Senators I see around me now also belonged to that group.

Mr. President, the case against Mr. Lilienthal is a much stronger one, as will be developed, than the case against Mr. Williams was. Mr. Williams had been a school teacher, as I recall; but he was a very enthusiastic Communist-front organization man. His nomination was rejected by the Senate by a very large majority. As I recall, approximately 56 Senators voted against confirmation of his nomination.

Until the nominations now pending came to the Senate, the nomination of Mr. Williams was the only one I ever voted against during seven administrations, four of them Republican and three of them Democratic. That is why I was so astonished when, a short time ago, the newspapers charged me with being such a terrible man.

As I have said, the first thing we are to consider is the motion which has been made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I am heartily in favor of having the Senate adopt that motion and send these Atomic Energy Commission nominations back to the committee, for the purpose of having the committee take and hear additional proof. Briefly, I shall give my reasons for supporting the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio.

First, Mr. President, it was shown in the main hearings—I do not believe this matter has been discussed as yet—that during 1930, Mr. Lilienthal received from the Commerce Clearing House, an organization of public utilities in Chicago, Ill., approximately $20,000 a year—to be exact, according to the figures it was $20,020—and he continued to receive that sum until 1931, when Gov. Philip La Follette, of Wisconsin, offered him a position on the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, as it was then called—since known as the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. His salary from the Commerce Clearing House was then reduced to $14,500. Mr. Lilienthal continued in that place during the year 1931 and at least a portion of 1932.

From February 12, 1931, until August 27, 1932, a period of 18 months and 15 days, he received $5,000 a year from the State of Wisconsin, and at the same time he received from the Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, Ill., $14,500 a year, contrary to the plain terms of the Wisconsin statute. A little later I shall show that by receiving such salary from the Commerce Clearing House at the same time that he was a member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, he vacated the office with the Wisconsin Commission, for the Wisconsin statute provided that such would be the case if a member of the commission received a salary from any other organization, regardless of whether it was the right kind of an organization or the wrong kind.

Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to ask the Treasury Department what income tax Mr. Lilienthal paid during the years 1931 and 1932. By the way, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is one of my dearest friends; even if he is a Republican, he is one of the finest men I ever saw in my life. I have served with him ever since he has been in the Senate, and I have enjoyed my service with him. So I asked him to ask the Treasury Department what income tax Mr. Lilienthal paid during 1931 and 1932. I never had any more doubt that the Treasury Department would send that information to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee than I had that I was living at the time. That would be the most natural thing in the world; why should the Treasury Department withhold such information from the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee? Nevertheless, Mr. President, the Treasury Department refused to give him that information. By all means, the committee considering the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal should have that information. Mr. Lilienthal has been nominated for appointment to what may be the most powerful office ever created, and yet we find that in Chicago, Ill., and in Madison, Wis., he was holding two jobs, in violation of law. One of them—the one in Wisconsin—was for the control and management of the power companies, the railroads, and other public utilities, whereas in Chicago, Ill., the job he held was that of editor of the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, for the Commerce Clearing House, and in that connection he was supposed to obtain all the information he could which would be beneficial to the private utilities and send it to them.

To that extent, he was serving two masters with opposing interests. All my colleagues present who are lawyers will recognize that it is just the same as a lawyer taking employment on both sides of a lawsuit. Is there anyone here who can think of anything different? Here is a man who was a member of the commission to regulate public utilities in Wisconsin, and in Chicago, nearby, he had this other office.

While I am speaking of that, I will tell the Senate how I got this evidence.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will wait for a moment, I shall yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The witness on the stand was not my witness. When I got through my proof, this lovely little woman was sitting there, and she was called by the chairman of the committee.

I digress, Mr. Chairman, to say that a Senator, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], paid the chairman of the committee a very high compliment and expressed very high praise of him this morning for his frankness and fairness in conducting the hearing, and I wish to join in that praise.

The chairman, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], had his papers out on his desk in front of him, and he said, "I do not seem to find my memorandum about you, my dear lady. Have you a memorandum?"

This was the substance of what was said. If I make a mistake, I hope the Senator from Iowa will correct me, because I do not wish to make any mistake in what I say.

This lady replied, "Yes, I have a memorandum." The chairman said, "Will you proceed to read it?" To my utter astonishment, more than astonishment, the little lady said, "I was born in St. Joseph, Mo., and moved to St. Louis in 1926"—or 1927. "In 1928 I moved to Chicago, and I saw a notice somewhere that Mr. Lilienthal desired a stenographer, and I went to his office. He treated me very nicely, talked to me a while, and said he thought I would suit. Thereupon he offered me $24 a week, and I accepted. When I went there I found he had employed another young lady, who stayed only a few days, and I took her place. He also employed a Mr. Booth at $28 a week, and Mr. Joseph C. Swidler"—incidentally, now the general counsel of the TVA—"at $17.50 a week."

Mrs. Leitzell got about $100 a month, Mr. Booth a little less than $125 a month, or about that, and Mr. Swidler $71.75 a month. Remember, Senators, those were hard times. The big salaries paid now were not being paid at that time. At all events, this lady went on to say that she found that Mr. Lilienthal was a shorthand man, that he wrote in shorthand, and she soon found that she could read his shorthand and he could read hers. She stayed with him as long as he remained there.

She then said—a most remarkable thing—that on February 5, 1931, he came to her and told her that he had been offered by Gov. Phil La Follette a position as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, afterward the Utilities Commission, and he said, "Now, I want you to keep this a very, very grave secret. I do not want to be known as having any interest in this business down here. I want you to keep it a secret. I want you to keep the books, I want you to write the checks. I want you to do everything that I could do here."

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator care to yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot yield just now. I will have to ask the Senator to wait a little while. I shall yield to him later.

She stated that he said, "I want you to look after things here." And she did, and I have no doubt did it well. She gave those figures and names, and I want to say that they made a big impression on me, and I began to look into the matter immediately, and sent telegrams to Wisconsin and Chicago to find out what the facts were, whether she was correct or not.

The next morning the most remarkable thing occurred. When I looked at the record, I found that the three names—of Mr. Booth, Mrs. Leitzell, and Mr. Swidler—and their salaries, were not in the record. I immediately called the stenographer and directed his attention to it. He said no, that he never received them; he was very mysterious about it.

I telegraphed Mrs. Leitzell, and I have the telegram somewhere in my records here. She did not remember about it. So the next day, I believe it was, or perhaps 2 or 3 days afterwards, I rose and called the attention of the committee to the matter. I recalled to the chairman having heard the names and heard the

salaries, the remarkably low salaries that Mr. Lilienthal was paying. Incidentally, Mr. Lilienthal was getting $20,000 a year—remember that—and these three people were getting, one $125 a month, another $100 a month, and the other $71.75 a month.

At any rate, I asked unanimous consent that the record be corrected. The chairman put the motion, and it was agreed to.

Mr. Lilienthal did not go on the stand to deny anything. The case closed without Mr. Lilienthal going on the stand. But in fairness and justice I should say that after the committee got together they called Mr. Lilienthal before the committee and he produced an agreement with the Commerce Clearing House, and the agreement showed exactly what the facts were. They did not differ from what had been stated. The only thing Mr. Lilienthal did to deny those facts was to say that he did not remember about having told this lady to keep the matter secret. He spoke very highly of Mrs. Leitzell.

I tried to get Mrs. Leitzell on the telephone, and to have her appear before the committee again, but could not do so. What happened I do not know. I am merely giving the Senate the facts exactly as they occurred.

Someone may ask, how does that affect the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]? It affects it in the most direct way in the world. If Lilienthal received $20,000 in 1931 and 1932, the Internal Revenue Bureau will have a memorandum of that fact, and of what tax he paid.

Here were competing organizations, one regulating railroads, telephones, and telegraph companies, the other being regulated, and if he was drawing salaries from both sides, one a salary on which he had to pay taxes, that ought to be examined into, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] ought to have the matter in his hands so that he can ask the Treasury Department for the tax files. They have refused to furnish them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I wanted to inquire of the Senator about when the Senator from New Hampshire asked the Treasury Department for the information concerning the tax returns. Was it before the hearing was concluded, or afterward?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was just a few days ago. It was, I think, one day last week.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator another question, because I think what the Senator is saying is extremely important. I think the statement he has made about failure of the minutes or record of the committee meeting to contain certain facts brought out before the committee is very important.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I did not go that far. I only said that something was left out.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator stated that something was left out which should not have been omitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that the chairman of the committee is not responsible for it in any way. No man ever acted with greater fairness.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to say to the Senator that two or three times something has been left out in committee hearings in which I have been participating, and I am beginning to be very careful to check anything that comes out in a committee, when I am present. It is very important to the Senate to know that the records of the Senate are accurate, and are full and complete.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I shall not now refer further to that angle of the matter, but at this very time I am making some investigations myself along that line. I now want to ask the distinguished Senator what reason, if any, did the Treasury give for not divulging the figures of Mr. Lilienthal's income?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Treasury said they were executive matters which ought to be kept secret.

Mr. HAWKES. Why should the amount of Mr. Lilienthal's income be any more secret than the amount of the income of anyone else?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have the letter. The Senator from New Hampshire had it. He will be here tomorrow.

Mr. HAWKES. Why should Mr. Lilienthal's income be any more secret than mine?

Mr. McKELLAR. It ought not to be.

Mr. HAWKES. Mine has been bandied all over the United States for 15 years. Why should Mr. Lilienthal have any more secrecy about his income, on which he pays his tax, than any other citizen of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator another question, because I am very deeply interested in this question and my only interest is the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my only interest, notwithstanding what others may say.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe that, sincerely, regardless of what anybody else may have said about the Senator. I believe sincerely what the Senator has just said.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my only interest.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe the Senator is a great American, trying to do his duty. I should like to ask him this question: If he or I had been nominated for this important post, and the American people, or any substantial number of Members of the Senate, wanted to know anything about our private affairs, our income, or anything else, does not the Senator think that we would not only welcome an investigation, but would demand it? I know what I would do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should at least invite it, and I expect, if it were necessary, I would certainly demand it.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to say to the distinguished Senator, that I would not only welcome it, and invite it, but I would demand it. I would not want to go into that great office under any cloud before the American people; and now there certainly is a cloud. Regardless of whether the nominee is confirmed or not, he is under a very great cloud, and that cloud is evidenced in my office by letters from the finest people in the United States. There are some on both sides. Some of my very dearest friends are strongly in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination, and there are some of the finest men in the United States who are just as strongly on the other side. I say to the Senator from Tennessee that if I were in Mr. Lilienthal's place, I would be begging and demanding that I be investigated by the FBI, that everything about my life be laid open to the Senate of the United States and to the people of the United States. It seems to me that Mr. Lilienthal should feel the same way, so that in entering upon the office he could not well be accused, as otherwise he might be, of many things for which he is not responsible. I would want to go into that office with clean hands, after a thorough investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator just one more question. Has the Senator or the committee thought of asking Mr. Lilienthal about how much he received and how much income tax he paid, and what he reported to the Government? I do not think the Senator would fail to get the facts, particularly if he asked for them under oath.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of any such investigation being made.

Mr. HAWKES. I think it should be asked for. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I thank the Senator, too.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Despite the intensity of feeling of the Senator from Tennessee in this matter, I still——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator could save a great deal of time if he would ask the question and not talk about the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator got that out of newspapers. I think he had better leave it there.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me, I was going to compliment him by saying that I know——

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not need a compliment.

Mr. McMAHON. I know the Senator would want to be fair enough to put into the RECORD at this point a telegram which was sent by former Governor La Follette to the committee, in which the former Governor comments on the charge that was made——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I am going to have that in the RECORD, but not at this point. I have it in my speech. I would not miss Governor La Follette for anything.

Mr. McMAHON. In which he entirely denies any improper conduct.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no; I will let the Senator pass on it for himself.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield further, while I read the telegram?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I will not yield to get into that kind of argument.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator. I think in fairness it should be clearly brought out at this point that this Commerce Clearing House or Information Service which the able Senator from Tennessee has mentioned was a publication house which put out information relative to public utilities, as to rates, and so forth. The testimony shows that this information was also made use of by State regulatory bodies, as well as being useful to attorneys who practiced before commissions, and by public utilities themselves. I am sure the Senator would not want the record to stand in such a way that the impression might be created that Mr. Lilienthal was serving on the commission, on one side, and then was serving private utility companies as such on the other, because that is not the type of organization this Commerce Clearing House was.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely mistaken about it. If he will look into the hearings, he will find that there is no such record there. This concern was employed by the Community Service of Chicago to get everything, to conduct research work. Lilienthal was a research man, and he was to get everything he could find that was beneficial to the private utilities, and send it to them. I have been told—it is not in the record, and I do not know whether I ought to say anything about things that are not in the record, but I have been told that they raised funds to pay his salary, saying that he was in a place of great importance in Wisconsin, and in that way would be in a better position to do greater good for the private utilities. I feel as though I ought to say that, because it has been so often repeated.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think it should be pointed out at this juncture in the debate that the Wisconsin statute prohibited Mr. Lilienthal from receiving remuneration from private employment while he was serving as a member of that commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. I was going to read the statute a little later, but it is perfectly true, as my colleague says, that there was such a statute. When he took the oath as railroad commissioner in Chicago, he had to hold up his hand to high heaven and swear on pain of losing the office, that he was engaged in no other business. The statute specifically provides that the office shall become vacant if the occupant holds any other position, regardless of whether or not it is an antagonistic position. At that time he was not allowed to go into any other business in Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield, but will the Senator please limit himself to asking a question at the present time?

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in a statement made by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the lady who appeared and gave certain testimony. Does the evidence disclose how she happened to come before the committee? Was she subpenaed by the committee, or how was it she came before the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall. I never saw her before that time. She was not my witness. I thought that at last Mr. Lilienthal was going to produce a witness who knew him, to testify as to his good character. I remember saying to the one sitting next to me, "Well, at last we will get a good character witness," because the lady had a good face. She was rather good looking, too. I said, "We will at last get a good character witness by someone who actually knows Mr. Lilienthal." But instead of being a character witness she was, to my utter astonishment, a very different kind of witness.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator simply ask a question and let me proceed with my statement? I want to make a little progress before the Senate recesses.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator left me in doubt as to how the witness happened to be before the committee.

Mr McKELLAR. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask those in charge of Mr. Lilienthal's campaign.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to know at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the Senator investigate that subject. I will help him investigate it, and I shall be glad if the Senator will impart to me the knowledge he has gained if he finds how the lady came to appear before the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator from Tennessee investigated everything so thoroughly that he would not overlook the reason for a female witness appearing before the committee. I was simply trying to find how it was she happened to be there.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I did not investigate that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he resumes his statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator said he had heard that certain utilities had accepted the service provided by Mr. Lilienthal's organization because of the powerful position of Mr. Lilienthal. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there anything in the record to show that his organization solicited such accounts?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; not in the record. I must be fair about that matter. Such a thing is not in the record, but the implication is very strong.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask a question at this point because I think what I have in mind fits into the record here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Tennessee inquired of Mr. Lilienthal, as appears on page 814 of the record:

> You were working for the public utilities in the first place, and you were working for Wisconsin as the commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, which was entirely contrary in character, was it not?
>
> Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, Senator.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Lilienthal, might I ask a question at that point?
>
> As a matter of fact, these reports that were put out were subscribed to and are of value to public-utility commissions all over the country, as well as to public utilities themselves, or to attorneys who practiced public-utility law; is that not so?
>
> Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes, Senator; they were widely used by State and local public officials concerned with utilities.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. In regulating?
>
> Mr. LILIENTHAL. Regulatory matters; that is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I presume that is about as good an explanation as any man who was caught in that sort of situation, a lawyer who was on both sides of the case, could make. I take off my hat to Mr. Lilienthal for being able to make so good an explanation under very difficult circumstances.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on Friday showed that Mr. Lilienthal and his associates in the TVA in 1934 formed a cooperative corporation in Tennessee. The statement made by the Senator from Delaware was that Mr. Lilienthal induced the State of Tennessee to ask the Federal Government for $300,000 of FERA money, that is, Federal Emergency Relief money, and then he and his associates incorporated a cooperative enterprise. By the way, that information, furnished by the Senator from Delaware, came as a great surprise to me. I thought I had fairly well kept up with what occurred in Tennessee, but I am frank to admit that I knew nothing about this matter, and I have been trying to find what the facts are ever since.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Delaware has rendered a great service in securing the facts concerning this corporation. I have taken the matter up with individuals in Tennessee by telephone and telegraph today, and I shall read a telegram sent to me by Mr. Walter Armstrong, who is one of the best lawyers in Tennessee, or anywhere else in the country. I believe some Senators present know Mr. Armstrong. He is a former president of the American Bar Association; a man of the highest legal ability. I asked him about the charter of the cooperative corporation, and received a telegram in reply.

Mr. President, when I practiced law in Tennessee the law required five individuals to take out a private charter. Only three names were attached to the charter in question; those of Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. H. A. Morgan, and Mr. A. E. Morgan. That seemed to be an unusual proceeding.

The directors of the TVA borrowed $300,000 from the FERA, and used it for such purposes as they saw fit.

Some Senator undertook to show the other day that that money was relief money. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said that Tennesseans were starving in 1934; that they did not have enough to eat; that they were wearing fertilizer sacks for clothing. That year I conducted a campaign in Tennessee. That was one of my many campaigns down there. I made a campaign all over the State that year, but I did not see a single individual in a fertilizer sack or in any other kind of a sack, except a sack suit, or if it were a woman, a sack dress. I did not see any people starving in Tennessee that year. The people down there were hard up, of course. People all over the country were hard up at that time. I do not deny that at all. But whether they were hard up or not, the money in question never got to any of them, as I am informed, though not in the telegram from Mr. Armstrong. But he informs me of the illegality of the action in incorporating this cooperative organization. I shall give the telegram to my good friend the Senator from Delaware, who has done such excellent service in connection with the Lilienthal matter.

I read the telegram addressed to me by Mr. Armstrong, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 31, 1947.*

Your letter, which was sent air mail but not special delivery came on regular mail delivery this morning after our conversation. Seddon, Ed—

They are his partners—

and I have carefully examined charter you sent. In our opinion this is not a cooperative association. It does not meet requirements of sections 3784 and following sections dealing with cooperative marketing associations or with sections 3884 and following sections dealing with excepted classes including cooperative associations within the general law. Under these provisions of code at least five directors would be required. The charter is attempt to incorporate under the sections of code providing for the incorporation of ordinary business corporations which require only three incorporators and three directors. The charter recites purposes of the corporation to foster the formation of cooperatives and not to act as a cooperative. The general business corporation act does not specifically provide for such a corporation, but it does not prohibit it and generally provides that any lawful business may be incorporated under its provisions. We therefore think that it is a valid charter under the ordinary business corporation law, sections 3709 and following. We find in supplement to Public Acts, Tennessee 1935, this corporation is listed by secretary of state as chartered under ordinary business corporation law.

WALTER P. ARMSTRONG.

If it was, it was a fraud. The Tennessee Valley Authority got the money. I talked with the former Governor of the State, who, someone says, got the money for the TVA, and which was said to have been spent by the TVA. I called former Governor McAlister, who is still living. He is one of the finest men in the world. I asked him if any such thing was ever done, and he said "No." He further stated that he would telegraph me in full tonight. I will impart that information to the Senate tomorrow.

A number of statements have been made, one of which has already been discussed; namely, that made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. He made an excellent showing as to the reasons why these nominations should be recommitted. I wish to add something to those reasons. The Senator from Ohio could not have made a stronger statement.

The Senator from Ohio gave a number of reasons why the nominations should be sent back to the committee, every one of which is good. The Senate should have the facts within the possession of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the facts in the files of the Department of Justice and the Army and Navy Intelligence, before passing upon these nominations in haste. I read an editorial in the New York Times to the effect that it was the duty of the Senate to pass upon these nominations at once.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator will recall the letter which I wrote to the President with respect to the information in the files of the investigating agencies, and the reply which the President wrote to me as chairman of the committee, giving me his assurance as President of the United States that a thorough check had been made of the files and the information contained in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence, and such other investigative agencies of the United States as might have information, and giving me, as chairman of the committee, his word as President of the United States that there was nothing in any of those files derogatory to any of the appointees.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee, in all sincerity: Am I, upon the basis of that high assurance from a man whom I respect personally, and who holds an office which I respect mightily, to say that that man is distorting facts, and that the highest officer of the United States is misleading me as a member of a Senate committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Am I to assume that he is concealing matters of vital importance?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I feel that under the circumstances I am entitled to rely upon the assurances of the man who holds the highest and most sacred office in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say in reply that I do not ask the Senator or the Senate committee to do anything of the kind. I would not do it myself. I have the highest respect and admiration for President Truman. I know that he is perfectly honest. But the Constitution of the United States, which is now a good many years old—even older than I am—provides that the President shall make nominations, but that an officer may not be placed in office until his nomination is confirmed by the Senate.

There may be various reasons why we should have the information. Some one may have misinformed the President. The President cannot go into all the details of every nomination he makes. It is impossible. If the Constitution had meant that we should accept the assurance of the President, it would have so provided, and under those circumstances if the President were to say in his message that the appointment was proper the Senate would have to confirm it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wished to make clear one thing. I was not so much disagreeing with the Senator at the moment in anything he said, but I inferred from the message he just read that the sender of the message insinuated that there were sinister things in the files of the investigative agencies of the Government, which we should have. In answer to that insinuation, which I took from the message which the Senator read, and not from the Senator's own statement, I stated that we had the assurance of the highest officer of the United States that there is nothing in those files derogatory to any of the appointees.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the President feels that there is nothing of that nature. I am sure that the Senator from Iowa feels the same way I do about the President's statement, that it should have the very highest position. But the Senate is required to act upon its own responsibility, and not upon the responsibility of the President of the United States. The Constitution, under which we all serve, requires that the Senate act upon its own initiative and upon its own knowledge. Things which may appear one way to a perfectly honest man may appear entirely different in my view or in the view of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. One cannot always tell. We must pass upon the nomination as a matter of constitutional duty, and I think we ought to have the information.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wanted very much to ask the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a question when he concluded his address. I listened attentively. As I recall his statement, he said that the President had assured the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that there was nothing in the files derogatory to Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The only point I wish to make—and I can make it without waiting for the answer—is that if my interpretation of what was said is correct, if I were to say to the Senator, "I find nothing derogatory in the file regarding John Jones," it would not mean a thing in the world unless the Senator knew how far I had investigated John Jones. That is the point I wished to make.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot do so now. The hour is growing late and I wish to conclude. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague a little later.

These nominations should go back to the committee for the reasons stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. They have all shown good reasons why we should get the facts in this particular case. These are very important nominations. They are not yet appointments; they are nominations. I doubt if the Senate will ever be called upon to consider more important nominations. I know that in the more than 30 years during which I have been a Member of this body I have never been called upon to consider any appointments of equal importance.

I am sure that if our good President had thought of it for a moment he would have felt the same way and would have sent those files to the committee.

Mr. President, I am advised that the tax records of the Treasury Department should be examined in order to see whether Mr. Lilienthal has paid the income taxes which he should have paid. I was told that one of his leftist TVA books has had eight editions. I am referring to the book entitled "Democracy on the March." I wonder what eleemosynary institution has received the profits?

The Senate should look into these matters. It is known that he misrepresented the facts in Chicago and in Madison, Wis. Why should not the Senate look into these questions as they arise?

At the present time the Atomic Energy Commission is a de facto commission only. I am advised that it is operating on funds transferred from the War Department. I have written Secretary Patterson, requesting information concerning the legality of this transfer of funds. How can the Secretary of War legally transfer to a de facto commission, a commission which is not yet confirmed, the great amount of money which is necessary to operate it?

As I shall later show by affidavit, the whole situation in Oak Ridge, Tenn., is changing. It is a town located on Government property. In it there were about 45,000 people. Certain concessions had been operated, but the concessions are now being taken up and the whole plant is changing into a nationally operated enterprise. It will be similar to TVA. When Mr. Lilienthal obtained charge of TVA he changed the law regarding the civil service, with reference to retirement, with reference to flood control, with reference to reporting profits to the Government of the United States. He changed laws all along the line. Why should the Senate permit this to be done before he even becomes a member of the Atomic Energy Commission? I think the Senate should look into the subject.

As I stated, the city of Oak Ridge, Tenn., now a city of 45,000 people, is entirely on Government property. Its merchants, doctors, dentists, and various other businesses and civilian services are all let to a firm with headquarters in New York known as the Roane-Anderson Co., Inc., which charges 10 percent or more on gross receipts of all business done.

I am advised that this de facto commission has recently taken over the city of Oak Ridge and that they expect to bring cooperatives into this section. This is another thing that should be investigated before these nominations are confirmed.

In this connection it will be remembered that as soon as Mr. Lilienthal took charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933 he made a deal with Dr. H. A. Morgan to conduct the affairs of the Commission so far as possible, and that they paid very little attention to Dr. A. E. Morgan after that combination was made.

This time the record shows that Mr. Lilienthal himself recommended a majority of the members of the Commission, namely, himself, Mr. Waymack, and Dr. Bacher. So he will have absolute control from the very beginning.

It will also be remembered that Mr. Lilienthal in his conduct of the Tennessee Valley Authority utterly disregarded the laws of the United States, including the law under which the TVA Act was passed. There is nothing in the TVA Act allowing Mr. Lilienthal to disregard the general law of the civil service, but he at once repealed the civil-service law insofar as the TVA was concerned. He also repealed the retirement law insofar as the TVA was concerned; he also repealed the flood-control law insofar as the TVA was concerned; and he also repealed the general-accounting law insofar as the TVA was concerned. He set up special laws of his own for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I wish to make a brief statement before I conclude, and then I shall ask for a recess.

Mr. Lilienthal has recently appointed three well-known Communists. The Commission is a de facto commission. His own nomination has not yet been confirmed, but he has appointed three well-known Communists. One is Herbert S. Marks, general counsel, receiving a salary of $14,000. I believe the law provides that under certain unusual circumstances the Commission, when it becomes a commission, can fix certain salaries. So it has given Mr. Marks a salary of $14,000 a year.

The next Communist is Richard G. Niehoff, assistant general manager, at a salary of $10,000 a year.

The next one is James Thomas Ramey, whose salary is not stated. But Mr. Lilienthal has surrounded himself in the case of three of the most important offices with men who are well-known Communists.

Should the Senate confirm the nomination of the man under those circumstances? I am appealing to the Senate as sensible men, because I have served with most of the Senators who are present for a long time, and I know that they, just as I do, have but one ambition in life, and that is to do the honest, honorable, careful, and prudent thing regarding our great country. We have the greatest country in the world. It is being attacked on all sides in various ways. Some nations want to borrow money, others want us to give them money. Some of them have very bad feelings toward this country. We have helped from time to time practically all the nations of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator inform the Senate where there is any basis in the record for his saying that the testimony shows that three persons connected with the Atomic Energy Commission are well-known Communists? I am sure the Senator does not mean that, because there is nothing in the record which shows any such thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It is shown on page 240 of the record. If the Senator will look at it he will find them all in the list on that page of the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is an entirely different situation. Being accused of being a Communist and being a well-known Communist are two different things. I submit that there is no such testimony in the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. The record is before us. I know the Senator has not looked at it carefully, or has read it erroneously. I do not charge him with any wrongdoing. The Senator is very much worked up. I regret that he feels the way he does, but I know he is sincere.

I wish to call attention to something else——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds further, will he yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not care to discuss the matter at this moment, but I assure the Senate that I thoroughly disagree with the Senator's statement that there is convincing proof in the record that those men are well-known Communists, or even Communists of any degree. I shall discuss that question later, but I did not want the statement to pass at this time without mention. I disagree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the Senator's disagreement, but the fact is that we have taken proof, and all three of those men were seen going in or coming out of Communist meetings. Various witnesses have testified that they were Communists. None of those three men has confessed it. Mr. Lilienthal did introduce three Communist witnesses, and I believe they were the only three witnesses from the Tennessee Valley Authority who were introduced. Two associates of Mr. Lilienthal on the TVA did not testify for him. He has had half a dozen different general counsels, and they did not testify for him. Even the Representatives and Senators who appeared before the other committee and testified in behalf of Mr. Clapp did not come before the committee and testify for Mr. Lilienthal. No prominent men in Tennessee testified in favor of Mr. Lilienthal. As I recall, there were not to exceed half a dozen witnesses from Tennessee who testified in favor of Mr. Lilienthal. None of his associates so testified, none of his friends, no public officer of any kind, Democrat or Republican. None of them testified, but he had three Communist witnesses.

Who were they? The first one was Mr. Hart. Mr. Hart testified for Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. Hart was a Communist. He said he had gotten over it, but he never resigned from the Communist Party; he just stopped. The next one was Mr. Cameron, and the other one was Mr. Frantz. Those were the three Communists. Is it not remarkable, I ask the distinguished Senator, my friend, who was on the committee, and at whose vote I was never more surprised than at anything in my life. I know he does not mind my saying that, because he is one of the finest of men; I refer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If a man had hit me in the face without notice, I could not have been more surprised than I was when I read in the newspapers that the Senator from Colorado had voted the other way in this case. I could not believe that he knew the facts relative to the matter on which he was voting.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I simply wish to keep the RECORD straight. The three men to whom the Senator from Tennessee referred a moment ago as coming before the committee and testifying for Mr. Lilienthal—Mr. Hart, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Frantz—appeared after the repeated insistence of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the RECORD. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I did that. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses. I never brought a Communist witness into any controversy in my life; and I never expect to do so. Why? Because my understanding of a Communist is that he will deny anything so long as he thinks by so doing he will help communism or will help himself. That is why I never have called on any Communists. There was another witness from the TVA, an employee of the TVA. I do not know whether he was a Communist. He was brought from the TVA. I refer to a man by the name of Schlemmer—a fine name. I think it is a German name, and I believe he or one of his parents came from Switzerland. Someone introduced him as a witness, and as the head of a woolen mill near Chattanooga. I shall put in the RECORD the telegram about him. Mr. Schlemmer worked for the TVA, in some subordinate capacity, from 1933 to 1946, in August or September; and then he got a job as manager of one of the sections of the woolen mill to which I have referred. He has no office in the woolen mill and he has no actual interest in it. That is the kind of testimony that came from the TVA for Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. President, I say to the acting majority leader that if he wishes to move at this time that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, I shall gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "A Spare-Time Issue," published in the New York Times for Friday, March 28. The editorial bears on the pending discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPARE-TIME ISSUE

It is 2 months yesterday since the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Commitee opened its hearings on the nominations of Chairman David E. Lilienthal and his colleagues on the United States Atomic Commission. It is 18 days today since the committee approved the nominations. The Senate waited 14 days before taking them up for debate. During that period it dealt with some important things, but also with many minor ones, such as a resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set up daylight saving if they wanted to. Last Monday the Senate took up the AEC nominations, and recessed at 3:24 p. m. Since Monday the debate has continued, as Anthony Leviero wrote in this newspaper, "on an on-again-off-again basis, fitted in as a spare-time issue."

Meanwhile, what does the Senate and what does the public suppose is happening to the Atomic Energy Commission? This agency is directed, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, to undertake research in the atomic field; to guide, foster, and safeguard private research; to take over all fissionable materials and all the facilities for processing them; to develop, control and license nonmilitary uses of atomic energy; to work with the armed forces in developing military uses of atomic energy pending any "international arrangement" to which this country is a party outlawing such uses. The great discovery which shook the world when the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and again when they fell on Bikini lagoon, is in this agency's hands. If the AEC cannot act no one can.

What is happening while these nominations are being "fitted in as a sparetime issue" is that the AEC is paralyzed. Chairman Lilienthal, his four fellow directors, and his general manager are acting in an interim capacity. In that capacity they can make no binding promises and enter into no long-range contracts. Their organization is in danger of disintegrating and collapsing. Good men are leaving the AEC because of its uncertainties. Other good men are refusing to sign up with it. They can draw larger salaries in private employment, but that is not their reason. Their reason is that the Senate seems bent on treating the most important issue in their world as a spare-time political item.

If we think of fissionable material as a weapon still exclusively ours, we will see the national defense imperiled by these delays. If we think of it as a means of drawing the world together and bringing lasting peace and prosperity for all mankind, we will see these objectives imperiled, too.

An actual majority of the Senators have expressed themselves in favor of confirmation. They risk their country's future if they do not now speed up debate and bring these nominations to a vote.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram which Governor La Follette, of Wisconsin, sent the committee in reference to certain charges made against Mr. Lilienthal.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Atomic Energy Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I note the imputation that David Lilienthal was underhandedly serving private interests while on Wisconsin Public Service Commission. When offered the appointment he was active in his profession and naturally had to wind up his affairs. He fully and completely disclosed his affairs and subsequently filed in the Governor's office a copy of the contract which his affairs were wound up. His record as commissioner was outstanding devoted public service and wholly honorable.

PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] be recognized tomorrow noon when the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

Williamson S. Howell, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nicaragua, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles Lee Spillers, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Joe V. Gibson, deceased.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Charles North Howze, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

First Lt. William Benton Carne, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 14, 1946.

First Lt. Clifford Thomas Riordan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. Ralph Henderson Miller, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 16, 1944.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. John Rodgers Clifton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 15, 1944.

Capt. Richard Wallace Cook, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 8, 1942.

Capt. Travis Ludwell Petty, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

First Lt. John Benjamin Beckham, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 18, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Evarts Clark, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Thomas McGahey Elgin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. James Edward Hammer, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. John Douglas McCormick, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 25, 1945.

First Lt. John Parrish McWhorter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 28, 1940.

First Lt. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. William Henry Harrison Mullin, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. James Herschell Nash, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. John James Petro, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1942.

First Lt. Charles Victor Pregaldin, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Elmer Wright, Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from April 8, 1940.

Second Lt. William Jackson Bowen, Air Corps, with rank from June 5, 1945.

Second Lt. Hobart E. Dewey, Field Artillery, with rank from October 20, 1945.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Merle Robbins Williams, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Huff Edger, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Dayton Willis Eddy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. William McKinley Shepard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

TO CHEMICAL CORPS

Capt. Charles Heron McNary, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from March 11, 1943.

First Lt. Noel Ambrose Menard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO CAVALRY

First Lt. Robert Morris Blair, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. James Lawrence Kaiser, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Horrell Holcomb Smith, Infantry, with rank from September 3, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Capt. Bryon Leslie Paige, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

Capt. Pasquale Francis Passarella, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Baker Cole, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 18, 1946.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Edward Henry Hendrickson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. William Jay Henry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Page Spencer Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Herbert Eugene Kemp, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Robert Pershing Muir, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Robert Walter Samz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Stephen Silvasy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

Second Lt. Lawrence Frank Ciszewski, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

Capt. Albert Raymond Cupello, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 21, 1945.

First Lt. Paull Alonzo Bane, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 20, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Frank Barrett, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from March 11, 1946.

First Lt. Roy Hilsman Bass, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from April 23, 1946.

First Lt. Andrew James Boechler, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 6, 1946.

First Lt. Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Charles Thomas Heinrich, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from January 5, 1943.

First Lt. Eugene Harvey Kipp, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from November 18, 1946.

First Lt. John Joseph Short, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. Charles Carroll Thebaud, Field Artillery, with rank from December 13, 1946.

TO AIR CORPS

Lt. Col. Edward Barber, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1944.

Lt. Col. Stephen Cecil Lombard, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1945.

Lt. Col. Wallace William Millard, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Lt. Col. Hugh Whitt, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from September 17, 1940.

Lt. Col. Lloyd Nelson Winters, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1941.

Maj. Elmer Blair Garland, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1944.

Maj. Samuel Howard Morrow, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1941.

Capt. Calvin Mitchel Bryan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 28, 1941.

Capt. Harold Cooper Donnelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. Frederic Henry Fairchild, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. Francis Raymond Fee, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 1, 1944.

Capt. Emory Edwin Hackman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. James Rollo McNitt, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 12, 1945.

Capt. Buford Russell Nyquist, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Ross Thatcher Sampson, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. William Theodore Welter, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 11, 1942.

First Lt. Donald Earl Adams, Field Artillery, with rank from August 30, 1946.

First Lt. Wilbur Winston Bailey, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Wallace Erwin Bjornson, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Benjamin Paul Blasingame, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Julian Holt Bowman, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 31, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Urban Brombach, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Clifton Lewis Butler, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. William Brooks Carroll, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. Glenn Craddock Coleman, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. Glenn B. Daughton, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Thomas Edward Delbridge, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from September 5, 1945.

First Lt. John William Dell, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 28, 1944.

First Lt. Thomas Legate Fisher 2d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Edwin Thomas Hall, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from December 19, 1945.

First Lt. Max Woodrow Hall, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. John Michael Johannes, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 2, 1943.

First Lt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 24, 1944.

First Lt. William Eugene Lewis, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Lee Ronald Lucas, Field Artillery, with rank from May 24, 1946.

First Lt. James Beecher McKenzie, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. John Joseph Neu, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 5, 1946.

First Lt. Frederick Kenneth Nichols, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 23, 1945.

First Lt Don Richard Ostrander, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Michel Andre George Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. George Florin Ruff, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from September 9, 1945.

First Lt. Eugene Elam Skinner, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. John Farley Splain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Darwin Trail, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Haywood Cooper Vaughan, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 16, 1946.

Second Lt. George Russell Berry, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 2, 1944.

Second Lt. Walter Baird Kamp, Infantry, with rank from September 1, 1945.

Second Lt. Andrew Raymond Reeves, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1945.

Second Lt. John Wilbur Switzer, Infantry, with rank from August 4, 1945.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. William McKinney Mantz, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 3, 1944.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. Menon Walker Whitsitt, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 14, 1946.

First Lt. Ivan Hurst Impson, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from August 10, 1940.

First Lt. William Forest Locke, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from September 27, 1940.

First Lt. Arnold Ray Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Elmer Willford Grubbs, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1946.

First Lt. Homer Griswold Barber, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Selby McKay Frank, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 3, 1942.

First Lt. Sidney Katz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Russell Faux Scott, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Robert Edward Summerall, Infantry, with rank from May 8, 1946.

Second Lt. John Thornton Peterson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO CAVALRY

Capt. Paul LeGrand Jolley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 18, 1946.

First Lt. George Alvin Berlin, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from November 12, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Capt. James Pickett Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 28, 1946.

Second Lt. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Michael Edward Wardell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. William Lafayette Fagg, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. Luke Bruce Graham, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. William Lloyd Richardson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Capt. Jack Lawrence Armstrong, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 5, 1946.

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Robert Frederick Frost, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1946.

Capt. Arthur Lafayette Inman, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

Capt. Edwin Malcolm Kirton, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from December 3, 1944.

Capt. Orville Laird, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 9, 1942.

First Lt. Haynes Madden Baumgardner, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from December 5, 1946.

First Lt. Donal Blair Cunningham, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 9, 1946.

First Lt. James Creelman Huntley, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. John Alwine Keiper, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 7, 1945.

First Lt. Michael Nicholas Mikulak, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 2, 1940.

First Lt. Eugene Smith, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from December 10, 1941.

First Lt. Donald Henry Vicek, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Theodore John Witt, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

Second Lt. Joseph Walter Stephens, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from September 22, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harry Innes Thornton Creswell, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Kenneth McCatty, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Harold Holmes Ristine, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Charles Timothy Senay, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Egmont Francis Koenig, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Theodore Woodward Wrenn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Whitaker Rehm, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Peter Kenrick Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Clifford Hildebrandt Tate, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Oliver Patton Echols, Air Corps (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. John Murray Jenkins, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Beverly Hare Coiner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Edgar Turley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Arthur Henry Truxes, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Gordon Joseph Fred Heron, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Whitten Mapes, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Chauncey Macon, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Stanley Bacon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Curtis Chase, Cavalry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Norman Edgar Fiske, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Wilson Tarlton Bals, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Jenness Wilder, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Fellows, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Lester Kraft, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. John Singleton Switzer, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellsworth Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Allen Frederick Kingman, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leander Russell Hathaway, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Theodore Pierce, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Stanley Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leven Cooper Allen, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Oliver Arlington Hess, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Amende Allen, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Jedediah Huntington Hills, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Donald Strong Perry, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Frederick Reid Lafferty, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. David Renwick Kerr, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Arthur Titman Lacey, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Hills French, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Sidney Sohns Eberle, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. David Wilson Craig, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Thomas Gannt Dobyns, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Pashley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Fondren Shaifer, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Richard Gentry Tindall, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Graham Wallace Lester, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Francis Artaud Byrne, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Farragut Ferry Hall, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Orville Monroe Moore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Leonard Russell Boyd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Withers Alexander Burress, Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. John Cheney Platt, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paul Nutwell Starlings, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Sevier Rains Tupper, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Irving Carrington Avery, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Aaron Joseph Becker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Vernon Ware, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robert Washington Brown, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Manuel Benigno Navas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Enrique Manuel Benitez, Coast Artilery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Modesto Enrique Rodriguez, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Warlick McDonald, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. David Hazen Blakelock, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Warren Cotton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Albert Russell Ives, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paul James Dowling, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Lenhart Rice, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Willis Henry Hale, Air Corps (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. William Cheney Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Wharton Girard Ingram, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clarence Paul Evers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Adrian St. John, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Colford Daly, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paul Everton Peabody, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Albert Francis Christie, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ray Milton O'Day, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Madison Garrett, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Julian Wallace Cunningham, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Cotter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edmund Bernard Edwards, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Merritt Elijah Olmstead, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Caffey, Jr., Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Frank August Heileman, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Clinton Albert Pierce, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Otto Blaine Trigg, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edison Albert Lynn, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Davis Jay, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clarence Maxwell Culp, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ray Lawrence Burnell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Raphael Saul Chavin, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Lester Scott, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Philip Shaw Wood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Henry McCutcheon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Adlai Cyrus Young, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clinton Inness McClure, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Evan Clouser Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Rasick Behrens, Coast Artillery Corps.
Lt. Col. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. George Ralph Barker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Waldemar Thompson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Sabin Ferrin, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Roger Hilsman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Holmes Ely Dager, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Fischer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Louis Whorley Hasslock, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. Frederick Stone Matthews, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Marcus Aurelius Smith Ming, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Walter Raymond Graham, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Patrick Murphy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Jacob Edward Bechtold, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Neal Creighton Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Norman Pyle Groff, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Glenn Adelbert Ross, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Francis Augustus Woolfley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Nelson Dingley 3d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Weaver Hocker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Ware Whitney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Peter Paul Salgado, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edward William Bondy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson McFarland, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Miller Fray, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harold Howard Galliett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Vincil Stark, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Grover Be Egger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Neely Hopkins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George William Gillette, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Agnew Howland, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Clifton Augustine Pritchett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Luke Donald Zech, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lucian Dalton Bogan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Pitt Morse, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Roy Eugene Blount, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Hubert Vincent Hopkins, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Edwin Sharpless, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Nels Erick Stadig, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ben-Hur Chastaine, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Leigh Bell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Frederick Spann, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Clayton Luck, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Richardson Simmons, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Frederick Hanst, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Everett Charles Williams, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Maurice Clenen Bigelow, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Kerschner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Otho Wilder Humphries, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Perry Lee Baldwin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Thomas Shank, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Thomas Butler Burgess, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Albert Chester Searle, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Carl Austin Russell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Will Gillett Gooch, Quartermaster Corp (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Chauncey Harold Hayden, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Erle Oden Sandlin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Isaac George Walker, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Walter Edward Jenkins, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ernest Louis McLendon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Rhodes Felton Arnold, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Eugene Nelson Slappey, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harwood Christian Bowman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Rosenham Beam, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Pleas Blair Rogers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Alfred Jones, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Donald Wilson, Air Corps (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Frank Austin Heywood, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Philip Coleman Clayton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Francis Heavey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robert Marks Bathurst, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Daniel Noce, Corps of Engineers (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Willis Edward Teale, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Hutchings, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry John Schroeder, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Matthew Devine, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Harold Albert Nisley, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. James Louis Guion, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Douglas Wahl, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Basil Harrison Perry, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harold Rufus Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ray Hartwell Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Augustus Milton Gurney, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Trott Murray, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Morris Keene Barroll, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Warfield Monroe Lewis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Walter Wilton Warner, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Rex Webb Beasley, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ira Adam Crump, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Elbert Louis Ford, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. John Tupper Cole, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Sampson Beurket, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Hunter Gerhardt, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Frederick Augustus Irving, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Burnett Ralph Olmsted, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Irvin Edward Doane, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Albert Cowper Smith, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Richard Mars Wightman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Charles Walter Yuill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Willis Eagles, Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Joel Grant Holmes, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Sackville, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Louis LeRoy Martin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Ernest Nason Harmon, Cavalry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Christian Gingrich Foltz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Scranton Tate, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Arthur McKinley Harper, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Carleton Coulter, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Aaron Bradshaw, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Robert Newton Kunz, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Hatton Weems, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Charles Radcliffe Johnson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Claude McMahon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bertrand Morrow, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Russell Pierce, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Collamore Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Milton Baldridge Halsey, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Charles Love Mullins, Jr., Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Sterling Alexander Wood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Alexander Hunkins Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. David Sheridan Rumbough, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Marvil Groves Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Donovan Swanton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Francis Atherton Macon, Jr., Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Laurence Bolton Keiser, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Homer Caffee Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Clement Whitcomb, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Wallace James Redner, Quartermaster Corps.
Lt. Col. Paul Hancock Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Stuart Eley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clarke Kent Fales, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Solomon Foote Clark, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Russell Gilbert Barkalow, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Frank Augustus Keating, Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Richard David Daugherity, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Clark Addington, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Allison Joseph Barnett, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. George Frederick Unmacht, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Settle Evans, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Walter Moody Tenney, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Bartholomew Moran, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Arthur Oscar Walsh, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Welcome Porter Waltz, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edwin Hugh Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Russel McKee Herrington, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lewis Abram Pulling, Cavalry.
Lt. Col. Fred Matthew Fogle, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Erwin Rayens, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Sidney Feagin Dunn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Hones, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Breckinridge Atwater Day, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George David Shea, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Donald Coe Hawley, Cavalry.
Lt. Col. Francis Truman Bonsteel, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Edwin Barott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Frank Nelson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Homer Carriker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Harrison Hensley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Henry Barnhart, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Theophil John Weishaar, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Jeffrey Matchett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John William Bulger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Moore Child, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Hurley Edward Fuller, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Paul Horan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Benjamin Wright, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Whitney Carter, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Wendell Lowell Bevan, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Augustus Brown O'Connell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Archibald King, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Fred Grimm, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Terrell Guthrie, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Alan Lockhart Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Donald Langley Dutton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Leroy Ryder, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lloyd Davidson Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Christiancy Pickett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Luis Felipe Cianchini, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lester Amiel Daugherty, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Raymond Edward O'Neill, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Frank Melvin S. Johnson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Porter Prescott Lowry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Jerome Jackson Waters, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Urban Ayotte, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Heyward Barnwell, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edward George Herlihy, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Arnold John Funk, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Alexander Shepherd Quintard, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Allen Skerry, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Norman Minus, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Heywood Shallus Dodd, Cavalry.
Lt. Col. Kent Craig Lambert, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Sylvester Emery Nortner, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Wiltshire Gano, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Samuel Davies Bedinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Malcolm Vaughn Fortier, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ray Bradford Conner, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Lloyd McKee, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Glenn Luman Allen, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Chance, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Augustine Buckley, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Willfred Rowell Higgins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Jesse Plez Green, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Howard Winthrop Turner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Wesley Crowell Brigham, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Cyrus Higginson Searcy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Turner Ransom Sharp, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ward Currey Goessling, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harold Burton Gibson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Victor Roland Woodruff, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Gustav Adolph Mellanchton Anderson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robert William Yates, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Dana Caswell Schmahl, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harry Adamson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Owen Rivers Rhoads, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Carl Russell Adams, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Elmer Forrest Wallender, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Herman Feldman, Quartermaster Corps (Assistant to the Quartermaster General with rank of brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Ernest Alvin Kindervater, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Gordon Cogswell Irwin, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Harvey Fye, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Mood MacMullin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Nicholas Szilagyi, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frederick Weston Hyde, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Royal Lehner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Rosser Lee Hunter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Carroll Arthur Powell, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Feodor Otto Schmidt, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Francis Brittingham, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Oscar Bergstrom Abbott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Carter Roderick McLennan, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Louis Garland Gibney, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Thomas Grady Jenkins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Leslie Carlyle Wheat, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Walter Compere Lattimore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Russell Hubbard Dixon, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. Everett Marshall Graves, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Tuttle Hamilton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Valentine McCreight, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Granville Purdy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Howard Baird, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Claudius Leo Lloyd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Carlisle Barksdale Cox, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Stanley Gloninger Saulnier, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Will Hughes Gordon, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Willard Wadsworth Irvine, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Charles Emerson Boyle, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. William Doughty Evans, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Benjamin Tuttle, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Donald Armpriester Stroh, Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Edwin Adolph Henn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Clyde McCormick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Raymond Owens, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Bruce, Infantry (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. John Edward Maher, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Philip Kohn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Dallas Loyd Knoll, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Robert Justin Van Buskirk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Floyd Emerson Galloway, Air Corps (temparary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Yost Lyon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paxton Sterrett Campbell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Ross Irvin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Alfred Lyons Baylies, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Roy Leo Schuyler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Louis DeSaussure Hutson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frederick Linwood Topping, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Richard Doran, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Ralston Middleton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Guy Douglas Thompson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. David Lee Hooper, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Thomas Raphael Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Oliver Edward George Trechter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Allen Gordon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Lee Autrey, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Napoleon Boudreau, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clarence LeRoy Strike, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Clyde Charles Alexander, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Grover Cleveland Graham, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Joseph Howard Rustemeyer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Foster, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Sexton Berg, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Cornelius Francis O'Keefe, Cavalry.
Lt. Col. Samuel Israel Zeidner, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Raymond Dresden Willis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Elliot Duncan Cooke, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Alfred Steere Knight, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Watson Hastey, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Chester John Hirschfelder, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Herbert Allyn Myers, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Emil Stoner, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Roy Francis Lynd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edward Henry Taliaferro, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Corbett Pilkington, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Valentine Pearsall Foster, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Henry Ball, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Everett Ernest Brown, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Fay Ross, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Nels Louis Soderholm, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Malcolm Byrne, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Sydney Clyde Fergason, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Severne Spence MacLaughlin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Burton Francis Hood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Patrick Eugene Shea, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Truman Menzie, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Eugene Martin Foster, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Glenn Alonzo Ross, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Mark Vinton Brunson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Norman Doud Finley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Philip Theodore Fry, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Tulley, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Wilmer Micajah Flinn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bernard Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lewis Charles Beebe, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. William Van Dyke Ochs, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Douglass Newman McMillin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Gersum Cronander, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harold Borden Bliss, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Coolidge Goding, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Stanley Woods, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Irvin Smith, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Macey Lillard Dill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edgar Peter Sorensen, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Edward Julius Renth, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Henry Harrington, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Francis Firmin Fainter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Peter Girardeau Marshall, Jr., Infantry.
Lt. Col. Edward Brigham McKinley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Walter Patrick O'Brien, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Brevard Hayne, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lloyd Chandler Parsons, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Theodore Edward Thomas Haley, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Archibald Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Clark Hughes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Gregory Brey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Sadler, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frederick Sidney Doll, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Gibson Forsythe, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Humphrey Swygart Evans, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Kosch, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Allender Swift, Infantry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Roy Samuel Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Melvin Earl Gillette, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Tom Christopher Rives, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
× Lt. Col. Andrew Raymond Reeves, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. William Frederic Marquat, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Allison Ware Jones, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Howard Herndon Davis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Eitle Hartman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Philip Frederick Biehl, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Gasper Devine, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Howard Nathaniel Frissell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edward Allen Everitt, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Robert Hughes Lord, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Mose Kent, Infantry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Harry William Maas, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Francis Henry Boucher, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Henry Sweet, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Bentley Mayer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Harold Kernan, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Hubert Augustine McMorrow, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Robert Stickman, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Maximilian Clay, Infantry (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Calvert Hinton Arnold, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Wilkie Collins Burt, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Leland Eberle, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Rufus Stanley Ramey, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Marcus Brenneman Bell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Louis Joseph Fortier, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Remington Orsinger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Stewart Morris, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Richard Henry Ballard, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Clay Short, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Fred Lafrenz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Deane Forsythe, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Byron Wyant, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Leslie T. Lathrop, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Black Muir, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Ralph Hudson Wooten, Air Corps (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Burman Bush, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles Henry Keck, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Thomas Duke, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Watkins Ligon, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edward Hale Brooks, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. James David Brown, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Wayland Bixby Augur, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Mark McClelland, Air Corps (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. William Brooks Bradford, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Edmund Waring McLarren, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Abram Franklin Kibler, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Harold Clarkson Mabbott, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Lucas Elmendorf Schoonmaker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Gordon Marshall Wells, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Raymond Orr, Infantry.
×Lt. Col. Clifford Dean Hindle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Morrill Ross, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Averill Steere, Field Artillery.
×Lt. Col. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Francis Howard Wilson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Swett Pettee, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Melville Sanderson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Sidney Hamlet Negrotto, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Egle Holmes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles William Walton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ward Hale Maris, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Hugh John FitzGerald, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Everett Langdon Upson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Paul Jacobs, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Paul Joseph Matte, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Murray Henry Ellis, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Cleveland Bomar, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edward Benedict McCarthy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Leslie Frederick Lawrence, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Horace Waldo Forster, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Hubert Randle, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Simpson Ridley Stribling, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Waldemar Adolph Falck, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Carl John Rohsenberger, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Veto McDowell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harry Lee Hart, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Henry Gibson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Henry Beals Bogman, Signal Corps.
Lt. Col. Percy Stuart Haydon, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Ernest Aldridge, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Blake Crabill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Alfred Marston Shearer, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Halbert Hale Neilson, Cavalry.
×Lt. Col. Raymond Frank Edwards, Infantry.
×Lt. Col. Maurice Eugene Barker, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Glaucus Holt, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Robert Alexis McClure, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Norman John McMahon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Paul Louis Singer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joseph Louis Ready, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Earl Coulson Flegel, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Herbert Blish Wheeler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Wilbur Storn Elliott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Kirke Brooks Lawton, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Neil Smith Edmond, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Haney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Martin DeWitt McAllister, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Colbern, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. John William Carroll, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Albert Barnett Jones, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Hamilton Thorn, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. David Cleveland Kelly, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Randolph Russell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Sumner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Green, Judge Advocate General's Department (The Judge Advocate General with rank of major general).
×Lt. Col. Donald Anderson Young, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Hans Charles Minuth, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Putnam Detwiler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Clarence Francis Hofstetter, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence Bolté, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Theodore Francis Wessels, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Malcolm Fraser Lindsey, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Horace Oscar Cushman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Maine Hutson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. David Henry Finley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Vinton Lee James, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Franklin Campbell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Henry Lester Barrett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Archibald Donald Fisken, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Fenton Stratton Jacobs, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Raymond Rolland Tourtillott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Lawrence Locke Clayton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Mayer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Laird Craig, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ray Maxey Hare, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Ernest Loucks, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Herbert Vaughan Scanlan, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Russell Gordon Ayers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Hayden Owens, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joseph William Loef, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Albert Dickinson Foster, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Donald Parker Spalding, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ercil Dale Porter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Jack Adams, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Booth Van Auken, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Archer Lynn Lerch, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Charles James Deahl, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Arcadi Gluckman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Dale Milton Hoagland, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Polk Gammon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Burton Curtis Andrus, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Arthur Lafayette Warren, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Irwin Lytle Lummis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. David Lewis Ruffner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Mark Milton Serrem, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Arthur William Gower, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Taylor Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Ross Breckon Warren, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Walter David Luplow, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Lusker McCroskey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Oliver Boone Bucher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Clarence Ames Martin, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Francis Stuart Swett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Henning Linden, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Taylor Brotherton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Miles Whitney Kresge, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ralph de Poix Terrell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Dumas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Emerson Keatley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Don Magruder Scott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Robert Edward Wysor, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Harold Day, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George William Outland, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Mead Silkman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Loren Archibald Wetherby, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bernard Butler McMahon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Edwin Fingarson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Rudelius, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Lee Blanton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Brady, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Porter Pise Wiggins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Gilbert Xavier Cheves, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Corkill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Thomas Zellars, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Emons Bert Whisner, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Hugh Tullock Mayberry, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harry Staples Robertson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Wynne, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Olaf Phillips Winningstad, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Winfred Charles Green, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Marion Irwin Voorhes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col George Van Wyck Pope, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Ellsworth Butler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joel Rankin Burney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Milton Burton Persons, Signal Corps (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Homer Case, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Earl Cranston Ewert, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bird Little, Infantry.
×Lt. Col. Guy Cummins McKinley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Hugh McClune, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Pearson Gibson, Infantry (temporary colone).
×Lt. Col Gilbert Everhard Parker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Francis Beeston Laurenson Myer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John George Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Gustave Villaret, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Sanders Van Deusen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joe Jene Miller, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Ernest Dahlquist, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. William Eugene Farthing, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Tom Sherman Brand, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Robinson Urquhart, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Morrill Watson Marston, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Bergin, Adjutant General's Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. John Calvin Butner, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edward Stanley Ott, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Melvin Leslie McCreary, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Herman Hollie Felix Gossett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Murray Matthews Montgomery, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Lester Johnson Whitlock, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Harry Lee Campbell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Kay Christmas, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Harvey Edward, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Leo James McCarthy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Arthur Williams, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Price Hays, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Harry Squire Wilbur, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Julian Canine, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Timothy Asbury Pedley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Donald Ross Dunkle, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Chester Earl Davis, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Turner Bowden, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Holmes Gill Paullin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ray Edison Porter, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Clarence Clemons Park, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Volney Rattan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Rosswell Eric Hardy, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Lloyd Zuppann, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Kirkland Rice, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. James Holden Hagan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted from this nomination. The first 349 nominees to be promoted will be given date of rank as December 28, 1945, to fill original vacancies authorized by Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, 1945. The remaining nominees will be given dates of rank appropriate to the vacancies they will fill. The dates of rank are omitted in order to assure that 349 officers may be promoted to fill the vacancies authorized by Public Law 281. If any of these officers should retire or die prior to promotion it would necessitate renominating the remaining officers in order to change their dates of rank to correspond with the vacancies.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.

O Conqueror, Thou who cometh in the name of the Lord, who didst go through the rejoicing multitude to a hill where stood a cross, make us, we beseech Thee, sharers in thy devoted spirit, as we remember the glory of Thy triumphant entry. Give us the faith which supported Thee and led Thee onward in Thine appointed mission. By gentleness, by selfless service, help us to breathe Thy spirit and interpret to men Thy rule of life, to the end that the kingdom of God may come upon the earth and be exalted in human hearts and homes. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Federal Works Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. Railroad Retirement Board.
10. Tennessee Valley Authority.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 29, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to yesterday, the Clerk did on this day receive from the Secretary of the Senate a message in writing attesting to the fact that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 918) entitled "An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective

Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 28, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 159) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having passed the Senate without amendment March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on March 28, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, March 28, 1947, he signed enrolled bills and joint resolutions as follows:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

On March 29, 1947:

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Owing to the fact that a conference report must be passed on in the House as early as possible in order that it may go to the Senate and become law today, the Chair feels that 1-minute speeches and requests for extensions must wait until after the disposition of this conference report.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls over other than household users may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however,* That—

"(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any provision of law referred to above, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (i) in any proceeding, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction or other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (ii) in any proceeding, under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and

"(5) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of this Act,—

"(1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 787);

"(2) shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than thirty-five pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals fifty pounds of refined sugar per capita; and

"(3) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available, for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this Act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

"SEC. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this Act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

"SEC. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby; (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this Act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property, available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions, and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this Act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this Act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than one year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

"(b) The term 'sugar' means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Surplus Property Act of 1944;' the following: 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947;'.

"(b) This Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The substitute agreed to in conference is similar in most respects to the joint resolution as it passed the House but there are differences which are explained below in this statement.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, after providing for temporary continuance of specified provisions of law, included the following provision:

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any such provision of law, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;"

In the conference substitute the words "under any provision of law referred to above" have been used instead of the words "under any such provision of law". This change is merely to make it perfectly clear that the provisions of law referred to are the ones cited in the introductory language to section 1.

Section 1 of the joint resolution passed by the House contained a subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the allocation and rationing authority transferred to him by section 3 of this Act, shall in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new sugar users, and for the needs of those who have no base period history."

This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute, but in lieu thereof provisions have been included providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of the act, (1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; and (2) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

The provision referred to in clause (1) of the preceding paragraph is taken from the Senate amendment, and merely makes more specific the intent of one of the provisions of the House joint resolution which is omitted from the conference substitute. The provision referred to in clause (2) of the preceding paragraph is a modification of section 4 of the Senate amendment. That section provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available not less than 50,000 tons of refined sugar, for other than provisional-allotment users, during the period from April 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, to provide for the same needs (other than the needs of hardship cases) which are to be provided for under the provision of the conference substitute here being discussed. The reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons made by this provision is in consideration of the fact that the amount referred to in the Senate amendment would have been allocated over a full year, whereas the provision in the conference substitute makes provision for a period from the date of the enactment of this act until October 31, 1947. In providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make such sugar available in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, and in making provision for hardship cases, this provision of the conference substitute follows the provision of the House joint resolution.

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products. The conferees are confident that such provision will be made because of assurances given to the Senate committee and referred to in the report of that committee on Senate Joint Resolution 58.

There is also included in the conference substitute a provision taken from the Senate amendment requiring that the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than 35 pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals 50 pounds of refined sugar per capita.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House contained the following subsection which is omitted from the conference substitute:

"(c) Nothing herein shall restrict the import of products of consumer size containers of not more than three pounds net each or more than one-half United States liquid gallons each, providing importers of such products shall obtain certification from the proper government officials of the exporting country that products so shipped shall have been produced out of domestic quota sugar."

In that part of section 3 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, which dealt with the temporary transfer of employees, the following proviso was included:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall in anywise be construed to violate any of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944."

In lieu of this proviso there has been included in the conference substitute the following provision taken substantially from the Senate amendment:

"The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act."

Section 6 of the conference substitute makes an amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act so as to continue, with respect to the exercise of the authority transferred by this legislation, the exemption from such act which is now applicable in the case of the exercise of such authority. This section also provides that this act may be cited as the "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947."

The Senate amendment contained a subsection 3 (d) providing for continuance in effect of orders, directives, rules, and regulations, pertaining to sugar, for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or proceeding with respect to violations, liabilities, or appeals. This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute solely on the ground that it was deemed unnecessary. By other provisions of the conference substitute orders, directives, rules, and regulations pertaining to sugar are continued in effect, and there is nothing in the conference substitute which would prevent them from being in effect for the purposes referred to in the Senate section 3 (d). Furthermore, section 13 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 1, section 29) provides that—

"The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing Act shall expressly so provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability. The expiration of a temporary statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the temporary statute shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability."

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House discloses that about the only changes from the House bill are in the interest of clarity. The bill as adopted by the conferees is substantially the bill as it passed the House.

Some questions have arisen as to whether sugar will be made available to new users, those without a sufficient base period, and hardship cases. The conferees have agreed that the Secretary of Agriculture should make sugar available to new users, to those without a base period, and for the needs of hardship cases in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program. In order that there might be no question that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available sugar for canning purposes, and for the prevention of spoilage and wastage of food, you will find on page 6 of the conference report, in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, substantially the same language as was contained in the House report, which clearly defines the intent of the Congress to making sugar available to prevent spoilage and wastage of food, in which it provides:

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I was interested in that language contained on page 6 of the conference report. May I ask the gentleman if the sugar to be allocated under the Secretary's authority is a part of the 25,000 tons referred to in the previous paragraph, or is that in addition to the 25,000 tons?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The sugar made available under the 25,000 tons is for provisional use, and it is my interpretation that the amount of sugar made available for hardship cases and new users is in addition to and not a part of the 25,000 tons.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what the per capita amount of refined sugar is that is now being used by the people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think, perhaps, I will have to divide that answer in two different parts. It is expected that this year there will be about 93 pounds available per capita as against a normal of 103 pounds. Now, that is for all domestic purposes, commercial as well as household purposes. Last year there was allocated 25 pounds per capita per annum. Under the estimate made for this year which, as I said, is within 10 pounds per capita of normal production, there is no question at all but that the householder shall be allocated at least 35 pounds per capita. The Senate wrote a provision in here that sugar should be allocated to household users on the basis of not less than 35 pounds per capita, and that any increase in the estimate should be allocated to the household users up to 50 pounds per capita. They did not have to do that. It might be a redundancy, but is an added protection which assures that each consumer, for household purposes, separate and apart from industrial purposes, shall get at least 35 pounds per capita. They possibly will get 50 pounds per capita, and perhaps more than that.

I do not think this sugar problem, Mr. Speaker, is nearly as serious as we have presumed. We are getting along splendidly, and I think one of our problems next year is going to be—I hope next year, anyway—that we will have so much sugar that there will not be any question of rationing; it will be a question of getting rid of the surplus.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is my understanding correct that if we are allocated 50 pounds and it can be proven that we cannot put up our fruits with the 50 pounds allocated to us we are entitled to have more sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very clearly the intention of the Congress that every possible attempt should be made to provide not only any additional sugars which are available but any sugar which is necessary to prevent wastage and spoilage. Of course we intend that there shall be made available adequate sugar for preventing wastage and spoilage of foods.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand this conference report correctly, you continue the rationing of sugar until October 31 of this year. Then you continue the inventory control over sugar until next March.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Control over commercial and industrial inventories is permitted until March 31, 1948.

Mr. RIZLEY. Following the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], may I inquire who makes the determination as to whether the housewife who needs more than 50 pounds of sugar for canning shall have the sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RIZLEY. Has the Secretary of Agriculture now a set-up in his office to take over the handling and control of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We provide for the transfer of appropriations and personnel to him, subject to the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RIZLEY. In other words, you take the present employees of the OPA, or whatever its successor was, and transfer them to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of further rationing and allocating the sugar up until October 31?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In practice it will be whether the Secretary of Agriculture wants them and whether the Bureau of the Budget will certify them as necessary, but I may say to the gentleman that the problem we have had has not been with the clerks and stenographers of OPA, it has been on the policy-making level, at the top. From now on, the policies with respect to the allocation and pricing of sugar will be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson, in whom I think we have more confidence than we have had in the administrators of OPA.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is one other question I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who has been very familiar with the whole rationing program from the beginning. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he observed that he did not think this sugar question is now nearly as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming decreasingly serious every day. I did not want to indicate that there is no serious sugar shortage now.

Mr. RIZLEY. In view of that statement, that it is not as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is, does not the gentleman believe the time is about here when we can get rid of these controls put on by virtue of the war? If it is not a serious matter, does not the gentleman believe it would be a pretty good idea to give the housewives of the country a little relief by just doing away with this thing now, in its entirety instead of continuing it on piecemeal, part of it until October 31 and the balance of it up until March 1948?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is just the problem. Because there is a world shortage of sugar at the present time, if we were to remove controls at the present time, it is very doubtful whether the housewife would be getting much sugar 30 days from now. We would invite competition between the commercial and industrial users and the housewife to the prejudice of household users. It is for the purpose of assuring the housewife that she is going to get an equitable supply of sugar that we are continuing this program until October 31, with the hope that production will be sufficient by that time to allow the controls to come off in an orderly manner without too much shock to our sugar industry and that part of the economy which is more or less dependent on sugar.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the excuse the controllers always give, shortage. We will continue to have shortages so long as we attempt to control our economy by New Deal planners. And so long as we continue to attempt to feed the whole world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I inquire of the gentleman if his committee is watching the present price situation as it affects consumers generally with a view to taking action unless there is a reduction in the cost of living?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are watching it with tremendous interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the intention of taking action, if necessary, for the protection of the consumers' interest?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it is necessary; but I think industry is taking the action which is necessary to bring about reduced prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice they are failing to cooperate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Industry is producing goods more rapidly at the present time than they ever produced before even in wartime. Industry is producing goods so rapidly in the United States today that our capacity for production really amazes us. One of the greatest problems today in many lines is the question of markets for our surplus production. That involves a great danger and that is why the gentleman and myself gave some consideration to making foreign credit available so that when we have these surpluses, probably this year and next year, we will have markets for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose originally in asking the gentleman to yield was in connection with the October 31st date. That is based upon the hope that there will be such an increase in production that there will be no sharp increase in price levels.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the purposes of the record, would we be able to ascertain by early July whether or not that hope will materialize so far as production is concerned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that we would be able to determine that with any degree of definiteness in July and perhaps not before August or September. But the date of October 31 is predicated upon the fact that the world-crop figures will then be pretty well known, and we will know just about what the domestic crop is going to amount to. So that, by October 31, if we have even a normal year this year, it is thought that we can safely take controls off.

I do not think we can tell definitely by July because many things might happen between July and September. By the latter part of August or the fore part of September, we should know within a few hundred thousand tons about how much sugar is going to be available in the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the situation and, of course, the conference report should be agreed to. But the thought I had in mind was that if there was a rapid increase in the cost of living, we would have to take some action for the protection of consumers somehow or other along this line. Is that a fair inference to draw?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Perhaps so, but I do not think the danger lies so much in an abnormal increase in the price of sugar. When controls come off in October, even if we are still in reasonably short supply, sugar will be coming on the market, so shortly after the danger would lie more in the fact that the commercial and industrial users might bid for the available supplies to the prejudice of the housewife. That is the reason why we kept this provision here for the permissive control of inventories so that the Secretary of Agriculture can say to an industrial user of sugar, "You usually keep a 60-day supply of sugar on hand and, therefore, you should not have more than a 60-day supply of sugar on hand until March 31, 1948."

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was in my district on Saturday and Sunday. Family after family said to me, "We have no sugar in our sugar bowls." I assured them that I believed it was the feeling of the chairman of the committee that there would be more sugar for canning and more sugar available, and that there must be more sugar than was anticipated because Dr. Marshall, of the Department of Agriculture, promised me before this legislation was introduced that the farmers would be given their regular supply of sugar to be used to make condensed milk out of their skimmed milk. Apparently, therefore, there is more sugar than was anticipated. But I know the gentleman is working on that. I voted rather reluctantly to retain controls until October 31, but I had faith in the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We did stress the necessity for making sugar available to prevent food wastage and spoilage. I may say the family sugar bowls will be replenished tomorrow. I think there is another stamp made valid tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman usually gets what he goes after.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the lady from Massachusetts.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there any relief in this bill for retail dealers in sugar who have had their stamps lost or stolen, to the end that they cannot supply their customers with even a small supply of sugar at the present time? What, if anything, has been done about a situation of that nature?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think there is a little relief, at least, to them in subsection (2) of section (b), on page 2 of the conference report, where provision is made for the needs of hardship cases, needs of new industrial users, and then in parentheses you will find this language:

> With particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts.

The retailer would have too little sugar for two reasons: Because he has lost his stamps, because he perhaps has cashed counterfeit stamps, but that in itself would be a hardship case which the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to. Then, if in a town where there are perhaps only two grocery stores which has had an unusual increase in population, due to population shift, throwing an added burden on those two grocers, that condition would have to be considered as creating a hardship, and the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to the needs of that community. In that manner the retail grocers would have their allotments increased proportionate as the population has increased.

Mr. JENSEN. Then the gentleman does feel there is some relief in this bill in the case which I have mentioned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; if it is properly administered, there will be substantial relief, and I am certain it will be properly administered.

Mr. JENSEN. I received this morning a petition from several hundred housewives in the city of Shenandoah, Iowa, and the surrounding community, in which they point out very carefully that they are worried about the sugar condition, and that sugar is very short at the present time. I understood the gentleman to say it was not a very serious situation at the present time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming less serious every day.

Mr. JENSEN. But will this thing be straightened out in time to take care of the canning season—that is, the canning of fruit in the country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The housewife will be much better off with this bill than she would be without it.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Mr. JENSEN. Categorically, just how much better off do you think she will be?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the first place, she will be assured of 10 pounds, per capita, more than she had last year, with the hope that if the sugar production is as it is estimated, somewhat better than normal, she will get up to 50 pounds as against 25 pounds last year. She will get that between now and October at that rate. Then, on October 31, all controls go off, and I hope she will be able to get all the sugar she will want after that date. There is some canning to be done, of course, at that time. It runs into November, I understand, although I quite agree that most canning is done before that. But most of the canning this year will be done at a time when sugar is under control, having the effect of guaranteeing that she will get much more sugar than she got last year.

Mr. JENSEN. And getting it soon—in plenty of time for canning, say within the next month or two?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We hope so. I think the fact that they are giving the housewives a little bonus on tomorrow, April 1, indicates that they realize that the sugar situation will be better than that which existed 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. From the realistic standpoint, I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture will make additional allocations to prevent wastage. How does that apply to the housewife or someone who wants to use sugar to can fruit to prevent its going to waste? The individual cannot take it up with the Secretary of Agriculture. Are we going to have an OPA in the communities to determine this additional allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are not going to have any more OPA as far as sugar is concerned.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Where is the housewife going to get in touch with the Secretary of Agriculture to get this allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture probably will not deal with the individual housewife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. How is she going to get the additional sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He will deal generally with the problem when it arises. If there is not sugar available to meet the needs for preserving food at the time of its harvest the Secretary of Agriculture will know the needs of the housewives and then he will make arrangements to validate coupons for increased amounts of sugar.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. What I am trying to get at is, How is the housewife to get this additional allocation to prevent the wastage of her fruit as it ripens?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Through directive or order of the Secretary of Agriculture which will be applicable generally to all household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then it applies only to a class?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right, the whole class of consumers throughout the United States in the class of household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That will not aid the individual housewife.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I believe it will; she will get as much as anybody else. It will aid the gentleman's wife just as it will aid my wife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we have this problem, the stores right here in Washington are full of sugar but there are no stamps, there are no passwords or anything to enable consumers to get the sugar. That is true all over the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Stamps for additional amounts of sugar will be validated tomorrow.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. They must have anticipated this; is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; they anticipated that there would be demand for the sugar. The fact that grocers, wholesale and retail, have adequate stocks of sugar on hand at the present time indicates that if we did not have this rationing at this time there would not be any sugar in the warehouses. Everybody would buy all the sugar as fast as they possibly could to the prejudice of the late comer. That is the reason for having it in the hands of grocers, so as to have a stock to meet the demand next week and the week following. You might just as well say that because the warehouses in Michigan are stocked today we should do away with rationing entirely; but we do not know what is going to happen 3 months from now. If we did not have rationing probably no housewife would have much sugar then.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. And the continuation of inventory controls does enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the sugar control, although, as the gentleman says, only as to wholesalers or dealers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The gentleman will remember that I offered an amendment on the floor to continue those controls only to nonhousehold users. It applies only to nonhousehold users. In conference we were very insistent that that provision stay in the bill. There was no trouble among the conferees in that respect.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we can rest assured that we are not going to have a continuation of the New Deal control and planned economy in reference to sugar rationing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my hope.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Am I correct in assuming that inventory control after October 31 also means use control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. BUCK. Then what is to prevent a person who has laid in a 60-day inventory from using it at a greatly accelerated rate, replacing his inventory the next day? I do not see how you can have effective control if you do not have use control along with the inventory control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman mean would a commercial user be allowed to expand?

Mr. BUCK. Expand his consumption.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the Secretary of Agriculture probably would take an average over a period of time to determine what that man's current needs or that industry's current needs were, and if he had, we will say, 20 tons of sugar in his warehouse on the average and he was replenishing that and keeping 20 tons in there, perhaps a normal 30-day supply, the Secretary of Agriculture would say: "You can have no more than 20 tons or a 30-day supply." He would have to use it out of his incoming sugar.

Mr. BUCK. Then control after October 31 does involve consumption control? It must, to be effective.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of volume use; yes.

Mr. BUCK. Yes. Will the gentleman explain how the Department of Agriculture is going to police that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That has not been worked out. It is a question of administration. Frankly, I may say it is one of our purposes to get rid of the cumbersome administrative machinery we now have. The Government should be encouraged to simplify control, or the enforcement of sugar control; so I think that is a problem which might well be left to the Appropriations Committee, the question as to how much of a staff it will give the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid the RECORD will show something I do not believe should be in this. Inventory control, as I understand this bill, does not prevent manufacturer A, for instance, from using 40 tons of sugar instead of 20 tons of sugar. Your rationing goes off on October 31. The Secretary cannot ration sugar subsequent to that date, but he can say, "You, Mr. Wholesaler B, can have on your floor no more than a 60-day supply of sugar at a time." You are in a free market so far as purchases are concerned. So when you reduce your inventory of sugar to a 30-day supply, if the rule is 60 days, you can go in the market and buy another 30-day supply of sugar, whether you are a manufacturer or a wholesaler. The point is, you must not have on your floor or in inventory sugar in excess of what the Secretary of Agriculture says you may have. Is that not the right interpretation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think in practice it is, but you have this additional protection: Every industrial and commercial user might expect when price control is off of sugar that there will be an immediate reaction in the prices. Prices may immediately go up; yet he knows also from experience that prices will very shortly afterward come back down perhaps below what they were before controls were taken off. So he is not going to stock unusually large inventories of sugar at high prices which he will have to sell for less than he paid for it. That controls very much these inventories and I do not think we need to worry too much about that. They have to go into the open market, and inasmuch as they cannot increase their inventories the only way they could use a disproportionate

amount of sugar would be to expand their production, which is probably now at capacity. So the two influences are against unusually large inventories. One, they will not have equipment to expand or to use so much sugar as to prejudice the needs of the householder; and second, it would not be very good business on their part to buy in a high-price market and sell in a few weeks in a low-price market.

Mr. BUCK. If a particular manufacturer doubled his output on November 1, then he would be permitted to have double the amount of inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. It would be under regulation. He could not start to build up those inventories. It would be under control. He would have to build his inventories before the controls went off, and he could not do that under the rationing system.

Mr. BUCK. How often could he replace his inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As often as it was necessary to maintain it at his average level, I presume. That would be under regulation also.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. When this bill was before the House we amended it to provide that nothing in it would be construed to violate any of the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, and I note the conference report has some wording different from that. Would the gentleman explain that to us and assure us that it is at least the equivalent of what we passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We did not think when we wrote the language in here that authorized the transfer temporarily of these employees that there would be any question but that the word "temporarily" modified the length of service and not the status of the individual. The Civil Service Commission, however, gave an interpretation which indicated there was some doubt in their minds as to whether it went to the status of the individual or to his employment. To clarify the fact that we did not intend by this transfer to interfere in any manner with the Civil Service status of the employee transferred, we substituted the language at the top of page 7 for the language that we had in the House bill. This positively assures that the civil service status of the employee transferred will in no way be affected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The conference report guarantees each consumer 35 pounds of sugar for this year, as I understand. We are dealing now with the question of supply, because our sugar has been produced and is now being refined, and there will be very little more available from the 1947 production until after these controls go off, so we are dealing with the question of distributing the supply which we have on hand and which is now being refined in Cuba.

I think it should be pointed out that we secure approximately 40 percent of our sugar from Cuba to take care of the needs of the American people. The Cuban production will be approximately 1,500,000 tons greater for this crop year than it was for last year. Now, the committee report holds out some hope to the consumers of this Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman give that figure advisedly?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That figure of 1,500,000 is the Department's figure; that is the Cuban figure. Everybody in industry has said it would be more than that, so I will take the Department's estimate on that. But what I want to point out is this: I do not think we should hold out a false hope that the housewives, the consumers, will each get 50 pounds of sugar because as I see it it is entirely dependent on what the International Emergency Food Council does with the consent of our administration in distributing that extra sugar from Cuba to other countries of the world.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Excepting that the Emergency Food Council has already allocated the estimated increase of Cuban production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is 1,500,000 tons. In the last 30 days the Cubans estimate that they will have five or six hundred thousand tons more than the January estimate. Now, I say this: That the American people are entitled to that extra five or six hundred thousand tons from Cuba, which will give them at least 5 pounds more sugar, to make it 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds, and also give some more to industrial users. Our Food Committee has made that request to the Secretary of Agriculture—that he will give that extra 5 pounds to the American consumers, which will give us 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman's Food Study Committee would continue to stress the point which the gentleman has just made—that it is the intention of Congress that any increase in the Cuban crop production should be reflected in proportionate increases in the available supply of sugar in the United States to effectuate our purpose that the housewife will get up to 50 pounds of sugar.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We will do that, and we know we will have the help of the gentleman and other Members of Congress. But I want to point out that if the International Food Council, with the consent of the administration, decides to give that five or six hundred thousands tons to other countries of the world, then we will not get more than 35 pounds.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. There has been a good deal of talk about dates. It is regrettable that the bill is not in the form in which it was originally introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of our committee. There is no significance to the October 31 date except that that is the period when we hope the crop will be marketed and be ready for distribution, that is, it will be on the way. The impression is that the gentleman from Michigan introduced a bill which extended controls to March 31, 1948. That is a false impression. His bill provided that on October 31 of this year the controls should end unless the Secretary of Agriculture should make a finding that this commodity continued in short supply, which is quite a different provision from the categorical ending of controls on a given date.

The point I want to make, and I make this comment chiefly from the standpoint of improving our legislative craftsmanship, is that Congress ought not to leave this situation in that condition, and the country ought not to be under any false impressions as to the possibilities that may confront us on October 31. There was a rather hopeful picture of the sugar situation presented by Dr. Marshall, who apparently knows a great deal about the situation. He said if growing continues, if the weather is favorable, there will be perhaps one of the finest crops not only in Cuba but in all parts of the world, and to that extent we can have a rather optimistic view of the future; but because of the action not only of this body but of the other body we are now left exposed to that potential hazard.

May I say in commendation of the chairman's action in that respect that I hope Congress will legislate with greater skill on situations of this kind and not walk away from the condition hopefully asserting that the crop will be abundant. If it is not abundant, we are going to have a situation between October 31 and January 1, when Congress reconvenes, that cannot be remedied by any action by any authority that we have placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I simply wanted to say with reference to the chairman's action that I thought the pattern which he laid out in his original bill is one that we ought to follow. It would hold the power in the hands of Congress and not turn us over to the cold processes of economic law, which have a way of bringing disaster. Certainly we do not want a repetition in the sugar situation of the condition that we had after the other war, when prices skyrocketed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This measure carries with it the right to fix prices of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The truth of the business is that sugar is being shipped from Cuba to other countries because it is higher in other countries in terms of our own money than it is in the United States. This measure is not going to cure anything. It reminds me of the fellow who wanted to fill up the empty barrel by pouring water in at the bunghole with both ends knocked out. Here we are in a monetary inflation. I call attention again to the fact that it is the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do something about it.

This is not doing a thing in the world but perpetuating until October 31 a control that should have been taken off long ago. If we will take these controls entirely off, there will be enough sugar coming to the United States, and produced in the United States, to supply the entire demand. As long as you keep this price fixing on you are going to have the same condition and the same reaction from the American people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is in substantial accord with the majority thinking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, except, of course, that we do have export controls and we do allocate the world supply of sugar throughout the world under the International Emergency Food Council; so the statement which the gentleman made that the bulk of the sugar is moving to foreign countries because of better price, in view of the exchange conditions at the present time, probably is not warranted.

I think we are all looking toward the same end as the gentleman. That is surely in keeping with the principle which the gentleman announces. I know the committee will follow through because it is our impression that we should remove these controls just as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. RANKIN. I am informed that all the sugar that is produced in Cuba and other countries is to be shipped anywhere except the United States, as long as we hold this price down, while our currency is inflated, from less than $5,000,000,000 to almost $30,000,000,000. Unless we attempt to restrict inflation of the currency, we are going to keep the American people from getting the amount of sugar they need.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman might be misinformed. We buy the entire exportable Cuban sugar crop and accept an allocation under the agreement with the International Emergency Food Council.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I brought up a point during the previous debate on this bill regarding towns that have had an unusual increase in population. The situation with reference to that has been made much clearer by the wording of this bill. The responsibility for meeting that situation is squarely in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that situation will be somewhat helped.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. How soon will he be able to put this program as outlined in the present bill into effective operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Theoretically, tonight at 12:01 a. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And all appeals should be made to him directly?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have one other situation in mind. Suppose a bakery is starting out in a rather large town, and there is no historic basis for the allocation of sugar; that is, a new bakery and there is no other bakery serving that community. That would come squarely within section 1 of this bill also?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is my impression that it would definitely come under that.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority under section 1 to grant authority to a new bakery serving a community exclusively to furnish them sugar immediately?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He has very wide authority in that respect.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Just a moment ago the gentleman from Mississippi made some reference to the duty or obligation upon the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I meant to say the Committee on Banking and Currency. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When I answered the gentleman from Mississippi I did so having in mind that he said the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But I can assure the gentleman that the whole question of credit and controls will continue to have the attention of our committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Until the Congress of the United States takes back the power vested in it by the Constitution to coin money and regulate the value thereof, you are going to have this wild and unlimited inflation that we are suffering from now, and you are not going to cure anything by attempting to fix prices and control the supply.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The guaranty provisions as to quantity which have been written in the conference report provide 35 pounds and possibly up to 50 pounds for the housewives.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We guarantee 35 pounds for the housewife and then provide that any increase over the estimates will be allocated to her until she has received up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. Essentially that is my understanding of it. Even if that were not in the bill, the governmental authority having to do with the rationing and distribution of sugar would certainly not sanction hoarding sugar in storage, would they?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The House committee felt that the amount of available sugar should be made available as quickly as possible to the housewife. I think the hearings indicate she would get at least 35 pounds. As a matter of fact, I think we assured the House when the matter was under consideration that she would get 10 pounds more than last year. So the 35 pounds written in the Senate language made no additional guarantee. She would have gotten 35 pounds regardless of that action.

Mr. DINGELL. But if the volume of sugar produced was less than would permit distribution per capita in the amount of 35 pounds, the guarantee in itself would mean nothing, would it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We assure her that she is going to get 35 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. On the visible supply? It might be more on the estimated world supply of sugar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be practical and realistic about it, we are confident there will be enough sugar so without any guaranty in the law she would have gotten 35 pounds anyway, and we hope she can get up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I am trying to bring out, but that will depend on the present maturing crop—that is, the total volume, not alone in the United States and off-shore sugar-producing areas, but the world supply of sugar. That will be the deciding factor as to how much sugar the housewives will get and what the commercial user of sugar will get.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The available supply is getting better and better. The prospect of increases seems to be getting better.

Mr. DINGELL. Is the gentleman fully satisfied with the provisions having to do with the controls of sugar inventories?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Personally, I am reasonably well satisfied with the provisions in respect to inventory controls.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have received a great many letters from people saying there is a large amount of sugar in storage throughout the country—in the stores. I want to point out to the gentleman that before the end of this week more than a billion pounds of that sugar will pass from the warehouses and stores into the hands of consumers, with this new 10-pound ration stamp which will go on April 1.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has answered the question which was asked a while ago much better than I did, and has clarified the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress were to refuse to adopt this conference report or pass this bill, as I understand it, the controls on sugar would go off now; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Tonight at 12 o'clock.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I am for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman refer to page 6 of the conference report, the language with reference to the reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons? Is that 25,000 tons there referred to the same as the tonnage referred to in section 3 of subparagraph (b) on page 2?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where it is broken down into 12,500-ton lots?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. May I say to the gentleman the Senate had provided 50,000 tons for the full year, up to March 31st. The conferees cut it in half. It had been allocated on a quarterly basis, but extending it to October 31st the gentleman will see runs it over into the fourth quarter. So we had to divide it

there somewhere, and we divided it on June 30, 1947.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One additional question on that same 25,000 tons: Is it out of that reserve, 12,500 tons quarterly, that the Secretary is to have the possibility of meeting, for instance, a very heavy fruit production, say in California or western Michigan or some other heavy fruit-producing State? In other words, can he take from that 25,000 tons the necessary sugar to increase the commercial or industrial allotment in an area where there is a great fruit crop?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have answered the question. It is my understanding that the sugar which should be made available for the classifications which the gentleman calls attention to is in addition to the minimum of 25,000 tons.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where would that language appear? That is what I should like to clear up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not know that it is so specific. That is my understanding, and I think the understanding of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO MAY 1, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I want to announce that the President of Mexico, His Excellency Miguel Aleman, will address a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and House on Thursday, May 1, 1947, at 12:30 p. m.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Thursday, May 1, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by him on Government control of sources of information, which appears in the current issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include therein two letters.

GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, able and popular foreign analyst of the Washington Star, and his charming wife have been in Europe since last January. Mrs. Brown, the former Helen Lombard, is one of the best known women in Washington, herself a scribe of wide experience, brilliant author of a book entitled "Washington Waltz," a volume dealing with the diplomatic life of Washington, and of a recent book entitled "While They Fought," which depicts events behind the scenes in our Nation's Capital during 1941 to 1946. They are now visiting Turkey.

In yesterday's Star, Mr. Brown points out that the guerrilla bands which have been and are now harassing the feeble Government of Greece were organized in other Balkan countries. They are large and powerful. They are well equipped and well supplied with stores of all kinds, derived mainly from two sources, UNRRA and lend-lease from the United States. How did they get them?

Now we are asked to send more supplies to those countries to stop the march of communism. What assurance have we that such supplies will not also fall into the hands of these communistic guerrilla bands and be used against us to defeat the very purpose for which they are sent?

It is tragic indeed that while we appease and coddle Communists in the United States we are urged to send supplies to halt their progress in other parts of the world.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY: PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon notwithstanding that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE IN FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 1621 to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boys Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for use at the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in France, in the months of July and August 1947, the following: 225 canvas bags, 1,200 duffel bags, 2,900 wool blankets, 200 vinegar bottles, 200 sugar bowls, 1,200 canvas watering buckets, 205 tent oil-stove burners, 25 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (24 gallon), 210 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (32 gallon), 1,200 meat cans, 200 five-gallon water cans, 1,200 aluminum canteens, 225 flag cases, 1,300 folding chairs, 200 alarm clocks, 100 round insulated containers, 1,250 folding canvas cots, 1,200 canteen covers, 1,200 aluminum canteen cups, 10 empty field desks, 25 five-gallon gasoline drums, ten 55-gallon gasoline drums, 225 national standard flags, 225 wooden flagstaffs, 1,500 forks, 100 halazone tablets (bottles), 25 immersion type for can heaters, 1,500 knives, 225 gasoline lanterns, 1 stencil-duplicating machine, 2,850 pillowcases, 1,250 feather pillows, 500 sirup pitchers, 300 water pitchers, 200 mustard pots, 200 stock pots, 7 field ranges, 25 latrine screens, 10 field safes, 200 pepper shakers, 200 salt shakers, 160 cotton bed sheets, 1,500 spoons, 205 tent stoves, 10 folding camp tables, 120 mess tables, 3 assembly tents, and 200 squad tents: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said jamboree as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War before delivering said property shall take from the said Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is further authorized, at his discretion and without expense to the United States, to provide transportation from the United States and return, on a vessel of the Army Transport Service, to those Boy Scouts of America and Scouters certified by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, attending this jamboree. That the amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be deposited to the credit of such of the current appropriations for the support of the Army as bear such expenses, and shall be available for the same purposes as those appropriations.

SEC. 3. The taxes imposed by sections 3469 and 3475, or any comparable sections that may now or during 1947 be in effect, of the Internal Revenue Code, shall not apply to amounts paid for ocean transportation to the persons and property herein and above described attending this jamboree.

SEC. 4. That under such regulations as he may prescribe the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters of the Boy Scouts of America who are citizens of the United States or, if not citizens of the United States, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States upon certification by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as to their qualifications to attend this jamboree as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, without fee for the application of the issuance of said passports.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "tents", insert "and such other equipment as may be required by the Boy Scouts of America which is available from American stocks."

Page 4, line 23, strike out the word "of" and insert "for or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] introduced a similar bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Clarksburg Telegram entitled "Congress Keeps a Promise."

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain statistics, tables, and a report.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence between himself and Mr. Clayton, also an article from the New York Times and an address made over the radio.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would like to announce that today the committee issues its first report, a 56-page highly documented report entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

Mr. Speaker, the facts contained in this pamphlet are the result of intensive study of several experts which, in one case, has extended over a period of 30 years of Communist activities and observations both in and out of the Communist Party.

The entire tenor of the contents of this report can be gained in the first four sentences, which I would like to read:

The Communist movement of the United States may be properly characterized as—

1. An organization operating under centralized discipline subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the single and ruling party of that country.

2. A section of a World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. An organization whose basic aim, whether open or concealed is the abolition of our present economic system and democratic form of government and the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship in its place.

4. An organization resorting to deception, evasion, illegal methods, violence, and civil war, methods implicit in its revolutionary purpose.

All Members will receive a copy of this report, and I highly recommend that every Member of Congress read it.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, like an old family skeleton in the closet, our huge Government debt is rattling its billions of bones. We prefer to ignore it in favor of more thrilling discussions of tax and budget reductions.

But most important to our economy is a careful and exacting study of the management of this debt.

In addition to my speech of last Wednesday, therefore, I shall, from time to time, report to the House the results of some inquiries I am conducting. I hope, in this manner, to create an interest in this subject.

From President Truman on down, the administration advises us that the important thing about our $260,000,000,000 debt is the annual interest charge. The debt itself can be paid whenever we get around to it; meanwhile, we can well afford to pay an interest charge of "only" $5,000,000,000.

But why five billion? Why, indeed?

When the war ended on September 2, 1945, this Nation owed virtually the same amount of debt it owes today. But it paid only $4,500,000,000 a year for interest on this debt. And it would pay only $4,500,000,000 today for annual interest charges if the administration had not, through the wholly unnecessary Victory loan and subsequent pay-offs, managed to substitute twenty billions in long-term high-interest securities for short-term seven-eighths percent and 1½ percent securities on hand when the war ended.

Nor is this the end.

In a study of Full Employment Patterns, 1950, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor assumes—see page 12—that—

No reduction in the size of the debt will be attempted during 1950.

Granting this assumption, it goes on to estimate—see page 13—that the interest charge on the debt will not be $4,500,000,000 nor even $5,000,000,000, but $5,600,000,000.

It would appear that the administration, far from anticipating an actual net reduction of the debt, is bending every effort to see how high an interest charge we can afford to pay. Within 5 years after World War II it will have increased this annual charge by more than $1,000,000,000—and this wholly unwarranted increase will equal the entire prewar cost of the debt, $1,100,000,000 of interest.

CATTLE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I point with some pride to the recent figures released by the Department of Commerce from the 1945 census which revealed that Cherry County, Nebr., in the Fourth Congressional District led all the 3,069 counties in the United States in cattle on farms. Six other counties in the Fourth District were among the first 100 counties. It will be interesting to my friends from the eastern part of our great country to know that Cherry County has an area of 5,982 square miles or 25 square miles larger than the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island together. Six counties in the Fourth Nebraska District are larger in area than the State of Connecticut.

The seven leading counties in the Fourth Nebraska District with their national rating, and their January 1, 1945 cattle and calves inventories follow:

County	Ranking	Cattle
Cherry	1	237,888
Custer	12	141,159
Holt	13	140,199
Lincoln	17	124,394
Sheridan	31	99,625
Garden	36	95,753
Dawson	82	76,460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered before the Agricultural Limestone Division of Pennsylvania last Monday at Harrisburg. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that this will exceed the authorized limit, but notwithstanding that fact I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRY L. HAINES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to report the death of a former Member of this House, my predecessor, who served here with you for 10 years, the Honorable Harry L. Haines, of Red Lion. At that time it was the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. While I differed very seriously with Mr. Haines on a great many important national issues, my respect for him as a citizen was not affected by it. Mr. Haines was elected and served here for 10 years, and always carried the esteem of his friends who knew him best and lived closest to him. Whatever they said or did not say of Mr. Haines, there was one thing you had to say about him: He was always a gentleman. He enjoyed a strong, Christian faith. He was a leader in his church and Sunday school. His town was known as the best attended Sunday school town of any city of the United States. He was one of the men who was responsible for that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Harry Haines for 10 years. I was closely associated with him. I regarded him as one man who measured up to Thomas Jefferson's standard who, when asked what were the essential questions to be asked of an applicant for office, replied, "Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful?" I never met a finer, more conscientious public servant in this House or elsewhere than Harry Haines, of Pennsylvania.

He was a statesman without duplicity, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to pay this tribute to Harry Haines as a colleague whom I served with in the House of Representatives. He was one of the finest men I ever knew. Mr. Haines came from Pennsylvania. He was honorable and conscientious. I do not think that I had a better friend in the Congress at any time, nor did I ever consider any Member of Congress a better friend of mine than was Harry Haines. I always admired him because he was straightforward and honest, and it was a great pleasure to serve with him. I am sure the people of his own county and State have lost a great citizen—one who shall always be remembered as a real gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

His town of Red Lion was known as the cigar center of the United States for many years. They made 7 percent of the cigars of the country there at one time. He was one of the pioneers of that industry. During the First World War he was chairman of the American Red Cross in his county. He was chairman of the Lion's Club and governor of the State organization. He was a director of the Keystone Automobile Club of the county, as well as the Boy Scouts of America. He was also on the committee of York County Manufacturers' Association and the National League of Masonic Clubs.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I doubt if I can add anything to the splendid tributes that have been paid to the memory of Harry Haines. I knew him all the years he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I remember him, and I always shall, as an earnest, honest, able servant of the people, and to those he leaves behind I would like to say that they have my deepest and heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Harry Haines was born and reared in the comunity in which he died. He was one of the leaders in everything that was for the benefit of that community during those years. The community mourns the loss of an outstanding citizen. I am happy to say that he leaves five sons and daughters who will carry on and who are a credit to the community. He furthermore leaves, I believe, eight grandchildren and one great-grandchild. I much regret to see the passing of this good citizen and extend to his bereaved family my deep sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the death of Harry Haines must have saddened the hearts of everyone whose privilege it was to come in contact with him during a full life. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Haines for 8 years in this body. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there was never a more sincere and hard-working public servant in this body during this period than Harry Haines.

Mr. Haines was a deeply religious man. I remember back during the dark days of the early thirties how disturbed he was at the move of our great Republic toward things that perhaps were foreign to his fundamental beliefs. Mr. Haines found comfort in the realization that all the steps taken during that period were taken from an emergency standpoint and for the purpose of trying to get us back on an even keel.

Mr. Haines has made a great contribution to the welfare of the entire Nation. I know his community and his fine family must indeed be very sad today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radiogram to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject House Tax Bill Lightens "Little's Fellow's" Burden, and include certain tables.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Moscow Conference.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our Assistant Secretary of State, Will Clayton, with about 100 experts, counselors, and advisers, leaves next week for Geneva to sit down at an international economic poker game that will last for some 3 months. Judging by the performances of our State Department in the past at international poker games, Uncle Sam will come home from this poker game without his economic shirt. I am going to speak on this matter next Monday, and at that time I expect to ask questions of this House and of the Nation that I was prevented from asking Will Clayton on Saturday by a point of order being made in the Committee on Ways and Means.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House and, particularly, those Members who have expressed interest in the matter, that I am today, as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and at the direction of the committee, introducing a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an inquiry and complete study of the policies and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

The original act was approved June 19, 1934. It is the opinion of many that it is appropriate, after this lapse of nearly 13 years, to reexamine the whole subject and ascertain whether and to what extent the original intent of Congress is being administered. There has come to the committee considerable complaint as to some of the policies now in effect and the procedures for administering the act.

The inquiry is not intended as a witch hunt, or for any purpose other than to make certain that present laws and administration are making available to the people of the United States the full use of radio communication upon the terms and conditions that best serve the public. Already a start has been made in this important matter by conferences between the committee and the Commission. The purpose of the resolution I am introducing is to widen the scope and make more effective the course which the committee has inaugurated and desires to pursue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I understand it will be in excess of the amount allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

RESULTS OF POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy of the questionnaire which in March 1947 I attempted to place

in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. It was humanly impossible to send such a questionnaire to each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received fully cover the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, which it is my honor to represent.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural populations; all labor and farm organizations represented; as well as large industries and small business; two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman, both Democratic and Republican, labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public office holders, salesmen, and school teachers. A total of 2,500 questionnaires was sent and the number of returns received—1,260—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues before the Congress for consideration.

I hope that each Member of Congress will carefully study the opinions as expressed by the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio.

WHY IS THE NAVY WITHHOLDING INFORMATION FROM CONGRESS?

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Public Lands Committee and at the request of the chairman of that committee, I recently inspected two of the non-self-governing possessions of the United States in the company of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and two of my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Hawaii, Delegate FARRINGTON.

On that trip, I learned many things about the hundreds of square miles of public lands of the United States in the far Pacific, about their local inhabitants, and about their government.

The Secretary of the Navy pursuant to Executive orders of the President is charged with the responsibility of administering the civil affairs of the people of Guam and Samoa. In his capacity as governor of an island population of American nationals it is his responsibility to keep the President and Congress informed of the wishes of the people he governs and to protect to the fullest the civil liberties and basic freedoms of these non-self-governing peoples. Among the rights of all Americans is the right to petition the Congress of the United States.

In Guam, which is ruled by a United States naval governor under the supervision of, and directly responsible to, the Secretary of the Navy, James F. Forrestal, I was told by certain of the people of the island—not by the naval governor—that they had petitioned the Congress of the United States for full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of their island.

Gentlemen, I have in my possession a copy of that petition, Joint Resolution 1, of the Eighth Guam Congress, which was unanimously adopted by that body of elected representatives of the people of Guam on January 4, 1947, and forwarded to the United States naval governor of Guam for forwarding, through channels of naval authority, to the Eightieth Congress of the United States. That petition has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Knowledge of that petition has been deliberately withheld from the Congress by the Navy Department—James F. Forrestal, presiding.

In American Samoa, the United States naval governor, who is also under the supervision of and directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal, told our party that the local inhabitants of American Samoa had not requested a change in their form of government. Gentlemen, at this moment, I have in my possession a true copy of an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa in which they proposed to the Congress of the United States a form of organic act for government of American Samoa.

Gentlemen, that request—that petition—from the duly elected chiefs of 16,000 loyal Americans has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Nor has the Congress been informed by Mr. Forrestal of the wishes of the people for local self-government. Knowledge of that request has also been deliberately withheld from the Congress of the United States by the Navy Department, James F. Forrestal, presiding.

Why have not these petitions been transmitted to Congress? They have been presented to the naval governors who are directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal and yet have never been transmitted to the Congress.

Mr. Forrestal, pursuant to Executive orders of the President, is responsible for the 40,000 civilians, including many resident Americans on Guam and Samoa.

The civil liberties and basic freedoms of these Americans should be as important to the administration as is the democracy of the Greeks and the Turks. I concur in the belief that the Reds must be eliminated from our Government but while the present administration is hunting Reds in its efforts to preserve democracy, it is stifling democracy in our own non-self-governing Territories by deliberately denying these people access to the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JONES of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Deputy Administrator C. H. Nance, of the Veterans' Administration, Bedford Hospital, Addition for Women Patients at Bedford, Mass., and a statement by Dr. Burrier, administrator of the hospital.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on the First Deficiency Appropriations bill in committee and to include certain statutory provisions and tables and excerpts from committee hearings.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

THE HAND OF ESAU AND THE VOICE OF JOHNSTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Eric Johnston, a representative of the motion-picture industry, came before the Committee on Un-American Activities and read a lengthy statement, which has been referred to as "The Hand of Esau and the Voice of Johnston."

If Mr. Johnston does not know of the Communist infiltration into Hollywood, he should study the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities as well as the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We have definite information that for years the script writers and movie actors in Hollywood contributed as much as $3,000 a week to the Communist Party—a subversive organization which is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

Large numbers of moving pictures that come out of Hollywood carry the Communist line.

We are called upon to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world because of its threat to the civilization of mankind. Yet we have them in Hollywood spreading their poisonous propaganda through the moving pictures. We have them on the radio sending their poisonous propaganda into every home. We have them in our educational institutions putting in extra time poisoning the minds of the youth of the land who are being educated at public expense.

If we are going to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world, let us begin at home and put a stop to the use of our public institutions and our public methods of communication by this dangerous element—these enemies within our gates.

As I told Mr. Johnston, unless the people in control of the moving-picture industry are willing to clean house and fumigate, then Congress will have to do it for them.

We are not going to permit American civilization to be destroyed in this way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one to include an editorial from today's Washing-

ton Times-Herald on the housing situation; in the second instance to include an editorial from the New York Times of today on Edgar L. Warren and the Conciliation Service, as well as a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star; in the third instance to include a newspaper article by Sidney Fields, from the Daily Mirror, and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 26; and in the fourth instance to include a newspaper article in today's Washington Daily News by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued jointly by the governors of six New England States in support of the Truman policy.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Centralia Illinois mine disaster and include three editorials.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each case to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 10, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Pulitzer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 3 hours, the time to be controlled by and equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean the entire day will be devoted to general debate on this bill?

Mr. TABER. I would hardly expect the entire day would be devoted to that, because, as I understand, there is a conference report expected from the Senate on the War Powers Act, and I understand it will be the purpose of the leadership to have that disposed of. Perhaps we may even rise during the progress of the debate in order to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement about the conference report. It is absolutely necessary that this conference report be agreed to before midnight. Therefore, the Chair would like the Committee to rise when that conference report comes from the Senate so that it may be acted upon immediately instead of waiting until late in the evening.

Mr. CANNON. Then it is possible that general debate may extend into tomorrow?

Mr. TABER. It might a little, but I think that I should say for the benefit of the membership that it will not be my purpose to try to read the bill tonight.

Mr. CANNON. The bill, then, positively will not be read today?

Mr. TABER. That will be my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 2849, first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have here a deficiency bill involving $2,471,000,000. The estimates have been reduced below the budget by $628,000,000. I am going to spend a little time at this point in describing what items are in this bill and discussing in a general way without too much detail what is included in the bill. I shall not cover the minor items, simply the major ones. The report goes into the full question in detail.

A good many of the items covered by this bill are for pay increases that have been allowed, and other items are for things that have come up as a result of contingencies that could not be foreseen. Some of them are for such things as new activities that have been created.

There is here a grant to States of $135,000,000 for old-age assistance; $9,064,000 for grants to states to administer the Unemployment Insurance Compensation Act; $2,780,000 for the Public Buildings Administration.

The bill contains provision to meet some damage claims.

There is included $1,881,000 for the new obligations of the Railroad Retirement Act resulting from the situation that was presented by the Crosser bill last summer.

There is $1,451,000,000 to take care of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but I am not going into any detail on this item until I get a little further along. I am simply going down through the items hurriedly to give an over-all picture.

There are a number of items for the District of Columbia totaling $4,035,000. The chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, by the way, persuaded us to add $665 on one item above the budget.

There is a small item for the government of St. Croix and the Virgin Islands. There is over-all $20,000,000 for the Post Office Department, $20,000,000, which was covered by a budget estimate for crop insurance, $465,000,000 for pay of the Army, and $300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas which goes to the Army. There is also an item of about $278,000,000 for pay of the Navy. That is represented by transfers

The Veterans' Administration item represents a cut of $200,000,000 on account of Army pensions. Taking the figures that General Bradley presented to us and upon his own testimony and concessions, we were able to cut that figure $200,000,000. The estimate had been made up some time before, and I do not believe they had taken into consideration certain facts which had arisen in the trend of those items. There is a very liberal figure in there, and that is conceded.

There is a cut of a million dollars for printing and binding, but that is small and is based entirely on what seemed to be their needs. There is no cut in the hospital service or the administrative service, although General Bradley has recognized that the number of employees has gone up too fast and he has told us he intends to reduce the number of civilian employees outside of the hospital picture by about 5,000 by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What accounts for most of the reduction in that appropriation?

Mr. TABER. They are all based on ordinary mathematics, taking the public expenditures for the months to come and multiplying them by the number of months yet to go in the appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I was not concerned so much with the method employed in making the reduction but as to what services the reductions were taken from?

Mr. TABER. Well, the estimates that we found with more money than they actually need.

The first one was the item for pensions, and we found that they are agreeing to General Bradley's own statement, allowing a very considerable margin to go by. They had $200,000,000 more in the estimate than they could possibly use in the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does this figure represent the figure submitted by General Bradley, or did he concur in this reduction?

Mr. TABER. After he had been examined for awhile and we analyzed the figures, he admitted that we could make this cut.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And can this cut be made and keep up the vital services of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TABER. This cut relates only to one item in the service. The item for administration of hospitals and the item for the Veterans' Administration itself was not cut, although frankly I felt that on the basis of the expenditures that had been made and that were in sight, there probably was $25,000,000 margin in the picture.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Do I understand correctly that the total reduction in the appropriations under the deficiency bill is $628,139,491?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Out of that amount the total reduction in the Veterans' Administration is $551,020,000?

Mr. TABER. That is right, but the reduction in the Veterans' Administration was based on what the needs of the Administration would be without attempting in any way to curtail the emoluments or the pensions or the educational facilities or the unemployment insurance that the veterans are entitled to.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In other words, they are on estimates committed on pensions and readjustment benefits. Possibly later on they will have to be made up anyway, will they not?

Mr. TABER. If there is a shortage they will have to be made up, but I would not think there would be a shortage, because we have been very liberal in our figures.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. But we are committed under the law to meet these benefits.

Mr. TABER. Oh, that would be an obligation of the Government and we would have to pay them, but it would not behoove us to appropriate more funds than the progress of operations under the Veterans' Administration indicated would be required. It is all right to allow a reasonable margin, but it would not be proper for us to provide a large amount in addition to what the requirements would probably be, and that is the type of consideration that this appropriation bill has had.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman to say that we have a $25,000,000 margin?

Mr. TABER. In my own opinion they have a $25,000,000 margin over what we can figure their possible requirements. In the first item, that is, the item for salaries and expenses and the pension item, I figure they have just about a $20,000,000 margin which I would regard as sufficient, because that is quite a stabilized item which can be figured much more closely than this rehabilitation picture that follows a little later on. I have forgotten whether it is the next item or not.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is as to those pensions that have already been established, is it not?

Mr. TABER. No; it is for the pensions that have already been established and which may be established and allowed in the period between now and the 30th of June. You see, we are not attempting in this bill to go beyond the 30th of June in our operations, because the regular bill for the Veterans' Administration will come in, maybe the 1st of May or about that time and will be taken up at that time, to provide funds for the next fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I started to say something about the crop-insurance item of $20,000,000. The budget estimate came up for that, and it has been included. The reason it was included is this: Claims have been allowed which they had no funds to meet of over $20,000,000. There is no question but that there is an obligation on the part of the Government to meet that $20,000,000 of claims. It was generally felt that as long as we had to take it and the Government owed the money we might just as well do it now. In my opinion, the whole operation has been very unfortunate. It shows a terrific loss from the beginning. I do not believe that if it were loaded with premiums sufficient to make it balance, anybody would take the insurance. I think it has been one of those things which the Government could get rid of.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of crop insurance. I have tried to make a study of it since 2 years ago, when we were asked for $40,000,000 additional capital. This will make $90,000,000 of capital all told paid in for this crop insurance, besides the $37,000,000 of expense money they have had, besides making $8,000,000 on wheat, and besides all the premiums that were paid in. They have lost practically everything. That does not finish up the job of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think it is one of the worst-managed pieces of business the Government ever got into. It never will be anything but a continuous loss if we keep it up.

Mr. TABER. I am very much inclined to believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. Is it the gentleman's statement that he is against crop insurance as a policy?

Mr. TABER. I am. I do not think it can be done successfully, and I think that has been pretty well demonstrated.

Mr. PEDEN. If we could say that crop insurance has been poorly managed, which perhaps in some instances has made it operate at a loss, would the gentleman still say that if management could be had that would provide it in an equitable and just manner, as a principle, crop insurance is a good thing?

Mr. TABER. I doubt if it is a practical thing. My own judgment after quite careful study is that it is not a practical proposition nor one that can ever work out.

We have had certain items up with reference to the Army and Navy pay. Those items have been computed by members of the committee, some on one side of the aisle and some on the other, and are reductions that have been made. These items have been based on what the thing figured out to on the basis of the number of men they have had and the number they expect to have the rest of this fiscal year.

We are carrying here an item of $300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas for the Army. This means in Germany, Japan, Korea, and Austria. There we have this situation. There is a saving in sight in the Korean and Japanese end of the picture of approximately $56,000,000, and if we are going to get Germany in a position where she can very largely take care of her own food problem, another $28,000,000. For that reason, we felt it was wise to carry the whole $300,000,000 estimate so that there might be enough in the pipe lines to take care of our picture down through the first of October and through the crop year. Later on, as the regular committee gets to meet that problem, they will be able to take these figures into consideration. There are many distressing problems over there. Some of them are natural and some artificial. For instance, under the restrictions of the Potsdam Agreement it is impossible for the Germans to catch more than 100,000 tons of fish whereas their prewar catch was 700,000 tons. We are making up the deficiency. I do not know whether that is the right thing to do or not, but it does not seem so to me.

Those restrictions should be loosened up so that Germany can catch the fish that she needs and not be dependent entirely on charity.

There were many distressing things that came to our attention during the hearings upon that particular subject.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the powers that be in these foreign countries that we are looking after and for which we are supposed to be the guardian angels would permit them to do their own work so that they could earn some of their own living and would not have to expect the United States to buy the things that are necessary for them to sustain life, how much lighter would be the burden on our taxpayers. I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely right. Those in authority should permit them to earn their own living rather than expect us to support them and keep them.

Mr. TABER. At the present time, according to the testimony we had, UNRRA was getting ready to send $50,000,000 of stuff to Yugoslavia, $50,000,000 to Poland, $22,000,000 to the Ukraine, $11,000,000 to White Russia, and $20,000,000 to Russian occupied zones in Austria. I suppose the UNRRA is an international organization,

but most of the food and most of the money comes from us, Export licenses are required for every single item that is put out.

Frankly, it has seemed to me that before we grant export licenses for that sort of thing we should say to Mr. Stalin and say it plainly that we expect free elections to be held in Poland and that we expect free elections to be held in Yugoslavia; we expect Russia to abide by the agreements that she made to avoid propaganda here in the United States; that we expect her to quit inciting border hostilities along the northern part of Greece before we contribute any more of our food or our supplies to the Russian-controlled territories. I do not make this as a criticism of the State Department but as a suggestion of a way that would seem to me to lead toward the peace of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman rather answer the questions that I have regarding the so-called cuts in the Veterans' Administration or have the gentleman from Massachusetts answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be here in a few minutes and I know he will be glad to answer them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman prefer that he answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there was a reduction of $1,000,000 for printing and binding. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That probably could be justified, could it?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I think so, according to the past expenditure, so far.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is only a deficiency bill, anyway.

Mr. TABER. That is all, to carry them through to the end of the year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Apparently there was a cut of $200,000,000 in pensions. Of course, even if you cut pensions today, those payments are authorized by law and you would have to put it in the 1948 appropriation bill if you took it out of the deficiency bill. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. Oh, we would have to pay it if there was a deficiency, but there will be no deficiency, and General Bradley himself admitted that in the hearings.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the readjustment benefits, I understand there is a cut of $350,000,000. That is also true of that item, is it not? That is authorized by law and the Congress, of course, would have to pay those benefits.

Mr. TABER. The Congress would have to pay them, but on the other hand we figured to allow them a $170,000,000 margin in that connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the Federal Court claims, my understanding is a $20,000 cut is provided for in some other way. Is that true?

Mr. TABER. All those tort claims in all departments, we have decided should be treated alike and that they should be paid out of existing funds, rather than to set up a fund in advance for the departments to handle. They have not got to the point where they have any. They do not know what it will be or anything about it. That is an item that is a matter of management all the way through the whole Government, rather than the policy as to the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So that is really not a cut?

Mr. TABER. It is wiped out because we felt that handing them a bloc of money for something they did not know anything about and had no past experience with, was not good business, and we felt that way with every department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I come to another matter that does trouble me very much. Apparently you call for the release of a hundred people in the Public Relations Division.

Mr. TABER. Yes. That is probably one of the things that is making more trouble for the Veterans' Administration than anything else. They have built up their force from 8 to 284. We felt that that Propaganda Division should be reduced; that that was one case where a very major mistake had been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that if the money is not available for these people they will be dismissed without any way of getting their terminal leave or other money that is due them?

Mr. TABER. I do not understand that at all, and I do not think anyone else believes that would result.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman have hearings on the work of the Public Relations Division of the Bureau?

Mr. TABER. Yes; we did.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Does the gentleman think there might be any danger in the reduction of these estimates for benefits and pensions of veterans that might influence the Veterans' Administration to be tighter in their rulings or freeze up in their consideration of the continuation of benefits?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three other items I would like to cover very briefly. If you will turn in the report to "Judgments and authorized claims," there are three that involves $2,158.01 for three people named Watson, Lovett, and Dodd. These people were on the pay roll of the United States Government, two of them in the Federal Communications Commission and one of them in the Virgin Islands. It appeared from testimony that was presented to committees at the time, after very careful hearings, that these people did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. The Congress, by an overwhelming vote, refused to provide any funds for the payment of their salaries.

To my mind, these judgments have such an odor that I could not possibly conscientiously bring in here a bill to appropriate funds to pay them. They have been left out.

I think that is all I have to say at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849), first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of a former colleague of ours from New York, Mr. Fish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) entitled "An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. DONNELL and Mr. MAGNUSON as additional conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) entitled "joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF TITLE III OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement as as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act shall be cited as the 'First Decontrol Act of 1947'.

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declared that it is vital to a free economy and full production in the United States that all emergency controls and war powers under the Second War Powers Act be removed except in certain limited instances.

"The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and for the purpose of affording further opportunity for the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider specific legislation granting restricted authority in limited instances, title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the 80th Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this Act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes: (a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III: *Provided further*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941) shall be in full force and effect as though this Act had not been enacted.'"

And the House agree to the same.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment to the bill strikes out all the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The first section of the bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the first section of the bill as it passed the Senate. It provides that the act shall be cited as the "First Decontrol Act of 1947."

Section 2 of the Senate bill contained a declaration of policy and in section 3 of the Senate bill was a statement that the provisions of the bill were for the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and of affording opportunity for the appropriate committees of Congress to consider specific legislation with respect to limited instances. Section 2 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains the same declaration of policy as section 2 of the Senate bill, and the statement in section 3 of the Senate bill, as to the purpose of the legislation, is contained in section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference as a statement of the purpose for which the amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act is made.

Section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference proposes to amend title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, in the same manner as proposed by the House amendment, except as follows:

(1) The following new language is added at the beginning of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942: "Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date of this section as amended takes effect."

This language was added in order not to repeal House Joint Resolution 118 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry") or House Joint Resolution 146 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribuion and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes"), in the event that either or both of such joint resolutions become law before the enactment into law of the conference substitute.

(2) The language contained in the House amendment with respect to building materials and facilities is deleted. Allocation and priority authority with respect to materials and facilities suitable for the construction and/or completion of housing accommodations in rural and urban areas, and for the construction and repair of essential farm buildings, is contained in section 4 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. This act expires December 31, 1947.

(3) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made by such title, would have remained in force for the purposes stated in the amendment until December 31, 1947. Under the conference substitute such title and amendment will remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purposes stated in the conference substitute.

(4) Under the conference substitute, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purpose of allocations of manila (abaca) fiber and cordage and agave fiber and cordage.

(5) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, would have remained in force for the following purpose:

"(b) allocations limited to control of production for export of automobiles and tractors;"

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "automobiles and".

(6) The House amendment provided that title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, shall remain in force for the following purpose:

"(c) allocating the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers;"

The conference substitute uses the words "allocations of" instead of the word "allocating".

(7) The House amendment used the words "allocations of materials or equipment" in two instances. In order to use language more consistent with the language contained in the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute uses the words "allocations of materials or facilities".

(8) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force for the following purpose:

"(e) allocations of materials or equipment for export which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments."

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "for export" and changes the word "equipment" to the word "facilities".

(9) The conference substitute contains the following proviso that was not contained in the House amendment: *"Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III."

Such proviso is applicable to all materials and facilities referred to in clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

(10) The House amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act contained the following: *"Provided*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any such title."

The conference substitute provides that the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title.

(11) The conference substitute contains the following new proviso: *"Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof."

This proviso was added to make it clear that whatever authority there may be to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives of either, is to be derived from House Joint Resolutions 146 and 118, if enacted into law, and not from the pending bill (S. 931). If House Joint Resolution 146 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate sugar or its derivatives. If House Joint Resolution 118 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate rubber or its derivatives.

(12) The last sentence of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as proposed to be amended by the House amendment was as follows: "After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted."

In order to avoid having the allocation and priorities power revived as it existed before the enactment of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute excepts from this provision the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate report on H. R. 931, which is Report No. 74, and the House report on H. R. 1983, which is House Report No. 192, plus the conference report just read, explains the whole situation. This is an unanimous agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the 1 hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this matter in the House, for explanation, the hour to be yielded by the gentleman as he sees fit.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which is now before the House explains very fully the action taken by the conferees on this particular piece of legislation. The only variance between the House version and the version reported by the conferees is very meager. I will attempt to explain the variances at this time so the Members will become familiar with them.

The particular act which is before the committee was called, as you will remember, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended. This has been changed and it is now denominated the First Decontrol Act of 1947. That came from the Senate bill and was agreed to by the conferees.

Section 2 of the conference report is added, and that comes from the original Senate bill, S. 931, which I think is entirely apropos at this particular time with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Title XV, which relates to section 1501 of the act, is the one with which we are dealing, because it deals with the question of extension of time. Always remember that tonight at midnight the Second War Powers Act expires by reason of the limitation of time. It was found upon the hearings before the subcommittee in the House and it was also so determined by the conferees that there were certain items which it was necessary that they be extended beyond this particular date. You will note in the conference report that titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of the Second War Powers Act are entirely eliminated, with the exception of certain items under title III which are extended. May I say that after the conferees had worked upon this report for quite a period of time it was finally unanimously agreed that the date for the final expiration of this particular act should be on June 30, 1947. You will recall that under the act in the form as it passed in the House certain items were extended until the 31st day of December 1947, but that date was eliminated, and each and every item which is contained in this bill, for extension, will expire on June 30, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman and the committee should be congratulated upon shortening that time. Is there any danger that it may be extended later as to any of these items?

Mr. SPRINGER. Not unless the House should vote to that effect. May I say that under section 2, which was written into the bill, this provision may be found:

> The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

That is the attitude of the conferees with respect to that particular subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman explain subsection (e) which appears on page 4 under section (3) of the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I state to my good friend that I will reach that point in just a few moments, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to one of the exceptions found on page 2 which provides, among other things, items that are still to be under control, if I understand it correctly, such as allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I will reach that point in just a few moments. I have one or two other matters I desire to explain before I reach that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Very well. I would like to be heard on that point.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman. You will be given ample opportunity to be heard.

Under subsection (a) those things which are positively and definitely continued under this conference report relate to allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony, and streptomycin.

Under the evidence which was submitted to both the subcommittee in the House and the subcommittee in the Senate, it was shown without question of doubt that those particular items were critical and that there would be need and a necessity for an extension of the power for allocation of those items beyond this particular date, March 31. Therefore, those are extended with the others to which an extension was granted until June 30, 1947.

Under (b), allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors, there has been some question about tractors as far as the people in the United States are concerned. Therefore, for their protection allocations are continued until June 30, so instead of sending out of this country tractors which are definitely needed in this country, that power of allocation is extended until the 30th day of June 1947 for the benefit of our own people. The words "automobiles and" were deleted. Any allocation of those are unnecessary under all evidence adduced.

Now, coming to section (c), allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carrier, I am quite certain that everyone is quite familiar with that particular feature because it relates to allocations of boxcars, freight cars, in fact, any kind of cars for the purpose of transportation. All realize that in some particular sections there has been a shortage of those transportation facilities. The power of allocation of those cars of all characters is continued until June 30, 1947. May I say especially for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] that our cars—boxcars, freight cars, all types of cars—are depreciating rapidly. Many of them are being taken out of use, and they are not being constructed as rapidly as they are being removed from use, because of the age and dilapidated condition of these items of transportation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the committee has done a very good job. It has had a very severe task before it. However, in connection with this rail-transportation situation, I call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that is very, very serious, and shows exactly what the CPA and ODT are doing under the construction they put on their power under the Second War Powers Act. During the World War, cars for the transportation of propane and other liquefied gas, which as the gentleman knows is used quite extensively, became very short.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that cars used for the transportation of petroleum and oil also were very short.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. So the Government built quite a number of these cars for the transportation of propane and allocated them to the various companies throughout the country that were

selling and distributing propane and liquid gases. Back as early as June of 1946 they found that they had a surplus of these cars. Several hundred of these cars were declared surplus and turned over to the War Assets Administration for the purpose of making disposition of them. The cars were already in use by companies that produce or transport liquid gas. Obviously if these cars were surplus, then everyone, I assume, would agree that they were not critical enough for someone to handle under the Second War Powers Act. Someone, however, conceived the idea that if they could get the CPA to declare that these cars which had been declared surplus were still essential to the national defense under the Second War Powers Act, they could bypass what the Congress said in respect to sales of surplus and have them allocated by the CPA and ODT. As a result of that, the CPA in January of this year took jurisdiction under title III of the Second War Powers Act and without making a finding that these cars were necessary for national defense, directed an allocation of them. The cars were all in use by various distributors of this fuel. There were 423 of these cars which had been declared surplus, and they took away some 200 of them which were being used by some of the companies and allocated them to other specific companies. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that benefited under the new allocation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course, that was a serious blunder on the part of those administering the law.

Mr. RIZLEY. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that got the cars. They made the allocation for the ODT. Thus, they used the War Powers Act to take cars away from certain companies who were using the cars in their business and gave them to other competing companies.

There was one little company down in Louisiana or Mississippi that had four of these cars. They took the cars away from that little company and turned them over to some of the larger groups who are in there now competing for the markets and customers of that little company.

Let me point out to the gentleman another case. A veteran of two wars who had been in business distributing propane gas since 1919 came back. He wanted to buy 200 of these cars. He had been advised by WAA they would be for sale at a certain time. In order to bypass him, CPA and ODT, decided that only the companies that had these cars leased were entitled to participate in this new allocation notwithstanding the fact that he was hauling the same kind of gas. They did not permit him to get a single one of those cars.

We had hearings for 2 days before our committee investigating war assets. We thought we had made a case so strong that the allocation would be reconsidered. But we hear this morning that if this act is continued these cars will be reallocated and directed under the same formula and will go to the same people designated in the original and in the same quantity. I understand the Attorney General on Saturday said the order was invalid because it was not made on the basis of a specific finding that the cars were necessary to national defense. I have had information this morning to the effect that, of course, it would be very easy to change that finding. Thus, they will be able to reallocate these cars. And this certain company has two of the allocators on its pay roll making the allocations.

I made that statement for the purpose of pointing out to the gentleman that in times of peace we should be mighty careful what we do in extending the powers of the President which were given to him in time of war because this matter of reallocation of cars does not affect cars only, but actually is a reallocation of markets. They are taking the markets of certain companies that sell and distribute propane gas and turning these markets over to some other companies which receive the 200 cars which they do not now have. The cars are very scarce although they have been declared surplus.

Does the gentleman take the position that the cars owned by the Government and used by these companies in this transportation business of propane is included under the provisions of this extension?

Mr. SPRINGER. My impression, is, and it was the impression of the conferees, insofar as it could be determined, that it embraced all rail transportation.

I wish to thank the gentleman for the observation that he has made. I hope the matters which he has stated on the floor of the House will be brought to the attention of those who have been violating this particular authority which is vested in them.

Under (d) "Allocation of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States"; that provision is identical with the one that was embraced in the measure that was passed by the House.

Coming now to subdivision (e) of section 1501—and if I may I would like to proceed and explain that subsection very briefly and then I will yield for questions—that subsection provides that allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments—and may I say in that connection that those items which are necessary to meet international commitments must comply with the two provisions which are contained in this particular conference report; that is, the item must have been allocated on March 24, 1947 or prior thereto. If on that date there was no allocation of the article, then it cannot be revived, but if it was allocated on March 24, 1947, and also, if it is certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as provided in the pending report—it requires a certification by both of those Secretaries—that it is absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, then such allocation may be certified to further continue up until June 30, 1947. But if such article fails to come within either one of those classifications, that is, if it was not allocated on March 24, 1947, or that it was not absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, which facts must be certified to by both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, then there could be no allocation of such article, or articles, even for any international commitments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to go back briefly to the boxcar situation, particularly with reference to the situation which the gentleman has just spoken of with reference to foreign commitments. Out our way we are probably going to lose a hundred million bushels of corn by reason of failure to get boxcars. Let me say to the gentleman, and to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], that while the ODT has something to do about it, the Association of American Railroads has something to do about allocations. But one of the things that I am concerned with is the question of how many of our new boxcar construction and new locomotives are being shipped out of the country. I wonder if the gentleman can advise me on that.

Mr. SPRINGER. As far as we could ascertain in the hearings, there was no evidence submitted that any are being shipped out of the country at the moment, but the construction of new box cars is far less than the depreciated and depleted cars that are being taken out of use.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand from hearings that we had a month ago a very large number of boxcars were being lined up to go out of the country.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPRINGER. The information we received was only from the departments of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Did you have Colonel Johnson of the ODT there?

Mr. SPRINGER. He was present and testified. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. What I wanted to say with reference to that point is that the economy of this country is being seriously impaired by the shortage of railroad transportation. I think we need to keep some of this material here to take care of our own economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say I entirely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota on that subject.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. The observation I wanted to make is this, that without control of any kind they could ship out all the box cars or other equipment they desire. So I take it the gentleman favors some kind of control, because that will prevent the shipping of cars out of the country. The committee has gone on the

theory that we should eliminate controls just as rapidly as possible, but I can see that with no controls at all, they could ship out as many box cars or anything else they may desire regardless of what our needs are at home. The gentleman is entirely correct. I thank him for that observation.

Mr. O'HARA. Until we had these controls I did not know that we were shipping boxcars out of the country.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the chairman for that observation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to get the gentleman's idea on some of the matters involved in subparagraph (e). It states in part that the Secretaries of State and Commerce shall certify in the event they find it necessary to meet international commitments. Referring to foods, grains, fats, oils, and such commodities, to whom do the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify?

Mr. SPRINGER. They would certify to those who were seeking to send these materials out of the country to meet international commitments. That would probably be to the Secretary of Agriculture or to some department which was seeking to send those materials away.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, if it were the Secretary of Agriculture and it related to food, the Secretaries of State and Commerce would certify such facts to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that would be the basis of the authority.

It also refers to certain commitments that the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify to. Are those commitments that are in effect and have been made on March 24?

Mr. SPRINGER. Those are commitments that were in existence. There was no definite date fixed as to when the commitment was required to have been made, but it is a commitment which must be in existence between this country and other countries, and at the time this extension becomes effective, if, in fact, the extension requested is granted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then if the commitment is in existence it will be carried forward under the power of subparagraph (e); but assuming that some new commitment should be made next week or the week after this conference report is approved and the bill signed by the President, would those new commitments made after such approval date come within the purview of this subparagraph (e)?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not the intent of this act to embrace or recognize future commitments. And may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that I think the one redeeming feature with respect to this conference report is the shortness of time during which these allocations may continue, up to June 30, 1947. Always remember that the bill which was passed in the House provided that certain items were continued beyond the date of June 30, 1947, and until December 31, 1947. That date has been shortened to the 30th of June, 1947.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman attempt, if he can, to answer the question about new commitments made after this conference report is approved?

Mr. SPRINGER. This subject was not mentioned in the conference; it was not mentioned by any of the conferees, and it was not intended that it should relate to any new commitments. Commitments already existing prior to the passage of this act would come within its purview, only.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I wish to concur in what the gentleman from Indiana has just said.

It was the intent without any question of doubt that commitments existing at the time this law becomes effective are the only commitments coming within its purview. Otherwise, the President, who plans and directs our foreign policy, could make such allocation as he might see fit at any time by simply making additional commitments.

The language was changed from that of the original bill which said "International arrangements and understandings." That language was too indefinite and the conferees agreed that we should use the word "commitments." What does the word "commitment" mean? It means something we are committed to do at the time we use the word. That is what it is intended to mean.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is that that language was employed so there can be no misunderstanding as to our willingness and intention to fulfill commitments already made.

Mr. MICHENER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If there were any new commitments, they would have to come before the Congress again to get authority and legislation to handle any new commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that assertion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman about imports. Does this conference report give any authority to the Government to license, control, or restrict imports of fats and oils and also raw materials from which fats and oils are derived?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not give any specific authority, and may I say that during the time the hearings were held, especially by subcommittee 4 of the House, the evidence indicated that in connection with fats and oils, which included also the importation of coconuts, and like commodities for crushing purposes, and copra, in that connection it was decided it was not necessary that there be any allocation upon those particular commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Does the conference report give any authority to the Government to limit or restrict, direct, on control the processing or manufacture of grains into flour, or fats and oils into any other commodity in connection with the carrying out of these commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not except that which might be found under subdivisions D and E. Those are the only places where there could be any possible authority by any stretch of the imagination. It is my judgment that such power is not granted in this report.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman would not want to concede that the Secretary of Agriculture or any other Government official would have the right to put on rationing again or, for instance, to require the manufacture of 80 percent extraction of flour, or such other restrictions, or even set aside orders for meat?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not concede that that authority is embraced in this act, and it is my independent judgment that it is not embraced in it. I know that question was not discussed by the conferees.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then that cannot be read into the conference report, as long as the gentleman who has so ably handled this bill has stated that that authority is not conferred by any language of the conference report?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing in this report. By way of recapitulation, in order to clarify the record and avoid possible confusion, may I ask the gentleman to again reassure the House as to the date involved in this legislation. As I understand the gentleman, by this act you are continuing the Second War Powers Act for the items mentioned herein from March 31 to June 30, this year. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. We are continuing only certain items under title III of that act and for the purposes set forth in this conference report; that is all. That extension extends only until June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to get the date fixed certain and definitely. That is June 30 of this year?

Mr. SPRINGER. This power is extended only to June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Am I correct in assuming from what the gentleman says that after June 30 of this year this act will not exist for any purpose whatsoever?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It exists to that date only for the articles and for the purposes mentioned therein?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman elicited any information as to the commitments with reference to the export of fats and oils in this country, particularly for the next quarter. The reason I ask that is that I have heard rather persistent rumors that during

this next quarter the industries of this country will be facing an absolute and terrific shortage of fats and oils for industrial purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. There was no information on the question of requirements for export of those particular articles. We asked questions when the hearing was held before the subcommittee but there was no information forthcoming upon that particular subject, so we are without information.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Am I correct in my recollection when I state that when the House bill passed and was substituted for the Senate bill that fertilizer, among other items, was excluded from allocation after March 31?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. It was excluded.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My second question is whether or not fertilizers, including ammonium nitrate and other nitrates, are included in the conference report for allocation after March 31, and if so, under what title?

Mr. SPRINGER. They are not included, and the only way they could be included would be under (d) or (e), and it is my best judgment that the only place they could be included would be under (e) in order to meet international commitments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, if they are included, as the gentleman states they may be under the language of (e), that would have reference only to the commitments that have been made to conclude up to the 30th of June?

Mr. SPRINGER. That would only have to do with commitments which are already made prior to the passage of this conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so, but what I am saying is that the power to make the allocations, in order to carry out those commitments, will expire under the terms of this act, including fertilizer, as the gentleman said, if it can be included at all, on June 30.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. As he will remember, the bill which passed the House provided that those items might be extended for allocation purposes until December 31, 1947, but the conferees have reduced that period from December 31 to June 30, 1947.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That did not include fertilizer, because it was excluded in the House bill for the items that could be extended to December 31.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but section (e) is in that same bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that that is very important. Will the Civilian Production Administration or its successor under the guise of power to carry out the commitments be able to make allocations that will not be effectuated after June 30, or will the power to make any allocation of any kind be effective after June 30 under the terms of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. On June 30, 1947, this bill terminates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And any power of allocation is terminated?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think our intent ought to be absolutely clear in that regard.

Mr. SPRINGER. And all our machinery with respect to carrying out the allocations will terminate on that date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think it is exceedingly important that our intent should be clear because the fact is that under the War Powers Act the Civilian Production Administration undertook to provide for the allocation of ammonium nitrates and other fertilizers in this country over the period ending June 30, 1947, before this act expired when by law that power expired on March 31, and I want it definitely understood—and if I am not correct I want to be corrected—that the power of allocation will expire and no allocation that is to be carried out after June 30 will be effective, whether it carries fertilizers, fats, grain, or any other item.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct, and that is my interpretation of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that it was advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to repeal the War Powers Act as quickly as possible. I think the strongest evidence of the wisdom of that came today when we heard the splendid explanation made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to sugar. What the Committee on the Judiciary has endeavored to do with this bill has been to terminate these controls on the 30th of June, so that if it should become necessary to make allocations or exercise controls because of the worldwide shortages, then the appropriate legislative committee of the House should take the necessary action. It seems to me and to the other conferees that reducing the date during which this act is operative to June 30 would serve as a notice to those people in interest, those people in the appropriate committees of the House, and those in the executive branch of the Government that the time within which they should take action is short.

The Colmer committee—the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning—in its carefully considered report on the extension of wartime controls unanimously recommended especially the extension of export and import controls. See the ninth report, pages 99 and 100 and the appendix, part 2, pages 6–8, and the eleventh report, pages 107 and 108.

The reasons for the retention of these controls, either through an extension of the Second War Powers Act or through special legislation dealing specifically with export and import controls and the allocations power necessary to support them, can be briefly stated as three:

First. Persistent shortages on a worldwide basis will make necessary the direction of some commodities in short supply produced in the United States to the areas of greatest relief need and to support our Army and the purposes of our occupation. Buying for these purposes against unlimited world demand would greatly increase government costs and might not get short supply at the right time to the right place.

Second. The inflationary effects of the removal of both export and import controls will add the most dangerous pressure that can be brought to bear in the wage-price spiral, because of the world shortage of some of the most necessary commodities that enter into the family budget. This shortage would be increased to a marked degree within the American market by the removal of these controls.

Third. The international equilibrium of supplies needed for the most necessary subsistence abroad would be upset "if the overwhelming buying power of the American market, stripped of price controls, were turned loose on the world market for sugar, fats, and oils, and several other commodities in very short supply by the removal of import controls"—Colmer report.

Accompanying this memorandum is a list of potential bottlenecks to maximum production which show, according to the latest Department of Commerce estimates, basic shortages in lead, copper, tin, crude rubber, and so forth. A separate study of steel is not yet available but the indicated shortages against world demand added to American reconversion needs cannot run annually to less than 500,000 tons of strip and sheet steel alone, and may well run nearer to a million tons, if our foreign program, as indicated by the President, is to be fulfilled.

These shortages drastically limit the capacity for building new freight cars, whose growing scarcity at present constitutes the greatest bottleneck to the healthy functioning of American industry. They also seriously affect the locomotive program, not only for this country but for export. A brief note on this is contained on page 7 of the accompanying memo from the Department of Commerce.

Soda ash is one among several chemicals that are having a severe restrictive effect upon American industry and is causing serious deficiencies in production at home and abroad, notably for the glass needed in building and reconstruction. In the manufacture of chemical and caustic soda, it is also a limiting factor, if present shortages continue, in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, some types of textiles, and petroleum products.

On the food and agricultural commodities front, the severest shortage which is producing industrial bottlenecks, as well as food shortages, occurs in the vegetable oils. This is treated on pages 11 and 12 with statistics on page 13 of the accompanying memo, which shows industrial shortages that would be increased largely by exports of fats and oils.

A world shortage of grain and cereal products has produced the highest prices in history, largely because of the approaching or anticipated removal of export controls. The immediate effect can be seen in the rise of the price of a loaf of bread to 15 cents, with prospects of going still higher.

Many other users of grain, including corn for the corn starch used by most in-

dustries, are facing serious difficulties of supply comparable to the industrial bottlenecks which are due to a shortage of fats and oils.

Fiber shortages on a world scale still persist in hemp, sisal, and other materials used for binder twine and rope. Cotton has reached once more the highest price since just after the Civil War in a speculative market resulting from prospective disappearance of controls.

In most of these shortage factors a removal of all barriers from the products of the United States for export would open competitive bidding by starved markets, rapidly exhausting the dollar exchange available, but in the meantime further temporarily inflating the American market with the attendant dangers of producing an inflationary crash.

Even in the consumer durable goods and in other American products uncontrolled exports present grave dangers. A second-hand American car commands a price of $20,000 in Syria today. Although this is an extreme instance, there are many indications of a general worldwide demand that would drain short American supplies before the pipe lines are filled for the domestic market, with the inevitable accompanying increase in prices.

The pipe lines are filling in many cases very rapidly to the point where the removal of export controls will afford no real danger, but the process is selective and differs widely with differing products and materials.

It is manifestly impossible to shape adequate legislation to supply the selectivity necessary in the extension of the Second War Powers Act. It seems absolutely essential, therefore, that the Second War Powers Act should be extended from the date of its termination, which is now set for March 31, on an emergency basis, to the date set for the expiration of the National Defense Act of June 28, 1940, which has been extended to June 30, 1947. The critical character of the international situation, as well as the short time limits available for considered action by Congress both denote the wisdom of the extension of the Second War Powers Act to June 30, 1947, so that mature consideration may be given to adequate new legislation on a selective basis.

POTENTIAL BOTTLENECKS TO MAXIMUM PRODUCTION—SELECTED LIST OF COMMODITIES—NOTE

The following material was extracted from a report prepared by the Office of Domestic Commerce for the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Preliminary Report on Potential Bottlenecks to Maximum Production." Several revisions and additions have been made to bring the material up to date. The report was not prepared in the detail needed to gain a full understanding of the industrial bottlenecks situation but to establish some preliminary facts to be expanded upon at some later date. Because of their special significance, certain commodities, such as steel, have been omitted from this presentation.

SUMMARY

It should be possible to achieve maximum output in most industries in 1947. However, a number of weak spots are still apparent which may cause continued shortages in certain products beyond this year. The greatest potential deterrent toward balancing supply and demand factors is the possibility of a recurring series of strikes. However, this brief summary deals with only material and production bottlenecks and assumes availability of the full labor force.

Bottlenecks which may cause continued shortages over an extended period fall into two categories:

First. Lack of adequate plant capacities: It is our considered opinion that total current production facilities for finished products and expansion under way are ample to meet most of the demand during 1947, provided the necessary raw materials and components are produced in adequate volume. Two possible exceptions to this are steel and soda ash where any delay in plant construction programs may delay a balancing until sometime in 1948.

Second. Basic raw materials shortages: The remaining deterrents to full production can be found in the supply situation of a small number of basic raw materials. Typically, the short-supply position of these materials result not only from high domestic demand but from the chaotic conditions surrounding production in foreign areas. The solution to some of these shortages rests in a large degree upon increased production in foreign countries.

LEAD

Lead presents the most serious problem of all the metals, both short-term and long-term, both domestically and internationally. Consumption in 1946 was 30 percent below demand and, under the best outlook for 1947, supplies will still be 22 to 25 percent short of needs approximating 1,300,000 short tons. The unsettled state of world production and supplies complicates any appraisal of the domestic situation.

World production is substantially below prewar and war levels, for the following reasons: the depletion of developed ore reserves, the absence of new discoveries, the destruction of certain mining properties, as in Burma, and interruptions to production resulting from labor disturbances. At the same time, world demand is at a very high level, and shortages are expected to continue for some time.

The demand pressures derive principally from the following: First, a high level of demand on the part of lead-consuming industries, including some carryover from 1946 as a result of the loss of production because of strikes in some of the mines, smelters, and refineries in this country as well as a mine strike in Mexico, the principal source of United States imports; second, continued limited mine production in this country because of the depletion of reserves and manpower deficits; and third, very limited imports because of the world shortage and international competition or commitments, as in the case of a shift of Australian lead which was an important part of United States supply during the war to Great Britain. Thus, despite the Government subsidy of imports during most of 1946 at the world price, receipts into this country were only a little more than one-half of 1945 imports.

With the end of control, the cessation of Government imports shifted the responsibility for supplementing domestic supplies to private industry, at the same time reinstating the tariff duty. While higher prices should bring forth some increase in supply, both from domestic and foreign sources, consumer resistance may be met with the possibility of substitutes. Some substitution has already been operative, as in the switch to titanium in the manufacture of paints, and the use of copper and brass tubing for lead pipe. Another possible substitution may be made through the use of iron carbonyl in the place of tetraethyl lead in connection with high-test gasoline production.

While increased substitution would have the effect of reducing pressure on the short supply of lead, in many of its uses no satisfactory substitute has been developed. This is true in the case of storage batteries, which is the principal user of lead, taking about 30 percent of total consumption in a normal peacetime pattern. While the production of storage batteries has been maintained at fairly high levels through the allocation of lead to that purpose in the past, there is no assurance that in a free market continued satisfactory production can be kept up. Under the stringent supply conditions that still exist, an increase to one type of use is simply a drain on another.

Salient statistics on lead, 1939–46

[In short tons lead content]

	Domestic mine production [1]	Domestic secondary production [1]	Imports [2]		Exports pigs and bars [2]	Total stocks, end of period [3]	Consumption [4]
			Ore, flue dust, and matte and base bullion	Pigs, bars, and scrap			
1937–39 average	415,380	247,147	44,566	4,906	[5] 74,392	(6)	630,567
1940	456,613	260,346	91,461	38,922	23,755	(6)	782,000
1941	460,764	397,416	109,711	329,350	14,359	203,618	1,050,000
1942	495,824	323,001	137,191	389,233	1,940	445,684	1,026,672
1943	453,113	342,094	87,538	247,951	2,003	390,716	
1944	416,817	331,416	104,924	233,865	15,523	287,531	
1945	390,820	363,039	71,628	254,862	1,407	292,656	1,051,601
1946	332,478	365,966	28,836	104,778	597	201,644	956,476

[1] Bureau of Mines.
[2] Bureau of the Census.
[3] Civilian Production Administration.
[4] 1937–41, American Bureau of Metal Statistics; 1942–46, Civilian Production Administration.
[5] 1939 only.
[6] Not available.

COPPER

Copper demand will approach 2,100,000 short tons in 1947, with supplies 25 to 30 percent short of this amount. The maximization of all supply factors would need to be realized to meet the full demand and this does not appear likely. Consumption in 1946 was maintained only by heavy withdrawals from stocks.

To meet 1947 needs domestic primary production would have to exceed 800,000 tons and imports rise to about the same amount. Production will be curtailed by a continued shortage of labor, war depletion of working deposits, and the removal of some marginal operations in the absence of subsidy support. Copper prices are not expected to rise sufficiently to maintain all the marginal operations kept going by the wartime premium price plan. Secondary production should be somewhat higher and may approach 600,000 tons.

The foreign supplies which will be made available to us is most unpredictable. Imports are very important in meeting our current high level of demand—double prewar requirements—which has made the United States a net importer of copper. With the Government no longer the sole importer in a pooled world market, receipts will be limited by competition with foreign purchasers and the import duties on entries into this country. Imports in 1946 were sharply reduced as a result of labor difficulties in Chile, our principal foreign source, as well as from diversion of part of the Chilean output to other prewar customers. Supplies of Belgian Congo and Canadian copper, which came to the United States during the war, are now being partially diverted to Great Britain.

The shortage of copper which will last at least through 1947, will continue to restrict production in many instances, particularly in the durable goods field, just as it has ever since VJ-day. High demands by the construction industry, power companies, appliance manufacturers, in automobile components, and so forth, will maintain a steady pressure on inadequate supplies.

Salient statistics on copper

[Short tons]

Year	Domestic mine production [1]	Domestic secondary production [1]	Imports		Stocks of refined copper, end of year [3]	Exports of refined copper	Apparent consumption [4]
			Ores and concentrates [2]	Other manufactured copper [2]			
1937-39 average	709,360	320,000	24,528	196,786	(5)	346,129	904,000
1940	878,086	334,000	31,222	333,775	127,300	356,431	1,292,000
1941	958,149	413,000	42,784	677,924	140,273	103,602	2,001,000
1942	1,080,061	427,000	67,678	714,682	152,416	131,406	2,032,000
1943	1,090,818	428,000	68,709	667,570	270,352	175,859	1,907,000
1944	972,549	457,000	59,874	706,200	397,417	68,373	1,774,000
1945	772,894	560,000	57,936	838,261	548,270	48,563	1,839,000
1946	602,355	540,000	30,730	329,068	168,610	52,629	1,794,000

[1] Bureau of Mines; 1946 secondary production estimated.
[2] Bureau of the Census.
[3] Civilian Production Administration.
[4] Computed by Office of Domestic Commerce.
[5] Not available.

TIN

A foreseeable new supply of 85,000 long tons of tin in 1947 to meet a probable demand of at least 100,000 tons indicates a deficit of about 15 percent. The shortage will mean the continuation of the serious restrictive effects on consumption which were experienced during the war and up to the present time. The shortage is world-wide, resulting from drastically reduced output in the principal producing areas of both metal and concentrates.

The United States produces only negligible quantities of tin from domestic mines and is, therefore, dependent upon foreign sources for primary tin, either in the form of metal or concentrates. The latter are processed in the only tin smelter in this country, which is located in Texas. This smelter was built in anticipation of the loss of far-eastern sources, such as developed after the begining of the war with Japan. In 1946 this smelter produced about 45,000 tons. To help alleviate the world shortage of tin, as well as to provide a bargaining point with the British and Dutch, who are in control of most of the tin producing areas in the Far East, it appears advisable to maintain the Texas smelter in operation for some years to come, even under Government subsidy. The chief source of concentrates has been Bolivia, although the relatively low grade of Bolivian tin has made it necessary to mix it with material from the Far East.

The current world shortage began in 1941 with the invasion of the far-eastern producing areas by the Japanese. The total salvage of tin from the quantities produced under the Japanese regime during the war amounted to about 41,000 tons, while production in the Far East in 1946 is estimated at from 24,000 to 30,000 tons. These quantities compare with an annual prewar output in that area of 160,000 tons. This poor showing, a result of several factors—the condition of the mines, lack of equipment, political unrest, inadequate food supplies—has been the primary factor in the world shortage. While output in 1947 is expected to be improved, full production is not anticipated before 1948 or 1949.

The principal use of tin is in the manufacture of tin plate. The harmful effects of the shortage have been lessened in this respect by the increased use of electrolytic tin plating, which requires less tin than the older method of hot dipping. In most other uses tin is so small a part, in volume, of the finished product in which it is contained as not to appear significant. Actually, however, as a component, with lead, for solder used in automobile manufacture, its shortage has been a serious bottleneck.

Salient statistics for tin, 1937–46

[In long tons tin content]

Year	World production	Domestic production (primary and secondary)	Imports of metal	Exports	Total domestic stocks, end of period	Apparent consumption
1937-39 [1]	183,667	[2] 24,700	69,305	(4)	(4)	77,444
1940	236,000	31,091	124,816	(4)	(4)	97,154
1941	240,000	39,339	140,873	(4)	143,370	134,695
1942	125,000	50,068	26,753	244	144,361	85,687
1943	127,000	55,289	11,919	398	125,544	80,330
1944	105,000	59,984	13,338	405	107,212	89,969
1945	87,000	71,875	8,440	708	91,623	83,583
1946	[3] 90,000	68,089	15,258	859	77,925	80,234

[1] Average.
[2] Tin content of ores used direct to make alloys not included.
[3] Preliminary estimate.
[4] Not available.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines, Civilian Production Administration, and U. S. Bureau of the Census.

RAILROAD EQUIPMENT

The shortage of freight cars is probably the worst in the capital-goods field. The exacting war demands on the railroad industry were met, but at the expense of wear and tear on inadequate equipment. Today, as one of the results of that experience, there are about 50,000 fewer cars in operation than at the beginning of 1946, in the face of unprecedented peacetime demands on the transportation system. In fact, without the wartime regulations which brought intensified use of freight cars, the present requirements in terms of cars are even greater than during the war.

The Association of American Railroads has announced that replies from members indicate they could use an additional 130,000 news cars at once. Estimates of ODT set replacement requirements at several hundred thousand cars over the next few years.

The freight-car-building industry had 90,000 cars on order as of March 12, enough to keep it running at theoretical capacity—about 15,000 units per month—for some 6 months. There are, however, no expectations that such capacity operations will be achieved. Without enough steel to go around to all consumers, the program of the industry calls for enough materials to produce 10,000 domestic cars per month, which compares with the 3,500 per month rate of 1946.

This present program, more than three times the 1946 average monthly production, is one which has been expanded since the first of the year as a result of a series of conferences between the car builders, steel producers, ODT, CPA, and a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Some doubt has been raised as to the supply of components other than steel but preliminary findings of ODT indicate the 10,000 car-a-month schedule can be reached by July. The most serious threat to the schedule appears to be pig iron which is required for 8,000

of the 10,000 sets of wheels needed monthly as well as for air brakes.

Difficulties in the passenger car field extend beyond steel and other basic materials into a serious lack of components. During 1946 cars which were nearly completed were held up by a shortage of electrical and air-conditioning equipment—motors, blowers, fans, fitting panels, transformers, generators, lighting fixtures—curtains, carpets, linoleum, plumbing fixtures, and so forth. The same situation is expected to plague the industry during at least part of 1947. The production of passenger cars averaged about 60 cars per month in 1946, considerably below capacity.

Locomotive builders are similarly troubled by shortages of basic materials, particularly steel and cooper. Boiler plates and tubes are among the most difficult items to obtain. Components, such as electrical equipment used on Diesel-electrics, are likewise short. Due to lack of materials one leading locomotive firm recently furloughed 75 percent of its personnel for 1 week.

Salient figures on railroad freight cars

	Cars delivered [1]—		Cars in service, end of year [2]	Cars retired [2]
	For domestic service	For export		
1937-39 average	39,700	771	1,720,674	85,944
1940	62,241	1,734	1,675,080	72,030
1941	80,623	2,386	1,725,437	40,781
1942	62,873	8,529	1,769,120	70,059
1943	31,836	43,117	1,780,520	26,086
1944	43,003	38,759	1,794,135	30,987
1945	43,864	10,658	1,784,674	45,840
1946	41,967	17,631	1,739,930	78,093

[1] American Railway Car Institute.
[2] Association of American Railroads, class I railroads only.

SODA ASH

A probable output of 4,500,000 short tons of soda ash this year may fail to meet all demands by approximately 250,000 tons. There is little likelihood of the deficit being met by imports from areas in a more serious supply position than that in this country. Normally imports add only negligible amounts to our domestic supply. Several new plants are under construction but, while some should be in production by the end of the year, no substantial increase in production is expected before 1948. A speeding up of the building of these plants which might be effected will help alleviate the short supply outlook.

The largest consuming areas restricted by lack of soda ash are the glass industry which takes 25 to 30 percent of the output, and the production of caustic soda and the manufacture of other chemicals, each taking about a fifth of soda ash production. Other smaller uses are in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, industrial and household uses, textiles, and petroleum products.

Foreign demands in excess of local production exert a pressure for export in the United States market, but during 1946 outgoing shipments amounted to only 1½ percent of our output. There is a world-wide shortage of soda ash. The United Kingdom, formerly a leading world producer of this chemical, is faced with a very critical situation, and its exports are at a low ebb. Continental countries report serious deficits of soda ash—Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. France, although in an improved position, has been producing at less than the prewar monthly average. The exchange of Italian soda ash for United States coal has been suggested as a partial solution, but the possibility of such an arrangement appears remote. In Japan the current rate of production is low and none is at present available for export.

Salient statistics on soda ash, 1937–46

[Thousands of short tons]

	Production	Exports	Producers' stocks, end of year	Consumption
1937-39 average	[1] 2,948	42	(2)	[1] 2,964
1940	(2)	59	(2)	(2)
1941	3,724	83	39	(2)
1942	3,925	64	109	(2)
1943	4,571	153	27	4,696
1944	4,718	79	62	4,692
1945	4,557	70	[3] 36	4,581
1946	4,497	67	(2)	4,490

[1] 1939 only.
[2] Not available.
[3] As of Sept. 30.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, except consumption data which are from Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Magazine.

FATS AND OILS BOTTLENECKS

Total supplies of fats and oils in the 1946–47 crop year, ending in September 1947, will fall short of unrestricted demand for 10,700,000,000 pounds by about 1,600,000,000, with per capita consumption at about 90 percent of the 1937–41 average.

Some realization of the effects of this limitation of supplies is obtained from the list of the industries whose output is restricted because of insufficient fats and oils. In the edible field, shortening, margarine, cooking and salad oils, salad dressings, and mayonnaise are the largest users. In inedible uses, soap, paints and varnishes, and linoleum and oilcloth are most important. To the American businessman the restricted supplies mean the inability to meet the current demand and the necessity of paying higher prices to obtain raw materials for his operations. This particularly affects the small businessman who is unable to store large amounts of fats and must, therefore, enter the market for current supplies. The lack of paints and linoleum has an indirect effect in connection with the desired expansion of housing, and adds to the difficulties encountered by the construction industry. To the consumer the restricted output is reflected not only in lower availability but also in a gradually ascending retail price.

An indication of the efforts being made by the American industry to overcome the bottlenecks imposed by current low supplies is represented in the field of soap and soap-type products. Any marked increase in production of soap is dependent upon increased imports of copra from the Philippine Islands. Soap sales in 1946 of 2,300,000,000 pounds were the lowest since 1935. However, output of soap-type products is increasing. These are called synthetic detergents and are made from fatty oils and from petroleum derivatives. The growth of output from petroleum derivatives is progressing at such a rate that they may permanently cut into the market for the more traditional types of soap made principally from domestic tallow and grease and coconut oil from Philippine copra. The position of the small soaper under such conditions would be particularly difficult.

The current rate of disappearance of our principle edible oils shows the difficulties of the shortening and margarine industries. Based on an estimated 1946–47 production of 950,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil and beginning stocks of 306,000,000 pounds, total supplies of this product in the current season are 1,256,000,000 pounds. By March 1, 1947, 63 percent of total supplies had been consumed, compared with 47 percent disappearance in the same period of the 1945–46 crop year. In the case of soybean oil, by March 1, 1947, we had consumed 41.6 percent of our supplies, compared with 35.4 percent utilized in the same period of the preceding season, with consumption currently increasing. Thus, it is clear that supplies of edible oils are disappearing at a rate in excess of that justified by crop-year estimates, and before the end of the season, probably in June and July, many members of the industry will be forced to curtail output even further or stop operating.

In the drying oil field the current purchase from Argentina of 40,000 tons of linseed oil should carry the drying oil industry over on a limited scale until the receipt of supplies from the new crop. Short supplies of pigments also act as a deterrent to increased output of paint products.

Two major reasons for the current bottlenecks in fats and oils are the relatively low output from domestic materials in the 1946–47 crop year and the necessity for shipping supplies from this country and from our normal import sources to European nations. Production from domestic materials in the 1946–47 crop year is expected to reach 9,200,000,000 pounds, which while larger than the 8,900,000,000 produced in 1945–46, is 2,000,000,000 pounds under the wartime peak in 1943–44. Part of the reason for this lower production is the emphasis placed on production of cereal grains for shipment overseas, with which vegetable oils seeds compete for acreage.

Although the United States was on a net import basis in 1947 by 220,000,000 pounds, the first time since 1942, this was only a small amount as compared with prewar net imports of some 1,500,000,000 pounds. The necessity for curtailing our position is the result of fat shortages abroad. World supplies in 1947 are estimated at 15 to 20 percent below the average for the immediate prewar years, and countries are reported to be giving fat imports a priority second only to wheat. Part of the reason for the reduced world output is tied up with the policies of countries with colonial sources of supply. These countries have shown a determination to retain the exportable supplies of their colonies and at the same time

have not taken steps to encourage production. The maintenance of price stability has been given precedence to increasing output through raising the prices for fats and oils.

As a result of the lowered world output countries have been obtaining supplies from areas normally the source of United States imports. This applies principally to the Republic of the Philippines. Before the war the United States obtained some 80 percent of Philippine exports of copra. In 1947, if the tentative allocations of the IEFC are carried out, this country will receive only about 40 percent of the total shipped.

Thus the availability of fats and oils in the United States is directly affected by actions in overseas countries. It is recognized that this country's per capita consumption at about 90 percent of prewar is considerably more favorable than that of many European nations which report about 75 percent to 80 percent of prewar usage. However, the United States has taken all possible steps to build up domestic supplies through support price programs and development of Philippine supplies through the Copra Export Marketing Corporations. It therefore becomes a matter of policy how much domestic operations should be curtailed in the interests of nations which for one reason or another cannot be considered to have taken all possible steps to develop their own supplies.

Salient statistics on fats and oils

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Primary fats and oils (crude bases)		Stocks, end of period	Foreign trade [1]		
	Production from domestic materials	Domestic disappearance		Imports	Exports and reexports	Net imports
1937-41 average	8,230	9,769	2,303	2,060	472	1,588
1942	9,983	10,308	2,017	973	937	36
1943	10,847	10,089	2,151	1,028	1,587	−559
1944	10,839	10,306	2,156	1,045	1,589	−544
1945	9,427	9,843	1,726	931	1,026	−95
1946	8,846	9,331	1,264	999	779	220

[1] Includes oil content of oilseeds, other products on full-weight basis.

Source: Derived from U. S. Department of Commerce figures except production of butter and lard obtained from U. S. Department of Agriculture.

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill we had the other day provided for some terminations on December 31. This bill provides for terminations of all allocations of so-called critical materials and of regulations now in effect upon June 30 of this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering if the committee can tell us how soon the different departments of the Government will be in asking for a continuation of some of these controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is one question that I cannot answer, of course, and the conferees cannot answer.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does anticipate, does he not, that they will be in asking for the continuation of some of these controls?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is speculative entirely. No one can tell.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the deadline is the 30th of June. These controls expire then. That gives these agencies which might desire to ask for a continuation of controls an opportunity to go before the several legislative committees having jurisdiction just as they have done before the Committee on Banking and Currency on sugar this morning, before the Committee on Armed Services on rubber the other day, and before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on shipping; so that after all is said and done, the policy of the country rests in the hands of Congress, and the gentleman and I and the others here must act affirmatively if controls are to be continued beyond June 30.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If all controls are dropped on June 30, how many persons presently employed to handle these controls will be eliminated from the pay roll?

Mr. SPRINGER. There will be several thousand of them. I had a superficial report from the various departments, from the ODT and the CPA. As I recall, they had already reduced the number more than 3,000, and, of course, on June 30 several thousand people will go off the payroll.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Lord hasten the day.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the few crumbs of comfort that are contained in the conference report are deeply appreciated. There is only one addition to the House bill, and that is to allocate abaca and the agave fiber and cordage.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That also will result in cutting into the amount of manila available. The amount that has been purchased since private purchases started has run up from 30,000 bales a month to 60,000 bales, and now it will go back.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, we are always illumined by and appreciate the knowledge that we get from the distinguished gentleman. That is exactly why we need the allocation power. We need it to keep those two large firms that have a monopoly from getting all of the hard fiber without which we cannot possibly have a string to tie up the farmers' crops, a string that will not stretch and "spill the beans." We are not as dumb as some people think we are.

Mr. TABER. It will simply accentuate your shortage because you will have less hemp to manufacture into rope.

Mr. HOBBS. But such as may be, whether much or little, will give the small businessman a chance to stay in business who does not have the purchasing power nor the mighty organizations of their dominating competitors.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to you, sir, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who deserted us and whose association we enjoyed so greatly when he would associate with us of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'HARA. I express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks, but I am very much concerned with not only the question of allocation but the question of how long that allocation will go on. Consider fertilizers and fats and oils. We have been told that allocation definitely ends on June 30. For how long a time can this authority under the War Powers Act last? Will the gentleman state whether that means that delivery is to be made by that time or can they go on allocating for 5 years under this extension of the War Powers Act?

Mr. HOBBS. For the first time since my mind has been occupied with a study of this bill, and that means for several years, that is the only one question that I cannot possibly answer. I can answer almost any question that may be propounded at any time by anybody because if I do not know, I can say so, and that is an answer to the question.

But here we have a situation where we are solemnly assured that only the outstanding commitments that have been made will come under subsection E of title III. Therefore, no commitment that was made, so Mr. WHITTINGTON'S argument runs, which is to be performed after today—in other words, by midnight tonight—every allocation that has been made and every commitment that has been made will expire with today. Then we are just as solemnly assured by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill that no other commitments can be made after midnight tonight under any circumstances to extend for as long as it takes you to snap your fingers, and, therefore, it would seem that if both of those statements be logical and true these sections amount to less than nothing—a few wasted words—for no control is vested by the conference report that was not being exercised on March 24, 1947.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, but I do have a statement which I wish to make, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for yielding so much of his time but the point that still bothers me is that we do not know as far as the economy of this country is concerned what allocations have been made and for how long a time, let us say on fertilizers and fats and oils. They could extend for a long period of time. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir. I do not know whether there is any power under heaven for one second of time to make any allocation even if it had been made before today or if it might be attempted tomorrow. My judgment about the matter is that it is highly probable that any commitments—and that is a strong word—any commitment that has been made by this Government, not only I but every other gentleman of this House, and particularly including the gentleman from Minnesota who has just asked the question, ought to be glad, if the commitment has been made by our Government, no matter whether we agree with it or not, to live up to it "if it takes the hide." I believe that would be the gentleman's attitude and I know it is mine. Now, how long, under the technical construction of this conference report that power will last, or that authority extend, I do not know and I do not believe anybody else knows.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman mentioned my name. Will he permit me to say what my idea is?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. I appreciate it, but the chairman of the subcommittee also rose and before the gentleman did on this particular question and therefore I will have to yield to my genial friend from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman very much.

May I say to the gentleman from Alabama and for the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Minnesota, under the original act, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, does not the gentleman believe that any allocations made under that act could not be made beyond the date when the act was to expire?

Mr. HOBBS. I am perfectly sure that no allocation could have been made legally, which was made after the date on which the act was fixed to expire by law.

Mr. SPRINGER. And does not the distinguished gentleman from Alabama now state that the same rule would obtain with reference to this date of June 30, 1947?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do. Both of those things are perfectly clear. As far as whether or not they would have the power during this interim period to make a commitment that might extend beyond June 30, I do not know. I am perfectly sure that there has never been any attempt to do so; there never would be and there could not be a legal attempt to thwart the purposes of the law in order to do that thing, and there would not be. But I can very easily see that if you had a cargo of any one of the materials that were subject to allocation until June 30, on the high seas, and because of a storm, perhaps shipwrecked the vessel, you could not stop that shipment nor would you want to, if there was a commitment of your Government that it should be delivered.

Mr. O'HARA. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir, I'm glad to.

Mr. O'HARA. I would agree with the gentleman on the seriousness of commitments, but I do think that we should write into this report that the delivery date had to be by June 30, 1947; that if it was not made by that time, I do not think it should be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. I want to say two or three things, if you please. Every bit of my time has been taken up on this one thing that does not amount to a hill of beans.

The organized beer or liquor interests are behind two of these deletions, I am sure, without intent on the part of our conferees or the committee. It is just as plain as the nose on your face that we are going to be short nearly 12,000,000 bushels in our international commitments, if we drop, as we have dropped in this conference report and under our bill, our commitment on grain and grain products. We are going to give them to the distillers, the brewers and to the makers of mixed feeds. The same thing is true of rice. We are not so utterly foolish as to have used any of these powers unwisely, in the sense of business propositions. What did we do when we committed to Cuba 3,800,000 bags of rice? We got ten times that much in our return commitments for sugar, and you could not have passed the bill you passed here for sugar control but for our exercise of this allocation of rice to Cuba. I know that only 1 percent of the world's rice is produced in this country, but such as we had gave we unto them, and we got ten times the value for the American table. But because the brewers wished that rice, for the manufacture of beer, the power to allocate rice has been omitted.

The same thing is true in several other matters that have been cut out. In fertilizer we get back in production abroad over ten times the value of that fertilizer here, and we cannot get sufficient nitrates in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. We are pathetically short of nitrates. We cannot get them here without the trading ability that this law has been giving us under these allocation powers.

On word more in closing. You are wiping out the general power which the President asked for, the power to act in the event of a sudden emergency declared by him to exist. In such a case, no matter how desperate the need, the President is now being denied the right to do anything. We do not begrudge a day of the mourning period that John L. Lewis has just declared. We all bow in sorrow, and real grief, with the members of his union and their friends in deploring the Illinois catastrophe. We are not saying one word against that, but we have here an illustration of the need of this general power which has been carried for years in this act and which I submit wholly without regard to this dividing aisle, we ought to be glad to continue. Suppose the coal strike which is threatened—not this mourning period, but a strike—should come; suppose something else of the kind comes, do you mean to tell me that you wish to deny to the President of the United States his expressed desire to have continued his power to save such situations? Of course you do not, all of us trust him. Yet this conference report kills that power. There are millions of tons of coal on the docks of New York today consigned overseas by private contracts. In the event of a coal strike we would need every ton for home consumption, to keep public utilities running, and to serve essential needs in a thousand lines, yet no one has any power to stop a single shipment.

Illustrations of the need of such a power might be multiplied, and, as you think on such possibilities, will be multiplied in your mind.

This conference report must be voted up or down. It cannot now be amended. But we can resolve that we will not let this mistake continue to haunt us with fear of the real dangers we can utterly rout by a simple bill restoring this one emergency power.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] states that the United States exports much less fertilizer than we import. I know that such information has been furnished Members of Congress. If such a situation obtained, it was in normal times. It does not obtain now in Mississippi insofar as Chilean nitrate or ammonium nitrate is concerned. Nor does not now obtain with respect to Canadian nitrates or cyanamid.

One-third of the ammonium nitrate available for Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley was allocated for export and for the Allied Nations by the Civilian Production Administration for the period July 1946 to June 30, 1947. There were no material amounts of Chilean nitrate imported the latter part of 1946, and there have been delays on account of strikes and inability to obtain ships in 1947. I am advised that about 550,000 tons of Chilean will be imported by June 30, 1947. At the same time, I am informed that the ammonium plants reactivated by the Army will produce for the first 6 or 8 months of 1947 approximately 600,000 tons of ammonium nitrate to be shipped overseas by the Army to the occupied countries. I am familiar with the situation in Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley. But little Canadian nitrates and cyanamid are being shipped into the Delta of Mississippi. The capacity for

ammonium nitrate of the TVA, Spencer, and Lion is around 45,000 tons a month. The Army's capacity is 65,000 tons a month. There has been much delay already in the importations of Chilean, and Canadian shipments are being canceled and delayed as stated. It is not an accurate picture, therefore, to say that so far as the Delta of Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley are concerned, exports are less than imports.

Under the bill as it passed the House, fertilizers were included, but section e, included in the Conference Report, obtained in the House bill. It is as follows:

(e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

The commitments of the Secretary of State are one thing; allocations are another. The Civilian Production Administration undertook to make allocations of about 15,000 tons each from the three plants supplying the lower Mississippi Valley from January 1 to June 30, 1947, after one-third of their production from July 1946 to December 1946 had been allocated directly and indirectly for export.

The intent of Congress, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated, is clear:

First. Fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate, could not be allocated unless it was being allocated on March 24, 1947.

Second. The Civilian Production Administration was allocating on March 24, 1947, and stated that the allocations to June 30, 1947, would be sufficient. The intent is that additional allocations cannot be made.

Third. The further intent is that no allocation can be made for delivery by a plant of fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate after June 30, 1947.

The Civilian Production Administration undertook to allocate to June 30, 1947, although the War Powers Act expired on March 31, 1947. The intent is that there can be no allocation for delivery or shipment after June 30, 1947.

All commitments by the State Department are conditioned upon the Department being able to obtain the materials and facilities. There is a universal shortage of fertilizer for all domestic purposes. I am sympathetic with the Allied Nations, but the allocations have been made for the Allied Nations. The Army is manufacturing for the occupied countries. Domestic growers are entitled to consideration, and inasmuch as allocations are not being made to domestic growers, they should not be made to foreign growers. Personally, I oppose the continuance of the allocation of fertilizer. I regret that the language of the House bill was not retained which excluded fertilizer, but I concur in the intent as expressed by Chairman SPRINGER that no allocation will be effective for export or delivery after June 30, 1947. The State Department will have the same privilege of obtaining fertilizer as American farmers. It is not fair to the American farmers to make allotments for foreign commitments when no allotments are made to domestic producers, with the result that many domestic producers today are without fertilizers, especially in the Mississippi Delta and the lower Mississippi valley, where only nitrogen can be used to advantage. Mixed fertilizers are not suitable to alluvial or Delta soils.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, with all due respect to the committee, with the one problem which is left open, in my opinion, and that is the question that is left on the matter of the extent of these allocations, as to time of delivery.

It has been made plain that the power to allocate ends on June 30. It is perfectly obvious to me that if we are going to say the power to allocate should end on June 30, the power to go beyond that date in the matter of delivery should end then also, and it is my interpretation that the power to deliver beyond June 30 should be limited to the same period; namely, that delivery under foreign commitments would have to be made prior to June 30, 1947. To hold otherwise would create a rather ridiculous situation which would not only be inconsistent with the will of Congress to terminate controls but would be absolutely contradictory to the express intent, for we are involved and concerned in the termination of controls over commodities which are scarce but which vitally affect the industry and the economy of this country in scarce items such as fats and oils and fertilizer.

So that there will be no misunderstanding in our vote upon this report and the limitations and termination of controls and the matter of delivery of commitments made, unless I hear to the contrary I will assume that the deliveries must be made under commitments by June 30 or such commitments will terminate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the termination of these war powers is centered primarily in the field of strategic and critical materials for the national defense. I have just finished 8 years' service on a special committee dealing with those particular materials. The committee in charge of that matter now is under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I trust that committee will go into this matter very carefully and critically with a view of conserving our strategic and critical materials.

I have some reason to be alarmed about the situation. I picked up an announcement of the Office of Temporary Controls of January 29 in which it was stated that they had authorized the licensing and exporting of 65,000 tons of tin plate and the article went on to say that this is in addition to 55,000 tons authorized in September and in addition to some other authorizations. At the same time we are down on our backs in the matter of tin and although I understand only about 1 percent of tin plate is tin, we are so totally unprepared for any national emergency in our supply of strategic materials and especially as to tin supply that I am shocked we would export any of it.

Although I am now serving on the Ways and Means Committee, and am no longer serving on the committee having jurisdiction over strategic materials, I am going to keep on watching this matter of a strategic materials stock pile in the interest of the national defense, and will go into that matter much more fully with the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I am not going to let the matter drop. I cannot conceive of a situation where America today can think that it has one pound of tin available for export; yet they have licensed the exportation of tin and have not made a move yet to acquire the stock pile of tin as provided in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As I stated, I have had 8 years of experience with this matter, starting with Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and culminating with Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. We have been talking for years about a stock pile of strategic materials, yet we still do not have a stock pile of tin and the officials operating under the War Powers Act are authorizing the export of tin plate. In my opinion, you cannot end their duties any too soon if that is the way they are going to fail to protect our national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute, and may I say that I agree entirely with him. All of us will watch this matter of allocations and we will watch the matter of sending much-needed materials out of this country when we need them ourselves.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I am seriously concerned about this conservation of our strategic materials. We are literally flat on our back, yet they are exporting tin. I cannot imagine exporting a pound of it. I feel that such exportation is a menace to our national safety, and the officials administering the war powers have overlooked the matter of protecting our Nation's security against war itself. Their record has not been such as to convince me that their authority should be extended longer than provided in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The reason they are exporting tin is that they can get a bigger price per ton for the tin exported than they can get in their own country. The gentleman will find that is the situation in relation to the exportation of tin if he will look behind the curtain.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am going to look behind the curtain on the matter

of tin and other strategic materials, and I commend the Committee on the Judiciary, and especially the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], for their good work on this legislation to end the war powers at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD just before the vote was taken on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2849, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve the economies effected by this bill. They are in keeping with and in continuation of, the program of economy which we followed in the last Congress in which we reduced practically every estimate submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Of course, when the war ended many governmental agencies had to be discontinued. They could not be dispensed with the day hostilities ceased. We had been 5 years developing them. They comprised widely distributed organizations, controlled billions of dollars worth of assets, employed hundreds of thousands and could not be concluded overnight. They had to be liquidated, and sometimes the cost of liquidation, for the time being, was more expensive than their continuation and maintenance would have been.

But just as rapidly as we reached the point where they could be eliminated, we curtailed their activities, reduced their appropriations, and prepared as expeditiously as possible for final and complete liquidation.

Most of such agencies have now reached that stage, and the program of retrenchment and liquidation which we are following here is precisely the program initiated in the last Congress.

But it does not follow, necessarily, that a cut in appropriations, a reduction in estimates, is either a saving or an economy. In fact, there are conditions when decreased spending may ultimately involve additional expenditures.

Unfortunately, there are some instances of that character in this bill, instances in which apparent retrenchments eventually would result, not merely in failure to economize, but in some cases in an all-over increase in actual expenses of operation and liquidation.

While most of the estimates incorporated in this bill were largely matters of routine, merely deficiencies which must be taken care of at the end of the fiscal year, there were some interesting high lights both in the hearings and the bill itself.

Undoubtedly the most notable witness who appeared before the committee was President Hoover, who came before us on the item in which an appropriation of $300,000,000 was recommended for government and relief in occupied areas. I do not think I have been more impressed with the demeanor of a witness and with the knowledge of detail and comprehension of the issues involved exhibited by President Hoover. He was wholly impartial. He confined himself entirely to the merits of the proposition before the committee, and made one of the most effective presentations I think I have ever heard. I was particularly impressed not only with his convincing and conclusive statement in support of the appropriation of $300,000,000, and supplementary appropriations when they should become necessary, but also with his warm approval, and his unequivocal endorsement of the efficiency with which the funds for this purpose have been administered, and are now being administered, in the foreign countries which he visited.

There have been charges of waste, maladministration, and unwarranted diversion in the recent distribution of supplies and disbursements from this fund. President Hoover reiterated his approval of the handling of these supplies and funds and said that after a personal inspection he did not believe they could be better administered under the circumstances. I commend to all who may be interested in the efficient distribution of American supplies in these famine-stricken areas, the careful reading of ex-President Hoover's very illuminating testimony before the committee as reported in these hearings.

In that connection may I also express my appreciation of the endorsement by the chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from New York, of the wise and effective administration of our international affairs by the Department of State. As he well said, we must make it plain to Stalin, and I might add, to all other European and Asiatic heads of state, that we insist on free elections in Poland and elsewhere and that we will resist further encroachment on Greece and Turkey and that we demand that the agreements heretofore entered into by them be adhered to meticulously.

America is the traditional friend of Poland and the Polish people. More than any other one man, ex-President Wilson was the determining factor in the rehabilitation and reestablishment of Poland following the First World War. And every American President since, including President Truman has championed a free people under a free government in a free Poland. President Truman, this month, in one of the most momentous pronouncements ever made in American history promulgating the "Truman Doctrine," announced to Stalin and the world our determination to support threatened nations against encroachment or infiltration of communism, either abroad or in our own country. I am glad to join with the chairman in approval of that policy.

President Hoover warmly endorsed the provision of American funds to be used in providing food for European children. He spoke especially of the permanent handicap, both physical and mental, resulting from a subnormal diet in childhood. And the Committee on Appropriations unanimously approved his recommendation and his concern for European childhood by recommending in this bill the appropriation of every dollar requested for the purpose.

President Hoover's diagnosis of the deleterious effects of a defective diet in adolescent years is amply corroborated by the Army reports on the large percentage of American youth who were found to be disqualified for Army service by disabilities resulting from deficient diet in childhood. While we are providing for a normal and healthy generation of European people through adequate diet would it be amiss if we at the same time and in the same bill provided for normal and healthy American men and women in the next generation? While we are voting food for European children why cannot we vote food for American children?

It is difficult to believe that this committee and this House would vote for food for the children of other lands and neglect to vote food for our own children. But that is the proposition before us in this bill. Although schools in every State in the Nation are closing their school-lunch programs this month due to failure of the Congress to provide a deficiency appropriation to sustain the program, there is no provision in this bill for the continuation of school lunches. There is a provision here of $300,000,000 for food for foreign children but none for American children. It is true that no estimate has been received for the item—due to the hostility against the program announced on this floor. But in view of the earnest representations made to us individually and collectively from every part of the country of the importance of continuing this program, a program which we led the American people to believe we expected to continue, it is much to be regretted

that this bill does not contain an appropriation of at least $15,000,000 to take care of the deficit in the school-lunch program.

I am certain the Members of the House have been appalled by the numerous instances in which it has been testified children come to school without breakfast, even those children who come from wealthy homes where through caprice the child has not eaten breakfast. There is an unbroken record of testimony to the effect that in every school in which this program has been followed—and it is now being extended to practically every part of the country—there has been an immediate improvement in physical health and mental alertness. Hungry children are handicapped in scholarship as well as in normal physical development.

I trust the House will be willing to add a small sum for continuation of the school-lunch program for the remainder of the fiscal year. To fail to provide for it in this bill—late as it is in the school year—will to that extent estop us from consideration of such a provision in the annual supply bill coming up next month.

Another very interesting witness who appeared before us was General Bradley. General Bradley was one of our outstanding commanders in the war, a man with an unsurpassed military record. He contributed in his particular field, as largely perhaps as any other one man to the winning of the war. His administration of the Veterans' Administration has been remarkably efficient in spite of many obstacles.

Of course, it is inevitable that the executive head of this vast agency should find himself the object of criticism from many quarters. It would be impossible to administer it to the satisfaction of everybody. There is criticism by some part of the membership of the Congress that he has spent too much. There is criticism on the part of some of the beneficiaries, on the other hand, that he has not spent enough. But no man could have steered a course so successfully between charges of waste and charges of neglected need; between the requirements which were urged on the one side and economies which were demanded on the other, as has General Bradley. Of course, all of us know General Bradley succeeded to this position very reluctantly. He did not want it. It was forced upon him. He finally took it with the understanding that he would hold it only 2 years. I was distressed to hear him say that so arduous have been the duties of the position and so great has been the pressure for unwarranted concessions, and so unfair the criticism, that he desires to be released at the first opportunity.

In this connection, I was impressed with an article that I read this morning by Marquis Childs, a commentator in one of the local papers. It was written in amusing vein. He said the situation had reached the point where no Government servant dared approach Congress these days except at the risk of his life, and that it was the prevailing custom to break a leg off the nearest committee table and beat the offender over the head on the apparent theory that all government is an iniquitous evil. Of course, that was a jocular fantasy, but it illustrates an idea which has gotten abroad through the country, an unfortunate idea unjustified by the situation, that we do not treat witnesses who come before us with courtesy. I am glad to deny that and say that all we seek of witnesses who come before us are facts. It is not a personal matter. All we want to know is what they can tell us on the merits of the proposition being considered by the committee. It is to be regretted that so unfortunate an impression has been disseminated—even in jest.

But we have been entirely too rigid in our efforts to achieve reasonable economy in the writing of the provisions in this bill providing for the Veterans' Administration. Speaking generally, we should realize at the beginning that the Veterans Administration is a rapidly growing and expanding activity. We were told when the Second World War obligations were first provided for that the activities of the Veterans' Administration would not reach their peak until about 1975 or 1980; that from this time on until that far distant peak of activity every year there would be more cases entitled to hospitalization and that every year there would be requirements for larger pensions, allocations, and benefits to which veterans and their dependents are entitled under the law. So we cannot always judge absolutely with arithmetical certainty just what the needs are. Under the circumstances, with so vital an issue involved, we should always see that no veteran suffers unnecessarily and that his convalescence is not retarded and that everything is done for him that his situation requires. That is one thing on which I think we are all agreed. That is the minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Insufficient provision has been made there to meet minimum requirements, in my opinion. There is the provision for school and training benefits, one of the most notable provisions of the GI bill. That is a responsibility which rests upon us with a seriousness that is equaled by few other responsibilities borne by the Congress and the Government. I do not think sufficient has been provided for it in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The training of veterans in agricultural lines has been very popular in the section of the State which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CANNON. It is popular because it is justified both by the program and by its effect upon the country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is a wonderful program, and the veterans are eager and anxious to take advantage of it, but we find that funds are being curtailed to the point where these programs cannot be carried on any longer. Are we going to say here, under the slogan of economy, that we are not going to give these boys, who want to learn agriculture, who want to take advantage of these programs, an opportunity to avail themselves of a law which this Congress has passed? Is that what we mean by denying this appropriation in this deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the statement is made in the hearings that by arithmetical computation ample funds have been provided. But they do not comport with the testimony which we have from other authoritative sources. Those most familiar with the situation say it is insufficient.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have letters from men who are trying to carry out this program, and they tell me that they do not have the teaching force, they do not have the equipment, they do not have the facilities for taking care of the great number of applications that are pouring in. In other words, those veterans want to take this training. They say they cannot give it to them because there are not adequate funds available. If we had an adequate appropriation in this deficiency bill, that work would go on. That is what they tell me. I want to ask the gentleman if that is true.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly we should make provision sufficient to take care of the situation, under any circumstances, no matter how rapidly it may expand, rather than to be caught with insufficient funds and any veteran fail to receive what he is entitled to have under the law.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When I say "some veterans," it is a great group of veterans in my section that are being denied this training, and I want to say there is quite a bit of resentment on the part of those veterans who want to take this training and make a better contribution to our economy. Now, did you go into that? Did you have testimony from over the country showing the need for this program?

Mr. CANNON. We had testimony from the Department, and all the testimony from the Department was to the effect that they needed the entire estimate for the readjustment fund.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. On what ground was this opposed in this deficiency bill? I would like to know.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, there is a great demand on the part of the country and the Congress for economy, and the danger is, as the gentleman has indicated, that in our zeal for economy we pare the cheese so close as to interfere with the adequate administration of the Veterans' Bureau and its obligations to the veteran.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Would you say it is economy to shut off medicine for a sick man or some man who was trying to recuperate? Do you call that economy?

Mr. CANNON. There is the possibility that such deep cuts instead of proving to be economies may involve additional expense and, incidentally, delay provision for the beneficiaries. Veterans are entitled to benefits under the law. If there is not sufficient money here it must be provided through deficiency appropriations. If such deficien-

cies develop after the 1948 funds become available, advancement will be made from the 1948 funds and a deficiency bill will be brought in later. If the deficiency develops before the 1948 funds are available a deficiency bill will have to be put through immediately. In either event nothing will have been gained by cutting the estimate in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. One other observation, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think the gentleman will recall here in this Congress during the days when these boys were giving their all for our country and for our defense that we said that these boys coming back were going to have whatever they needed, that we were not going to deny them anything. Is this the answer to these boys who come back asking for an opportunity to go to school and learn to be farmers?

Mr. CANNON. I trust the bill before it leaves the House, or at least before it is reported out of conference, will provide amply for the veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has proven herself an unfailing friend of the veteran. I trust she still maintains that attitude on this appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman anticipate offering an amendment?

Mr. CANNON. I hope an amendment can be offered which will be agreeable to both sides of the House making certain that no veteran suffers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that there is no decrease in the matter of salaries with the exception of the public-relations service. Is that true?

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And the cuts for the pensions of $200,000,000 and readjustment benefits $350,000,000 were put in because it was thought they were not needed at this moment. Is not that true?

Mr. CANNON. As I explained, the mathematical computations of the committee seem to indicate provision of ample funds, but evidence before the committee was to the contrary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe there would be no difficulty in getting an amendment correcting it if that be true.

Mr. CANNON. I trust we may have from the distinguished lady from Massachusetts the support which she has always contributed to all worthy veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that General Bradley has stated that he might get along with a million dollars less on binding and printing. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. We propose no change in that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand, but the gentleman knows that we must insist on the amount for compensation, pensions, and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. There are of course numbers of items throughout the bill—not merely in this particular section of the bill—in which I approve the amount reported out by the committee. Only on those which seem unquestionably inadequate would I propose any change.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Five hundred and fifty million dollars, then, is the sum of the two items on pensions and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. I had in mind the readjustment allowances. For example, there is one provision under this item which should be increased and which should have general endorsement. That is the revolving fund from which a veteran can borrow money in an emergency or to tide him over some particular need. A veteran may come in and borrow $100 from the fund. All of us realize that there are times when loans should be available in such emergencies. There is not a chance for the Government to lose a penny on this program because when we lend a veteran $100 from the fund we take $10 a month from the amounts due him from the Government until the fund is fully reimbursed. So far as I know, there have been no losses.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That has not been cut, I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The amount requested was not provided.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. I think the gentleman might be interested in knowing that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has approved a bill with an authorization for a larger amount for a revolving fund. There are too many disabled veterans unable to get their loans.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to hear that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They were not able to get a loan because of lack of funds.

Mr. CANNON. The gentlewoman always anticipates any legitimate need of the veterans.

There is another item which does not come directly under the Veterans' Bureau but which immediately concerns administration of the GI bill of rights. It has to do with the Bureau of Community Facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, every college and university in the country is closing its doors to further enrollment because it no longer has facilities to take care of the veterans coming in under the GI bill of rights for training and education. There is not a school in the country, so far as I know, that is not sadly in need of these facilities for carrying out the provisions of the bill having to do with the training and education of its ex-servicemen. It may be that we are paying an extraordinary price, but the emergency is also extraordinary. Unless these boys can be cared for this year, their hopes in many instances, if not in most instances, will be dashed because unless the boy starts now he will be so late as to lose the full benefit of the law.

There is another failure in the bill to provide required funds necessary to pay the accrued salaries of Messrs. Lovett, Wilson, and Dodd as required under a decision of the Supreme Court. No one was more critical of these three men than I was. I appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of the very able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to investigate the charges against them and after a complete and exhaustive investigation the undisputed evidence was that these men should be dismissed, and as they were not dismissed, the Congress declined to appropriate salaries for their services. However, unfortunately for our conception of the situation, the Supreme Court decided that they were entitled to their salaries.

There have been countries in which the decision of the ballot and the opinions of the courts, if not acceptable, precipitated a revolution. When they did not win an election they resorted to arms. When they did not like the decision of the court, they resorted to violence. But not so here in America. Here in the United States we are a law-abiding people. If we lose an election, we go along with the majority. That is the glory of our form of government. If the Supreme Court decides against us, as unpalatable as it may be, we bow in obedience to the decision of the greatest court on earth.

Now, I do not think these men should have been continued in their positions. I do not think they are entitled to salaries, but I cannot countenance a revolution against a decision of the Supreme Court. To do so is to flout the Constitution—an attempt to undermine the very foundations of the Government itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

This decision is rendered all the more significant in view of the decision of the House to deny an appropriation for the Warren salary. The refusal is an attempt to legislate out of office an employee of the executive branch of the Government by the refusal of money. No one has asserted more frequently or more emphatically on this floor the right of the Committee on Appropriations to deny appropriations, any appropriation, the right of the committee to refuse to appropriate for any purpose under any circumstances, but there is an implied limitation upon that right in the Constitution itself. To permit such action in effect annuls the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of our American freedom. The Constitution establishes three branches of the Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Each has its appointed field, and neither shall encroach upon the prerogatives of the other. For us to legislate men out of office, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, could violate not only the decision of the Supreme Court; by denying salaries we could abolish the Supreme Court itself. If you can do that in a small office, an inconsequential position, you can do it in any office, not excepting

the office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that before this bill leaves the House, we will be able to modify it sufficiently to take care of those imperative needs, the restriction of which would involve not economy but in the end additional expense and loss to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Public Service Commission of Vermont has rendered several distinct and valuable services to the farm population of Vermont during the past 2 years. Not only have electric rate reductions during that 2-year period far exceeded those of any comparable period in the history of the commission, but in its rural electrification survey and program for the electrification of rural Vermont it has been instrumental in bringing electricity to thousands of Vermont farms for the first time.

This study has received high praise from many. The worth of this program was assessed by ex-Gov. Mortimer Proctor in his retiring message in January when he said:

> No more valuable service to the people of rural Vermont has ever been rendered by the public service commission than that to be found in this feature of its activities and the manner in which it has followed through with its program of rural electrification.

Moreover, in its publication, Electricity on a Vermont 25-Cow Farm, the Vermont commission made available to farm users of electricity in Vermont a charted course or blueprint which shows not only the relative cost of, but how the individual farmer can profit from, the planned use of what the commission describes as his most valuable, most economical, most profitable hired man, electricity.

The following statement by Fletcher Plumley, chairman of the Vermont Public Service Commission, describes the rural electrification study. It is followed by excerpts from the commission's report on the use of electricity on the farm:

A REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT

(By Fletcher Plumley, chairman, public service commission)

In 1945, a State-wide survey of rural electrification was completed by the Vermont Public Service Commission. The information gathered was the basis upon which the commission supplied the retail distributors of electricity in Vermont with a detailed and well-charted postwar rural line building program. Today only 2 years later, the private utilities, the municipals and cooperatives, having taken full advantage of this material and having followed the suggestions made by us, over 90 percent of all Vermont farms have electricity available to them; when our survey started, on the other hand, less than 75 percent of all farms had electricity available. We consider this progress.

Mr. Chairman, the high lights of this survey follow:

In the first place, the field data was gathered by having an engineer of the public service commission staff perambulate some 14,300 miles of Vermont highways and byways.

The then-existing electric lines with their approximate locations were plotted on individual town maps (scaled 2 inches to the mile). Each building outside of cities, villages or small settlements was given a number, the owner or tenant was identified and the building was classified either as a farm,[1] a farm tenement, a rural residence, a school, a summer home, or "other."

Our field data also showed whether the individual establishment was electrified and, if not, whether electricity was available to it. (Electricity was considered "available" if an existing line was within one-quarter of a mile of the buildings thereof.) Where the farm buildings were electrified, notation was so made; also indicated was the company, municipality or cooperative by whom service was being supplied. If not electrified, the logical source of electricity was noted.

Lines were thereupon drawn on the field maps as the field survey progressed, showing a possible location and source for new electric lines. The source of electric service was designated by a code number on a working data sheet for each building not electrified.

The basic data thereafter was compiled, analyzed, summarized and eventually shown in detail. (Biennial Report for 1945, pp. 32 to 45, inclusive.)

From this data and these maps it was possible for us then to show in detail, county by county and town by town:

1. The county or town.
2. The total number of farms therein.
3. The total number and percentage of farms electrified, those with electricity available, and those to which electricity was not available.
4. The total number and percentage of farms that we of the PSC believed should either have electric service or have it available.
5. The approximate miles of line that would be necessary for area coverage.
6. The total number of prospective users on these miles of line for each town, each county, and the State as a whole.

This is the first complete survey of this nature that has been made. It has already proved of inestimable value. We believe no such undertaking in Vermont has been done for less cost by so few with such beneficial results to so many. In the days of PWA, CWA, or whatever the short-lived Federal agency may have been called, many attempts were started for surveys with this objective in view. Several were begun in Vermont; they have reposed for many years somewhere in the graveyard of similar projects which died aborning—but which, with no concrete results attained, far exceeded the cost incurred by the PSC for this survey of ours, which has been of such great use and value.

Our data, when first compiled, disclosed that of the 21,872 farms in Vermont, some 14,970, or 68.8 percent, were electrified as of December 1944. In addition, 1,370 farms, or 6.3 percent of the total number of farms, were found to be located beside or within one-quarter of a mile of existing lines, the limit within which we considered electric service as being available when, as, and if the farmer might desire it.

On the basis of the complete data then assembled, our commission came to the conclusion that as soon as manpower and material restrictions imposed by the war were removed there should be prompt electrification of an additional 4,000 farms in the State. We then believed that we would then see 93 percent of Vermont farms either electrified or with electricity available. That was the goal we set in December 1944. Moreover, not only would 4,000 additional farms be served, but, at the same time, approximately 1,500 rural residences, summer homes, camps, and schools would have electric service made available to them. To do this, it was estimated, would require the construction of 1,762 miles of rural electric line, at a cost of over $2,000,000, to those called upon to build the lines.

It should be emphasized at this point, perhaps, that the commission does not actually build a half-mile of line, allocate the money, or supervise its construction. This is all done by the electric systems, when and where they please. We of the commission can point the way, suggest what should be done, and urge that it should be done; from there on it is largely [2] up to the individual utilities.

As far as we know, at this stage, few of the then existing 45 electric systems in Vermont either had definite postwar plans or had given such serious thought to rural electrification that a concise, constructive, or planned program of progress was projected.

We believed that if this picture we had drawn could be adequately presented to the utilities in the State, pointing out at the same time the benefits which would accrue to them and to the people of the State, they would be as anxious as we were to reach the objective set.

Representatives of each corporate and municipal electric system were thereupon asked to come to Montpelier in a group and, later, individually, to meet with us and to discuss the possible program we believed their utility could and should follow.

There had been prepared for each, not only the detail for their existing system and all probable extensions, total farms, and total prospective users but also the miles of line necessary for the construction of each individual extension in each town served by them and for their system as a whole. In other words, we had a detailed postwar rural electrification building program for each of them. This mass of data, mapped and analyzed, we placed in the hands of the utilities, the municipalities, the cooperatives, without charge to them and as a public service.

As a follow-up to these conferences and discussions, each utility was supplied with a form on which to report their plans to us, and, also, a suggested form to follow in reporting to us each extension as and when built and energized.

This latter form is still being used to report progress to us; it shows the town, the system, the individual farm owner's name, the PSC map number of his farm, the line mileage involved, the date energized, the classification or symbol change, if any (i. e., whether they would classify the property as a summer home, a rural residence, or what), and a freehand sketch showing the approximate location of the new line.

Our first summation period came in December of 1945, and even though a late start had been made in the spring of that year, we were able to report to the public that 422 miles of new electric line had been built and energized.

The second summation now shows that between January 1, 1945, and November 1, 1946, some 1,026 miles of new electric line were built and energized and that 385 additional miles under construction are expected to be energized by the end of December 1946. This results in a total of 1,411 miles in the last 2 years, 80 percent of the mileage we

[1] Our definition of a farm closely parallels the U. S. Census definition. Thus, considerable latitude is used. For our purposes, the complete electrification of rural Vermont was the goal; this meant and means availability of electricity to all establishments including those where even a small "farming operation" is being performed.

[2] Secs. 6452, 6453, 6454, and 6455 of the public laws of Vermont outline the procedure to be followed before the PSC by one who desires electric service but has been denied an extension by those to whom he has applied.

proposed in January 1945. Also, these 1,411 miles of new line mean substantial investments in rural electrification have been made by the utilities concerned.

In 1945 we said some 4,000 additional farms should have electric service; we also said—and I quote from our last biennial report—"When this is done, we will see 93 percent of Vermont farms electrified or with electricity available."

Today electricity already is available to 90 percent of all the farms in Vermont—not 90 percent of the best farms in the State, but 90 percent of all establishments which by any stretch of an enthusiast's imagination might be called farms.

Furthermore, we of the commission now expect, with the utilities of the State cooperating to the extent they have during the past 2 years, that by the end of the 1947 construction season 96 percent or 97 percent of all Vermont farms will have electricity available to them.

Vermont's record in rural electrification progress during the past 2 years has been outstanding. Area coverage is not just something to talk about here in Vermont; it has become an actuality.

Mr. Chairman, the publication of the commission, to which reference was earlier made, entitled "Electricity on a 25-Cow Farm in Vermont," is a source of information which should be in the hands of all farmers served by electricity, so I include it as a further extension of my remarks:

ELECTRICITY ON A 25-COW FARM IN VERMONT

(A publication of the Vermont Public Service Commission)

Electricity has now been made available to over 90 percent of Vermont farms. By the end of 1947 this percentage will have moved ever closer to complete coverage.

The Public Service Commission of Vermont is gratified to have played an important part in this undertaking so meaningful to Vermont and Vermonters.

We are aware, however, that in too many instances electricity-on-the-farm has been allowed to remain a sleeping giant whose strength has not been used even to partial advantage.

In this pamphlet, material is included which attempts to point the way: to suggest that this "sleeping giant" is your most valuable, most economical, most profitable "hired man" if you would but use him.

This past fall, the public service commission asked each utility in Vermont to furnish it with information concerning the monthly bills of and the electrical farm machinery used by three or four of its "top" farm customers. We found that there are farm operations in Vermont using as much as 34,000 kilowatt-hours per year, that there are many using over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per year, and that the uses to which electric power is being put are legion.

These uses as yet are above average, to be sure. It was to bring some average figures to public notice that we asked Ralph Bugbee, farm director for Central Vermont Public Service Corporation (the utility having the largest number of farm customers in Vermont), to submit to us, for use in our biennial report, the results of his study of electricity on the farm. The following letter was sent to us by Mr. Bugbee.

We believe this is a challenging, informative and suggestive study that should have attention and wide distribution. We hereby incorporate it in this separate pamphlet so that the information it contains may more readily become the subject of discussion and, perhaps, the basis for individual study and action.

FLETCHER PLUMLEY, *Chairman.*
CHARLES C. MORSE.
WM. F. SINCLAIR.

There is no purchased service available to the farmer which lends itself in so many ways to the efficiency of the farm and the farm home as does electricity. Electricity is also the only purchased service which has declined in price during these past years when everything else has been increasing.

An electric utility is a mass-production business on which there is a very small profit per unit. In such a business both the customer and the utility should benefit if both play their part. When the farmer increases his use of electricity, he increases the gross profit of the utility. The utility in turn passes back part of its increased earnings in reduced costs of electricity and makes investment in improved equipment and service from which the customer benefits. As proof that this policy is working, I wish to point out that in 11 years from 1935 through 1946 the average kilowatt-hour use per farm on the system of the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation has increased from an average of about 1,000 kilowatt-hours to over 2,300—230 percent. During this period the company has put into effect four rate reductions and has improved its plant and equipment to a marked degree. In addition to the four general rate reductions, the low rates of the company have been made available to about 2,900 customers acquired by the purchase of other electric companies. The average cost of a kilowatt-hour to the farmer served by this company is at least 30 percent less than it was 10 years ago.

We have heard it said that the farm-electric bill is steadily going up. It is, but the ratio between cost per unit and what the farmer gets for his total bill is interesting. For instance in this company a farmer who uses 100 kilowatt-hours per month pays an average of 4.38 cents per kilowatt-hour, if he uses 250 they cost him 3.03 cents, and if he increases his use to 500 they drop to 2.51 cents. Looking at it another way his total cost has increased two and eight-tenths times but for that increase he has received five times as much electricity.

The Central Vermont Public Service Corp. believes that it is not unreasonable to expect that within a few years the average farm on its system will be using at least 6,000 kilowatt-hours per year. To accomplish this the company has a farm department of five trained men to consult with its farm customers and give them sound advice upon electrical applications. When the farmer knows how to use electricity, he soon realizes it is profitable and applies it to more and more of his farm operations with benefit to both the farmer and the utility. The company too will presently be serving considerably more than 90 percent of all the possible customers in its territory. It will have over 3,000 miles of rural lines or enough to reach from New York to San Francisco.

In support of our very real belief that liberal electrical installations on the farm are economically sound and financially profitable, the following statistics are presented for an average dairy farm of 25 cows and a small flock of hens. Figures of this type can always be questioned but there are on file many actual case histories, lists of equipment, and check meter tests which are even more convincing.

It is true that a reasonably complete list of electrical equipment for the farm and the home represents considerable money, but this cost compares favorably with other items of equipment that cost nearly as much for one item alone and whose use is limited to a very small part of the year. Electrical equipment is unquestionably more free from operation troubles and has a much longer productive life.

With the trend of labor away from the farm, a probable reduction in the financial return from farm products, and with an increase in the cost of all services—except electric—which farmers have to buy, there is a tremendous opportunity for Vermont utilities to render a real service to the State by making electricity available to all areas and especially by showing their customers, both farm or urban, how to make the very best use of it.

Yearly average current consumption of electrical equipment and equipment depreciation on an average Vermont 25-cow dairy farm with a poultry flock of 500 hens

	Kilowatt-hours per year	Equipment cost (dollars)	Life (years)	Depreciation	
				Percent	Dollars
FARM USE					
Lights	240	50	20	5	2.50
Milking machine (2 kilowatt-hours per cow per month)	600	250	10	10	25.00
Milk cooler (25 kilowatt-hours per can per month for 7 months cooling both night and morning, average 6 cans per day)	1,050	330	10	10	33.00
Dairy water heater (8 gallons twice a day)	1,800	65	10	10	6.50
Barn ventilator (check meter tests 7 months)	630	150	10	10	15.00
Clippers	25	22	10	10	2.20
Small utility motor, ½ horsepower, to do the following work: Concrete mixer, separator, churn, emery wheel, grindstone, drill press, portable elevator, ice-cream freezer, lathe, sprayer	60	20	20	5	1.00
Large power motor, 5 to 7½ horsepower, to do the following work: Wood saw, bench saw, feed grinder, silo filling, hay hoist	600	200	20	5	10.00
Soil cable (2-sash hotbed, 75 kilowatt-hours per sash per season of 2 months)	300	15	10	10	1.50
Water-pipe protection (120 feet of cable and control, operating one-fourth of time, 800 watts, 5 months)	1,000	15	10	10	1.50
Radio (100 watts, 2 hours per day)	73	25	5	20	5.00
Water pump (pump only) (25 gallons per day for 25 cows, 2 horses, 12 young stock, etc.; 1,000 gallons for 1 kilowatt-hour)	360	125	20	5	6.25
Brooder (2 broods of 300 chicks, ½ kilowatt-hour per chick)	300	35	10	10	3.50
Total for farm	7,038	1,302			112.95
HOME USE					
Lights (fixtures only)	240	100.00	20	5	5.00
Washer (wringer type)	48	100.00	20	5	5.00
Refrigerator (8-foot)	360	175.00	10	10	17.50
Range (8,000 customers, average 100 kilowatt-hours per month, farmers use slightly more)	1,500	150.00	20	5	7.50
Toaster (good one)	48	17.50	10	10	1.75
Percolator	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Vacuum cleaner	12	50.00	20	5	2.50
Mixer beater	48	30.00	10	10	3.00
Radio (100 watts, 6 hours per day)	219	50.00	5	20	10.00
Waffle iron	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Heating pad	12	4.00	5	20	.80
Flat iron	72	10.00	10	10	1.00
Ironer	144	100.00	10	10	10.00
Water pump (barn system supplies house, 25 gallons per person per day)	6				
Total for home	2,568	796.50			65.05

Total kilowatt hours for both farm and home	9,606
Average kilowatt hours per month	800
Average monthly kilowatt-hour cost	$18.58
Total kilowatt-hour cost for year	$222.96
Total depreciation for year	178.00
Total cost for year	400.96

Now let us see if this yearly average expense of $400.96 can be justified from an efficiency and economy point of view. Many small farmers say that electrical equipment, especially milkers, coolers, and water pumps

alone make it possible to eliminate one hired man. At present wage scales the cash-wage payment alone exclusive of the usual prerequisites is more than twice the yearly bill. Each farmer can best analyze his particular operation by making a study of what it would cost him to do by some other method the work electricity is doing for him taking into consideration not only the dollar cost of operation but the convenience, safety, and versatile nature of the service.

We believe the following figures are conservative:

Yearly savings made possible by use of certain electrical equipment

Lights, 7 months half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	$52.50
Milker 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Cooler 7 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Water heater 12 months one-quarter hour per day at 50 cents per hour	45.62
Utility motor 12 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	52.50
Soil cable 5 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	18.75
Brooder 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	10.25
Water pump 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Ventilator—saving in health of cattle, depreciation of building, saving in moldy hay, veterinarian, etc. Estimated at least	50.00
Power motor—saving in labor, time, gas, and oil, wear and tear on machinery at least	50.00
Home—put your own figure on the value of this service to your wife and family and to the better home you can have	(?)
Total savings	827.12

To effect this saving of $827.12 per year, it costs $400.90 for electric current and depreciation. This leaves $426.16 as a return on the investment of $2,098.50 in electrical equipment. This is better than 20 percent.

We have purposely omitted the investment in a wiring system because it is such a varying figure. Three hundred dollars should put in one of the best, and when properly done it is good for a lifetime. An adequate and properly installed wiring system is essential for proper and economical operation of equipment, and is without question the safest source of light, heat, and power.

In addition to the items of electrical equipment mentioned above which are commonly accepted today on the reasonably well-equipped farm, there are others that are rapidly coming into use and which will eliminate still further much of the hardest farm labor. Some of these are the barn-hay finisher, farm and home food freezers, barn cleaners, home water heaters, dishwashers, electrically controlled central heating systems, and many small items to take the drudgery out of life.

We repeat that the liberal use of electricity under the trained supervision of utility personnel and extension service can and will make farm life in Vermont even more attractive than it is today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

PROPAGANDA AGAINST ECONOMY

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries appropriations aggregating more than $2,400,000,000. It represents a reduction in budget estimates of more than $628,000,000.

It is to be hoped that those who are determined to oppose all reductions in Federal expenditure will in this instance obtain the facts before resorting to unjustified discharge of personnel and indulging in false propaganda such as we have recently witnessed.

The well-known practice of applying cuts to personnel in the lower brackets, as distinguished from those in the upper brackets, and to activities which are obviously important and popular as distinguished from those which are unimportant or unessential is contrary to the national interest and must cease.

It is perfectly evident that an organized campaign is being conducted against every effort to bring economy into the Federal Government in spite of the clear mandate from the people last November.

Of course, the bureaucrats with vested interests in their jobs are opposed to economy. Of course, the New Dealers who cling to the philosophy of "spend and spend, tax and tax" are opposed to economy. Of course, the Communists and fellow travelers who would destroy free enterprise in this country are opposed to economy.

No doubt they will all work together by propaganda, or otherwise, to continue the spending policies of recent years which have brought this country face to face with the most menacing financial picture in its history.

The most flagrant example of the point of view of those sponsoring this organized propaganda campaign is afforded by their recent action in respect to the House appropriation for the customs service in the next fiscal year.

This service asked for an increase of $6,500,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. The House approved an increase of $3,165,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. Yet, because the full increase requested was not granted for the fiscal year 1948, the head of the customs service actually went so far as to send dismissal notices, effective immediately in the fiscal year 1947, to some two thousand border and port patrol agents while fantastic stories were circulated to the effect that our borders and ports were, as a result of congressional action, wide open to smugglers.

This is just an example of the propaganda campaign emanating from the administration by which those in the Congress who seek to carry out the will of the people are confronted at this time.

I am confident that the American people will ultimately recognize the sources of this campaign. I am confident that they will ultimately appraise the campaign at its proper value. I am confident that they will continue to insist on the elimination of all waste and extravagance in the Federal Government.

A topheavy bureaucracy does not help the veteran, the wage earner, the farmer, or the people generally. All waste and inefficiency in Government simply increases the bill that all must pay.

The problem of putting our financial house in order is the most important domestic problem in America today. Failure to take the steps essential to this end can easily result in national calamity and untold suffering for all.

ANTIDEFICIENCY LAW

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the so-called antideficiency law.

I call attention to the fact that your committee has been confronted by repeated violations of the spirit if not the letter of this law. There are in this deficiency bill some six or seven examples where in my judgment the spirit if not the letter of the law has been violated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD the provisions of the law appearing in title 31 of the United States Code.

TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month. (R. S. 3679; March 3, 1905, ch. 1484, sec. 4, 33 Stat. 1257; February 27, 1906, ch. 510, sec. 3, 34 Stat. 48.)

We are all familiar with its provisions in a general way, I think. We know that it provides, among other things, that no department shall employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

We know also that it provides that all appropriations shall, on or before the

beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

We know also that the penalty for violation of the act is summary removal from office together with fine or imprisonment.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the provisions of this act, your committee has been confronted again and again by agency after agency, often with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but without one word to the Congress, by the actual employment of additional personnel, compelling the Congress either to approve additional funds for the fiscal year in question or to discontinue essential activities.

This practice, Mr. Chairman, must be ended.

One example in this bill is perhaps sufficient. I refer to the Veterans' Administration.

In 1940 there were some 38,000 people on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. When General Bradley took over in the summer of 1945 there were some 64,000 people on the rolls. A year ago when this House approved the 1947 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, it was approved on the basis of 143,588 persons on the rolls. In February of this year, General Bradley came before our committee and told us that he had no less than 204,654 people on the rolls. As a matter of fact, after examination it turned out to be not 204,654, but 224,852 people, and that did not include various employees who are not carried on the regular pay roll, which brought the over-all figure up to about 232,000 persons on the rolls.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we were confronted in February with an increase of 80,000 persons on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration at a probable annual cost of something like $240,000,000 without one word having been said to the Congress prior to the employment of any one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pick out any one agency. We all appreciate the tremendous problem that General Bradley has had. We all want to see a 100 percent job done for all our veterans. As a matter of fact, your committee has allowed, with a minor exception, the entire request for personnel for the balance of the year, subject to reconsideration in connection with 1948 funds.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, if the Congress is to exercise control over appropriations, it is manifest that the antideficiency law must be complied with.

Regardless of the merits or demerits, in this particular instance, of the increase in personnel, it is clear that a 60 percent increase in personnel without one word to the Congress cannot be justified.

REDUCTIONS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS

Now, as far as appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are concerned, we have already made available $6,356,000,000. In this bill a further appropriation to the extent of $2,003,000,000 was requested.

I may say that that request has been allowed in full except for two substantial reductions, the result of recalculation on the basis of recent rates of spending, largely concurred in by General Bradley; and two or three minor items of reduction, including a reduction in the number of those engaged in public relations work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Am I correct in understanding that this money is not given now for the pensions and readjustments, but will be given in a later bill? In other words, it is just a matter of bookkeeping whether you do it now or later, because if the money is due the veterans by law, of course we will pay them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, when pensions are due, they will be paid in full. Of course, when readjustment allowances are due, they will be paid in full. The reductions here have been made because on the basis of the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration, more money was asked for than is required at this time.

For example, take the matter of pensions. The figures furnished your committee show that in the first 7 months of the year about $1,068,000,000 was actually expended. The rate of expenditure in December was $168,000,000; in January $171,000,000.

Your committee allowed $180,000,000 for each of the last 5 months of the year, and, in addition, a sum of $172,000,000, which was expended in the fiscal year 1946.

Adding those three figures together gives a total of about $2,140,000,000 needed as compared with about $2,346,000,000 requested, giving an indicated cut of $200,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will note if she will refer to page 631 of the hearings before the committee.

Now let us look for a moment at the figures furnished in reference to readjustment allowances. This item breaks down into three subdivisions.

First, there is the request for loan-guarantee work, which General Bradley and the Bureau of the Budget indicated could be reduced by $27,900,000. Your committee followed this recommendation.

Second, there is the request for education and training; and, third, the request for readjustment allowances.

For the first 7 months the Veterans' Administration figures indicate that there was spent for education and training $1,272,000,000, an average of $181,000,000 a month. Your committee allowed $200,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, or a total of $1,000,000,000. Adding that to the amount spent in the first 7 months gives a total of $2,272,000,000 needed as compared with $2,441,000,000 asked, indicating a possible reduction of $170,000,000 in respect to education and training.

Figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration for readjustment allowances indicate that $995,000,000 was spent in the first 7 months. Adding $550,000,000 to that figure which allows $110,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, an amount well in excess of the January expenditure, gives a total of $1,505,000,000 needed as against $1,850,000,000 requested, indicating a possible cut of $345,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will see by referring to page 638 of the committee hearings.

As a matter of fact, the committee did not cut the combined item the indicated $515,000,000—$170,000,000 plus $345,000,000. It reduced the combined figure by $350,000,000, leaving what appears to be a cushion of $165,000,000 over and above that which is required.

I repeat that with the exception of these two reductions made on the basis of Veterans' Administration figures indicating that the money requested is not needed at this time, and two or three other minor reductions the Veterans' Administration has been allowed every cent that it has requested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield again briefly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that General Bradley made an error in asking for the amount? It would seem so because he apparently agrees that it is not needed. I am very much troubled about it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. From the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration it appears that someone overestimated present needs. The committee has made reductions to offset that overestimate on the basis of the Veterans' Administration's own figures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And it is satisfactory to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have referred the lady from Massachusetts to two citations in the committee hearings which seem to indicate that General Bradley is largely in accord with the reductions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time, and I shall condense as much as I can the remainder of what I intended to say.

RELIEF IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

The chairman has referred to the item for relief in occupied areas amounting to $300,000,000 on top of the $425,000,000 already appropriated.

The reasons given for the supplemental request are: First, increase in food costs; second, displaced persons to the number of 620,000 in Germany and Austria; third, the taking over of the Ryukyu Islands from the Navy; fourth, the termination of UNRRA work in Austria on December 31, last; and fifth, an extra appropriation for Korea for economic rehabilitation.

The general objective is the increase in the calories per day to be made available in these countries, help to be provided until these countries are on a self-sufficient basis.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving a break-down of the requested $300,000,000, first by country and second by commodity:

Supplemental estimate, fiscal year 1947, Government relief in occupied areas

[By project and area]

Subject No.	Purpose of project	Austria, United States zone, cost	Germany, United States zone, cost	Japan, cost	Korea, United States zone, cost	Italy, cost	Total
110	Purchase of grain, food, and kindred products	$13,662,557	$46,607,013	$111,975,563	$41,074,000	----------	$213,319,433
130	Purchase of petroleum and petroleum products	960,050	4,173,350	8,823,765	2,291,566	$50,224	16,298,955
140	Purchase of textiles	1,097,534	3,953,715	----------	----------	----------	5,051,249
160	Purchase of other supplies and equipment	718,789	4,695,711	----------	10,000,000	----------	15,414,500
421	Commercial ocean transportation	2,117,445	6,982,512	18,780,569	13,727,486	24,273	41,632,685
423	Transportation of civilian supplies (rail)	----------	1,465,838	4,616,551	1,550,789	----------	7,633,178
430	Incidental operating expenses	----------	----------	650,000	----------	----------	650,000
	Total	18,556,675	67,878,139	144,846,848	68,643,841	74,497	300,000,000

You will notice that about $67,000,000 is to go to Germany, $18,000,000 to Austria, $144,000,000 to Japan, $68,000,000 to Korea, and a small amount to Italy.

If we add the sums already provided for these countries under the $425,000,000 appropriation we shall find that Germany will receive, all told, about $216,000,000, Austria $22,000,000, Italy $16,000,000, Japan $330,000,000, and Korea $138,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that the amount involved for ocean transportation is extremely high. It amounts to almost $15 a metric ton.

Former President Hoover has suggested that perhaps $90,000,000 might be saved in the next fiscal year if some of our Liberty ships were used for carrying the relief commodities.

As the chairman has pointed out, it appears that a reduction of $38,000,000 might be made in this over-all item. The committee has preferred, however, to make the whole amount available on the understanding that the pipe line will carry on until September or October on that basis, and afford the committee a further opportunity for detailed consideration of the request for 1948 in connection with the War Department appropriation bill.

FOREIGN FINANCING SINCE WAR

Mr. Chairman, for my part I think it is manifest that much of the financing in other countries that we are being called upon to do, is essential if from no other point of view than that of national self-interest.

The difficulty that I find in the matter is the difficulty of knowing where to draw the line.

I think that difficulty has been tremendously increased by the fact that the administration has never put all the cards on the table nor given the Congress a complete, over-all program. It has been fed to us piece by piece and it has been our problem to try to put the picture puzzle together.

I have tried in this instance to obtain something of an over-all picture as to the period since the ending of the war. You will find the results of that attempt included on pages 897 to 910 of the committee hearings.

Briefly, the information furnished seems to indicate that since the ending of the war in one form or another we have made available over $14,000,000,000 and that we have given further authorizations of over $7,000,000,000 or a grand total of over $21,000,000,000.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a brief table which summarizes the information that Assistant Secretary Clayton furnished the committee in this connection:

UNO and certain other international organizations	$29,289,349
International Bank (total obligations, $3,175,000,000)	635,000,000
International fund	2,750,000,000
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
Occupied territories	802,034,187
Liberation territories	969,892,106
Lend-lease credits (since VJ-day)	1,402,000,000
Lend-lease aid post VJ-day (China and Italy)	761,000,000
Surplus property credits	1,148,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom (total obligations, $3,750,000,000)	600,000,000
Grants to Philippine Islands ($20,000,000 loans also authorized)	620,000,000
Export-Import Banks (loans disbursed)	1,592,207,176
Total	14,009,422,818
Further authorizations:	
International Bank	2,540,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom	3,150,000,000
Loan to the Philippine Islands	20,000,000
Export-Import Bank	1,339,000,000
Total	21,058,422,818

May I point out in closing that it appears from the RECORD that approximately $3,700,000,000 have been made available for UNRRA and of that Uncle Sam has contributed about $2,700,000,000.

There is available for expenditure in the calendar year 1947 some $600,000,000 and of this same $305,000,000 contributed by this country is planned for expenditure after the 1st of July next—in other words, in the fiscal year 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, included in this $600,000,000 for distribution in the calendar year 1947 is over $243,000,000 for China, over $34,000,000 for Austria, over $21,000,000 for Greece and over $194,000,000 for seven Russian satellite countries.

I mention this in closing Mr. Chairman because it seems to me that unless General Marshall is able to obtain results at Moscow a very definite question presents itself as to whether these supplies should be allowed to go forward to the satellite countries to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill, you will notice on page 11, at the bottom of the page, these words:

JUDGMENTS

House Document 131, submitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, included judgments in favor of Goodwin B. Watson, $101.78; William E. Dodd, Jr., $59.83; and Robert Morss Lovett, $1,996.40. These judgments resulted from action in the courts to recover compensation for periods of service after November 15, 1943, the effective date of an act of Congress forbidding the employment of such persons unless appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The committee has denied the requested appropriation to pay the judgments.

The decision of the Court of Claims, speaking through the Chief Justice, concludes with these words:

In view of the conclusions arrived at it is immaterial whether section 304 of the Urgency Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 or any part thereof is unconstitutional or not. We do not decide that question. The plaintiffs are entitled to recover in either event.

Then it goes on to say that Robert Morss Lovett is entitled to recover $1,996.40, the same amount certified by the Budget, the Treasury, and the President; Goodwin B. Watson is entitled to recover $101.78; and William E. Dodd, Jr., is entitled to recover $59.83:

The judgments will be entered accordingly. It is so ordered.

That is the conclusion of the Court of Claims. The Supreme Court decision concludes as follows:

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of freemen they envisioned, and so they proscribed bills of attainder. Section 304 is one. Much as we regret to declare an act of Congress violates the Constitution, we have no alternative here.

Section 304, therefore, does not stand as an obstacle to payment of compensation to Lovett, Watson, and Dodd. The judgment in their favor is affirmed.

I have no desire to quarrel with anyone who disagrees with the position I feel compelled to take in this matter, but I have always had the belief, yea, more than the belief, the conviction, that the purpose of the Appropriations Committee, its chief function, was to implement the will of Congress and to perform the duty lawfully assigned to it by Congress as interpreted by the courts. When, therefore, Congress enacts a piece of legislation and the Supreme Court affirms judgments of the Court of Claims to the effect that whether that enactment is constitutional or not, the money decreed by those judgments must be paid. I maintain no Member, nor committee, nor body of Congress has any right to defy the law so declared. Especially is that true in the Lovett, Dodd, and Watson cases, wherein the Supreme Court not only affirmed the judgments of the court of claims, but also went further and declared that the enactment by Congress which sought to prevent payment of their salaries was a bill of attainder, and hence utterly null and void because unconstitutional. So, in those cases it is too clear for doubt that it is the manifest duty of all who would observe the law of the land to bow to that mandate.

Unless, then, we hold ourselves above the law, we must provide the funds needed to satisfy these judgments.

I am not here to try to lecture anybody. I am not here blaming anybody. I am simply rising for a point of information which I desire fervently. I listened to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his statement today that he could not conscientiously vote to pay these judgments. I honor him as I do few men in this House for his integrity and for his high character in every respect, but I submit that his statement does not satisfy me as an answer, and I would love to ask the gentleman to point out what he relies on to justify his position.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this Congress in the past when unconscionable judgments were rendered by courts to refuse to pay them. There are precedents of that character. This is an unconscionable judgment. These three men beyond dispute did not owe their first loyalty to the Government of the United States. When the Court refused to pay attention to the law which the Congress wrote, and when it by virtue of an assumed power attempted to declare that provision of law unconstitutional, I felt that the operation had such an odor that I could not conscientiously be a party to bringing in an appropriation to meet it. Under the Constitution, the direct power to make appropriations, whether to satisfy judgments or otherwise, is exclusively in the Congress, and I feel that we have that responsibility.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for amplifying his answer and I appreciate his answer. Of course, I agree with the gentleman that the power to appropriate is not only in Congress but particularly in this House, and, more especially, in the great committee of which the gentleman happens to be the honored and able chairman at this time. But his answer amounts to nothing more than that he so violently disagrees with the courts that have decided against his contention he will do what he pleases, without regard to the law as declared by the authorities to which that duty has been committed, and seeks to excuse his conduct because it has been done before.

Of course, the legislative branch of our Government has the power of the purse. But that great power, as every other power in a government of law, not of men, may only be exercised within the law and in accord with the law.

Does not your theory lead to the destruction of our form of government, which the Constitution prescribes should be administered by three coordinate branches, free and independent of each other?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I think there are many among my colleagues of the House who have seen a far-stretching graveyard of a great forest, and who have realized the terrible loss to mankind. Irreplaceable destruction has been caused by forest fires. But today we have in the Pacific Northwest another, and not less potent, killer of trees—the tussock moth. This insect has ravaged thousands of acres of valuable timber in the primitive and beautiful mountains of northern Idaho.

Just east of the heavily wheat and pea productive Palouse farming section, stretching across from eastern Washington, I take you to the edge of the immense evergreen forests of the Idaho Panhandle. Here in this border area, between farm and forest, during the summer of 1945, it was noticed that some destructive agent was attacking scattered areas of fir trees. Then it was recalled that in 1944 a few trees had turned brown and died. There was no pronounced public uneasiness, although a few owners sprayed or cut down and burned dying farmhouse shade trees. But in the summer of 1946, the damage quickly spread to an alarming extent. Whole hillsides of heavy timber now turned yellow as though touched by a searing blast, and great patches appeared in State and Federal forests, reaching out into stands of merchantable timber. Public meetings were held. Experts from the Forest Insect Division of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and the Forest Service men assigned to the region, who had been checking on the outbreak, reported that the Douglas fir tussock moth was responsible for the damage.

The Tussock moth is a small insect which basically attacks Douglas fir and white fir, but feeds on other tree species associated with firs when food is scarce. The injury is done by the larva of the moth. The young caterpillars hatch in late May and feed on the foliage, killing the tree by defoliation. They are active and travel in search of food and the infestation is most widely spread by these tiny, newly hatched caterpillars. These are covered with hairs, spin little silken threads after coming out of the egg, and are blown by the wind to other trees for considerable distances. While the rate of increase is tremendous, there is fortunately but a single generation each year, and the damage is done only in the period of about 30 days before the caterpillar changes to a moth.

About 350,000 acres are now covered by the infestation in Latah, Benewah, and Clearwater counties. This includes Federal, State, county, and privately owned land. With the wartime development of new insecticides, particularly DDT, and the fact that small quantities are effective, spraying can be done by airplanes. Such a program has been tried out successfully on a much smaller scale against the gypsy moth in New York and Pennsylvania. Obviously, the aerial spraying must cover the whole area, and there is no way to stop it exactly along the boundary of the various owners. It is peculiarily a project for cooperative effort. The legislature of Idaho this last month appropriated $210,000 for its share of the work. The private timber owners, including lumber companies, who form the Potlatch Timber Protective Association, have voted to assess themselves $68,000 for their share. Private owners of small forest plots have agreed to put up 42½ cents per acre for the aerial spraying.

The Federal Government is particularly concerned in stamping out the infestation because the untouched area to the east, and in the path of the prevailing winds is heavily timbered national forest. There is an immediate prospect of the loss of millions of dollars of lumber values. This lumber cannot be spared at any time, and certainly not now, in the face of our acute building shortage.

But the commercial timber is only a part of the loss. Large areas of dead trees mean a greatly increased fire hazard. Farm woodlots of smaller private owners will continue to die if the center of infestation is not cleaned out. As grave as all else is the threat to our watersheds and, not the least, the destruction of the scenic beauty of one of the loveliest parts of the primitive forests of Idaho.

That is why I urged upon the committee, and now urge upon you the necessity for this item in the deficiency bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to this bill as an economy move. I will say to the gentleman, on the record the bill hardly stands up as an economy measure. Of the $628,139,491 the committee has cut from the budget estimate, $551,020,000 is being taken from the Veterans' Administration—and that is the part of this bill I want to talk about now.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the action taken by the committee in reducing the current deficiency appropriation of the Veterans' Administration is sheer folly. This action does not contribute to economy. Rather, the action taken by the committee contributes only to the growing confusion facing our administrative agencies as a result of bungling of appropriations.

Hearings on the current Veterans' Administration deficiency appropriations were held for the first time on February 13, of this year. It has taken since February 13 to get this measure to the floor. I point this out because, due to the committee's action—if it is upheld—it will be necessary to act on another deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration before this session of Congress adjourns.

The bill as reported by the committee reduces pensions in the amount of $200,000,000. It also reduces by $350,000,000 funds with which to take care of direct benefits under the GI bill of rights. These are not savings. This action by the committee will merely make it necessary that another deficiency appropriation be considered at a later date.

This action cannot be a saving because the purpose for which the original budget estimate was requested is provided for under existing law—and under law the Government is committed to make these expenditudes to our war veterans.

At the present rate that this bill is progressing, it cannot conceivably become law before April 10. Therefore, in order that the GI benefits and the pensions of our veterans be paid for the remainder of the fiscal year, it will be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to request another deficiency appropriation on April 15 in order to obtain action on its request before the adjournment of this session of Congress.

It seems to me ridiculous that we are taking this action. Certainly we are not saving money. Certainly, we are not saving the time and efforts of the committee nor of the House. In my estimation the only thing that is accomplished by this bill is that it will provide a false basis for claims of economy by the Republican Members of this House.

The money that is requested in the original budget submitted by the Veterans' Administration for these pensions and direct benefits must eventually be paid. In my opinion the House should promptly meet the full estimate for 1947 pensions and readjustment benefits in order that we may know exactly where we stand in matters affecting the national budget.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the contentions of the gentleman who have preceded me, I think I should call attention to certain testimony of the officials of the Veterans' Administration.

I hold in my hand the hearings on this bill. At page 638 of the testimony dealing with the readjustment benefits, the record reads as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under $90,000,000; with $15,000,000 it would be $105,000,000. If you call it $110,000,000 you would be getting to pretty near a stable average, would you not? It ought not to run over $110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis $550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about $1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6 months was $955,000,000. So that $550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about?

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about $1,250,000 average and now we are getting only about $1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up these estimates for the deficiency requests, they though they would have about a million and a quarter veterans asking for readjustment allowances. It is running considerably less than that. General Bradley says we are now getting about $1,150,000.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There has been a decided increase in the number of veterans requesting this allowance in the past 2 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This was the statement of General Bradley before the committee, and we had him before the committee two or three times. The hearings from which I quoted are dated March 17.

I do understand there has been some confusion with respect to one item in their request, but that is a matter on which we expect to take additional testimony. We expect to get some further information on that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Who would be better informed than the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, sir, no one should be better informed than the Veterans' Administration, and General Bradley said, "Last fall, we expected $1,250,000. Now it is running $1,150,000." He agreed that the total of the figure of what had been expended during the first 7 months, plus allowing $110,000,000 for the last 5 months, made $1,505,000,000. That compares with the request in the deficiency estimates of $1,707,000,000.

You will also find in the hearings that General Bradley said that the amount required for Army and Navy pensions, on the basis of actual expenditures, would run about two hundred million below what they estimated last fall, when they prepared their deficiency estimates. I believe everyone agrees that reduction should stand.

No Member of the Congress wants to welch in any sense on any promise that has been made to the veterans. At the same time, when representatives of the Veterans' Administration come before us and tell us that things are not coming out quite the way they expected and they do not need as much money as they expected, the Congress would expect us to reduce the estimates accordingly.

There was another item for loans. I think in their estimates as they came up they indicated that a cut-back of $27,000,000 should be made. Surely we are expected to report that item in the reduced amount.

Advance estimates can be off either way, up or down, when you are setting up an activity as large as the Veterans' Administration. A year ago, when they came before the Committee on Independent Offices and asked for their money, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] knows, they estimated that 143,000 employees would do the job. But at the end of January this year they had about 220,000 employees. In other words, they just missed it by about 80,000, as to the number of employees they would have. General Bradley told us he was starting to whittle that down and he thought he could cut it down to 205,000 perhaps.

On the 1st of July 1945 the entire Veterans' Administration had eight employees assigned to public relations work. At the end of January this year they had 281 on the job of public relations. Let us not be confused between public relations and contact men. The public relations men are publicity men. You will probably hear from some of these publicity men about this cut because the Committee proposes to place a ceiling of 100 on the number of public relations or publicity people that the Veterans' Administration may have. Do not confuse those with contact representatives. The number of contact representatives the Veterans' Administration had at the end of January was approximately 6,900. So the ceiling on these publicity men will not interfere with contact representatives. There are something over 6,900 contact men still on the rolls.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress would pass a law to give permanent status, call it a pension, compensation, or what you please, for everyone who has been on the roll for 10 years—in other words, make his status a permanent situation, so that all they would have to do would be to issue the checks to him, in my opinion in that way they could cut down largely the employees of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a very interesting suggestion.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I will give the gentleman my reasons for that. In 1928 and 1929 we had about as many people drawing pensions, that is, Civil War, Spanish-American War, and peacetime men, as were drawing compensation from the Veterans' Bureau, yet the expense of the Pension Bureau was only about $3,500,000 while the expense of the Veterans' Administration was about $41,000,000 or $42,000,000. It is true that a large portion of that, about $19,000,000, I believe, was due to hospitalization; but even with that eliminated the difference was about eighteen to twenty million dollars. So if instead of having a large number of people to, as the saying goes, boll weevil through the records of these boys who have been on compensation for 5 or 6, or 8 or 10 years, they be put on permanently and their cases retired to the files, in my opinion, we could cut down the number of employees in the Veterans' Administration considerably.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished gentleman who served so long as chairman of the Committee on World

War Veterans' Legislation and now is the ranking minority member, I hope will pursue that matter further in the deliberations of his committee. Certainly it is important that the country be in a position to discharge its obligations to the veterans, and nobody knows better than the gentleman who has just interrogated me that the country does not want to see the time come when somebody comes along and proposes another economy act that will strike from the pension rolls a good many men who deserve to be kept there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman, but I hope he will not take all my 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

I would be the last man in the House to want to balance the budget on the disabled soldiers. I fought the economy bill, because it cut a great many disabled soldiers too deeply; but I do say that there is room, if properly managed, to bring about some economy without at the same time injuring the cause of the veterans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct; but if get we economy that will help to protect our ability to pay the men who should be provided for.

Now I wish to direct your attention for just a minute to an item which appears at the bottom of page 26 following the $300,000,000 item for government and relief in occupied areas.

It is a new proviso which reads as follows:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that the governments, military and otherwise, or nations receiving aid under the provisions of this act, shall be expected to provide, in agreements to be signed by their governments when established (if not already established) for reimbursement to the United States for such aid: *Provided further*, That not exceeding $60,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available.

The first part of the proviso goes to the matter of the reimbursement of this country for the aid to be extended to occupied countries. Mr. Petersen, representing the Secretary of War, and others appearing before our committee told us it was anticipated that reimbursement would be received by crediting favorable export balances and, in addition, every effort would be made to obtain from the governments of the occupied countries such provision for future reimbursement as could be obtained. The committee thought that idea ought to have the approval of the Congress; so we provided that it is the sense of the Congress this reimbursement agreement should be sought.

The committee also felt something should be done about shipping costs. The testimony disclosed that of the money expended during the first 6 or 7 months of the year the shipping costs came to 28.6 percent of the total that was being expended for this food and relief. We thought that was just too big a proportion to go for transportation. The request for $300,000,000 contemplates $64,000,000 for that purpose. In the limitation in the second proviso we say "not to exceed $60,000,000," which will bring the cost down to not to exceed 20 percent rather than permitting it to go up to 28.6 percent.

In addition to that, we have provided that this $60,000,000 may be available for providing water transportation and transportation facilities, including surplus ships. This looks ahead to the possibility of using some of the surplus Liberty ships manned by crews of the recipient countries in line with a suggestion made by former President Hoover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, on page 24 of this bill there is given to the Treasury Department for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation the sum of $20,000,000. This makes a total of $90,000,000 that has been given to this organization.

I have today introduced a bill providing that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into any insurance contracts to insure the protection of agricultural commodities against any loss in yield. In 1945 I fought those appropriations on the floor of the House. I had J. Carl Wright, Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, before me in my office a number of times. We discussed this. I also discussed it with Marvin Jones, and came to the conclusion that this is one of the biggest rat holes in the country for the expenditure of money and that this Corporation should be disbanded at once.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. This provision was put in the bill after considerable deliberation on the part of the committee, especially by the chairman and myself. In fact, the provision was inserted in the bill at my request. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that while the possibilities of working out a practical insurance program for the future is a matter of debate, yet outstanding claims which have already matured should be honored?

Mr. RICH. Yes; and if the gentleman had followed me in 1945 when we tried to eliminate this, we would have saved this country from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. The country would have been better off, the farmers and everybody else would have been better off. It is a Corporation that ought to be dispensed with and the quicker that is done the better for the country.

Federal crop insurance was first authorized by Congress in 1938 and has been a losing proposition from that day to this.

The Corporation was granted an authorized capital of $100,000,000. Seventy million of this capital has been issued and all lost except about $14,000,000. More than 2 years ago I discovered this Corporation was a constant sink-hole for not only the money appropriated for running expenses by Congress, but also for the $70,000,000 capital stock issued. Having opposed the legislation on the floor of the House, I felt that no legitimate business could exist under such conditions or management, and therefore, on March 5, 1945, I sent a letter to the then manager, J. Carl Wright, in part as follows:

> MARCH 5, 1945.
>
> FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION,
> *Department of Agriculture,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> (Attention of Mr. J. Carl Wright, Manager.)
>
> * * * * *
>
> Now in order that I, as a Member of Congress, can expect—and I shall expect—a good business administration, not only of your Corporation but all Government corporations, I am asking for a report on the qualifications of yourself as well as the other members of your board of directors to handle insurance, and what experience you have had to qualify you for appointment to the position you occupy. Have you carried out the intent and purpose of the Congress in trying to conduct this Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on a basis that would be commensurate with sound business principles? Are your rates such for the year 1945 that, from your past experience, the insurance you put in force will pay the expenses of the operation of the Corporation; and if in normal years, would you break even, or have a balanced budget, or would you have losses? If so, how much would your losses be; or would there be a likelihood of a gain, and why?
>
> You were given $40,000,000 for this Corporation; and you lost, according to your reports, $37,500,000 plus the seven million that you made on the increased price of grains. Today you only have left $2,500,000, of the forty million that was given you to start operation. What recommendations have you made for changes in law, if any are necessary, to make your organization a successful insurance corporation?
>
> Now I am not personally acquainted with you, or any of the other managers, and I do not wish to offend you. I am merely asking for a report that I can follow up to determine whether this Corporation is even trying to be successful, or whether there is a motive behind this to give hand-outs to the farmers in the guise of insurance. I believe it would be very wise for you to be absolutely frank and open and aboveboard in your reply, giving me all the facts. I am not inquiring of you anything that I would not inquire of any other corporation which I knew to be as unsuccessful as your Corporation has been since 1939.

For 19 days I waited for an answer to this letter, and on March 24, 1945, received a four-page letter, dated March 23, 1945.

In reference to my inquiry requesting a report on the qualifications and experience of the Manager and the Board of Directors who handle this insurance, I received the following quotation from said letter:

> You have asked also for a report on the qualifications of myself and members of the Board of Directors. With regard to my own qualifications, I have been Manager only since September 1943. I would be pleased to come to your office at your convenience to answer this question in person.
>
> The Board of Directors are men each of whom has been successful in his own field of work, and are as follows:

Mr. E. R. Duke, Chairman, Director of War Boards.

Mr. W. A. Jump, Director of Finance of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration.

Mr. W. B. Boyd, Director of Price, War Food Administration.

The Board of Directors are appointed by the War Food Administrator. The Board appoints the Manager of the Corporation.

If there is other information you would desire as to myself or the operation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, I would be pleased to furnish it or come to your office at your convenience and discuss the same with you.

Sincerely yours,

J. CARL WRIGHT,
Manager.

From the foregoing it was readily seen neither the manager nor any member of the Board knew anything about insurance. Two of the directors were appointed from the War Food Administration and the Chairman from a directorship of the war boards.

Their only qualifications from this letter showed that they had no experience in insurance and thus no qualifications whatsoever to manage this Corporation. They were simply transferred or appointed from one political agency of the Government to another, regardless of their competency to handle or even to understand either crop or any other kind of insurance business.

No corporation on earth engaged in private business would even consider men to run or manage its affairs without more experience and competency than these men had, according to this letter. They appear to be totally unfitted for the top positions they have occupied. It would be just as reasonable to have a blacksmith perform an appendicitis operation as to have such men run a crop-insurance corporation.

Because this letter was so unsatisfactory and lacking in information, I sent another letter to the Honorable Marvin Jones, then War Food Administrator, on the 24th day of March 1945, which, in part, read as follows:

MARCH 24, 1945.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Agriculture Administration Building,
Washington, D. C.:

* * * * *

I am much concerned in some of the objectives of government. When the first deficiency appropriation bill, asking for an appropriation of $30,000,000 additional for the Federal crop-insurance program came before the House, March 2, I opposed the item mainly on the point that the crop-insurance program had been in effect 5 years, and during that time the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation lost $37,500,000 of the original $40,000,000 appropriated and had invested $7,000,000 in wheat and made a profit, which they lost also. I came to the conclusion that this was a mighty poorly organized and managed business under the law to lose such a great amount of their capital in such a short time.

Now, I understand that the War Food Administrator appoints the Board of Directors of this Corporation and they are composed of the following: Mr. E. R. Duke, Mr. W. A. Jump, and Mr. W. B. Boyd.

The Board in turn appoint the Manager. I would like to know from you, Marvin, what experience these men have had in insurance; what experience have they had in making rates; why is it that this Corporation has been so very, very unsuccessful? Since it is your responsibility to appoint the Board of Directors, certainly you should look into the operation of this Corporation. I would like to know what are the qualifications of these Directors and the Manager, Mr. J. Carl Wright, that you entrust them with such a sum of money and it is dissipated in such a short time.

This just does not make sense to me as a businessman, Marvin. I am writing you this letter not with the idea of interfering with any successful organization, but of trying to help one that is not successful, and if the right men are not at the head, then it is up to you to change them. I know none of these men personally, but am going to keep my eye on this Corporation in the future for successful operation. If I can be of any assistance, you know you may command me.

This letter to the War Food Administrator was answered on the 7th day of April 1945, and is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 7, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RICH: I have your letter of March 24, which is in connection with the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and can well understand your concern regarding the financial position of the Corporation after 5 years' operations in insuring wheat and 2 years' in insuring cotton. The results have been disappointing to us, and we recognize that mistakes were made in the development and administration of the program. However, when the program was initiated there was no experience in this field upon which we could draw. Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Although indemnities exceeded premium collections by approximately $37,500,000 during this period and the desirable objective of providing insurance without impairment of the capital stock of the Corporation was not realized, this amount as well as the premiums collected was paid to farmers who suffered crop losses from adverse weather and other hazards over which they had no control. Without this protection many of these farmers would have been forced into liquidation. From the standpoint of national welfare, it could, therefore, hardly be said that these funds represent a total loss.

When the amendment to the Crop Insurance Act became effective December 23, 1944, I immediately appointed a new board of directors of the Corporation. One of these men worked in the crop-insurance program for a number of years and was selected because of the constructive suggestions which he made for improvement in the program during that time and because I considered that his experience would be useful in avoiding errors in the future. The other two were selected because of their long experience in the administration of agricultural programs and because of their reputations for dependability and sound judgment. I am sure you will agree that the administration of an all-risk insurance program on crops involves thorough knowledge of farming methods, the nature of the crops insured, and the hazards which are encountered in producing various crops as well as certain insurance principles. It is an agricultural program which requires the application of sound insurance principles in its operations.

At the time the program was reinstated after the passage of the act of December 23, 1944, it was extremely difficult to obtain the services of able insurance executives although we recognized that it was necessary for the corporation to have available the best possible insurance counsel and advice. Accordingly, the board of directors, with my concurrence, has entered into a contract with Ekern & Meyers, a Chicago firm which has an outstanding reputation in this field, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. The senior member of this firm served as chairman of a consulting committee which in 1941 and 1942 made an analysis of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The committee published a report containing a number of specific recommendations for changes and most of the recommended changes have been incorporated in the present program. Mr. Ekern has been in Washington almost continuously during the past 2 months for the purpose of assisting the management in developing an insurance program on cotton, wheat, and flax on a Nation-wide basis, and for cotton and tobacco on an experimental basis.

In view of the late date on which the legislation was enacted, these programs had to be developed hurriedly in order to make them applicable to crops planted in 1945. We are endeavoring to do the very best job we can in the limited time available.

I have been most interested in having the crop-insurance program succeed and have personally met with the agricultural committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate and sought their counsel and advice. I feel that the objectives of the program are so desirable that no work should be spared, and every possible avenue which might offer a sound approach should be explored in an effort directed toward successful operation.

I shall maintain an active interest in the program; and if changes appear to be necessary either in the personnel of the Corporation or in program provisions within the framework set up by the law, you may be assured that such changes will be made.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

This letter admits that premiums were exceeded by losses or indemnities by approximately $37,500,000, and the 1945 crop was not included because it was not yet harvest time and losses could then neither be ascertained nor determined.

Furthermore, it was therein asserted that the Board of Directors, with the consent of the War Food Administrator, had entered into a contract with the firm of Ekern and Meyers, a Chicago concern, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. What was paid this firm is not reported. But their employment seems to have ended. Why was it necessary to employ this firm at all? Why not appoint men skilled in insurance, instead of men who know nothing about the business? And above all, what good did these men do in furtherance of making crop insurance self-supporting? The record seems to disclose that the results brought about by these men to crop insurance amounted to very little, judging from results, and the Crop Insurance Corporation still continues to run at a loss.

In addition to the letters sent the departments, numerous interviews were had with those in authority but all ended in either an acknowledgment of failure in the past or a promise to make a better showing in the future.

Long and involved statements and reports were issued from time to time by the Department of Agriculture purporting to show some reason for the continuance of crop insurance by the Govern-

ment. However, a thorough examination of these reports invariably discloses that in the end the result was not only always disappointing but frequently unwarranted and indefensible, and a continuance of the project pointed to such loss to the Government which in a private corporation could only end in certain bankruptcy. But these losses that no private corporation can endure without disaster to both its usefulness and its stockholders, surely no Government can stand indefinitely. Sooner or later there must be an accounting and the longer such accounting is delayed the more serious it becomes and the more damage it does to the Government and the taxpayers who must support it.

Nevertheless, this letter of the War Food Administrator made promises and furnished a ray of hope to those of us who had seen the constant loss of the Crop Insurance Corporation. The Administrator's letter contained the following:

Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Again, we wanted to see what the "acquired experience" would bring about. One of the things brought about during that same year of 1945 was a worse deficit than had been suffered at any time before in the entire history of crop insurance. Another significant thing likewise brought about was the resignation of the War Food Administrator from his position as head of the agency or corporation for crop insurance and his appointment to another Government office or position.

Perhaps he saw the error in his prediction that "acquired experience" should prove invaluable in future operations, and abandoned crop insurance for a more congenial field of endeavor. In the meantime the American people, hoping for a balanced crop-insurance budget, must have felt the truth of the old proverb, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," as they saw the perpetually rising deficit.

The true financial condition of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been not only difficult but impossible to obtain. However at long last, on March 25, 1947, a belated audit report to Congress on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was placed on my desk for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, by the Comptroller General of the United States. Why was this report delayed by 1 year and approximately 9 months after June 30, 1945? Where is the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946? What is actually the condition of this Corporation at present? These are pertinent questions and should be answered.

The confusion shown in this report is plainly evident. Beginning on page 4, I quote the following:

9. We are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position at June 30, 1945, and its results of operations for the year ended that date for the following reasons:

(a) The financial statements do not include the results of operations for the 1945 crop year.

(b) The reserve for losses on collections for premiums for the 1943 and prior crop years may be inadequate.

However, the financial statements and comments in the report set forth these matters as completely as possible.

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful. In this connection the following recommendations are submitted:

(a) The Corporation's management should be set up under a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public. It should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers selected by the Board. In addition to a man versed in farming, the top officers should include an individual with a broad insurance background, another who is an expert in insurance-sales promotion, and a controller serving as chief accounting officer. (See p. 7.)

(c) Every effort should be devoted toward development of sound underwriting policies and practices, insurance-sales promotion, and improved financial and accounting practices.

(d) Insurance contracts should be written in monetary terms rather than in commodity terms; this involves certain difficulties. (See p. 16.)

(e) The Corporation should have a fiscal year ending December 31, after the close of the crop season. (See p. 39.)

(f) Accounting for operating expenses should be simplified. (See p. 25.)

(g) The cotton plan should be reduced to a trial basis until sufficient reliable information has been gained to warrant the resumption of Nation-wide participation. (See p. 20.)

(h) We believe consideration should be given to allowing the management freedom by law to exclude areas from insurance on individual crops, when it finds there is little demand or economic need for such insurance in those areas. This would permit a substantial savings in operating expenses.

Subsequent to completion of this audit, but prior to release of this report, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson made public a letter to the chairman of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress in which he enclosed a letter directed to the Manager of the Corporation. The letter voiced views and criticisms of and suggestions by the Secretary, based on two studies which had been made for him by representatives of the National Association of Insurance Agents and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co. A subsequent press release pointed out the action already taken by the management to remedy some of the conditions to which attention was called and to withdraw certain of the criticisms. Many of our comments coincide with those contained in these reports which indicate a feeling within the Department of Agriculture of need for broad changes in the program.

From the foregoing it is seen that officers themselves do not know where they are going when they say "we are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position." This is certainly a remarkable statement from a Corporation report. It reminds one of Dooly's grasshopper "that had a hell of a lot of action, but damn little direction."

In paragraph 10 we also find the following:

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop-insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful.

Of course it would take real courage to come out into the open and admit failure, but this statement comes as near to it as possible when it is acknowledged that if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended, and so forth. We suggest a reading of this recommendation.

The following quotation from page 7 of the report also shows that possibly my letters hereinbefore mentioned to this Corporation management, suggesting men of insurance experience to run it, may have been of some effect, for on page 7 of the report:

It is suggested that the importance of the crop-insurance program and the difficulties of establishing a sound program, if it be continued, require the policy-making direction of a Board of Directors composed of men experienced in insurance matters as well as representatives of agriculture and the general public. We recommend that, if the program is to be continued, the law should be amended to provide for a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public; it should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers elected by the Board, including a president, one or more vice presidents, and a controller. One of the top officers should be a man with a broad insurance background, especially from an actuarial standpoint, because of the necessity of establishing sound underwriting policies and practices. Another, well versed in sales promotion, should be charged with improving sales technique and actively directing the sales organization. The controller, as the chief accounting officer, should have full responsibility and authority in directing all accounting activities in order to obtain better accounting and financial policies than now prevail.

However, it is to be noted that this report contains many remarkable statements suggestive of a desire to continue the Corporation even with its unsavory financial record, but at the same time admitting the probability of its discontinuance by Congress, such statements being: "If the program be continued we recommend," or "suggest," and so forth.

Page 17 of this report shows the costs of the program to 1945 to be as follows:

Insurance losses	$38,126,200
Operating expenses	32,742,082
Total loss	70,868,282

Table does not include losses on 1945 crop program estimated to be $13,641,550 but not recorded in accounts at June 30, 1945.

In addition to losses resulting from the excess of indemnities over premiums, the insurance loss figure reflects $382,669 of unallocated costs, the largest portion of which was a provision of $375,000 for losses on uncollectible premiums at June 30, 1945.

The act charges the Board of Directors with fixing premiums at rates sufficient to cover claims for indemnities and to establish a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. Premiums are not required to be sufficient

to cover any portion of the operating expenses (see p. 24). To date, not only has no reserve been accumulated, but capital has been consumed to the extent of $38,126,200, exclusive of losses estimated for the 1945 fiscal year. Without exception, premiums failed to meet indemnities on all crops in each of the first 5 years as shown in terms of quantities in table IV.

The loss for 1945, which is above estimated to be $13,641,550, but is not included in the above calculation, amounts really, according to letter of Secretary Anderson released February 26, 1947, to the astounding sum of $17,536,218.74. And the end is not yet. If 1945 losses amount to $17,536,218.74 this sum added to the losses before 1945 which are admitted to be $70,868,282, the total through 1945 equals $88,404,500.74. And what about losses of the year 1946, which are admittted to be very high?

When all the reports come in, may we not expect to find that even the entire sum of the capital stock of this corporation, that has already been issued amounting to $70,000,000 and poured by the United States Government into this sinkhole, is entirely exhausted? We are surely warranted in assuming it to be gone in the light of the action of the Secretary of Agriculture who has held up all payments on cotton indemnities until Congress makes further appropriations.

This Corporation has, on its record, been "weighed and found wanting" and is still wanting, wanting, wanting—more money to keep its total of 945 employees on the public pay roll, notwithstanding its constant failures and losses in operation.

It has been reported, and I believe reliably so, that in many instances policies were taken by this Corporation on crops that were only planted and then abandoned by the farmer because it would pay him better to realize on his insurance than to cultivate and take care of his crops. Thus the chinch bug, the potato bug, the grasshopper, and the boll weevil had not only field days, but whole field seasons, under this crop-insurance plan, and increased, multiplied, and replenished their kind so tremendously until in some sections of the country they are destined to be difficult if not impossible to destroy.

In truth, crop insurance is tending to injure the farmer instead of benefiting him. Personally I have seen some fields of uncut grain long after the harvest season was past—fields that would yield, in my opinion, an average crop. Upon inquiry I learned that the grain was left standing in the field for the crows and other birds because it would cost considerable to harvest it and the farmer believed he could realize more from his crop insurance than would be possible if he harvested it. I am informed that this is a rather frequent occurrence in the cotton fields, and a potent factor in the great losses suffered there.

Since the losses in crop insurance have invariably been so heavy since its beginning, the time is at hand when it should be discontinued without delay. I hope this Congress that should be—and I believe it is—desiring to take this country out of the red, will no longer appropriate any money for the continuance of crop insurance but repeal the act in its entirety. Let the insurance people who are qualified in business assume crop insurance, if it is to exist at all. Let us kill the bill. Let us help save America from bankruptcy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the matter of crop insurance, I would like to say for the RECORD, in view of my conversation on the floor with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I approve the theory of crop insurance. I only regret that up to now it has not been possible for Congress and for the Corporation to devise a program that is workable from the standpoint of the country and from the standpoint of the producer, and I feel that the matter should be given further study by the Congress in the light of the experience which we have had.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Un-American Activities by Mrs. Julia W. Talmadge, president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript. He has been informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but he asks that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SLOVAKIA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, America and all liberty-loving nations should at this time concentrate against international situations which might bring about war in the future. I have, on several occasions, stated on the floor of Congress that the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter is our greatest antidote for future peace. Self-government, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion is as essential for smaller countries as it is for the large nations. Our Nation, during World War II, spent billions of dollars and sacrificed in lives and casualties to preserve the above principles in order to insure liberty and future peace.

Since VJ-day, aggression and tyranny has again been launched in certain areas of Europe. The latest example of persecution, unfair trial, and threatened execution for political belief is that of Dr. Joseph Tiso, former President of the Interim Republic of Slovakia. Dr. Tiso has been acclaimed a hero in the eyes of nearly all the people of Slovakia and the prevailing majority of Americans of Slovak ancestry. My attention has been called to the fact that over 80 percent of the Slovak American fraternal organizations have forthrightly declared themselves to be of the opinion that Tiso was a hero in the defense of the best interests of the Slovak people. During his presidency, Slovakia thrived, progressed, and developed internally more than it had during any 5 years of the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic. The communistic control now over the country of Slovakia will execute Dr. Tiso, a political prisoner, unless our Government intervenes. This communistic control is inflicted upon the people of Slovakia in spite of the fact that the election of May 26, 1946, gave over 64 percent of the total vote cast against the present government. The press is likewise controlled, at least to the extent that the newspapers cannot publish what they think. This is evidenced in the fact that four American newspapers have been barred in Slovakia. The present communistic government will brook no freedom of political thought; though the people voted for Christian democracy, they received totalitarian communism.

The archbishop of Slovakia testified at the trial of Dr. Tiso. He is and has been a respected member not only of the hierarchy of Czechoslovakia, but of the official family of Czechoslovakia, including its President, Edward Benes. Appearing as a witness for Dr. Tiso, the archbishop testified that—

> Tiso acted and worked in the interest of Slovakia and was never a traitor, and that his election as President of Slovakia was the will of 90 percent of the Slovaks at that time and was acclaimed by the bishops, priests, and ministers of both the Catholic and Protestant churches.

It is apparent that Czechoslovakia has been re-created with the aid of Moscow and that Moscow will undoubtedly demand the extinction of Slovak national leaders of ability and high intellect. The ways of the Communists are devious and it behooves us to understand more of the Slovakia situation. In the meantime, the least that freedom loving nations can ask is that the so-called peoples courts in the Communist-dominated countries in eastern Europe, refrain from

any further political executions or from liquidating political opposition by long-term imprisonment as in the case of Archbishop Stepanic. All of this adds up to the price we will have to pay to aid in the establishing of true democracy in the countries of eastern Europe to insure world peace.

In supporting President Truman's international program, we cannot be unmindful of what is happening throughout this region in Europe, comprising over 100,000,000 Christians who have nothing in common with communism. We have heard of political executions, imprisonment, and banishment of outstanding citizens in Poland, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other small countries. Thousands of brave Polish soldiers who fought to stamp out fascism are now prohibited from returning to their native Poland by a communistic controlled government. Americans are asking the question "do we not have at least a moral obligation to voice our protest against such trials and executions?"

The judge who presided at the trial of Dr. Tiso, previous to the trial, vowed personal vengeance on Tiso and was provided this opportunity by being placed in charge of the case.

These facts, though not appearing in the American press releases, are not disputed. Almost unanimously, the people of Slovak descent in America, are rising in protest to the impending execution of Dr. Tiso. I ask the Members of Congress to join with me in protesting this unjust conviction by interceding with President Truman and Secretary Marshall to use their good offices to prevent this injustice.

We might well apply the words of the Honorable Judge Robert H. Jackson:

> All experience teaches that there are certain things you cannot do under the guise of judicial trial. * * * You must put no man on trial before anything that is called a court, if you are not prepared to establish his personal guilt. * * * If you are determined to execute a man in any case, there is no occasion for trial. The world yields no respect to courts that are merely organized to convict.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

To Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE), for the week of March 31, 1947, on account of death in family.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, March 31 and April 1, on account of illness.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 26, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of my other duties and committee assignments, I am forced to resign as a member of the Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard Commission. Please consider my resignation effective as of this date.

I do want to thank you for paying me the honor of having me appointed a member of the Commission and I regret that I am unable to serve.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LOANS TO GREECE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, since 1824 when the new Greek Government, having fought a war of independence, obtained its first foreign loan from the London banks, that nation has been in financial bondage. The bankers of England and Europe discovered long ago that they had easy pickings in Greece. Year after year, they would extend large loans at top interest rates, and would take first mortgages on the revenue of the Greek Government. By 1843, the accumulated debts amounted to 66,000,000 drachmas. But that was just a beginning. There were the loans of 1879, for example, of 60,000,000 francs at 6 percent interest; there was the loan of 1881 of 120,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1884 of 170,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1887 of 135,000,000 francs at 4 percent interest.

It was natural that the London bankers should exact heavy service charges. Each new loan generally would provide for a certain amount of repayment on the old debt. Various requirements would be made for purchases abroad. All kinds of curious and interesting deductions were levied which made the net proceeds of these loans to the Greek Government comparatively small. The international London bankers did not let the Greek Government pay back the principal. They pushed the Greek Government further and further into debt, and constantly increased the service charges.

Indeed between 1879 and 1897, the Greeks paid a total of 470,000,000 francs for service and interest on their national debt, an amount corresponding roughly to the total amount borrowed, yet were unable to reduce the size of the total debt. On the contrary, their public debt rose from 1869 to 1893 from 137,000,000 to 823,000,000 drachmas.

But in 1897, Mr. Speaker, the bankers of London were just getting under way on bleeding Greece. There were two or three wars between 1890 and 1912 in the Balkans and the Near East in which Greece became involved. I would not suggest, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the bankers had anything to do with it. Subsequently, between 1912 and 1933, the foreign indebtedness of Greece rose from 840,000,000 gold francs to 1,650,000,000 gold francs in 1933. Somebody, Mr. Speaker, was making money, but it was not the Greek people.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1897 the London bankers apparently wanted to make sure that they would get their interest, so they arranged an International Finance Commission to control Greek Government finances in order to safeguard the interest payments on the foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government. This commission, by agreement with the Greek Government, received the income from government monopolies in salt, kerosene, matches, cigarette paper, stamp taxes, and the custom duties of the Port of Pireaus. At various times in 1926, and again in 1929, and again in 1933, new revenues were pledged in order to be sure that the interest on the foreign indebtedness was paid. The Treaty of Geneva, for example, established in 1927, added new revenues in order to take care of new loans. The International Finance Commission obtained the revenue from the alcohol tax throughout Greece. The custom duties of six new cities were added to the revenue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, after 1927, the only unpledged public revenue left to the Greek Government were direct taxes, miscellaneous excise taxes, and export duties. Believe it or not, this commission still today continues to exist.

Mr. Speaker, does the International Finance Commission still have legal status? Is the greater portion of all revenue of the Greek Government still pledged for the payment of taxes on the Greek foreign indebtedness?

In round American dollars, the Greek Government owes apparently over five hundred million to the international bankers. The interest and principal of 90 percent of all of these loans are payable at the Hambro International Bank of London.

Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know whether the loan proposed under the Truman Greek deal will go to pay off the bankers of London or whether it will go to assist the Greek people. Mr. Speaker, we should like to know whether or not the proposed loans to be made by us to the Greek Government will become a first mortgage on the revenue of the Creek Government or whether the international bank of London gets theirs first.

Mr. Speaker, from 1821 until today the international banks of London have received anywhere from four to five times the amount in interest, service charges, and other deductions—five times the amount they have actually lent the Greek Government during that period.

With the help of a corrupt monarchy, the international bankers have bled the Greek people and the Greek nation for five times what they have lent that country, and still today have by legal right the first lien, the first mortgage, on more than one-half of all the income of the Greek Government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people refuse to be suckers for a hundred-year-old scandal of international financial intrigue and blood-sucking.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of March 30, 1947]

TRUMAN'S "LOAN" PLAN GIVEN COLD APPRAISAL

For the benefit of those readers who came in late on our discussions of the $400,000,000 Greco-Turkish loan, we submit the following dialog in which the editor is being questioned by a young man who has been reading the newspapers and finds himself, as nearly everyone else, slightly confused on the subject.

Question. What is the real purpose behind President Truman's proposal to lend Greece and Turkey $400,000,000?

Answer. To stop the Russians.

Question. What are the Russians doing in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. Helping Greek and Turkish Communists to spread communistic propaganda and undermine the Governments.

Question. Are there any Russians in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No.

Question. Then what are we worried about?

Answer. England has decided that she can no longer afford to finance King George's regime and has turned the job over to us.

Question. President Truman stated that 85 percent of the Greeks favor the present Government. If that is true, how can the other 15 percent overthrow the 85 percent who are supporting the King?

Answer. That's what we would like to know.

Question. When did England make this decision?

Answer. Secretary of State Byrnes was warned of the possibility last October but the British acted only 3 weeks ago.

Question. Why does Russia want to gobble up Greece and Turkey?

Answer. For centuries, the Russians have tried to get control of the Dardanelles. They were stopped by Britain and France in the Crimean War. After Russia whipped Turkey in 1877, Britain and other great powers deprived Russia of most of the fruits of victory in the treaty making.

Question. Why are Greece and Turkey so important to the British?

Answer. To protect British oil interests and the life-line through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal and the road to India and other British Far East possessions.

Question. Will the proposed $400,000,000 loan keep the Russians out of Greece?

Answer. Not if they use force.

Question. Have there been any indications that Russia intends to invade Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No. So far, the Russians have been content to wage a propaganda war of nerves.

Question. Why can't the United Nations handle a situation of this sort?

Answer. The UN conceivably could succeed as it did in Iran where the Russians gave up their attempts to establish a government friendly to the USSR when the force of public opinion became too strong.

Question. Why didn't we try to solve this situation through the United Nations?

Answer. You will have to get the answer to that one from President Truman.

Question. Wasn't the UN established to stop potential aggressors?

Answer. Yes, but Representative GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida says it hasn't had time to catch up with world problems.

Question. Is this a good argument?

Answer. Not in my opinion.

Question. What about Turkey?

Answer. Turkey was Germany's ally in World War I and aided the Axis powers in World War II while posing as a neutral.

Question. Do you personally know this to be true?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If we are trying to stop the spread of communism in Greece with dollars, what about other nations facing similar situations?

Answer. They will all have communism for sale at a price.

Question. Will we loan them money, too?

Answer. Yes, if the President and his advisers are sincere in their crusade against communism.

Question. Do you have any doubts about that?

A. I don't like to question men's motives but there are certain political advantages these days in fighting communism. You may have noticed that the President is now determined to purge his administration of known communists. Some of us urged the same course of action years ago when Communists within the Government were being accepted in the best Washington circles as liberals.

Question. Is the Russian threat similar to Hitler's march in the Rhineland?

Answer. No. In Hitler's case, England and France winked cynically at the violation of the Versailles treaty because Great Britain's traditional policy of power politics always made her cuddle up to the second strongest power in Europe.

Question. What do you think of William Bullitt's recommendation that the United States should not "hesitate to use the atomic bomb to stop new crimes of Soviet imperialism"?

Answer. Bullitt is a volatile, unstable ass who failed in every ambassadorial post and thought he could persuade the Russians to like us by teaching them to play polo.

Question. Did Franklin D. Roosevelt get along with the Russians?

Answer. Very well indeed, by giving them nine-tenths of the Balkans, the Kuriles, Dairen, Port Arthur and half of the 20 billions in reparations from Germany and everything else that wasn't nailed down.

Question. I see the Turks don't want any strings attached to the United States loan.

Answer. That's right. When you offer to lend a fellow money, he sometimes gets arrogant about it.

Question. Why did Governor Dewey give the Greco-Turkish loan his support?

Answer. Hadn't you noticed? Mr. Dewey is running for president. His statement fitted in nicely with designation of March 25 as "Greek War Relief day."

Question. Aren't you in favor of helping the Greeks?

Answer. Absolutely. The resources of the International bank (formed for that purpose) could help stabilize the Greek economy. Greek credits frozen in London should also be used. A private charity drive for Greek relief would be enthusiastically supported in the United States. Actually, we have already given the Greeks $358,000,000 in food, clothing, medical and other supplies.

Question. Why then, don't you favor a Government loan and so forth as it has been called?

Answer. Because it is an open invitation to war.

Question. What do you mean by that?

Answer. Approval of the loan by Congress will mean that we have sidetracked the United Nations to take over Great Britain's traditional role as world policeman. It will mean that we are shaking our fist in Russia's face and warning her not to try any more of "that funny stuff."

It will mean that we are pledged to fight communism wherever it may exist and at whatever cost. It will mean that we are discarding world democracy for visions of empire.

It will mean that all of the high and lofty principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations have been scrapped.

It is a road that can lead only to war.

Question. But Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Secretary of War Patterson say they see slight possibility of war, and that "the sending of combat troops is not contemplated."

Answer. That "not contemplated" phrase, my boy, is better known as diplomatic double talk.

Question. What would you do about the spread of communism?

Answer. Communism is an ideology that cannot be stopped by sticking a $400,000,000 thorn into Russia's side. To quote an unknown author, "Communism will be stopped by something that works better."

No lasting support will accrue to communism unless it is believed to yield benefits which the capitalistic system cannot provide.

Let us demonstrate, as expressed by Allen Haden, formerly of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, "that our system is a living, breathing, satisfying system within which men and women live better and more freely than in any other."

Question. What did you think of Fiorello LaGuardia's remark that "conditions in the Balkans can't be corrected overnight or in 10 years—it will take a generation"? Also, his statement that we will rue the day we ever entered the Balkans alone?

Answer. I agree. But the military is already girding its loins for war.

The pronouncement by Admiral Chester Nimitz that "the Army and Navy are prepared for operations that might have to be carried on in the event of another national emergency" is ominously prophetic.

When top-drawer admirals of Nimitz's caliber start talking about "operations," they don't mean target practice.

Question. You sound mighty pessimistic, Mr. Editor.

Maybe I'd better start thinking about what branch of service I'd like.

Answer. That's no joke, son.

How about a nice, safe job in the State Department?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title 111 of the Second War Powers Act.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on March 28, 1947, present to the President, for his approval,

a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. A joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. A joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

505. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report sh wing credit operations through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

506. A letter from the Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

508. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the organic act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as well as the several States, in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of November 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government to grant employees leaves of absence for research and study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

512. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services, H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2331. A bill to amend section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2336. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2758. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2568. A bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; with amendments (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2856. A bill to provide transportation of passengers on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2857. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2858. A bill to provide a permanent civil-service status to certain Federal employees and reinstatement rights to former employees who have been discharged from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 2859. A bill to regulate the sale of essays or proofs of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2860. A bill to provide protection for designs for textile fabrics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2861. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2862. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services injuriously affecting the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide for the protection of the Dall sheep, caribou, and other wildlife native to the Mount McKinley National Park area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2864. A bill to provide that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into insurance contracts to insure producers of agricultural commodities against any loss in yields; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2865. A bill to provide a sea wall or other form of shore protection at the town of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2866. A bill to extend percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate to bentonite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2867. A bill to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2868. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide that the beneficiaries of certain Government employees who died between December 6, 1941, and December 21, 1944, shall be compensated for leave accumulated and accrued by such employees but not taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2870. A bill to amend the act approved February 25, 1946, permitting the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2871. A bill to amend section 302 (a) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 2875. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to operate the building known as the Capitol Park Hotel as a dwelling for Members of Congress and their employees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2876. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2877. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2879. A bill to authorize the unconditional grant of all interest of the United States in certain school buildings and temporary housing to educational institutions without consideration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the St. Louis World's Fair 1953, Inc., in the city of St. Louis, during the year 1953; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 165. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the administration of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to undertake an investigation with respect to the potato surplus; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging and recommending that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges, instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Valdez, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that road funds allotted the Public Roads Administration for new construction in Alaska be materially increased; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that an extension of the road in Chugach National Forest for a distance of approximately 9.6 miles to Point Whitehead be authorized and that funds therefor be specifically allocated from public roads and National Forest Service funds for such work in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish regulation W; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct with Government funds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of Miklos Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Henry Atmik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Alexander George Kalesky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Louis Angelefsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2886. A bill authorizing the sale under supervision of land of Richard Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2887. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Bernard Old Coyote, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Sternshein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Gaspare Vassura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Mattie A. Horner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Henrique David Fernandes Garim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2893. A bill for the relief of Chester Chuji Fujino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Domenico Salvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2899. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlingson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

286. By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Petition to the Congress from the distributors of TVA power; to the Committee on Public Works.

287. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 15 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

288. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition transmitted by Mr. R. C. Carpenter in behalf of Local Union No. 129, Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Frankfort Heights, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. Also, petition transmitted by Mr. Robert Harriman in behalf of Local Union No. 73; Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Marissa, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the officers and executive committee of the Maine State Bar Association, by Herbert E. Locke, secretary and treasurer, Augusta, Maine, expressing their approval and endorsement of the bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, H. R. 1639; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. Also, resolution of Assembly No. 3, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Lisbon Falls, Maine, Helen Tenco, president, and Mary Adams, secretary, urging congressional investigation of the Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

292. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6355, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that the full amount necessary to the usual efficient conduct of the Customs Bureau be provided in the Federal budget to insure that the operations of that important agency of government shall not be curtailed or rendered ineffective; to the Committee on Appropriations.

293. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. Treciokas and other Lithuanian displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making efforts to change immigration laws, permitting all Lithuanian refugees in western Europe to enter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of Robert L. Reynolds, Madison, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a proposal to

deal with strike situations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

295. Also, petition of the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. Also, petition of John Riner, president, group 9, SS. Cyril and Methodius of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

When we are honestly perplexed and have to do something, and are not sure what to do, we need Thy help, O God. In our choices let us not ask, "Will it work?" but, rather, "Is it right?" In this prayer we reach up to Thee. May we find that Thou art reaching down to us, and may we believe that when we are willing to listen Thou wilt speak. We wait upon Thee, O God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 1, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the world jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947, and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Prior to the call of the roll, may the Chair say that the Foreign Relations Committee presents the request that it be permitted to sit the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

(At this point Mr. BARKLEY yielded to Mr. WILEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MYERS, respectively, each of whom, as in legislative session, presented matters of routine business, which appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew my point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records. It is a unanimous report of that committee. It may be necessary later in the day to ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 27)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency amounting to $20,000, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment as contained in House Document No. 101, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, requested to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with a view to returning to the territorial government all public lands, particularly beach areas and areas suitable for public parks, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas there is only one United States district judge for the third judicial division (Anchorage), Territory of Alaska, and

"Whereas the population of said division has tremendously increased during the past 5 years, to the point where it is now the most populous division in Alaska; and

"Whereas the judicial duties in said division have expanded beyond the capacity of any one judge, and now require and demand the establishment of a second judgeship in said division to meet the need; and

"Whereas Valdez, Alaska, is the most centrally located municipality in the third judicial division:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges and recommends that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Valdez, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 14, 1947.

"Passed by the senate February 26, 1947."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, Commissioner of Public Roads and Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas there are 20,800,000 acres of reserve forest lands in Alaska comprising a major portion of shorelands in southeastern Alaska and embodying large potential resources; and

"Whereas for the past 8 years practically no new road construction has been performed in such forest areas; and

"Whereas funds for new road construction in such national forests allotted to the Public Roads Administration are proportionately less than for similar areas in the United States proper; and

"Whereas numerous road construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation projects are required in many localities in Tongass National Forest, including roads in and near Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka, Wrangell and Douglas, Hoonah, Klawock, Kake, and in Chugach National Forest, including roads in the vicinity of and near Seward, Cordova, Coopers Landing, and Turnagin Arm; and

"Whereas such roads would contribute materially to the settlement, growth, and prosperity of Alaska as a whole; and

"Whereas such roads are necessary to promote an orderly growth and development of that portion of Alaska held under national forest reserve:

"Now, therefore, it is requested that road funds allotted the Public Roads Administration for new construction in Alaska be materially increased; that such road funds be allocated on the basis of an equitable distribution to the forest areas in Alaska as compared to forest areas in other parts of the United States, and that sufficient new construction moneys, in addition thereto, be allocated to construct, reconstruct, and rehabilitate pressing road projects in the national-forest area in Alaska specifically enumerated in paragraph five above.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 17, 1947.

"Passed by the house February 27, 1947."

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, Commissioner of Public Roads and Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Public Roads Administration has already constructed approximately 3 miles of road in Chugach National Forest along the southern shore of Orca Inlet, in the vicinity of the city of Cordova; and

"Whereas such road is incomplete and does not serve its full and most useful purpose; and

"Whereas this road should be extended to tidal areas, salmon cannery, crab cannery, and residence areas in and near Cordova; and

"Whereas such road would traverse the forest area which would furnish lumber, ties, and piling, and would offer possibility of light agricultural development; and

"Whereas such road would open numerous small bays and inlets and would provide safe mooring for small vessels and satisfactory housing locations; and

"Whereas such road would provide access to what is known as Boswell Bay region, which has numerous opportunities and locations for camping and recreation, ocean-beach vacationing, small truck farming, and residence sites; and

"Whereas such road would connect the existing CAA installations at Strawberry Point to the present Cordova road system: Now therefore,

"It is requested that an extension of the above-named road for a distance of approximately 9.6 miles to Point Whiteshed be authorized and that funds therefor be specifically allocated from Public Roads and National Forest Service funds for such work in the Territory of Alaska and that construction of this project be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate, February 19, 1947.

"Passed by the house, March 3, 1947."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by approximately 600 residents of the city of Clinton, Tenn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP TO HONOR GOLD-STAR MOTHERS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution I have received from Buffalo County Post, No. 52, the American Legion, of Kearney, Nebr. It is signed by my good friend, Commander Joe B. Elliott, Jr., recommending that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Post Office Department of the United States each year honoring the Gold Star Mothers of the wars in which the United States has participated.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas World War II has been brought to a successful conclusion by the combined heroic efforts of the young men and women of the United States of America who suffered, bled, and died on the far-flung battle fronts of the world; and

Whereas those who were members of the armed forces of the United States during this great conflict are fully aware of and recognize that those who remained at home were largely responsible for the heroic efforts made on the battlefield, and that they, too, suffered equally with those who participated actively in the fighting, to include sweethearts, wives, and mothers, and that many of these mothers now suffer the agonies of the loss of sons, who have ceased to suffer and have gone to their great reward; that these heroic mothers should be especially honored throughout the coming years and should not be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Congress of the United States that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Post Office Department of the United States each year honoring the Gold Star Mothers of our wars; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators representing Nebraska, to the Congressmen representing the State of Nebraska, to the Department of Nebraska of the American Legion and to the national organization of the American Legion.

Dated this 9th day of January 1947.

BUFFALO COUNTY POST, NO. 52, THE AMERICAN LEGION, KEARNEY, NEBR.

By JOE B. ELLIOTT, JR., *Commander.*

Attest:

[SEAL] E. A. SNOWDEN, *Adjutant.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1010. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Patrick Afraid Of Bear; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. DWORSHAK) introduced Senate bill 1011, to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of George Abromopoulis; and

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1015. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 1016. A bill to authorize and direct the removal of certain stone piers in West Executive Avenue at Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 1017. A bill providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1018. A bill to authorize the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government to grant employees leaves of absence for research and study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1019. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1020. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, jointly with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], a bill to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and on federally owned property and in areas overburdened with war-incurred enrollments. Identical bills already have been introduced in the House.

This bill represents the thinking of the various Federal agencies concerned with these problems, and was written following a series of conferences between representatives of the agencies and representatives of the United States Office of Education. Its purposes are:

(a) To provide orderly payment under the administration of the United States Commissioner of Education of sums now payable and to be payable in the future by various Federal agencies for the education of children residing on federally owned, tax-exempt property;

(b) To provide a formula for the payment of Federal funds for federally owned property now making in-lieu-of-taxes payments in instances where those payments do not equal the actual cost of educating children residing on those properties; and

(c) To provide assistance for areas which are still overburdened with war-incurred enrollments.

The bill has the usual safeguards to assure that there shall be no Federal supervision or control over State or local school systems, and to provide for administration through the Commissioner of Education and through existing educational agencies on State and local levels. The bill also contains adequate safeguards in the expenditure of any funds to become available to implement the act, by specifying that State, local, and other Federal contributions shall be deducted in determining any grants to be made.

Those of us who have joined as sponsors of this measure have introduced it for reasons we conceive to be valid and sound. We believe the Federal Government must continue to recognize its responsibility for contributing to the cost of the education of children residing on federally owned property. In several instances in the past, in acts providing funds for several Federal agencies, Congress has acknowledged its responsibility to contribute toward the education of children on various Federal projects. In my own State school districts have received funds from the Bureau of Reclamation, from the Navy Department, and even from private contractors on Government projects. This bill is designed to provide for the orderly payment of any Federal funds to become available under its terms, through one instead of through several channels. The provisions under this title of the bill may very well be considered as a continuing policy and program.

Other sections of the bill provide for assistance in the education of children in areas where emergent situations created by the war impact continue to exist. These provisions are temporary in character. They provide a stopgap until certain Federal properties can be returned to local tax rolls. They permit States and local districts the necessary time to adjust their affairs against the date when the temporary sections of the proposed act will expire. In short, the bill establishes a fair formula to assist States and local school districts which are burdened beyond their normal means by conditions not of their creation. None of us wishes to spend Federal funds indiscriminately, and all of us are convinced this measure will afford relief in those situations which are actually deserving of Federal assistance.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1011) to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GEORGE ABROMOPOULIS AND HARRIS MOHAMMED ALI

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I call this matter particularly to the attention of the representatives of the New York Daily News and the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C. One of the bills is for the relief of George Abromopoulis, a resident of the United States for more than 30 years, whom the Government is now trying to deport, and the other bill is for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of George Abromopoulis; and

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER ON THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 26, the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, testified before the House of Representatives Un-American Affairs Committee on the subject of meeting the menace of Communism.

His statement, as usual, was a masterpiece of clarity, of straight-thinking, straight-shooting, and factual analysis. Mr. Hoover reported on the strength of the Communist Party, on ways and means of defining Communists and fellow travelers, on infiltration of communism into radio, motion pictures, and government and what America should do about it.

Mr. Hoover's basic suggestion was that pitiless light of publicity be used to expose continually the plotting of the Red Fascists. I feel that every Senator should have on hand copies of Mr. Hoover's speech. It has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but at this time I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statement be made a Senate document in order to insure its ready availability to all my colleagues and to constituents to whom they may care to send it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the regular meetings of the Committee on Public Lands are on the first and third Mondays of the month. However, in view of the fact that the committee is holding a regular meeting out of order on Thursday next, at which time, among other things, the nominations for the Commission on Indian Claims will be presented, I thought Members of the Senate would like to know that we are having the nominees before the committee on next Thursday, at 10:30 a. m.

THE SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS FOR MOVING GRAIN

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, numerous articles have recently appeared in the newspapers regarding the rise in the price of wheat. There has been a feeling by some that there has been hoarding on the part of farmers. We in North Dakota have constantly endeavored to secure a more equitable proportion of the box cars assigned for use in the Northwest so as to be able to dispose of our grain. In spite of our pleas, at the present time the Great Northern Railway has only 59.6 percent of its ownership of cars on its line, and the Northern Pacific has only 64.7 per cent. In North Dakota we have 90,196,000 bushels of wheat that the farmers and grain elevators want to market. There is only one way that the market price of wheat can be leveled off and that is to make more cars available for the farmers of the Northwest.

BUDGET PROBLEMS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE BY JAMES MARLOW

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently read an article from the Plain Speaker, of Hazleton, Pa., by James Marlow, Associated Press writer, entitled "Vets Administration Proves To Be a Big Job." This article, Mr. President, is written about as objectively as anything controversial could possibly be written. Mr. Marlow, the author, is noted for the dispassionate, objective, factual tenor of his articles, which are often masterpieces of clarity, even when discussing the most complicated and technical legislative matters.

I cite Mr. Marlow's reputation because in this instance he writes on a very touchy subject, insofar as this body is concerned. He is discussing the budget problems of the Veterans' Administration, the effect of a "penny-wise, pound-foolish" policy of economy in dealing with our obligations to that group of our veterans which, foremost among all veterans, deserves our genuine cooperation, that is, the veterans disabled in action, or suffering from service-connected illnesses.

This article reports that some Members of Congress did not like General Bradley's insistence that the Veterans' Administration budget was rock-bottom. It gives this quotation from General Bradley's testimony:

I am not trying to build this up. I did not ask for this job. I only took it because I was asked to do so and I am trying to do the best I can until I can be replaced, which I hope will be as soon as possible, because it is a thankless job no matter how done, and I am just trying to make the best of it and doing the best I can to carry out what I think the Congress intended.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate this article, including excerpts it carries of a letter to General Bradley from the administrator of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Topeka, Kans., who warned that the fine corps of physicians which the Veterans' Administration has recruited will disintegrate if the doctors are now led to believe that in caring for our veterans penny pinching is to become the criterion in the operation of our veterans' hospitals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by James Marlow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETS ADMINISTRATION PROVES TO BE BIG JOB

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Running the Veterans' Administration is a big job, and a tough one.

Because it's tough and getting bigger, President Truman more than a year ago borrowed Gen. Omar Bradley from the Army to run VA.

How does he like the job? Apparently, not much. He wants to get back to the Army as soon as he can.

But before listening to what he says about it, here are some of the VA problems.

The VA operates the veterans' hospitals, educates and trains them, gives them loans to buy homes, and handles their insurance.

There are billions of details mixed up in that.

At this time there are 18,300,000 veterans of World War II and other wars eligible for veterans' benefits of one kind or another.

VA is paying for the schooling of 1,700,000 veterans now in 10,000 separate schools and colleges.

Another 720,000 are training in 358,000 job-training places.

In January alone VA received 12,927,522 separate pieces of mail; its 4,000 contact representatives held 2,394,786 personal conferences with veterans in VA offices; they answered 955,840 telephone calls for information; they prepared 443,733 pieces of correspondence; and they assisted veterans in filling out 928,727 application forms for benefits.

General Bradley went up to Congress to ask the House Appropriations Committee for more money to keep the VA going.

The chairman, Representative TABER, New York, Republican, is very economy-minded and has been very eager to cut down the number of Government employees.

Mindful of this, General Bradley had sent out a telegram to all VA branches to keep down expenses and not hire any more people.

He read TABER a letter from one of the doctors running a veterans hospital, saying his people were in panic because of this order.

The general read the letter. TABER didn't like it. He told Bradley.

He was almost of the opinion that Bradley resented the idea of any cuts in the VA.

Bradley told him that wasn't his attitude, and then he cut loose with both barrels on TABER. The general said:

"I am not trying to build this up. I did not ask for this job. I only took it because I was asked to do so and I am trying to do the best I can until I can be replaced, which I hope will be as soon as possible, because it is a thankless job no matter how done, and I am just trying to make the best of it and doing the best I can to carry out what I think the Congress intended."

The letter he had read was a scorcher. It was from Dr. Karl A. Menninger, who's running the VA hospital at Topeka, Kans.

After relating his great trouble in getting doctors to work for the Government at all, he said the doctors now are saying:

"It is time for us to get out of this and into private practice and let the VA revert to the mediocre type of medical care it used to have."

Then Dr. Menninger told Bradley in the letter:

"We all realize that this is not your idea but that your hand is being forced and that certain Members of Congress think that this is just a political item.

"But they should know that there are many who are not politicians and not disposed to submit to political maneuvers. I came into this thing because I saw the possibility of developing a great thing for the veterans and the Nation.

"But I and many others like me will drop it like a hot cake if penny-wise, pound-foolish politics are forced upon it.

"I have read this letter to the administrative staff of my hospital and received their unanimous endorsement as to its accuracy and faithful representation of the local situation."

LAST MESSAGES OF DOOMED CENTRALIA COAL MINERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an Associated Press article which was printed on the front page of the Washington Post this morning entitled "In Face of Death—Last Letters of Miners Pathetic."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN FACE OF DEATH—LAST LETTERS OF MINERS PATHETIC

CENTRALIA, ILL., March 31.—The final words of 13 miners who scrawled in darkness on pages torn from a foreman's time book were published today.

The notes were in the clothing of the last group of the Expansion's 111 victims who were found Saturday morning. They had lived a possible 15 hours after the blast.

A notice on the rock face above their bodies advised rescue workers "look in everybody's pockets. We all have notes. Give them to our wives."

Names of the writers were withheld.

LOOKS LIKE THE END

"To MY WIFE: It looks like the end for me. I love you, honey, more than life itself. If I don't make it, please do the best you can and always remember and love me, honey. You are the sweetest wife in the world. Good-by, honey and Dickey," one note said.

Another, addressed to two boys:

"Be good boys. Please your father. O Lord help me."

Others:

"DEAR WIFE: Please take care of the children. Leave all to my wife. Love."

"Good-by. Give ——— family (sum of money). Put tombstone on all graves."

"MY DEAR WIFE: Good-by. Name baby Joe, so you can have a Joe. Love all. Dad."

"DEAR MOTHER AND SISTERS AND BROTHERS: I am fine at 5:30 p. m. It looks better, getting some air. ——— is in bad shape, moaning and going on. Take care of mother. Tell ——— I forgive her. See about security insurance. We won't all get out. We found a place in the air a little. The smoke was bad. God bless you all. Your loving son."

"Everyone going; all are gone but Joe Ballantini, Fred Gutzler, Ned Jackson of the joy (refers to machine) is here. Don't know about the others."

"DEAR SWEETHEART AND SONS: It's now 6 o'clock. ——— is feeling pretty low, but, honey, if I don't make it, sell the house and go live with your folks. Your mom and dad will take care of you and the boys. Please pray for me and join the church for me. Tell dad to quit the mine and take care of mom, not like this. Well, baby, and my loving boys, good-by as I am feeling weak. Lots of love."

"DEAR WIFE AND SONS: Well, hon, it looks like this is the end. Please tell mom and dad I still love them. Please get the baby baptized and sent ——— to the Catholic school. Well, I love you all and please take care of them and raise them a good Christian. I love them. Love to all of you."

HOME—POEM BY WILLIAM McKINLEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Home," written by William McKinley, of Convent, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

TO STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, THE UN—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Strengthen, Not Weaken, the UN," from the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM FOR IRELAND—LETTER FROM THE ANTI-PARTITION OF IRELAND LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter

to Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of England, from the Anti-Partition of Ireland League of Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON FORMER GOVERNOR EARLE'S STATEMENT ON THE ATOMIC BOMB

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Knoxville (Ky.) Journal of March 27, 1947, commenting on the statement by former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, concerning Russia's knowledge of and ability to manufacture atomic bombs, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN OF ATOMIC ENERGY TO THE MILITARY—STATEMENT BY LOUIS E. STARR

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Grant Dillman, published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 27, 1947, dealing with a statement by Louis E. Starr, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, proposing that control of atomic energy be returned to the military, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE—EDITORIAL FROM LOWELL (MASS.) SUN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Electoral College" published in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY CHRIS J. AGRAFIOTIS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Chris J. Agrafiotis, on March 25, 1947, on the occasion of the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Greek independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN BEFORE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McCARRAN before the national convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, at Chicago, Ill., on March 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can Spread of Communism Be Halted by Yankee Dollars?" by John S. Knight, published in the Miami Herald for March 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TURKEY AND GREECE—ARTICLE BY EDGAR M. WAHLBERG

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Turkey and Greece," by Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, published in the March 21, 1947, issue of the Community News, of Dearborn, Mich., which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be relieved from attendance on the Senate the week beginning April 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman and the nominations of members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], under the unanimous consent and agreement of last evening, is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me in order that I may straighten out the RECORD of yesterday?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a discussion between the Senator from Tennessee and myself yesterday, on page 2881 of the RECORD, near the bottom of column 1, in which the Senator from Tennessee, referring to Mr. Lilienthal, said:

None of his associates so testified, none of his friends, no public officer of any kind, Democrat or Republican. None of them testified, but he had three Communist witnesses.

Then the Senator from Tennessee named Mr. Hart, Mr. Frantz, and Mr. Cameron. At or near that point I rose and said to the Senator:

I simply wish to keep the RECORD straight. The three men to whom the Senator from Tennessee referred a moment ago as coming before the committee and testifying for Mr. Lilienthal—Mr. Hart, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Frantz—appeared after the repeated insistence of the Senator from Tennessee.

The Senator from Tennessee then said:

Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the record. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses.

I wish to correct one statement which I made yesterday. I do not believe that Mr. Cameron's appearance was requested by the Senator from Tennessee. To that extent I wish to correct my statement of yesterday. The fact is that Mr. Cameron called my office and said that he had been mentioned in the testimony, and wished to appear with reference to the mention of his name.

However, I wish to call attention to page 256 of the hearings before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, about the middle of the page, toward the end of a statement made by the senior Senator from Tennessee, as follows:

I also asked this committee, as I remember, and, in case I have not, I will repeat the request here. I think Mr. Henry C. Hart, in the interest of truth, ought to be summoned before this committee, so that everybody's doubt is removed.

I then asked:

Do you have any idea where his address is?

I quote from page 408 of the record:

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the chairman and this committee, time and again, to subpena, for their own satisfaction—not as my witness because I do not know him—for their own satisfaction I have asked them to subpena Mr. Hart. He is in the State of Wisconsin attending school up there. You can find him there any time and he has not been subpenaed.

I now refer to page 560 of the record. The woman referred to was not mentioned in the Senator's statement of yesterday, but she was summoned here because it was alleged that she was a Communist in TVA. I read from page 560:

Senator McKELLAR. May I ask the committee at this time to subpena forthwith Muriel Spear Borah Williams as a witness, for the reason that she stated to Mr. Starnes, of the Dies committee, on July 28, 1940, that she knew who the Communists were in the TVA but refused to name them, but admitting, however, that she was a Communist.

I read from page 561 of the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. All right, sir; and I also want the committee to subpena John Marshall Frantz, executive assistant to the Assistant Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority here in Washington. He is the John Marshall Frantz which this young man is putting up with, I believe. Is he not the same man?

I now read from page 747 of the committee record:

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I have been trying for several days to get Mrs. Williams—Mrs. Muriel Williams, of Atlanta, Ga.—before the committee, and I have not been able to get her. She has not been summoned yet. She says she will come if the committee wants her.

I read further from page 747:

Senator McKELLAR. I am sure she will come if you have a subpena telegraphed to her. Can you do that?

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly can, but we did not get her address until either Friday afternoon or Saturday. I expected her here this morning, in view of that report I got from the office.

Senator McKELLAR. If you will just tell your secretary to telegraph her, I am sure she will be here tomorrow morning. I would like her to be here.

I now read from page 753 of the committee record:

Senator McKELLAR. They could not have understood that from us, because we were doing everything, calling on your secretary almost every hour on Saturday and Friday, to get Mrs. Williams here. There was not any misunderstanding, because we could not get in touch with Mrs. Williams.

I place these excerpts in the RECORD because there has been some misunderstanding. I am sure that yesterday the Senator from Tennessee had forgotten that it was at his insistence that the alleged Communists were brought before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I had not forgotten anything. I thank the Senator for calling attention to the fact

that I constantly worked on the committee to have someone from the TVA here to testify for their man. He was associated with Communists down there. The question of their aims had arisen a number of times, and I urged the committee to bring them before it. They were not my witnesses. They were examined by the committee before they were examined by me. Ordinarily when I introduce witnesses I bring them before the committee.

The Senator has correctly read the record as to what occurred. I constantly chid the chairman of the committee, who is one of the finest men I know, to bring before the committee the Communist friends of Mr. Lilienthal from the TVA.

One of them was an open and notorious Communist who had resigned. Some were Communists who had been testified to as being Communists time and time again. I thought they ought to be before the Committee, since their chief, Mr. Lilienthal, went down to Birmingham and made a speech sponsoring a Communist-front organization. He even had some of his colleagues act as sponsors. I am not sure about both of his colleagues on the TVA Board. I do not think he persuaded Dr. H. A. Morgan, but he did get Mr. Pope and I think he got Mr. Clapp to sponsor the Communist-front organization known as the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. I must have asked about these Communist witnesses even oftener than has been suggested, because it was constantly in my mind to have them as witnesses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to proceed to discuss something else, since we discussed this matter yesterday; but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In order completely to clear the record, Mr. President, I read again, in view of the record which I have just read, from the statement of yesterday in the middle column of page 2882 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following:

> Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the record. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I did that. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses. I never brought a Communist witnesss into any controversy in my life.

I merely want the record to show that statement clearly.

Mr. McKELLAR. That record is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard the discussion yesterday. One of the observations which the Senator from Iowa made was that the committee had relied entirely on the President of the United States with reference to FBI reports on the nominees. As I recall the statement of the Senator, it was that the President said there was nothing in the files derogatory to these men. I am interested in this aspect: Did the chairman of the committee ask for the FBI reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Why were they not obtained?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because the FBI is not authorized to turn over to a Senator or House committee the records of their investigations if they have any.

Mr. WHERRY. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary for nearly 4 years. It has always been my understanding that when the committee requested FBI reports it was done through the Attorney General, and that the reports which were requested were furnished to the committee. They sent a man up with the report. That has been done time and time again.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. As is well known to every Member of the Senate, judicial appointments constitute a special exception to the rule, and always have.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the Atomic Energy Committee was denied the right to look into the files of the FBI?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is a committee of the Senate, and I know of no committee of the Senate, other than the Committee on the Judiciary, in connection with judicial appointments, that has been accorded the right to have access to FBI reports.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the committee subpena the reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It did not.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee has the power of subpena?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why did not the committee subpena the reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because it ran up against the well-known fact that it did not have a right to subpena those reports, as the law has been interpreted and as the rulings of the Attorney General have been repeatedly given.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I should like to see it done. I should like to see the chairman of the committee subpena those FBI reports, and see if the subpena is turned down. I do not know what the precedent has been, but it is my opinion that if the committee, which has the power of subpena, were to subpena those records the committee would not be denied. I do not see how it could be denied. If it should be denied, then it is time for Congress to assert itself. I am not saying anything about what the committee did, but I think that the membership of the committee, passing on the qualifications of these nominees, should have in its possession every record it desires; and I think that if the right is denied the time has come when the situation should be corrected by legislation, so that a committee of the standing of the one involved, with subpena power, could have FBI records any time they were desired.

Certainly a Senator who is called upon to advise and consent to a nomination should have every right that any employee of the FBI has to look over those records. That ought to be the right of the Senate. So I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa why it would not be feasible and why it would not be the right thing to do, to subpena those records and ascertain what is in the reports. If we rely upon the statement of the President, even though he be honorable and honest, he might go through the reports and not find something that the Senator or I might find. I think it is essential that we have the reports from the beginning to end, so that members of the committee can read them and make up their minds what the committee should report to the Senate. I cannot understand why any tradition or custom should prevail that would deny the committee the right to see the entire FBI reports on these men.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make reply?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not take too long.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall try not to do so. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that aside from the Judiciary Committee, I doubt whether he has ever sat upon a committee of the Senate that has been able to subpena an FBI report. I will say further, in answer to his question, that the FBI never made any investigation of any of the appointed members or the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. So there is no FBI report.

Mr. STEWART rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall complete my answer to the Senator's question at a later date.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wanted to make the same statement that the Senator from Iowa has just made; that is, that there has been no investigation by the FBI. I think that is the important thing. There has been no investigation of any of the members of the Commission on Atomic Energy, conducted by the FBI. The President's letter says, as I understand, that there is nothing derogatory in the files concerning these men. That is negative testimony. Any lawyer knows that such testimony is of no value. If a witness is asked if he heard a certain statement made by someone present at the scene of a crime, and if he says, "If he said that, I did not hear him say it," that is negative testimony. It is not worth a dime.

The Senate is charged with the responsibility of advising and consenting to the confirmation of these nominees, of giving its consent to the appointment of men whom the President recommends and whom, indeed, the President has named as members of the Atomic Energy Commission. It reminds me of playing what used to be called blind man's buff—pinning the tail on the donkey, with a handkerchief tied around one's eyes. It is difficult to find the proper place to stick the pin; maybe he will hit it and maybe he will miss it. It is a shot in the dark. This is negative testimony.

We have a right to have an FBI investigation, and not a "spot" check. Pulling something out of a file and saying "There is nothing derogatory" means nothing. There may be in the file a newspaper clipping, or something from the iniquitous PM to the effect that a man has not bought a new hat for Easter. Perhaps it is derogatory; perhaps it is not. It is negative testimony, and it is not worth anything. Since when have these nominees become so holy that the Senate cannot put its hands on them? They are no better than Federal judges, who are investigated by the FBI. Why can we not have an investigation? Why are not we entitled to have made an FBI investigation which will go to the roots of this matter? Under the law an FBI investigation is made of even the janitor who fires the furnace of the Commission; yet we are told that it is impossible to have the FBI make an investigation of the five nominees. Mr. President, the records of these gentlemen seem to be a sacred cow that cannot be touched. I think the FBI should make a real investigation of this matter, so that we may have it for our information, rather than be compelled to rely upon newspaper clippings which may have been put in the file and be told, "This is the record so far." Mr. President, even if we required the production of such newspaper-clipping files, they would have little value, for they are negative testimony; they mean nothing. I should like to have produced something with positive meaning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me say, if the senior Senator from Tennessee will yield to me for that purpose, that I believe the Senator from Nebraska misunderstood the discussion of yesterday with respect to the President's letter. I rose yesterday after the Senator from Tennessee had read a letter or message which I thought indicated, or at least created the impression, that there was something insidious in the files of the investigating agencies, and that we should get hold of those files and uncover the insidious material which was in them. I rose at that time, saying that we had the assurance of the President of the United States that there was nothing derogatory in those files.

I also say that there was no investigation by the FBI of any of the members of the Commission or of the General Manager.

I also say to the Senator that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has the power, as has been repeatedly stated on this floor, to use the facilities, the personnel, the equipment, and whatever else is authorized under the language of the act, of the departments and agencies of Government, but the Senate section of that joint committee does not have such power. That distinction is one which we must keep in mind. It is clear that the Senate section of the joint committee does not have that authority. If the Congress wishes to give the Senate section that power, I think it is a power which could well be used. But it was not in existence, and we have no power or authority to demand an investigation or to demand from the FBI the results of an investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to read at this point subparagraph (d) of section 15 of the so-called atomic-energy legislation:

The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof—

Mr. President, it would only be necessary to have the joint committee appoint the Senate section a subcommittee to do what I think the Senate section of the joint committee should have done—in short, to do what, Mr. President?—

is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

All in the world that it was necessary to do was to have the members of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was set up to inquire into the qualifications of these so-called nominees, ask the joint committee to appoint them as a subcommittee to do the thing I am asking the Senator to do today; namely, to subpena those records so that a subcommittee can go through those files from beginning to end and see whether there is in the FBI reports anything which would be of interest to us in either confirming or rejecting these nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Iowa the fact that even in the case of the Judiciary Committee at the time when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was chairman, when the FBI refused to let us see the record in certain cases, the Senate Judiciary Committee simply announced, "All right, gentlemen; there will be no confirmation until we get it." It did not take them long to produce it after that. Strangely enough, Mr. President, when that record was produced, although both Senators from the State concerned had recommended the confirmation of the nomination of that judge, and although every one of the members of the Judiciary Committee except one had voted for confirmation of the nomination, yet after we saw the record, one of the Senators from that State withdrew his endorsement, and subsequently upon this floor every Republican Senator but one, acting on the basis of that FBI report, refused to vote for confirmation of that nomination for Federal judge, and some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle—Democrats—also refused to vote for confirmation.

So, Mr. President, I think it is of the most vital importance that we obtain an FBI report. As I have said, we have a simple remedy: If they will not show it to us, let us refuse to confirm anyone for the position. Let us do that until the record is produced.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say again that there was no FBI investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I ask the chairman of the Senate section of the joint committee why an FBI investigation should not be made? If the Senator's position is that because no FBI investigation has been made, the Senator and his associates on the committee are not going to ask for the records, then I say that this nomination most certainly should be sent back to the committee until there is a chance to have an FBI investigation made. That is my view, if the position just stated by the Senator from Iowa is the position the committee is going to take. Certainly if five nominees for any position should ever be investigated by the FBI, these five nominees should be. I say to the chairman now that if there is no investigation by the FBI, then certainly we should require that one be made before we pass on these nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to resume the speech which I began yesterday. Before doing so, I desire to thank the various Senators who have interrupted, because I think the material developed in the course of the interruptions shows how necessary it is that the desired information from the FBI be made available. There is no reason in the world why it cannot be obtained, either by calling a meeting of the joint committee, if the Senate members do not have the power, or by following the advice of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and simply saying there will be no confirmation until the information is furnished. That should be done, Mr. President.

At this time I desire to discuss for a few minutes Mr. Lilienthal's political doctrine. Although he said he had no politics and was not a Democrat or a Republican—or even a Communist—yet his political doctrine is set out in a number of places in the record and also in one of his books. I wish to read it:

Our Government and every government—

Just think of this doctrine, Mr. President, for a moment—

is and must be a government of men, not a government of laws.

Mr. President, he does not bear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States or to the Federal laws which have been passed, not even to those concerning the matter with which he is dealing, as I shall point out a little later. He says the Government is a government of men, and that, so far as his activities are concerned, he administers the law. He first announced that doctrine years and years ago—if I remember correctly, in 1926. He has held to it ever since. He practiced it in Tennessee, as I have stated, and he paid no attention to the Federal

laws governing certain subjects in the TVA. He paid no attention to the United States civil-service laws; he paid no attention to the United States retirement laws; he establish a civil-service system of his own; he established a retirement law of his own; he had something to do with flood control; he established a system of flood control and selected his own manager; he disregarded the laws of the United States—paid no attention to them.

Lastly, he established an accounting system of his own.

Mr. Lilienthal does not work under law; he does not believe in law; he believes in a government by men, and he has practiced what he has preached; he has practiced it down in Tennessee.

Incidentally, he practiced it in Illinois and Wisconsin before he went to Tennessee. He disregarded the law. He took an oath in Wisconsin, when appointed to office there, that he was engaged on no other business, whereas his main business, conducted in Chicago, was directly opposite to what his business in Wisconsin was.

He does not believe in law. Look at his writings. By the way, while I am on that subject, I shall digress here long enough to call the attention of Senators to something Mr. Lilienthal wrote. I believe it is generally understood that Senators are Members of Congress. We have something to do with the Congress. We are one body—one branch of the Congress. What does Mr. Lilienthal say about us? He did not make any exception in favor of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], or my good friend on the other side of the aisle the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], or my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I shall read what he thought about the Senate. I read from his book, which has been greatly advertised, Democracy on the March. I read from page 190:

> More hazardous to democracy than such a dream of a ruling elite of managers and technicians, but not unrelated to it, is the growing contempt of "politics" and of Congress.

Mr. President, I differ with this distinguished author, this distinguished nominee whom we have not yet confirmed, that there is a growing contempt for the Congress. This is his formal writing. He prepared a book, in which he says he has a contempt for the Congress. I do not agree with Mr. Lilienthal that there is a growing contempt for Congress, and I doubt if there is a Senator present who agrees with him. If there are any, I should like to have them hold up their hands. I see no hands held up.

This man, whose nomination for probably one of the most important offices in all the world, must be confirmed by the Senate, if he is to function, wrote a book, which was published in 1944, I believe, in which he says there is a growing contempt of politics and of the Congress.

> This is nothing new or surprising from defeatists about democracy, and from reactionary forces generally. But to find this depreciation of politics spreading among progressives and especially among those who are administrators and technicians is a sign of great danger. The strongest expression of disgust and impatience with politics and with Congress—

Mr. President, I am sorry for some of my friends who voted for this man's confirmation in Senate section of the joint committee. I see but two of them present. How proud they must be that they voted for the confirmation of the nomination of a man for this great office, who expresses such contempt for them as Members of the Congress.

> The strongest expressions of disgust and impatience with politics and with Congress I have ever heard have come recently from men of great executive or technical ability in Government service and in business who tried to get an urgent war job done quickly, only to be delayed and even frustrated by what they describe as "political pressure," by exhausting congressional committee hearings, and endless conferences with legislators.

Do Senators know what Lilienthal will say when this is brought out, as it is now being brought out? He will say that he treated it exactly as he treated—let me recall who brought it out in the committee a few days ago—the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the latter our distinguished President pro tempore. Disregarding the committee and the Congress, and rambling on, as he frequently does, with his eyes down, he told them that he had taken over the business of atomic energy, and that he did not need the military. They had left on the first of January, when he took charge, and he saw no reason for the military in this activity, as I remember his testimony; and I think I recall it with a fair degree of accuracy. He did not want the military in it.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], excellent man that he is, said that did not suit him. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] instantly took Mr. Lilienthal to task, and in less than 5 minutes Mr. Lilienthal had taken all that back—he thought the military ought to be at least invited to come around and look at them sometime. He fumbled around as to whether they had any rights. He did not think they had any rights, but they might come and look and see what he and his associates were doing—disregarding Congress.

I wish to say to Senators who will vote to confirm Mr. Lilienthal's nomination, after his making that sort of a statement indicating disrespect for Congress, they will regret it but once in their lives, and that will be so long as they live on this earth. They will regret having voted to confirm a man who expresses openly, even if somewhat enigmatically, his utter disrespect for Congress.

It is the easiest thing in the world to tell what a man thinks by inference from what he says. Lilienthal says what other people are doing. Yes, but he is giving publicity to it, and as we who were familiar with the proceedings before the committee know—I was not a member of the committee, of course, but I was present at the committee meetings frequently—Mr. Lilienthal is a past grand advertiser for himself, and he thought, at the time he wrote this book, that it was a mighty good thing to criticize the Congress, inferentially, that it would add to the sale of his book; and I have no doubt it did.

We have heard much about this book recently. The pages from which I have read are 190 and 191. The Senators who voted in the committee to confirm his nomination and who will vote to confirm it in the Senate, in my judgment will do themselves a very great injustice, and do their constituents a very great injustice, because no man should be appointed to this great office who has such disrespect for Congress that he writes a book and in a round-about way, tells how he disrespects the Congress.

I want to say another thing about Mr. Lilienthal at this point. So long as he was the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority it was a government of men and not of law, except laws announced by himself. He believed in a government of men and not of law. He disregarded all the laws of the United States, unless they fell within his program of a government by men.

He is already undertaking now to do exactly the same thing in the Atomic Energy Commission. While he is not yet really a member of it, he has absolute control of the Atomic Energy Commission; and he is going to keep it, because he has got his two men, and so far as the record shows, the only two men that he recommended, Dr. Bacher and Mr. Waymack; which gives him a majority of the Commission. Depend upon it, Senators, his nomination, that is if confirmed, he is going to run the Commission without regard to the laws of the United States, but solely as he has done with the TVA, on the theory that this is a government of men and not of law.

Mr. President, if it is desired to turn over the control of atomic energy to Mr. Lilienthal, a man who holds this body and the entire Congress in disrespect, as set forth in the book he has written, all that is necessary is to vote to confirm his nomination. But if Senators still believe in law and order, if they still believe that no one man has the right under this great Government to override the law, if they still believe in a republican form of government, or in a democratic form of government, they will vote against his confirmation. No matter what may be said, no matter how fine the other members of the Commission may be, no matter who they may be, Mr. Lilienthal, for the specific purpose of his control of atomic energy, will use them, just as he took charge of poor old man Morgan in Knoxville when he was at the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Do Senators want that repeated? If so, they will vote for his confirmation. If Senators want this body treated with disrespect, they will vote for him; that is the way to do it. If Senators want to promote such a man to a higher office than he has ever held before, and higher than most other offices under the Government, or under any other government, they will vote for Mr. Lilienthal, and he will certainly be the man they want. If Senators have no respect for their colleagues, if they have no respect for this body, if they

have no respect for the history of this great institution, the United States Senate, whose roll has been adorned by some of the greatest names the world has known, they will go along and vote for Mr. Lilienthal at this time. But if they have respect for it, I am here to plead with them, and to plead with them most earnestly, not to vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I now come to my next reason for thinking these nominations should be recommitted. Mr. Lilienthal, although actually in the position of any other man who does not hold office, has already appointed certain men to serve the Commission. Mr. Lilienthal, himself, has been recommended by the President but he is not an official of the Government until he is confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, though I want to say to my friend, and I call his attention to it in the hope that he will change his attitude, that last Friday when I very respectfully asked the Senator to yield to me, he declined to do so, in a most vociferous and disrespectful manner, though he yielded to everyone sitting right around him who asked him to yield. I am merely calling it to the Senator's attention, because of my love and respect for his father. I hope it will have a good effect on him. I hope his conduct in the Senate will improve and that he will yield to Senators when they respectfully ask him to do so. I now yield to him under those circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. I certainly desire to apologize to him if inadvertently I did not yield to him last Friday. I recall that I had a number of interruptions, and I declined to yield to a number of Senators, in order that I might proceed and finish the remarks, which I was not able to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. The RECORD will not show that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to assure my colleague from Tennessee that I had not picked him out especially, not to yield to him; but I do wish to call the Senators attention to the fact——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator would have been in good company, because the newspapers, by direction of Mr. Lilienthal, have all been jumping on me for 2 or 3 months because I did not agree with the Senator on the marvelous qualities of Mr. Lilienthal for this office. So I am not holding the Senator responsible, any more than I am holding the newspapers responsible, but I am simply telling him, as I am telling the newspapers, it is not a very kind thing to do to a man who is holding public office and trying to discharge his duties properly. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Thanking the Senator again, I merely wish to keep the RECORD straight. The Senator has indicated that Mr. Lilienthal is acting more or less without authority in his capacity as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I most respectfully call the attention of the Senator to the constitutional provision which gives the President of the United States power to make interim appointments. The appointment of Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of the Commission were made under that provision of the Constitution of the United States, and under authority of the law of Congress. Certainly my able colleague from Tennessee does not mean to indicate that Mr. Lilienthal has assumed duties and powers more or less by a coup d'état, which he has no authority under law to assume.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, strange as that may appear, I do think that Mr. Lilienthal is not entitled to hold and conduct this office indefinitely. He was appointed. The interim period to which the Constitution refers was that period between the 12th of October when he was appointed and the 3d day of January, when the Congress met. His position now is exceedingly indefinite. I do not think he has any right, and especially I do not think he has a right to fill up his office with Communist appointees while his nomination is being discussed here in the Senate.

That brings me to my next proposal, as to why this matter should be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. Lilienthal has already appointed to the Commission three well-known Communists and is now arranging for the appointment of a fourth. He has appointed three well-known Communists as a part of his official family at the Atomic Energy Commission. I shall give their names to the Senate. By the way, he has not only appointed them, but he has passed a law in their favor to begin with, under some claim of right; that is, he has fixed their salaries at a higher level than the civil-service law permits officers of the Atomic Energy Commission to receive.

This is my eighth point. Mr. Lilienthal has appointed Communist Herbert S. Marks to be general counsel, at a salary of $14,000 a year; Communist Richard O. Niehoff, to be assistant general manager, at a salary of $10,000 a year; and Communist James Thomas Ramey, at a salary unstated. I believe he is going to permit Mr. Ramey to receive his salary under civil service, but the other two men, Mr. Marks and Mr. Niehoff, are too important for that, and in a moment I shall show the Senate why they are so important. Mr. Lilienthal has passed a separate law for them, and a little later I shall give the Senate the reason why he did so.

All three of these men were taken from the TVA before the Atomic Energy Commission was legally formed, and it is perfectly evident that the Communists are going to have control of the Atomic Energy Commission under Lilienthal, just as they have had control of the Tennessee Valley Authority under Lilienthal.

Joseph Volpe was appointed, too, but this is to be said for Mr. Volpe that there is no evidence to show that he is a well-known Communist, However, his brother is one, but whether communism runs in the family I am not now in a position to say. I do not know whether communism runs in a family or not. However, Mr. Volpe is a member of Mr. Lilienthal's cabinet.

All of these matters should be gone into fully by the committee.

I next come to my ninth reason why Mr. Lilienthal's nomination should not be confirmed. This and other reasons assigned by me are in addition to those presented by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Listen to this ninth reason. Mr. L. B. Bolt, Jr., was a witness before the committee. He was a former principal attorney for the TVA at a salary of $7,500 a year, under Mr. Volpe. I will say in passing that the record shows that Mr. Bolt was appointed as a young lawyer many years ago in the TVA. He was promoted eight times, if I remember the number of times correctly, and then it was found he was not a Communist, and Mr. Lilienthal had him kicked out. I received a telegram from Mr. Bolt, who lives in Knoxville, Tenn., where he is practicing law. He is one of the finest men we have in the State. The telegram in part is as follows:

> From my personal knowledge, based on actually seeing the drafts, observing him work on it, and frank admissions, James T. Ramey prepared the original draft of the Murray Missouri Valley Authority bill. Later Ramey made several trips to Washington to work with Herbert S. Marks, now general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission—
>
> At $14,000 a year—
>
> on redrafts of the Murray MVA (Missouri Valley Authority) bill. Ramey frankly admitted to me the purpose of these trips, which was on TVA time and (at TVA) expense.

That is not all, Mr. President. This is my tenth point—and I still quote from the telegram sent me by Mr. Bolt:

> In like manner, Ramey also admitted to me working with Herbert S. Marks in Washington in assistance to draft the McMahon Atomic Energy Commission bill. TVA travel vouchers should show these trips, although the real purpose may not be revealed.

Senators, what are we getting into? It looks almost like there was a very unfair situation in Tennessee. Mr. Lilienthal claims to be a lawyer, but I believe the record shows that he never in his life tried a case. He said he had something to do once with a case which the distinguished lawyer of Chicago, Mr. Donald Richberg, had charge of; but the record does not show that Mr. Lilienthal ever practiced law. After Mr. Lilienthal graduated he served in Mr. Donald Richberg's office for about 6 months or a year, perhaps a little longer, and then he went into the research business for the utilities organization out there known as the Commerce Clearing House but belonging to the utilities. That is all the experience Mr. Lilienthal ever had as a lawyer. He has never had any experience as an atomic scientist, because, as I stated yesterday, the first thing Mr. Lilienthal ever knew about atomic energy was after Hiroshima. He admitted that on the

stand, and there cannot be any question about it. Why should he be singled out for this great position under these circumstances? It seems to me, Mr. President, it is a great mistake so to single him out.

I come now to my eleventh point. I want to call attention to another thing in connection with TVA. I wonder how long it will be before Mr. James C. Swidler, general counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, will be taken over by the Atomic Energy Commission? Mr. Swidler has admitted in writing:

Ramey's first major assignment in the legal department in the agricultural and fertilizer field was the drafting of legislation providing for a national fertilizer policy and program and participating in the formulation of TVA policy. * * * In carrying out this assignment, he drafted the original Hill bill, S. 2035, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and assumed major responsibility for the drafting of the Hill-Bankhead-Flannagan bill, S. 882, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

What I have just read appears on pages 26 and 27 of a written statement filed by Joseph Swidler in the appeal of L. B. Bolt, Jr., and James H. Eldridge on July 16, 1946.

These questions should be examined into by all means. Are we going to let a great organization like that be controlled by Communists? Mr. Ramey and Mr. Marks are both Communists. Neither one of them appeared before the committee.

I am sure that the chairman of the committee will recall that I had a great deal to say laughingly—and sometimes probably a little more seriously—about their not coming before the committee. Why did not Mr. Marks, instead of having a half a dozen so-called distinguished men testify for him, himself appear and let the committee see him, if he was to be general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission? Why did he not appear before the committee? What reason was ever given for Mr. Marks having half a dozen Representatives and other notables testify in his behalf when his nomination was not before the committee at all? He was appointed by Mr. Lilienthal even before the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal was confirmed. He cannot be lawfully appointed until this body confirms Mr. Lilienthal's nomination. And yet Mr. Lilienthal has appointed three Communists, namely, Mr. Joseph S. Marks, Mr. Ramey, and Mr. Niehoff. He has appointed all three of them, who are Communists, to be attorneys at big salaries.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to reiterate to my able friend from Tennessee that there is nothing in the record, directly or indirectly, which indicates that any of the three men named by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee are Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read something, and we shall see. This is what the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] said. He is a very able Senator, and he made a wonderful impression on this body the other day when he spoke. On Friday, March 28, 1947, the Senator from Ohio read the report of Maj. Fred B. Rhodes, executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I read from page 2801 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Ohio was quoting from the report of Mr. Rhodes:

2. Herbert S. Marks, age 39, divorced, general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, previously employed in a legal capacity at TVA and Bonneville from 1935 to 1940. Associated Gas & Electric Corp., New York City, 1940–41. War Production Board, 1941–45. Department of State (special assistant to Secretary), 1945–46. The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed.

Expediency! Let me interpolate at this point. He did not appear before the committee at all. He had not even been appointed counsel; but someone had half a dozen witnesses come forth and testify in behalf of Mr. Marks. Why in advance? It will be remembered that at that time it was supposed, beyond question, that Mr. Lilienthal's nomination would be confirmed. I think some of the newspapers stated that he would be confirmed by 94 of the 95 Senators. The poor superannuated, worn-out senior Senator from Tennessee was the only Senator expected to vote against him. That was what was said, or the gist of it. I do not mean that those words were used, although some of them were. At any rate, it was expected that his nomination would be overwhelmingly confirmed.

Mr. Rhodes' report further states:

The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed.

Is it not a fine thing to start this great organization of the Atomic Energy Commission with the unconfirmed, temporary head of the Commission selecting counsel at a salary fixed by him at $14,000 a year, and placing a man like this in that position? The report further states:

He is said to have followed a policy of expediency in handling his work.

Not only has he been expedient, but his sojourns in various positions have been rather brief. For example, when the heat was turned on him in Tennessee, where he was working for the TVA, he left the TVA. Where did he go? He went out to the State of Washington. I do not see the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in the Chamber. He made an admirable speech here the other day. Mr. Marks went to the State of Washington and began to work for a Government corporation there. He was transferred. There was apprehension as to what might happen to him if he were kept in the TVA, with all the charges of communism and socialism that were being brought against him.

The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed. He is said to have followed a policy of expediency in handling his work.

He found it expedient to go from the Tennessee Valley Authority, where he held a fine position, to the State of Washington. Later he returned to Washington, D. C., and entered the office of the Secretary of State for a little while. I wonder what happened in the State of Washington?

He is believed by many to be completely a self-server.

We have seen examples of that sort. They never think of the public interest. They never think of the other man's position. They are thinking of themselves all the time. They are selfish, self-serving.

He has spoken in the defense of a number of left-wing individuals and groups. He is, or has been, a member of the Lawyers Guild and of the United Federal Workers.

I do not know about the United Federal Workers, but the Lawyers Guild is nothing in the world but a Communist front organization. We have testimony in the record. Let me read from page 239:

Senator MCMAHON. Those were the labor meetings held in the labor temple?

Mr. Bolt was the witness, and a splendid witness he made.

Mr. BOLT. No; Communist meetings.

Senator MCMAHON. Where?

Mr. BOLT. I don't know. This Muriel S. Williams in her testimony stated and testified before the Dies committee that she had attended Communist meetings with Herbert S. Marks.

Herbert S. Marks is the man, if the testimony given by Mr. Bolt is correct, who wrote the Atomic Energy Act, or he had another Communist write it and send it here.

Are we going to change our Government to a Communist government? I wonder if Russia will have so much influence that she can persuade us to change our splendid Government to a Communist government before she takes it over from us. I am not in favor of it if she does take that position. So long as God gives me the strength to sit in the Senate and vote I shall never vote for any measure which will give Communists control in this country, or for any man who desires Communist control in this country.

Something else was said about Marks. Marks appears in another place in this record, at page 920. Let me read it:

Mr. BARKER. Did you ever attend meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Another Communist who was testifying.

Mr. BARKER. And Melvin Siegel?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Melvin Siegel?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And Herbert Marks; you know Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, you see when you say this meeting business—yes.

Mr. BARKER. You knew Nelson Travis Barr?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Again Mrs. Williams testified that she attended meetings with Mr. Herbert Marks.

Will the Senate confirm the nomination of a man who has such disrespect for the Congress that he writes a book about it and takes such an attitude; such disrespect for Congress that he writes words in his book and then appoints among his first appointments, before he is qualified and his nomination is confirmed by this body, three well-known Communists? I understand that another one is coming here in a few days. I have forgotten his name, but I shall insert it in the RECORD. He is now being passed upon by other Communists to ascertain whether he is eligible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has been referring to meetings which Mrs. Williams testified she attended with different persons?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, did not Mrs. Williams testify before the Dies committee to this effect? I shall read the question which Mr. Barker asked her.

Mr. BARKER. How about Harry C. Bauer? He is technical librarian for the TVA. Did you attend meetings with him?

And did not Mrs. Williams give this answer?

Now, this business of attending meetings, it is also very general. I don't know what you are reading into the record as to what kind of a meeting, because when I say "meeting" I mean a group gathering of any sort.

I believe the Senator can say in all fairness that when Mrs. Williams testified before the Dies committee that was her statement, and when she said she attended meetings she did not necessarily mean Communist meetings.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken, because she was asked about Communist meetings all the time, and she testified about Communist meetings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, it was in hearings before the Dies committee, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am talking about Mrs. Williams testifying before the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee. She testified as to the fact that she attended Communist meetings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator does not take long; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I refer my able colleague to page 7764 of the record of the Atomic Energy Committee. Here is a question which I asked of Mrs. Williams, the same Mrs. Williams about whom the Senator has been talking:

Senator KNOWLAND. Did you see any policy-making official whatsoever of the TVA at any Communist meeting?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I did not, sir.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Did you ever see any of them at any labor meeting?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, the union had a regulation that the policy-making officials were not to be union members. And when people rose to positions of supervisory character, they automatically were dropped from the roll of the union.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator thinks that is an answer to the statement I read from the hearings I shall not bother about trying to change his mind. I could not change it, anyway. That is a very different situation, and refers to a different time. The Senator forgets that, according to Communist "red tape," Communists are required to deny they are Communists whenever they are questioned.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. When Mr. Hart was testifying before the Committee on Public Works I asked him the direct question, if, as a matter of fact, assuming for the sake of argument, that he had never advocated communism but was still a member of the party, he would deny it under oath, and he said he would deny it, because that is the teaching and doctrine of communism—never admit you are a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what they all testified in the hearings.

As one of the numerous reasons for recommitting these nominations to the committee, Lilienthal in his testimony stated that he "did his damndest"—and I put that in quotation marks—to keep from being appointed to this position.

Mr. President, the evidence is undisputed that he used a large $60,000 airplane belonging to and operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe they have four airplane pilots to operate this one plane. Mr. Lilienthal admitted that he went all over the country making speeches to show how much he knew about atomic energy—a lawyer who had never had a case; a man who had never had any scientific training either in college or elsewhere. He admitted he was not a scientist; and yet there he was, flying all over the country in a $50,000 airplane belonging to the Government, lecturing about atomic energy, concerning which he admitted he never knew a thing until about 2 years ago; and the probability is that he had never thought of it prior to Hiroshima. Mr. President, as you know, the ancients used to make investigations and experiments about splitting the atom. I asked Mr. Lilienthal if he knew about that. If I am not mistaken he said he had never heard of it. I may be mistaken about that, and of course I do not wish to do him an injustice.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a minute or two.

Mr. President, it now turns out that Lilienthal was never a scientist at all; but he was a writer and was educated as a lawyer, although he never practiced. Yet it is proposed that the Senate confirm his appointment to a position in which it will be necessary that he, as the holder of that office, shall know something about science.

Mr. President, if the Senate confirms his appointment what will happen? Then the Senate will be setting aside the man who had charge of that work, General Groves. Although the world has been trying to make this discovery for more than 2,000 years, and, as I said yesterday, although Alexander the Great had Macedonian scientists working on splitting the atom in the fourth century B. C., and although General Groves and those who worked under him made the discovery and thus brought great credit not only upon themselves but upon our entire Nation, yet in less than 2 years after it successfully won the greatest war which ever was fought among men, the Government of the United States proposes to turn out General Groves and those under him and appoint a research man who was educated as a lawyer but never practiced, a man who administered the Tennessee Valley Authority wholly improperly. That man is to be appointed in General Groves' place. Why should that be done, Mr. President? I wish to ask all Senators most earnestly how they can decide to vote for the confirmation of such a man. One Senator has said that the Senate should vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal because no one else will take the position. Mr. President, no one ever asked General Groves to take it. Why should he be turned out? Why should the Army be excluded?

Now I wish to refer to another book. As I said yesterday, the United States spent at least $2,600,000,000 in developing this great discovery. Nevertheless, in less than 2 years from the time when that discovery was made, it is proposed that we select a man—or some of us wish to select a man, I shall put it that way, because I do not think the Senate will ever confirm his nomination; I have too much respect for the Senate to believe that it ever will confirm the nomination of a man who lacks the necessary equipment for that office, as has been shown here—but in less than 2 years after the discovery was made, following attempts to make it, extending over a period of more than 2,000 years, the nominee, Lilienthal, has a plan for having the United States give away that discovery to other nations. It won us the Japanese war; the dropping of two or three such bombs over there brought about the winning of that war for us. But what does Mr. Lilienthal wish to do with it? Here is what he wishes to do with it as disclosed on page 31 of his Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy. However, Mr. President, before reading from the report, I realize that I owe an apology to the Senator from Louisiana for not yielding to him before this.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator very much, but he has passed the point which I wished to discuss.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very sorry. I would not have intentionally done that for anything in the world.

Mr. President, let me read to the Senate what Mr. Lilienthal says we must do about this discovery which cost us $2,600,000,000. Incidentally, we may have use for this discovery again. But would we have it if we had previously turned it over to Mr. Lilienthal? Let us see what

he says about it. I now read from page 31 of the report to which I have referred:

The following pages contain first a brief summary of the plan we recommend, and then an expansion going into some detail.

Summary of proposed plan—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous, or safe, operations.

Mr. President, that would not be done by our Government; our Government does not propose to sell it. But if Mr. Lilienthal has his way, he will give it away—will give away, in effect, the $2,600,000,000 which I spoke of yesterday, and which I said gave me a great deal of concern and trouble at the time when we were spending it, for I never hated more to vote for anything in my life. I was one of four Senators and four Members of the House of Representatives who knew something about it then, and it was a well-kept secret. But if I had remotely dreamed or had remotely surmised that after we spent $2,600,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States in order to make that discovery during the greatest war that ever was fought among men, as soon as it was over this Government would turn that discovery over to Mr. Lilienthal, to let him divide it among the nations of the world as he saw fit, I never would have voted for it, and I never would have asked my friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], or my friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], or any other member of the Appropriations Committee at that time to vote for that expenditure. I never would have done so in the world.

But Mr. President, listen to what Lilienthal says he wishes to do with it. Hear what he says about his big ideas. This is Lilienthal talking now—not Marks or Ramey or Niehoff, the three Communists whom he has placed temporarily in charge of atomic energy today—but this is Mr. Lilienthal himself speaking:

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission, or an international corporation or authority.

Mr. President, he seems to like the word "authority" because under an "Authority" he has all authority. I read further:

We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority.

Mr. President, the members of the committee treated him wrong when they redrafted the bill which was written by his two Communists. They should not have struck out the word "Authority." I believe they have given a little different name to it now. If it had been known that Mr. Lilienthal's two men, one of them his so-called general counsel, were going to do that, such action would never have been taken.

It will be recalled that we have not made peace with those engaged in the late war. It will be remembered that we loaned vast sums to Russia, England, and France and have received nothing or practically nothing in return from any of them. We do not know whether we are going to make peace with our enemies or our friends, the principal strife now being between Russia and England.

And here is a man proposing as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission who gets himself appointed in some way on a commission to determine what to do with atomic power and here is the Lilienthal-Acheson plan as reported by themselves.

It will be observed that he does not want to keep the bomb for our own protection and our own security. Oh, no, quite the contrary, he wants to give it, without money and without price, to friends and enemies alike, when he must know of his own knowledge that today we have only one rival and that our security and defense can only be interferred with by one possible nation and that is Russia, and yet this plan gives to Russia and all other nations the same right in it as we have.

The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous or safe operations.

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission or an international corporation or authority. We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority. It must have authority to own and lease property, and to carry on mining, manufacturing, research, licensing, inspecting, selling, or any other necessary operations.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field. This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives. The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands. These would consist of all activities in the field of research, except on explosives, and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles. National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules, and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like. The international agency would also maintain inspection facilities to assure that illicit operations were not occurring, primarily in the exploitation of raw materials. It would be a further function of the Atomic Development Authority continually to reexamine the boundary between dangerous and nondangerous activities. For it must be recognized that although the field is subject to reasonable division, the dividing line is not sharp and may shift from time to time in either direction.

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis. Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw materials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations, but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

This matter should be examined into by the committee before these nominations are confirmed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may present my views regarding the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator for that purpose, but I do not wish to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

COMMODITY SHORTAGES AND HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 188)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 2992.)

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it would contribute greatly to my peace of mind were I able to erase from my memory impressions and judgment on Mr. Lilienthal's methods gained a number of years ago.

It chances that I was intimately connected with the Lilienthal-Morgan controversy which resulted in the latter be-

ing put out of office as chairman of the TVA by President Roosevelt.

I had known Dr. Arthur E. Morgan previous to his connection with TVA. I had known his reputation as an engineer, particularly in connection with the Miami Valley flood control work, which was a splendid undertaking, splendidly carried out. I knew him as the president of Antioch College at Yellow Springs, Ohio. He conceived and carried out in that institution a novel plan of education which combined practical earning of a living with academic and technical studies, and served to bind, into a harmonious whole, living and learning during the learning period instead of leaving the student entirely without living experience, and forcing him to gain it by years of hard knocks after leaving the school for active life.

Dr. Morgan's ability as an engineer, his deep and well-rounded philosophy as an educator and his transparent sincerity as a man remained unquestioned up to the time he took the TVA chairmanship, and it remains unquestioned today.

The other two members of the TVA were Dr. Harcourt Morgan, an agricultural specialist, and Mr. David Lilienthal. The three men did not work well together. Troubles multiplied. In deep mental distress as to what he ought to do, Dr. Arthur Morgan consulted with his friends as to the wisdom of bringing the difficulty out into the public view. I was one of those whom he consulted in the matter. He drove all the way up to Vermont and spent a day with me going over the situation.

As to what the situation was, it developed in some detail on pages 328 to 366 of the hearings, whose record lies on the desks of Senators. I do not know how many Senators have read Dr. Morgan's testimony. I am sure that none of us can vote with the whole situation in mind unless he has read that testimony.

As you read it, it is important to remember this point: That in assessing the value of that testimony we are not concerned with Dr. Morgan's engineering ability or his executive ability. We are not concerned with the question of whether it was altogether easy for his associates to get along with him. We are concerned with but one question. Our sole concern is this: Was and is Dr. Morgan an honest man? To that question there can be but one answer: Dr. Morgan is transparently honest. From the viewpoint of the man with whom he was having trouble, Dr. Morgan was and is naively honest.

Mr. President, if the record recited by Dr. Morgan is true—and I believe it to be true—it is a damning record. The truth of that record has not been contested. Can any Senator read it and feel comfortable in voting for the confirmation of the man whose name is before this body for appointment as the head of the most important commission which our Government has ever set up?

When it became known that I could not vote for Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation many of my friends, men whom I sincerely love and deeply respect, dealt with me and sought to change my purpose. None of them, however, undertook to change that purpose by disproving the grounds on which my action has been determined. The plea was always based on the great abilities of the candidate, on the long delays in the organization of the Commission, and on the importance to the Nation of having an able administrator get the important work of the Commission going and under way at the earliest possible moment.

There are others who did not know me as well, who have adroitly intimated that my opposition to this appointment is really based on other grounds. It is alleged that I am an opponent of Federal power, and that this is the reason for my opposition. Mr. President, with regard to this allegation, there are two things to be said.

The first is that as I look over those who are supporting Mr. Lilienthal I find among them every natural opponent of Federal power; I find among his opponents no known opponents of Federal power, unless I may myself be so classed.

This brings me to my second point: I am an opponent of federally subsidized power. I have long objected to being taxed to help pay the electric bills of consumers in other parts of the country. I must similarly be opposed to taxing the citizens of other parts of this country to help me pay my own electric power bills.

That is the nature and extent of my opposition to Federal power—opposition to it only if the investment is not self-liquidating over a reasonably long period and so requires taxes for the maintenance of the low rate at which the energy is sold.

Trying to pin a tag of this sort on an opponent of Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation is a familiar and usually effective means of substituting innuendo for argument, where the argument is difficult to sustain. It is not the first time that this has been done. I would call the attention of the Senate to the attitude of the late Senator Norris toward anyone who intimated that the process of fixing atmospheric nitrogen for which the Muscle Shoals plant was built was outmoded, inefficient, and impracticable. Every competent engineer in the country knew that that was not the way to produce the needed nitrates. Yet, whenever that point was made to the good Senator, and he was a good Senator, whose ideals were of the highest, he picked up his rubber stamp and applied it to his inkpad and sealed the forehead of the protestant with the brand of Cain.

As to that seal, the image and superscription thereof was "Tool of the interests." Yet "the tools of the interests" were right and the Senator was wrong, as the event clearly showed.

There was a similar situation in connection with the campaign which resulted in the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That project was sold to the Congress and the American people as being a yardstick for determining the proper charge which private utilities should make to consumers for electric power. As a matter of fact, it never was and never could be such a yardstick for many reasons, but anyone who pointed out those reasons was charged with being "a tool of the interests" in the mind of the good Senator and of all the supporters of the project.

It was at this point that I had my own first connection with the TVA situation. I was at the time connected with the American Engineering Council, since dissolved, which was, at the time, the organization through which various engineering societies sought to work with the Federal Government.

In the course of our studies it became clear that it was actually cheaper in the Tennessee Valley to generate electricity from coal than it was to pay the amortization costs of a hydroelectric plant, all the differences being considered on a fair and equitable basis.

Becoming convinced of this, I corresponded with Dr. Arthur E. Morgan on the subject. He being an honest man, made no attempt whatever to prove what could not be proved. He took the ground that there was in this TVA project a great opportunity to see whether it might be possible to raise the standard of living of the inhabitants of a great socially depressed area of our Nation. That was a purpose and a point of view which I could understand. The TVA should have been sold to the Congress and the American people on that basis and honestly operated on that basis. It was not. It was sold under false pretenses.

A few months ago I was invited by Dr. Alvin Hanson to attend a seminar at the Littauer School, Harvard University. The seminar was conducted by Mr. Lilienthal, who gave an excellent and moving description of the social uplift which had come to the region as a result of operations of TVA. In the course of his talk he remarked incidentally and debonairly: "As for the yardstick—of course, that's out." The poor old yardstick had served its purpose, which was that of getting the appropriation for the Authority. It was never intended to have honest application to the price of electric power and was never so used.

For myself, this was a current confirmation of a conviction I held, which is that men's characters do not change unless they undergo a definite religious conversion. That our candidate has gone through such an experience has not been reported or, if reported, has not come to my attention.

I defy any Senator to read Dr. Arthur Morgan's testimony and then say that he would be willing to hire for his own business the candidate whose name we are considering for a position of trust so great that we find difficulty in defining its limits. The candidate is too clever, too slick.

Can any Senator find justification for approving appointment to such a position of a man whom he would not himself hire? That any of us should do so is inconceivable to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to continue for a moment or two with respect to what Mr. Lilienthal is going to do with the bomb. Mr. Lilienthal in his report continues:

The proposal—

That is his proposal—

contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field.

Now according to the testimony this discovery has cost us $2,600,000,000. I read that language again because it is very important.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field.

That means, if carried out, that Russia and Great Britain and France and all the other great nations and the smaller nations too, will have the control of the warlike features of the atomic bomb.

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to one point. What Mr. Lilienthal is asking for this year is an appropriation of $500,000,000 to carry on this activity, $250,000,000 in cash and $250,000,000 as a credit, making a total of half a billion dollars. What is it for? In part, of course, to distribute the warlike features to all the other nations of the world.

The Senator from New Hampshire is my successor as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am very happy to serve with him as a member of his committee. I have not talked with him about what the committee is to do; but very frankly I wish to say to him, as well as to the country, that, knowing of Mr. Lilienthal's actions in Tennessee, in Chicago, and in Wisconsin, I would hesitate a long time before turning over to him $500,000,000 for expenditure in 1 year. Instead of having $14,000 salaries for three of the leading Communists in the country, there is no telling what his salary list would be, and there is no telling how many Communists there would be in the organization. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that not only am I going slow myself, but I very much hope that my distinguished and able friend from New Hampshire will go slow in appropriating this very large sum—for what?

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives.

We have had all that. We have discovered how to manufacture the atomic bomb. It is proposed to give $2,600,000,000 worth of research to the other great countries of the world; but we are to continue to make improvements.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator reading from the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly am. They have not taken that back yet, have they?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that, regardless of whether Mr. Lilienthal or someone else is the head of this Commission, the principles of the Acheson-Lilienthal report have been officially adopted as the policy of this country, as probably enlarged by the Baruch report. So it would make no difference whether Mr. Lilienthal or someone else was the head of the Commission. Until that policy is changed, the Commission would be bound by the broad principles announced in that report and in the Baruch proposals, so far as the international handling of atomic energy is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are a long way from that now. The present act may not remain the law for a great while. I hope it may not. To my mind it gives authority to this Commission which ought not be given to any commission, no matter who the members of the commission might be. I believe that General Marshall is one of the greatest men in the country. He is certainly one of the greatest men in the Army. However, I would not be willing to turn these powers over to a commission headed by General Marshall, however much of an improvement he would be over the present head.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I dispute the statement made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Acheson-Lilienthal report is not the adopted policy of this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have never heard that it was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It never has been adopted by this country. The Congress has not adopted it. There may be some approach in it which Mr. Baruch followed in his work.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has resigned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; he is no longer there, and that report is not the policy of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his interruption. The Senator has described the situation exactly as I understand it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it is entirely correct to say that the Acheson-Lilienthal report as such has never been officially adopted as the policy of this country. What I meant to be understood as saying was that the Baruch proposals to the United Nations for the handling internationally of atomic energy have been designated by the President and by the State Department, and officially transmitted to the United Nations as the policy which this country desires to pursue in the international handling of atomic energy. I believe the record is complete on the point that the Baruch proposals were based upon the findings of the committee appointed by the Secretary of State. Mr. Lilienthal was the chairman of a panel appointed under that committee. That was the general, broad foundation upon which the Baruch report and the Baruch proposals were enlarged and based.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I still contend that the Senator from Iowa is totally in error in the statement which he has just made. The Acheson-Lilienthal report was a source of considerable embarrassment to Bernard Baruch, who arrived at his plans independently of that report. As a matter of fact, Mr. Baruch was kind enough not to make any serious public scandal about it, but the truth is that he was terribly embarrassed by that report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much.

I continue to read from the Acheson-Lilienthal report:

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives—

Listen to this—

The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands.

The underlying purpose of this report, whether those who made it so understood or not, is to place all of the war operations in the hands of an international committee. I think that is the last thing the Senate wants to do. So far as I am concerned I violate no confidence and no promise to anyone, given recently or some time ago, when I say that I am utterly opposed to dividing with all the other countries of the world this great discovery, one of the greatest ever made, at a cost of $2,600,000,000. If any other country could manufacture atomic bombs, it could drop them on us if conditions were changed. Who knows that they would not do it? Would any Senator want to have an international committee divide the supply of atomic bombs with all the world and take the chance of having them dropped on us in the future? If anyone is in favor of that, either he must be against America or he must believe that there will never be any more bombs dropped in the world. In my judgment there will be bombs dropped in wars of the future.

I shall vote against any such plan as this. I think it is one of the most un-American and unpatriotic proposals that has been made by any public man in a long time.

I continue to read from the Acheson-Lilienthal report:

These would consist of all activities in the field of research (except on explosives) and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles.

That is to be reserved by this country.

National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like.

The same sort of rules now in effect in the Tennessee Valley Authority, in violation of the laws of our Nation; rules relating to retirement, accounting, civil service, and various other matters, which have been established by Mr. Lilienthal since he has been in charge.

I do not know of anyone in his right mind who would vote for that sort of thing, and yet it is what we would be voting for if we vote to confirm this man's nomination.

I come now to the development agency. That is an international agency. I read further:

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis.

Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw materials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations—

Not the United States. Oh, no. It would not be proper for the United States to conduct these activities as to its own problems. We must turn them over to the United Nations—

but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

Whatever the formal organization, its integration with national structure would of course be one of the major problems. Measures to assure the proper degree of accountability to the United Nations and to individual nations, measures to assure that individual nations would have ample opportunity to be informed of the agency's activities, measures to make the agency responsive to the changing needs of nations—all these would have to be worked out with extraordinary care and ingenuity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of pages 31, 32, and 33 of the Acheson-Lilienthal report on the International Control of Atomic Energy be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the pages referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION III. SECURITY THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding sections of this report we have outlined the course of our thinking in an endeavor to find a solution to the problems thrust upon the nations of the world by the development of the atomic bomb—the problem of how to obtain security against atomic warfare, and relief from the terrible fear which can do so much to engender the very thing feared.

As a result of our thinking and discussions we have concluded that it would be unrealistic to place reliance on a simple agreement among nations to outlaw the use of atomic weapons in war. We have concluded that an attempt to give body to such a system of agreements through international inspection holds no promise of adequate security.

And so we have turned from mere policing and inspection by an international authority to a program of affirmative action, of aggressive development by such a body. This plan we believe holds hope for the solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. We are even sustained by the hope that it may contain seeds which will in time grow into that cooperation between nations which may bring an end to all war.

The program we propose will undoubtedly arouse skepticism when it is first considered. It did among us, but thought and discussion have converted us.

It may seem too idealistic. It seems time we endeavor to bring some of our expressed ideals into being.

It may seem too radical, too advanced, too much beyond human experience. All these terms apply with peculiar fitness to the atomic bomb.

In considering the plan, as inevitable doubts arise as to its acceptability, one should ask oneself, "What are the alternatives?" We have, and we find no tolerable answer.

The following pages contain first a brief summary of the plan we recommend, and then an expansion going into some detail.

Summary of proposed plan: The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous, or safe, operations.

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission, or an international corporation or authority. We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority. It must have authority to own and lease property, and to carry on mining, manufacturing, research, licensing, inspecting, selling, or any other necessary operations.

This chapter is not an attempt to write a corporate charter for such an international agency. It is the aim, rather, to show that such a charter can be written in workable terms, and that the nature of the organization and its functions will have decisive consequences for world security. We are satisfied that the differences between national and international operations can be exploited to make the problem of atomic energy manageable. This idea, we think, can become as familiar as the fact that the differences between individual enterprise and corporate enterprise have important consequences in the conduct of business.

If we are to do anything constructive in relation to atomic energy it must inevitably be novel and immensely difficult. We think that the weeks that we have spent in analysis of the problem have made it appear somewhat less difficult and somewhat less novel. A succession of such processes will be necessary, each building on the preceding analysis, before even the major ramifications of the problem can be understood and the major questions partially answered. What is chiefly important now is to describe the right course of action in terms sufficiently practical and valid to show that the further exploration is worth while.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field. This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives. The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands. These would consist of all activities in the field of research (except on explosives) and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles. National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like. The international agency would also maintain inspection facilities to assure that illicit operations were not occurring, primarily in the exploitation of raw materials. It would be a further function of the Atomic Development Authority continually to reexamine the boundary between dangerous and nondangerous activities. For it must be recognized that although the field is subject to reasonable division, the dividing line is not sharp and may shift from time to time in either direction.

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis. Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw materials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations, but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

Whatever the formal organization, its integration with national structure would, of course, be one of the major problems. Measures to assure the proper degree of accountability to the United Nations and to individual nations, measures to assure that individual nations would have ample opportunity to be informed of the agency's activities, measures to make the agency responsive to the changing needs of nations—all these would have to be worked out with extraordinary care and ingenuity. But certainly our experience with business and Government institutions, national and international, would afford a wealth of guidance in the development of such measures.

In the actual conduct of its operations the development organization would at all times be governed by a dual purpose, the promotion of the beneficial use of atomic energy and the maintenance of security. We believe that much can be done in a convention or charter to make these purposes concrete and explicit, to draw the line between the dangerous and the nondangerous, to establish the principles determining the location of stock piles and plants so that a strategic balance may be maintained among nations, to establish fair and equitable financial policies so that the contributions of nations to, and their receipt of benefits from the organization will be justly apportioned. The most careful and ingenious definitions will be required in order to accomplish these purposes.

In what follows we shall attempt to develop and expand the foregoing statement of essentials.

We can best visualize the Atomic Development Authority in terms of the answer to these concrete questions:

1. What will be the functions of the agency; what are the things that it will do?
2. What kind of organization is necessary to carry out these functions?
3. How will the organization be related to the United Nations and the individual nations that it will represent?
4. What policies will guide the agency in determining its manifold actions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday quite a to-do was made about Mr. John Lord O'Brian. If I am mistaken, I should like to have some Senator on the other side correct me. It was stated that Mr. John Lord O'Brian appeared as a witness for Mr. Lilienthal. If he did, the record does not show it. Mr. John Lord O'Brian appeared as a witness for the future appointee of Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. O'Brian was what might be called an interested witness, to some extent. He looked like a very fine man, and I have no doubt he is a fine man. But Mr. O'Brian reminds me of my old lawyer days. Mr. O'Brian is either a very fine lawyer or a very fine collector, one or the other. He is interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority. He did not testify for Mr. Lilienthal; he testified for Communist Marks.

That is the most remarkable thing I ever heard of—a man of Irish extraction testifying for a Communist. I do not believe I ever saw such an instance before. I do not recall ever having seen one before.

Why was Mr. O'Brian here? I shall refer to him for a moment. At page 22 of the record it is shown that John Lord O'Brian was appointed by Mr. Lilienthal on a board of advisers to recommend the appointment of a general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In his testimony for Mr. Marks, Mr. O'Brian referred to "kidding" Marks. This is another way of bringing out facts by humor. He referred to the fact that

he "kidded" Mr. Marks about the "revolution" that was to come. The real reason why Mr. John Lord O'Brian has been so much in favor of Mr. Marks is that Mr. O'Brian enjoys very fine fees through the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have some very unusual-looking documents in my hand that I want to put into the RECORD. Mr. O'Brian is a good lawyer. I do not know what his politics may be. Why was it necessary for the TVA, with all the legal force it had, to employ him? The TVA had Mr. Swidler, a great lawyer who used to work for Mr. Lilienthal for $17.50 a week, and a number of other lawyers. Why did they have to enter into agreements like the ones I hold in my hand? I wonder if Senators can see what kind of documents they are? If they will look, they will see these are photostatic copies. One of them reads as follows:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with the Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, ancillary proceeding; and *Georgia Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TVA 16,876, dated June 9, 1937, $25,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. Before my friend from Michigan came to the Senate he had the reputation of being one of the great lawyers of his State. He was an active lawyer and tried cases in the courts. I am just wondering if a fee like that, for services beginning June 9, 1937, to and including June 30, 1937, would not be a pretty fair fee. I am asking the Senator. He was going to interrupt me, but I wish to ask him that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was not going to pass upon the amount of the fee. Naturally, it would depend upon the nature of the services.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I shall have to admit that in 1937 a $25,000 fee for that service would have been a considerable fee. I was on the bench at that time, and my salary for the whole year was $15,500.

I wish to ask the able Senator who would have had authority or who did have authority to hire Mr. O'Brian at that time, and by whom was he hired to do that job?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was James Lawrence Fly, the General Counsel. Whether he had authority under the law I cannot say. But I shall read a little later——

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me inquire whether Mr. Marks had a legal position with the TVA at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection, but I shall examine the record and be certain about it.

Now I wish to call attention to another thing on the first pages:

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23d, 1937.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that the contract went up to June 30, 1937. That certification was made on the 23d of June. It is signed with a facsimile of Mr. O'Brian's signature, "John Lord O'Brian."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to get the dates clear in my mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read this document just as it is. There cannot be any mistake about it, because I am reading a photostatic copy:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority, George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TV-16876, dated June 9, 1937, $25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23, 1937.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

Mr. President, all three of those dates were in 1937—even the one which was furnished. So let me read further; there may be an explanation of it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not clearly understand the number of days of consultation for which that fee was charged. As I understand, there were only a very few days.

Mr. McKELLAR. This document shows that it was from June 9 to June 30. But surely there must be some mistake about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would represent a period of 21 days, and for consultation services over a period of 21 days $25,000 was charged.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what the document shows on its face in regard to those two cases, at least. I do not know what was done. I know that in the old days when I was a very busy practitioner—and I think I was one of the busiest who ever practiced in my city of Memphis—we did not get any such fees for any such short services, and, in fact, we got very few fees of that size at all. Yet we were very actively engaged in practice. As a matter of fact, there were scarcely any fees of that size at that time.

From the next page, which is also a photostatic copy, I read the following:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1938, under supplement to contract No. TV-16876, dated June 30, 1938, $25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This October 10, 1938.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

I hereby certify that the above services have been performed and this statement is hereby approved for payment.

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those two the same fee, or are they two separate fees for two separate services?

Mr. McKELLAR. When I read them, I thought they were the same. I do not clearly understand how it could be otherwise. But I shall read further, and we shall see. I now read the agreement, which is under the same sort of heading:

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 9th day of June 1937, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called "Authority," witnesseth:

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Authority, by resolution dated June 11, 1936, authorized the employment of John Lord O'Brian, attorney, and directed its general counsel to enter into a satisfactory agreement with Mr. O'Brian in the conduct of its constitutional litigation; and

Whereas John Lord O'Brian accepted said employment with the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel, and to date, at the request of the Authority, has attended conferences, studied, prepared, and represented the Authority in preliminary motions and other matters in various Federal courts in the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Company et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority;* and

Whereas the Authority desires to compensate John Lord O'Brian for services performed to date; and

Whereas parties desire a written agreement covering the services herein until the termination of the litigation herein mentioned:

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. John Lord O'Brian agrees to render legal services to the Authority, including conferences, travel, preparation of briefs, appearances at hearings, arguments in the district courts, circuit courts of appeal, and the United States Supreme Court, and incidental services connected therewith in the cases of *Tennessee Electric Power Company et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, when and as requested by the Authority.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of $25,000 in full settlement for services performed to the end of the present fiscal year in connection with the litigation herein mentioned.

I am in doubt as to what that means, but that is what it says.

I now read the following:

3. The Authority further agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937.

4. When John Lord O'Brian is away from his residence in Buffalo, N. Y., in connection with his services the Authority will pay him, in addition to the above compensation, a subsistence allowance of $5 per diem and his proper transportation expenses which shall in no event exceed his actual expenses or the cost of travel by rail under such conditions and including such incidentals as are allowed to Government employees under Government travel regulations. This pro-

vision shall include travel previously rendered in connection with services herein described, and shall authorize payments for travel heretofore or hereafter performed in connection with the services provided for by this contract.

5. The term of this contract is the period covered by the litigation herein mentioned.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
By JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,
Secretary to the Board.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the various photostat copies of the bills, contracts, and other documents to which I have been referring.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority; account No. TV-16876: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority;* for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TV-16876, dated June 9, 1937, $25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23, 1937.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

TVA audit of disbursements. Received June 24, 1937, voucher unit.

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority;* for the period up to and including June 30, 1938, under supplement to contract No. TV-16876, dated June 30, 1938. $25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This October 10, 1938.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

I hereby certify that the above services have been performed and this statement is hereby approved for payment.

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

TVA audit of disbursements. Received October 11, 1938, voucher section.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 9th day of June 1937, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called Authority, witnesseth:

Whereas, the Board of Directors of the Authority, by resolution dated June 11, 1936, authorized the employment of John Lord O'Brian, attorney, and directed its general counsel to enter into a satisfactory agreement with Mr. O'Brian in the conduct of its constitutional litigation, and

Whereas, John Lord O'Brian accepted said employment with the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel, and to date, at the request of the Authority, has attended conferences, studied, prepared, and represented the Authority in preliminary motions and other matters in various Federal courts in the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Company, et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander, et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority;* and

Whereas, the Authority desires to compensate John Lord O'Brian for services performed to date, and

Whereas, parties desire a written agreement covering the services herein until the termination of the litigation herein mentioned:

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. John Lord O'Brian agrees to render legal services to the Authority, including conferences, travel, preparation of briefs, appearances at hearings, arguments in the district courts, circuit courts of appeal, and the United States Supreme Court, and incidental services connected therewith in the cases of *Tennessee Electric Power Company, et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority; George Ashwander, et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority,* when and as requested by the Authority.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of $25,000 in full settlement for services performed to the end of the present fiscal year in connection with the litigation herein mentioned.

3. The Authority further agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937.

4. When John Lord O'Brian is away from his residence in Buffalo, N. Y., in connection with his services the Authority will pay him, in addition to the above compensation, a subsistence allowance of $5 per diem and his proper transportation expenses which shall in no event exceed his actual expenses or the cost of travel by rail under such conditions and including such incidentals as are allowed to Government employees under Government travel regulations. This provision shall include travel previously rendered in connection with services herein described, and shall authorize payments for travel heretofore or hereafter performed in connection with the services provided for by this contract.

5. The term of this contract is the period covered by the litigation herein mentioned.

In witness whereof, the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
By JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,
Secretary to the Board.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 30th day of June 1938, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called "Authority," witnesseth:

Whereas the parties executed a contract under date of June 9, 1937, for the employment of John Lord O'Brian in a consulting capacity and as special counsel;

Whereas John Lord O'Brian has served the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel continuously and effectively;

Whereas said contract of June 9, 1937, provided for the payment to John Lord O'Brian of "such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937," "upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties"; and

Whereas the parties desire to arrange immediately for the compensation of John Lord O'Brian for services performed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and to continue the terms of the aforesaid contract of June 9, 1937;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and the mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. The parties hereby reaffirm the terms and conditions of the contract executed on June 9, 1937, for the purposes therein set forth.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of $25,000 in payment for services performed to the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, in connection with the litigation specified in the contract of June 9, 1937.

In witness whereof, the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
By JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—NOTICE OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

To: Gordon R. Clapp, Director of Personnel
From: L. Duane Dunlap, Assistant Secretary
Date: July 26, 1939
Subject: Contract with John Lord O'Brian

The following entry appears in the minutes of a meeting held by the Board of Directors on July 20, 1939:

"There was submitted to the Board for approval a proposed contract with John Lord O'Brian providing payment to Mr. O'Brian the sum of $25,000 for legal services rendered during the fiscal year 1939, and providing further for the retention of his services for the fiscal year 1940. A true copy of the contract, labeled exhibit 7-20-39a, is filed with the records of the Authority. After examining the provisions of the contract and finding them satisfactory, the Board adopted the following resolution:

"'*Resolved,* That the Board of Directors hereby approves and authorizes entry into the contract (Exhibit 7-20-39a) with John Lord O'Brian;

"'*Further resolved,* That the General Manager, or in his absence, the Acting General Manager, be and he is hereby authorized and directed to execute the same for and on behalf of the Authority'."

L. DUANE DUNLAP.

(Two vouchers No. 39-24394—Public voucher for purchases and services other than personal—not printed in RECORD.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to make a very short statement with reference to why Mr. O'Brian was appointed. Mr. Robert H. Jackson, one of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court, was Solicitor General in 1938. He was Solicitor General during a part of the time when Mr. O'Brian was employed by Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. Justice Jackson is a very able man and a very fine Justice, and he could have performed that work probably just as well as could Mr. O'Brian, who charged such a large fee. Everyone knows that it is the duty of the Solicitor General of the United States to represent the Government before the Supreme Court. Why did the TVA ignore him entirely, and hire a private attorney?

Who was the Solicitor General in 1937? Mr. President, it was Stanley Reed. He is now a Justice of that Court. Who was the Solicitor General in 1938 when Mr. John Lord O'Brian got his second $25,000 fee? It was Robert H. Jackson, who also at this time is a Justice of the Supreme Court. Why did

Mr. Lilienthal ignore these two fine lawyers, who now are on the bench of that Court? It is just another instance of refusal by the TVA to follow the regular procedure and to obey the laws of the United States.

Mr. President, as will be seen there is another contract of a similar kind. It is dated a year later—1938. It provides for a similar payment of $25,000. In the first place, Mr. President, I do not know why a general counsel like James Lawrence Fly, assisted by all the other lawyers serving under him and being paid by the Government should have needed still additional lawyers.

Here is a receipt for that money, too; it shows that $50,000 was paid in those 2 years. I do not know whether it is still kept up, but the other day, when Mr. Marks came forward—not Mr. Lilienthal, but Mr. Marks—Mr. O'Brian appeared to testify for him. I suppose Mr. Marks was one of the lawyers of the concern at that time, and perhaps it was all right, I do not know, but Lilienthal was in charge of the TVA at the time this contract was made, and it could not have been made without his knowledge and consent. It seems to me that if by any mischance Mr. Lilienthal's nomination should be confirmed, provision should be made and perhaps penalties fixed to guard against such a situation. I do not know whether penalties would do any good or not; he might do as he did in Madison, Wis.

Everyone knows it is the duty of the Solicitor General of the United States to represent the Government before the Supreme Court. I wonder why Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Fly ignored the Government's representatives. We had a Solicitor General here to try cases before the Supreme Court. Why was it necessary to employ Mr. O'Brian? I do not know how many of these fees may have been paid. The accounts have not been submitted to the Congress, and that was one of the reasons why I introduced a bill several years ago, and succeeded in having it passed by the Senate, although the House did not pass it, requiring that an examination be made of the accounts of the TVA, and requiring the TVA to pay its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, as the Post Office Department does, and as every other department of the Government does. TVA is the only agency of the Government which is exempt from paying its receipts into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Lilienthal is a law unto himself. That corresponds with his well-known maxim that the United States Government, like other governments, is a government of men and not of law.

Mr. Lilienthal is very ignorant about the United States Government, because our Government is a government not only of law, but of the Constitution, as every American should know. I am surprised that Mr. Lilienthal, if he graduated at Harvard, as he said he did, did not know that this is a government of law and the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2803 of the RECORD, the history of Herbert S. Marks, as read by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], would indicate that Mr. Marks was employed in a legal capacity at TVA and Bonneville from 1935 to 1940—during that period.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. I note this in the third column at the top of page 2803:

> Mr. O'Brian told what Mr. Marks did in that Division. Finally he said, "But I know this man intimately. And any suggestion that he is a Communist or has communistic tendencies, or has subversive tendencies, is just sheer nonsense.

I assume that he was speaking from his experience after obtaining $50,000 in 2 years as fees, intimating that any man who had any tendency to communism would certainly not want to pay any such fees to a lawyer.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a great deal in what the Senator says, and I thank him.

Who was the Solicitor General in 1937 and what was the matter with him? His name was Stanley Reed, and he is one of the finest men in the United States, now a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have know Mr. Reed for many, many years. I knew him when he was connected with one of the Government departments, the Department of Justice, I believe it was. At any rate, I knew him a long time before he was appointed on the Supreme Court. I have always had the highest opinion of him, and I know, as well as I know my name, that if the Tennessee Valley Authority, through its general counsel, had called on Mr. Stanley Reed, Solicitor General of the United States, to represent the TVA in the case referred to, Mr. Reed would have done it. He is an upright, honest, hard-working, fine man, and makes a good Justice. I believe there was some other reason in this matter.

Mr. President, this is the way the man whose nomination as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission we are now asked to confirm acted with the TVA. If he threw away $25,000 to this friend and that friend and the other friend, there is no telling what would happen if we turned over to him the $500,000,000 a year he has asked for.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. It does not seem to me, from the record the Senator has read, that the attorney who was paid $50,000 ever appeared in the Supreme Court on behalf of the Tennesse Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those records do not show, but I assume he must have done it. Mr. O'Brian has a very excellent reputation as a lawyer.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; but it seems to me that in the time that elapsed there would not have been any case in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. One would not have thought so. It simply shows how the TVA was operated.

Mr. MOORE. What was the case? It was a case between the TVA and a power company, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a case between the Tennessee Power Co. and the TVA, and a case between George Ashwander et al., against the TVA, and the Georgia Power Co. against the TVA.

Mr. MOORE. I do not know what the case was, but——

Mr. McKELLAR. There must have been several cases. It certainly shows that the men who conducted that kind of an establishment in Tennessee should not be the head of this so-called world establishment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator have any further information, or can he give us any further statement, with reference to the number of special attorneys or counsel employed, who were paid fees during the period of time, outside the regular legal staff?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; this is the only one. I would put it this way: I am not consulted about what is done in the Tennessee Valley Authority, or how many employees they have. The Tennessee Valley Authority was organized against me in the beginning, has been against me all the time, and is still against me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I had in mind was whether in the hearings, or through the Senator's research and investigation into the matter, he has discovered that other consulting attorneys besides Mr. O'Brian outside the regular staff were hired.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the only one we found.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The claim has been made for Mr. Lilienthal that he has great capacity for this administrative job. It would be pertinent, would it not, to inquire about how he handled the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. How who handled it?

Mr. MOORE. How Mr. Lilienthal handled it, how cheaply he handled it, and how much he did without any authority in the expenditure of the Government's money. It was the Government's money, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I will say to the Senator that TVA has made many contracts with power companies. They sell most of their power to power companies. I see present the distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN]. The Alabama Power Co. buys a great deal of power from the TVA, or did.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have not interrupted the Senator, but I can advise him that I made an inquiry as to how much power of the TVA was at the present time going to private power companies, not only the Alabama Power Co., but other private power companies, and I was advised that of the power developed by TVA

about 15 percent is going on short-term contracts to private power companies.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not in accordance with what I have been advised. As I understand the facts are these: The Tennessee Valley Authority can sell power to power companies nearby, such as the Georgia Power Co., the Alabama Power Co., and various other power companies, cheaper than those companies could generate the power themselves. Why? It is because the Alabama Power Co., for instance, must pay Federal, State, county and city taxes, and it must pay interest on the bonds representing the money invested in it. But the Tennessee Valley Authority, under the great Mr. Lilienthal, does not have to pay interest except on $75,000,000 worth of bonds. It pays no interest on the other $925,000,000 investment. It pays no taxes. It therefore can sell its power, and does sell it, whether properly or not, at a cheaper rate than private power companies can produce it. The other power companies call on the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is why all the power companies favor Lilienthal in this fight. Almost unanimously, the power companies favor Mr. Lilienthal and a number of the other officers. I do not remember them; I shall produce that information a little later. They came to testify for him. The various power companies testified for him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will recall that the Senate passed an act amending the TVA Act, providing certain payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knew that?

Mr. McKELLAR. But not in lieu of Federal taxes. The Tennessee Valley Authority pays a certain tax, of which I do not know the exact amount, to the State of Tennessee. Whether the cities receive any part of it, I do not know. I do not think they do. I think it goes to the State. But it does not pay the United States Government a single, solitary cent. It pays interest on $75,000,000 only, of the billion dollars now invested. For that reason, it is able, by concealment of its books, by not furnishing them to the Congress as it ought to do for examination by Congress, it is able to sell to power companies at a cheaper rate than the rate at which the power companies are able to manufacture. Therefore all the power companies are strongly in favor of Mr. Lilienthal in this fight. They want his nomination confirmed; not only the Communists but the power companies want it confirmed. That is not all—some of the manufacturing companies want Lilienthal's nomination confirmed. All that is necessary is to read his list of witnesses. Generally, his witnesses were not persons who knew him; although some of them did. One witness I believe testified he had met Mr. Lilienthal but once. He liked him, though, and he was called as a witness. But what Tennesseans, what Iowans, what Chicagoans were brought here to testify for him? What witnesses were brought here from Wisconsin to testify for him? There is a telegram in the record from Phil La Follette, who was lecturing in Pennsylvania. He did not come to testify; he sent a telegram. I defy anybody to say what that telegram means. He employed Mr. Lilienthal once. Why? Mr. Lilienthal, while an employee of the Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, was prohibited by law from becoming at the same time a member of the Wisconsin railroad commission; yet he was appointed. He was prohibited by the very law that Mr. La Follette was undertaking to enforce in Wisconsin. Why should the Senate confirm him, especially in view of his statement that I read this morning, denouncing the Congress? He does not believe in the Congress of the United States, yet he seeks confirmation to one of the greatest offices in the world. That exemplifies the doctrine, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." That is the only basis on which a Senator could vote for Mr. Lilienthal, because he is certainly against the Congress. He shows it. I believe the Senate ought not to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I desire to go just a little further. It will be recalled, as I have frequently said today, that the discovery of the process of splitting the atom cost the United States $2,600,000,000. Mr. Lilienthal wants to give to all the world that secret, obtained at such a cost.

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED NATIONS IN SOLUTION OF GRECIAN AND TURKISH PROBLEM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield, with the understanding that I shall have the floor after the Senator concludes his statement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution; and I request that the clerk read it, and that it lie on the table under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 101), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States representative to the United Nations organization bring before the United Nations organization immediately, for its immediate consideration, the present problems which have arisen with respect to Greece and Turkey with a view to having said organization take such action with respect to such problems as it may deem necessary for the immediate solution thereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to preface what I am about to say with a sincere tribute to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has performed a most notable service in connection with the establishment of the United Nations organization. I want to compliment him as one of the chief architects in that great movement designed to assure the future peace of the world. He deserves, and has received, world-wide applause for his ability and leadership. After devoting months of effort to establishing the United Nations organization, I can well understand his misgivings toward the proposal to bypass the United Nations organization and intervene directly in Greece and Turkey by providing military aid, with both implements of war and military missions.

In very clear and unequivocal language, the Charter of the United Nations provides for taking "effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace." This is to be accomplished by collective action and not by unilateral action of any one nation. It is indeed the very basic spirit of the idea upon which the United Nations was built.

After introducing the bill providing for intervention in Greece and Turkey, the Senator from Michigan has proposed a preamble, denying that the United States intended to bypass the United Nations organization. This is merely a lot of pious words and one can imagine that when the officials of other governments read this language they will surely think he "doth protest too much."

The Senator from Michigan now proposes another amendment which will give to the United Nations the right to veto the action taken by the United States Government in extending aid to Greece and Turkey. When the statement is made that this eliminates all question of superseding the United Nations, I submit that this amendment is completely unrealistic. As a practical proposition, a majority of the members of the United Nations have the hope, prospect, and expectation of becoming beneficiaries of American dollars just as is proposed in the case of Greece and Turkey.

These hopeful nations would certainly not oppose the beginning of the new American foreign policy which visualizes an extension of aid to Turkey and Greece on the basis that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures.

I look with anxious astonishment upon this latest proposal which establishes the very unique principle of permitting an organization of foreign nations to veto legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States. The effect of it, of course, is to bypass a Russian veto by setting up a method to veto the veto.

The time has come to call a spade a spade and to deal frankly with the foreign situation that confronts us. The reason we are not willing to submit the question of military intervention in Greece and Turkey to the United Nations is because of the fear, if not the certainty, that Russia will veto such an action, and, because of that fear, we propose to undertake to do ourselves what the United Nations could and should do had it been organized on a basis of majority control.

In taking this independent action, we overlook some important factors of the most vital consequence. First, by taking independent action, we cannot very well

mobilize world opinion against the communism in Russia, which, in essence, is our new foreign policy. Affirmative action taken with majority support in the United Nations would mean that we would have the moral support of many other nations who would favor and support this action. The force of public opinion still remains the greatest force in the world, and we must use every force at our command to assure success of such a global venture in this troubled time.

Secondly, dependence upon military assistance in Greece and Turkey by the United States for resisting communism in those countries would overlook the great power which this country and associated nations could exert through economic sanctions and other measures for retaliation against communistic influence. Under pending proposals we appear in the contradictory position of with one hand dealing out money to Russia and her satellites, which will strengthen communism, and with the other proposing to deal out vast sums to oppose the aggression of communism. Russia owes us many billions for lend-lease. We have loaned her many ships. Only recently the Under Secretary of State appeared before Congress asking for an appropriation of $25,000,000 to send oil, equipment, and machinery to Russia as a gift. We are even now sending millions to Russia's satellites.

I agree that the time has come to act firmly with Russia, but we cannot ride two horses going in opposite directions. If the veto power given to Russia has made unworkable the existing United Nations organization, then we may as well face the situation frankly, but, at the same time, we must recognize the fact that the United States urged this tragic error. Despite opposition from other nations, it was at the insistence of the delegates of the United States that the veto power was given to Russia, as well as to all the so-called Big Five.

I say the time has come to be realistic and to reorganize the United Nations organization, if such action is necessary to permit it to function. If Russia is an enemy, and persists in being an enemy to free peoples, it is better to have her outside the family than inside the family. If we cannot get along with Russia, what is the use of trying to appease her at the council table as we have done from time to time, thereby strengthening her hand for a future show-down with us?

The first appeasement to Russia was giving her the power to veto any punitive action against her, regardless of whether she is an aggressor or not. I was strongly opposed to this first appeasement. Russia has so far used the veto 11 times and virtually stymied and made impotent the United Nations organization. There is no reason to think she will not continue this course unless her hand is called within the United Nations. Let us not repeat our tragic error with Japan, when, just before the war, we permitted her to purchase in America 10,000,000 tons of scrap metal out of which she manufactured ships, arms, and bullets for the slaughter of thousands of American boys.

As time goes on it appears that the Greek and Turkish crisis is not so serious as at first it was claimed to be. The 9,000 bandits menacing the Greek Government of 7,000,000 citizens are apparently being brought under control. England is not going to withdraw her troops immediately, as was first stated, and in the meantime America can continue her economic aid to Greece without violating in any way the spirit of the United Nations Charter. England, I am sure, will stay in Greece for a reasonable time, at least, if this country requested her to do so, in view of the fact that she received from us only recently a loan of $4,000,000,000 and, prior to that, about $30,000,000,000 in lend-lease. The war of nerves in Turkey appears to have subsided.

If the Greek-Turkish gift—and it will be a gift; not a dollar of it will ever be repaid—is made as a part of the global policy announced by President Truman, we are beginning interventions which will extend all over the world and which will continue for many, many years to come. We should not undertake this alone until we have exhausted every means to associate with us other like-minded nations.

I propose that we request our representative in the United Nations organization to present the problem of Greece and Turkey to this organization for action. It will first go to the assembly of nations composed of 55. If the assembly approves it, then it will go to the Security Council, where it can be nullified by a veto of any one of the Big Five. Let Russia, if she pleases, veto it, and then have a show-down with her, and, if need be, take steps to remove the veto privilege. If this means the retirement of Russia from the United Nations organization, it will be far better that she does so, because if she continues her selfish and obstructive tactics, there is no hope of the United Nations being a real instrument for the preservation of world peace. If we accept alone the terrific obligations of the new global foreign policy, our enormous expenditures in many foreign nations will weaken America, and Russia will get stronger. Today, too, we have possession of the atomic bombs, which give us a source of strength which we will lose if and when these bombs are destroyed, or when other nations obtain the secret. So there is no question in my mind that now is the time for a show-down with Russia within the United Nations organization rather than wait until we have been weakened by excessive drains on our economic system which may result in bankrupting ourselves in the effort to help bankrupt nations. It is far better to have at least the moral support of a majority of the nations of the world in such a gigantic undertaking rather than to go our way alone.

There is one other consideration to which we must give close attention. A foreign policy in America is only as strong as its public support here at home. Millions of our citizens, when they are called upon to make great sacrifice at home in the years to come for expenditures contemplated abroad, would much more willingly assume these burdens provided the machinery of the United Nations were utilized instead of bypassed with ill-advised, independent action on our part.

I am introducing, Mr. President, a Senate resolution providing that our representative in the United Nations be instructed to present for immediate action the question of Greece and Turkey to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Again, I respectfully submit that the last amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan is like going in the back door instead of the front. We have had enough of vetoes, and we do not want to establish another system of vetoes. Let us meet the issue face to face and not attempt to equivocate, because no matter what skillful maneuvering we do now to convince the people that we are not going outside the province of the United Nations, the fact remains that the basic principle of the United Nations was collective action to promote world peace. When we take unilateral action we cannot object then to other nations taking a similar course, which means the ultimate collapse of the United Nations organization.

In plain language, I propose a show-down within the United Nations with Russia and her communistic satellites. If the United Nations organization must be reorganized and strengthened in order to function, let us do so now. As a matter of fact the Truman plan may bring war, or the reorganization of the United Nations organization may bring war, or no plan may bring war, but strong measures within the United Nations organization are more likely to bring Russia to cooperation than an infiltration of American money over the world in an independent crusade against communism.

For myself, I started with the United Nations as the only hope I could see for future world peace. I will continue with it as long as the last vestige of hope exists for this agency to become the world instrument of peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia will be received and lie over under the rule.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. About how long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make a few remarks on the pending question.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may yield a little time, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may resume the floor when I shall have concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have placed upon the desks of Senators copies of the address which I am about to make, so that Senators may read and reflect upon the trappy, tricky mind of the bureaucrat whose nomination we are considering at the moment. He is typical of all bureaucrats. As will be seen from the record, he is for anything,

against anything, over anything, under anything, and all around it. He is all things to all men. He simply does not recognize the two words "yes" and "no."

The other day in the debate in which I took part with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] on the nature of the liaison between the military and the Atomic Energy Commission, I expressed deep concern over the unsatisfactory attitude maintained by Mr. Lilienthal in the hearings. The Senator from Iowa replied that the matter of military liaison had been discussed with Mr. Lilienthal on two occasions and that the Senator from Iowa had all his doubts set to rest by Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot come to the same optimistic conclusion. I not only have doubts on this point, but they are grave doubts.

When we passed the Atomic Energy Act we favored the position of civilian rather than military development of atomic energy. I see no particular harm in writing that principle into law as a long-range basis on which to act.

But we also made it clear that in the immediate future—the next few years at least—the military aspects of atomic energy are paramount for the security of the country. In these circumstances, the attitude of these new members of the Commission—and of the Chairman, Mr. Lilienthal, in particular—toward military liaison is of the utmost importance.

This must also have been uppermost in the minds of Senators conducting the hearings, because they made a special point of questioning Mr. Lilienthal about the matter. No less than five Senators pressed the point very vigorously, namely, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have read this testimony carefully and I am not at all satisfied with Mr. Lilienthal's attitude. I cannot agree with the Senator from Iowa that our security is properly protected by the kind of liaison Mr. Lilienthal contemplates.

The testimony on this point was brought out on two successive days. On the first day, January 27, it covers pages 11 to 16, and on the second day, January 28, it is on pages 24 to 27.

If Senators will read those pages carefully they will see an interesting performance. On the first day, Mr. Lilienthal's testimony was quite aggressively against letting the military in on the Commission's proceedings. He took the position that the military should be content to remain on the outside and wait for a hand-out of information from the Commission. I will give his exact words in a moment.

On the second day, Mr. Lilienthal raised the question himself. He had read the previous day's transcript and was clearly a little uneasy in his conscience about the high-handed way in which he dealt with the military. He backtracked quite a bit from his positive views of the day before because I think he realized that his views did not set well with Senators. He wanted his views to stand well with Senators, because they were the ones who were to pass upon his nomination to be a member of this great Commission.

In the course of this back-tracking he floundered all over in what sounds to me like a maze of evasion. He tried hard to give the impression that he was all for adequate liaison with the military while at the same time he left himself free to do as he pleased.

This is the testimony which the Senator from Iowa says convinces him conclusively that proper liaison will be had. I deny that. I say that Mr. Lilienthal left loopholes to his complete freedom of action which are wider than a barn door. Senators know how wide a barn door can be opened.

The proper way to show this is to read every word of the testimony on those 10 pages, and I am not sure but that I ought to do it that way. Perhaps Senators will do it on their own if I touch upon the high lights.

On page 11 Mr. Lilienthal gives the impression that the military should and will be in on the whole process of developing atomic energy. He makes this statement for public information and then, shrewdly, in the Lilienthal way, says he would like to discuss the matter further with the committee in "executive session."

But Senators do not always fall for such smart tactics. They pressed Mr. Lilienthal on the point. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado sought clear assurances on this military liaison.

The Senator from Michigan said:

Senator VANDENBERG. May I pursue that one step further? Of course, I entirely agree with you that this is contemplated as a civilian operation, but it seemed to me in your answer you drew a rather sharp distinction between the civilian operation and the military application. Do you mean by your answers that men of military background or military experience are not eligible, because of their background, to take part in the civilian operation?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; I didn't mean that, Senator. I meant that men in the active service presumably would not be—I don't know whether "eligible" is the word—would not be suitable.

To this Mr. Lilienthal gave an evasive answer. So the Senator from Colorado took up the questioning, and I want to read every word of this colloquy:

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to pursue that statement a little further. Do I understand that you call in the Military Liaison Committee only when in your judgment a military matter is involved?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No. That is what I tried to say is not the policy. Because it is our purpose to keep the Military Liaison Committee informed—that isn't exactly the terminology of the law, but it is something of that sort—not simply as to the weaponeering end, but as to the entire enterprise.

Senator MILLIKIN. Let me put it to you this way: Is there any restriction whatever on the military liaison so far as its ability to acquaint itself fully with everything that is going on in the Commission?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Not at all.

Senator MILLIKIN. There is no such policy?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No such policy is intended.

Senator MILLIKIN. No such policy.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Quite the contrary. What I was trying to bring out was this: You cannot say at any point up to the weapon that anything is "exclusively civilian" or "exclusively military." They are interchangeable. Therefore, the military liaison committee should be informed with respect to the entire operation, from mine to active material.

Senator MILLIKIN. No one will substitute his judgment for that of the Military Liaison Committee as to the field in which it is interested?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. The answer to that is definitely that it is up to the military liaison committee to decide what it regards as an appropriate military field.

Senator MILLIKIN. And there are no impediments which will be put in its way?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No impediments will be put in its way.

Senator MILLIKIN. I mention that because those of us who were most actively instrumental in getting this law adopted, considered that those matters were inseparable; that there could be no departmentalizing as far as the military liaison and the civilian activity are concerned.

Are we in complete agreement on that?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. We are in complete agreement. It is a matter of fact that they cannot be separated. They are virtually interchangeable.

Senator MILLIKIN. Does the military liaison committee understand that, as far as you believe and have observed?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I am confident of that; yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Have they kept themselves fully acquainted with everything that has been going on?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I am confident that whenever questions were asked they certainly received information.

Senator MILLIKIN. Are they in attendance at all sessions of the Commission?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; and we do not contemplate that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Why not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I think there is a distinction between these two things. One is the responsibility which the Commissioners have, and the other is the responsibility of liaison with the military liaison committee. There will be many joint sessions, and there will be a great deal of interchange of information. But it would be very difficult for the Commission to feel free to discuss many matters except within a Commission meeting.

Senator MILLIKIN. What would be the difficulty of that? I mean, how can the Military Liaison Committee know what is going on, unless they are actively participating in the discussions with the Commission as the Commission does its business?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I have difficulty in conceiving of that, Senator. But it would be comparable to the joint committee of the Congress, which has also a continuing responsibility, not simply by which they review matters, but by concurrent consideration of the problems before the Commission.

There will be nothing withheld from the Military Liaison Committee.

Senator MILLIKIN. But you are putting that as a matter within your own judgment and discretion as to what should be put out to the Military Liaison Committee.

I am suggesting to you that possibly the Military Liaison Committee should be privileged to attend all of the sessions of the Commission; and that if you do not permit that, the Military Liaison Committee has no way to protect its own responsibility.

Senator VANDENBERG. Senator, you mean as observers?

Senator MILLIKIN. As observers, of course. I do not mean that they shall vote, but I mean that they shall be present whenever the Commission is meeting.

Are we in agreement or disagreement on that?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; we are in disagreement on that, I am afraid, Senator. I think that would become very unwieldy.

After some further slipping around the question on Mr. Lilienthal's part, the Senator from Colorado observed:

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest to you, Mr. Lilienthal, that you have not met the intent of Congress that the Military Liaison Committee should be advised of everything that is going on in the Commission. Your observation, your formula, do not admit of that.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Because they are not present at all meetings of the Commission?

Senator MILLIKIN. That is right. I am not talking about the right to vote. I am not even sure that I am talking about the right of unlimited discussion. But it is the intent of Congress, I suggest, that they should have the right to know everything that is going on in the Commission. And they can't do that unless they are present.

Again Mr. Lilienthal began to fumble around. He wanted to keep the military at arm's length and tell them only what he thought good for them, but here were Senators quite disturbed over that prospect. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] insisted that "it will not be satisfactory if there is anywhere a single closed door to the military liaison or the congressional committee."

Finding himself rather groggy, Mr. Lilienthal rang the bell on this first round with the Senators by stating: "I would personally like to think about it first, because it is a new idea."

Imagine that. A new idea.

Here is a man who is palmed off on us as a great administrator and yet he had not thought through this most important but simple problem of military liaison. Here is a man who is supposed to have had a heavy hand in the Acheson-Lilienthal report dealing with all aspects of atomic development on a world stage. Yet the crucial problem of interim security of this country through complete military liaison is a new idea to him.

I cannot see how any of the members of the committee could vote for him in view of the fact that some of them made such a searching inquiry.

He had to think it over first. Let me tell you why I believe he had to think it over. He did not expect the problem to arise. He thought that because we set up a civilian commission the military was already on the outside and glad enough to take liaison in the form of hand-outs from him.

But the Senators upset him by their persistent and penetrating questions. He saw that they were greatly disturbed by his answers. And he wanted to gain time, to stall and to think up some slick answers. That is why he had to think it over first.

This whole performance is an eye-opener for Senators as to Mr. Lilienthal's character and methods if they will reflect upon the testimony I read.

It is an excellent demonstration of what Dr. Arthur E. Morgan described as Lilienthal's double talk. On page 11 he gave the impression that the military would be in on everything from start to finish. On page 14, he said that would become very unwieldy. When Senators appeared dissatisfied with his answers and plainly said so, Mr. Lilienthal quickly said he would think it over; it was a new idea to him. He made three definite statements in approximately three pages of testimony.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the second installment of this crucial liaison problem. It comes on the second day of the hearing.

Mr. Lilienthal sweated over his testimony of the day before. It is clear that he worried over the bad impression he made.

At any rate the question of military liaison was so important that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] picked up the point again:

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if Mr. Lilienthal and I are in any disagreement on the point we discussed yesterday regarding freedom of access of the members of the Military Liaison Committee and the Congressional Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

You will recall, Mr. Lilienthal, that I was insisting that neither this congressional committee nor the Military Committee could hope to confront adequately its total responsibilities if confronted with any locked doors when it came down to see your Atomic Energy Commission.

In reading over the record, it occurred to me that you might have misunderstood perhaps what I had in mind. I am not talking about an arrangement which requires the constant attendance of observers from the Military Liaison Committee or the congressional committee. I am not talking about any situation whereby you cannot proceed without the presence of these observers.

I am simply inquiring whether or not it would be your understanding that these observers can attend at any time, whenever they think they need to attend.

Here is where Mr. Lilienthal begins the further process of evasion and befuddlement. Let me read this reply to Senator VANDENBERG:

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I think what you have said helps on one of the things that troubled me, because my concern relates not to access to information, nor to liaison in any of its forms. It is essentially a question that relates to the administrative possibilities of this set-up. I think it can be worked out completely satisfactorily.

I have been thinking about it. I have consulted my associates. We do not believe we have the complete answer as to how and in what way these objectives can be achieved; but if I may, I should like to go back and trace the matter a few steps, as far as we have been able to think about it. And what you have said helps on one serious administrative point.

Now watch this gem of evasion in the following colloquy:

Mr. LILIENTHAL. As to our objectives, I hope that the record is very clear: That we see this atomic energy as interchangeably useful for peaceful development, industrial development, and so on, and as a weapon of war. That therefore there should never arise any jurisdictional disputes, let us say, as to the right of the military liaison committee to be advised about matters that might technically be described as non-military applications; that such question purely as a legalism should not arise; that there should be complete access to all information, sources of information, personnel, and so on, which in the judgment of the military liaison committee, as well as in our own judgment, those being independently exercised, as to what is a matter of concern to the military.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question there? In case of a conflict between your judgment as a Commission member and that of the military liaison committee on matters that they believe to be important to the military security of this country, whose judgment will control in your opinion?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. There would be no conflict, Senator. Because this is what I intended to say and what I would like to make very clear: It is the judgment of the military liaison committee which controls. I merely said our own opinion would be that things should be called to their attention which they, perhaps, on their own initiative, had not regarded as having military significance.

But I hope that is perfectly clear: We are not putting ourselves in the position of saying to the military liaison committee: "This is not military; therefore, it is none of your business." It is to be their judgment which is final as to its relevance. It will, however, be our policy; although we have not had much time to develop this, and it is a difficult thing, but it will be our policy—and that is fixed—to regard virtually everything as having some consequence in military terms.

Now, the question of how to maintain liaison and still operate this enterprise is an administrative question. The Congress has placed great responsibility for the conduct of a complicated and extensive business enterprise on a group of five men, sitting in virtually continuous session. That is the way we have been operating, and that is likely to be the way we shall have to operate.

Decisions come along requiring urgent attention. They sometimes will not await the passage of time. So we find ourselves making decisions or discussing possible future action virtually continuously. That is a unique kind of business management set-up.

And I want to be perfectly frank with you: There is yet to be any evidence that it can be operated successfully; I mean, in experience. I believe it can be done. I should not have attempted it if I did not believe it could be done. But I am sure that if it is done it will require a unique kind of set-up, a kind of managerial set-up that has not yet been developed.

And we should be careful—by "we," I mean everybody who is responsible for the result, and of course that includes the joint committee—not to weight down what is admittedly a difficult managerial set-up with and paraphernalia that can be avoided and still achieve the result.

I think it would clearly present a problem. I do not know what the answer is, but I think it can be worked out. It would present a very great problem if we had to so formalize our commission meetings—that is why I was so pleased at your reaction—that the meetings could be held only at stated times, because otherwise one could not get the full attendance of the liaison groups or even representatives of them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has not Mr. Lilienthal there clearly weaseled himself out of all he has said before?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. He said, "I think it would clearly present a problem," and then he said, "But I think it can be worked out."

The answer had been clearly and repeatedly indicated in every question asked by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and other Senators. Their questions clearly indicated what

they thought the answer was. Yet, after 2 days of discussion and debate, Mr. Lilienthal still recognized the problem, but did not know the answer, although he thought it could be worked out.

On the basis of that record, could there be any doubt that if access to the committee meetings were refused by Mr. Lilienthal and his cohorts, there could be no cause for complaint on the part of any Member of the Senate or on the part of anyone else in the United States? Has not he clearly indicated that he is reserving to himself the decision, and that the determination which will be made will be the one made by him, together with those of his colleagues who may agree as to how that shall be achieved?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is correct. Of course, it is very difficult to understand how the Senators who signed the majority report were able to use any part of Mr. Lilienthal's testimony as a basis for a report recommending favorable action on his nomination. It is most difficult to determine the part of Mr. Lilienthal's testimony on which they based their recommendation for favorable action on his nomination or the confidence they have placed in him.

I now continue to read Mr. Lilienthal's testimony:

> Well, I do not think that is needed, and I think it is would be fraught with real danger so far as getting the job done is concerned.
>
> As to closed doors and closed files and nonaccess, there are security problems in that connection which we ought to discuss in executive session, and which I anticipate we will be discussing, if I should be confirmed, every week or two with the committee as we go along.
>
> We cannot anticipate them, but there are very grave security problems involved. I think they can be solved. I am not sure quite how. But everyone knows that security is not simply a matter of the good faith or trustworthiness of people; the more people who have certain information the less secure, generally speaking, is the security system.
>
> We have the responsibility if there is a leak. Therefore, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not warn the committee that there is a problem there, and the liaison should be carried on with both bodies in a way to minimize that.
>
> So we want some time to work it out. I think it can be worked out. But there need be no situation where, upon request of the liaison committee or the joint committee, there will be nonaccess.
>
> Now, there also are rather formal provisions for liaison provided here in this law.

Mr. President, stop a moment to reflect on what we find in that incredible passage of slippery language.

First. Mr. Lilienthal will keep the military liaison group "advised."

Second. The military will have the controlling judgment.

Third. Each body will exercise "independent judgment."

Fourth. There will be no conflict.

Fifth. Military questions will be called to the attention of the military—by Mr. Lilienthal, I suppose.

Sixth. This is an administrative question. Think of it—a vital matter going to the entire security of the country will be "an administrative question," with Mr. Lilienthal handling the machinery.

Seventh. Mr. Lilienthal does not want his set-up loaded down "with any paraphernalia that can be avoided and still achieve the result." He regards this military liaison as nuisance "paraphernalia."

Eighth. After supposedly settling the question, Mr. Lilienthal says, "I think it would clearly present a problem." It is a serious problem, Mr. Lilienthal says, and he wants to warn the committee Senators about it. For 2 days they are so serious about the military aspect that they push Mr. Lilienthal doggedly and in minute detail. But here Mr. Lilienthal warns them there is a problem. He tells the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Iowa, and all the other members of the committee that there is a problem, so that they will know.

Is not this a most remarkable passage? What was settled there? Absolutely nothing except to leave Mr. Lilienthal wholly free to do as he pleases.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire should emphasize again at this point, if I may say so, the answer Mr. Lilienthal gave. After saying, "This is a problem"—and he made that statement after 2 days of discussion—he said, "I do not know what the answer is, but I think it can be worked out. We cannot anticipate them, but there are great security problems involved. I think they can be solved, but I am not quite sure how."

Mr. President, it seems to me that at the end of 2 days, Mr. Lilienthal there clearly indicates that although he recognizes there is a problem, he does not know the answer, although everyone else seemed to know that the answer was that the military and congressional groups should be allowed complete freedom of access. But after 2 days of hammering by the Senate committee, Mr. Lilienthal still was ignorant of the answer. In view of that record of his answers, I think no one can be surprised when, if the present nominations of members of the Board are confirmed, it is discovered that it will still take some time to find the answers, that there still is trouble about it, and that the military committee and the congressional committee may well still be hanging around cooling their heels for some time while Mr. Lilienthal is still seeking the answer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely correct. Mr. Lilienthal's record, as he has made it during the time I have known him—for 16 years—indicates that he knows how to be the big boss, once he has the power. He is courteous to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and other Senators now, because he seeks that power and seeks confirmation by the Senate. But once he gets that power, again he will show himself in his true light, and will be, as he has always been, a very ruthless administrator. He recognizes this because he concludes this passage with these words:

> So we want time to work it out. * * *
> There need be no situation where, upon request of the liaison committee * * * there will be nonaccess.

After this there was some further discussion and the matter of military liaison was finally disposed of in the following passage by Mr. Lilienthal:

> Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, as far as taking them separately is concerned: As to the Military Liaison Committee, I am completely persuaded that although with what time we have to work we have an admittedly difficult problem, that given the kind of good faith we can expect, and some ingenuity, a form of liaison can be devised which will provide real access, which will be really liaison, without running the hazard, that I am really quite concerned about: That we won't get anything done; that we shall have made the procedure so rigid and formal that it would be quite unwieldy to operate.
>
> As to the congressional committee, I should like to have the opportunity to discuss this further. But I am assuming that the committee's staff members who will be assigned to the Commission are not juniors, that they are directly responsible, and that, again, no rigid formula would be adopted that no Commission meeting can be held without the presence of such liaison staff members.
>
> And supplementing that by the assurances, on the part of the Commission, which will be complete and detailed, as to the information about what is going to be discussed, what is pending, and what has been decided, including copies of minutes, I believe a technique can be developed that will do this rather extraordinarily difficult job.
>
> So the answer would be, as I recall the question, that there is no reason at all why this cannot be made to work. And there is every reason to believe, that those objectives of liaison can be reached without any restriction on access, except those that perhaps the committee will agree with us are in the interest of maintenance of security.

Mr. President, all of this is an incredible performance. Here we are with the world in violent agitation. Our entire national security is involved. The atom bomb is the one new element in our security and the one real destructive weapon which can be turned against us if other nations get it or if our military are not in on all atomic development.

Mr. Lilienthal, who, it is proposed, should be put in charge of this great new Commission, blows hot and cold and all degrees of temperature in between. The military is to be in; it is to be out; it is to have the last word; it is only to be kept advised; it may recommend; it may request; it is a piece of nuisance "paraphernalia"; and finally Mr. Lilienthal has to work the whole thing out because it is an "administrative" question—merely a business of Mr. Lilienthal working out a formula to give the military a little peek as circumstances allow.

This is what the Senator from Iowa says is clear and satisfactory to him. I have a very deep affection for the Senator from Iowa, but I cannot agree with him.

Mr. President, it is not clear and satisfactory to me. I do not believe it will be clear and satisfactory to other Senators who are concerned with the security of their country in these perilous times. I do not beieve it will be simple to the people of this country when they understand the issue, and I think that any Senator who votes for Mr. Lilienthal will live to see the day he will regret it, and regret it very deeply.

What I want to know is, does the military get in on atomic development

from start to finish, as Mr. Lilienthal first declared? Or, are they on the outside to be kept advised only as Mr. Lilienthal also said?

Just as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated, I do not expect the military to operate as commissioners on Mr. Lilienthal's board. But I do expect military representatives will be present to know what is going on.

I do not want them on the outside waiting for a Lilienthal handout, when he deems it proper to make one available. National safety is too precious for Mr. Lilienthal to handle as an administrative matter.

Mr. President, Mr. Lilienthal's testimony is the kind of double talk we had in the TVA. Then we found that he ran it like a czar. He set up trick cooperative corporations with Federal money and then denied that Federal money was in them. He fought the General Accounting Office for years to prevent an honest audit of his books. He spent plenty of money on propaganda and self-glorification and charged it to regional development and demonstration projects. He made tricky allocations of funds between power, navigation, and flood control so as to set up a tricky yardstick on power rates. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan testified to this. The minority members of a House committee investigating TVA—mostly Republican—set it out in chapter and verse. There are other proofs if we have the time to set them up.

Mr. President, I do not want atomic energy handled in that way. But after reading these pages on military liaison that is what we will be in for with Mr. Lilienthal. But this time the very safety of our country and our people is at stake.

Mr. President, my reason for bringing this matter up and covering it so thoroughly this afternoon is because of the debate a few days ago, when there were questions and various interpretations about the relation between military liaison and Mr. Lilienthal. So far as I am concerned, for one, I am not satisfied, and when I am not satisfied I am not going to take a chance. I am not going to gamble with the future security of my country or the future peace of the world.

When one has any doubt in his mind or in his heart and votes for Lilienthal, he is gambling with the future of the Nation, the future security of all the people. More than that, he is gambling with the future peace of the world. That I am not willing to do, and I am not satisfied with the testimony of Mr. Lilienthal in any respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire, on the first page of his prepared address, in the first paragraph, stated:

> I expressed deep concern at the unsatisfactory attitude maintained by Mr. Lilienthal in the hearings. The Senator from Iowa replied that the matter of the military liaison had been discussed with Mr. Lilienthal on two occasions and that the Senator from Iowa had all his doubts set to rest by Mr. Lilienthal.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if he interrogated the military liaison committee as to how they felt about this arrangement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not interrogate the military liaison committee, but I interrogated the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, who are the heads, the appointed superiors, of the liaison committee. They expressed full satisfaction at the arrangement, and full confidence that the military liaison committee would not only be given full access and knowledge, but have the right to have it, and stated that it was amply safeguarded.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Iowa answer my question? I asked him if he interrogated the members of the military liaison committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I said at the outset of my answer that I had not.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator why he did not interrogate that committee, the committee which was to sit with the civilian committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because the responsible administrative heads of that committee are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. They are the ones that constitute the committee. They can change the committee if they want to. They are the responsible heads of the Military Liaison Committee. I consulted with them rather than their appointees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator answer a further question. He says the members of the committee are responsible to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Of course, that is so; and because they are military officers, they are ordered to this particular assignment; but that still does not answer my question. I should like to know whether the Senator interviewed the military personnel of the committee. Certainly what they thought is not what the Secretary of War might think, or vice versa. Why did not the Senator interview them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, for the third time, I will say the answer is, No; I did not interview the members of the Military Liaison Committee. I interviewed those who appoint and who are responsible for the decisions of the Military Liaison Committee, the Secretaries of War and Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Did the Senator interview General Groves?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I cannot say that I interviewed General Groves. I had two talks with General Groves about the matter sometime ago, in January. I think he went to Florida some time in January.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did not interrogate General Groves?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I said I talked to him twice. It was not exactly an interview.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator a question. I am not asking whether he had a social visit with General Groves. I am asking whether the Senator interviewed General Groves about the very thing of which we are speaking, which Mr. Lilienthal promised would be done when he consulted the Military Liaison Committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not; no. I did not talk to General Groves after Mr. Lilienthal gave his testimony. I did, however, on several occasions either visit with General Groves or interrogate him or interview him—whatever terminology the Senator may prefer—about the Military Liaison Committee and whether in his opinion it was a satisfactory protection for the military production of atomic energy, and I received his assurance that it was. That was last year, after the law had been passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator received assurance from General Groves that the law as passed by Congress was satisfactory. What I am asking the Senator is, Did he interrogate General Groves along the questions I have been propounding? Is General Groves satisfied with the Military Liaison Committee? Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator mean the members of the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to the way it is being operated by Mr. Lilienthal, to this day.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have had no communication of any kind with General Groves since the interview, or since the testimony of Mr. Lilienthal was given to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator have any communication with him before that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I recited the interviews I have had with General Groves about the Military Liaison Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I would ask the Senator again, whether, either before January or afterward, he has consulted General Groves as to whether or not he is satisfied with the Military Liaison Committee that has been set up by Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Military Liaison Committee has not been set up by Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. WHERRY. Or with reference to the nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission. Is General Groves satisfied with them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I have not specifically discussed his satisfaction with the appointees to the Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the distinguished chairman discussed with General Groves anything except the law? Has he discussed with him the nominees, or the prospective authority or the scope of the authority of the Military Liaison Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I have answered that question, Mr. President, two or three times. I shall be delighted to go through it again.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would do so. I should like to get it in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I told the Senator a moment ago that I had talked with General Groves about the Military Liaison Committee, its set-up under the

law, its functions, its rights, and its obligations. He told me that he thought that that was ample and sufficient protection and provision for the military end of the production of atomic energy and its control supervision.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there not a Military Liaison Committee now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is.

Mr. WHERRY. When was it set up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot give the exact date. General Groves is a member of it.

Mr. WHERRY. When was he appointed a member?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot give the Senator the date.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it after January?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was about 6 weeks ago, I think.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it after this investigation began, and when he was in Florida?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall. I do not know the dates when General Groves was in Florida, but it was about 6 weeks ago.

Mr. WHERRY. It was after the Senator talked to him in his office, was it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes; some little time.

Mr. WHERRY. That was after January 1?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; it was after General Groves was relieved as director of the Manhattan district.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he asked whether or not he would accept the appointment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the least idea. He accepted the appointment.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether he will serve or not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He is serving.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether he will continue to serve or not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He is continuing to serve up until this moment. I do not know whether he will serve tomorrow or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did not the Senator subpena him, in order that the facts might be brought out before the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I went through that the other day, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator the other day. I would like to ask why did not the Senator call him before the committee, so that he might be examined?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. General Groves is an officer of the Regular Establishment, and my experience with officers is that they either announce the policy of their commanding officer, or they do not give their opinions on these matters.

Mr. WHERRY. That might be the opinion of the Senator, but that certainly does not excuse the committee from subpenaing General Groves and asking some of the questions I have asked the Senator. The committee did not do that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I cannot read the variations of the Senator's mind. I could not know what questions he would ask General Groves. I had no way of anticipating what questions he was going to ask, or will ask me, so I could not call General Groves and ask him the questions that the Senator from Nebraska either has asked or is apt to ask me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is what I would have asked General Groves. The first thing I should have asked him is this: "Do you feel that in this set up, under Mr. Lilienthal, the Military Liaison Committee will be given the information it should be given as it proceeds under this commission, under Mr. Lilienthal? Are you satisfied with that set-up?"

I would ask Mr. Groves why it was that Mr. Lilienthal did not reemploy Colonel Nichols, a man who knows more about atomic energy than any other man in the military service, and, I think, more than any civilian operator in this country?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President I can answer the question about Colonel Nichols.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can answer the question any time the Senator wants to know.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; but I should like to continue for a moment. I would ask General Groves why it was that he did not reemploy General Farrell, one of the outstanding men on military practice in connection with atomic energy in this country? Colonel Nichols is now serving as a professor at West Point, wasting his energy, wasting his knowledge. He is one of the best authorities on atomic energy in this country.

I would like to ask if the men who took their places are satisfactory. I think the Senate has a right to know that. I think those are important questions.

The second thing I would ask is this: How many times has Mr. Lilienthal consulted the military since he took over? How many times has Mr. Lilienthal consulted with General Groves? The other day, on the floor, the distinguished Senator from Iowa stated that he had consulted with him, I think, three times, before January 1; and then, as I recall the record, there were remarks or observations made here that he had consulted him several times after that. But I am here to ask the question whether Mr. Lilienthal consulted with General Groves officially about atomic energy, since he was made chairman of the civilian commission? Has he asked his advice? I should like to hear the truth of the matter, and I believe that if General Groves were subpenaed and asked to talk, he would talk, regardless of the fact that his superior is an Army officer. I think it is unfair to assume that an officer would not speak his mind, or that he could not speak his mind, simply because he might not be in total agreement with some military man who is his superior. I am as confident as I am that I am standing on the Senate floor at this time, that if General Groves had been called before the committee there would have been entirely different answers from those given to some of the questions I have asked this afternoon. That is one more reason why I am in favor of recommitting the nomination to committee until these questions have been gone into thoroughly.

If there is any doubt about what I have said, I simply ask the committee to request that the nomination be sent back to it, and subpoena General Groves and let us get the truth from the General himself. I have examined the record. We are told that representatives of the Commission were in Florida on the 7th or the 8th or the 9th or the 10th of the month. I assert now on the floor of the Senate that no individual, with the exception of one, has been there to see General Groves since January 1 on an official mission connected with the Atomic Energy Commission. They are not consulting with him. They have refused to consult with him. That is their attitude and that has been their attitude until the afternoon when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned Mr. Lilienthal on what he expected to do in the matter of cooperating with the military.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the source of the Senator's information?

Mr. WHERRY. That is something which I have the privilege, as a Senator, not to disclose. All the Senator has to do is what I told him to do, and I am sure he will secure the information that I have received, and about which I have asked questions today on the floor of the Senate. The Senator will not then have to depend upon me for the source of the information.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator receive it from General Groves?

Mr. WHERRY. I will not answer any questions respecting the source of my information. I do not have to. I am a Senator of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course I have no power, Mr. President, to——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I have not yielded to the Senator at this point. I have not concluded. If I want to secure this information for myself I can secure it. But I will tell the Senator that he is not treating the Members of the United States Senate fairly when he does not have called before the committee the men who really know what the situation is. What so-and-so thinks is not the kind of testimony we need. What we want is the direct evidence, and we want it from the men who are high in authority. I challenge the Senator to summon them before the committee so they may tell the story. As to what answers General Groves would give to the questions I have asked I do not know. But I have a right to assume what he might say. I have the right to think what he might say, he having been one of the leading men in helping to develop atomic energy.

I know what happened to Colonel Nichols. I found it out for myself. I know what happened to Major General Farrell. I found that out for myself. Anyone can find that out from the record. But we should know what the true situation is before we vote to confirm this

man Lilienthal to the most important position in the world. Why, this man is going to be the chief justice of civilization. We as Senators have the right to have a searching investigation made and find out everything we can respecting Mr. Lilienthal. Instead of merely going to Mr. Lilienthal and asking him, "How do you feel about this; what do you think about this?" we have a right to go to those who developed atomic energy—those who have kept that development a secret since 1942—and find from them what they think about the nomination. There is not a word from them about this matter in the testimony.

Senators are asking me to support Mr. Lilienthal on the basis of what he said. I want to know what some of those who helped develop atomic energy think about the matter. I have the right to know what they think about it. I think every Senator on the floor should make up his mind not to vote on the question of confirming the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal until we have gotten the whole truth and nothing but the truth as to how the military liaison group feel toward Lilienthal and his nomination to the Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a statement and then to ask the Senator a question about it?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was present in the committee when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] interrogated Mr. Lilienthal about the part the Army would have to play in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. I have not examined the record in the last day or two and do not recall exactly what the record says about the matter—it may have been changed—but as I remember what Mr. Lilienthal said to the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado, it turned them both, as I understand, against him, for he said that the military was not to have anything to do with the matter, or that the military would play a very secondary part, or practically have nothing whatever to do with it. As I recall, the two Senators said that did not suit them at all; that Lilienthal's reply and his position did not suit them at all. I never saw a man change front any faster than Lilienthal did on that occasion. I never saw Lilienthal himself change faster than he did on that occasion.

Mr. BRIDGES. And that is quite a record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is quite a record when Lilienthal changed faster than he ever has before in his different capacities. He changed immediately, but for some remarkable reason the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado both voted favorably on his nomination notwithstanding what he had said on that occasion. To me that is one of the strangest things about this whole proceeding, and I want to know how it strikes the Senator from Nebraska? After General Groves had undertaken a task which has been the task of the ages, because for more than 2,000 years men have been trying to unlock this great secret—and General Groves and Colonel Nichols are away up at the top of the atomic-energy experts, and they are servants of the Army, servants of the people, working for the defense of our great country—after they and others engaged in the project had performed almost a miracle in bringing about this history-making discovery, is it not the most remarkable thing the Senator from Nebraska ever heard of that the Congress, and the Executive, should turn their backs on the great men who helped make this discovery, under whose management and control the discovery was made? Is it not the most remarkable thing in the world that those two men should be virtually turned out of the Army, and a man who probably had never before heard the words "atomic energy" used together 15 times in his life be given this important position? The words "atomic energy" never appear in any of his written works. They never appear in any of his letters or speeches or his correspondence until after Hiroshima.

Does it not occur to the Senator that it is a most remarkable lack of appreciation on the part of our Government, on the part of the Congress, on the part of the Executive, to say to these two men who took the lead in bringing about this discovery "Get out; the Government has no longer any use for you; you can go to Florida if you want to"; and to the younger men to say, "Why, you can take another job if you want to. We do not want you around. You have served us"—they did not even say, "You have served us"; they simply turned them out. Not a word of commendation was uttered for their part in what was probably the greatest discovery that has ever taken place in the history of the world. Those men were simply kicked out. Does not that seem a little remarkable to the Senator from Nebraska? I should like to have the Senator's view on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that no one has more ably answered that question, or can, in my opinion, more ably answer it than the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has already answered it. That is the burden of his message. I have been surprised. The answer can only be that we are amazed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think we ought to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], for whom I have the highest regard, says to us that he talked with Mr. Lilienthal, and that on two occasions Mr. Lilienthal told him that everything would be all right. That satisfied the distinguished chairman of the committee. That is not testimony. I am amazed that there is not one word of testimony from General Groves. He was trusted with this secret for years. He developed atomic energy. He helped to build the bombs. I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and year after year I voted vast appropriations without ever asking a word about them, because I understood that they involved a great military secret. I would have approved any appropriation that was asked for under that heading.

General Groves did this job, and now we have no word from General Groves. I do not know what he would say. I tried to get him on the telephone. He was in New York. I should like to know what General Groves would say under oath before the committee about the military liaison. I should like to know if he is satisfied with the plan, whether he was asked to serve, and many other things. I should like to ask him a number of questions.

Mr. President, I think the Senate has a right to know what General Groves thinks about this question. I think Colonel Nichols should be brought here. Let us talk to him and see if he is satisfied. What is wrong about it? Why should we not obtain such information?

Earlier in the day it was stated that because of a precedent we could not get FBI reports on these nominees. We can get them only with respect to Federal judges. I think that is the answer of a school boy. I think we can get an FBI report on every one of these men if the Senate insists upon it.

This afternoon we have the revealing statement of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Once again we ask the question, What about the military? Why were not they consulted? We find that they were not consulted. They were not consulted before January. They are not being consulted now, and there is not a word of testimony from any of the top-flight men who gave us atomic energy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator from Nebraska. General Groves is one of the ablest men I have ever come in contact with, and he deserves as much credit for the atomic bomb as does any other man living. While he may not have done the scientific part of the work, he did the manufacturing part. I was a member of the first Committee on Atomic Energy, and I must say that I am surprised that General Groves was not called as a witness on this very vital question about which he can tell more than almost any other man.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make one further point. Mr. Lilienthal very glibly passes off the question of military liaison, which was apparently disregarded by Senators who formed the majority of the committee.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as the President pro tempore of this body, have heard the statement of Mr. George Earle, who was formerly Ambassador to Bulgaria. He was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the position of Ambassador to Bulgaria. He served over there all through a very

violent period. The other day, testifying before a committee of Congress, he stated that, in his judgment, 5 years from today, as a result of atomic destruction, less than 10 percent of the people in this country would be alive. I do not know whether Mr. Earle is right or wrong. He may have made an exaggerated statement. Time alone will tell. Nevertheless, I point out that he was the Democratic Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. Democrats supported him. He was appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt as Ambassador to Bulgaria. He is a member of the Democratic Party. I assume that when he was elected Governor of Pennsylvania and when he was appointed as Ambassador to Bulgaria, there must have been good reason for choosing him. He comes back with this very doleful prediction.

When a responsible person makes such a statement, and when we hear reports as to what is actually going on in the world, a very deep and heavy obligation and responsibility is placed upon us as United States Senators in connection with the Lilienthal nomination. If this country should be partially destroyed by atomic weapons, and millions of our people should be killed, I would not want the responsibility on my shoulders. Therefore I say that we should have as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission a man upon whom we could all agree, a man of unquestioned integrity and purpose, a man so outstanding that every Senator, whether Republican or Democrat, could agree upon him. We can select such a man.

The first necessary step in that direction would be for Mr. Lilienthal to withdraw. If Mr. Lilienthal had any sense of propriety at all he would withdraw his name from consideration for the position to which he has been nominated. I believe that the first Senators who should ask to have the nomination referred back to the committee on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] should be the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and other Senators who reported the nomination. I do not believe that they want on their shoulders the threat of potential responsibility which might result from some of the violent things going on in the world today.

So let us send the nomination back to the committee. Let us put Mr. Lilienthal out to pasture, where he can do no damage. Let us select some outstanding man that we all can agree upon, whether it be the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other Members of this body. There are many outstanding men in the country upon whom all Senators could agree.

In my judgment Mr. Lilienthal should withdraw. If he does not withdraw, then the members of the committee which reported the nomination should hold another meeting of the committee and withdraw the committee report on the nomination, which it is within their power to do. Let us put Mr. Lilienthal back in the private-citizen class where he belongs, and start anew. Would it not be a great thing for this Nation and the world; would it not be a great thing for the President of the United States, Mr. Truman; would it not be a great thing for the Atomic Energy Commission, if a man could be selected whom all Senators could support? It can be done. It is an important enough issue that it should be done. I think that is a goal for which we should all strive.

It is said that General Groves is in Florida. The attitude assumed was that it was not important enough to bring him up from Florida to discuss this weighty question. If we have great men in the country who know the military aspects of a world which is aflame and perhaps headed toward destruction, we should bring to bear on this problem their brains and put them at the service of the Atomic Energy Commission. We should not place at the head of such an agency a man like Mr. Lilienthal, who will turn a cold shoulder to the military, and ring down the iron curtain.

If Mr. Lilienthal has been autocratic to date, wait until his nomination is confirmed. I venture to say that even as partisan a Senator as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] may be upset by his actions in the years to come. I know that at present the Senator from Connecticut is pretty well sold on Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. President, we face a tragic moment. Make no mistake about it. It may be glibly passed off by many, and it may be said that Mr. Lilienthal should be quietly accepted by a docile Senate with their eyes closed and ears shut. But we are in a very violent period in the history of the world. It is our primary duty to safeguard the security of this Nation. The United States Senate is torn asunder by lack of confidence in this nominee of the President. I do not want the responsibility on my shoulders, but I am afraid that it will rest on the shoulders of other Senators if we approve the nomination of such a man.

It is a very serious thing. Let us make no mistake about it, and let us not try to dodge the responsibility or evade the issue. It is here. We cannot dodge it; we cannot evade it. A Senator who votes for Mr. Lilienthal must bear his share of the responsibility. The tragic thing is that it will be too late then. Perhaps millions will be dead; perhaps part of our Nation will be destroyed. Even now, before the Commission gets started, Mr. Lilienthal is denying the military access to the Commission. It is tragic. Newspapers, including some in Washington, are carrying on a personal feud with the United States Senate because some Senators dare to stand up and be counted and are not willing to gamble with the safety of our country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A while ago I called the Senator's attention to the responsibility which attends voting in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal. A tragic responsibility rests upon those who delay longer the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission so that the business of atomic energy and the safeguarding of this country can go forward. We are in that tragic situation now. At this moment we are making no progress in atomic energy. It is vital that we make progress. So there is a responsibility on both sides.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the responsibility when I cast my vote for Mr. Lilienthal; and, conversely, those on the other side will have to accept whatever responsibility may attend further delays and further continuation of argument which prevent our going forward with atomic energy.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I raised that very question the other day. I asked the able Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, whether or not the present Commission is now functioning as fully, completely, and comprehensively as it will after the nominations have been confirmed The Senator told me that it is. It is serving under Executive appointment, and I understand that it is performing all the functions it could possibly perform, and is expending money that is turned over to it in anticipation, I presume, of confirmation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may amplify my statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The members of the Commission whose nominations are before us for confirmation have full power under appointments made by the President last October or November. It is true that they have power, but the practical result is that the uncertainty of the situation has caused a stalemate, which will exist until the question of the confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission is settled, whether it be this Commission or another commission. I dislike to think of the tragic further disruption of the atomic energy plan of this country if these nominations are not confirmed. There is an overriding public good which has to be considered in addition to our personal agreement or disagreement with respect to individuals on the Commission.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator speaks of a stalemate. Does he infer that the situation at Oak Ridge is static and that there is no production of atomic energy or bombs?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No bombs are made at Oak Ridge, but some of the materials that go into them are produced there. Atomic material is being made.

We must keep the plants going. A certain degree of efficiency and progress has been attained in the present state of the art, but we have already lost 19

months of progress into new fields of atomic energy. I do not mean that 19 months' time has been lost in this debate, but we have lost the time that has elapsed between the time the last bomb was dropped in Japan and the present time. We have lost that time in the progressive development of new and additional fields of atomic energy. That is the situation we face at the present time. We are not making the progress we should make, and we certainly are disrupting that progress with every day or week of delay.

Mr. STEWART, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think the tragic thing we are faced with now is that we have a civilian commission in charge of atomic energy. I believe that the statement of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which I put into the RECORD this afternoon, hits the nail on the head. When war clouds are actually hanging low over the entire world, atomic energy should be under the control of the military. I believe that one of the strongest blows which we could deliver to a potential enemy which respects nothing but force would be to return control of atomic energy, for the present, at least, to the military to make such use of it as we are told we may have to make in the not too distant future. I hope such use will not be necessary.

In almost every newspaper we may pick up we are daily confronted with the statement that Russia has the know-how; that Russia is making demands of the United States and other nations which are utterly out of reason. From the over-all picture, the conclusion which is drawn by men who are quite able to draw conclusions is that in the not far-distant future we may actually face serious trouble with Russia. Mr. Bullitt, former Ambassador, testified that if Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it, she would have dropped it upon the cities of America. I think the tragic mistake that is being made is that the military is being excluded and pushed aside. I believe that the military should have full control at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I have previously indicated, I have been repeatedly irritated by reference to 19 months having been lost. I do not understand it. I understood that the military were in charge up to January 1, when the Commission took over. I understand that the Commission is functioning; I undertand that research is being carried on. We have heard the suggestion repeatedly from scientists that they were going on a sit-down strike if we did not arrive at a solution acceptable to them. That is one of the most amazing suggestions I have ever heard—that unless we adopt a formula of which they approve they will walk out on us. That is pretty near to deserting in the face of the enemy.

Within the past week I have read in the newspapers that the Atomic Energy Commission, now functioning under recess appointment, had decided to shift the emphasis in research from military uses of atomic energy to civilian uses. The clear inference from that statement is that military research had been going on, and that now a shift in emphasis to the civilian aspect is to be made. It comes at rather an extraordinary time, when we are saying to Russia, "Thus far and no further." I cannot conceive of any time in the past 19 months when a shift from military to civilian uses would have been more inappropriate than it is at this particular time. It is notice to Russia that we have gone as far as we wish in the military direction, and that we are now placing emphasis on the civilian aspect. I do not know how many thousands are employed by the Atomic Energy Commission, but I presume they are earning their money and doing their job. If they are not, certainly the Atomic Energy Commission is rather seriously derelict in its duty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the statement was directed to me, I say that I think when the bill was passed last year, the whole intention of Congress—perhaps not the intention of every Member of Congress, but certainly the intention of the overwhelming number of the Members of Congress—was to emphasize the civilian development of atomic energy. We were then under the illusion or the delusion that the war was over. Whether we were mistaken in that belief we do not need to argue now. The bill was written as a civilian bill. It was written to declare the importance of civilian investigation and of civilian uses of atomic energy. But I say now that the military was and is amply protected in that bill. In the first place, in the Commission itself there is a division of military applications. In the second place, there is a military liaison committee; and under the law it is entitled to acquire, and can acquire and will acquire, all information within the activities of the Commission touching upon the military activities of the Commission. If the Military Liaison Committee believes either that what the Commission is doing or what the Commission is failing to do is inimicable to the national defense, the Military Liaison Committee can appeal to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; and if there is anything there at all that does not satisfy them, they can take the matter to the President, who then can order them to do something to benefit the national defense or to refrain from doing something that is harmful or calculated to be harmful to the national defense.

I say, I believe we are giving ample programing to questions of national defense. If this Commission or any Atomic Energy Commission can be assured of its position and can proceed with confidence, and if those in key positions under the Atomic Energy Commission can be assured that the work is to go forward, real progress can be made. But until that occurs, the uncertainty of the whole matter is damaging to the very thing—the national defense of the United States—about which all of us are concerned.

I say that in my opinion many Members of the Senate are permitting personal disagreement with an individual or individuals to interfere with and prevent action by the Senate in respect to the overriding national good in the present instance. I am just as much concerned about the difficult times in which we find ourselves and the uncertainty of international affairs as is any other Member of the Senate.

I made a suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire, the other day, in speaking frankly about Mr. Lilienthal. The Senator from New Hampshire had asked me whether I thought Mr. Lilienthal was the best man in the United States for this job. I said, "No; I do not think so, but I do not think he is the worst man, either." Mr. President, I do not know who else would take this job. As I said to the Senator then, Mr. Lilienthal can do the job; we find no dishonesty about him; he is able; and those who oppose him did not begin to establish any charge of communism against him; and we are in an emergency.

I say to the Senator that in my opinion today, not only in atomic energy but also in our whole international situation, we are in an emergency period, and we had better think rather quickly and act rather vigorously, with great speed and great determination.

I should like to see this issue settled one way or the other. I know how I shall vote. I shall not quarrel with any other Senator about how he votes. But we had better begin to vote rather quickly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think all of us appreciate the importance and urgency of this matter. I am sure the Senator from Iowa will not be critical of the Senate for wishing to take a small portion of the time the committee itself took in considering this matter and in conducting hearings on it. We have this great volume of hearings before us, which we have had an opportunity to study only for the last week or 10 days. The President took a number of months in considering the matter himself before he acted—all under the pressure of this urgency.

Do I correctly understand that work is being done, that research is being carried on, and that emphasis is being shifted from the military to the civilian uses? Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me, let me say that I think work is being done and research is being carried on, but I do not think they have the steam up that they need if the job is to be done.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we can understand that there might be some doubt in their minds. But I should appreciate it if during the remainder of this discussion we did not have the repeated statement that 19 months have been lost. Can we not agree that it has

been only 18 months or 17 months, or even a portion of that time?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be glad to split the difference with the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. As a matter of fact, the Senate has had this subject before it for only 10 days or 2 weeks. So if there is any cause for complaint as to unconscionable or unwarranted delay, certainly the responsibility is not upon the Senate, except for the 2 weeks during which it has been giving the matter consideration.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Would he consider it good judgment, in view of our current relations with some foreign countries, to shift the emphasis at this time from the military to the civilian? I understood the Senator to say that when we made that decision last year we thought the war was over. Of course, I think we have begun to realize that perhaps the war is not over. Is not this a rather unusual time, in view of the present status of affairs, for this Commission to make a decision of apparently such profound significance, with General Marshall at Moscow, and with our troops getting ready to form along the new line that is proposed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield further to me, let me say I do not know the news report to which the Senator from Maine has referred, but I say to him that it is my belief that we did shift from the military to the civilian. Please bear in mind that when the war ended, the entire activity in regard to atomic energy was military, completely devoted to making atomic bombs. That was all it was. Then we thought the war was over. However, the military kept control of the atomic energy situation, under the Manhattan district, until Congress passed the law setting up the machinery and organization which would take control from the military and place it in civilian hands. That happened; that law was passed. I think the transition from complete emphasis upon military production to emphasis upon civilian production has been going on for quite a while, but in my opinion the military has not been neglected and is not now being neglected.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from Iowa; namely, whether he wishes us to infer, from the last answer he made, that in his opinion the military were not capable of doing the research which could be done under civilian control. Is that what the Senator desires to indicate; in other words, that the military fell down on conversion or transfer over to the civilian?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, no, Mr. President; by no stretch of the imagination could my statement be interpreted as meaning that. If in some way it is so interpreted, I should like to correct it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then how could we lose 19 months, if the military was in full control up until January 1 of this year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. After the military operations had ended, the military was merely holding the plant together until the Congress and the country had decided what the permanent disposition of this great new force should be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire to yield further.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does what the Senator from Iowa has said mean that the executive branch had this held in abeyance, and nothing was done during this period? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think they kept the wheels moving, kept the plant in a sort of a stand-by position. A little progress was made, but there was no program, and today there is no reliable program, because the Commission is not confirmed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I have been trying for quite a while to enter the debate to read something which I think will be illuminating, and inform the Senator from Maine as to just what the situation is, what has developed in the past year and a half, and why it was developed. If the Senator from New Hampshire will indulge me, it will take me about 2 minutes to read this quotation from Prof. Karl T. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute for Technology.

It might be of interest to the Senator to know that Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. Karl Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, are the three top scientists, and have been, in the matter of atomic energy. The engineering was done by the engineers for the great concerns of the country—Eastman, Monsanto, General Electric, Chrysler, and I could name a dozen more that built the plants from the designs of the scientists.

General Groves was assigned the managerial job. He was in charge of security. He procured material. He was the coordinator. But not even General Groves' most ardent admirers, in the Army or out of the Army, would claim that General Groves made any contribution to the scientific or to the engineering aspects of this project.

Now let me read to the Senator what Professor Compton has to say about the present situation in which we find ourselves, and why we are in it:

> Having known Lilienthal more or less for about a dozen years, and having been in conference with him several times since his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission, I am convinced not only that he is well qualified for the post, but also that I would know no one as well qualified and possibly available.
>
> However, my concern with the situation goes deeper than the fate of Lilienthal himself. He has won the respect and backing of the key people in the atomic-energy development. Among them there is, so far as I can judge, a universal feeling of disillusionment over the manner in which the case has been handled by the Senate. If this should lead finally to failure to confirm him, I believe it will be a very serious blow to our future progress in the atomic-energy field, especially in the direction of its practical application to industrial and military objectives.
>
> This development is in the nature of the case dependent primarily upon the work of the nuclear physicists, chemists, and a very few research engineers, on whose findings the practical application must be built.
>
> Already the projects at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos have been severely reduced in effectiveness by the withdrawal of a large portion of the scientific personnel after the war. The shortage of competent scientists and the competition for their services are very great indeed, and practically all of the key men have many other offers and most of them still on the job have stayed there from a sense of duty.
>
> If, however, they become disillusioned or gain the impression that political or special interests are getting control of the program, I believe that it will collapse into a rather hollow shell. This, it seems to me, is the fundamental threat. Considerable harm has already been done, but I believe that much greater harm will be done if the confirmation is not made.
>
> We can talk glibly, both nationally and internationally about a great atomic-energy program but it will be relatively empty talk unless this program is carried on with enthusiasm.

Then there was Enrico Fermi, and if I were to award the palm to one man I think Fermi would be the one who is most responsible for the discovery of atomic energy.

Fermi is an Italian by birth. He was born in Italy, and did some work in Italy. He happened to marry a Jewess, and Mussolini persecuted him for that reason. He fled to our shores, and carried on his work in Chicago and New York, and came upon the great discovery of chain reaction in Chicago in 1942.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the date of the statement the Senator has read?

Mr. McMAHON. This statement from Mr. Compton appears in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for March 1947.

Mr. BRIDGES. On what date did he make the statement?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator means on what date Mr. Compton made the statement?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I think he sent this telegram to the President pro tempore about 10 days before the hearings ended, which would be about the 1st of March, if I am not mistaken. That was the date when he made the statement which is reprinted.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senate at that time did not have the matter before it for consideration.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator from New Hampshire will further indulge me, I am not at this point quarreling with Senators as to the dereliction of the Senate or its position on the question before it. I am not going to argue that at this time. I may have something to say about it later. I am trying to point out to the Senator the foundation on which the Senator from Iowa, the distinguished chairman of the committee, based his conclusions, which he stated so eloquently, as to the danger of delay in this program.

Senators will appreciate, I think, that if we fail to obtain international control of atomic energy, effective international control, as I have said since September 6, 1945, when I made the first speech that was made on the floor of the Senate, or in the Congress, on this subject—I recently reread the speech to refresh my recollection—the only defense we will have—and God help us if we have to rely on it—is more and better and bigger bombs. That is the only thing that will save America, more and better and bigger bombs, and we cannot have more and better and bigger bombs unless we have nuclear scientists, and unless we have the cooperation of the engineers in the process.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator also recognize that we will not get more and bigger and better atomic bombs for military use unless we continue, during the period of the present crisis, to turn our attention to that, rather than shifting our emphasis, at this time of all others, from military to civilian research? That is what puzzles and astounds me. The eloquence of the Senator only reinforces my fears.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know the source of the Senator's information.

Mr. BREWSTER. I read it, what I thought was an authoritative report in the public press. Perhaps the Senator can inform me about it.

Mr. McMAHON. I might inform the Senator that no such release has come from the Atomic Energy Commission at any time.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not the question. The question is whether there has been such a shift. That is the question.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me point out to the Senator that there has been at Oak Ridge, Tenn., a development in the nature of an experiment looking to the use of atomic energy—fissionable materials, that is—as a source of power. However, our experiments have gone forward at Los Alamos, the weapon center, under the conditions, as well as they could go ahead. It is necessary to have fissionable material first. It is necessary to make it cheaper, to make it faster, and to make more of it, if we are to have more material to put into the casings that do the exploding. There must be additional research and additional engineering if we are to have a weapon which will make the Nagasaki and Hiroshima bombs look like a model T Ford.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator trying to tell us that that can be secured only under Mr. Lilienthal? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is misinterpreting me. What I have said to the Senator is that the only way we will accomplish the desired result is through nuclear physicists, scientists, and the cooperation of the scientists and engineers who broke down the atom in the first place.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the implication——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment, if I may interrupt the Senator. Now, what does Fermi say? I cannot give you the exact date, but in the month of March he said this:

> Russia is behind us now, but she may pass us.

That refers to the delays.

What does Urey, the inventor of heavy water, say? He is another Nobel prize winner who made a distinguished contribution to atomic science.

> Many of my colleagues are deeply disturbed over the possibility that the Senate may decline to confirm the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I share this concern. I believe that atomic-energy work in the United States will be crippled for several years if the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission is changed at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Just a minute, please.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will pardon me, I want to read a little further.

Mr. BRIDGES. I say that is the "bunk."

Mr. McMAHON. Pardon me.

Mr. BRIDGES. For any man to say that the development of atomic energy could be crippled for several years if Lilienthal is not confirmed is just pure, undiluted "bunk."

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has been very kind and indulgent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have been.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to read just two more paragraphs of what Mr. Urey said:

> Eighteen months have now passed since Hiroshima. During this time the work on atomic energy in the United States was virtually at a standstill because there was no one who could take the responsibility for major decisions. Many of the projects badly disintegrated during this period. Other projects are still held together by the hope that a responsible management will soon be established. The Lilienthal Commission took over the operations on the first day of January, having previously made a study of the problems of operating these projects. If the Chairman of this Commission should be refused confirmation now, another 6 months will pass before orderly operation of atomic energy research will get under way. During this time, these projects may collapse, and the work on atomic energy in this country will be wrecked at a time when other nations are making rapid progress in this field. The scientists hope that Congress may keep party politics out of the vital issue of atomic energy.

In conclusion, let me say this: The Senator may wish to voice his opinion, and I have respect for it, and I know his colleagues have, too; the Senator and others brought about an appropriation to make the atomic bomb, but neither he, nor any other Member of this body, contributed one iota of ideas or intelligence that went into nuclear science.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Lilienthal, sir, has contributed at least to this extent, that since his appointment and designation as Chairman of the committee for the international control problem, in the State Department, he and his associates, Mr. Acheson and General Groves—let me pay him a compliment—and Dr. Conant, and the other members who are on that Commission, contributed a basic plan of control for this terrible thing that has been developed, which all sensible persons in the United States, so far as I know, have noticed. That was his contribution.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In the light of the recent developments, I should like to point out that under the extraordinary plan produced by Mr. Lilienthal, which the Senator read recently, if the proposal to locate bomb plants all over Russia were carried out, such plants could now be devoted to producing atomic bombs, if this plan had gone through.

Mr. McMAHON. I have read the plan, I would say to the Senator, on which he bases his comment. I anticipated, I may say to the Senator—and I see that my anticipation and prediction have come true—that during the course of this debate there would be two principal attacks made; one, on the so-called military control of atomic energy, a question which we settled after a very thoroughgoing consideration of the matter, a year ago; and, the second, the soundness of our international proposal. I expect to be heard later, during the course of the debate, on the soundness of those proposals.

Mr. TAFT and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The extraordinary proposal to which I referred was that there should be set up an international authority on which there was to be no restraint. It was to have strictly international personnel. It was to take charge of all atomic development. It was to build atom-bomb plants in Russia, in order that they might balance the atom-bomb plants that we had. That was expressly provided. That is the plan that was proposed. He says that—

> As such operations and facilities have been established by the atomic-development authority, and are being operated by that agency within other nations, as well as within our own, a balance will have been established with us, because we have got the atom-bomb plants today.

Not only that, but this international authority, with international personnel, was to come into this country, take over our Oak Ridge plant, and all our plants, and operate them, if you please, with international personnel, Russians, perhaps, who would find exactly how the whole thing had to be operated—an international agency over which we would have no control whatever.

It seems to me that it is the most extraordinary plan, and if that is what Mr. Lilienthal is praised for in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, then I see no basis whatever for saying that he has contributed to the solution of the atom-bomb problem of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose

of enabling me to answer a question which was directed to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the light of what the able Senator from Ohio has read about the establishment of plants in Russia, under an organization international in all respects, I think it would be well for us to read the editorial in the Washington Post this morning, about the international organization created to investigate the Greek situation, and how they have conducted themselves. I think it would be well worth while for us to read that in the light of this report.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my last remarks, the editorial from the Washington Post of today, to which I referred. I have just obtained it, and I hope all Senators may read the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINGER ON MR. LIE

Reports of the poor quality of the UN Secretariat that accompanied the Balkan Commission to the Greek frontier are sufficiently authoritative to warrant a strict investigation of Secretary-General Lie's office. It appears that some of the 75 secretaries that accompanied the mission are not possessed of the standards of "efficiency, competence, and integrity" that the United Nations itself laid down as the prerequisites of international service. Integrity is, apparently, the main deficiency. Some of the attachés are said to have displayed a bias in favor of the countries of their nationality amounting in a few cases to outright sabotage. Like a government, the United Nations is singularly dependent upon the integrity of its civil service, and these revelations are second only to the Russian abuse of the veto power in undermining confidence in the existing United Nations.

Staff service for international organization did not receive the attention it deserved when the Charter was under draft at San Francisco. The prime reason was the foolish attitude of some of the chief delegates in thinking they were pioneers of history. The fact is, of course, that they were engaged in a quest that mankind has been engaged upon since the days of the Amphictyonic League, B. C. They forgot, as the jurists who were considering the World Court did not, that, as Oliver Wendell Holmes put it, continuity with the past is not a virtue but a necessity. In consequence, nobody seemed to pay any attention to the lessons of the League of Nations, and several past and present staff members of the League, who had been invited to San Francisco, were left to cool their heels in their hotel. Nobody was interested in listening to their voice of experience. No League officer undoubtedly would have argued against leaving the Secretary-General without a Deputy Secretary-General. They would have advised that the United Nations Secretariat should be offered in part by neutrals. For instance, the nationals of Sweden and Switzerland have given men and women of great merit and international mind to administrative and expert tasks in world organization. What the UN Secretariat needs above all is the same degree of impartiality.

Upon UN's Secretary-General will devolve the task of explaining the kind of men he saddled upon the Balkan Commission. To be sure, his staff problem is formidable, as a result both of the newness of the organization and the relatively slim nature of his budget. But Mr. Lie above all knew the explosive nature of the task of this Commission, and he should have been most scrupulous in making these appointments. This is not the first time that we have seen fit to question the administration of Mr. Lie. There was the occasion last April 17, when we protested his effort to remove the Iranian dispute from the Council agenda. As a result of this intervention, many observers felt some doubt about Mr. Lie's own impartiality. The doubt arose again when Mr. Lie last week administered an oblique rebuke of the United States for its near eastern policy. This might have passed unnoticed but for the precedent, for the United States, to our view, was, indeed, remiss in not informing the UN earlier of its proposal, and of not giving greater attention to the UN in the President's message to Congress. The scandal about the Balkan appointments, however, admits of no extenuation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I just entered the Chamber as the Senator from Connecticut was referring to some of the scientists. I want to observe in this connection that this is a most important discussion we are having, from every angle. I appreciate everything that is being said on both sides, because I am trying to get light.

I want to say to the Senate that during the last month or two I have been engaged in working on the new scientific foundation bill, and during that time I have been in touch, through correspondence, having nothing to do with this controversy, with Dr. James B. Conant, of Harvard; Dr. H. D. Smyth, of Princeton; Dr. Karl T. Compton, of MIT; and Dr. Vannevar Bush. I wish to read a postscript to a letter Dr. Karl Compton, an old friend of mine, wrote me in discussing the foundation bill. He added a postscript which reads as follows:

I am very much worried lest failure to confirm Lilienthal may pretty much wreck the atomic-energy program. The keymen have confidence in him, and are pretty much disgusted with the way he has been handled. All these keymen could step into other attractive jobs easily.

I know what Dr. Karl Compton contributed to the cause of atomic energy and the part he played in it, and while some may discount it if they care to, one in my position is bound to consider that as a very important statement from a very important man.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. What the Senator from New Jersey has read is another expression of something of a profoundly regrettable nature which I feel is creeping into our consideration. It was manifested a while ago, at the close of the war, in the suggestion of some scientists that they were going to quit, and at various times, an intimation of what apparently was a sit-down strike if this atomic energy matter were not handled in the way they deemed desirable. I do not question their patriotism or their intelligence, but I do challenge the attitude of mind of men who will express themselves as the man whom we have all come to respect and admire expresses himself in that postscript, to the effect that unless Mr. Lilienthal is confirmed it is going to be impossible or impracticable for scientists to continue their collaboration.

The same note was apparent in what the Senator from Connecticut read, when he intimated that political or special interests might be moving into this scene. That idea again, I say, is expressed in what was read by the Senator from New Jersey, from a statement either by Dr. Compton or Dr. Conant, I do not know which the Senator was quoting. That injects the idea that unless we all sit in a sacerdotal attitude, accepting the edict of the scientists as to the solution of what, after all, is primarily a question of business management of a great governmental enterprise, they will not play on our team, they will not play ball.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, I will not myself yield. I want to finish what I am saying, now. I cannot conceive that men having the character, the caliber, and patriotism of these scientists are going to take such an attitude. The chairman of the committee has said here, with a candor that does him credit, that he does not necessarily believe Mr. Lilienthal is the best man, nor does he believe he is the worst man; he recognizes that among 130,000,000 people, and with all the graduates there are of Harvard Law School, of whom I am one, it might be possible to find someone else who could handle an administrative position comparable with the one in question.

I think Dr. Conant or Dr. Compton or any of the others, if they realized the implications of these suggestions, would be the first to regret them. Now we are trying as earnestly and as honestly as we can to solve this problem. I have, from an experience of more than 10 years of observing Mr. Lilienthal, grave doubt as to the wisdom of selecting him, and particularly because of certain of the men associated with him in the management of this great enterprise, in the Atomic Energy Commission. That is the result of my observation, Mr. President, of Mr. Lilienthal over many years. Certainly it seems to me it is possible to secure some other man or some other men who can be commensurately equal for this job. For them to say that everything is going to wrack and ruin unless the Senate of the United States, with almost a gun pointed at its head, solves this matter by confirming the nominees, or the scientists will walk out, is something I regret.

Mr. President, we had a period from 1920 to 1930 when big business was in the saddle. We had a period from 1930 to 1940 when big government was in the saddle. We have a period now when we are challenged by big labor. And apparently the suggestion is now being made that over the horizon big science is preparing to move onto the scene.

The American people in the period 1920 to 1930 showed their opposition

toward big business when it became too strongly entrenched. In the 1940's the American people slapped down big government. We are now in the process of coping with big labor. And I say to my friends in science that greatly as we appreciate their achievement, profoundly as we respect their knowledge, they do not have a monopoly on the political wisdom that is essential to the solution of the problem we here face, and with all deference we say to them that if in their scientific research they will show a little more deference to the Senate or the Congress of the United States as possibly having an equal patriotic devotion to the common good, and perhaps having a little understanding of all the political aspects—and I use the word "political" in the highest sense—and that perhaps it is a subject to which some of us have devoted our time and talents, and if there will be a little recognition on their part of our knowledge regarding some aspects of the conduct of governmental business with which they have not been hitherto concerned, it would be a salutary lesson to the people of the United States and be helpful in the consummation of the objective which we all hold as common to our cause.

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to compliment the Senator from Maine for the statement he has just made. To me it is a terrible thing that scientists—and I have great respect for them—should infer that they are going on a strike against America simply because the Senate does not do what they want done. To me it is a terrible thing to contemplate that they would take such a position.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the statements which have been made, but I know that the statement that Dr. Compton made to me had nothing to do with a strike or anything else. The scientists are very much disturbed because they turned loose in the world something more terrible and destructive than had ever before been known. I know they have had heart burnings over what they have done, and have wondered how this terrible problem could be solved in an international way or otherwise. They are concerned that there should be lengthy discussion over the pending nominations and delay in dealing with the subject, because they feel we are delaying their ability to acquire the information they need and the effective means of dealing with this matter. I want to commend them for their deep sincerity and I want to enter a protest against the suggestion that there is in their minds such a thing as a strike against America. There is no thought on their part of a strike. But they want to get on with the work of developing atomic energy and safeguarding its uses.

Mr. BREWSTER. What did they mean, as suggested by what the Senator previously said?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are going to strike against America. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not agree with the Senator. These men are trying to show to the country that what we are now dealing with is something much more serious than anything ever before dealt with in the history of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. At a time when our national security is in question, the Senator from New Jersey stands up and says the scientists are going to strike against America. That is certainly the implication. That is a terrible thing to contemplate.

Mr. SMITH. I disagree with the Senator's conclusion from what I said. The scientists did not say that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wonder if the scientists mean that unless we follow Mr. Lilienthal in his proposal to give this secret in part to Russia and to the other nations, we ourselves are going to run.

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is our secret; it is our property; it is our discovery. Does the Senator want to follow Mr. Lilienthal in his plan to divide it up with all other nations, and especially Russia, at this time, when we are so greatly concerned over Russia's attitude? I hope the Senator does not feel that way. I have always esteemed the Senator as being an American 100 percent. Does he want to give this great discovery to all the world as a method of settlement of international problems? That is Lilienthal's proposal.

Mr. SMITH. Might I ask the Senator if anything I have said has even suggested such a thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; what the Senator just said suggested that to me very definitely.

Mr. SMITH. I am very sorry the Senator from Tennessee has drawn that conclusion from what I have said. I am trying to defend my scientific friends who are sincerely troubled and deeply concerned over this matter. What they are particularly deeply concerned with is the Senate's delay in acting upon this matter. They feel the importance of there being no further delay, and they feel concerned over the debate that is going on in the Senate. That concern is felt all over the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the scientists take the position that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Connecticut take about this matter, as well as Mr. Lilienthal himself, that this discovery should be divided with all the other nations of the world, that means that Russia will also be given the secret. The scientists then would turn it over to Russia in part, and to all the other nations in part, when we now own it ourselves. I am opposed to the scientists doing that. I think this discovery ought to stay in America. We furnished the money with which the work was done and the discovery was made.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he thinks this discovery can remain in America only, merely because we possess it alone? Is not the Senator aware that the scientists know that Russia already knows a great deal about it?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is not a nation under God's heaven save our own that can put up $2,600,000,000 to bring about such a discovery.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad for the Senator's sake that he thinks a wall of that kind can protect America. But I do not share his view.

Mr. McKELLAR. To me it would be exceedingly foolish, it would be exceedingly silly, after having spent $2,600,000,000 in making the discovery and now owning it ourselves, voluntarily to divide it up with all the nations of the world.

Mr. SMITH. I am not advocating that, Mr. President.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like, if I might, to have the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The Senator from Ohio asked me when I had last read the Acheson-Lilienthal report, and I told him I had read it again within the last 10 days. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio has had an opportunity to read the Acheson-Lilienthal report or the propositions which were made by Mr. Baruch which incorporated the Acheson-Lilienthal report, before the beginning of this debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I read the report when the Lilienthal nomination first came before the committee. I read the report on the international control of atomic energy, the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report. In fact, the statement which I made a month or so ago was based largely on the reading of that report. I may say further that I also read at the time the Baruch report and the various minutes of the Atomic Energy Committee of the United Nations from which it was perfectly apparent that Mr. Baruch really thoroughly disapproved of the Acheson-Lilienthal report; that he did everything he could to put safeguards around it. I understand that Mr. Baruch was told, after he had accepted the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission, that this must be the basis of American policy, and that until that time he did not know that his hands were tied; that he had gone so far that he did not desire to retire at that time from this thing, but he hedged the Acheson-Lilienthal report about with safeguards. His report, if anything, places the other report more in the background and emphasizes the elements of security, the elements of the surrender of the veto, the elements of change in the whole United Nations setup that he proposed. Certainly I could not find any kind of so-called approval of this report. He puts the report further in the background.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I regret he had not read the report when it was released by the State Department, I believe, in April of last year. It was probably as important a proposal as the State Department or any section of it has made on policy in many generations.

I will say further to the Senator that Mr. Baruch stated before our committee in praise of Mr. Lilienthal, that—

He was one of the authors of the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report, and that, gentlemen, was a very fine report.

Furthermore, the proposals which Mr. Baruch made to the Security Council are basically the proposals which have been made in the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which the Senator criticizes. Mr. Baruch added only one important thing to it, and that was the point with respect to the veto.

Let me further inform the Senator that it was not within the comprehension of the instructions which were given to this committee to go into political questions, as the President pro tempore of the Senate pointed out during the hearings when that question was raised.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to call attention to the fact that the agreement which was finally voted on in the United Nations to a very large extent eliminated the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I think the Senator will find that that is a fact. The so-called international agency has practically disappeared from the proposals which were finally voted on in the United Nations.

Mr. McMAHON. The record will show who is right on that point.

During the hearings before our committee, on December 3, 1945—and this is probably as good a place as any to place it in the RECORD—I said to Dr. Bush:

> Doctor, to reach the objection proposed by Senator JOHNSON and also advanced by some of our other witnesses, that peacetime use of atomic energy in power plants complicates the problem of control, would it be possible or feasible, do you think, to have any such peacetime power plants controlled under the United Nations organization, to be internationally maintained with, perhaps, a stock to be owned on a basis of contributions, such as the UNRRA organization? That is, each country putting in that portion which their national income will justify for international control of these power plants, internationally inspected and internationally operated?

I will say further to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from Tennessee that the international proposals are based upon three principles: First, that this is the controlling weapon; second, that there is no defense against it; and third, that we cannot maintain a monopoly. That is why Winston Churchill said, in a stirring speech on this subject in the House of Commons, that in his opinion unless mankind learned to live together in peace and harmony, within a period of 3 years there would be no hope for civilization itself. I say that America has done one of the finest things any nation has done in the history of time. Its position is morally unassailable. We have said to the nations of the earth that we propose to share with them the fruits of the greatest discovery ever made by man, in return for only one thing, namely, suitable and effective guaranties that it shall not be used murderously against us. On that position we can all stand with pride.

Let me say to the Senator that no one is more tragically disappointed than I am that our Russian ex-allies, friends, or whatever one chooses to call them, have not seen fit to accept that proposal. As an American and as a United States Senator I take a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that we have justified our place in history in this respect as the primary power of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we have perhaps justified that place up to the present time; but we now come to the question of who is to head this great Commission. There has been a great deal of debate on the subject.

I regard the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a very good friend. I may have been a little harsh with him a moment ago, but I had no personal feeling in the matter. He speaks about delay. We could eliminate delay in a moment. We could obtain action in one of three different ways.

First, we could vote immediately on the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit the nominations to the committee.

Second, the committee itself, headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], could be called together and could recall the nomination.

Third, the President could withdraw the nomination.

I am sure that a nomination could be placed before us which Senators would approve in 30 minutes. It is a sad commentary upon the United States and a reflection upon our future to spend our time in trying to determine, not whether this man is well qualified for the job, but whether he is too bad for the job. That is what we are doing. We are being subjected to high pressure from all sides.

It is said that we are playing politics. The political thing to do would be to vote for Mr. Lilienthal, because the press and a large section of the misled public, some of whom are most sincere, are for Mr. Lilienthal, and we would be patted on the back and called great Senators. But I believe this is the time to stand up for America.

We have heard the statement which was made by the former ambassador to Bulgaria, a former Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Earle says that within 5 years only 10 percent of the people of America will be alive. Such a statement should cause us to pause and think. Whether the statement is justified or not, whether it is an exaggeration or not, it is made by a responsible citizen.

We have a very deep responsibility as individual Senators. Before a Senator votes on this question he should commune with his God and his conscience, because within a reasonably few years his action may have tragic consequences. When I vote I may be unpopular with certain of the press. I may be unpopular with the "pinks," the "reds," the "crackpots," the fellow travelers, and some sincere but misled people, but at least I shall be clear with my own conscience and my God. I intend to vote against Mr. Lilienthal.

If Senators do not wish to delay this matter, the thing to do is to recommit the nominations so that a nomination can be sent us upon which we can immediately agree. It need be only the nomination of one of the best qualified in America, one upon which every Senator could agree, whether he be the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], or the Senator from New Hampshire. I am sure that we could agree upon such a nomination.

That is the issue. Let us not try to dodge it, because it will return to plague us. The testimony in this case and the debate in the Senate will be examined in the months and years to come, and we shall have to answer for our action. Let us not try to dodge our responsibility.

The record to which I referred today showed how Mr. Lilienthal dodged the question of military liaison in this violent period in the history of the world. It shows what the situation is, and what we must face.

If Senators want quick action, let us recommit the Lilienthal nomination, and see if the President cannot name an outstanding man. He does not have to be a Republican. There are many outstanding men available; men like Bob La Follette, who served in this body with us, and whom all of us know and respect.

Many persons may say, "The Senator from New Hampshire is against Lilienthal because of his attitude on the question of public power." That is not true. That is one of the damnable lies put out by commentators in the press and on the radio, and by the "pinks." Bob La Follette is as much in favor of public power as Mr. Lilienthal, but I would vote for Bob La Follette, because I have no question as to his integrity. They could put up a man like Jim Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy. There could be no question about him. They could put up a man like Mr. Bernard Baruch. There could be no question about a great American like Bernard Baruch. They could put up a man like former Senator Byrnes, men of that character and caliber. The Senate would not hesitate a moment to confirm the nomination of that sort of men. Mark my words. I know that many of the Senators have this in their minds, because some have told me about it privately. If the Senate confirms the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, within a period of a relatively few years the Senators who support the nomination may regret it and they will have to answer for it to the people of this country, and perhaps to members of their own families. It is a tremendous decision that we are making. On the night before the Senate votes we should go home and kneel down and pray to God to guide us in our voting on the next day. The situation is that serious, because it affects the future of this country, the security of this Government, and the future of the world.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Lilienthal's attitude toward the international aspect which has been raised by Senators on the floor today, I should like to put into the RECORD and say something with reference to a statement which Mr. Lilienthal made on October 30, 1946, shortly after his appointment.

In this connection I should like to make reference to some excerpts from

the first statement issued by him after his nomination to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. With casual indifference he dismissed all methods of handling atomic-energy problems through international treaties, inspection procedures, and United Nations machinery, and came to the conclusion which a man of his philosophy always reaches, namely, that—

The sole workable plan, Mr. Lilienthal held, was for the establishment of an international atomic development authority composed of men "who might well become the elite of the scientific world," and who would know as much as anyone in the world about new possibilities in the field of atomic energy.

That quotation is from the New York Times of October 30, 1946.

He looks upon himself as being a leader of an elite class to whom should be entrusted the whole of the people's welfare. He considers himself so omniscient as to know as much as anyone in the world about new possibilities in the field of atomic energy.

The able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] said today that General Groves had no scientific knowledge and contributed nothing to the science of atomic energy in this great development. I find nothing in the record to show that Mr. Lilienthal is a scientist, but he wants to head all international organizations in order that he may become the elite of the scientific world. This is in keeping with all his other statements about the need of the people turning over their affairs to superexperts and managers.

Expressions like these honeycomb all of Mr. Lilienthal's activities ever since he came to Government, and they constitute one more confirmation of my belief that a man of such tendencies should not be entrusted with the enormous powers at the disposal of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. So much has been said regarding the Lilienthal report that I think the Senate should not get the idea that the report was written by Mr. Lilienthal all by himself. Whatever may have been his contributions to the report, there were a number of very eminent men who helped to prepare and write the report and who put their stamp of approval on it. Some of those who contributed to the report were Mr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of the California Institute of Technology and the University of California; Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, vice president and technical director, Monsanto Chemical Co.; and Mr. Harry A. Winne, vice president in charge of engineering policy, General Electric Co.

In addition to those gentlemen, who prepared the report and unanimously concurred in it, were the members of the State Department committee: Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, who is chairman of the State Department committee; Dr. Vannevar Bush, who I believe is chairman of the Science Institute; James B. Conant, president of Harvard University; Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, of the United States Army, who at one time had charge of the Oak Ridge project—in fact, he had charge of the whole project, so far as authority was concerned; and also John J. McCloy, who was Assistant Secretary of War under Secretary Stimson, and resigned as Assistant Secretary of War before he accepted a position on the committee of the Department of State.

All the gentleman to whose names I have called attention, and who joined in the preparation of the report, approved it, and it was really the composite wisdom, work, and effort of all of those distinguished gentlemen.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to say just a word, Mr. President. It has been pointed out this afternoon that it was contemplated that an international agency would control the production of atomic bombs in various parts of the world. Some Senators seem to deny the third premise of the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], namely, whether it is possible to make a monopoly of this most destructive of all powers, and that Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. Acheson, and their conferees were contemplating a time when the production of atomic bombs would be under international control, rather than that atomic bombs would be produced in many nations of the earth, with no control from any international source.

My last observation, Mr. President, is that it would be a tragic mistake for Members of the Senate to underestimate the power of the Soviet Union to make this bomb. It has even been suggested by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that no other country could make the bomb because no other country could appropriate approximately $2,000,000,000 for its construction. Mr. President, I assure the Senate that a nation that could build the big dams that the Soviet Union built upon its mighty rivers, a nation that could remove whole cities from their original sites to places behind the Urals, a nation that could build upon barren plains cities of many hundreds of thousands of persons, a nation that can use the power of all its people, under the direction of only one man, assuredly can make the atomic bomb, once it obtains the technical know-how.

Therefore, I hope we shall not underestimate the power of the Russians, as some did when Hitler attacked them, and I hope that none will gamble with the mighty strength that Russia possesses, by underestimating Russia's great power.

So, Mr. President, it is imperative that we contemplate the establishment of international control of this great power; and if we have to make some concessions in order to bring it under international control, that will be the lesser of the two dangers.

BRITAIN'S FINANCIAL POSITION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, two articles which appeared in the April 1 issue of the New York Times, will, I believe, be of great interest to many Senators.

The first is a statement that Britain had a deficit of slightly over two and a quarter billion dollars for the fiscal year 1947, which, in Britain, ends on March 31 of each year. It is worth remembering that Britain's financial operations are on a much smaller scale than ours, and that this deficit amounts to about 15 percent of her total expenditures. It is clear that the British Labor Government has not been very successful in restoring financial soundness. With a deficit like that, it is no wonder that Britain is suffering from inflationary pressure, and is badly in need of financial assistance from abroad. I ask unanimous consent to have the article inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S DEFICIT SLASHED TO £569,122,597 FOR YEAR

LONDON, March 31.—Britain had a deficit of £569,122,597 ($2,276,490,388) for the fiscal year that ends tonight. This is considerably less than was expected.

The Treasury returns show that total ordinary revenue was £3,341,223,358, more than had been estimated and an increase of nearly £57,000,000 over last year's receipts despite a slight easing of the income tax.

Expenditures, £3,910,345,955, were well below those estimated and showed a saving of more than £1,500,000,000 since the previous year.

Mr. BUTLER. The second article is more or less of an unofficial denial by official London, as the correspondent calls it, that the British Government is considering a request to us for an additional loan. Several days ago Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the British Board of Trade, in a public address made some reference to the fact that the British loan was being used up very rapidly, because of high American prices, and suggested the possibility of needing an additional loan. The gist of the article to which I am referring is that Sir Stafford's words were misunderstood, and that no such request is being considered at the present time. At this point I ask consent to insert that article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN DISAVOWS HINT OF NEW LOAN—LONDON IRKED AT INTERPRETATION OF CRIPPS' TALK—HIS VIEW OF BORROWING CLARIFIED

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

LONDON, March 31.—Official London is disturbed and mildly irritated by the latest wave of speculation about new United States financial help for Britain.

Misinterpretation of a statement by Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, in his speech Saturday in Bristol seems to have given some sections of the British and American press the idea that Britain had already decided to seek a new loan.

What Sir Stafford said was that Britain would have to borrow £350,000,000 ($1,400,000,000) abroad during 1947. Britain does not borrow money under the United States and Canadian agreements until an actual drawing from one of the Treasuries is made.

Sir Stafford was merely repeating the estimate made in the economic white paper that Britain would have to use up £35,000,000 of foreign credits during this year. While con-

ceding that Sir Stafford might have used better terms, a Board of Trade spokesman was quite emphatic today in his assertion that an effort to read into the statement a subtle approach to new loan negotiations was mere misdirection of energy.

Britain still has an unused balance of more than $3,000,000,000 under the United States credit. The real concern is not over the rate of exhaustion of credit, which has not so far been much in excess of original expectations—despite frequent assertions to the contrary—but over the fact that so much of the loan has been spent without resulting in any substantial improvement in the country's productive capacity. Britain has been using the loan just to keep up minimum imports, without getting either much new equipment or rebuilding her stocks of industrial raw materials.

In addition to the loss of exports as result of the industrial crisis of February, the yet unknown additional strain on imports resulting from flood damage to agriculture has made it likely that the rate of exhaustion of credits will increase.

It can be stated quite definitely, however, that a British request for a new loan is at present out of the question. While a few back-benchers of both major parties have raised the issue in Parliament, the Government is not now looking in that direction for a way out of the country's difficulties.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe this semiofficial denial may clear the air somewhat. Speaking merely as one Member of the Senate, I should like to state that I do not believe this body will be inclined to look favorably on a proposal for an additional loan to Great Britain. A number of Members of Congress expressed the opinion last year that a loan to Britain would not solve her problems, but that a more fundamental readjustment was necessary. If Britain should come to us with a request for another loan, I suspect that many more Members of Congress might come around to the thinking of those who opposed the loan last year.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I request that the proper officials of the Senate have placed on the desk of each Senator tomorrow a copy of the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I understand that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will discuss it tomorrow. I think it better to request that the report be placed before Senators in that way, rather than to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which would be a rather expensive way of getting the report before Senators. I think it clear that the report should be before us when we meet tomorrow.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure the majority leader the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would wish me to announce that it is planned that when the Senate meets tomorrow, the session will run into the night if a vote has not been had upon the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal. So I desire to announce that it is planned that tomorrow the Senate will continue in session during the afternoon and into the night, without a recess at the dinner hour.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is also true, is it not, that the same program is contemplated for Thursday and Thursday night, if the Senate has not previously taken final action on the nominations?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; I thank the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee for that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the majority leader about the possibility of deciding today or tomorrow whether to ask the Senate to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote perhaps some time on Thursday on the nominations. I am not prepared to make such a request at this time, because very few Senators are now on the floor of the Senate. I had in mind having further discussion along that line with the majority leader tomorrow. I wish to give notice that such a request may be made some time tomorrow, so that Senators will at least be in a position to make up their minds about what they will do if such a request is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that of course such a request is always in order, but my opinion is that it will depend entirely on how we get along with the debate. Certainly there are many speeches yet to be made. I know that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] will speak, and I imagine he will speak at length, because we wish to hear from him. There are many other Senators whom I know will wish to speak. At any rate, we shall jump that hurdle when we reach it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska agree that if he hears from me at length, he will listen at length?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I will. I always am glad to listen to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. If I can convert one Senator, I shall be glad to speak at length, for that will be the first time I shall have had that experience since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, do I hold the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, when the Senate convenes, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. George Mayo, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Galilean Master, Thou who hast given to home and country all that can be given; who didst carry in Thy holy breast all the sacred aims which cannot die, bear witness of us that this day may be blessed.

We pray to open the way that leads to lofty altitudes of conscience and thus honor our high estate, fortifying our understanding with freedom from prejudice, from intolerance and bigotry. Quicken the sentiment of the public in deepest sympathy for all who suffer, that it may not fail in the performance of its whole duty for the welfare and protection of the people.

O that the spirit of our Master may bless and comfort those whose loved ones perished in the darkness of the bowels of the earth. Walk with them on the road to their earthly Emmaus, breaking the bread of eternal life.

"When sinks the soul, subdued by toil to slumber,
Its closing eye looks up to Thee in prayer.
Sweet the repose beneath Thy wings o'ershading,
But sweeter still to wake and find Thee there."

In Thy holy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOGGS of Delaware addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a brief summary of the various State laws dealing with communism.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Independence Reporter.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some letters.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I have just sent to the Attorney General, asking the Attorney General why he does not prosecute the Communist Party under the Voorhis-McCormack Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I asked a man who operates a little gasoline station in a small town what he thought about the President's plan for Greece and Turkey. He said he was perfectly willing to extend some little help to Greece but was absolutely opposed to sending any troops. He is also opposed to Congress appropriating large amounts to numberless foreign countries without some direct approval by the people.

He says that people are now asking him for credit for a couple of dollars' worth of gasoline, which they did not do before, and from his conversation with them he thinks they are losing their respect for their Government.

He says a man is not born "red," but becomes that way because of conditions, and that if we continue to give away everything we have and continue high prices for scarce goods in this country we will have a field in which communism can thrive.

EMERGENCY TEMPORARY DISPLACED PERSONS ADMISSION ACT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit admission to the United States of our fair share of displaced persons, provided they meet the standards under the immigration laws.

This bill seeks to give those unfortunate people, uprooted by war and unable to return home for fear of persecution, a chance to lead decent, useful lives as free men and women. At the same time, the bill would result in the saving of millions of dollars now spent in maintaining displaced persons' camps.

Offering these people opportunity would be totally in keeping with the tradition of our Nation which was founded by immigrants and always has profited by their contributions.

OPINION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SENIOR CLASS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL AT SPARTA, WIS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased this morning to receive a letter from the senior class of the Sparta High School of Sparta, Wis., giving me their opinion and recommendations as to the proposed loans to Greece and Turkey.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this letter as part of this statement.

I commend the members of the senior class of Sparta High School for writing their Congressman and giving him the benefit of their views. I wish all senior classes in the United States would write their Congressmen and let their Congressmen know their opinions on national issues. I welcome the useful and stimulating remarks of every senior in every high school on all matters before Congress.

SPARTA, WIS., *March 27, 1947.*

The Honorable WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: After having put in some study on foreign relations, we have decided that the only way to have a firm American policy is to back up the one we state.

We are much in favor of President Truman's plan as put forth in his recent speech regarding aid to Greece and Turkey. We feel that unless immediate action is taken, the issue will die in committees. Too many times, the American people have threatened and not acted. We have seen the results of delayed action in the Nazis' attack on Europe, in the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the Japanese invasion of China.

It would seem that the American people have backed the President almost unanimously in his stand against the spread of totalitarian forms of government. Yet Congress does not seem willing to express the people's desire for immediate action.

We have told Russia where we stand; now let us show her that we mean what we say by carrying out, without delay, the policy we have stated. That would mean not quibbling about the methods by which it should be done but to get it done as quickly as possible.

Very respectfully yours,

The Senior Class, Sparta High School: Phyllis Martin, Robert Munger, Wm. Ziegler, Shirley Petersen, Betty Knudtson, Beverly Hohn, Margaret Van Kirk, Basil Abbott, James Beron, Jesse McComb, William Hgzsman, Mary Flood, Madge Morgan, Dora M. Olsen, S. Barrett, George Olson, Eleanor Paulson, Bob McCollough, David Sullivan, Lloyd W. Peters, Verna Schober, Carol Schild, Arvilla Van Dkye, Beverly Hannis, Beverly Waege, Byron Zimmerman, John R. Druyer, Robert Goodman, Jeanette Griffin, Betty Jane Guy, Carmen Hesselberg, Suzanne Johnson, Juantine Knouse, Viola Brockman, Rosemary Kness, DeLaus Mautzke, Jane Peterson, Dick Hubbell, Carlos Z. Cartilh, Delores Bonin, Gloria Leenett, Dale Bernett, Lucille Andringa, Jerry Neumann, Doris Ninneman, Delores Rasmussen, Connie Schauf, Bob Salmon, Charlotte Schlaver, Jack Shlimovitz, Alice Slaver, Joyce Swingle, Beverly Zimmerman, John L. Sullivan, Allen Stendal, Farrell D. Sousek, David Koss, Janet Erlandson, Jean Hanson, Rietk Christensen, Sue Hill, Margaret Willey, Margaret McCoy, G. Oakley, Dolores Ottum, Arnold Petersen, Mary Schmitz, Elizabeth Schroeder, Don Sutter, Carol Wilcox, Ronald Wettstein, Helen Lebke, Donna Newbeng.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a message and report

of Adele I. Springer, the new president of the National Association of Women Lawyers.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by David Lawrence and also a report by Cecil Holland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION REDUCTIONS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, $6,000,000,000. The question is, Where are you going to save the money?

We now have the answer, and the answer is by slashing appropriations for the veterans, by slashing appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, by crippling national defense, by understating our known obligations, and by refusing to pay our just debts and obligations.

Mr. Speaker, that is the program of the majority as I see it, and I am against it.

GOOD FRIDAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on the eve of Good Friday to call to the attention of the House H. R. 1981, a bill which I introduced several weeks ago. The purpose of this bill is to give Good Friday the same legal status as Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Armistice Day.

I am sure that if the Members of the House will read the hearings recently held by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, they will be impressed with the justification for making Good Friday a national holiday.

Since introducing this bill I have been receiving mail from all over the country commenting favorably upon the measure and expressing the hope that it will be enacted into law.

There has been a marked progressive increase in the observance of Good Friday in recent years in this country. Among Christian countries Good Friday is looked upon as a great holy day and one to be observed with appropriate reverence. The United States is the only large Christian country in which Good Friday is not a legal holiday. It has been made a legal holiday in the British Empire, the Baltic countries, Italy, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and practically every other country. And in most of the countries where it is not a legal holiday it is religiously observed.

I am informed that approximately 15 States in our Union have, either by legislation or proclamation, established Good Friday as a holiday.

It is my hope and belief that if this bill is enacted into law in order to permit a more free and full religious observance of Good Friday, it would aid in the advancement of the fundamentals and ideals of Americanism and contribute to the resistance of ideologies foreign to our way of life.

I have been pleased at the general national interest that has followed the introduction of this measure and the support that it is receiving from the churches, service organizations, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, business and trade organizations, and civic groups.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the TVA appearing in last Sunday's Boston Herald.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the essential parts of a speech recently delivered by Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, at Boston.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Country Gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the session of the House, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DORN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who just spoke a while ago with reference to what the Republican Party was trying to do which would be harmful to the veterans and public works. We Republicans are not trying to do anything at all that is harmful to the veterans. We want to assist them all we possibly can. I want to say that if the New Deal Democrats had not been so much of a spendthrift administration for the last 10 or 15 years, you would not have had a debt of $259,185,335,159 on March 27. It is because you people have been squandering the money of the taxpayers of America that you have got this country in the terrible hole in which we find ourselves. A shocking debt. We are only trying to save this country for the veterans and for our people. We are trying to save this country for the American people, the thrifty people, the people who want to work and earn and save and protect America. That is what we want to do. We want to help these people, not harm them, and the Republican Party is going to stand up and do everything it can to preserve the institutions of America and make this country safe and solid for everybody for years to come. We believe in a sound, strong Government so we can have a good government for our people to live in, one that can protect and defend all our citizens by having a sound Treasury, a well-balanced economy, jobs for all, and happiness on every hand.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by Paul Mallon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the bill unanimously reported favorably by the Committee of Public Lands, of which I am chairman, to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, adopted March 28, 1947, and House Resolution No. 45, adopted March 26, 1947, by

the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by him at the University of North Carolina under the sponsorship of the Carolina Political Union, dealing with the President's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an address delivered by Rear Adm. O. L. Colclough at a convention of the Reserve officers of the naval services held in St. Louis last week end.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from Los Angeles papers.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks made by Daniel Webster 123 years ago on the subject of extending relief to Greece.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE GREEK FINANCIAL SITUATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank at the time that Premier Tsaldaris was in this country seeking a loan made a confidential report on the Greek financial situation. Why does the State Department refuse to make public this report of one of the agencies of our Government? And, Mr. Speaker, the UNRRA in February of this year, made a confidential report which the State Department also refuses to make public. Mr. Speaker, why is the State Department afraid to tell this Congress and the American people the truth about the financial foreign indebtedness of Greece, and why is the State Department afraid to tell the truth about the present Greek Government?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Department of State does not have confidence, in the common sense, of the Congress, or confidence, in the common sense, of the American people. The State Department seems to be infected with the idea that the truth is not a good thing. In fact, they seem to have procured an iron curtain from somewhere and they have decided to put an iron curtain around the truth about Greece and Turkey. I suggest that the State Department give us the truth, and they return that iron curtain of theirs to the place where it belongs. The American people do not like iron curtains, and our State Department, if it does not yet know that, ought to become acquainted with the love that the American people hold for the simple plain truth about situations in which they are asked to take action. As an example of the kind of thing I mean, will our State Department please inform the Congress whether or not the Greek Minister of Security Zervos was a collaborator of the Nazis during the time of their occupation of Greece? Second, will our State Department please inform us why it is that over 1,500 officers who served in the Nazi security battalions during their occupation in Greece are today officers in the Greek Army. Mr. Speaker, we would like to know how many of the present ministers in the Greek Government were collaborators with the Nazis—we want to know! We have a right to know. We are being asked to support that Government with assistance of American taxpayers, and before we vote to pour that money down a rat hole, we want to know the truth about the present Greek Government—its financial commitments, its foreign indebtedness, the history of its cabinet ministers, and why it is that 1,500 officers in the Greek Army were Nazi security police.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to where we are going to make slashes in the Federal budget, I know a young man who is now working with the Army. After working 8 hours for the Government he works 8 hours in private employment. He says that out of 86 people in his department, 40 could be disposed of with resulting greater efficiency in that civilian branch of the Army. He says those conditions exist generally as to civilian employees in the Army and Navy. So we can cut the budget of the Army and Navy and help to meet the $6,000,000,000 reduction in the budget and get greater efficiency. It is my opinion that there are no departments in the Government in greater need of being gone over with a fine-tooth comb by the Committee on Appropriations than the Army and the Navy. By so doing we will not impair national defense, but will increase it.

THE BRITISH PUNISH THE INNOCENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the British Palestine Government will require the entire Jewish community to pay for the damage of at least $1,000,000 caused by fires of oil installations at Haifa. This damage was sabotage and is ascribed to terrorists. The British action is equivalent to visiting punishment upon the innocent. Responsible Jews in and out of Palestine deplore terrorism. I condemn it. Jews themselves have been hurt and killed by the unlawful action of members of the Stern and Irgun gangs. Certainly the entire Jewish community should not be made to pay for the crimes of a few desperadoes.

Attlee and Bevin fail to realize that the deliberate default of their solemn pledges to open the gates of Palestine to refugees has caused despair, and despair creates terrorism. But why hold innocent people as hostages and make them pay blood money? It makes a farce of British justice. It is like making the entire citizenry of Washington pay for the desperate action of a few of its citizens. That is unthinkable.

But British cruelty knows no bounds in Palestine. Our administration should offer vehement protest to the end that Great Britain will punish the guilty and not the innocent.

We are up to our necks in the middle east. Our Government can and should protest the latest campaign of British injustice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include three pages of a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

INTERNATIONAL MOON GAZERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Members of the House of Representatives should not remain silent while a large number of international moon gazers, who seem to be floating around in a pink cloud of sublunar radiation, attempt to destroy the Government of the United States or make it subordinate to UN, which has been compared to an international Sanhedrin.

I am opposed, and I believe nine-tenths of the American people are opposed, to setting up any supergovernment over the United States.

These speeches that were made on yesterday, especially by Mr. "Corn" Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, and others I could mention, demanding that we subordinate this Government to this outfit in New York, this Tower of Babel if you please—that behind-the-scenes talk mostly about what they are going to get out of the United States or what they are going to do to us—do not

reflect the sentiments of the American people.

It is time for real Americans to wake up and say to the world that we are not going to destroy the United States or subordinate it to the will of an outfit dominated by Joe Stalin, Molotov, or Gromyko.

We have appeased those enemies of our country too long now.

We had better look out for our own country and our own people before it is too late.

Remember that—

No man escapes
When freedom fails,
The best men rot
In filthy jails:
And they who cried:
"Appease, appease,"
Are hanged by men
They tried to please.

Communist control of this country would mean the putting to death of probably millions of our people and the enslavement of tens of millions more. It would be the end of freedom of all kinds in this country.

It must not happen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, giving some information about the safety situation in the coal mines.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the front page of the New York Times on the Communist drive in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Abernethy	Chapman	Gorski
Allen, Ill.	Cheif	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Clements	Hale
Andersen, H. Carl	Clippinger	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Harless, Ariz.
Andrews, N. Y.	Cotton	Harness, Ind.
Barden	Coudert	Hartley
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Heffernan
Bishop	Dawson, Ill.	Hinshaw
Bland	Delaney	Hoeven
Bonner	Donohue	Howell
Bradley, Calif.	Doughton	Huber
Bradley, Mich.	Elliott	Hull
Bramblett	Elsaesser	Jenkins, Ohio
Brophy	Fallon	Jenkins, Pa.
Buchanan	Feighan	Johnson, Tex.
Buckley	Fletcher	Karsten, Mo.
Burke	Fogarty	Kean
Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Gallagher	Keefe
Carson	Gavin	Kelley
Chadwick	Gerlach	Keogh
Kirwan	Gordon	O'Brien
Klein	Pace	Simpson, Pa.
Knutson	Passman	Smith, Wis.
Larcade	Pfeifer	Somers
Lyle	Philbin	Taylor
McMillan, S. C.	Plumley	Thomason
Maloney	Potts	Towe
Mansfield, Tex.	Price, Fla.	Vail
Meade, Ky.	Rains	Vinson
Meyer	Rayfiel	Wadsworth
Mills	Rooney	Whitten
Morgan	Sadlak	Williams
Morrison	Sadowski	Winstead
Murray, Wis.	Shafer	Woodruff
Nodar	Sikes	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 167) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance, in the amount of $50,000, providing protection against loss with respect to such funds. Until otherwise provided by law, premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the Sergeant at Arms and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 22, 1947:

H. R. 1968. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On March 27, 1947:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

On March 29, 1947:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On March 31, 1947:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2849, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Readjustment benefits: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Readjustment benefits," $523,836,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 9, line 5, strike out the sum "$523,836,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$873,836,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am restoring by this amendment, and the House will if it adopts the amendment, the $350,000,000 cut which was made by the committee in connection with this matter. There was an item of $524,000,000 which was expended to meet 1946 requirements, about which there was considerable confusion in the testimony and direct confusion in the main table that we considered on page 4 of the justification that General Bradley presented to us. We had General Bradley up after his representatives called our attention to it late yesterday. This question took place while the general was there:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You can see in this testimony that Mr. CASE refers to how apparently there was some trouble on the cut which we made, and there was apparently some misunderstanding, but that testimony certainly indicated that that cut was in order.

General BRADLEY. If I misled you there, I am sorry, because I was discussing the amount needed for the rest of the year. I also did not begin back and pick up this $24,000,000 that we started short.

Now, that is the reason that cut was made. We were deceived by this page 4 of the justifications which we had before us when the General was before us and this did not show the $624,000,000 expenditure, and although we made the most careful analysis that we could of the picture, we did not run into that testimony and these figures. I am sorry that the committee made that mistake, and I can see nothing else to do under the circumstances except to offer this amendment. I hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his strategy. He was wise enough to sense the temper of the House and its determination to increase the appropriation to the amount

requested by the Bureau. At this late date, in a deathbed repentance, it is proposed to restore the $350,000,000 cut.

Something has been said about deception. If there was any deception it was self-deception, because this whole matter, including the expenditure of the $624,908,509 in 1946, the first half of the fiscal year, is plainly set forth in the table on page 650 of the hearings. This table was before the committee at the time the bill was marked up—at the time it was determined to make this unwarranted cut in this important provision for the veterans. There could have been no mistake about it. It stood out like an elephant in a flower garden.

The table lists the total amount of money available for the year. The first question that naturally would have been asked—if they had not known already—would have been, "How much of it have you left at this time?" It is evident that the insistent fight made by the minority to restore this item, and the obvious support of the House on the floor yesterday during the debate on the amendment has not been without results.

To have passed the bill as it was submitted to the House yesterday without this $350,000,000 would have been to deny the veterans benefits and advantages to which they are entitled under veteran's legislation enacted by the Congress by practically unanimous vote. I am glad the motion comes from that side, although we had the identical motion ready to offer from this side and the House was ready to pass it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me it is just a little unfortunate that the gentleman from Missouri was not present during a great deal of the hearings on this bill so that his committee might have had the benefit of his knowledge; also that the gentleman was not present at the time that this item in the bill was marked up. I am not criticizing the gentleman, for the gentleman's many duties may have called him elsewhere, and I can add that it was not my privilege to be present during a great deal of the testimony of General Bradley because the Committee on War Appropriations was meeting at the same time, and I was there much of the time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed; then if I have time I shall be glad to yield. The hearings, of course, are available to everyone.

Let me call your attention to the following statements made during the testimony of General Bradley and appearing at page 638. The chairman asked General Bradley how much money had been spent month by month. They went over the various months, and the Chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under $90,000,000; with $15,000,000 it would be $105,000,000. If you call it $110,000,000, you would be getting to pretty near a stable average; would you not? It ought not to run over $110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis $550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about $1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6 months was $955,000,000. So that $550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

Mr. Moore was the finance officer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about.

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about 1,250,000 average, and now we are getting only about 1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up their deficiency estimates, they estimated they would have a million and a quarter veterans getting the readjustment allowances. Now it is running about 1,150,000 as an average. So, taking the figures which General Bradley had given and running them back to him and asking him if $550,000,000 would be sufficient for the balance of the year, the chairman was entitled to think, on General Bradley's replies, that the amount suggested would cover the requirements. That is, the $1,505,000,000 on which the committee's figures were predicated.

In the same way, during the testimony on the estimates the chairman asked General Bradley about the funds required for Army and Navy pensions based upon the monthly expenditure experience. And in the same way General Bradley answered him on that, and said it looked like they could do with $241,000,000 instead of $441,000,000. In other words on Army and Navy pensions General Bradley said that a cut of $200,000,000 could be made. He reiterated that this morning and the figures on that saving will not be changed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that both in the subcommittee and in the full committee Republicans and Democrats alike were unanimous on both these matters?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And is it not a further fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] at no time prior to the time the bill came on the floor indicated that the cuts as made were not properly made?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a fact. The action of the committee so far as anyone knew was unanimous, and if the gentleman had some other information the committee did not get the benefit of it. In any event, the figures that were presented by the committee were on the basis of the testimony that I have cited, and General Bradley this morning expressed his regrets that his replies had unintentionally misled the committee.

In addition to that, it should be pointed out that the general table at page 4 of the estimates showing the amount of funds that had been appropriated for 1947 gave a larger amount than was needed to meet 12 months' expenditures at the rate of actual expenditures. The explanation is that actually some of these funds which were listed as appropriated for 1947 were used in 1946 fiscal year.

In fact, $624,000,000 was spent before June 30, 1946, which explains the misunderstanding that developed. There is even a definite possibility that the amount of the budget estimate being provided by the chairman's amendment will not meet the requirements. In that case, we hope that an additional deficiency estimate may be considered before the end of the fiscal year so we can get on an even keel and start the new fiscal year with a clean slate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Missouri and my friend who has just spoken, I am glad that this matter has been taken care of in the way it will be in a few minutes; however, the action to be taken shows the constructive import of a minority party in this body. The Democratic Party, as I have said on several occasions, the role of our party, is as a constructive critic, a constructive proposer and a constructive opposer. In other words, the role of a minority party under constitutional government is one of constructiveness and the Democratic Party in the House yesterday under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] as well as others, who spoke yesterday on this bill, lived up to the highest ideals of that role, in calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that a very serious mistake had been made in the sum of $350,000,000, a matter of grave import to the veterans of this country. I congratulate the gentlemen on my side for their constructive leadership of yesterday which was brought about, I am sure, mainly as the result of the leadership of the minority party in taking the action that will be taken today and in the action taken by the leadership of the majority party, and I want to express to them my congratulations for recognizing the power, the force and the logic of the constructive criticism and the constructive suggestions made only yesterday by the leaders of the Democratic Party in connection with this bill, bringing back into the bill $350,000,000, which means so much and will mean so much between now and June 30 to the veterans of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to restore this appropriation, but I rise at this time to deplore the unjust

criticism that is being heaped on General Bradley.

I saw the same thing done to General Hines 2 years ago. I served in this House as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation in the minority, for many years and 8 years while General Hines was head of the Veterans' Administration. I never knew a more conscientious public servant in my life than Frank Hines. Two years ago an investigation was stirred up and some writers poured into the RECORD statements that when run down were found to be made by inmates of insane institutions.

It embarrassed the Administration and General Hines resigned and became Ambassador to Panama. Now, the same type of attacks are being made on General Bradley, one of the great heroes of the war through which we have just passed.

When General Bradley became head of the Veterans' Administration he came before our committee. I said, "Now, General, remember you have only been through a war up to this time. It may look like a sewing circle by the time you get through with this job."

I am not saying that everything that is done by the Veterans' Administration is perfect, but suppose you keep on until you drive General Bradley from that position, just whom will you put in his place? Why disturb an institution that is doing so much for the servicemen of this Nation by continuously nagging that great soldier, that great American, who is now head of the Veterans' Administration?

I just wanted to utter these few words of protest and say to you that General Bradley has one of the hardest jobs that ever fell to the lot of an individual any time, anywhere. It is one of the biggest jobs in the world, and the less criticism, unjust criticism, that is hurled at him, the better he will be enabled to discharge the duties of that exalted office.

For my part I say that General Bradley is doing a splendid job. Let's help him and not hinder him in the discharge of his duties as head of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military and naval insurance: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Military and naval insurance," $3,125,500, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not burden the RECORD with a personal reference but for the fact that reference repeatedly has been made by the gentleman who has just spoken to my absence from the committee.

It is a matter of common knowledge in the committee that I was a member of two subcommittees meeting simultaneously, devoting part time to each committee, and in addition was a victim of the flu a considerable part of the time the two committees were in session. For that reason I was unable to attend the meeting of the committee when the bill was reported and certainly would not have agreed to the item had I been present. I was, however, present when the bill was marked up in the subcommittee and offered numerous suggestions, but not a single suggestion I made was given the slightest attention. So the statement made that it was unanimous is not sustained by the record.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, maybe the coolness with which the gentleman was received was what gave him the flu.

Mr. CANNON. The warm friendship of all members of the subcommittee more than made up for the official chilliness accorded my humble suggestions.

But we must not get away from the one proposition, Mr. Chairman, that an attempt has been made here to deprive the veterans of $350,000,000 without which we could not have carried out the provisions of the GI law. The proponents of the cut planned to cut that much money from the bill and drafted the bill with that in mind and wrote the report and brought it in here on the floor. Only our determined opposition to the cut here on the floor yesterday—and the obvious support accorded us from both sides of the aisle—brought about the change which they propose this morning. They marched up the hill. They saw the situation. And they promptly marched down again.

Now, the only alibi offered is that they did not know about this $624,000,000 spent in the first half of the fiscal year. It was like a headlight on a locomotive at midnight. It could not have been overlooked. It is here in the table on page 650 of the hearings. They had this table before them in print when they marked up the bill. All of that has been said here—all the citations of colloquy with General Bradley cannot conceal the fact that they made this cut of $350,000,000 with their eyes open. Any other version would be a sad reflection on the ability and alertness of the large number of experienced men at the majority end of the table who made a searching cross-examination of all witnesses who testified on behalf of the Veterans' Bureau. Any suggestion that they did not know that any part of the money for the fiscal year had been spent in the first half of the year constitutes one of the most transparent alibis ever offered on this floor.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I must offer condign criticism against the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the failure to include moneys for payment of judgments obtained in the Court of Claims and approved by the Supreme Court, approximately $2,000 for the salaries for past services rendered by Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., formerly members of the Communications Commission staff, and Robert Morss Lovett, former Government counsel of the Virgin Islands. The Supreme Court held that the action of the last Congress in depriving these men of their salaries was a bill of attainder. We now thumb our nose at the Supreme Court and still refuse those salaries to those three gentlemen, although that Court said our previous action was illegal. Thus we continue an illegality and refuse to admit our error.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for many years and as a student of the excesses growing out of the actions of the French Chamber of Deputies in passing bills of attainder during the Reign of Terror, I think the Committee on Appropriations was woefully in error when it previously deleted these salaries, and this Congress was woefully in error in adopting the views of the Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations repeats its sin by deleting the salary of one Warren of the Conciliation Service and by still refusing justice and earned salaries—now reduced to judgments against the United States—to Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett.

Let me read you briefly from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against Lovett:

> What is involved here is a congressional proscription of Lovett, Watson, and Dodd, prohibiting their ever holding a Government job. Were this case to be not justiciable, congressional action, aimed at three named individuals, which stigmatized their reputation and seriously impaired their chance to earn a living, could never be challenged in any court. Our Constitution did not contemplate such a result. To quote Alexander Hamilton, "A limited Constitution * * * [is] one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice; whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing."

We will again be flying in the face of the principle enunciated by Alexander Hamilton if we follow the lead of the Committee on Appropriations and agree to cut out the salary of this man Warren. To my mind, this action is small; it is petty. Not much money is involved, but a very bad practice is involved, as is a very bad precedent, a precedent that may well come back to plague us in the future. If we can cut off the salary of Warren, then we can cut off the salary of an Ambassador, a Federal judge, a Cabinet officer, the President himself. Such action destroys the separation of powers theory of our Government. Cutting out salary is tantamount to dismissal—an executive act.

This is the first time I know of that an appropriations committee has recommended that a debt sanctified by a decision of the Supreme Court shall not be paid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In connection with that, may I say to the gentleman that in the case of Dalton against the United States in 1930 the Committee on Appropriations refused to pay a judgment of $11,900. That came up several times, and an amendment was offered on the floor in

several subsequent years, and it was refused.

Mr. CELLER. I am not familiar with that instance. I am not informed of the court that rendered the judgment. I probably should be. I probably am derelict in not recalling that incident. I do not recall whether the judgment was rendered by a State or Federal court. But I know it is repugnant to the Nation's conscience to repudiate a debt. A debt was incurred when these men rendered services and when Mr. Warren rendered services. After the services were rendered and a debt has been incurred, by an ex post facto enactment you cut off that salary, you repudiate that debt.

Mr. TABER. I presume the gentleman is familiar with the provisions of the Constitution that no money shall be authorized to be paid out of the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I am well aware, of course, that the powers of appropriation reside in the legislative branch, but in the exercise of those powers the legislature cannot poach on the preserves of the judicial or executive branches and the legislature cannot indulge in what I might say in common parlance is lynch law, to condemn a man or woman without trial and without confrontation of witnesses and without an opportunity to be heard to defend themselves. That is what we do in the case of Warren if we delete his salary. That is what we did in the case of the three gentlemen I mentioned—Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, and Godwin Watson. We simply said in effect, "You men are guilty," because somebody somewhere said that they were associated with certain subversive organizations, but they had no chance to defend themselves and confront their accuser before this body—the body that sought to judge them. We acted as prosecutor and judge and jury. We have no such procedure here to permit them to exculpate themselves, to defend themselves. We simply point a finger of guilt at them and we say, "You are guilty, and you must be taken off the payrolls."

I want to say I do not harbor any sympathies for these men, if they are subversive. I may not agree with their political ideologies. If they are Communists, I want them taken off the payroll, but there are other methods by which we can take them off the payroll—legal ways. We seek to dismiss them in an illegal way. Only the executive can discharge them. We have no such rights.

The President of the United States in his wisdom recently announced a procedure to determine an employee's loyalty and we should follow that procedure, but we should not, as I said before, develop a kangaroo court here and make of justice a travesty by our action.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. If the founding fathers had expected that the Congress would exercise its power to appropriate funds in any other way than by an exercise of its discretion and the merits of each item that came up, a provision would have been inserted making the payment of judgments of this character automatic.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking now of the Warren case, and this is what the Supreme Court says.

Mr. TABER. I am talking about what is before us.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking about the Warren case. We cannot exercise the power of appropriation by passing what I called before ex post facto statutes or bills of attainder. Here is what the Supreme Court said:

> Those who wrote our Constitution well knew the danger inherent in special legislative acts which take away life, liberty, or property, of particular named persons because the legislature thinks they are guilty of conduct which deserves punishment. They intended to safeguard the people of this country from punishment without trial by duly constituted courts. When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishment were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of free men and vision, and so they proscribed bills of attainder.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. In order to correct the RECORD, the gentleman stated that Dodd and Watson had no hearings and were not confronted by witnesses.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that, sir. I did not say that. I said there were no hearings before us where we constitute ourselves as a court and strip them of their rights and privileges. A hearing before a legislative committee is not a judicial hearing, hearing where there is accorded the right of counsel, the right to be confronted with the accusers, the right of cross-examination, the right of direct examination under proper rules of procedure, with no admission of hearsay and self-serving declarations. That is what is meant when we speak of judicial hearing.

Mr. MASON. Hearings were held before the committee of this Congress and full testimony was taken.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with that, but that is not a court. That is not a procedure outlined by our Constitution whereby the condemned secures a fair trial before his rights of property or salary are taken from him. The accused are deprived of their rights under the Constitution if we do not accord them a trial where they can adequately defend themselves and have counsel and cross-examine and confront hostile witnesses. A hearing before a legislative committee is insufficient to ground the claim to deprive a man of his property or his security or his life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to my good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] lamenting the actions of the Appropriations Committee, I think I ought to say a word in the way of commiseration of the committee in view of all the pressure that is being exercised at the present time. To me it is an astonishing spectacle that pressure of the most highly organized type is becoming so rife in the country today with respect to the actions of the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives in respect of appropriations for the Federal Government.

One of the latest editions of my very fine collection—and I assure you I am getting a collection from all over the country—is a letter sent out by the National Customs Service Association, dated the 27th of March 1947, and signed by one J. F. Doyle, the president of the association. It is a very interesting document, and I think the House and the country ought to know a little something about it.

It starts out in the first paragraph by saying:

> In anticipation of favorable action by the Senate on the customs budget—

You see under the rule one should not mention the deliberations of another body, but already they are anticipating favorable action from another body. They are anticipating that the money will be restored. They are anticipating, of course, that they are going to roll back the well-deliberated action of the House of Representatives and the subcommittee that spent weeks and weeks in exploring these matters.

They say further:

> This letter is being distributed so as to put you all on your toes.

Get ready, boys, for one grand offensive upon the Congress of the United States that is charged under the Constitution as the guardian of the purse and the taxpayer's money. So get on your toes now for a grand assault upon the Public Treasury.

They say further:

> We must all be ready to get going.

Be ready in all corners of the country now, not only to retain your spot on the pay roll but to get additional spots on the pay roll.

This letter goes on:

> Contact particularly the House Subcommittee on Appropriations.

And then it mentions the names. They forget about the antilobbying statute, and perhaps it needs a little doctoring up. It is deficient in the sense that you have to use public funds to carry on this lobbying work. The time has come when we are going to have to give serious consideration to this business of these people who are entrenched on the pay rolls of the country pressuring Congress to put back money that should have been taken out long ago.

So, "Contact members of the subcommittee and then contact other members of the Appropriations Committee," and it names them.

Then, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] it says, "Write particularly to Congressman TABER." You see, he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Write par-

ticularly to him. Address your missives and your telegrams to him, and put the bee on JOHN TABER, who has been fighting the battle of economy for a quarter of a century for the people of this country in this Congress. JOHN TABER, who has been on the Appropriations Committee since 1923, has done a magnificent job for the country. So, boys, put on the pressure now and see if you cannot weaken him, now that he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Then they have this further very significant thing. Now, listen, if you have any doubts about these telegrams coming from home:

Granting of the $36,000,000 as approved by the Budget Bureau for personnel will allow the retention of all employees and the addition of 600 new employees.

The subcommittee was correct. They wanted to put on 600 more and we said, "No." So full steam ahead now. Put the pressure on Congress and on all Members and get some favorable response from them. That is the kind of propaganda that is going out by the ton at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of it has been inspired here in Washington.

Now, I will read a little more from this very edifying document:

Have your letters and telegrams ready. Have your contacts made.

If anybody has got any influence now, have him call his Congressman. Have him send telegrams, have him send letters, find out who your Congressman is. Maybe none of these boys have had contact with him before, but find out now, because maybe your job is in jeopardy, but be sure and contact your Congressman. Maybe he had not shown up in other days and other years, but contact your Congressman now and find out who he is.

Do not miss any chance to convince your Congressman that he should act favorably.

Lay it on the line now. Tell every Member of the House and of the Senate that you demand favorable action to put this money back, including money for 600 over and above those who are on the pay roll at the present time. They are not satisfied with that kind of pressure. They go on to say:

Letters and telegrams from home are needed.

Circulate around in your neighborhood, find out somebody who knows the Congressman, and get them to send in letters and telegrams.

Petitions also will help. Circulate one in your own division or room.

Throughout the customs service they are urging that they send petitions to Congress to break down their resistance in the interest of the taxpayers of the country so that more people can be added to the Federal pay roll.

Contact newspapers.

Now you know why all these articles have been appearing in the country press, and in the daily press. The boys are busy, they are giving a good account of themselves. I saw an article in the New Hampshire paper which says this, if it is put into effect, will result in dope smugglers running wild all over the country. And so the pressure is on. They are getting the word out to the country newspapers:

Contact chambers of commerce and business houses. Contact veterans. Contact railroads and steamships. Contact politicians.

That is great. Contact politicians and have them give Congress the business. Maybe there is a State legislator or a State senator out home; maybe there is a chief of police or a sheriff who is elected to public office; anybody, any elected official, any politician, get him to write in and tell the Congress how serious it is that the Senate ought to put back this money and the House ought to go along.

Contact your governor, the mayors of every city, all State and city officials, and everyone or anyone who can help.

Yes, they are getting ready to go out and put the pressure on Congress. They have got to get that "dough" back into their bill because there are 600 additional jobs that probably will be available in the 1948 election. So full steam ahead, boys, get everybody from the governor on down, the chamber of commerce, your neighbors; put the pressure on those humble Representatives in Washington, make them put back the "dough." The sanctity of the Federal pay roll must not be profaned by those profane Representatives of the people on Capitol Hill who are trying to scare up an occasional dollar for the great forgotten man in America, John Q. Taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, and as a lawyer, I say the Supreme Court has a good deal of repenting to do before it will ever direct me how to legislate, especially after the Bridges case. Besides, it is not the prerogative of the Supreme Court to tell the Congress what to do. The Constitution vests that power in us.

I voted to eliminate these men from the pay roll before and I am going to vote so again.

To show you the kind of propaganda they are spreading all over the country they will be coming in here and demanding that the Supreme Court put back these men that President Truman is getting ready to throw off the pay roll.

I have here an advertisement that appeared in both big New York newspapers, an advertisement by the Communist Party, and to show you how they are going to concentrate on others I want to read this for the edification of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It states:

Act now.

To outlaw the Communist Party is to scrap the Bill of Rights.

That is a criminal party or organization engaged in a criminal conspiracy to overthrow this Government, a criminal plan for spreading poisonous propaganda for the purpose of destroying American institutions. There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Un-American Activities, a successor to the same committee before which these people had their hearing, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] was on the committee at that time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. They were convicted upon their own testimony?

Mr. RANKIN. That was my understanding.

Mr. MASON. By words from their own mouths?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. Now, they come back here, after the Supreme Court has made a first-class citizen out of Harry Bridges, and try to have the Supreme Court tell us how to legislate.

This Communist advertisement goes on and states:

Protest this effort.

Telegraph or write to (1) President Harry S. Truman, White House, Washington, D. C.

They ask these people to write to President Truman, as if he does not have enough mail on this subject already.

Who is the next one they want the people to write to? Listen to this:

(2) Representative RANKIN, House Un-American Committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

Just imagine the message in garbled English that will come to my desk as a result of this appeal.

They ask them to write to President Truman and to write to me.

Who is the third one?

(3) Your own Congressman.

That is, after they find out who he is, I presume.

No; this element that is attempting to browbeat Congress into keeping men on the Federal pay roll who are found to be unfit and unworthy has brought about a great deal of the trouble that we are having today. It has brought about the necessity for President Truman's issuing his Executive order recently to drive from the Federal pay roll those people who are subservient to a foreign power and who are working for the destruction of this Government.

Let us be men, let us vote our own convictions, and let the Supreme Court know that the Congress of the United States will do its own legislating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Operating expenses," $38,220.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 11, line 6, strike out "$38,220" and insert in lieu thereof "$63,700."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. We are glad to see the bill improved.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I personally am responsible for the amount stated in the bill, and I personally want to be responsible for restoring this amount. It is for the conducting of our recreational facilities here in the District, and it is made necessary by action of this House in raising the wages of the people employed in those recreational facilities. I think it is mighty important that they be kept going at their present status.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' SERVICES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], this question, while it is fresh in my mind and before I forget it, if it is true, according to newspaper reports, that you have ordered the discontinuance of construction of veterans' hospitals in this country?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. I have no authority to do anything of that kind. I have tried, insofar as I have been able, to persuade the Veterans' Administration to take over and operate hospitals that the Army and the Navy are using or have been using, which they are ready to surrender, so that they might have some place to take care of these boys temporarily, and I have also urged that the Veterans' Administration use the 3,000 beds that they were supposed to use in the Navy hospitals that are being operated by the Navy, so that they might be better able to take care of the boys who need hospitalization.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also ask the distinguished gentleman this question: How could the plan operate without sufficient money? We also have inadequate staffs.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about sufficient money being available to the Veterans' Administration for those hospital operations.

Mr. DORN. I understand that in a lot of places right now, in addition to the 23,000 men who are on the waiting list, we have lack of funds to provide for adequate staffs to take care of some of those we do have.

Mr. TABER. Whether there is or not, that matter has never been presented to our committee. Frankly, from the best computation that I was able to make, I felt that for salaries and expenses the chief of the Veterans' Administration had a margin of about $25,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. Be that as it may, if an estimate were presented to us for our consideration, or if any facts were brought out which justified our going into anything of that kind, we would have hearings upon it and go the limit in trying to provide.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that the American Legion has quite a few facts on men that are on the waiting list for hospitalization, men of both wars, and also inadequate staffs in certain sections, and also that 14,000 beds of the Army and the Navy, civilian and State hospitals, are already being used right now.

Mr. TABER. Well, the gentleman may be right. Instead of using about 5,500 Navy beds they have dropped down to using 2,500 beds. That is the picture as far as utilization of Navy beds goes. I have felt that they should take advantage of their opportunity to use the Navy beds that are available to them. Maybe I am wrong in trying to get them to do that, but I felt it would relieve the pressure on the bed situation.

Mr. DORN. Did or did not the gentleman ask them to suspend construction? That is the report. Whether or not it is erroneous I do not know, so I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I did not ask them to suspend construction, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since we are speaking of the beds for the veterans' hospitals, I should like to bring to the attention of the House a thing that has alarmed me very much, and that is General Eisenhower's reported statement that there should be one head over the Army and Navy and Veterans' Administration hospitals. I believe the Members of the House would agree with me that the veterans want to be hospitalized, in the main, in their own veterans' hospitals under their own veterans' physicians. The entire membership of the House will want to look into that situation with me and see that the Army and Navy do not take away that service. My understanding is that neither General Kirk nor Admiral Swanson want to consolidate the service. I believe that the veterans would not get as satisfactory care if that were done. There are many things that veterans require that are not so easily adjusted if they are hospitalized in Army or Navy hospitals. That is just one reason for not consolidating them.

Under the GI bill of rights we authorized the appropriation of $500,000,000 for the construction of hospital beds, so there can be no question of there not being enough money to go ahead with hospital construction. We have all been greatly distressed that for one reason or another the construction of veterans' hospitals has not gone forward during the past 2 years. To me it seems inexcusable.

I should like to say to the House, in view of the fact that it has been stated quite often that General Bradley resents surveys or inspections or investigations, that as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have the opinion, in which I think the other members of the committee will all back me up, that General Bradley not only does not resent our survey of his installations but rather welcomes our suggestions. I saw General Bradley this morning, and I am under the impression that he is very glad of any work done by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its staff insofar as the curtailment of $350,000,000 in this appropriation for veterans is concerned. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] acted promptly to reinstate the appropriation after the real need was shown for the appropriation at this time. I think it was work done by our Veterans' Affairs Committee or related to it that was somewhat responsible for the Veterans' Administration correcting the mistake in the figures they gave to the Committee on Appropriations so that the figures were finally agreed to. The employee of the Veterans' Administration who gave erroneous information is no longer doing that kind of work. That is an instance of the Veterans' Administration wishing to correct any situation that is not helpful. The task of caring for over 20,000,000 veterans is a staggering task. Cooperation is necessary if we are to be successful——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just wondering whether the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can advise us whether or not that committee is in agreement with the policy, as I understand it, of General Bradley with respect to having the veterans' hospitals wherever possible at medical centers and large points of population where they will be easily accessible to the veterans. Is the committee in agreement with General Bradley on that policy?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, as chairman, I cannot speak for the entire membership of the committee. We have 21 new members on the committee now, and the chairman does not know the views of all the members. I do think the committee would agree entirely that it is important to have hospitals where the most expert medical advice is available. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly stated that hospitals should be made accessible to the veterans. General Bradley and General Hawley deserve an enormous amount of credit for the fine medical and nursing service they are giving the veterans, the very fine outside consultants that are being used, and the outside clinics that make more beds available in the hospitals, outside clinics which, because they are available, allow the men to continue their work, since they can go to the clinics and still continue on their jobs.

In this bill is a ceiling of 100 persons in the Public Relations Division of the Veterans' Administration. I am of the

opinion that the other body will modify that cut in personnel. I should like to point out certain functions that Division performs:

The increase in staff of VA public relations was made by General Bradley because the previous Appropriations Committee established a ceiling of 300 people for this operation and specifically recommended that the then existing staff in this operation be built up in order that more and better information might be disseminated to veterans and their dependents as to their rights and benefits and how and where to obtain them. It was felt by the previous Appropriations Committee that an organized, nationwide effort of this sort would accomplish two things:

(a) Render a service to which veterans are entitled.

(b) Ease the ever increasing burden of letters, inquiries, misdirected claims, applications and complaints pouring into Veterans' Administration.

There is considerable evidence that VA public relations has more than paid its way in accomplishing those results. VA radio programs alone have done an effective job of disseminating information to veterans.

The figures on VA radio programs are interesting:

During the first 7 months of fiscal 1947 VA spent $92,212 on radio salaries and $17,609 on records. That is a total of $109,820.

The programs those salaries and records created were aired by radio networks and stations throughout the country to the tune of $5,170,899 worth of radio time for which VA paid nothing!

I want a complete analysis of the functions and effectiveness of this activity before too drastic cuts are made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a few minutes ago, appeared to be very, very much disturbed over a letter that the president of the Customs Employees' Association had sent out. After 16 years of being on the majority side in the House and knowing what the results are of people exercising their constitutional right of petition—and that is all that this gentleman was doing—I would suggest to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that he view these experiences from a more tolerant angle because what Mr. Doyle did—I think that was the gentleman's name—was under a constitutional right which he, as well as every other American citizen, possesses to petition their public officials. Whether or not he did it in a way that pleases my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not the question. I think what he did is all right.

I remember in past years receiving many letters from the National Association of Manufacturers. I did not take the floor and accuse them of pressure of any kind. I received those letters recognizing the fact that whether or not I agreed with them that organization had a constitutional right to communicate with me.

It is only recently that the wool interests in my section of the country—and I do not know that any of them are Democrats up my way, but I do know many of them whom I personally like—contacted me. They are businessmen. They have contacted me through the years, and I hope they will continue to do so as long as I am a Member of this body. I never considered they were doing anything other than exercising their right as American citizens to petition their public officials.

I have in mind the fight now between certain Western States and western interests and New England on the question of export of leather and hides. I have taken the position which I think is for the best interests of New England. I do not consider they are doing anything terrible or engaging in any sinister act in communicating with me. I consider they were doing so in the exercise of their constitutional right of petition.

However, Mr. Doyle's letter did certainly produce great results. In exercising his right as a humble American citizen, he has started into operation something that apparently disturbs greatly my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In any event, it has brought to the country the fact that the appropriations for the next year for the Customs Service, unless increased, will seriously affect that service which the agency will be able to give to the business interests of America.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, on page 1367, I inserted a letter which I received from Commissioner Johnson which fairly sets forth the situation showing why they have had to lay the men off. In the deficiency appropriations carried in this bill, some slight relief will be afforded between now and June 30, but it will not meet the situation that will exist after June 30 because in the appropriation bills we have passed heretofore relating to the Treasury Department there is a provision, so far as terminal leave or annual leave pay is concerned, that it is to be paid out of 1947 appropriations and not out of 1948. The committee and the House by that action tapped into the 1947 appropriation in relation to separations, that ordinarily would have taken place on or after July 1.

But my main purpose in rising is to call to the attention of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] impersonally and in the most friendly and warm spirit, the fact that for 16 years we Democrats have received those communications on this side and we have considered it the constitutional right of citizens to petition their public officials. The letter that was sent out by the president of the Customs Association was one that he had a perfect right to send out. In doing so he is exercising his right as an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COURTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member and I am beginning to learn that matters are not always debated where they appear on the agenda. I believe it would not be fitting if some member did not visit on this side of the aisle to call attention to the failure to give full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. As a lawyer I am shocked by the proposal before us to deny such full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court. The separation of the powers between the Judiciary, the Executive and the Congress is basic in our constitutional Government, we have found it the surest check on tyranny. There may be a tyranny of Congress just as there may be a tyranny of the Judiciary or the Executive. I do not want such tyranny nor, do I believe, does any clear-thinking Member of this House. For today the objection may be that the three men in question are fellow travelers I do not quarrel with that; tomorrow, it may be United States citizens of German, Polish, Italian or Russian extraction; it may be Catholics or Jews or it may be Negroes. Once respect for the coordinate branches of Government breaks down, there is no end to the mischief which can be done. No democracy can survive without self-discipline. I can sympathize with the feelings of the gentlemen of the Deficiency Subcommittee, when they speak of the odor relative to these cases, and I can appreciate the feelings of these and other members who believe sincerely that they have suffered here for years under the tyranny of a Chief Executive; but the people gave us a mandate not to substitute a new tyranny but to do away with the old. I believe we must honor these judgments of the Supreme Court.

I hope and pray that in the same spirit of public interest that some changes have already been made in this bill today, and on the basis of sustaining the coordinate branches of Government as we ourselves wish them to be sustained, the Deficiency Subcommittee may again consider this matter, small in money and yet very great in principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public assistance and children's services: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Public assistance and children's services," $155,200.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee to clear up some misconceptions that apparently exist with regard to the availability of funds. It is important that these items that have just been read be made available as of March 1. Is it the understanding of the chairman that is possible.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that this language as it reads would make funds available for the whole of the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. HORAN. Then there is no question as to their availability at any time in the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. TABER. Within the limits of the law which authorizes their distribution.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 15, after line 21, insert the following:

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, $6,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

The statute which purports to authorize it provides as follows:

Such payments to any State in any fiscal year during the period 1947 to 1950, inclusive, shall be made upon condition that each dollar thereof will be matched during such year by $1 from sources within the State determined by the Secretary to have been expended in connection with the school-lunch program under this act.

* * * * *

For the purpose of determining whether the matching requirements of this section and section 10, respectively, have been met, the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment as certified, respectively, by the State educational agency and in case of schools receiving funds pursuant to section 10, by such schools.

The total appropriation distributed amounts to $72,975,000; the total matching complete $11,470,000.

There has been complete failure of matching by local authorities within the provisions of the statute. Under the circumstances they have not complied with the law and there is no opportunity for a deficiency here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment indicates, the appropriation proposed here is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. The act speaks for itself. Under the law the question of matching is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is not a matter to be determined by this body. That is a function specifically delegated by the act to the executive in charge of the program—the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no question about the amendment being in order. The sole proposition involved is to carry out the provisions of the act. I submit that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is germane to the bill and the appropriation authorized by law; therefore overrules the point of order presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the shoemaker's children are without shoes. That is the situation before us in this bill today.

The bill carries $300,000,000 for food for foreign countries. Under the provisions of the bill we provide money to feed children all over Europe. Out of this $300,000,000 America pays to feed the children of every race, kindred, and tongue, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, the learned and the unlearned, the washed and the unwashed, from Kamchatka to Karahissar. Foreign children are provided for but there is nothing in this bill for the children at home. The shoemaker's children are without shoes. American children are without food.

The evidence adduced when the authorizing legislation for the school-lunch program was before the House showed an appalling number of children in every metropolitan center in the United States who went to school without breakfast.

Mr. Chairman, the efficacy of the school-lunch program, and its universal need throughout the country, is demonstrated in a vivid and convincing manner in the reports from the draft boards in the recent war. Vast numbers of young men were disqualified by the draft boards and rejected for Army service because of disabilities directly due to lack of an adequate diet in the period of adolescence.

This program is now in operation in schools in every congressional district in the Union, and it is the practically universal testimony of teachers and parents that in schools in which the program has been adopted and noon lunches are being served, there has been a notable increase in the weight and health of the child, and simultaneously there has been a corresponding increase in scholarship. A hungry child lacks the power of concentration and study. An ill-nourished child does not learn as readily.

And results are not confined to the schoolroom or to the school life of the child. They are reflected in the training and ability, the body and mind of the adult. There is nothing this House can do that will contribute more directly to the physique and mentality of the next generation than the support of this appropriation to effectuate the National School Lunch Act passed by such an overwhelming majority in both Houses in the last Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Is it not a fact that we have appropriated money to care for the cattle of our country, yet we neglect our children?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. We have just made an appropriation of $9,000,000 to control diseases of livestock in Mexico. Now we are asked to refuse an appropriation of $6,000,000 to ameliorate malnutrition of American children in every State of the Union.

One of the things President Hoover particularly emphasized when he was before the committee was that unless European children are fed now the next generation will be dwarfed and stunted for life. You can starve an adult and there will be no ill effects if proper food is provided in time. But if a growing child is starved, the child is permanently injured both mentally and physically, regardless of the food eventually provided. Children deprived too long of proper nourishment never attain in later life full growth and stamina or the highest degree of mental alertness. European children must be fed now. And for the same reason American children must be fed during school years. Will you deny them that priceless heritage by refusing to add this small amount to the pending bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this school-lunch proposition comes here without any hearings before the committee, without any estimate from the President, without any approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and let me say to you that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget refused to make an estimate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to remind the gentleman that I asked for permission to come before the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of this deficiency item, for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. After the hearings had all been closed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. At the first opportunity I could come, I asked.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is this Congress going to let the Bureau of the Budget legislate for it?

Mr. TABER. No; but you know the Bureau of the Budget is the President's representatives, and I thought that you folks might be interested in knowing what the executive branch of the Government thinks of it.

Now, I want to give you the picture just as I see it. Seventy-five million dollars has been appropriated already. The total funds to match this appropriation that have been made by States and local governments run $11,470,400 and those were the figures submitted by the Agriculture Department to the Bureau of the Budget.

Let me say to you that the children do not get free lunches. According to the amounts that were paid toward these lunches, the children paid $127,000,000. Of the amount that was allotted by the Agriculture Department upwards of $6,000,000 was for distribution. Well, if these things were operated right in the localities, they would be taken care of for less money. Now, the Federal Government is right on the verge of bankruptcy. Most of our State and local governments are in good condition. Many of them have surpluses. There has been no local matching that was at all satisfactory. The matching in New York State was the highest in proportion. There it was $2,500,000 against Federal expenditures of something like $4,400,000, and the statute requires that this matching be dollar for dollar, which it very evidently is not. Illinois comes next among

those that matched, and there, as against about $3,100,000 they matched $858,000. But no single State has matched according to the law. If they had matched according to the law, instead of the $75,000,000 being used, there would be a very large surplus at this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What the gentleman says may be right, but does that relieve us of our responsibility to provide hungry children throughout the Nation with something which they need at a time when they need it?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide children with these lunches. I think the locality should do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Where the State has failed to supply the necessary funds, they have been supplied from other local sources.

Mr. TABER. No: they have not. They have not been supplied at all. The payment for the lunches is in no possible way a compliance with the law. The law has been violated the way this money has been distributed. These States and localities have utterly failed to meet their responsibilities if they are going to continue with this operation.

Another thing I want everyone to consider is that if this bill is passed by the 1st of May, that is about as good as we can expect, and it is impossible for anything of this kind to begin to operate on a deficiency basis at that time. There would be no excuse for any money being appropriated here even if there had been a legal and valid operation of this proposition. It is time the Federal Government begins to balance its budget and that we cease to raid the Federal Treasury for every single item that is needed for the operation of schools or anything else in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from New York has made the assertion in opposition to this amendment that there was no estimate from the President or no approval by the Bureau of the Budget. What the gentleman says is correct. However, we are doing the legislating, and on past occasions this House has acted independently of any recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget. I will concede that as the general rule and the general practice an estimate from the Budget is sought, and it is generally followed, and the appropriations are generally reduced where there are reductions, but it does not necessarily follow that there are no exceptions made. In my years here I have many times seen estimates increased, and I have seen money appropriated where authorized by law where there was no estimate, where the Committee on Appropriations included it in a particular appropriation bill. I call the attention of my colleagues to the occasion of only a few days ago when the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill passed the House. There was a budget estimate and a Presidential recommendation for $50,000,000 for hospital construction to carry out for the next fiscal year the provisions of the bill we passed last year. In its wisdom, and I agree with the wisdom of the subcommittee and the full committee, the committee struck out the $50,000,000 recommended in the President's budget but included a provision permitting the agency administering the law, the United States Public Health Service or the Office of Education, the right and power to make contract obligations in the sum of $150,000,000 during the fiscal year 1948. There was therefore no Budget recommendation for this. I think the committee acted wisely, and I approved of the action and made that approval manifest.

In the same bill there was an increase in the appropriation for cancer research. I think the appropriation of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 was increased to $19,000,000.

Again, I wholeheartedly approve of that. I think there were one or two other appropriations or items in the bill where there was an increase. So I think that is a complete answer to my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], whose main argument is that there is no estimate.

The House has inserted items in bills before where there was no estimate, and so has the committee.

We must also keep in mind that my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] a few weeks ago, in answer to a question that I asked of him, frankly admitted that he personally is opposed to the school-lunch program. One thing about the gentleman—when he gives an answer, he always gives a frank answer. Of course, we have to keep in mind in interpreting his state of mind with reference to the remarks he made today is that he is personally opposed to the school-lunch program.

It seems to me that this has been a very fine program. It is now permanent law. We made it permanent law last year. No matter what the original intent of Congress was in making the appropriations in connecting it up with surpluses on the farm, that has been changed by act of Congress and we have passed permanent authorizing legislation. Therefore, we consider it in all of its aspects to be a wise policy for our Government to follow.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman from New York in his remarks in defense of this cutting of the school-lunch program said the Federal Government was on the verge of bankruptcy.

May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York: Does he believe then that this is the time for us to cut taxes and reduce the revenue of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I do not. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from New York is sincere in his position, but his main argument today is not a precedent for this House to follow. We have repeatedly in this House put in items in a bill where there was no estimate. The Committee on Appropriations has also done so. We did so, as I said, in the labor and security appropriation bill just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the good judgment and integrity of my good friend from New York, but I do not subscribe to the doctrine of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. If I economize, and I am for economy, I will never economize at the expense of a hungry child.

I have taught school back in the mountains of my native east Tennessee and in the coal-mining camps. I have seen children come to school who did not have enough food at home or enough food in the little lunch baskets that they brought with them. In many instances they did not have enough food to properly nourish them.

If we appropriate this $6,000,000 to supplement the school-lunch program, it will cost each and every person in this country the stupendous sum of 4 mills. If there is any Member of this House who feels that he or she cannot afford to invest 4 mills in the minds and bodies and souls and welfare of the school children of this country, while I am not a wealthy man, I will reimburse him or her the 4 mills that he or she is out as the result of the adoption of this amendment.

Abraham Lincoln said that a nation may be said to consist of its people, its territories, and its laws. The vital and determinative feature of a nation's life and existence, its whole future, lies in the growth and development of our boys and girls. They are the seed corn of the Nation. I know that the people of Tennessee are complying with their part of this program which the Federal Government held out to them in the law of the land, establishing the school-lunch program. Thousands of devoted women in Tennessee are canning hundreds of thousands of cans of fruit and vegetables each year that are used in preparing these lunches for the school children. We will be asked in a few days to appropriate $400,000,000 to start with, in undertaking to take care of Greece and Turkey. Well, if we are to undertake to take care of Greece and Turkey and the other countries of the world, we must first take care of America. These boys and girls are our first line of defense. They are the hope and pride and strength of the Nation. They are the power of the people unto the salvation of the State. They will meet our enemies in the gates.

I recall that during the First World War, one of the ablest physicians and surgeons that I ever knew in all my life, Dr. James L. Heffernan, of Jellico, who was on the board of medical examiners who examined the manhood of Campbell County, my home county, for military service, referred to the fact that the men of Great Britain were so undernourished that only a small percentage of the manpower of that country was fit for military duty. He said that in his examination of the men from Campbell County he had to turn down less than 1 percent. They had been properly nourished. Great, vigorous, broad-shouldered, muscular men who were unafraid, and capable of being built into a living wall of offense and defense for their country's victory in that war.

Mr. Chairman, let us not pinch a penny or skim around the brink until we fall into perdition. Let us vote this 4 mills per capita, and my proposition will be made good to any man in this House. If he wants his 4 mills back, I will refund it to him; if he wants it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when in 1933 and 1934 food was rotting on our farms, to relieve the situation and bring about a fair distribution of the tremendous surpluses, we provided an appropriation for a school-lunch program through which a great deal of the food that was going to waste was utilized by the children of our country. At that time nearly all of you gentlemen representing the rural districts and agricultural districts supported this proposition. But, unfortunately, of late you seem to forget that that appropriation was passed to aid you and to help the children of the poor. You do not need that aid now, because the prices that are being received for milk and other farm products are so favorable that this legislation really is not necessary at this time. But the children need these school lunches more than ever.

Does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] remember that in the last session the Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, which set forth a declaration of policy and authorized such appropriations for each fiscal year as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act? I quote sections 2 and 3 of the act, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. For each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") to carry out the provisions of this act.

I concede that we have many school districts like those in the district of the gentleman from New York, populated by well-to-do people, who can and do provide nourishing lunches for their children, but even in those districts there are families who, due to misfortune, illnesses, or disability of the wage earner, can ill afford to pay the complete cost of these nourishing lunches.

Mr. Chairman, I observe the bill before us carries a provision for an appropriation of $300,000,000 to feed people in Germany, Austria, and Japan, and, in fact, the committee increased the appropriation provided for Germany and Austria by $28,000,000. But, to the minds of some, it is not necessary for us to provide for the continuation of a worth-while school-lunch program that will give proper nourishment to our own children to keep them strong in body and health.

I also notice that the committee has increased the appropriations for "Grants to States" by $2,600,000, as well as providing for an additional appropriation of $20,000,000 for crop insurance, yet it would deny insurance for the most valuable crop—namely, 10,000,000 school children who will be denied school lunches if provision is not made therefor.

Many letters, telegrams, and resolutions are received by me daily urging my support of a deficiency appropriation to provide for the carrying out of the school-lunch program for the remaining months of the fiscal year. I would insert some of them in the RECORD except that I will have one insertion to make in my remarks and do not wish to unduly encumber the RECORD. However, I want to say that there has not been a single appropriation proposed since I have been a Member of this Congress which has been for a more humane and deserving purpose than the one for this school-lunch program. I was hopeful that the gentleman from Missouri would offer an amendment providing at least an additional $10,000,000 in order that the program might fully continue.

I appreciate that had it not been for the higher price of food and milk and the increased number of schools who subscribed for participation in the program, the original appropriation would have been sufficient. With the cost of food having increased by nearly 60 percent it consequently follows that this additional appropriation of several million dollars is necessary for the schools to continue to furnish luncheons for these needy children, many of whom without this balanced and nourishing sustenance would actually be hungry.

Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago you read about the terrible mine disaster in my State, outside of Centralia, Ill., where 111 miners lost their lives. Most of these men wrote letters to their loved ones while dying, and it was their urgent plea that their children should be protected and provided for. I read only a few excerpts from some of the letters:

Goodbye ——— and ———: God bless you and two boys, your father and ———. Please do as your father has told you and listen to Mom.

(Addressed to two boys): Be good boys. Please your father. O Lord help me.

Tell Dad to quit the mine, and take care of Mom, not like this.

Dear Wife: Please take care of the children.

Dear Wife: Goodbye. Forgive me. Take care of all the children.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposing this additional appropriation to continue school lunches, if adopted, will help some of these children, will relieve some of the widows and mothers of these children in saving them from hunger. If only the children of those miners who died will obtain their school lunches, it will be money well spent. Not only will it be a great blessing and benefit to them, but to the 10,000,000 other school children in our country. Provide proper nourishment for the child and you have given it the best basis to make a successful life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. My time is limited and I have only a few moments remaining. I regret I cannot yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist on his motion until we have had some debate.

Mr. TABER. We have had long debate and three times as much on the affirmative side as on the negative.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) were were—ayes 82, noes 72.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 85.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. Does that motion mean that the gentleman who has already been recognized has all of the time, or does it mean 10 additional minutes to the 10 that have already been allocated to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion to close debate in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, every State in the Union is in better financial condition to provide school lunches than is the Federal Government.

Apparently hearts do not bleed for the lunch program back in the States. All the bleeding hearts are here in Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is nothing so important pending before Congress at the present time as the request for additional funds to extend the free school-lunch program. The taxpayers of this country, I am certain, will all agree with me that we should first take care of our undernourished children at home before trying to feed the undernourished children of the world.

We have appropriated funds for the relief of practically every country in the world during the past 6 years and there is no sound reason why we should not appropriate sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program. It is my sincere opinion that the school-lunch program is one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted during the Democratic administration. It has proven highly satisfactory to the children and to the farmers who have surplus farm products. There is no sound reason why additional funds should not be appropriated at this time to continue the school-lunch program.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the opposition to the continuance of the school-lunch program. The issue is very simple. You are either for the school-lunch program or against it. If you are for it you will vote for the amendment; if you are against that program you will vote to defeat the amendment. I am for it and I rise to support the amendment.

I fail to follow the reasoning of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee. He urges that this program should be a local one; that the States should pay the cost of it and that they are better able to do it than the Federal Government; that they have substantial surpluses, and yet in the next breath he criticizes the States for not matching the contributions of the Federal Government as the program contemplates. I ask how can we ever expect the States to pay all of the cost of school lunches when the gentleman admits they will not even pay their one-half share. The answer is simple. If we do not pass this amendment and depend upon the States to carry the load we will have no school-lunch program at all. We all want to feed hungry school children. Then let us do it and not indulge in specious arguments with the object of defeating this worthy, necessary, and humanitarian project. I must repeat: If we want to feed hungry school children, we must vote for this amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely shocking that the Republican Party has cut from the budget the money to help feed the school children of America. This is something that should be passed without partisan politics, but since Republicans have now exalted dollars and cents above flesh and blood let the full blame fall on you members of that party. Do Republicans feel that a solvent fiscal America is more important than a solvent physical America? I charge you with playing political football with American children. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] quoted his facts. Let me give facts of human life.

The National Research Council states:

Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States.

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement. Seventy-four percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had substandard diets.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West, and 27 percent in the South, had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children, only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 66 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 failed to meet the minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C.

In a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement.

Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story. In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest, and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the school-lunch program is one of the finest things ever undertaken by our Government. It is a real investment in the future of America. It is an investment in our children. The number of young men rejected for military service for physical reasons in the last war is itself sufficient proof of the need for this program. In all too many cases these rejections could be traced directly to inadequate diets. While, therefore, we are preparing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to feed starving populations abroad, it seems to me we should also make this relatively small contribution to the health and well-being of our own American children. I strongly urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the omission of an appropriation for the school-lunch program in this bill submitted by the majority is indefensible. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the ranking Democratic member of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for $6,000,000 although I am in accord with the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that he had hoped the amendment might be $10,000,000.

To my colleagues on the Republican side let me say that we have fed the children of the world for the past many years—why not continue to feed the undernourished children of our own country? I take it that shortly this Congress will approve a $400,000,000 loan to Greece to aid among others the children of that stricken country. Why not, my Republican colleagues, think now of the children suffering from malnutrition in our own country? Perhaps within a short time our largess will be extended to

Korea—why not indeed extend the largess of our Government now to the underprivileged and undernourished children in the substandard areas of our own municipalities, or to similar children in the rural areas of our country.

We speak of the spread of communism throughout the country and we are disturbed at its spread. Communism thrives on hunger and distress; it thrives especially where the victims of hunger are children and where their plaintive cries for food drive their parents to desperation. The adoption of this amendment will not only be a boon to the undernourished children of America, but it will be a direct and affirmative act against the spread of that ideology which preys upon the distress of people.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the appeal Spokesmen for Children, Inc., for a Government appropriation necessary to continue and extend the national school-lunch program, I wish to include a résumé of the facts and figures of nutrition surveys which have been reported by the National Research Council, the United States Public Health Service, and other medical and scientific groups, as follows:

The National Research Council states, "Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States."

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement, 74 percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had a substandard diet.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse, showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West and 27 percent in the South had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 66 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 percent failed to meet minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C; in a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement. Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story.

In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during the quorum call earlier this afternoon but I am glad to be able to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program to the end of the current fiscal year. I hope the amendment will pass because in my opinion the school-lunch program is one of the soundest investments we have ever made. One of our greatest assets is the youth of our Nation. To keep them well and healthy will insure a stronger and better America. I am going to support the amendment and I hope that it will be adopted. We have heard a great many speeches in recent weeks about the health of the young men and women of our Nation. The statistics of rejections from the military service is appalling. Here is an opportunity to continue a program that will go far in raising the standards of health of our school children. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of $6,000,000 for the continuation of the school-lunch program until the end of the present school year, June 30. As a stanch supporter of this worthy program I am hopeful that this House today will forget partisan politics and that there will be enough Members on the left side of the aisle joining with us on the Democratic side to carry this amendment.

Economy is a good thing. Any sensible person favors it. I know I do. But some measures offered in the name of economy very often in reality are not for the best interest of our country.

In this case, scrapping of the school-lunch program may be termed expensive economy. Congress some time ago—in the days which the gentlemen to my left like to refer to as the period of the New Deal—authorized the school-lunch program by passage of permanent legislation. Now a new Congress, under Republican leadership, seeks to kill the program by withholding funds. If we fail to accept this amendment this afternoon the actual program will be dead, yet the statute books will still carry authorization for the program.

I know the argument will be raised that this should be a function of the community and the States. The communities in many instances already participate. In no instance does the Federal Government bear the entire load.

From the past experiences we know the majority of States will not be able to support the program. True, State treasuries are filled with funds at the present time but as Governor Green of Illinois has pointed out most of these funds are earmarked for normal State functions which had to be put aside during the war years. As they are taken up once again, the State treasuries will quickly feel the drain.

The Illinois State superintendent of public instruction, Hon. Vernon L. Nickell, has urged the Illinois delegation in the House to support the school-lunch program. Mr. Nickell advises both State and Federal funds are needed in Illinois to carry on an adequate program.

Practically every school district in the State of Illinois favors this program. Teachers by the score have written to me—telling me of the wonderful accomplishments of the program and pleading for my support to continue the good work being done.

At Collinsville when the funds were exhausted the cost of school lunches immediately doubled. That will be the story everywhere. The result will be that thousands of children will suffer.

At Alton the school system was enthused over the school-lunch program and when it was written into permanent legislation the board looked into the future foreseeing the great benefits it would bring.

"During the past year our board of education has spent over $10,000 of its building funds for the improvement of our school cafeterias, and we have planned for more expansion next year." Mr. P. L. Ewing, superintendent, wrote to me. The Alton board did this because it felt it had some assurance that the Federal and State school-lunch program would be carried out.

If we fail to act favorably today we will be letting down many school boards like the Alton board. More than that we will be taking the chance of injuring the health of thousands of school children. If you do not believe this latter statement just review the record of the program.

Most of us can remember when a child's lunch consisted of a hot-dog sandwich, a coke and a piece of pie or perhaps a scoop of mashed potatoes. Do we want to return to that? The school-lunch program taught children to select adequate meals and it developed in them a desire to do so.

Teachers can tell you how successful this program has been in this regard. Teachers also know that without Federal help most children cannot afford to buy the lunch previously provided. Purchase of milk under present prices would be almost prohibitive.

In 1941 a survey showed that 75 percent of school children failed to meet a standard even lower than that recommended

by the National Research Council. In 1946, principally because of the school-lunch program, a survey revealed a 25-percent improvement.

We can avoid a future recurrence of the 40-percent draft rejections of World War II due to nutritional deficiencies if this percentage of improvement is allowed to continue at this rate.

It is generally conceded by principals, teachers, and lunchroom workers, and parents alike, that the student partaking of a hot plate lunch daily, improved immeasurably in scholastic and athletic ability. They say there is less absenteeism and more attention at classes.

This problem affects the health, progress, and security of our Nation—and for these reasons I shall continue my support of the school-lunch program by voting for this amendment, and I sincerely hope it carries.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and endorse all that he has said so well.

It is difficult to understand the philosophy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Apparently he believes that the children of our Nation should be penalized because of the failure of the States to match the funds of the Federal Government. I do not know if or why the States have neglected to do so, and I am not the least bit interested in that phase of the debate. I am interested in providing sufficient funds to continue this program of providing lunches for needy school children. Juggling of figures has never appealed to me, nor have I the ability to do a good job in this respect, but there are men in this House who have a great gift for that sort of thing.

I would like to see the school-lunch program strengthened and extended. The money spent will bring great dividends to our Nation in the form of healthier children today and more efficient citizens tomorrow. In a survey I made 36 years ago in several public schools I found that most stupid children were found to be the victims of poor nutrition. Following this survey a group of women, of which I was one, became interested in this problem; we cooperated with the teachers who had called our attention to the situation and provided milk for these undernourished children, and in a very short time thereafter a decided change was noticed in their mental attitude. Thirty-six years ago few communities realized the tremendous importance of nutrition in its relation to mental attitudes, particularly in growing children. Now we have at long last attempted to correct this waste of human energy, but we have not gone nearly far enough. We are conscious of the need of children of other lands and are making some provision to better their condition, and I am all for that, but why a Republican majority should dare to deprive the children of our own country of a paltry $6,000,000 to provide school lunches for needy children is something completely beyond my comprehension.

I sincerely hope in voting on this amendment politics will be put aside and that we shall vote for the amendment in the name of humanity and better American children for America.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have said before, and I wish to reiterate today, that it is poor economy indeed to try to save taxpayers money at the expense of such a worthy and necessary project as the school-lunch program.

In yesterday's debate the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] very ably explained the necessity of continuing and maintaining the school-lunch program. It is difficult to conceive of any justification for the termination of the program which has meant so much to the health and well-being of our children and Nation.

Many of the school-lunch projects throughout the country are now being discontinued simply because this body has not appropriated the funds necessary to carry on the project and furnish the lunches which are so vitally needed by thousands of our growing children. To many school children, Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program will mean the difference between health and sickness, the difference between malnutrition or sufficient food to properly sustain the youngsters of our fair land.

Mr. Jesse B. Gilmer, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, has recently advised me that at least 32 States would face deficiencies in the school-lunch program if a deficiency appropriation were not made to tide the program over until the end of the school year.

Included in the 32 States is my own State of South Carolina, which will have a deficiency of several hundred thousand dollars. Some little money may be covered from the few States which will have a surplus, but that amount would be far less than the sum needed to carry the 32 States over until the end of the school year.

Mr. Chairman, in refusing to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program over, the Congress is scuttling one of the most progressive pieces of legislation passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In effect it is wiping out a public law which was passed to establish a permanent program for the benefit of our Nation as a whole.

No other program sponsored by the Federal Government has met with more wholehearted approval by the people of the Nation, and no program has had less criticism. The amount of money involved is insignificant in proportion to the benefits derived from the school-lunch program.

The money spent for this program is an investment in health, happiness, and national security. If we are to be strong as a Nation our children must be healthy; they must be assured of the nutritious foods they require. It is a fact that many school children who are the beneficiaries of the fine program would not otherwise have sufficient food properly to keep them in sound health of body and mind.

During the 1945–46 school term this program served more than 4,500,000 children, and in this year's program it has been estimated that more than 7,000,000 have been served.

I for one, Mr. Chairman, do not want to be guilty of depriving a single child of the food that he needs. But I know that if we fail in our responsibility to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program on, many thousands of children will be deprived.

I am convinced it will be a grave mistake if we allow this national school lunch program to go by default.

WE MUST FEED OUR OWN

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if we deny the underprivileged school children of this Nation an opportunity to be assured of at least one balanced meal during the school day, it will be as pathetic as tragic—pathetic on our part to look into the future and tragic to those who cannot provide for themselves.

In this Nation there are countless thousands of undernourished and underfed little children grasping for the light of education.

In this country there are many thousands of families who know nothing about providing their school children with adequate and balanced diets. From the mountains to the seas, there are families who must have our help on this matter.

We have recently loaned the British government $4,000,000,000.

We are now contemplating making a loan to both Greece and Turkey to feed their undernourished. Can we be remiss if we provide for our own?

I do not care what course the Republicans may follow in this matter, but as for me, I am for the future men and women who will carry on long after we have perished into forgotten dust.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee has decided to make a small saving in appropriations at the expense of the health and welfare of our greatest asset—our American children.

Our Government has spent billions to fight a war for liberty and we should not now refuse to spend a comparatively small sum to protect the health of young America who will be our country's leaders in another generation. The Federal Government spends millions on soil conservation and it is money well spent because it guarantees to the future abundant food and prosperity. We spend millions each year on conservation of our natural resources so they will last down through the years to serve our people and this is also money well spent. We spend millions each year conserving the health of our livestock, treating cattle for hoof-and-mouth disease, hogs for cholera, and more millions developing food to make cattle and hogs put on weight, cows to give more milk, chickens to lay more eggs, and so forth. I am not opposed to the above expenditures, but the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee of this Congress should not deny to our children a small percentage of the money spent for care of animals and soil. We want our American children to grow and develop physically and mentally into real American men and women, strong in mind and body so they will be capable of carrying

on and preserving our God-given institutions of freedom, liberty, and equality. I know the fathers and mothers of America are for the school-lunch program.

The school-lunch program is not a new idea. Progressive, far-seeing men and women, church groups and parent-teacher associations in many sections of our country years ago realized the need of a child for a hot, nutritious school lunch and in a great number of instances the above groups provided school lunches on their own initiative.

I am satisfied that the Members of Congress, when they give solemn and serious thought to the necessity of providing hot school lunches for millions of underfed children that they will gladly appropriate these necessary funds. Let us protect and aid our greatest asset, the foundation of our country, our American children.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to provide $6,000,000 for the school-lunch program. We are appropriating by this very bill before us today $300,000,000 for aid to our stricken brothers across the sea. I am happy to support that program. I believe the American people are back of it, but I find myself unable on the same day I am taking that action, to deny to the children in our schools the benefits which I know they have derived from this program.

My attention has been called again and again to cases where children from the lower income families have gone to school without any breakfast at all. They cannot do their work. They cannot become useful citizens in our community, or any other community, on empty stomachs. It is, in my opinion, false economy in this bill, which provides total appropriations of almost $2,500,000,000, to deny this comparatively modest sum for a worthy project.

I yield to no one in my desire and sincere intention to cast my vote in favor of the reduction in governmental expenditures. I voted to reduce the President's inflated budget by $6,000,000,000. I have already withstood repeatedly the assaults of various pressure groups who have sought to get my assistance in restoring cuts in their budgets which have been made with prudence and sincerity by the Appropriations Committee. I shall continue to follow that course.

Furthermore, I am an opponent of Federal interference with the conduct of our schools. I think they should be under a control closer to the grass roots. I shall welcome the time when the school-lunch program can be taken over in its entirety by the localities. That will benefit the State which I have the honor to represent, since they pay more than any other to the support of this and all other Federal programs.

Until that time comes, however, I do not believe the people of my district want to see the school children go hungry, as I have been informed will happen in many instances unless this amendment passes. Certain it is, at least, that my conscience will not permit me to cast a vote which will effect such a result.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, for the life of me I cannot understand the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the leadership on the other side of the aisle in opposing this amendment, which seeks to appropriate the comparatively small sum of $6,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. How can they justify their approval of the item in this same bill of $300,000,000 to the War Department, as urged by former President Hoover, for government and relief in occupied areas all over the world, and their refusal at the same time of $6,000,000 for undernourished American school children? They cannot; that is why they used their majority to shut off debate as they did, denying the privilege of the floor to a dozen or more Democratic Members who sought to speak for 5 minutes in behalf of this meritorious amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the current year 130 schools in the State of Wyoming participated in the school-lunch program. An average of 12,500 lunches were served each day. Under the act of the last Congress Wyoming has been given a total allocation of $109,421.59, of which amount $18,000 was earmarked for the purchase of equipment, leaving a trifle ove $90,000 to reimburse all school-lunch programs in our State. The increase in the cost of food, cost of labor, and other expenses has resulted in exhaustion of the funds for this purpose some time back. I was extremely sorry to learn that the Bureau of the Budget had not approved an item in the deficiency bill for the school-lunch program. I think that was a mistake.

I am not certain that the appropriation of $6,000,000 will be adequate to provide funds sufficient to continue the Wyoming program for the present school year, but it will go a long ways toward that desired end.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress committed itself to this program last year, and I am very hopeful that this amendment will be adopted. I shall vote for and support the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, Federal funds allotted to Minnesota for the school hot-lunch program were exhausted on March 31, 1947. Approximately $375,000 are needed to continue this worthy program in Minnesota for the remainder of the school year.

Daily, 150,000 to 160,000 children in Minnesota participated in the program, and the beneficial results are apparent in the improved health and physical well-being of our youth. We cannot allow the discontinuance of this program.

Parent-teacher groups, school boards, educators, and civic organizations have joined parents in a demand that their children be not sacrificed for the so-called mandates, campaign promises, and false economy expounded by the majority Members. I join our people in a concern for true economy, but it is not economical to sacrifice the health and well-being of growing children. This is penny-wise reasoning; a contribution toward adequate food for our young people is a sound governmental investment. We are building for a healthy citizenry of tomorrow.

NEED HEALTHY CHILDREN

Much is said of the need to conserve our natural resources. Here are the most precious of all of America's resources. Our country must preserve its heritage. We need offer no apologies for our pride in our country and its people. But we cannot be merely satisfied. We must continue working for our country and its people. A well-fed, healthy child today becomes the backbone of a progressive, clear-thinking citizenry tomorrow.

We fear for the depletion of our mineral resources. With a wealth of minerals, they will do us little good unless we have the strong hands to mold them into the tools of an advanced civilization. The milk, soup, meat, and vegetables we provide now will strengthen those who will guide us tomorrow.

Make no mistake, the few dollars taken from these children are intended for those who need none of our sympathies. The few dollars sought here will be used as tax-relief for the big-income earners who have garnered more money than ever before in the history of our country.

I am personally familiar with the hot-lunch program. For some time before the war I helped administer the program in the rural schools of our communities. From the beginning, we could see the health of the pupils improve. A hot, balanced meal prepared by expert cooks, served under supervision, showed its results. That program expanded until almost every community in our area participated. There have been only words of praise from the parents and school officials. They now plead for a continuance.

SHOULD KEEP PROMISE

The Seventy-ninth Congress made our people a promise that the hot-lunch program would be a permanent project. Are we to breach the promise in this first year of its "permanence"? Depending upon the word of the Congress, States and school districts have gone to expense in providing their share of supplies and appliances. Are their contributions to be forfeited now? This Congress has a moral obligation to provide an adequate appropriation to carry the hot-lunch program through this year and to appropriate sufficient funds for the next school year.

I call upon my worthy colleagues to subordinate their concern for tax savings to the wealthy and to concentrate on building our national wealth, our children.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment which increases the school-lunch moneys by $9,000,000. I have already heard from my home State of Louisiana and find that some 4 months before the end of the fiscal year, the school-lunch moneys were exhausted. As a result of this fact, the price of the school lunch to the children is increasing and unless additional funds are appropriated, the entire program may break down completely before July 1.

I believe $9,000,000 will go far toward remedying the current shortage. In my judgment, the overspending by the several States is due to the encouragement which Congress has already given them. We have previously indicated we desire the program to expand and to include all poor children who do not have money to pay for their own lunches. No Government can justify a failure to take care of the hungry school children and at the same time export hundreds of tons of food to the hungry mouths overseas. I therefore hope very much that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment which I consider to be an expression of part of the national responsibility for health. The program of a hot lunch for school children has met with the universal approval of mothers, teachers, educational authorities, and Parent-Teacher Associations. The cost is infinitesimal compared to the benefits. The health of the child determines the health of the man. I look forward to legislation which will be a national expression of the responsibility for the health of all citizens. The continuation of the school-lunch program is an early and a necessary step.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this House, I introduced H. R. 1775, providing for $15,000,000 for the school-lunch program. I feel that both the House and the Senate would be doing their duty toward the people of this country in making this $15,000,000 appropriation for such a worthy program. However, since this amendment now before the House calls for only $6,000,000, I am at a loss to understand how any Member can conscientiously vote against this amendment and then go home and face his people and try to answer for his action.

When we stop to consider that many of the Members of this Congress have appropriated millions of dollars to feed people all over the world, when we have appropriated money to prevent our cattle from being affected by the hoof-and-mouth disease from adjoining nations, it is inconceivable to understand why there should be any opposition to feeding our boys and girls throughout this Nation a good, nutritious, hot lunch—many of whom will go without if these funds are not provided. I know of no money that this Nation can spend more wisely than to provide and insure a well-balanced meal at lunchtime for the future citizens of this great Nation.

I am, therefore, in accord with this amendment, and shall support it, and my only regret being that it is for $6,000,000 rather than $15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 88, noes 104.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

TUSSOCK MOTH CONTROL

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations, independently or in cooperation with State agencies, associations, organizations, or individuals, to combat an outbreak of tussock moth, $395,000, to remain available until December 31, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay the cost of property injured or destroyed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I watched this vote a minute ago with interest. Many of you will remember that a few weeks ago I engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this school-lunch program. The last 4 or 5 days that we have been debating appropriation bills I have been listening attentively to one phase, but this situation here a few minutes ago was slightly different.

I will say this to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who talked here a few minutes ago about lobbyists on the customs bill and about the letters that came out in mimeographed form putting the heat on, putting the pressure on: On this amendment here today you do not have that kind of lobbyist. I had a letter from the Governor of the State of Oklahoma. It was typewritten. I received a few scattered letters written with pencil on tablet paper from school children.

I can state that there is no red herring anyone can draw across the trail of this amendment; there is no lobby that will be the beneficiary of this amendment; no Edgar L. Warren will be the beneficiary of this amendment. The only beneficiaries of this item will be the school children of this Nation.

I wondered what the Republicans and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] were going to say to try to defeat it, and it comes down to this: Anything that takes money, no matter for what purpose, they are against it, whether it means the building of a strong Nation or not—they are still against it—and I do not believe you can point to anything that will build a stronger Nation than having healthy school children in this country. This is a sound program. You gentlemen on the left side of the aisle are so used to talking about boondoggling, waste, and extravagance that when a good bill comes before you, or a good amendment such as this one that was offered this afternoon, you forget and vote by habit, and vote against it. I am pleased to note that the vote in favor of this program has gained all the time this afternoon through pitiless publicity that was put out by the American people, not by paid lobbyists, not by mimeographed sheets, by just the conscience of American children calling out to you.

Down in my State we were a little bit worried about the Republicans last year. The fellow who ran against me said: "Send me up there and I will abolish OPA and everything will be O. K." He never told the people he was going to abolish the school-lunch program, though.

This is something you are going to have to face. I want to make this observation: Here is a good bill. I was surprised that debate was shut off, because the American people would like to know what their chosen Representatives think about these things. No wonder you wanted to shut debate off. The vote, however, speaks for itself, and I think next fall you will find when you come before the people, when you are put on record, when you tell them what you are going to do, that some of you will have to vote as you did this afternoon. I do not know that these talks accomplish anything, but it is good to let the American people know. Maybe I am slightly presumptuous; I do not know, but I say to you, as I told the gentleman from New York: You did not get a mandate from the American people last fall to do what you tried to do this afternoon when you voted against the school-lunch program. If you had presented them with the kind of program you are putting through during this session I doubt if there would be as many over on the other side of the aisle as there are now, and when you get through with this session and come to the election in 1948 I think we are going to have slightly fewer on the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TABER and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia was recognized before the gentleman from New York was on his feet.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquired as to why the gentleman from New York rose.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 103, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: The sum of $410,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests under Weeks Act" to the appropriation "National forest protection and management."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen an example of what comes rather close to being a gag rule. I believe that no time is gained by efforts to shut off honest debate on a measure that Members are

honestly interested in and wish to present their views upon. Many Members desired to be heard on the merits of this amendment before the vote was taken. The rules permit that those who wish to speak may yet speak, as I am doing now, although, as the gentleman who just preceded me has pointed out, the vote has been taken, and what I say now cannot be considered with reference to the merits of the amendment.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in answer to a question from me stated that I requested to be heard before the Committee on Appropriations after hearings had ceased. No notice was given, so far as I know, to the membership of this House as to when hearings would cease on these deficiency items. I made what I thought was a timely request to come before that committee and be heard on behalf of citizens from my district who were vitally interested and who are vitally interested in this measure. Now, if the hearings had been closed, what was wrong with opening them and having some more hearings? I remember very well during this session when the critical condition of this country with reference to copper was brought to the attention of the House. The Committee on Ways and Means promptly called hearings on a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]. Hearings were had. They were not scheduled prior to the time that this situation was brought before the House. Possibly the Committee on Ways and Means may have more time to hear presentations of bills than the Committee on Appropriations; I do not know. But this was certainly an emergency measure. The money was running out on the 31st day of March, and it strikes me that the action of the chairman of this committee then was in keeping with his strenuous efforts here today to block the passage of this amendment. The gentleman first made a point of order which was overruled. Then when the Committee had given unanimous consent to the gentleman from Illinois to proceed for five additional minutes, giving him 10 minutes in all, the gentleman from New York moved that all debate close in 10 minutes. Many Members who had been on the floor clamoring for recognition were denied the right to say what they wished to say on the merits of the amendment. That is not good for legislation.

We know and concede that there is a larger Republican membership in this House than Democratic.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a lot of Members had not had the privilege of speaking on the amendment. Of course, the gentleman was not here during the Democratic reign in this House. If he had been, he would have seen the Democrats really put the bee on us by shutting off debate when there were possibly 25 of us who wanted to talk. Therefore, I hope the gentleman will forget that kind of attack.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; I was not here then. If I had been here then, I would not have participated in that kind of movement.

I noticed that many Republicans voted for this amendment, and I want to express my personal appreciation of that. I know what it means to vote one way when the majority of the members of one's party are voting the other way. My purpose in making these remarks now is to say that I feel that it is for the good of the country that when Members want to debate the merits of a thing they should be allowed the opportunity to do so, and not have to place a statement in the RECORD that will have no effect whatever on the merits of the matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fighting forest fires: For an additional amount for fighting forest fires, fiscal year 1947, $3,944,000.

FOREST SERVICE ITEMS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of explaining the four items approved by the committee for appropriation to the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

The first item was $395,000 for the control against the tussock moth. This money will be used in connection with a joint effort by the State and Federal authorities to stamp out an outbreak of tussock moth which threatens valuable timber in northern Idaho. Funds have already been provided by the State for its share in the enterprise.

The second item is $410,000 for the cruising and offering of timber for sale over and beyond the amount which would otherwise be handled this coming summer. The Forest Service estimates that the Government will receive at least $2,000,000 from the sales of timber which this appropriation will permit. The current market for stumpage is the highest in forest service history. The cuttings to be authorized are all within the sustained yield cycle. The funds are made available by transfer from funds heretofore appropriated for acquisition of lands under the Weeks Act.

The third item is for control of tree-insect epidemics of national-forest lands in Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, in the amount of $250,000. The committee was advised that, unless checked, these epidemics threaten to reach the scenic timber areas in the Jackson Hole country south of Yellowstone Park. While this situation does not have the same critical emergency character as that of the Tussock moth, and is more of the steady warfare which must be waged against enemies of the forest, the opportunity for making progress this season is good and the amount of $250,000 will permit the organization of an effective campaign as time permits after the funds become available.

The fourth item is $3,844,000 for fighting forest fires. The amount represents the full estimates of the Forest Service, based upon experience to date in this fiscal year.

Together, the approval of these four items shows an appreciation of Forest Service problems which will please those who follow such matters, I feel certain. They provide real forest conservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1947," $1,900,000.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in rebuttal to the statement of the gentleman of the committee who, when our distinguished colleague from Georgia protested at the manner in which he was taken off his feet previously, said that the Democrats had put the bee on the Republicans for the past number of years. Apparently that is what the Republicans intend to do to us, and without justification.

I challenge the gentleman to point out one instance in all the times when the Democrats were in the majority when a Member was on the floor and asked for 5 minutes additional time and when that time was courteously granted by the minority as we did today, when, in all that time, can the gentleman point out an instance, where, as soon as an extra 5 minutes was unanimously granted that the chairman of a committee or anybody else on the Democratic side ever rose and moved that there should be no more time except to the man who got the five additional minutes, leaving the other Members without an opportunity to speak.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I shall not yield now.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of representative government are we going to have if the minority may not even rise and express an opinion? What kind of government are we going to have if the Members of the minority may not be permitted to speak before our committees? We have seen this same thing happen in the Committee on Ways and Means where members were not allowed to speak. Here we are seeing the same Republican formula being adopted in the House. For what reason? Because they have the votes to limit debate—yes, to prevent debate. The country knows you have the votes. The country knows also that you have the responsibilities of government in your hands. The country knows that despite the fact that you have been endeavoring to shut off debate and apply the gag rule you have not brought out a single worth-while bill since you took over the House on the 3d of January. If this continues, you will lose the complete confidence of the country—whatever confidence the country may now have in you, after you have been in control for the past 3 months.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. May I say to the gentleman that I do not doubt he can get all the time he wants to get.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman can get all the time he wants. He can make a motion to strike out the last word. You know how to get time. But on your side

it is different; you have more votes than we have, and you can stop us from talking. The majority have stopped us from talking when we had 8 or 10 men standing here who wanted to speak on the school-lunch program and the Republicans would not give them a chance to speak.

As has been said, there is a very good reason why you would not want us to argue about the school lunches; a very good reason why you would not want the people to know that despite all your promises about what you are going to do for the country, you do not even want to give school lunches to the undernourished and underprivileged American children, although we have given and will undoubtedly continue to give, millions of dollars to feed the people of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Of course, it is not necessary for me to stand here to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], because everyone who was in the House during the reign of the New Deal knows that the gentleman was just making a talk to the gallery. The gentleman knows, as everyone knows, that many times the Republicans were shut off from debate, even when the lives of American boys were at stake, and you know it. It was regular procedure for you fellows to shut off debate as the records will prove.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504), fiscal year 1947, $20,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this $20,000,000 to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is twenty millions more going down the rat hole of the worst administration of a public corporation I have ever seen administered by our Government since I have been in Congress. In 5 years they have squandered in the capital stock of the corporation $90,000,000, besides expense money appropriated by Congress of close to $50,000,000; also a profit made on wheat in 1945 of over $8,000,000, besides all the premiums received for insurance. It shows up the incompetence of the organization. I have been in correspondence and by personal visits with the authorities. They stated in 1945 that their experience would enable them to work with more efficiency, and experience would cause them to do a sound insurance business. The results, however, are worse from 1945 to date than they were before. Federal crop insurance will never be a success—when it is under such supervision and administration. It is a racket, and not sound business. If you want to aid the farmers do so without a Government pay roll of millions annually to the party faithful. Cut out the dishonesty by calling it insurance and causing unnecessary and untimely expenses of government. It is a racket and the Department of Agriculture should recommend its discontinuance at once. I have offered a bill to that end.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surgeon General", $82,100;

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of title I be considered as read and be open to amendment. It is all Pay Act legislation. There is nothing else in the balance of that title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202 (a) For the payment of a judgment, rendered against the Government of the United States by a United States district court under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes", approved March 9, 1920 (46 U. S. C. 741 and the following), and which was certified to the Eightieth Congress in House Document Numbered 126 under the War Department, $5,850.

Mr. TABER (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read down to section 203 and that it may be open to amendment at this time. There is no controversy down to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy Department, $201,501.58;

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS:

On page 46, between lines 8 and 9 insert as follows: "Federal Communications Commission $161.61."

Page 46, line 15, strike out "$164,500.45." and insert in lieu thereof "$166,496.85."

Page 46, line 16, strike out "and."

Page 46, after the number "45910" insert "46026."

Page 46, line 22, strike out "$2,102,638.17." and insert "$2,104,796.18."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment comes too late. The Clerk has read beyond that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman comes too late.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it this amendment was on the Clerk's desk and the fact it was not reported was due to the Clerk's failing to see the amendment. The parliamentary inquiry is: Does it come too late when the amendment was on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama was not present to protect his rights and the Clerk continued to read beyond the point where the amendment should properly have been offered.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I was here but I did not know just where the Clerk was reading. I ask unanimous consent to return to the point where the amendment would be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his gracious kindness. I appreciate it very deeply.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to put into this bill provision for the payment of those judgments which have been rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. No such provision is now carried in this bill.

These three judgment creditors of our Government are no longer in Government service. They have been separated therefrom for more than 3 years. No question is here involved of taking them off of any pay roll.

The question is: Shall we repudiate these debts of our Government? Or, phrasing it more specifically: Shall we appropriate the $2,104,796.18 required to pay all of the judgments of the United States Court of Claims now past due and unpaid or shall we appropriate the $2,102,638.17 that would pay them all except three, totaling $2,158.01?

Each Member's answer to those questions depends not so much on how fiercely he hates the victims as upon how much he loves our Government. Another question guides the answer your vote will make. How much do you hate the decisions of the courts that decreed payment? Or this: Shall the Congress keep the faith and do its plain duty?

If you don't like the decision rendered by the Court of Claims, which Congress created, you have more legal right to vote to abolish that court than to repudiate a judgment Congress empowered it to render.

I have just as much right to vote to deny the payment of the salaries fixed by law for the members of the Court of Claims, or of the Supreme Court of the United States, as I have to so treat those appointed in accordance with the law Congress wrote governing appointments in the executive branch of our Government.

It is just as legal for us to wreck the Government by wholesale as by retail.

We could gain absolute power quicker if we could abolish the other two equal, free, coordinate branches of the Government designed by our forefathers and prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield briefly, but I want to make my own speech, if you please.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has said that if this line of reasoning is correct, we could take the salary away from the judiciary.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is unmindful of the fact that the Constitution itself says that they shall hold office during good behavior and shall at stated times receive for their services compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office. Certainly, to take it away would be to diminish it.

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, sir. You propose to extinguish it—to wipe it out. And with no reference to "good behavior." In the Watson, Dodd, and Lovett cases there has been not so much as a syllable of criticism of their demeanor. They are to be punished, if you prevail, for the entertainment of a past belief, which, according to the testimony, never affected their performance of duty while in office.

So, I repeat, and challenge successful controversion, that you can just as legally deny all pay for the members of the Supreme Court or of the Court of Claims as for these three men.

But, my hypothesis was, as correctly stated by the gentleman: if the gentleman's line of reasoning is correct. And on that fallacious basis, may I ask: "Since that line of reasoning shows no regard for the Constitution, why claim it as binding in one case and not in another?"

In conclusion I must fling this challenge: Very emphatically, I am against all lynching, whoever may compose the mob, however high may be their motives, and no matter that the victim be our system of government!

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before the legislation was passed which prohibited the payment of funds to Watson, Lovett, and Dodd, the Committee on Appropriations had hearings, and these three men appeared before a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, and on which served such outstanding Members of the House as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. From the testimony of these three men, out of their own mouths, it was apparent that they were not loyal to the United States and that they did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. Following that, in accordance with the law, payments were not made to them, and they brought suit and the suit resulted in this judgment.

This is not the first time such a thing has happened. In the Dalton case, about 1930, when the Honorable Will Wood was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, a judgment for $11,900 was obtained under circumstances of very questionable character. The committee refused to consider it and refused to report the funds to pay it. Later further attempts were made to get the money, and an application was made to the committee when the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, was chairman, and that was refused.

The Constitution provides:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

We are not given authority over these things without having a discretion to exercise. If we exercise that discretion in our conscience, believing that this judgment should not be paid and that it is not a proper obligation of the United States, we are performing our duty. Otherwise we are abdicating the duty which the Constitution places upon us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Was not the Dalton case one in which the Congress had refused to provide funds for the extinguishment of a claim which was subsequently pressed in a court and a judgment obtained?

Mr. TABER. No; it was not. It was not that kind of case.

Mr. WALTER. It was not for salary, was it?

Mr. TABER. It was for retirement pay, at a time when Dalton was working for and drawing a salary from the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

If the founding fathers had expected that a judgment of a court required funds to come out of the Treasury automatically, regardless of the proprieties, they would have so provided in the Constitution. At one time we had a law in effect that such a judgment should be paid automatically by the Treasury, but that has been repealed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to prevent any part of an appropriation made several years ago to go for the payment of compensation to Dodd, Watson, and whoever the third man was—Lovett. But that is not the question before the House today. There is only one question involved and that is, as I see it: Are we, the legislative branch, going to take a step that will nullify the judgment of the Court of last resort of our land? That is the only question involved here today.

I can remember over the years how jealous we have been of our prerogatives when the courts have done what we considered an invasion of the legislative field. But it certainly seems to me that there would be just as much justification for the Chief Executive to call out the armed forces to enforce an administrative order in conflict with the judgment of the legislative branch as it would be for us to refuse to honor the judgment of the Supreme Court.

I shall not discuss the decision in the Lovett case. It has been discussed on several occasions since this bill has been called up. But suffice to say that the Court reached the conclusion that these men were entitled to compensation. That is the last word from our Supreme Court. I do not think any of us want to weaken in one single iota any of the powers of any one of the three coordinate branches of our Government.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. My distinguished friend is a member, as I understand it, of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House. Has not your committee recently approved an act to nullify the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in the portal-to-portal cases?

Mr. WALTER. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported on numerous occasions legislation designed not to nullify but to restate the law where it has been very clear that the courts have invaded the legislative field. Certainly we did not do anything to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called portal-to-portal cases. That was not the situation at all.

I am sure my friend has not examined carefully the Mount Clemens case.

But the point is, where will we go next if we refuse to honor and recognize the judgment of the Supreme Court? What will the next move be? It can be almost anything. It seems to me before we take this very important step we should carefully weigh the consequences.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the men who wrote our Constitution were experts in government. They thought in terms of government. They were familiar with every experiment in human government from the dawn of history down to their day. They knew that the mightiest instrumentality of governmental power is in the purse. Therefore they lodged the power over the people's pocketbooks, the power to tax, and the power to appropriate money primarily in the House of Representatives. If we surrender in this instance our right to control the purse, we will have surrendered the greatest prerogative with which this House is vested for the defense of the liberties of the people and the preservation of our institutions. The keynote of the whole controversy is in the discretion of the House. We have discretion in this matter that is inherent in the powers of the House. The simple test is this: Has any court in the land the power to mandamus and compel the Congress to appropriate money in discharge of a judgment that runs counter to our conception of what the powers of the House are? Do not be mistaken about this matter. This is the opening gun in the fight of this Congress and the American people to purge the public pay roll of men and women who do not believe in our form of government and who are in the positions they now hold with the avowed and settled purpose of overthrowing, hamstringing, and destroying this Government. If we do not vote to withhold this money which we have steadfastly declined to appropriate, then we cannot get rid of any of these men that the President says he now wants to

ferret out, expose, and get rid of. This is a power that we should not surrender, and I am not disturbed about this judgment of the Supreme Court. Let the Supreme Court follow down the path that Presidents and other judges have followed and then will be time enough for us to consider whether or not we will surrender this great power of purse, and this power of discretion which, in my opinion, it is our sworn duty to exercise under our oath of office. Let us vote down this amendment and preserve this power of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any more fundamental question that can arise in this Congress than the one now before us in reference to the payment and the discharge of these purported judgments. These employees had an opportunity to stay on the public pay roll of this Government. This House and the Senate of the United States provided in an action concerning their payment, that if they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, they could stay here. They never undertook to ask anybody to appoint them or to approve of their appointment. They continued the work they were doing, after they were ordered stricken from the pay roll, and they remained until they had secured enough salary in order to bring an action against the United States Government. They proceeded to sue us in the Court of Claims, and the case finally went to the Supreme Court of the United States. These employees, Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, were not deprived of their offices and they were given an opportunity, if they complied with the requirements of Congress, to keep their jobs and not lose them. They declined to do this in the light of the evidence against them and they remained on their respective jobs long enough, and in violation of the law of Congress, to acquire a sufficient amount of salary, as they thought, to bring an action against the Government.

There has been a great deal said today about the legal question involved in this controversy. I think the power of the purse is a very fundamental principle involved in the legislation of this country, and I am satisfied that the men who made the Constitution and created this Government, of which we are so proud, determined that the representatives of the people, the Congress of this country, should pass upon the fairness of all claims, the justice of a claim, and the legality of any claim. The position that the Court has taken has been misunderstood. For just a few minutes I wish to read to you what the Court has said in respect to this kind of action. I believe this House will understand very well why Mr. Dodd, Mr. Lovett, and Mr. Watson were asked to get off the pay roll of this Nation. I think certainly the large majority of this House understands it full well.

The Supreme Court has never held that Congress must pay any claim or debt against the Government. In the case of *Reside* v. *Walker* (11 Howard 272), a verdict had been rendered in favor of an employee of the Post Office Department to pay certain compensation for services. The Supreme Court held as follows:

> The difficulty in the way is the want of an appropriation by Congress to pay this claim. It is a well-known constitutional provision that no money can be taken or drawn from the Treasury except under an appropriation by Congress.

That is one of the leading cases, and it is a case to which my distinguished friend from Alabama referred on a previous occasion.

The Court went on to say:

> However much money may be in the Treasury at any one time, not a dollar can be used in the payment of anything not thus previously sanctioned. Any other course would give to the fiscal officers a most dangerous discretion. But without such an appropriation it cannot and should not be paid by the Treasury, whether the claim is by a verdict or judgment, or without either.

This fundamental doctrine has never been overruled.

There is another opinion of the Supreme Court to which I wish to call your attention which clearly declares that Congress is within its fundamental rights, that we are protecting the people of this Nation as the makers of the Constitution intended they should be protected.

The situation was summed up by the Federal District Court in California in the case of *Spaulding* v. *Douglas Aircraft* (60 Fed. Supp. 985). In that case the Court held as follows:

> The purpose of the appropriations, the terms and conditions under which said appropriations were made, is a matter solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain and explicit duty of the executive branch of the Government to comply with the same. Any attempt by the judicial branch of our Government to interfere with the exclusive powers of Congress would be a plain invasion of the powers of said body conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States.

I could cite many other cases holding to the same effect, that it makes no difference what sort of claim may be brought against the Government, the claimant cannot get his money until the representatives of the people say it shall be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of discussion about the Supreme Court here this afternoon on this amendment. I wish to call attention to one fact, and that is that the members of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, whereas the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people. I believe that puts us just a little closer to the people and more in touch with their ideas than possibly some of the members of the Supreme Court. For just a minute I wish to review some of the history of this case.

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the Seventy-eighth Congress, in reporting out an appropriation bill, funds were denied these three gentlemen, Dodds, Watson, and Lovett. When the Democrats at that time saw what was going to happen they desperately rushed in a resolution, setting up a special committee to investigate whether or not these three men were subversive. That was done, even though the Committee on Un-American Activities had made a report on them and the Appropriations Committee had made a report on them. They appointed a Democratic-controlled committee, chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who just preceded me. That committee, after an investigation, brought in a report recommending that these three men should not continue on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone can vote for this amendment if he will but take the time to read the testimony taken before that committee, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. That report was unanimous?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois is correct when he says the report was unanimous.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the question of the politics of these three men involved or is it a question of whether the House should honor a decision of the Supreme Court? Is that not the fundamental question?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not agree with the gentleman that the fundamental question is whether or not we are going to honor a Supreme Court decision. I will say it is not a question of politics because it was a Democratic-controlled committee that brought in an adverse report on these three men.

One thing further. If the Members will read the report they will find this language:

> Upon consideration of all the evidence your committee finds the membership and association of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., with the organizations mentioned, and his expressed views and philosophies of government constitutes subversive activity within the definition adopted by the committee, and that he is, therefore, unfit for the present to continue in Government employment.

If you will refer to pages 4480 to 4484 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1943 of the Seventy-eighth Congress you will find that I gave a rather extensive account of some of these gentlemen in a speech I made at that time.

I do not see how you are going to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in support of his order of a week ago last Saturday to rid our Government of subversives and vote for this amendment. The President came out with an order, of which I have a copy and a full report of his committee. If you are going to start getting rid of these fellow travelers, Communists, and subversives in our Government, it would certainly be a very poor start to vote for this amendment which in effect pays the salaries of these three men accumulated under the circumstances explained a few

minutes ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The Honorable Clinton Anderson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, a member of the committee to investigate Dodd, Watson, and Lovett, made a fine speech as to the fact the committee found these three men subversive and unfit for Government employment. In the final analysis it is a privilege to be employed by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of true Americanism this amendment should be defeated and I hope it will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that a judgment of the Supreme Court is a very solemn obligation which we should not, dare not repudiate in this Chamber. We would weaken the forces of law and order. We would encourage disregard of the decrees of all courts. Anarchy would follow.

There has been much said derogatory of the Supreme Court here in the debate this afternoon. But, of course, it all depends upon whose ox is gored. Some of the very men who made these statements against the Supreme Court acclaimed that Court a few days ago when it rendered the Lewis decision.

There is a great deal of hysteria developing in our campaign against the Reds, but that hysteria should not rob us of our common sense and of our wisdom in legislating here. If this body can in an appropriation bill chop off the appropriations of an officer say, of the Virgin Islands government, it could by token of the same reasoning or lack of reasoning chop off the salary of a district judge or chop off the salary of an ambassador; the salary of the President himself. You might say that is farfetched, but not so many moons ago in this very Chamber there was an oligarchy of legislators, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, who did things that seem rather queer to us now. By legislative fiat he practically ran the Government and trampled upon the Executive and the judiciary. He impeached the President on grounds which were subsequently declared utterly and willfully unconstitutional. This House, under Thaddeus Stevens, not only wanted to cut the salary of President Johnson, but wanted his scalp as well. Many things can happen in this very Chamber if we do not beware and if we are not careful of what we do. If the pending amendment fails, we repudiate the judgment of our highest Court—the Court to which the opponents of this amendment would quickly repair if they got into trouble and needed its help. Yes; we have the power of the purse, as has been indicated this afternoon, and we are given that power by the Constitution, but there is also the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder and ex post facto laws. One part of the Constitution is as sacred as the other. The opponents apparently and deliberately close their eyes to those portions of the Constitution which protect the liberties of the individual and guard against undue encroachments upon those liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me assure you I am not speaking at all because of any affection for Mr. Watson or Mr. Dodd or the type of government they apparently believe in. I am speaking because of a deep and abiding affection for sound principles of constitutional government. I would regret it if this amendment were not adopted. When we had the original amendment here to remove Dodd and Watson from the pay roll I voted against the amendment on the theory that it was a bill of attainder. The court has simply done its duty. It has recognized an obligation which I think we did not recognize when we adopted that amendment and has said that these people were not taken from the pay roll in a proper manner. In accordance with their duty as they saw it they rendered a judgment.

We must distinguish between the power to do something and the right to do it. Of course we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money. If we should disagree with the Supreme Court we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money for their salaries or to run their institution. Nevertheless, we have no right to do it, and we have violated our oath of office, in my judgment, if we put our conduct on the naked question of power regardless of the question of the right. The court is a coordinate branch of the Government. It has in the exercise of its power and authority rendered a judgment which I think it is our duty to uphold.

This is not similar to the portal-to-portal case. The right of Congress after a judgment has been rendered, after a decision has been made, to rewrite the law for the future is unquestioned. That is a question of policy. But the portal-to-portal bill, if you read it carefully, recognizes that we had no right to interfere with the judgment which was beyond appeal, and we specifically excluded that in that measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reason the Committee on Un-American Activities called Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett subversive was that these men favored a government that was totalitarian, a government that operated through the one-party system. The strength of America, it seems to me, is in the balance of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our Government. If because we have the power in this chamber to do so, we should hold back payment of this money to these men and not honor the decision of the Supreme Court we would be breaking down that division, which at this particular time is all-important. I therefore feel it essential to our integrity and to the integrity of our Government that this claim be honored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, up our way the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stands high in the estimation of everyone. His integrity and singleness of purpose are the objects of our utmost admiration. I know he is utterly sincere in the position he takes and the same remark applies to the committee which has favorably reported this bill. It is with great regret that I find myself in disagreement with my esteemed colleague. But I must join my distinguished colleague from Iowa of the Committee on the Judiciary in what he has so forcefully and so well said.

The amount involved here is only a little over $2,000, so small, in fact, that one scarcely dares mention the sum in official Washington. But the principle involved, it seems to me, is basic and fundamental—more so, in fact, than any yet faced by this Congress. To deny this appropriation strikes at the very heart of our system of government. I do not know any of these men. I never heard of them until this bill was brought to the floor. So far as I have been able to learn, their conduct as employees of this Government was thoroughly reprehensible. I am entirely ready to assume that it is a fact, as stated by the chairman in his opening remarks, that the evidence showed that these men did not owe, or pay, their first loyalty to the United States.

Nevertheless, they went to court with their claims, were sustained in the Court of Claims, and the judgments which they recovered were affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States. The only way whereby they can translate their piece of paper called a judgment, into cash in hand, is through an appropriation made by this Congress. No matter how violently I may disagree with the decision rendered by our highest court, I am unwilling to lend the support of my vote to the use of this process to render such a judgment ineffectual. If we seize the power to nullify this judgment, where are we to stop? What limit shall we set on the substitution of our discretion for the solemn pronouncement of our highest court?

My sincere and able friend defends the elimination of these items from the bill by saying that there is precedent for such action by Congress as is here recommended. I am not familiar with the case to which he refers. But my answer is unhesitatingly that if such precedents exist they are fundamentally wrong. No matter what some previous Congress has seen fit to do, I cannot support or vote for a proposition which does violence, in my judgment, to the doctrine of the separation of powers between the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of our Government. The very structure of the American political sys-

tem rests upon the mutual regard and respect of the three coordinate elements which compose it.

Accordingly, I shall support the amendment which has been offered to make provision for the payment of these judgments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us be cool and keep our feet on the ground. These are indeed serious times through which we are passing. Let us not do unlawful things and foolish things in a moment of caprice or a moment of madness.

The Supreme Court of the United States determines lawsuits. It has determined these lawsuits and has rendered its solemn judgment. In my judgment we have no right under our theory of government to deny these judgments by refusal to make sufficient appropriations to pay them.

I know nothing in the world about these men. I assume from what has been said that they are not in any way the type of men that I would approve of. I do not know anything about them, but it is not for this body to judge that in this instance. Their case was for the Supreme Court to determine. It was for the Court to determine whether or not they were entitled to their money. Since it has so determined, I believe we have no right to deny it. We have no lawful right to deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am so conscious of my limitations in the field of constitutional law that I am most reluctant to match wits with the very distinguished lawyers of this House. Yet, I find myself in disagreement with so many eminent gentlemen from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let us look at the matter in this way, quite aside from the ideology that is involved and quite aside from the emotionalism.

You will remember surely those cases in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the gold clause, and especially the notable case of Perry against the United States, in which the Supreme Court said: "Why, indeed, you are in possession of a piece of paper. It has language in it that provides that on the tendering of this bond you can be paid in gold." But the Court said: "You are without a remedy. It is a charge upon the conscience of the sovereign"—and the sovereign might in this case be the Congress. It said: "Indeed, you have a valid contract; but, unfortunately, there is no remedy by which you can pursue your right. There is no way by which you can compel action on it and get payment in gold. You have to be paid in paper."

Now, here are three gentlemen who, in my considered judgment, in the first instance came into court with unclean hands. But the fact remains, they have a judgment. Now, the question is, What remedy is available to them? The Supreme Court said they are entitled to the money. But that does not mean that the Congress must appropriate the money any more than the Congress was required to set up a procedure to pay the holders of every gold bond in the country. The Court said it was a charge on the conscience of the sovereign, but did the sovereign do anything about it? The sovereign did exactly nothing. Every holder of a bond that had a gold clause in it had to take paper money as payment. The sovereign did nothing. Now, must the sovereign do something in this instance? Must the sovereign now, notwithstanding the fact that here is a valid judgment, take action to honor that judgment? In my opinion, the sovereign in this case, the Congress, has no such obligation. Let us not forget that we did not take these gentlemen off of the roll. What we did was this: We put a proviso in the urgent deficiency bill in 1943 stating that they can have no money until they are confirmed by the Senate. They had to be appointed and confirmed by the Senate. They did not go and get confirmation from the Senate. What they did was this: They remained on the rolls in defiance of the Congress and in contempt of the Congress until there had accrued sufficient pay to make out a case, and then they went into the Court of Claims. But in the same proportion that the Supreme Court said in the Perry case, "While the Congress is under no duty to provide remedies through the courts, the contractual obligations do exist, and despite the infirmities of procedure, remain binding upon the conscience of the sovereign." So we have much on our conscience, because all holders of those gold contracts were never paid. I am willing to charge my conscience with one more thing and not appropriate money for this purpose.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. If the Supreme Court decided in the Perry case that we should pay in gold, should we not pay it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It said there was an obligation on the sovereign.

Mr. RABIN. Had they said we should have paid in gold, should we not have paid in gold?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not, because we had taken away their remedy. In other words, there was no way for them to enforce it. But let us not forget that the Congress of the United States is, after all, a coordinate branch of this Government, made up of three separate and distinct and independent branches. Here is an element of discretion, and while our conscience is charged with it, yet we are under no obligation to pay it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am very much troubled in attempting to follow the gentleman's judgment, whether two wrongs make a right. Is this not another wrong?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. This is wholly within the realm of rights of Congress. In other words, we have the discretion whether we are going to set up procedure and that procedure would have to go through all the necessary motions of the Appropriations Committee to get the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOBBS) there were—ayes 86, noes 97.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this vote on whether a final judgment of our Supreme Court should be paid is a very difficult vote. I voted for the original law striking Dodds, Watson, and Lovett from the Federal pay roll. I thought then, and still think, that they were and are unworthy to be on the Government pay roll because of their subversive views. I disagree with the Supreme Court decision which held that law of Congress unconstitutional.

In voting to pay this judgment I am upholding a judgment I disagree with; these men have shown their willingness to overthrow the very Constitution which the Supreme Court invoked in awarding this judgment.

Nevertheless, I voted for the Hobbs amendment appropriating funds to pay this judgment. No one can sue the United States unless Congress grants the right. These cases were properly filed in the Court of Claims according to the laws laid down by Congress. A final judgment was duly obtained against the United States of America. We may have the power to refuse to pay that judgment, but I feel we do not have the right to do it. Congress should act to pay money judgments obtained by citizens against the Government, in accordance with the laws provided by Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Naval procurement fund," $4,817,350.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 49, after line 9, insert:

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation, 1945	$55,000,000
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946	130,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1945	4,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946	12,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1945	9,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1946	40,000,000
Fuel and transportation, Navy, 1945	10,000,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:	
Medical Department, Navy, 1945	5,500,000
Medical Department, Navy, 1946	7,000,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1945	100,000,000

Bureau of Aeronautics:	
Aviation, Navy, 1945	$460,000,000
Aviation, Navy, 1946	6,000,000
Bureau of Ordnance: Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1945	50,000,000
Marine Corps:	
Pay, Marine Corps, 1945	7,000,000
Pay, Marine Corps, 1946	36,000,000
General expenses, Marine Corps, 1945	14,000,000
General expenses, Marine Corps, 1946	55,000,000"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these are rescissions that have been submitted to us by the Secretary of the Navy and are items that appear in accounts that they might expend. They have felt and many of us here have felt that they would be better off with them wiped off the books. They do not intend to use any of them before the expiration date.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman when these expire?

Mr. TABER. Some of them will not expire until the end of the next fiscal year. Every time the Navy has come up against something the suggestion is made that they have this block of funds available that might be obligated and it is embarrassing to them.

Mr. CANNON. As the items were read, I did not note any which would not expire this year. If that is true, and if, as the gentleman says, the Navy will not use them this year, it is only a matter of a few weeks, and nothing is to be gained by taking action at this late day.

Mr. TABER. It is simply an effort to clean up their books, and it puts them in a position where they cannot use the funds. On the other hand, it leaves them in the position where no one can say that they have in sight $6,600,000,000 to spend after this fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. Every year we have these odds and ends at the close of the fiscal year which expire automatically. We have never taken action of this kind before. It is merely a gesture, and might be construed as an attempt to leave the impression that we are making a saving when we are not making any saving at all. Does the gentleman think we can save any money by this procedure.

Mr. TABER. I think undoubtedly we will.

Mr. CANNON. In what items does the gentleman expect to save money?

Mr. TABER. Some may be obligated, as I understand it, up to the end of June, and I understand that $286,000,000 of that may be obligated to the end of June next year, and the temptation is there where any of them might be used. Now, it would seem to me it was good business to cut them out.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment going in, although, on the face of it, it is of no force or effect whatsoever. It will not effect economies of any kind. It is merely making a bookkeeping entry in advance of the automatic rescission of the entire amount.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri last year brought in a rescission bill and thought it was a very proper thing to do?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I did not bring in a rescission of this character. I reported actual rescissions of sums which would be available after the end of the fiscal year. These will expire June 30. This amendment will not salvage a penny.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman that there is herewith transmitted a list of balances available for immediate rescission.

Mr. CANNON. But all of them will automatically expire on the 30th of June, and the Navy assures us they will not be spent in the meantime. Nothing is to be gained by adding them to this bill. But I have no objection to including them. It does not mean anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the balance of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Hobbs amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dodd-Lovett-Watson amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS:

On page 46, between lines 8 and 9, insert as follows: "Federal Communications Commission, $161.61."

Page 46, line 15, strike out "$164,500.45" and insert in lieu thereof "$166,496.85."

Page 46, line 16, strike out "and."

Page 46, after the number "45910" insert "46026."

Page 46, line 22, strike out "$2,102,638.17" and insert "$2,104,796.18."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 110, noes 97.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Civil Service Commission regarding certain navy yard employees.

RENT CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 188)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Public Law 548 of the Seventy-ninth Congress provides:

> On or before April 1, 1947, the President shall report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations, are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of the powers granted by this act as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to established departments or agencies of the Government (other than the Office of Price Administration) which should be charged with the administration of such powers.

On November 12, 1946, price controls were eliminated on all commodities except sugar, sugar solutions derived from sugarcane or sugar beets, corn sirup and corn sugar, blended sirups, and rough and milled rice. Since the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 has become law, it is unnecessary for me to repeat the views I have already expressed with respect to the subject matter of that act.

Despite the rapid upswing in residential construction during 1946, the Nation is still faced with a critical housing shortage. Dwelling accommodations, particularly rental units, are still radically out of balance with demand. In 88 cities surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of the Census during 1946, vacancies in rental units were virtually nonexistent. The vacancy rates in habitable accommodations for these cities ranged from zero

to a maximum of 1 percent with an average well below one-half of 1 percent. Proper protection of millions of our American families requires that effective rent and eviction control be extended beyond June 30, 1947, for a further period of 1 year, and I so recommend.

As for the agency of the Government to administer rent controls, it was my original recommendation that the Office of Temporary Controls be assigned this responsibility. However, recent legislation requires the liquidation of that agency, and a bill now under consideration by the Senate would transfer these functions to the Housing Expediter. I raise no objection to this proposal.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 1, 1947.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 1439, and include a statement by John J. Giltinan.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE GREEK AND TURKISH SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this day I rise to speak as an American citizen deeply devoted to my country and filled with loyalty for her. Our country stands at a crossroad, the most hazardous in her history. What you and I do now will undoubtedly set the course of our national policy so inexorably that we shall be caught in a politico-military tide from which there is no escaping. True it is that the President sets the course of our foreign policy; but equally true is the fact that Congress must appropriate the money and therefore share full responsibility for the consequences of the policies toward Greece and Turkey, and other countries.

It has become customary to brand independent thinking on foreign affairs as isolationism. If my remarks are construed within that category, gentlemen, I shall accept the accusation with pleasure, because I speak as my conscience dictates. I am an American, a citizen of the United States of America and my first consideration is for my country. If that be treason, make the most of it.

We have thrown the gauntlet to one of the most powerful nations in the world and we propose to embark upon a series of international adventures that can lead only to heartache, human suffering and national bankruptcy. We have been asked—and appear to have accepted—the role of bankrupt Great Britain. Although she was the world's richest and most powerful state for over a century, she did not have wealth enough to continue her imperialism indefinitely and avoid economic disaster. And now with that object lesson before us, we propose to pour our good money into the same bottomless well. I say that rich as we are we do not have and never can have enough money to fill the well of British imperialism.

We are told by the President that the money requested is to fight communism abroad. That is a worthy enterprise as far as that doctrine and its practice oppose our free institutions. But how does the President hope to fight communism abroad when it is rampant within our own country? Why did he not appear before us recommending measures for its eradication from our own governmental departments here in Washington long before he did? When does he propose to clean out some of our own domestic hotbeds? Surely, we are not so naive as to believe that we can fight a doctrine abroad and still have that doctrine preached to us by our own governmental departments here at home. How do we expect to carry on the fight against communism abroad when the boring from within menaces the foundations of our Government at home? The fellow travelers are found in high places. Secretaries of Commerce are not the only ones who are susceptible to these leftist doctrines.

But fighting communism is only a cloak for the more fundamental and underlying power politics which is being played. It is not food and relief which are in question. Everyone of us is for that, and Congress has already before it measures for the granting of relief. Nor is this simply a loan. Look at the matter in its broader implications. The $400,000,000 is only the initial loan. We are to have the right to send American troops to Turkey and Greece. We are to combine loans and troops with relief and food. But in addition we have been asked to pass the President's budget with few cuts. We are asked to pass the Army and Navy merger, and finally to enact compulsory military service. Thus we are asked not only to embark on a hazardous foreign venture whose outcome none of us can envision, but we are granting to the military cliques complete control of our Government. In short, what is there to distinguish us in that respect from totalitarian regimes? Already the military rules our State Department. For the first time in history a general is the Secretary of State. Too many generals now fill our diplomatic posts.

If I read history correctly, this is alien to American ways of thinking. For we have always kept the military establishments in balance. We are become a war, not a peace state. What did we fight two world wars for—more war and the loss of our freedom? We are in the midst of setting our course along militaristic and imperialistic lines which contradict the bases of Amercian thought and our beliefs. Equally disturbing is the fact that our contemplated conduct runs contrary to the foundations of our foreign policy. Hear what George Washington said in his Farewell Address. He saw more clearly than we do in an equally disturbed era.

> The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.
>
> Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.
>
> Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.
>
> Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?
>
> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements.

And then, of course, while President Monroe said:

> We owe, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Are we to do to Europeans what we forbid them to do to us? President Monroe also said:

> In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries and make preparation for our defense.

On September 12, 1940, Senator Nye said of the Monroe Doctrine:

> In very brief language, the two paragraphs together mean just this:
>
> 1. We want no part of anything in Europe and we aren't interested in interfering in Europe. Our best interests are served by staying out of European power politics.
>
> 2. But we intend that Europe shall stay out of the Americas; we will not stand for its interference in our affairs or the affairs of our sister republics, and any European nation attempting to so interfere in any of these nations will have us to reckon with.

And now because British imperialism has led that country to make commitments, which she no longer can fulfill, notwithstanding our billions to her, President Truman asks us to take up the burden, jettison the bases of our foreign policy, which have led us to greatness, and contradict the wisdom of our years. To all this, American interests dictate an emphatic "No." We have fought aggression in two major wars. Do we now propose to succumb to it ourselves? Where is the line of our true interests to be drawn? Did I not hear over the radio the other day that some of our military experts are already contemplating outposts on Mars and the Moon for the conduct of atomic warfare? Where do we propose to stop?

I said, and I repeat, the course the President recommends is dangerous, unnecessarily so. We were responsible for the League of Nations, and have been

equally responsible for the United Nations organization, to whose institution we have subscribed from the very beginning. Is there not an effective Food and Agricultural Organization and an International Bank which can handle much of the Greek relief which the President proposes? Russia is not a member of either one. Surely, if Greece needs help and we fear Russia, then the United Nations organization should now be used by us. We are reverting to independent national action which is a sure road to war, when there lies at hand an international agency whose use will lead to peace.

I think the President has already made a grave mistake in bypassing the United Nations in this matter. The United Nations is the only international organization we have today which can further the cause of peace. The United States has taken the lead in promoting the United Nations organization, and it therefore behooves us to aid in every way if it is ever to amount to anything at all. If we bypass the United Nations organization now we will brand it useless in the sight of the nations of the world.

The President owes it to our people and to the world to present the case of Greece and Turkey to the Security Council and to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and request them to act and do so now. They should assume the responsibility, not the United States as proposed by President Truman. Only one other alternative comes to mind, and that will be, give the money to the churches—Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew—and ask them to send their communicants into Greece to alleviate suffering from hunger, cold, and disease. Religion is more vital than weapons. Religion is to be more welcome to a war-torn people than the form of government they have.

When men rule people in their own way and by their own methods, by force or otherwise, they are most likely to fail. When men join up with God and ask Him to lead the way they succeed if they will follow Him.

I believe the failure of the United Nations to date is because they did not nor do not ask divine guidance in their deliberations at their sessions. Men win with God—men fail without God.

What makes this matter of aid to Greece so urgent? Are we just becoming aware of the situation and would be panicked into action? Surely Greece has needed assistance for a long time. That war-torn country has been helped time and time again, both privately and publicly, by the Government and the citizens of the United States. If Russia disturbs us so much, where was our State Department when the treaties of peace were drawn up with Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria? Do we hope to contain the Russian State within its own borders when it is already surrounded by friendly neighboring states frankly distrusting the United States?

There is chaos and confusion in the recommended course of action, which can only grow more pronounced as we proceed along the path laid out for us. This is not a question of backing the Government, or bipartisan policy, or even of party interests. This is a matter of the true and sound course of American policy, much broader than the interests of any individual or any official institution or group of people. It is as broad as our country itself.

Read the headlines of the news stories and editorials which appeared at the time the President delivered his address. Here are some: "Russia's bawling out," "Get ready for war," "Taft probes likelihood of Soviet war if United States aids Greece and Turkey," "America's new role." Can there be any question as to the significance of the course we are taking?

A little over a year ago we sent an international commission into Greece to observe the elections there. Was that the forerunner of much more expansive action to come? Greece is no democracy; to inject ourselves into her domestic affairs gives us the choice between, on the one hand, communism and its allied forces, and, on the other hand, an unpopular, dictatorial monarchy whose only excuse for living is that Britain established it there. Nowhere is democracy.

To vote the Greek and Turkish recommendations will commit this country to an impossible task and will convert it in the eyes of the world from a haven and refuge for the oppressed and, therefore, the most popular country, into the most unpopular country charged with interfering everywhere. The contemplated program is impossible to fulfill. Taking the world as a whole, we have only a comparatively small part of the manpower and a comparatively small part of the wealth. Let us not forget how near disaster we were just 4 short years ago. A little more weight on the side of the enemy, his election of different courses of action, might well have prolonged the war indefinitely. For the moment we are the most powerful state in the world. Let us not use that power to create conflict but rather let us use it to promote peace, understanding and good will. Russia can be fought with armies, but communism cannot be killed by bayonets or rifles; nor will a loan of $400,000,000 kill it in Greece, Turkey or the rest of the world. And when will the American taxpayer stop having to contribute? After Greece and Turkey comes Korea, then Rumania, Yugoslavia, Finland, and all the border states of Russia. Such a program would commit us indefinitely to unproductive budgets of billions.

I would remind my brother Congressmen that while we like to think of ourselves as wealthy, almost a decade and a half of the New Deal and a World War have mortgaged our wealth in an unprecedented fashion. We are talking of balancing the budget and tax cuts in this session. I venture to predict that if we embark upon this course we may be the last Congress to talk in these terms.

There are so many reasons against this course of action that it is impossible to give them without exhausting your patience. May I close by quoting the reactions of one of my constituents:

I am all for helping any nation to feed its people and establish a democratic form of government, but Greece does not have a democratic government. It has a feudalistic government, established at point of the British bayonets. Now it is proposed to back such a government as we have been backing reactionary governments all through the war years. If we were really sincere when we claim to want democracy and free government, we would long ago have helped poor Spain out of its present plight. We would not now, as we are, be a party to the tearing apart of Korea, and our munitions would not have been used in Java to keep the Javanese from their freedom.

Briefly, these are the reasons why I want to oppose with all my power this proposal:

It would make the United Nations organization worse than a scrap of paper; it would make our entrance into it a pure hypocrisy. With one hand we subscribe to it; with the other we play party politics.

It will aline our country with reactionary governments in the eyes of the rest of the world. Our reputation for this is nothing to be proud of even before this proposal.

This means we are starting on the road of imperialism. The one and to my mind the only good reason for the past war is that imperialism was given a death blow. Now we propose to keep it alive a little longer.

This marks the beginning of an armament race between Russia and us that will bankrupt both.

It shows us the terrible consequences of leaving the military men to rule our Government.

It must lead inevitably and directly to war. Surely no sane person believes Russia will take such a blow lying down.

Let us send food to Greece and elsewhere to allay starvation. Let us back every decent democratic government that stands for freedom, but let us be done with any government that was established at the point of bayonets.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE GRECO-TURKISH AID PROPOSAL—"THE THIRD ROAD"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to speak on the subject of the Greco-Turkish aid bill. On March 12 President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress. His address was virtually a public declaration of political war on Russia. On that date the President proposed a radical and startling change in our traditional foreign policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations.

The consideration of Mr. Truman's proposal does not involve partisan politics. It is a question that concerns every American citizen regardless of political affiliation. The charge of imperialistic warmonger and starry-eyed internationalist will be made against those who support intervention as proposed by Mr. Truman. The charge of isolationist, anti-British, and pro-Russian will be made against those who oppose the Truman proposal.

There is a great body of American people who do not accept any of the hysterical labels I have named. There are in this Congress many Members who refuse to be classified under any of the labels noted. I am among that number. Neither blind party loyalty nor fear of labeling from either the extreme right or the extreme left can deter many of us from viewing with great concern this proposal. A proposal which seeks to change our traditional foreign policy in such an abrupt and drastic manner.

TWO FATEFUL ROADS

Mr. Truman's proposal involves the choice of only two roads, and they might be posted as follows: Nonintervention and intervention. Down the road of nonintervention we see the old mud hole of isolation, with its attendant danger of refusing again to accept our world responsibilities in a rapidly shrinking world. Down the second road, which is posted intervention, we see the dangerous quicksands of imperialistic, unilateral procedures which have preceded every war. Before we make our choice between the two roads which stretch so fatefully before us we want to be sure there is not a third and more desirable road as yet undisclosed by our leaders. Maybe there is a third road which we can find, and maybe that road is named United Nations Way. I will return to this alternative road later.

There are many questions to be asked, and there must be many satisfactory answers given, before some of us can choose either the first road—nonintervention—which beckons the traditional isolationists, the Communists, the pro-Russian fellow travelers, as well as the timid group who draw back from world responsibilities, or before we can choose the second road of unconditional intervention, which lures the twentieth century American imperialists, the hate Russia warmonger, and the confused group who do not realize the meaning of the Truman proposal.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN QUESTIONS ON AID PROPOSAL

On March 20, 1947, a letter was addressed to the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, by a highly respected Member of the other body. Appended to this letter was a questionnaire containing 110 important questions relating to the Greco-Turkish aid proposal. I have read the 110 questions. Satisfactory answers may be available, but I have not to this day been furnished with a full list of answers. Not being on the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I have not had the benefit of hearing the testimony presented, neither have I read the testimony presented in the similar committee in the other body. I have only this to say, unless satisactory answers are given, many of us who refuse to be classified as isolationists or labeled as Communists will not vote for the bill. I do not intend to take up these 110 questions in detail. Time on the floor and space in the RECORD would forbid. I do intend to advance a few important questions however and make a few observations. The first question which concerns most of us is the basic one of Why has the United Nations been bypassed? Regardless of the belated excuses and explanations by those who wholeheartedly indorsed the Truman proposal, the fact remains that the original proposal was belligerent in its tone, filled with hot generalities, and fraught with most startling and dangerous implications. It was as dangerous from the standpoint of what it left unsaid as it was for the things it said.

WHY HAS THE UNITED NATIONS BEEN BYPASSED?

The furor of public alarm and opposition to the President's approach to this problem is now forcing tardy explanations, ameliorating excuses, and sycophantic references to "a stopgap emergency program pending United Nations action." Which is, to say the least, suspicious. It betrays a policy of second guessing, which strives to cover up the initial mistake. That the original joint message to Congress justifies the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" cannot be denied. The reaction from every thoughtful person was immediate and shocking, when they realized that the United Nations was practically ignored. People from every walk of life began to wonder if the United Nations was being classified as a futile and functionless shadow. A careful reading of the part of the President's message which summarily dismisses the United Nations as being too slow and ineffective to merit more than a passing bow, or a careless backhand slap, brought consternation and alarm to many thoughtful people. The harm done throughout the world in crushing the feeble flame of hope which exists in the heart of many war-weary people was incalculable. We realize that the United Nations has not been brought to fruition; we know that many parts of the outline are yet to be filled. We will concede that there is no international police force which can be sent into Greece to maintain civil order in the emergency. We will concede that it might be difficult to aid Greece in a monetary way without special multilateral action such as obtained in the establishment of UNRRA. We will concede that a Russian veto might prevent a unanimous edict of policy by the Security Council delegates. All these concessions we are willing to admit, and they do present great difficulties to prevent emergency action by the United Nations in this hour of crisis.

But because they present great difficulties shall we use these arguments as an excuse for killing the United Nations in its infancy? Shall we use the element of short time between the President's proposal on March 12 and the British evacuation on March 31 as an excuse for weakening an organization which holds the hope of millions throughout the world, the hope of millions who pray for the obtaining of world peace?

Or should this Greco-Turkish problem have been used as an opportunity for revitalizing and developing the United Nations in the direction of its original goal; that is, the formation of a vital, functioning, world organization for the solution of international problems and the assurance of world peace?

WHY SUCH UNSEEMLY HASTE?

Let us consider some pertinent factors involved in the proposal. First, the appeal to act hastily on the grounds of the emergency conditions which would ensue immediately after the abrupt withdrawal of British troops on March 31. I would like to know why the British are being allowed to precipitate such an abrupt crisis. Is it not true that our State Department has known for many months that such action was contemplated? If so, why was the proposed British withdrawal not publicized so that Congress would have an adequate period of time to study and debate the subject of American intervention? If the British notice of withdrawal was necessarily as sudden as we have been led to believe, I would like to know if our State Department protested the abrupt action, and whether they requested the British Government to postpone for 60 or 90 days their withdrawal. This would have been a reasonable request and within the possible bonds of British compliance. It would have given us time to explore multilateral action. Laying aside for a moment the ethical question of the subject of intervention, and assuming that external political, economic, and military aid is necessary for the welfare and protection of the Greek people, assuming also that the United Nations has not been developed to the point where it can function in the Greco-Turkish crisis, we are still confronted with this question, "Is there no alternative to unilateral action of the United States?" The Truman proposal in effect says "No." But many of us are not satisfied with this answer. We do not believe that it is impossible to develop an alternative procedure. A procedure which would not duplicate the unilateral imperialistic solutions which have been the basis of all previous wars. We believe that a procedure could have been and still can be developed which will have the moral and spiritual force of multilateral sanction. A procedure which will comply with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the proposed goal of the United Nations.

IS THERE AN OVER-ALL FOREIGN POLICY?

Another very important question which I would like to ask is this, Do we have an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern foreign policy? The reason I ask this question is obvious. The necessity of considering the Greek problem as part of an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern problem is so plain that even a fool can see it. The solution of any of the various problems in these areas depends upon its relation to the other problems involved in adjoining areas.

Setting up a new procedure, a unilateral procedure on our part toward Greece, does two very important things: First, it ignores multilateral procedure as envisaged by the United Nations; and, second, it sets a precedent of unilateral procedure for not only ourselves, but for every other nation in the world. Once we embark upon this course of unilateral solution of international problems, we have no reason to criticize other nations for doing the same thing. That is why this proposal assumes an importance far beyond the scope of the Greek-Turkish aid proposal.

Our policy of piecemeal, spur-of-the-moment development of foreign policy, without regard to an over-all policy, has proven time and again to be a mistake. In this particular case—the Greek case—we know that the question of internationalization of the Dardanelles is involved, or at least Russian demands for egress and ingress to and from a

warm-water port in the Baltic. We know that this is the reason the Turkish military loan is tacked onto the Greek loan. It is to strengthen Turkey in her opposition to Russian demands. The excuse of starvation and maintenance of a quasi monarchist-democratic government, which clothes our Greek intervention with an aura of humanitarianism, has not been advanced to justify the Turkish portion of the appropriation. The reason it has not been advanced is because it is palpably untenable. Turkey is not starving, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be classified as even semidemocratic.

WHOSE CHESTNUTS ARE AT STAKE?

Another related problem, of course, is the oil problem. I say "related," but what I mean is it is one of our most important reasons behind our sudden interest in the Mediterranean. Now, lest some of my anti-British friends say, "We are pulling English chestnuts out of the fire," let me make it very clear that in Iran, Iraq, and in Saudi Arabia, there are other chestnuts besides British chestnuts.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point two tables of statistics, which show whose chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 1 shows the daily oil production and the estimated oil reserves in barrel units of the Persian Middle East countries.

It also shows that not only the British chestnuts, but American, Dutch, and French chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 2 shows the names of the petroleum-developing companies and their ownership, by nationalities, and the respective percentages of ownership involved.

TABLE 1.—*Petroleum production and reserves of Persian Gulf countries by nationality of corporate ownership*

[U. S. 42-gallon barrels]

	Daily production [1]			Reserves [2]		
	United States	British-Dutch	French	United States	British-Dutch	French
Iran		420,000			6,500,000,000	
Iraq	24,000	48,000	24,000	1,200,000,000	2,400,000,000	1,200,000,000
Qatar				250,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000
Kuwait	20,000	20,000		4,500,000,000	4,500,000,000	
Saudi Arabia	200,000			5,000,000,000		
Bahrein	20,000			300,000,000		
Total	264,000	488,000	24,000	11,250,000,000	13,900,000,000	1,450,000,000

[1] Oil and Gas Journal, Dec. 28, 1946, p. 175.
[2] American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, S. Res. 36, 79th Cong., p. 73.

TABLE 2.—*Middle East oil companies—ownership by countries, 1947*

[Information supplied by U. S. Department of State]

Country	Company	Ownership by nationality
Bahrein	Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd.	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co.
Iran	Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd.	100 percent British owned.
Iraq	Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd.	23.75 percent American owned—Near-East Development Corp., in which Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. share equally.
Do	do	23.75 percent French owned—Compagnie Francaise des Petroles.
Do	do	23.75 percent Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd., British owned.
Do	do	23.75 percent Dutch owned—Royal Dutch Shell.
Do	do	0.5 percent owned by "individuals."
Quawait	Quawait Oil Co., Ltd.	50 percent American owned—Gulf Oil Co.
Saudi Arabia	Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco).	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co. A deal is pending for Standard Oil of New Jersey to buy 30 percent and for Socony Oil Co. to buy 10 percent of these holdings.

I cannot develop at this time the true significance of these tables of statistics, but I am sure that there is enough information presented in these tables to adequately lay the ghost of "British chestnuts" only.

Let us be frank and admit that the Turkish portion of the loan has two great reasons behind it. First, preservation of the status quo in regard to the Dardanelles, and second, the protection of American, Dutch, French, and British chestnuts in the oil deposits of the Middle East. The subject of oil, therefore, cannot be divorced from our consideration of the Greek-Turkish aid bill and we should openly acknowledge its involvement.

PALESTINE, A RELATED PROBLEM

And then there is another great question which has been before the American people for many years, and that is the Palestine question, a question which involves the life or death of millions of people of Jewish ancestry throughout the world. The Palestine question has been explored on this floor too many times for me to go into detail at this time. But suffice it to say that Britain is maintaining in Palestine, we are informed, 100,000 troops. Many of us believe that the British handling of the Palestine question has been wrong. We believe that she has violated the Balfour agreement, and that her handling of Palestine as a League of Nations mandate has not been just or fair. Our President has asked for certain concessions from the British Government in opening the gates of Palestine to the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in Europe. This request has not been granted. Would it not be possible to include this part of the Middle East problem in negotiations with Britain and give it the importance it deserves in the development of an over-all, Middle East foreign policy?

If we are going to embark on an overall Middle East policy, why not include along with the Greek problem the internationalization of the Dardanelles, the equitable division of concessions in the Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia oil fields? Also, why not include in the over-all discussion a solution of the Palestine question? There are other problems in the Middle East, but these three that I have mentioned are pressing enough and are related enough to demonstrate the fact that I first stated, that you cannot solve the Greek problem without taking into consideration other related problems in the Middle East.

MULTILATERAL SOLUTIONS IMPERATIVE

If we are to embark on a world-leadership program, as befits our position among the society of nations, let us be careful to exercise that leadership to give strength and being to the United Nations. We want to exercise that leadership in the full light of United Nations debate. We want to know when we embark on this venture of world leadership that we have the moral and spiritual force of at least the majority of the United Nations behind us. We do not wish to be in the vulnerable position of using our resources in an imperialistic way. We either move forward in the world of tomorrow, in concert with other nations toward multilateral solutions, or we move backward alone to the unilateral fiascos of the past.

THE RUSSIAN VETO

We have been told that one of the reasons why this matter has not been referred to the United Nations has been because of the certainty of a Russian veto. We want to discuss this point for the moment on the assumption that this prediction of a Russian veto is correct. First, let us remember that the veto provision in the Charter is not wholly chargeable to Russia. The United States was equally insistent that this veto provision be included. So in our criticism of Russia, for the misuse of the veto, let us not forget that she uses the tool which we helped to make.

The veto has been used 12 times by members of the Security Council. It was used twice by the United States and the United Kingdom voting in unison. It was used once by France and Russia voting together and it was used nine times by Russia alone. Many of us have come to the conclusion that the United Nations cannot be effective as a world organization if the nations comprising the "big five" retain the veto power. Let me point out, however, that we are probably no more ready to renounce the veto than Russia. If we find, however, that important international problems cannot be solved on the basis of complete unanimity, we must admit the futility of depending on the United Nations as now constituted to guarantee or facilitate world peace.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

What is the alternative? Referring specifically to the Greek problem, I notice that the morning papers report that a distinguished member of the other body

proposes to offer amendments which will in effect give supervisory powers over our proposed venture to a procedural vote of the Security Council—not subject to veto—or a majority vote of the General Assembly delegates. This proposal, in my opinion, is a very important move toward multilateral approval. A substitute joint resolution has been offered in the House by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. While I am not 100 percent in accord with this proposal, I do believe that it is worthy of very serious study as the main theme of the resolution points away from unilateral action and in the direction of multilateral action.

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL ALLIANCES

Addressing myself to the general problem of international organization, I would suggest that we encourage the formation of an adequate number of regional alliances consisting of as many nations as possible in each area who would be willing to work together on the principles of the United Nations. We have already done this in the Western Hemisphere and it has been approved as consistent with the world organization. The great advantage of the regional alliance would be that action could be taken on a policy or procedure without the paralyzing requirement of unanimity.

It may be necessary for the nations to learn to work together on a regional basis before we can function on the world level. We must admit that human nature has not yet attained that peak of perfection where unanimity is commonly achieved. Those functions of the world organization which are possible, and there are many, should still be encouraged and maintained. Many of these international subdivisions of the United Nations are making remarkable progress, without the participation of the U. S. S. R. I speak of the trusteeship council, the provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Every possible effort should be made to develop multilateral solutions as international problems arise, first on the regional basis and then on the world level. The principle of collective action must be maintained and unilateral action, such as the Truman proposal, avoided as we would avoid the plague. Like the bubonic plague, it is a virulent and contagious disease and a single case can start an epidemic that means certain death to the United Nations.

There is still time to return to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

In the first part of my speech, I described the choice between the two fateful roads of "nonintervention" and "unconditional intervention." I described the dangers attending the choice of either. I also suggested that there might be a third road which I called the United Nations way.

THE THIRD ROAD: "THE UNITED NATIONS WAY"

I believe that that third road is opening up before us. I believe that it can be developed and safeguarded by legislative conditions in the appropriation bills and public commitments on the part of the President, the Secretary of State, and the United Nations delegate. To our delegate on the United Nations, the former distinguished Senator from Vermont, the Honorable Warren Austin, we owe a great debt of gratitude for pointing out the third road, "the United Nations way." The echoes of Mr. Truman's speech of March 12 had hardly ceased before the tide of public criticism began to mount, throughout the length and breadth of the United States. The people who had sacrificed so much in the great war just concluded, the people who saw the League of Nations scuttled after the First World War, the people who had pinned their faith to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations had asked again and again the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" Our delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Warren Austin, went before the United Nations Assembly on March 28 and said the things which the President should have said on March 12. Mr. Austin answered some of the important questions which have been troubling us, where Mr. Truman's proposal of intervention was based on one aim of the United Nations, that is, to prevent aggression against a weaker nation. It indicated that our action would be taken on a national basis, depending solely on our own strength and judgment. Mr. Austin's statement to the United Nations put the United States action on a very different basis indeed. Admitting that the United Nations was not ready, he made it clear that our intervention would be in line with the international principles of the United Nations, and that we welcomed the support of the other nations, both morally and financially. He admitted that the United Nations, as presently constituted, was lacking in financial resources. He pledged that our financial aid was on a temporary basis, pending the functioning of the United Nations on a long range basis through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He further advised the Greek Government to apply for a loan of at least $100,000,000 from this source. He promised that our temporary aid would be administered along the lines recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, an international commission which has just completed a very fine survey of Grecian needs.

Mr. Austin pointed out that a United Nations commission is at the present time investigating territorial invasions by armed bands on the northern border of Greece. He asked that special efforts be made to expedite their report to the Security Council. And certainly, by implication, he pledged our support in their recommendation.

We see then that belatedly we are harmonizing our plans with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

CONDITIONAL CLAUSES AND PUBLIC COMMITMENTS

All of the questions have not yet been answered; we hope they can be answered in a satisfactory manner. The conditional clauses have not been enacted into legislation. We hope they can be enacted. The public commitments and assurances from our President and the Secretary of State have not been made. We sincerely trust and hope they will be forthcoming. Unless these conditional clauses can be written into the bill and unless proper collaboration on a multilateral basis can be developed, many of us cannot vote for the bill. Vigilance on the part of every patriotic person will be required to mobilize an enlightened public opinion to point the way down the third road indicated. An enlightened public opinion which will demand that this crisis be handled the "United Nations way."

It may be the deciding factor in the life of the world organization we call the United Nations. It may mean the difference between world peace and world destruction in this atomic age.

If we save the United Nations, it will be because the common people demand that our leaders walk down the third road, "the United Nations way."

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two tables of statistics.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here from a gentleman whom all of you know. I am not at liberty to reveal his name because I would like to talk to him before I do. But it is of little moment as to who he is. It is what he says that is important. I would like to read a few excerpts from his letter:

Byron wrote when he made his spectacular entry into Greece to help the Greeks throw off the yoke of the wretched Turks. The first four lines go like this:

"If a man has no freedom to fight for at home
Let him battle for that of his neighbors,
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors."

Then the English were fighting against the infidel Turks. Now we are called on to fight for them. We have been denounced for not getting into the Spanish War on the side of the Communists, and are told if we had done so it would have stopped Hitler and prevented World War II. Now we must go into Greece against the Communists to stop Stalin and prevent World War III.

Meanwhile the poor American taxpayer has no freedom of choice and no money. He must not have a penny cut off his taxes or a penny in debt reduction lest this should threaten the security of his country. But it is all right to pour uncounted billions into the rat holes of the whole earth.

This Greece-Turkey thing is exactly like the token force in World War I and the 50 over-age destroyers in World War II. I hate to agree with LaGuardia on any issue, but his testimony yesterday was 100 percent right. If we go into this Greek thing we shall be pouring in money and the blood of our sons for generations. This is a turning point in the history of our country.

No matter who may have said that, whether a lowly citizen or a man of high position, those statements, and especially that poem, are most timely.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. RAMEY. The question that is before the Congress is not the question of who is right but what is right.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct, and I think the gentleman who wrote this letter and who recited this poem from Byron hit the nail on the head—I wish I had the entire poem—let me read it again:

If a man has no freedom to fight for at home,
Let him battle for that of his neighbors.
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors.

Recently I had dinner with a young man who had just returned from the Philippines, a boy who was a draftee after the war. He said that we Americans are thoroughly despised. At least, the boys get that vibration from the Filipinos they met when they were serving in that country. Apparently, our role here is to be generous and kind and loving and considerate, and then we get knocked on the head for all of our good deeds. I think we ought to do some pretty good thinking about how we become involved in this Greek deal at this stage of the game.

A member of the other body—I am not supposed to mention his name because it would violate the rules of the House—said this matter should be referred to the United Nations, after we act on it here. I do not know just what the maneuvers are, but in any event, since we have a United Nations we ought to use it or else get out. The United Nations was most effective in the Iran controversy and even though Russia objected for a while, she yielded and went along with the program. I think it is entirely in order that this matter be considered by the United Nations and that we have no legislation here at all.

I believe the people of the world and the people of this country are sick unto death of government by emergency. We have had emergencies for 14 years, one after another. It is a sleight-of-hand performance under which you do not know what in the world you are doing except that you are following the path of least resistance.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. BREHM. If we would stop financing the various countries throughout the world they would come to an end immediately.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. The materials that are now being used are lend-lease and UNRRA materials. I maintain that there could not be another world war unless the American people financed it. If we would stop financing these conflicts it would do more to stimulate peace than anything I know of.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business the following Members of the House: Mr. PLOESER, of Missouri, chairman; Mr. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin; Mr. HOWELL, of Illinois; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. JACKSON, of Washington; and Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), until Thursday, April 3.

To Mr. WOODRUFF, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of illness.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 169) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States has learned with profound sorrow of the death of His Majesty, George II, King of the Hellenes, and sympathizes with his people in the loss of their beloved King.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of Greece.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of King George the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard to the consideration of the resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 31, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 146. An act to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

513. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the proposed deletion of part of the last paragraph in their letter of March 21, 1947, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report pursuant to Public Law 601 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) on investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 167. Resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to insure the funds of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2339. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 603. A bill to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1099. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1584. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 341. A bill for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 437. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; with amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim; with amendments (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Eva Bilobran; with amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Gilda Cowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; with amendment (Rept. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2389. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2900. A bill providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1947, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2901. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2902. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 2903. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by a veteran otherwise entitled to a pension by reason of a non-service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2904. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act relating to fishermen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2905. A bill to amend section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2906. A bill to provide advice, counsel, and assistance from the Veterans' Administration to citizens of Mexico who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2907. A bill to amend the act of May 7, 1941 (ch. 87, 55 Stat. 177), and to provide for health and safety in coal mines affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2908. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2909. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved November 21, 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 2910. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens or members of our armed forces, by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to a part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2911. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2912. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. Res. 168. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to the cost of living, strengthening our national economy, and preserving the free-enterprise system; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of the Hill-Taylor bill, which proposes the establishment of additional national cemeteries in each of the several States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Noboru Shirai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Lucile L. Rice, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and James E. Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Andrew Weininger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfonsina M. Corradini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Long Caton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

297. The SPEAKER presented a petition of G. H. Wells, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to aid to Greece and Turkey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who didst love us all so much that Thou didst send us Jesus Christ for the illumination of our darkness and the salvation of our souls, give us wisdom to profit by the words He spoke, faith to accept the salvation He offers, and grace to follow in His steps.

As Christ said: "When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any," O God, give us grace now so to do.

As Christ said: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," O God, give us grace today to think, not of what we can get, but of what we can give.

As Christ said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged," O God, give us grace this day first to cast out the beam out of our own eyes before we regard the mote that is in our brothers' eyes.

And when we find it hard to be humble, hard to forgive, O Lord, remind us how much harder it was to hang on the cross. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, April 1, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MEETING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair submits the request that the committee be permitted to continue in session during the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from Thursday until next Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee appointed to investigate the Centralia mine disaster may be absent from the Senate this afternoon and until such time in the fore part of next week as it may conclude its labors in the field.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE DUE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES UPON SEPARATION FROM SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission requesting an amendment to the draft of proposed legislation transmitted by him to the Senate on March 21, 1947, providing for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of members of Townsend Club No. 22, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Berthoud, Colo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a copy of a resolution, H. R. 79, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Texas employers paid into the Federal Treasury last year approximately $5,537,000 in Federal unemployment taxes; and

Whereas those five and one-half million Texas dollars, along with sums from other States, were so paid into the Federal Treasury to finance the administration of an unemployment compensation law in Texas and the other States; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is by law charged with the duty of returning at least a part of those Texas dollars to Texas for the sole purpose of paying all administrative costs of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission in administering the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act; and

Whereas the administrative funds granted to Texas for the first 6 months of 1947, amounting to $640,948, are so inadequate that the commission must discharge more than 150 employees and is prevented from granting its remaining employees the salary increases which the Texas Legislature has just granted to other Texas State departments; and

Whereas Texas employers and workers, Texas veterans and other Texas taxpayers are being deprived, by the failure of Congress to grant sufficient administrative funds to Texas, of their right to a proper administration of the Texas unemployment compensation law including:

(1) Thorough examination of doubtful claims;

(2) Investigation of cases involving fraud;

(3) Opportunity for Texans living in smaller towns to file claims;

(4) Service to Texas veterans of World War No. II; and

Whereas because of the shortage of operating funds, the Texas commission has been required to cancel claims and investigation service at 99 itinerant points within the past 2 months and will, in all probability, find it necessary to stop service at additional itinerant points; and

Whereas this absence of service at these points is discriminatory against individuals living in and around those smaller Texas cities; and

Whereas the lack of funds to pay for proper investigation processes will inevitably result in higher taxes on Texas employers under the experience rates provided by the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives strongly urge the Members of Congress of the United States to make available to the Social Security Administration adequate money for a grant of administrative funds to the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission to permit the type of administration of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act for which the employers of Texas have already paid; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate of the United States, and to the Members of the Texas congressional delegation in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 64. A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; with amendments (Rept. No. 83).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 814. A bill to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 85).

RENEWAL OF 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES—REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, and I submit a report (No. 84) thereon. I request that the bill and the report be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the bill and the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (by the act of May 14, 1942; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year level-premium term policy may be renewed for a second or third or fourth or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the fourth 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1947, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance, such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same con-

ditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

The report (No. 84) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDING EXISTING LAW TO PROVIDE PRIVILEGE OF RENEWING EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES FOR ANOTHER 5-YEAR PERIOD

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize holders of 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance to renew such policies for a fifth 5-year period, at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination. The 5-year level-premium term policy was first authorized in 1926. There have been three renewals since authorized for periods of 5 years each, making a total period of 20 years during which such Government insurance may be carried on the 5-year term plan. A bill similar to this one was last enacted on May 14, 1942 (Public Law 556, 77th Cong.). The committee feels that anyone who has such a policy at present should not be denied the privilege of renewing this type of insurance if he so desires. The committee also recognizes that there are cases where protection of a veteran's family in the next few years is a matter of primary concern to him. From this standpoint, the renewal of term insurance may well have advantages over an attempt to convert to other types of insurance at the present time.

However, in the long run, the committee wishes to point out the marked disadvantages of a level-premium term policy to veterans as they become older in point of age.

At every 5-year period, as the veteran becomes older, the annual premium will sharply increase. And, furthermore, a veteran relying upon 5-year term insurance does not have the cash, loan, or paid-up values in his insurance which he would have if he converted to another type of policy.

Nevertheless, the committee takes the position that veterans who wish the protection of term insurance during the years of the immediate future and who simply cannot afford at present to convert their policies to other types of insurance should not be denied the right to continue their term insurance.

The report on this bill to the committee from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is self-explanatory and is as follows:

MARCH 19, 1947.

Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: Reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 1327, Eightieth Congress, "An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize renewal of United States Government life insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan for a second, third, fourth, or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination. Under existing law such insurance may be renewed for a second, third, or fourth 5-year period.

The level premium legal reserve system was devised in order to overcome the objections to the renewable term plan. Under this system the yearly term premiums for the entire period of life are adjusted to provide for level premiums payable throughout the period. During the earlier years the insured under this plan pays more than the amount of premium required under the yearly renewable term plan, the excess being accumulated at interest to create a fund which will provide for the excess cost at such time as the cost of protection exceeds the amount of premium being paid. This plan of insurance is more advantageous to the insured than the renewable term plan for the reason that not only will the premium never increase but on the average the total amount of premiums which the insured will be required to pay will be less under the level-premium plan due to the interest earnings.

The comparative results under these two systems may be shown by considering the insurance status at the end of 20 years of two veterans A and B now aged 55 years, on the assumption that both veterans live to attain the age of 75 years. Veteran "A" takes out an ordinary life United States Government life insurance policy issued at age 55 for $10,000 paying thereon a level annual premium of $451.30 which will never increase during his lifetime. Veteran B takes out a 5-year level-premium term policy issued at age 55 for $10,000, and it is assumed for purposes of comparison that at the end of each 5-year period, he is permitted to take out a new 5-year term policy issued at his attained age. The annual premium on this term policy during the first 5 years is $207.90. During the second 5-year period the insured will be required to pay an annual premium of $306, during the third 5-year period $467.80, and during the fourth 5-year period $727.70.

At the end of the 20-year period, that is, at attained age 75, veteran A has an ordinary life policy under which there is a cash value of $5,401.10 or a loan value of $5,077. If he wishes to discontinue the payment of premiums he may secure a paid-up life policy in the amount of $6,747.30, or he may let his policy run under the extended insurance provision in which case his insurance protection will be automatically continued in the amount of $10,000 for an additional period of 7 years and 75 days without the payment of any further premiums. If he desires to keep his policy in full force after attaining age 75, it may be continued until his death by the payment of the original annual premium of $451.30.

On the other hand veteran B, upon attaining age 75, has no cash, loan, paid-up or extended insurance values. If he desires to continue his insurance on the 5-year term plan it will be necessary for him to pay the increased annual premium required, which for ages 75 to 79, inclusive, is $1,111.60. The annual premiums required under this plan for further periods are as follows:

Ages 80 to 84, inclusive	$1,769.60
Ages 85 to 90, inclusive	3,129.20

If veteran B, upon attaining age 75, desires to continue his protection under a permanent life plan it will be necessary for him to pay the premium at the ordinary-life rate for age 75 which is $1,449.40 per year.

An examination of the above figures and the comparative results under the two plans show the advantage in an average case of placing insurance under one of the permanent forms of level premium-life insurance at as early an age as possible, thereby securing the maximum benefit from interest earnings.

The group of term policyholders of United States Government life insurance is composed of a larger percentage of impaired lives than any other group, and death and disability experience of this group show a high ratio to the claims expected under the mortality tables. Many of the losses are not traceable to the extra hazard of service and must be borne by the United States Government life-insurance fund.

All United States Government life-insurance policies include a provision granting benefits on account of total permanent disability, without limit as to the age before which disability must occur, for which no additional premium is charged. The probability of becoming totally disabled increases with advancing age and at the older ages practically becomes a certainty. The liability assumed on account of the disability provision must be met from what would otherwise be considered as surplus earnings if no disability provision were included in the policy. It is, therefore, necessary to accumulate from these earnings a fund which will be sufficient to provide for the liability assumed. The margins available for this purpose are smaller under the 5-year level-premium term plan than under any of the other plans of converted insurance. The longer the holders of this plan of insurance are permitted to continue their insurance on the term basis, especially if evidence of insurability is not required, the more difficult it will be to make provision for the liability assumed on account of the disability provision, in fact in the case of the older policyholders it will be impossible to make provision for this liability from their own contributions.

Sound insurance underwriting requires that safeguards should be established to minimize the chances for adverse selection. Commercial life insurance companies grant total disability protection only to persons in a preferred classification as to risk who are below a certain age limit, and the protection generally ceases when the insured attains the age of 60 years. Under Government insurance there is no restriction as to the classification of risk or limit as to the age before which disability must occur and no age limit for the granting of new insurance. If the holders of 5-year-term insurance are permitted to renew their insurance on this plan without requiring evidence of insurability, it is evident that the adverse selection will be great and that the burden of this adverse selection will fall upon the other policyholders and not upon the 5-year-term group.

The United States Government life-insurance fund is a trust fund created and owned by the policyholders, the Government acting as administrator and trustee of the fund. In the administration of this fund the rights and interests of the great body of policyholders should be considered and protected. To grant special rights and privileges to one class of policyholders, known to contain a large percentage of impaired risks, at the expense of the other policyholders, would be unjust and discriminatory.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of this proposed legislation to the United States Government life-insurance fund, since such cost will depend upon the degree of impairment among the members who continue on the 5-year-term plan, but there is no doubt that the cost will be considerable and will extend over a period of years. The Government pays for the extra hazard due to military and naval service no matter what plan of insurance is selected, this cost being determined by the difference between the face amount of insurance and the reserve. Since the reserve on 5-year-term insurance is very small compared with the other plans of insurance, the cost to the Government on account of claims which have a service connection will be greater if impaired lives are permitted to continue on the 5-year-term plan than if they were carried under some other plan having a larger reserve. The increased cost will extend over a number of years and will continue even after the completion of the additional 5-year period, but it is impossible at this time to estimate the additional cost to the Government.

The following table shows the number of 5-year level-premium term policies in force as of December 31, 1946, the aggregate face values of such policies, and the periods in which such policies are being carried:

First period	10,998	$85,910,577
Second period	7,215	41,738,704
Third period	6,161	37,479,393
Fourth period	12,821	82,954,875
	37,195	248,083,549

It will be noted that only about one-third of such policies are running in the fourth period and would require legislation to continue on the term plan after their respective expiry dates.

For the foregoing reasons, the Veterans' Administration is unable to recommend favorable consideration of the proposed measure.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

The committee is in accord with the purposes of the bill and recommends its enactment.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the months of February and March 1947 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

MARCH 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter E. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

APRIL 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Pearl Mae Leisinger, 1401 South Barton Street, Apartment 102, Arlington, Va., Office of Temporary Controls, Washington, D. C.; annual salary, $3,271.80.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Federal employment during the month of February 1947, both continental and abroad, dropped 9,713 from the January total of 2,261,459 to the February total of 2,251,746. Of this reduction, all but 1,105 of it was in the War and Navy Departments, the remainder of the Government dropping from 1,276,404 in January to 1,275,299 in February. Inside the United States, Federal employment dropped 7,336 from the January total of 1,977,200 to the February total of 1,969,864. Excluding War and Navy again, there was a net reduction in the other agencies within the United States of only 873 employees. Outside the United States, there are still 281,882 employees, a reduction of 2,377 from the January total of 284,259.

Twenty-two establishments of the Government increased their personnel during the month. Three of these increases were substantial: The Treasury Department with an increase of 2,040 over the January total of 101,742, the Post Office Department with an increase of 1,224 over the January total of 457,924, and the Veterans' Administration with an increase of 965 over the January total of 229,874. During the same period, 27 establishments decreased personnel. The most substantial decreases occurred in the War Department, which dropped 6,077 employees from the January total of 608,601; the Navy Department, which dropped 2,531 from the January total of 376,454; and the War Assets Administration, which dropped 1,929 from the January total of 53,744.

A more comprehensive picture of increases and reductions in Federal personnel is accomplished by comparing present employment with that immediately after VJ-day. During the year and a half since then large-scale reductions occurred in the War Department which reduced 1,208,447 to the February total of 602,524, the Navy Department which reduced 347,419 to the present total of 373,923, and the other war agencies which reduced 137,033. Meanwhile other agencies have expanded. Veterans' Administration has increased 157,829 to the present total of 230,839, the Post Office Department increased 71,886 to the present total of 459,148, but this included approximately 53,000 employees previously employed but not reported until after VJ-day. The State Department increased 10,768 to its present total of 21,956 and the Treasury Department increased 7,974 to its present total of 103,782. During the same period there have been added 8 new agencies to the Government with a total personnel of 62,126, including 51,815 in the War Assets Administration.

Many other agencies have had substantial, if not so spectacular, increases in personnel since the actual cessation of hostilities. Thus in numerous instances such reductions as may now be taking place are in this category and do not represent a decrease below the wartime peak of employment, but rather a leveling off at that level without consideration being given to large-scale increases already made during the war. In order to reduce the national budget it is imperative that employment be reduced, not to the prewar level perhaps but at least to a level in which the necessity for economy is given recognition beside the necessary new functions stemming from postwar needs.

I ask unanimous consent that a report prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Federal personnel, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, JANUARY–FEBRUARY 1947

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH JANUARY 1947

(All figures compiled from reports submitted by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during January decreased 7,336 from a total of 1,977,200 in January to 1,969,864 in February. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 873 from the January total of 1,220,144 to the February total of 1,219,271. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 3,260 from the January total of 432,010 to the February total of 428,750. The Navy Department inside the United States decreased 3,203 from the January figure of 325,046 to the February total of 321,843. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 2,377 from the January total of 284,259 to the February total of 281,882. The majority of these employees are industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 232 from the January figure of 56,260 to the February figure of 56,028.

The consolidated table, presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside the continental United States, shows a total decrease of 9,713 from the January total of 2,261,459 to the February total of 2,251,746. Excluding War and Navy Departments' reductions of 8,608, there was a decrease of 1,105 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the January figure of 1,276,404 to the February figure of 1,275,299. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of February decreased 9,648 from the January total of 628,148 to the February total of 618,500. The War Department decreased 7,010 outside the United States and decreased 1,240 inside the United States in the industrial group, making a total reduction of 8,250 employees. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	78,477	77,812	−665
Commerce Department	34,726	34,810	+84
Interior Department	44,840	44,939	+99
Justice Department	23,882	23,939	+57
Labor Department	7,419	7,278	−141
Post Office Department	456,509	457,737	+1,228
State Department	8,627	8,485	−142
Treasury Department	101,045	103,060	+2,015
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	96	96	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	145	149	+4
Selective Service System	8,956	8,770	−186
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	27	28	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	456	[1] 0	−456
Office of Government Reports	146	149	+3
Office of Housing Expediter	1,971	1,926	−45
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	158	133	−25
Office of Price Administration	13,916	13,458	−458
Civilian Production Administration	4,032	3,835	−197
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,119	4,280	+161
War Assets Administration	53,722	51,415	−2,307
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Bureau of the Budget	610	611	+1
Civil Aeronautics Board	499	518	+19
Civil Service Commission	3,503	3,523	+20
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	117	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,357	1,351	−6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,167	1,184	+17
Federal Power Commission	794	783	−11
Federal Security Agency	30,894	31,003	+109
Federal Trade Commission	592	592	
Federal Works Agency	24,343	24,551	+208
General Accounting Office	11,442	11,045	−397
Government Printing Office	8,013	8,037	+24
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,281	2,287	+6
Maritime Commission	11,851	11,444	−407
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,624	5,617	−7
National Archives	399	396	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	284	283	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	313	310	−3
National Housing Agency	16,468	16,041	−427
National Labor Relations Board	888	883	−5
National Mediation Board	99	100	+1
Panama Canal	484	522	+38
Railroad Retirement Board	2,636	2,788	+152
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,543	8,336	−207
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,204	1,195	−9
Smithsonian Institution	502	502	
Tariff Commission	224	224	
Tax Court of the United States	122	121	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,535	13,566	31

[1] Agency terminated Feb. 23, 1947, Executive Order 9809.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	228,061	229,014	+953
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,220,144	1,219,271	−6,106 +5,233
New decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−873
Navy Department	325,046	321,843	−3,203
War Department	432,010	428,750	−3,260
Total, including War and Navy Departments	1,977,200	1,969,864	−12,569 +5,233
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−7,336

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	1,388	1,283	−105
Commerce Department	2,505	2,498	−7
Interior Department	4,678	4,426	−252
Justice Department	545	521	−24
Labor Department	93	97	+4
Post Office Department	1,415	1,411	−4
State Department	13,752	13,471	−281
Treasury Department	697	722	+25
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Selective Service System	85	82	−3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of Housing Expediter	3	3	
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of Price Administration	90	52	−38
Civilian Production Administration	21	20	−1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	55	[1] 62	+7
War Assets Administration	22	400	+378
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	75	75	
Civil Aeronautics Board	12	11	−1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	36	37	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	692	966	+274
Federal Works Agency	297	308	+11
Maritime Commission	346	339	−7
National Housing Agency	52	54	+2
National Labor Relations Board	2	3	+1
Panama Canal	27,458	27,234	−224
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	110	110	
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	

[1] Estimated.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	1,813	1,825	+12
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	56,260	56,028	−947 +715
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−232
Navy Department	51,408	[2] 52,080	+672
War Department	176,591	173,774	−2,817
Total including War and Navy Departments	284,259	281,882	−3,764 +1,387
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−2,377

[2] As of Jan. 31, 1947.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1947 and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	79,865	79,095	−770
Commerce Department	37,231	37,308	+77
Interior Department	49,518	49,365	−153
Justice Department	24,427	24,460	+33
Labor Department	7,512	7,375	−137
Post Office Department	457,924	459,148	+1,224
State Department	22,379	21,956	−423
Treasury Department	101,742	103,782	+2,040
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	96	96	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	145	149	+4
Selective Service System	9,041	8,852	−189
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	27	28	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	456	[1] 0	−456
Office of Government Reports	146	149	+3
Office of Housing Expediter	1,974	1,929	−45
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	158	133	−25
Office of Price Administration	14,006	13,510	−496
Civilian Production Administration	4,053	3,855	−198
Philippine Alien Property Administration	57	[2] 64	+7
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,119	4,280	+161
War Assets Administration	53,744	51,815	−1,929
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	78	78	
Bureau of the Budget	610	611	+1
Civil Aeronautics Board	511	529	+18
Civil Service Commission	3,508	3,528	+20
Export-Import Bank of Washington	117	119	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,393	1,388	−5

[1] Agency terminated Feb. 23, 1947, Executive Order 9809.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1947 and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,170	1,187	+17
Federal Power Commission	794	783	−11
Federal Security Agency	31,586	31,969	+383
Federal Trade Commission	592	592	
Federal Works Agency	24,640	24,859	+219
General Accounting Office	11,442	11,045	−397
Government Printing Office	8,013	8,037	+24
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,281	2,287	+6
Maritime Commission	12,197	11,783	−414
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,624	5,617	−7
National Archives	399	396	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	284	283	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	313	310	−3
National Housing Agency	16,520	16,095	−425
National Labor Relations Board	890	886	−4
National Mediation Board	99	100	+1
Panama Canal	27,942	27,756	−186
Railroad Retirement Board	2,636	2,788	+152
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,653	8,446	−207
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,204	1,195	−9
Smithsonian Institution	510	510	
Tariff Commission	224	224	
Tax Court of the United States	122	121	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,535	13,566	+31
Veterans' Administration	229,874	230,839	+965
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,276,404	1,275,299	−6,494 +5,389
Net decrease excluding War and Navy Departments			−1,105
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	376,454	373,923	−2,531
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	432,010	428,750	−3,260
Outside continental United States	[2] 176,591	173,774	−2,817
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,261,459	2,251,746	−15,102 +5,389
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−9,713

[2] Estimated.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Commerce Department	1,083	1,139	+56
Interior Department	4,827	5,408	+581
State Department	302	320	+18
Treasury Department	5,468	5,474	+6

[1] Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled, and supervisory employees on construction projects. Maintenance and custodial workers not included.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
National Housing Agency	19	16	−3
Panama Canal	2,703	2,625	−78
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,520	6,511	−9
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	20,922	21,493	+661 −90
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+571
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	260,546	258,577	−1,969
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	202,589	201,349	−1,240
Outside continental United States	[2] 144,091	[2] 137,081	−7,010
Total, including War and Navy Departments	628,148	618,500	−10,309 +661
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−9,648

[2] Estimated.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1021. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Business Committee and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. 1022. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; and

S. 1023. A bill to amend the act of March 14, 1944, to include Coast Guard personnel in the exemption from payment of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1024. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1025. A bill to authorize public improvements at Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1026. A bill to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of Severino Di Sandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1029. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse; and

S. 1031. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zamora, Mrs. Antonio Zamora, Antonio Zamora, Jr., Mrs. Juan Chavez, John Chavez, Jr., Roland Chavez, Selso Trujillo, and Dr. M. G. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 1032, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 1033. A bill to authorize payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase price of automobiles or other conveyances purchased by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. MCCARRAN) introduced Senate bill 1034, to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON) introduced Senate bill 1035, to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility by the Veterans' Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1036. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1037. A bill to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request of the State Department, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States. I request that the bill, together with a letter addressed to the President pro tempore by the Department of State be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1032) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following named persons the sums herein specified in full satisfaction of their respective claims

against the United States for compensation for the fair value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by such persons as a result of war conditions: Ralph J. Blake, $958.00; William T. Turner, $100.00; Fulton Freeman, $40.00; John Frederick Zahoruiko, $126.35; John Duncan Sumner, $33.26; Liang Chen Yi, $18.57; Ming Chen Tai, $6.97; Harold C. Roser, Jr., $42.83; William George McCoy, $79.50; Philip D. Sprouse, $1,517.00; Franklin J. C. Liu, $168.74; John B. Burleson, $764.00; Sham-Tai Chau, $1,551.00; Wing-Tai Chau, $1,926.00; Barbara Schurman-Petro-Pavlovsky, $1,350.45; Charles B. Beylard, $369.50; Benjamin F. Middleton, $671.50; Florence Palmer, $325.00; Jacob D. Beam, $601.04; H. C. Furstenwalde, $6,500.00; Tigner Ogletree, $2,819.00; Edith Bland, $2,026.50; Alfred W. Klieforth, $77.50; Edward S. Parker, $2,270.05; James E. Parks, $4,494.63; Howard K. Travers, $3,880.00; Ivan Lavretsky, $5,500.00; Walter A. Foote, $3,764.00; Frank C. Lee, $4,847.12; Robert C. Burton, $261.75; William C. Affeld, Jr., $2,067.55; Marorie Callaghan, $200.00; Douglas Henderson, $790.50; James E. Mann, $95.00; Edward A. Rood, $177.07; Nelson R. Park, $1,865.33; Patrick J. Sheehan, $348.47; Edwin Schoenrich, $523.80; Carter Vincent, $623.00; Ann van Wynen, $29.70; Raymond Ziminski, $226.01.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1947.

The Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill the enactment of which is recommended by the Department, requesting an appropriation in the aggregate amount of $54,036.69, providing for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, who sustained losses by reason of war conditions prevailing in the world during recent years. There is also transmitted herewith a memorandum setting forth somewhat in detail the basis of the claims involved, indicating in each case the amount claimed, the amount disallowed, and the amount recommended for approval by the Department.

The Congress has on two previous occasions enacted legislation providing relief under similar circumstances, namely, Private Law 145, Seventy-eighth Congress and Private Law 13, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Social Security Committee. I request that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be reprinted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of eight members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social-security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON RESOLUTION TO CREATE JOINT SOCIAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

Mr. President, I am resubmitting today a concurrent resolution which I first offered 4 years ago, providing for the creation of a 14-member Joint Committee on Social Security.

The purpose of this resolution is obvious: It is to fill the need for more coordinated study, for more information, and for more authoritative recommendations on a subject on which every one of my colleagues each day receives countless anguished mail—correspondence from old folks, from blind folks, from widows, and others, pleading for an adjustment of the social-security system.

LACK OF ADEQUATE SECURITY TODAY

It is obvious, too, that in these years, when prices have gotten far out of line and the purchasing power of the dollar has declined, that our present system of old-age compensation, of unemployment insurance, of aid to widows and orphans, of aid to the blind, must be reevaluated. I call attention to the fact that throughout the country that there is an average amount of social-security aid to 60,000 blind persons of $33.67 per month. I ask how many indigent blind folks can survive in these years on such an income? There is an average payment per family per month for 887,000 dependent children of $55.42. I ask what family, without the breadwinner, can raise growing children on $55 per month?

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN MEN

Years ago I spoke on the subject of the forgotten man here in the Senate. I referred to the man or woman living on a fixed income during an inflationary time—the white-collar worker, the professor, the clerk, the retired Federal worker living on a small annuity, the retired teacher, the retired policeman. I asked, How could we take pride in a society which deprive: those who need it most of security in their elder years, or similarly deprives those in indigent condition through no fault of their own?

Through the Full Employment Act, the Senate created a Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Through the legislative-reorganization law, we created a Joint Committee on the Budget which I recommended 4 years ago. We already have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Surely, the need for a Joint Committee on Social Security will be apparent to my colleagues. America cannot thrive and prosper when the security of our elderly and our blind folk and our widowed citizens is in jeopardy. I am, therefore, hoping that early action will be taken on my resolution.

THIS COMMITTEE WOULD BE BUT FIRST STEP

Surely, if there is any single issue on which the Republican Party or any party can gain the unyielding admiration of the American people, it is on the issue of promoting the security of our citizens in an insecure world, the issue, of course, of not making loafers of any Americans but productive workers who can enjoy reasonable security. My recommendation is but the first small step. Let that step be taken.

The effects of that step in helping to ease the worry, the anxiety, the care of countless folks throughout the Nation may be incalculable. At least, they will know that the Republican Congress is on its toes, eager to explore the whole subject of social security with adequate, integrated resources—with an open mind, with a sympathetic heart.

We know that the financial resources of our Government have been severely strained in recent years and we do not want to place an undue burden on our Treasury. But we know, too, there is still a vast field for further cooperation of Federal, State, and local Governments for social-security expansion—and that such cooperation is urgently needed for our "forgotten" men and women.

A piecemeal approach to social security will not do. Let us have the joint committee which I suggest.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, since January 8, I have had a collection made of the various editorials and columns that have appeared in the press of the country commenting upon the Economic Report of the President which was

transmitted to the Congress on January 8 of this year in accordance with the Employment Act of 1946.

I have been particularly concerned in endeavoring to ascertain the extent of public interest in the entire question of economic stabilization and in the problem of what can be done by the present Congress to avoid another great depression.

The information I have collected thus far has been extremely illuminating.

First of all, it is readily apparent that the President's economic report achieved more editorial attention than practically any other Government document that has been issued since the fall of Japan.

Second, it is also apparent that the great majority of the press supported the President's analysis of economic conditions and his proposals for Government action. This, I believe, is a tribute both to the judgment exercised by President Truman and the splendid work done by his Council of Economic Advisers.

But far more important to me is the fact that the press of the country has taken it for granted that the Congress of the United States would give careful and mature consideration to the President's recommendations. This point of view, I am sure, derived to a considerable extent from the fact that the Employment Act itself set up a Joint Economic Committee to analyze the President's Economic Report and to present its findings and recommendations thereon in a formal report to the Congress.

The New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, took the position that—

Neither the Congress nor the people can afford to neglect the report itself, insofar as it is a factual analysis of the economic state of the Union at the turn of the year.

The Cincinnati Enquirer stated that—

The factual data in the report are valuable and the recommendations in most cases are worthy of the most careful and sympathetic consideration from Congress.

The Baltimore Evening Sun predicted—and I am afraid that to date their prediction has proved erroneous—that—

The President's economic report will encourage not only Congress but all the rest of us to do the kind of thinking that is needed on this subject.

The Washington Post made the following statement:

It is extremely helpful to have the outline of a comprehensive legislative program designed to strengthen the American economy laid before Congress, so that it may be impressed with the fact that no one remedial program or even two or three, can insure maintenance of full employment.

The Washington Star commented that although many of the economic report's proposals are not likely to win Republican support, nevertheless it merits careful consideration.

The Louisville Courier-Journal states:

It would be stubborn and heedless for the President's opposition in Congress or any pressure group to reject out of hand the prescription for prosperity that he and his advisers have written.

Mr. President, I could go on endlessly quoting from editorials that have appeared in eminent newspapers throughout the country. All I should like to say at the moment, however, is that the majority of these newspapers seem to take it for granted that the economic report would be given serious consideration in Congress. Therefore, it is my profound hope that in the very near future the Joint Economic Committee will make a careful analysis of the President's economic report and transmit its conclusions thereon to both Houses of Congress.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the editorials from which I have just quoted as well as a number of additional editorials also commenting on the economic report of the President.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1947]

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The recommendations contained in the lengthy economic report that was read to the Congress yesterday in the President's name are already coming under fire from leaders of the Republican majority in both Houses. This was to be expected. The present mood on Capitol Hill is strongly against holding the line on taxes and rents. Nor is there likely to be much enthusiasm for the President's proposals to expand Federal programs in the fields of social security, public welfare, health, and education. Retrenchment rather than expansion of Government activities and expenditures will be the goal of the new Congress.

Nevertheless, neither the Congress nor the public can afford to neglect the report itself, insofar as it is a factual analysis of the economic state of the Union at the turn of the year. The President acknowledges the advice and assistance of his Council of Economic Advisors. It is apparent that the job of lucid economic reporting that makes up the major part of the report is mainly or entirely the work of this body. It was created by the Employment Act of 1946, which was passed by a bipartisan vote. Its members, whose appointments were endorsed by the Senate, are generally recognized as sound, cautious economists. Their findings are entitled to respectful consideration.

While these findings are favorable on balance, some serious dangers are pointed out. Civilian employment is at an all-time high, and production in 1946 set a peacetime record. It should be even higher in 1947 if employment is maintained. Consumer purchasing power, on the other hand, has fallen sharply with the rise in prices that followed the lifting of controls. Specfically, real earnings of workers and salaried employees have fallen.

On the other hand, it is reported that "business in general is receiving exceptional profits." Although this might sound like a statement made for political purposes, it is supported by Department of Commerce statistics which show that net corporate profits after taxes have increased by 33⅓ percent over 1945. In view of the decline in consumer purchasing power, the report asks pertinently whether consumers in 1947 will be able to absorb the anticipated increased production of consumers goods. Here it wisely emphasizes price reduction as the best method of restoring purchasing power, though it does not overlook the desirability of increases in pay rates in some sectors.

The inference is that it is up to industry to price its products low enough to avoid destruction of its markets, while the most constructive role for the Government would be to pursue antiinflationary fiscal policies, putting public-debt reduction and economies in Government spending before tax cutting. Mildly deflationary action now can help avert a sudden and disastrous deflation later.

The President calls the economic report "an opportunity for national self-examination and self-criticism" and "a challenge to the President and the Congress to determine the causes of whatever problems we face in our economic life and to find the solutions to those problems." The forthcoming budget message will make clearer the President's idea of a solution. The Congress and the country, while recognizing the limitations of all generalized economic analysis, must respect this serious attempt to establish a considered basis for action.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 11, 1947]

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE

The President's economic report to Congress is of particular interest because it is the first such survey of the Nation's economy submitted in pursuance of the act which began as a full employment bill. In the main, it is a careful and neutral study of the over-all economic position of the country. It also contains a good many recommendations, and these are of somewhat divergent character.

The picture presented is a favorable one—of unprecedented numbers of Americans holding jobs, of high production and of sustained demand for new construction in almost all fields. The outlook, likewise, is encouraging, with reasonably good prospects for increasing output of goods and services in the year to come.

Mr. Truman notes some danger signs, however, such as the possibility of excessive wage-increase demands, the expansion of purchases on installments, and the tendency to hold prices higher than necessary. All of these are danger signs. But one may doubt whether the decline in saving by individuals is such a warning signal. Most persons saved abnormally large proportions of their incomes during the war. They had larger incomes, and they had less opportunity to buy things—or services—they wanted. They also were under strong patriotic incentive to buy bonds.

It is natural that the rate of saving should drop off rapidly for people of moderate and small income. The accumulation of capital is not their job, although they ought to save something for their own future security. In fact, one might go further and argue that excessive saving would bring the very decline in consumer purchases that Mr. Truman feared in another part of his report.

Although it may be inconsistent with his plea for augmenting consumer purchasing power, Mr. Truman's strongest recommendation—and soundest—is that for continued heavy taxation in order to retire the public debt more rapidly. Ironically, a Democratic President is making the case here for sound, conservative finance, while the principal spokesmen for the GOP are taking their cues elsewhere and calling for drastic tax reduction.

This first economic report to Congress is not likely to become the foundation of national economic policy in the year 1947. The President and the majority in Congress are too far apart on economic questions for that. But it should be said for Mr. Truman that he has discharged his obligation conscientiously in preparing a careful, comprehensive, and balanced survey of the economic state of the Nation.

He does not give as much ground in this report as he did in the preceding state of the Union message delivered in person. That message was definitely a bid for cooperation. In the economic report he hews

closer to the line followed by him and his party prior to the November elections. But the factual data in the report are valuable and the recommendations in most cases are worthy of the most careful and sympathetic consideration in Congress.

[From the Evening Sun of Baltimore of January 9, 1947]

THE STATE OF THE UNION

The President's economic report to Congress yesterday was in reality a new form of message on the state of the Union. In pursuance of constitutional requirements, all Presidents from Washington on down have reported to Congress on this subject and have recommended measures for the Legislators to consider. In all cases, Presidents have had in mind the promotion of the general prosperity and welfare.

In the past, however, presidential discussion of the state of the Union had proceeded on a piecemeal basis. Presidents have treated production, employment, housing and taxes as if they existed as separate parts of a jigsaw puzzle that could never be fitted together. The interdependence of labor policy and tax policy and the connection between agricultural policy and the enforcement of the antitrust laws were too often ignored.

In discussing the state of the Union in his economic report, President Truman sought to put all the pieces of the jigsaw together. The result is for the first time in our history a message which undertakes to discuss all the factors affecting the economic welfare of the nation in a systematic and comprehensive way.

Material for the report was supplied by the Council of Economic Advisers set up under the Employment Act of 1946. The treatment is in some degree necessarily technical, but an attempt at simplification has been made, with the result that this document provides Congress in understandable form with most of the material necessary for a systematic study of the issues upon which continued prosperity depends.

This kind of report would be useful at any time. It is particularly appropriate at this juncture. We were a hundred-billion-dollar country in 1939. The wartime expansion of our productive capacity has made this a $200,000,000,000 country. We have not, however, fully or securely adjusted ourselves to the new and higher level upon which our economy operates. It is of the utmost importance that we think intelligently about the steps that are necessary to effect a full adjustment. The President's economic report will encourage not only Congress but all the rest of us to do the kind of thinking that is needed on this subject.

Obviously, such a report cannot be summarized within the space of a single editorial. Obviously, there is a certain distortion in picking out one or two points for discussion here. The only way to get the rounded picture is to read the document in its entirety. Members of Congress will do well to take this course, and members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report will need to study it with meticulous care in preparing to pass on its various recommendations.

Those of us who do not have time for such lengthy perusal will have to be satisfied with a few high lights. Recognizing the danger of viewing the report in this manner, it may be said that the main point which it makes as to the immediate future is that 1947 will bring an increased volume of consumer goods without any great increase in consumer spending power.

The rise in consumer goods will come about partly through the increase n productivity as industry and labor settle into their postwar stride. Another and more important influence making for more consumer goods will be the fact that industry will be largely over the hump of reconversion and will be able to devote itself more to production than to rebuilding and retooling. On these two points most observers will agree with the President.

The question which this increase poses is how the public will absorb this larger amount of consumer goods without increased purchasing power. The report indicates three ways by which this could be accomplished. One would be to increase wages. Another would be to reduce individual saving, thus increasing the proportion of income spent. Still a third would be by way of reduced prices, which would make the present income buy more.

The report chooses the price-reduction method as the best. It says that it would be dangerous to reduce the rate of saving. It says further that it would be impractical to raise wages. For one thing, the increases would not be distributed over a wide enough area to bring about increased consumption. For another, wage increases would tend to increase costs in some industries and produce bottlenecks and lowered output. So the President concludes that price reductions which would increase the real purchasing power of everyone are the best method.

In a free economy such as ours, this is a choice which Government cannot enforce. So the report urges business to reduce prices on its own initiative. Many factors will be conducive to this end, for, as the supply of goods rises above the power of the public to purchase, the law of supply and demand will operate to force down prices. The great question is whether the reductions are made promptly enough to assure a continuity of production.

There are many other points in the report and many other recommendations, some of which will raise debatable questions as to general policy. The main point is that here is a comprehensive survey of the economic state of the Union that deserved careful attention.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 9, 1947]

AN ECONOMIC BLUEPRINT FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE

The extent to which this session of Congress may be fateful for us all is revealed by the issues set forth in the President's economic report. This document charts a course to action for stability, higher living standards, and improved welfare. And there is an enormous importance in the manner of its acceptance or rejection by Congress and the public as well.

The report comes as the first demonstration of value in the so-called Full Employment Act which Congress passed last year, even though watering it down to a pallid thinness. The Council of Economic Advisers, which the act created, studied conditions, trends, and needs, then made its recommendations to the President. Upon these, Mr. Truman based his report.

Shining brightly is one of the clearest of facts. It rests on the foundation truth that there can be no fears for prosperity if purchasing power is kept high, and everybody lives well. But it goes on to show that purchasing power is not a matter of higher wages so much as of lower prices. With the latter, everybody may share in the supply of goods and services, not merely the minority which has the power to force its wages up—and thereby to force prices up so that the majority is even less able to get its share.

This is sound doctrine. It becomes the core of Mr. Truman's appeal to business for price reductions in many articles of food, clothing, housing and building materials, textiles and furnishings. It is part of his appeal to organized labor to refrain from asking excessive wage increases that might force higher prices or prevent lower prices.

But for all its truth, this appeal carries mainly a moral force. It underscores the fact that business, industry, commerce—the whole economic structure—are parts of society and therefore have a social purpose. This is to serve people, and the more people the better. Profits are not loot to be divided between owners and workers. The people also have a claim, and perhaps a prior claim, to lower prices.

More definite in their challenge are the council's recommendations for legislative action and policy as transmitted to Congress by the President. In the very first of these the issue is joined for a rousing political battle. Mr. Truman proposes keeping tax rates as they are for the present. He, or the Council of Economic Advisers through him, says it would be unsound fiscal policy to cut taxes while employment is high, income at a peak, and a debt to be whittled down. Much will be made of this. The opposition, tied to blithe campaign pledges to cut taxes, doubtless will undertake to change the subject to that of expense cutting. They will rave at the President's budget. They have raised already the vote-catching cry of firing a million Government employees. The President's budget message, due Friday, will come now as an anticlimax. The fight is on, and Mr. Truman has brought up his documentary weapons.

He is armed also with evidence to support a program more positive than anything proposed in his message on the state of the Union—extension of rent controls, higher minimum wages, extended benefits of social security and wage-and-hour laws, and bigger and better housing programs. He speaks now, thanks to the council's advice and the law's sanction, in the name of full employment. It would be stubborn and heedless for his opposition in Congress or any pressure group to reject out of hand the prescription for prosperity that he and his advisers have written.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of January 13, 1947]

OLD GUARD'S TURN

President Truman's economic report, the first under the Full Employment Act, is a message of great significance despite the brush-off it has received from the opposition press. Because the President did not recommend stringent or revolutionary measures to head off an impending slump, many have professed to see it as a mild and innocent message capable of doing neither harm nor good. But the Nation can ignore the trends and facts pointed out only at its own loss.

The President pointed out that our high production is being sustained by shipment abroad of $15,000,000,000 of goods annually. Should this drop to even twice the total of prewar exports, as is likely, domestic buying power will have to make up the difference or production suffer a sharp decline. It is time now for the Nation to answer the question of where eight to ten billion additional dollars in consumer buying power is to be found to replace this prospective loss.

The report called attention to a decline in wages from $116,000,000,000 to $109,000,000,000 and an increase in corporate profits from $10,600,000,000 to $13,000,000,000. At the same time it showed a jump in food costs from an index of 140 to 187 this year. Thus money and real wages are down and profits are up. To complicate the picture further is the prediction of a decline in farm prices and therefore in farm purchasing power in 1947. Capital investment during the past year was shown to include many billions of high-priced inventories—inventories which can turn a slowly declining market into a plummeting one.

The President's recommendations of voluntary cuts in prices, moderate wage demands, measures to expand foreign trade, controlled consumer credit, aid to small business, vigorous enforcement of the laws against monopoly, continued rent control,

higher and expanded minimum wage coverage, wider social-security benefits, unchanged taxes, and more housing are all well calculated to hedge against the recession implicit in the abnormal economic conditions pictured in his report.

Chairman TAFT and the Joint Congressional Full Employment Committee are under legislative mandate to draw from the report a positive program to be submitted to Congress. The material is there. It will be both politically expedient and economically sound for the Old Guard majority to submit concrete measures designed to keep the national economy off the soft shoulders of the prosperity highway. If they fail to do so and a slump occurs, it won't be easy to escape the blame.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of January 10, 1947]

THE NEW PROCEDURE

Expressions of disagreement with many of the recommendations in the first economic report of the President have already been heard in Congress. More are to be expected when the President submits his fiscal proposals today in his budget message. But debate over specific issues should not obscure the significance of his review of the Nation's economy.

For the first time in history a President, with the aid of competent advisers provided by law, has considered the national economic problem as a whole. Along with his conclusions he has transmitted to Congress the data on which they are based. The document now goes to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report to serve as a foundation for a program that will meet the need.

It may be taken for granted that Congress will not follow the President's wishes in every respect. But it is worth noting, at the same time, that the new procedure evidently has had a profound influence on the President's thinking. The contrast between the policies he followed a year ago and those he advocates today is sharp. He no longer advocates higher wages all along the line to maintain purchasing power, for example. He calls for only limited increases here and there while he puts his main trust in reducing prices or holding them stable through the cooperation of industry.

Time and experience, no doubt, have taught him much. Still, it seems reasonable to believe that the competent advice now available to him has had much to do with his changed attitude. So there is reason to hope that Congress, examining the facts now before it, will arrive at decisions that will be in the best interests of a Nation eagerly seeking a sound and expanding economy.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of January 9, 1947]

PLANNING FOR PROSPERITY

Last year the United States Government set out, for the first time, to frame and carry through a long-range program to avert depressions and keep the country prosperous. Congress set up the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which recently made its initial report. This document, with the President's comments, goes to a permanent joint committee of Congress for action.

The task thus set is an appallingly large order. It involves foreign policy, social security, taxes, Government spending, the activities of capital, management, and labor. The size of the job accounts for the great length of the message President Truman sent to Congress yesterday—first of a series which now must accompany the traditional messages on the state of the Union and the budget. The excerpts from the text, as sent out by the Associated Press, would fill a whole newspaper page of solid type. So it is necessary to confine comment to the general idea and the President's salient points.

Mr. Truman observes that America has "a fabulous wealth of resources." Its plant is larger and in many cases better than before the war. There are ample funds for business expansion. The labor force has been greatly increased, spending power is higher, and there are large accumulated needs, long-deferred public works, and a strong foreign demand for goods.

On the other side of the picture there is a decline in buying power because of high prices. If wage-price adjustments are not made soon enough, purchasing will falter, production drop, and unemployment will increase. A weakening of investment activity, or a new round of strikes could also cause a set-back.

Mr. Truman recommends that prices be cut wherever possible, and that labor recognize the need of high production and refrain from demanding "excessive wage increases that would require price increases or would prevent price reductions." He also has a very long list of recommendations for Government action along many lines. In some respects these differ widely—and wisely—from past policies with which the country has become all too familiar.

For example, the President asserts truly that public works have been overemphasized as a means of stabilization. They are not sufficient for a major depression, too slow in effect for a minor one. He urges planning public-works construction according to our long-term needs. The program could, however, be expanded in case of recession to give what help it can.

Mr. Truman would bring order into a great number of Government welfare programs which, like Topsy, just growed. He would measure the total amount spent for all against the total size of the economy. Some of these programs were "born of a depression psychology"; they should not, however, be regarded as depression expedients, but as "an inescapable obligation of an enlightened people," and should be tied in with our economic programs.

In a broad, detailed plan for agriculture, Mr. Truman puts a final period to the plowing-under folly by insisting that policy should be based upon the principle of plenty and not upon the encouragement of scarcity. He opposes restriction of production as part of farm policy.

The President gives much attention to foreign trade, probably because the Republican majority threatens the progress that has been made in that field. We can sell to other countries, he observes, only if we buy from them or invest in them. We need foreign imports, and needn't fear foreign competition if we have full production and employment. But he properly opposes indiscriminate reductions of barriers to imports; some tariffs must be kept.

In this connection Mr. Truman warns that other countries fear an American depression as a threat to their own stability. Despite these misgivings, 17 governments joined our own recently to work out a trade charter, "the first major effort in the field of trade to replace unilateral action—which often injured other countries and provoked retaliation—by cooperation and joint action under a set of common principles." Their willingness to go on will depend largely on our attitude in this year's reciprocal trade negotiations. In return for tariff concessions in these talks, we can eliminate a mass of restrictions, in particular, rigid import quotas preventing our access to foreign markets. If we don't cooperate, other nations will increase their own government controls and break up the world into trade blocs.

Success of the ambitious American effort to prevent depressions will be hampered by selfish actions on the part of labor and business groups, by striving for personal and partisan advantage in Congress and the administration, mistakes in both policy and practice, and popular unwillingness to make temporary sacrifices for future stability. (For example, Mr. Truman writes: "In the present economic situation it is clear that it would be unsound fiscal policy to reduce taxes"—but it is doubtful that he will have public support.)

Despite the difficulties, the effort is worth making. We must at least try to see that our own folly does not keep on causing disasters when we have the means for prosperity at hand. As the President concluded:

"Continuing policy cannot be extemporized from month to month or even from year to year; most policies designed to increase the stability of the economy are of long-range character. Fortunately, we have time in which to plan deliberately and wisely, and in which to secure the cooperation of all our citizens in driving toward our common goal—an expanding economy of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power under a system of free competitive enterprise, with full recognition of the duties and responsibilities of forward-looking government."

[From the Washington Post of January 9, 1947]

ECONOMIC REPORT

For the first time an economic report on the state of the Nation has been transmitted to Congress by the President as required by the Employment Act of 1946. The Council of Economic Advisers has, we think, proved its worth by helping the President to give Congress and the country at large a better understanding of the relation between specific legislative recommendations and the over-all long-range objective of maintaining a high level of production and employment. Painstaking objective analysis of the factors conditioning economic activity is the best possible safeguard against unpreparedness when depression threatens. It is also a safeguard against undue reliance on mechanistic devices for rescuing the country from depression, such as Government pump priming or attempts to maintain purchasing power by indiscriminate increases in wages and salaries.

Although at present civilian employment is at an all-time high level, the President and his advisers realize that there are certain unfavorable factors in the economic situation that call for remedial action to insure maintenance of prosperity. For example, the sharp rise in living costs during the past 6 months has brought about a pronounced drop in the real purchasing power of wages, giving rise to well-founded fears of a drop in consumer demand that may adversely affect business activity and slow down investment. Work stoppages caused by strikes and lockouts likewise constitute a threat to continued business activity and industrial expansion.

Threatening developments stressed in the report are not in the nature of discoveries. On the contrary, repeated warnings of a lack of balance in the economic structure have come from many sources. But the unique value of the report lies in the linking up of its analytical conclusions with specific recommendations for legislative action that the President has already indorsed. Major responsibility for bringing about necessary adjustments, however, rests with the people themselves, the report points out. Prices much be reduced wherever possible to bolster up market demands. If business makes these reductions in a timely and orderly way, it will help sustain markets rather than destroy them. Labor, too, must strive for increased productivity, and not demand excessive wage increases that would require price increases or prevent needed price reductions. Rejected decisively is the notion that there can be any universal rule governing price reductions or wage adjustments, although it is admitted that some adjustments in both prices and wages are essen-

tial. In both cases, account must be taken of the individual situation.

The role assigned to Government in preserving the needed balance between prices and wages is, therefore, secondary. However, the role is regarded by the advisers as extremely important, and also by the President. Continuation of rent control, a rise in statutory minimum wages, expansion of the social-security program, stimulation of a long-range housing program, and encouragement of a sound system of collective bargaining are among the legislative recommendations mentioned as contributing to maintenance of a high level of consumer purchasing power and well-being. Tax reduction programs likewise, the President states, should be framed with the view of providing the work and the business incentives essential for a high level of production. However, he makes it clear that in his opinion wise fiscal policy calls for a postponement of tax reduction.

Although the concluding section of the report is described as a long-range program, it deals with problems of agriculture, public works, welfare, and international relations that will engage the attention of Congress in the near future. This far-reaching program cannot, of course, be exhaustively discussed in any single report. Nor is there any expectation that Congress will agree with all the conclusions set forth, some of which are highly controversial. Nevertheless, it is extremely helpful to have the outlines of a comprehensive legislative program designed to strengthen the American economy laid before Congress, so that it may be impressed with the fact that no one remedial program, or even two or three, can insure maintenance of full employment. As the President well says, "Only by blending all practicable programs in wise proportions can we be successful in stabilizing our economy at the highest feasible levels."

[From the Washington Star of January 9, 1947]

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

In his first economic report to Congress under the Employment Act of 1946, the President has reemphasized his opposition to tax cuts at this time. In addition, he has asked for a continuation of rent curbs, advocated legislation against racial discrimination, and urged an increase in minimum wages under the fair labor standards law. Apart from these and a few other controversial matters, however, he has confined himself to drawing a broad picture of the national economy in objective and rather conservative terms.

Taken as a whole, the picture is a cheering one. We have virtually full employment. Labor, agriculture, and business are better off than ever before in our history. Consumer demand for goods of all kinds remains high. The outlet for our production in foreign markets continues large. As against a hundred-billion-dollar economy in prewar years, we have a $200,000,000,000 economy now. In the President's words, "America has never been so strong or so prosperous. Nor have our prospects ever been brighter."

But there are unfavorable factors demanding serious attention. They include the marked price increases of the last half of 1945, the use of wartime savings by consumers for current purchases, and the danger of more industrial strife. These could cause "a recession in production and employment" if allowed to go unchecked, and the President has therefore called upon the different groups involved—labor, business, agriculture—to take their own corrective measures. Thus, he counsels against strikes and excessive wage demands, urges producers to cut prices wherever possible, and stresses the importance of having a free flow of world trade. As for the Government's part, besides such short-range steps as rent curbs, he recommends a long-range program for the fullest utilization of our great human and productive resources and for the encouragement of free competitive enterprise—a program free from illusory pump-priming projects.

Under the Employment Act, the President's report will be acted upon by a permanent joint congressional committee. Some of the points in it—especially the one against tax cuts—are not likely to win Republican support, but by and large, because of its lucidity and its persuasive general thesis, it merits careful consideration. Certainly, given cooperation, common sense and wisdom of the sort advocated by the President, the Nation can avoid major depressions and enter upon a period of unprecedented long-term prosperity.

[From the Chicago Sun]

THE FACTS OF LIFE IN 1947

Senator WHERRY, the Republican whip, dismissed the President's economic report as "just a campaign statement." If that is going to be the attitude of the majority party, the Employment Act which the Republicans helped pass last year will become a hollow sham.

The economic report is the work of trained economists brought into Government for the precise purpose of lifting some issues of public policy above the level of partisan wrangling. Their conclusions have been reached on the basis of objective facts and expert judgments, not by balancing political appeals or calculating the strength of pressure groups. If the Employment Act is to mean anything, those who oppose the measures recommended by the President's Council of Economic Advisers must prove their case by challenging the council's evidence or its reasoning. The council has framed a policy for facing what it finds to be the facts of life in 1947; Congress in considering the report has a duty either to find its own facts or prescribe a better policy.

What are the facts of life in 1947? The state of national prosperity will be determined basically by the volume of buying done by four kinds of customer—the Government, business, foreign countries, and consumers. The writers of the report appear to believe that business and foreign buying may remain close to 1946 levels, but that buying of government and of consumers will decline. That prospect clearly points to a fall in economic activity, yet the council seems to hope that maladjustments may be corrected in time to prevent or moderate the drop.

Greatest of all maladjustments, of course, is that between prices and consumer incomes. As every family knows, the rise in prices that followed the wrecking of OPA has steadily eaten into the public's ability to buy. The report measures that depletion of purchasing power and discovers that it has reached a disturbing pace.

In 1945 consumer incomes after taxes were running at the annual rate of $978 per person (in terms of 1944 prices). By the last quarter of 1946 this rate of disposable income had fallen to $880 per person. This means, roughly, that consumers today have $14,000,000,000 less effective purchasing power than they had in 1945; and $14,000,000,000 represents a lot of groceries, two-pants suits, house dresses, and refrigerators.

What to do? The report expresses a hope that business will reduce prices wherever possible, and reduce them in time; that labor will refrain from excessive wage demands that require price increases; that management will raise wages and salaries where they have lagged markedly behind living costs; that Government will raise minimum wages, keep rent control, stimulate low-cost house building, refrain from cutting taxes, and help maintain industrial peace.

This is something less than a precise economic blueprint for 1947. In view of the scuttling of controls, greater precision may have been impossible. But businessmen and political leaders will do themselves as well as the country an injustice if they fail to study the report carefully and guide their actions accordingly. Unless American capitalism can learn to take the general welfare into account in the millions of daily decisions that determine the economic state of the Union, real trouble lies ahead.

[From the Chicago Sun]

TAFT SEES SOME WHISKERS

Senator TAFT says that the whiskers of the New Deal peek around the corners of the President's economic report. But he concedes that it is an interesting and valuable document which deserves the most careful study. If Congress and the country receive it in that spirit, the report and its successors may become landmarks in American history.

No doubt it is the long-range recommendations of the report that arouse Senator TAFT's suspicion. In considering them, one should remember that the Council of Economic Advisers, which prepared the report, is a decidedly middle-of-the-road body. Its members, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Leon Keyserling, and John D. Clark, were chosen by President Truman not for their opinions but for the qualifications which Congress specified. Each, as the Employment Act requires, is "a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments and to formulate and recommend national economic policy."

As Congress told it to do, the Council in the long-term section of the report took up the problem of maintaining at high levels of production and employment a national economy that was greatly expanded for purposes of war. Up to now, the backlog of exceptional consumer demand, accumulated while most of our production was concentrated on military effort, has enabled civilian output to reach a peak 50 percent higher than prewar. But if we are to stay on this heady plateau, as the Council says, "the extraordinary postwar demand that we enjoy today must be transformed into the sustained demand of an expanding peacetime economy."

A policy of drift, dressed up with suitable encomiums to free enterprise, will not be enough. We followed this line after the First World War, and inherited the depression of the thirties for our pains. This time it is essential that positive measures be taken—and taken soon enough—to sustain prosperity. Another crash would not only imperil the foundations of our democracy but by dragging much of the world down with us, undermine the peace that is now so laboriously being built.

Not for social reasons, not for humanitarian reasons, but for the hard, practical reason of maintaining full opportunity for jobs, profits, and private enterprise, the economic advisers propose their long-term program.

They urge that racial discrimination in employment be ended, not because this is justice (though it is), but because thus we can take one step toward the most efficient use of the labor force. They ask publicly financed school lunches and study of nutrition programs for low-income families not because these measures would aid the beneficiaries (though they would), but because they are steps toward a farm policy of plenty rather than scarcity, and expanded farm market which would make crop curtailment unnecessary.

In the same way, development of water resources is recommended in the interest of the full use of our productive capacity, which means expanded ability to consume. A long-range housing program and an expanded social-security system would provide reservoirs of purchasing power which

can be drawn upon when needed. To maintain a healthy foreign market for our goods we must have an intelligent foreign lending policy and keep trade barriers down.

Are these the whiskers of the New Deal? Senator TAFT may call them that, but others will see something else. The Employment Act acknowledged the Government's responsibility to promote "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." The economic council is trying to make good on that pledge, and those who disagree with its conclusions have an obligation to offer a program of their own—not just a policy of drift—that will serve the same purpose.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 9, 1947]

UP TO THE PEOPLE

President Truman's economic report to Congress merits wider, closer reading than it may get. It won't interest folks who think that by some magic formula Government can insure full employment and prosperity, now and forever. They're the ones who ought to study it.

Its gist is that the country can enjoy fine economic health this year if the people work and act wisely, and that the people, with help from the Government, can keep the economy healthy in years to come.

Here's what Mr. Truman and his Council of Economic Advisers think about 1947 prospects:

Consumers have much higher buying power than ever before the war. But at present or higher prices they may be unable to buy the huge volume of goods and services that can be produced if we eccape a new strike epidemic. Should buying falter, production would drop, unemployment would grow, and we'd have a "recession."

How to avoid that? Business should reduce prices wherever it can. Farmers should realize that many of their prices must come down. Labor should work for high productivity and refrain from excessive wage demands that force prices higher or keep them from being lowered. Management should recognize that increased productivity and good profits justify some wage rises as well as price cuts; should give the increases to workers whose wages are substandard or have lagged furthest behind living costs. All that is up to the people. The Government can't compel them to be wise.

But, Mr. Truman says, the Government's own policies can help. He wants vigorous antitrust enforcement, to keep competition free and active. He asks Congress to extend rent controls; continue present tax rates; authorize a big, long-range housing program; increase social-security benefits; bring more workers under the wage-hour law and raise the minimum wage; pass laws to help collective bargaining work better and prevent strikes.

This is the first such report a President has made. It was required by the Employment Act, passed by Congress last year. A newly created committee of Senators and Representatives is supposed to give it earnest consideration, and we hope they will.

We believe in free enterprise. Government planning and management of the national economy would restrict, and might destroy, the freedom of business, labor and agriculture. To avoid Government planning and management, the economy must be handled in a way to prevent skyrocket booms and disastrous busts. We welcome this first real attempt by Government to look ahead and show a way by which a free people can coordinate their own activities to keep American economic life on a steadily rising plane instead of a roller-coaster.

STATEMENT BY LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CONCILIATION SERVICE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on March 27, 1947, by the labor and management members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the United States Conciliation Service, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY — EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Constructive Proposals," dealing with proposals relating to American foreign policy, published in the Progressive of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CUSTOMS BUREAU — LETTER FROM SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Senator CORDON, relative to appropriations for the Customs Bureau, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING—EDITORIAL FROM THE SCRANTON TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Industry-Wide Bargaining," published in the Scranton Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING SITUATION—LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY AND R. J. THOMAS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to the housing situation, addressed to Senator TOBEY by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and R. J. Thomas, vice president, United Automobile Workers, CIO, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has the floor.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield for that purpose?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	McClellan
Baldwin	Flanders	McFarland
Ball	Fulbright	McGrath
Barkley	George	McKellar
Brewster	Green	McMahon
Bricker	Gurney	Magnuson
Bridges	Hatch	Malone
Brooks	Hawkes	Martin
Bushfield	Hayden	Maybank
Butler	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Byrd	Hill	Moore
Cain	Hoey	Morse
Capehart	Holland	Murray
Capper	Ives	Myers
Chavez	Jenner	O'Conor
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Cooper	Kem	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kilgore	Overton
Donnell	Knowland	Pepper
Downey	Langer	Reed
Dworshak	Lodge	Revercomb
Ecton	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	McCarran	Robertson, Wyo.
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith	Thye	White
Sparkman	Tobey	Wiley
Stewart	Tydings	Williams
Taft	Umstead	Wilson
Taylor	Vandenberg	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF UNCONTESTED NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for the submission of a unanimous-consent request, without prejudice to his right to the floor?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. There are on the Executive Calendar a number of nominations which are in controversy. There are also two nominations appearing under the general title "New Reports" about which, so far as I am advised, there is no disagreement whatsoever. I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to the pending business, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of these two nominations under the title "New Reports."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified immediately of the ac-

tion of the Senate with respect to these two nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] advises me that he has a short speech on the Lilienthal case which he wants to make, and I am perfectly willing that he should make it now, if I may retain the floor when he finishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield the floor to the Senator from Virginia for that purpose only, with the understanding that the senior Senator from Tennessee will regain the floor upon the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, may I inquire how long it will take the Senator to complete his speech?

Mr. BYRD. It will take about 10 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, without contradiction David E. Lilienthal has allowed the reputable Current Biography—1944 to quote him as saying: "Our Government and every government is and must be a government of men and not of laws," and the same biographical sketch continues with the statement that "He"—Lilienthal—"was expressing a thought which he is still paraphrasing today."

This expression by Mr. Lilienthal represents the fundamental difference in his philosophy of government and mine. With all my mind and heart I feel that only a rigid adherence to our fundamental conception of a "government of laws and not of men" will preserve our democracy. The founders, in their supreme wisdom, established for the people of America a government by laws enacted by their representatives in preference to a government by men, which they knew meant autocracy and dictatorship. John Adams summarized our philosophy when he concluded the Massachusetts bill of rights—"To the end it may be a government of laws and not of men." In the final essence, this is the difference between dictatorship and freedom; between totalitarianism and democracy. A "government of men and not of laws" can end only in the destruction of the freedoms that have made America great. In fact, the act we are going through today is to strengthen a "government of laws and not of men." The Senate of the United States is sitting in judgment on the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal. We have the power either to confirm or reject his appointment, and thus the legislative branch is given a curb on the appointment by the President of the United States of an official who will exercise a towering influence on the future of America and the world.

In my 14 years of service in the Senate I regard this as the most important nomination submitted to the Senate. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission can well determine the future security of America and the future course of the world. It is for that reason that the Members of the Senate should, with the utmost care, investigate the characteristics and the temperament of any person whose nomination for this position is submitted to the Senate for confirmation. The statement made by Mr. Lilienthal that he believes we should have here a "government of men and not of laws," is amply corroborated by a review of his public career. Time and time again he has resisted the control of Congress over the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He has opposed the auditing of the vast TVA expenditures by the Comptroller General as the expenditures of other Government agencies are audited. He has shown a contempt for any control by the representatives elected by the people and has arrogated to himself the power to make decisions of vital consequence and to conduct the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority as he himself desired, without regard to the fact that it was the funds of the United States Government derived from the taxpayers whereby $800,000,000 was invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The power of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which Mr. Lilienthal will be chairman, if his nomination is confirmed, presents a vast opportunity for good or evil. I know from long experience that a forceful and dominating chairman can greatly influence any commission over which he presides. America has never before been faced with such a problem as the control of the atomic bomb in all its implications. We brought the bomb into being and thereby created a weapon of such destructiveness that it may, in the end, be used to destroy us and even to end world civilization as we know it.

I served as a member of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, which prepared the legislation creating the Atomic Energy Commission and outlined its powers. During long and confidential hearings our committee was told of the frightful and appalling destructiveness of the atomic bomb and that future scientific developments would immeasurably increase the destructive power of such bombs as were dropped on Japan. Our committee, in preparing the atomic energy control legislation, wrote all the safeguards that could be conceived, but legislative safeguards can be rendered useless by a chairman of a commission who publicly proclaims that he believes in "government of men and not of laws." One mistake by the Atomic Energy Commission, intentional or otherwise, in handling the secret of the atomic bomb, may be irreparable. We may later remove or impeach Mr. Lilienthal, but the damage cannot be repaired.

I want to make it clear that I do not charge Mr. Lilienthal with any such intent, but I cannot vote to confirm any man to a position of such vast importance unless his philosophy of government and his previous official actions conform with what I believe to be true Americanism and the American concept of democracy. Dictatorship and totalitarian government are all synonymous with a "government of men and not of laws."

I do not charge that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. Such a charge, if made, cannot often be proved, as most Communists in America deny their faith, but I do say, and I say it with the utmost sincerity, that I believe Mr. Lilienthal has a tolerance toward communism, which in this case is just as dangerous as if he were an avowed apostle of communism. No man should be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission unless he has a passionate hatred of the slightest trend toward a communistic state and a will to cut it down.

Today in America the infiltration of communism, which is a serious menace to our Republic, is not coming from avowed Communists but from those who profess democracy, but at the same time are willing to do things that weaken our democratic form of government.

I have earnestly endeavored to reach a fair decision in accordance with my convictions. I have read the hearings and weighed the testimony. I have considered the public career of Mr. Lilienthal and the actions that he has taken in responsible offices. My duty is to do all I can to protect the future of the American people. With the thousands of able men from whom to choose, why should a selection have been made that has even a taint of some foreign "ism" abhorrent to the American people?

My study and knowledge of Mr. Lilienthal's activities as a public official demonstrate to me definitely that he believes in a government of men and not of laws, and that he has practiced this belief in his daily work in important governmental capacities. For more than 10 years in my investigation of governmental agencies, I have been impressed time and time again with the ruthless purpose of Mr. Lilienthal to dominate his colleagues and to conduct his public duties to serve his own wishes, regardless of the expressed acts of Congress.

I cite these concrete instances: He has invariably resisted any departure from lump-sum appropriations for his agencies, which means he can spend public funds without legal restrictions. For many years I have exerted my efforts to see that every single agency of the Federal Government be audited by the Comptroller General, an office established by Congress to conduct an independent audit of the disbursements of the executive branch. Time and time again Mr. Lilienthal resisted the auditing of the funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Comptroller General, although the taxpayers have invested in excess of $800,000,000 in this agency.

On one occasion, the Comptroller General said in an official communication:

> It is inconceivable to me that any agency entrusted with the expenditure of mammoth amounts of funds collected from the people of the United States should desire to evade responsible accounting and security by an independent office created for that purpose.

This reference was made to Mr. Lilienthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Again, in testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee, on June 18, 1941, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren said:

> I am faced with the alternative of permitting the authority (TVA) indefinitely to continue to draw large sums from the Treasury for which no accounting is rendered, which I believe to be contrary to law and my official duties.

And, on June 27, 1941, Mr. Lilienthal said the proposal he was advocating "places squarely upon us the full authority in the expenditure of funds and holds us responsible for them," demonstrating that in his belief his agency and himself were alone to be held responsible for the expenditure of funds.

Instances could be multiplied time and time again showing the unwillingness of Mr. Lilienthal to submit to ordinary auditing by the Comptroller General. The Annual Report of the Comptroller General for the fiscal year 1942 discloses that under date of November 23, 1940, the officials of the TVA refused to submit to any further auditing. Mr. Lilienthal appeared also against provisions in the Byrd-Butler bill. It was only the passage of this bill last year that has enabled a proper auditing of his accounts. The bill required the auditing of all Government corporations, and its passage was the culmination of 10 years of effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a statement concerning the first report made by the General Accounting Office of the audit of TVA under the provisions of the Byrd-Butler bill. I thought I had a typewritten copy of it in the file I have with me. It is at the office, and I shall get it, if it is necessary. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the report was made more than a month ago, and was furnished to the Public Printer for printing probably longer ago than that. I have called and asked the Public Printer to complete the printing of the report and submit it to the Senate while the nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission are being considered by the Senate.

It contains many things which Senators ought to see. However, it has been absolutely impossible to get it from the printer. It is always "next Monday" or "next Tuesday," or "next Wednesday," or some other day. It has been promised a number of times. I called this morning, hoping that the document would be printed for the use of Senators in this particular connection. It is the first report, and it is a very enlightening report. I have a typewritten copy, and I know something about it; but there are not enough typewritten copies for each Senator to have a copy. The result is that the Senate does not know about the report. I have now been promised that the report will be ready tomorrow morning, and I hope each Senator will look for it and examine it. I am quite sure that Senators who are interested will find many important facts in the report, if we can get the printer to act.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Virginia to say that the accounts of the TVA have not been audited?

Mr. BYRD. I said that Mr. Lilienthal resisted the audit, and that for a certain period of time they were not audited. I can quote to the Senator the letter which was written by the Chairman of the TVA refusing to submit to an audit by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which I presume is the same report to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, under date of March 17, 1947, about 2 weeks ago.

Mr. BYRD. The statement of the Senator from Virginia was that the auditing was not done with the consent of Mr. Lilienthal until the passage of the so-called Byrd-Butler bill, which was passed last June, I think. It required all governmental corporations to be audited by the Comptroller General. The report to which the Senator is referring is in conformity with the Byrd-Butler Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The statement of the Comptroller General does not sustain the position of the Senator from Virginia, unless I am in error. If the Senator will yield, I will read what the Comptroller General says about the auditing. I read from page 14 of the report, under the heading "Methods of financial and accounting control":

> The act requires that the Authority shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account, and shall file with the President of the United States and with the Congress, in December of each year, a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of the Authority covering the preceding governmental fiscal year.
>
> Beginning with the fiscal year 1938, but covering the period from the beginning of operations (June 16, 1933) to June 30, 1938, the Authority's financial statements have been examined annually, to and including the fiscal year 1944, by independent public accountants.

Mr. BYRD. That is just the point I made.

Mr. HILL. Let me read the next sentence.

Mr. BYRD. He refused to be audited by the Comptroller General, and had independent auditors employed by the TVA to conduct the audit.

Mr. HILL. Let me read the next sentence:

> The Comptroller General of the United States has made annual audits of the books of account of the Authority through June 30, 1944; and in accordance with section 236——

Mr. BYRD. Beginning with what date?

Mr. HILL. That was from the beginning of the Authority.

Mr. BYRD. How does the Senator reconcile that statement with the statement of Mr. Warren on June 18, 1941, before the House Committee on Military Affairs? Mr. Warren said:

> I am faced with the alternative of permitting the TVA Authority indefinitely to continue to draw large sums from the Treasury for which no accounting is rendered, which I believe to be contrary to law and my official duties.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me read the next sentence——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will allow me to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation so that Senators who arrived late will understand what is going on. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has the floor. He has granted time to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who now has the floor by unanimous consent for this purpose. Therefore, the Senator from Virginia technically has the floor at the moment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may finish reading this statement?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I continue to read from the report of the Comptroller General:

> The Comptroller General of the United States has made annual audits of the books of account of the Authority through June 30, 1944, and, in accordance with section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), the General Accounting Office settles the accounts for all cash receipts and disbursements of the Authority.
>
> The Authority's funds have been derived principally from appropriations by the Congress. Appropriations are applied for by the Authority on the basis of Budget estimates submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. The Authority also submits to the Bureau of the Budget quarterly and annual financial statements.

Mr. BYRD. In reply to that statement of the Senator, let me say that the Annual Report of the Comptroller General for the fiscal year 1942 discloses that under date of November 23, 1940, the officials of the TVA refused to submit to any further audit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while we are on that subject, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to read from the same page in the hearings on House bill 4961, on June 18, 1941, from which the Senator from Virginia quoted a while ago. This is what Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, had to say about this audit. He is the head of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator give the page?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is page 4:

We say the audit they rely on is merely in addition to the audit under the Budget and Accounting Act. Now, what kind of audit is this that they say is all we can make and all that they will permit us to make? Well, it is nothing more than what is known as a commercial audit. Under that, they can go ahead, if they please, and make every kind of illegal expenditure on the face of the earth, and there is nothing that we can do about it but report it. The horse then is out of the stable.

That is the kind of accounting we had until the Byrd-Butler law was enacted a year or so ago.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to give another instance, about which there can be no dispute or contradiction, to show how Mr. Lilienthal deliberately refused to comply with a congressional act.

Not only has he constantly resisted budget and accounting control, but he was the first to breach recent personnel ceilings set up by Congress. On September 30, 1945, Harold D. Smith, the late Director of the Budget, reported to the Speaker of the House of Representatives that Mr. Lilienthal, as Chairman of the TVA, exceeded legally imposed personnel ceilings by nearly a thousand employees.

These and other instances convince me that Mr. Lilienthal has practiced what he preached, namely, that he believes in a "government of men and not of laws."

Evasion or breach of legislative controls at this stage of atomic energy development would be treasonable, and a man with a tendency to resist such controls should not be entrusted with the tremendous responsibilities of this position.

When the Senate consents to an appointment of the Executive, it means that a majority of the Senate believes that from the standpoint of character, temperment, and qualifications the appointee is satisfactory. Senate confirmation does not mean a perfunctory approval of the appointee of the President. It is one of the safeguards of our constitutional democracy, namely, that the Senate has the power to check Presidential appointees by accepting or rejecting those nominated.

I have reached my conclusion after deliberate consideration, and for this position of such vast importance I do not feel I can vote for the confirmation of any man when there is any real and proper doubt as to his temperament, his ability, or his sincere belief in the form of America democracy which has made America the greatest Nation in all the world. In less important appointments a greater chance can be taken, but in this instance I, for one, do not intend to gamble with the future of America. I have never cast a vote in the Senate which is more in accordance with my sincere convictions and beliefs than the one I shall cast in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke about Mr. Lilienthal's believing in a government of men and not of laws. In the hearings before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, when Mr. Lilienthal was questioned by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on this very matter, Mr. Lilienthal stated:

I think we must have a government by law rather than by hearsay and suspicion and innuendo and rumor, but that we must also rely upon men. I think there is a major fallacy in the aphorism that this is a government of law and not of men, implying that by passing good laws and not having men of integrity and judgment to administer them we have thereby achieved sound government.

I think it is very clear, from reading the writings of Mr. Lilienthal, and not possibly taking one sentence out of the context, that what he is emphasizing is that we must not only have a government of laws, but a government of good laws, and we must have good men to administer them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a significant quotation from Mr. Lilienthal's statement:

Our Government and every government is, and must be, a government of men and not of laws.

That statement in itself would not be of such great consequence to me, except that from my investigation and my familiarity with his career as a public official I am convinced that he believes in it, because he has been arrogantly taking unto himself authority which Congress never intended him to have, and has tried to add more and more power.

RESIGNATION OF GORDON T. BURKE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION, OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to introduce into the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Gordon T. Burke, regional director for the War Assets Administration at Omaha, Nebr., and a front-page story from the Omaha World-Herald, announcing Mr. Burke's resignation.

Mr. Burke has resigned because, in his own words—

Month by month it has become increasingly difficult to operate the regional office in a businesslike and efficient manner because of the incompetent personnel at topside who insist in changing the rules and installing a lot of harebrained theories which have no place in a sales organization.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the letter in full be inserted, and also the article from the Omaha World-Herald.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Omaha, Nebr., March 26, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: I wish to advise you that I have submitted my resignation as Regional Director of the Omaha Office of War Assets Administration effective April 30.

I have taken this action because I am wholly and completely out of sympathy with the announced plans and policies of Administrator Littlejohn. The contraction of the regional offices at this period, when we are in the midst of the biggest selling campaign in the history of War Assets Administration, in order that all of the functions can be done in Kansas City, to me neither makes sense or reason.

For the last 9 months the Washington office has come up with a new plan, formula reorganization, or what have you, on the average of every 45 to 60 days, and each time surplus sales have been retarded and the entire program jeopardized. This latest move will, in my opinion, prolong the surplus disposal program a year or more, to the detriment of the public and consequent loss to the Government. The reason behind it is said to be economy, but I fail to see how transferring functions from one office to another and creating a wholly new organization known as the zone can accomplish this result. This office has consistently met and surpassed all of the quotas set for it, which is more than can be said for many other offices in the War Assets Administration set-up. Experience has shown that the big offices have failed miserably, while the smaller offices have performed the job assigned to them. The elimination of the smaller offices to make still bigger offices certainly sounds like poor reasoning. As I have been with the surplus program since its inception, I think I am somewhat qualified to at least express an opinion.

Not being a career Government employee, I have absolutely no personal interest other than that of a citizen and taxpayer. It has become increasingly evident to me that the Government operation cannot support or hold the interest of qualified business executives.

I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your considerations and courtesies extended to me during the period that I have served as Regional Director at Omaha.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

GORDON T. BURKE,
Regional Director.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald]

WAA CHIEF QUITS AS STAFF CUTS ORDERED—BLASTS DREAM PLANS OF INCOMPETENT MEN—DECLINES BIGGER JOBS

Gordon T. Burke announced his resignation Tuesday as regional director of the War Assets Administration.

Doing so, he loosed a blast at "ivory tower" policies, unworkable operations, and dream plans.

Announcement of his resignation came on the first anniversary of his appointment as regional director.

Touching off his action was the transfer of a major part of the operations of the regional office to the zone headquarters at Kansas City.

Mr. Burke's resignation will become effective April 30. It was sent to Maj. Gen. Robert L. Littlejohn, WAA Administrator, February 28, when Mr. Burke heard of untimely plans to consolidate the Omaha and Kansas City offices.

HAREBRAINED THEORIES

General Littlejohn, in accepting the resignation, disclosed that he had offered Mr. Burke two higher posts.

One was in Washington to be in charge of capital and consumer goods. The other was to be administrator of the Kansas City zone.

The Administrator noted that "you do not agree in my philosophy or organization."

Mr. Burke said he declined both offers.

"I have never been a career Government employee. I have consistently tried to operate the regional office in a businesslike and efficient manner," said Mr. Burke.

"Month by month, it has become increasingly difficult to do so because of the incompetent personnel at topside who insist in changing the rules and installing a lot of harebrained theories which have no place in a sales organization."

MAKES BUYING DIFFICULT

"The skeletonizing of the Omaha office," said Mr. Burke, "is bound to result in inefficiency, a break-down in sales which are reaching peak proportions.

"It will make it difficult, if not impossible, for a local purchaser to obtain surplus merchandise."

"The regional offices have been thoroughly damned for their inefficiency throughout the entire surplus-property program," he said. "While it is true that some regional offices have had poor administration, the great wonder is that any of them have been able to accomplish anything in the face of the tremendous obstacles which have been placed in their way and the fumbling and bumbling of the Washington administration."

PUZZLED OVER PURPOSE

Appointment of a businessman as Administrator, Mr. Burke said, might lead to untangling the mess that WAA is in today. He added:

"In recent months, I have wondered whether the object was to sell surplus, or go through a series of reorganizations. Each of these has slowed sales and been detrimental to surplus disposal."

Since its organization 3 years ago as a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Omaha office has brought about $23,000,000 into the Treasury. It has sold surplus goods resulting from the war, which cost the Government $54,000,000.

HAVE TO SALUTE

The Omaha office has consistently topped sales goals. It is 42 percent through its second program, which ends May 31.

The program drew the praise of General Littlejohn for its efficiency.

But Mr. Burke has been outspoken in urging more businesslike methods.

"The thing has been so brass-bound that it has got to the point where you have to salute when you enter the room," he asserted.

General Littlejohn has been giving the WAA sales program the Army treatment, Mr. Burke added.

Letters and orders contain such phrases as D-plus-one, D-D, operations, target.

Mr. Burke added: "We're still playing soldier."

Mr. Burke thinks consolidation of offices is coming too early. He favors it. But, he added, the more efficient way would be to wait until inventories are down and easily handled.

FROM 551 TO 203

The consolidation program will reduce the Omaha region force to 203. There were 575 employees January 31. Tuesday there were 551.

The 203 would handle sales in Omaha, Des Moines, Casper, Cheyenne.

The Kansas City zone will have an employee ceiling of 2,800 June 1. That will mean cuts at St. Louis and Denver, said Mr. Burke.

The shifts will mean no saving to the taxpayer, he said, adding: "What they eliminate here, they will have to do in Kansas City."

Mr. Burke has been an Omaha resident since 1928. Before the war he was vice president and general manager of Waxed Paper Products Co. here. The next was in charge of the Loan Administration Division of the RFC office here. He set up the surplus property disposal program under RFC in Omaha in 1944. Later WAA was set up as a separate agency.

Mr. Burke said he is considering forming a firm to give sales assistance in distributing locally made products.

Mr. WHERRY. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate because I feel that the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] should be advised of this situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska has called it to the attention of the Senate and has thereby called it to the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property, which has received many complaints. I wish to say to the Senators that if they will advise the committee and advise the Senate so that we can get into the official record the facts as to what is going on, I am satisfied that we shall be able to do a much better job. We have spent considerable time in getting prepared. We are just now in position to start on these matters. We hope to be of service to the entire Senate and to the country. I am glad that this subject has been called to our attention, because these are the kind of things which we must look into, and when there is an indication that there is something very seriously wrong, we must see that the situation is corrected. That is the purpose of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I offered an amendment to the budget resolution providing that the recaptured funds from the sale of surplus property should be applied to the national debt. Senators will recall that I said that I felt that if that could be accomplished it would be evidence to the public of how much money was being realized from the sale of surplus property. On that occasion I called attention to the fact that while in excess of $103,000,000,000 had been inventoried in the Baruch report, the indications were that the maximum amount recaptured would be approximately $3,700,000,000.

What Mr. Burke says would constitute a grave charge against the War Assets Administration, under any circumstances, but it is particularly serious because Mr. Burke is recognized as one of the most qualified business executives in the State of Nebraska, and it was at considerable personal sacrifice that he consented to remain in the Government service to establish the regional War Assets Office a year ago. Under his direction this office has functioned with outstanding success in comparison with the record in many of the field offices of the War Assets Administration.

I know from my personal acquaintance with Mr. Burke that he has been a conscientious and efficient employee in the Government service. Therefore I put stock in his statement that—

For the last 9 months the Washington office (of WAA) has come up with a new plan, formula reorganization, or what have you, on the average of every 45 to 60 days, and each time surplus sales have been retarded and the entire program jeopardized.

Mr. Burke states further that in his judgment the move to consolidate regional offices into larger zone offices will—

in my opinion prolong the surplus disposal program a year or more, to the detriment of the public and consequent loss to the Government. The reason behind it is said to be economy, but I fail to see how transferring functions from one office to another and creating a wholly new organization, known as the zone, can accomplish this result.

As will be noted from the newspaper story, Administrator Littlejohn, of the War Assets Administration, has offered Mr. Burke his choice of two highly responsible positions, one as Director of Capital and Consumer Goods Disposal in Washington, and the other as administrator of the new Kansas City zone office.

I bring this matter to the floor of the Senate today because I believe this action and these statements from a man of Mr. Burke's responsibility and reputation are a serious reflection on the method of handling our entire war-surplus disposal program. It is more than that. It is new and important evidence to lend further credence to past reports that the operation of our surplus disposal program is bogging down in inefficiency and red tape, and that many of its executive personnel are working at cross purposes.

The liquidation of vast quantities of surplus war goods and properties and the recovery of a maximum in dollar value for the taxpayers of the United States are subjects of the utmost importance to our economic welfare. I believe every Member of the Senate should give his personal attention to the gravity of this situation, and I am hopeful that the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whose attention Mr. Burke's resignation and statement have been called, will give this matter prompt attention, will also give attention to the statement which now has been placed in the RECORD, and will lose no time in exploring this situation completely. Perhaps they will find it expedient to confer with Mr. Burke and to go more fully into the matter with him. I suggest now to the distinguished chairman of the committee that he subpena Mr. Burke, have him come to Washington, and let him tell his story to the subcommittee which is investigating the sale of surplus property under the War Assets Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Without prejudging the matter, I think there is a great deal to the statement that some of the rules and regulations which have been promulgated delay the sale of surplus property and interfere with the accrual of income therefrom to the Government. It was called to our attention only a few days ago that in Cincinnati there was to be a sale of surplus Government property, and men stood in line all night,

waiting to buy it. When I say "all night," I should point out that they went into line at 4 or 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon, and remained in line all night, until next morning at 9:30, when they finally got into the plant. After 3 men had signed for purchases of some of the material, with approximately 120 men still waiting in line, someone called from Washington, and the sale was canceled. No reason was given; nothing was said about why it was canceled; but it was simply canceled. Those men had traveled from various sections of the country; some had come from Michigan; some had come from Chicago. If people are so anxious to buy Government surplus property that they are willing to stand in line all night in order to have an opportunity to buy it, it seems to me that there must be something wrong when on order from Washington an announced sale is canceled.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I make the further comment that what he has stated is one of the reasons why the Government will realize only $3,700,000,000 from the sale of surplus property which in the Baruch report was inventoried for as much as $103,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wish to state that yesterday, in Cincinnati, the machine tools of the Wright plant, which had been advertised for sale a long time, were put up for sale at 9 o'clock. Bidders were there from all over the United States. The value of the machine tools was estimated at $25,000,000. But at 9:30, a telegram arrived stopping all sales, and the whole thing was called off. I have received protests about it from all over the State.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will permit, I simply wish to correct the record. Instead of being a telegram, I think it probably was a telephone call—which would have been quicker. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. TAFT. That may have been the case.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Some months ago when trucks were badly needed in North Dakota for the movement of the enormous crop harvested there, after a great deal of advertising a number of the dealers finally went to Georgia to buy trucks. But when they arrived there, they found they could not buy a single truck.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senators for their observations. They definitely reinforce my remarks.

Certainly something should be done immediately about this matter. Mr. Burke is one of the finest men I know. He is an exceptionally able executive. Of course, there are a number of able executives in Government; I do not mean to cast any reflection upon those who are doing this job, for many of them are fine men; but when Mr. Burke resigns his job and says to the world that it simply is not feasible to continue because of the red tape and the entanglements caused by various agencies, it is obvious that something is wrong.

I know that the action taken by Mr. Burke was not a pleasant one for him. He is not the type of man who would willingly take such a step if his conscience would permit him to do otherwise. Therefore, it is to be hoped that the unpleasantness and the sacrifice which he has incurred by his action will in part be compensated for by results which will accrue in the way of serving the public interest, through an improvement of the war surplus disposal program.

Mr. President, I submit that proper steps should be taken by the subcommittee so as to result in the immediate establishment of a businesslike program by which it will be possible to recover from surplus property a maximum number of dollars which may be applied to the national debt, the war debt, to which they should be applied.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for giving me this opportunity to speak.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when I discontinued my remarks yesterday, in yielding to other Senators, I was speaking of the three Communists whom Mr. Lilienthal has already appointed, at very large salaries, to serve under the Atomic Energy Commission, although he himself has not yet been confirmed as a member of the Commission. I discussed with considerable particularity the first of those Communists who have been appointed. That is Herbert Marks. I did not discuss the other two, but I wish to discuss them now.

The second one is Mr. Richard O. Niehoff. As I shall say something about him, I shall first refer to his record. His age is 39. He is married. He was employed as training specialist—whatever that may be; I do not know whether it means physical training or mental training, or some other kind of training—by the TVA, from December 3, 1935, to June 5, 1942; he was with the OPA and National Housing agencies from 1942 to 1946; he was with the State Department for a short period late in 1946. He now is a training specialist for the Atomic Energy Commission. Niehoff, according to information contained in the security files of the Atomic Energy Commission, attended Communist meetings in the Knoxville area while employed at the TVA. It appears that if those were not Communist Party meetings, they were attended by Communists; and at the meetings, Communist affairs were discussed.

He is the second Communist who has been employed by the Atomic Energy Commission under Mr. Lilienthal, even before Mr. Lilienthal's nomination has been confirmed. We can hardly blame him for appointing Marks, because Marks, according to the testimony which was referred to yesterday, was one of the authors of the celebrated bill which created the Atomic Energy Commission. He helped to prepare it and he submitted it to the office.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that Mr. Marks had anything to do with the preparation of the domestic atomic-energy bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. If the Senator will look at the evidence, he will find the testimony of Mr. Bolt, who was an attorney employed by TVA at a salary of $6,500 a year. He speaks of conversations had with Mr. Marks and Mr. Niehoff, or with Mr. Marks and Mr. Ramey, I believe, in which they said they prepared a bill and brought it to Washington and turned it over to Senators, and that after they had prepared it, the Senator from Connecticut refashioned it and introduced it. That is what the testimony is.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say for the record at this point that there is not a scintilla of truth in that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will simply say to the Senator, in that connection, that, of course, I do not know what the truth of that matter is; but that was the testimony of a man who was shown by everyone to be a reputable witness. Even the TVA showed that they believed him to be reputable, because they increased his salary eight different times before they found he was not a Communist, and they gave him a fairly good character.

He testified to that effect before the committee of which the Senator is a member, and the Senator did not deny it at that time. Mr. Ramey and Mr. Marks were both here in reach of the committee. They could have been subpenaed if they had told an untruth, as the Senator now says they did. If they had told an untruth, they could both have testified before the committee and cleared it up, and the Senator would not have had to deny it if it was not true.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The statement the Senator has made that that is in the record comes as a total surprise to me. I do not say that it is not there, I say that it comes as a surprise to me. It may have been that at that particular moment I stepped out of the room, or answered a telephone call. I can remember being there when Bolt testified, and if he had said such a thing at that time I would have cross-examined him on it, because it is not true.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read it here yesterday.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator read it from the record yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was not denied this morning.

Mr. McMAHON. I am denying it now. It is the first time I have heard of it, and I suppose the Senator's clerk will give me a reference to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have the Senator deny it, if that is the way he feels about it, but I repeated what was said.

By the way, I have a telegram about it, and I shall read it at this time. It is addressed to me, dated March 26, and reads:

Joseph C. Swidler, TVA general counsel, has admitted in writing "James T. Ramey drafted the original Hill bill, Senate 2035, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and assumed major responsibility for the drafting of the Hill-Bankhead-Flannagan bill, S. 882, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session."

The telegram then continues:

From my personal knowledge, based on actually seeing the drafts, observing him work on it, and frank admissions, James T. Ramey prepared the original draft of the Murray Missouri Valley Association bill. Later Ramey made several trips to Washington to work with Herbert S. Marks, now general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, on redrafts of the Murray MVA bill. Ramey frankly admitted to me the purpose of these trips, which was on TVA time and expense.

Over on the next page of the same telegram is this:

In like manner Ramey also admitted to me working with Herbert S. Marks in Washington in assistance to draft the McMahon Atomic Energy Commission bill. TVA travel vouchers should show these trips, although the real purpose may not be revealed. The above should have been included in my testimony.

That is signed "L. B. Bolt." So, evidently he made the mistake of not putting it in his testimony, but it is in a subsequent telegram. He is here. The Senator can examine him now. If he is delayed and he is not here, I will see that he is here so that the Senator can examine him as to whether Marks had a hand in preparing the atomic energy bill.

I will ask the Senator a question, if I may, with all due respect, and everything of the kind. I myself am not saying what the fact is, because I do not know; I am taking the testimony of other people.

Did the Senator see Mr. Herbert S. Marks or Mr. Ramey while this bill was being prepared?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I did not.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator never saw them at all?

Mr. McMAHON. At no time. Most of that bill was written, I will say for the Senator's information, at my house on Woodland Drive, after many laborious nights of work, and then it was submitted by me to the Atomic Energy Committee, for appointing which the Senator must take his share of responsibility, because as President pro tempore he appointed the committee. I spent weeks and weeks combining every line and every period of that bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has said something about my appointing the committee. The Senator was anxious to get on the committee at the time, I remember. I appointed them all.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what the Senator did.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was not one man on the committee I did not appoint. Everyone of them knew that this man Lilienthal had so conducted himself in Tennessee as to be personally and politically offensive and objectionable, under the Senate rules, to both the Democratic Senators from Tennessee, and everyone of the committee, Democrats and Republicans, voted the other way. The only one who gave me an unbiased judgment in the matter seems to have been the new Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who has just entered the Chamber.

Now I shall proceed, if I may. If I may say so, when I remember how utterly discourteous some of the members of that committee have been to me in this fight, except the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I wonder whether I probably did not make the worst Presiding Officer the Senate ever had, or I must be the worst judge of men I ever knew of. It has not been that way in Tennessee. Tennesseans treat me fairly, and have always done so. But I have received the most offensive kind of opposition from a number of the members of that committee, everyone of whom I appointed, except the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], as I have said. Evidently, instead of returning good for evil, they return evil for good. That is all right, if they conscientiously believe that way. Since the Senator from Connecticut has brought the matter up, I am going to say something very frank to him. He could not wait to hear what the facts were. About a week after the hearings started, he went back home to Connecticut and gave out an interview. I cannot say exactly about the time of the interview, but he gave out an interview before he had heard testimony revealing one-tenth of the facts, and said he was going to vote for Mr. Lilienthal. It seems to me that under the circumstances the Senator might have waited to hear some of the facts, if not most of the facts. He had practically heard none at the time he gave out the interview, which I read in the papers. That is where I first learned of it. That is all right. The matter is not concluded, and I wish to proceed now.

A third man was appointed by this gentleman Lilienthal, who claims to come from Tennessee, but who I think, from the way he talks, is a citizen of the world. He testified before the committee that he was not a Democrat and was not a Republican, that he did not take any part in politics, and that he was not even a Communist. That was his testimony before the committee. So he is a citizen of the world, as I judge especially when I read his recommendations, namely, that we should give away this wonderful discovery our own citizens have made. He appears to be a citizen of the world, because he wants to give away free this secret which cost us perhaps $10,000,000,000. I have heard that statement made, and I am merely quoting it; but certainly $2,600,000,000 were appropriated, and there is a request for $500,000,000 more for this year, which has not yet been granted. It is certain that Mr. Lilienthal wants to give to the world the secret of atomic energy and atomic bombs; he wants to give it to Russia, Great Britain, and to any other nation which might have occasion to drop a bomb on us some time; he wants to share it with all nations. The remarkable part is that he wanted to let it go to Greece and Turkey, though there are Communists in Greece and Turkey, as is reported. Why he would want to turn this secret over to Russia, I do not know. Russia probably could raise the money to produce bombs after they got the plant.

Why should he want to do it? Why should he want to give away a secret the key to which the world has been trying to discover for more than 2,000 years? It has just been discovered through the brains and genius of America. Why should anybody want to give it away "free, gratis, for nothing," to use a colloquial expression I used a while ago? Why should he want to give it away? Why should my distinguished and very greatly beloved friend from Illinois want to give this secret away after we kept it so carefully for 5 or 6 years before it was utilized? This great destructive force might be used against us at any time if another nation learns the secret and has the money or can borrow the money with which to develop the necessary plants. I imagine such a nation probably could borrow the money from us through the UNRRA. Would it not be grand. We would be such a generous people to share this secret which had been hidden for all time up until a couple of years ago, and give it away to other nations, so that they could make war on us if we did not do right. Perhaps that would be a very generous thing to do; but I do not think so. I think it would be a very hazardous thing to do, not only for us, but for the very people who want it and there is no doubt about brother Stalin's wanting it.

Indirectly, he has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. Why do I say that Mr. Stalin has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal? Who is Mr. Stalin's representative in the United States? What is the leading Communist newspaper? It is called the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker represents the Communist Party. It represents Mr. Stalin's party in this country. It is Mr. Stalin's representative. Nothing is ever said about Mr. Stalin in that newspaper that is unpleasant. They look to him as their great leader. The Daily Worker has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. There are two other Communist papers in the United States, and they, too, have endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. Stalin is now engaged in a controversy with our Secretary of State, one of the greatest men in America, a man who fought for this country, who used his great talents and his great military ability to help win the greatest war that was ever won by men. He cannot agree with Mr. Stalin or rather Mr. Stalin will not agree with him. Stalin wants more of Germany probably than Mr. Marshall is willing to yield to him. But why? That does not make any difference to the Senate. A majority is now claimed to be in favor of Lilienthal. A newspaper majority; a

majority for Mr. Stalin. They stand 100 percent with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Stalin's newspapers in this country.

Is that not a remarkable thing? I have not known the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for a great many years, but I have known him for a number of years. If somebody should ask me, "In connection with this matter is SCOTT LUCAS going to vote to give to Stalin and the Russian Government what they want; with all the differences that now exist between that Government and ours, is he going to vote to turn this secret over to one of the men supported by Stalin and by Stalin's newspapers?" I would not believe that he would.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will never believe that, until he casts such a vote. I will yield to him in just a moment. I have too much admiration for the Senator from Illinois to believe that he would cast a vote on the side of the Communist newspapers. They are fighting every day for Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation, and therefore they are representing Mr. Stalin, and therefore they are putting matter right squarely up to my distinguished friend from Illinois. He will surprise me greatly if he votes for a man endorsed by Stalin and his three newspapers in this country, and endorsed by all world "progressivists," if I may use that term.

I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the fact that my dear friend is yielding just a little time to me, in view of the fact that he directed his remarks toward me on the question of communism. I do not know too much about the statements the Senator is making with respect to the fact that Stalin is endorsing Lilienthal. I read the testimony; I did not find where he had testified before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator could not find that. The Senator did not find that one of the editors of the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, who I think is Rob Hall, testified before the committee. He is the Washington representative of the newspaper. Let me continue a little further. There was discussion here yesterday about my having asked the Communists to come up to testify for the other side. I chided members of the committee time and again and asked, "Why do you not get Rob Hall here? His name has come into this hearing more frequently than the name of anybody else. Why do you not get him? He is the Washington correspondent of Stalin's newspaper. He is running it. Why do you not call him before the committee?" But they never did. Is it not remarkable that they did not call Mr. Hall, who represents Mr. Stalin in America? Why did they not call him? I have never understood that.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I cannot tell the Senator why they did not call him. I was not a member of the committee. Let me say this to my distinguished and able friend, whom I have admired so much all the years I have been in the Senate. The Senator talks about Lilienthal giving away the atomic secret to Russia. Of course, if the Senate did not confirm Lilienthal, I presume that if Lilienthal wanted to give away the secret to Russia, he probably would be able to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt it.

Mr. LUCAS. He knows it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will admit he knows the secret?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not. I doubt it very much. I doubt if he will ever know the secret. I doubt if Mr. Lilienthal will ever know the secret of how this bomb is made.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator was arguing that one of the reasons he did not want to confirm Mr. Lilienthal was due to the fact that immediately he would give away to Russia the secret, and Russia would make the bombs that would be sent over here to destroy us. If that be true——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is in the open. That does not have to be done because Mr. Lilienthal knows the secret, but because he directs the secret to be given to Russia.

Mr. LUCAS. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the Senator is wrong I think, much as I like him I will say that he is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. If Mr. Lilienthal does not know anything about this secret then it seems to me the Senator's argument falls by its own weight; The Senator has intimated, or implied, at least, that Mr. Lilienthal would dispose of it to Russia through the Commission—I undertake to say that if Mr. Lilienthal is the type of man the Senator thinks he is, if he is no good, if he is un-American, if he is a Communist, he would not hesitate a minute, if he could fly to Russia, to give away this secret to the Russian people. I am basing that statement, however, solely on what the Senator has said.

Mr. McKELLAR. He would be afraid to do that openly. I say that because I have known this man for some time. I know more about him than the Senator from Illinois does. If the Senator will look at his record in Chicago, when he represented the utility companies, the power companies, the telephone companies and at the same time was serving as regulator of them, as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, he will know what kind of a man he is.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that he——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator understands that, but he seems not to take it into consideration. I think when it comes to the question of endorsing a man by confirming him to be one of our representatives in a great organization such as the Atomic Energy Commission, such a thing as I have just stated should count in weighing his qualifications. Does not character count with the Senator? I am sure it does for the Senator is a man of such fine character himself. I ask the Senator this question: Does he approve of a man who while working for the utilities at $20,000 a year, at the same time worked for the opposite side, the public, in a public office, as Mr. Lilienthal did in Chicago and in Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not approve of that?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I certainly do not approve of that. But I certainly do not understand the testimony to be that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it is undenied. It is admitted. Mr. Lilienthal did not go on the witness stand until the committee called him, and Mr. Lilienthal brought the contract itself and added to the testimony against him instead of subtracting from it. Is the Senator from Illinois going to vote to endorse a man whom he thinks has committed a wrong of that kind against the public in Illinois and in Wisconsin? I cannot conceive how the Senator could do such a thing.

Mr. LUCAS. May I rejoin by saying to my able friend that there is apparently a very serious dispute—as to what the testimony shows along that line, and certainly the former Governor of Wisconsin, Phil La Follette, gave Mr. Lilienthal a clean bill of health through an affidavit he filed with the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; Governor La Follette was lecturing close by, and an endeavor was made to have him come to Washington and testify before the committee. The committee tried to get him to testify. Mr. Lilienthal tried to get him to testify. But Governor La Follette did not come and testify. He sent an enigmatical telegram which did not mean anything. It was not worth that much as evidence for anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me to make one observation, and then I shall not trespass upon his time any longer. I desire to speak briefly about the alleged communistic tendencies of Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I doubt if there is anyone in America who despises the communistic doctrine more than does the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. LUCAS. I have made speeches all over this country denouncing communism long before I came to the United States Senate. But it is very easy to make a charge of communism against a man. Does the Senator know that in my campaign in 1944 the Chicago Tribune ran an editorial entitled "Comrade LUCAS"?

Mr. McKELLAR. We know that newspapers do not always tell the exact facts. I have found that out in the last month or two.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the Senator. I think I did so once before, because the story in the Tribune went out all over Illinois that SCOTT LUCAS was a Communist and that my campaign was being financed by Earl Browder and the late Sidney Hillman. It is perfectly all right with me if the Tribune wants to make such a statement. All of us who are in public

life have to take these attacks; they are made every day. And I will say that, in my humble opinion, the Senator from Tennessee has been unjustly attacked by some of the newspapers of this country for his participation in the opposition to Lilienthal. I have not agreed with that. But we in public life all understand such things, and we are obliged to submit to such attacks.

Let me say further that such attacks form one of the reasons why many men in public life want to get out of public life. It is one of the reasons why many good men and good women do not want to have their names placed on the ballot. They do not want to do so because of what they are obliged to take through the press and over the air and from the opposition in a political campaign.

I only mention the allusion with respect to communism made concerning the Senator from Illinois to show the Senate how easy it is sometimes to get oneself classified with a subversive front in this country. Of course, I do not think anyone who knows me in my State or here in the Senate would ever say that I had the slightest Communist sympathies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly know a way for the Senator to——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that I do not have any such sympathies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that the easiest way in the world the Senator can show it is to vote against the nominee. The Senator has now the grandest opportunity to show that he has no such sympathies, the grandest opportunity he has ever had in his life or ever will have again, and that is to cast his vote against this man who has just appointed three Communists to be high up on the column he has just erected for himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation, and then I shall be through.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator by implication is saying that, unless I vote against Mr. Lilienthal, perhaps such a statement as was made by the Chicago newspaper might be true; that I may be inclined a little along that line.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is not the implication. I will give the Senator a guarantee, and it will be ratified by the people of Illinois, that the greatest mistake the Senator will ever have made in the United States Senate since he has been a Member of it will be, if he votes for a man like Lilienthal, who has conducted himself in the way he has and who, without authority, already has appointed three Communists to high positions in this important Commission in connection with his plan of action for the future.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that he may be correct. I do not know. It is difficult to tell here in the United States Senate how one's vote may affect his future political career. I never cast a vote in the Senate but that I step on the toes of some group in the State of Illinois, with all its divergent views and interests. Of course, one can make too many mistakes. But I will take my chances, I will say to the Senator, on this vote. It can be made an issue in the campaign if I am ever a candidate again. I think by 1950, if I should be a candidate for reelection, the Lilienthal case will not be an issue in Illinois. The issue will be something else.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think Mr. Lilienthal's nomination is going to be rejected, and for that reason he will not be an issue in the future. If the Senator is going to vote on this question simply to be on the safe side, for some reason, or because he may have made a promise—let me stop there and ask the Senator a question. Has he promised anyone to vote for Lilienthal?

Mr. LUCAS. I made a statement some time ago to the press that I was going to vote for Lilienthal.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; and the Senator from Tennessee knows that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator made that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I made the statement to the press that I was going to vote for the confirmation of Lilienthal.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the Senator feels bound by that statement, regardless of whether this man has worked for two masters, as he did in the Senator's State and in the nearby State of Wisconsin? The Senator from Illinois is going to vote for that man, although he finds that he accepted money from both sides of the utilities situation?

Mr. LUCAS. I know the argument the Senator is making, but I want to impress the Senator with this thought: The Senator might well change his mind, too, since he is talking about people changing their minds, if he would follow the advice of the committee, which sat for weeks and weeks and listened to the testimony. Eight out of the nine members of that committee said that Mr. Lilienthal was not such a bad sort of fellow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that all the Communist newspapers and all the Communists in America are supporting Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. All of them. I have not heard of a single Communist in America who is not supporting him. I have not heard of a single Communist newspaper that is not supporting him. I have not heard of a single Communist organization that is not supporting him. I believe there are a great many more Communists in this country than there are in Greece or Turkey.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the Communists never support anyone they do not like?

Mr. McKELLAR. They will never support him unless they think he has Communist leanings.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can the American people or any Senator reconcile the fact that we are asked to go to Turkey and Greece in order to fight Communists with the fact that we are asked to confirm the nomination of a man to head the Atomic Energy Commission who is being supported by all the Communists in the United States? I do not know whether the man is a Communist or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not either.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I do not know how we can get away from the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see how any Senator can.

Mr. CAPEHART. To me there is a great deal of hypocrisy in the one position or the other.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not charging anyone with hypocrisy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither am I.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to add one word to what the distinguished Senator from Indiana has said. Is it not a fact that this Government and the President of the United States and all of us have determined to get the Communists out of our Government now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought so; but when I find certain Senators boasting about having a majority in the Senate to line up for a man who has had a host of Communists in his department in Tennessee, to the utter dislike of practically everyone on both sides of the political house down there, I do not know what to think of it.

Mr. HAWKES. I sometimes do not know what to think of it myself.

Either yesterday or the day before the Senator from Tennessee spoke about Herbert Marks, whom Mr. Lilienthal has appointed general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. At $14,000 a year, by special arrangement.

Mr. HAWKES. The $14,000 a year is almost meaningless to me, alongside of the other implications as to the man.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee referred to Mr. Marks several times the other day as "Communist Marks."

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator have grounds for making that statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. The proof is in the record that he attended Communist meetings. He admitted to this witness and that witness that he was a Communist. He did not appear to deny it, although he was in the City of Washington. Those who were interested in Lilienthal did not have him appear, and yet Mr. Lilienthal appoints him, a Communist, among the very first appointments in his organization.

Mr. HAWKES and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. If the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is true—and I do not believe he would make it if he did not think it was——

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly would not.

Mr. HAWKES. Is it not folly for us to be talking about having communism investigated in all the Government offices and administrative branches, and yet be taking a Communist into the most im-

portant organization in the United States today?

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely. I should like to refer to the record.

Mr. HAWKES. It does not make common sense to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to page 920 of the committee record, in the testimony of Mrs. Williams, who was a TVA Communist. She belonged to what is called a cell. We would call it an office or association, or whatever it might be; but in Communism it is called a cell. That is the Communist name for such an organization. Mrs. Williams testified that she was a Communist. I read from the examination of Mrs. Williams:

Mr. BARKER. And Herbert Marks; you know Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, you see when you say this meeting business—yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment—

Mr. BARKER. You knew Nelson Travis Barr?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How about Niehoff? Did you know him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. Niehoff is one of the men whose names have been mentioned in this debate.

Mr. BARKER. And you have attended meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I used to work in Mr. Niehoff's office.

The majority of the committee have disregarded the evidence with respect to communism. There is no doubt in the world about there being a cell down there. I read from page 239 of the record. I was examining Mr. Bolt.

Senator McMAHON. What did Swidler do in the Navy?

Mr. BOLT. He was a Navy lieutenant stationed here in Washington, doing contract work, as I recall.

Senator McKELLAR. A lieutenant doing contract work in Washington. And when he returned to the TVA—when was it?

Mr. BOLT. That was about December 6, I think, 1945. Within a month he was working very closely with James T. Ramey, who was located off in the extreme left somewhere.

Mr. KNOWLAND rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I shall be glad to yield to him in a moment. I continue reading from page 239 of the committee record:

I mean, Ramey generally—in thought, as I have heard him express—generally follows the Communist Party line. He doesn't talk very much.

This is the same man we have been discussing, who was appointed by Mr. Lilienthal even before his nomination was confirmed. He is not a real or de jure officer until his nomination is confirmed by this body.

In 1938 or 1939 he made an extended trip to Russia, but under whose auspices and for what purposes I do not know. We often asked him about it, but he wouldn't talk.

Now, those two got together and began making grandiose plans about the fertilizer industry. Ramey immediately began research on the possibility of antitrust proceedings. Then they began to work on drafting and preparing strategy with reference to the Hill fertilizer bill.

This is the kind of man that Mr. Lilienthal is appointing, even before Mr. Lilienthal's nomination as an officer of this Government in this great position is confirmed. He is appointing Mr. Marks, a well-known Communist, who attended all the Communist meetings down there, Mr. Ramey, a well-known Communist, who attended all the meetings, and Mr. Niehoff, who attended all the meetings. By the way, I am informed that in a day or two another Communist who is now being scrutinized by the Department—secretly, of course—will be the fourth Communist in the Lilienthal outfit, if they can make out a good enough case for him.

Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. After listening to what the Senator has said, and after listening to what has been said by such Senators as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and others, and with the deep cloud which has been thrown over this nomination, I can come to only one conclusion, and that is that we had better get our own house in order before we try to reform the rest of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we ought to keep our own official household clean.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Lilienthal has been referred to as the indispensable man. I have read that in a number of places.

Mr. McKELLAR. We people down in Tennessee would like to dispense with him. We would like to dispense with him instantly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that he was the sixth or seventh choice of the President? Is there any testimony to that effect?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard it. There is no testimony with reference to it of which I am aware. If any Senator has heard of any testimony to that effect I hope he will call it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether this is hearsay or whether I read it. I think I read it. I think I even read the names of the men who were previously offered the position by the President, but they declined. If that be true, how can anyone say that Lilienthal is the indispensable man?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see how it is possible.

I have had a very unusual experience. The other day the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] yielded to a dozen Senators all around him, and Senators on this side of the aisle, but declined to yield to me at all. I do not know what I have done to the Senator from California. If I have done anything to hurt his feelings I certainly apologize for it, because I do not believe in hurting people's feelings.

Mr. Lilienthal has had his way the whole time. In the Roosevelt administration he was appointed, over my protest, as a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and I made the statement that he was not acceptable to us in any way. Mr. Roosevelt paid no attention to either one of us. Mr. Truman never consulted either of us with reference to the appointment. The man claims to be a citizen of our State. It has been a well-known rule of this body for many years that Senators are asked whether or not an appointment of this kind would be satisfactory to them. But not a word was said to me; not a word was said to the junior Senator from Tennessee. This man was appointed to probably the most powerful office in the world, because he can drop a bomb on anyone if bombs are turned over to him. He was appointed to this position without the President's saying a word to either of the two Senators from Tennessee. That was disappointing to me. I am not hurt over it. I am able to take my medicine. I have done so for a great many years, and I expect to continue to do so. But I regret it very much.

The nominations of two Communists from the TVA were submitted for confirmation. One was a Mr. Clapp, who appeared before the Committee on Public Works. That committee fixed the hearings on exactly the same date as that fixed by the other committee. It was absolutely necessary that I attend those meetings if it was humanly possible, but I could not make two men out of myself. I had to divide my time as best I could and go from one committee to the other. I think that is the only inconsiderate thing I ever knew the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to do. He is a very delightful gentleman personally. He set the meetings of his committee at exactly the same time as the hearings were set by the other committee, and therefore it was exceedingly hard on me—just as the Senator from California has made it hard by declining to yield. Therefore, I am not going to follow his example; I am going to yield to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will do so. I think that in the course of this debate it is important that we keep the record straight and keep the facts before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator will do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is very easy on the floor, under our congressional immunity, to make charges, but the fact of the matter is, as I pointed out the other day, that there is no reputable testimony in the record before the Atomic Energy Committee which indicates directly or indirectly that the three persons who have been appointed are Communists or Communist sympathizers. The committee heard all the evidence. The committee consists of nine Members of this body, all of whom are just as much interested in serving the United States of America

and its Government as are any other Members of the Senate. I do not claim that anyone who might disagree with me has not a perfect right to disagree in whatever choice he may make with reference to this nomination. But after hearing all the testimony before the committee—the Senate section of the committee consisting of five Republicans and four Democrats—the committee voted 8-to-1 to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal.

The Senator from Tennessee has read from the testimony of Mrs. Williams. She had previously testified before the Dies committee. I say this because I believe the American people, in the interest of fair play, should have all the background. She testified that she had attended some Communist meetings. The evidence before the committee showed, I believe, six or seven persons in the TVA organization who were Communists. She said she had attended some of those meetings. She said she had also attended some labor meetings. Throughout the country labor meetings are being held, and perhaps a few Communists have infiltrated into some of them. But I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee will not charge that every labor organization is a Communist organization.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator stop there? He made the statement that there were possibly some Communists in the meeting. Is the Senator in favor of selecting Communists who attend labor meetings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly am not.

Mr. McKELLAR. If he is, I wish to know if he believes in giving such men $14,000 jobs and appointing them to very important offices under a commission which has been created to control this new discovery. To choose Communists who attend labor meetings I think is a reflection on labor. Does the Senator believe that he would be willing to vote to give a Communist $14,000 a year in an establishment of the kind we are discussing?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, categorically, "No; I do not." I served in the Army of the United States for 3 years, and if I thought there was even a remote bit of evidence that any one of these men was a Communist I would not have voted in committee to confirm his nomination, and I would not so vote on the floor of the Senate. But I think, as a matter of fairness, we who enjoy congressional immunity should stick to the facts adduced before the committee and not draw conclusions wholly unwarranted by the record.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair admonishes the occupants of galleries that any expressions of approval or disapproval are strictly contrary to the rules. The occupants of the galleries will please refrain from demonstrations of any kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I say, Mr. President, that we have been waiting for weeks here—at least this is the second week—to get some opportunity to cheer the other side; and especially when the Senator states that he wishes to vote and will vote for a man whose organization in Tennessee, as the facts show, is virtually controlled by Communists, no wonder the Communists in the galleries like their first opportunity to cheer. I want to congratulate my friend on having Communist applause in the United States Senate. The Senator should get all of them from California the next time. The Senator should get all of them in California next time.

Mr. President, I wish to read now an editorial which appeared in the Daily Worker, Mr. Lilienthal's right-hand bower in the newspaper world. This editorial appeared in the Daily Worker for February 12, 1947, not very long ago. The heading is "From Eisler to Lilienthal."

Of course, we all know who Eisler is. Here is the editorial:

> With the ganging up on David Lilienthal, the country can see a little more clearly what is behind such hysteria-making devices as the Eisler case and the atom spy scares.
>
> Lilienthal is a well-known Roosevelt New Dealer sponsored by the multimillionaire Bernard Baruch, and even by the colleague of Martin Dies, Joe Starnes, of Alabama.
>
> But Mr. Lilienthal helped President Roosevelt in the TVA project.

Well, Mr. President, that was grand of him. As a matter of fact, he had no more to do with the building of the dams on the Tennessee River than he had to do with marking the Gulf Stream in the Atlantic Ocean. He was just a man on the Commission; that was all. He was a young lawyer who had never had a legal practice. That was Lilienthal's record up to that date. Also he had once taken both sides of a case in Wisconsin and Illinois.

I read further from the editorial:

> But Mr. Lilienthal helped President Roosevelt in the TVA project.
>
> And for this crime, he will not so easily be forgiven by the rough-riding muscle men of the GOP gang.

Ah, Mr. President, the Senator from California is looking at me. He can take heart. They will not hold him responsible.

I read further from the editorial:

> They have hated such competition with the Power Trust.
>
> Could they slash Lilienthal's reputation to pieces before public opinion because of his TVA achievement? Not so easily. The patronage-greedy Senator McKELLAR—

Mr. President, in view of that statement in the editorial, I digress long enough to say that I examined into my patronage the other day. I found that all the OPA officers had been appointed by others, not by me, and usually from other States. I found that all the positions in the CPA and the Public Works Authority and the various other authorities had been filled without any knowledge on my part. Yet I am talked about as a patronage-greedy man. Mr. President, what do I want with patronage? Heavens above! I have been in this office for nearly 31 years; it soon will be 31 years. I have gotten along fairly well with the small amount of patronage I have had. I have served under four Republican Presidents, and during their administrations I had no patronage at all. I was reelected, however. I served under three Democratic Presidents, and during their administrations Democratic Senators should have had some patronage, and I had a small amount of it, I reckon. I suppose there is hardly a Democrat in this body who got less than I did. But that is all right; I have no complaint to make. The truth of the matter is that patronage is the cause of much trouble; and other Members of the Senate, after they have been in the Senate as long as I have, will come to the same conclusion. Certainly the small amount of patronage that comes to a Senator is much more trouble than it is worth.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the testimony shows that during all the time Mr. Lilienthal has been with the TVA, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] never has asked him for a single appointment of any kind or character, whether the appointment of a clerk or the appointment of anyone else?

Mr. McKELLAR. He testified to that; but some of his friends on the committee—those who have made a favorable report regarding his nomination—say he was mistaken about that, and that afterwards they found some letters, although they are not in the record, in which either I or my secretary made such a request. I do not recall ever having asked him for an appointment in my life. I know I never received one. That is perfectly all right. If I could get rid of him on that ground, I would be willing never to ask anyone connected with the TVA for any appointment of any kind, nature, or description. I was delighted when he left the TVA last year; but having the President appoint him to the office for which he is now under consideration would surely not get rid of him.

Mr. President, Mr. Lilienthal is an unworthy man, wholly unfit for that job. He has caused the Government to lose great sums of money. If Senators will read the report, they will find that the TVA lost money even in as prosperous a year as 1945. The TVA pays no interest except the interest on $56,000,000 worth of bonds. The TVA does not pay the Government a single penny of interest on the nearly $1,000,000,000 which the Government has invested in it. The TVA does not pay the Government of the United States one cent in taxes—not one cent. Do Senators call that good management? Mr. President, any one of a number of men right around me here, whom I see in this body, if put in charge of the TVA, would have it pay the interest and pay a reasonable amount of taxes and make money every year, because the TVA is one of the best dam outfits in the world—and I do not mean "cussing" damns, either. I mean that there are no better dams than those of TVA. Were they created by Mr. Lilienthal? No, Mr. President; they were created by Arthur E. Morgan, whom Lilienthal kicked out of office, and took it himself, just as he has kicked General Groves out of the Atomic Energy office, and is trying to take it himself.

That reminds me, Mr. President, that when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] asked Lilienthal, "What do you mean, are you going to turn the military out?", Lilienthal replied, "Oh, yes. We cannot have two in charge." Both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado expressed themselves as being very much opposed to depriving the military of any say in connection with the greatest weapon in the world. Mr. Lilienthal replied, as I recall, "Well, I will think that over." The next day in the record he changed his statement, because he knew that otherwise he would lose two votes, and he did not want to lose two votes. That is the fact of the matter. If the Senators look at the record, they will see it shown there.

I shall try to finish reading the editorial which I began to read. As I have said, it appeared in the Daily Worker, run by a man who knew something about this matter, but would not appear as a witness:

> And for this crime, he will not so easily be forgiven by the rough-riding muscle men of the GOP gang. They have hated such competition with the power trust. Could they slash Lilienthal's reputation to pieces before public opinion—

I wonder if the writer of the editorial means his reputation for serving both sides, as in the Wisconsin-Illinois incident, when Lilienthal served under Governor La Follette as one of the commissioners of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission and at the same time received a salary three times as large from the utilities themselves.

For some strange reason which I cannot fathom, that does not make an impression on all Senators. It seems not to have made an impression, for instance, on the Senator from Illinois. One of the reasons he gave was that he had already made a statement that he would vote for Lilienthal, and he would adhere to his statement. But does it indicate the possession of a good character for a man to have a job secretly, involving the gathering of information and making research for public utilities, and at the same time to hold an office in another State on a commission controlling those very utilities? It is said that is why money was raised for him: "He is a commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, and we should raise this money and make his salary good."

Are Senators going to vote for a man who will stand on both sides of a proposition like that, at the same time drawing money from both sides? There are many lawyers Members of the Senate. There is not a lawyer in this body who ever took a fee on both sides of a lawsuit. Yet that is exactly what Mr. Lilienthal has done. How, in the name of heaven, a lawyer, in the face of this undisputed record, could vote for him I cannot understand. There is no doubt about the proof—not a particle. It is upheld by Governor La Follette. It is upheld by the evidence in the record. How in the world are Senators going to vote for a man who takes money on both sides of a proposition?

He claimed to be a lawyer at the time, too. He was not practicing; he was in the research business. He was preparing newspaper and magazine articles and books in favor of the utilities, and getting a salary of $20,000 a year for doing that. Then he allowed Governor La Follette to appoint him on a commission whose duty it was to regulate these very utilities. Has the Senate reached such a point that Senators are unwilling to consider that? Are Senators going to vote to put a man in a high place, such as the one to which this man has been appointed, who took money on both sides of a question? They would not do it for any other lawyer. They would not do it for one of us.

Suppose we should lose our places as Senators. Suppose we resigned, or suppose we were forced to quit for some reason. Suppose the people voted against us. If one was known as a lawyer who took fees on both sides, what would happen? Mr. Lilienthal was a lawyer. He took compensation on both sides. It might not be called fees, but it was compensation on both sides. If one of us had done such a thing he would receive no votes.

There is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. He is not a lawyer, I believe.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I am.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know the Senator was a lawyer. I congratulate the fraternity, because it has a good member in the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose it were the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Would Senators vote for him if they found him taking fees on both sides in a lawsuit? No; they would not vote for any man doing such a thing. Yet just a few years ago Mr. Lilienthal was taking $20,000 from one side of the house, and $7,000, plus, from the other side. That is a pretty impressive record of illegality. The law of Wisconsin absolutely forbade him doing it; and not only that, but the law of Wisconsin required that he hold up his hand to high heaven and take an oath that he would not do it.

I wish now to read the remainder of this editorial:

> And if the GOP could first drench the Nation in a cloud of poison-gas concerning Russian spies and Soviet master minds allegedly hanging around back alleys in New York's family neighborhoods, then they could "get" Lilienthal easily.
>
> They only had to mention his name along with the spies and Russia appeasers, and his goose was well on the way to being cooked.
>
> The Lilienthal treatment grows out of the Eisler treatment.

Eisler was a Communist. Is it not wonderful how this Communist paper takes that kind of course?

> The persecution of a German Communist refugee not only leads to, but has for its main purpose, the crucifixion of every American not ready to knuckle down to toryism.

That is what Mr. Stalin's representative in America has to say to those who are voting for Mr. Lilienthal in this matter.

Mr. President, before being asked to yield for a few moments, I must say something about the third Communist already employed in the Atomic Energy Commission by Mr. Lilienthal. I forget whether Niehoff or Marks came first, I believe it was Marks, and I have discussed those two, but I wish now to discuss the third for a moment.

> James Thomas Ramey, age 32, married, member of the Tennessee Bar Association.

Mr. Lilienthal is now a member of the Tennessee Bar Association, but he does not practice law.

> Employed 1941–47 by TVA, first as an assistant to the public manager, later as senior attorney.

Remember, he was an attorney there, but it seems that the attorneys in the TVA do not act. When they want action, they employ Mr. O'Brian, at $25,000 per employment.

> According to a report in the Atomic Energy Commission security files, Ramey, in making application for a passport on or about April 20, 1937, crossed out the words—

In his application for a passport—

"and defend"—

Mr. Lilienthal is appointing this man who, when he wants to go to Russia, leaves out the words indicating that he will defend the United States—

> and inserted in longhand following the words "United States" the words "and will so far as my conscience will allow defend it."

Is that the kind of citizen of the United States Senators want to honor with this fine $14,000 job? If so, vote to confirm Mr. Lilienthal, and that will be accomplished.

Listen to this language. When this man comes to taking an oath to defend the United States, he strikes that out and inserts "and will so far as his conscience will allow defend the United States."

We are voting on his confirmation at the same time we are voting on that of Lilienthal, because Lilienthal has already appointed him. Is that what Senators want to do? Is that the kind of man they want to represent America? He was going to Russia at the time.

The report also discloses that as a student at Columbia University Law School, he became involved in an argument over the administration of the moot court, during the course of which he caused to be printed inflammatory matter concerning the dean. Ramey admitted the statements were untrue. It was also reliably reported that while in the TVA legal department, Ramey urged that certain evidence, which by the preponderant weight of authority was inadmissible, be brought to the attention of the court through some accidental extrajudicial method.

I want to read to the Senators a description of how Mr. Ramey practiced law. He is the man the Senate is asked to confirm. I am sorry my good friend from Illinois is not now present, because I would like to call it to his attention. This is the way Mr. Ramey did it, and the Senate is asked to confirm him to a $14,000 office, as I recall. He may get the office. This is the way to get results. If the Senate confirms Mr. Lilienthal, it

will at the same time confirm Mr. Ramey, because Mr. Lilienthal has already appointed Mr. Ramey. Most of the Senators here are lawyers. When something extrajudicial arises, how do Senators handle it? Let me show how Mr. Ramey did it—not that Senators need the information for themselves, because they are not lawyers of that kind. Mr. Ramey wrote a letter about it.

It also depends on whether or not the offer could be brought to the attention of the judges via—

He did not say "by way of," but "via," which is a Latin word—

some accidental extrajudicial method.

I see my friend from Kentucky looking at me. I wonder if he is willing to vote for the confirmation of Lilienthal when it means the confirmation also of a man like that, who under his own signature—and here is the letter—who under his own signature wants to bring something to the attention of a court, or the judge, in an extrajudicial way. It cannot be told to the judge, of course; it cannot be argued to him; but it must be gotten to him in an extrajudicial manner.

How often will this distinguished gentleman be getting things across to people in an extrajudicial way if the Senate confirms Mr. Lilienthal? If we confirm Mr. Lilienthal, we confirm the appointment that he has already made of Mr. Ramey. There are three that are already appointed. They are drawing salaries now under the Commission through Mr. Lilienthal's having appointed them, although the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal himself has not yet been confirmed.

How can Senators possibly vote for a man of that kind? The only justification in the world for such a vote would be that Senators have been asked to commit themselves and have promised to do so, and have promised to vote for this man, regardless of the facts. That is the only way in the world that Senators can vote for "confirmation in the second degree" when voting for the Lilienthal "confirmation in the first degree."

Mr. President, I have been asked to yield the floor at this time. I have not finished my speech, but I have been speaking for nearly 2 hours. I am somewhat tired, and if the leader on the majority side wants me to yield the floor to a Senator on his side, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Ohio desired to discuss the matter at this time. If agreeable to him, it is perfectly agreeable to me that the Senator from Tennessee yield the floor temporarily without prejudice.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio as long as he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McGrath	Thye
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Ecton	Magnuson	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Williams
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	Myers	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state the reasons why I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of David Lilienthal. On February 22 I issued a statement summing up those reasons, which have been only intensified by a further study of the record, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT ON FEBRUARY 22, 1947

I have decided to vote against the Senate advising and consenting to the appointment of Mr. David Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe he is temperamentally unfitted to head any important executive agency in a democratic government, and too "soft" on issues connected with communism and Soviet Russia.

This is no party issue. It is an issue of governmental philosophy. The question of confirmation, therefore, is not like that of a member of the President's Cabinet. The Senate has equal responsibility in selecting the right man, because to him are delegated wide legislative powers. There are qualified men from among whom a man of less questionable leanings could be chosen. Mr. Lilienthal has always been a very able propagandist in his own behalf. I have seldom seen cleverer or more carefully organized propaganda than that which is now flooding Congress in behalf of the ridiculous proposition that Lilienthal is the indispensable man.

I see no reason why any Senator should vote for Mr. Lilienthal unless he would have been willing to appoint him, and I think there are few Senators who would ever have made this choice.

This was a proper case for the exercise of that cooperation which President Truman has promised but, although he delayed for 3 months in making the appointments authorized by Congress, he never consulted Congress in any way as to the men, or type of men, who should have been appointed.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the most important agency created in recent years. It was necessary to give it tremendous discretion in exercising power over the atom-bomb field and many related activities. It can extend its regulations into many industries. Furthermore, the Chairman of the Commission is bound to have a tremendous influence in determining our international policy relating to the atom. Mr. Lilienthal is a typical power-hungry bureaucrat, one of the group of men who, in recent years, dominated the thinking of perhaps half of the Government departments and bureaus in the manner seen so clearly in the administration of OPA. They have defied Congress. They have attempted to stretch their powers far beyond the limit of statutes. They have sought vast sums of money from the public purse to help them carry out their plans, concealing as far as possible what the money was really to be used for. They created the conception of the bureaucrat, against which the people revolted in the last election. They have been unprincipled crusaders for what they perhaps thought were the public interests.

Mr. Lilienthal has conducted the affairs of the TVA in a secretive and arbitrary manner. He attempted to build it up into a little independent, but all-powerful, government. For instance, in his district he has always excluded the Department of Agriculture from the activities it conducts in every other part of the United States.

His treatment of Dr. Arthur Morgan, former president of Antioch College, clearly revealed his character. While Dr. Morgan was TVA Chairman, Mr. Lilienthal undermined his authority until he finally brought about his dismissal and obtained the position himself. The TVA investigation was whitewashed by the appointment of Mr. Francis Biddle, another member of the inside group, as counsel for the committee. The minority of the committee found that Mr. Lilienthal had followed methods of concealment, manipulation, and lack of candor. In the matter of the Berry claims, Mr. Lilienthal testified that he thought questions of ethics should be disregarded in making the decision. He repeatedly had the TVA minutes changed—months later—to paint a better picture of his own action. I agree with Dr. Morgan's testimony of last week that Lilienthal has a "personal desire to be irresponsibly in power," and was guilty of dishonest practices at that time.

He always fought bitterly any investigation into his actions as an official of the TVA.

Like the group of which he was a part, Mr. Lilienthal was soft on the subject of communism. Members of this group were not Communists, but like the CIO they accepted the Communists' strength and assistance, particularly the Communist propaganda which supported many of their plans. As a result of this attitude, Communists were permitted to infiltrate into many of the bureaus and departments in Washington which they dominated. There is no doubt that a Communist cell was tolerated for a while by Mr. Lilienthal in the TVA.

The same general softness appears in the Lilienthal report on the atom bomb. All atom manufacture is to be turned over to an international authority to duplicate our atom manufacturing plants throughout the world, including Russia. No practical suggestions for safeguards were included. If Communists could infiltrate into the Government and into TVA, is there any reason to believe that they could not infiltrate into such an international authority? After all, the Russians claimed only recently that the United States and Canada are conspiring against them. No suggestion was made in the Lilienthal report of any method of nullifying Russia's veto against action by that government in seizing the new plants or violating the rules. The whole emphasis in the report had to be changed by Mr. Baruch in presenting a plan to the United Nations.

I do not want to see a man as muddled in his thinking on questions of international

power as Mr. Lilienthal in charge of our atom bomb policies. I would consider his confirmation a real threat to our national safety.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place I should like to discuss the basis on which the Senate confirms or refuses to confirm individuals appointed by the President. It seems to me that the mistake of the Senate committee in this case lies in the fact that they have approached the whole problem from the wrong angle. For a number of years the Members of the Senate, perhaps because of the fact that a majority of them usually stood with the President of the United States, seem to have approached appointments from the point of view that they should be confirmed unless it was proved that the appointee was a thief or a criminal or was involved in a scandal so serious that he was clearly incapable of exercising the office to which he was appointed. I do not think that is the consideration at all in determining the selection of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I feel very strongly that, as the Constitution says, these men should be appointed "with the advice and the consent of the Senate." The advice of the Senate, if you please, is involved. We should not confirm them unless we ourselves would be willing to appoint them to the office, if we had the appointing power. Particularly in the case of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission I believe that our responsibility is equal to that which the President of the United States has, and that we ought to reject the nominees unless we ourselves were willing to appoint them. Personally I would not be willing to appoint Mr. Lilienthal to such a position.

In the case of members of the President's Cabinet, the custom has arisen, properly, I think, that in the absence of very serious objection, the President should have the right to have his own personal advisers as he wishes to select them.

In the case of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission there is no particular connection with the President. The members of the Commission are entirely independent. They make the policy under the act. Not only that, but the act is so broad that in effect they exercise legislative authority. They exercise legislative authority just as much as they exercise administrative authority, and the legislative body, in delegating such legislative authority, should retain control over those who are in fact its agents in exercising it.

We have been criticized, I think, for passing an act as broad as is the Atomic Energy Act. I think perhaps it was a mistake to pass an act which is so broad. But that only makes it more important that the men who administer the act shall be men who will not press the powers given to the very limit. They should be responsible, and should feel themselves responsible, to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we were urged to delegate legislative authority because atomic energy was a subject which was so new; so few people knew anything about it; it was so important that some action be taken that it was absolutely essential that this broad power be given, and certainly the broad power is given in the act. The Atomic Energy Act passed last year provides in the first place for the issuance by the Atomic Energy Commission of many regulations having the force of law. In section 12 (2) it provides that the Commission shall—

(2) Establish by regulation or order such standards and instructions to govern the possession and use of fissionable and by-product materials as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable.

The Commission practically makes the laws governing atomic energy, and that may be a very wide provision, because the Commission may reach out to all sorts of things that atomic energy gradually comes to affect. The act is studded with provisions for licenses, and no one can do anything without a license. It provides that no one can possess any fissionable material without a license.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Would the Senator change the provision of the law which requires that no one can have fissionable material in his or her possession without a license?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I am only pointing out the fact that when we give the Commission power to license—and there are five or six such provisions in the act—we give it the power to make the law on the basis of which those who are licensed must operate. I am merely calling attention to that fact because it shows that we are delegating legislative power, and therefore that we have the primary responsibility to determine whether the men who are appointed are proper men to conduct their affairs. It is not a case where the Senate looks at a presidential appointment and says, "Well this individual has not committed any crime, he is not a Communist, and therefore we will confirm him."

Such it seems to me has been the attitude of the committee, however. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said:

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said:

The Senator from New Hampshire had asked me whether I thought Mr. Lilienthal was the best man in the United States for this job. I said, "No; I do not think so, but I do not think he is the worst man, either."

Mr. President, I do not know who else would take this job. As I said to the Senator then, Mr. Lilienthal can do the job; we find no dishonesty about him; he is able; and those who oppose him did not begin to establish any charge of communism against him; and we are in an emergency.

That is not the proper basis upon which to determine whether or not we are to approve a nomination—because he is not the worst man.

It seems to me that that shows the approach of the committee, and it seems to me that that approach is fundamentally wrong. It seems to me that we ought not to confirm the nomination of anyone unless we would be willing ourselves to appoint him.

In the Atomic Energy Act we set up a joint committee which has very substantial duties, which has to maintain a continuing supervision. We recognize that the authority granted herein is largely a legislative authority.

Of course, it is also an administrative authority in very wide respects. The authority in paragraph 5 of section 12 gives the Commission the power to—

acquire such materials, property, equipment, and facilities, establish or construct such buildings and facilities, and modify such buildings and facilities * * * and construct, acquire, provide, or arrange for such facilities and services (at project sites where such facilities and services are not available) for the housing, health, safety, welfare, and recreation of personnel employed by the Commission as it may deem necessary.

Under that provision the Commission is now operating a city of 45,000 people at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and other cities throughout the United States. That tremendous authority, as will be seen, goes into every field of housing, health, safety, and welfare. Recently we heard the complaint that all the concessions in Oak Ridge, Tenn., were being canceled and that the Authority itself was to operate all the restaurants, soda fountains, and anything else that related to housing, health, safety, and welfare of the personnel. Tremendous discretion is given those men. Perhaps we should have given it, and perhaps we should not. That is not the point. The point is that, having given it, we are looking to these men, in effect, to do some of the things we ought to do. It is all the more important, by reason of the fact that we have recognized the tremendous powers in this growth, that we now ask that the men who are appointed to that job exercise those powers in a conservative way.

MR. LILIENTHAL BELIEVES IN CONSTANT EXTENSION OF GOVERNMENTAL POWER

The fact that the law is radical is all the more reason for refusing to appoint a radical who will press every advantage to the very limit, whose philosophy throughout shows that he is in favor of Government operation if it can possibly be had, whose philosophy shows that he is in favor of pushing the powers and activities of Government to the very limit. We give these men discretion as to how far some part of atomic energy may remain with private enterprise. We ought to have persons who believe in private enterprise, and not those who are opposed to private enterprise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinctive thing about Mr. Lilienthal's administration of TVA has been the help and encouragement which he has given to private enterprise. Instead of operating in a bureaucratic fashion to try to have the Government do everything, he has sought himself to

have the Government do as little as possible, encourage and stimulate private enterprise, and work and cooperate with other governmental agencies and private associations.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read a letter from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, under date of March 4:

Mr. Lilienthal constantly preaches local autonomy, but he absolutely dictates the terms under which municipalities must sell TVA current. Today one city has a suit with the TVA. It wanted to pledge electric department earnings as additional security for a loan to build a school building. TVA undertakes to contravene this in court.

The point is not which policy is better, but the fact that TVA takes this position as to policy while Lilienthal widely proclaims the opposite. What the Senator says today is not true. Mr. Lilienthal has pressed public enterprise as far as he can press it. In his towns he operates as many of the municipal services as he can operate. He does not permit the people in his towns to conduct their affairs as the people of a city in Ohio would conduct theirs.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. While Mr. Clapp was on the stand in the hearings with respect to his nomination, before the committee having his nomination under consideration, Mr. Clapp, reflecting, I think, very closely if not altogether, the views of Mr. Lilienthal, stated that it was his view that the Tennessee Valley Authority should forever remain a Government organization, controlled by the United States Government, and that after the TVA had paid back to the Government what the Government had expended on it, it should continue to be controlled by the United States Government and not by any private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct. I do not think Mr. Lilienthal himself will deny that he is in favor of public ownership. He is in favor of the Government doing many things which the rest of us do not think the Government ought to do. A number of years ago he wrote an article in the Harvard Law Review, stating that he thought that policy should be extended, and that Government corporations were the best way to handle it, that they ought to be allowed a wide latitude in the operation of their business, just exactly as a private enterprise might operate its business. I do not think Mr. Lilienthal will deny that he believes in that kind of philosophy. He has a perfect right to believe in it. I am only saying that he is not the kind of man that we ought to give tremendous discretion to push the powers of Government to their very limit.

There have been various quotations from Mr. Lilienthal's remarks. Perhaps the most enlightening book is his book on TVA, entitled "Democracy on the March," in which he sets out his views. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] quoted the statement that—

Our Government, and every government, is and must be a government of men and not of laws.

He further states:

We cannot think of atomic power as apart from those who direct its course and use and define the purposes for which it is put. That is a towering responsibility—

The point is that Mr. Lilienthal thinks it depends entirely on men, and not on laws.

He further states:

As new problems grow to national proportions the people of the country will find it necessary to grant further powers to their Central Government. The trend is unmistakable; it cannot be denied.

He further states:

The policies of lawmaking in the immediate past have been largely regulatory and negative: "This shall not be done." The atmosphere of the legislature has therefore been heavy with this regulatory spirit, expressed in carefully limited responsibility, lack of trust, and forever setting one man to watch and checkmate another.

Mr. Lilienthal favors giving someone else the power to regulate, and not regulating clearly by law which the people can read.

Mr. Lilienthal further states:

The tradition and climate of the skill of management are remote from all such negation. Management is affirmative and initiatory. "This is to be done." It is in the process of defining with skill and sense, what is to be done, and with it the fixing of responsibility for results, with wide freedom for judgment in the managers as to how it may best be done, that you have the essence of the best modern management.

He further states:

To see each citizen thus as a "human being" is easy at the grass roots. That is where more of the functions of our Federal Government should be exercised.

He wants the power of Federal Government extended down to the grass roots, at every point to which the power of the Federal Government can be pushed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is this not a fair interpretation of the passage which the Senator has just read: Mr. Lilienthal was talking against the centralization of government in Washington; while he recognized that there was an inevitable growth due to our industrial revolution and the events in Washington during the last three decades, nevertheless he was speaking for a principle which I believe the Senator would not disapprove; namely, that the dealings of the Government with the people should not be handled from Washington, but only the broad policy should be established by the agencies here, and then it should be administered on a local level.

Mr. TAFT. I think undoubtedly what Mr. Lilienthal wants is to have the Federal Government run everything, and delegate to all its lackeys and satraps throughout the United States power to act as they choose to act under Federal law, and with Federal power behind them. That is exactly what I think this Congress does not want, and, in my opinion, Congress does not want to put that kind of a man in a place where he can push that power to the very limit. Whether it is spread out, dissipated throughout the country, or exercised from Washington, does not make a great deal of difference, because in the ultimate analysis, the power behind the operations is the power of the Federal Government, which operates from Washington.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is that the Senator's final opinion of what Mr. Lilienthal meant, or will the Senator now read a passage from Mr. Lilienthal's writings which indicates that he wants greater and greater power to be administered from Washington, but operating on the local level?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is the whole trend of everything I have read. I think that is what he believes. I do not think he would deny it for a moment. He believes in a constant expansion of Federal power. His statements on that subject have been read. Other statements of his have been read. I do not want to repeat everything that has been said before. That is what he believes should be done. He believes in the decentralization of power only because, in the case of the TVA, for instance, he wants to have it all in the TVA, so that no one in Washington can interfere. But he wants to exercise the power over the local authorities, in defiance of the local and State authorities; and he is there with the Federal law behind him, and he does not want anyone in Washington to interfere with what he plans to do.

Mr. McMAHON. Is not the Senator aware that the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, wished to have all such power centralized in Washington, and was not that bitterly resisted by Mr. Lilienthal because he thought it would result in the concentration of too much power in Washington in the hands of one person or department?

Mr. TAFT. It was bitterly resisted by Mr. Lilienthal because he did not want Mr. Ickes to take that power away from him. In the same way, he bitterly resisted efforts of the Department of Agriculture to operate in the TVA the same kind of fertilizer program and improvement program that the Department of Agriculture operates in every other section of the United States. He bitterly resisted it because he did not want the power to be taken away from him. It is merely a question of whose ox is gored. He had the power, and he did not want it taken from him and placed in Washington. I think the Senator will find that as soon as Mr. Lilienthal is in charge of the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington, he will be in favor of having all the power concentrated or centered in Washington, where he then will sit.

Mr. McMAHON. Without attempting to judge Mr. Lilienthal's motives—the Senator can do as he pleases about that—I take it that the Senator at least would agree with Mr. Lilienthal's opposition to the plan that Mr. Ickes developed at that time, or to the trend at that time. Let us forget his method. The Senator does not disagree with his point of view at that time; does he?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry to say that I did not go into all the details of the controversy. I read Mr. Ickes' statement and Mr. Lilienthal's answer, and that is all I saw. I am not exactly an expert on the details of Mr. Ickes' proposals for the control of power in the United States. Whether I agree or disagree has not the slightest bearing on the question before the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. But the Senator from Ohio is trying to make the point that Mr. Lilienthal is in favor of concentrating all power in Washington. If the Senator chooses to ascribe an unworthy motive to him in advocating that, he may do so; but I have demonstrated to him that when Mr. Ickes tried to have all power over our water and other power resources concentrated here in Washington, Mr. Lilienthal opposed it. Whether his motive for doing so was mean or base is for the Senator from Ohio to interpret to suit himself. At least he will agree with me, I think, that Mr. Lilienthal was opposed to the concentration of power in Washington, which is the point the Senator is trying to make to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. It is perfectly clear; Mr. Lilienthal is on record. He wants one Government corporation after another established. He wants such Government corporations given full power, and to have complete freedom, so far as they can be free from Federal control. Later on I shall point out that he wants the same kind of freedom for the International Atomic Energy Commission. I do not think it is worth disputing, because it is perfectly obvious that that is the kind of man Mr. Lilienthal is. He wants an extension of Federal power, and he would like to exercise the power himself. There is no question that that is his philosophy. I do not criticize it. I think he sets it forth very clearly and effectively. I only point out that that is the kind of man who wants to be put in charge of the administration of a law which confers tremendous power to regulate in some way almost everyone in the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the subject has been covered. That is the reason I decline to yield.

Mr. President, my opinion in this matter has been partly made up perhaps by my acquaintance with Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former president of Antioch College, in Ohio, and now a resident there. No one can talk with Dr. Morgan for any length of time without being convinced of his complete honesty. He probably has had more to do with Mr. Lilienthal than any other man has ever had. He saw him at close range. I intend to quote at different times things Dr. Morgan has said.

On this one subject, in summing up on this same point, Dr. Morgan said this in the record:

> The difficulties that I found in dealing with Mr. Lilienthal were of two kinds. One arose out of his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power.

That is the essence of Mr. Lilienthal's character; and I think it is a very fair conclusion from everything that has happened—"his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power." Wherever he has been that has been his effort. He succeeded, after some time, in ousting Dr. Morgan from the chairmanship of the TVA and assuming it himself. He retained that power for a long time. He is now seeking broader and wider powers, and anyone who has read his report on international atomic energy can only conclude that he would like those powers to go on into a still wider field.

There is another objection to Mr. Lilienthal, besides the fact that he believes in the extension of Government power; but before coming to that I should like to call attention to other respects in which Mr. Lilienthal has pushed the power of TVA beyond what seems to be reasonable and beyond what I think good practice would have required. I mentioned the Department of Agriculture. The minority views of the joint committee which investigated the Tennessee Valley Authority says this on that subject:

> All agricultural activities should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. This Department is well equipped to carry on the work. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture already has an adequate nitrogen laboratory at Washington and has carried on experiments with phosphates. There is no need to try to build up a new regional Department of Agriculture in the Tennessee Valley. To return these agricultural functions to the Department of Agriculture, where they belong, would avoid duplication and waste and result in very material economy in operation, without loss of efficiency.

But Mr. Lilienthal has fought every effort to return any agricultural power to the Department of Agriculture.

On the question of civil service the report says:

> The refusal of TVA officials to recognize the civil-service laws as having any application to the employment and dismissal of employees is another glaring example of TVA's aloofness to Federal law. As a result, "favoritism" of a most vicious type is prevalent. By such system, employees are dependent upon the "favor" of department heads. A feeling of uncertainty and dissatisfaction has been created.

The question of accounting has already been covered largely by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But the minority said:

> TVA has arrogantly defied the General Accounting Office when that agency sought to discharge its statutory duty with respect to TVA. This defiant attitude might be slightly less reprehensible if the TVA accounting technique was of such character as not to require any supervision or control from the General Accounting Office.

It seems to me that that is exactly the attitude we do not want to have in the Atomic Energy Commission. We want a commission operating in cooperation with Congress, endeavoring to carry out the wishes of Congress, and not barring the door, as it has barred the door to military advisers, and as it has barred the door to the joint committee, apparently. At least, from Mr. Lilienthal's testimony we learn that he is very dubious as to how far they can be admitted into the interior consultations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has read from the views of the minority of the joint committee which investigated the TVA in 1938, I wonder whether he realizes that those statements by the minority applied to the TVA at the time when Dr. Arthur E. Morgan was chairman. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HILL. The minority of the joint committee was composed of two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives. Two of those four members of the minority party did not even join in the minority views. Nevertheless, the statements apply, as I have said, to the TVA under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. That was before Mr. Lilienthal ever became chairman of the TVA.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read what was going on before the committee went there:

> Months before the removal of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan from the TVA Board, efforts were made by his colleagues on the Board and their adherents in effect to oust him from active connection with the affairs of the TVA. An order was issued by the general manager to all employees in December 1937, that any information supplied to Chairman A. E. Morgan must be transmitted through the general manager's office, and Chairman Morgan had to ask permission from the general manager to get certain information from TVA engineers. This order was issued after it was generally known that there were sharp differences among the directors of TVA. At about this same time, after Mr. Hoffman had furnished Dr. A. E. Morgan with copies of TVA minutes for use in the Berry Marble case condemnation proceedings, Mr. Fly—
>
> Then the general counsel—
>
> gave Mr. Hoffman instructions to refer all requests from Dr. A. E. Morgan to him before complying with them.

So although Dr. Morgan was Chairman, he was Chairman in name only. The other two members of the Board had taken all power from him and were concealing all information from him.

Mr. President, that majority report was the usual type of whitewash report. The committee was appointed and went there. First of all, it appointed Mr. Francis Biddle as counsel for the committee. Mr. Biddle ran the committee and wrote the report. As a result of his good work in that respect, he was subsequently appointed to be Solicitor General of the United States, and later to be Attorney General of the United States. Subsequently he was dismissed by President Truman. Mr. Biddle was on the inside with the same group of which Mr. Lilienthal was a member; and when that investigation had started, the whole thing was a set-up. It was set up under Mr. Biddle, as counsel. Orders were issued that no TVA employee could talk to any member of the committee.

Every effort was made to hush up and reduce the charges which had been made. Anyone who cares to read the hearings and then read the report of the committee and the minority views will find, I think, that what I have read from the minority views was, practically, not answered or contradicted in the report of the majority, except as to the conclusions which might be drawn from the facts thus set forth in the minority views.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that two members of the minority party did not join the other two members of the minority party in signing the minority views?

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that only one member of the minority party did not sign.

Mr. HILL. If my memory serves me correctly, two members of the minority party did not sign.

Mr. TAFT. There were only four members of the minority party on the joint committee, and three of them signed the minority views.

Mr. HILL. Well, one member of the minority party did not sign; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. Senator Lynn J. Frazier, of North Dakota, did not sign the minority views. He was quite an advocate of public power; and although he was a man of the highest character, I do not think he paid much attention to the whole proceedings, any more than did my then colleague, the late Hon. Vic Donahey, who was a member of the majority.

I may say that the minority views were signed by James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania; Charles A. Wolverton, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey; and Thomas A. Jenkins, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio. I may also say that it is impossible to conceive of anyone less partisan than Mr. JENKINS. He has been a Member of the House of Representatives for many years. He himself was once a miner. He had no particular prejudice against the TVA, but I do not think it is too much to say that he told me that after that investigation he never in the world would think of voting for Mr. Lilienthal for any office under the Government of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio has said that the chairman of that special committee was the then distinguished Senator from Ohio, the late Senator Donahey. If the Senator will examine the hearings I think he will find that Senator Donahey very patiently and very devotedly attended practically all the hearings—not only those held in Washington but also those held in the Tennessee Valley. If there was one man who seemed to be devoted and indefatigable in his work, particularly in that work, it was the late Senator Donahey. Knowing Senator Donahey as I did, and knowing his reputation—he was called "Honest Vic Donahey" in the State of Ohio—I am sure he would never be a party to making any sort of report that was not absolutely fair and square. Of course, I realize there are always differences of opinion; but certainly the Senator from Ohio would not imply that the late Senator Donahey did not do his full duty as chairman of that committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have the highest respect for Senator Donahey. I remember that after he came back from that investigation, he was very uncomfortable in his mind. He had nothing to do with writing the report. He went along with it. Many of us go along with things which we are not prepared to get into a general battle about. I do not think the Senator from Alabama will find that Senator Donahey was a very strong advocate of the present appointee.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make on this question is that, after all, today in the United States there are only a relatively few men who have the philosophy that Mr. Lilienthal has. Even at the time of the TVA investigation, the group was small. Mr. Francis Biddle was one of them. It was a small group of men who largely dominated the so-called New Deal departments in Washington, and have dominated them for the last 8 years—men who have been opposed by the great majority of the Members of Congress, both Democrats as well as Republicans. There has been a little knot of such men in each department, and they have actually run the departments and have brought about the policies which today the people have disapproved. They always were a small group of men, and in my opinion they never received the support of more than 25 percent of the entire membership of either the House of Representatives or the Senate, although a majority often went along with the plans they prepared. Today that group is a still smaller percentage of the total number of people of the United States. Why we have to go to that group to get the chairman for the greatest enterprise this country has undertaken for many years, why we should go to them and give them the unlimited authority which is granted by the Atomic Energy Act, I cannot understand. Why a Congress which today wholly disagrees with the philosophy of this gentleman should vote to confirm him, I do not understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. It has been intimated that Mr. Lilienthal is of an autocratic disposition. Has the Senator from Ohio read the statement of the seven governors whose States are affected by the TVA? I think the St. Louis Post-Dispatch collected the statements of those seven governors, and in that statement they say that the TVA management has been cooperative in every way, shape, and form, and has not sought in any way to override State or local rights.

Mr. TAFT. I read the statement. The more people who sign a statement, the less attention I pay to it, because a large number of signatures usually indicates that the statement has been circulated among various persons, and of course it is easier to sign such a statement than not to sign it.

I must say that in this case more propaganda of that kind has been circulated for Mr. Lilienthal than in the case of any other appointee of whom I have knowledge. Never before have I seen put forward so much propaganda as has been put forward in the case of Mr. Lilienthal. Many people have signed letters, in my opinion without thought, without looking at the record, without going back to find out what went on. Mr. Patterson, the distinguished Secretary of War, testified that Mr. Lilienthal never differed with the War Department, when he had a constant battle with the War Department from the very beginning right through the war as to how power should be obtained, whether it should be public power or private power. Yet that never came to Mr. Patterson's attention, apparently.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may point out that the particular statements of the seven governors to which I have referred were not in a circular letter; there was an original statement from each governor setting forth his views in the matter, and all the governors were high in their commendation of the TVA, what it had done for their States, and the cooperative attitude of the director and the personnel of TVA in dealing with State and local governments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to proceed from a discussion of Mr. Lilienthal's character, to another feature, which certainly has come to our attention in many respects. It is found again in the minority views. I refer to Mr. Morgan's statement. After his one objection that Mr. Lilienthal had a personal desire to be irresponsibly in power, he said:

> But I was known to the world as Chairman of the TVA, and representations were made to the public by the TVA as the TVA, which I considered to be, to use a short word, dishonest.

I do not think I need go through all this record. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] referred to the testimony of Mr. Morgan in the record, and every Senator can read it.

I think I might refer to one or two of the incidents, the Willkie episode, for instance. Mr. Lilienthal first came to Dr. Morgan with a letter which he proposed to issue to the press, a letter he was writing to Mr. Willkie, then head of the Commonwealth & Southern, in which he said:

> Confirming our recent conversation, you do not agree to cooperate with us except on the basis that you have a monopoly of power distribution in all the vast area of the four States in which you operate. The only condition under which you will cooperate is that we do not compete with you in the great areas in the four States in which you operate, and you insist on maintaining a monopoly in that area.

Dr. Morgan raised some questions. He said, "Did Mr. Willkie say that? Is that

his position?" Mr. Lilienthal finally agreed that Mr. Willkie might be summoned, and asked whether it was, in fact, his postion. Mr. Lilienthal agreed to write and asked Mr. Willkie to come.

Mr. McMAHON. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. TAFT. Page 331 of the record of the hearings. Dr. Morgan stated:

At the time of the meeting, Mr. Willkie told me that after sending that letter Mr. Lilienthal called him by telephone and told him that letter was a mistake and there was no meeting necessary.

He tried to put Mr. Willkie off, but he came anyway. He was suspicious of something peculiar, and finally came.

According to Dr. Morgan, the offer of the Commonwealth & Southern was to—

Sell to the TVA its whole system, or the system in any State, or any part of any system in any State.

I quote from the letter to which reference was made:

It will sell part of it now, and part of it later. The fact that some is bought now doesn't prevent other parts being bought later. It will sell any part at any time, with these three conditions: First, that if a part is bought, it shall be a normal part.

In other words, Mr. Willkie did not take the position that was alleged in Mr. Lilienthal's letter, but later Mr. Lilienthal insisted, in any event, on using the statement.

Dr. Morgan points out that Mr. Lilienthal was distinctly misleading the public; that Mr. Willkie's statement was correct; that no such conversation as described previously in the letter took place.

Dr. Morgan cites another case of a letter written by Mr. Lilienthal to Bessemer, Ala. They had an agreement with the Commonwealth & Southern that they would not compete in the same territory, but the Commonwealth & Southern was willing to sell out when they wanted to buy. This letter was sent to the city of Bessemer, Ala., by Mr. Lilienthal:

We are estopped from pushing the extension of power while this agreement with the Commonwealth & Southern is on, but we can accomplish the same purpose in another way. If you will write to us and ask us for questions and ask us for help, we can't refuse those requests. And so long as the initiative comes from you, then we can get the same results without formally violating that agreement.

Here is a public official of the United States saying, "I made an agreement with Mr. X, but if you will push me hard enough, I will violate it." That is the type of general deception in which Mr. Lilienthal apparently has continuously engaged.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that as I read in the record, on page 333, the alleged letter just referred to by the Senator from Ohio, it is the statement of Dr. Morgan as to his interpretation of a letter as he remembered it. It does not purport to be a direct quotation of a letter, but only his understanding at that time of what he thought he had read in the letter some years before.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know anyone who has a better memory than Dr. Morgan, and I would say it was almost certainly accurate.

When the committee went to Knoxville Dr. Morgan told them of this letter, and they tried to get it. I now read from Dr. Morgan's testimony:

The return came back that no such letter was in existence. The man who then had charge of the files was a Mr. Pierce. He had charge of the TVA files.

After the hearing, some months afterward—he left the TVA service—he told me that during that hearing the files were practically empty of any communications from Mr. Lilienthal or Mr. H. A. Morgan. He said: "My material was there, but H. A. Morgan's communications and Lilienthal's communications were just not there. They weren't in the files when they were called for. They just didn't exist in the files."

In other words, when the committee went there, the material was taken from the files, and that was quite in line with the general order issued, that no employee of TVA should talk to any member of the committee.

Dr. Morgan cites another case, that relating to Tupelo, Miss., which was cited as a great example of public power, the statement being that it was making a great deal of money. Dr. Morgan said:

I can't go into detail. If you want to find the detail, you can go to our hearing. In my opinion, that publicity was explicitly misleading and false, for the reason that a very large part of the cost of the development at Tupelo was hidden, did not appear in the records.

And it would take all day to go into that, but you will find some of the records of it. That was a chase that gave me a very clear opinion.

I have already read the portion which indicates the methods pursued to keep Dr. Morgan out of power, the fact that Mr. Lilienthal was constantly undermining him at every opportunity, was constantly going to the President in opposition to him. I think that if Senators will read Dr. Morgan's testimony they will come to the conclusion that Mr. Lilienthal constantly misrepresented to the President the attitude of Dr. Morgan.

In the minority views, to which I have just referred, there are a number of other instances which cover about the same kind of action on the part of Mr. Lilienthal when he was a member of the TVA Board. The minority report says:

We find from the evidence that there was a fundamental reason for the division in the Board. The Chairman—

That is, Dr. A. E. Morgan—

wanted the business of the Authority to be conducted in the open and upon the highest plane of competence and integrity. He wanted candid representations made of the failures as well as the successes of the whole TVA. He objected to indirectness, concealment, manipulation, and indeed to all methods of carrying on the business of the TVA which, while within the pale of the law, could not be justified by a high standard of fair dealing.

On the other hand, the majority of the Board were determined to make a favorable showing for the TVA without always giving all the pertinent facts. They insisted on taking short cuts to make a showing for the TVA, as, for example, Mr. Lilienthal's insistence on using the byproduct theory of allocation to determine the investment in power facilities.

There is an interesting extract from the evidence in which Mr. Lilienthal stated his defense against the fact that he was willing to go through and make a settlement with Berry for the so-called Berry marble deposits, the good faith of which Dr. Morgan questioned. Mr. Lilienthal said:

I tried to make the point * * * that all we could be concerned with were legal rights, that the question of morals and ethics had not been conferred upon us by law, and that as administrators we were concerned only with legal rights.

Mr. BIDDLE. You mean you were not concerned with Major Berry's ethics and morals, is that your point?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes.

* * * * *

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Whatever might be our opinion and my opinion has never been a mystery before the Board as to the proprieties in the matter, but that those were personal matters. Matters of personal opinion and questions of ethics are not submitted to the Government to determine. I never could make that clear and I think there is a fundamental cleavage in philosophy between Arthur Morgan and Dr. H. A. Morgan and myself on that point.

The question was, Were these claims made in good faith, or had the claims been bought for the very purpose of selling them to the TVA? I think it was a proper question. I think it was a reason why they should not settle these claims, which were settled, in my opinion, for a grossly excessive sum, considering the fact that the marble was undeveloped and uncertain, and certainly the question whether or not the plaintiff was acting in good faith was a question to be considered. Mr. Lilienthal says that he has nothing to do with any question of ethics in the Berry case.

There is a more serious matter. Mr. Lilienthal constantly changed the minutes of the TVA after the event; in some cases, many months after the event. The minority views show, and it is not contradicted in the majority report, that Mr. Lilienthal himself admitted the responsibility for deleting paragraphs from the original drafts of two corporate minutes of the TVA Board at a meeting held on November 2, 1933. One of the paragraphs so deleted summarized the negotiations which Mr. Lilienthal had undertaken with the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., for the sale of certain Alabama and Mississippi properties of that corporation to the TVA. These negotiations ultimately resulted in the contract of January 4, 1934, but the minutes of the Board of Directors were not changed by Mr. Lilienthal until some months after the contract of January 4, 1934, had been executed.

Here is a man who goes back and changes the minutes more than a year after they were written, and apparently for some purpose—to prevent an investigation or to prevent an attack on the contract such as was finally made.

Another paragraph deleted from a TVA corporate minute of November 2, 1933, stated that Mr. Lilienthal had consulted

with Secretary Ickes, requesting that immediate action be taken on the applications of Tuscumbia and Sheffield, Ala., for PWA loans to build municipal electrical distribution systems.

Mr. Lilienthal would make no explanation of the purpose of those alterations in the TVA corporate minutes, but merely stated that the Commonwealth & Southern was not prejudiced by the deletion concerning his negotiations with them.

The deletion from the corporate minutes of the summary of his consultation with Secretary Ickes with respect to PWA loans and grants, Mr. Lilienthal admitted, and he testified that evidence of such cooperation between TVA and PWA, in the TVA corporate minutes, could not be used as evidence in a lawsuit between the power companies and TVA, because the trial court had refused to receive any evidence concerning such cooperation and conspiracy. But he obviously removed the minutes for fear they might be used in a later suit. He changed the record, and I think that is very typical of his later attitude.

He is a man who does not care what means he uses to reach the end which he thinks happens to be desirable. So, Mr. President, entirely apart from the question of Mr. Lilienthal's general philosophy of government, it seems to me that his methods, and what Dr. Morgan calls his dishonesty in the sense of being willing to misrepresent conditions to other people to accomplish his end, constitute a sufficient reason to bar our acceptance of his nomination.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio has pointed out about the disappearance of letters from the files, and I should like to ask the Senator if the fact that minutes, which are presumed to set forth what happened at a meeting of the Board of Directors, were changed months after they were made does not check and dovetail with the removal of the letters from the files? It demonstrates very clearly, it seems to me, to everyone who is looking for the truth, that this man wanted to cover up, and so he resorted to any minor tricks which might be within the law in order to prevent a disclosure of the real facts; he wanted to represent things only as he desired others to see them.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct, and I think it shows his desire to have complete power over the operations of any organization of which he is a part. In the event of his confirmation as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I think as soon as that occurs we may expect a repetition of exactly the same kind of thing that was done in TVA.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I would assume that the Senator from Ohio is well acquainted with Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who certainly had a very fine opportunity to become acquainted with the characters about whom we are talking. I wondered if, in his reading of the record, the Senator from Ohio had come across Mr. O'Brian's description of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, upon whose character and testimony the Senator has in large part erected his case. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when Mr. O'Brian was asked about his contacts with Mr. Morgan——

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment. I want to point out that the matter about the minutes was brought out, without Dr. Morgan's cooperation, by the minority members of the committee. It was not denied; and there are one or two other things that do not rest on Dr. Morgan's testimony. However, go ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. In any event, I think the Senator will agree that most of it does on Dr. Morgan's testimony.

Mr. O'Brian said:

> Now, I would simply like to add this touch, that in all my contacts with Dr. Morgan, that I have referred to, I was impressed in every instance with this feeling of his distrustfulness toward everybody, and the fact that he was under apparently great strain and very greatly overwrought. These wrongs had grown in his mind to such an extent that I felt his judgment was colored by it, and that is the criticism that I have to make.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I might say that Dr. Morgan is certainly a distinguished engineer, and all one needs to do is to know him to appreciate that he is honest and straightforward. He is so particular that undoubtedly it is hard for a man like Mr. Lilienthal to get on with him, because he wants to tell the truth, every minute, and he wants everybody else to know it.

Dr. Morgan, as I say, was the president of Antioch College. He was chief engineer of the Dayton Conservancy District, one of the great flood-control projects undertaken in the State of Ohio. He had no difficulty whatever there. He was the chief engineer of the Pueblo Conservancy District, in Pueblo, Colo. He had no difficulty there. He never had any difficulty until he came into contact with a man of Mr. Lilienthal's character.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like the indulgence of the Senate while I read sentences from my remarks on yesterday:

> In assessing the value of that testimony we are not concerned with Dr. Morgan's engineering ability or his executive ability. We are not concerned with the question of whether it was altogether easy for his associates to get along with him. We are concerned with but one question. Our sole concern is this: Was and is Dr. Morgan an honest man? To that question there can be but one answer: Dr. Morgan is transparently honest. From the viewpoint of the man with whom he was having trouble, Dr. Morgan was and is naively honest.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for the quotation, which supports the statement which I made.

Mr. President, I have only one other point to make. I do not purport to pass on or claim even that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or a fellow traveler. I do think that the group of which he was a part took an unduly friendly attitude toward communism. Like Mr. Henry Wallace, they felt that communism was merely another form of democracy, and, as Mr. Wallace often implied, a little better form of democracy than our democracy. I think most of them have seen that that is not the fact, but that was the condition, that was the attitude of many of this group throughout the Government, and it was for that reason that they were soft toward the admission of Communists into Government departments. The fact that many Communists are here is not evidence of Communist ability, Communist aggressiveness; the fact is that we had plenty of people in the Government who thought that communism was just as good as American democracy. Therefore when a Communist came along they did not exclude him, and just as in the TVA, there was a Communist cell for a while, Mr. Lilienthal not doing much about it, so the same attitude existed in the Government until the President of the United States himself recently was forced to issue an order in which he said that now the time has come when we must get rid of Communists. He admitted that many of the departments of government have proceeded to admit Communists. Why? Not because perhaps the heads of those departments were Communists but because they were soft on the subject of Communists, because they did not regard Communists as being threats to the American security. That was exactly Mr. Lilienthal's attitude.

I think that is the only way to explain the report known as the Acheson-Lilienthal report on the subject of international control of atomic energy. It is a very interesting report. Senators will find copies of it on their desks, placed there today by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. I think it is said that many others joined Mr. Lilienthal in this report. That is true. But if Senators will read it, I do not think they can have any doubt that Mr. Lilienthal wrote the report. The others went along with him in the report. The others, for the most part scientists without great experience in the subject of power, without great experience in governmental questions, and inclined at the time to believe that the only solution of the whole problem of atomic energy was in effect to give it away to Russia or any other country that wanted it.

The report in essence proposed that we set up an international atomic development authority, which is described as something as like TVA as two peas in a pod, except it is on an international scale. This atomic development authority is to take over all mines of uranium and thorium; it is to take over all plants; to operate the plants; to conduct all atomic research of every kind, and all atomic manufacture of every kind except some vaguely denatured products at the end of the process which might be left to the individual nations to develop. That atomic development authority was to be substantially independent.

On page 45 of the report, Mr. Lilienthal does recognize the desirability of having it responsible to somebody; he does not know exactly to whom. He says:

> There are many ways of assuring this necessary degree of accountability on the part of the Authority to the nations and peoples whose instrument it will be. Some integral organ of the United Nations, perhaps the Security Council itself, will need to serve as the overseeing body for the Authority. But it could do so in ways generally comparable to those employed by congressional appropriations and investigating committees and the Bureau of the Budget in relation to governmental institutions in the United States.

In other words, he envisages the same independent authority that he had as chairman of the TVA.

> Detailed measures would have to be worked out to assure the proper connection between such overseeing or "accountability" body and the Atomic Development Authority itself.

Of course an international Atomic Authority would be even more independent, I think, than the TVA, because the rather vague Security Council control would be something exceedingly indefinite. Certainly this authority would be completely independent of the United States. It would be so far away from the United States that there would be nothing we could do about it. We would not control the personnel. We would have only one voice among many in deciding what its powers should be, or how they should be changed. We would have only one voice among many in selecting the personnel. As Mr. Lilienthal says in his report:

> One of the important problems will be the question of personnel. It will be of the essence to recruit that personnel on a truly international basis, giving weight to geographical and national distribution.

That means that the great bulk of the personnel would be foreigners so far as we are concerned, and would not be Americans. The head of the organization might be a Russian; he might be a Yugoslav; he might be a Frenchman, a French Communist; or anyone else that the United Nations might conceivably agree upon. We have seen recently that an attack was made on Mr. Trygve Lie. The charge was made that the members of the secretariat or commission which Mr. Lie sent to Greece to look into the Greek problem is dominated largely by Soviet members.

When Mr. Lilienthal has set up this organization, it is to move in and take over all our plants. It is to take over Oak Ridge, Tenn., with 59,000 acres and 49,000 Americans. Apparently it is to take over the Hanford Engineering Works, with 400,000 acres in Pasco, Wash., and take over 45,000 acres at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and a number of smaller plants throughout the United States. I suppose in making the deal we might cut down the acreage somewhat, although if the organization is to conduct the necessary experiments which it is prepared to conduct, I do not see how we can help turning over all this land to an international authority conducted by an international force to operate the plants existing in the United States, or how we can prevent foreigners from other nations having full access to all those plants.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator mind withholding his request until I have proceeded a little further so that I may present a picture of what this international authority would do?

Mr. McMAHON. I will let the Senator himself indicate when he is ready to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I shall yield to the Senator when I have concluded this part of my statement.

Furthermore, this body would have complete regulation of a growing industry in the United States as well as in the other countries throughout the world. The organization would, in effect, have to say what possible activities with some denatured products, if there is such a thing, could be conducted by American business, and under what conditions, and that international check would exist, of course, throughout the United States. That may be necessary. I have some doubt as to whether there is really any field for denaturing.

The whole report is based on the theory that after a certain point of dangerous manufacture the stuff can be denatured, and then other people can have it and use it without any danger to safety. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the hearings said that denaturing is a completely fallacious scientific theory. I do not know whether it is or not.

But in any event, no one can tell the limit to this regulatory power, or what the limitation respecting this international agency may be over the whole subject in the United States outside the actual operation of the plants which the authority takes over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAFT. I shall ask the Senator to wait until I have finished one more point. I wish to present the whole picture.

The other side of the picture is that the Atomic Development Authority would build in Russia, and in other countries throughout the world, plants exactly like our plants. On page 47 the report says:

> In strengthening security, one of the primary considerations will relate to the geographical location of the operations of the Authority and its property. For it can never be forgotten that it is a primary purpose of the Atomic Development Authority to guard against the danger that our hopes for peace may fail, and that adventures of aggression may again be attempted. It will probably be necessary to write into the charter itself a systematic plan governing the location of the operations and property of the Authority so that a strategic balance may be maintained among nations. In this way, protection will be afforded against such eventualities as the complete or partial collapse of the United Nations or the Atomic Development Authority, protection will be afforded against the eventuality of sudden seizure by any one nation of the stock piles, reduction, refining, and separation plants, and reactors of all types belonging to the Auuthority.

This will have to be quite a different situation from the one that now prevails. At present with Hanford, Oak Ridge, and Los Alamos situated in the United States, other nations can find no security against atomic warfare except the security that resides in our own peaceful purposes or the attempt at security that is seen in developing secret atomic enterprises of their own. Other nations which, according to their own outlook, may fear us, can develop a greater sense of security only as the Atomic Development Authority locates similar dangerous operations within their borders. Once such operations and facilities have been established by the Atomic Development Authority and are being operated by that agency within other nations as well as within our own, a balance will have been established. It is not thought that the Atomic Development Authority could protect its plants by military force from the overwhelming power of the nation in which they are situated. Some United Nations military guard may be desirable. But at most, it could be little more than a token. The real protection will lie in the fact that if any nation seizes the plants or the stock piles that are situated in its territory, other nations will have similar facilities and materials situated within their own borders so that the act of seizure need not place them at a disadvantage.

Except that the other fellow will have all the bombs he does not now possess.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that is in substance the plan. Before I proceed to the implications of the plan, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut. I ask him whether I have misstated the plan.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. Of course the Senator realizes that he, and the Communists, the Russians, and Joe Stalin have this in common: Apparently none of them like the plan.

Mr. TAFT. Wait a moment. The plan, of course, was rather substantially changed before the Communists finally turned it down. What they objected to was the surrender of the veto. They liked it all right, so long as there was the veto.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator stated yesterday that there has been considerable change by Mr. Baruch in the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I intend, if I ever obtain the floor in my own right, to answer that contention specifically, and I think accurately. The change which was made by Mr. Baruch was not a change at all, but merely an addition of a political phase of the plan which was not entrusted to the Acheson-Lilienthal Commission.

I ask the Senator if he does not think that this is a good point in the debate for him to outline to the Senate and to the people of the United States—in fact, to Warren Austin, who is advancing this very policy in New York with what he thinks is the support of the United States—what he believes should be our atomic energy policy with regard to its international control. Or does he believe that there should be no policy at all?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I am called upon to develop the whole atomic-energy policy by myself, but I shall be glad to indicate the general ideas which I have on the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator intend to indicate them in this debate?

Mr. TAFT. As to Mr. Baruch——

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator intend to indicate his theories of international control in this debate?

Mr. TAFT. No; I intend to indicate what I think we ought to do. I think we ought to withdraw our offer immediately. That is my belief as to what we should do at the present time.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me get this straight. The Senator feels that we have a complete blunder and a mistake in advancing the proposals which we have advanced in the United Nations; that the declaration which was entered into by Messrs. Truman, Attlee, and King on November 15 was a mistake. That declaration announced that we would have to seek international control. The Senator feels, I take it, that we should rely upon sitting on a stock of ever bigger and better bombs as our protection of the Nation at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that. What I said was that I think we should work out some plan of international control. But I believe that is impossible at present. I think so long as the Russians have taken the position which they have taken—which I think anyone might have guessed they would take—on the whole subject of peace in the world, we had better withdraw the plan at present. I hope that in the future we may be able to devise a better plan.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand the Senator—and I am really trying to get this straight, because I think it is of tremendous importance to the Senate and to the country that we sharply define at least this issue—he would withdraw our plan, and he has no plan to suggest as an alternative at this time, but possibly at some future time he may work out a plan.

Mr. TAFT. I think the atomic question involves the subject of disarmament. The only possible way I can see for us to hope that peace may ultimately come in the world is through a general agreement for disarmament, enforced by military forces sufficiently strong, with the assistance of the majority of the nations of the world, to attack any nation which violates its disarmament agreement, whether it relates to atomic energy or any other limitation on arms. Until that comes, I do not see how we can do anything special with atomic energy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. He is looking for a program. He is looking for a way to handle this problem. Why is it not a sensible program, in view of the Greek-Turkish situation and the world conditions, to return atomic energy to the military forces, where it belongs, and where it should be today? Why is not that the practical thing, and why is it not consistent with what we are asked to do in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of answering the question.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I hope I shall not unduly trespass on his time in making the reply.

The question which is phrased by the Senator from Indiana is one with which I hope to deal a little later in my own time. Let me say this to the Senator: There were two primary reasons why the committee which reported the bill which later became law, and which now governs the domestic control of atomic energy, was impelled to set up a commission——

Mr. CAPEHART. The motives which impelled the committee to take certain action 6 months ago have no bearing today in the light of the present world situation.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me to finish; I do not agree with him.

As I say, there were two primary reasons why the committee was impelled to establish a commission under the terms of the bill which it reported. The Senator must realize that the first reason is one which is imbedded in the traditions of our country. It has been traditional in our history that we are a civilian government. We are not a people who believe in the military exercising any unnecessary authority. The Senator will say, "But it is a necessary authority." I shall now demonstrate to the Senator—at least to my satisfaction, if not his—that it is not necessary.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say this——

Mr. McMAHON. Let me finish, please. In fact, the situation is quite the reverse. Let me say to the Senator, as I stated upon the floor of the Senate yesterday, that unless we succeed in getting an agreement for effective—and note that I say "effective"—international control of atomic energy, America's only defense is the making of more and bigger bombs as quickly as we can.

Mr. CAPEHART. May I——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment, if the Senator will permit me. Military men do not make bombs. They do not make B–36's. They have not been responsible for the invention or development of any great weapon of war in the past century. I will say to the Senator that bigger and better bombs will be made by two classes of people—the nuclear scientists and the engineers who have made the present bombs. The Senator probably was not present last night when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] attacked certain scientists because of their concern over whether or not the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal would be confirmed by the Senate. In harmony with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] he launched an attack upon the scientists and said that they were on a sit-down strike. I do not undertake to defend the scientists. I will say only that if Shakespeare were living and were brought into this Chamber we could not point a gun at his head and say, "Write a sonnet." If Rubens or any of the other great masters of old were living, we could not put them in a room and say, "Paint a picture, and have it done by 5 o'clock."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are a little off the track. I prefer not to yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make reply to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a brief reply.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the able Senator from Connecticut that the Army does not necessarily make bombs and guns, just as I admit that policemen in the city of Washington or any other city do not make guns or ammunition. But the Senator must agree that after the guns and ammunition are made, they are placed in the hands of the policemen, or in the hands of the armed forces. The Senator has stated that some of these days he might be in favor of returning the control of atomic energy to the armed services, if we are unable to establish an international organization satisfactory to him.

Mr. McMAHON. I said no such thing; I said directly the contrary. It is because I am interested in better defense through atomic energy that I wish to put it in the hands of those who have to do the work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator admit that there is today no organization in the world to which it can be turned over, and will the Senator not admit that until such an organization is established the smartest thing to do is to return it to where it was originally, that is, the Army and the Navy?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further. I would favor returning it to a military commission. The Panama Canal was to be built by civilian engineers, but before we got through with it, we said to the Army, "You build the Panama Canal"; and the Army built it. I think the Army is competent to handle a job that civilians are competent to handle. But at the moment I am not discussing that particular question.

The Senator from Connecticut has raised the question as to whether I am opposing the whole plan submitted to the United Nations. I think at the present moment I would withdraw that plan, at least until the world is in a more peaceful state. I want to show, however, that when Mr. Baruch presented this plan on June 14, 1946, to the United Nations, he described in about seven lines what the Lilienthal report was. He said:

I offer this as a basis for beginning our discussion—

He was not accepting it with any tremendous enthusiasm—

But I think the peoples we serve would not believe—and without faith nothing counts—that a treaty merely outlawing possession or use of the atomic bomb constitutes effective fulfillment of the instructions to this commission. It would be a deception to which I am unwilling to lend myself were I not to say to you and to our people that the matter of punishment lies at the very heart of our present security system. It might as well be admitted here and now that the subject goes straight to the veto power

contained in the charter of the United Nations so far as it relates to the field of atomic energy.

The very heart of the problem was ignored by the Lilienthal report. It assumed, apparently, that all we were going to do was to set up an international authority and everything would be wonderful. No man could have had such a belief except a man who naively believes in the good faith of the U. S. S. R. and their willingness to enter a peaceful world. I say that it is Mr. Lilienthal's softness toward communism which led him to make this report, which got us into the position in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio that some of the same questions and misgivings he has expressed were expressed by me in the committee during the early days of the sessions. That will be found by referring to pages 285, 286, and 287 of the hearings. Finally Mr. Acheson made this reply:

That is correct. Now, what I have said several times is that the Attorney General's committee—

He said, "Attorney General's committee," but it was the Secretary of State's committee—

and the Board of consultants undertook to limit what they were doing. In my judgment it is a wise court that limits its own jurisdiction. We undertook to deal with the basic physical problems; what had to be done if you are going to control it. We did not undertake to go into the questions of international law, international finance, the use of international armaments to repress aggression.

Subsequently the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] confirmed the theory expressed by Mr. Acheson.

I wish further to point out that in the so-called Lilienthal-Acheson report, in the letter of transmittal to the Secretary of State there appears this paragraph on page IV:

In our opinion it furnishes—

Speaking of the Lilienthal-Acheson report—

the most constructive analysis of the question of international control we have seen and a definitely hopeful approach to a solution of the entire problem. We recommend it for your consideration as representing the framework within which the best prospects for both security and development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes may be found.

The letter of transmittal is signed by Dean Acheson, Vannevar Bush, James B. Conant, Leslie R. Groves, major general, United States Army, and John J. McCloy, who had been Assistant Secretary of War.

I point out that even Major General Groves, who, we all agree, made a mighty contribution to this effort, recognized that the Lilienthal-Acheson report, in his opinion, furnished the best basis for both international control and domestic control on this subject.

Mr. TAFT. That is an explanation, but not an excuse. This report discusses the question of other nations seizing plants. It discusses the question of security, but it does not say a word about any nation giving up the veto. It does not discuss in any way the manner in which we are successfully to enforce this control, except for one thing. It says that if we build a plant and it is seized, that is a danger signal. Then we will know that the enemy is going to war. Of course we will know it. We will know that they are going to war with the bombs which we let them build and for which we built the plants. The report discusses the question of security, but it wholly fails to realize the seriousness of the problem, the difficulty of an international agency, the fact that an international agency is shot through with every kind of nationality. If Communists can infiltrate into TVA they can certainly infiltrate into any international agency. They will know every detail of the atomic bomb. Those who come into the United States and operate the plants can arrange to blow them up at any time the Russian Government tells them to do so.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. No; I shall not yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

If this international authority happens to be more Russian than American there is no way by which we can restrain them from developing in Russia bigger and better bombs than in the United States. It seems to me that this is the most naive report that could be made by any man who has ever dealt with an international problem, and it can only arise from the fact that Mr. Lilienthal considered communism just another form of democracy. He considered Russia a nation like ours, desiring to reach every possible agreement and eliminating every possibility of war. In that Mr. Lilienthal was completely mistaken.

Let me read what President Truman said this year:

This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples by direct or indirect aggression undermines the foundations of international peace, and hence the security of the United States. The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will.

By the U. S. S. R., of course—

The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

How foolish a report looks which was made about a year ago, when we were proposing not only to turn over all bombs to Russia but to build plants in Russia so that they could construct them to carry out the plans described by the President.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. No; I decline to yield.

That was no new thing at the time Lilienthal made his report. All this violation of the Yalta agreement and all the results on the other nations were occurring at that time.

It seems to me there can be no defense or explanation for that kind of report, that kind of operation, that kind of give-away-the-bomb theory that dominated this report. Why? Because at that time I think every left-wing source of propaganda was to the effect that there could be no possible defense against the atomic bomb; there could be no possible way by which we could prevent Russia from building bombs, and for that reason we must give them the bomb immediately and take in return their promises, which the President says they have not kept, and probably never will keep. That is the naivete of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understood the able Senator from Ohio, he said today that he has absolutely no faith in the position that this country and other countries are now taking toward making an everlasting peace in the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I say that until the situation changes, and certainly until the position of Russia, as described by the President, is changed, we cannot undertake to give them the atomic bomb. That is all I have said, and that is the fact. It is perfectly obvious today. I have talked to scientists, and even they are beginning to say, "We had better withdraw this whole report until we can work out with the Russian Government something better than we have today."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that he would withdraw the report and would do nothing toward establishing an international commission for the control of atomic power. In other words, that means, if we should withdraw from any international organization and cease trying to find a way to control atomic power from being exploited for military purposes, we in the Congress must begin to appropriate more money to build up our defenses in the United States. Under such conditions we serve notice on Russia and every other country in the world that that is exactly what we intend to do. In fact, it is what we must do if we are to defend ourselves in the future.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the Senator what he thinks is the logical conclusion to be drawn from the President's statement about Russia and the fact that we are requested to make a loan to set up armies in Greece and Turkey against Russia?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the President's statement is decisive in character and demonstrates what he believes to be our position with respect to communism in Greece and the possible effect of communism in Turkey. I commend him for his courage in bringing the question before the Senate and the country.

But that hardly answers my question about atomic energy at this time. In talking about the Greek and Turkish loan, as the Senator from Indiana and other Senators have been trying to do. I

think we get away from the real meat of the situation in connection with atomic energy. If we do not try in some way to control atomic energy through some kind of international commission, in my humble opinion there will be a race to see who can make bigger and better bombs, as the able Senator from Connecticut has said. I hope we will not have to come to that, and I am one who still has faith that we shall some day find the answer. As a Senator I am willing to try and to keep on trying to reach some agreement with the other powers of the world to control this death-dealing instrument.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I, too, shall be glad to have negotiations continued, but I would not begin by putting atom-bomb plants in Russia. That would seem to be the limit of all asininity on our part at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true, from the Senator's viewpoint. But he himself must admit that if we are going to control it, we must give and take. We cannot forever keep this atomic secret in our power. If we are to believe the scientists who have testified time without number about atomic energy, 3 to 5 years is the limit before some other nation will get the know-how.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say further, with reference to what I said yesterday, that the final action or general findings and recommendations approved by the Atomic Energy Commission on December 30, 1946, and incorporated in its first report to the Security Council, seemed to be very different, indeed, from the Acheson-Lilienthal report. In addition to dealing specifically with the veto power, there is no mention of an international atomic-development authority. The emphasis is that an international agreement to outlaw the international production and use of atomic weapons is an essential part of any international system of control and inspection. There is no particular suggestion as to what the control is to be; but it is stated that there is to be a unified international system of control and inspection. The ownership of mines of uranium, which was proposed in the Lilienthal report, is expressly denied in the first report to the Security Council. Certainly, anyone who read the Lilienthal report and then read the final agreement would be very dubious as to whether we were not just entering into a general agreement to do what we could to prevent the manufacture of atomic weapons. I do not think what we now have before the United Nations is at all the Lilienthal report, in many important respects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to call my able colleague's attention to the first report of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council, dated December 31, 1946, published by the Government Printing Office. I call his attention to page 20, where the recommendations to the Security Council are set forth as follows:

> 1. There should be a strong and comprehensive international system of control and inspection aimed at attaining the objectives set forth in the Commission's terms of reference.

Then, turning to the next page, at the bottom of the page we find subsection (b), reading as follows:

> Affording the duly accredited representatives of the International Control Agency unimpeded rights of ingress, egress, and access for the performance of their inspections and other duties into, from, and within the territory of every participating nation, unhindered by national or local authorities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator see anything there about operating plants? On the contrary, as I read the recommendations, the implication seems to be entirely against the operation of plants, except insofar as conducting research operations is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator to let me finish reading at that point, please:

> (c) Prohibiting the manufacture, possession, and use of atomic weapons by all nations parties thereto and by all persons under their jurisdiction.
>
> (d) Providing for the disposal of any existing stocks of atomic weapons and for the proper use of nuclear fuel adaptable for use in weapons.

The recommendation primarily made by that group, and with it I agree 100 percent, as I am sure the Senator from Ohio does, is the following:

> Once the violations constituting international crimes have been defined and the measures of enforcement and punishment therefor agreed to in the treaty or convention, there shall be no legal right, by veto or otherwise, whereby a willful violator of the terms of the treaty or convention shall be protected from the consequences of violation of its terms.

That is substantially the meat of what was added by Mr. BARUCH to his proposal.

As I have said heretofore, I raised this same point in the committee. But I believe Mr. Acheson very clearly outlined that the job of the so-called Lilienthal-Acheson committee was not to go into all the details of the security provisions, but, rather, to present a report as to whether it was practicable to control atomic power.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that these two plans are different. Even the Administration, even Mr. Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, who approved it, has moved away from the Lilienthal report, as being impossible. They have at least inserted the provision for the veto power. Furthermore, let me read what the regional report said. This is what Mr. Lilienthal said:

> The facts preclude any reasonable reliance upon inspection as the primary safeguard against violations of conventions prohibiting atomic weapons, yet leaving the exploitation of atomic energy in national hands.

Yet, these recent proposals are based entirely upon control and inspection; and there is far more emphasis on inspection, as I see it, than there is on control, except as each nation agrees that it will renounce the manufacture and use of atomic weapons.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The able Senator from Ohio quoted a very distinguished member of the Democratic Party a few minutes ago. I wonder if he would permit me to quote very briefly a distinguished Member of his party, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], regarding the Lilienthal report and veto. I read from page 287 of the hearings:

> Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make a brief observation at this point to help clear the record.
>
> I happened to have been with the Secretary of State at the front and in the trenches at the particular time this Commission was launched. We had been rather glibly discussing international inspection and control, with the constant question in the back of our heads as to: Just how do you do it when you get around to it? And it is my opinion that the Commission to which you refer was created for the specific purpose, and the purpose only, of answering the physical question: How do you do this thing if you get a chance to do it?
>
> It did not occur to me, I must say, that the absence of a discussion of the veto in your particular report was any reflection on the report. I quite agree with Senator KNOWLAND, as I know you do, that in the final show-down the veto becomes perhaps exhibit A in connection with the entire affair. But I think I would have to testify from my own association with the development of the enterprise that the problem presented you was purely an answer to the question: Can you physically, factually, mechanically, actually, control atomic energy?
>
> Mr. ACHESON. That is the way we understood it, Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is nothing in the new proposal which carries out the Lilienthal idea that we should distribute plants all over the world in order to get security. There is no suggestion in the final proposals to the United Nations that we build plants in Russia. So far as I can see, there are many respects in which the Lilienthal report and everything in it has simply faded into the background, because people knew it was not a conceivable thing, that it was proposing to give away things without any return, that it was creating great danger for the United States instead of less danger. I think anyone who cares to read and note the gradual change in the various proposals discussed in the United Nations will agree with the conclusions to which I have come.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. The Senator is a very good lawyer, I think one of the best in the Senate, but I find it very difficult indeed to follow his argument.

Mr. Baruch, in testifying before the committee, said, speaking of Mr. Lilienthal, after praising him:

> You know, he was one of the authors of the report, which was a very excellent report.

I do not think Mr. Baruch at any time has claimed that he has changed that opinion one iota, except by adding the veto provision.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that Mr. Baruch did it. It was done by the joint committee of all the nations that got up the final declaration and finding.

Mr. McMAHON. My point is that Mr. Baruch has recommended—and I think the Senator has denied it—exactly the declaration of the Lilienthal report. In his speech on June 14 Mr. Baruch advocated:

1. Managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security.
2. Power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities.
3. The duty of fostering the beneficial uses of atomic energy.
4. Research and development responsibilities of an affirmative character intended to put the Authority in the forefront of atomic knowledge and thus to enable it to comprehend, and therefore to detect, misuse of atomic energy. To be effective, the Authority must itself be the world's leader in the field of atomic knowledge and development and thus supplement its legal authority with the great power inherent in possession of leadership in knowledge.

If that is not the Lilienthal report line for line and word for word, then I cannot read the English language.

Mr. TAFT. However, Mr. President, as I pointed out, those words are in a speech, they cover about 14 lines in a speech of 8 or 10 pages, and they say, after we get through with them, "I offer this as a basis for beginning the discussion."

I have heard—I do not guarantee the accuracy of it—that Mr. Baruch said, when he was appointed, that there was a report, and that he was supposed to be bound by it. He did not know, apparently, that he would have to resign at the time, after he had just accepted. He said, "I offer this as a basis for discussion, but"—

Then he goes on for 6 pages of "buts."

I think it is fair to say that the conclusion, to anyone who reads it, is that he did not like it very much.

Mr. President, when we come to the final findings of the committee, which he supported and which he put through, it appears that nearly every feature of the Lilienthal report has disappeared, it is not there. Let Senators read it themselves. I have here the report by the President to the Congress, and on page 190 those matters are covered. Let Senators read it, and then read the Lilienthal report, and see if they think the two have a close connection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has been very kind in permitting interruptions, and I shall not interrupt him again.

There is one paragraph, however, already read from the letter of transmittal sent by the committee, which included General Groves, among others. I wish to read one paragraph from the introduction of the group consisting of Mr. Lilienthal and others who drafted this report, which was later acted on by the Secretary's committee. That group consisted of Mr. Chester I. Barnard, Mr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Mr. Charles A. Thomas, Mr. Harry A. Wynne, and Mr. David E. Lilienthal as Chairman. This is what they had to say about their own report:

We have tried to develop a report that will be useful, not as a final plan, but as a place to begin, a foundation on which to build. Many questions that at later stages should and must be asked we have not touched upon at all. We recognize that securing the agreement of other nations to such a plan will raise questions the precise contours of which can hardly be drawn in advance of international meetings and negotiation. We have not, of course, undertaken to discuss, much less to try to settle, problems of this character. The newly created Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, when its deliberations begin, will deal with many of these in joint discussion. Indeed, this process of joint international discussion is itself an integral part of any program for safeguards and security.

I merely wish to point out that the Lilienthal-Acheson group themselves recognized that this was merely a foundation on which to build in a vast new subject, and was not in any sense meant to be the final word.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the fact must be apparent to anyone who will read the report that they thought it was the final solution, and that Mr. Lilienthal wrote the report and offered the solution. It is a solution which looks perfectly ridiculous today, and yet it is still said it should entitle him to the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the floor longer in this matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator spent much time yesterday and today denouncing the Lilienthal-Acheson report. In fact, his whole discussion has been upon that question, and I have learned some things about the report I did not know before.

The Senator says the report is naive, is simple, and indicates we are giving everything away to Russia under this plan. Can the Senator tell me, if that be true, why Russia does not accept this plan in a hurry?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is because Mr. Baruch came in with a veto power, and they thought the left-wingers in the United States, like Mr. Lilienthal and others, were going to get this thing through without the veto power. They did get Mr. Baruch out of the picture. In that much they were successful. I think Russia's refusal of the Lilienthal report is because they think they can get rid of the veto power. The Senator wants to know why they did not take it. I think it was because they thought they could get the Lilienthal report in its original form, the way Henry Wallace wants it, the way all the left-wingers in the United States want it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is reaching a conclusion based upon his own information. Assuming the Senator may be right with respect to the veto power, my conclusion is—yet I confess it may not be worth as much as the opinion of the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator has equal capacity, equal right, equal mental ability. Certainly I have every respect for his opinion. I think that he is a profound student of international affairs in general.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. That is a gracious tribute by my colleague and rather difficult to live up to, but the point I make, even though it be repetitious, is this—the Senator has taken a lot of time announcing what he calls an ordinary, naive, simple report. I do not undertake to say that Russia failed to agree to the plan or not because of the veto power insisted upon by Mr. Baruch. I have my opinion, the same as the Senator from Ohio. As a result of the attitude of the Russian leaders, following them step by step, until at this very hour, I have no hesitancy in saying Russia would never have approved the plan that had been submitted by the Lilienthal-Acheson report. I regret to say this, but current events cause me to reach that conclusion. I still hope for the sake of the world that Russia will change her views upon this important world problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, from some of the questions which have been asked, there seems to be doubt as to whether or not knowledge of the atomic bomb, the secret of its creation, could be divulged. I think that can be set at rest by Mr. Lilienthal's report. I read a short paragraph from page 54, in which Mr. Lilienthal himself acknowledges that adherence to the plan outlined in the report will divulge information to the world generally upon the creation of the bomb, and I read as follows:

We wish to emphasize that the initial disclosures will place in the hands of a nation (should it be acting in bad faith) information which could lead to an acceleration of an atomic armament program. We do not regard this circumstance as in any way peculiar to the plan recommended in this report. It is inherent in the concept of international control. The adoption of any workable scheme of international control may shorten the time during which the United States has a position as favorable as it is today. We cannot be sure of this, but we must be prepared for it.

I take that language to mean, Mr. President, that in making this report, Mr. Lilienthal says in it that he recognizes that if the plan be followed, the knowledge of the atomic bomb will be revealed to other countries.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that I think the only explanation for this report is a submission on the part of its authors to the theory which spread so rapidly through the United States. I cannot help thinking that it had some foreign support or initiative, but it reached many Americans well beyond the influence of Communist propaganda—the theory that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, there is no way to prevent other people from getting it, therefore we might as well give it away at once. The conclusion was so desirable to the Communist group that I cannot help thinking that to some extent the arguments for it were at least propagandized by them.

We had this tremendous propaganda last year against any military touch apparently of the whole subject of the atomic bomb, and we have it again today. We have the same propaganda today for the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal, on the theory apparently that in some way,

if we go ahead with this policy, there will be a wider distribution of the atomic bomb throughout the world.

Mr. President, all I say is this: We in this body have the responsibility practically of appointing the Atomic Energy Commission. We ought not to confirm anybody we would not be willing to appoint.

There are plenty of people in the United States, in the first place, who are believers in the system of free enterprise, who are believers in the American division of constitutional powers between the legislative and the executive; there are plenty of people in the United States who believe that our form of government can handle the atomic energy question as well as any other question that may confront us.

In the second place, there are plenty of people today who are realists about Russia, who realize that Russia has a form of government which is a threat to the welfare of the world and of the United States, who are not going to be soft toward Russia, and who are primarily concerned with seeing to it that we have absolute and complete protection against any threat from any foreign nation.

Finally, Mr. President, there are plenty of people in the United States who are open, frank, and truthful. I think we can choose one of those people rather than Mr. David Lilienthal.

USE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have a very unpleasant task to perform, in that I must severely criticize one of my colleagues. I know of no other way. I have spoken to my colleague about the matter, but there has been too much of it going on at this session of the Senate and in past sessions.

I hold in my hand a so-called news letter. The title is "Space and Time," a news letter of advertising, published by M. Munro, 46 Clinton Place, Mount Vernon, N. Y., telephone Mount Vernon 73696. The particular letter I have in my hand, at the end of the letter, says:

Subscription rates $15 for 52 issues; $2 for 6 issues; 35 cents a copy.

This is a news letter. Those who publish it do so for profit. One of the able Senators purchased, or rather had delivered to him—I do not know whether he paid for them or whether they were given to him, but in any event he secured a number of copies; I do not know how many.

The publisher informed our committee that he wired for 200. How many of them he mailed out I do not know, but I hold in my hand one copy which was returned to me from the Miles City Star Printing Co., from Miles City, Mont. It says:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Since this so-called news letter openly criticizes you and makes light of your efforts, as well as those of Senator WHERRY, perhaps you would be interested in inquiring how it came to be mailed out postage-free under Senator MURRAY'S frank. Your attention is particularly called to the last page of the letter, on which subscription rates to the letter are quoted.

Is this Government business to which Senator MURRAY has lent his personal frank?

That is signed W. F. Flinn.

Now I shall read some of the paragraphs, perhaps all of them, from this letter. It is No. 515. The date is March 17, 1947. The heading is "Republicans and republicrats of newsprint." Then it goes on to say:

HOMER the CAPEHART performs. Up until the reversal of last November, Montana's Democrat and liberal JAMES E. MURRAY—

And I presume when he says "liberal" he means liberal with the taxpayers' money, mailing out letters that are not permitted, illegally, under the franking privilege—

was the Senate man on newsprint, as chairman of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business. This year it devolved upon Indiana's Republican and foolish HOMER E. CAPEHART, acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Paper Shortage, which is a newly created section of the Small Business Committee, now headed by KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska. MURRAY wanted a return to Government allocation, during the shortage, as the only means of getting over the hump. CAPEHART and WHERRY hoped for a scheme of voluntary rationing by which broad-minded publishers would find ways of making a return to official allocation unnecessary.

To that end they issued a call to the great publishers of America. Last week found these personages in Washington—meeting, of course, in executive session, for such is the concept of freedom of the press held by the owners thereof. It came to nothing. And, in fact, the cause of a return to Government allocation was materially advanced. The event turned out to be a much-needed educational exercise for Senators CAPEHART and WHERRY. They have emerged sadder, quieter, and (possibly) wiser men. Other Senators present included EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana; SPESSARD HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida; and WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, Democrat, of North Carolina.

I might say at this point that we did call a meeting of our committee at which the publishers, the jobbers, and the managers of the newspapers of the United States were invited to appear, and some 100 of them did come before our committee. They came in a spirit of cooperation and they came frankly. They came after I had called a meeting of the committee, at which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was present, and the Senator voted for the holding of the meeting which was described in the paragraph I have just read.

Just what happened to HOMER, S. and T.'s correspondents have not revealed. But HOMER got himself into a comparable difficulty only the other day. He appeared in support of the Bulwinkle bill, which would exempt railroads from the Sherman Act—

I have not appeared before any committee in respect to the Bulwinkle bill—

and suffered a turn of the tables when it was revealed that as a shipper, in tougher times than these, manufacturer CAPEHART had complained to the Department of Justice about railroad rate-fixing in violation of the law.

That is simply an unadulterated lie. I never had thought of complaining, much less actually complaining about such a thing.

For KENNETH WHERRY the education process was more direct. He is an honest, if stumbling and myopic man.

Myopic, I understand, means nearsighted.

When the executive session was drawing to its dismal close, this Nebraska master of bombast pounded the table in the following fashion: "As you gentlemen all know, I did my part to eliminate controls, both of OPA and the CPA, but we'll have to return to those controls if you gentlemen cannot find some way of guaranteeing newsprint to the little papers." Spectators would have rubbed their eyes—if there had been any alert enough to sit up and rub their eyes over anything—over the spectacle of KENNETH WHERRY almost emerging as a responsible Government official.

Wendell Berge killed Cock Robin. The "free enterprising" Senators have little use generally for that guardian of free enterprise, the Antitrust Division, but WHERRY, CAPEHART, et al., had even less use for the Division after Wendell Berge, its head, contributed his wisdom to the executive session last week. In general, the idea proposed was that each big publisher contribute a stated percent of his paper as a "pool." This would be administered by regional councils of publishers who would allocate paper to distress cases as they saw fit. Naturally the publishers turned to Berge, who had been invited in, for his opinion on such a pooling arrangement. And Berge laid the scheme low. "I would be less than frank," he stated, "if I did not tell you what I think with respect to this suggestion. To begin with, no matter how praiseworthy its purpose, it is beyond the power of any official of the Antitrust Division to confer immunity from Federal prosecution. It would also appear to be likely that publishers would leave themselves open to treble damage suits under the Sherman Act by paper users who felt they were discriminated against."

Now I must say in all fairness that I have read the transcript of the record, and Mr. Berge made no such statement.

As Berge talked, relief spread over the faces of big publishers. They didn't want to give up any newsprint. They were quite happy that the Capehart-Wherry plan looked so illegal that it appeared inadvisable even to attempt it.

There is no truth whatsoever in that statement.

Where does MURRAY come in? Senator JAMES E. MURRAY knows more about newsprint, of course, than all his Republican and "republicrat" colleagues put together.

I again want to say that likewise he knows more about mailing documents illegally under his own personal frank than any of the leading Republicans or "republicrats."

Last week end found him chuckling to himself. Though a member of the Capehart subcommittee, he had not attended the secret session. He was letting the boys hang themselves on any convenient protruding gibbet of fact. Meanwhile he is busy preparing a bill to put newsprint back under the Government allocation. It is a difficult bill to write because MURRAY would be the last to want to freeze out prospective new ventures as was done in wartime.

Even the Antitrust Division fits more definitely into the picture than was indicated by last week's hit-and-run hearing. It is

known that several of the more flagrant cases of squeeze are now being investigated by Justice operatives. The standard condition is that the big mills have been tied up in long-term contracts with the big publishers. By reason of poor judgment, folly, or coercion, these contracts were generally signed at very low rates—$60, $70, and $80. Today the great bulk of newsprint sells at these rates under these contracts. Examples: The Washington Star beat the parade and won a favorable contract with Finnish suppliers and now sells its excess to the Washington Shopping News on condition that the latter take no national advertising; the Los Angeles Daily News beat the competition to a $69 Norwegian contract and now resells its excess to its LA competition at fancy fees. Meanwhile, there is a free market for newsprint at from $200 to $300 a ton. It all provides an interesting condition in which the jurisdiction of Justice or the applicability of the Sherman Act is unproved.

Saving the Senators' face. Though the above was the actual outcome, it should also be noted here that the conferees put the exact opposite interpretation on it in an official statement issued Friday, March 14. It read as follows:

"This group of newspaper publishers unanimously decided that they will undertake, so far as they possibly can, to have the local publishers' associations, which includes the regional, State, and city associations, examine all cases of distress of newspapers of general circulation, which includes weeklies as well as dailies, under section 520 of the Postal Laws and Regulations and do all in their power to see that they are enabled to continue to publish. As to other publications which are classified under section 521 of the Postal Laws and Regulations they are appointing a committee to investigate the situation and that committee will report back to this Senate subcommittee in 10 days."

The letter continues:

The committee mentioned above follows—

The names of those present are listed.

The letter then proceeds to give the testimony of a Mr. Lopez. Then there is a page of other matter which is not pertinent to the newsprint business. I read the concluding paragraph of the letter:

RADIO COUNCIL A STILLBIRTH?

One morning last week the word "czar" was suddenly front-paged as the suggestion of the Broadcasters Advisory Council (see S & T, last week). Next day Standard Brands and others were reported pulling out. It appeared that the pitiless limelight of openly exercised authority was too much for the Madison Avenue boys, who were not only in love with their money but with the way they made it. They refused to be a party to setting up a "radio Will Hays," refused to see the handwriting on the wall, which the Daniels of responsible broadcasting have been vainly trying to interpret to them. Though the outlook looks dim for progressive radio, there is nothing to prevent the broadcasters—plus such forward-looking advertisers as General Foods, Lever, et al.—from going ahead with their plans, naming their "czar," paying him his fee, and letting him whip the hucksters into line. The logical czar—Morris Ernst.

M. MUNRO.

Subscription rates: $15 for 52 issues; $2 for 6; 35 cents a copy.

As I stated in the beginning, that letter was franked, sent out at the taxpayers' expense, by one of our colleagues in the United States Senate.

There is a shortage of newsprint. Everyone knows it. We have been trying to help solve the problem. We have been trying to do a sincere, conscientious job. In every step we have taken from the very beginning we find persons such as this, as well as members of the old staff of the Senate Small Business Committee, continually sniping at our heels, continually interfering with our work. Now we find that the document which I hold in my hand has been mailed out under frank by a member of the committee.

I spoke to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] about it. He told me that he knew nothing about it. His answer is that a member of his staff ordered a certain quantity of the document which I hold in my hand. A quantity came into his office and was mailed out.

I ask the question, How much more of this is going on? I have reason to believe that literally thousands if not millions of pieces of literature have been mailed out of Washington under the franks of Senators and Representatives, at the expense of the taxpayers. That, in my opinion, is illegal. I bring this matter to the attention of Senators in order to protect the integrity of the United States Senate, in order to protect the integrity of the franking privilege of United States Senators and Representatives.

To me this is an unpardonable sin. I dislike very much to refer to this, but I cannot permit it to go unchallenged, because if Members of the United States Senate permit the misuse of their franking privilege for this sort of thing, it will be misused in other instances. Why any Senator or any Senator's staff should mail out a private letter, one which is published for profit, one which at the end of it contains an invitation to send money for subscriptions, is beyond me. I think it is an unfortunate situation. I do not like it. In the first place, the body of this so-called letter is not according to the facts. It is untrue. It is propaganda.

I may say for the benefit of the Senate that we are going to subpena Mr. Munro. We are going to bring him before our committee and ask him to bring down his mailing list showing the persons to whom this letter was mailed. We are going to find out where he received his information, which is so utterly unreliable. I find from reading the letter that there are very few facts, if any, stated therein.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know who this man Munro is, other than what the Senator has told us?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that he is a writer. As I have just stated, we are going to subpena him before our committee. We are going to place him under oath and get the truth out of him, because there is too much of this thing going on.

I also have before me an account of the meeting described in the letter. That account was published by one of our columnists. It certainly misses the facts, as we say in Indiana, by at least a mile.

There is too much of this sort of thing going on, both on the Democratic side and the Republican side. Too many letters having no basis of fact are being sent throughout the United States. One of the reasons I bring this subject to the attention of Senators is that I wish to know whether Members of the Senate and of the House have sufficient courage to put a stop to this sort of thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that this literature was never incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon during the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] mention was made of the fact that Mr. Lilienthal was a high-handed autocrat. Those probably were not the exact words used, but that was the implication. I mentioned a series of statements which had been obtained by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from the seven governors in the region affected by TVA, dealing with their relations with the management, the directors, and the personnel of TVA, the benefits obtained from it, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks this entire page from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY GOVERNORS REPORT ON TVA—RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF THE STATES, THEY SAY, HAVE BEEN STRENGTHENED BY OPERATIONS OF THE AUTHORITY—EXECUTIVES INTERVIEWED BY THE POST-DISPATCH ACCLAIM WIDESPREAD BENEFITS OF PROJECT AND PRAISE THE COOPERATIVE SPIRIT OF ITS REPRESENTATIVES

The governors of the seven States which comprise the Tennessee River Valley, interviewed by the Post-Dispatch, are unanimous in acclaiming the benefits which the Tennessee Valley Authority has brought to their respective States. They deny the two charges most frequently made against TVA, the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and regional authorities in general—that such a Federal agency is a "super-State" which violates States' rights, and that it robs the States of tax revenues. They also testify unanimously to the cooperative spirit of the agency and its avoidance of high-handed methods and

agree that the rights and interests of the States, on the over-all balance, have been strengthened by TVA's operations.

The governors, interviewed at their State capitals by Harry Wilensky of the Post-Dispatch staff, were asked for frank statements of what is good and what is bad about TVA. Their statements follow:

BY PRENTICE COOPER, GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"The people of the United States are entitled to development of their country's natural resources. The only instrumentality capable of effectively developing a great river valley is the Federal Government.

"TVA benefits not just a region but the country as a whole. The agency is justified from the standpoint of national defense alone. Our country needs to develop great power resources in the interior, where installations are less vulnerable to attack than in coastal regions.

"TVA already has effected tremendous savings in flood control, and will provide extended protection after the war, when additional dams are constructed and reservoirs are operated for this purpose. National commerce has benefited from improvement of the inland waterways and cheap transportation rates.

"People throughout the Tennessee Valley are enjoying low electric rates which the private companies used to tell us were 'fantastic and impossible.' Our farms have been electrified, and rural life has been made more profitable and enjoyable. You will notice that, in speaking of TVA benefits, I have placed several things ahead of cheap power. Power development is only one of the phases of this regional plan.

"I have heard the argument that a regional authority centralizing control over a major drainage basin interferes with States' rights, and I consider it an example of cloudy thinking. It comes from failure to recognize what is a natural field for the Federal Government. From the beginning of this Nation, development of natural resources has been considered a Federal field.

"I believe in upholding States' rights. I have served as head of the Southern Governors' Conference, and I drafted the resolution, which was unanimously adopted last year at the national conference of governors in Columbus, Ohio, calling for strict guarding of States' rights against Federal encroachment. During my 6 years as governor of Tennessee, I certainly have had ample opportunity to study TVA, and I can say that the rights of this State and its citizens, far from having been restricted or violated by activities of this Federal agency, have been enlarged through enriched opportunities.

"To those who contend that TVA eliminates large areas from local taxation, let me say that these taxes have been more than replaced in Tennessee by TVA contributions, both in the form of direct compensatory payments to the State treasury and in indirect benefits.

"TVA has proved an uplifting, progressive, civilizing influence on our people, and whatever opposition once existed in Tennessee has completely disappeared. The agency represents one of the best investments ever made with taxpayers' money. It would be little short of a crime if the benefits of such unified regional planning were not extended to other regions with undeveloped resources. The Missouri River Valley is only one of the regions capable of such development. We would like to see our Cumberland River Valley similarly developed.

"PRENTICE COOPER.

"NASHVILLE, TENN."

BY J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"I have found TVA to be most cooperative, and have only praise for the agency's operations in this State.

"In distributing fertilizers for soil improvement tests on more than 5,000 North Carolina farms, TVA has worked with State and county agencies. All the county farm agents with whom I have talked have commented on the fine service and the cooperative spirit of this Federal agency, which is free of arbitrary methods.

"Minerals research has been carried on in cooperation with State agencies, including work on kaolins, vermiculite, olivine, and mica. Experiments in the TVA ceramic laboratory at Norris Dam have increased use of North Carolina pottery clays. Whenever we have a problem pertaining to minerals, we find TVA invariably ready to lend a helping hand. The agency has agreed to staff and equip a laboratory for research on clays which we are erecting in Asheville.

"New and improved farm machinery is now in use in North Carolina. These improvements include a barn hay drier and a small trailer thresher developed by TVA; the trailer thresher is manufactured by a North Carolina firm.

"I am a strong believer in States' rights, but TVA has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State. In building Fontana Dam, for example, it was necessary for TVA to pond a highway. The agency agreed to build a satisfactory substitute road and also to extend a park area. There was nothing arbitrary about this, the whole thing being arranged through amicable negotiations.

"Swain County has been deprived of a large part of its taxable land values by ponding for Fontana Dam, it is true, but this loss has been largely offset by TVA payments in lieu of taxes. Certain TVA revenues are paid into the State treasury, and this money is distributed to the affected counties on the basis of a formula recognized as equitable and satisfactory.

"My only complaint about TVA is that power generated in North Carolina is used by factories located mainly in other States. I would like to see the Federal Government place more war industries in this State, but I cannot hold TVA responsible for the Government's policy in this regard.

"To sum up, North Carolina has found TVA to be thoroughly competent and cooperative, and public sentiment in the State is highly favorable.

"J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON.

"RALEIGH, N. C."

BY COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR., GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"Only a small part of Virginia is in the Tennessee River watershed, and TVA has no construction projects in this State. Our experience with TVA has been principally in soil conservation work. In this field the Federal agency has made a notable contribution, and farmers in southwest Virginia are enthusiastic about it.

"Virginia has many test-demonstration farms using TVA phosphate fertilizers. I am told that the State extension service, reporting results on 98 farms after 8 years, showed a 30 percent increase in farm income based on 1935 prices, 40 percent increases in crop yields and carrying capacity of pastures, a 25 percent increase in livestock, and a 20 percent increase in labor efficiency.

"TVA has provided millions of seedlings for planting on eroded acres, and has established selective cutting demonstrations on farm woodlots.

"TVA operations in Virginia have not resulted in any encroachment on State rights. Of course, impairment of State rights might develop in the long run, and is a possibility to be borne in mind. But to date there has been no such impairment.

"Virginia has enormous coal deposits at the expense of which hydroelectric power projects may be organized. I do not know whether such hydroelectric projects, financed with tax money, really provide cheaper electricity. It is a moot question, and TVA production of power was the subject of considerable controversy before the war thrust most other considerations into the background.

"COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

"RICHMOND, VA."

BY SIMEON S. WILLIS, GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"TVA's work in Kentucky centers around the gigantic Kentucky Dam, $110,000,000 structure controlling the Tennessee River near its mouth. The dam, designed to extend the navigation channel 184 miles upstream and to reduce flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, is nearing completion.

"The operational test for TVA in Kentucky is yet to come. My experience with the agency during 1 year in office has been confined largely to the building stage. I can say that during this period there have been no conflicts between the State and the Federal agency. As far as I know, there were no land controversies in preliminary work on the big dam.

"There is no reason why TVA should not be able to operate without encroaching on States' rights. The idea underlying the regional valley authority is sound, and it is perfectly reasonable for State and Federal Governments to work together to realize all the varied advantages accruing from unified control of an entire drainage basin.

"Of course, something has to be done to compensate local governmental units for loss of revenue in taxes on property taken over by TVA. The agency recognizes this, and has made substantial payments in lieu of taxes. I have only a preliminary report on these payments at present. The subject is under study, and is a matter for future development.

"Anything improving the home life and the income of farmers naturally is welcome. TVA has numerous test-demonstration farms in Kentucky, and has provided tons of phosphate and nitrate, with the result that there have been increases in net farm sales and livestock carried, and a reduction in labor required. To encourage sustained-yield forest practices, selective cutting demonstrations have been established on Kentucky farm woodlots. Municipal and cooperative systems supply TVA power to a number of Kentucky consumers.

"Development of Kentucky Lake, which will have a 2,000-mile shoreline, should provide a popular recreational area. TVA has transferred 9,000 acres of land to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for inclusion in the Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge.

"SIMEON S. WILLIS.

"FRANKFORT, KY."

BY CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS, GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"At the inception of TVA 11 years ago, I publicly stated that I considered this the greatest experiment in empire building this Nation ever had undertaken. I have had no reason to change that view.

"Under the leadership of David E. Lilienthal, TVA chairman, the agency has kept free of politics. Not only that, but TVA has

been careful to work with our State agencies and local communities. In its far-reaching soil improvement experiments, TVA has cooperated with the State extension service, and in developing industry it has worked with chambers of commerce and other local groups. There has been no question of a Federal agency coming in and riding roughshod over the State and local agencies.

"TVA's fine record has impressed business, agriculture, and labor alike. In recent years I have found no opposition to TVA. Conducted as it has been conducted, with vision and regard for local agencies, it has made a tremendous contribution to public welfare.

"Taxation is the major potential field of conflict between State and Federal rights. In this connection I should like to point out that the Federal agency makes an annual contribution to the State in lieu of taxes, appraising the value of lands taken over and making a contribution from its power earnings. Last year TVA contributed $447,869 to the State treasury in lieu of taxes. In addition, it makes a settlement with each city and county affected on an ad valorem tax basis.

"Taking into account what TVA has done in improving flood control, navigation, power distribution, agriculture, cattle raising, dairying, soil conservation, and home life in general, I can say that the State has gained immeasurably more through service to its citizens than it has lost in mere taxes on lands taken over by the agency.

"CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS.

"MONTGOMERY, ALA."

BY ELLIS ARNALL, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"The only complaint I have regarding TVA is that its influence has not permeated this State further. Activities of this agency have been of great benefit to the people of Georgia, and we would welcome extension of TVA operations from the northern to other sections of the State.

"There once was talk about the danger of such a Federal agency wrecking local government and upsetting the tax structure. Such fears have proved unfounded. There has been no encroachment on States' rights, and I believe the States actually have received more money under the TVA system of payments in lieu of taxes than they did before the Federal agency went into operation.

"If we are going to industrialize the South and the West, we must have wider distribution of electric power. I might add that privately owned utilities have benefited from the advent of TVA, having been stimulated to render more service, with the result that their profits increased.

"TVA has been particularly active in cooperating with Georgia institutions in programs for development of the State's resources. Extensive work has been done in developing a flax-growing and processing industry with the Georgia School of Technology. In cooperation with several State institutions, TVA was instrumental in setting up 30 community dehydrators in 1943 as a first step toward complete community food-processing plants.

"This has been done in addition to rural electrification, establishment of test-demonstration farms, erosion control, forest-fire control, and selective cutting demonstrations for better utilization of forest resources. The mountain lakes TVA has created in north Georgia have given marked impetus to our developing tourist industry.

"People in all walks of life—business, agriculture, and labor—have benefited from operations of this agency and are grateful for TVA.

"ELLIS ARNALL.

"ATLANTA, GA."

BY THOMAS L. BAILEY, GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"Mississippi was the first State in which TVA power was distributed, commencing with Tupelo early in 1934. I was a member of the State legislature when this development was proposed. I supported this, as well as subsequent TVA measures.

"We are largely an agricultural State, and any program—Federal or private—designed to bring electric power to rural sections is definitely a step forward in the development of the State. The life of our people has been greatly enriched by TVA and the Rural Electrification Administration, the development and extension of cheaper electricity having proved sound and wholesome from every point of view.

"Use of electrical appliances has lifted many of our burdens. In the northeastern part of the State we are milking cows, pumping water, cutting wood, refrigerating food, and giving decent light chiefly with TVA power. Better refrigeration means not only a saving of food but improved health, while the electric pump, tank, water system, and sewage-disposal facilities are likewise of incalculable value to public health. These vital things we owe largely to TVA and to the power companies operating in our State.

"I do not feel that the role played by this Federal agency in Mississippi has constituted any encroachment on our State rights. We have cooperated with TVA, and it has cooperated with us and our State agencies. The result has been satisfactory.

"Development of cheaper electricity in other sections of the country, either through Federal agencies or private companies, where feasible and practicable, is in the interest of the Nation's welfare. In addition, such development would help provide jobs for returning service men and women and war workers, at the same time encouraging resettlement on the farm by giving to farm life the many blessings which would result from the use of electric energy.

"THOMAS L. BAILEY.

"JACKSON, MISS."

DECATUR (ALA.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRAISES OPERATION OF TVA

DECATUR, ALA., December 30.—Deep-water navigation has reduced freight rates, commerce moves on the bosom of the river and industry hits top speed on the shores of the stream. Farm yields are increasing on smaller acreages since the river is controlled by a series of dams and millions of folks in the Tennessee Valley have all sorts of confidence in the days that will follow the war. They foresee continued industrial growth, full-scale development of water transportation, improved and continually diversifying farming methods.

This is the opinion of John A. Caddell, president of the Decatur Chamber of Commerce, who has watched the city of Decatur grow from 14,000 to 25,000 people since TVA started 11 years ago. Continuing, Caddell said:

"The Federal Government wisely decided to control the Tennessee River, now the only controlled river in the world. The several millions of people in the valley decided to make the most of new opportunity, are capitalizing upon low-cost transportation, low-cost power, and are practicing scientific farm development. The fundamentals were provided through TVA, the people are doing the work. TVA helps when called upon, does not direct, and when you call on TVA, you'll find the officials right here in the valley living with and working among our own people day by day."

TRANSFER OF REMOUNT SERVICE FROM WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to offer some bills and to make brief comments on them.

The first bill I wish to offer is a companion bill to the bill introduced by Mr. CASE on the House side, H. R. 2868. I am introducing it for the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] in behalf of himself, myself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

This bill seeks to save the Remount Service presently operated by the United States Army and which we are given to understand is about to be brought to an end by the Army, and it proposes to transfer the Remount Service from the Army to the Department of Agriculture under certain conditions in accordance with certain understandings as set forth in the bill.

Of course I think it is very important to the horse breeders of America that the Remount Service be saved. I think it is most regrettable that it is not to be continued, as I understand it is not, under the Army. It has served over the years to the great benefit of the horse-breeders of America. In fact, I know of no other one thing which has so greatly improved the blood line of American horses than has the Army Remount Service. It is true, as the Secretary of War tells me in a letter which I shall shortly introduce into the RECORD, that the Army intends to discontinue the Service because of the fact that Army operations have been practically entirely mechanized it is very difficult to justify further expenditures of military funds for remount purposes.

I do not entirely agree with the Secretary of War, because there has been set up under the Army over the years a system of records and personnel and knowledge of the remount problems which, in my judgment, will result in a more economical spending of the money which goes into the Remount Service if left with the Army than will be the case if this Service is transferred to any other department, even including the Department of Agriculture.

However, in our bill we have sought to assure the greatest of efficiency and economy in the administration of the Remount Service if and when it is transferred to the Department of Agriculture, by providing that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by agreement, enter into mutually satisfactory arrangements for the transfer of the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture, including the records and even personnel. It should be provided that the Department of Agriculture shall be able to make use of the highly qualified personnel of the Army which really has grown up with the Remount Service and developed it to its present fine standing.

The need for the Remount Service has not come to an end simply because the

Army has mechanized itself. There is still a great need throughout our country for improving the blood lines of our horses for domestic use. Therefore, I think it a very important service that ought to continue to be rendered by the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point a letter which I have received from the Secretary of War which leaves no doub as to the apparent intention of the War Department to dispense at an early date with the Remount Service.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 25, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have your letter of March 19 on the horse-breeding program. I have also read the letter from your constituent and I am returning it to you.

The need for horses in Army operations has virtually disappeared, due to the airplane, tank, truck and other advances in mechanization. This being the case, the continued expenditure of War Department funds for maintenance of the horse-breeding program has become an expenditure that cannot be justified or defended. It has been plain enough that unless some other agency or branch of the Government was willing to assume this activity, by transfer of the program from the War Department, the War Department would be obliged to terminate it.

An effort was made last year to transfer the program, with the property, funds and personnel pertaining to it, to the Department of Agriculture, by agreement between the two Secretaries and by Executive order of the President under the First War Powers Act. As I understand it, the Attorney General has recently ruled that the suggested transfer cannot be made under the First War Powers Act. There remains the possibility of a transfer by Executive order of the President under the Reorganization Act, but I am informed that the Department of Agriculture has come to the conclusion that it does not believe it should take over the horse-breeding program as now conducted by the War Department.

The impression has been prevalent that this program does not cost the Government any money, the thought being that it is on a self-sustaining basis. This impression is entirely erroneous, the program requiring an expenditure of Government funds in the neighborhood of half a million dollars a year.

Under the conditions the War Department has directed that steps be taken to terminate the program. I see no other alternative.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say again, as I have said to the Secretary of War, that I think it is a mistake to transfer the Remount Service out of the War Department into the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, but if it is a choice between dispensing with the Remount Service entirely or transferring it to another department of the Government, then I think our bill is a most appropriate one. Under such circumstances it ought to be vested in the Department of Agriculture.

I sincerely hope that both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of War will proceed by mutual agreement, in acordance with such terms and conditions as are set forth in the bill, to work out a satisfactory arrangement, if this bill passes, as I hope it will, so we can save this very important service to the horse breeders and the farmers of this country.

I shall not burden the RECORD with the large amount of mail which I have received and which some of the other sponsors of this bill have received in support of the Service from the farmers and horse breeders of the country. I do want to say for the RECORD that Congress can be assured that the horse breeders of this country are vitally interested in seeing to it that the Remount Service is continued either under the War Department or under the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have incorporated in this part of my remarks the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1034) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. MCCARRAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interests of economy and efficiency, the records, property, real and personal, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947 Prior to that date, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a written agreement on the property and the personnel covered by this transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to receive the property transferred by this act and is directed to administer it in such manner as he deems will best advance the livestock and agricultural interests of the United States, including improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States; and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary. He is authorized to acquire breeding animals by donation, exchange, or purchase, and to dispose of surplus or over-age stock from time to time by public auction. Proceeds from such sale, or from a share in breeding fees collected by persons with whom breeding animals are placed, shall be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War may detail to the Department of Agriculture, from time to time, such military personnel, including veterinarians in the Medical Corps, as he may determine with the Secretary of Agriculture to be desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act or to safeguard the interests of the United States. Retired personnel of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, employed by the Department of Agriculture, for the purposes of this act only, may be paid at a rate, which together with their retired pay, shall not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture such funds as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority of the War Department to conduct a remount breeding program as set forth in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 245) and to accept donations of animals for breeding purposes, insofar as it relates to horses (44 Stat. 1095), is hereby abolished. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

ACQUISITION OF HOSPITAL AT CAMP WHITE, MEDFORD, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I introduce a bill which seeks to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility of the Veterans' Administration.

I do not think that it is sound economy for us to proceed as we have already proceeded too far in dismantling some facilities in this country which have cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars and which are now being dismantled for salvage and junk purposes, when investigation will show that there is still a great need for those facilities. I predict, Mr. President, that after we finish dismantling many of them it will be only a matter of a short time before we shall be called upon to appropriate additional funds to build identical facilities, or at least facilities, to serve the same purposes that some of these facilities which are about to be dismantled could serve.

In Medford, Oreg., at Camp White, we have a very fine hospital plant, a plant which should be used, in the judgment of the two Senators from Oregon, for veterans' purposes. We fully realize that it is the program of the Veterans' Administration, as far as concerns hospitals that call for the immediate attention of patients by way of surgery, and service of a so-called clinical character, to seek to locate such hospitals near metropolitan areas easily accessible to the veterans. We have a rather large number of veterans who do not need that type of hospitalization. We know that there are several thousands of veterans who are suffering from various neurotic disorders, types of battle shock, and psychological upsets, who need to be placed in domiciliary facilities for some time, where there can be a maximum of freedom and yet treatment and supervision and care by the Veterans' Administration.

Rather than see the great hospital at Camp White dismantled and junked at financial returns which will not begin to equal the great cost that the taxpayers have put into the site, we are proposing that it be turned into that type of a domiciliary hospital or resident hospital which will take care of the veterans who need that sort of care during their rehabilitation period. We think the proposal is a very economical one and will save in the long run a great many thousands of the Federal taxpayers' dollars. Hence, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the body of the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1035) to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility

by the Veterans' Administration, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to acquire from the War Assets Administration the tract of land with improvements thereon formerly used for hospital purposes at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and known as Camp White Hospital, and to operate and maintain thereon a facility for domiciliary care for veterans.

PROMOTION OF SCIENCE, ETC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate bill 526 to promote the progress of science, to advance the national worth, prosperity, and welfare, promote the national defense, and for other purpose.

The amendment which I am offering is the result of efforts of a considerable number of educators in my State and in other States who have asked me to introduce it. I have received a letter from the president of the University of Oregon, Dr. Newburn, pointing out to me the desirability of seeing to it that Senate bill 526, known as the science bill, is amended so as to assure to our land-grant colleges and to our colleges west of the Alleghenies at least a proportionate share and a fair share of the funds which are to be made available under S. 526 for scientific research purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the amendment in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, viz: On page 15, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be appropriated among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census; and the amounts so apportioned to each State shall be expended only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects, but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless such institution submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), an additional amount of not less then 25 percent shall be expended in the facilities of nonprofit organizations without regard to the above limitations relating to State quotas or the tax-supported character of the organization. In meeting the requirements of this subsection, the Foundation may take into account whatever funds may be expended by it for facilities to be operated by the land-grant, tax-supported, or other nonprofit organizations, even though the title or ownership rights of such facilities remain with the United States."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very desirous of seeing a science research bill pass the Eightieth Congress. But I think we should frankly face the fact that in many of our universities and colleges in the Midwest and the West, and particularly in our land-grant colleges, there are scientists who view with some concern the present language of Senate bill 526. If it is contemplated—as I understand the authors of the bill would say, if they were here to discuss the matter—that there is no intention in any way to discriminate against land-grant colleges or tax-supported institutions or other State-supported schools, then I see no objection to the language of my bill, because it will quiet a good many fears on the part of those educators and scientists who object to the bill in its present form. My amendment will make it much easier, in my judgment, to gain support for Senate bill 526. If, on the other hand, it is planned by this bill to permit of a discretion on the part of the Foundation to the end that it could deny a reasonable apportionment of these funds to land-grant colleges and State-supported and tax-supported institutions, then surely the language of my amendment is sorely needed. I hope the authors of Senate bill 526, after reading the bill and reading the remarks I am now making on it, will find a way to accept the amendment I am proposing without making it necessary to draw any issue over it.

But I am going to be rather insistent that the bill be amended in some such way as that proposed by some of the educators in my State, so as absolutely to remove any fear they may entertain as to the possibility of discrimination by the Foundation against these midwestern and western institutions. I say that also, Mr. President, as one who owes part of his education, at least, to one of the great eastern universities. I have a very high regard for the great scientific work that takes place on the Atlantic coast in the so-called great institutions on the Atlantic coast. Nevertheless, they have no monopoly on scientific research, and the Congress of the United States should pass no bill which permits the entertainment of any fear by educators in other parts of the country that its language is such as to make it possible in the administration of the bill to discriminate against institutions in other parts of the country. Hence I say I hope the authors of Senate bill 526 will see the fairness of the language of my bill and will accept it, without making necessary the raising of any further issue over it.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT LABOR SERVICES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon still has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have the floor, I now turn my attention to another matter. I turn my attention to the problem of appropriations for some very-much-needed labor services in the United States because I think it very important that we take note of that need now before there is used on me, at least, the argument that so frequently is used on me by some of my colleagues after I have raised what even they sometimes admit is a very good point, namely, to say to me, "But it is too late. It is all arranged now." Of course, it is very difficult for me always to be able to guess what the strategists will do, when I am not "in" on the time schedule or program upon which they have agreed. So I frequently find myself confronted with the argument that it is too late to do much about some matter because it has all been done or agreed upon before I raise my objection to it. Nevertheless, I wish to give my party a little advice in regard to some of our appropriation problems as they affect the labor services. I am not sure that my advice will be taken, but I am sure of one thing, namely, that a great many people in 1948 will agree that I am right about it. Hence, I should be very happy if my party and the Congress would at least give serious consideration to it before they wake up, too late, to discover that a great many voters in 1948 want the Republicans to do what I now suggest. I do not want my party to face voters in 1948 who will say, "It is too late for you now to get our votes, in view of the appropriation policies you followed in 1947." I think there are going to be a great many workers in the country who will say that, Mr. President, if we proceed with some of the appropriations policies that we are hearing about over on the House side. They will oppose us if we cut the heart right out of the National Labor Relations Board—a Board which already is months and months behind schedule with its cases because it does not have sufficient staff, on the basis of its present appropriations, to do the job which should be done. Of course, Mr. President, speed in the handling of labor cases is of vital importance to peaceful settlements.

Likewise, if we look at the proposed cuts in the budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics—one of the most important informational services which could possibly be rendered by our Government in supplying both employers and labor the objective data they need for settling disputes and for reaching agreement as to the terms of contracts—we find that the House proposed to emasculate it. Both workers and employers have come to rely on that service. I am one who, although sometimes accused of being rather theoretical and not being a very practical politician, nevertheless thinks he is practical enough to recognize that if we make very many mistakes like those we are making in regard to labor-service appropriations, I will have a hard time in 1948 in trying to convince a labor audience why it should vote for the

Republican Party. I will do my best, Mr. President, as I said the other day, but I am pleading for something to work with; that is all. Just give me something to work with. That is all I am asking of my party. I am now making a plea that they give me something to work with in regard to adequate appropriations for the United States Employment Service, and in order to speak very accurately about it, I have reduced my observations to the following comments.

Mr. President, I propose to say what I have to say about the reckless cuts in the United States Employment Service budget now, while there is yet time for the Senate Appropriations Committee to repair the damage which has already been done to morale by the House action, and which threatens to damage the interest of not only the wage and salary earners in the country, but also consumers, manufacturers, businessmen, and financiers who for years have used the many services of that Department in their daily lives.

This is not true economy, of the sort the Republican Party is pledged to achieve. It is economy on a binge, false economy, dictated, not by prudent expenditure of taxpayers' money by a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy once more being proposed by Republican leadership.

As a Republican, I want no part of the responsibility for economy at any price such as is displayed in the 77 percent cut in the budget of the United States Employment Service. Let me make my position clear on this point. I assume that every penny requested for payment to the State Employment Services is needed and justified. I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee will approve that item. I cannot discover any possible justification for the slash of funds for the functions of the Federal Government in our Federal-State system of public employment offices from the requested total of $3,900,000 to 23 percent of that figure, $900,000.

It is rather interesting that the President, after the estimate has gone through the Bureau of the Budget, should ask for $3,900,000 and the House should cut it to $900,000; $3,900,000 asked, $900,000 given. It is a remarkable selection of figures. It looks as though it was decided by those having to do with it that if they just crossed out the "3" and would leave "900,000," and presto, change, $3,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. President, this is not fiscal therapy, this is not surgery; I think it is butchery of the welfare of the workers of this country. This is a wrong which is proposed be committed to the Wagner-Peyser Act, and I know of no such pledge on the part of the Republican Party at any time to emasculate that act. I know that continuance of a Federal-State employment service has been endorsed year after year by both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

By cutting out the functions of the Federal Government, the effect will be to appropriate Federal funds to a system of individual State services with a great deal of duplication of effort, and with a great deal of multiplying of expense.

This proposal is to strike out of the whole Federal-State cooperative system recognition of the hard and inescapable fact that we are one nation, and that our economy, as far as employment, at least, is concerned, is a one-country economy.

It is an attempt, in my judgment, to repeal or set aside the very character of the interstate nature of employment. It is one of the secrets of the success of our economy and of our form of government that our country and our employment is fluid, that it is mobile, that it moves in response to demand and opportunity from one end of a State to the other, and from one section of the country to another.

We certainly learned that during the war. Look at the way we moved thousands and thousands of workers from the east to the west coast, and from the middle to both the East and the West. It taught us clearly the lesson that ours is a one-nation economy, as far as employment is concerned.

As I pointed out last year in my speech on this subject, when we were fighting the battle of Federal versus State employment services, we should not overlook the need of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State governments in regard to employment problems. We should avoid the setting up of State barriers.

Mr. President, this proposal to cut this budget is a mistaken attempt again to turn back the clock, to break up our united economy into 48 separate economies, competing with each other for labor, seeking to hold labor within the State, to deny employees in one State access to jobs in other States, seeking even to make it possible to keep from them the information as to the availability of jobs in other States.

Furthermore, and more immediately, it would result in the setting up of 48 duplicating sets of special services such as are now provided on a single, Nationwide, standardized basis, but adaptable to the needs in each of the 48 States.

Mr. President, at this moment our economy and the world's recovery is suffering from vast shortages of vital goods such as steel, coal, automobiles, box cars, locomotives, linotype machines, and a host of other items essential in the whole complicated cycle of production, distribution, and consumption. The railroad industry, the automobile industry, and the housing industry at this moment are all competing for the short supply of steel. Looking ahead, it appears obvious that if we can surmount the critical months when inflation threatens to blight postwar prosperity, every responsible analyst foresees several years of production up to the limit of our capacity, material, plant, and manpower capacity. In fact, I think if we can get over the next 12 to 15 months we will enjoy, perhaps, the greatest era of prosperity we have ever had in this country, and I only hope and pray we will know how to handle it wisely.

In manpower it is essential that we have the maximum utilization, at fair wages and under decent conditions. The United States Employment Service is the only implement at hand for dealing with the manpower problem on a Nation-wide scale, for seeing to it that qualified workers are available at the right places, the right times, and in the numbers and skills needed.

Consider even our atomic energy program. I think it goes without saying that we are going to have great problems in connection with further development of that program. It is going to call for transferring from different sections of the country a good many thousand skilled workers as we go forward with the various developments in the program. We cannot do that on a State-wide basis unless there is friendly cooperation between the States and the National Government. We shall need an efficient and effective United States Employment Service, such as we provided for last year. Such a service is being ruined by the proposed cut in the appropriations for the USES at the present time.

I submit that it is the sheerest folly, at this critical moment, to consider the deliberate break-up of this efficient implement—that is, the United States Employment Service—it has served us well for 14 years. Instead of reducing the operating efficiency of our Federal-State Employment Service, it is my judgment that it should be improved and assisted by an appropriation even larger than has been proposed by the President.

I happen to know that the amount asked for by the Service was cut down by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget went over it with a fine-tooth comb, and they finally agreed that the minimum amount that should be asked for was the $3,900,000, which the House now proposes to reduce to a mere $900,000.

If the Federal Government, in the judgment of the Congress, finds itself in such dire financial straits as to require a cut in the funds for the Federal arm of this cooperative service to only $900,000 we will be guilty of false economy. The United States Employment Service cannot operate efficiently on that amount. If that is all that is to be granted it would be wiser to let the States take over the entire burden of maintaining their own State employment services. If this appears to be too drastic a proposal, perhaps the States might be asked to share 50 percent of the $72,000,000 which we are granting to the States under last year's amendment to the Wagner-Peyser Act. This, incidentally, was the 50–50 matching fund proposed in the Wagner-Peyser Act from which we departed during the war.

Rather than subscribe to a meaningless continuation of an ineffective United States Employment Service operating at 23 percent of the amount proposed for next year's operations, I would prefer to see an outright and aboveboard repeal of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

We would then have a clear-cut opportunity to vote for or against a Federal-State cooperative system or a system of State services, some of them excellent, some of them existing in name only, and others operated in such a manner as to be shunned by self-respecting wage earners and employers.

My position regarding the Employment Service was put on the record last year

when legislation affecting that service was before this House. I then stated:

I do not think we can ever get away from the fact that, after all, the problem of employment and the problem of unemployment is not a Federal problem alone, nor a State problem alone, but a combined Federal-State problem.

I think this is one of the social and economic problems which should be handled by the State and Federal Governments working in cooperation.

I was deeply concerned by the fact that substantive legislation was not enacted in both Houses to assure maximum cooperation in the operation of the Federal-State system of public employment offices. Instead, you will recall that the Employment Service, after nearly 5 years of Federal operation, was returned to a Federal-State system through the medium of the Appropriation Act of 1947 without legislative provision to insure its successful operation, which the Senate considered necessary. In this connection I pointed out that: "The obligation still rests upon the Congress to continue the work cooperatively with State governments in seeing to it that there is worked out an adequate Federal-State cooperative employment service for all our citizens as one of the best guaranties and checks against the danger of depression with its accompanying mass unemployment."

I am deeply concerned with the continuing necessity of making adequate financial provisions to assure that the Federal Government makes its proper contribution to a strong Federal-State system of public employment offices. This system cannot be maintained unless adequate funds are appropriated for both the operation of local offices in the field and for the United States Employment Service. The USES is responsible by law for maintaining a coordinated Nation-wide system of public employment offices. It does so through the development and maintenance of minimum standards of efficiency, uniformity in administrative and statistical procedures, furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment, and other information of value in the operation of the system; and maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States. All of these requirements are specifically set forth in the basic legislation which governs the activities of the United States Employment Service. These activities must be carried on by the United States Employment Service in addition to carrying its responsibilities for budget administration and fiscal management, involving the allocation of funds to the several States in accordance with the requirements of efficient administration and assuring that the expenditures made by the States conform with the law.

The basic legislation establishing a Federal-State system of public employment offices requires the United States Employment Service "to maintain a veterans service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans." This responsibility was clarified and increased with the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It is specifically stated in that act, and I quote:

The Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policy shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

The Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service is concerned with maximizing employment opportunities for veterans. Ninety-five percent of its staff is located in local communities to supplement and assist the local employment service offices in developing job opportunities for veterans. But the procedures, methods, and program materials used by this staff are prepared by the United States Employment Service. The Veterans' Employment Service can be fully effective only if the USES is equipped to render the technical assistance which VES requires.

A strong Federal-State system of employment offices cannot exist in this country without the kind of activities carried out by the United States Employment Service. These include:

First. Collecting, analyzing, and distributing on a national basis of labor market information reflecting employment trends, job opportunities, hiring specifications, and conditions of work. Such information is now being used by all employment offices to counsel workers on job opportunities nationally and to assist workers in getting jobs in other States than the State of residence. Employers, labor organizations, and community groups concerned with the location and staffing of plants and the stabilization of employment, now use such information constantly.

Second. The continued development for use by all local employment offices of the Manual of Employment Office Operations, which sets forth recognized and tested employment office practices and procedures and which has now been adopted without change by almost all local employment offices.

Third. Promoting Nation-wide programs, such as the job development program, with specific emphasis on obtaining employment opportunities for veterans; coordinating and improving employment counseling for veterans, handicapped workers, and new entrants into the labor market; and conducting such special programs as the National Hire the Physically Handicapped Week.

Fourth. Rendering technical services to local employment offices resulting from the conduct of occupational analyses and the preparation and maintenance of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles; analyzing physical requirements of jobs, and the aptitudes and physical capacities of workers. These materials are used by local offices (a) in matching men and jobs and (b) in the placement of disabled war veterans and handicapped workers.

Fifth. Maintaining a system to clear workers between the States, which is particularly important for professional and technical personnel whose employment opportunities exist in the national labor market. The interstate movement of workers is especially important both to the employers and to the job seekers in industries having peak seasonal demands and whose production is dependent upon migration in accordance with patterns that extend over several States.

Sixth. Maintaining working relationships with national organizations of employers, labor, and veterans which are concerned with employment problems and are organized on a Nation-wide basis.

The same reasons that I advanced last year, for developing such a cooperative Federal-State relationship as we now have, apply equally today, and certainly in my judgment at least are an adequate rebuttal to the proposal to cut $3,000,000 off of this Federal Employment Service.

I have enumerated only some of the activities through which the United States Employment Service assures a coordinated and strong Federal-State employment office system. These are the normal activities. There is one other, however, that in the face of existing circumstances needs to be mentioned. This agency is the only agency in this country that has the responsibility and facilities to mobilize our manpower resources on a Nation-wide basis. With billions now being appropriated for the military aspects of our national security program, it seems to me to be nothing short of folly to virtually wipe out the United States Employment Service to whom we must look for the organization of our labor resources in case of emergency.

I should like to call attention to a statement by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Daily News on March 31, 1947, entitled "Hamstringing USES."

In fact, I think he presents the problem much better than I possibly could present it. Mr. President, this article states, and accurately, that if the House cuts of the Employment Service budget shall be concurred in by the Senate, the Wagner-Peyser Act will have been, in effect, nullified or repealed and a Federal-State employment service will have been destroyed. That, Mr. President, is a piece of legislative folly which I do not want charged to my party or to this Congress. I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee which, on April 7, will begin hearings on this budget, will make whole again the organism that has been developed in the past 14 years and which is going to be vitally needed in the future, both in good times and bad.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAMSTRINGING USES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In the numerous drastic economies which the House voted a few days ago in the Labor Department's appropriation for next year it carved the United States Employment Service down to such a skeleton that it will be incapable of maintaining a national employment system.

That was the purpose for which it was created, back in 1933, in the midst of depression. In the Wagner-Peyser Act, Congress recognized unemployment as a national problem by setting up USES to cooperate with State employment services in finding jobs.

In the years since, USES has justified itself for its services, in cooperation with the States, to industry, labor, and, more recently, to veterans. It functioned so effectively, built up standards and procedures for job placement so well, that when the war came it was assigned the task of channeling millions of workers into war industry—a big job which it did most capably. Because of the emergency, USES was given temporary control and direction of State employment systems. The system, in short, was federalized.

After the war Congress restored the Federal-State cooperative system, turning control of State employment services back to the States. USES, though, was to continue its functioning of coordinating and assisting the States as provided by law.

That is, until the House last week knocked its appropriation to $900,000, a 74-percent cut below President Truman's budget recommendation. That will require the agency to reduce its staff from 875 to 202 and to close all of its regional offices with the possible exception of one on the Pacific coast. About all it would be able to do would be to serve as a fiscal agent to review State budget requests for funds appropriated for maintenance of State systems and to audit accounts.

Protests are coming in from certain types of business that require seasonal labor, particularly canners—which indicates the need of a national clearing house for transient labor. But further than this, the USES also serves all sorts of business and industry of stable employment. The search for skilled help and the search of skilled help for jobs know no State lines.

During the war, USES compiled a job dictionary which listed some 30,000 job classifications and kept this constantly up to date, so that the call from one locality for certain types of skills could be met from another locality through the clearing house.

This sort of service would have to be stopped under the appropriations cut. Congress would be taking quite a responsibility in doing away with it, with at least the prospect of a recession being forecast by economists. This will be one concern that will face the Senate when it considers the Labor Department bill. States are unable individually to perform this clearing-house function adequately.

But that is only one function that would be affected. Another, is a job occupational analysis carried on in cooperation with industry that industry has found valuable. Still another is a job-placement program just started in connection with colleges and universities for GI students who will graduate as specialists of one sort or another. This is a service USES provides, among others, for the Veterans' Employment Service, the appropriation of which was itself cut 34 percent to $1,756,800, so that the staff of that service also will be reduced here to only a handful.

What is seen, if the House action is upheld by the Senate, is a slow deterioration of the national employment system. For the USES also helped, by its surveys and its surveillance, to keep up standards in States to protect labor. There is a tendency in States, under pressure of special interests, to whittle down standards.

Mr. President, I do not see how we can carry out our obligations under the full employment bill that we passed last year, and which now is really being carried out, as far as our policies are concerned, by our Joint Committee on Economic Report. I do not see how we could carry that out, without a cooperative arrangement between a Federal employment service and the employment services of the State. We certainly need to continue the budget that is being asked for by the Federal Employment Service if we are going to make a good-faith attempt at least to prepare this country and to keep this country ready at all times to meet any great unemployment problem that may confront us.

It is very interesting that those spots of unemployment are beginning to develop now, like economic smallpox, all over this Nation, Mr. President. In almost all sections of the country there can be found areas of unemployment infection already beginning to fester. Out in my section of the country, for example, at Portland, Ore., we are suffering from unemployment. My senior colleague and I are now trying desperately to get the War Assets Administration to develop some understanding about this problem. I hope it is not a hopeless task we have undertaken though I sometimes despair of it. We are going to keep trying, Mr. President, to develop some understanding of the relationship between disposing of great industrial surplus property plants and employment.

I digress to call attention for example to our Swan Island problem, in Portland. Swan Island is one of the great shipbuilding yards of the country—not only of the west coast, but of the country. What is to be done with it? Are we going to recognize, as the leaders of industry and of labor in Oregon are recognizing today, that it is a great employment potential, and that it ought to be turned over to such a subdivision of government as the port of Portland, which is trying to get possession of it for lease purposes, so that it can be used for industrial employment in that area so that hundreds of men can be put to work? Or are we going to junk it? Are we going to dismantle it? I am opposed to dismantling it, for two reasons, and I wish someway, somehow, I could get General Littlejohn to see the importance of these two reasons. He ought to be able to see one of them, on the basis of his background. I hope the President will persuade him as to the other, too, because I have written to the President suggesting at least that this is of such importance to the economy of the country that it deserves some Executive attention.

The first reason is that we ought to use it for industrial purposes in order to put to work skilled craftsmen, who are now in increasing numbers in the Portland area becoming unemployed.

Those facilities can be leased for employment purposes so that those men can be put to work. Of course, if we want to take the attitude that we must exact from a government subdivision, such as the port of Portland, a Shylock price for Swan Island so as to make it not feasible to interest lessors in operating the yard for employment purposes, then of course we defeat, it seems to me, what I have thought was one of the objectives that was to be applied by the Surplus Property Administration in disposing of industrial plants. I thought that it was understood that wherever possible we ought to dispose of them to agencies of government which in turn can make maximum use of such plants for employment purposes.

The second reason why I think that these great industrial plants should not be junked at this time and sold only for salvage value is because of national defense. I happen to be one in the Senate who believes that the Eightieth Congress had better go slow in any fiscal program that does not give us every possible assurance that we shall maintain ourselves at a very high level of defense security. I think that is going to be true for several years. I think that is going to be true, Mr. President, until all the members of the United Nations give clear evidence that they intend to habituate themselves in the ways of peace and in the ways of peaceful procedures for the settlement of international disputes. Hence, I think it would be a great mistake for the War Assets Administration to dispose of such industrial sites as Swan Island for salvage value. I do not care where they are located; if they are located in Baltimore, Md., or Norfolk, Va., or Houston, Tex., or any other place in the country—I say we ought to make very clear to the War Assets Administration that wherever possible those facilities should be disposed of in a manner that will make possible their use for employment purposes and thus keep them available as potential defense and national security plants.

Of course that is closely related to this problem of maintaining a United States Employment Service at an efficient and effective level, because I do not think we can fairly risk dispensing with the Service which is the only efficient Service equipped to handle our manpower problems in time of emergency.

It is being charged, Mr. President, that the reckless cuts in the appropriations which have been made by the House in this budget are part of an attempt to nullify and abolish all the labor and social legislation of the past 14 years. For myself, and I believe for many Members of the Congress—and I think I speak certainly for a great many citizens who voted the Republican ticket in the last election—this is not truly the position of the Republican Party. We have always been a party and we must not cease being a party which believes in and stands for sound progressive social legislation. We recognize, I think, as a party, and we should recognize as a party the importance of working out a friendly and cooperative program between the Federal Government and the States in the administering of sound, social, progressive legislation. I think one of our chief quarrels with the New Deal has not been so much to the objectives of certain social legislation of the New Deal, but disagreements over the administering of the legislation that seeks those objectives. The fight has been between an over-centralized Government and the operation of Government on a local level working in cooperation with a friendly Federal Government. That is why I am pleading here again, as I did on this issue last year, that we recognize that in the handling of the employment problems of the country we are not dealing with a problem that is either State or Federal. It is dual in nature. I think that not only sound Republican policy, but sound Government policy should dictate that we not only continue the type of administrative set-up that we adopted

last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress, but that we appropriate the necessary funds for its efficient management.

The Republican candidate in 1944 did not pledge himself to repeal or nullify by cutting off appropriations any of the legislation which was overdue in 1932 and was enacted in the years that followed. He pledged himself, and his party—and I am here today to fight for that pledge as I understand it—to keep that type of legislation, and to improve it, and make its administration more efficient in the interests of the wage earners, employers, consumers, and all the groups and segments of our population.

Knowing the junior Senator from California and his deep interest in the development of the Pacific coast as the new frontier of this great advancing Nation facing on the new markets of the Pacific Basin, I am confident that, as chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling the USES appropriation, he will look at these cuts with the eyes of youth and of the veterans of World War II, who went to victory on the seven seas and the world's battle fronts under the motto "We do the difficult immediately. The impossible takes a little longer." I am confident that the junior Senator from California will see to it that those of us who hold views contrary to those which have been expressed in the House by the cut on such appropriations as this one for the USES will obtain a full and fair hearing before his committee in support of such a position as I am taking here this afternoon.

We know that the size of the amount requested for the United States Employment Service of $3,900,000, which is equal to the money costs of the war for about 20 minutes, is not the real question at issue in the granting or slashing of this appropriation. Before the issue is settled I think the truth will out. Those who want this $3,900,000 cut to $900,000 do not want a dual Federal-State employment service. It seems to me they are determined to wipe out such effective service. It seems to me they are determined to break up the national economic unity into 48 different State economies warring with each other for short-range advantage in labor costs and in stagnant pools of surplus idle workers in isolated towns and villages being bought and sold like commodities on the labor markets.

I recognize that the same program for the break-up of our economic unity—for the Balkanization of the United States—is planned with respect to other appropriations, if I judge correctly what is coming out of the House appropriations. I propose to stand up and oppose that type of budgetary cut in the Senate of the United States.

I call upon every Member of this body who has faith in the future of a nation that is united economically and politically, to resist the first attack as represented in the proposal to cut the budget of the USES from $3,900,000 to far below that amount, below the operating level of the Federal service as far as its Washington office is concerned, down to a meaningless $900,000 appropriation.

Mr. President, that will only pay for the bookkeeping services in connection with transmittal of Federal funds for unreviewed, unstandardized, and irresponsible expenditure within each of the 48 States under the supervision and absolute control of 48 State employment services. In fact, Mr. President, it is my mature judgment that we cannot justify to the Federal taxpayers of this country appropriating a single dollar of their money if we do not appropriate more than $900,000 of their money for this service. As I say, it will pay only the bookkeeping charges, and we shall have no check at all upon the use that is made by the States of the money involved under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

As I stated last year, I think we have a duty, when we come to appropriate Federal tax dollars, of double-checking and seeing what use is made of those Federal tax dollars by the States for whose benefit they are appropriated.

The House has also cut the veterans' employment service budget by 34 percent. In passing, let me point out that the reduction of 34 percent in the Veterans' Employment Service will taste rather bitter on the tongues of several million veterans applying through public employment offices, who may not be able to find employment in their own towns or localities where they are now finishing their GI schooling. Do the roses which were strewn along the path of these returning veterans in a good many towns of this country fade quite so quickly in the minds of Members of Congress when it comes to appropriating money for employment services to our veterans? I point out that the veterans have the least job status, the least security of seniority and skill, and the greatest exposure to shakeouts and changes in private employment of all our workers, they may be inclined, if we do not watch out, to write down their regard by a similar or greater percentage at their first opportunity at the voting polls.

The Veterans' Employment Service should, of course, be maintained at the level requested in the original budget, and, in my opinion, should be increased even above the figure recommended by the President. Likewise, I think that at least the $3,900,000 recommended for the United States Employment Service should be maintained by the Senate, and we should insist upon its replacement in the budget when that item comes to the floor of the Senate.

I close with just another sentence or two. I think we are in the making of a political program for 1948. I think we must stand on the record that we make in the Eightieth Congress as to our appropriations for needed Federal services, the efficient functioning of which is absolutely necessary if we are to have a prosperous economy in this country. So, for the record, in order that no one can ever say that no warning flag was raised, I now state that, in my judgment, if the Republican Party continues to make the type of budget slashes that are being made on the House side in such needed services as the United States Employment Service we Republicans will be hard put in the 1948 campaign when it comes to justifying that type of Republican program.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no desire to yield for that purpose, unless the Senator has some other purpose in mind. If it will accommodate him, I will yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would not want the Senator to think that I would take advantage of him, but I do have another purpose in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the understanding that I may have the floor after the quorum call, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator that my purpose in suggesting the absence of a quorum is to discuss the question of a unanimous-consent agreement. I would not take advantage of the Senator for anything.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Holland	Revercomb
Bricker	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Sparkman
Cain	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the debate on this question has proceeded at some length. It seems that Senators for and against the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit have had an opportunity to express themselves, and, under the suggestion which I should like to make, they will have further opportunity to express themselves.

I again say, Mr. President, that it is in my opinion of vital importance that the Senate reach the earliest possible determination of the question of confirmation of the nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission. The first question to be acted upon before confirmation can be acted upon is the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit with instructions. So far as I am personally concerned, I feel that that will have a substantial effect upon the attitude of the Members of the Senate insofar as final action is concerned. I do not under any circumstances want to appear as trying to curtail frank and open discussion of this subject so far as pertinent facts are concerned, but I am mindful that we shall have a night session tonight, and it has been announced that we shall have one tomorrow night if the matter is not concluded. I am also fully mindful of the fact that a strong effort will be made to bring the subject of the Greek and Turkish loans before the Senate for consideration, beginning on Monday, and that considerable debate will ensue on that question.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am wondering whether it will be possible to secure a unanimous-consent agreement along the following lines: To agree upon a time tomorrow when a vote shall be had upon the question of the motion to recommit, which has been submitted by the junior Senator from Ohio.

In order that we may discuss the matter at this time, so as to see whether there may be objection to such a request, I wish to read a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement which I have taken up with the majority leader, the minority leader, and a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle who are interested in this matter. The proposal is as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Thursday, April 3, 1947, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon the pending motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit, with instructions, to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, including that of the General Manager; and in the event that the said motion is rejected, that the Senate immediately thereafter recess until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

I ask further unanimous consent that the time on tomorrow, which would be Thursday, the day above referred to, between the convening of the Senate and the hour of 5 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the motion, to be controlled respectively the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. President, that is the unanimous-consent request which I propound for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request which has been stated by the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me inquire why the Senator inserts provision that as soon as the Senate votes tomorrow it shall stand in recess until Monday. What was the Senator's reason for including that provision?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate well knows, unanimous-consent agreements are seldom, if ever, spontaneously adopted on the spur of the moment. There has been much discussion on both sides of the aisle and among both those who are opponents and those who are proponents of this matter. I will say that the matter of adjournment until Monday was one of the controlling items that the proponents of the motion insisted be included in the unanimous-consent agreement. We felt that the interests of speed and accomplishment here would be best served by including provision for it. So far as I am concerned and, as I understand, so far as the majority leader and other Senators to whom I have talked are concerned, that is agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he has any arrangement regarding the amount of time he will allow each Senator under the parceling-out arrangement which is included in the request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me to reply, let me say that no arrangement has been discussed in regard to the limitation of time or whether it will be a few minutes or many minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator suppose that the junior Senator from Oregon could have 20 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is no question but that that could be arranged. I do not know what idea the Senator from Nebraska has about it, but I say it would be my idea that those who wish to speak against the motion to recommit should get in touch with me, and we shall put the time in a hat and try to allocate it equitably, in keeping with the approximate length of time which each Member wishes to have.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Iowa will be very reasonable; but I remember that not so long ago I found myself in a similar position in regard to another unanimous-consent request arrangement, and in that case I received only 5 minutes. I do not wish to be in that position tomorrow. I should prefer to have at least 20 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator from Oregon has sufficient confidence in me to realize that we must view the whole picture. I could not guarantee him twenty minutes, but I will stick my neck out far enough to say that perhaps I would give him 15 minutes, or perhaps 25 minutes. Of course, this evening we are having a session, and if the Senator from Oregon can get the floor, he can speak from now until we adjourn or take a recess. He will not be limited this evening, under this agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not be ready until tomorrow afternoon; I am sorry. But I am sure we can work out a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to add that if there is any question in the mind of any Senator that a little more time might be helpful, it would seem to me to be constructive to suggest that the hour of meeting tomorrow be 11 o'clock, instead of 12. I think that would be helpful.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me, let me say that before we discuss this matter further, I wish to suggest that we are having a night session tonight, and no limitation is proposed upon the length of time for discussion this evening. Any Senator who wishes to discuss this matter pro or con tonight will not be inhibited or interfered with in any way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's understanding that if at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate fails to adopt the motion proposed by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], then on next Monday the Senate will resume debate on these nominations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my hope—although I do not control the situation—that if the motion of the Senator from Ohio fails of adoption, then on Monday we shall resume consideration of the nominations. But there is no agreement as to that, at this moment, so far as I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say that in the event we take a recess, if the motion is rejected, we shall still be in executive session, when the session convenes on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I understand that the plan is to have a recess taken tomorrow at 5 o'clock or immediately after the vote is had at 5 o'clock.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is true. The Senator from Nebraska has correctly stated, as I understand, that, under the agreement, when the Senate takes a recess after the vote is taken at 5 o'clock, it will convene on Monday in executive session, and the nominations will be the order of business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request proposed by the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, paraphrasing the immortal language of Mark Antony at the bier of Julius Caesar, I do

not come either to bury or to praise Mr. Lilienthal. I do rise to discuss the Lilienthal report because after listening intently to the arguments on both sides of the aisle for the last several days I have reached the conclusion that the Lilienthal report is not quite so good as those who favor it would make it and not quite so bad as those who oppose it seem to think.

For a long while I was a member of the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate, and it was during that first year, I think, that we met nearly every day, and had before us not only the men who had manufactured atomic energy, but the very top flight 10 or 12 or 15 scientists who had brought atomic energy into being, and we had the 3 leading scientists who had actually designed the bomb.

In order that Senators may appreciate the impulses which provoke me to speak at this time let me say that at one of those hearings there were two scientists who had participated in the manufacture of the bomb, and, as I recall, before we went into the hearing room FBI agents had pretty well searched the room, and there were FBI men at the door, so that the information we were to receive there in very earnest secrecy would not be imparted by any unusual apparatus or source to the outside world.

I became greatly impressed with this problem, and so when Mr. Lilienthal, before I left the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate, appeared briefly a time or two in support of his plan, I took the liberty of opposing it, not feeling it was a sound solution to our own national defense or to the peace of the world. I told Mr. Lilienthal I did not think his plan was a sound one. So, with that brief word of preface, let us see what the Lilienthal plan really is, good and bad.

To start with, it is a mistake to call it the Lilienthal plan, because the plan was evolved by five men, of whom Mr. Lilienthal was only the chairman. The five so-called experts who were summoned consisted, in addition to Mr. Lilienthal, of Mr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of the California Institute of Technology, University of California, a name we all know in connection with the manufacture of the atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N. Mex.; Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, the vice president and technical director of the Monsanto Chemical Co.; and Mr. Harry A. Winne, the vice president in charge of the engineering policy of the General Electric Co. So, if the plan is a bad plan, these five men share its evils on their shoulders, and if it is a good plan, they share the credit with Mr. Lilienthal. This committee of experts acted under another committee, which was composed of Mr. Dean Acheson, as chairman; Vannevar Bush, James B. Conant, Leslie R. Groves, major general, United States Army, and John J. McCloy. I do not have to identify these gentlemen, because they are well known in the very large and important fields in which they daily perform their work. The Lilienthal plan, so-called, was in part prepared and created and sponsored by 10 men, and therefore it would be a mistake, in my judgment, in all fairness, as we sit here as a jury, to condemn this plan as the Lilienthal plan when it might as well be called the Conant plan, or the Oppenheimer plan, or a plan under any one of the other names that went into the creation of the plan.

My objection to the Lilienthal plan was, briefly, this: It proposed, through a series of steps, to come to the point in world affairs where all atomic energy, so-called, would be turned over to the United Nations. That is rather a generalization, but an accurate one. Coincident with that and inherent in it there was to be created an international inspection force to see that, once the plan agreed upon was put into operation and adopted, no nation would violate it. It was an honest, sincere attempt, with which I did not agree, to approach the problem of world security generally through the mechanics which I have outlined.

My reason for opposing it was, briefly, this—and I think it is the defect in the so-called Lilienthal plan which should have caused us to examine it more thoroughly than we did in our great haste to do something to avert the danger of the atomic bomb in this modern world. My objection to it was that I assumed, for the sake of argument, that the Lilienthal plan would be adopted by all the nations of the earth, and that an inspection force would be set up to see that, once it was agreed upon, no nation would violate the terms of the agreement. Then I said to myself, "Suppose they should refuse to go on with progressive disarmament from that point. What would happen?" The net result of what would happen, briefly, would be that in the process we would have imparted to the scientists of other countries the knowledge of how to make atomic energy, and when we impart that knowledge, we give away 80 percent of the knowledge of what is necessary to make an atomic bomb.

For the making of an atomic bomb briefly is divided into two general categories; category one being the manufacture of the energy, and category two taking the energy and knowing how to put it in the bomb, so that at a given point at a given time the bomb would explode. So, when we impart the knowledge, no matter how much inspection and agreement may go with the imparting of the knowledge to any other country, we have told the world 80 percent of what it needs to know to manufacture the atomic bomb. So as I visualize the evolution of the Lilienthal plan, if the world then refused to prohibit the use in warfare of disease germs, or flying missiles, or flying bombs, or artillery, or poison gases, or all the other things that have been used in modern warfare, we would have accomplished nothing. We would have left the world an armed camp. We would have left the United Nations impotent. And then if a war broke out in the future, atomic bombs would be sure to be used; for the minute that hostilities started, every nation that knew how to make the bomb—and we would have told them how to make 80 percent of it through the Lilienthal plan—would immediately as a matter of necessity proceed to manufacture atomic bombs, for fear its enemies were going to do it, and that the first nation that had them and used them would probably win the day. So all that would have been done in the process of adopting the Lilienthal plan, if evolution toward disarmament stopped there, would be to outlaw the atomic bomb between wars. It is not going to be used between wars, anyway, and if in any event it is going to be used if war comes, the plan seemed to me to represent a lot of lost motion, with elements of great danger, even if it were successfully carried through to its logical conclusion.

I thought the approach should be as follows: There should be a special disarmament conference called, devoted to one purpose only, namely, disarming the world and putting a police force at the disposal of the United Nations. The atomic bomb and atomic energy should be a part of that picture. If a schedule like that could be set up and carried out by an inspection force, with a police force at the disposal of the United Nations stronger than that of any country, then there would be some hope that the United Nations could inflict its will to keep the peace as against any aggressor who might rise up, but to proceed in a piecemeal fashion and in time of peace give away the secret to a future potential enemy, who would use it anyway, was not good sound common sense. I think I am reasonably safe in saying that when I presented rather briefly, as I am presenting it today—and I do not want to detain the Senate very long—the elements of my objection, to Mr. Baruch and others who assembled there, I think Mr. Baruch was impressed with it. But the committee decided to go ahead, on the theory that we had to make a start, and if we could make a start on atomic energy, then flying missile and disease germs and all the other things which nations have in their hip pockets, "just in case," could in turn be considered, and we would progress down the road of peace to that happy day when all weapons except small arms would be done away with, and the United Nations would have the only strong and mighty force in the world.

I did not share that point of view, but I say that those who did share it thought that they could use the plan as a beginning and then progress on from there. I think in the light of subsequent events the objections which I humbly made to this very distinguished group of scientists, Mr. Baruch and others who had been assembled, have been abundantly demonstrated to be pretty sound, although, as I recall, I was the lone dissenting voice in the original tackling of this problem.

Mr. President, I do not think Mr. Lilienthal, notwithstanding great names were associated with him in the scientific and educational and manufacturing fields, was very sound. I say that of him with no harsh or prejudicial intent. I do not think he was sound in the political and human fields, about which sometimes those of us who go out among the great masses of the people of the country, and who deal with political things, might quite often be a little better informed.

I do not think he was sound, for the reasons I have stated, and because he assumed events would shape up, which in the light of subsequent happenings have gone completely down the other road.

If the atomic bomb and atomic energy in truth are to serve mankind rather than to destroy it, every minute, every second the world postpones an approach to world disarmament under proper safeguards with proper inspection to make sure that every nation carries out over a period of time on a schedule its progression toward world disarmament—every minute and second that we lose is perhaps to doom this civilization to dust.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me proceed for a moment, and I shall yield to the Senator.

I am in total seriousness about this, and, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, the views I am expressing in the major part are shared by some of the highest ranking Army and Navy officers.

I never thought when I came to the Senate that I would ever stand here and be an exponent of world disarmament. I thought it was impractical. I have been a strong Army and strong Navy man ever since I came here in 1922. I cannot recall that I have ever opposed, at least in its essence, any proposal to strengthen the defenses of the country.

But, Senators, sooner or later—I cannot guess any better than others can, whether it be 2 years, or 4 years, or 6 years, or 8 years, or 10 years—the day will come when we will know that country X or country Y has mastered atomic energy and the atomic bomb. And if we know that that nation has the planes with which to transport it, the peace and the safety which we share at this moment in this Chamber we shall never embrace again. We cannot visualize how we shall feel when that knowledge comes to us, and if, when we are gone, some 50 or 100 years from now, the great United States of America is still here with its great people; if its capital is still here, if its great cities like New York and Columbus and Toledo and Chicago and Baltimore and Pittsburgh are still here, they will be here only if we have been able to evolve and devise a system which will control war. There is no other way, because without such control, without the prevention of war, which it is most difficult to bring about, I admit, we face a period of complete global devastation for most of the human race.

Does anyone think the atomic bomb of 5 years from now will be the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima or on Nagasaki, or at Bikini? Not at all. I am not a scientist, and I am not giving away any secret information, but it is my considered opinion, based upon the evolution of other things that have happened in my own lifetime, that the atomic bomb of the not far-distant future will be 100 and possibly 500 times more powerful than the bombs which were dropped on those 2 cities in the Far East.

Last summer I flew over Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Like many of my colleagues—and I see the Senator from Colorado present—we saw hundreds of moving pictures of what occurred at Nagasaki and Hiroshima before we undertook the trip. Together with the Army observers, I saw the bomb come down on the fleet at Bikini, and, Senators, it was an ominous thing, but it was a crude engine of destruction compared with the bomb of the future.

Nothing would make me feel more secure, nothing would do so much to fill my soul with hope than if the President of this, the greatest nation on earth, the most powerful nation on earth, the only nation with the bomb and with the secret of atomic energy at this moment, were to call the representatives of the leading four or five nations into a single meeting which would be devoted exclusively to an effort to assure the maintenance of law and order in this world, to bring about the disarmament of all nations, and to place an adequate police force at the disposal of the United Nations. There are many things involved in such a proceeding that I do not like; but what is the alternative? The alternative is, with our life insurance policies in force, to sit in our homes or on our farms or in our places of business, while our children grow to manhood and womanhood as we plan for their future education, and to realize that in 10 or 15 or 20 years other nations will have this secret, and all the time fear will grow as inventions for the transmission of news and propaganda multiply, until, when it is all too late, we discover that we have lost everything without even making a fair trial of the other alternative.

Let us suppose the President were to call such a conference. Let us suppose any nation should fail to attend. That is what I want to know—the name of that nation. Suppose they all come, but that nation X refuses international inspection and disarmament on a proportionate scale throughout the world. That is what I want to know—the name of that nation, for the name of that nation is the name of the greatest enemy of mankind in all the days from the beginning of Christendom down to this hour.

Mr. President, I made a talk something like this a year ago in this body. As I look back over that valuable year of time which has gone I see little or nothing that has been accomplished in this world to save the children and the grandchildren of the parents of today from the holocaust which, in all possibility, is just over the horizon.

Yes, when the war was freshly over all the Allies were drinking toasts to each other and falling into each other's arms, and there developed a false sense of security. Our airplanes were scrapped willy-nilly, our plants were dismantled. I doubt whether we can put two squadrons of fighter planes in the air over Germany today.

I know America. America loves peace. It hates war. It hates the waste resulting from war both in humanity and in property. I know that having that feeling, as each year passes we will drop lower and lower and lower down in the scale of our national defense and preparedness. I came out of one world war to serve in the Congress, and I have seen that happen over and over again. But other nations are not democracies; they are not responsive to the same longings that are expressed by the American people, through their representatives in this body. They are controlled by men who declare what is best for the people and who can impose a program of military preparedness and might do so without one voice of criticism being raised. Five or 10 years from now, when we are a little further away from this war and its irritations, when perhaps the peace treaty with Japan is written and signed, when the treaty with Germany is written and signed, when our boys have all come home, we will go to our tasks, the farmer to the plow, the clerk to the counting house, the blacksmith to his forge, and we will think about Amos and Andy on the radio on Tuesday night, and the best movie in town, and how to buy a home in the suburbs, and how to win a case in the county seat that is coming up next November, and all the other things of normal life.

Now is the time for America to act. The mystery to me is why our friends, the Russians, did not accept the Lilienthal report. If they had we would in time have told them how to produce atomic energy. Of course there would have been an inspection force, I will admit, and certain safeguards thrown around it. But if we had told them that, they would not have to spend a great deal of money and time to learn the secret. They would today know 85 percent about the manufacture of atomic bombs, and the production of atomic energy.

Who were the men who proposed this plan? Some of the greatest educators in our country and some of the greatest scientists in our country.

I want to tell the Senate something about the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb. They are fine men, they are patriotic men, but they are human, just like you and just like me. The discovery of the atomic bomb is worrying them. They have created this Frankenstein. They want something done about it. In their great desire to eliminate the evils which have sprung from the production and the discovery of atomic energy they are not quite so careful as you or I who do not have on our conscience to such an extent as they have the problem of undoing the Frankensteinian aspect of this epoch-making discovery. They are not always the best ones to advise us internationally in regard to atomic energy because understandably and humanly they want to accentuate the good side, to make this discovery worth while. They are not always the best advisers in the world, because, being human and being good, they want to counter the potential good in this great discovery against the impossible evil.

No; the Lilienthal report, in my judgment, is not quite so bad as those who oppose Mr. Lilienthal say it is, because it was an attempt—a bad one, I think—but an attempt to meet this problem. It was supported by nine other eminent, honest, patriotic and successful Americans. It was not quite so good either, as its advocates on this side of the aisle would

seem to make it out to be, for the very obvious reason that if it had succeeded, and we had been able to go no further, all we would have done would have been to outlaw the atomic bomb between wars when it was not going to be used anyway, and in the process to have told our potential enemies how they might make the atomic bomb if war again did come. So I felt, without wishing to take sides in this debate, that I should make this brief explanation neither for nor against Mr. Lilienthal per se, but to bring this note of realism, and I hope fact and truth, into this discussion.

I should like again to ask my colleagues many of whom have been good enough to say, some in public, many in private, that they favor the resolution which is now pending in the Foreign Relations Committee, which asks the President to call a conference on world disarmament and world inspection, under proper safeguards, as Senators will find if they read the resolution, if they will not request the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, in particular its chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to report that resolution to the Senate and give our President support in calling such a conference. If it fails we shall have lost nothing. But it it succeeds we shall have won centuries, perhaps, for the human race. If it ultimately fails after trial, I have the firm conviction that millions of people now living on this earth are doomed to death in a quick and horrible war, more cruel in all its aspects than all the other brutalities of the human race put together. In the next war the greatest man in America in any big city will be a doctor. When the first bomb drops on New York, the Army will not take over. It will be the medical men who will lay down the law.

Mr. President, atomic bombs could even be smuggled into the Capitol in Washington in times of peace. We have seen quick attacks made in Europe. When everyone was saying, "Will there be war, or will there not," the next thing anyone knew the Germans were in Warsaw in 20 days. Then the "phoney" war came along. The French and German soldiers were facing each other, exchanging tobacco, and the French were playing mandolins and drinking champagne. In the Siegfried line the Germans were telling the French how fond they were of them. It was called a "phoney" war. The armies were not expected to fight. The French had the Maginot line. Gamelin was the greatest military man in the world. The armies sat there all winter, and we heard stories of the soldiers visiting back and forth, exchanging the best stories. All of a sudden the rush came, and France was conquered in a few months.

We were sitting quietly in our homes one Sunday when bombs were dropped on the fleet at Pearl Harbor. Fifty years from now or 20 years from now bombs may be dropped on the Capital of the United States. It is as easy as that. The President, the Vice President, and Members of the Cabinet may be killed, together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Members of Congress. It could happen.

We are not playing with gunpowder, bows and arrows, or the cross-bow. We are not playing cat and mouse, as Drake played with the Spaniards. We are not playing with poison gas and mustard gas, which were used in World War I, or with the machine gun which then came into use on a large scale, or the French 75. We are not even playing with the fast airplanes which carried demolition bombs over Berlin, Frankfort, and Essen. We are not even playing with the flying bomb with which Hitler, 150 miles away, showered London. We are playing with something a thousand million times greater than all those things put together; and the time when we can play with it safely is becoming shorter. It may be next year that the world will learn that countries X and Y have mastered the secret of atomic energy It is always more difficult to deal with another person if one is settling a lawsuit, buying a piece of property, or running for political office, if his case is just about as strong as ours.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator in his statement point up the absolute and imperative necessity of Truman, Attlee, and King getting this program under way, as they did in November 1945?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal to commend the point of view that the leaders of the three nations which had most to do with the production of atomic energy and the atomic bomb were anxious to project a thought in the world which would eliminate some of the conditions which I have been describing. Whether it worked or not is not the question for the moment. The point I am making is that there was an effort, and that here there is no effort. We have virtually quit work on atomic energy, atomic-energy control, and world disarmament. The Senator knows, and I know, that the United Nations is simply a farce and a sham in a world where every nation is armed to the teeth.

We make speeches about the hope of humanity, and we extol the United Nations, as though it could keep law and order in the world, as though it could keep down a war if any nation really wanted to go to war. It has no equipment to do so. I say this not in derision. I say it in sadness. The people of this country have been lulled into a false sense of security, a feeling that there will never be another war if only the debating society continues in session in New York.

The League of Nations, whether we went into it or stayed out of it, never would have been successful in a world armed to the teeth, because it is clearly evident that nations which pledged their faith and trust in the League of Nations and then maintained large armies on the side did not really depend on the League of Nations at all. It is the same way with the United Nations. Why are we keeping an Army and Navy and an Air Force, and discussing a unification program in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate? What have we been discussing on the floor of the Senate for 3 days? We have not called it by its right name. We have not been discussing Lilienthal. We have been discussing World War III.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why do we not return the problem of atomic energy to the military, as Bernard Baruch stated on page 103 of his report should be done?

Mr. TYDINGS. I voted to turn it over to civilians, and I think our committee was unanimous at that time, provided there were certain military safeguards.

Mr. WHERRY. Times have changed, have they not?

Mr. TYDINGS. With the stalemate which exists in world progress toward peace and order, and with the lack of an attempt to obtain real disarmament and to establish the United Nations so that it will be worth something, and so that it will mean what it says, I am thinking seriously of having to reverse my position in the light of future events. I do not want to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to keep on trying, because the possibilities are so horrible if we fail.

Against whom are we maintaining an Army? It is not against Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, or Jamaica. It must be against Russia, England, France, or China, or all of them. Why are the Russians maintaining an army? Does any one suppose that they are maintaining it because they are worried about Afghanistan or Azerbaijan, or Korea? Not at all. They are maintaining it against France, Britain, America, or China. It is the same way with the British.

The five great allies have all subscribed to the United Nations Charter, which bristles with the ten commandments of love, sweetness, and light. "We will never wage war again as a matter of national policy. We will settle all disputes by peaceful means. War is an abominable thing. We pledge our faith and trust to the principles enumerated above." The Charter is signed by the United States, Russia, France, England, China, and other nations. Then back home they go to get large appropriations for intelligence services and larger air forces. They must have the secret of the atomic energy and the atomic bomb; they must have conscription in peacetime; they must have navies. What becomes of that little piece of paper floating on the wings of time? It is merely a pious and passing hope of mankind.

The purpose of these remarks—and I have spoken longer than I intended—is to say that Mr. Lilienthal is one of many eminent men who thought this procedure was the proper one at the time the plan was presented, and I am sure he acted in the best of faith and with hope for the welfare of the country. I was one man who did not agree with it, and I

do not agree with it now, but I do not think we should condemn Mr. Lilienthal on that account. If it had worked, maybe we would have gone on through the successive steps I have mentioned. The important point is that it did not work; and I am not sure that it was not a good thing for us that it did not work if it was not going any further than it has. I know that was not Mr. Lilienthal's intention.

I should like to have the men who have children, and those who speak for the women and the children of the country, ask the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body to report the resolution to which I have referred. Let us request the President to call such a conference and find out what nations are unwilling, in spite of their pledged word, to live under the terms of the United Nations, and we shall know where we stand. If they all agree to live up to it and carry out its high principles and then pursue actions which make that course possible of realization, we shall have accomplished a great deal. If they fail and we learn why, and who caused the failure, we shall have learned a great deal.

I do not like the strategy of nations having one foot in the United Nations and one foot in the barrack room and one hand on the gun just in case. What shall we do about it in this the sovereign representative Chamber of this Republic? Are we willing to see time pass on until next year, if we are all alive? If I am back here I shall be making the same speech again next year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to state a thought of mine and also to repeat that which I have stated on many occasions.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should welcome it.

Mr. THYE. Atomic energy will be known to the other nations of the world just as soon as we perfect it here. It is only a matter of time. I made the statement a year and a half ago as Governor of the State of Minnesota that it is only a matter of time before mankind will know the secrets of atomic energy, and then it becomes only a question of who strikes first as to who shall control the affairs of the world. Insofar as atomic energy is concerned, I fully concur that mankind will commit murder in order to obtain the secrets of atomic energy if they are at war, and they will be paid handsomely to do exactly that. It may be our secret today and some other nation's secret tomorrow. We had better prepare ourselves and know that we are going to control it by international police power in order that mankind shall not be struck in the manner in which the Senator has so ably described.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for his invaluable support. But for fear I may be misunderstood, let me say I do not believe in disarmament by example. We had a taste of that in 1922, when we had a naval disarmament conference. I am not arguing for that kind of disarmament at all. It is not worthy of the name. I want an arrangement which will run the whole gamut and will be carried out by successive steps under the eyes of competent inspectors, over a period of time, until the day arrives when every nation is playing the game from the point of disarmament, and until simultaneously there is raised and placed at the disposal of the United Nations, a force sheriff suitably and well equipped to keep the peace.

But, Mr. President, we cannot argue this matter 5 years from now, perhaps, or 8 or 10 years from now. Our opportunity then will be gone. I am not a pacifist who believes that we can do away with national defense and keep out of war. I am willing in a fair game to put my cards on the table, so to speak, if we can get others to put their cards on the table, and constitute a world of law and order and establish a civilized community in which people can turn a great amount of money and great effort to hospitals, schools, roads, and all the other things which contribute so much to the progress, civilization, and welfare of mankind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of one single instance in history in which a nation, having developed a new instrument of warfare, has been able to keep the secret of that instrument to itself for as long a period as 5 years, once it has been employed in warfare?

Mr. TYDINGS. It never has been so in the whole history of the world. The history of weapons, from the spear on down, demonstrates that once a nation has used a particular maneuver or weapon or means of warfare, it has been employed in the next war by other nations. For example, the crossbows of the Englishman, as we know, withstood the mailed might of France in one of the great battles of history. Does the Senator believe that after that exhibition of the value of the crossbow, immediately upon the decision rendered on that battlefield, the defeated nation did not take up the crossbow to eliminate mailed might? Of course it did.

So we could go on through time. The Senator is right. It is only a question of how long, and I would rather, while we have all this might, not be the bully; I would rather try to use it so that my good intentions could not be questioned if I were moving with caution and courage and fairness toward an objective that would be good for all mankind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, England forced the invention of the crossbow by cutting down all of the yew trees of sufficient length to make long bows.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But, to get back to the point which I wished to make earlier, it would be only the blindest folly on the part of the United States to assume that other great nations of the world will not be able to make atomic bombs within 2 or 3 or 5 years' time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. When I talk with friends in the Senate, Democrats or Republicans, or when I talk with friends outside the Chamber, and the subject of the atomic bomb comes up, the question always is, "How long do you think it will be before country X or country Y or country Z will know how to make the atomic bomb?" One says he thinks it will be so long, and another says it will be somewhat longer, or that Mr. So-and-So or General So-and-So, they heard, said it would be so long. But let me remind the Senate that it is going to be 1 year less from now on than it was a year ago, and it is going to be 2 years less a year from now than it was 2 years ago—less and less and less.

There may be men who honestly disagree with my proposal. It did not spring like Minerva full-blown from the brain of Jove. I have thought a great deal about it. I know that when I served on the Atomic Energy Committee of this body, together with my good friend and able representative of the State of Iowa, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], both of us serving together, many nights when we went home after hearing much of this secret testimony we thought, "What in the world can we do about this devilish thing which has such potential possibilities for good and such indescribable possibilities for evil?" As a result of all that thinking, I have formulated this plan. I assure the Senate it was hard thinking, and I knew I would be somewhat laughed at as a visionary to propose such a plan, but I did it only because I could think of nothing better. God knows, Mr. President, if there is in this Republic any man who has a better plan than this, he has my wholehearted support. But I say we are either going down that road and have national and international survival or we are going to face circumstances that are indescribable.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question in the nature of an observation?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the Senator considered—I am sure he has—that it took a totalitarian economic organization to produce the atomic bomb? We did not produce it within the functions of what we call a free-enterprise society.

Mr. TYDINGS. A civil economy, so to speak.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It took the pressure of war, under the compulsions of war and under the power of a totalitarian organization which is essential in modern warfare, to produce the atomic bomb and to command the services and materials and fidelity by way of security and otherwise that had to inhere in connection with the bomb that blew up in the desert.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we now delay or fail to do the very thing which, in general, the Senator has been talking about—in short, to find a solution for the control of this great force internationally, so as to keep it from being used for destruction—then we may face the very real possibility that if, as, and when another nation discovers how to make this very bomb, we may be forced against our will into a totalitarian state of war production in order to protect our

own borders or even to have any semblance of protection against possible invasion. In other words, if we have to go into an atomic-production race, at this moment I see no possibility of carrying it on other than in a type of totalitarian economy with the same measure of compulsion which had to be brought to bear during the last war in order to produce the atomic bomb in the first instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. I endorse what the Senator has said, because I would say we are now in an atomic-bomb race. Every nation which can do so is experimenting with atomic energy. Every one of them that can afford to do it is doing it. There may be members of the Senate who agree with me. I want to do something about it. I am impatient by nature, particularly when I face a problem. Probably that is a weakness, but I am certainly impatient about this matter.

In my opinion we are marking time, while time is drifting on and on and on. Perhaps if this Chamber survives, 20 or 25 years from now someone will dig up this speech and will say—and please pardon the immodesty, which I do not intend by this remark, "Maybe if the Senate had acted then this great catastrophe which has come might have been averted."

If Senators agree with me I ask them to act. Or if they have a better plan, I ask them to tell me what it is and I will agree with them. But in heaven's name let us not sit here twiddling our thumbs. We represent the sovereign people of this Republic. They look to us for leadership and they look to us to promulgate policies. We do not have to wait on anyone in the Republic to set in motion what we think is going to be for the good of the people of the Nation. If Senators agree with me, I ask them to write a letter to the Foreign Relations Committee of this body and request action on the resolution pending there. Let us debate it on this floor. If we devote to that matter half the time we have given to the appointments now before us we shall have made a greater contribution to civilization than we are going to make by considering the appointments themselves.

I want action. I am not content to sit here and see this prairie fire come closer and closer, and admit that the Congress of the United States is impotent. After all, God Almighty gave us brains and arms and feet and hearts, and I hope he gave us courage. Let us face the situation forthrightly. Let us have in this world a showdown as to whether we are to live by the tooth and the claw, or whether mankind in the various nations is to have a chance to live under a government of law and order, maintained by a sheriff competent to keep law and order in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that I have approved his resolution; I did so when I first heard of it. But, like many other persons, I, too, talk about the weather and do not do anything about it. Many of us do that. But as a direct result of what the Senator has said, most certainly I shall write to the Foreign Relations Committee and urge that action be taken on the Senator's resolution.

Let me ask the Senator a question. In order properly to police the world and be able to have an authority that can arrest anyone, anywhere in the world, does not the Senator feel that it is also necessary to call a convention to consider ways and means of turning the United Nations organization, which the Senator has called a debating society——

Mr. TYDINGS. I say that, not in derision, but in sadness——

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that myself. I say I am all for the United Nations. I voted for it—but simply as something better than nothing; that was my attitude toward it.

But does not the Senator feel that we should call an international conference, having in mind the objective of turning the United Nations into a general world government with elected representatives, and thus ending the impotence of the United Nations?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator at this point. I understand the purport of his inquiry, and it is a proper one, and I shall answer him.

First of all, I thank him for his support, and I am glad to have it. I shall appreciate any support he can give, because I am interested in what we are trying to accomplish.

I do not think it would be wise to try to eat the whole cake in one bite. One of the reasons why we often fail as human beings is that we set out to conquer Rome in 1 day, and that is a rather large undertaking. There is no reason in the world why we cannot have a disarmament conference, and it might be a stepping stone toward what the Senator from Idaho has in mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be.

Mr. TYDINGS. But people who would be for one thing would not necessarily be for something else. The reason the United Nations is in the shape it is in today is that it has 85 or 90 different problems before it, but it is not working on a single one of them.

That is why I want a separate conference which can work on this one problem. I shall have to answer the Senator that, for the time being, at least, I would not favor incorporating so broad a horizon into this work, which already is so difficult that the addition of any other controversial matter would, in my judgment, kill it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator does not think it would be wise, then, to call a separate constitutional convention to consider the ways and means of turning the United Nations into a genuine representative world government?

Mr. TYDINGS. If we had world disarmament and put a police force at the disposal of the UN, I visualize 99 percent of the things we should then do would follow as a matter of logic. But if we attempt to do those first, we will not accomplish the major objective, without which the UN will never be any good, namely, to make it superior in its ability and authority to keep the peace in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the Senator in that wholeheartedly. As the Senator said, Rome was not built in a day.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with the Senator. I merely think it is not opportune at this time to enter into that particular field.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have often thought what kind of a body the United States Senate would be if we were appointed by the Governors of the various States to come here, and we could not sit down and talk with each other man to man, and thrash matters out. When a question was put before us, there would be no need of debating it, we would just go to the cloakroom and put in a call for the governor and say, "How do I vote, Governor?" He would not be here to look out over the Nation, he would be back in the State—my Governor, in Idaho—and he would instruct me from the point of view of Idaho how to vote.

I believe the United Nations is in exactly that predicament, so that when the matter of Greek and Turkish assistance came up, I do not believe Mr. Austin was free to act on his own initiative. He had to come and see the President, who appointed him, and get his views in the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have said about all I care to say on this subject, and will hasten to my conclusion. Since the birth of Christ 1,947 years have rolled by. Progress was very slow for the first 1,900 years, more or less, and terrifically fast for the last 47. Transportation and communication are almost instantaneous. I understand the Army feels it will soon have a plane that will travel a thousand miles an hour. The atomic bomb is no longer a theory; it is a hard, cold fact. The one atomic bomb I saw drop at Bikini was a relatively crude affair, but I visualize a hundred of them, in my imagination, of the improved and modern type.

I tried to visualize what damage they could do to New York, Chicago, Moscow, Paris, or London. I have tried to visualize the time when atomic bombs would be a part of the equipment of the armies of the great nations of the world. Perhaps I was overimaginative, perhaps I am a descendant of Jules Verne, but it seemed to me that man had lost his ability to challenge, that he had lost belief in himself, that he said, "This is tremendous," and ran to the cyclone cellar and hid, instead of standing up to the new force, devising a means to utilize it for the benefit of civilization, and to protect humanity from the dire consequences of its abuse.

I hope that these brief remarks may challenge the reflection of those who have been good enough to sit here and listen, and I hope that out of these reflections may come support for the proposal that is pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am hopeful that in this session we can show enough leadership, and so keep abreast of the times in which we are living, that the Senate may request the President of the United States to call a world conference to achieve world disarmament, under proper safeguards, not

disarmament by example, but world disarmament, with a world inspection force, and with the United Nations equipped to keep the peace thereafter.

If the conference should fail, if the goal is not attainable, I want to know it, because my course will be to do everything I can in such a world, where peace is not attainable, to protect the institutions and the people of the United States of America from what I believe might be an instantaneous conflagration coming without notice, as Pearl Harbor came to us, and Hitler's invasion came to Poland and to France—to protect them as best I can in the time available, with the implements and the means that are still at hand, rather than to sit here uttering pious words and empty proverbs, and putting my trust in an institution that is no stronger than the shell of a newly laid egg.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments made in the Senate in the last few days with respect to whether or not the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal should be confirmed by this body.

Soon after the President appointed Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Sumner Pike—and I mention Mr. Sumner Pike because he is embraced in the motion now pending to send all the appointments back to the committee—as members of the Atomic Energy Commission, which may prove to be the most important administrative body ever created by the Congress, I announced that I could not agree with the President as to the fitness and qualifications of these two gentlemen. My objection to the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Pike was based on the well-known philosophy of government held by these gentlemen, which had been so vividly demonstrated by their previous activities as government administrators. The committee hearings and the discussion of those hearings on the floor of the Senate confirmed and emphasized the fact that these men are not imbued with those principles of constitutional government so necessary to safeguard the welfare of the United States in administering the congressional policy concerning atomic energy.

Mr. Lilienthal has had a long career as an administrator of one of our experiments in the field of Government ownership. He is an outstanding exponent of Government control of natural resources, including electric power, and the Government ownership of the business of the distribution and sale of such power.

Mr. Sumner Pike had a long and well-known career as an administrator in OPA. He believes in the theory of a governmentally controlled economy. Upon leaving the OPA, Mr. Pike made a public statement, in which he said that Federal price control on petroleum and petroleum products would have been removed by the OPA long since if it had not been for the fear of the Federal administrators that State authorities would so restrict production of petroleum as to cause an increase in prices. This statement reflects the essence of his thinking on the subject of a centrally controlled economy.

Atomic energy is both a military weapon and a potential source of great industrial, commercial, and social advancement. If we conclude that its military value is paramount in these times of world uncertainty, then, for the present, the secret of harnessing this great power should be left in the hands of the military. It seems to me there can be no argument on this score. If atomic energy is to be looked upon at the present as a military weapon, then the Congress has no more business taking the control of this weapon away from the military than we would in taking the control from the military of dozens of other highly important, secret weapons. In my own view, we would be extremely wise in treating atomic energy as a military weapon for the present, and so long as we are confronted with the international adjustments that are constantly arising as an aftermath of the war. The economic and social stamina of every nation that has survived the recent war has been seriously impaired. New international policies have come into being on every hand. No man can say what destiny the future holds for the world.

It has wisely been suggested that for the present, at least, the control of atomic energy should be recommitted to the military. Certainly, we can make no mistake in this decision.

If, however, we are to adopt the policy, now or in the future, of undertaking a civilian administration of atomic energy, then it is all important that the members of any such commission shall enjoy the faith and confidence of the public. They must be men whose ideals are grounded in the theory and practical operation of our constitutional form of government. They must believe wholeheartedly in the constitutional protection of the private enterprise and effort of the individual. They must understand that government ownership and a governmentally controlled economy are the antithesis of our form of government.

I have heard it argued that it should be the policy of the Senate to go as far as possible in the acceptance and confirmation of personal appointees of the President. I think it should be recognized that in this case, as pointed out by the junior Senator from Ohio on last Friday, Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of this Commission are not appointed by the President as members of his official family. Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of the Commission are appointed to fill positions created by the Congress itself, and to carry out a specifically defined policy of the Congress.

This Commission, in effect, is a mere agency of the Congress to carry out the congressional intent and policy that have been established. In this case, and in all such cases, the legislative branch assumes a responsibility equal to that of the President with respect to the appointive power. To accept such Presidential appointees without question would be shirking a self-imposed responsibility of the legislative branch to the detriment of the public interest and contrary to what the public expects of the Congress.

Mr. President, the basic determining factor of Mr. Lilienthal's qualifications to serve as chairman of this important Atomic Energy Commission has resolved itself into one of public confidence. It certainly cannot be said that a substantial majority of the people accept Mr. Lilienthal's philosophy of the superiority of public ownership versus private enterprise, or Mr. Pike's theory of a controlled economy as against our traditional competitive system. It certainly cannot be said by anyone that doubts and fears have not been raised as to Mr. Lilienthal's sympathy, and even his active support of people generally classed as fellow travelers and tools of the Communist Party. Let us not forget that the Communist Party believes in the declared principle of the destruction of our capitalistic system and an overthrow of our form of government. It has been pointed out here on the floor of the Senate that since the Atomic Energy Commission was appointed by the President, testimony was heard by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as to the kind of men that had already been employed by the Commission. From the testimony it appears that one of these employees, Mr. John L. Burling, has been charged with giving to an unauthorized individual information from Government files concerning an enemy alien, while he was a member of the Office of Alien Enemy Control under the Department of Justice.

Mr. Herbert S. Marks, general counsel of the Commission, previously employed in a legal capacity at TVA and other Government agencies, is reported to be "a strong advocate of state socialism." His "integrity" has been questioned by a number of people interviewed. He is said to have followed a policy of "expediency" in handling his work. He is believed by some to be "completely a self-server." He has spoken in defense of "left-wing individuals and groups." He was refused a commission in the United States Navy because he did not possess "the requisite qualifications for appointment." Every opportunity appears to have been given to show whether this had reference to physical qualifications, but no such showing was made to the committee. Other testimony, however, shows that Mr. Marks apparently served in the Army under the direct command of Col. Walker L. Cisler, overseas, as a part of the Public Utilities Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces. This would not indicate that he was denied a commission in the Navy because of "physical disabilities."

It has been pointed out that this Commission, although not yet confirmed by the Senate, has proceeded to employ and set up a personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the salary schedules of other departments of Government. It has been pointed out that the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during the committee hearings on these appointees, requested of the President that he direct any investigating agencies of

the executive or administrative branches of government to put into the hands of the committee all information possessed by any such agency or branch bearing upon each of the appointees and the general manager of the Commission, and explained to the President that the members of the Senate section of the committee believed that "justifiable criticism can be directed if we do not exhaust all reasonable avenues for the securing of information upon which to base our final recommendation." This request was refused by the President on the ground that it has been the established policy that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest. The President further stated by his letter of March 1 to the chairman of the Senate section of the joint committee that the records of the investigating agencies of the executive branch of the government were checked at the time the appointees in question were named to the Commission and that no derogatory information was contained in any report; that before answering the chairman's letter a current check had been made of the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments, and the Intelligence Section of the Manhattan district, and that no derogatory information with reference to any of the appointees or with reference to the general manager of the Commission was contained in the files of these agencies.

It is difficult to understand the President's statement in this connection in view of the fact that the Navy files disclosed that Mr. Marks, general counsel of the Commission, was refused a commission in the Navy because he did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment.

It is also difficult to understand the President's statement in this connection in view of the report made to the committee concerning Mr. John L. Burling, who has been employed as an attorney on the legal staff of the Atomic Commission.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has never been requested by the Attorney General or the President of the United States to investigate Mr. Lilienthal or any of his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. MOORE. We have no evidence to that effect.

Mr. MALONE. I was informed today of that fact by the Attorney General himself, that no request had ever been made by the Attorney General or the President of the United States or their representatives for the FBI to make such an investigation of either Mr. Lilienthal or any other member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think the President's letter indicates whether or not there was an investigation by the FBI of these appointed Commissioners. It says that he has been told by the FBI and other agencies that there is nothing derogatory.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I can state with certainty that the Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, informed me today that no such investigation had ever been requested or had ever been made, to his knowledge, by the FBI, and that so far as the FBI is concerned, there would simply be, in the case of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Commission, a name file; a "name file" meaning merely a file with no investigative information whatever.

It is further my information that the FBI is not entitled to initiate and can not initiate such an investigation, on its own volition.

Mr. MOORE. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Furthermore, since the Attorney General and the President of the United States are the only authorities entitled to request such an investigation, and since that has never been done, then there is no file on Mr. Lilienthal, and the President of the United States is therefore technically correct no doubt when he says that there is nothing in the file derogatory to Mr. Lilienthal, since there has been no opportunity to investigate him.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, the charges and countercharges that have been made with respect to Mr. Lilienthal and his associates are such as to shake the public confidence in these men, and for that reason, if no other, it would be a serious mistake for the Senate to confirm them for the tremendously important positions to which they have been appointed. Men of wide experience and who enjoy public respect and confidence are available. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] yesterday suggested several names of individuals to whom the President could have no objection, and who, I am sure, would be accepted by the public with a feeling of confidence in their Americanism.

I suggest to the Senate now that if these present appointees are confirmed, it will result in raising fear and suspicion in the public mind, and will result in continued attacks upon the Commission that will impair its effective operation. This situation will be particularly aggravated by the approval of Mr. Lilienthal, but I include the entire membership of the Commission, because their activities on the Commission have already been such that they cannot escape the censure of which I speak.

The division of the Members of the Senate is such as to remove this matter from a political or partisan consideration.

I urge upon every Member of the Senate to approach this question with the future welfare of the Nation as a paramount consideration.

I say to the Senate now that it is not good business to employ men for these important key positions in Government on which there is such a wide public division of feeling.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Holland	Revercomb
Bricker	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Sparkman
Cain	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that today we have had a most illuminating and thorough-going debate on the paramount problem of our time. I indeed regret that this debate did not occur a year ago. I had the distinct honor and privilege of being asked to address the joint Army-Navy War College last September. The invitation came at a very inconvenient time for me, but I thought that my duty required that I respond to it. For 4 hours I was before an audience of approximately 400 Army and Navy officers, from lieutenants to generals and full admirals. I talked for about an hour and a half; I answered questions for at least 2½ hours. I was indeed pleased to see that that body of men on whom our future security, from the standpoint of military leadership, depends, seemed to understand that which happened on the desert of New Mexico in July 1945. I must say, in all frankness and regretfully, that I am sure they understood the implications, military and political, much better than does our American citizenry as a whole, and perhaps better than does the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, when the bomb dropped on Hiroshima from an airplane manned by 11 men, and the plane sped away, it left behind it a scene of indescribable ruin, death, decay, and confusion, and there were certain things and certain concepts of a military nature that absolutely and positively disappeared in the same fashion and form as the Roman phalanx has disappeared from the military operations of our time. When that happened, Mr. President, the conceptions of generalship, the conceptions of strategy, military frontiers, strategic railways, armies—yes, and navies as we have

known them—became distinctly obsolescent if not obsolete.

I do not intend to belabor the description of what this force is—we all know about it—except to ask Senators what they think would have happened when we massed our troops for invasion on the southeast coast of England if Hitler had possessed even three atomic bombs, two atomic bombs, or even one atomic bomb of the kind that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and they had been dropped on that concentration of troops. It would probably have resulted in not one man reaching the coast of Normandy. If while Hitler was on his death bed in 1945, or as late as March, he had possessed some atomic bombs, even though the death rattle was in his throat, it is my firm conviction—not only mine, but that of many eminent military men with whom I have discussed this subject—that he would have risen and stricken the armies of the Allies and dispersed and defeated them.

The Bikini tests have been referred to. Only two have been held. The first one seemed to disappoint some who anticipated that the world itself would end. The effects were horrible enough. I remember commenting on it to one of my friends when he said that there were some battleships left afloat. I agreed that that was true, but I said that 140,000,000 people could not live on battleships.

When the second test was held, the water-level test, a scene of indescribable destruction and confusion was created on the naval armada; and, Mr. President, if the third or deep-water test had been held not a single ship would have survived in that lagoon, because according to scientific testimony the force of the explosion beneath the water would have opened the seams of every ship and plummeted it to the bottom.

We are dealing with the force which is contained in the sun. We have opened the heart of nature. I sometimes regret that we have done so, because I am obsessed with the fear that we shall not match our physical accomplishment with our actions in the field of ethics and morality, law, and order. Mankind has finally reached an achievement by which he may destroy himself. The other night I was looking in the Book of Revelations. I saw the prediction that man would destroy himself by fire. I could not but wonder whether we had achieved the first step in that horrible prediction.

Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate know, I early became acquainted with the implications of that which we have done. Yesterday I referred to the fact that on September 6, 1945, the first day the Congress reconvened after the end of the Japanese War, I made a speech which did not take me more than 10 minutes to deliver; and in it I said there were two obvious things which we had to do. The first was to put this discovery domestically under national control, so that fissionable material would be used in the public good, so that we might try to harness it for the benefit of mankind. I pointed out that it was unthinkable that we should permit this force to be handed out to any private citizen or private corporation. I believe in free enterprise. The free enterprise system has been rather good to me. But it seemed only obvious that we could not permit the existence of private armies or private navies in the hands of any individual or any corporation.

The second principle which I enunciated in my speech on that day was that what we had done some other nation would do in a given length of time; and that when we ceased to have a monopoly on the making of atomic bombs, America would be in mortal danger. I said we were in the position of a man who had money in the bank and who knew that inflation was inevitably coming and that when it came his money would amount to nothing more than pieces of paper; and that, being in such a position, we were in effect, closing our eyes to what was coming, and were watching what we had and letting it become worthless, instead of using it to buy something, while it still had buying power. So on that day I said it was absolutely and imperatively necessary to get this force under control. I advocated that it be done through an international inspection system.

As a result of that speech and of a bill which was introduced by me on that day, with the very great aid and assistance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who now is the distinguished President pro tempore of this body, we succeeded in forming a special committee to consider both the domestic and the international control problems which arose out of what we had done. All Senators know, I am sure, that we were most devoted to our duty. We spent weeks and weeks and weeks, hour after hour, listening to the testimony. We even went so far—for the first time in congressional history—as to go to school. That was the first time in the history of Congress that a senatorial committee ever went to school. We went to the Bureau of Standards, and there we tried to learn at least the basic essentials of what we were attempting to deal with. We faced the blackboard. Some of the most distinguished scientists of this land tried to implant in our minds some knowledge of nuclear physics which would enable us to appreciate the nature of that which had been accomplished.

Mr. President, I shall not at this moment dwell on the domestic legislation, except to say that I do not suppose any piece of legislation in the history of Congress has been more thoroughly tested and argued over and interpreted than the legislation which was finally agreed upon unanimously by the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman—the Committee on Atomic Energy which was considering the problem to which I now refer.

I see before me now the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. Let me pay tribute to him, fine lawyer that he is, for his suggestions and arguments and the consideration which he gave, hour after hour, in our room on the first floor of the Senate Office Building, in hammering out our differences—and they were many and serious—in connection with the formulation of this act. When the bill finally emerged from the committee, it contained things which the Senator from Colorado did not like. Yet the Senator from Colorado was the strongest advocate of the provisions contained in that bill, which for the first time enunciates principles which never before have been adopted in our American system of government. The Senator from Colorado knows that I did not particularly enjoy having them incorporated in the measure, either. But we were faced with the compulsion of certain facts which absolutely demanded that we do that which was done.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to confirm, so far as my own personal philosophy is concerned, what the Senator has said about the revolutionary character of the bill. I would not possibly tolerate the application of that bill in any other governmental direction that I can think of, and it was made very clear, during all the debate and all the proceedings, that we were tailoring a bill to fit this new and unprecedented energy, and that it was not to be considered a precedent in other directions.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if Senators will examine the record of the debate on that bill—and I shall never forget it—they will find that I stood next to the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Colorado stood in front of me, and he made exactly that observation, and I agreed with him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, for the first time we have said that a man in the United States cannot take out a patent on a patentable idea; we have barred him from taking out a patent on a new weapon utilizing atomic energy, and we have barred the granting of any patent on the production of fissionable material. For the first time we have compelled the compulsory licensing of a patent granted by the Patent Office of the United States. In this bill for the first time we have said to a governmental commission, "You must not issue a license until you make a complete study of what the articles or products manufactured under the patent would mean when that new invention is introduced into American economy; and you cannot issue a license until you report on that matter to the Congress of the United States." The Congress is given 90 days in which to make up its mind regarding whether any further legislation is necessary in view of the development, let us say, of an atomic-energy locomotive.

Mr. President, we also considered the international question. The other evening I was interested in rereading the hearings before our special committee.

I came across a passage which I put into the RECORD a few days ago from the hearing held on December 3. We were discussing international control, and I wish to read to the Senate what I said, because the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which I shall defend, had its genesis right there on page 173 of the hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Atomic Energy. This was the genesis of it. Dr. Bush was on the stand, and I said:

Doctor, to reach the objection proposed by Senator JOHNSON and also advanced by some of our other witnesses that peacetime use of

atomic energy in power plants complicates the problem of the control, would it be possible or feasible, do you think, to have any such peacetime power plants controlled under the United Nations organization, to be internationally maintained, with perhaps a stock to be owned and a basis of contributions such as the UNRRA organization, that is, each country putting in that portion which their national income will justify for international control of these power plants, internationally inspected and internationally operated?

I omitted to state that on November 15 the now famous three-power declaration was signed by Mr. Truman, Mr. Attlee and Mr. King, and in that declaration they acknowledged certain fundamental facts which have been the guide of what I thought until today was the thinking of our Government on this question. Of course, underlying all efforts to get international control are the following salient facts:

(a) This is the all-controlling weapon. Joe Stalin does not think so; at least, that is what he said. Last September he said, "Well, I think people are exaggerating their estimate of what it is." I suggested in a newspaper interview that it might be well if Mr. Stalin were to consult the relatives of the dead at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that I hardly thought he would find them in agreement. I further said that perhaps his lowly estimate of the capacities of the bomb were somewhat influenced by the fact that he did not have it yet.

It is the all-controlling weapon, and any military man who is worth his salt will say so. Despite the assertions of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] this afternoon, Mr. President, there is no defense against it, and unfortunately and unhappily our scientists and military men do not foresee the possibilities of a defense.

Mr. President, now comes the second and probably the most fundamental and salient fact of all, that is, regardless of what the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] believes—and I must say to him I wish I could believe with him—it is impossible for any nation to maintain for a long period of time a monopoly on this death-dealing device. That Russia will in time secure the bomb is as inevitable as that we are sitting in this Chamber this evening.

Mr. President, what I and others, shall I say, who have studied the problem think and know is that before any other nation, especially Russia, gets the bomb it is absolutely essential that we get this force under effective control. Mind you, I said "effective control."

I have heard Senators declare on this floor that we should outlaw the bomb. That is exactly the position Joe Stalin takes. I refuse to take that chance with America. For my part, I am not going to vote for any outlawing of the bomb, and trust to the chance of any other nation using it against us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator made reference a few moments ago to the position Stalin takes with reference to the importance of the bomb and atomic energy. The Senator said Stalin did not believe it was the supreme weapon. Does he believe Stalin is sincere in that statement?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator think any American who knows anything about the effect of the bomb would be deceived by such a statement?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that Stalin does not deceive me, and at the time the statement was made I was chairman of the joint committee, and I thought it was incumbent upon me to tell him that at least we were not "falling" for the statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I believe the statement is a sample of the tactics being employed, and I think the only solution of the great problem which now confronts us is to determine with respect to whether we can have disarmament with world inspection, with police power with authority to make a world inspection, to know that all nations stay disarmed, atomically and otherwise. If we do not achieve that, and achieve it soon, the United Nations and everything else will fall by the wayside.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. Let me interject at this point something which has been brought to my mind by what the Senator has just said. I want the Senate to note the qualification I put in the statement, because it is all-important.

I say that if Gromyko uttered the last word, 4 weeks ago tomorrow, on the international control of atomic energy, if the door has been finally closed, on that day the United Nations died.

Why do I say that? I say that if an association of nations which has gathered for the primary purpose of organizing law and order and peace, cannot solve the basic and first problem that hangs like a dark cloud over the minds of men—then its raison d'etre has disappeared.

We are talking these days about the fact that we may get into an atomic armaments race. The Senator from Delaware was absolutely accurate when he said that we are in an atomic armaments race now. It is no secret to our own people that all the governments of the world are seeking to produce an atomic bomb. They are seeking desperately to produce it because they realize that the possession of the bomb gives to the United States the controlling weapon of war.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In all the conversations and debates it seems to be generally understood and taken for granted that, of the entire 51 nations in the United Nations organization, if any one of them, other than the United States, should discover the atomic-bomb secret, they will use it upon us. Why is that assumption made?

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand the Senator's question, it carries an implication that he feels it does not make any difference whether other nations have atomic bombs or not.

Mr. MALONE. No; the Senator misunderstood me. Why does the Senator from Connecticut, and why do other Senators—I have listened very carefully all day—assume that as soon as another nation, that is also a member of the United Nations, discovers the secret of the atomic bomb, it will immediately attack us?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that I am aware, just as he is, of the exacerbation of feelings and sentiments, and the tension that is mounting daily between this country and Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Why?

Mr. McMAHON. The fault, certainly in the atomic-energy field, in my opinion is Russia's. I shall develop why I feel that way. There are other reasons which time does not permit me to discuss with the Senator now.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Why is feeling in Russia rising against us?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, I suppose, due to the fact that the Russian people are living behind a high wall which keeps out the true knowledge of the intentions of the American people and what they desire to do, they have been able to convince a good many of their own people that we are bent upon destroying the Russian Nation.

Mr. MALONE. By "they," to whom does the Senator refer?

Mr. McMAHON. I am talking about the political end. I am talking about the people who control and rule Russia. That is quite obvious, is it not, to the Senator?

Mr. MALONE. No; it is not obvious to me. Russia is a member of the United Nations, the same as we are. Why do they not take the same attitude?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, I refuse to stand responsible for the foreign policy of Russia. That is all I can say.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If it be true that they have an attitude such as the Senator describes, and if it be true that this feeling is mounting, then is it the opinion of the Senator that it would be better, and it would stop this mounting feeling, if we should give them the atomic-bomb secret?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator assumes something that is simply not true. I shall talk about that, if the Senator please, in a few moments.

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I am not assuming anything; I am asking the Senator from Connecticut for information.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me, that is a question which I want to discuss when I come to describe what we have really proposed in the United Nations.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I share with the Senator, and I have so stated on this floor, his deep regret that the Russian delegate has not seen fit, under instructions of his government, to embrace the proposal which we have made. I say that because

if the problem regarding atomic energy can be settled, and if the problem of controlling atomic energy can be solved in a way that will assure effective control, it is my opinion and belief that the other questions, such as reparations, boundaries, ethnic questions, and all the other questions that disturb the peace, are infinitesimal in comparison with this prime question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If it be a fact that Russia, being the only other great power besides the United States, takes the attitude that the Senator apparently assumes it to take, is it not an impossibility to secure such an agreement until Russia entirely changes its attitude?

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator has answered his own question. If the Senator had listened to what I said a little earlier he would have heard me point out that if Gromyko has said the last word in New York, then the United Nations has died.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, if this is the only real weapon of national security in the world, and we are the only ones that have it, temporarily, would it not be a great mistake if we were to part with the secret of the atomic bomb until such an agreement has been made?

Mr. McMAHON. Who in the world proposes to part with any atomic bomb secret until an effective agreement has been made?

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon, if I misunderstood him earlier in the evening to say he believed that the proposal made in the report by Mr. Lilienthal should be accepted.

Mr. McMAHON. Absolutely; and if the Senator has read the Acheson-Lilienthal report he would know that it does not propose giving the bomb to Russia at this time. Will the Senator permit me to explain?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me point out to the Senator that that board which was appointed and which has been truly described as being composed of great Americans, finally produced, in the month of April 1946, as I recall, the Acheson-Lilienthal plan or report. I should like to point out to the Senator something that I do not believe has been discussed. That is, that the Secretary of State, in publishing the report, wrote a foreword from which I should like to quote:

> The committee also states that it regards the consultants' work as "the most constructive analysis of the question of international control we have seen and a definitely hopeful approach to a solution of the entire problem. The document is being made public not as a statement of policy but solely as the basis for discussion.

That is one statement contained in the Acheson-Lilienthal report which, I think, has generally escaped the attention of Senators. Incidentally, let me say to the Senator, regardless of the statement of the senior Senator from Ohio as to the abandonment of the Acheson-Lilienthal proposals by Mr. Baruch, a study of both proposals will show that they are identical, with the exception of the addition of the veto feature.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume the fact I am about to suggest has been developed before; but all through the debates there is reference to the Lilienthal report or the Lilienthal-Acheson report, and those opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal would have the Senate and the country believe that it is the creation of Lilienthal and of nobody else. I think it is time, if it has not already been said, to state just who was on the committee, and the type and kind and character of men who signed the report, who considered it carefully and conscientiously for weeks and months before signing it.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. It is in the RECORD, I suppose, three or four times. Mr. John J. McCloy, former Assistant Secretary of War; Dean Acheson, at present Acting Secretary of State; Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who seems to have won the acclaim of a good many Senators who are opposed to Mr. Lilienthal; also joined in signing that report, as did also Dr. Conant, of Harvard; Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was probably more responsible for the organization of the scientists in their work on the bomb than any other man; and Harry A. Winne of the General Electric Co.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any evidence in the hearings that any of the individuals whom the Senator has mentioned, who are great Americans, had any communistic leanings or were charged with belonging to any subversive organizations?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know. They have not been nominated and so become subject to confirmation. I cannot tell what would happen if they were. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that after hearing what went on in the hearings I would hate to predict what might happen in such event. I listened in the hearing to an old man who was brought up from Tennessee, who was described as a peace officer. He was a funny old fellow about 65 years old. His name was Remine. He said he had been put to the job of hunting Communists, and he said he was assiduous in his work. Where do Senators suppose that work took him? It took him to a nudist colony, and he got up close to it. He said his purpose was to hear what they were plotting and conspiring to do. Of course I suppose there was no other attraction. He hid behind the trees. He said, "Yes, they were Communists all right." But lo, and behold, it turned out that they did not work for the TVA. They were among the 55 Communists in the State of Tennessee. But that old gentleman was subpenaed at public expense and brought here to testify. The Senators who sat on the committee, with a total of 105 years of service in the Senate, had to give of their time to listen to him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. When I look back over the record of leadership of the last 30 years, not only of our own country but of the entire world, and when I look back at two world wars and all the suffering that has taken place in the world, I am not so certain but that it may be well to listen to an old man like the old gentleman from Tennessee. He at least could not have done any worse than was done by those who have had charge of affairs in the world and in the United States, and who have had responsibility for what has taken place during the last 30 years under their leadership. I do not know how anyone could have gotten our world into a worse mess than it is now in.

Mr. McMAHON. I was disappointed that the Senator was not present to hear Mr. Remine's testimony. If he had, I am sure he would share my own estimate of the worth of the testimony.

Mr. CAPEHART. I also am sorry I was not present to hear his testimony, but I do not particularly appreciate the taking advantage of an old gentleman who possibly was 70 or 75 years old, and perhaps was unable to do any better than he did when he appeared before the committee, so far as detailed conversations were concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I did not subpena Mr. Remine, nor was I responsible for him appearing before the committee. The testimony I have described appears in the record. I wish those who represent the point of view the Senator from Indiana represents were as tender of the susceptibilities of one of the demonstrated great public servants of this country.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I likewise wish that those who advocate that we go into Turkey and Greece to fight a certain ideology of government which we are asked to go there to fight would likewise look a little bit toward the interests of America, and look around a little bit over America to see what is going on here. I wish they would be as much opposed to those who may have that ideology in America as they are opposed to those who are six or seven thousand miles away.

Mr. McMAHON. I suppose the Senator is announcing his steadfast opposition to Communist ideology anywhere in the world. Is that the intention?

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly am, and I expect to vote for the proposal made by the President of the United States. But I likewise shall oppose communism in America. I see no sense in going seven or eight thousand miles to fight communism and then wink at communism in America. I am not saying that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. I do not think he is. But, in my opinion, it is one of the most unfortunate things that ever happened to our country that we should now be asked to confirm a man about whom there is a single bit of suspicion. I pray to God that someone may be appointed to head the Atomic Energy Com-

mission, important as it is, important as the Senator thinks it is, and as I think it is, in whom America can have the utmost confidence. I know of nothing more important than the matter under consideration.

I am not responsible for the situation as it exists. This is the first time I have made a statement in respect to Mr. Lilienthal on the floor of the Senate. We are asked to appoint a man upon whom the United States is divided. Sincere Senators are divided upon that question on the floor of the Senate; sincere Americans are divided on it. We were not divided with respect to Mr. Marshall when he was nominated to be Secretary of State. We were not divided over many other nominations submitted to us. We are divided on this particular nomination. I admit that I do not know whether the Senator is right or whether those who are opposed to Lilienthal are right. But in the name of heaven, on a matter so important as this is, why is it not possible to have someone nominated, even though he may not be as well qualified as is Mr. Lilienthal, even though he may not be indispensable—why is it not possible to have submitted the name of a man in whom we can have the utmost confidence regardless of who he is or whence he comes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think that Mr. Lilienthal meets the qualifications that have been laid down by the Senator from Indiana. I further know that Mr. Lilienthal's appointment was acclaimed in every leading newspaper of the country, and by dozens and dozens of our outstanding public men immediately after his appointment on October 21. There was no indication whatever of the storm that was to overtake us when we opened the hearings and when we had a parade of witnesses from Tennessee, discharged employees, people who had a grudge, people with no standing of any consequence in their community—people who were brought here to testify, mind you, not against Lilienthal per se. I may be wrong, and if so I should like to be corrected, but I do not recollect that any single witness subpenaed here for 1 minute claimed that this man was as he was described by the senior Senator from Tennessee, "The chief Communist of my State."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator from Connecticut tell us how long Mr. Lilienthal has been in public life?

Mr. McMAHON. As I recall, he entered public life in the Wisconsin Public Utility Commission, or Railroad Commission, I believe it was called, in 1931.

Mr. PEPPER. Was he confirmed by the State senate of Wisconsin for that position? I ask for information.

Mr. McMAHON. I believe he was.

Mr. PEPPER. And thereafter did he come into the Federal public service?

Mr. McMAHON. As the Senator knows, he did. He was appointed to the Tennessee Valley Authority, confirmed and reconfirmed, I believe, twice.

Mr. PEPPER. And his conduct was subject to public scrutiny all the time by Members of Congress and by the American public; and were any of these charges ever made against him, and was he ever impeached as to his patriotism or his integrity until after his appointment to this position was announced to the country and to the Congress?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am aware the answer is "No."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Connecticut sat on that committee a good deal of the time. He was away much of the time, but he was certainly present when the Senator's own witness, Mr. Lilienthal's own witness, his former secretary and stenographer, came before the committee and testified that Mr. Lilienthal, all the time he was with the Railroad Commission or the Public Utilities Commission of Wisconsin, was performing business for the very railroads and public utilities that he had been chosen to regulate, and that during 18 months and 15 days he had drawn from the utilities more than $7,000, in violation of the laws of Wisconsin, and had drawn from the utilities which employed him more than $17,000 at the same time. He was a lawyer. He was not doing legal work. It was research work. He seems to have been a book man, and he was doing research in books, magazines, and newspapers for the public utilities of Wisconsin, contrary to the terms of the Wisconsin law, just as a lawyer who takes fees on both sides of a case, except that in this case it was in direct violation of the statutory law. The Senator, after hearing that evidence before the committee, says that this man is without blemish and without fault. How can the Senator say that?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator made his speech yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I told the Senate——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. That is a habit of the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. It is the same treatment which I received yesterday. The Senator made those charges yesterday about his Wisconsin experience. I endeavored to read into the RECORD at that time a telegram from the then Governor of Wisconsin on this subject. The Senator from Tennessee refused to yield to permit me to do so at that time. I now read that telegram into the RECORD, dealing with this transaction. Mr. President, his record is as clean as a whistle. What does Governor La Follette say?

> I note the imputation that David Lilienthal was underhandedly serving private interests while on Wisconsin Public Service Commission. When offered the appointment he was active in his profession and naturally had to wind up his affairs. He fully and completely disclosed his affairs and subsequently filed in the Governor's office a copy of the contract which his affairs were wound up in. His record as commissioner was outstanding, devoted to public service, and wholly honorable.
>
> PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE.

What are the facts in regard to this Wisconsin matter? I did not intend to go into it at this time, because I am anxious to discuss with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] the question which he has asked me as to what we have proposed in this report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator intend at a later time to recur to a discussion of the Wisconsin incident? I urge the Senator to do so, because I believe that a great many Members of the Senate are uninformed, or have been misinterpreting the so-called Wisconsin incident. I think the RECORD should be perfectly clear on that point, because if the Senator will place the facts in the RECORD, I am satisfied that no Senator can justify voting against Mr. Lilienthal on the ground of the Wisconsin incident.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I intend to discuss it to the best of my ability.

On February 19, Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell, a Chicago housewife and secretary to Lilienthal when he maintained a law office in Chicago in 1931, testified that Mr. Lilienthal continued to receive compensation from the Commerce Clearing House, a legal reporting service which abstracts decisions of courts and commissions pertaining to various fields of law, after he became a member of the Wisconsin Railway Commission. Although Mrs. Leitzell apparently is not a lawyer, she testified that she believed the receipt of this compensation to be in violation of the Wisconsin law. That is the charge which has been made by the senior Senator from Tennessee at great length on the floor of the Senate.

I have read the telegram which has been received from Governor La Follette. Mr. Lilienthal testified about this incident. I should like to read into the RECORD a short synthesis of what he said.

On February 20, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] inserted in the record of these hearings the provisions of the Wisconsin Statute, 1945, No. 195.01, as follows:

> No commissioner shall be pecuniarily interested in any railroad, public utility, or motor carrier, and if any such commissioner shall voluntarily become interested his office ipso facto shall become vacant.

Section 4 is as follows:

> Full time office: No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit or pursue any other business or vocation or serve on or under any committee of any political party but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office.

This is what Mr. Lilienthal said about it:

> The record of my activities as a member of the Wisconsin Commission is a public record. The soundness of the work I did as commissioner is, of course, a matter of opinion, but that I put every ounce of energy and every moment of my time into that work is well known to scores of people, to members of the then Wisconsin Commission staff, to utility executives and experts with whom I had official relations, to public officials in the State government and throughout the

State. I was fully and entirely engaged upon the commission's work. For example, at the outset of my service I drafted a complete revision of the utility regulatory laws of the State for consideration by the legislature, a draft which was agreed to in advance of its introduction by most public and private interests and enacted virtually as drafted.

Early in 1931, 16 years ago, the newly elected Governor of Wisconsin, Governor La Follette, called me to Madison from Chicago, where I was engaged in the practice of law. I had never met Mr. La Follette before, and he knew me only by reputation. He said that due to a death there was a vacancy on the railroad commission and that he had called me to Madison to discuss with me my appointment to serve the remaining 2 years of that unexpired term. He said that during his administration he hoped to bring about the improvement and strengthening of the utility regulations, and believed that I would contribute to that objective. At that time I was 31 years of age. I was interested and honored by this offer, but I explained to Governor La Follette that there were a number of important business affairs that would have to be worked out before I could accept such an appointment.

I told him that I had only recently signed a new lease for a term of years on space in the new 1 North LaSalle Street building where I had established my law practice. I also explained I had for some years had an arrangement with the firm of Commerce Clearing House to supervise the editing of a loose-leaf legal reporting service abstracting the decisions of courts and commissions on the regulation of public utilities and carriers, that this publication had involved the Commerce Clearing House in a substantial investment of money, that the publication, which now ran into some 20 volumes and was still not complete, had been sold by Commerce Clearing House on a continuing basis to a number of subscribers. I told the Governor that it had been generally contemplated at the time the service was started that as the service got a market I could expect substantial returns in the future in compensation for the low level of current payments I had agreed to accept during the building up period of writing the service and getting it started.

I explained that we were about at a stage, I thought, in the development of the service where it seemed reasonable to expect that I should begin to get paid for this past effort expended during the development stages. I told the Governor that in view of this situation and the new lease I had just entered into it seemed very doubtful indeed that I could accept even for a short period of time. La Follette said that he realized that anyone in active practice would have problems to work out, but strongly urged me to return to Chicago and try to work this out with Commerce Clearing House and report back to him. He said that even a year's leave of absence from my work would give me a chance to help reorganize the Commission's work and aid in drafting new legislation.

I returned to Chicago and took up the matter at length with Mr. Kixmiller, president of the Commerce Clearing House. After considerable discussion Commerce Clearing House agreed to the arrangement embodied in the following letter contract under the heading of Commerce Clearing House, dated February 5, 1931—

This is signed by Mr. Kixmiller—

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: Following your report to me yesterday that you would like to accept the position of member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission provided your appointment is confirmed, I am glad to inform you that we should be willing to give you a leave of absence for a year, with an option to renew the absence the second year.

It is understood that you will render no personal services for us during this period and will receive no compensation from us. The editorial work heretofore performed by you, and carried on in your office by assistants under your direction is to be continued by them during your absence, pursuant to this arrangement.

Your present weekly check from us of $385 will be reduced initially to $240 per week. This check will be drawn directly to you to avoid unnecessary bookkeeping, and is to reimburse you for liabilities (such as rent, salaries, and so forth) heretofore assumed by you primarily to carry on our work. In addition to such reimbursement these weekly checks drawn to you during your absence will include a margin above reimbursement as part payment for your past services, particularly in the training of assistants to carry on this editorial work. We estimate this sum to be $2,000 per year, though it may be less. Your right to the reimbursement of payments above provided for is not and will not be in any way affected by the extent to which we market the service.

COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE, INC.,
WM. KIXMILLER, *President*.

It was accepted by David E. Lilienthal. Then he says:

I returned to Madison and conferred with the governor. I showed the governor this letter contract.

He is a despicable, conspiratorial fellow, is he not?

I explained that the arrangement would involve me in no obligation to render any service to Commerce Clearing House and that I would not be compensated for anything except heretofore uncompensated past services. The contract would take care of my obligation to Commerce Clearing House respecting the publication in which they had invested rather heavily, and would take care of my office lease situation during my absence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is quite important at this point to clear up an erroneous impression given by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. On the floor today the impression was certainly given to the Senate that at the same time Mr. Lilienthal was serving as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, later called the utilities commission, he was also serving public utilities which he was regulating. I think it should be brought out at this time that Commerce Clearing House is a publishing house which issues material used by those who practice before commissions; used by regulatory commissions themselves, and State and municipal bodies in the regulation of public utilities, as well as by public utilities themselves. So in no sense was he working for the people whom he was regulating.

Mr. McMAHON. That is an absolute fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not that, in substance, a sort of legal service? These articles are sent to lawyers and others who buy them and use them. They do not operate any utilities that are being regulated by the commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us hear what the Governor did when Mr. Lilienthal arrived. I read further:

The Governor studied the contract, and as I recall he had it examined by his legal adviser. He thereupon advised me that he regarded this arrangement a proper and legal one. Shortly thereafter, he announced my appointment and late in March 1931 I took office. A copy of this contract with Mr. Kixmiller was made a part of the official executive files. The arrangement was also reviewed with the Honorable Theodore Kronsage, chairman of the railroad commission, a distinguished member of the Wisconsin bar, who also gave it his approval. The editorial work on this publication was carried on in my former office in Chicago, supervised by Commerce Clearing House directly. It was an open arrangement, well known to many people, both in Madison and Chicago, and at no time a secret, nor done clandestinely as falsely imputed here.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the view of the Senator from Connecticut that the arrangement which Mr. Lilienthal made with Commerce Clearing House was somewhat similar to the arrangement which an author has with a publishing house for royalties on a book previously written by the author?

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. That is a very good analogy.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not somewhat similar to rights which an inventor retains in a patent on which he receives royalties after the patent has been turned over to a production agency?

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that there is nothing in this record that shows that after Mr. Lilienthal went to work with the Wisconsin commission he did any work for Commerce Clearing House during that period of time?

Mr. McMAHON. Not a thing.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, whatever work was done for the Commerce Clearing House by any individuals who previously had been assistants or members of the so-called editorial board working under the direction of Mr. Lilienthal was thereafter done under the supervision of officials of the Commerce Clearing House and not under the supervision of Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McMAHON. That is the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to read from the record for a moment to show how utterly mistaken the Senator is in his facts. I shall read from the bottom of page 589. There were only three people in Lilienthal's office. If I may be permitted to say so, this witness was not my witness. I never heard of the lady before, never saw her before, never dreamed that there was such a human being on earth until she appeared as a witness and was placed on the stand by the chairman of the committee, I supposed as a witness for Mr. Lilienthal. I

assumed that she was a character witness. This is what she had to say:

I handled such correspondence as was necessary. Mr. Lilienthal often wrote his notes and material in shorthand. I could read and transcribe his shorthand notes.

I handled his check book, preparing checks for payment of myself, Booth, and Swidler, and for office expenses, such as telephone bills and rent.

I checked his monthly bank statements against the stubs in his check book, which was kept in the office.

This was before he was ever appointed.

Early in 1931, Mr. Lilienthal was appointed to the Wisconsin commission and went to Madison.

He continued to maintain his office at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago. He continued to pay the office rent. He continued to pay me. He continued to pay Mr. Booth and Mr. Swidler.

He handled these checks in one of two ways: Either he would come into the office and sign the checks, or I would mail them to him in Madison for signature.

After his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told me to tell anybody who asked for him that the office was no longer his. I followed his instructions.

I am reading now from the testimony of Mr. Lilienthal's witness, who was brought there to my utter astonishment. I never dreamed of it before.

I read further:

If I couldn't cope with any situation that came up, I turned it over to Mr. Booth or Mr. Swidler.

I continued to work for Mr. Lilienthal under these conditions through and beyond the summer of 1932. I remember the date, because in the summer of 1932 my husband went on a camping trip and I returned to work for Mr. Lilienthal after coming back from that trip.

That lady was utterly unknown to those who oppose Mr. Lilienthal. She was put on the witness stand by the distinguished chairman of the committee. She was told by Mr. Lilienthal not to tell anyone that the office was his, but to state that the office was not his—why? Because he was drawing two salaries from antagonistic sources. Those are the facts. It is precisely the same as having a lawyer draw fees from both sides of a case. I challenge any Senator to read the entire statement of that lady; for if her entire statement is read, the truth is apparent.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, the unfortunate thing about the testimony the Senator from Tennessee has read is that it is entirely and utterly consistent with the arrangement which was entered into openly and publicly and was filed in the office of the Governor of Wisconsin.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield. I should like to get away from this point, because I think we are spending too much time on it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator would take my judgment on that matter. I do not think we can spend too much time on this particular point, because I think it has been greatly misunderstood by some of my most cherished senatorial friends on this side of the aisle. I think the Wisconsin incident will stand any analysis which anyone wishes to give it, if they will really go into the facts, including the testimony which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has just read.

Does the Senator from Connecticut agree with me that that testimony shows very clearly that Mr. Lilienthal gave to his secretary instructions that he was no longer doing work in that office?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; if I may answer the question, let me say that he told his secretary to tell anyone who asked for him that he was no longer connected with it. He just wanted to pull the wool over their eyes, so to speak. He wanted to keep everyone in the dark, and to continue to keep his business and salary, while holding the Wisconsin office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say, with all respect, that I think the interpretation made of that language by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is most interesting, but I do not think there is a word of the statement of that witness that will support his interpretation. I think the interpretation the Senator has just stated is what he would like to read into the testimony, but I find in the testimony, which he himself has read from the record, nothing which would support his conclusion.

What she said was that after his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told her to tell anyone who asked for him that the office was no longer his. She said, "I followed his instructions."

I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say that Mr. Lilienthal pointed out to the then Governor of the State of Wisconsin the problem that he had in regard to his previous connections with the Commerce Clearing House, and that it was suggested to him that he take a leave of absence for a year or, if necessary, 2 years, in order to do that work with the Wisconsin commission; and that Mr. Lilienthal had told the Governor that he had already taken a lease on the office in Chicago, for a term of years; and the Governor suggested to him that they work out an arrangement whereby he could help for at least a year or possibly longer, and then go back to the Chicago practice; and that all Mr. Lilienthal did, in regard to the testimony which has been read, was to work out such an arrangement with the Commerce Clearing House, whereby the office would be available to him when he went back to Chicago, after leaving the Wisconsin commission, but that during the period of time when he was on the Wisconsin commission he would devote his full time to the work of the commission.

The people who had previously been associated with him on the Clearing House reports, continued to do the work on the reports, under the supervision and direction, not of Mr. Lilienthal, but of officials of the Commerce Clearing House.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I thank him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment, Mr. President. First I wish to say that there is an old saying of law, falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus. The charge which has been made here cannot and will not stand up. It is typical of the other charges which have been put together on the floor of the Senate in order to accomplish the end which some seek to achieve. I say to the Senator that instead of the interpretation which has been put on this matter by the Senator from Tennessee, I leave it to my brother Senators that if a statement of those facts does not demonstrate that Mr. Lilienthal was entirely honorable, entirely ethical, and entirely decent and aboveboard in that transaction, then I do not know the meaning of the code of ethics.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I promised first to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago my friend the Senator from Oregon said that in talking to some of his colleagues he found they expressed concern about that arrangement. I confess that I am one of those. Without going into a discussion of my own views, I can say that at the beginning of these hearings no question had arisen in my mind as to the qualifications of this nominee. But beginning with this arrangement in Wisconsin and from the testimony of Mr. Morgan, certainly questions have been raised about him which, although they may not seem fundamental to some persons, nevertheless seem to me to touch on the very fundamental intellectual honesty of this nominee.

The letter which touches on the contract—I read from page 806 the provision of the Wisconsin statute:

(4) Full time office: No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit, or pursue any other business or vocation, or serve on or under any committee of any political party, but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office.

I think all of us agree that if he continued in any other business or vocation, he would be in violation of that law.

I find the following in the letter or agreement:

It is understood that you will render no personal services for us during this period and will receive no compensation from us. The editorial work heretofore performed by you, and carried on in your office by assistants under your direction is to be continued by them during your absence, pursuant to this arrangement.

Your present weekly check from us of $385 will be reduced initially to $240 per week. This check will be drawn directly to you to avoid unnecessary bookkeeping, and is to reimburse you for liabilities (such as rent, salaries, etc.)

Certainly from that letter, we see that before this contract had been entered into, he had the office, he paid the rent, and he paid the salaries of his assistants; and it is stated in that letter that his work had been performed by his assistants prior to this arrangement.

After that letter was written, he still maintained the office, he still paid the rent, and he still paid for those assistants. They did the same work that they had done before; they continued the work. They published the same publications that had been published before by the Commerce Clearing House. He still received the compensation.

I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut in what respect does the business which he had pursued prior to this arrangement differ from the business he pursued subsequent to the arrangement?

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be happy to answer the Senator. Before this contract he stayed there and supervised the work. After he entered into the arrangement he devoted no time to the duties required by the Commerce Clearing House, with one exception, as I see it, that he checked on employees who were working under the supervision and control of the Commerce Clearing House.

I suppose the Senator is aware of the fact that his name was taken off the flyleaf of the publication. I suppose the Senator is aware that the work that was done was done under the direction and control of the officers of the Commerce Clearing House.

Mr. COOPER. I should say, in response, that I have read the hearings, and I find no statement in them as to that, except his statement that he recalled that his name had been taken off the letterhead, and I still say that from my reading of this letter, and my understanding from reading his own testimony as to the type of business that had been carried on before, there was absolutely no cessation in the work, no difference, after he had taken this office.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator recognize the right of this man to receive compensation for the work which had been done in the past?

Mr. COOPER. I will ask the Senator this question——

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to get an answer to my question.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I do.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what was provided for, was it not?

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that the telegram received from the clearing house, given on page 812, states:

> Assuming your telegram of even date, our records show payments to David E. Lilienthal for production of manuscripts in the amount of $17,574 between February 12, 1931, and August 27, 1932.

Are we to believe that sum was in compensation, in payment, for prior services, when upon page 809 Mr. Lilienthal himself said:

> The Commerce Clearing House gave recognition and acknowledgment to my past contribution to the development of the service by agreeing to compensate me from current earnings of the service.

In answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who gave an analogy from a case to some past work, that paragraph and sentence stated that his payment was coming from the current earnings of the service.

I should like to ask the Senator whether in his investigation he made any effort to determine what the salaries of these assistants who worked with him came to, so that the Senator could determine whether he was receiving a substantial portion of this weekly sum.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Tennessee put those figures in the RECORD yesterday. The sum total of them I do not remember. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee can tell.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to give them. When he was getting $390 a week—it was above $300, either $380 or $390 a week—he was giving Mrs. Leitzel, who came here, as I always supposed, as his witness, $24 a week, he was giving Mr. Booth, his other clerk, $28 a week, and he was giving Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, now the general counsel drawing twelve or fifteen thousand dollars a year, I believe, in the TVA, the enormous salary of $17.50 a week. Monthly it amounted to about $125 to Booth, or a little less, about $100 to his stenographer, Mrs. Leitzel, and about $71.75 to Mr. Swidler.

After he left, he paid those three clerks just exactly the same that he paid them before. He was getting at the rate of $20,020 a year from this concern, which furnished the utilities and the railroads all this information. They got up his pay by subscription, and one of the reasons that was given, as some letter in the record said—they advertised the fact that he was then a commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, and that the railroads and other utilities should contribute. Mind you, these clerks did not get a large salary when he got another position in Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. I do not care to take the time of the Senator from Connecticut, but I should like to ask one further question. The office with which Lilienthal was connected continued to publish or to give to the Commerce Clearing House a publication which was of great interest to utilities. Did the committee make any effort to determine whether that service was sold in the State of Wisconsin after Mr. Lilienthal became a member of the railroad commission in Wisconsin?

Mr. McMAHON. It is my recollection that some telegrams were dispatched—by whom I forget—asking whether or not any force had been used by Mr. Lilienthal, or any inducement or any influence exerted by Lilienthal, in the selling of this service, and the answer categorically was "No."

Mr. WHERRY. O, Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry, but it is now getting late, and I have much more ground to cover.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator——

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time. The facts have been thoroughly outlined. The Senator can draw any conclusion he desires to draw. I have drawn my own. I stand on it as an ethical transaction. The Governor of Wisconsin stood on it as an ethical transaction. The other members of the railroad commission stood on it as an ethical transaction. The Governor's council stood on it as an ethical transaction. I say to the Senator that to try to impute some evil motive, some improper action, into something that was done openly, open to all the world, seems to me to be straining at a gnat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may yield to the Senator from Kentucky. I do not care to interrupt.

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I had no intention of implying in any way that the Senator from Connecticut could not reach his own conclusion and form his own judgment. I have no fault at all to find with that. I can only say that for myself, reading that testimony on the question of whether or not the business done had been discontinued, frankly, I could not see that any business had been discontinued.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us see what Lilienthal said he did.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he goes into that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time. This is what he said he did—I call this to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

> I moved my family to Wisconsin—
>
> After his appointment—
>
> made Madison my residence, and devoted myself exclusively to the work of the commission.
>
> Except for signing salary and monthly rental checks—
>
> "Rental checks"—
>
> (until August 1932 when the contract was terminated) and during the earlier months of the new arrangement an occasional conversation with the management of Commerce Clearing House or the two lawyers who were carrying on the service in my absence, I had nothing to do with the editing or the marketing of the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, and rendered no service to the Commerce Clearing House in respect to the editing of this Service or otherwise.
>
> During the entire period I held no other position than that of commissioner, pursued no other business, and devoted my entire time to the duties of my office.

Does that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. I received the Senator's answer. I am not satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McMAHON. I think I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska first.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I wanted to surprise the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did, and I thank him very much indeed. I appreciate it.

Mr. LUCAS. A pleasant surprise.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator with reference to the statement he made in answer to a question by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky about the messages which were sent to the public utilities of Wisconsin. I understood the Sena-

tor to say that the answer, categorically, was no. Are those messages and answers in the record?

Mr. McMAHON. I cannot answer the Senator on that point. I frankly do not know, but that is my recollection. My recollection may be faulty, but that is as I remember it.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I know the Senator wants to be honest, but we want to make the record clear.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator does not mind the interruption, there are 900 pages of the record, and I believe there were something like 23 hearings. Despite the suggestion by the Senator from Tennessee that I was absent a good deal of the time I think I missed but three of the hearings, and therefore I feel that I have a good deal of the record in my mind. I do not pretend to have it word for word.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way indicating that the distinguished Senator is evading an answer. As the distinguished Senator has said many times, we want to keep the record straight. I should like to have the Senator point out to me where the answers may be found which the Senator has said he knows categorically were in the testimony. I refer to the messages that were sent to the public utilities of Wisconsin. I have been unable to find them in the record, and I am interested in that, because I was one who advised the committee of that situation and asked that it be investigated. Furthermore, I understood the Senator to say that the name was not on the letterhead. Does the Senator wish to leave the impression with the Senate that it was not on the letterhead, that there was no attempt on the part of this new association formed by Mr. Lilienthal to force that service upon these public utilities and railroads?

Mr. McMAHON. That is exactly what I want to tell the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator say that there is no letterhead indicating that, and that the Senator could not find it?

Mr. McMAHON. I quote:

> Following my appointment to the Wisconsin Commission, Commerce Clearing House sent out a new title page to the volumes of the service, from which title page my name had been removed as editor.

I may say to the Senator that I know there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record to show that any pressure was exerted on any public utility. The Senator apparently adopts the attitude that it was up to Lilienthal, when he was before the committee, to show that he had not exerted any pressure. That is exactly the standpoint from which this case has been tried, from the start. The attitude of those who have opposed Lilienthal has been, "You are guilty, now show that you are innocent."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to suggest to the distinguished Senator that all I asked him was about these messages and about the letterhead. I am satisfied that the messages went out, and I was interested to know what the answers were. They might have gone to but a few; I do not know, but I think it is highly important. I know the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I know that he does not want to leave the inference that the messages that went out, all were answered with a categorical no. I am sure he does not. I am sure the Senator wants the record to show the facts.

Mr. McMAHON. I notice that the chairman of the committee is sitting here. Perhaps his recollection of the answers received to those telegrams is better than mine. I ask the Senator from Iowa, if he recollects, to tell us what the facts are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have the facts on that particular situation, and I shall try to give them to the Senate as clearly as I can. I believe the Senator from Nebraska or some other Senator, near the close of the hearing before the Senate special committee, came to me, or sent to me, as chairman of the committee, a suggestion that certain utility companies in Wisconsin had been high-pressured into subscribing for the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, which was the service published by Mr. Lilienthal before he became commissioner, on the strength of Mr. Lilienthal's name on the Wisconsin Power Commission, in other words, that salesmen had gone around, and the insinuation that had come I believe to the Senator from Nebraska was that there was some collaboration or some pressure by Mr. Lilienthal, as a member of the commission, to drum up this business for this carrier company.

I obtained a list of agents of power companies in Wisconsin. I will give the list for the RECORD: Wisconsin Electric Power Co., of Milwaukee; Wisconsin Gas & Electric Co., of Racine; Wisconsin-Michigan Power Co., of Appleton; Wisconsin Public Service Co., of Milwaukee; Northern States Power Co., of Eau Claire; Lake Superior District Power Co. of Ashland; Madison Gas & Electric Co., of Madison; and Wisconsin Power & Light Co., of Madison.

These are not all the power companies, but as I understand, these are the larger power companies which would be apt to be subscribers for a special reporting service, which is at best, as any of the lawyers know, an expensive service.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, it costs about $200 a year, does it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It costs a little more than that, I think, depending upon the size of the company and the extent of the service. On March 1, 1947, which was either the day that I obtained this suggestion from the Senator from Nebraska, or the day after, I cannot recall now, but it was immediately thereafter, I sent the following telegram to each of the power companies referred to or mentioned by me, a month ago. The telegrams were identical, so I will merely read the body of one, and it applies to all of the companies. The telegram is as follows:

> Will you please wire me, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., as soon as possible, specific answers to the following questions:
>
> 1. Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House of Chicago, or anyone else, to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities and Carrier Service," during February 1931 or thereafter, through June 1933?

Those happen to be the dates, I believe, of the service of Mr. Lilienthal on the Wisconsin Commission.

> 2. If the answer is yes, what was the name of the person soliciting you?
>
> 3. If you were solicited, did solicitor refer to David Lilienthal in connection with his solicitation, or indicate that David Lilienthal had any connection with Commerce Clearing House or with the service being sold?
>
> 4. Did you purchase the service? How much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?
>
> 5. Had you been a subscriber to or a purchaser of the service prior to February 1931?

I am continuing the telegram:

> It may be difficult for you to recall all details because of expiration of time, but I would appreciate your answers as fully as it is possible for you to make them at this time.

I signed that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. I received telegrams from each of the companies. From the Wisconsin-Michigan Power Co., on March 3, of Appleton, Wis., I received the following telegram:

> Question 1. No record or memory of solicitation or purchase.
>
> Question 5. No.
>
> W. E. SCHUBERT,
> *Wisconsin Power Co.*

Senators will recall that question 1 was, had they been solicited by anyone. The answer was "No."

Question 5 was "had you been a subscriber to or a purchaser of that service prior to February 1931." The answer was "No."

On March 3 I received a telegram from the Northern States Power Co. of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, Wis., as follows:

> Re tel March first, relative public utilities and carrier service Commerce Clearing House. Be advised, number one answer: This company was not a subscriber to the services mentioned during period February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933. Number two answer: Do not recall being solicited. Number three answer: see above. Number four answer: See above. Number five answer: Records do not indicate that this company was a subscriber or purchaser prior to February 1931.
>
> J. V. RORK,
> *President, Northern States Power Co.*

On March 3 I received a reply from the Wisconsin Gas & Electric Co., of Racine, Wis. The message is as follows:

> Find no record of purchasing or being solicited to purchase Commerce Clearing House's utility and carrier service.
>
> WISCONSIN GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. McMAHON. Does that conclude the reading of the telegrams?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I have eight of them. I can place them in the RECORD, but I thought the Senator would like to know the answers in each case.

Mr. McMAHON. There was no answer in any case that there was a solicitation of them, was there?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Read one of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Read all four of them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to burden the Senate, but I thought that since this matter was of interest I should place the telegrams in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. McMAHON. I assume the Senator will. Go ahead and read the telegrams.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to read them and place them in the RECORD, and then give a short explanation of the exact method in which this information was handled before the committee.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator will not have any interruption from me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On March 3 I received the following telegram signed by Aberg, Bell, Blake & Conrad. I assume that to be a law firm representing the utility company. The telegram is as follows:

Mr. Walter Hodgkins, president of Lake Superior District Power Co.—

That would be of Madison, Wis.—

has requested us to reply to your telegram of March 1. To the best of his recollection the company was not solicited for CCH public utilities or carriers service during 1931-33, and did not purchase service then or earlier.

ABERG, BELL, BLAKE & CONRAD.

On March 3 I received the following telegram from Grover C. Neff, president of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co., as follows:

March 1. Answer question 1. Yes.

Question 1, Senators will recall was:

Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, or anyone else to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities Carrier Service" during February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933?

The answer to that question in this telegram was:

Yes, on April 2, 1931, April 1, 1932, and April 3, 1933. Question 2—

Which was the question as to the name of the solicitor—

Question 2 (answer). H. M. Wisland, thirty-one.

I assume that refers to 1931.

Do not know the name in thirty-two, and T. H. Credon in thirty-three. Question 3, Yes.

Question 3 is as follows:

If you were solicited, did the solicitor refer to David Lilienthal in connection with his solicitation or indicate that David Lilienthal had any connection with Commerce Clearing House or with the service being sold?

The answer to that was "Yes."

Question 4, Yes.

That question was:

Did you purchase the service, how much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?

The answer to question 4:

Yes; $800 in April thirty-one; $200 in April thirty-two; $200 in April thirty-three.

Question 5—

Which was—

Had you been a subscriber prior to 1931?

The answer to question 5 was "No."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the record in any other place showed the cost of this service per annum. The telegram would indicate $800 in one place and $200 in another.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume the Senator has purchased many lawbooks and law services, and there is usually a very substantial charge for the accumulated services up to date, and then a yearly charge for the supplements or the continuation of the service. I assume that that was exactly what this was.

Mr. McMAHON. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator proceed to a conclusion?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to place the telegrams in the RECORD and get through with that end of it.

March 3 I received a telegram from the Wisconsin Public Corporation of Milwaukee as follows:

Retel. March 1. Following is our reply numbered in accordance with your questions:

1. Yes.

That is on the question of solicitation.

2—

Which is the name of the person who solicted them—

H. M. Wisland in 1930, 1931, and 1932. T. H. Credon in 1933 and 1934. T. L. Armstrong in 1935.

3—

Which is the question as to whether or not the solicitor referred to David Lilienthal in connection with these solicitations or indicated that Lilienthal had any connection with the Commerce Clearing House or the railroads.

The answer to that is "Yes" in this telegram.

4. We purchased the service paying $270 in April 1930, $70 in April 1931, $70 in April 1932, $50 in April 1933, $50 in April 1934, $60 in April 1935, and $60 in April 1936.

5—

Which question is—

Had you been a subscriber prior to February 31?

The answer to that is:

See answer to No. 4—

Which I have just read as to the year's subscription.

On March 3 I received the following telegram from the Wisconsin Electric Power Co. of Milwaukee:

Referring to your telegram, March 1, asking for specific answers to five questions, such answers are as follows: Question 1. Yes.

"Were you solicited," I will interpolate.

First solicitation, March 1931.

Question 2—

Which is the name of the solicitor.

H. M. Wisland in 1931. Invoice of 1932 lacks name of representative, but for 1933 name of T. H. Credon appears as representative. Question 3—

Which is the question as to whether or not Lilienthal was referred to in connection with the solicitation.

Question 3. Yes. Question 4—

Which was "Did they purchase?"

The answer is "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, question 3 is the one concerning solicitation, in which Lilienthal's name was mentioned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Question 3 is the question with respect to whether Lilienthal was mentioned in connection with the solicitation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Question 4 is:

Did you purchase the service, and how much did you pay for it and for how long a period?

Question 4. Yes, 1931, $660; 1932, $200; 1933, $150; with installment of $50 carried over to the following year. Question 5—

Which was the question as to whether they had been a subscriber before 1931 or not.

The answer to question 5 was "No."

For some reason I received two telegrams on the same day from the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., but they are duplicates.

On March 3, 1947, I received the following telegram from John St. John, president of the Madison Gas & Electric Co., Madison, Wis.:

Reply to your day letter of March 1, question 1, answer, yes.

That is the question with reference to solicitation.

Question 2—

That is the question as to the name of the solicitor—

Don't remember name.

The answer to question 3, which is the question with reference to whether or not Lilienthal's name was mentioned in connection with the solicitation, is "Don't remember."

Question 4 is:

Did you purchase the service? How much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?

The answer to question 4 is "Yes." The amount paid for the year 1931 was $190; for 1932, $50; for 1933, $50.

Question 5 is:

Had you been a subscriber before 1931?

The telegram merely says "Question 5" and then ends. I think probably there is a strip missing.

Those are the eight telegrams which I received, and I shall be glad to place them in the RECORD verbatim.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Will not the Senator yield——

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield. I have the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. I have tried to be very generous in yielding. I intend to yield to the Senator from Nebraska in just a moment, but I decline to yield at this particular time. The Senator from Iowa has indicated that he has something to add after reading the telegrams.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator from Iowa still wish to say something?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would appreciate it if the Senator would yield to me for just a moment more, so that I can tell the Senate exactly what happened with respect to these telegrams, what the committee thought about them, and what we did.

Mr. McMAHON. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I expect to place the telegrams in the RECORD, although in the original program we did not think they were of sufficient significance to place them in the record of the hearings. I say that very frankly. This information came to us about the 1st of March. I immediately telegraphed, as did the committee, in response to many rumors which came to the committee. We received these telegrams. My telegrams to those companies and the telegrams from the companies in reply were taken before the committee. A full report was made to the committee. I cannot recall whether the entire membership of the committee was present, but I think it was a full-committee meeting. There might have been an absentee. However, the committee discussed them, and every member of the committee took the same attitude. Every member of the committee has been either a business or professional man. Four of the eight companies had never been solicited and had never purchased the service. They had never heard of the gist of the questions in the telegram.

Representatives of three of the companies stated that they had been solicited by the same sales force, Mr. Creden, Mr. Wisland, and someone else. Those names appear. They said that Lilienthal's name had been mentioned in connection with the solicitation.

Any Member of the Senate who has ever been the victim of a law-book salesman or of a professional service of any kind knows that those people are artists, and that they will use any name, any reference, any connotation, any suggestion, to get the poor professional man's name on the dotted line on a contract to purchase their service or books. I have been through the mill many times. When I was a young lawyer, salesmen would come to me and use the names of prominent lawyers in my town, to whom the particular service was absolutely indispensable. Many times I was gullible enough to sign a contract, which I had a great deal of trouble fulfilling when the bills came later.

Representatives of only three of the companies stated that this method had been used in the solicitation. One of them stated that he could not remember the name of the salesman, and that the writer had no recollection that any references had been given.

I do not know of a single member of the committee who raised his voice in objection to the action taken by the committee, or who pointed his finger at this thing and said, "It smells." I think the committee approached the question from the standpoint of practical professional businessmen of experience, conscious that any salesman who travels the road selling books would use exactly the same methods. We asked ourselves, "Are we witch hunting? Are we seeing ghosts? Are we jumping from this conclusion to that conclusion on the basis of a foundation of cards, and thereby concluding that because some salesman took advantage of the fact that Lilienthal had been connected with the operation of this business in the past, we should condemn Lilienthal as a scoundrel, a crook, and a cheat in high public office because someone said he tried to profit from the transaction?" As I recall, not one member of the committee pointed a finger of accusation at him. The members of the committee are practical men with a great deal of experience with sales methods. They said "Phooey. There is nothing to it. It falls flat, and we cannot sustain any charge against Lilienthal on that basis."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know whether or not to thank the Senator from Connecticut, because I did not care to make a speech tonight on this subject. However, if there are any questions left unanswered, I will say that I expect to place these telegrams in the RECORD in full. I have done my best to give a factual recital of what happened, and under what circumstances, and how the committee looked at the question.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator yield for a question of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this moment. I do not wish to seem captious, but I have at least half a dozen other very important questions to cover in my remarks tonight. I think the Senator from Iowa has completely answered the question as to the attitude of the committee. Furthermore, my statement stands, that there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record, nor do I believe that any could be produced, that David E. Lilienthal improperly, in any manner, shape, or form, tried to influence any prospective purchasers of this service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I could continue to yield and debate this subject until 12 o'clock tonight. If Senators have comments to make on this transaction they will have to make them in their own time tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator promised to yield to me when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] had concluded.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that if he thinks I made a promise to yield to him, I will yield for a question at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa a question.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for whom I have the highest regard, stated categorically that in the record the answers to the messages were "No."

Mr. McMAHON. It is my recollection—the RECORD will show—that I stated that there was not a single scintilla of evidence that any effort was made by David E. Lilienthal to procure subscriptions to this service. I stand on that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The messages are not in the RECORD. I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if they are in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are now. I put them in.

Mr. WHERRY. They were put in the RECORD tonight. Eight messages only were sent out. Not one of the eight public utilities had taken the service prior to Mr. Lilienthal's entrance into Wisconsin.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is not quite correct. I think one of them had subscribed before.

Mr. WHERRY. Which one? Will the Senator give me the name?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield further. The RECORD will show the Senator from Nebraska the facts he is asking for at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. They are not in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Nebraska in order that he might ask a question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. LUCAS. I demand the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator want to take me off my feet?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not taking any Senator off his feet. I demand the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Nebraska to ask a question of the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Iowa was answering the question when the interruption came.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the case of the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation of Milwaukee their telegram showed that they subscribed, beginning in April, 1930. I can read the telegram to the Senator if he wishes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, aside from one company, does the Senator from Iowa know that any of them kept the service after Lilienthal left Wisconsin?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. One company made its last payment in April, 1936.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for finally giving the Senate this information. It may be said that it is immaterial, but the Senate is trying to arrive at a conclusion as to the honesty of Mr. Lilienthal in the conduct of operations in Wisconsin, and this question was raised, so we have here tonight the testimony which has just been adduced. I did not read all the messages. I asked the distinguished Senator from Iowa why he had not placed them in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let us keep the RECORD straight. The Senator from Nebraska read the messages not a half hour ago when I showed them to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator why he had not introduced them into the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my opinion and in the unanimous opinion of the committee they are not material.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment for one observation, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I feel that I cannot yield further at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make one observation? I have been on my feet for the past 30 minutes trying to get the able Senator to yield for one brief observation, and I have not been able to get in a query.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to my good friend the Senator from Illinois that I do not see how I can yield to him, having refused to yield to other Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator permits further colloquy to be carried on as it was conducted on the Republican side of the aisle a few moments ago, I shall make a point of order to take him from the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, five employees of this Commission were challenged by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before proceeding to another point in the argument?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether there is any other evidence or testimony taken before the committee which is not incorporated in this record.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that the committee held two executive meetings in which some highly confidential matters relating to security, proposed methods of operation of the commission, and employment fields and policies were discussed. I am merely trying to recall whether there were any other matters of evidence taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I complete my answer to the Senator's question? The Senator has referred to the telegrams as evidence. They were not necessarily evidence. They were not accepted by the committee, after canvassing the whole situation, as necessary or material parts of the evidence. They came in on the basis of a rumor. No witness testified to them. There was no firm allegation of any irregularities. They merely came by way of a rumor from, I believe, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and they were investigated. I have a file full of "wild goose chases" which were followed up by some members of the committee, based upon fleeting and nebulous rumors. Most of them ended in thin air. All of them were reported to the committee, but nothing resulted therefrom. If the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator who was on the committee can recall anything of that nature I should be glad to have him state it at this time; but so far as I can recall there was no evidence before the committee that does not appear in the hearings, with the exception of the executive session.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I must proceed; there is much yet to be covered. Apparently I was mistaken in joining in the unanimous-consent agreement, inasmuch as it certainly does not appear now as if I shall be able to cover the subject. I certainly cannot cover it if I yield to every Senator who has a question. In view of the fact that we have entered into an agreement to vote at 5 o'clock tomorrow, I think it is fair that Senators use their own time tomorrow.

I now pass to the charges which have been made against employees of the Commission. I refer to the case of James T. Ramey, who is a young lawyer. His appointment was protested on two grounds. The first ground was that he had signed a qualified oath on his passport. The Senate will recollect that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] pointed out that as a college student Ramey went to Europe and wrote on his passport that he would defend the United States insofar as his conscience would permit. Since that time I believe this young man has taken four or five oaths. In the last one he made and in all of the ones subsequent to the first one that is criticized, he added no qualification whatsoever.

I think it would be interesting to the Senate to listen to a very short letter which Representative CHURCH, of Illinois, who represents the district in which this young man and his family have their residence, has sent to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] regarding Ramey. We all know Representative CHURCH; he is a Republican Representative from a district in and near Chicago. He said the following in his letter to the Senator from Tennessee:

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: It seems that the public press in the Chicago area about January 23 included the name of James T. Ramey, connected with the TVA, as among those named by you as being affiliated with Communist activities.

Being acquainted personally with the boy's father, James F. Ramey, and the family, who are residents of my congressional district, and knowing of their excellent reputation in our community, I feel certain James T. Ramey is in no way connected with any communistic movement. I know of no family in my district of higher standing, or more loyal and patriotic than the James F. Ramey family.

I am advised that the name of James T. Ramey was not included with the names you furnished to the committee to be included in the hearings, although I understand his name was included with some notes furnished you by someone at Knoxville. I want to express my thanks to you for not including the name of this boy in any published hearings.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

The Senator from Tennessee graciously replied to that letter. I read the reply which he sent to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who also wrote him to the same effect:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 13, 1947.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Answering your letter of the thirtieth. It has been delayed because of my active work on the two committees considering the nominations of Lilienthal and Clapp.

I am delighted to hear the young Mr. Ramey is all right. Of course, I take his father's word for it. I am happy to have this information.

Thanking you and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,
KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Another charge made against Ramey was to the effect that he was guilty of unethical conduct in seeking, while he was an attorney for the TVA, to get into the RECORD some testimony, which under the rules of evidence, should not be admissible. Mr. President, when I investigated that allegation I found, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, that directly the contrary is true. An investigation of the memorandum discloses that this young man pointed out to his superiors in the TVA that although it might be possible under the law to exclude certain evidence in a condemnation hearing, he was of the opinion that it would be better that the evidence be admitted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The record that is now made, and that I read to the Senate last Friday, was a report made to the committee of which the distinguished Senator is a member. It was made to that committee by an employee of the committee. I read his exact words, so far as the security files of the commission itself are concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that it was only last Friday that investigators for the FBI actually read the memorandum that is referred to. What the Senator has referred to—and that is all he could refer to—was the statement of a man by the name of Bolt, who was a discharged employee, as to what Ramey had actually done.

Mr. BRICKER. The record I read to the Senate, if the distinguished Senator will yield, was made by an employee of our own committee, from the security records of the Atomic Energy Committee, filed with them by the proper department of the Federal Government.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator in further explanation that the record which was synthesized, and which he read, was the FBI record on this case. Unfortunately, the FBI did not get the final facts of the case until last Friday. When they did get them, they were exactly contrary to what was alleged against him.

I pass now to John L. Burling, whose appointment and employment were criticized. Mr. Burling is a son of a mem-

ber or partner of the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, an old and dignified law firm in the city of Washington. It was charged that Mr. Burling had made available to an unauthorized person a file of the Department of Justice.

I was very much interested in that accusation, and I pursued my own investigation of it. I found, as I stated yesterday, that a professor of military government went to the Department of Justice, and saw Mr. Burling, who had been his student. He knew him, and said to him, "Do you know anything about an alien by the name of X?" Burling said, "I do not, but I shall find out something about him. Why do you want to know?"

The professor said, "Because I am thinking of employing this German for the purpose of having him teach some of our students some of the things they ought to know before they go to Germany."

So Burling consulted his superiors, he got all the information he could, and he gave it to this professor at Harvard, with their full authority.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator to yield for an inquiry.

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield.

As I have said, Mr. Burling did that with their full authority. He gave that information to this professor, and advised him that, in his opinion, it would be improper or would be an unsafe thing to employ this alien. As a result, the professor went home and apparently told that or gave that information to another alien, who, in turn, told it to the applicant. It was then discovered that this had been done. As I understand, the alien got word to the Department of Justice that Burling had issued unauthorized information. As a result of that complaint, Burling was called up, and the Department placed charges against him. But when the facts were known, of course, Burling was entirely exculpated, and he went back to work, and worked there until he was hired by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I next referred to Joe Volpe. If Senators will recollect, a statement was issued by a Member of the Senate to the effect that Volpe, who was hired by the Commission, unfortunately had a brother who was a Communist. I may say that Joe Volpe was a trusted personal assistant of Gen. Leslie B. Groves. There were no doors closed to him; there were no files secreted from him; there was no information in connection with the Manhattan district that was closed to Joe Volpe. Let me say that that confidence in him was not misplaced. I have had considerable contact with Volpe. Let me pay tribute to him now as a very real, live, competent young American.

Yes; Volpe's brother was a Communist—not a very active Communist; he signed an application, and went to one meeting, and said he had no use for it, did not understand it, and left the organization, and went home. So Joe Volpe is used as a basis by those who do not wish to confirm Mr. Lilienthal.

I refer now to Herbert Marks, the general counsel. The charge against Marks is that he was denied a Navy commission. I believe the file says that he was a member of the United Government Employees and Lawyers Guild until 1940. Those of us who are lawyers will remember that it was during that year that those who did not believe that the Lawyers' Guild was holding up the ideals and purposes for which it had been formed, resigned from the Lawyers' Guild and left it. Marks resigned during that year. Yes; Marks was a member of the union, and so was every other employee of TVA. He was denied a commission, and I think there are those of us in the Senate who know many a young man who was denied a commission in the Army or the Navy, who did not automatically thereby become suspect as to his loyalty or his patriotism to the United States.

On the other hand, what do we find, when we look at the record, about Marks' associations, and what do we find from the people who knew him best? I read into the RECORD the other day a telegram that was sent by the brother of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in which he said, as I recollect, that he was proud to have Marks as his friend, that he vouched for him as a man of patriotism and integrity, and that the Government of the United States was fortunate to receive his services.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Marks was a man of combat. A man by the name of Cisler, of the Detroit Edison Co., testified about how they went to Europe to see what they could do about reviving the power systems that were destroyed during the war, and Cisler paid a tribute to Marks for his conduct under fire, and to his patriotism, that was most impressive to the members of the committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry; I cannot yield to the Senator at this time.

Mr. Cisler said:

> And I could give you instances of where these men, Mr. Marks among them, were right up where the firing was going on. And I recall particularly that in the Netherlands we were trying to get power back so that coal mining could be resumed because we realized the importance of getting that coal mining going.

Then we have a remarkable list of Americans testifying to the patriotism and to the integrity of Mr. Marks. I should like to read into the RECORD just a few of them.

Mr. Acheson, whose confidential assistant he has been for some time past, said:

> I am as certain as I am of anything in this world that he has no shadow of a leaning of any sort toward either communism or fellow-travelerism or any such doctrine or idea. * * *
>
> I should stake my life and my reputation on the fact that all of those allegations are untrue.

I have referred to the Taft telegram. I refer, among others, to the statement by Mr. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co; Col. Walker L. Cisler, chief engineer, power plants, Detroit-Edison Co.; William L. Batt, former Vice Chairman, War Production Board; Donald Nelson, former Chairman of WPA.

John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, testified and he also vigorously endorsed Marks. Dickey stated that he had known Marks for 17 or 18 years, and I now quote him:

> My opinion is that I know no man who is more loyal to this country than Herb Marks. I am perfectly certain that I know no one, likewise, whose devotion to the public good is greater.
>
> And I know of no one who combines those things with extraordinary capacity to serve the public good, as does Marks.

I could go on and read another list that takes up three or four pages. But suppose I pass to John Lord O'Brian, lately the Republican candidate for Senator from the State of New York, and one who worked most closely with Marks. O'Brian said:

> Then this goes on to say that he irritated so many people that they were compelled to move him, and from the War Production Board he went to the State Department.
>
> That is absurd. Marks' assignments were never changed during the period that he was there, except in connection with these several reorganizations of the war production effort.
>
> Certain functions would be redistributed, and he might have supervision of something besides power. But he remained with power from the beginning to the end.

Mr. President, I have talked about Volpe, I have talked about Ramey, I have talked about Marks, I have talked about Burling, and there is only Niehoff left. All I can say about Niehoff, that I recollect as being in the record, is to the effect that Niehoff went to a labor meeting at which there were some Communists. There is not a Member of this body who has not been in a meeting where there were some Communists. We did not know them, we could not identify them, but nevertheless we may be sure that in our extensive campaigning we have been in their presence and in their company.

Mr. President, there has been much reference to the fact that Lilienthal wants more and more power, that he is a power-hungry individual. There is cited as authority for that statement mainly the testimony of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan.

Let me say—and it cannot be too much emphasized by those who want to be fair—that every single charge that has been brought by Dr. Morgan was brought in 1938 before a joint congressional committee. Every single one of those charges was heard and tried and found wanting.

It is significant that the majority report was signed by a Senator on the other side of the aisle, Senator Frazier, of North Dakota, I believe. It is significant that not a member of the minority, except Representative JENKINS of Ohio, insinuated or implied in any way that any whitewash had occurred.

Mr. President, I do not have the time to read in detail from Democracy on the March, but I have read much from that book, and everything I have read indicates to me that this man is a democrat, a democrat with a small "d", and I should like to say to the Senate that those of us who were privileged to be

present when he was asked by the Senator from Tennessee what his definition of "democracy" was, will always cherish that moment as one of the privileges that comes to a Senator of the United States, to be present to hear a great American define, in the most superb, the most eloquent, and the most persuasive terms, his concept of democracy, which swept this country, and which roused the enthusiasm of the people of the United States as it has not been aroused in many and many a day.

Ah, Mr. President, it was a simple thing. There are those, I suppose, who will say that he put it on, but one could not sit there and watch that man think it out, and spell it out laboriously and slowly, without knowing that that was the faith that was in him. Senators need have no fear of his patriotism and integrity.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I cannot yield at this time. I regret it.

Dr. Morgan was Chairman of the TVA. Many of the things that are complained about in its administration took place under his chairmanship. When it suits the purposes of those on the attack, they conveniently forget that Dr. Morgan was Chairman of the TVA at that time. Then when it suits their purpose, they drag him out and quote him as one whose testimony is to be believed against this proposed commissioner.

I should like to point out that Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who certainly had as many dealings with Dr. Morgan as anyone else in this connection—that is, in connection with TVA operations—said:

> I would simply like to add this, that in all my contacts with Dr. Morgan that I have referred to I was impressed in every instance with this feeling of his of distrustfulness toward everybody, and the fact that he was under apparently great strain and very greatly overwrought, and these wrongs had grown in his mind to such an extent that I felt his judgment was affected by it. That is the criticism I have to make.

A few days ago I quoted the characterization of Dr. Morgan by the senior Senator from Tennessee, in which he referred to him as an engineer little known, who, he believed, had built old levees in Arkansas.

President Roosevelt had dragged him out of security for some reason, he knew not what, and I think a search of the records will disclose that the senior Senator from Tennessee, who now calls Dr. Morgan to the witness stand, in 1936 denounced him as one who would associate with the private power companies so that the objectives of TVA would be defeated.

Mr. President, the hour is getting late, but I feel that I must cover one or two other matters rather briefly. Something has been said today, in fact it has been said more frequently during this debate during the past week than I anticipated, and yet I am not totally surprised; it has been said that the thing to do with atomic energy is to turn it back to the military for its control. I have tried to explain carefully to those who held that viewpoint that the safety of America, if we do not achieve effective international control, can only rest in the manufacture of more and bigger and better bombs as speedily as possible. I have pointed out that that cannot be done under military supervision. I have pointed out that that must be done with the cooperation of the nuclear scientists and the physicists and the engineers of this Nation.

I have pointed out, Mr. President, that we are a civilian government, that we are a government that does not believe in the supremacy of the military. I will point out to the Senate that when this question was fought out last year, the people of this country rose in their might and made it evident to the Senate and to the Congress and to the country that they believed that this greatest of all God-given forces should be put where our traditions and our history and our beliefs demanded that it should be put, and that is in the civilian government.

I should now like to direct my attention to the question asked me by the Senator from Nevada earlier this evening. I will say to the Senator that Mr. Baruch, as I have pointed out, adopted in toto and completely the Lilienthal-Acheson plan, so called.

In this plan it is proposed to do several things. The first thing is to erect an international authority, to erect it by contract or treaty, if you please; that after this authority is contracted for, after the contract is executed, then the first stage in the proceedings is for us and for all of the countries in the world to divulge the source materials out of which atomic energy is made. It is proposed that during this first stage the inspectors of all countries have free access to all other countries for the purpose of locating that source material. That is stage No. 1. I might say to the Senator that no timetable has at any point been suggested, nor have we gotten that far in our negotiations. At any rate, that is the first stage.

When that has proceeded to a certain point, a point at which we are satisfied that our security is still maintained and that there have been no violations of the agreement, the second point is the production of fissionable materials by the authority. After fissionable materials are produced for a certain length of time, it is proposed that we set up a laboratory in the International Authority for the purpose of doing research work on peaceful and wartime uses of atomic energy. I cannot attempt at this time, I say to the Senator, to diagram that timetable for him. It might be that step No. 1 would take place this year, if the agreement were entered into; step No. 2 would take place the following year, or the next year; and the third step, 2 years later; the idea being that each of those stages is so worked up that we can retreat if we find the agreement is not being lived up to, without a total prejudice to our own security.

Why is it necessary, I ask the Senator, that the International Authority shall have the authority and the power and the duty of doing the research on weapons? That means all nations together, owning stock, if you please, in the Authority; and the reason will be obvious to the Senator when I point out that it is necessary for the Authority to keep ahead, in weapon experimentation and research, of any nation that would seek to break the agreement.

I will say to the Senator from Nevada and to other Senators, I have had the belief, unlike the Senator from Maryland, that we were doing the right thing in going ahead on atomic energy now. I think we should go ahead on atomic energy now and seek as we have sought to get an agreement to the propositions which we have advanced. I sympathize with the desire of the Senator from Maryland and other Senators who believe with him, in the desire that there shall be complete and total disarmament, but I know, and I think everybody else will know upon reflection, that unless we can get agreement on the control of atomic energy, we shall not get control of other weapons of war.

I have also been constrained to believe, Mr. President, that probably one of the hopes of making a lasting peace would consist in getting atomic energy into the useful and peaceful work of mankind. Ah, Mr. President, it is no idle dream to say, and I do not say it, but the scientists and the engineers who know the subject say it, if only mankind would get down to the basis of experimenting and using atomic energy for peaceful uses, that would do more to contribute to the peace of the world than any other thing we could do. We could harness rivers, we could turn deserts into blooming valleys, we could lighten the work load of the Chinese, and the Indians, and the other poor and downtrodden people of the earth.

Countries notoriously have fought over oil in the past, since oil became such an essential to our industrial society, but the competition in oil will fade into insignificance when it comes to the competition that will exist and the struggle that will exist to secure these materials that are the basis of atomic fission. It was because we felt that way, most of us, apparently, it was because we realized there was no defense; it was because we realized that we could not indefinitely hold on to this bomb, that we made what I believe is to be the most unique proposition in history, the most moral, the most decent proposition that has ever been made by a great people, a proposition which will do credit to the Government of the United States and to the people who proposed it and backed it.

We said to all the world "Here is this great thing that will bring you help, that will bring you wealth, that will bring you happiness, and all we ask in return is effective agreements; effective agreements that it will not be used murderously against us." If we could only get such agreements it would be the greatest achievement I can think of.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I will yield in a moment. If we could obtain such agreements I say that peace would dawn. If we can solve this first question I do not believe any other question that exists between us and Russia cannot be solved. If we can solve this problem a new day will have dawned.

I said to the Senate before, and I say it again, that there is no man in the Sen-

ate or in this country who feels more disappointment at the progress we have made in the last year than I do. I will say to the Senate that I do not believe we can forever carry on these negotiations, because I believe that every day other nations are drawing nearer to achievement of the bomb. The Senate will remember that only a few weeks ago it was reported that 7,000 engineers and scientists in Russia were engaged in making this bomb.

What I have never been able to understand is how Senators who have damned this proposition believe that they have any prescription for the security and safety of the American people except the operation of this plan. Do they feel that the possession of a large stockpile of bombs is going to protect this country? I say to the Senate, not half as eloquently as the Senator from Maryland told the Senate this evening, that the country which strikes first wins the war, and that there will be no warning. We in America are so susceptible to atomic warfare, with 52,000,000 people in, I think, some 60 cities. If those cities should be struck or even a goodly portion of them, then I say that this Nation could not continue as a fighting nation.

I wish I could see some proposal which would save this mad atomic armaments race in which we are engaged.

I said earlier but I repeat it, because I do not think the Senator from Maryland was present then, that while I share his desire, I cannot follow his reasoning when he calls for a general disarmament conference. We have had an atomic disarmament conference in existence, I will say to the Senator, since last June 14. We have made our proposals, we have discussed them, we have tried to secure agreements respecting them, and we have to this point failed. I have not given up hope, however. I cannot believe—and that is one of the reasons why I am for the Greek and Turkish policy—that we shall continue to fail. I cannot believe that if we demonstrate to Russia that we intend to present our proposals and maintain them firmly that she can, in the face of acceptance by all the other nations of the earth, finally reject them. So I live in hope. I live in hope, Mr. President, that the day will come when we will secure that agreement, and I say to the Senate that, in my opinion, there cannot be any change in its basic terms without weakening its effectiveness and thereby making it unacceptable.

I regret—and I said so on January 27—the undue stress that we have placed on the veto question. I think we have made a mistake psychologically in the stress we have placed upon it. Let me emphasize at this moment that I believe that any nation entering this contract should not insist on a veto. I think it is immoral to do so. Let us take that out of the argument immediately. But let me also point out that we proceeded to talk to Russia about the veto, on which at least she had some argument to make, because we insisted in San Francisco, just as Russia did, in writing the right of veto into the charter. Let me point out that last July, when we adhered to the International Court of Justice by a vote of 72 to 12, we inserted into the International Court's jurisdiction the right of our veto, and that was at a time 10 or 15 days after we had insisted in New York that we should eliminate the veto in connection with atomic disarmament.

I still believe, let me emphasize, that we should insist on the veto. But I say our mistake occurred when we did not focus the attention of the world on the fact that we were insisting on control and inspection, when we did not focus the attention of the world on the fact that those were the things which Russia really basically objected to. I say to the Senate that it is so important, so vitally important, that we make our record crystal clear so that it cannot be misunderstood in history. The moral obligation rests upon this Nation to make a proposition for the use of this force for mankind's good instead of mankind's destruction in the tradition of the first nation in the family of nations. That was our obligation, and I think we have fulfilled it to date.

It is necessary, however, for us to rally on our side the opinion of decent men everywhere, not only in our own country, as to the rightness of our proposals and the rightness of our intentions.

Now, Mr. President, suppose there is no agreement reached, what are the horrible alternatives? My friend Harold Urey, nuclear physicist, Nobel Prize winner, man of peace, one of the principal men in this science, wrote an article some time ago in which he said that unless we achieved agreement there was nothing for America to do but to go out and conquer the whole wide world. That did not surprise me because I had talked with Urey on many occasions. I knew of the man's good heart. I know of his sound intentions. I pointed out to him then and I point out to the Senate now that if America should be compelled to take that course the result would be that we would lose our democracy here at home, because, as some one has pointed out, the regimentation and regulation of this country would be bound to be such as to destroy our civil liberties and our Bill of Rights.

The regulation and regimentation necessitated by the last war would be a shadow in the wind to that which would be required in this country by the promulgation of any such program. Assuming that we could conquer the world and impose our will upon it, it would be necessary from then until the end of time to maintain occupation troops to see that the conquered nations did not get on their feet and manufacture the bomb and come back at us.

Then the other alternative has been suggested that we could form an atomic energy authority without Russia or without any disagreeing nation. At first that seems like a possibility, and rather an attractive one, but I think it would probably be rejected because it would be realized that without all great nations within the authority it would be certainly bad judgment for us to distribute fissionable material, as we would, around the world to make that many more points of contact for the securing of it by stealth and subversive activity.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator understand, and am I correct in assuming, that the chief difference between the so-called Lilienthal proposal and the Baruch proposal was that Baruch proposed the inspection which the Senator has outlined?

Mr. McMAHON. No. It cannot be too clearly emphasized that the Baruch proposals were identical with the Acheson-Lilienthal proposals, except for the addition of the political matter of the veto.

Mr. MALONE. Are they identical with respect to inspection?

Mr. McMAHON. The plans are identical. Inspection was a feature of both of them. The creation of a world authority was in both of them. The various stages which I have outlined were in both. That is the report which has received the unanimous approbation of the leading figures in American life.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Am I correct in understanding that Russia has refused such a proposal?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Earlier in the evening I asked the Senator why it is assumed in every conversation and every debate that if any one of the other nations in the United Nations Conference should discover the atomic bomb secret, we would immediately be attacked.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned——

Mr. MALONE. Why does the Senator dwell so much upon such a threat?

Mr. McMAHON. So far as I am concerned I will say to the Senator that if I thought any other nation had this secret tonight, and our relations were in bad shape, I would not sleep as well as I shall probably sleep. I have developed, at least to my own satisfaction, a new definition of aggression. In my opinion—I may be mistaken—any nation which refuses to accept decent, fair, and objectively moral proposals for the control of atomic energy has committed an act of aggression against the rest of the world. It is my opinion that when a nation has refused to enter into such an agreement, given a certain period of time, which I believe to be from 3 to 6 years, no sensible person in the United States will go to bed at night knowing that he will get up in the morning, and no sensible man will get up in the morning knowing that he is going to bed at night. If that is the kind of world that those who condemn this proposal want to live in, I say that I want no part of it for myself or those who are near and dear to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not like to be a war-monger or one to throw a scare recklessly from the floor of this Chamber or anywhere else, on the subject of the imminence of war. However, I believe

that if another great nation, as the Senator has set forth, solves the secret of atomic energy and makes the atomic bomb, in the course of time the fears which will flow from the thought that two nations—and I am assuming that they are two great nations—each of which has this decisive force at its disposal, will result in confusion and misunderstanding between those two nations to the point where war will be almost inescapable.

It is my further conviction that if two great nations, each having the atomic bomb, go to war, there is not a man in the world who can begin to visualize or imagine with reasonable accuracy the dire consequences for civilization all over the face of the earth. It was for that reason that, while I opposed the Lilienthal plan in the committee, I did not carry the opposition anywhere else. I thought that perhaps if a start could be made progress could be continued from that point on through the other categories of weapons. However, I still would have preferred to have the whole question considered at the same time. I wish to endorse the point that unless we find a meeting of the minds between great nations capable eventually of discovering and producing the atomic bomb, there is very little hope for civilization on the face of this earth, in my humble judgment.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator has very eloquently stated the point. I believe that the difference between the Senator from Maryland and myself is briefly this: In my judgment first things come first. I thought it was important that we get at the control of atomic energy immediately, hoping that we would achieve it. Then we would have something to give. Mind you, we have nothing to give in battleships or airplanes or other weapons of war. This is the only weapon with respect to which we have something to give the Russians and other participants in the plan. What we have to give, I have described as those things which will inevitably come from the use of this material in a peaceful economy.

Mr. President, there is much more that I could say, but the hour grows late. I expect to take a few minutes tomorrow to discuss one more facet of this problem. But let me say that David E. Lilienthal is the kind of man who understands this problem. David E. Lilienthal and the other men who wrote this report steeped themselves in the subject for many weeks. They have consulted with the engineers and scientists who have made the report. They know that this problem is desperate. They know what they are up against. They have rendered a report to Congress, which they are required to do under the law. I urge every Senator to read their first report. They clearly show that they realize that they must continue with all speed—unfortunately and sadly—in the development of atomic energy for military purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I know that the Senator would not like to leave any doubt in the minds of other Senators with respect to the investigation of the men previously mentioned in his speech. Is the Senator prepared to say that an FBI investigation and report were made on Mr. Volpe and Mr. Ramey prior to their being hired or retained by the Commission?

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that the facts which I have detailed and which the Senator has heard are, in my opinion, the exact record on those two gentlemen, and cannot be disproved.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator did not mention the FBI investigation. Is the Senator prepared to say that such an investigation was made in accordance with the law as laid down by the Atomic Energy Act?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; and those investigations are continuing things. As I understand, the rule of the Commission is that such employees do not engage in security activities.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator prepared to say that such an investigation was made?

Mr. McMAHON. An FBI investigation?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Absolutely.

Mr. MALONE. And the report was made available to the committee?

Mr. McMAHON. It was made available in Ramey's case, so far as the investigation had been conducted at that time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will agree to make it his last.

Mr. MALONE. I will. Does the Senator know that no request was ever made to the FBI, either by the President of the United States or the Attorney General of the United States, for an FBI report on Mr. Lilienthal or any of the Commission members recommended?

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly do know it. Let me say to the Senator that when we have to get FBI reports on the Secretary of State, on nominees for the Presidency, on nominees for Justices of the Supreme Court, or on nominees for the United States Senate, I would think it entirely proper that the President of the United States should send scurrying around the country $4,000 agents—to do what? To manufacture evidence, or to consult people? To consult people, I assume. Everyone of these men has lived the past 20 years in a goldfish bowl, and every radio, every newspaper, and every weekly magazine has carried news of the hearings on their nominations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield. Everyone has been invited to come to the hearings and give them the "works." When the Senator examines this record what does he find with respect to the first nominee for the Commission. Admiral Strauss? Is there anything derogatory with reference to him?

Mr. MALONE. There was no investigation of him.

Mr. McMAHON. No. He has only been a rear admiral in the Navy; a partner in a banking house in New York, and a noted philanthropist. Do we need any FBI agent at $4,000 a year to tell us that?

William W. Waymack, of Iowa is known throughout the Middle West as a citizen of integrity. Do we need an FBI agent to go out to Iowa to discover that?

Robert F. Bacher is one of the principal scientists in the accomplishment of atomic energy. Do we need any FBI agent to investigate him?

Mr. MALONE. It might help me if the Senator will yield for one further question.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry; I cannot yield until I finish this.

Sumner T. Pike has been in this city for 15 years. He has been employed in various commissions. For many years he was with the SEC, living his life in a public goldfish bowl.

Lilienthal has been the subject of attack by those who resent the fact that he has made a success of that which he was charged by the Congress of the United States to do. After all the advertising, Mr. President, we held hearings, and some of the best citizens of the country came and testified.

Let me read to the Senator from the testimony of Father O'Connell, representing that great Communist organization, the Catholic Committee of the South.

> The Catholic Committee of the South honors itself in honoring David Eli Lilienthal who, like his namesake of old, contended with a menacing giant, this time the Tennessee River and conquered.
>
> Victory was his because he brought to the fray unshakable confidence in his fellow man, the burning love of an adopted son for the vast and hospitable region of the South; and a colorful genius for making every grass-roots farmer a warm friend, and for steering a true course through the eddying tides of partisan and political waters.
>
> America honors a most capable son, as Chairman of the International Atomic Bomb Control Committee; the southland honors him as the Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the "Man of 1946;" and the Catholic Committee of the South honors him for answering practically and courageously his own question: "Are machines to control man or are men to control machines, and direct them for the glory of God and the flowering of the human spirit?"

Speaking for the Catholic Committee of the South, Father O'Connell testified further:

> The Catholic Committee of the South believes that the eminent qualifications of Mr. Lilienthal which brought such great success to the TVA and such a bright new outlook to so many people of the South are exactly those needed by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Another witness was Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church of New York. Dr. Hughes, the oldest Methodist bishop in the United States, testified to what he believed to be the scandalous procedure of dragging this man's reputation and name through this kind of proceeding.

I do not think it is necessary for a $4,000 FBI agent to go chasing around the Tennessee Valley to see what he can dig up on David Lilienthal, because those who knew him best and worked with him, those who helped him fashion the TVA,

have come before the committee and said that his heart is sound and his mind is right.

Those who came to testify against him were not witnesses who would impress any jury in either my State or that of the Senator from Nevada. They were either disgruntled employees or persons like Remine, who went out looking at nudist camps in his pursuit of Communist activities.

If the Senate votes against this man's confirmation I say in all sincerity and from my heart that it cannot be done on the basis of this record. It cannot be done on the basis of anything that this man has done. It must be done outside the record, because there is in the record no evidence which I think would convince a fair man of Mr. Lilienthal's lack of qualifications for this position.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator understands, of course, that regardless of high standing in the community, when a man is being considered for the position of Federal judge or United States marshal or United States attorney it is customary to get an FBI report before he is recommended. Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that probably I understand the workings of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—if I may say so, without any offense to the Senator—better than the Senator does. For a period of 9 months I had administrative supervision over the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice. I know quite a little about it. I administered the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice for several years. It is perhaps because I know so much about it that I am not brought to the point where I think we should send an agent receiving a salary of $4,000 a year to investigate the qualifications of a nominee of the President of the United States for a position on this Commission, because the men who have been nominated to this Commission are men whose reputation was untarnished, men whose reputation was not assailed until their names were brought before the Senate in this proceeding.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Am I to understand that the Senator, having been so close to the FBI and supervising it for a number of years, holds their work in contempt and as being unnecessary?

Mr. McMAHON. Not at all. The Senator seeks to strain my meaning. That is not the case at all. I have the highest admiration for the work of that great agency.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I understood the Senator to imply, at least, that the testimony and work of various esteemed gentlemen from various sections of the country, with perhaps no experience at all, or at least none shown in the record, in investigational work, might be considered to be superior to that of the FBI.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has missed the point entirely. I think I have explained it. I do not wish to be impolite to the Senator, but he can read the RECORD tomorrow and see whether it has been explained to his satisfaction. I think he will find that it has.

Mr. MALONE. This has not been explained to my satisfaction: Inasmuch as it is customary, although not required by law, to have the records of all persons recommended for appointment as Federal judges and the records of all persons recommended for appointment as United States attorneys or United States marshals examined by the FBI, and since the Atomic Energy Act, as laid down and approved by the Senate, provides that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission should be examined, even down to the scrubwomen, and including all employees up to the assistants, then why are the men who are to head this agency exempt—this agency which we all agree might be doing the greatest job in the world within a few months or a few years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, Mr. Lilienthal has been a representative of the Government in one capacity or another for quite some time. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut this question: Before this debate began I was of the impression that the main reason why it was asserted that Mr. Lilienthal should not be confirmed for appointment to the Commission was because he was said to be a Communist. I elicited from the chairman of the committee which heard all the evidence the fact that the committee as a whole, even including the honorable Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] who will vote against confirmation of the nomination, agreed that there was not a scintilla of evidence to connect Mr. Lilienthal with communism or that he even leaned toward communism. I ask the Senator whether that is a fact.

Mr. McMAHON. I answer the Senator from Louisiana, I hope to his satisfaction, that is exactly the fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Joseph Starnes, who as a Member of the House of Representatives had a principal activity as a member of the Dies committee and was vice chairman of the old Dies committee, was brought by us before the committee to testify on this matter. Let me read what he said:

> And I wouldn't for a moment endorse any living soul for any position of power and trust and responsibility unless I had unbounded faith in his judgment, his patriotism, and his loyalty to the Government of the United States and its people and their best interest.
>
> And I certainly wouldn't have said what I had today, Senator MCKELLAR, for my life, about Mr. Lilienthal—my estimate of his character, his ability, and his patriotism—which if what I said had not come, as I said, through years of work with him as a man and as a public official.
>
> And I have absolutely no qualifications in my belief in this man's sincerity, his integrity of character, and his patriotism and loyalty to the United States of America and its institutions and its people.

Mr. ELLENDER. So such a statement as that nullifies what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has tried to bring into the debate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, Mr. President, once a judge has been examined by the FBI and has served, is it necessary to go any further?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this man has never been examined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Lilienthal has been serving in the Government.

Mr. MALONE. He has never been examined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; he has been.

Mr. MALONE. Not by the FBI.

Mr. ELLENDER. He has been attacked by various persons for quite some time. The only reason why I, as a Member of the Senate, would vote against Mr. Lilienthal would be if it could be established that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or is in some way connected with communism. But I asked the Senator from Iowa, who is chairman of this committee; and he answered that the committee as a whole, even including the member of the committee who voted against making a favorable report on the question of confirmation of the nomination, agreed that there was nothing in the record to connect Mr. Lilienthal with communism or that he was in anywise agreeable to the principles of communism.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In the first place, I, for one, do not understand that the only question before the Senate is whether Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. Even if he is not a Communist or never has been accused of being a Communist, he might not be qualified to do the job for which he has been nominated.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, I say to the Senator, that is not the question today. As I have understood the question from its inception, it has been that Mr. Lilienthal has been accused of being a Communist and of leaning toward communism; and that was the main reason why many Senators were supposed to oppose him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question—and that will be enough.

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say that the only outfit——

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time, Mr. President. I wish to point out to the Senator from Nevada that before he came to the Senate the Senate confirmed Mr. Lilienthal for reappointment to the TVA.

Mr. MALONE. But I am here now.

Mr. McMAHON. The President of the United States has chosen Mr. Lilienthal,

and it is up to the Senate to determine his qualifications upon the basis of its investigation. That investigation has been as thorough and complete as anything I know of.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to indulge me in my own time, please, until I indicate that I will yield.

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McMAHON. The investigation of Mr. Lilienthal has been, I suppose, as complete as that of any man, whose nomination has, within my memory, come before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been as complete as any that was ever made, because one of the chief opponents has, to my personal knowledge—and I have been in the Senate for 10 years—been complaining that Mr. Lilienthal was a Communist and therefore should not represent the Government in any capacity. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Apparently the Senator from Nevada would like to substitute the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the agency to consent to the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal and other Presidential nominees. Despite the high repute of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great Director, Mr. Hoover, may the day never come when the Senate of the United States bases its judgment on that of either the present or the past or any future director of the police agency of this Government.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield for one more question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana has said that he is now convinced that there is no taint of communism in Mr. Lilienthal, and that that was the only reason why he ever objected to him, why does he object to having an investigation made by the only agency which would be capable of finding out whether he is a Communist—namely, the FBI?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I never objected to Mr. Lilienthal on that ground. Mr. Lilienthal has been a part of this Government in an administrative capacity for quite some time.

Mr. MALONE. Did not the Senator say that for 10 years he objected because he was a Communist?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I did not object to him, but the chief reason advanced for his incompetency was that he was a Communist.

Mr. MALONE. Would the Senator object now to an FBI investigation to see if he is a Communist?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I would not; but the Senator should know that Mr. Lilienthal has been a member of this Government, in some capacity, for the past 8 or 9 years. He has been accused during all that period of being a Communist, and all I have heard were accusations.

As to actual proof, there has never been any, and the best authority on the subject is the Committee on Atomic Energy itself, and its chairman said that every member of the Atomic Energy Committee concluded, after hearing all the evidence, that Mr. Lilienthal was not a Communist, and was not in any manner connected with communism. That applies also to the Senator who voted against confirmation.

Mr. MALONE. If he has been accused for 10 years of being a Communist——

Mr. ELLENDER. He has not been accused.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not about time he was investigated by the only outfit that could determine it?

Mr. PEPPER. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DWORSHAK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Sometimes one would not think so here tonight. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Now we come to the end of a long and weary day. I suppose that every Senator has his mind pretty well made up as to what he is going to do.

I should just like to conclude, at least this evening, by reading into the RECORD again the names of the committee which heard the testimony. As I compute their joint service, it amounts to something like 73 years in this body.

First, there is the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Then there is the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the President pro tempore of this body, a man with whom I am proud to be associated and to call my friend.

Next is the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], whose sterling integrity and patriotism are not open to dispute by any man either in this body or out of it, a man with whom I frequently disagree in his economic theories and beliefs, but a man for whom I have the highest opinion as to his integrity and patriotism.

Then there is the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who, since his entry into the Senate, has impressed all of us with his sincerity, his integrity, and his ability.

Then there is the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], former Governor of his State, who disagreed on the basis of the record of five employees, more or less, whom the Authority had hired, and an analysis of those five employees shows that the Senator unfortunately has depended upon a very weak case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at no time concluded that Mr. Lilienthal was a Communist or in any wise connected with communism. He said he did not feel that Mr. Lilienthal was in any wise connected with communism, and that he was not leaning in that direction. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. That is true, and I will say to the Senator that the only accusation that has been made of communistic activity or communistic feeling or of his being a fellow traveler has been made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Of all the witnesses he has brought, not one, as I recollect from the record, has said one single word about Lilienthal being a Communist or a fellow traveler.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same accusation by the Senator from Tennessee has been made in the past 6 or 7 years every time Lilienthal has come up for confirmation before the Senate for any office. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment, after I finish reading the names of the committee.

Next is the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], whose Americanism certainly needs no defense from me.

Then there is the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whom we all know, and who also needs no encomiums from me as an American first, last, and all the time.

Then we come to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body, who has taken such a large part in shaping the foreign policy of this country during the last few years.

Ah, Senators, we listened to the testimony. The lawyers in this body know the value, if they have done trial work, as my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has, of seeing the witnesses, the value of hearing them testify, as against reading a cold record.

I think this committee has discharged its responsibility to the Senate and to the people of the United States, and after over 75 hours of deliberation, which we have given to this Commission and to its general manager, we have by a vote of 8 to 1 certified that not one of the nominees has been found wanting.

These men have been nominated by the President of the United States. No man will dare rise and impugn the patriotism of that man who chose them, dare to suggest that he would have chosen any man about whom a breath of scandal could be uttered.

Harry Truman has known—oh, I wish his knowledge had been shared by the Members of the Congress, at least by more of them—what happened when the nominations came up. It has weighed on his mind, it has weighed on his conscience, and he has had to carry that burden. He has carried it bravely, he has carried it well. When he sent to the Senate the nominations of the members of the Commission he discharged a duty that lies upon the Chief Executive of our country.

No; Senators will not find the reasons for the votes against these men in this record, they will not find them in Lilienthal's operation of the TVA, they will not find them in the only practical plan that has been proposed for the control of atomic energy, in which he had a decent and honorable part. No, Senators will not find the reason in that entirely creditable business arrangement into which he entered in Wisconsin. They will not

be able to predicate it on any claim of any proof that these five young gentlemen who have been hired to work on the Commission are anything else but loyal Americans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Senators will be put to it to find the reasons somewhere else. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator like to continue his speech tomorrow?

Mr. McMAHON. I intend to speak for a few minutes tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I might ask the Senate to recess, if the Senator is not through, and I suggest to the Senator that I would ask unanimous consent that we recess in executive session until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I ask the acting majority leader a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to propound this question to the acting majority leader, whether or not he would be willing to have the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, or whether he would be willing—I do not think it is necessary at all to have a quorum—to permit a very brief discussion of one of the most important issues that has been raised here tonight, namely, the so-called Wisconsin incident. I should like to get into the RECORD, about 10 minutes of discussion on the Wisconsin issue, so that the Senators may read it tomorrow, because I think it happens to be basic to this discussion. Here we are confronted with a unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow, which makes it impossible for some of us to have the necessary time to discuss that. I know the Senate is probably tired, but having gone this far tonight, I do not see why we should not be allowed to finish up this incident, and I should like to discuss it for about 10 minutes at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I would be willing to stay here as long as anyone, but he is not the only Senator who wants to speak on the Wisconsin matter. If 10 minutes were granted to him, it would simply mean that we would stay on for others who would also like to present their views. I should like to accommodate the Senator.

As to the suggestion about convening at 11 o'clock tomorrow, I think that is a good suggestion. The only draw-back is that we have committee meetings each morning. Without an announcement prior to this hour of the night, I think it would be impractical to follow the suggestion. I should like to accommodate the Senator, because I know he has a message, but if time is granted to him the same courtesy will have to be extended to other Senators. I should be glad to ask the Senator from Connecticut to retain the floor tomorrow, so he could yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the opponents of the pending motion should give the time. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I am satisfied, will grant the Senator from Oregon the time he asks, in which to make his statement about the Wisconsin incident. I am sure that when the Senator finishes there will then be others who will want to say something about that incident who have not had a chance to do so tonight.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut whether it would be agreeable to him for me to make a motion to recess, as in executive session? I shall be glad to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator be recognized so he may complete his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I ask the acting majority leader another question?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does he yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. What the Senator from Nebraska suggests is perfectly satisfactory to me, and I rather think that we could finish the debate by meeting at 12 o'clock. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon when we meet tomorrow, as he wishes to make a brief statement on this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that suit the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. No; it does not suit me at all. All I am suggesting is that I should like 10 minutes' discussion in the RECORD tonight, so that my colleagues may read it tomorrow and make whatever reply they care to make

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. McMAHON. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon that he wishes to get this material in the RECORD tonight, I now yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield the floor?

Mr. McMAHON. With the understanding, Mr. President, as the Senate majority has said, that I shall be recognized tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a second. First Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon the distinguished Senator from Connecticut shall be recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that an order has been entered by unanimous consent under which the time is to be equally divided between the two sides of the aisle, as of tomorrow, with a vote certain at the hour of 5.

Mr. WHERRY. And that the time of the Senator from Connecticut will be charged to the opponents of the motion. I make that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I should like to know if there is any objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senate meets at 12 o'clock tomorrow, we will have at least 5 more hours in which to discuss the subject, and I plead with the majority that if and when we recess this evening, we meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock, because we have very important meetings of committees tomorrow, especially the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be equally divided between the two sides, controlled by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but what I am pleading for is that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock rather than at 11 o'clock, as has been suggested.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield the floor for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I entered the Chamber in the middle of the request by the Senator from Nebraska. I am not informed as to exactly the nature of the request, or what the proposition is that is before the Senate. I should be grateful to be informed.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator propounding the question to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am propounding it either to the Chair or to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the question. I asked unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut retain the floor, and that the time he uses to conclude his remarks be included in the time of the opponents of the pending motion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry. Did the Senator from Connecticut yield the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut yielded the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Did the Senator from Connecticut request that he be recognized tomorrow, on the convening of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator that by unanimous consent there is an agreement that the time will be equally divided between the two sides tomorrow, and that a vote be taken at 5 o'clock; so the leaders of the two sides will have the right to the floor tomorrow, and whoever then will have their consent may speak to the question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry. I am familiar with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into prior to this time. I am merely trying to clarify

whether the Senator from Connecticut yielded tonight, and whether or not it is his desire to occupy the floor and to conclude tomorrow.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Iowa that I am not particularly concerned about being recognized when the Senate meets tomorrow, but what I would like to do is to be assured by the Senator from Iowa, and I assume there will be no trouble about it, that during the debate tomorrow I may have 20 minutes—not more than 20 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, that he knows as well as I do that there are a certain number of speakers on each side to be accommodated tomorrow. I am sure he may rest assured that we have been working closely together in this matter, and that insofar as anything I can do in keeping with the rights of other Senators who desire to speak, and who would have the right to speak, is concerned, I shall be glad to have him conclude; but I also say in fairness that, of course, if the Senator speaks tomorrow, I see no other answer but that it will have to be charged to the time of the opponents of the motion. I mean that that would be my attitude. I can see no other.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, I do oppose the motion to recommit. But I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I think he and I will have no trouble in agreeing on an allocation of sufficient time for me to say whatever I want to say tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I understand the Senator to yield for either a parliamentary inquiry or to discuss the agreement which is before the Senate, or does the Senator yield to me so I may speak in my own right?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I desire to move that the Senate take a recess. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for a question or for any observation he wishes to make respecting the unanimous-consent agreement, but I shall not yield to him for extended remarks. The Senator knows that. I do not have to advise the Senator in respect to that matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. No; not just now. Mr. President, I inquire if there is objection to the request I have made?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, then I move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TOBEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska is not debatable. The question is on the motion. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to be recorded as voting "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I call for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, April 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24) 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John F. Simmons, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

Paul F. Alling, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

POSTMASTER

Carl E. Lindsay to be postmaster at Souris, in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our spirits, we pray that we may realize the true values of life—its gold and not its tinsel, for no earthly affluence can possibly atone for poverty of soul. Help us, O God, to summon the resources of our beings—imagination, faith, hope, and love—that we may live in more constant companionship with the one perfect Man.

As we unveil the cross and behold infinite love struggling for infinite expression, forbid that we should ever crucify our Lord afresh. Enable us to take from our lives all malice, resentment, and the sins of negligence, and to find the compensating rest that comes with sorrow. He who stands at the door of our hearts and gives blessings; He who stretched forth His arm when we were burdened, saying, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor"—this is the Christ who shall be our King and our Lord.

Blessed Lord, give unto our beloved Speaker the ministry of Thy strength and wisdom, and abide with the Congress in the measure of good health and good cheer. In the honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

A BUTCHER'S VIEW OF THE GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the butcher in a grocery store in a small town what he thought about the President's proposal regarding Greece and Turkey. He said, "A hungry man is a dissatisfied man, and therefore a dangerous man." So he approves the sending of a reasonable quantity of food to Greece, but he is absolutely opposed to the use of military force. He further said this: That if we go too far high prices of corn and other grain products mean high prices of meat; and when you get an excessive high cost of living, we will then have hungry people in this country, which will bring about the very condition we are trying to cure in Europe.

DEMOCRATIC MAYORALTY NOMINEE D'ALESANDRO

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that his many friends in the House would like to be informed that the dean of the Maryland delegation, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, yesterday won the Democratic nomination for mayor of the great city of Baltimore.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, when the legislative reorganization bill was un-

der consideration in the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress I called attention to the desirability of writing into title IV of the bill a limitation of recovery—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1946—only to meet the disapproval of the sponsors of the bill, who would entertain no amendments.

Though the Federal Tort Claims Act has now been in operation but a few months, the experience of the Federal agencies under the act has already demonstrated the wisdom of such a limitation in the law. For example, the War Department reports that a claim for $212 for damage to clothing is now the basis for a suit for $75,000 for personal injuries, and another for $1,047.29 for wearing apparel and personal property destroyed and for medical bills is now the subject of a suit for $50,000. The Navy reports similar experiences and cites a claim for personal injuries originally filed for $927 which was inflated to $25,000 when suit was filed, and another which increased from $4,500 to $51,200 when it was transferred to the jurisdiction of a court under the Tort Act. In a suit for $60,000 the Department of Justice advises that compromise settlement of $49,506.75 was under consideration—over 80 percent of the amount for which suit was brought.

It is too early yet to estimate the amounts which will be awarded in suits brought under this act. In fact, the availability of the courts is probably not yet known generally, but the suits being filed indicate that the damages asked are in an exorbitant volume. Some 138 suits known to have been filed since October 1, 1946, demand $4,331,653. This ratio, projected over a year, indicates a demand of possibly as much as $12,000,000. Judgments or compromises as authorized by the act would be less than the demand but obviously would represent a substantial increase in the cost of settling such claims over the amounts authorized when such claims were handled by the Congress.

I have, therefore, just introduced a bill, H. R. 2924, calling for the repeal of the Tort Claims Act, title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and for the establishment of a Committee on Private Claims to consider private claims bills in all categories. The present law places a ban only on tort claims, leaving still a great number of private claims requiring the consideration of the Congress and placing thereby an extremely heavy load on committees of the Senate and the House whose Members find little time to devote to their study and determination.

For 3 years, as a member of the Claims Committee of this House, I was deeply impressed with the fairness and justice with which each private claim bill was treated. Particularly in tort cases, a person injured through the negligence of Government employees, civilian and military, first had their claims screened by their own elected Representatives. He then, being satisfied of the prima merit of the claim, yet not attempting to pass judgment on the matter, offered the claim as a private claim bill. He had no interest other than to see justice done.

In that Claims Committee the claim was assigned to a subcommittee. Then, much as does a court, the facts upon which the bill was predicated, as established by the claimant's statement, supporting affidavits, the reports of doctors, and the surrounding facts as developed through investigation by the Federal agency involved, were carefully studied. After deliberation the subcommittee reported its findings and its recommendations to the full committee, which, incidentally was composed of outstanding lawyers and judges from all over the country. Upon the facts presented the committee acted, guided by the rules of the committee which insured like consideration for claims based on comparable facts regardless of the locale of the accident, with fairness and justice to the claimant and consideration for the taxpayer who is required to foot the bill.

As a further check these private bills, when called from the Private Calendar, were subject to objections by recognized objectors from both sides of the aisle, or by individual Members, if it should appear that the committee recommendation was out of line.

Much the same course of action was followed in the Senate.

The practice of over 150 years of freedom from litigation due to personal claims which disposed of those claims with fairness, justice, and a reasonable regard for the taxpayer, has proved itself in the crucible of time and experience.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding record of fairness established by Claims Committee procedure and the anticipated exorbitance of prospective claims, together with the unlimited power of compromise by district attorneys, convinces me, as I hope it will all Members of Congress, that the Tort Claims Act title should be repealed and the Committee on Private Claims reinstituted.

Also, this action will eliminate the necessity for providing additional employees and additional attorneys in the Department of Justice, and avoid the possible demand for an increase in the Federal Judiciary to handle this increase in litigation.

CENTRALIA MINE DISASTER EXPLOITATION

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, this week America's 400,000 soft-coal miners are idle, although the Nation's need for coal was never greater. Whether or not they want to be at work, whether or not the loss of wages during this period will subject their families to hunger and hardship, they are all off the job. Why? Because one man has commanded them to do so in order to demonstrate his dictatorial power and to express his defiance of the Government and the decree of the Supreme Court forbidding the calling of a strike.

All of us are deeply moved by the terrible tragedy which struck down 111 lives in the Centralia, Ill., mines last week. None of us condones in any degree whatever deficiency in safety measures may have existed. But subsequent developments make two points stand out with crystal clarity.

The first is that the period of "mourning" which has been decreed is a thinly veiled and mocking strike, ordered with contemptuous disregard of the express terms of the decision of the highest court in the land.

The second is that, as is now reported, the miners' dictator has had, since last November, a copy of the report of Mine Inspector Frank Perz recommending numerous reforms in the Centralia mines. The record fails to show that he acted at any time to safeguard the men whose loss he now officially mourns.

It is obvious to every thinking citizen that Lewis is more interested in the prestige and power of John L. Lewis than he is in the welfare of his miners. And it is time to bring to an end this kind of exploitation of American labor and the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he recently delivered at Fresno, Calif.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News in reference to one of our colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune of last Sunday.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Anti-Communist Legislation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the contents of the editorial taken from a recent issue of the Shreveport Times and entitled "Anticommunist Legislation." This editorial comments very favorably upon the recommendations made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities published last January 2. Had these recommendations been placed into law a number of years ago, the House would not have been confronted by the disagreeable duty of passing upon the Supreme Court decision yesterday to pay three adjudged Communists the sum of $2,100 which came up before the House yesterday. I am certainly not in sympathy of paying Government employees who do not freely give loyalty to this Government. In fact,

I am thoroughly in accord with the President in his program to get rid of all Communists, and as quickly as possible. I hope the appropriate legislative committee will give these recommendations immediate consideration.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities completes its current hearings—which are yielding sensational testimony on the activity of Communists in the United States—the committee will presumably recommend a program of legislation to deal with communism.

Some hint as to the recommendations which may be approved is found in the final report of the same committee in the last Congress, when the committee was under Democratic control.

This final report, published last January 2, urged adoption of legislation having these purposes:

1. No Government employment for noncitizens.
2. No office in trade-unions for noncitizens.
3. Prompt deportation of all alien Communists.
4. Stringent screening of the political background of would-be immigrants.
5. Restriction of tax-exemption privileges for educational and relief bodies that are really Communist-front groups.
6. No second-class mailing privileges for (a) embassies and agencies of foreign governments that do not extend reciprocal privileges to officials of the United States; (b) foreign-language publications unless these carry English translations of the foreign-language content in parallel columns; (c) groups distributing subversive or un-American propaganda.
7. No organization using the mails or subject to Federal laws to have concealed or secret memberships under aliases.

While the old committee was attacked from many quarters, particularly by persons and groups now suspected of Communist leanings, there is nothing in this recommended program to indicate that it failed in its duty or was overzealous in its attack on subversive radicalism.

Virtually every recommendation listed has the approval of an overwhelming number of Americans. In a referendum, some would probably receive an affirmative vote of better than 95 percent.

The present committee should hew to the line of courageous action, setting up safeguards which will strip the Communist front in the United States of as much power as possible. Congress is in a mood to support a vigorous course if the committee recommends it.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] presented to the House a letter he has written to the Attorney General, demanding that the Department of Justice prosecute the Communists in this country for not registering as agents of a foreign power.

I join the gentleman from New Jersey in that request, because every Communist in America is an agent of a foreign power, a foreign conspiracy, that is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, and the destruction of the American way of life.

On yesterday I read to you an advertisement that the Communists published in the New York Times and the Herald Tribune asking people to write to President Truman and to me, urging us to oppose legislation that would protect this country against communism.

I am glad to inform the House today that those letters are coming in, and about nine-tenths of them are demanding that we outlaw the Communist influence in America and that we put a stop to this criminal conspiracy that is trying to undermine and destroy this Government and wreck American institutions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ELECTION IN CHICAGO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was an election yesterday in the city of Chicago and Martin H. Kennelly, a Democrat, was elected mayor with 59 percent of the votes cast. A few days ago the Republican national chairman, Hon. Carroll Reece, said that the Chicago election was to be the GOP's second step toward the White House in 1948. It appears now the step was downstairs, perhaps in search of that bargain basement that the National Association of Manufacturers promised the people of this country would come if price control were only removed.

The Republican Party in Illinois insisted on fighting the mayoralty campaign on national and international issues. Mr. Reece, by his utterances, gave it national importance. The results speak for themselves.

ELECTION IN CHICAGO

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the gentleman from Illinois I just want to say that his thoughts concerning the election in Chicago are entirely wrong, because we had seven aldermen prior to yesterday, and after yesterday we are going to have at least 17, and possibly 18, increasing by almost three times the number of aldermen we previously had.

Mr. DEVITT. Is the Kelly-Nash machine still active in Chicago?

Mr. OWENS. The Arvey-Kelly machine is still active, but the results of the election, as shown by the increase of Republicans who have been elected to the city council, proves that we have broken the back and the power of the machine in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and the Republican Party will prevail there in 1948.

WISCONSIN PRIMARY RESULTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that since reference has been made to certain recent election results, it might be of interest to report that there was a special primary in the second Wisconsin district yesterday. All but three of the precincts have reported. Without going into too much detail as to the figures, I can report that the Republican total vote in that primary was 64,887 and the total Democratic vote, was 16,044. So, it seems quite sure that the country is still very definitely Republican.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by her before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on April 1, 1947.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on the subject of displaced persons.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on income tax revision.

JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 13, is Jefferson's birthday. I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 14, prior to the legislative program of the day, someone appointed by the Speaker may read Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ELECTION RESULTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader just called attention to the results of the special election in the State of Wisconsin. I understand that this was not a special election, but was merely a primary. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that all of the

Republican candidates in that primary publicly repudiated in their platforms the so-called Knutson plan of giving the least tax relief where it is most needed and giving the most relief where it is least needed, and that perhaps may be the reason why these Republican candidates polled such a large vote; because there was a repudiation of the tax bill that was passed here by the Republican majority last week.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke and tell him that the reason we are economizing in Government is because of the fact that you and the New Deal have for 12 or 15 years been squandering the money of the taxpayers of this country. The country is in such a terrible condition that it is going to be impossible to get things going right unless you fellows join us in trying to economize. Vote once for economy. If we do not economize, I do not know what will happen. You are so ready to spend the funds of the taxpayers. Now, they need help, and we can help them if you will join us. Be wise and economize.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Where are you going to save this $6,000,000,000?

Mr. RICH. We will do it if you will only help us to save it. I have asked you for 14 years where are you going to get the money. Never once did it register with my colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the House may be in session the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SAVINGS IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] referred to the $6,000,000,000 budget savings. Frankly, this Eightieth Congress will be in session for 2 years. We are not going to be deterred in our purpose to decrease expenditures, possibly six or seven or eight billion dollars. What we fail to do this year we will do next year, and you will find economies effected during this session of Congress that I am sure easily reach the figure that we voted for during this session. We are not going to do a half-baked job. We will reduce expenses, balance the budget, and meet every campaign pledge that we made last November. That will be a treat to the taxpayers of America after having had the New Deal walk out on every pledge it made to the American people during the 14 years of its existence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we will have to do that without the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. If he had his way he would go right on spending untold sums of money that would have to be taken out of the taxpayers.

Mr. BENDER. On the one hand, you New Dealers object to our saving money, and on the other, you object to our not saving enough. Now, make up your minds and tell us what you want us to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois can get any comfort out of the election that was held in Chicago yesterday by electing 16 aldermen out of 50, and also by losing the city by a hundred thousand more votes than they lost it either in 1939 or 1943, then they may take that comfort and that unction to their soul.

As far as the Wisconsin matter is concerned, it is my understanding that one of the men who ran in the Republican primary at one time sat in this House not as a Republican, and that his vote, added to the Democratic vote, was more than the local Republican candidate received.

Now, coming to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], you have been in the minority a long time. You were full of promises last fall. You could have won the election last fall in the backwash of the great world disturbance without making any promises at all. But you made them. I do not understand now why you just did not say you were going to cut expenditures to the bone, and if you had saved a billion and a half or two billion, which is probably the limit of what you will save under the President's budget, you could have glorified yourselves with saving two big billion dollars. But the taxpayers of this country are going to ask you this year and next year, "Where is the other four billion that you so solemnly promised?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ESTATE OF THE LATE MARSHALL W. PICKERING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 154) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of Marshall W. Pickering, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Marshall W. Pickering.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "1 year's" and insert "6 months'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK FOR MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer the resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $3,000 per annum each, for the employment of a clerk to the majority and minority whips, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 6, 1947, the expenses of conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held

in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, in addition to the sum provided by House Resolution 61, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) or rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Printing and binding" and insert "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCE TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 135 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$40,000."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Printing and binding" and insert "The."

Page 1, line 9, in each instance where it appears strike out the word "Committee" and insert the word "sub."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 170) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 100, Eightieth Congress, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

"SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it stand adjourned until Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next it stand adjourned until the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be any legislative program on tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know of any, although we will meet tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECEIVING MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next, April 9, 1947, to consider the Consent Calendar, and that on Thursday next, April 10, 1947, it be in order to consider the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will probably be absent on tomorrow and Monday and designates the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to act as Speaker pro tempore.

SUPPORT OF COMMUNIST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, we applaud Secretary of War Patterson for his efforts in ridding the War Department of subversives and pinks, but it is rather discouraging to note that while he is making an effort to rid the War Department of Communists and subversives, he is inserting advertisements in a Communist newspaper asking for recruits in the United States Army.

What kind of recruits for the Army are we going to get from such advertisements?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that fact, we are practically subsidizing the Communists in this country by contributing to their newspapers by inserting these ads. I have requested 10 minutes to address the House today at which time I shall go into more detail on that subject. In addition to what I have said, I have discovered that in Detroit, Mich., some courts are putting legal notices in

a Communist newspaper, probably paid for with taxpayers' money.

Just how bright are we in America?

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], whom he has just designated as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday and Monday next, has illness in his family which may preclude him from accepting the appointment; therefore, the Chair withdraws that designation and designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday and Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include other material.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts from House documents of the Massachusetts Legislature in each instance.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PENALTY IMPOSED ON THE VETERINARY CORPS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, in 1916 the Congress of the United States passed an amendment to the National Defense Act authorizing the War Department to establish and organize a Veterinary Corps as a part of the Medical Department of the Army. Although this was less than 1 year prior to our entry into World War I, this newly organized corps had an excellent record in that war, and its value and importance as an organized corps in the Army was recognized. This is evidenced in the National Defense Act of 1920 when the authorized strength of the Veterinary Corps was increased and the officers of that corps could advance through the various grades from second lieutenant to colonel, inclusive.

In 1935 due notice was taken again of the professional qualifications, the attainments, and the valuable service of the members of the Veterinary Corps as a part of the team of the three professional corps of the Medical Department of the Army—the other two being the Medical and Dental Corps. In 1935 Congress passed a law that members of the Veterinary Corps would be initially commissioned as first lieutenants. They have been so commissioned for the past 12 years.

We have been told that one objective of the War Department in the procurement of officers is to secure men of high caliber; secondly, that to accomplish this an attractive career and certain inducements must be offered.

Mr. Speaker, since 1935 Veterinary Corps officers have come into the Army as first lieutenants. As a result men of high scholastic attainment and high potential professional ability, far above the average of their graduating classes, have chosen the Army as a career. I predict that unless the inducements offered veterinarians to make the Army a career are as good or better than at present, the type of individual that I am sure the Army wants in the Veterinary Corps will not be obtained. Who will suffer? The Medical Department and the Army as a whole.

Under the proposed bill as it affects the Veterinary Corps, an officer would be given only 2 years' service credit. He would, therefore, come in as second lieutenant and serve 1 year in that grade before being eligible for promotion to first lieutenant. He would then be required to serve 4 years in the grade of first lieutenant, or a total of 5 years prior to being eligible for the next grade. Mind you, this is 2 years more than what is required under the present law which has been in effect since 1935.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years, officers commissioned in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, and Veterinary Corps have come into the Medical Department of the Army as first lieutenants. Furthermore, they have advanced through the various grades to include colonel at the same stated period of service. I have great admiration for the accomplishments of these respective corps during World War II. The entire Medical Department did a magnificent job. I offer no objection to any service credit proposed for the Medical or Dental Corps. However, I do protest the penalty imposed on the Veterinary Corps in this proposed bill by requiring veterinarians to be initially commissioned as second lieutenants. The profession of veterinary medicine has made tremendous advances during the past 30 or 40 years. There is a great demand for veterinarians in this country in the various sections of this field of science, such as pathology, bacteriology, virology, research, public health. All fields involve not only the diseases affecting the health of animals but those affecting the health of humans, especially in the field of preventive medicine. This applies equally to the Veterinary Corps of the Army.

Therefore, without equivocation or reservation, I will state that part of the bill which provides that veterinary officers will enter the Army as second lieutenants will cause a deterioration of this corps and result in a loss of effectiveness. I repeat, the type of professional man desired and necessary will not seek the Army as a career.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. I wonder if the gentleman is aware that the shortage of qualified veterinarian personnel in the Army during World War II was such that it was necessary for the War Department to set up under the Army specialized training program special schools for the training of veterinary personnel for the armed services throughout the United States?

Mr. GILLIE. That is absolutely correct; the AST program. One of the large training centers for veterinarians and technicians that I am familiar with was at Beaumont Hospital at Fort Bliss, Tex. They did remarkably fine work there. They trained these young veterinarians and assistants, and they did a very fine job all during World War II.

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman probably knows that similar schools were established at Iowa State College, Kansas State College, and certain other schools throughout the United States. Then emphasis was being laid on making that particular branch of the service attractive to qualified personnel. I agree completely with what the gentleman has said today.

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad to get that information from my good friend from Missouri.

May I say in connection with the training of veterinarians that there are only 10 approved schools in the United States. We do not have nearly enough veterinary colleges in the United States to train these men. There are now only approximately 12,000 veterinarians in the United States and we need about 30,000 right now to carry on the work in the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing this subject to the attention of the Members of the House. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the restrictions and limitations which have been placed upon the commissioning of veterinarians in the service is retarding the interest of veterinarians to enter the service at this time, when they are badly needed?

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman's remarks are very pertinent at this time. The Committee on Armed Services, as you probably know, at present is considering the promotion law both for the Army and Navy. The gentleman raised a question a few moments ago which is also very pertinent. The fact is that the Army and Navy both had to go out and train not only veterinarians, but other professional groups also. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the integration law and the problem of integrating these qualified officers into each corps. At the present time I am not familiar with the Veterinary Corps. Is it completely filled at present or are they still having difficulty securing personnel to complete this corps as authorized by the Congress?

Mr. GILLIE. I understand they still need some additions to the Army Corps of Veterinarians. The point I want to impress upon the House is the fact that veterinary graduates will not come into the Army because they find other fields of endeavor that suit them better. I would like to see high-class veterinarians come into the Army, but you are not going to get them when you offer them a second lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, the promotion law is for the promotion of not only veterinarians but other officers as well. Does the gentleman complain that promotion is not fast enough?

Mr. GILLIE. No; I do not claim that. They are all promoted in the same manner as far as I can see. That is to say, veterinarians and dental and medical graduates are promoted the same after they reach a first lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. That is, in the beginning?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes, in the beginning, after they reach first lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. But under the integration program at the present time, if the veterinarian also has belonged to the reserves, at the beginning he can be integrated with a higher rank or whatever rank his age qualifies him for. Does not the gentleman think that that takes care of part of the situation?

Mr. GILLIE. I think that would be all right, as far as I can see, but the new graduate coming in would have to take a second lieutenancy for a year before he becomes a first lieutenant. I believe dentists, chaplains and J. A. G., and medical doctors come in as first lieutenants.

Mr. DURHAM. The pharmacists do not. They come in on your level. I see the gentleman's point.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. The pharmacist comes into the Pharmacists' Corps as a second lieutenant and not as a first lieutenant.

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. The very fact that the veterinarians are compelled to come in and serve a certain length of time as second lieutenants, rather than as first lieutenants, is causing many veterinarians to hesitate joining the Veterinarians' Corps in the Army. Is that not correct?

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct. I do not see how the Army will get a high-grade veterinarian at that level.

Mr. DURHAM. That is applicable to the young graduates coming from the veterinarian schools.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. But it does not prohibit a man who has a good many years' experience as a veterinarian and who has belonged to the Reserve Corps from coming in on the same basis as anybody else and being integrated perhaps as a captain, if he happened to be in that age bracket and if he has had a certain number of years' experience in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. GILLIE. As I understand it, under the plan that has been worked out, any veterinarian who has heretofore been in the reserves and then wants to join the Army can join as a first lieutenant. Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. I agree with the gentleman, of course. I think all these professional groups should come into the service on the same level because the Congress has adopted a policy with reference to the Naval Academy and also the Military Academy of bringing these boys in when they graduate as first lieutenants.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman has given any consideration to the effect on the practice in the Veterinary Corps and on the Veterinary Corps itself of the discontinuance of the Cavalry and the transfer or liquidation perhaps of the Remount Service. The War Department has taken the position that the Remount Service will be ended as far as that Department is concerned. I had a letter from Secretary Patterson within the past week on the subject, stating that that was their final decision in the matter and that the Remount Service, unless transferred to the Department of Agriculture, or otherwise disposed of, will be liquidated from the 30th of June. In that connection I have introduced H. R. 2868 on last Monday, to provide for the transfer of the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture. Of course I do not know what will happen to it. As the picture stands today, the War Department goes out of the horse business, so to speak, on the 30th of June.

Mr. GILLIE. And I am thankful for the horse's sake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I recognize that the veterinarians have much to do besides looking after horses. But my original question was, Had the gentleman considered the possible effect on the Veterinary Corps of this decision of the Army?

Mr. GILLIE. In view of the fact that horses have almost entirely passed out of the picture in the Army, the veterinarian still has a very important work to do, more important than ever, as I see it, in following food production from the time it is first processed until it gets to the front lines. That is a very important part of the work in the veterinarian's service. They have done a splendid job, and I think they should get more recognition than they are getting in the reorganization of the Army.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the lady from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I speak with a great deal of feeling and appreciation of what the veterinarians have done, inasmuch as I have had close connection with the National Guard of Ohio for a great many years, with 16 members of my family a part of it. The grief throughout our section at the decision of the War Department to abolish cavalry is very real. Some of us feel that it is not a wise decision at all; that just because they are against cavalry and horses at the moment does not at all mean that the use for them is gone, and particularly when it is considered in relation to the breeding of horses, with which the Army has had so very much to do. I want to thank the gentleman very much for what he has said today. I feel very eager to have some recognition given to the veterinarians for the splendid work they have done during all these years.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentle lady from Ohio for that fine contribution. I may say in that connection that as far as the Army of the United States is concerned, the horse has almost passed out of the picture. Terrific speed counts today; but if you will remember, in the war in Europe, Germany used some 300,000 head of horses in their campaign in Poland. They used more than 500,000 head of horses in their campaign through central Europe, down through France, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and so on.

Mrs. BOLTON. I remember that very well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WAR DEPARTMENT SUBSIDIZES COMMUNIST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the War Department, as of March 1947, is reported to be undertaking a campaign to eliminate subversives and pinks from its officers' staff and to eliminate enlisted men of that character from sensitive spots.

In the light of the disclosures made by our House Committee on Un-American Activities and the drastic action recommended by important private persons, as well as Government officials, regarding American Communists, it is gratifying to note the delayed recognition of our War Department concerning the Communist menace. I would suggest, however, that they be a little more forthright in their attitude toward this problem and instead of giving mere lip service show actually a more constructive and discerning attitude. I am compelled to make these observations because the War Department has been for some time, and still is, inserting advertisements in the Italian language Communist weekly, L'Unita del

Popolo, of New York City, soliciting enlistments in the United States Army. The most recent advertisement of this character was in the March 15 issue.

I submit that unless one were colossally ignorant, it does not make sense subsidizing a Communist publication which constantly criticizes our Government as an imperialist one and portrays our Army as lackeys of imperialism. It seems to me that any persons attracted by an advertisement in this paper should be top priority candidates for an exhaustive investigation by our Government as subversives, whose primary role would be to infiltrate our Army and impair morale. I suggest that Secretary of War Patterson might well impel his talents to investigate his own Department and ascertain how many other advertisements are currently being placed by the War Department in other foreign language Communist publications in the United States. By so doing, he may be able to obtain some concrete information about the misuse of Government funds and at least hold to a minimum the necessity for expenditures of Government money to investigate subversives in his Department.

These advertisements constitute in fact an official Government subsidy to this Communist and subversive publication.

I now cite the advertisements appearing in L'Unita del Popolo on the following dates:

[Translations]

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: March 15, 1947.

FORGET THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

You don't need to worry about the high cost of housing, food, or clothing when you are a member of the new Regular Army. All of these things are furnished free, in addition to the new, remarkable pay which you will be able to save almost entirely. These are the financial advantages of military life. If you are between the ages of 17 and 34, physically fit and mentally alert, then hurry to obtain all these things, by going to the nearest United States Army recruiting station.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.
39 WHITEHALL STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COX. In other words, they are extending an invitation to the people who are attracted by such a publication to become a part of the United States Army.

I want to commend the gentleman for taking note of this abuse of power and of public funds.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Georgia is exactly right; and the danger which results from it is to infiltrate our Army with individuals who might come from that source who would read these Communist advertisements in a Communist paper and thereby undermine not only the morale of our own Army but endanger the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I continue quoting the advertisement:

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.

A FINE CAREER AWAITS YOU IN THE ARMY

These are the things offered you:

New high pay, which you can practically save in entirety, with your food, shelter, clothing, and medical care furnished free.

Hygienic work with excellent conditions, with paid vacations which are twice as long as those offered by private industry.

Real security, with a pension plan which is most liberal—half pay for the rest of your life after 20 years, and three-quarters pay after 30 years of military service.

If you are physically fit and mentally alert, between the ages of 18 and 34 years (17 years with parents' consent), obtain immediately all detailed information from the nearest United States Army recruiting station.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.
39 WHITEHALL STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: February 1, 1947.

FINANCIAL ADVANTAGES OF MILITARY SERVICE

A worker in an American factory can expect an average of $191 a month. It is considerable pay, but how much of this money does he have left for spending and saving?

Consider the cost of rent, living expenses, income tax, doctor and dentist bills. He is fortunate if at the end of the month he suceeds in saving more than $25 in all. Now, the soldier escapes all these expenses. From his $75 a month he saves, on an average, more money than any civilian worker.

And this applies to the new regulations, which also offer every opportunity for promotion with increased pay. You will be given increments for foreign service, for paratrooper service, or for airborne and aviation service.

The soldier also receives pension credits without any cost through which he is able to retire after 20 years of service at half pay and after 30 years of service at three-quarters pay. Such a retirement plan would cost a civilian from $75 to $100 a month for 30 years.

Learn all the other benefits in military service. Go to the nearest United States Army recruiting center.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

Your Regular Army serves the Nation and humanity in war and in peace.

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: November 23, 1946.

There is a picture of a girl saying: "His pay is practically a saving.

"To be the wife of a soldier in the Regular Army is ideal for me from many points of view.

"Let us consider, for example, his pay. When Dick, my husband, enrolled as a private, his pay, $75 a month, seemed very little to me. Reconsidering, however, I had to admit that that wasn't all.

"For example, the Government itself took care of other things: dental and medical care, housing, clothing, postage, exemption from income tax of more than $1,500 extra a year. We also have an allowance for me, and Dick also hopes for one on maintenance. He also has paid vacations of 30 days a year. I can also save on social security, theater, railroad tax. Our deposits in the bank earn three times as much as civilians'.

"We can even save. For me, Dick's pay is practically a total saving. And this is not the only reason which makes me happy, knowing Dick is satisfied with his career and feels he is learning much and progressing."

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

There are also ads in the following numbers of L'Unita del Popolo through the year 1946: October 5, September 28, September 7, July 27, June 29, June 15, April 27, and March 30.

These advertisements are 4 inches by 4 inches in size.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I note from the newspapers that the Turkish Government has been consulting for the last few days over whether or not they will accept a loan from us because the present bill requires that our observers, our newspapermen, and radio people be permitted to have full access to what is done with the money, how it is spent, and in general, to have free access to all parts of Turkey.

Obviously, a dictatorship such as exists in Turkey will not be happy to permit American public opinion to know the truth about how they will spend their share of the $400,000,000 that Mr. Truman has requested the Congress to appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, apparently Turkey has now over $75,000,000 of gold which the Nazis stole from Belgium and Holland. Our State Department has had some negotiations with the Turkish Government, requesting that they turn over this looted Nazi gold to us as a part of our reparations from Nazi Germany. So far, the Turks have not turned over the Nazi looted gold which they have.

In addition, our State Department apparently has made some small effort, however tiny, to persuade the present Turkish Government to turn over to us the millions and millions of dollars of Nazi assets which are today concealed in Turkey; yet so far, the Turkish Government, whatever the diplomatic pleasantries may have been, have not turned over one thin dime of Nazi assets.

Today, we have a national debt of several hundred billion and our State Department characters want us to spend ten or fifteen billions a year bribing every international bandit throughout the world, for God knows how long in the future. Mr. Speaker, we want to know the truth about Turkey. We want to know the truth about stolen gold. We want to know the truth about Nazi assets in Turkey.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to an Associated Press dispatch appearing in last Sunday's paper which gave the total foreign credits in this country as being in excess of $9,000,000,000. In that $9,000,000,000 Greece is listed as having $93,700,000 of credits in this country and Turkey $40,800,000 awaiting the time that we can manufacture merchandise for them to buy.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. As a matter of fact, if we had all the facts, we could approach these questions properly and would know exactly what the picture is. However, much of this is handed to us piece-meal and we are handicapped in

our consideration of these items because of that policy. Obviously, there are some people who by design fail to make all the facts known to the Congress of the United States, yet on that basis we proceed to legislate, we proceed to act without all the information that we should have.

It may just be the case, Mr. Speaker, that the looted Nazi gold which belongs to the American taxpayer, and the concealed Nazi assets in Turkey, which also belong to the American taxpayer, amount to more than the loan which our good President proposes to extend to Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here talking about the $250,000,000 in gold reserves which the present Turkish Government has in other foreign countries—I am not here talking about the several hundred millions of dollars that the Turkish Government blackmailed out of us in the war under the threat of sending chrome to the Germans; I am not here talking about the profiteering that the Turks engaged in during the war; I am not talking about the fact that 90 percent of all Turkish exports during the war went to Germany; I am not talking about the fact that Turkey refused to enter the war in 1943 when she was requested to do so by the Allies. Mr. Speaker, I am just talking about the plain fact that seventy-five millions of stolen gold and hundreds of millions of dollars of German assets now in Turkey belong to the American taxpayer. Why, Mr. Speaker, does our State Department refuse to give the Congress and the American people the truth about our relationship with the present Turkish Government? Why, Mr. Speaker, does not our State Department present to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House in executive session, if they want to, the correspondence with the Turkish Government in regard to the Nazi-looted gold and the Nazi assets in Turkey? I, for one, am sick and tired of the willful, deliberate squandering of the money of American taxpayers on foreign adventures in behalf of corrupt, dictatorial, undemocratic governments, under the pretense that by such squandering we are building a bulwark against communism.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman from Ohio allow the gentleman from South Dakota to hazard an answer to his question?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to have the answer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, I will just hazard the guess that the reason is that the State Department would prefer to appease Turkey rather than to appease Russia.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is half correct; while we are appeasing Turkey we are at the same time appeasing Russia, we are doing business with Russia, and are providing the money and the relief for Russia and her satellite countries. You just have to see the whole picture; not just that part of it that is convenient for you to look at.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, I would not want to imply that I was justifying that position, but I do think it may be entirely possible that the State Department is being a little lenient with Turkey because it wants Turkey to stay in the picture. I am not sure what my final conclusion is going to be on this whole Turkish-Greek situation, and I would not want the gentleman's last observation attempt to commit me one way or the other on that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I very much regret to see the gentleman taking the position that he does take; in other words, it is perfectly apparent to me that the gentleman is laying the basis for a very determined opposition to the proposal that this country go to the aid of Greece and Turkey. I regretfully say that I construe the gentleman's speech to mean water on Stalin's wheel. I hope the gentleman, when he shall have concluded his undertaking of gathering all the facts, may come to a conclusion quite different to what I now anticipate.

Mr. BENDER. Well, I am only interested in water on the American wheel, and I am not interested in pulling anybody's chestnuts out of the fire, for Stalin or anybody else. We have a vehicle through which we can function, and which we are a part of, and that is the United Nations. Now, with that vehicle, certainly we can approach this question as we did the problem in Iran.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it ought to be perfectly apparent to the gentleman that we are being very rapidly encircled by Russia, and that self-interest demands—that is, if we would save America—that we act, and act now, and it appears to be the best judgment of those responsible for the handling of our foreign affairs that we go to the aid of Greece and Turkey, and go quickly, and with that I am in accord.

Mr. BENDER. I would like to ask the gentleman, since when did the Government or the State Department see the light, or when did they get this religion that they now profess?

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman, if it is his disposition to criticise them for being slow to move, but I think they have come to the right conclusion, although they came to it late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the fact that the gentleman's remarks are more or less exploratory and we are getting several figures of speech in here about water on the wheel, and so forth, I would like to pass along a metaphor or figure of speech suggested to me this morning. It comes from a woman who lives on a farm, who has had a good deal of experience in the raising of chickens. She said, "Just how far can the Government go?" She said, "I have had some experience in raising chickens, and I have found that there is a limit to how many eggs an old setting hen can cover."

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The farm lady certainly said a mouthful.

Today the Turks are stealing millions and millions of dollars from the American taxpayers and they have the unmitigated brass to demand from us another $150,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, do you trust the bandit who comes into your home to protect you from an enemy?

Mr. Speaker, the fancy footwork of our State Department characters, their easy-handed distribution of billions of American wealth has got to come to an end. Back in 1936 and 1938 we were worrying about a national debt of $60,000,000,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewomen from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. This is a little for the record, because I think the gentleman is a little misinformed if he thinks that the Turks are demanding with brass some assistance. I think the Turks are not coming to us at all in that spirit. They are coming to us asking for help. If the gentleman had been in Turkey, as I happen to have been, and had seen some of the situation there and had studied the position of Turkey, I think, perhaps, he would be a little more willing not to come to any final decision in his opinion on this whole matter before more of the real facts are known.

Mr. BENDER. I thank my good friend for her advice. I shall be glad, as usual, to take it, and I shall be glad to discuss the matter with her both privately or publicly.

Mrs. BOLTON. I just wanted the record a little straighter about the Turks.

Mr. BENDER. I respect the gentlewoman's opinion very, very highly, but, of course, each of us has to make up his own mind.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course.

Mr. BENDER. Even though I have not been in Turkey, I have tried to inform myself on this subject as fully as possible myself by burning the midnight oil and by watching and observing.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say that I am quite certain of that.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentlewoman. However, I want to say that I have absolutely no thought in mind other than that we in the United States should stop this crazy-quilt policy of ours in our relations with other countries everywhere throughout the world. If this threat of communism is as great as it appears to be and if, as has recently been discovered, after years of calling to their attention the things we have on and off the floor of this House, there is only one way to proceed, that is, by direct action, or by refusing to do business with Russia, we should take that course. Had we re-

fused to do business with Japan, and had we refused to do business with Germany, I am sure Hirohito and Hitler would not have been implemented as they were during the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr BENDER. Back in 1936 and 1938 we were worried about national bankruptcy when we owed $60,000,000,000. Today we have a national debt of approximately $280,000,000,000, not including the debts of States and municipalities and other political subdivisions. The American taxpayer cannot carry this load.

We want to know the truth of this situation. We want to know the truth about Nazi assets in Turkey. I have been taking this time daily to address the Members of the House because I believe this is the most momentous decision that the American Congress has ever had to make at any time in its history. We are departing from traditional American foreign policy. We are trying something new here.

If we once get into this Greek-Turkish deal, we will be asked to get into the Korean deal; we will be asked to get into all kinds of other deals. It will involve us anywhere from $10,000,000,000 to $11,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. What, in the gentleman's opinion, would be the result of doing nothing?

Mr. BENDER. I am not in favor of doing nothing. I am in favor of doing something, but I am in favor of doing it with all the cards on the table and knowing what we are doing.

As I see it, the State Department has not put all the cards on the table.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. With the information that the gentleman has, would he be able to indicate to the House what will probably be his position when this whole question comes to a vote?

Mr. BENDER. I have most emphatically indicated on the basis of the facts I now have that I am against it. I am very much against it, and I have been saying so every day since it was proposed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What affirmative action does the gentleman recommend at the present time?

Mr. BENDER. First, I believe we should put our own house in order; next, we should get tough with the crowd which is menacing the peace of the world. There is only one way to get tough short of war, and that is by not implementing Russia, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For quite a number of years after the inception of the communistic government in Russia, the United States and many other nations of the world refused to recognize the communistic government in Russia, and refused to transact business with them or to have an exchange of diplomatic representatives. Does the gentleman suggest, as some other statesmen have already suggested, that perhaps it might be wise to more or less ostracize this Russian communistic government and prepare to have the decent nations of the world support us in our attempt to bring about world peace and disarmament?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman says a mouthful; and, his comment is most timely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have been very much interested in the analysis that the gentleman is making of this entire picture. I received a very interesting letter from one of my constituents along this line. He pointed out that apparently at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam we made a lot of commitments to the Russians and that they were all right at that time.

Of course, I can understand that the war was not over at that time, and perhaps we had to do some things that we did not want to do. Then he pointed out further that after the war was over, at the United Nations Council, we let the Russians pretty much have their own way. He further pointed out that some people in this country seem to think Byrnes was getting a little too tough with the Russians. General Marshall was with Mr. Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta and Potsdam as one of his advisers. He pointed out further that they recalled Pat Hurley from China because they thought Pat was getting too tough with the Russians. He finally said, "Just when did this great light of Damascus begin to shine in the faces of these people?" What was it that brought about overnight this apparent complete change? Well, it is a hard question for me to answer. The gentleman seems to be confused along the same line. Just what was the thing that apparently caused this whole change of attitude overnight?

Mr. COX. I think I can answer the gentleman's question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I think that change of front came with the realization that public opinion of the country was turning to the right.

Mr. RIZLEY. Probably on November 5.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Roland Rogers, one of our greatest international students, has directed my attention to the fact that one of our members on our Foreign Affairs committee stated: "Are we going to call Russia's bluff?" The witness answered, "Well, I think for you to make that statement is one thing. For me to make it would be another." My question is, Why should a Congressman be denied information? They are the representatives of the people who always "stand up to be counted." We say, "Where do you stand?" and the witness in substance said to us, "I must not answer questions or make a statement." Why?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is referring to Roland Rogers, of Ohio, one of our greatest citizens. The gentleman has made a very fine observation and that is exactly what we are alking about here and have been talking about. Since public opinion, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] indicates, is moving in that direction, then it behooves our Government to be frank and honest in dealing with the American people and telling them the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Why do they not answer questions?

Mr. BENDER. I wish I could tell the gentleman why they do not answer questions, but obviously they do not. Does the gentleman think that if the people of America had known what was agreed to at Yalta, or if they had any voice in the matter, or at Potsdam or at Tehran, does the gentleman think those commitments would have been made? I do not think so.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am going to agree with the gentleman to this extent; that is, that we are in part, and a large part, responsible for the situation as we now find it. In other words, we have helped build the trap in which we find ourselves, but I insist that the power we still reserve should be used in an effort to extricate ourselves. I regret the attitude that the gentleman takes, because I think he increases rather than diminishes our trouble.

Mr. BENDER. Well, the gentleman has a right to his opinion, but I want to say this: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has asked for time to read the words of Thomas Jefferson on the 13th, and I trust not only the words of Thomas Jefferson will be read but the words of Washington regarding our relationship with other countries. I hope that we get this American policy fixed in our minds and do some pretty straight thinking.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman referred to the assets of the Nazis in Turkey. Does the gentleman mean we should unfreeze them and claim those assets for our taxpayers, or does not the gentleman believe that if they were unfrozen, the Russian demands would take all of those assets in this $10,000,000,000 reparation demand they are making? Does the gentleman think we would get a dime of that money?

Mr. BENDER. I think it is high time we began defining our relationship to Russia. While we are infusing money into Germany and elsewhere we must see to it that in turn that money is not made available to the Russians. I believe we have sufficient force and I believe we have the respect of the other democracies and other countries in the world as to enable us to begin unscrambling these eggs. The American taxpayers have financed and today are financing most of the world. We want to see to it that our dollars, if they go for relief, actually reach the hungry and starving and suffering people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish to say to the gentleman that most of the others seem not to be thinking just the way he is on the question of military aid to Turkey and Greece and they have a perfect right to. No one knows for a certainty, of course, who is right about it. I want the gentleman to know, however, that he is not the only one in the House who believes as he does. I have spoken against it on the floor of this House, and unless I can see further light I agree with the gentleman that we should not give military aid to Greece and Turkey. I want the gentleman to know that he is not the only one who believes that way.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to me as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands by the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy. The letter is self-explanatory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday Congressman NORRIS POULSON, of California, charged that I had deliberately withheld from the Congress knowledge of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States by the Eighth Guam Congress, requesting full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of the island.

I understand that such a petition was adopted by the Guam Congress on January 4, 1947, but the Guam Congress took no further action to implement this resolution, nor did it forward any copies thereof to the Governor of Guam or to me. Late in February the Governor of Guam directed the attorney general to request action on the part of the Guam Congress in order that the resolution might be forwarded. Copies of the resolution were prepared by the attorney general and, at his request, signed by the presiding officers of the congress. I understand that they were not delivered to the Governor of Guam for forwarding until March 15. They have not yet reached this Department and I do not have, and never have had, this petition.

Congressman POULSON also referred to an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa, petitioning the Congress of the United States for an organic act for government of American Samoa. It is inferred that I likewise withheld this from the Congress. In April of 1945 an assembly of Samoans adopted a resolution requesting citizenship, and transmitted it to the Governor of American Samoa, who forwarded the papers to Washington. These resolutions were submitted to the Fono of Samoa at its annual meeting in November of 1945, but no action on an organic act was taken by the Fono because the members themselves were not prepared to submit a proposed act.

In November of 1946 the matter was again introduced in the Fono and a resolution adopted requesting citizenship and an organic act. The records of the proceedings of the Fono was transmitted to the Hopkins committee, which had been appointed by me to study and make recommendations concerning the governments of Guam and American Samoa. This Hopkins committee returned to Washington from its visits to Guam and American Samoa on Friday, March 28. The resolution of the Samoan Fono, I understand, is embodied in the report of the Hopkins committee, which has not yet been submitted to me but which should reach my desk sometime this week.

Be assured that I have not deliberately withheld either of these matters from the Congress of the United States and that immediately upon their receipt I shall transmit them expeditiously.

Sincerely yours.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 2861) to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation as a result of certain labor disputes of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a resolution by the Polish-American Congress and in the second to include an analysis of the Italian peace treaty.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Senator O'MAHONEY; and also separately to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 154. Resolution to authorize the payment of 1 year's salary and funeral expenses to the estate of the late Marshall W. Pickering; with amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk to the majority and minority whips, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 136. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 151. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations; without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 135. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118; with amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 170. Resolution amending House Resolution 100, providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 2861. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services; with amendments (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2923. A bill granting to married persons living in Alabama the same Federal income-tax consideration and treatment upon filing joint tax returns as is now enjoyed and extended to those living in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2924. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act, repeal the Federal Tort Claims Act, and provide for the congressional handling of private claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2925. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2926. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2927. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2928. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2929. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2930. A bill to provide for the transfer of title in certain temporary housing from the United States to educational institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2931. A bill to increase the rate of pension for certain widows of veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2932. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS (by request):

H. R. 2933. A bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2934. A bill to amend section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the inclusion in the gross estate for the purposes of the estate tax of certain transfers taking effect at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2935. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 2937. A bill to provide that the laws of the District of Columbia relating to the insane may be applied to dangerous habitual sex offenders; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2938. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 483), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 171. A resolution authorizing the printing of the statement of J. Edgar Hoover before the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 172. A resolution to study and inspect the operations of the United States Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 173. A resolution to create a select committee on foreign aid; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to accepting amendments to permits from the Government of the United States for the construction of approach roads and toll-collection areas over certain rights-of-way leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, and relating to the retrocession by the Congress of the United States of jurisdiction over said rights-of-way as relocated and said toll areas, bridge ends, and bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of John Aaron Whitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sutematsu Kida and estate of Kiichi Kida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sook Cha Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2942. A bill for the relief of John F. Guthridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Manley O. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Alexander Polychroniu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Walwyn Erasmus Pennyfeather; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

298. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of 193 residents of Lowell, Mass., asking for the immediate passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

299. By Mr. WELCH: California Assembly Resolution 33, relative to accepting amendments to permits from the Government of the United States for the construction of approach roads and toll-collection areas over certain rights-of-way leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, and relating to the retrocession by the Congress of the United States of jurisdiction over said rights-of-way as relocated and said toll areas, bridge ends, and bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

300. By the SPEAKER: Petition requesting a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, we, Thy children, so often confused, live at cross-purposes in our central aims, and hence we are at cross-purposes with each other. Take us by the hand and help us to see things from Thy viewpoint, that we may see them as they really are. We come to choices and decisions with a prayer upon our lips, for our wisdom fails us. Give us Thine, that we may do Thy will. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Wednesday, April 2, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is now proceeding under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL BY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. As in legislative session, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the introduction and immediate consideration of a joint resolution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield under this condition: that if there is any objection, I will have to withdraw the consent.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say this is a joint resolution dealing with the retention of former Senator Burton K. Wheeler as counsel for the War Investigating Committee. The joint resolution apparently is necessary in order to avoid any legal questions which might be raised. I ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the introduction of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received and was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in yielding on these incidental and routine matters be charged to the time of both sides. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 166 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committe on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF TRANSACTIONS OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of the transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, together with a copy of the statement of the Acting Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, filed by the Secretary of Agriculculture on February 10, 1947, in answer to the exceptions noted therein (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 77

"Whereas the present system of financing State unemployment-insurance administration and State employment-service operations through Federal appropriations covering the entire cost is unsatisfactory, and under it the Federal concern regarding State practices, procedures, and policies results in Federal interference with State action; and

"Whereas this system, requiring a multitude of Federal fiscal and policy controls and reviews, has failed to supply the State with the moneys needed for efficient administration, adequate staffing, and progressive planning; Federal financing of 51 different and separate State administrations does not allow proper consideration of individual State needs and fails to afford the State administrator the opportunity to present and demonstrate effectively his requirements; and

"Whereas part of the moneys now collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from employers in each State, amounting to three-tenths of 1 percent of pay rolls, levied for the purpose of defraying the cost of State administration, is not applied thereto but is diverted to other uses; and

"Whereas the excess of Federal tax collections over amounts expended for administration as of June 1946 is approximately $750,000,000 on a Nation-wide basis and approximately $90,000,000 for New York State; and

"Whereas any partial financing of State administration from Federal sources would require similar Federal controls; and

"Whereas the State is entirely able and ready to manage its own affairs without Federal supervision and would be better equipped to carry out its responsibilities by being made fully self-reliant; the cessation of Federal appropriations would tend to prevent friction between Federal and State officials and lead the Federal-State program of unemployment insurance and employment-service operations into a more harmonious partnership: Be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation with the effect of empowering, without restrictions, each State to provide in accordance with its needs for the financing from State sources of its unemployment insurance and employment-service programs, be it through taxation under its unemployment-insurance law or otherwise; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress elected from New York State."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Resolution 50

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Eightieth Congress H. R. 577, concerning the preservation of graveyards in abandoned military posts; and

"Whereas by the terms of such bill the practice of transferring bodies from historic graveyards to national cemeteries would be immediately discontinued in every case where local and/or State agencies are willing to assume, through proper legal steps, the responsibility of giving these graves perpetual care; and

"Whereas many of such military graveyards are located within the State of New York; and

"Whereas such places of interment are held sacred by the residents of the communities where they are located; and

"Whereas in many instances the inhabitants take great pride in their upkeep, prompted by the ties they hold with loved ones who paid the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields of the world; and

"Whereas many of these graveyards, such as those located at Fort Ontario and Madison Barracks have long been a source of solace to grieving descendents, parents, wives and sweethearts of fallen heroes; therefore be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests and urges the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 577 or similar legislation designed to safeguard existing military graveyards, that are given proper and adequate care by States and/or communities wherein they are located; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by Frederick Chapter, No. 1, American War Dads, Frederick, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation providing compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Cumberland, Md., favoring appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the continuation of the low-cost-luncheon program in the schools of Allegany County, Md.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Frederick Chapter, No. 1, American War Dads, Frederick, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to insure the full utilization of all vital building materials for the use of veterans' housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Hagerstown, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 332, to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the bar associations of the counties of Washington and Anne Arundel, in the State of Maryland, favoring the enactment of House bill 1639, to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States District Courts or in State courts under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Frederick Chapter, No. 1, American War Dads, Frederick, Md., praying that the limitation of $200 per month in the earning power of veterans engaged in on-the-job training as GI students be increased; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., relating to strikes and labor legislation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1017. A bill providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 86).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from the transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports; without amendment (Rept. No. 88).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; with amendments (Rept. No 89).

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment Senate Resolution 25, amending rule XXII relating to cloture, and I submit a report (No. 87) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit my individual views to accompany the report just submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on Senate Resolution 25, and request that they be printed as part of the majority report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the individual views will be received and printed as part of the majority report.

MARGARET M. COLGAN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 96, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 96), submitted by Mr. MILLIKIN on March 19, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Margaret M. Colgan, widow of Eugene C. Colgan, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 1038, to amend the Federal Airport Act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Ada B. Foss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1040. A bill to provide for the transfer of title in certain temporary housing from the United States to educational institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1041. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1042. A bill to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1043. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Aron Rosendor, Sara Rosendor, Batia Rosendor, Sammy Rosendor, and Suzanne Rosendor;

S. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucia Kim; and

S. 1046. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacinta Santos Harn, Dr. Charles S. Harn, Helen Harn, Winifred Mary Harn, and James Harn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1047. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 1048. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1049. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Malitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1050. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917;

S. 1051. A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928, as amended, with reference to a revision of the census roll of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1052. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; and

S. 1053. A bill to provide for the tenure of office and retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Barnett; and

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma M. Pierce and Charles Z. Pierce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to permit adjustment of benefits authorized by section 1506 thereof and similar benefits extended by governments allied with the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 97, limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY):

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act. I request that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. BREWSTER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER CONCERNING AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced would amend the Federal Airport Act (Public Law 377, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), which has been in effect a little less than a year. These proposed amendments are, in most respects, noncontroversial, clarifying amendments directed at improving the operation of the act. With the exception of minor changes suggested by State officials in section 5 (section 11 (5) of the act) and the supplemental legislation suggested in section 6 (section 14 of the act) these amendments are noncontroversial, technical in nature, and based on recommendations of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in his report to Congress concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act which was recently transmitted to this body by the Secretary of Commerce. The submission of the report received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed amendments contained in this bill have been reviewed by State aviation officials and have met with their approval. However, one CAA suggestion for changing the act has been omitted in this bill. State officials feel that there is no need for supplemental legislation amending section 8 of the act to relieve CAA of its present responsibility for securing from Congress authority for undertaking the construction of class 4 and larger airports during the fiscal year 1947. State officials feel that this section should not be changed since it is the only way that State agencies, as well

as the Congress, can be kept advised of proposed airport projects.

In addition to these minor amendments, which are mainly technical in nature and noncontroversial, the bill would amend section 14 of the Federal Airport Act to make effective the so-called Brewster amendment which was a part of the Senate version of the bill before it went to conference last year. This provision was eliminated from the bill as finally enacted. The Brewster amendment required the participation of the State governments in carrying out the Federal Airport Act.

Today, more than ever before, there is need for a return to those sound and traditional governmental principles which have contributed so much to the growth and development of our federalism. Today, more than ever before, there is a need for us to return to that long-established, successfully operated program and pattern of Federal-State cooperation which has always distinguished the operation and administration of our grant-in-aid programs.

Time and again in recent weeks our Appropriations Committees, as well as the Byrd committee, have recommended more direct State participation in the administration, operation, and financing of governmental functions. The States are both qualified on the basis of administrative experience and financial condition to do many things that in the past have been done by the Federal Government. Let us give them a chance.

Within recent months, while their legislatures were in session, approximately 15 States have accepted the invitation contained in section 9 (b) of the Federal Airport Act to enact State legislation specifically requiring that Federal funds for airport development be channeled through the State governments as are other Federal grants-in-aid. Other legislatures are expected to enact such legislation. This is not enough. It is encumbent upon us to go further than we did in the weak compromise provided by section 9 (b) and to reverse this mistake in policy which was made by the Seventy-ninth Congress in order to break a stalemate caused by the failure of the House and Senate conferees to agree after months of fruitless negotiations. By accepting this amendment to section 14 of the act we will make it possible to return to that long-established, traditional policy of the Federal Government and the Congress in administering and operating grant-in-aid programs.

Not only should we do this because it is a principle that has been traditional with Congress from the beginning of grant-in-aid programs, but also because it is the sound, economic, and constitutional way of administering this program.

I don't like to hark back to what was said in this Chamber during the debate on the bill, but it has seemed to me and others that many of the things that we prophesied have come true. For instance, many cities in recent months have been so financially pressed that they have had to turn to the States and ask for aid and assistance in order to continue the operation of numerous essential services and to prevent utter financial bankruptcy and the break-down of Government in our large cities.

An outstanding example of this is New York City which is turning its airport problems, particularly LaGuardia and Idlewild Fields, over to the New York Port Authority (an agency of the States of New York and New Jersey) for administration, operation, and remaining construction.

The city of New York is not financially able to undertake its part in developing airports for the city. It has turned to the State. That is true of so many large cities which have felt it far more essential to use city funds for badly needed schools, hospitals, and other institutions.

There are also numerous instances of cities rejecting bond issues for airport improvements or of being unable to raise matching funds for airport construction without State aid either directly or indirectly. At the proper time, I will present further information to the Senate on this subject. In my own State efforts are going forward to provide for State participation in the administration, operation, and financing (up to 25 percent) of airports.

In brief, I think the Federal airport program, by bringing the States back into this picture, will proceed much faster, will be better planned, will be more economically managed than if we by Federal law continue to encourage the Federal Government and particularly CAA to deal directly with thousands of the States' political subdivisions without paying any consideration to the States' plans, programs, and financial obligations.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following: "Expenses of tribal councils or committees thereof (tribal funds): For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for 'Expenses of tribal councils or committees thereof (tribal funds),' including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, $10,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of the particular tribe interested."

RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN SALARIES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 808) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

NEEDS OF AMERICAN VETERANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the needs of American veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICA'S VETERANS NEED AND WANT

There is a vast amount of legislation on the subject of veterans' affairs now pending in the Congress. There are few subjects which should receive closer attention than the subject of the welfare of our Nation's ex-servicemen. They are the cream of our manhood; they gave their all in blood, sweat, and tears for us; we owe them the incomparable debt which was once described as "the only national debt America can never repay."

VETERANS' LEGISLATION I HAVE INTRODUCED

I say that, having introduced some veterans' legislation of my own, having been, for example, one of the original sponsors of the GI bill of rights, and having introduced measures such as these bills in previous years: The bill to coordinate all of the Federal Government's scattered veterans' activities into a central Veterans' Administration; the bill to assure adequate job placement for returning servicemen; the bill to assure an ex-serviceman aide for every United States Senator; the bill to assure an automobile for veterans with an amputated arm or leg; the bill to restore full pensions to hospitalized single veterans without dependents, whose pensions had been cut to as low as 65 cents per day. Most of those bills were enacted into law.

There is other veterans' legislation which I intend to introduce and which I hope will receive prompt and careful consideration by my colleagues in the Senate and House, along with the consideration given hundreds of other bills now pending on behalf of our ex-soldiers and sailors and marines. I hope our congressional committees will continue to work closely and sympathetically with recognized veterans' organizations to advance the security of our veterans.

THE VETERAN'S HIGH PLACE IN AMERICA

It is important to note that within 10 years, war veterans and their dependents will number almost one-half the population—one-half of our taxpayers. On January 1, 1947, there were 17,900,000 living men and women veterans. By 1952 this number will rise to 19,200,000. On January 1, there were 46,000,000 war veterans plus their wives and children under 18 years and their dependent relatives. By 1952, this grand total of veterans and their dependents will climb to 62,300,000. Legislation affecting so vast a number of our citizens, particularly ones who have served the Nation so well, must be evaluated rapidly and conscientiously rather than sat upon or pigeonholed.

OUR DEBT TO OUR VETERANS

I recall the words of Calvin Coolidge: "The Nation which forgets its defenders will soon be itself forgotten."

I recall, too, the words of Rudyard Kipling in his poem, Tommy:

"Oh, it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' 'Tommy, wait outside';
But it's 'special train for Atkins' when the trooper's on the tide."

This poem, like many others, clearly expressed the fact that nations apparently tend to think more of their soldiers and sailors when war is on—"when the trooper's on the tide," than when the bugles of battle have ceased.

VETERANS' NEEDS AND WANTS

What basically are the needs and wants of America's veterans? They are few in number. America's ex-servicemen ask no more than justice for themselves. What they do ask, to take one example, is an end to false talk about them. I call to mind the fact that there has been much criticism in recent moths about veterans in the so-called 52-20 club, who allegedly refuse work and reportedly prefer to draw $20 per week readjustment allowances for 52 weeks.

Yet, of an estimated 313,000 veterans in my own State, a tiny fraction of them—a mere 157—have exhausted their 1 year's readjustment allowance claims. No, the veterans of our country are not the shiftless lot that certain loose-thinking folks would make them out to be.

These men who have worn the uniform of our Nation, who have bled for their flag on foreign battlefields and across the waters in foreign seas, who have seen their buddies die, ask little of America but what common decency and justice require and what we, in our gratitude, are eager to give them.

What they ask, basically, are these five things:

1. Jobs: They want decent-paying employment, that will enable their families and them to survive in these inflationary

times. They want to have the chance to start businesses with encouragement, to learn their trades, to get vocational training, to make up for time lost in the armed services. They want to use in civilian life the leadership talent which they displayed on the battlefield.

2. Housing: America's ex-servicemen want a decent place to live, whether they are paying for their own home or are renting an apartment. During the war, as one veteran put it to me, "they were promised the world with a fence around it." Today, they've only got the fence. America's veterans don't want to have to buy houses at badly inflated prices, which they will lose in later years because they cannot keep up with high payments.

3. Medical services: During the war, we rightly claimed that our servicemen were getting the finest medical care in the world. Now, America's veterans demand that their buddies in Veterans' Administration hospitals and facilities also receive the best possible medical treatment to restore them to health or at least to ease their suffering.

4. National security: America's veterans insist that our country shall remain adequately prepared in this atomic age so that neither they nor their sons will ever again have to experience the horrors of war, or the calamity of a surprise attack which catches America asleep at the switch. America's veterans hate war, but they know, as George Washington knew, that the best way to prevent war is to be prepared for it, while making every reasonable attempt to achieve world understanding and cooperation through the United Nations.

5. Liberty. Finally, America's veterans basically want, in my belief, to have America realize the full liberty for which they fought and for which their buddies died, liberty from racketeering from any source, liberty from monopoly, political liberty, religious liberty, economic and social liberty.

SPECIFIC NEEDS

These, I believe, are the basic general needs of America's veterans. Their specific needs can be seen in the countless pieces of veteran's legislation to which I referred, and to which I promise my most sympathetic attention and consideration.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES BY SENATOR McKELLAR

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD supplemental notes connected with his address on the nomination of David E. Lilienthal, which appear in the Appendix.]

WORRIED WOOL MEN—ARTICLE FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Worried Wool Men," by John O'Riley, published in the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT, CIO, AND R. J. THOMAS, CHAIRMAN, CIO HOUSING COMMITTEE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with the housing situation, addressed by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and R. J. Thomas, chairman CIO housing committee, to Senator TOBEY, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR FBI PERSONNEL—EDITORIAL FROM FALL RIVER (MASS.) HERALD NEWS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In the National Interest," endorsing legislation for the retirement of FBI personnel, published in the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, with the understanding that the time consumed thereby will be charged equally to both sides, if that is agreeable, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With that understanding, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Sparkman
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Cain	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lodge	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Thye
Cooper	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hatch	O'Conor	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, investigating the Centralia, Ill., mine disaster.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DWORSHAK in the chair). Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSIONER—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand the question before the Senate is the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be chairman, and the nominations of members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has opened up a debate of such far-reaching importance that I feel impelled to place my position in this matter clearly on the record.

During these proceedings, letters have been pouring in to Members of this body from all sections of the country expressing amazement and dismay at the consequences which may result from the failure of the Senate to confirm the President's nominee.

For this past month the press has been exposing an exhibition of unjustified and unsubstantiated charges, and of power lobbying and political duplicity behind the scenes which is seriously undermining the faith and confidence of the American people in the integrity of our democratic institutions.

The matter before us, on its face, appears to involve the simple question of the confirmation of a Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—the question of whether or not the Presidential nominee, Mr. Lilienthal, is an American citizen of integrity and probity who adheres to the principles of our Constitution and is qualified by education, training, and experience for the task involved in the program of this important Commission. The real controversy, however, does not appear on the surface, but is hidden from view because chicanery and subterfuge always follow subterranean channels.

If, therefore, we are to discharge our sworn obligations we must look beyond the heavy smokescreen of baseless charges, of double talk, and political propaganda which has been put forth as a substitute for proof in this vicious attempt to defeat the confirmation of the President's nominee.

It seems clear to me from the character of the opposition to Mr. Lilienthal and the vicious and unfounded abuse which has been leveled at him, that he is being opposed principally because of his splendid record of administration of the TVA in the public interests as against the private power interests, and because it is generally recognized that he will likewise guard the public interests in the administration of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, I do not question the motives of anyone opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal. I am satisfied they are opposing him because they have been led to believe that he is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. It may be difficult for some to believe that anyone could be justified in coming to such a conclusion upon the record.

Nevertheless, we must accept their protests against Mr. Lilienthal as based on their honest convictions. No doubt some sincerely oppose Mr. Lilienthal because he has been in sympathy with the progressive policies of our late President, Franklin Roosevelt—particularly the Roosevelt policies which led to the establishment of the TVA. Some have expressed their opposition to his confirmation on that very ground. Of course, anyone is entitled to oppose him for that reason, or for no reason at all. I am not surprised that the propaganda let loose on the country by the power interests and other monopoly interests hostile to the policies of the late President Roosevelt has deceived many citizens. It is claimed by psychiatrists that few mentalities in the world today can withstand the terrific bombardment of propaganda which are let loose on the public. Whole nations sometimes succumb to modern practices of propaganda. In fact, at a convention of psychiatrists in New York City a few years ago it was pointed out that the great majority of the people of this country were susceptible to the effects of modern propaganda methods. Indeed, it was openly declared on the platform of one of their meetings that as a result of the confusing, contradictory, and conflicting propaganda, the United States has become one grand "transmogrified" lunatic asylum. Evidences of these conditions have been displayed on the floor of the Senate many times during this debate.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is rendering a great service to the people of our country in exposing to public views and repulsing the flood of propaganda which has been unloosed in this country in an effort to defeat Mr. Lilienthal.

This fight, let me warn, is not a mere fight against a man; it is a fight of the private power interests of the Nation against the general policy of public power development in the interest of all the people. It is a ruthless fight of falsehood and fear against the confirmation of one who will regard the development of atomic energy wholly in the public interest—one who will direct its policy and control towards the widest and most beneficial uses for all Americans. This is the central force in this attack, which prompts the capable columnist, Joseph Alsop, in his Washington Post article of February 21, 1947, to conclude:

> The Neanderthal wing of the power industry is fighting hard against Lilienthal, using all weapons available.

Mr. President, the wilting touch of monopoly as exemplified in the electric-power field not only affects the social and economic life of every citizen, but it reaches out to slow up and throttle the National Government whenever it seeks to broaden and strengthen the national economy. This struggle between the Government and the power interests is a classic example.

If, in the present struggle, the public interest prevails and atomic energy is developed and preserved for the welfare of the whole people, monopolistic control of our country will have suffered its greatest defeat.

The development of atomic energy free from monopoly control will have a fundamental effect on the economy of the Nation. Its influence is so all-pervasive that it may lead the way to a genuine era of free competitive enterprise, a wider distribution of the national income, and general national prosperity. Such are the realizable possibilities in the development of atomic energy. Small wonder that the already well-entrenched private power monopoly fights anything and anybody that may bring about these desired outcomes.

The part played by the privately owned electric-power companies in the affairs of Government is well recognized. As a rule, State and municipal legislatures are forced to suspend action on all measures, however meritorious, which have not had the green light from this powerful group.

Here in Washington one can never tell from day to day what public interest will be next to feel its scorching influence. Through the years, this vast profiteering monopoly combination, reaching every community in the land, expresses its attitude on a wide variety of matters, some of them seemingly only remotely connected with the electrical industry. Legislation dealing with taxation, housing, foreign and domestic trade, flood control, insurance, and rural electrification, more often than not, and irrespective of its merits, must be able to weather out attacks of the electric companies—usually speaking with a single voice.

The electric utilities have built up a system of public relations and political control that parallels the several levels of government which it seeks to influence against the best interests of the public for the selfish and ofttimes antisocial benefits of a small group of men who control them.

At the State level the private electric utility companies have a single-purposed and usually well-staffed lobby, intent on using its bulging treasury and its highly paid personnel to influence legislation and control legislators and utility regulatory commissions; thus, it directs the course of State government away from any utilization of the God-given riches of natural waterfall which could so tremendously benefit the surrounding communities.

The private electric companies use tactics that have been repeatedly exposed as vicious and un-American and calculated to bring the democratic processes of government into general disrepute. They seek to prevent the application of the TVA method of unified approach to flood control, power development, and industrial expansion to other regions of the Nation. They seek to dominate and control the development of all hydroelectric power in the Nation unless they are permitted to dictate the terms of production and distribution. Mr. President, does anyone doubt that they would, if they could, undertake to gain the same character of control over atomic power?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I am limited to 10 minutes and must proceed without yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that the real reason for desiring the defeat of Mr. Lilienthal has been divulged by the proposed amendment presented here during the debate which proposes to dispose of the existing Atomic Energy Commission and substitute one more to the liking of those who do not wish to see atomic energy controlled and directed in the interests and welfare of the whole people.

A careful study of the remarks on the floor a few days ago in behalf of that amendment reveals the thought and the suggestion that, inasmuch as our natural resources of minerals, fuels, and forests are rapidly being exhausted, and opportunities for investment of capital and the development of new industries are drying up, there is a need that private industry should have control of the production and exploitation of atomic energy for industrial purposes.

While the proponents of the amendment have not said so explicitly, there is behind all this opposition to Mr. Lilienthal and this scheme for the setting up of a new commission freed from the controls of the McMahon Act, the apparent belief that there would then be opened up one of the richest fields for private exploitation that American monopolists have ever had offered to them. It has been said that they have had their eyes on atomic energy ever since its discovery, waiting and ready to get aboard at the first opportunity, just as the buccaneers of old used to board the richly laden galleons on the Spanish Main.

And, mark you, this great bonanza was completely outside the realm of possibility until American scientists, under patriotic urge to strengthen our national defense through the use of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, evolved this modern miracle, atomic energy. Now, if the present Atomic Energy Commission can be ditched or sidetracked and relieved of its control of peacetime development of atomic energy in the public interest, monopoly capitalism will have won its greatest victory in all history.

When this fight on David Lilienthal is viewed against its true background, I am sure that we who represent the interests of the whole people, and not the selfish ambitions of a small group of financial speculators and profiteers, will defend the Atomic Energy Act and approve with an overwhelming vote the able public servant, David Lilienthal, named by the President to administer that act. Mr. Lilienthal's loyal and efficient administration of the TVA, his unquestioned service in the people's interests, and his admitted qualifications for this new task are the strongest guaranties that he will guard and protect the public interest in the industrial development of this great revelation of science made possible by the taxpayers' money.

Here in Washington, at the seat of our National Government, is the peak of performances of that system of private

utility propaganda government which begins in the thousands of towns and cities of this country. Its capital is located, as indicated by the lobby registration of its president, one Purcell K. Smith, at 1336 New York Avenue. That it is no cheaply financed empire is hinted at by the recorded salary of its chief executive, namely $65,000 per year. What it costs to run this private utility pressure government is anybody's guess, for the expense accounts and such subterranean costs are not available to the public. But it is the public that feels its pressure and never more so than at such a time as this when a distinguished public servant is up for confirmation before the Senate to a post for which the Nation fully recognizes his competency but whose views on public rights may conflict with power-monopoly interests.

These attempts of the electric-power combinations to control both legislature and the Government itself cannot be described as sporadic. The influence exerted sometimes has its origin in the events and personalities of the long, long ago. The background of what is taking place today has its roots in the past, which is not always evident.

For instance, Arthur E. Morgan, formerly Chairman of the TVA Board, was one of the witnesses called in the current hearings on the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. His testimony was a part of a publicly announced effort to prevent the Lilienthal confirmation. After admitting Lilienthal's well-recognized and demonstrated ability, he charged him with being a disciple of the doctrine that "the end justifies the means" and lacking in scruples in reaching his objectives. Now, mind you, this transpires in spite of the fact that the Morgan testimony was nothing more than the resurrection of certain old charges, which were thoroughly discredited at the time a joint committee of the Congress investigated the TVA in 1938 and 1939.

I do not question the motives of Mr. Morgan. I have no doubt but that he sincerely believed that Lilienthal's stubborn adherence to the policy of public power development at low cost for the public benefit was all wrong. But, Mr. President, the American people ruled in favor of Mr. Lilienthal back in 1939. The matter was debated in Congress, and it, too, ruled in favor of the position taken by Mr. Lilienthal.

So the result of that controversy over the administrative policies established by the TVA under Mr. Lilienthal's leadership has been that the public has ever since overwhelmingly given support to the Lilienthal position that multiple-purpose dams should be developed to provide hydroelectric energy at low cost for farm, home, and factory; that floods should be prevented; cheap navigation fostered; and intelligent usage of land encouraged. The advantages of this multipurposed uniform program of resource development have been completely established in the minds of the American people. The TVA stands as a conspicuous accomplishment of Government in that period, and will be recognized in history as an outstanding democratic achievement.

And so, Mr. President, the difference of opinion between Mr. Morgan and Mr. Lilienthal is an ancient chronicle in the history of the struggle of the power interests to gain the upper hand over the Government's program and has no bearing here.

Certainly, the American people can be thankful that the demands of the private utilities were not allowed to prevail in planning the development of the Tennessee River.

Of course, this struggle on the part of private power interests will not soon end. It will go on as long as the power interests are provided with overflowing treasuries with which to finance their devious plans and schemes to overcome our national policies relating to the development of public power, established by the Congress and supported by the people these many years.

We find the private power companies now distributing their preposterous "analysis" of TVA accounts as part of their share in the infamous campaign. If Mr. Lilienthal had never been nominated to the Atomic Energy Commission, the private power companies' propaganda against the TVA would be in full swing anyway. But this occasion gives the enemies of public power a chance to do a double job—first to discredit TVA and, second, to deprive the country of a tested public servant who has shown that he will defend the people's interest when it is threatened by private greed.

It is safe to say that every private power company in the country has been circularized with the ludicrous "analysis" of TVA's financial set-up which the discredited Edison Electric Institute has been distributing as a part of the "vigorous and extensive" campaign referred to. That propaganda agency of the power monopoly through this widely distributed statement endeavors to prove that TVA's power operations are unsuccessful by the astonishing device of charging the cost of all TVA projects and activities, even the cost of munition plants and navigation locks, both so indispensible in World War II, against revenues from power sales so as to minimize the return on the investment. By this perverted accounting and this specious logic thus advocated by the Edison Electric Institute, the electricity consumers of New Orleans should be forced to pay the cost of levees which protect the lower Mississippi in time of floods, and the navigation dams on the Ohio River should be charged to the consumers of power in that area.

On June 6, 1946, the Christian Science Monitor carried a story, the heading of which was, "All-out utility drive indicated against United States power program," in which the writer gave the strategy of the campaign as outlined at meetings of the Edison Electric Institute which he summarized as follows:

1. Vigorous and extensive publicity campaigns to emphasize the business efficiency of private utilities, with special emphasis on the taxes they pay.

2. An equally vigorous and extensive public-relations campaign to challenge the efficiency and sound enterprise of the Government programs.

3. More active opposition through the utilities' representatives in Washington to congressional appropriations for public power facilities. The Washington private power lobby will concentrate on the Government's efforts to secure funds for transmission and distribution lines for the public power.

4. Support of Federal agencies engaged in flood control, rivers-and-harbors development, some phases of irrigation and reclamation, which do not embrace extensive power manufacture.

Notwithstanding such widely publicized revelations and the findings of the Federal Trade Commission as to the infamous activities of the predecessor organization, the National Electric Light Association, we are now asked by those opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal to accept at face value the statements of the Edison Electric Institute.

In spite of the witch hunters and the Edison Electric Institute combined, TVA's record stands up. Every citizen should know that the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley are paying amounts which will return to the Federal Treasury every dollar TVA has invested directly or indirectly in power facilities, and some 40 years hence, the taxpayers' original power investment will have been repaid, the Government will still own a power system of infinitely greater value, greater service, and greater earning capacity, than the one which the taxpayers' money created, for consumers' money is going into its improvement every year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sorry, but I must inform the Senator that his 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to be given a short extension of time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well; I will yield the Senator 1 minute to conclude his statement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it takes time to catch up on the "big lie," but it will be done. The people will learn that in spite of power-industry propaganda, TVA stands as an example to the world of the way in which the Federal Government can develop the resources of a river valley by businesslike methods without either politics or centralization of authority, and thereby strengthen the institutions of democracy. Citizens of the Tennessee Valley are for the TVA. They unequivocally endorse the record of David E. Lilienthal. They are the shock troops in this fight against the misrepresentation and the greed of the private-power industry.

When I called the attention of the Senate on June 18, 1946, to who is who in the power lobby in Washington, I indicated that just such a fight as this now before the Senate on a question seemingly outside the power field would become the special concern of the power lobby. Certainly the celebrated investigation of the Federal Trade Commission, under the hammering blow of that sterling public servant from Vermont, the late Robert E. Healey, brought out many cases where the power lobby and its masters carried on their selfish power fight by hiding behind and working through many public questions. I say without any reservations that in this

fight against David Lilienthal the fine Machiavellian hand of the power lobby is clearly discernible. We have a war expression which has become familiar, "the underground." All Senators know what that implies. That is the kind of fight leveled at Lilienthal and public-power development, as in the past the late Senator George W. Norris was accustomed to describe it.

And speaking of that great public servant who left an imperishable imprint on this Nation, George W. Norris, I know that if he were with us today, he would be urging the nomination of David E. Lilienthal because he very often, as the record shows, expressed his high confidence and admiration for this fine public servant.

The time is ripe for another investigation of the power lobby. The Christian Science Monitor article shows how they are now opposing the extension of the great projects in the West, such as Bonneville in Oregon, Central Valley in California, Grand Coulee in Washington, and the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. Everywhere the power trust is urging that new developments in the TVA, Grand River in Oklahoma, the Colorado and Red River projects in Texas, the Santee Cooper in South Carolina, and the St. Lawrence project, be put aside.

It is more than significant that the Governor of California has had to journey to Washington recently to urge that the great project of the Central Valley in the State of California not be brought to a dead stop by the technique of cutting its appropriations for transmission lines and the installations required to complete the project and make electric power available to that great State which is suffering, as is the whole Nation, one of the most acute kilowatt famines our expanding industry has ever faced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, again the Senator's time has expired, but I can yield him one more minute to conclude.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be glad if the Senator will give me one more minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Time is limited by a very tight schedule.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I said in the course of my remarks in June that if the work of Franklin D. Roosevelt and George W. Norris for power development is to be "killed," let us have the issue decided right now and without any reservations. No weasel words about delaying these projects until prices come down should fool anyone. It is but a part of the whole scuttling plan that the power interests have sought to make effective on State, municipal, and national projects which they fear will interfere with their control and monopoly.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an article by that brilliant correspondent, Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, entitled "Stokes Thinks It's Part of a Public Power Row," from the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1947. May I call attention to this comment from Mr. Stokes' statement:

> The outlines of this battle were clearly sketched in a significant Senate debate over the budget.

And then he goes on to say:

> Private power interests bitterly fought creation by Congress of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Losing, they predicted it would never succeed. It has, notably under the capable management of Mr. Lilienthal and his coworkers.
>
> His success there has inspired plans to develop other great river valleys along regional lines for production of electric power, for irrigation, reclamation, and flood control.
>
> The Northwest is far along with development of such projects—Grand Coulee in Washington and Bonneville in Oregon, among others.
>
> Not only was it lucky for us that these projects, like TVA, were ready when war struck us, for they provided power for production of aluminum and ships. But, for peacetime they and others being built or planned offer the key to great industrial development through cheap power and for agricultural development through water for irrigation and reclamation.

The genius of this great Nation has been its ability to invent and to use the products of invention. In atomic energy, there is the prospect of such new uses, such extensions of our economy, such increases in our standard of living, such impact on our political and social institutions as to constitute not merely new additions to the long list of great inventions which we have harnessed for our common benefit. Atomic energy is a new force of such magnitude as to require new approaches to its use and control. That is why, in part, we have set up this Atomic Energy Commission. In the selection of its Chairman, we cannot be guided in the least degree by the selfish interests of the private power lobby which has covered the land with its smoke screen of fear and hate propaganda against David E. Lilienthal.

The American people cannot be fooled, once they are put on notice and given the facts. They have met and put the private power trust in its place before and will do so again under the insistent demand which is becoming every day more apparent to us all—that David Lilienthal be confirmed and that we go forward with the great task which lies ahead.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, before this debate began in the Senate I had the conviction that the nomination of David Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission should not be confirmed by the Senate. My reason was a simple one. Two systems of economic life are competing in the world today. One is the Russian system, which is based upon the Marxian principle of abolition of private property in the means of production. The other is the American system, which is based upon free enterprise, personal initiative, and private property. The British are now trying, with dubious success, to combine the two. For my part, I believe thoroughly in the American system. I mean to stand for it, and stand by it, so long as I remain in public life.

As the driving force of TVA, and the distinguished author of Democracy on the March, Mr. Lilienthal is an outstanding exponent, perhaps the leading exponent in this country, of Government ownership. This is not a question of Government ownership of private utilities or of public power, as has been inaccurately stated by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It involves the whole philosophy of our way of life.

The Atomic Energy Act, to which the senior Senator from Montana has referred, creates a power pool to be owned by the Government, but it specifically seeks to preserve free competition in private enterprise. It is provided, in section 1 (a) of the act, to which I invite the attention of the senior Senator from Montana, that the development and utilization of atomic energy shall, so far as practicable, be directed toward strengthening free competition in private enterprise. Having made this forthright declaration in plain language of its intention to strengthen free competition in private enterprise, the Senate should implement the act by insisting that the man appointed as chairman of the Commission to administer it shall be a stanch believer in the system of competitive private enterprise which is spoken of so aptly in this declaration.

It is one thing to declare a purpose; it is another thing to carry it out. The question is now placed squarely before the Senate: Did the Senate mean what it said in the declaration of policy when the Atomic Energy Act was passed?

Mr. President, this debate has taken a wholly unexpected turn. It has developed along lines which no Senator could have foreseen. The judgment of Senators who are not members of the Atomic Energy Committee can obviously be no better than their information. They have a right to expect that all the facts which bear upon the character and qualifications of Mr. David Lilienthal shall be fully and carefully investigated and the results placed in a complete record to be read by all concerned. I do not hesitate to say that as yet this has not been done. We have confidence in the able, distinguished, and experienced Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They have labored under difficulties. I doubt if any one of them is satisfied with the record as it stands today, and is willing to present it to the Senate as wholly adequate and satisfactory for our purposes. Certainly not many of them are.

In the limited time I have I can cite only one example of what I mean. At the time Mr. Lilienthal became a member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission there was in effect in that State a statute which provided that no commissioner should pursue any other business or vocation. After becoming chairman of the Wisconsin Commission Mr. Lilienthal continued a connection or association with his former employer, the Commerce Clearing House of Chicago. This organization was the publisher of certain public utility reports sold to public utilities and lawyers.

Last night there occurred in this Chamber the following colloquy, which

I read from page 3058 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. COOPER. I do not care to take the time of the Senator from Connecticut, but I should like to ask one further question. The office with which Lilienthal was connected continued to publish or to give to the Commerce Clearing House a publication which was of great interest to utilities. Did the committee make any effort to determine whether that service was sold in the State of Wisconsin after Mr. Lilienthal became a member of the railroad commission in Wisconsin?

Mr. MCMAHON. It is my recollection that some telegrams were dispatched—by whom I forget—asking whether or not any force had been used by Mr. Lilienthal, or any inducement or any influence exerted by Lilienthal, in the selling of this service, and the answer categorically was "No."

Following this statement by the Senator from Connecticut telegrams were produced which had been sent by the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to eight public utilities in the State of Wisconsin. These telegrams and the answers received are set forth on page 3059 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They had not been previously incorporated in the record of the hearings of the Atomic Energy Committee. Eight telegrams were sent to utility companies in the State of Wisconsin. Of the eight named, four replied that they were solicited to buy the Commerce Clearing House reports after Mr. Lilienthal became a member of the State public-service commission. Of these, only one was taking the service when he became a member of the commission. After he became a member this one continued, and three commenced to buy it. After Mr. Lilienthal resigned as a member three of those companies immediately discontinued the service, and one of them discontinued it 3 years later. In three cases Mr. Lilienthal's name was used in making the solicitation, and the representative of one company replied that he did not remember the transaction.

During Mr. Lilienthal's term of office Commerce Clearing House, his employer or associate, was trading on his name in dealing with utilities of the State, which utilities Mr. Lilienthal was called upon to regulate in his official capacity. How widespread this was we do not know. The 1946 Directory of Electric and Gas Utilities of the United States, issued by the Federal Power Commission, which directory I hold in my hand, shows that there are today 124 gas and electric utilities in the State of Wisconsin. In addition, there are 33 municipally owned plants. Can anyone fairly say that this phase of Mr. Lilienthal's career in Wisconsin has been adequately investigated and the results presented to the Senate before a decision is made on the momentous question now before us?

Mr. President, Napoleon once said that he could control Paris with a whiff of grapeshot. The man in the United States to whom the atomic bomb is entrusted can control the United States if he wills to do so. David Lilienthal has described himself as a man who believes in a government of men and not of laws. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has shown that in his public career David Lilienthal has always been impatient—even defiant—of restraint.

The Constitution of the United States defines and separates the duties of the President of the United States and the Senate in this matter. The President may make appointments, but only with the advice and consent of the Senate. We cannot escape or delegate our constitutional duty to determine the facts and reach a sound judgment. The people of the United States are entitled to our judgment based not on speculation, not on supposition, not on inference, but on facts.

Mr. President, I trust that the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will prevail.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is said, with unfortunate accuracy, that politics never takes a vacation in Washington. There are times when all of us wish this were not so; but there is seldom if ever a time when all of us do not recognize that it is so. There have been instances when we came close to achieving a moratorium on politics, but we never really quite accomplished it.

As a result, while many other cities here and abroad are noted for their particular brands of sports—football in South Bend, for instance, and of course also in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, and other cities are noted for baseball, soccer, basketball, wrestling, boxing, tennis, swimming, and so on—Washington remains noted for its own peculiar variety of sport known as politics, and this city holds not only the indoor but the outdoor championship as well.

When the English talk of punting on the Thames, they refer, of course, to boating; but punting along the Potomac carries an altogether different connotation—it invariably means the year-round sport here of kicking the opposition party around.

There were times, especially immediately before the war and during the war, when the impossible nearly occurred in Washington, in Congress, and politics all but took a vacation—albeit a short one. The millennium, as I said, never quite arrived, however. Regardless of the urgency of some of the emergencies which struck us here, there were always a few strident voices rising in the Halls of Congress in behalf of politics as usual.

There was a period shortly after the pending nominations were announced during which I really thought and hoped that when the Senate took up these vital, urgent nominations for the vital Atomic Energy Commission we might, at last, in humble awe of the great, terrible, devastating yet remarkable force unlocked by daring and courageous men, forget temporarily our traditions of politics as usual, and, as Americans, bend our efforts to a speedy, but wise, and, above all, nonpolitical approach to this terribly urgent matter.

Of course, this has not happened. I had no reason really to think it would happen. It has never happened.

But, Mr. President, it has come so close to happening in this case as to constitute in itself a phenomenon rarely seen, rarely enjoyed in this body, and I am deeply gratified.

I think that long after the heat and the bitterness which have been aroused over these nominations are forgotten, the Senate will continue to remember, with deep gratitude, the patriotic, nonpartisan, objective work of the fine committee which has reported these nominations.

Speaking for myself, I want to say, Mr. President, that I am personally deeply grateful to this committee for its work on these nominations. I have long known that the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is possessed not only of the longest surname in the Senate but also of a commensurate degree of patience and of fair-mindedness. I discovered that first in connection with committee work upon which we were engaged together. I like the way he has conducted these hearings, and I like the way he has guided our deliberations on these nominations.

The remaining members of the committee reflected in the main the same spirit of fair-mindedness, patience, and objectivity.

I cite this at this time because the conduct of this committee, as reflected primarily by the conduct of its chairman, was responsible to a large extent for my abandoning a course of action I had previously decided upon in regard to these nominations.

The early returns, as they might be called—the first letters I received in opposition to the Lilienthal nomination—were almost uniformly based on a partisan appeal, although in being addressed to me, they were, of course, partisan in the wrong party sense. I was being urged to vote against Mr. Lilienthal because, as these letters angrily declared, he is a New Dealer and hence, it would seem, not fit for dog catcher, let alone to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The mail continued in this tenor—that is, the small amount of opposition mail I received—as the hearings began and some Senators were beginning to take up the howl with statements to the press about Mr. Lilienthal's New Dealism, as they called it.

Mr. President, as one who supported the basic reforms of the New Deal—reforms, I note, which have all been adopted into the platforms of the Republican Party—and as one who was himself called a New Dealer—reviled might be the term some would use—for supporting our late President Roosevelt in preparing this country for a horrible war, and, incidentally, for my supporting also the Atomic Energy Act under which these nominations were made, I began to bridle a little at these attacks on Mr. Lilienthal for his so-called New Dealism.

I became convinced the fight on this nomination would revolve primarily around that charge, on a party-line division, and I was preparing to fight such a political attack with some appropriate countermeasures. I began dusting off some of the facts I had used in campaign

speeches about what the New Deal really was and what it accomplished. I was prepared here for something I dreaded but nevertheless refused to dodge, if it arose, and that was a partisan, political attack on this nomination for perhaps the most important single administrative job in our Nation's history next to the Presidency itself.

I shall not make such a speech today, and I am glad I do not have to. I am grateful that we can discuss this issue of the Lilienthal nomination on its merits without getting into a party-line partisan squabble. And for that I salute the chairman and the majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate. Although some Members of the Senate may still feel inclined to make political speeches on this issue, either out of habit or for some vague political purposes not yet evident, the nonpartisan approach of the committee has made such speeches, in my opinion, completely inappropriate.

In keeping with this fact, I feel I should acknowledge that much of the support for Mr. Lilienthal in my State arises among persons who identify themselves as active and practicing Republicans, and from among newspapers which have supported the Republican Party either exclusively or with a frequency I sometimes find distressing at election time. I appreciate, more than I can tell, the decency and the patriotism of these Republicans and Republican newspapers in my State in approaching this problem, this terribly urgent problem of atomic energy control, with no partisanship in their hearts but with only a sincere desire to see this awesome power which has been placed in our hands administered properly for the good of all our people and for the good of a civilization we all hope to see endure.

What are the facts? I am sure I do not have to repeat them. They certainly have been repeated often enough to be engraved on the minds of all of us. We know by now that President Truman, after wide consultations and much soul-searching, selected a group of men to whom would be entrusted America's ownership of the greatest single scientific discovery of our times, perhaps of all history.

He had to have men in whom he could trust, men in whom the country could trust its very existence as a Nation. He had to have men sincerely committed to the use of this great discovery for the benefit of all the people of the United States and, eventually, to all the peoples of the world. He had to have men who would have the capacity and ability to administer this most far-flung experiment in Government ownership in all history, yet men, while possessed of such great capacities, still willing to devote their time and energy to their jobs of public trust at the comparatively low salaries those jobs command. He needed capable men, men of extraordinary capabilities, and possessed also of extraordinary patriotism to be willing to devote their capabilities to this public trust.

Fortunately, he found such men, and his selections were greeted with acclaim throughout the land. These men went to work, learning as much as they could of the tremendous job facing them. The editorial reaction to their selection was almost universally favorable.

And then something happened, I am not sure just what, but slowly, then snowballing into great articulateness, began a campaign of whispers and of lies and of vilification and of innuendo to prove the unprovable—that these men were not fit for the jobs for which they had been selected, even though they had been selected with such universal acclaim.

How it started, who started it, I do not know, but out of nothing grew a campaign the like of which we have seldom seen in our Nation's history, a campaign to "get" these nominees and defeat their confirmation. I do not charge that all opposition to Lilienthal, for instance, is the result of some diabolic, mysterious underground movement—some of it is based on more obvious and discernible motives—but for much of this opposition I can find no reasonable explanation at all.

We have heard it said that Lilienthal is either, first, a Communist, or, second, "soft" on communism, whatever that means. Most of the mail I have received against this nomination cite these charges—charges utterly disproved in weeks and weeks and weeks of tedious hearings which have developed not a single shred of evidence to support them. Amazingly enough, the charges persist. Why?

Some of the opposition mail I received struck an intriguing chord—that, while Lilienthal may not be a Communist, yet, since the charge has been voiced against him, no matter with what lack of evidence, he is therefore not above suspicion. "Where there is smoke there is fire" is a line I have read in numerous of these opposition letters.

Mr. President, the only smoke I have seen has arisen from someone's pipedreams; the only fire, the fiery intensity with which some Members of the Senate have proclaimed their determination to "get" Lilienthal, regardless of the grounds or of the tactics required.

In connection with this frequently voiced—not very frequently, but rather vociferously voiced—charge that there is "controversy" about the Lilienthal nomination, that there has been "suspicion"—regardless of how unfounded, but suspicion, nevertheless, raised about him—I had a rather amusing experience in recent days.

I received a telegram urging me—the words used were "strongly urge"—to vote against Lilienthal for the reason that, this constituent said, "I feel that the man selected for this most important position should be one about whom there is no controversy of suspicion."

I presume he meant "controversy or suspicion" but it did not come out that way.

I recognized the name signed to the message, a name I do not feel I should reveal here because the Pennsylvanian who sent the telegram did not indicate how he felt about having his opposition made public. In any event, it is a name which would be readily recognized here.

When I received this telegram, I did a little checking. I discovered that a former public official, quite close to this constituent of mine, was once subjected to a very intense attack in this same body, with a number of Senators vigorously demanding his ouster on a legal issue not at all related to his fitness for the job he held, but rather on an interpretation of an old law which some Senators said made him ineligible for his job and which another group of Senators said did not. As it turned out, the gentleman was not found to be ineligible, but a lot of heat was engendered here and various charges were hurled back and forth. That man was Andrew Mellon, former Secretary of the Treasury.

Now on the basis of the reasoning in this telegram I have cited, Mr. Mellon should have been removed from office solely because there was controversy or suspicion in connection with his eligibility.

The reasoning is rather specious, and the Pennsylvanian who used such reasoning in the Lilienthal matter would, I am sure, insist it should not have applied in this historic case I have recalled here.

I cite the episode not in criticism of anyone and not in any attempt to indicate that persons opposed to Mr. Lilienthal are not entitled to their views, but rather in an effort to show that sometimes when we are so prone to accord serious considerations to suspicions engendered for various relevant or irrelevant reasons against other persons, we forget that we ourselves, or persons close to us, are often subjected to the same suspicion-mongering technique.

Mr. President, I have listened to much of the debate on the nomination of David E. Lilienthal and his conominees, and I have tried to follow closely the voluminous record as it was built up by the committee in its hearings. I am not an atomic scientist nor am I an expert on the TVA. Whenever I am faced with a decision on matters of fact with which I am not personally acquainted, as a lawyer, I like to find experts to do some interpreting and some explaining for me.

A trial centering largely on the testimony of expert witnesses is sometimes a pretty dull affair but often very illuminating. One must take the conflicting testimony of the experts and weigh it, and the weight usually lies on the side whose witnesses do not necessarily make the prettiest speeches but who appear to have the soundest backgrounds and experience; in other words, on the side of those witnesses who know their subject better and whose reputations are the more outstanding.

We are faced today, Mr. President, with such a situation. None of us knows enough about atomic energy to argue the technical phases of it. Some members of the committee know more of this subject than do the rest of us, but I am sure they would be the first to acknowledge they, too, are not technical experts.

But the technical experts have been heard—the men who had most to do with bringing into existence this remarkable force with which these nominees will have to deal. What is the opinion of the experts on the fitness of these nominees?

Without a single exception of which I know—these atomic scientists and administrators, those who were the actual obstetricians at the birth of the atomic bomb, say these nominees are fit and suitable for their jobs.

Now, the question is, Who says they are not? No one really. No one of whom I know—who professes to know—claims Mr. Lilienthal is not competent to handle a job of such importance. No one claims he lacks the skill or the ability.

Instead, we have heard attacks on his personality, his parentage, his attitude toward democracy—a pretty good attitude, I would say—attacks on his friends, on his political views.

No one has charged that Mr. Lilienthal has ever been disloyal to his country or that he intends to be disloyal. The charge is rather that he might be disloyal.

On what basis is this charge made? Is it on anything he has done or said? No. It is rather because of a subjective fear apparently held by a small minority of Senators and by a tiny fraction of the population that under certain theoretical circumstances, faced with certain theoretical choices, Mr. Lilienthal might conceivably make a decision or a choice not to the benefit of his country.

It would be, we are told, not so much a deliberate error of will as perhaps an error of judgment. Though not personally disloyal, he might, we are led to believe, make a bad decision, or exhibit bad judgment, which would have the effect of damaging our country's position.

This is plain silly. There is no Senator, no American, who could not be subjected to the same attack. As a matter of fact, in this very Chamber, not so many years ago, some errors of judgment were made which might really have brought disaster to our Nation. No one here today would, I am sure, question the loyalty of the Senators who made some of those bad guesses before December 7, 1941; and yet those guesses could have been fatal to America.

Mr. President, does anyone ask that Mr. Truman find a man for this job who would be guaranteed to make no errors of judgment at any time, anywhere? If that be the case, then we had better abolish completely the office of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission because it would be unfillable by mortal man.

When it comes to judgment, I think Mr. Lilienthal has more than earned the respect of our people.

My mail shows that. I have some mail in opposition to this nomination. I received, to be exact, 54 letters, telegrams, and postcards.

There were some anonymous communications—more than 10 percent of all the opposition communications I received were anonymous, and some were of a very vicious character, so vicious their authors understandably hesitated to sign them.

Then there were other letters—nearly a fifth of all of them—which were from persons and groups outside Pennsylvania who were apparently circularizing all Members of the Senate.

Several additional, some from Pennsylvania and some from other States, were outright endorsement of the race-hate theories of Adolf Hitler. I think we can ignore those.

The rest ran to a pattern, they cited the so-called Communist bogey; some conceded that Lilienthal was probably free from any Communist taint but maintained that since someone in the Senate of the United States had talked about communism in the same breath with Lilienthal, that there was therefore some doubt in someone's mind and that, therefore, Lilienthal would not do; that the man for this job should be of such outstanding purity of soul and character that no one could express any doubt whatsoever about him. If there be such a man, I say we must find him quickly and place him safely under glass among the rare mammals in the Smithsonian Institution.

In short, Mr. President, among the remarkably few letters and telegrams I received against Lilienthal—less than 45 from the entire State of Pennsylvania—there were the views first, of a few sincere citizens who believe in our democracy but who are inclined, perhaps, to take entirely too seriously some of the things they read in the headlines without bothering to read further down the page or look at the editorial columns, and then there is reflected in other letters some of the sentiments we usually associate with the fringe elements of our population, elements which pay lip-service to the things our democracy stands for but who actually seem to have little regard for real democracy, elements which are quick to hate at the first clarion call of prejudice.

That covers pretty much the opposition mail, all 54 pieces of it of which 45 or so were from the 10,000,000 or so people of Pennsylvania.

On the other hand, I received hundreds and hundreds, I have lost count, but hundreds of letters, telegrams, and postcards, all individual communications and not petitions, all in favor of these nominations.

The outpouring was so large that I had to laugh when I received a letter from a resident of Philadelphia who began by saying:

> According to the papers, people have been writing to their Senators about Lilienthal.

Mr. President, whether the newspapers said so or not, it is certainly true in Pennsylvania. In any event, since this gentleman had learned from the newspapers that everyone else was doing it, he did it too, and he wrote me he was in favor of the nominees. He let it go at that.

Many others did the same, endorsing the nominees in a few words.

But other hundreds went to some length and into some detail about it. And here is what struck me about those letters:

Almost without exception the people from Pennsylvania who wrote me in favor of these nominations, and who took the trouble to identify themselves at all, were exactly the same sort of people who used to write in on issues previously faced by the Congress in which the future of our country was regarded as at stake.

These were the type of people—undoubtedly in many cases the same people—who favored lend-lease and similar measures, who saw the dangers to our country arising out of unbridled aggression anywhere in the world, who wanted our country to be strong in case of the attack they—and many of us—knew might come. They are the type of people who were against aggression and international lawlessness—not just after we were attacked in 1941 or not just after the Hitler-Soviet pact was broken so violently in June of that same year but long before that—in 1931—and continuing after that with no time out for any changes in any party line. They are the type of people who wanted this United Nations to be brought into being and who are insistent now that it be made to work. They are the people who favored real domestic and international control over atomic energy and not the ersatz variety so far advocated by Soviet Russia and by some of our muddled conservatives who share the same bed with the Soviets on atomic-control views.

I will tell you, Mr. President, who these people are who wrote me on this nomination. They are the preachers and the teachers, the students, the small businessman, the engineers, the scientists, the mothers, and a cross section of the churchgoing decent real people of America, the people who know wars are not something which just happen, that wars are caused by the criminal short-sightedness of ostrich-minded politicians equally culpable with the criminal greed of power-mad aggressors.

In some respects, I deplore the heroic stature to which Mr. Lilienthal is raised in many of these letters. I do not think David Lilienthal is Superman at all. I do not think he is capable all by himself of preventing the next war or is smart enough all by himself to make atomic energy the servant of mankind. Some of the mail I have received seems to accord him such powers.

David Lilienthal, in my opinion, is just a human being, a man—albeit an unusually capable one—who can do this job about as well, I think, as anyone else who could be enlisted for it and better than most. And that is all the job requires. He will have competent assistance from the fellow members of this Commission and from his staff and from the military. There will be enough people watching him like hawks to see that he does not do anything foolish. There are sufficient safeguards thrown up around this job so that no one could botch it seriously or for long. But this man can be trusted not to botch things, and that is why I am for him.

How do I know he is qualified? Well, Mr. President, I have some expert witnesses. I read with interest what the outstanding atomic scientists of the Nation and of the world had to say about Lilienthal. I read what some of our leading businessmen who know something of this problem had to say. They were for this man.

And I heard from my own people in Pennsylvania—particularly the scientists in Pennsylvania—many of whom worked on the atomic bomb, some of whom are now working on atomic energy or in related fields.

Not a single one of the 54 persons who wrote me against Lilienthal claimed any scientific background.

From Oak Ridge, Tenn., a Pittsburgh research physicist now engaged in atomic energy research at the Clinton Laboratories, on a leave of absence from his industrial job in one of the great Pennsylvania corporations, wrote me:

As a citizen interested in the welfare of our country, and a lasting peace for the world, and as a scientist familiar with the benefits that will come to us all from the peaceful development of nuclear energy, I would like to urge you strongly to confirm Lilienthal. I feel that his past experience and accomplishments particularly fit him for the Nation-wide development of nuclear energy which we expect now to pursue. His foresight and leadership on the subject of international control will make this Nation the guiding spirit in the field of cooperation between nations. His rejection would be taken as a sign to the world that we are again on the path of isolation, which in the past led us into a bitter and costly war.

Is this a dangerous radical speaking? Mr. President, those are the words of an American scientist profoundly concerned for the safety of a world which has learned through science how to destroy itself, of a man who has earned the right to speak because he knows whereof he speaks, of a citizen who undoubtedly passed every test the FBI could devise before he ever set foot in Oak Ridge.

I have a similar letter from another Pennsylvania scientist at Oak Ridge, one now designing a power pile at the Clinton Laboratories. He is not effusive. He does not maintain that David Lilienthal is the only possible man who could be selected to head the Atomic Energy Commission. He does not gush. He is scientifically matter of fact. He says:

Mr. Lilienthal is adequate for the job.

Note, Mr. President, that he says not that Lilienthal is a superman, but rather is a man who can do this job. Do we need qualifications beyond that? This man adds—and this, to me is very significant—that if these nominees are rejected:

Time that would be lost searching for a new Chairman would seriously hamper the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. Although the newspapers are ahead of us in printing pictures of atomic power plants, it is reasonable to assume it can be done successfully, but we must be given the go-ahead signal from someone. Now, indecision is holding up the project.

Mr. President, as that scientist indicated, somebody else could probably handle the job of Chairman of the Commission. We could stall around for several years finding what some Senators seem to demand—the one man compared to whom there could be no better selection. We could conduct talent searches, give civil-service examinations, ask the radio to run a contest in which each of the contestants would submit a sentence of 25 words or less and would enclose the top from a toothpaste container; we could invite the Senator from Ohio to examine the inner consciences of each candidate to see which in his opinion might be soft on the subject of communism or of mother love or of horse racing or whatever. Then somebody could unveil this superman with appropriate ceremonies. But in the meantime, atomic-energy research would be a subject we would read more about in the technical journals of other countries than in those of our own.

A professor of physics at Haverford College reports that it is with alarm, as he put it, "that we see a matter of such importance to the United States of America and to the world become a political football." "Times's awasting'," he warns, "and we must move rapidly and snap out of our old ideas of what constitutes 'security.' The laws and discoveries of science," he says, "have little regard for national boundaries."

He has a further admonition to the Senate. He says:

We must grow up—now!

A man and wife from Philadelphia, who worked on the Manhattan project at Oak Ridge, after seeing TVA at first hand and observing Lilienthal's accomplishments, and, incidentally, after knowing something about atomic energy, say of Lilienthal that—

A man of his ability and experience is well suited to the atomic energy chairmanship.

I assume the FBI carefully investigated this couple before they went to Oak Ridge. Assuming that, I think I can treat their views with some consideration. They certainly know more about the qualifications required for this job than I do, and more than is known by those in the Senate who would clutch this atomic bomb so tenderly to their bosoms, as if we in Congress had developed the thing ourselves merely by voting $2,000,000,000 for it—without knowing, incidentally, that we were voting it.

I received a letter from a young lady in Pittsburgh who also knows something about the problems involved here. She has done research in high explosives—not customarily a feminine occupation—and she informs me she did some work on the atomic bomb in a technical capacity. She would like to see Lilienthal confirmed. She wrote:

I have given this matter much thought, and I have a great feeling of responsibility. In a small way I did my part to bring this terrible weapon into being. Now, I want to see its control for peace.

I might digress here, Mr. President, to say that we in the Senate have that desire, I am sure. The monumental legislation drafted and passed with such unanimity here last year would prove that. But sometimes, I am afraid, some of us here are too inclined to ascribe all sorts of outlandish motives to others who are no less patriotic Americans than we, no less committed to a decent world than we. I think this young lady deserves to be heard.

Skipping some somewhat feminine aspects of her letter—the sentiments, for instance, you would expect from a sensitive young lady who feels that Lilienthal showed great forbearance during his ordeal before the committee, and that he showed high idealism, personal courage, and so on—she says that as a citizen and a scientist she believes Lilienthal is a man of great integrity whom she believes to be able to withstand the pressures, so she says, "that will be brought to bear on him in connection with misuse of his position on the Commission."

I should now like to read what a physicist at the University of Pittsburgh wrote me:

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: An individual like myself, who is both a scientist and a citizen with concern for the future of our Nation and of civilization in general, cannot avoid a sense of deep concern regarding the question of the control of atomic energy. Never before in the history of mankind has a source of energy of such magnitude been made available. Such a tool can lead either to a world more nearly free of drudgery or to a world in which a few can enslave or even annihilate the rest of humanity. It is my conviction and, I believe, the conviction of the majority of scientists that the surest way to achieve the former alternative is to entrust the control of atomic energy, first, to a civilian board within our own Government, and, as soon as adequate safeguards can be instituted, to an agency within the framework of the United Nations. A real start in that direction was made by the passage during the last session of the Congress of the McMahon bill, and further progress was made when the President of the United States announced his nominations for the members of the Federal Atomic Energy Commission.

Because of the convictions which I hold on this subject, the proceedings within the Joint Atomic Energy Committee have been extremely painful to me. There seems to be no justification whatever for the attempt to blacken the character of Mr. David E. Lilienthal. He has a distinguished record as an able, honest, and imaginative public servant. Throughout the recent barbaric attack he has maintained himself with dignity becoming a gentleman. It would be a tragedy of the greatest magnitude if the wholly unsupported accusations of communistic sympathy or the totally irrelevant issues of racial origin and party affiliation should be allowed to influence the judgment of the Senate in considering the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal. The situation is particularly serious, because, should his appointment be rejected, it would be difficult to induce another man of high principle to subject himself to the risk of the personal abuse Mr. Lilienthal has suffered.

On the basis of the considerations herein outlined, I urge you to do everything in your power to aid the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal as Director of the Federal Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely yours.

A man in Cheswick, Pa., of technical education and background, a Republican—and by the way, Mr. President, as I said earlier, many of my constituents from Pennsylvania who are urging the confirmation of this nomination identified themselves as Republicans; and I am glad they did, because it proves that this is not and must not be a partisan issue, regardless of the efforts of some persons to make it one.

But to resume, this Republican from Cheswick reports that his letter was the first he had ever written to any governmental representative. It is thus clear that he feels rather strongly about this matter. He deplores what he calls the sorry spectacle of some leaders of the Republican Party in this issue.

Those lines in his letter are beside the point, because I am not making a political speech. I said earlier that I appreci-

ate more than I can tell the nonpartisan approach of the Republican members of the Atomic Energy Committee. I repeated these lines only for the benefit of those of my friends across the aisle who may like to keep abreast of Republican grass roots sentiment. The relevant portions of this letter are in the following words:

> There is very real danger that misuse of atomic weapons may mean an end to civilization in this generation. The control of the knowleige and resources of atomic power is by far the most important subject in the United States today. It is much too important to be used as any issue for political chicanery and petty party politics. Unless more real and serious charges than "Communist" can be brought against Mr. Lilienthal I feel that you should support his confirmation. * * * He is certainly the most suitable man that has yet been considered, excepting, of course, men of science like Drs. Conant and Compton and others connected with atomic research who would not wish to be embroiled in the political maelstrom.

Mr. President, this gentleman's reference to being "embroiled in the political maelstrom" is more than a theoretical fear. Let me read what a research scientist at Carnegie Institute of Technology had to say on this point in a letter he wrote to me:

> It should be noted that the Government has been very fortunate in obtaining the services of the very best nuclear physicists in the country; but these men are not interested only in the scientific aspects of its work, they are deeply concerned about its moral obligations. * * * I feel completely safe in saying these men will be very much dissatisfied if the atomic-energy project comes under the jurisdiction of a political biased Commission. This is the chief reason for supporting Lilienthal so strongly. They fear the appointment of a less worthy man would be a first step toward revision of the McMahon bill and the defeat of international control of atomic energy. These things they feel would be very dangerous to the future safety of the United States.

That, Mr. President, is a warning we must heed.

Someone—I do not immediately recollect who it was; it may have been a Member of the Senate—has made the statement that we should not really pay much attention to what the scientists have to say on this issue, because they are just naive theorists, perhaps a little on the crackpot side. In that regard, I might pass on, for what it is worth—I myself do not think it worth very much—the suggestion of one man who wrote me that it might be a good idea to select as head of the Commission some person whom he says "the scientists do not care for," on the theory that such a person would be inclined, as he adds, "to keep a stricter eye on them."

In other words, the scientists who gave us the bomb and the secret of atomic energy are just like schoolboys who must be disciplined properly and kept in their place. Perhaps we should shoot them all for fear they might precociously give the secret to someone else, to destroy us with.

Mr. Lilienthal and his conominees, incidentally, know now much of the detail of atomic energy. If their nominations were to be rejected, should they, too, be shot in order to protect the so-called secrets? That would be no less sensible than rejecting their nominations on flimsy pretexts that their loyalty is open to question.

A history teacher at the University of Pennsylvania, who has studied the rise and fall of many civilizations before ours and who thus knows how a civilization can rot at the core from indecision, distrust, or fear of new discoveries, wrote as follows:

> I believe that both the interests and the honor of our country are deeply involved in this issue.

He is, of course, in favor of the nominations.

Many other faculty members at the University of Pennsylvania—research scientists, medical men now working with some of the dividend payments in radioactive isotopes from atomic-energy research—have written me on this nomination, and all are in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Seven of the eight members of the political science faculty at Pennsylvania State College—the eighth was not in town at the time—sent the committee a petition, a copy of which they also sent me—the only petition which I recollect receiving, among hundreds and hundreds of letters on this issue, urging in their individual capacities that the nominees be confirmed. Dr. John H. Ferguson, chairman of the department, said in sending the letter to me that in signing this petition these seven "have done more than casually affix our names to something put before us. Each of us feels deeply about the matter."

I received similar letters from a number of Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. research scientists, from Mellon Institute scientists at Pittsburgh, from a University of Pennsylvania chemist who feels "it would be a great shame," as he puts it, "if the control of such a potent military and potential commercial force were in less competent hands." I also received letters from professors at Pitt, and from Temple, and from other schools. Yes; these are professors—gentlemen at whose profession it is often the fashion here to sneer—but professors, I may add, of the type who gave us this force we now have—this atomic energy, which we sometimes seem to handle as if it were a hot potato we wish had never been tossed into our unwilling hands.

I do not intend to read here every letter I have received from Pennsylvania scientists, but I should like to include a few words from an electrical engineer in Pittsburgh who declares that to reject these nominees "on the tenuous, unproved charge of 'Communist' or upon prejudiced personal attacks is little short of folly. The United States and the world would be the loser."

The rules of the Senate would prevent my reading some of the letters. They liken some of the discussions here to treason, which of course they are not. But these letters reflect a people really aroused and concerned.

I mentioned hearing from many clergymen in favor of this nomination. The clergy in Pennsylvania is not what you would call soft on the question of communism; yet every letter I received from a clergyman in Pennsylvania was in favor of this nomination. One good Presbyterian minister made a very significant observation: He said the Senate of the United States this time "must be a different Senate from the Senate after the first World War, or ignominy will be piled upon the name of the United States of America for all time." He urged that our country "rise to the demands of the present hour and prove to be the truly great Nation which she may be."

His is a prayer to which I append a very sincere and reverent "Amen."

Among expressions from veterans I received was one which struck home. It came from a Butler, Pa., resident, formerly of Michigan, who wrote that he does not know how the veterans' organizations feel about this matter—let me state that many in Pennsylvania have indicated to me they feel rather strongly in favor of these nominations—but, at any rate, although he does not know how the veterans' organizations feel about it, he said that—

> As an individual veteran, I resent the fact that our elected officials use the same tactics and methods against a fellow citizen that a regime which we just got through fighting used. Indirectly, fairness and straightforwardness are among those things we fought to protect and keep.

I have cited many Pennsylvanians who claimed some special right to be heard on this issue—scientists familiar with atomic energy, veterans, church leaders, and so on. Most of the letters I received, however, were from plain citizens who claimed no special distinction, who were just good Americans voicing their sincere convictions on something which touches every one of us, our children, our future.

For instance, a lawyer in a small northern Pennsylvania community, in sizing up this situation, took the word, not of any New Dealers or scientists or social workers or do-gooders or professors or pinks but, he said, "of business leaders who worked with Lilienthal during the war." He asked them. They endorsed Lilienthal, he said, "as safe and sound, and that is sufficient guaranty of his loyalty and patriotism, and his ability needs no further elaboration." He added that the campaign against Lilienthal "is enough to sicken any decent person of good will." The evil of it, as he sees it—and I agree—"is," he says, "that it drives men of Lilienthal's ability who could earn $50,000 a year in private industry away from public service."

I would call that a reasonable observation.

So many of the letters I received protested as an "inquisition" Mr. Lilienthal's examination before the committee. Well, Mr. President, I think in this man we have one who can take it. He did all right for himself in that "inquisition." Instead of being just another exceptionally good administrator, he has emerged from those hearings as the shining knight of millions of Americans, and, ironically enough, he can thank for that rise in public esteem the very persons who tried so hard to discredit him.

All of us have heard rumors about a pressure campaign in Lilienthal's behalf. I should say that no pressure campaign, no write-your-Congressman drive, no agitator, inspired the sentiments in

a postcard I now have before me. It comes from a mother in Lansdale, Pa., and says, very simply:

I am very much in favor of David E. Lilienthal for Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, as I am thinking of the future of my children.

For the further benefit of my grassroots-minded friends across the aisle, I should like to read what a registered Republican, a student at Pennsylvania State College, had to say on a postcard:

I support any Republican who places world peace first in his values, as I believe those supporting Mr. Lilienthal do.

I should be glad to have such a purposeful young lady on my side.

A Pittsburgh man sees in this issue a requirement that "the hands of Warren R. Austin must be upheld." "The issue," he adds, "transcends anything our lives have hitherto known. It is a matter, as Mr. Baruch has said, 'of world peace or world destruction.'" He is, as you can gather, for Lilienthal.

Mr. President, I am not here today reading letters from constituents just to fill up time or to answer my mail via reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a handy method, but one not necessary in this instance, because just about all of my mail on this issue has already been answered. I have read all of these communications, dull though this perhaps might have been for the Senate, because I think these expressions are well above the ordinary caliber of mail; they are based on real and deep conviction and sincerity and—most important of all—on awareness of the issues and acquaintanceship with the facts regarding atomic energy.

Many of my constituents wrote me in the belief that I was a Republican. In that respect they were not quite clear on the facts. But, thinking me a Republican, they considered me for that reason subject to some unseen pressure to defeat this nomination as a party issue. I do not know where the impression arose that Republican Senators are under such pressure. I know that the Republican leadership within the Atomic Energy Committee has established a complete absence of partisanship in its approach to the issue. The impression of party activity, however, still seems to be present among many Republicans in my State. I trust that the final vote on these nominees will show that Republican Senators, generally, following the lead of the Atomic Committee members, will vote their personal convictions and prove conclusively that there is in truth no party pressure here.

Mr. President, for days and days we have talked and talked about these nominations. We have before us a warning from our scientists throughout the country, that I find repeated again and again in my mail from those in my State, and that is that if this Lilienthal nomination were rejected—and I am sure it will not be—it would have a disastrous effect both on the procurement of additional scientists to continue the development of atomic energy and on the cause of world peace itself.

One Pennsylvania scientist warned me that Lilienthal's rejection might cause other countries to question the sincerity of the United States in pursuing our plan for effective international control of atomic energy.

His reasoning is rather clear: although we have here a magnificent law for the control, domestically, of this fearsome power, which we have decreed is to be used for the common good, we have not so far implemented that law by the final approval of competent personnel. The domestic control plan, then, is merely limping along, pending the outcome of this debate. In the meantime, however, we have proposed an even more daring and revolutionary plan for world-wide control which we are backing vigorously in the United Nations, over some real and substantial opposition, chiefly from the Soviet Union.

The point is this: If we turn aside these nominees now before us and reject them on political or other false grounds—particularly if we reject a man generally regarded not only here but among our friends abroad as a most harmonious companion to the law he is to administer—would it not be a signal that we have rejected this man because we are looking for someone less in sympathy and harmony with this far-reaching legislation. If we are regarded as abandoning key features of our program for domestic control, is not the world then entitled to anticipate backsliding on our even more far-reaching international plan?

Let us be open and frank on this matter. It is not really David Lilienthal, the man, who appears to be opposed here; basically, I think it is the law he is to administer which is on trial.

The reason I say so is that there is no one we could have as chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission who could be in complete accord with the law under which he is to work, who would not be subject to the same attacks which have been made upon Mr. Lilienthal. The job needs a man committed to public ownership of so fearsome and so powerful a force. Yet any man committed to public ownership of anything appears as suspect, I am afraid, in the minds of some Members here.

We have unequivocally gone on record for public ownership in this instance. Has anyone changed his mind, Mr. President? Has any Senator regretted his vote of last year? If so, let us know now.

If there are those here who have repugnance for the law we passed, then they should make their opposition public and should attempt to amend that law to their liking. Let us fight that out right now, if it is the undisclosed real issue beneath the surface issue of Lilienthal's so-called communism, socialism, New Dealism, pinkism, bureaucratic mania, or whatever other of the derogatory terms which have been put forward in his direction.

If the intent of Congress is to be changed by legislation, then it should be done through a direct approach—amendment of the basic laws—not by a back-door approach, such as is becoming much too prevalent in the Eightieth Congress, where we have time after time seen the process of amendment of law achieved, not in the normal fashion, but by means of appropriation legerdemain. Here we would have basic principles of our Atomic Energy Act changed single-handedly by the Senate, merely by refusing—should these nominations be rejected—to allow competent men to be named to administer the act.

We are dealing here today with a force which carries within it the power to end mankind or to give mankind a golden new civilization. Which shall it be? Are we to acknowledge administrative ability when we find it, or are we to pursue narrow, partisan, or personal vendettas at the risk, perhaps, of the world we know?

It is my anxious belief that although the attacks now are directed mainly at Lilienthal, he is, in truth, merely the primary objective of a spearhead which has many secondary targets on the atomic-control front, once the Lilienthal nomination should be rejected.

I think we should all try to think back less than 20 months ago when the A-bomb first burst into our consciousness, and recall how we felt on learning of the existence of this terrible thing. Let us think back to last year, when we voted, with such solemn awareness of our responsibilities, to curb this thing and hold it in check and make it work for, instead of against, humanity.

Mr. President, we must think back even further, to a period after another war, when the Senate of the United States failed to live up to its obligations. The bad reputation our Senate inherited from those days has gradually been overcome in recent years by our awakened knowledge of some of the facts of international life. Let us not retrogress; let us not lose our hard-won good reputation, and with it, perhaps, the chance for a world without war.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation to the hundreds and hundreds of citizens of Pennsylvania, Republicans and Democrats alike, who thought enough of their responsibilities as citizens in this grave issue to write me their views. In contrast to the usual run of legislative mail, their correspondence was thoroughly devoid of any special interest or selfish interest aims. The Pennsylvanians who wrote me—both those whose letters I have not read to the Senate, even though I had hoped to read them to my colleagues, and those whose letters I have read in part to the Senate, wrote me, I know, for only one reason, namely, as good Americans, deeply anxious to live to see a world in which they and their children can exist without fear of war, they want to see our Nation make from this marvelous atomic energy discovery, the paradise this world can really be, should we succeed in our day, in our lives, in doing what He who 2,000 years or so ago this very week died to achieve, although it has not yet really been achieved, and will not be achieved unless we with our wealth and our will and our hearts are determined to work at the monumental task of achieving it—and that is peace among men, brotherhood among men, friendship among men and among nations.

These nominations and our actions thereon constitute a test of that high resolve.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has consumed only 15 minutes of the 20 minutes allotted to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is our side to be charged with the 5 minutes which was not used by the Senator from Pennsylvania, although it was allotted to him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator's side will be charged with only the 15 minutes which the Senator from Pennsylvania actually consumed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, when we vote on the question of confirmation of the nominations of the Chairman and the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, we are voting on appointees to the most powerful positions not only in the United States, but in the entire world. We in the United States were the first to use the atomic bomb. A few men in executive authority made the decision to use it.

It proved to be the most destructive, devastating, and deadly weapon in the history of mankind. Although we used it upon orders of a very few men, and in an effort to shorten a war that was destined to cost many more lives if fought to conclusion by the use of other methods and means of warfare, we nevertheless, were the first to use it, and thereby we served notice on the world that we possessed such weapons and power. We served notice that it might again be used under the orders of a very few men in executive positions. This notice was thereby served upon the people of the United States, as well as the people of the world. No single weapon or power has ever caused so much comment, concern, or contemplation.

Since that day, the world has literally been combed for individuals who possess scientific knowledge of this subject matter. Scientists are said to have been captured and held, bribed, or threatened, to induce them to divulge their present knowledge and to develop it further, by various countries who were allies in the last war. The so-called allies have developed their spy, secret service, and espionage systems to secure evidence and knowledge from each other by bribery or theft. The safe-keeping, development, and use of this information have turned into the greatest race in the world.

Our entire Nation was shocked at the disclosure of the Communists' attempt to secure the secrets of our atomic energy in Canada. It was established that it was the Communists who made that bold attempt.

The cold facts are that the race is between the Soviet Government on the one side and the United States and governments who believe in the philosophy of human rights and liberties on the other.

Anyone who faces facts knows that the struggle throughout the world today to a major degree is between communism and the preservation of human rights, established, maintained, and advanced under our truly representative form of government.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of our FBI, recently testified that—

> The Communists have been, still are, and always will be a menace to freedom, the democratic ideals, the worship of God, and the American way of life.

Mr. Hoover also testified:

> The Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column if there ever was one. It is far better organized than were the Nazis in occupied countries prior to their capitulation.

The secrets of atomic energy may well be the most powerful secrets and force to determine the safety of our lives and the continuance of our traditional form of government which guarantees the precious liberties of life and the pursuit of physical and spiritual happiness. No other position in government even remotely approaches the importance of the positions we consider today.

This being true, the men who are approved for these important positions, developing atomic-energy knowledge and maintaining its secrets, should be men of unquestioned allegiance to the traditional American representative form of government. They should be above all suspicion of having any affiliation, association, or sympathy with any communistic theory or communistic-front organization.

In our desire to fulfill our responsibility to the people we represent in such an important matter as this, it would seem little enough that we should demand and receive, before confirmation, a complete, thorough, and exhaustive report from the FBI on each of the individuals subject to confirmation for these important positions.

I do not know whether Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or not. I have never charged that he was. I would like to have an exhaustive FBI report on the subject. It has been reported that Mr. Lilienthal, either by cooperation or lack of interest, allowed communistic-front organizations to develop in the vast TVA organization which he headed and administered with such an iron hand in all other respects. I would like to have an exhaustive FBI report on that subject also.

I do know that he displayed before the Appropriations Committee an attitude favoring the development of a Government corporation that was not entirely responsible to the people, acting through their representatives, who furnished the money and the authority for the development of that corporation. It has been developed that he did create, without legal authority, other Government corporations to advance his own peculiar philosophy of social and economic development by the use of the people's money and the electric power under his direction.

The TVA was an experiment both in flood control and the development of electric power. Mr. Lilienthal found ways to thwart the will of Congress when it sought to limit his autocratic rule of the project. He showed constant hostility to legislative limitations on his activities. His attitude and acts showed lack of respect and at times contempt for congressional views in connection with his dictatorial advancement of his insatiable desire for personal power.

In my judgment he lacks the fundamental regard for our representative form of Government where the people retain controls through their elected spokesmen in the Congress.

With these tendencies which have caused such widespread concern among the American people, whose lives, liberties, and safety, will depend upon the proper development and safeguarding of atomic power and its secrets, I do not believe that the Senate of the United States should confirm Mr. Lilienthal as the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Although I am not an expert on atomic energy and power, it has been generally conceded that it would take any government years to develop such energy and power to in any measure compete with us, and I believe that there is no immediate race against time to confirm any one man to this important position. It is generally believed that Mr. Lilienthal was not among the first to be considered by the President as one qualified for this position. I believe that it is the duty of the Senate to refuse to "advise and consent" to this confirmation, and to suggest that the President submit the name of another man who is free from the distressing suspicions that are so manifestly entertained concerning the qualifications of David E. Lilienthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is prepared to proceed at this time. There are several on the list who are not present at the moment. I would not care to force the Senator to proceed now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, depending upon time, I shall confine my discussion to two main points, first, what I believe the facts are about the so-called Wisconsin incident, and, second, the value which I think should be placed upon the testimony which has been submitted in behalf of Mr. Lilienthal.

I desire to say, as one who has taught a law-school course in legal ethics for a good many years, that it is just beyond my powers of comprehension to understand how Members of the Senate can reach the conclusion that there was anything unethical in Mr. Lilienthal's conduct in the so-called Wisconsin incident. Let me very quickly review what I understand are the salient charges against Mr. Lilienthal so far as the Wisconsin incident is concerned.

On page 806 of the hearings there is quoted the Wisconsin public utility law which he is supposed to have violated by the contractual arrangement into which he entered with the Commerce Clearing House. It reads as follows:

> No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit or pursue any other business or vocation or serve on or under any committee of any political party, but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office.

On page 808 the Senators will find without my taking the time to read it, because time is now precious in this debate, the letter of contract into which Mr. Lilienthal entered with the Commerce Clearing House at the time he went back to Chicago following his conference with Governor La Follette and told the Commerce Clearing House that he was inclined to accept the invitation of the Governor of Wisconsin to be appointed to the Public Utility Commission of Wisconsin.

All the facts of the arrangement were set out in that letter of contract. The letter contract was taken back to the Governor of Wisconsin, and the Governor not only checked into the details of the contract, but he had his legal adviser check into the details of the contract. They both approved of it. The contract was made a matter of public knowledge at the time Mr. Lilienthal accepted the appointment. Now it is charged that because during the period of time that he served on the commission he received income from the Commerce Clearing House for editing services and writing services previously rendered, and clearly so stipulated in this contract, he has committeed some unethical act. The record does not support such a charge.

What else does the record show, Mr. President, as to the arrangements that he entered into with the Commerce Clearing House? It shows, as was pointed out by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] last night, that when Mr. Lilienthal talked with the Governor of Wisconsin he expressed some hesitancy in accepting the appointment because he was just starting in his legal work in Chicago. He was a young man I believe of the age of 31 at the time. He had taken a lease on some offices, a lease which involved a considerable sum of money. He had been working along in his practice and as so many other young lawyers have to do, he did extra work on the side, in editing and preparing this material for the Commerce Clearing House. He needed to do it in order to get started in the practice on a financial basis that would help him meet expenses. He could not forego the financial obligations he had entered into for his office without satisfactory arrangements being made, because he did not know how long he would stay with the utilities commission. The governor had said to him, in effect, "Well, take it for a year, if you can; help me out for a while." I do not quote him exactly, I paraphrase it. In his conversation with the Commerce Clearing House, I think it is very clear from the record this was Mr. Lilienthal's position at the time he arranged the contract. He said he would like to try the position for a while but that he would have to make arrangements for taking care of his office.

Many of us that come to the Senate of the United States find ourselves in somewhat similar positions as far as law offices are concerned. I was a member of a law firm, and, as the chairman well knows, a United States Senator would be guilty of unethical legal conduct if he engaged in any Federal legal practice. It is so difficult to determine frequently, when a case starts out to be a State case, whether or not it will take on Federal aspects before it is over. Very frequently a State case develops into a Federal case; and so what do many of us do? I think many do what I did. I became "of counsel" with my firm. In other words, I ended all pecuniary interests in the firm. If and when I go out of the Senate I shall, of course, go back to the firm.

Mr. Lilienthal had before him the problem of deciding what to do with his law office. He owes obligations to his law clerks, and the contract in its very terms refers to the clerks that he had in his office. They were the young people who had served as his editorial assistants. Some comment was made last night about the very low pay they were receiving. Mr. President, in 1931 and 1932, as dean of a law school I placed many law clerks at the magnificent salary of from $25 a month to $50 a month in law firms. In that period of time such wages were considered satisfactory if a young man could secure an association with any firm. In this case Mr. Lilienthal paid his assistants much more than that sum, as shown by the record. So to cast reflections on him, as was done here last night, because of the low salary paid these law clerks, I think simply overlooks what the pay rates were for law clerks in 1931 and 1932.

Now, what office arrangements did he make for himself and his clerks? The Commerce Clearing House, in effect, took over his offices. That was the understanding. That was to continue to be the workshop for preparing the publication by the clerks. They had, there, all the materials for the editing and the writing of these reports that became the Commerce Clearing House Reports. The important thing, Mr. President—no innuendo, insinuation, nor out-and-out accusation can change the fact—the important thing is that after he went on the commission Mr. Lilienthal devoted his full time to the work of the commission. The clerks no longer had any employment relationship with him in regard to editing and publishing the material. Their relationship was with the Commerce Clearing House. They took their instructions from the Commerce Clearing House. They sent their material to the Commerce Clearing House. Mr. Lilienthal had nothing to do with the editing and the publication of that material for the period of time that he was on the commission. The clerks received their pay in accordance with Mr. Lilienthal's contract with the Commerce Clearing House.

I took the initiative this morning, Mr. President, to check into these facts with Mr. Lilienthal. He assures me what I think is clearly in the record, too, that once he went on the Commission he had nothing more to do with the editing and the publishing of the reports.

He also told me an interesting thing. I think it is interesting because it bears on the analogy that I attempted to draw last night when I was asking a question of the Senator from Connecticut as to whether or not this was not to all intents and purposes similar to receiving payment of a royalty for writing already done. He said:

> You know it is interesting, the first contract that I had with the Commerce Publishing Co. in regard to this project was on a royalty basis; but through no fault of my own, there were many delays in getting the first copies of the reports ready for sale, and so the contract was then subsequently changed. It was agreed that I should get a certain stipulated sum for my work on a weekly basis, and that thereafter when the publication became a profitable and a going concern, the Commerce Clearing House would give me additional compensation of the nature called for in the letter contract which was filed with the Governor of Wisconsin for my services.

He was entirely aboveboard about it, Mr. President, and I think it is most unfortunate and regrettable, because he followed the course of action that he followed, putting all of his cards on the table at the time he entered into the arrangement with the Governor of Wisconsin, that now, years later, insinuations should be made that there was something questionable from the standpoint of ethics in regard to the arrangement which he entered into with the Governor of Wisconsin.

What is the next charge? Some book salesmen went out selling Commerce Clearing House reports on utilities. What are these reports? They are for the most part the digests of court decisions, the footnoting of cases, and the making of bibliographies. We lawyers know that. Mr. Lilienthal's name was mentioned, it is said, as one of the authors of the report when the salesmen talked to customers. Mr. Lilienthal said to me this morning in answer to a question I put to him, that he had no knowledge of it; if he had had knowledge of it, he, of course, would have insisted that no such representations be made. But here, again, Mr. President, I should like to see before me in black and white the type of representations the salesmen made. Any Senator's guess is as good as mine, perhaps, but knowing book salesmen, who have also come through my office, by the hundreds, over the years, they always like to point out the names of prominent people that ever had any connection with a publication, as well as the names of people who have subscribed for a publication.

I surmise, Mr. President, that what actually happened in regard to these book salesmen is that they pointed out that at one time Mr. Lilienthal was one of the original authors of the publication. But is Mr. Lilienthal going to be charged with unethical conduct because of such statements or even of some puffing on the part of book salesmen? I think it is almost too absurd, Mr. President, even to warrant an answer.

Now, one other thing in regard to the so-called Wisconsin incident. I like the

fact, and I think this is the way to test motives, Mr. President; I like the fact that Mr. Lilienthal, at the time he entered into the so-called contract with the Governor of Wisconsin, made a perfectly clear and full disclosure of his past relationships with the Commerce Clearing House. There is no evidence that I can find at least anywhere in the record that he engaged in any unethical conduct in accepting payment for editing work previously performed prior to his acceptance of a post on that commission. He was entitled to those payments for past service rendered.

I say, Mr. President, I think the fact is crystal clear that he washed his hands of any work for the Commerce Clearing House, once he accepted the job on the Commission.

I think another thing is perfectly clear, Mr. President, and that is that he entered into an arrangement with the Commerce Clearing House which would be approved by any grievance committee of any bar association that might seek to try Mr. Lilienthal for any unethical conduct growing out of that contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator to the fact that he has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, not at this moment, but if the Senator cannot conclude in 2 minutes, I shall yield him additional time.

Mr. MORSE. I will do my very best to conclude in the time allotted.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I think a grievance committee of a bar association would simply laugh out of court the insinuations which have been heaped upon Mr. Lilienthal as the result of this contract with the Commerce Clearing House. I say that because it was a proper contract. Read it from its four corners, read it up and down, forward and backward, and I say it spells out the conduct of an honorable man who wanted to make perfectly clear to the Governor of Wisconsin and the people of the State of Wisconsin the arrangements he had with the Commerce Clearing House. That was honorable ethical conduct—not the conduct of a dishonest man.

If Senators will go into the record they will also find that day after day he performed full time work for the commission once he accepted the appointment.

I understand, Mr. President, someone has some letterhead with Mr. Lilienthal's name on it which was used by the Commerce Clearing House after he accepted the appointment. Again I say, as lawyers we know that does not even support an inference of any unethical conduct on the part of Mr. Lilienthal. So far as we know it was the old letterhead they were still using up. Let the insinuators supply us with proof that there was any letterhead with his name on it printed after he accepted the appointment on the Public Utilities Commission. Then let them show he had any knowledge of such use of his name and we shall begin to talk and think as lawyers on this issue.

I shall conclude now very quickly, Mr. President. I did not get into the other point I wanted to raise, but I do want to say——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I will take 1 minute.

I do want to say, Mr. President, that I think the immortal words which David E. Lilienthal uttered when he announced his firm devotion to and conviction in favor of the principles of the democratic process should be emblazoned on every schoolhouse in America. I wish to insert them in the RECORD at this point, and ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

This I do carry in my head, Senator.

I will do my best to make it clear. My convictions are not so much concerned with what I am against as what I am for; and that excludes a lot of things automatically.

Traditionally, democracy has been an affirmative doctrine rather than merely a negative one.

I believe—and I conceive the Constitution of the United States to rest upon, as does religion—the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual; and that all government and all private institutions must be designed to promote and protect and defend the integrity and the dignity of the individual; that that is the essential meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as it is essentially the meaning of religion.

Any form of government, therefore, and any other institutions which make men means rather than ends, which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power over men as a fundamental tenet of government are contrary to that conception, and, therefore, I am deeply opposed to them.

The communistic philosophy as well as the communistic form of government falls within this category, for their fundamental tenet is quite to the contrary. The fundamental tenet of communism is that the state is an end in itself, and that therefore the powers which the state exercises over the individual are without any ethical standard to limit them.

That I deeply disbelieve.

It is very easy simply to say that one is not a Communist. And, of course, if my record requires me to state that very affirmatively, then it is a great disappointment to me.

It is very easy to talk about being against communism. It is equally important to believe those things which provide a satisfying and effective alternative. Democracy is that satisfying, affirmative alternative.

Its hope in the world is that it is an affirmative belief, rather than being simply a belief against something else and nothing more.

One of the tenets of democracy that grows out of this central core of a belief that the individual comes first, that all men are the children of God and that their personalities are therefore sacred, carries with it a great belief in civil liberties and their protection, and a repugnance to anyone who would steal from a human being that which is most precious to him—his good name—either by imputing things to him by innuendo or by insinuation. And it is especially an unhappy circumstances that occasionally that is done in the name of democracy. This, I think, can tear our country apart and destroy it if we carry it further.

I deeply believe in the capacity of democracy to surmount any trials that may lie ahead, provided only that we practice it in our daily lives.

And among the things we must practice is that while we seek fervently to ferret out the subversive and antidemocratic forces in the country, we do not at the same time, by hysteria, by resort to innuendo, and smears, and other unfortunate tactics, besmirch the very cause that we believe in, and cause a separation among our people—cause one group and one individual to hate another, based on mere attacks, mere unsubstantiated attacks upon their loyalty.

I want also to add that part of my conviction is based on my training as an Anglo-American common-law lawyer. It is the very basis and the great heritage of the English people to this country, which we have maintained, that we insist on the strictest rules of credibility of witnesses and on the avoidance of hearsay, and that gossip shall be excluded, in the courts of justice. And that, too, is an essential of our democracy.

Whether by administrative agencies acting arbitrarily against business organizations, or whether by investigating activities of legislative branches, whenever those principles fail, those principles of the protection of an individual and his good name against besmirchment by gossip, hearsay, and the statements of witnesses who are not subject to cross-examination—then, too, we have failed in carrying forward our ideals in respect to democracy.

That I deeply believe.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is a great statement of the principles of American democracy by a great American.

I hope the Senate of the United States today will not strike down, as an attempt is being made to strike down, one of the greatest exponents of democracy, one of the truest believers in the private-enterprise system that we have among the great leaders in America today. If the Senate does, Mr. President, I, for one, in my prayer to the Almighty tonight will pray:

God forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Mr. WHERRY. I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Nebraska for yielding me 10 minutes, but I do not think it will be necessary for me to use the full period of 10 minutes.

I desire to place in the RECORD, without comment, two statements with respect to the services rendered by General Groves as head of the Manhattan atomic-energy project. One is by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the other is by the President of the United States. I shall not make any comment on either one of them, but I want to place them side by side in the RECORD in order that the Senate and the country may be informed as to what services General Groves did render in the Manhattan project.

The Senator from Connecticut, after stating, "I could name a dozen more that built the plants from the designs of the scientists," made this statement, as it appears on page 2961 of the RECORD of April 1, 1947:

General Groves was assigned the managerial job. He was in charge of security. He procured material. He was the coordinator. But not even General Groves' most ardent admirers, in the Army or out of the Army, would claim that General Groves made any contribution to the scientific or to the engineering aspects of this project.

That is the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut.

I read now the citation for a distinguished-service medal given to General Groves by the President of the United States:

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDAL

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves, as commanding general, Manhattan Engineer District, Army Service Forces, from June 1942 to August 1945 coordinated, administered, and controlled a project of unprecedented, world-wide significance, the development of the atomic bomb. His was the responsibility for procuring matériel and personnel, marshaling the forces of Government and industry, erecting huge plants, blending the scientific efforts of the United States and foreign countries, and maintaining completely secret the search for a key to release atomic energy. He accomplished his task with such outstanding success that in amazingly short time the Manhattan Engineer District solved this problem of staggering complexity, defeating the Axis Powers in the race to produce an instrument whose peacetime potentialities are no less marvelous than its wartime application is awesome. The achievement of General Groves is of unfathomable importance to the future of the Nation and the world.

That is the full citation. It is signed by the President of the United States.

For the purpose of emphasis I desire to repeat the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut and also the statement contained in the citation. The Senator from Connecticut said:

But not even General Groves' most ardent admirers * * * would claim that General Groves made any contribution to the scientific or to the engineering aspects of this project.

President Truman:

His was the responsibility for * * * erecting huge plants, blending the scientific efforts of the United States and foreign countries.

Mr. President, I submit the two statements without any comment as to which is right, the President of the United States or the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity of reading the telegrams which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] received from certain utility companies with respect to Mr. Lilienthal's connection with the Wisconsin Public Service Commission simultaneously with his connection with the Commerce Clearing House of Chicago.

The Senator from Iowa has graciously placed in my hands a copy of his telegram and of the replies thereto. I do not know that they have been placed in the RECORD. I did not see them in the RECORD today. I should like to read two or three of the replies.

The telegram addressed by the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to various utility companies contains several questions. The first question is:

Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House of Chicago or anyone else to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities and Carriers Service," during February 1931, or thereafter through June 1933?

This is the answer of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.:

Referring your telegram March 1 asking for specific answers to five questions, such answers are as follows: Question 1, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has but 1 minute remaining of the time yielded to him.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram sent by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and certain answers thereto printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram and replies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1947.

Will you please wire me, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., as soon as possible, specific answers to the following questions:

1. Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House of Chicago or anyone else to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities and Carriers Service," during February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933?

2. If answer is "Yes," what was the name of the person soliciting you?

3. If you were solicited, did the solicitor refer to David Lilienthal in connection with his solicitation or indicate that David Lilienthal had any connection with Commerce Clearing House or with the service being sold?

4. Did you purchase the service, how much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?

5. Had you been a subscriber to, or a purchaser of, that service prior to February 1931?

It may be difficult for you to recall all details because of expiration of time, but I would appreciate your answers as fully as it is possible for you to make them at this time.

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator, Chairman, Senate Committee on Atomic Energy.

APPLETON, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building:

Question 1: No record or memory of solicitation or purchase. Question 5, no.

WISCONSIN-MICHIGAN POWER CO.
W. E. SCHUBERT.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Atomic Energy:

Regarding telegram March 1 relative public utilities and carrier service of Commerce Clearing House, be advised No. 1 answer this company was not a subscriber to the services mentioned during period February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933. No. 2 answer: Do not recall being solicited. No. 3 answer: See above. No. 4 answer: See above. No. 5 answer: Records do not indicate that this company was a subscriber or purchaser prior to February 1931.

G. V. RORK,
President, Northern States Power Co. of Wisconsin.

RACINE, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate Office Building:

Find no record of purchasing or being solicited to purchase commerce clearing houses utility and carrier service.

WISCONSIN GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

MADISON, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Mr. Walter Hodgkins, president Lake Superior District Power Co., has requested us to reply to your telegram of March 1. To the best of his recollection the company was not solicited for CCH public utilities and carriers service during 1931-33 and did not purchase service then or earlier.

ABERG, BELL, BLAKE & CONRAD.

MADISON, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate
Committee on Atomic Energy:

March 1. Answer question 1: Yes; on April 2, 1931, April 1, 1932, and April 3, 1933. Question 2: H. M. Wisland, 1931. Do not know name in 1932. Andt H. Creden in 1933. Question 3: Yes. Question 4: Yes; $800 in April 1931, $200 in April 1932, and $200 in April 1933. Question 5: No.

WISCONSIN POWER & LIGHT CO.
GROVER C. NEFF, *President.*

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding telegram March 1, following is our reply numbered in accordance with your questions: (1) Yes. (2) H. M. Wisland in 1930, 1931, and 1932. T. H. Creden in 1933 and 1934, T. L. Armstrong in 1935. (3) Yes. (4) We purchased the service paying $270 in April 1930, $70 in April 1931, $70 in April 1932, $50 in April 1933, $50 in April 1934, $60 in April 1935, and $60 in April 1936. (5) See answer to No. 4.

WISCONSIN PUBLIC SERVICE CORP.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate, Chairman, Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Referring your telegram March 1 asking for specific answers to five questions, such answers are as follows: Question 1: Yes; first solicitation March 1931. Question 2: H. M. Wisland in 1931. Invoice of 1932 lacks name of representative, but for 1933 name of T. H. Creden appears as representative. Question 3: Yes. Question 4: Yes; 1931, $660; 1932, $200; 1933, $150 with installment of $50 carried over to the following year. Question 5: No.

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO.

MADISON, WIS., *March 3, 1947.*

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate, Chairman, Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, Senate Office Building:

Reply to your day letter of March 1. Question 1 answer: Yes. Question 2 answer: Do not remember name. Question 3 answer: Do not remember. Question 4: Yes. Amount paid year 1931, $190; 1932, $50; 1933, $50. Question 5: No.

JOHN ST. JOHN,
President, Madison Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations as to my position as a Member of the Senate who was not on the committee which conducted the hearings into the Lilienthal case. I have been so closely confined by

duties in connection with other committees on which I am serving, namely, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it was not possible for me to attend the hearings.

It has always been a principle with me, when a subject was before a committee in which I had confidence, not to prejudge the case. I have always waited until the committee made its report. I propose to follow that policy while I am a Member of the Senate.

I should like to state further, to make my position clear, that ordinarily I feel that nominations made by the President of the United States should have the right-of-way unless we can find very definite evidence that a person nominated to a certain position is either incompetent, disloyal, or in some other way completely disqualified for the job. So I begin with a presumption in favor of Presidential appointments, in approaching the consideration of a question such as the one before us.

In this particular case I waited until the committee had reported. I consulted members of the committee with regard to the testimony. I read some of the testimony, and after doing so I made what might be called a preliminary statement, in which I stated that I proposed to support the report of the committee, in which I had confidence, and support the nominations of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates.

Since that time a great many questions have arisen which deserve most careful attention from all of us. In what I am now saying I by no means wish to depreciate the sincerity or ability of Senators who take the opposite side. However any Senator may vote on the pending question, I feel that if he votes from his conscience and his conviction, he is not open to criticism, because there are many serious debatable questions in this picture.

I feel that the motion to recommit the nominations to the committee is definitely the wrong way to go about the solution of this problem. I would much rather see the nominations brought to an immediate vote and disposed of. I say that because I have had occasion to talk with many persons who know something about this very difficult subject, with respect to which I am not well informed. I have talked with men in the scientific world who feel that it is deplorable to have this long-drawn-out discussion while Rome is burning, so to speak. I feel very strongly that prompt action would have been much better than delay. I feel very strongly that sending the nominations back to the committee for further investigation is wrong. If we cannot approve these nominations, let us refuse to confirm them, so that the President may know whether he must submit new nominations, rather than wait 2 or 3 weeks, or a couple of months to see whether these nominations will be approved. So I am definitely opposed to the motion to recommit. I should have been glad to support any kind of an agreement to vote immediately on the merits, and I should be glad to make more extended remarks on the merits of the case.

If the nominations are recommitted to the committee, that disposes of them, so far as I can see. By that process we virtually wipe the slate clean, because any such investigation as the FBI is asked to make would certainly require a much longer time than we can afford to wait. If we recommit these nominations it will be almost necessary for the President to withdraw them. If that is what is intended by the indirect method suggested, it is up to the majority of the Senate to make the decision. Personally, I shall vote against recommitment, but I wish to make it clear that I would be glad to vote on the merits at any time, and speak further from that standpoint.

I have had the opportunity to talk with scientific men who are acquainted with the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. They feel that a very excellent Commission has been appointed to deal with this question. The Commission will be under the control of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It will not be footloose. All the talk about giving away secrets to Russia is beside the point. If members of the Commission were disposed to give away those secrets they have already had 4 months in which to do it, and the secrets would have been given away. It is ridiculous to say that if we confirm these nominations the secrets will be given away. If there had been any such nefarious intention on the part of members of the Commission—and, of course, there is no such intention—they would have had opportunity to do so since they have been working on this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from my contacts with men in the scientific world—and I have great confidence in the scientific world, in spite of what I regret to say has been said against them—I am convinced that they feel that they have turned something loose in the world which needs a totally different treatment from that accorded any other weapons of destruction. They feel that it is important to confirm the nominations of a commission—whether or not it be this Commission—and they have confidence in the men who have been nominated. If the vote were today, I would vote for confirmation.

As to the businessmen whom I know who worked with Mr. Lilienthal on the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report which has been discussed, I have every confidence in Chester Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. He is not a public-ownership advocate. He is one of the ablest and hardest-headed businessmen of my acquaintance. I have known Mr. Owen D. Young since he was first elected vice president of the General Electric Co. some years ago. Mr. Owen D. Young has endorsed these nominees.

With respect to the nominees themselves, the only one whom I know personally is Mr. Lewis Strauss, who volunteered for service in the last war. He is a man of middle age. He volunteered as a lieutenant commander and came out as a rear admiral. He is one of the closest advisers that Secretary Forrestal has. I have known Mr. Strauss ever since World War I, when he was Secretary to Mr. Hoover. I have absolute faith in his ability and integrity. I have talked with him about the subject from all angles, and I am convinced from the approach which he has taken to the matter that we are on the right trail in confirming the nominations of this group of men. I regret very much the heat which has been brought into the discussion. I have the greatest respect for the opinions of my opponents in this matter. I do not think we should impute wrong motives to any Senators, irrespective of how they vote.

I shall vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, first, I want to state that I shall be very temperate and brief in my remarks.

Weeks ago I realized that the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. David E. Lilienthal would be a very important issue on the floor of the Senate. I realized then, as did other Senators, the great importance of the position to which he had been appointed and the great responsibilities of that office because it carried with it the security and safety of this Nation. At that time I determined that by reason of the importance of this matter, there should be no doubt in my mind as to the propriety of voting for his confirmation. I felt then, as I feel now, that I should have an abiding conviction that his confirmation was to the best interests of America.

I also determined at that time that his confirmation should be approached with an open mind, free from emotions, prejudices, or any extraneous matters, and that the final decision should be based upon the evidence produced at the hearing and upon the floor of the Senate.

During the weeks of our consideration of this matter, pressure groups have endeavored to influence me in my final determination. An army of fellow Pennsylvanians on the Federal pay rolls contacted me and my staff. Organized propaganda has flooded my office. Respected and distinguished citizens of my State have talked with me both for and against the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination.

In spite of all this, I have kept an open mind and I was determined that their action should not influence me in my final decision. Up until this very moment I have made no public statement as to my position. I have reviewed the testimony before the committee. I have listened to the able arguments that have been presented by my distinguished colleagues both for and against Mr. Lilienthal.

Frankly, after reviewing the testimony before the committee, I found no substantial testimony upon which to reject the President's appointment. But during the days of debate, which I have followed carefully, new evidence has been presented by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The matters which they have presented, and particularly the factual and authentic statements of those Senators, have raised serious doubts in my mind as to whether Mr. Lilienthal should be confirmed.

I doubt whether Mr. Lilienthal, if he is the type of man his supporters claim he is, would want his nomination confirmed with these questions still in doubt. It seems to me that for the good of the United States and of the world, these nominations should go back to the committee for further investigation, with the hope that all of us can in good conscience vote for confirmation.

My good friend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has talked about the necessity of speed in this matter, particularly from the military standpoint. Bear in mind that probably an atomic bomb will not even be used in the next war. There is no reason for scientists and businessmen to become alarmed with reference to this great weapon from a military standpoint.

Following World War I, from the layman's viewpoint it was thought that the next war would be fought with the use of chemicals; but not a single battle was fought with the use of gases. There is no reason to be in a hurry.

So far as the Senate confirming without question the nominations made by the President is concerned, I respect the office of President and admire the man occupying that position as much as does any other person in America, but I feel that the President of the United States expects the Senate to carry out its duties in conformity with the basic law as laid down by the founders of the Republic. The President of the United States vetoes many measures passed by the Congress, but Senators and Representatives do not criticize him, because he is fulfilling a part of his duties as President of the United States.

Mr. President, this is one of the most serious questions that have confronted the Senate during this session. Party lines are divided, and that is a fortunate and patriotic thing in connection with this important subject. But I appeal to my fellow Senators that we may not do an injustice to the people of the United States. Let us send these nominations back to the committee with the directive that further study be given to the questions which have been brought up on the floor, and then possibly, after they are cleared up, all of us can vote for confirmation. None of us desires to vote against an appointment made by the President. My long experience in the military service of this country has caused me to believe in this philosophy: Whenever there is any doubt, resolve it in favor of the United States. In 40 years experience that philosophy has never taken me down a dead-end road.

Again, Mr. President, with all the sincerity at my command, for the good of the Nation, for the good of the world, let us give this nomination further serious consideration and sound thought. It will not hurt the defense of America to continue its consideration even for weeks if that be necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in determining whether or not the Senate should confirm the nomination of an appointee of the Executive it must decide upon a personality. It is difficult to undertake a discussion of personalities without becoming emotional. In the past few weeks we have become emotional and perhaps intemperate at times in the discussion of personalities in connection with the appointments made by the President to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Another question which is always involved in the confirmation of or refusal to confirm a nomination is how to become informed about the personality involved. I personally do not know Mr. Lilienthal. I personally know only one of the six men who are involved in this discussion. If I do not know a person concerning whom I must render an opinion, I must rely upon the knowledge of those who know him or who have investigated him. In this instance I can do both. I can rely on the knowledge of mutual friends and associates of Mr. Lilienthal and myself, and I can rely on the investigation and study which has been made by the Senate committee, whose responsibility it was to investigate the character and fitness of the appointees.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has just said; namely, that when in doubt, we must always decide a matter in favor of the United States. At the same time, as one who has held an executive office and has had the responsibility of making appointments, as has had my friend from Pennsylvania, I have always felt that the burden of proof was on the body which had the responsibility of confirming the nominee, to decide whether the Executive's choice was or was not a fit one for the position for which the person was chosen. In other words, I believe that the Executive should be entitled to select the men he prefers, those whom he wants to serve in the administrative positions which he must fill, and with whom he must associate, and to have his appointees confirmed, unless there are substantial reasons for not approving his selections.

Another thing we must remember in considering these nominations, Mr. President, is that a senatorial committee has considered this matter most carefully. It spent approximately 6 weeks in investigating and hearing evidence concerning these six men. That committee is composed of honorable Members of this body, all of whom take their positions and their responsibilities most seriously. That committee has reached its decision, and by a strong majority it has reported to the Senate that these men are qualified to hold the positions for which they have been nominated, and for which we must either confirm or reject them. I think this is another burden of proof which we who are Members of the Senate, but not of the committee, must overcome before we decide to disregard the President's selections. In other words, I feel that the President should have his choice in every instance if it is possible for him to have it; and in the second place I believe that, if we possibly can do so, we should support the committee which has investigated this matter, if we ourselves have no personal knowledge.

In this instance we are called upon to confirm the nominations of men who will be asked to undertake what is a new responsibility in the Government of our country, and to administer a new and very tremendous source of power. It is a completely new undertaking. As I see it, in selecting a chairman, particularly of a commission of this character, it should be our desire to have selected a man who has certainly ability to do the job, who has initiative, who has imagination, who has knowledge of the world's resources in respect to the subject with which he will be concerned, and who has knowledge of science, of the laboratories and universities of the country, and of its scientific men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in this instance Mr. Lilienthal has shown, through his administration of the TVA, that he has those qualities. He has administrative ability, as is shown by the magnitude of the TVA undertaking. He has administered that undertaking with imagination and initiative. It has grown. As one who was somewhat skeptical of the TVA project at the start, I have become convinced that it has benefited a very large section of the country; and in benefiting that section, it has likewise benefited the entire Nation. That has been due in great degree to the manner in which the TVA power project has been administered.

In the instance before us we have another new undertaking, with vast potentialities as a source of power, and in its administration many of the same qualities are required as in the case of the TVA. So, with this thought in mind, I believe Mr. Lilienthal is entirely qualified for the position.

The man who is to occupy that position must also be a man of integrity and character and of unquestioned patriotism. No one has brought forward any real evidence to show that this nominee is not a man who loves his country and is loyal to it. Anyone who stands out prominently and who is about to undertake a great responsibility is subject to criticism. Whether this man is "soft" to Communists, I have no idea; but I rely upon the views of the members of the committee who have reported the nomination and have investigated all the

stories concerning his character and activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there is just one other point which I should like to make concerning this nominee. I said we had to rely on the committee and I said we could rely on mutual friends. I happen to have great admiration and friendship for Dr. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Conant, of Harvard; and Dr. Bush, of the foundation here in Washington. All those men have taken the trouble, not to write to me, not to telephone to me, but to come to see me personally to endorse Mr. Lilienthal. Those three men were among the ones who started this whole atomic-energy program. They have worked with Mr. Lilienthal, they have seen him as an administrator, they have seen him as a man; and all of them endorse him most heartily.

More recently I have had the very pleasant opportunity of talking with Dr. DuBridge, of California Tech. He is another scientist who is a member of this group, and he also endorses Mr. Lilienthal most enthusiastically.

So, Mr. President, from mutual friends and from the committee I believe we have evidence which permits us and encourages us to vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal and the nominations of the other appointees. For these reasons I shall vote against recommitting the nominations. The committee heard the matter for 6 weeks. No Member of the Senate has suggested that new evidence could be produced in regard to the nominees. I believe that the recommittal of the nominations would be simply a delay and a waste of time, and I hope the motion to recommit will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WHERRY. Thirty minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I should prefer not to do so, since our time is limited.

Mr. BYRD. Very well; I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to speak to the question of confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a position of responsibility and power which has been described by many outstanding people in the United States, including the President of the United States, as second in importance only to the office of the President of the United States.

Before I begin my statement regarding Mr. Lilienthal and the position I take in voting on his nomination, I should like to say that I not only listened attentively to the speech made on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, March 28, by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], but I also had the privilege of listening to the analysis of Mr. Lilienthal by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who served as a member of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I concur most heartily in the dispassionate analyses made by these two great Americans of Mr. Lilienthal and his fitness to serve as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I wish it were possible for every American to read carefully those two speeches expounding the philosophy which would preserve our American system of free men, with the Government serving only as the agent of the people and not as their master.

Mr. Lilienthal avowedly believes in Government ownership of certain important industries, even if it is necessary to have the Government compete with private industry. He apparently approves of the use of funds received by the Government through taxation being appropriated to support, in competition with private industry, a Government-owned industry which seemingly has the power to cover up its mistakes and losses so that the stockholder, the American taxpayer, does not understand the processes and objectives of the venture and apparently lacks the power to call for the same type of accounting report to the public as is demanded of any private industry by its stockholders.

Most of my colleagues will recall that during the hearings conducted by the Special Committee on Atomic Energy of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Congress was advised of the tremendous industrial potential represented by the successful harnessing of the power of the atom. Predictions were made by men of unquestioned ability to the effect that the use of atomic energy ultimately may supplant such basic industries as coal, hydroelectric power, petroleum, and other sources of power which provide motivation to industry the world over.

If atomic energy is developed to a point that even approaches these predictions—and I believe that it will be—then it will become an industry in itself which will be the backbone of the economy of this Nation. The Atomic Energy Commission will be charged with the responsibility of formulating the basic policies on which will rest the commercial and industrial utilization of atomic energy. This Commission, if directed by men who have collectivist ideas, and men who do not believe in the free-enterprise system, may constitute the shortest route to socialism that has yet been offered to this Nation.

It is my firm conviction that the Congress of the United States made a mistake in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and that the mistake should be corrected before additional mistakes are made because of this act.

I think it was a fundamental mistake to disqualify a military man for service on the Atomic Energy Commission. Why should a fine American, who served his Nation in uniform, be precluded from serving in the top capacity on that Commission because of the fact that he has been a military man?

There is no man in this country for whom I have a higher regard, and for whose Americanism, intelligence, and courage I have greater respect, than for Gen. George C. Marshall. Thank God the President of the United States did not feel we could not utilize General Marshall's wonderful services as Secretary of State because he has been a military man throughout his life. If the reasons we followed for excluding military men on the Atomic Energy Commission were sound, then the President of the United States never should have appointed General Marshall Secretary of State.

There is no office in our Nation, outside of the Presidency itself, in which a man is called upon to be more diplomatic and more considerate of the views of the civilian citizens of the United States than in the office of Secretary of State, where he is compelled to handle delicate issues of international relationship which lead either to war or peace. Let us think this over and not pass it by carelessly, and if we decide we made a mistake in the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, then let us take prompt action to amend it.

The Congress has made many mistakes before, and will make many in the future. The important thing is that when we have made a mistake we should be willing to recognize it and take steps to correct it without delay.

I am not deeply concerned over the argument that a great emergency exists and we must confirm Mr. Lilienthal and the other appointees without delay, and regardless of our difference of opinion as to their qualifications. To me the decision as to who is to head the great Atomic Energy Commission is one of the most important questions that has come before this or any other Congress. We talk about atomic energy being used for peace. We talk about having only civilians on this great Commission because we are in peace. I ask, where is the peace?

The very steps the President of the United States proposed in his message on March 12, 1947, could easily lead to war. We are told the appointments of Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of the Atomic Energy Commission are for a period of less than 2 years now, and are peacetime appointments. I do not know whether or not they are peacetime appointments. I think there is about as much war in the air as there is peace in the air, and for that reason I would conserve and utilize the knowledge and experience of every important man who contributed to the development of the atomic bomb under the so-called Manhattan Project.

I cannot conceive of any great business institution which, confronted with a serious problem, and having available dozens of men who had worked on it incessantly and successfully day and night, would cast aside those great administrators merely because they wore uniforms.

The institution would take the uniforms off, put those men in civilian clothes, and utilize them and their great experience.

I would ask General Groves, General Farrell, Colonel Nichols, and others, who had great experience and, therefore, have great knowledge of this important development of nuclear energy and the atomic bomb, to step into the situation in high-up capacities, so as not to lose the value of what they have to offer us. If time really is of the essence of everything, and that is what we hear nowadays—time—then certainly time will be conserved by utilizing experience and knowledge already in existence.

Those who favor Mr. Lilienthal and the other appointees say that General Groves is the liaison officer of the military to cooperate with the Commission. Let us not be childish in our understanding of such a situation. My experience in life has taught me that you cannot put the president of a company into the job of office boy and expect him to function in any other way than as an office boy, if, perchance, he is willing to carry on that way.

I merely wish to say, without going into minute detail, that the War Department itself issued a citation praising highly what General Groves had accomplished for this country. Then all of a sudden someone drew a bill which was put through the Senate. I was here when it was passed, and there were eight Senators sitting in the Chamber at the time. Anyone who cares to look up the record will find that there were just eight Senators present. I can prove that. The bill was rushed through; General Groves, and the other able men who had rendered distinguished service to this country were pushed aside. They are the men who put us where we are today; if we do not now have to worry too much about Russia, it is because of their accomplishments.

I have no right to question the President of the United States to name whomever he will to this commission or any other important governmental position. But I have a right and a very sacred duty to exercise the power and duties conferred upon Senators of the United States by the Constitution of the United States under the advice and consent section. I see that duty as not confined to asking whether a man is a good citizen, or has a good reputation among his friends, but it goes to the very essence of the thing—is the man the right man to head an important project or Government department, the conduct of which involves not only the welfare and happiness of the American people, but their safety and lives?

I have been overpropagandized in connection with Mr. Lilienthal in a way that I have never experienced in my private life before I came into the Senate, nor since I have been a member of this important body of the people's representatives. The propaganda became so strong and came to me from such prominent sources that I decided to utilize some of my time to determine why men, who believed as I believe, in our form of government and the private competitive enterprise system, should be willing to go on record as urging, without any reservations, the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal.

I spent a great deal of time on this. I selected from the letters 12 endorsements of Mr. Lilienthal, with the determination of talking directly with the 12 men who sent these endorsements to me. I asked them the following questions:

First. How long and how well have you known Mr. Lilienthal?

The answers from nine were that they had never met him. The other three admitted they had met him incidentally at a banquet or at some meeting where he made a speech. They were introduced to him and shook hands with him, but admitted that that was the extent of their acquaintance with him.

Second. I asked these 12 men what they knew about his philosophy of Government or his direction of the affairs of the TVA.

The answer of 10 out of the 12 was that they had heard he believed in Government ownership, but only in industries where the people could not, through private enterprise, serve themselves as well as or better than the Government. Four of the 12 said they understood he had done an outstanding administrative job as Chairman of the TVA. When questioned as to how the TVA would have stood the test applied to private corporations and industry, if faced with the necessity of getting the required funds from the stockholders and based on standard accounting practices and reports to the stockholders, each of them said they had not gone far enough into the subject to answer that question. The balance of the group knew nothing more than what they had read in the newspapers.

Third. I asked each of the group if he felt that with the great centralized bureaucratic power that had been accumulated by our Government, we had any sound reason to believe that our Government would not encroach, step by step, into the fields of private industry and enterprise, and thereby destroy our great American business system which, in my opinion, cannot resist Government competition conducted with the citizens' money procured through taxation.

Senators, it is unfortunate that so few people now realize what some day will be generally realized, that if the free enterprise system, under which private individuals have the right to proceed to use their abilities for a fair reward, is destroyed then this Nation will become mongrelized as other nations of the world have become mongrelized. Our form of government cannot survive except on the foundation of which I am speaking.

Practically all of these gentlemen admitted that this was a difficult question to answer with certainty but that there is a grave danger whenever Government trespasses on the field of private enterprise, and unless the American people, as a whole, and their representatives, cloaked with power, completely believe in the private-enterprise system versus Government ownership and control, we are apt to do in this country just what they have done throughout the world—drift farther and farther into a system which destroys individual rights and opportunities and makes Government the master rather than the agent of the people.

We all agreed that Great Britain has proceeded, step by step, into nationalization and Government ownership of important industries and would move faster if she knew how to do it. We agreed, further, her Government officials have announced with each forward step into nationalization that it is not their intention to take over private industry while yet she is proceeding to do it.

Fourth. My next question to these 12 gentlemen was what activated them to write me unqualified endorsements of Mr. Lilienthal. Each of the 12 admitted he never would have written, except for the fact that he had been urged to do so by one or two very prominent men, which demonstrates clearly to me that all of this propaganda was effectively stimulated by a very few men who are deeply interested in the appointees.

Fifth. Finally, I asked them whether they thought it fair, with their limited knowledge of Mr. Lilienthal, to send me an endorsement without reservations, coupled with a request for confirmation.

Nine of the twelve answered no, and seven of the twelve said they regretted they did it and asked that I disregard their request.

Mr. President, is this the kind of propaganda on which you feel we should act in trying to serve honorably and intelligently the best interests of our constituents throughout the United States? My answer is, certainly not. It is this type of propaganda which makes it difficult for the people's representatives to function with any degree of knowledge as to what their constituents really want and what is best for them. I admit I do not know how to stop this propaganda, but I am determined to use what little time I have left from my work to continue to investigate letters which come from sources which I would otherwise believe to be opposed to government ownership and socialism.

There is not a man in this Senate Chamber who does not know that it is a thousand times as easy to get endorsements for a man appointed to this high position by the President of the United States, as it is to secure open statements opposing such a man who not only has been appointed but has been functioning in the office for several months.

Experience has taught me that endorsements and letters of recommendation are most dangerous as a basis for conclusion. The true facts regarding a man are the only things that count, because endorsements and recommendations are often tinctured with side issues, such as friendship, emotionalism, politics, personal interest, and often with the hope of reward or special cooperation or favoritism. I have had much experience along that line. The only endorsement I want is that of a qualified person who knows a man and says he is honest. I will then do the rest of the judging myself. People are not as careful in endorsing and recommending others as they should be in justice to those who may rely upon them.

A very distinguished and outstanding scientist in the United States, who made a considerable contribution to the development of nuclear energy, told me he definitely felt for a number of years that Mr. Lilienthal was tinctured with pink of a hue that approached the red. He had not liked his philosophies and ideologies, although he never questioned his sincerity. This great scientist went on to say that while he thought Mr. Lilienthal had been too pink, he changed his mind after hearing Mr. Lilienthal's statement to Senator MCKELLAR as to what he, Lilienthal, believes regarding the dignity of the individual versus Government domination. This statement is found on pages 130 through 132 of the hearings before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This scientist said he felt Mr. Lilienthal has seen the error of his ways and from his statement during the hearings, he now believes Mr. Lilienthal is a fine American and can be trusted.

I told this gentleman that my experience in life had taught me that it requires more than one good statement to make a great American, just as it requires more than one confession to make a good Christian. This gentleman replied, "That may be so and you may be right, but I have been convinced by the hearings." I then reminded him that the Bible gives some pretty good advice, if the human family would follow it, in the quotation, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and called his attention to the fact that the Bible does not say "by their words ye shall know them."

Every Senator here is charged with the responsibility which came with his oath of office when he took his seat, and he should keep faith with his conscience and his obligations to the people of the United States, regardless of any political consequences.

The Constitution of the United States is only as good as the morals of the people make it, and only so long as the American people wisely choose representatives who keep faith with that great document in the meaning of its words and the spirit behind those words, will it continue to be the greatest document that has come from the mind of man under the guidance of God.

Just a few months before Chief Justice of the United States Harlan F. Stone was called into the Great Beyond, I invited him to be my guest of honor at a luncheon attended by 24 Senators.

The Chief Justice made a very fine American speech in which he gave his views on the duties of Senators under the Constitution and the things he felt it was necessary for them to preserve if we were to have any hope of getting this Nation back on its true course. The Chief Justice stated that the power of advice and consent in connection with appointments, as given to the Senators under the Constitution, is one of the greatest protective powers of the people's rights. Chief Justice Stone stated there was a misconception in the minds of some as to the use of this power and the obligations which rested upon the shoulders of each Senator each time an appointment came before them for confirmation or rejection.

I am sure the 24 Senators who were present will recall very clearly that he stated, without any disrespect to any President of the United States, that he believed the duty imposed upon the Senate by the advice and consent section must be exercised in such a way as to demonstrate that the Senators, in addition to recognizing the value of the appointment by the President, realized that they had a responsibility in the confirmation.

He stated that Senators should not vote at random on these important appointments; that Senators should use every source available to them to ascertain the true facts regarding the loyalty, honesty, intelligence, and experience of the appointees. He went on to say it is not enough that he is of good moral character and that he stands well with his neighbors, but Senators should inquire as to his qualifications to serve in the office to which he has been appointed, and above all else, the Chief Justice said in connection with appointments to the Federal bench, the Senate, in his opinion, should ascertain whether each appointee is truly loyal to the Constitution of the United States and believes in our American system of Government. He emphasized, time and again, the importance of the quality of loyalty and belief in our way of life.

When the Chief Justice finished talking about the Federal bench, he remarked that his statements applied with equal force to all other important appointments made by the President. I remember very vividly his asking the question: "How can we hope to preserve this great American system unless we choose the best we have for the highest and most important positions?" He further asked this question: "Why do you assume that our founding forefathers gave this great and important right to the representatives of the people in the Senate unless they expected it to be exercised by them independently of anyone in either of the other branches of the Government?" He stated that often a President made appointments because of political pressure—I think we all realize that—and many times the President might be pleased if the Senate rejected the appointee. I do not intend to imply that there is anything of this sort in the present appointment, but I do wish to differ with those who think that when the President of the United States appoints a man, who we may feel is unqualified for the position, it is nevertheless our duty to confirm him. I do not agree with those who take such a position.

The late Chief Justice of the United States, who has gone to his well-earned reward in the Great Beyond, left the impression with the 24 Senators that the power to confirm, if properly and intelligently exercised, is the counterpart of the power to appoint and together they establish the appointee in office for service, if the confirmation is favorable.

The Chief Justice of the United States clearly left the impression that an appointment was no good, unless the appointee was confirmed, and while the power of confirmation is distributed among 96 Senators, nevertheless the power to confirm was wisely devised by the makers of the Constitution and, in his opinion, there is no question but that they expected that power to be exercised courageously and intelligently to protect the people's interest against poor appointments.

I am sure that the Senators who were present will remember the thought left with them by the Chief Justice—that the power of advising and consenting had not been too wisely exercised by the Senate for a number of years past.

The Chief Justice's admonition has been in my mind since it was given and will remain there for use so long as I serve as a representative of the people, and so long as I am able to take any interest in good government.

I know that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was present on that occasion, that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was present, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] was present, and I know that the able chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was present. I read this statement to him, and he said it was exactly what the late Chief Justice had said. Those Senators are now in the Senate Chamber, and if the statement is not true I am sure they will dispute it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Before the Senator proceeds to another point I should like to place in the RECORD the fact that I was present at the meeting to which the Senator referred, and I, too, shall always remember the remarks made by the late Chief Justice Stone before the group of Senators. His remarks were very impressive, and the Senator has related them as I heard them at the time. I think they should be remembered by all who vote on the question of confirmation of nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to inform the Senator from New Jersey that he has approximately 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should also like to corroborate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey with respect to the remarks made by the late Chief Justice Stone.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to yield 5 minutes of my time if the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] can arrange to have it done, because I have taken some of the time of the able Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan desires to yield 5 minutes of his time to the Senator from New Jersey. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. It is, Mr. President.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I do not want to encroach on the time of the Senator. Does he care to yield for a question?

Mr. HAWKES. I have only 5 minutes in which to complete my statement, and I should like to finish. Otherwise I

should be very happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I am bearing in mind the scriptural injunction to cultivate the things whereby one may edify one another, and I think I can edify the Senator in connection with his talk.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not sure that I can edify the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That cannot be done without the consent of the Senator from Nebraska, and his announcement to that effect.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator, and I shall proceed on the basis that no Senator who was present at the dinner will dispute anything I have said.

Mr. President, I do not think Mr. Lilienthal is an indispensable man. I am not willing longer to approve things because of stated emergencies. This country has been going long and fast on the wrong road because of the immature judgments and actions of the people's representatives—because we are assured things must be done without delay and many times without proper consideration because of an emergency.

In connection with this emergency system of pressuring legislation into existence, and which causes us to do things today which we regret tomorrow, I remember a story told a few years ago by Dr. Hopkins, of Dartmouth, which is very meaningful. He told of two men on motorcycles who had their leather jackets buttoned, their mufflers tied around their necks, their leather caps tied under their chins, and their goggles fastened on. Each rider was leaning forward into the wind, and a great cloud of dust trailed each motorcycle. Over the roar of the motors, one man called to the other, "Jim, I think we are on the wrong road." Jim replied, "What the hell do we care, we're making good time, aren't we?"

In summing up, I would like to say that I would far rather be a little late in starting on the right road than be a little early in starting on the wrong road.

With no malice toward Mr. Lilienthal or any of his associates, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that as an American who believes America cannot be a great leader in world affairs toward the coveted goal of peace unless she is preserved strong, virile, and forceful, and with great hope and considerable faith in the United Nations to establish and maintain peace long enough so the world may understand its value and then seek it above all else on earth, I find myself in the position where I shall have to hew to those things which I believe are vital to the preservation of the American system of freemen; namely, true individual freedom and liberty of the individual to function in all fields for his own advancement and service to others, rather than the elevation of Government to a place where it was never intended to serve under our system. Government ownership and competition with private citizens were never contemplated under the Constitution, and had we adopted them earlier, we never would have rendered to freemen throughout the world the service we have rendered. To me, Government ownership is a straight road to socialism, and socialism is a straight road to the destruction of the God-given rights and liberties of men.

There is a desire on the part of a number of Senators to have Mr. Lilienthal's record investigated promptly and thoroughly by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and have a report made to the Senate for its guidance.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has made a motion with which I am heartily in accord. I agree with him that the names of the appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager should be returned to the committee with the request that their records be promptly and thoroughly investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I cannot help feeling that the report of the committee favoring the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal is lacking in completeness because of the inability of the committee to tell us whether Mr. Herbert Marks, who has been designated by Mr. Lilienthal as General Counsel of the Commission, was refused a commission in the Navy on the ground of physical disability or whether he was disqualified for a more serious reason. Certainly the Navy records should be positively available in the investigation of a man who will have much to do with the future welfare and destiny of the American people.

I am strongly in favor of the purpose of the motion, even though it may delay the consideration of the subject and confirmation a short time. If I were Mr. Lilienthal, I would not only welcome but demand such an investigation, if I believed my record were perfectly clear. I would demand it because I should not wish to undertake such responsible work under a cloud which has divided not only public opinion but the opinon of the Senate which is asked to confirm him. If his record is clear and clean on loyalty to our American way of life, I predict he would receive a very substantial majority, whereas if a vote is taken now, with the great difference of opinion in the minds of the Senators and the people of the United States, he is likely to find a formidable opposition, if not enough votes to defeat his confirmation.

I shall vote for the motion made by the junior Senator from Ohio, and I urge its adoption. If it is not agreed to, I shall find myself compelled to vote "no" on Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the debate on this very important group of nominations has almost come to a close. However, I wish to stress several points which I believe should be cleared up in the minds of Members of the Senate, and for the record.

The other day a very able address was delivered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for whom I have the highest regard. He is one of the most able Members of the Senate. He quite correctly pointed out that this should be a Government of laws and not of men. I do not believe there are many of us, if any, who would disagree with that contention. He then proceeded to point out that in some of the writings of Mr. Lilienthal there appears to be a connotation that Mr. Lilienthal believes in a government of men and not of laws. I believe that the wrong connotation has been placed upon what Mr. Lilienthal had in mind. I submit in all fairness that a different interpretation could be placed upon his remarks and upon his writings. Those of us who have observed or had anything to do with municipal government or State government recognize the fact that many times over the years so-called reform movements have come into being.

In the early days of our Republic most of our municipalities had a strong mayor-council type of government under the old ward system. Then, seeking to get better government, the people set up the commission form of government. When they found that there were some imperfections in it they went on to the city-manager type of government. All those things entailed the changing of laws or ordinances, and the changing of municipal charters.

What I think Mr. Lilienthal really had in mind was that no matter what form the government takes, no matter what type of laws are established in order to create a government, be it municipal, State, or National, in the final analysis any of those forms of government will work if the right men are operating the government, and any of them will break down if the wrong type of men are operating the government.

There is no doubt that in many municipalities the old-fashioned ward system gave good government to the people; and yet if there was misrule it led to boss government and machine power in politics. The same thing can be said of the mayor-council and the commission types of government. I submit that if the wrong persons get control, and if they are determined to set up a corrupt type of political machine, even the city-manager form of government will not protect the people from mismanagement by men. So I think it was in that sense that Mr. Lilienthal was speaking when he stated that in the final analysis this was a government of men and not of laws—not that he did not recognize that the very security of the people rests upon limiting the powers of those who wield influence and power in the government, but rather that, within the limitations which we as a free people set forth, if we are to have efficient and capable government, if we are to have a government that can function in the atomic age in which we now live, it must have some of the capacity and some of the leeway which business has had in meeting the great problems that have confronted business during the past few decades, and which has brought this Nation's economy to the highest state of development that any nation has ever attained at any time in all history. So much for the point that was made in that connection.

The other day on the floor of the Senate the able Senator from Maine [Mr.

BREWSTER] made reference to the fact that there had recently been published in some column an article or item which seemed to indicate that the appointees of the President of the United States to the Atomic Energy Commission had lost sight of the importance of the military development of the weapon. If that were true, I would agree that Members of this body might have great concern as to whether they should confirm the Presidential nominations; but I submit that no such thing has taken place. I refer to the report to the Congress contained in the letter from the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Let me read several paragraphs from that report. I read from page 6:

Under this concept of organization, the Division of Military Application assumes a far more important position in relation to the entire program of the Commission than would be the case if it were merely a line-operating division concerned with direct supervision of such portions of the Commission's operations as might be identified as primarily relating to military applications. The Division of Military Application will be concerned with the broad and complicated interrelationships between military planning and the research, development, and production programs of the Commission.

In view of the great responsibilities placed upon the Commission by the act, that its operation shall be conducted always with the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security, the Commission has given most careful consideration to the essential qualifications for the officer who shall be the Director of the Division of Military Application. The Commission has discussed its views of the qualifications for such officer with the Secretaries of War and the Navy and have asked them to submit the names of the best qualified officers in their respective services. The Commission has under consideration a small group of exceptionally qualified officers who have been so recommended and expects to make the appointment in the near future.

Does that indicate that the Atomic Energy Commission as now constituted and as it has been functioning since October and November of last year, and since December 31, has been operating de facto with all the powers, responsibilities, and secrets formerly in the hands of the Manhattan district? It certainly does not indicate that they have lost sight of the importance of the military applications.

Let me read from page 8 of the same letter of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Congress of the United States:

The production operations which Manhattan district had under way at the time of the transfer are being continued. Much of the information relating to the production of fissionable materials and atomic weapons vitally concerns the common defense and security. This information received the highest security classification by Manhattan district, and that classification has been continued by the Commission.

I continue the quotation:

The primary application of atomic energy is today in the production of weapons. These weapons require fissionable material of considerable purity, and this requirement was the main reason for the construction of the installations at Oak Ridge and Hanford. Fissionable material also is necessary for the development of many of the peacetime applications of atomic energy. In addition, the basic raw material—uranium—is the same either for weapon production or for the peacetime applications. There is accordingly a very deep and basic relation between weapons and the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The long-range security of the Nation may very well depend closely upon the wise and speedy development of the applications of atomic energy. Research and development work on improved atomic weapons is in progress at installations now operated by the Commission.

Does that indicate that the Commission has lost sight of its responsibilities in the field of atomic power and atomic weapons? It most certainly does not.

I merely wish to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I am opposed to the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit these nominations to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because I believe the motion is tantamount to the rejection of the nominations. Any Senator voting for the motion should vote with his eyes open to the fact that it is a motion to reject these Presidential nominees. I further believe that if that unfortunate situation should occur, having already lost about 18 or 19 months in this particular field of atomic power when other nations are endeavoring to close the gap between where we are now and where they hope to be, we might be striking a fatal blow at the defenses of the United States of America. For that reason, Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to recommit.

Finally, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that for a period of approximately 6 weeks the committee held almost daily sessions. It had the opportunity of listening to witnesses, examining and cross-examining them, and judging their qualifications, their abilities, and their general character as witnesses. After listening to the testimony and to other factual information which was received in executive session, the committee, consisting of five Republicans and four Democrats, by a vote of 8 to 1, recommended to the Senate that the Senate confirm these nominations and not repudiate the committee's action by recommitting the nominations to the committee.

For that reason also I urge that the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] be defeated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not responsible for Mr. Lilienthal's nomination. I know of no one in the United States Senate who is responsible for it.

There are not sufficient words in the dictionary to describe destruction by atomic bombs. It is one thing of which people all over the world are frightened. It is one thing that our people do not understand. It is possibly the greatest weapon of destruction the world has ever known.

I am surprised at the stubbornness of many sincere, conscientious people, who would force upon the American people as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a man concerning whom the people of this Nation are so divided. In the name of Heaven why, for possibly the most important position in the world, must a man be appointed, out of 140,000,000 persons, upon whom sincere, conscientious people cannot agree? This man certainly is not indispensable. If he is, that is possibly one big reason why he should not be appointed to this position. I shall not argue the merits and demerits of the matter. I do not believe such an argument belongs on the floor of the Senate. The fact remains that if there was ever a position requiring that the man appointed to it should have the utmost confidence of all the people, upon whom all could agree 100 percent, it is this position. I cannot understand the stubbornness of those who would continue to push this gentleman into the position to which he has been nominated. I see nothing wrong with recommitting his nomination and the nominations of the other appointees. Frankly, I think the President should withdraw his name. If I were in his position, I would ask that my name be withdrawn, because we are considering one of the most important positions in this Nation and in the world, and it is admitted to be such by Mr. Lilienthal himself.

In the name of harmony and union and in the name of our people and the best interests of our Nation and of the world, let the President appoint to the chairmanship of the Commission someone upon whom all of us can agree. Let us spend no more time talking either for or against Mr. Lilienthal. So far as I know, he is a fine gentleman and he is qualified for the position. But I, for one, will not vote for a man for that position when the American people are so divided as they are regarding him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, no investigation or report has been requested of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of Mr. Lilienthal or any of those who have been nominated to be his associates on the Commission. No such report has been requested by either the President of the United States or the Attorney General or the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Joint Committee.

Since the atomic bomb is admittedly the only effective national security weapon in the world today, the most effective safeguards should be provided.

On page 14 of the published Public Law 585, second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, of the Atomic Energy Act, under section 10, subsection 5B, an FBI investigation and clearance is required for all employees, licensees, and prospective contractors working for or operating under the Commission.

The act provides as follows:

(B) (i) No arrangement shall be made under section 3, no contract shall be made or continued in effect under section 4 (e) or 7, unless the person with whom such arrangement is made, the contractor or prospective contractor, or the prospective licensee agrees in writing not to permit any individual to have access to restricted data until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual, and the Commission shall have determined that permitting such person to have access to restricted data will not endanger the common defense or security.

(ii) Except as authorized by the Commission in case of emergency, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

Mr. President, we find, then, that the law itself requires that all personnel, of whatever connection with the Commission, be investigated and cleared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That is not my idea; it is required by a measure approved by this body and also by the House of Representatives, and finally enacted into law. It provides specifically that such persons shall not be "employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual."

We also find upon inquiry that it is the established custom to have such investigation and clearance of all candidates for Federal judgeships, United States attorneys, and United States marshals. It would be logical to assume then that any person who might be a candidate for such a high office as the one we are now considering would naturally, through established custom, be investigated—doubly so if, in addition, it were required by law that all employees who would be under him must be cleared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. While such a clearance is not required either by law or custom for the Federal judgeships or United States attorney or United States marshal offices, they themselves are, by custom, so investigated.

It comes then as a considerable surprise to find that no Federal Bureau of Investigation report has ever been ordered, or made, in the case of any of the candidates for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission, including Mr. Lilienthal. Since this Commission could become the most powerful body in the world, within a matter of months or years, such investigation and clearance would seem to be doubly important.

I have just had from the Attorney General of the United States a report that no such investigation and report was ever requested either by the Attorney General or the Attorney General's office or by the President of the United States. It follows, then, that the names of the candidates for these high offices are merely names to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Bureau has no adequate specific information as to any of them for the simple reason that they have never been requested to obtain it, and that they cannot themselves initiate such an investigation.

The letter from the President to the chairman of the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Joint Committee, stating that there was nothing derogatory regarding Mr. Lilienthal in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be, and no doubt is, entirely in line with the facts, but it is also misleading, in that the President did not say that no investigation of this man was requested by him, or had ever, in fact, been requested by anyone with the authority to order such an investigation.

I regret that on some occasions it has been indicated that the objection made to Mr. Lilienthal is on grounds of race, Federal patronage, or politics. None of these have any weight with me, and I do not believe they have weight with a large majority of the men on this floor.

I am supporting the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate because I believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be requested to make the same investigation and report on the men nominated by the President and submitted to this body for confirmation as members of the Atomic Energy Commission, as is by law required for their employees.

Mr. President, inasmuch as it is a long-established custom for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate any man who is nominated to be a Federal judge, a United States attorney, or a United States marshal before action is taken on the question of confirming his nomination, I firmly believe that anyone who is named to be head of what is potentially the most important commission on earth should not be confirmed for that position without the same assurance of his loyalty and integrity from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. However, that has not been done. Therefore, I shall vote for the motion of my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit the nominations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Let me say that I think one of the most unusual aspects of the current debate has not been touched upon. It is that although the debate has centered almost entirely around the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, yet there are, after all, four other members of the Commission to be considered. They, as well as the General Manager, are to serve in these most important positions.

I think it is not to be assumed, and in fact it is not true, that the four other members of the Commission, in addition to the General Manager, are either nitwits or fools or corrupt or accused of corruption or incompetent or accused of incompetency. Nevertheless, if the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is adopted, the Senate will in effect be sweeping back into oblivion not only Mr. Lilienthal but the other four distinguished and outstanding citizens of this country who have been nominated to serve on the Commission, as well as the General Manager, who bears the highest of recommendations and who apparently has the highest of qualifications.

Mr. President, I think we have completely overlooked that fact in the debate, and are likely to completely fail to consider it in connection with the action we take on this motion. In all the hysteria and fog and confusion of innuendo and unsubstantiated and unsupported charges that have run riot throughout this debate, we have forgotten that there are four other capable and prominent Americans in this picture, men who will be swept by the tide of emotion and the tide of hysteria and the tide of innuendo to what will perhaps be the last requiem and the burial services.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is within the dignity of the Senate to perform such a thoughtless act. If the Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world, then it must live up to that reputation and be a deliberative body in the truest sense of the word, and must consider the facts and situations and qualifications of all the nominees who are covered by the motion to recommit.

I think we fail to give proper consideration to the division of authority and the province of the branches of this Government. Wisely did the founders set up a three-branch Government—a Government with an executive, a judicial, and a legislative branch. Clearly in the Constitution and in the laws which have been written under it, in applicable cases the power and the duty and the responsibility for the selection and the appointment of officials to execute the laws have been lodged in the President of the United States.

The Senate is not in the position of a man who goes into a store to buy a suit of clothes and is shown rack after rack of clothes from which he can pick and choose, compare the colors, and try on a suit. We, perhaps, may be more in the position of a man who is being presented a suit of clothes by somebody else whose obligation it is to procure it. We have no province, no opportunity, if you please, to canvass the people of the United States, to evaluate them through some kind of a psychological test, or mental test, or any other kind of a test, and eventually pick the one who rises to the top as the result of the tests and say, "This is the man the President shall appoint." Mr. President, usurpation of power by one branch over another has caused difficulty throughout all history when men were struggling upward to find a satisfactory, workable system of government.

If the Senate operates upon the theory that it has the right and the responsibility and the duty to dictate to the President in the province and the field that is particularly and peculiarly reserved to him, then how can we criticize the President—any President—who attempts or cares to dictate to the free, independent legislative body in its province and its field?

I think we fail to consider that there is a division not only of the rights and the privileges and the power, but a division of responsibility which must be kept clear, a division of responsibility which must not be confused.

There has also been injected into the record and into the debate the ominous suggestion—and a drive for it seems to be beginning—that atomic energy should again be placed solely and entirely in the hands of the military. It is true, Mr. President, that today the most extensive practical use of atomic energy is as an explosive, but its use as an explosive is only an incident to the great possibilities which lie ahead in the field of atomic energy. It is only an incident, and the bill written last year recognized that while today that may be the paramount thing, yet the best interests of this coun-

try and of mankind demand that we accentuate and develop, as the years go by, the humanitarian peacetime uses of atomic energy, and minimize, in an increasing degree, the wartime uses.

Today it is said that the clouds of war seem to be gathering, or that there are threats or uncertainties in this world, and that, therefore, we should run for the storm cellar, and take this great new discovery and put it again under the complete control of the military.

No, Mr. President; that must not be at this time. If the emergency of war should descend upon us, certainly our entire industrial and economic plant must again be put under the dictation of war controls, but I have heard no one say that the power plants, the railroads, the economy of this country should now be placed in the hands of the military merely because there are rumblings, merely because there is uncertainty in the world, and fears in high places.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment for a brief question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Cannot the Senator conceive of a man who has meritoriously worn the uniform, taking it off, and becoming a civilian in American life, and not administering according to Army rules?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the better soldier or sailor a man is, the better private citizen, the better civilian he is, and I can see no reason why a great soldier or a great sailor should not be a great citizen; I think he is.

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield, though I am working against a dead line.

Mr. HAWKES. I appreciate that, and thank the Senator very much. If what he has said be so, why could we not have the man who brought the atomic bomb into fruition take off his uniform, and use the information and the experience and the ability he accumulated in 2 years' work, to complete the development?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have the greatest admiration in the world for General Groves, and I think he did one of the most outstanding pieces of work that was done under the technical conditions of war, and if the President had appointed General Groves to have something to do with this Commission as a member, I certainly would O. K. the appointment, because of my admiration for his ability. But that is not the case. The President has appointed others, and we must examine to see whether the appointments are so offensive that, under the confirming power of the Senate, we should refuse to confirm.

Recurring to the question of a return of this great field of science to the military, let me suggest that there are great fears and apprehensions, and in fact there may be ground for them, that tomorrow's war may be fought with germs, with blights, with biologicals the horror and extent of which no man today can fully realize. If that be the case, and if the war clouds are gathering, should we put all our pharmaceutical houses, all our laboratories, and all our scientific biological experimentation and development projects, under the military? The fallacy of that seems apparent, and I think it is applicable to the great science of atomic energy, just as it is to the science of biology, or the science of bacteriology, or any of the other new and strange and terrifying sciences which may be used to destroy mankind if we do not solve the problem of keeping out of war.

Mr. President, we are dealing here today, not necessarily with the personality of one man, or we should not be; we are dealing with principles of government, and we are dealing with things which are vital, and urgently vital, to the well-being and the future of this Nation of ours.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a short question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that I share his high regard for General Groves, but if General Groves were taken from the War Department and put on the Atomic Energy Commission, the Army would lose the man who knows most about the atomic bomb and atomic energy in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. The Senator from New Jersey asked me a moment ago, hypothetically, or speculatively, what I would do if General Groves' name were before us. I would say that, unless other matters that I know not of should interfere, I would be happy to approve him as a civilian member of the Commission.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one short remark?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield; I have two more minutes.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to know whether any Member of the Senate expects General Groves to function efficiently in the Army as liaison officer after demotion. I never knew a case in all my life where it was possible to make an office boy out of a president and expect him to function.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think there is great merit in what the Senator has said, and yet I will say that my confidence in the ability, the loyalty, the integrity, and the common sense of General Groves is such that I believe, as a soldier, so long as he is a soldier of the United States, he will bring to whatever job he may be assigned, the fidelity, the integrity, and the ability that he has brought to his various assignments in the past.

We have heard the cry of communism, and we have seen the ominous ghost of communism stalking these Halls. I will say to Senators that with the exception of myself—and I shall be pardoned, I hope, if I eliminate myself from the committee—the members of the committee are men whose patriotism and intense zeal for the preservation of American principles cannot be questioned. The ghost of communism did not stop the final deliberations of the committee after it had spent weeks on this question, heard all the innuendos, traced all the unsupported and unfounded rumors, and examined with great meticulousness into the background and qualifications of these men. No taint of communism or Communist sympathy was established. On the contrary it was established, I think, to the satisfaction of the members of the committee, for whom I do not pretend to speak, except as the vote speaks for itself, first, that the appointees of the President were able and capable men; that morally they were above reproach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield myself three more minutes. Second, that their patriotism and their motives were unquestioned. The committee found nothing to condemn them. They are worthy. They should be confirmed by this body.

Mr. President, the motion by the Senator from Ohio goes much further than recommitment to the committee. If this motion prevails, in my judgment none of these men on the Commission, or the General Manager, will ever be confirmed by the Senate or will ever serve with permanence under an appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission. It is equivalent to a complete repudiation of the men. We must not forget that while the shocks have been centered on Mr. Lilienthal, the tide of insinuation, innuendo, and suspicion will sweep away the other four members of this Commission along with him, as well as the General Manager. I do not believe that befits the dignity of this body, nor does it sustain its reputation for deliberate and exhaustive examination of the merits of a case in the broad interests of the public.

Mr. President, I fear, if this motion is adopted, we shall do a disservice, not so much to the Atomic Energy Commission as to the development of the greatest field of science man has ever opened, and we shall be doing a disservice to the defenses and for a time to the future prospects of our Nation. I hope, Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Ohio will be rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, during the extended discussion of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal the able Senator from Delaware has developed the activity of the three directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority in organizing the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives. To my mind this has a very definite bearing upon the pending question. Many things have been brought into the discussion of this nomination which, in my judgment, have no place here, and should have no place, but I want to pay this tribute to the Senator from Delaware: That he brought to the attention of the Senate a subject which was not examined into by the committee at any length and which is very germane to the qualifications of the nominee.

It will be recalled from the statement made by the Senator from Delaware that Mr. Lilienthal, with his two associates, organized the corporation, took the stock in the name of the United States of America, and definitely provided in the charter that no one could serve as a director of the corporation except the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of whom at that time was

Mr. Lilienthal, or, in lieu of that, their agents and appointees, thus retaining complete control of the corporation, which distributed, as I recall, several hundred thousands of dollars in its work.

The question was raised as to the legal authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority directors to organize the corporation. No one brought forth any statement, any data, any information, that would show such authority. The Senator from Delaware, with his usual complete power of investigation and his fairness, addressed to the Attorney General of the United States on April 1, the day before yesterday, this communication:

MY DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: On January 25, 1934, three men, namely, Harcourt A. Morgan, David E. Lilienthal, and Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, formed a corporation known as the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., in the State of Tennessee and had stock issued in the name of the United States of America.

It will be appreciated if at all possible that you advise me by tomorrow noon whether the above men had a legal right to form such a corporation in the name of the United States, and if so, please cite the source of such authority.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

This reply was received by the Senator from Delaware from the Attorney General of the United States, dated April 2, 1947:

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of April 1, 1947, in which you request advice by noon April 2, concerning the source of authority for the formation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

I believe that you will find all the information that you desire in Senate Document 86, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Reference Manual of Government Corporations." Detailed data relative to the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., may be found on pages 244 to 247 and 495 to 502.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

TOM CLARK,
Attorney General.

Mr. President, I have before me Senate Document 86, which is the Reference Manual of Government Corporations, presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on August 1, 1945, and ordered to be printed. Turning to the pages cited by the Attorney General as his reply upon this question, I read on page 244 as follows:

There has been found no Federal statute specifically authorizing the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority to organize a corporation.

That statement is made under the heading "Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc," the very corporation that these directors organized and, we know now, without authority of law and beyond the law.

I turn further to page 246 and call attention to an Executive order issued by the President in which he called upon the several Government corporations to make their returns of all receipts and expenditures.

Then we find on page 247, with respect to this corporation organized by Mr. Lilienthal and his associates, this statement:

The corporation—

Referring to the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.—

The corporation has not complied with the legal requirements relative to accounting by regular Government establishments, providing for the rendition of accounts to the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, this subject has not been before the committee, and it affords one reason why the nomination should be recommitted. Why do I say that? Laying aside every other charge, every other issue in this question, we have standing out paramount this one: Is the nominee beyond the law? Does he act without authority? Mr. President, he might do that in the Tennessee Valley Authority without damage to his country, but when he is appointed upon a commission and the Senate confirms him in his place, where he will be dealing with the great destructive force of atomic energy, if he steps beyond the law, if he acts without legal authority, the whole country is jeopardized as well as the life of every man, woman, and child in it.

I say, Mr. President, that if there were no other issue in this case than the one developed by the diligent work of the able Senator from Delaware; if there were no other charge than this one, which has not been examined into thoroughly by the committee, these nominations should be recommitted to enable the committee to consider this point as well as other phases of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator two more minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think I can conclude in 1 minute.

Mr. President, I was impressed with the statement made by the able Senator from Iowa when he said that to recommit this nomination meant the end of it. I do not think he really means to draw such an inference as that. I know that the committee would act with great sincerity in inquiring further into the matter. The committee acted with sincerity before. The committee would inquire into this matter and report back to the Senate. There is nothing that would cause the committee not to report back favorably unless the committee should find in its reexamination some reason why it should not report or why the members should change their minds. But I think sufficient has been developed here to justify a reexamination of the whole question. No harm could be done the nominee by such a course. He would receive examination at the hands of the same committee earnestly and sincerely investigating the subject, and the committee would report back after hearing further evidence and considering again whether or not it approves the nomination.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish briefly to make a matter of record my reasons for believing that under all existing circumstances Mr. David E. Lilienthal should be confirmed as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission without further delay. I do so with no illusions that any Senator, at this late hour, after weeks and months of bitter controversy, is still open to persuasion. I do so with complete respect for the good conscience with which every Senator will take his position. I quarrel with none. I do so chiefly because it is my only way of advising my own constituents of my views in response to thousands of letters on both sides of the issue, which it has been a physical impossibility for me to answer.

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee which sat as a jury in the Lilienthal case from January 27 to March 4. I have heard or read every word of the testimony. As a result, I have been driven away from the adverse prejudice with which I started. I have been driven to the belief that logic, equity, fair play, and a just regard to urgent public welfare combine to recommend Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation in the light of today's realities.

I say this with full appreciation of the earnest zeal with which others hold a contrary view, including many of my warmest friends. I say it with a candid expression of regret that other possible nominees whom the President first unsuccessfully sought declined to serve. I agree it would have been a happy thing if this Commission could have been long since launched with the benediction of universal approval. On the other hand, I must summarily reject the frequently quoted doctrine that no nominee is eligible if he is attacked. It seems to me that any such doctrine would surrender to "hue and cry," regardless of truth and justice.

Since it is impossible for all Senators intimately to know the record developed in 7 weeks of utterly exhaustive hearings, I respectfully suggest that fair-minded men cannot wholly ignore the impact of the cold, hard fact that eight out of nine of the Senate's own jury, commissioned by the Senate to pass upon the facts, report, regardless of party lines, in favor of confirmation. I remind the Senate that these jurors consisted of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the senior Senator from Michigan. At least in respect to the others, Mr. President, I am surely entitled to say that a more representative or competent Senate jury could not have been impaneled. It seems to me that it would be highly improbable that such a jury would almost unanimously go wrong. At any rate, I plead a reasonable presumption—and I say this with deepest respect for the good conscience of our lone dissenter, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

In the climax of this long investigation, almost without parallel in Senate history, the "jury" agrees—8 to 1—that it is in the public interest for the Senate to confirm Chairman Lilienthal and order him officially to the intensive atomic labors which, for the sake of the public welfare and the national security, have too long lagged.

I repeat that I recall no such thoroughness of inquiry by a Senate committee in all my 19 years of service here. I am unable to believe the process has not been adequate or that we would be warranted in prolonging it.

I can summarize my own feeling, Mr. President, by reading one of the countless telegrams which I have received from unimpeachable Americans. This has been read before. It is worth repeating because of its source, and I repeat it because it happens to be addressed to me. It comes from a great free enterpriser—a great industrialist, who long headed General Electric. It comes from a great citizen whose broad devotions to the public weal cannot be gainsaid. It is from Owen D. Young:

Because of my interest in public utilities I became associated with David E. Lilienthal nearly 20 years ago. I regarded him as an adversary and so naturally watched him with a critical eye. Because of my interest in the international problems of this Nation, I have also watched Lilienthal's work in the atomic field. As a result, I wish to say that he is a man of clear vision, of executive ability, of firmness and unquestioned loyalty, and in a unique position to serve effectively in the position for which he is nominated.

But, Mr. President, with varying shades of emphasis, he is charged with either sympathy for communism or too easy toleration of it. After weeks of testimony, I find no basis for this charge. I hope my own record, plus the fact that I am in the top bracket of all Communist blacklists all round the world, demonstrates that I am not calculated to be "soft" on such a subject. But I do not want to emulate the intolerance of communism itself by condemning to some sort of Siberia all persons who do not happen totally to subscribe to my own view as to how America ought to be run; nor would any of us, I hope, use communism as an excuse for verdicts otherwise unjustified.

It is the opinion of our committee that Mr. Lilienthal is no part of a Communist by any stretch of the imagination. There were a few youthful intriguers in one minor department of the Tennessee Valley Authority who were juvenile Communists. I have no doubt they were there, an infinitesimal percentage of the total TVA personnel. I am sorry the Chairman of TVA did not find this tiny group and root them out. But let us be fair about it, Mr. President. If I were to hold every top executive in American industry personally responsible for the underground communism which exists in every large employment, I would denude most American industry of its leadership. I even read recently that no less reliable a witness than former Senator Robert M. La Follette charged that we had some highly questionable characters in the staffs of some of our committees right here in the Senate of the United States. I take it, however, that this does not warrant the impeachment of Senators.

I do not minimize these things. They put us on notice as to our necessities for eternal vigilance. It has been useful to rip all these matters to their bare bones. I can guarantee that the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee will make this matter its special business. But I am unable to find anything in the record in respect to this phase of the case which indicts Mr. Lilienthal. Thank heaven this is so because if he were unreliable, he has already had at least 3 months in which to subvert our atomic secrets and sell us down the river; and if we were to reject his nomination he would be under none of the special restraints of the Atomic Energy Act to still hold his tongue. We would, indeed, be in a bad way if we could not honestly, conscientiously, and conclusively give him a clean bill of health in respect to communism.

I add, Mr. President, that there is another far graver alien danger that our own development of atomic energy shall slow down to a point where we shall not everlastingly keep ahead of the rest of the world in nuclear physics. Already we have been relatively stagnating far too many months while the famous Manhattan project has been in the twilight zone of uncertain transition from military to civilian control. It will remain in this uncertainty until the Commission is firmly in the saddle. This is a hazard to which every American scientist testifies. This has been told to our committee in plain, blunt language by those who know, and by those to whom the American people must look for responsibility in respect to national security as related to this awful contemplation. We have been put on notice. This would not justify us in confirming a bad Commission. But it may well temper our pursuit of perfectionism, if such there be. Certainly it calls for action now without further delay.

I may say at this point, Mr. President, that when I hear suggestions now made that we should repeal our present atomic energy law, which provides supercontrol of atomic energy in this country by civilian auspices, and when I now begin to hear again that it must all be subordinated to military control, my mind goes back to the many months during which the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate struggled with that problem.

Mr. President, if we found out one thing truer than another, it is that in peacetime we cannot drive science into its laboratories with bayonets.

Now let me come to a second charge against Mr. Lilienthal. It is said he is such a devotee of public ownership that he will endanger free enterprise. Mr. President, I confess that that gave me pause. I am one of those who do not want the Government to compete with private enterprise unless it is an indispensable public necessity. But what are the realities in the instant case?

We, the Congress, have declared by law that the control of atomic energy must be the tightest Government monopoly ever set up in the United States—pending the day when the destructive use of atomic energy shall be outlawed for keeps. You all voted for it. It passed the Senate unanimously. We solemnly and unavoidably decreed that Government ownership and management, no matter how much we dislike it in other aspects of our national economy and life, is an indispensable public necessity for the sake of national security in respect to the control of atomic energy. To leave this world-wrenching mystery, involving life and death, in private hands or under private enterprise at the present time would be a shocking outrage upon human values. It would violate every element of public trust. So we, the Congress, declared for a primary Government monopoly. Therefore one of the most available men to run it is the successful manager of the greatest existing comparable example of public ownership and management. Whether we like it or him or TVA, this sequence leads logically to David Lilienthal's door. His liability under other circumstances thus becomes an asset for the time being.

It seems to be a fact, despite incidental arguments, that TVA is one of the most successful public institutions of its sort on earth. It is the nearest thing, if not the only thing, comparable in general character to the far-flung empire of the Manhattan project with its vast public investment and its vaster personnel. It is not Mr. Lilienthal's chairmanship which makes the job a public project. We, the Senate, did that unanimously months ago. Rather, it is because we made the job a public project that Mr. Lilienthal becomes peculiarly eligible.

But we did something else when we passed the original atomic-energy bill. We set it down that, when the world is freed of the hazard in the destructive use of fissionable material, we propose to turn this new power back into the relatively free control of competitive American initiative. Indeed, the law requires the Commission to report back to Congress for new instructions whenever the nonmilitary use of fissionable material becomes feasible. Mr. Lilienthal could not escape the many mandates of the bill in this direction even if he would, and he will never get a chance because his appointment runs only for 17 months; and unfortunately there is no possibility of international agreements dependably to outlaw atomic bombs, under adequate disciplines against bad faith, within this time. In 1948 this appointment, if renewed by the President, will again pass under free and untrammeled Senate review. Meanwhile, the more expertly the phase of "public monopoly" is run, the nearer we shall be to creating maximum atomic opportunities for transfer to the domain of free enterprise, when that happy time comes.

I pause at this point to add that I expect the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to be something more than a collection of dummies in the evolution of all these plans. It is clothed with every authority to know what goes on. It will walk sentry post at all times. It is our constant congressional liaison.

I confess that I am not heavily impressed with the idea that, once confirmed, Mr. Lilienthal is going to become such a superautocrat that even Congressmen and Senators will suddenly disintegrate into impotent pygmies. That is several miles from true, if I know my Congressmen and Senators. Yet, it is some kind of a compliment to Mr. Lilienthal, from his critics, when, however fatuously, he is assigned such giant stature.

Now I come to the third charge. The charge is made that this nominee's connection with the Acheson-Lilienthal report, covering the problem of physical atomic controls, discloses a flaw in his reliability as a guardian of our atomic secrets because this report did not go to a finality in prescribing the ultimate security system demanded by the later Baruch report. It seems to me this criticism is irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial. The Acheson-Lilienthal report was offered, according to its own language, merely as a place to begin. Clearly, its authors were charged with the exploration of physical mechanisms for atomic control; not with the exploration of political mechanisms which became the subsequent responsibility of the Baruch group. But they made an invaluable and indispensable report, without which the Baruch report and the ultimate finished American plan would have been impossible, and—this ought to end this part of the argument—Lilienthal wholeheartedly endorses the Baruch report and the American plan, and Baruch wholeheartedly endorses Lilienthal.

The Acheson-Lilienthal report was a vital milestone on the journey to this final goal.

It was approved precisely for what it was by a very distinguished board of consultants. Prominently among those consultants who put their stamp of integrity upon this report which is now subjected to critical attack was the very man who is the idol of all the speeches I have heard here against the Lilienthal confirmation. It is signed by Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who says:

> In our opinion this report furnishes the most constructive analysis on the question of international control we have seen and a definitely hopeful approach to a solution of the entire problem.

It is signed by three other great Americans, any one of whom, if he was nominated for the post of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I am sure would be confirmed unanimously and in the twinkling of an eye.

Such being the case, I am unable to find Mr. Lilienthal any less acceptable on account of a report for which these and four other distinguished men are equally responsible. On the contrary, I think his intimate association with these men and with this report actually underscore his unique eligibility for the equally unique responsibilities which this task entails. In equity and logic, I must dismiss this charge.

In doing so, Mr. President, an additional observation seems pertinent. I have mentioned a few names, now associated with Mr. Lilienthal, without which Hiroshima might have been too late. I think it is important to mention a few others who have richly earned the right to be special consultants in this matter. Dr. Bush, the Government's chief atomic consultant, flatly testifies that in his opinion Mr. Lilienthal is the best available American for this pending assignment; and he bluntly asserts that his rejection by the Senate, under all existing circumstances, would be serious disservice to the public welfare at a critical moment in atomic history. Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, whom I suspect the Senate would instantly have confirmed for this appointment, endorses Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. John M. Hancock, Mr. Baruch's trusted assistant in many an enterprise dedicated to the public welfare, endorses Mr. Lilienthal. Dr. Karl Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one of the great figures in our atomic history, vigorously urges Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. Dr. Thomas, the great scientific engineer representing the Monsanto Chemical Co., which played a key role in this gigantic enterprise, endorses Mr. Lilienthal. So does Mr. Chester Barnard, chairman of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., and another keyman in our atomic history.

I do not know of one single scientific, engineering, or industrial authority who has had anything to do with our wartime triumph in atomic energy and who has testified in this celebrated cause who has not joined in this unbroken record of approval. Where are the comparable witnesses against him, Senators? I ask that again. Where are the comparable witnesses against him? I confess that these are things that count with me, Mr. President. I am unable to forget what we owe these men. They know whereof they speak. They are not speculating in episodes of ancient history or relative inconsequentiality. They bring to us from the rich experience of their devoted loyalty to their country the advice that this is the thing we should do. They know at first hand. They are not likely to jeopardize their own transcendental achievements. They are not likely to desert their country's welfare.

I cannot count them as less reliable or less patriotic than we found them to be in war. If Mr. Lilienthal is good enough for them, he must be good enough for the Senate to confirm, even though he may not be one whom we might have preferred. I realize that it is a great responsibility to confirm him—or anyone else. Under the circumstances, however, it may be an even greater responsibility to turn him down and thus further prolong our dangerous era of atomic drift.

There were other complaints against the Lilienthal record, such as the charge, way back in the early 1930's, that when he was Public Utility Commissioner of Wisconsin he held another job in Chicago in violation of the Wisconsin statutes. What he did, however, was to make a contract with his erstwhile private employers to compensate him subsequently, not for current services, but for adjustments due him on account of services previously rendered.

Mr. President, when I confront matters of ancient history, as to which it is very difficult, because of the lapse of time, to know all the facts intimately, it occurs to me that if I can find a key witness of impeccable morality to testify, I am entitled to take his word. Who is it who testifies in this particular situation? It is the then Governor of Wisconsin, Philip La Follette. He testified that he knew all about the contract, that it did not violate the law, that it was entirely appropriate and satisfactory, and that it was approved by him before Mr. Lilienthal took office. On a moral and legal question of this nature, I know of no better reliance than Governor La Follette himself.

Mr. President, there are many other incidental controversies involved in this situation. My time is running out, so I can refer to only one more. The other day in the debate it was suggested that the military liaison which will be available for the protection of the national security, under the operation of Mr. Lilienthal, administering this responsibility, will be inadequate. It was pointed out that in his examination in respect to the military liaison committee he was somewhat confused at points in respect to the direct answers—the confusion being, I submit, Mr. President, that he was perfectly honestly confused as to how he could fit his administrative responsibilities into the very unusual requirements of military liaison which the law requires of him. But when it came to the key questions upon which the correct answer depends, Mr. President, I submit that there is no doubt about the answer. Those who were on the committee when this law was written know that the whole argument turned on the question as to who was to decide what the military liaison committee could contact itself with in respect to the operations of the Commission.

Here are the questions to which the telltale answer were given:

> Mr. LILIENTHAL. The answer to that is definitely that it is up to the military liaison committee to decide what it regards as an appropriate military field.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. And there are no impediments which will be put in its way?
>
> Mr. LILIENTHAL. No impediments will be put in its way.

How can that be called equivocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DWORSHAK in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Iowa whether I may have 5 minutes more.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, further in his examination Mr. Lilienthal said:

> There will be nothing withheld from the military liaison committee.

That is all the Military Liaison Committee requires, Mr. President; and even if that guaranty were not written into the text and the body of this law, I respectfully submit to the Senators who are fearful that the Military Liaison Committee will not have adequate approach to information, that they scan the membership of the Military Liaison Committee. There, once more, they will find their great friend and their idol—I do not speak of him with any disrespect; on the

contrary, I think he rendered his country one of the greatest services ever rendered by any American in time of war—Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves. He is part of the Military Liaison Committee. If anyone wishes to try to make me think that General Groves will stand impotent or silent in front of closed doors when the welfare of his country is at stake, such a person has a far less valid opinion of General Groves than I have. Mr. President, there is no possibility of any menace or threat in respect to the Military Liaison Committee under the Lilienthal appointment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for giving me additional time. I wish to return as much of it to him as I can.

I simply say, in conclusion, that I have substantially reviewed the record which many weeks of testimony unfolded. In dismissing the complaints I have in almost every instance found an affirmative reason, a positive reason, for supporting Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. It seems to me that the preponderance was in his favor overwhelmingly.

I have no quarrel with those who disagree. I know there is a deep-seated prejudice against Mr. Lilienthal in many earnest, sincere minds. I have no quarrel whatever with those feelings. But for myself, in the presence of the evidence I have no alternative except to say to my colleagues that I have no doubt that in the interest of the national welfare and for the sake of a square deal, Mr. Lilienthal is entitled to be confirmed.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate forbid any demonstrations in the galleries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe there is about a minute and a half left of the last 5 minutes I yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say, in the first place, that I am greatly concerned about what just happened. I sincerely regret the demonstrations in the galleries, as a matter of practical decency in the Senate.

Something was said against Joseph Volpe, Jr., in the debate. I take occasion to put into the RECORD now, without going into the subject, a telegram with regard to Volpe, whom, incidentally, I have known for 2 or 3 years, and for whose integrity and loyalty I have the highest regard. The telegram reads as follows:

> I would endorse without reservation Joseph Volpe, Jr., for a position of trust and confidence connected with national defense and security. During war period Volpe carried out several missions of highest importance to war effort, requiring great skill and unquestioned integrity and loyalty.
>
> THOMAS F. FARRELL.

Thomas F. Farrell, incidentally, is General Farrell, who needs no introduction to patriotic Americans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, like many other Members of the Senate, I regret that it has been impossible for me to be in attendance during all the time this matter has been under debate in the Senate. I want only 2 or 3 minutes to explain my reasons for the position I shall take on the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

During this day the Committee on Public Lands held hearings on the appointments of three men, who will, if confirmed, be members of the Indian Claims Commission. The appointments of those three men were delayed in reaching the committee for several weeks, during which time they were being thoroughly investigated by the FBI. I am thoroughly in favor of such investigation, but I see no logical reason in delaying the nominations of men for appointments of the kind the committee on Public Lands was considering this morning in order to get a thorough investigation, having the rule applied in such a case, and not requiring the same rule and order when it comes to filling a commission of such great importance as the one under consideration here today. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall support the motion to recommit.

Just one other thought in connection with Mr. Lilienthal himself. I have known him only as I have come in contact with him in the Senate in the last few years. I think he is a very amiable sort of a gentleman. I think most of the Members of the Senate know what a struggle we had to pass the corporation control bill, on which the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I especially worked very hard for nearly 2 years. At every turn of the road we were met by Mr. Lilienthal, who opposed the provisions of the Government corporation-control bill if for no other reason than that he did not want to be regulated.

When a man who is placed in charge of an organization such as the TVA immediately feels that he becomes super to the Government which created the organization he controls, I doubt if he has the right disposition to become the administrator of an organization like the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time?

Mr. WHERRY. Twenty minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall summarize only briefly what I said yesterday.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred to the endorsements received from many scientists. Of course, since those endorsements were given we have had much new evidence in the Senate. None of those scientists have read the account of Mr. Lilienthal's operations in the TVA. None of those scientists have read the evidence before the committee which has been examining the various facts relating to Mr. Lilienthal's past history. None of those men have anything except a casual social acquaintanceship with Mr. Lilienthal, having had some conversations with him, and some vision, if you please, of his attractive personality when he meets a man, and his ability to conduct an investigation such as that which produced the Lilienthal report.

In the revelation of the evidence we have seen that Mr. Lilienthal did not hesitate, in the TVA, to accomplish his own purposes by pursuing every deceptive method which could be pursued. We have seen that he changed the minutes of the TVA a year after they were written in order that they could not be used against him in some legal proceeding, or against the TVA project, in which he was interested. This was not a personal matter. The objection to Mr. Lilienthal is that he does not care what means he uses to accomplish the purposes which he desires to attain. None of these scientists knew that in this very case Mr. Lilienthal had no interest whatever in the ethics of people and the methods by which they acquired claims which they could then bring against the TVA.

These scientists had no reference to the proceeding in Wisconsin, which certainly bears every evidence of being an exceedingly dubious transaction. The letter that was written was false on its face. Obviously there was no real attempt to pay Mr. Lilienthal for past services. That was simply to avoid the Wisconsin law, which provided that he could not be doing anything except what he was doing as Public Utilities Commissioner of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, his name was used on Commerce Clearing House advertisements and letters during all the time he served as head of the Public Utilities Commission of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I offer here as evidence an affidavit of Mr. Irwin S. Rosenbaum, former associate of Mr. Lilienthal, in which it is stated that the Commerce Clearing House letter of November 3, 1931, addressed to the Oregon subscribers for Public Utilities, carries at the head the name of Mr. David E. Lilienthal. There is no doubt that all the Commerce Clearing House letters continued to carry his name, and there is no doubt that the $2,000 a year he received was money paid to him for the use of his name during the time he was serving as head of the Wisconsin Public Utilities Commission.

Our committee says, "The fact that this service was being sold and his name used to sell it to the utilities in Wisconsin which were under his jurisdiction is of no importance," that he did not know about it. It is of importance in showing that the $2,000 paid him was paid for the use of his name at the head of this service, no matter what work he did or did not do, and was not for past service, as represented in the letter which appears on page 808 of the record.

These scientists, furthermore, have a curious lack of knowledge, I think, of the realities of government, of the different philosophies of people in operating government. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan says that we voted these tremendous powers, and because this is a monopoly we must put in charge a man who believes in Government monopoly.

Mr. President, I think I pointed out the fallacy of that view yesterday. I pointed out that the Atomic Energy Act is not

a complete Government monopoly act. There are all kinds of fringes. There is a discretion given the Commission, wide discretion, and it seems to me obvious that this is one place where we do not want a man who is going to press the powers to the very limit, to use every inch of power that is given to him.

These scientists have not gone into Mr. Lilienthal's writings as the Senate has. They have not examined his philosophy of government. They have not seen the articles written over and over again showing that he believes we should steadily extend Government activities through the operation of Government corporations, and that such Government corporations should be left almost untrammeled by the legislative authority. They have not studied his philosophy of government as Senators have studied it. All they know is that Mr. Lilienthal is an attractive man, who has taken very largely the point of view of the scientists, that we should give away the atomic bomb to Russia. That was the basis of the report in the beginning. There was no solution of this problem, except to hand to Russia, and to every other nation in the world, the power to make atomic bombs.

The Lilienthal-Acheson report was described as a wonderful document, but today it is not so considered. In the United Nations set-up it has practically disappeared from the agreement that was actually signed. Of course the report recommends what I suppose the scientists thought was all right, but which certainly the Senate of the United States does not think is all right. It proposes that the authority to be created locate similar dangerous operations within the borders of every important country in the world. If the report had been literally followed, by this time we should be building atomic-bomb plants in Russia for the Russians to operate and to produce the atomic bombs, in order, according to Mr. Lilienthal, that there might be a balance, so that the Russians would feel secure and they would not be subject to the threat of our holding the atomic bomb. Unfortunately, the scientists who have endorsed it, do not realize the dangers of international power, any more than they realize the dangers of an arbitrary Government control of various operations, no more than they realize what we have been up against here for the last 10 years in trying to cut down the tremendous power of the Executive to make regulations to regulate the lives and the very existence of the people of the United States.

Certainly, Mr. President, I think the Senate has every right and every duty, if you please, not to say, "There are men we might have preferred, but Mr. Lilienthal looks pretty good, so we will agree to his nomination." I made the point yesterday, I think, that the Senate should not confirm anybody unless he is the man the Senate would have appointed. I venture to say if we had taken a preferential vote before the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal, he would have been well below 50, or even 100, in the list of names from whom the Senate would have selected the five men for the Atomic Energy Commission.

I think our duty, Mr. President, is to exercise our own judgment as to what kind of man Mr. Lilienthal is. I have no hesitancy in saying that the record as it appears before the Senate shows that he is a man whose philosophy completely disagrees with that of a large majority of the Senate today; that he is a man who does not hesitate to use any means to accomplish the ends which he wishes to accomplish; that he is a man who believes in the steady extension of governmental power, and will use every iota of power conferred by this generous "conferring" law on atomic energy which the Congress has passed.

Mr. President, I think it has been shown further that Mr. Lilienthal has a complete misconception of what the Russian threat is, which has been so graphically set forth by President Truman. I think the record shows without question that he has what may be called a "soft" feeling toward Russia. He was one of those who felt that Russia had a form of democracy in communism which was just about as good as our democracy, a little different perhaps in nature, but with which we could afford to deal. That is the explanation of the admission of Communists to his organization, as well as to other departments of the Government. The feeling was that communism was really a threat to the United States. I say this is no time to put in charge of this tremendous enterprise a man whose views on foreign policy are so naive, or a man who is so willing to regard Russia as a friend and an ally, and so wholly incapable of conceiving the actual operation which Russia today is conducting against the United States, as set forth so graphically in the last speech of President Truman to this body.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time did the distinguished Senator from Ohio use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES). The Senator from Nebraska has about 8 minutes more of the time remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan made the statement a few moments ago that Mr. Lilienthal said the military would have the complete cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission. I want to turn to page 102 of the report, wherein Mr. Baruch was being questioned by members of the committee investigating Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. Baruch is on the stand, and the question is asked whether or not there has been such cooperation. Here is his answer:

> This subject is now more a military question until the treaty is signed and an understanding is reached with the various nations of the world.

Mr. Baruch further says:

> I think this is a problem that is as much military as anything else.

Then Senator JOHNSON of Colorado continues questioning him. Turning to page 103, in the middle of the page, we find Mr. Baruch is asked by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado this question:

> Senator JOHNSON. You have heard some discussion, perhaps, if you read the papers, in regard to the Commission's relationship with the military?
>
> Mr. BARUCH. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. Do you have any views on what such relations should be?
>
> Mr. BARUCH—

This is the man on whom the senior Senator from Michigan pinned his statement as to this phase of the question this afternoon. From his testimony, he made the statement that we would get full cooperation with the military by the Commission. Here is his answer:

> Mr. BARUCH. Yes, sir; very decided ones. I think we have gone too far in our criticism of the military, which for want of a better name we have called "the brass hats." I have been through two wars, and I have found that the Army and the Navy were starved, and then, all of a sudden, were given the job to prepare the United States to fight the whole world.
>
> Then they do it—do it successfully. Then, when it is all over, people turn around and criticize them. I think that, perhaps, is due to our American habit of hurrahing for a fellow when he makes a home run and then, when he is sitting on the bench, throwing a bottle or two at him. But in my opinion, sir, this remains a military question until it has been settled internationally.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. And you think that the military should have a voice in the policies that are adopted, and a full knowledge of the policies?
>
> Mr. BARUCH. They should have a full knowledge of what is going on. The policy has to be made by this Commission of five, and there is no military man on it.

That is the testimony of Mr. Baruch. Time does not permit me to continue the reading now, but if Senators will read the record they will find that Mr. Baruch sets forth that the military has not been given proper consideration, either in the way of a place on the commission or by contacts that the civilian commission should have made with the military.

There is one other observation I should like to make. It is with reference to another statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, to the effect that we now have the promise of Mr. Lilienthal of full cooperation with the military. The Senator from Michigan said, "the Military Liaison Committee could be canvassed, and I doubt if there will be found one but what will say it has the cooperation." The Senator says, "Certainly General Groves would not stand idly by and not complain, if he did not have the cooperation he wanted."

Mr. President, I should like to say I talked personally to a member of the Military Liaison Committee, and I want to give the Senators this report: I cannot quote the name, but if the committee will subpoena the man he will tell the committee the truth and tell what he told me. What he told me was that the military had not been consulted prior to January, except three times. Twice

the military asked to consult the civilian committee, and once the civilian committee requested a consultation with the military committee. At no time was there anything whatever about policy and military practice considered in the conferences that were had. He told me that after January 1 of this year he had not been consulted except in a social way by the civilian appointees of the committee; and it was only after the hearings began in January that they began to telephone his office and make social calls in an attempt to show that they were consulting the Military Liaison Committee that had done such great and wonderful work along with the Army in developing the bomb.

I will go a step further and say that if the Senate will examine the members of the military liaison committee I guarantee it will not find the cooperation and support suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan, but will rather find anything but such cooperation and support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield myself one more minute.

That is what I found, Mr. President, by interrogating one member of the military liaison committee. I wish to suggest to the distinguished members of the committee that I am quite satisfied that if they will move the recommital of the nomination and interrogate the military liaison committee they will find that they must go a long way before they will secure the cooperation which has now been promised by this nominee—Mr. Lilienthal—of whom the senior Senator from Michigan has spoken so generously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the time remaining is 39 minutes, of which 27 minutes are at the disposal of the Senator from Nebraska and 12 minutes at the disposal of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to occupy any time of the Senate on this matter whose consequences may be so vital to the welfare of our country, and I do not do so out of any whimsical desire to talk. I do so only because I feel it my duty to say a few words in regard to this nomination.

I do not owe Mr. Lilienthal anything, personally or politically. I am under no conceivable obligation to him in any way. I have known him a long time, somewhat at a distance in a way, and although I live in the Tennessee Valley and have advocated and supported that great enterprise ever since World War I, and live within 20 miles of the largest dam on the Tennessee River, no man or woman who ever had any connection with the Tennessee Valley either now holds or ever held any position under Mr. Lilienthal at my request or upon my recommendation. And so, Mr. President, I approach the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal impersonally, in a sense, and without being under the slightest obligation in the casting of my vote.

The Senator from Ohio a while ago advanced what seems to me a rather curious if not spurious theory that we ought not to confirm anyone in the Senate whom we ourselves would not have appointed or whom the Senate itself might not have appointed if it had the appointing power. I challenge any Senator, no matter what his attitude may be on this nomination, to forecast the name of any man whom the Senate of the United States could have agreed upon if it had been charged with the responsibility of making this appointment. So that the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, in addition to being a rather curious one, is utterly impracticable and impossible of fulfillment.

Mr. President, I cannot in the short time at my disposal go into the hearings. I am not a member of the committee that so patiently heard the testimony for and against Mr. Lilienthal. Due to my obligations to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the matter which has just been concluded there, by unanimous vote, I am happy to say, it has not been my privilege to have heard a great amount of the debate which has ensued here in regard to Mr. Lilienthal. Therefore I cannot quote from line or page or chapter in the book of hearings. I need not do so.

I believe that Mr. Lilienthal is both personally and intellectually an honest man. I realize that any man who has progressive views, who believes that government must constantly advance if it is to remain a servant of the people, if it is to keep its functions and facilities in line with the advancing age in which we live, just as medicine and education and religion and science and agriculture and industry must move on—I say I realize that anyone who believes that government likewise must take its place in this progressive movement forward for the people is liable to the charge that he is a Communist or a Socialist or that he is intellectually dishonest.

What is the test of intellectual honesty, Mr. President? How are we to determine a man is intellectually honest? On one day in the facing of one problem he may take one viewpoint, whereas next week in another problem he may take another viewpoint, depending on the approach to it, and he might be equally intellectually honest in both instances.

Mr. President, I have heard objection to Mr. Lilienthal because he is a liberal or a progressive. If that were the test of public office, I should be booted out of the Senate. If that is the test of a man's qualification or his desirablity as a public officer, I myself have always been disqualified to hold public office, for I have always been a liberal, I have always been a progressive. Because of that I have admired Thomas Jefferson, who was the outstanding liberal and progressive of his day, and by reason of which he was denounced as a demagogue.

I have always been a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln, and in my school days and in my political life I have sat at the feet of Abraham Lincoln, a great liberal, a great progressive, a great forward-looking statesman, whose name grows more illustrious and whose stature grows more magnificent as the years go by. Such a test would have barred him likewise from public office.

I was a liberal under Woodrow Wilson and, though a Democrat, I thrilled at the square deal of Theodore Roosevelt. As a young man just entering political life, I read avidly all that I could read about Theodore Roosevelt and his fight for progressive measures and his liberal approach to measures in this country, and the square deal of Theodore Roosevelt inspired me just as the new freedom of Woodrow Wilson inspired me long before the New Deal, so-called, came into existence.

So, Mr. President, I am not frightened by any name that a man may be called because his mind is not closed to new ideas, even when they are applied by government in promoting the welfare of our people. The people themselves will not permit their Government to become static, hide-bound, immune to the infiltration—if I may use that word—of new ideas and new ideals, so that under our Constitution we cannot solve the changing problems of the American people as they arise. The people themselves will not permit eitheir their society or their Government to become static and impotent in the face of the overwhelming problems which now face us and the world, and which in the long shadows that stretch into the future must face us and face the world.

I am not frightened by the designation of "Socialist." I recall that when I was a young man I advocated certain measures which were not then on the statute books. I was denounced as a Socialist in my own community. Most of those measures have become fixed in the statutes of our country, and have been there so long that few men recall when they were enacted.

I recognize that in this hour, when the specter of communism gives rise to fears in the minds of many of our people, and when commentators, writers, and others are talking about an inevitable contest between communism and democracy, every tendency on the part of any public man to hold a liberal, advanced, forward-looking ideal upon any subject may subject him to the charge that he has a soft place in his heart toward Russia or communism, or some other specter of that sort.

I have read the report in which Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. Acheson, and others on the temporary commission joined. I see nothing in it that I can interpret as in any way endangering the interests of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that in this hour, in this age, and in this day we cannot forget the lines of Omar Khayyam:

The Moving Finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

I favor the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, and I am opposed to the motion to recommit the nomination to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The residue of the time belongs to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the past few moments I have been thrilled by the reference by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, to the great Theodore Roosevelt, and his admiration for him. As he spoke I could not help almost longing at this hour that we might have before the Senate for consideration for this most important post the name of a man with the same undefiled and unadulterated love of America that characterized the life of Theodore Roosevelt. There was no mixed loyalty in him.

Today we are ending a debate on an appointment to this most important post which has raised many questions of doubt in the minds of Senators and in the minds of the people of America as to Mr. Lilienthal's suitability.

I rise to support the motion which I made last Friday, after thorough consideration of all the issues involved and with a knowledge of the investigation which has been made by the committee. A while ago the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred to the fact that there had been attacks—prejudicial attacks was the expression which he used—upon Mr. Lilienthal. I am quite confident that his remarks did not apply to me. But let me say that if the time should ever come when I would follow my prejudices rather than my patriotic judgment in my votes on the floor of the Senate, I would resign my commission as a United States Senator.

I have listened to the hearings. I have read the complete record. I think I attended as many meetings of the committee as did any other member of the committee, with the possible exception of the chairman. I wanted to confirm the appointment submitted by the President. I have held executive office, and I know the responsibility which rests upon an Executive in selecting men for responsible public positions.

I first became alarmed when I heard the witness testify that he had done his damnedest to keep from getting this position, and that he had failed. That did not ring true to me. I have talked with too many men who have held public office, and too many men have applied to me for public offices of insignificance as compared with this for me to believe such a statement. I say that no one was ever forced to accept public office. I have even heard candidates say, "My friends have crowded me into this campaign. I cannot keep out." I do not believe that, any more than I believe that Mr. Lilienthal tried his damnedest—to use his own words—to prevent being appointed to this position.

I have not made up my mind as to the Lilienthal-Acheson report, but I have some very pertinent views in regard to it. I have read it, and I have heard it discussed. I do not agree with it in many respects, while in some respects I do. I think that the Baruch report was an improvement upon it. The give-it-away idea, the proposal to hand the atomic secret to the other peoples of the world, and to share our knowledge of this great invention with the Russians or any other people, does not meet with my approval.

During the war frequently it seemed that the administration was afraid to offend Russia. It feared that Russia would quit taking lend-lease. Now it appears from this discussion and the Lilienthal report that we must offer the secret of atomic energy to Russia, we must be generous, we must not offend the Russians, for fear that they will not take the secret when we offer it to them.

Mr. President, if we were to stop talking about giving away the atomic secret to Russia and other countries of the world, they would be over here within 6 months trying to find some way to preserve the peace of the world and their own hides. So I do not agree with the Lilienthal report.

From the fragmentary information which has been disclosed through the investigation, and information which I have been able to pick up on the outside, I have tried to analyze the situation. Some of the information consists of rumors, but the Senate, or Washington itself, would be a rather uninteresting place if there were not plenty of rumors. So we must listen to them and try to separate the wheat from the chaff and find the truth.

I ascertained that this was an Acheson appointment. I have been told—I cannot verify it—that on the morning that the Secretary of State heard the appointment was to be made he called the President and requested an opportunity to protest the naming of Mr. Lilienthal; that the appointment was made in anticipation of the Secretary's visit; and that the Secretary of State was never consulted about the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal to this important commission. The truth of that can be ascertained if the motion is sustained and the nominations are recommitted to the committee for further hearing.

The Senate is entitled to know from where the appointment came, who sponsored it, what group, what clique, what faction of the administration was so prominently back of the appointment and determined to jam it through the Senate without an adequate and complete hearing. This is an important age in the history of our country. The Senate faces an important issue in this confirmation.

Let me say in reply to the distinguished chairman of the committee that the Senate is not interfering with the right of the President in any way. Senators have a constitutional duty. They have sworn to defend the Constitution; and unless every Senator approaches his responsibility in a sense of duty and obligation to his country, rather than following the dictates of the appointing authority, he will fail to fulfill his true obligation to the people of America and his own duty in this body.

I have said that this is a serious age. The Temporary Committee on Loyalty which the President appointed a short time ago recommended that there be complete investigation of all employees appointed in various departments of the Federal Government to examine into their loyalty or disloyalty, with the idea of ridding the Government service of all those who are disloyal to the United States.

During the recent campaign I promised the people of my great State that at every opportunity, whenever the matter might come upon the floor of the Senate, I should vote to drive from public office every man and woman, high or low, who did not subscribe to the Constitution and pledge undying loyalty to the Nation which thousands of our friends and neighbors, the best boys of America, died to preserve.

That is the sense in which I approach my responsibility in connection with this nomination. The Temporary Committee on Loyalty recommended to the President that the Atomic Energy Commission be given authority, without any question, to discharge any employee, so vital did they think this job to be. I do not know why the President did not see fit to go along with that recommendation. He did not include it in his report. But there is a list of all the organizations which have been considered disloyal and un-American, Communist-front or Communists. It is not the latest official list issued by the Department of Justice, but is the prior one which contained the name Southern Conference on Human Welfare. It was published in the press of Washington only a couple of nights ago. Remember that Mr. Lilienthal, the man upon whose nomination the Senate is passing, acted as a sponsor of that organization, the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, to which $2,000 of Communist money went from New York to sustain. Maybe Mr. Lilienthal did not know it. The organization had a high-sounding title. But Mr. Lilienthal was an important man. He was the head of TVA. He had spent $800,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. He had spent $150,000 of that amount to publicize himself and the project in which he was involved. As a result of that, he stood out before the American people. He should have known about it if he was a good administrator and one to be trusted with public office.

There is one other correction which I wish to make at this time in the RECORD. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] mentioned that General Groves had approved this report. The information which I have—and I think it is accurate; it can be checked by the committee if the files are returned to it for further consideration—is that General Groves was appointed in March 1947 to this responsible place. Where is General Groves? Why has he not been called? Why does not the committee confer with him? Why has not Mr. Lilienthal, since he took over the Atomic Energy Commission, conferred with General Groves?

Only after those questions were asked on the floor of the Senate and in the committee hearings was General Groves appointed to this position and another general was removed to give General Groves the place. Yet this authority was created in September 1946.

A fallacious argument was made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the effect that these gentlemen have been on the job since last January—they were appointed, I think, in September, or late in the last year—and that to turn them out now that they have all this information would be dangerous. Mr. President, in the name of all that is good and patriotic, if they are that kind of men they ought to be kicked out before they acquire any further information. The Senator's argument is a fallacious one. If any Member of the Senate thinks that any one of them would betray a secret which he holds because of the responsible position to which he was appointed by the President and which was assumed before the Senate could pass upon his qualifications, that man should be kicked out before any further injury can be done our beloved country.

Mr. President, I approach this subject after calm consideration. I did not find myself in a comfortable place, I grant that, as being one of nine who voted against confirmation. It disturbed me. I sat on the committee with men many years my senior in service and in years, and I did not like being a minority of one. I felt that possibly I did not have very good judgment about the matter. Possibly there was something I had missed. Perhaps, being a new Member of the Senate, I did not have the right sense of responsibility toward these Presidential appointments. And yet, Mr. President, I am more confirmed than ever in my conviction that I voted correctly and that it was a proper and patriotic vote, and I shall stand by it to the end of this consideration.

Another matter was brought to the Senate's attention a short time ago in the address of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the effect that the scientists had approved of Mr. Lilienthal.

I wish the Senate would get this picture in its mind: No one with whom Lilienthal had ever been associated in the Tennessee Valley came to testify for him. Dr. A. E. Morgan appeared against Mr. Lilienthal. He is an honest and patriotic man. All one had to do to know that he was telling the truth was to hear him. Scientists wired, they wrote letters, and they appeared. They were impressive. I was impressed, I grant. They are great men in their field. Their association with Mr. Lilienthal had been relatively limited. They had in the course of 2 or 3 weeks, or perhaps a couple of months, been with him in working out the Acheson-Lilienthal report. Lilienthal came in not as a scientist, not as a businessman. I can think of no better description of his responsibility than as being that of a clerk, taking orders from them, because he was no doubt in a maze, as I should be in listening to atomic energy secrets. He did not know the terms when he started in. That is the reason Mr. Acheson pushed him forward as the chairman of the Secretary of State's Committee of Consultants, and put him in a position where he might be a candidate for the Atomic Energy Commission. Oh, yes; the scientists made a good impression. I do not criticize them. We welcomed them before the committee; but I would not permit them to substitute their judgment for mine as to whether or not Mr. Lilienthal's nomination should be confirmed.

I said here last week, if Senators will remember, that some rather definite tests should be made before we vote to confirm this appointee. The first one is, Can he efficiently, successfully, and economically handle this atomic-energy project? It is easy to spend public money. It is mighty hard to save the taxpayer's dollars. Everyone wants more service. Nine million dollars' worth of fertilizer was sold last year by the TVA under the prices at which it could be manufactured by private industry. Two million dollars' worth of it was given away. Much of it went to my State. Some of those who received it called themselves Tennessee Valley farmers, and they came down to testify for Mr. Lilienthal. They approached me about it.

Let me say also—and I am picking up some of the loose ends as we conclude—that the presentation made to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] a while ago that this is a fight between the private citizens and the great power companies and power resources of the United States is the most unfounded assumption that I have yet heard stated in this debate. I told this body last Friday that only one great utility man had approached me. Others came before the committee, but only one approached me—taking 2 hours of my time at my home last Sunday to tell me that it is necessary for the good of the Republican Party to endorse and confirm Mr. Lilienthal. He is a representative of one of the greatest power companies or holding companies in this country. He is the only one to approach me, the only man who has talked to me about the power issue in this case.

In the second place, I think we should ask the question, Does Mr. Lilienthal possess the ability to work harmoniously with the Congress and with the departments of the Government? We have already heard, here, enough discussion to convince anyone that there is serious question as to whether Mr. Lilienthal will work along with the Congress of the United States. I could not help thinking there was serious question as I listened to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whom I greatly admire, as he spoke of the difficulties he had had, in his responsible place in the Senate, with Mr. Lilienthal; and that testimony can be confirmed by that of almost everyone else who, in serving on the committees either in this body or in the House of Representatives, has had contact with Mr. Lilienthal.

Then, finally, let us consider whether this man has the desire and ability to choose capable and loyal personnel to carry out the will of our people, as expressed in the law. There has been a great deal of discussion about the records, about the exhaustiveness of the committee's investigation, and about what is in the record and what is not in the record. I read into the RECORD of this body last week the story about those in permanent places in the Commission who have been appointed at salaries far above the level of the salaries for similar positions in other departments or branches of the Government—among them the attorney who at the end of 2 years will draw more than the Solicitor General of the United States, and the comptroller of this organization, who will draw more money than the Comptroller General of the United States.

I also pictured here the character of employees who have been gathered together by Mr. Lilienthal to aid him in carrying out this most responsible task. I know of the Wisconsin incident which, last night, turned into quite a Wisconsin affair before it was finally finished. There is no explanation of it except the one which was given by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] today. I remember it because I was a member of the Ohio Utilities Commission at the same time, and I know the discussion which went on among the membership. I know it was not common practice, either, for a utilities commissioner to carry along with him a publicity expert under the guise of a truck inspector. That was not common practice among the utilities commissioners in that day. But it was practiced by Mr. Lilienthal on the Wisconsin commission.

Let us pass over the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and consider the employees of the great Tennessee Valley Authority. There is no question that there was Communist activity there; there is no doubt that there were radical influences that hurt, and that they occurred from the top down—not solely among the adolescents who came before the committee to testify. I should like to see that question, too, gone into thoroughly by this committee of the Senate.

Then we asked for reports on the employees in the Atomic Energy Commission field. We got nine. There were only three or four of them that had anything pertinent or of interest. We asked for more, and 20 of them came. Six were sent back because they were not in the nature of a report at all. Then, out of the 23, 5 were analyzed—not by me, but by one of the employees of the committee. His report I also presented to the Senate last week. It contained the names of five men. One of them, a Mr. Burling, is reported to have given secret information from the files of the department of the Government in which he was employed at one time. That should be a red flag; yet the committee made no further investigation of that, and it would not have been called to the attention of the Senate or to the attention of any of us if we had not insisted upon seeing those files. I insisted at that hour, Mr. President, that they be made a part of the record, but that request was denied because it was said they were confidential files. I also asked that an attorney be appointed to investigate them, but that request was also denied because of the time that would be consumed. I asked further, then, that a synopsis of

the record of those employees be included in the record, so that the Senate might know the character of the men Mr. Lilienthal has gathered about him to carry on this very great public responsibility.

I mention Herbert Marks; he has been a subject of much discussion. I wondered, as the record was made, why so much was brought into the record in regard to Herbert Marks. He was not a candidate for one of these positions; he was not before us as a nominee to be considered by the Senate. Yet when this record is studied, it reveals that the Navy of the United States turned him down as a candidate for a commission because he was not acceptable for a commission in the Navy of the United States. Under those circumstances, I say to you, Mr. President, that he has no business dealing with atomic energy and atomic bombs, if the Navy of the United States has turned him down because of his radical and left-wing associations.

O, Mr. President, I could go on through the list to the three others who were just as bad. One of them was a man who scratched out, in an application for a passport, the words that he would defend the Constitution of the United States, and he qualified it by writing in, "as far as my conscience will permit." I ask that that matter be sent back to the committee, to have it determine whether that man had a conscientious religious belief against taking the oath.

Mr. President, I consider the approaching vote to be one of the most serious votes I shall ever cast in the Senate. We need more information. This committee can get it if it goes at the job and casts aside a lot of the trivial things that we have spent 6 weeks upon.

I wish to say to the Senate, in the words of General Washington before the Battle of Trenton:

> This is the time, this is the night, to put only Americans on guard—no French, no allies.

Mr. President, this is the time and the hour to put only true, trusted, patriotic Americans on guard of this, the most precious asset which a free people perhaps ever had in the history of time. Let us not use men who are questionable, who are pink, who will gather about them others who are not thorough-going Americans, men about whom there is any doubt at all. Let us not use men who will change a record to win a case.

Mr. President, this motion should be sustained by the Senate; and I am sure that when the committee concludes its investigations, the Senate will open its eyes to the seriousness of our responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska, who has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Sparkman
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Cain	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lodge	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Thye
Cooper	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having responded to the roll call, a quorum is present.

By unanimous-consent agreement, the hour has been reached when debate is concluded, and the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nominations of David Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. CORDON'S name was called). The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who also is absent on official committee business. If present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If he were present and permitted to vote he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I repeat the announcement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business, and is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea." If the Senator from Washington were permitted to vote he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], because of a death in his family. If he were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—38

Brewster	Ecton	Overton
Bricker	Ferguson	Reed
Bridges	Flanders	Revercomb
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Bushfield	Kem	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Watkins
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Cain	McKellar	White
Capehart	Malone	Wiley
Cooper	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Moore	Wilson
Dworshak	O'Daniel	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hoey	Pepper
Baldwin	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Ives	Russell
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Taylor
Downey	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tobey
George	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Maybank	Umstead
Gurney	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hatch	Morse	Wagner
Hayden	Murray	Young
Hickenlooper	Myers	
Hill	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—5

Cordon	McCarthy	O'Mahoney
Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson	

So Mr. BRICKER'S motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement by which we are operating, the Senate is supposed to recess immediately. The Chair asks unanimous consent to recognize the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The Chair hears no objection.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 90)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as in legislative session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

I also ask unanimous consent that the committee may be permitted to file a report during the recess following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in legislative session, the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, leave is granted to file the report as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan when he expects to move the consideration of the bill providing for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to answer the Senator categorically. Obviously it is desirable to proceed as soon as possible next week. If the pending executive business shows any sign of conclusion within a reasonable time, I would be prepared to wait before moving to proceed in legislative session with the

bill; but I cannot give the Senator any assurances on the subject until we find out the status of the Lilienthal matter next week.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] be excused from attendance on the Senate during the sessions next week, in order that we may attend an international conference overseas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted yesterday it is provided that in the event the motion, which is the motion just had, be rejected, the Senate immediately thereafter recess. I am not sure whether that means that the Senate is in automatic recess at the moment, or whether it is appropriate that I make a motion to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's understanding is that anything can be done in the Senate by unanimous consent, and unanimous consent is being obtained for all that is now transpiring.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to propound a question to the majority leader concerning the probability of a vote being taken on Monday on any measure that may come before the Senate, or on the nominations now pending to the Atomic Energy Commission. I know that a number of Members of this body contemplate going away over the week end, and some of them perhaps cannot return before Tuesday. I should like, if possible, to have an announcement made and an understanding with respect to what is proposed to be done on Monday.

Mr. WHITE. On Monday we will proceed with the consideration of the unfinished business. Whether a vote will be reached during Monday afternoon I cannot say. I shall be perfectly willing myself, if that should be agreeable to the Senator in charge of the matter, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], now to agree not to vote on Monday, but to vote on Tuesday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is agreeable to me, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on the basis of what has just been said to me, I will give such assurance as I can that there will be no binding vote on Monday.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand that statement, it does not mean that there will be a vote on Tuesday; only that there will not be a vote on Monday.

Mr. WHITE. That is all we can do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I am being bombarded fore and aft. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Maine. I am simply trying to listen in, and in doing so I came a little closer so I could hear the discussion. I have nothing to contribute to it, but I thank the Senator from Maine just the same. I know that the chairman of the committee has something he would like to say.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to be laboring under any misapprehension. When I said that the suggestion was agreeable to me, it was my impression that the question was, if we did not vote on Monday, would we agree to vote on Tuesday. I am fairly agreeable to that kind of an agreement. I wonder if it is propitious at this moment to suggest the question of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, at a given hour, on the question of the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa to propound such a unanimous-consent request if he desires to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not have a specific unanimous-consent request prepared, but I will toss a request out for such suggestions as may be made and such action as the Senate may desire to take.

I request unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday next on the question of the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter, in the order in which their names appear upon the Executive Calendar, to vote upon the other appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter to vote upon the name of the appointee to be General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, the voting, after it begins, to be continued without further debate upon the successive nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Iowa. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator include any request with respect to control of time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before anything further is done, let me say that we had an agreement that nothing of that sort was to be done this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Tennessee is quite right, and I shall not insist upon the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it had better go over until Monday. I may be perfectly willing to enter into such an agreement on Monday, but I do not want to do so this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to assure the Senator from Tennessee that I had no intention a moment ago, nor do I have any intention now, in any way to violate the spirit or the letter of the unanimous-consent agreement we previously entered into, and, therefore, I withdraw the request.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator had no purpose of violating the spirit or letter of the unanimous-consent request.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Whether it is necessary to do so now or not, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fr. Lorenzo D'Agostino, the Society of St. Edmund, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thy youngest nation has come of age, and is being asked to become the father of Thy world, to take the lead, to care for and protect Thy indigent children. These legislators are being called upon to make decisions which will influence the lives of Thy children throughout the world. Thou hast stated that all nations will be gathered one day before Thee. May these legislators hear from Thee on that day.

"Come, blessed of my Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison and you came to me. Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me"—Matthew xxv: 34–41.

Lord, on the eve of the commemoration of Thy crucifixion, give us the courage to shoulder our responsibilities, no matter what they may be, so that when we shall meet Thee face to face we shall have reason to rejoice. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST.

GEORGE] may today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a series of three letters indicating the type of activities the bureaucrats are undertaking to continue themselves in office.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include some editorial excerpts.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two statements, one concerning General MacArthur and the other concerning bureaucracy.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

GI TEACHERS FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the April 1947 issue of the Reader's Digest, which is entitled "GI Teachers for German Children." I want to commend Gen. Joseph T. McNarney for a forward step. The best way to combat communism, racial prejudice, and the other substitutes for true Americanism is through education. I am seriously considering making an extended speech suggesting that an educational program should accompany any assistance which we give in connection with loans, military assistance, or any other aid. Unless we establish some such policy, communism will move in when we move out.

GI TEACHERS FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

(By Frederic Sondern, Jr.)

(Condensed from the Kiwanis magazine)

For 2 years now our military occupation authorities in Germany have been trying to find a formula for the reeducation of Adolf Hitler's former subjects. Psychologists, teachers, and other specialists have analyzed the postwar German mind. German schools have been purged of Nazi teachers. Teenagers have been forbidden to march, drill, or do anything militaristic. Radio, newspaper, and lecture barrages have been aimed at the older Germans to prove the falseness of the Fuhrer's ideas.

But most of these efforts have made only a slight impression on a hungry and despondent people. The most promising campaign yet launched to affect the German mind of the future has been the invention and doing of the young GI himself.

In bomb-torn Bremen, where juvenile crime and underground Nazi activity were rife last spring, an engaging Minnesota Irishman, Master Sgt. Patrick Moriarty, collected nine of his GI friends. If they wanted to avoid sending their sons to Europe to fight another war, said Moriarty, they would have to do something about these German kids, who, if left to their own devices, would certainly grow up spoiling for it.

The sergeant and his friends decided to start a club for boys from 10 to 17. They found modest quarters, scrounged some furniture, and put an ad in the local paper. To their amazement, 7,000 youngsters responded. Moriarty and his helpers selected the hundred who answered their questionnaires most frankly and intelligently. They came from all levels of German society. The success of the Bremen Boys' Club was immediate and important.

Moriarty made certain ironclad rules. No politics except club politics were to be discussed. Such questions as German war guilt, racial discrimination and the concentration camps were taboo. The young German should think and talk about the future, not the past.

When Moriarty takes his daily walk in Bremen he is usually surrounded by club members, who hang on his words as he discusses everything from the United States legislature to boxing and sportsmanship. His propaganda is naive, and the more effective for its sincerity.

Typical of Moriarty's teachings are the posters, drawn by the boys themselves, which satirize the Rider—the person who bows with servility to his superior and kicks his subordinate. Other caricatures ridicule the lazy Hans, who begs, picks up cigarette butts on the street, and steals food scraps. Scavenging, which is so common and demoralizing in Germany today, took a sharp drop among Moriarty's boys.

The club members proved highly receptive to sound political ideas, too. They were fascinated when told to elect their own governing committee by secret ballot, were even more delighted when informed that they could remove the committee if it became unpopular. These were new ideas and they made a deep impression on the children.

Moriarty and his assistants kept the club's larder freshened with post-exchange supplies, and provided athletic equipment and coaches for the boys. But once the club was under way, the sergeant insisted that the boys run it themselves. They get advice and help from him only when they ask for it. He wants them to be able to carry on after the GI's have gone home, when it will be even more important than it is now.

The influence of Moriarty's idea on Bremen's youth was quickly apparent. The sergeant was summoned before military government officers to tell them how he did it. Get under the kids' skins with something they like, the sergeant explained, and you can teach them anything. In other parts of the American zone, other men like Moriarty were finding this to be true. And word gradually filtered up to headquarters.

By spring of last year it was obvious to Gen. Joseph T. McNarney's staff in Frankfurt that something radical would have to be done about German youth. The Army's Counter Intelligence Corps was particularly worried by the rapid growth of the notorious Edelweiss Piraten and other illegal organizations patterned on the Hitler Youth. Led by former Hitler Jugent fanatics, these foot-loose children chalked slogans on walls, raided military depots for weapons, attacked American soldiers on dark streets. A dangerous nucleus of a future Nazi Party was unquestionably taking shape.

Even among youth groups supervised by military government the old German military traits were cropping up again—the military formation, the rigid standing at attention, the harsh command, and the importance of beating the other fellow.

General McNarney, with this bleak picture before him, decided that our GI's would have to be mobilized in a concerted effort to change the young German's thinking. The example of Sergeant Moriarty and the others pointed the way. "The average GI is a natural Pied Piper," said one military government officer. "With enough Pied Pipers at work we should accomplish something." The Army's German youth activities program was born.

The Army as a whole was far from delighted. Under a youth-activities officer the GI's were to organize the youngsters of their areas, teach them baseball and football, put on contests, take them on hikes, and hold discussion groups. "So now they want me to be a scoutmaster, too," one irrigated colonel complained to me. The GI's also had misgivings about giving up any of their spare time. But despite the resistance, the program gathered momentum rapidly.

I went to look at some of the results. The tall young trooper from the United States Constabulary Regiment grinned as he looked around the athletic field swarming with German youngsters and GI's. "How do you like our children's party?" he asked me. "There's about 8,000 kids here already, and more coming. They look like they're having a good time."

It was hard for me to believe I was in Germany. In one corner of the huge former Nazi parade ground a noisy softball game was in progress. The Vaihingen "Dodgers" and the Möhringen "Sluggers"—ranging from 8 to 15 in age—were battling erratically but with enthusiasm for the regional pennant. There was a fast double play and GI spectators roared their approval. The German kids on the diamond either beamed or beefed in good sandlot fashion.

In another corner of the field boys and girls were being judged for freckles and red hair—a most un-German sort of competition. There were merry-go-rounds, dodgems, and marionette shows. But the most popular attraction was the jeep riding. A GI would load up his jeep to the limit with squealing, laughing children and give them a fast ride around the grounds. Other GI's distributed quantities of milk, doughnuts, and candy bars.

After five violent hours, the children were loaded into trucks to go back to the city. The regiment's Kinderfest had obviously been a success. "I have not heard so much real laughter among the young people of this district for a long time," remarked an elderly German standing next to me. "It is very encouraging. Your soldiers can do much for a healthy Germany if they keep on with this."

I heard a sour note, too, however. "How they can play these filthy American games," an older teen-age lounger, in remnants of a Volkstürm uniform, said to a companion. "How they could touch that food, and laugh, in the face of our disgrace." Few of the young people who make up the age group from 17 to 25 join the boys' clubs.

The GYA's organizers quickly discovered that sports, particularly baseball, were by far the best way to get under the skins of both the German children and the GI's. At first the children's parents were suspicious, scenting an insidious propaganda scheme. The youngsters themselves were difficult pupils. "They simply don't know the meaning of teamwork," moaned a corporal, sweating over his nine in a Munich ball park. "Everybody wants to be the pitcher. They make politics over it. As for sportsmanship—if they lose a game, they talk about losing their honor, and make out that the other guys were cheating. But," he sighed, "we try to teach them. They break down if you keep at them long enough."

Quite a few German youngsters told me their reactions. One of them, the 14-year-

old son of a minor Nazi official, summed it up this way: "At first I didn't like the soldiers. I had heard so much bad about them—their cruelty and all. But our school teacher said we had to learn baseball to please the Americans. After all, they were our governors. But then I discovered that they were really friendly. So I tried very hard, and now I'm on our first team. I wish I could go to America. I think you like each other more than we do."

The GYA program spread in everwidening circles. I went to the weekly meeting of a Rhineland sports club held in a bombed-out house which the local GI's had made habitable. They had installed comfortable furniture, a radio-phonograph, ping-pong table and heating equipment. In the club's board room, where a newly acquired track-meet trophy stood in the place of honor formerly occupied by Hitler's portrait, there was first a heated discussion between a group of GI's and the boys in an amazing mixture of German and English about the organization of a neighborhood football league. Then the question of repairing an abandoned mountain hut for their summer headquarters was taken up.

When the formal part of the evening began, a GI who had been a civics teacher in Ohio gave a talk on election practices in the United States. Although he spoke fluent German, it was heavy stuff to follow. But the kids—almost all of them—listened carefully. The questions that followed were eager:

"How does a man get to be a governor?" "Is it true that the Jewish population of the United States is so strong that they elect the President?" "Has the President a Gestapo like Hitler's?"

They kept at him for over an hour. And one by one the soldier kept knocking down misconceptions created by Dr. Goebbels and perpetuated by word of mouth to this day. He was filling the vacuum in which the bewildered, ignorant youth of Germany are floundering. And they were eating it up.

But the high point of the evening, for me, followed. A youngster about 15 years old got up to talk about "what he had learned from the Americans." He delivered his lecture in typical grade-school-composition fashion. When Germans get together to discuss something, he said in effect, each one tries to force his opinion down the others' throats. The best thing he had learned from the Americans, he thought, was the ability to meet with other people, listen to their views, then come to an amicable agreement. He was very earnest about it, and when he sat down he got resounding applause.

Our military police and CIC reports indicate that both juvenile delinquency and anti-American activity have dropped sharply in those sections of our occupation zone where the GI's have been busy. If the Army's GYA program can be continued and expanded—with sufficient support from the War Department, with athletic equipment, building materials for youth hostels, reading matter and enthusiasm—we have a chance of affecting materially the mentality of many Germans who will strongly influence the key country of Europe 10 or 15 years hence—a time that is likely to be crucial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCONNELL (at the request of Mr. TIBBOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters and tables.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorial comment.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma delegation and a statement on the global alphabet by the Honorable Robert L. Owen, former Senator of Oklahoma.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. ANGELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and in each to include other material.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in an independent paper, the Chicago Times, and also an article appearing in the Washington Post regarding the fact that 2,900 corporations made 28 percent more last year than they ever made before, showing that the country is prosperous.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion.

A TEXTILE MILL OWNER'S VIEW ON THE GREEK-TURKISH PROPOSAL

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, a woman who owns and operates a textile mill in a large city told me that although she believes that if a man is hungry we should feed him, and if naked, clothe him, yet the President's proposal about Greece and Turkey is very disturbing. She said first, that Congress has the power to get the facts, and they should be given to the American people. But she wants to know how we can stop communism in any country if the people want it. She says that $400,000,000 will not do it. Finally, Mr. Speaker, she asked this question: "Would not the best contribution of the United States of America to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can still remain, as always, the bulwark of free government in the world?"

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, when the Greek question comes to the floor for debate, I sincerely hope that someone will at least attempt to tell this House and the American people what is the foreign policy of this Government.

Frankly, there are so many contradictory statements by persons in authority, so much double talk by administrative spokesmen, that the picture becomes more confused every day.

If the objective of this so-called foreign policy has been peace and security for ourselves and peace and security for peace-loving and industrious nations of the world, then, as of today, it is a 100-percent failure, and no progress to report.

If that policy is to commit this Government to assume every financial burden of all the nations of the world, to supply the armies of the opposing factions striving for power in many of the countries of Europe and Asia, if it is to appease everyone and continue forever the giving away of our money and the products of our labor, if it is to promote confusion and turmoil, then some success can be reported.

Now, 2 years after the war, and the continued flow of billions of dollars in supplies and our meddling in the affairs of most everyone, we find confusion, socialism, communism, guerrilla warfare, and starvation rampant in most of the countries of Europe and Asia. Consequently, we are disturbed by the new venture proposed by the President.

In reviewing the facts surrounding the Greek question, a very confusing and paradoxical situation is presented.

Mr. Constantine Brown, writing for the Washington Star, reports that the guerrilla bands that are now harassing the Greek Government are well equipped and are mainly supplied through UNRRA and lend-lease from the United States.

A Member told the House a few days ago that Greece has $220,000,000 in assets in the Bank of England and that this sum is restricted to use within the sterling bloc, or can only be used to purchase goods within the Empire.

An Associated Press item in the paper Sunday stated that Greece had active credits in this Government totaling $93,700,000, to be used for purchases as soon as goods are available.

Turkey, according to reliable reports, is in good financial condition. She did not enter the war and profited by selling supplies to Germany.

A former Ambassador to Russia in a statement to the United States Weekly, as reported in the Times-Herald this morning, says he is in favor of giving legitimate aid to suffering humanity in

Greece and wherever needed, but make sure that this aid goes to relieve suffering humanity and not to support political aspirations.

All in all, this presents a very ugly and confusing picture.

As I said in the beginning, this House and the American people are entitled to a frank and honest statement of our foreign commitments and objectives. This is almost too much to expect from the State Department.

However, after several days of extensive hearings, it is hoped and believed that the members of our Foreign Affairs Committee will throw some light on a very dark subject.

PETITION FROM EIGHTH GUAM CONGRESS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted a communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, which dealt with a statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] in the RECORD of March 31. This statement alleged that the Secretary of the Navy had withheld a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States from the Eighth Guam Congress.

Whoever told my friend from California that the Secretary of the Navy withheld this petition told him that which is not true.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is a member, I have gone into this matter thoroughly. I find that the Secretary of the Navy has never received this petition and therefore has not deliberately withheld the matter from Congress.

The action of my colleague in correcting an injustice done the Secretary of the Navy is commendable and manly. Both the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] and the Secretary of the Navy were apparently victims of unfounded and false information.

REPRESENTATIVE ADOLPH J. SABATH

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that tomorrow, April 4, will be the eighty-first anniversary of the birth of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has served continuouly in this House longer than any other man in the history of this country. He is now in his forty-first year of continuous service to his country.

The story of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is one which should be an inspiration to every child in the country. Coming from Europe at a very tender age, he has established himself throughout the country as a great force and factor in the upward march of civilization. He holds the belief that the best way we can bring to full fruition the ideals of the framers of our Constitution is to be liberal and progressive in our thinking, and to endeavor to raise the standard of living, in every respect, of all the people of this Nation.

Many of the Members who have served with the gentleman from Illinois during the 41 years he has been here differ with him in principle, but I know that everyone admires his sincerity of purpose, his courage, the tenacity with which he has pursued the right as he believes it to be, and his attention to duty. I do not know of any man in this House who works more faithfully and consistently than the gentleman from Illinois despite his advanced age of 81 years. I hope that we all will see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] with us for many, many more years. He is an example for other Members of Congress to follow. I wish for him the greatest happiness on tomorrow, his birthday, and many more years of health, cheerfulness, and prosperity. Congratulations to you, the dean of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I extend my felicitations to the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, on his eighty-first birthday, and also on his twenty-first term in the Congress of the United States.

He has indeed had a colorful and fruitful life and merits our heartiest congratulations.

It is interesting to reflect on the fact he was born just 1 year after the Civil War came to an end, and came to the United States at the tender age of 15, when James A. Garfield, onetime chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, was serving as President.

When our distinguished colleague was elected to Congress in 1907, Theodore Roosevelt was in the White House and Uncle Joe Cannon, also of Illinois, was presiding over the destinies of the House of Representatives.

What enriching experiences and associations our good friend from Illinois had in his long and fruitful service in this House.

When he assumed the duties of office in the Sixtieth Congress, there was serving in this body many distinguished men, whose names have been indelibly imprinted upon the pages of American history.

From Alabama there was Tom Heflin, Richard Hobson, and Oscar Underwood.

From California there was Julius Kahn, with whose widow many of us served in a later period.

From Illinois came such stalwarts as James R. Mann, Martin Madden, Joseph Cannon, and others, and the gentleman from Illinois is the only survivor of this illustrious group.

Others who were here at that time were Jim Watson, of Indiana; Gilbert Haugen, the farm leader from Iowa; Ollie James, of Kentucky; and also Swager Sherley.

From Massachusetts there was Frederick Gillette, who later became Secretary of War.

From Michigan there was that great tariff expert, Joseph Fordney.

From the State of Minnesota, there was the father of Lindbergh, the flier, and Volstead, the author of the Volstead Act.

There was John Sharp Williams, from Mississippi, who later moved to the Senate, and Champ Clark, of Missouri, who served as Speaker of the House and was in the forefront as a candidate for the Presidency.

From Nebraska there was Norris. Sulzer and Bourke Cochran and Vreeland, of New York, and Claude Kitchen, of North Carolina, served here in the Sixtieth Congress.

From Ohio there was Nicholas Longworth, who later became Speaker, and Theodore Burton, who later went to the Senate.

From Oregon there was Mr. Hawley.

From Tennessee there was Cordell Hull, who later became Secretary of State.

From Texas there was Albert Burleson, who later became Postmaster General, and John Garner, who became Vice President.

From Virginia there was Carter Glass, one-time Secretary of the Treasury, and from Wyoming there was Frank Mondell, who was Republican leader in this House.

What an illustrious group it was, and since then the gentleman from Illinois has enjoyed the associations of thousands who have served with distinction in this body.

I can think of no richer or more colorful experience than that which he has been privileged to enjoy, and may I express the hope that he will have a long life.

As the Easter season approaches, may I wish for him also that rarest of all gifts—serenity and peace of mind.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the House may be in session this afternoon that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the District of Columbia may sit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Criterion for Rent Control" from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SHORTAGE OF HOUSING AND COMMERCIAL SPACE IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, Kansas City, Mo., in which the larger portion of my district is located, is recognized as one of the growing and progressive cities of the Midwest, with extraordinary industrial potentialities. It is a strategic

gateway to the rich agricultural areas, natural resources, and unmeasured markets of the West. Its location and productive capacity make it a strong and important factor in the planning of our national economy which, for reasons of security and for other reasons, must shift its center of gravity toward the geographical center of the United States. One by one the few conditions which inhibit the vigorous growth and development of Kansas City are being eliminated, and within a few days a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will consider the removal of an important one, the recurrent danger of flood damage from the Missouri River at that point.

Like other cities, Kansas City is experiencing the critical shortage of housing and commercial space which has grown out of the last great war. I am deeply concerned with the acute and distressing conditions resulting from the housing shortage, but it is a specific situation affecting commercial rental space in the downtown district of Kansas City that I wish to discuss today.

Two facts present a sharp silhouette of the picture.

The first is that the great aircraft engine plant in Kansas City, formerly operated by the Pratt & Whitney Co., owned by the United States and presently maintained, I am informed, at a cost to the Government of more than $65,000 per month or more than three-quarters of a million dollars per year, contains a half million square feet of office space, of which only 150,000 square feet are occupied. The War Assets Administration is attempting to rent the other 350,000 square feet to private tenants at $1 or less per square foot per year.

The second fact is that in August of last year, 1946, the United States, through the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, purchased one of Kansas City's largest and finest downtown office buildings—the Fidelity National Bank & Trust Building, 32 stories tall and containing some 234,000 square feet of space—for occupancy by Federal agencies, and is dispossessing its private tenants as rapidly as their leases expire. Most of these private tenants have no idea where other space can be obtained, for the Government's action has resulted in a crisis because of the absence of rentable commercial space.

I might add a third fact. Within the last several days the Veterans' Administration has been negotiating for, and by this time has probably concluded, a lease for a building known as the Corrigan Building, containing some 100,000 square feet of space and now occupied by one of Kansas City's foremost manufacturing concerns, the Donnelly Garment Co. That company is preeminent in its field and, with one of the largest pay rolls in the Kansas City area, is a valuable asset to the community. With sufficient, suitable, privately owned space not available elsewhere in the city, Donnelly Garment Co. is obliged either to leave Kansas City or to take over Government-owned space in the aircraft plant while the Government takes over its space in the Corrigan Building.

It doesn't make sense any way you look at it. How can the Government justify its purchase and occupancy of first-class downtown office space, and its action in ejecting private tenants who have no other space available, when the Government owns and maintains acres of new office space at the edge of town?

The excuse for the purchase of the Fidelity Building was the argument that Federal agencies and employees in the Kansas City area could be consolidated and centralized in the building, with increased efficiency and at reduced cost. But the fact is that of the approximately 8,000 Federal employees not already housed in postoffice and courts buildings, not more than 2,000, or 25 percent can be accommodated in the Fidelity Building. The "consolidation" argument is obviously no justification at all. Moreover, one of the agencies newly moved into the building is the Weather Bureau, which moved out of the Federal Courts Building and not out of commercially leased space.

Let me give you some of the facts concerning the Fidelity Building. It was built in 1931, designed for commercial use. Many of its offices were specially laid out and constructed for particular tenants. Its lower floors are occupied by a bank, and other tenants include insurance agencies, lawyers, real-estate and rental firms, railroad offices, investment houses, engineering firms, advertising agencies, and building-and-loan companies. In its present condition, cut up into many suites and separate offices, it is altogether unsuitable for Government occupancy, which requires large open floor spaces. Major, and probably structural, alterations are required to adapt the building to Government use. It is peculiarly unsuited to Government use because of its height of 32 stories and the inadequacy of its elevators to handle the heavy traffic which characterizes any Government space. It was bought by the Government for $3,300,000, and its removal from the real-estate tax rolls will cost the State of Missouri, Jackson County, and Kansas City more than $60,000 per year in tax revenues, while 350,000 square feet of Government-owned, tax-free space at the edge of Kansas City goes vacant and begging.

Some Government agencies have already moved with their employees into the building. Several of my constituents have written me that it is difficult to get into the building at all because the lobby is constantly jammed with coffee drinkers and "coke" sippers. One of them wrote me, rather plaintively, I thought:

> The Government clerks arrive at work—hardly any of them have anything to do. They no sooner get in the building than they flock over to Brecklein's or to the cigar counter for "cokes" or coffee. In the middle of the morning and in the middle of the afternoon they have to go somewhere for refreshment and relaxation. The FHA has moved to the Fidelity Building. Prior to its removal I made several visits to the Land Bank Building and saw the office in action. * * *
>
> * * * You cannot imagine more people doing less work. I should say there were 10 men in the office. I never saw one of them busy. I never observed a typist who appeared to have anything to type. What burns me up is that the taxpayers are being bled to death with this kind of waste. I hope that Congress makes a searching investigation of the bureaus. If the ones in Kansas City are any example, their personnel could be cut at least three-fourths and the service improved thereby.

Mr. Speaker, many others would testify to the same effect. It is unthinkable that the Government should deprive private firms and individuals of their space in a building specially designed for their use and fill it with myriad clerical and ministerial activities which could as well be carried on in the 350,000 square feet of office space which the Government owns at the edge of the city. Yet for that very purpose the Government bought the building and paid for it almost twice its assessed value. One result has been a sharp inflationary increase in rates for the insignificant amount of office space available in the city, for which there is desperate competition among those persons and firms who are being or are to be evicted from the Fidelity Building.

There are many other undesirable consequences which have followed the Government's purchase of the building. The parking problem, always a difficult one in downtown areas, is becoming infinitely more so in the vicinity of the building, as increasing numbers of Government employees, other tenants, and persons doing business both privately and with the Government, seek parking space. The result is confusion and delay.

Consider the 350,000 square feet of vacant office space which the Government owns in the aircraft plant. It is considered suitable for private occupancy and is offered for that purpose by the War Assets Administration, but it is ideal for the use of Government agencies because of the large areas of open office space, unpartitioned. The War Assets Administration is asking $1 per square foot per year for it, with no takers. That is the space which ought to be occupied by Government agencies. It is true that some Federal agencies need to be in the downtown area. They can be adequately housed, in my opinion, in the thousands of square feet of commercial space which the Government already occupies downtown. There are many departments which can carry on their work with equal or better effect in the space which the Government already owns. They do not need to occupy first-class, expensive office space in the heart of the business district. Certainly, established private businesses ought not to be compelled to leave the city or perhaps be forced out of business in order to make room for them.

Of course, myriad objections are made and will be made to utilization of the Government-owned space by the Government. It is located outside the business district and at the very edge of the city. But it is easily and quickly accessible by automobile; public transportation is nearby, and, in the event of expanded occupancy, would be available to the door; and a large Government-sponsored housing project virtually adjoins it. There is no merit to the argument that

it is inconveniently located for Government use. Some relocating of agencies ought to be made which would leave in space already rented downtown those whose activities involved the greatest public contact. The others should be moved to the Pratt-Whitney plant, with its 350,000 square feet of empty office space, which the Government owns.

Early in my Army service my duties included the leasing of space for use of all War Department agencies. In that work we took over some 10,000,000 square feet of office and storage space in the nine States comprising the Seventh Service Command. Exigencies of the war compelled us to cause some dislocation of private business, some of it in Kansas City. But the war is over. Economy and common sense demand that the Government make the best and most efficient use of what it has—of the enormous facilities it constructed with the taxpayers' money. I know from experience that no Government agency is ever satisfied with the space to which it is assigned, but in this critical period of recovery and readjustment they should be required to get along with what is available.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. REEVES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is happening in Kansas City in connection with the purchase of this large office building is also happening in many of our other cities. I wonder if the gentleman has given any thought to the question whether or not the Government of the United States should compensate Kansas City and other cities for the taxes that they lose by reason of these buildings being taken off the assessment rolls. Further, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the District of Columbia most of the downtown large buildings are owned by the Government and are therefore not subject to taxation, but the Congress for years has recognized the inequality brought about by their removal from the tax rolls and appropriates annually a certain sum of money for the upkeep of the city of Washington. Does the gentleman not believe we are now reaching the point where such consideration should be given to other cities where the Government is purchasing these large buildings and taking them off the tax rolls?

Mr. REEVES. I certainly think the equities of the situation demand that the Government should not be accorded the benefit of all the services provided by local governments and not take care of any of the costs of them. I think what the gentleman has said, and I thank him for what he has stated, emphasizes that point. Where the Government has space, and certainly as much space as it has available in the particular instance to which I have alluded, it should use that space first before undertaking the dislocation of private tenants.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Last year the Veterans' Administration purchased one of the most valuable buildings in the downtown area of the city of Des Moines, although there were other Government buildings available at the edge of the city that they could have used. It chose to go downtown and purchase a large office building which has now been removed from the assessment rolls and the private owners will be required to pay proportionately higher taxes.

Mr. REEVES. I think the action of the Government in that case is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, conditions in the business area of Kansas City brought about by the Government's purchase of the Fidelity Building are growing rapidly worse, and public resentment is increasing every day. No remedy will alleviate the situation except the return of the Fidelity Building to private ownership and occupancy.

I have today introduced in the House a bill looking to the sale of the building if there is a private buyer for it at its fair market value. The bill is not long and I include it at this point in my remarks:

A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized and directed to cause to be determined by appraisal the fair market value of certain real estate in Kansas City, Mo., recently acquired by the United States, which real estate consists of the building known as the Fidelity National Bank & Trust Building and the tract of land on which said building is situated, said real estate being located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ninth and Walnut Streets in said city. Said fair market value shall be determined and the amount thereof shall be made a matter of public information on or before September 1, 1947. For the purpose of making such determination, the Commissioner shall employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, three disinterested persons, resident in Kansas City, Mo., who have knowledge of the value of real estate in Kansas City and are qualified appraisers of real estate used for industrial or commercial purposes in said city.

SEC. 2. From and after the date upon which such fair market value is determined as herein provided and until December 31, 1947, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall solicit and receive sealed bids for the purchase of said real estate from the United States. Said bids shall not be opened prior to January 1, 1948. On or after January 1, 1948, but in no case later than January 10, 1948, said bids shall be opened and made a matter of public information.

SEC. 3. On or before February 1, 1948, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall transmit to the Congress a report of the action taken pursuant to this act and the results thereof, attached to and making a part of, said report (1) a digest of said appraisal and a statement as to the amount of the fair market value of said real estate as determined thereby, and (2) an abstract of all bids received for the purchase of said real estate, showing as to each bid the name of the bidder or bidders and the amount and terms of the bid. Said report shall serve as the basis for further action by the Congress with respect to the sale of said real estate by the United States.

In order to establish the fair market value of the building and land, provision is made for a new appraisal, to be made by three qualified and disinterested appraisers of Kansas City, Mo. The result of the appraisal is to be made public not later than September 1, 1947. In order to test the market, it is provided that the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall receive sealed bids for purchase of the building until December 31, 1947. The bids are to be opened, and their amounts and terms made public, not later than January 10, 1948. It is further provided that by February 1, 1948, a report shall be made to the Congress giving the amount of the fair market value as determined by appraisal and the amounts and terms of the bids. If this bill is enacted, which I earnestly urge, and a bid is received which equals or approximates the fair market value, I intend to introduce a bill immediately after February 1, 1948, authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to complete the sale.

Only return of the building to private ownership and private occupancy will relieve the critical space shortage which has brought about the present emergency in Kansas City.

It is my conviction that in acquiring title to the Fidelity Building the Government has once again failed to consider the impact of its action upon existing conditions.

(Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a bill he introduced today.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] be granted leave of absence from noon today to and including Tuesday, April 9, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a statement by the legislative representative of a veterans' organization, and in the other a statement by the national commander of the DAV.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ANTIRACKETEERING LEGISLATION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the whole country has recently been shocked

by the reports of bribery and attempted bribery in the world of sports. A bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to punish such activities. Such a measure has the endorsement of my good friend and constituent Abe J. Greene, of Paterson, N. J., president of the National Boxing Association and a long-term fighter for clean and honest sports. He urges passage of the Hébert bill, about which he has written me as follows:

MARCH 31, 1947.

Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you very much for the copy of the bill introduced by Congressman HÉBERT, of Louisiana, to punish bribery in connection with interstate athletic competition.

I think this measure should be very vigorously pushed, and I hope that it is not sidetracked as unimportant legislation as soon as the momentary hysteria in the athletic world is dispelled. It is very important that there be on the books of the country a measure which will always be available with which to strike hard at the crooks and other vermin who would prostitute sports. America is a nation of hero worshippers and there isn't a kid in the country who at some time or other hasn't adopted some outstanding sports figure as an example in whose footsteps he would hope to follow. Crooks who hold forth the lure of a bribe to the fellows in athletic spotlight do more than merely transgress on decency—they strike a blow at one of the basic influences of American life, and I think Congressman HÉBERT will perform a national public service in seeing his measure through to final enactment.

Please give him my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ABE J. GREENE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DAIRY PRICES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, few people, I believe, realize that New York State is the greatest producer of fluid milk in this country. New York State is famous for many things, principally the city of New York, but few appreciate that it is one of the greatest agricultural States of the Union. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent two of the greatest dairy counties in the great State of New York, Orange and Delaware. When I was last home I saw two farmers' delegations, one from my home county of Orange and one from Delaware County. Their plight is practically the same. They are the victims of planned economy, and, as we know, plans often miscarry. I should like to take time to explain just how the plans of the Federal Government have miscarried in respect to the dairy farmers of my district.

The Federal Government, in its omniscience, decided that beginning January 1947 there would be a price recession and that, therefore, the price of milk should be reduced. Unfortunately the recession did not occur. The farmers are paying more for all feed, for gasoline, for tractors and farm machinery, and for lubricating oil. These prices are still going up; they are not receding. The price of wheat was $87 on February 13 and it was $100 on March 13. Oats were $72.60 on the same date in February and $84 on the same date in March. The increase has occurred on oats, soybean oil, meal, hominy, middlings, and bran.

On March 17 the GLF manager telegraphed into my district that 20 percent dairy ration price would be increased $2.50 a ton.

It stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer cannot be expected to produce anything for less than he is being paid. I should like to quote from a letter from the Montgomery Producers Cooperative of Orange County under the date line of March 12:

A meeting of protest of all milk producers in southern Orange County was held in the Goshen Courthouse on the evening of March 6, 1947. Representatives of most of the creameries were present, and the city of Middletown is their principal shopping center. The pay checks from 10 creameries have had until now a combined total of approximately $800,000 each month. Figuring at the daily intake rate of 50,000 pounds of milk at each plant, a 2-cent reduction which we have been forced to accept amounts to about $5,000 per day for the 10 creameries, or $150,000 per month that this area is reduced in purchasing power.

It is unfair on the very face of the thing. It costs just as much to produce a quart of milk in February and March as it does in December. When cattle are not stabled, the cost of production is much less, and we are most willing to cooperate at that time.

If there is a surplus now, that increased production was in response to Government needs and its constant urging to produce. The dairyman, having done all that his Government required, should not be compelled now to bear the possible losses sustained in reconversion to a peacetime footing. Do you think labor would take a 20-percent cut in wages now?

The farmers have asked for a price of $5.02 per hundredweight up to and including the month of June. Economists from our State college say this price represents only costs, and if they are to continue to operate they must have costs.

I called up the Department of Agriculture this morning, and the price for this month per hundredweight in Delaware County is $4.60 and in Orange County $4.65, and the cost price is $5.02 per hundredweight.

The cost of milk is one that the public is willing and able to pay. There is no question of asking for Government subsidies. Most of the farmers I have spoken to do not want any; in fact, they want no Government interference. They would like the Government to admit that the price rescission they fear has not occurred and that they have penalized the farmers by putting the price of milk down to $4.60 a hundredweight when it costs $5.02 to cover the cost of production.

I am sure that we want to see agriculture prosper. I know that all fair-minded people will agree that no one did more unselfish work during the war to feed not only our own country but a great part of the civilized world than the American farmer. And, last but not least, Mr. Speaker, the farmer works 365 days a year every year. The farmer never strikes, and without the farmer none of us could live.

The American farmer is not asking for favors. He is only asking for justice. He is not asking for hand-outs. He is asking for a fair price for his product.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is the all-important question of what the Congress intends to do about strikes which injuriously affect public health, safety, and welfare, which is emphasized at the present time by the threatened industry-wide strike of telephone employees.

Sooner or later Congress must find the right answer. We might just as well come up with it now as later. We all recall that a year or so ago the railroad employees went out on strike and President Truman sent a message to the Congress asking that we pass an act drafting railroad employees, compelling them to work. If my memory is correct, that bill went through this House with but a few dissenting votes and died in the other body. That was drastic action on our part.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe there were 13 votes against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman for the correction. That is an unlucky number, is it not?

The gentlemen who voted against the President's request may have thought the measure was too drastic; was contrary to our principles of government. Those who voted for it undoubtedly believed that the public could not be permitted to suffer through a Nation-wide tie-up of transportation of food.

Then, we had the coal strike. Fortunately for our people, the President and the Supreme Court settled that one, at least, temporarily.

Now, we have this threatened strike in the telephone industry that will inconvenience everyone if it comes as announced. It may perhaps injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare. But, regardless of that particular situation, the Congress now and the Committee on Education and Labor has before it the necessity of determining what the public policy shall be when the welfare of the Nation is threatened.

The Committee on Labor has been wrestling with that question for something like 2 months. Just the other day, on April 2, I believe, it reported out a bill—a quickie, they called it. It was my understanding when the bill H. R. 2861 was drafted it would provide that when the President found there was a situation which injuriously affected the public health, safety, and welfare, he would

so declare. Then he was required to order the Attorney General to make application to the court for an injunction and for other court orders which would remedy the situation, get the utility back into operation. That was all right, so far as it went. Then the committee proceeded, after the first two pages of the bill, to write in provisions as to fact-finding, then mediation. Then there was a suggestion that there be what they called voluntary arbitration, if there is any such thing, with the Government on one side of the issue, over a period of 75 days. I wonder what those who know that the supplies of food, water, light, transportation, and communications of a whole city like Washington will be shut off think is going to happen if that should continue for a period of 75 days.

I wonder what they believe as to whether a company can find people to operate the service if you have mediation and conciliation and arbitration, and then when the striking employees agree to a settlement, those who have gone in in the emergency and taken over the job of running the street cars, tending the electric-light plants which furnish the light or pump the water, are to be kicked out as soon as those who are in the union have concluded that they want to go back to work.

There is no use of fooling about this situation. The basic and fundamental issue is this: Does this Congress intend to be intimidated, coerced longer into temporizing with measures which permit groups, and organizations, to impair the welfare of all of the people? You can talk about the right to strike, you can talk about the right to organize, all those things; but in the end the issue is whether the desire of the individual or of a minority must yield to the public good. We know what happens when the safety of our Nation is threatened by a foreign enemy. The Congress enacts a law and the President takes the young man into the Army, sends him wherever they want him to go, to work or to fight as the commanding officer directs. Yet, when the safety and the welfare of our Nation are imperiled by strikes we sit back and say: "No, you cannot stop that."

Well, why not? If these strikes continue, and there have been examples all over the country where the interest of the public has been affected and health and safety impaired, we will have on a large scale just what we have had in some of these instances. As for example, down in Tennessee, where the employees' relatives got together and went down to the picket line and said: "Get out of the way." And they got out of the way.

Some people say you cannot make a man work. All right, concede that point for the sake of the argument, although I deny its validity when the national welfare is involved. But concede it if you wish. What is the answer? If the employees of the telephone company, the railroad company, for instance, or any public utility want to quit, refuse to work, let them quit. In the bill, H. R. 2862, offered on the same day H. R. 2861 was offered, and in the bill H. R. 90, which was offered on the 3d day of January of this year, it was provided that if any man did not want to work he could quit. Then what happens? The bill provides that the company may and that it shall be its duty to hire someone else. Why? Because you and I must have water to drink, we must have food to eat, we must have light, we must have heat, and all of those things which are necessary if we would live. Yes, and so must the man who quits his job, and so must his wife and his children. When he will not transport food to the city, is it your obligation or mine to feed him, his family? He would be outraged if the groceryman refused to sell to him. But he will not work or aid in replenishing the groceryman's shelves. Then why, I ask, should Congress sit back and because someone wails about the sacred right to strike and says you cannot make a man work—why should we sit here and refuse to pass legislation which everyone must concede is for the benefit of the Nation as a whole?

My thought is this: Keep right on and let these men strike, let them prevent others from working, and sooner or later you will have violence, rioting, you will have civil strife; for while our people are patient and long-suffering, there comes a time when their patience is exhausted, when they are not going to stand for it any longer, then let those who stand between the people and their food or their fuel beware.

It is my hope that if and when the House Committee on Labor gets its bill to the floor for consideration, the membership will strike out some of those provisions about fact-finding, mediation, and conciliation, and think first not of the effect that the act might have upon our political future but of what is necessary to protect the public.

In that bill—H. R. 2861—there is a provision exempting all of those to whom the Railway Labor Act applies. Why, think of it. Is there any reason, is there any reason, I ask, why the railway employees throughout this Nation should be permitted to tie up the transportation system of the Nation and imperil the lives of those in the cities? If you tie up the distribution of food for even a week, the folks in the city will be hungry. That would be true if it were tied up for only a few days.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In my opinion, the gentleman in his thinking, in his utterances, and in his performances is as sound as gold money. He discusses a question that is presented to this Congress and it is one we must meet. It is a question that will test the worthiness of the membership of this body to represent all the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. That issue is coming up; it has been with us for a long time but soon we are going to be forced to stand up and be counted. I repeat, the issue is whether we are going to legislate in the interest and for the benefit of our people as a whole, legislate for the public health, safety or welfare or whether we are going to be frightened because of what might happen to some of us through the voting power of some union or some group of unions who issue—upon having their way—their special privileges?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot help but think of the tragic consequences of, for instance, tying up our light system or even the telephone system or any of our public utilities. You can hardly pick up a paper that you do not see where there has been some marvelous operation performed on an infant or on an adult. Hundreds of people are under the knife on operating tables every day, particularly in large cities. Just imagine what might happen to a surgeon who was in the midst of operating on a muscle of a heart or perhaps working on some delicate mechanism of the eye if suddenly the lights were to go out. What would be the ghastly consequence of that? Take the telephone strike now impending. We saw in the paper this morning the picture of a couple of babies that were saved because they were able to get the necessary drugs and get them quickly. Suppose there were no telephone facilities by which they could reach the right doctor, the right surgeon, or the right institution in order to save life? It could carry itself to a point where this would be anything but a free country when people are deprived of their life as well as their liberty as the result of a group tying up the country in such a way that it might almost be called murder of the innocent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will recall, in Michigan in 1937, on the eastern side of the State, the CIO threatened to pull the switches through which went the power to hospitals, police stations, and fire departments. At that time the public opinion shut down on them, and said, "No; you don't." But it required a show of threatened force to end that situation. Soon after the 15th of the month the House will get an overall labor bill. Before that date let us do some sound, sober thinking.

STRIKES AFFECTING THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan very properly directs our attention to the problem of what we are going to do with strikes involving the public welfare. He very properly calls attention to the proposals he has made and the proposal being reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. In this connection I would like to suggest to the Members that they call for a copy of the bill, H. R. 2900, which I introduced yesterday. This takes portions of H. R. 725, which I introduced in January, and deals with what I call the "end dispute" and proposes a remedy, a method of handling the situation.

The end dispute, in my opinion, is that dispute which you have on your

hands when you have exhausted all of the procedures of collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration. If it is a dispute in an essential or monopolized service or industry which vitally affects the public welfare, the public health, or the public safety, we, as Members of Congress, simply cannot ignore the situation.

Under the Clayton Act and under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the courts have held that the Government is practically powerless. Read the Norris-LaGuardia Act where it says that no court shall have jurisdiction to grant an injunction in questions involving a labor dispute. You will find it difficult, if you are a layman, to quarrel with the contention that was made by John L. Lewis and his attorneys that the courts have been denied the right to grant an injunction, and on that particular point the Supreme Court upheld the Government's position by only a 5-to-4 vote, as I recall.

So it seems to me that this Congress faces the responsibility of saying what we are going to do in these end disputes. The John L. Lewis decision hung upon the seizure of the industry under the Smith-Connally Act, an act which expires the 30th of June. Without Government seizure, the Government is powerless today to handle these end disputes.

The public must be made aware of the difference between the right of an individual to quit work and the right to strike. A distinction must be established between the right to work and not to work, and the right to strike. A distinction must be established in the public thinking between the right to work or the right to quit work, and the right to strike, when you are speaking of public-welfare disputes. The right to strike implies acting in concert; it implies collective action.

Now, the courts have held that under the interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act the courts are powerless to grant injunctions where a private employer is the applicant in any situation involving a labor dispute or labor organization. The courts have held that if a labor organization does something, thinking it is doing it in its own best interest, the court will not intervene. That kind of a concept must be changed. I want to assert that where the public welfare, the public safety, and the public health are involved, there is no natural right for any group of men to conspire, to act in concert, against the general welfare, even in the name of good intentions by labor organizations. And until the Congress writes some law that says that effectively, the public will not be protected.

So I urge, with the gentleman from Michigan, that you give consideration to these bills that have been presented and be ready to act upon them when the opportunity comes before us.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there obection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see an interest manifested in this very vital question of what we are going to do about strikes in public utilities. Really, the time has come when we ought to stop talking about it and do something about it. It is most vital and most dangerous.

Now, the gentleman from South Dakota, who has been so helpful in this matter through the years, called attention to the fact that the so-called Smith-Connally Act expires the 30th of June and that we will not be able to get any aid from that act after that date. I call your attention to the fact that, so far as any future strikes are concerned, the Smith-Connally Act has already expired, because the law provides that there shall be no seizures under the act after the President's declaration of termination of hostilities, so that, if the telephone strike takes place on next Monday, this Government is utterly powerless to do anything about it.

Now, the only reason that the Government is powerless to do anything about it is because of the previous conduct of the Congress in passing the Norris-LaGuardia Act. If it were not for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it is unquestionably true that the Government would have the right to intervene in these strikes which affect the general welfare of the whole public to go into court and ask for an injunction. As a matter of fact, there are numerous decisions of the courts which hold that the paramount right of the public, the paramount right of the Government to exist and conduct its normal affairs overrides what some people are pleased to call the right to strike. There are plenty of decisions on that subject. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court has held that there is no such thing as an absolute right to strike.

What we have been neglecting to observe over the years in dealing as we have with these labor problems, the vital thing we have neglected to observe, is that the right of the public, the right of the average citizen to pursue his normal course of activities, is paramount to the right of any minority group to say that the Government shall not function any longer "unless we say so."

I have called attention to this situation over the years. I have made numerous speeches on the floor on the subject, in which I pointed out to the Congress that you have a situation existing in this country when one man can, and does, say to this Nation of 140,000,000 people, "You shall not have any coal after tomorrow morning, and therefore the wheels of industry of this whole Nation shall cease to revolve." You have a situation where one man by reason of his influence through the closed shop and other influences which he exerts over the workingmen of this country, whether they wish it or not, can stop the production of the steel that is necessary to carry on the economy of this Nation. You have the situation where one man can stop the wheels from rolling on all the railroads in the country. That condition is not something new today. You are confronted today with a condition where one man is saying to this Nation that the telephone shall not operate after next Monday. That is nothing new. That has been with you ever since all of you have been Members of Congress. It has been called to the attention of this Congress, and I am glad to say that this House has attempted to act on this subject and has been stymied in its action only by failure to act on the part of another body on this Capitol Hill. That does not relieve us of our duty to continue to try to act, to continue to bring to the attention of the other branches of government and to this Nation as a whole the situation in which we are placed by the autocracy of half a dozen men in this Nation who have the power and exert the power month after month and year after year to come forward with their demands and say, "Unless you meet our demands, reasonable or unreasonable, you shall no longer function."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to call attention to the fact developed by the hearings before the Labor Committee that right at the present time, beginning back on January 16 of this year, a man named Abe Goldberg, a gangster, but acting as head of a union, pretending to act as a union official—of course he was not—declared and made good his declaration that the people of Philadelphia should not have produce to eat unless it was handled the way he directed it to be handled and by the men he directed should handle it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are numerous such instances. They are prevalent all over the country. Everybody knows about them. They are happening every day, yet we are not doing anything about them.

Now, on these public utilities, we ought to think about this question. We have this bill coming from the Labor Committee which says that we shall enjoin them and we should enjoin those types of strikes, no question about it, but then it goes on into fact-finding and submitting proposals as to what the utility ought to do about wages. But there is one thing that we must never overlook. A public utility is regulated and controlled by the Government in the matter of its rates. When you put up the rates of pay on a public utility, unless you also at the same time put up the rates of the service to the public you are just heading those utilities into insolvency. But when you come down to talking about arbitration of these wage rates with public utilities, unless you at the

same time can arrange some device by which their rates to the public shall likewise be arbitrated so that they may have a fair return, you are getting into serious trouble.

I do think we ought not to delay very much longer in putting over to the body on the other side of the Capitol some constructive legislation on the whole labor situation, and on the boycotts that are going on and destroying little businesses all over the Nation, and we ought not to delay putting up to the other body the question of what we are going to do about these strikes in essential industries that so vitally affect the economy of the whole Nation.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot restrain myself. Do you not recall that clarion call of a citizen of Massachusetts, "There is no right to strike against the public safety any time, anywhere"? Do we not realize that the public enthusiastically supported that statement? Can we not now have an anvil chorus of that familiar slogan, "There is no right to strike against the public safety any time, anywhere"? This Massachusetts citizen was afterward elected President of the United States. Why do so many Members of Congress show only a sheep's courage in defense of the safety of the people?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD for March 31 shows that a request was made in my behalf for leave of absence for March 31 and April 1. I did not make that request. The request was not made in my behalf. I was present on both March 31 and April 1. I make this statement for the purpose that the RECORD may so indicate that fact. Apparently the request was made for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

514. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 166 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1362. A bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; with amendments (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1371. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2946. A bill to make retrocession to the State of California of jurisdiction over certain land to be used in connection with operations of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2947. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police Force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2948. A bill to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies acting within the United States or its Territories and dependencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2949. A bill to prohibit certain interferences with interstate commerce in connection with the transportation of property by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2950. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2951. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2952. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCOWEN:

H. R. 2953. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2954. A bill to provide for the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia through the establishment of rating organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 2955. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2956. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 2957. A bill to establish a National Memorial Forest Park in the State of Missouri as a memorial to World War II veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2958. A bill to emancipate the Indians of the United States and to establish certain rights for Indians and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2959. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Treasury Department who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Chauncey C. Ketchum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Meador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

301. Mrs. NORTON presented a petition of James Boulgarides, of Jersey City, N. J., and 23 others, protesting against the President's proposed policy toward Greece and Turkey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We know, our Father, that there is a time to speak and a time to keep silence. Help us to tell the one from the other. When we should speak, give us the courage of our convictions. When we should keep silence, restrain us from speaking, lest, in our desire to appear wise, we give ourselves away. Teach us the sacraments of silence, that we may use them to know ourselves, and, above us, to know Thee. Then shall we be wise. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Ira Lamar Morgan, term expired.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission;

William M. Holt, of Nebraska, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission; and

Louis J. O'Marr, of Wyoming, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session, and the pending question is the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what his program is so far as proceeding with the question of the confirmation of the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager thereof?

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the situation, there are a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle, and some on this side, who are unable to be her today. Most of those on the other side of the aisle have been away participating in Jefferson Day meetings, and I felt the courtesy should be accorded them of passing from the Lilienthal nomination today and proceeding with legislative business. I should be happy to see an effort made to arrive at a decision for a vote on the Lilienthal nomination tomorrow, if the Senator would make such a request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not know that I have any objection to the motion made by the Senator from Maine, and I understood on last Thursday that the situation would be as stated by the Senator. I am not objecting to the proceeding as suggested by the Senator from Maine with this reservation, that I earnestly hope that the Senate will agree to come to a vote on the question of the confirmation of the pending nominations some time tomorrow.

I am not prepared to urge a unanimous-consent agreement at this moment, but I should like to suggest to the Senator that I may want to suggest such an agreement later today, and I do not want to foreclose my right by keeping silent and not stating what I have in mind.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Iowa will proceed in his efforts to secure a vote on the Lilienthal nomination. I suppose I have been as much opposed to his nomination as has any other Senator, but I think the time has come when we ought to dispose of the matter, and we ought to dispose of it at the earliest possible moment. However, I want to accord, as I think all of us want to accord, to our colleagues who are necessarily absent today such courtesy as the situation permits. I very much hope that in the latter part of the afternoon the Senator from Iowa will submit a unanimous-consent request fixing a time for a vote, and I hope that the Senate will agree to the request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that I would rather not make the request at this moment, but I should like to have an understanding with the Senator that it will not be considered out of order, so to speak, if I make the request and attempt to get an agreement later this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. I will say for myself that I shall join in any effort the Senator may see fit to make pointing to a vote tomorrow or as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection to the motion the Senator now makes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that my subcommittee may meet this afternoon, commencing at 2:30 o'clock, to hold a hearing on the apprentice training service and the Bureau of Labor Statistics appropriation requests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit for a short time this afternoon, owing to the fact that some persons from Alaska are present and desire to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RECORD OF JUDGMENT AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURT (S. DOC. NO. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a special case as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $186.75 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for personal injuries in the sum of $50, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (31 U. S. C. 224b), and which requires an appropriation for its payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death in the sum of $39,244.51, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and which require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting

to $4,330,782.14, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF JUDGMENTS BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 32)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $48,487.87 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of a judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, amounting to $4,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam, in the amount of $61,478.26, which have been considered and adjusted under provisions of the act of November 15, 1945, Public Law 224 (59 Stat. 582), and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RECORDS OF JUDGMENTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, puruant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $3,957.57, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest and costs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $29,148.24, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1945, Public Law 277, Seventy-ninth Congress, and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $19,366.89 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of the Interior to pay a claim for damage to or losses of private owned property, in the sum of $75, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which requires an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CLAIM FOR PERSONAL INJURY AND DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 39)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay a claim on account of damage arising out of personal injury and damage to privately owned property occasioned by Army personnel in a foreign country, in the amount of $8,000, which has been considered and adjusted under the act of January 2, 1942, as amended (31 U. S. C. 224d), and which requires an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 40)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation under the War Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $14,408.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD (S. Doc. No. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the National War Labor Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the 30-day period ended March 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer to the Employees' Compensation Fund the payment of benefits in certain cases arising under the Civilian War Benefits program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas it is possible to maintain livestock in health in the United States only by exercising vigilance to prevent the incidence and spread of communicable diseases of such livestock; and

"Whereas there is now prevalent in Mexico a highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock known as epizootic aphtha, or more commonly, hoof and mouth disease; and

"Whereas there is urgent necessity for preventing the spread of such disease across the international boundary line to livestock in the United States; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of said disease of livestock, and authorizing the Department of Agriculture of the United States through its Bureau of Animal Industry, and other appropriate Federal departments and bureaus, to render expert advice and practical assistance to the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of controlling and eradicating communicable diseases of cattle and other livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 19

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the processing and marketing of crab meat is an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska that is capable of supplying the needs of the United States for such product, if given a fair opportunity so to do; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign crab meat has hampered the development of this industry and will, if unrestricted, seriously curtail and impede the growth and development of an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oregon."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation appropriating funds to continue the Rural Electrification Administration and provide funds for loans to rural electric cooperatives

"Whereas Congress is now in session and is considering the amount of funds, if any, to appropriate for continuance of the rural electrification program; and

"Whereas the record of rural electric cooperatives is one of outstanding service and achievement and is a wholly self-liquidating enterprise with several million dollars paid back in advance of schedule; and

"Whereas Oklahoma is in great need of the continuance and extension of the REA program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such legislation as shall continue rural electric cooperatives in operation and to enable them to extend service to all additional rural communities in the United States as is practicable on a self-liquidating basis.

"SEC. 2. That the speaker of the house of representatives be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of said United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation to Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 3d day of March 1947.

"Adopted by the senate the 20th day of March 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the issuance of public-improvement bonds of the Territory during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, without regard to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act

"Whereas the public-improvement program of the Territory was interrupted by the war; and

"Whereas no improvements have been financed by Territorial bond issues for many years, the last such issue having been September 1, 1939; and

"Whereas during said period the Territory of Hawaii not only has sold no new issues of bonds for public improvements, but also has reduced its bonded indebtedness from the amount of $38,966,000, the amount of said bonded indebtedness as the same stood after the issuance of said public-improvement bonds of September 1, 1939, to $11,076,000 as of March 1, 1947, the legislature having appropriated for the reduction of said bonded indebtedness the sum of $5,850,000, in addition to the regular appropriations for the sinking fund, by act 8 of the sessions laws of Hawaii, 1945; and

"Whereas the postwar requirements of the Territory for public improvements far exceed the amount obtainable from current taxes, and the limitations imposed by section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act would unreasonably defer the accomplishment of such improvements, which the necessities of war have already too long deferred; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to issue, over a 5-year period, public-improvement bonds of the Territory for necessary projects, without regard to the limits imposed by section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, provided the total indebtedness of the Territory is not extended beyond $35,000,000: Now, therefore, be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to authorize the issuance by the Territory of Hawaii, during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, of public-improvement bonds in any amount, provided the total indebtedness of the Territory shall not at any time be extended beyond $35,000,000 by reason of such authorization, and any extension of the total indebtedness of the Territory beyond such amount shall be made only in conformity with the Hawaiian Organic Act. Such bonds shall be serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years, from the date of issue thereof. No such bond shall be issued until approved by the President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 29th day of March A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 13

"To the Congress of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Governor of Alaska, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Whereas an investigation has been made of the decline in the productivity of the Alaska Salmon Fisheries, including consultation with officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., the United Trollers of Alaska, and representatives of other fishermen's unions and the Cold Storage Industry in Alaska; and

"Whereas for the past 3 years there has been a rapid and continuous decline in the salmon taken in the waters of southeastern Alaska, and particularly in the northern half of southeastern Alaska, with the result that the earnings of fishermen have been seriously affected, and the industry as a whole does not expect any improvement unless some very drastic changes are made. Although the earnings of those engaged in the industry have not declined to the extent indicated by the reduction in the catch, this fact has been due entirely to the high price of fish on the markets of the United States; and

"Whereas with the resumption of normal supplies of meat and other products, the industry is faced with a serious financial problem which will affect the whole economy of the Territory of Alaska and particularly the economy of the coastal cities and villages. The Fish and Wildlife Service does not have an adequate-research program for the purpose of accmulating facts on a scientific basis which are necessary for a complete rehabilitation of the industry and the promulgating of the regulations under which it operates. Other problems of similar magnitude have been solved with respect to the halibut fisheries and the sockeye run on the Fraser River of British Columbia. The Fish and Wildlife Service has long recognized the need for an adequate-research program and is unable to obtain the necessary appropriation for a long-range program of the intensity desired; and

"Whereas some phases of the life cycle of the salmon are a complete mystery to those engaged in the industry, and it is generally believed that among other things, tagging programs should be resumed and research conducted with respect to the effect of temperature changes in the water. It is alleged by all fishermen that present conservation and regulatory measures are aimed at those salmon which escape the traps and are headed for the spawning beds. Since this type of regulation jeopardizes the livelihood of thousands of fishermen and injures the industry as a whole, the Fish and Wildlife Service is urged to extend its study of the salmon migrations and its conservation regulations from the spawning beds to the territorial limits of our offshore waters. Particular and immediate attention should be given to the restoration of our early runs of salmon and to an honest examination of our present regulations to the end that such regulations bear upon all types of gear with equal force; and

"Whereas it appears that the most important factor in the decrease of the salmon run in this area has been caused by violations of the fishing regulations with respect to the various types of gear employed regularly in the industry, and particularly with respect to the use of seines, chicken wire, and dip nets in taking salmon from closed areas at the mouths of streams while the salmon are congregating before ascending the streams. This condition has been aggravated and the number of violations generally have increased because of the scarcity of salmon in areas open to fishing and the high prices since 1941 for all varieties of salmon. In order to effectively patrol the streams and apprehend violators, substantial increases in the appropriations for these activities must be obtained. In the Juneau district, which comprises the northerly half of southeastern Alaska there are 1,500 miles of coastline closed to fishing, but these areas are scattered through 4,500 miles of coastline comprising the district; and

"Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service is now patrolling the area with two boats, two aircraft, which are both in need of repair at the present time, and about five stream watchmen. The Service has lost many valuable men who have found it more profitable to resign and engage in other activities. Necessity is shown for 5 boats, 3 aircraft and about 50 watchmen for the Juneau area alone for the purpose of preventing illegal fishing and the apprehension of violators. Sufficient funds have not been made available for a patrol program of this size which is needed for the protection of the industry. Adequate provision of funds has not been made to permit the inspection of fish buyers' records and the inspection of fish purchased at the buying stations. Many violators can be apprehended and placed under suspicion by such inspection, for the fish caught in seines have net marks upon them and the fish caught in streams are discolored. Such inspection would prevent the sale of fish after the seasons have been closed and after those caught during the open season are sold; and

"Whereas the program of licensing fishing boats by means of metal licensing plates was suspended during the war, but should be resumed for the purpose of ready identification and a tabulation of the number of persons using each type of gear; and

"Whereas it has been suggested that individual licenses be provided with space for recording violations and that there be a law requiring such record. It has also been suggested that if present penalties are unenforceable that they be changed in such manner and to such extent that violations shall be unprofitable without depriving the violator of his means of livelihood:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges, because of the necessity for immediate corrective measures to restore the salmon industry to its former productivity, that appropriate legislative and administrative steps be taken to correct the present critical situation as above indicated and that an immediate

budget of $1,000,000 for carrying out an effective enforcement program be appropriated by Congress as a wise investment in the preservation, expansion, and planned utilization of the Nation's great salmon fisheries resource.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Emily Greene Balch, Wellesley, Mass., praying an appropriation of $71,030,000 as the American share of the International Refugee Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, Washington, D. C., favoring postponement of the consideration of the treaty with Italy until such time as the treaty with Germany shall have been concluded; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council of the State of Florida and the West Palm Beach Townsend Club No. 1, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of the Territory of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., favoring continuation of paying additional compensation to the Supreme Court Justices and the judges of the circuit court, in an amount at least equal to the additional compensation now provided by law, until such time as the Congress acts favorably upon House bill 854, or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for the completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel

"Whereas there is a threatened shortage of base metals throughout the United States which causes considerable distress among our people and industries and especially among those using base metals; and

"Whereas the Leadville, Colo., district is noted for its great reserves of base metals as shown by past production records and present mining activity in that district; and

"Whereas a deep drainage tunnel for the Leadville area has long been advocated by the State of Colorado through its various mining agencies over a period of years; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, as one of the war-emergency measures, by Public Law No. 133, approved July 12, 1943, appropriated $1,400,000 for the construction of the Leadville drainage tunnel, which sum is to be repaid to the Department of the Interior by those operating mines drained and benefited by said tunnel; and

"Whereas although said sum, excepting approximately $35,000, has been spent, the Leadville drainage tunnel is now only half completed; and

"Whereas if said tunnel is not completed, the money heretofore spent thereon will be completely lost and those operating the mines in that area will be unable to repay the money already spent on said tunnel; and

"Whereas because of the fact that said tunnel will assist in making available vast mineral reserves to be used in the event of future emergency, the completion thereof should not be delayed until such emergency is imminent or has occurred; and

"Whereas the said tunnel is urgently needed to serve not only the best interests of the Leadville area and the State of Colorado, but will also serve the entire United States and its industries, and when completed will be of material aid in reconversion, and in obtaining full production of scarce metals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve the continuation and completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel, and to appropriate sufficient funds therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Eightieth Congress of the United States."

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 8

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore to the Bureau of Customs the funds cut from its 1947–48 appropriation by the National House of Representatives, so that the customs port patrol can continue to exercise its proper functions in safeguarding the national welfare

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana that, as a result of a cut of $3,505,000 in the funds allotted to the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, as passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, the collector of customs for the district of New Orleans has been ordered by the Bureau to dismiss in his district 74 out of 88 port-patrol officers, leaving the port of New Orleans and the subport of Baton Rouge open to completely uncontrolled importation of contraband, as well as removing a great measure of control over lawful imports; and

"Whereas it is understood that similar action is being taken at all other seaboard ports in the United States; and

"Whereas this action, in effect, repeals many of the provisions of the Tariff Act and other protective legislation, as the customs port patrol is the principal agency guarding our ports against smuggling of all kinds; and

"Whereas the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States is directly affected when the bars against the illicit importation of narcotics, contraceptives, abortives, aphrodisiacs, immoral and subversive literature, firearms and dangerous drugs and undersirable aliens are let down; and

"Whereas the guarding of vessels in American ports is the principal function of the customs port patrol, for the very purpose of preventing such illicit importations; and

"Whereas the Congress, from time to time, has wisely legislated against the importation of dangerous articles and commodities, and has imposed customs duties upon acceptable imports, both to raise revenue and to protect the American farmer, worker, businessman, and manufacturer, who cannot maintain the American standard of living and still compete in an open world market with coolie and, in certain instances, forced (or prison) labor; and

"Whereas the majority of importers, shipowners and operators, masters, officers, seamen, and others connected with them are honest and will obey the law without strict surveillance, there remains a lawless minority, ready to turn a dishonest dollar at every opportunity, and this minority is the only class which will benefit through the elimination of the controls over vessels and imports, exercised since the foundation of the Republic by the customs; and

"Whereas the necessity for economy in Government is fully recognized by every citizen, but any attempt at economy which strikes at the foundation of the social structure and imperils the revenue is a false economy; and

"Whereas the need for such a drastic step as the liquidation of the vital service performed by the customs port patrol is questionable, when it is considered that many nonessential agencies, in whole or in part, are still operating; and

"Whereas the welfare and adequate protection of the American people are of paramount importance to our national legislators: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Louisiana, That the Legislature of Louisiana do respectfully request and recommend to the Congress of the United States that the funds deleted from the appropriation for the Bureau of Customs be restored, so that the necessary functioning of the customs port patrol can continue unimpaired; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana be, and he hereby is, directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint Senate Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers, and military attachés in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

"Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

"Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its Foreign Service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the Foreign Service of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas under the present acts of Congress and regulations governing the collection of certain Federal income taxes, it was provided that prisoners of war held in the Philippine Islands and certain other territories were exempted from a portion of the Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the terms of such actions discriminated against prisoners of war who had been removed from the possessions of the United States for internment in Japan and in other localities; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States certain legislation proposing an amendment to section 251 of the internal revenue act; and

"Whereas in fairness to the prisoners of war who were removed from or interned in the possessions of foreign countries, some legislation should be passed placing such prisoners upon a status similar to that providing for prisoners interned in the possessions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon."

By Mr. WHITE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at the city of Washington on Friday, the 3d day of January 1947, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"'"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress"': Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Westfield and Caribou, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a copy of a resolution I have received from Mr. Paul A. Schneider, secretary of the Niobrara River Basin Development Association, in behalf of an uninterrupted program for the development of the Missouri River Basin, and particularly that part known as the Niobrara River Valley.

This basin-wide development, as the Senate knows, was authorized by Congress in 1945, and it is the judgment of a vast majority of our people that the best economy for the Nation as a whole will be served if Congress makes available adequate appropriations so that work on the development of the Missouri basin resources can proceed on schedule.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MISSOURI LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and myself, I present Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, which was adopted by the senate of Missouri on March 7, 1947, and concurred in by the house of representatives of the State of Missouri on March 28, 1947. I ask that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

I read the last paragraph of the resolution:

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in its sixty-fourth regular session assembled, respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Whereas an inequality exists between citizens and residents of the several States of the United States, in that residents of 9 States having community property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of 39 States not having community property laws; and

Whereas by reason of the premises legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequality by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in its sixty-fourth regular session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Missouri.

CASH PAYMENT OF GI TERMINAL LEAVE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina State Legislature requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

I should like to point out further to the Members of this body that there is at present pending before the Senate Committee on Armed Services a bill, S. 102, introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself, which would authorize the Treasury Department to cash these bonds at the option of the holder. It seems to me this is purely and simply a matter to grant by law simple justice, in that it would give to the enlisted personnel of the armed forces the same privilege and rights which have been enjoyed by officer personnel. It is my hope that that committee will see fit to report this bill to the Senate for action in the immediate future.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds

Whereas the National Congress of the United States of America, by legislation duly passed, issued to enlisted men of World War II terminal-pay nontransferable bonds for their services as rendered; and

Whereas these veterans in the United States could more acceptably use such pay in the readjustment period in so many ways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress a number of bills to make immediate cash payment of these terminal-pay bonds to the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby requests the National Congress of the United States to give as early attention as is practicable to the payment of the terminal-pay bonds heretofore issued to veterans of World War II; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the National Congress from South Carolina urging immediate attention and assistance with this pending legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the legislative committee of the American Legion and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all in Washington, D. C.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING

Mr. BUTLER. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD three petitions relating to interstate transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising. Following each petition I should like to have the first name printed and the number of other signers given thereafter. On one petition there are 39 names, on another there are 30, and on another there are 71.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and the first name on each petition and the number of signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAUSA, NEBR., *March 30, 1947.*

Hons. WHERRY and BUTLER,
Senators of Nebraska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens of Wausa, Nebr., do hereby petition you, our representatives in Washington, to be sure to vote for Senator ARTHUR CAPPER'S bill, known as S. 265, to prohibit the advertising of intoxicating liquor in newspapers, magazines, and over the radio.

C. T. NELSON
(And 39 others).

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

LETTA SEXSMITH
(And 30 others).

O'NEILL, NEBR.

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

Mrs. VELMA PFEIFER
(And 71 others).

GORDON, NEBR.

SUPPRESSION OF COMMUNISM IN AMERICA—LETTER FROM UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, from time to time the statement has been made that our institutions of higher education are in many instances giving sympathetic accord to communistic doctrines. I lend no emphasis by expression to that statement, however frequently it may be made. At least one institution of higher education, from its own standpoint, has seen fit, over the signatures of its faculty, to express itself and request its representatives in Congress to stamp out communism in America by whatever means Congress may see fit to employ. The University of Nevada, sending a communication to the two Senators from Nevada, has made known its attitude by way of a letter over the signatures of the respective members of its faculty, requesting that action be taken to stamp out communism in America, saying, among other things:

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Stalin.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the senior and junior Senators from Nevada be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
AND POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Reno, Nev., March 14, 1947.

Senator PATRICK A. MCCARRAN.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE.
Representative CHARLES H. RUSSELL.

HONORABLE SIRS: We, the undersigned, respectfully urge your support for any movement made in Congress looking to the outlawing of the Communist Party and to the circumscribing otherwise of Communist activities in this country.

The paramount allegiance of all American and other Communists is to Soviet Russia, not to the United States. Says William Z. Foster, president of the American Communist Party: "The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag, and that is the Red flag"; and again, "The unconditional support of Soviet Russia is still the main duty of the Communists of all countries." (See J. Edgar Hoover.)

Says a former Communist, Benjamin Gitlow, twice Communist candidate for Vice President of the United States: "Soviet Russia was our fatherland, its Red army our army, its Red flag our flag. Patriots of Soviet Russia, we would not hesitate to commit any act of violence or treason against the country in which we lived * * *. We became the most ardent agents of the Soviet Government and were prepared to render any service it might require of us."

An argument against outlawing the Communist Party may be to the effect that such action would drive the Communists under ground. Well, that is where their chief work is done at present—in labor unions and in politics.

The argument may be raised that to outlaw the Communist Party would be to infringe upon constitutional rights of free speech, of the press and of assembly. But, certainly, the fundamental law of the land was never intended to be constituted the instrument for the overthrow by force or by subversion of the very government for which it provides.

Again, quoting Gitlow: "The typical American Communist regards himself * * * as an important cog in the world-wide Communist machine that serves the Soviet Government. He is compensated for his opposition to the United States Government by being impressed with his importance to the Government of the Soviet Union."

Again, we—the undersigned, urge you to use your influence and your votes in Congress for the outlawing of communism and of its activities in the United States. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Stalin."

Respectfully yours,

Charles Roger Hicks; B. F. Chappelle, Head, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Nevada; C. C. Smith, Associate Professor, Historical and Political Science; Harold N. Brown, Professor of Education; Ralph A. Irwin, Professor of Psychology; Theodore H. Post, Professor of Music; Edward G. Sutherland, Associate Professor of Economics; F. W. Traner, Dean, School of Education; Louis Titus, College of Agriculture; Stanley G. Palmer, Dean, College of Engineering; Everett W. Harris, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering; Frederick Wood, Dean, College of Arts and Science; G. W. Sears, Professor and Head of Department of Chemistry; Frederick W. Wilson, Director of Residence Teaching; Alden J. Plumley, Assistant Professor of Economics; Austin E. Hutcheson, Associate Professor of History and Political Science; Phillip G. Auchampaugh, Associate Professor of History and Political Science; J. E. Martie, Head, Department of Physical Education; William C. Miller, Department of English; Reuben C. Thompson, Professor of Philosophy.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the bill (S.

907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1057. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1058. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Joseph Dobos; and

S. 1061. A bill for the relief of Sherman White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1063. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit coverage thereunder of employees of States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1064. A bill relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1065. A bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 1066. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXEMPTION FROM ADMISSIONS TAX FOR ADMISSIONS TO AGRICULTURAL FAIRS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 684) to provide for exemption from the admissions tax for admissions to agricultural fairs which are conducted with financial aid from States or political subdivisions thereof, which was referred to the Commttee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at the Jefferson Day dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Saturday evening, April 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Democrats, our meeting together this evening carries forward an old party custom. In this annual tribute to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, we, who are members of the party he founded—the Democratic Party—take great pride and feel deep satisfaction.

We know that as long as we remain free the spirit of Thomas Jefferson lives in America. His spirit is the spirit of freedom. We are heartened by the knowledge that the light he kindled a century and a half ago shines today in the United States. It shines even more strongly and steadily than in his time. What was then an untried faith is now a living reality.

But we know that no class, no party, no nation, has a monopoly on Jefferson's principles. Out of the silence of oppressed peoples, out of the despair of those who have lost freedom, there comes to us an expression of longing. Repeated again and again, in many tongues, from many directions, it is a plea of men, women, and children for the freedom that Thomas Jefferson proclaimed as an inalienable right.

When we hear the cry for freedom arising from shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote:

"Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another."

We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

We, too, have declared our protest.

We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say, "We don't want war." We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world.

We know how the fire starts. We have seen it before—aggression by the strong against the weak, openly by the use of armed force and secretly by infiltration. We know how the fire spreads. And we know how it ends.

Let us not underestimate the task before us. The burden of our responsibility today is greater, even considering the size and resources of our expanded Nation, than it was in the time of Jefferson and Monroe. For the peril to man's freedom that existed then exists now a much smaller earth—an earth whose broad oceans have shrunk and whose natural protections have been taken away by new weapons of destruction.

What is the responsibility that we must assume?

Our responsibility is to stand guard before the edifice of lasting peace which, after so long a time, is at last being built.

That edifice is the United Nations.

The functions of the United Nations is to quench the flames wherever they may break out; to watch throughout the world and extinguish every spark that comes from a difference between governments; to do this, if possible, through the machinery of peaceful arbitration, but to do it in any case. This is so, even if armed conflict must be prevented by the use of an international police force.

We believe that formula is sound and workable. Our faith in it is strong and resolute. The United Nations is man's hope of putting out, and keeping out, the fires of war for all time. In supporting the United Nations we must, when necessary, supplement its activities. By aiding free nations to maintain their freedom we strengthen the United Nations in the performance of its functions.

The foreign policy of this country transcends in importance any other question confronting us. It would be fatal if it were to become the subject of narrow political consideration.

Our foreign policy must not be wrecked on the rocks of partisanship.

United support of a policy that serves the interests of the Nation as a whole must be our aim.

I wish to commend the efforts of those members of both parties who have worked, side by side, to achieve this goal.

To meet the responsibilities placed upon us today this Nation must be strong. A strong United States means a country that maintains a military power commensurate with its responsibilities. It means a country of sound domestic economy. It means a country that holds its place in the forefront of industrial production and continues its leadership in creating the techniques of abundance. And it means, most of all, a strong, united, confident people, clear in the knowledge of their country's destiny, unshaken and unshakable in their resolve to live in a world of free peoples at peace.

No matter how great our military potential may be, military potential alone is not enough. It is necessary that we maintain sufficient military strength to convince the world that we intend to meet our responsibilities.

Now, what of our domestic economy? How strong are we at home?

As we appraise our domestic scene—our mighty array of factories, mines, farms, producing at or near capacity, and with employment at an all-time high—our doubts, if we had any, are put to rest. We are viewing a panorama of prosperity—such prosperity as no generation of Americans before us ever experienced.

You may recall hearing dire predictions, in the last year and a half—predictions that the United States was heading into an economic crack-up, predictions of glutted markets, of a great deflationary plunge. It is significant that the most pessimistic cries of calamity came from men who had little confidence in our American system of free enterprise.

They were wrong in their predictions. They were wrong because they do not understand the strength of our system of free competitive enterprise. Under that system, each man is free to go where he likes, to follow the calling of his choice, and to be rewarded in proportion to the productivity of the effort or the property he contributes. Insofar as we insure that each individual has the opportunity and inducement to make the largest contribution he can to this country's total production, we not only strengthen our Nation against any possible encroachments, but we also set an example to all other peoples of the desirability of free government in the economic as well as the political sense.

Our country's financial stamina was tested in the recent war as it had never been tested before. But in spite of the tremendous cost of the war, we emerged with our financial leadership in the economic world greater than ever before. Beyond making our best effort to eliminate waste in the conduct of the war, the cost of the war was

not a matter within our power to control. We emerged bearing a burden of debt, representing that cost, and what we do with that burden is a question of tremendous import, but fortunately it is a question that we have the power to decide for ourselves.

The first decision that we made was to reduce Federal Government spending as quickly as possible.

The extent of retrenchments by the Government is shown by the record.

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government spent $100,000,000,000. In 1946 we cut expenditures to $64,000,000,000. In 1947 we have further reduced expenditures to an estimated figure of $42,000,000,000. The budget for the next fiscal year, which I have sent to the Congress, totals $37,500,000,000.

Not only have we greatly reduced expenditures, but we have made tremendous progress toward the elimination of deficits.

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government had a deficit of over $53,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1946 it was in the red by about $21,000,000,000. But now we have worked our way into the black, and I am happy to be able to say tonight that for the present fiscal year 1947 we shall balance the budget and we shall have a surplus.

I am determined that stringent economy shall govern all peacetime operations of the Government.

When the several departments and agencies were called upon, a few months ago, to submit their requests for funds for the coming fiscal year, they were told of my determination.

They responded by eliminating many of their former activities. This was not enough. When the estimates were in, I went over them, making further substantial reductions. When I finished, these department estimates had been reduced by a total of some $7,000,000,000 under their original level.

I was warned by some that I was going too far. I was aware of the risk. But I was aware, too, of the greater risk of a weakened postwar financial structure. I knew that in the public interest, sacrifices of some Government services had to be made.

The result was a budget of $37,500,000,000. That figure marked the border line beyond which we could not reduce the activities of our Government without entering the area of false economy. In other words, further so-called economies would not have been economies at all. They would merely have meant curtailment of services that would cost our taxpayers—all taxpayers—more than the reduction in cost that appeared on the surface.

You, my fellow citizens, are properly cautious of false economy in your daily lives. If the foundation of your house needs repair, or if the roof leaks, you know that you are wasting money, not saving it, by failing to make that repair.

So with government. If we abandon our work of reclamation, of soil conservation, of preserving our forests, of developing our water resources, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cease our vigilance along the borders of our country and at our ports of entry, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we falsely economize by reducing the staff of men and women who audit tax returns, or who increase the country's productivity by settling labor disputes, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cut down the effectiveness of our armed forces, we run the risk of wasting both money and lives.

Any substantial reduction of the 1948 Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress, must be clearly understood by the American people as a venture into false economy. To the extent that we countenance any such reduction, we shall weaken our own house by our refusal to keep it in basic repair. At best, this is poor judgment. At worst, it is an invitation to disaster.

The second decision we must make, affecting the strength and health of our economy, concerns the public debt. We must resolve to begin the long process of reducing that debt, which represents a large part of the cost of winning World War II. That debt amounts to almost $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In deciding whether we shall start substantial payment on the debt, or whether we shall reduce taxes instead, we are deciding a question which will affect the future of every one of us. Our decision will affect the number of jobs in the future, the wages men and women will earn, what those wages will buy, and how much our savings, our insurance, and our bonds will be worth.

We, as a nation, are now having prosperous years. This is the time when we must start paying off the debt in earnest. When a man is earning good wages, and at the same time owes a lot of money, he is wise if he uses his excess income to pay off his debts. He would be short-sighted if he cut his income just because he was not spending it all at the moment. When the people, through their government, owe a lot of money—as we do today—it is the course of wisdom to make payment on our debt. It would be extremely short-sighted to cut down the Federal revenue without making a real effort toward debt reduction.

I recognize frankly, that the present burden of taxation on our people is too heavy to be considered as permanent, and at a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust that burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

In further evaluating the strength of our domestic economy, I must express to you my deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today. A system of free enterprise does not automatically work out its own adjustments without our giving thought to the process.

The main factor that can weaken our economy at this time is our own selfishness—the kind of selfishness which is now expressed in the form of unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. These prices must be brought down if our entire economy is not to suffer.

With the exception of a very few items, all price controls have been removed. But freedom from such controls, like other freedoms, cannot be abused with impunity. A profound moral responsibility rests upon those citizens whose decisions have widespread effect on our markets—to put it simply, the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits. The alternative is inflation, industry priced out of the market, and, eventually, men priced out of their jobs.

The world today looks to us for leadership. The force of events makes it necessary that we assume that role.

This is a critical period of our national life. The process of adapting ourselves to the new concept of our world responsibility is naturally a difficult and painful one. The cost is necessarily great.

But it is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this Nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people.

We are the people who gave to the world George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We are a people who not only cherish freedom and defend it, if need be with our lives, but who also recognize the right of other men and other nations to share it.

While the struggle for the rights of man goes forward in other parts of the world, the free people of America cannot look on with easy detachment, with indifference to the outcome.

In our effort to make permanent the peace of the world, we have much to preserve—much to improve—and much to pioneer.

As we strive to reach the fulfillment of our quest we will do well to recall the words to Thomas Jefferson:

"I have sworn, upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—LETTER AND MEMORANDUM FROM R. S. SMETHURST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a letter and a memorandum which I have received from Mr. Raymond S. Smethurst, counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, in regard to amendments to the Wagner Act.

There being no objection, the memorandum and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1946.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read with a great deal of interest your address before the Senate on March 10, 1947. It was a very thorough and thoughtful presentation.

I was particularly interested in your discussion of the separation of functions in NLRB and the changes in Board procedures resulting from enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. Referring to these changes, you said:

"These changes were presented and discussed at a meeting with the leading attorneys from all parts of the country, including representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, independent unions, and private firms of attorneys who frequently have business with the Board. No substantial complaints have been heard regarding the Board's procedures insofar as separation of functions is concerned."

Members of our law department staff participated in these conferences, and later on we submitted a memorandum covering several rather important requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act which had been omitted from the revised rules of procedure. As you will note from the attached copy, most of these deficiencies related to the separation of functions.

In all fairness, I should add that in December 1946 the Board filed with the Federal Register some amendments to its general statement of procedures (not its Rules of Procedure), covering some of the points referred to in the attached memorandum. This statement of procedures is merely descriptive and does not have the legal status of the formal Rules of Procedure. Consequently, until the Board's formal rules are amended, we feel there still remain substantial complaints that the Board has failed to conform to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

For your information I am attaching a copy of the Board's printed rules and regulations, which, you will note, became effective September 11, 1946, in advance of the conferences to which you referred. These printed copies were distributed to those in attendance at the conference, so that the Rules and Regulations were an accomplished fact before any opportunity was presented for comment or suggestion.

I apologize for writing at such length, but I did want the record to show that, on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers, we did register the complaint that the Board's rules did not recognize the separa-

tion of functions to the extent called for by the Administrative Procedures Act.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

R. S. SMETHURST,
Counsel.

MEMORANDUM RE NLRB REVISED RULES AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The object of the Administrative Procedure Act is "To improve the administration of justice by presenting fair administrative procedure." This purpose is to be achieved by making available to the public certain information relating to administrative agencies and by establishing certain minimum procedural requirements in the conduct of agency functions. The act, as stated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, "is a comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness."

It was stated at the November conference that the Board's customary practices meet the standards of procedure required by the Administrative Procedure Act. It is not the purpose of this memorandum to examine the strict legal adequacy of the revised rules of NLRB. Rather it is intended to suggest wherein the rules may not conform to the letter or the spirit of the act. "The act," said Senator MCCARRAN, "is intended as a guide to him who seeks fair play and equal rights under law, as well as to those invested with executive authority" (Senate Document No. 248, p. iii).

If the act itself is intended as a guide, it is not unreasonable to assume that Congress intended agency regulations to be an encyclopedia of procedural rights and duties of Board agents, as well as of parties before the Board. Congress, however, must necessarily establish broad principles of administrative fair play and leave the complete implementation of those principles to the agencies. As stated by the House committee, "The general public is entitled to know agency procedures and methods or to have the ready means of knowing with certainty." It is to this objective of according complete information to the general public that the following comments are directed.

AFFIDAVITS OF PREJUDICE

Section 7 (a) of the APA provides the voluntary disqualification by a trial examiner and for the good faith filing of a timely affidavit of prejudice against such examiners.

No reference to these provisions appears in the revised rules. It would seem that the rules should advise parties of their rights in this regard and establish procedures for the orderly effectuation of the right. Moreover, a provision stating the right of examiners voluntarily to disqualify themselves would be conductive to a greater feeling of independence on the part of such officers.

SUBSTITUTION OF TRIAL EXAMINERS

Section 5 (c) of the act provides, in part, that the same officers who preside at the reception of evidence shall make the recommended or initial decision except where they become unavailable to the agency. Section 203.29, however, provides that trial examiners may be substituted at any time. It fails to specify under what circumstances and at what stage of the proceedings substitution will be permitted.

EVIDENCE

Section 203.32 of the revised rules, in conformity with section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, provides that the rules of evidence shall not be controlling. The rules do not, however, direct examiners to exclude irrevelant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence as contemplated by section 7 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act. Moreover, the rules do not expressly embody the further provision of section 7 (c) that the proponent of an order shall have the burden of proof.

INTERMEDIATE REPORTS

Section 203.38 of the revised rules provides for an intermediate report by the trial examiner who is to make recommendations as to the disposition of the case based on the record. He is not expressly directed to base his findings and conclusions upon the whole record as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence as provided in section 7 (c) of the APA. In other words, he is not directed impartially to weigh the entire evidence pro and con a particular issue and reach his conclusion in accordance with the preponderance of the credible evidence. (See H. Rept. No. 1980 on S. 7, the Administrative Procedure Act, p. 37.)

Neither does the rule expressly direct the examiner not to consult any person or party on any fact in issue unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate as required by section 5 (c) of the act providing for the separation of agency functions.

DECISIONS

Section 7 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act provides in part: "Where any agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, any party shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary." However, the revised rules do not establish procedures to be followed by any party seeking to avail himself of the right granted in section 7 (d).

DECLARATORY ORDER

Section 5 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act authorizes the Board, in its sound discretion, to issue declaratory orders to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. The revised rules, however, fail to provide procedures to be followed by persons seeking such orders.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

At the conference held on November 7 and 8 it was pointed out that Board attorneys felt the Administrative Procedure Act "is not intended to expand or substantially change existing law as to judicial review." While the scope of judicial review is not deemed relevant to a discussion of agency rules of procedure, it is perhaps pertinent to observe that we have serious reservations as to the correctness of the expressed opinion.

LAW DEPARTMENT,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C.

Submitted to National Labor Relations Board under date of November 29, 1946.

CANCER TREATMENT AND RESEARCH—ADDRESS BY FLEET ADM. ERNEST J. KING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able address on the cancer problem and the need for adequate funds for cancer research. The address was delivered by Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King at Trenton, N. J., on March 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to be asked here tonight to participate in the opening of the 1947 campaign to raise funds in New Jersey for cancer treatment and research.

It may seem somewhat presumptuous on my part to speak on the subject of what should be done to carry out the plan to control and to cure cancer. However, I can repeat the information furnished me as to what has been done and what is in the making. Much of this information may well be already known to you—in which case I invoke the dictum that repetition is a form of emphasis. And I can say, in my own behalf, that although I have been in the Navy for nearly 50 years, I have been—and am—a fellow citizen—and a fellow taxpayer.

I find that it is a common practice to open such a talk as this with a story. I have one which I hope may be appropriate to what I have to say. At the Tehran Conference December 1942, at the first round-table meeting between Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and the Marshal Stalin there was a temporary lull after seats were taken. Mr. Roosevelt broke the ice by suggesting, through his interpreter, that the Marshal Stalin might wish to make some opening remarks. The Marshal Stalin's response, through his interpreter, was no, that he'd rather listen. Mr. Roosevelt then spoke for about a minute on the purpose of the Conference, what it meant in the successful conduct of the war, by closer association among the Allied Powers, and what it might well mean to the future of the world. He passed the conversational ball to Mr. Churchill who talked in his best form for 6 or 7 minutes. Then everybody present looked at the Marshal Stalin—he had to say something. He spoke to his interpreter who then stood up and said, "The Marshal Stalin says that he subscribes to those sentiments." Then, gulping, "The Marshal Stalin says 'Now let's get down to business.'"

The American Cancer Society is a nationally recognized organization founded some 30 years ago. It is the sole Nation-wide agency which has for its purpose the collection of funds to be used for the treatment and the research of cancer. Its organization comprises a national headquarters in New York City and divisions of the society incorporated in each of the States and in the District of Columbia. We are met together here tonight as the New Jersey Division. Local chapters operate under charters from the State divisions. This plan is uniform throughout the United States. Of the funds collected, it is the practice that 60 percent is to be used within the State and 40 percent is administered by the national headquarters. Of this headquarters fund, over 40 percent each year is applied to cancer research in institutions, part of them accredited by the National Research Council.

But the strength and effectiveness of the organization for the control and cure of cancer is not solely in the organization for raising and administering funds. An integral part of the State and chapter organizations is the field army which renders such outstanding service to our fellow citizens in the war against cancer. This voluntary service is not only an essential element but also an indispensable part of the work whereby the human touch is brought into play, whereby the gifts of heart and hand do their noble part in the fight for which members are enlisted.

I note the statement that any person is eligible for membership in the American Cancer Society without discrimination or distinctions because of age, sex, race, color, social or economic status, or religious or political belief. What seems not to be stated, but nonetheless clearly implied, is that treatment and service are to be rendered to all regardless of age, sex, race, color, social or economic status, or religious or political belief. Surely this is democracy at its very best.

In the armed services there has been in use for nearly 50 years or so a more-or-less standard method for dealing with military problems which, incidentally, has the merit that it can be used in meeting any problem of whatever kind. In brief, the method is called Estimate of the Situation and consists of analyzing the problem at hand in the following steps:

(a) What is the mission? What are we trying to do?

(b) The enemy—what are his factors of strength and of weakness?

(c) Ourselves—what are our factors of strength and of weakness?

(d) The decision—what shall we do to attain the mission?

(e) The plan—how shall the decision be put into effect?

I shall now essay to estimate the situation in regard to cancer:

The mission is clear: The control and the cure of cancer.

The enemy—cancer—which now claims in excess of 175,000 lives annually in the United States. In New Jersey in 1945, over 7,000 persons died of cancer. Its strength is that it is a fatal disease with no known specific cure. Its weakness is that we are alive to its dangers—that we are determined to overcome it—and that it can be cured in its earlier stages.

Ourselves: Our strength is that we recognize the dangers of cancer, that we are organized to oppose it, and that we have made a fair start in opposing it. Our weakness is that we have not yet done enough.

The decision: While we have conformed to Confucius' maxim, "the longest journey begins with the first step," we must continue to take steps until the journey is completed and the mission accomplished.

The plan: Through the agency of the American Cancer Society to make unremitting war on cancer by adhering to the definition of responsibilities so clearly and ably set forth by the president of the New Jersey division, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, I quote:

"It is the responsibility of the doctors to advise how, where, and for what medical facilities, programs, and services money shall be spent, and

"It is the responsibility of the laymen to raise the money and to administer the funds in accordance with sound business practices."

One may note that these definitions set up a coordinated responsibility which conforms to the well-known tenets of the general principle called division of labor—not that there is a divided responsibility but, I repeat, a coordinated and cooperative responsibility, each doing the part that he is best fitted to do. It is enlightened teamwork.

While note is being taken of services rendered in the war against cancer, mention must be made of our fellow citizens of the medical profession—and their technical assistants—who are doing such valiant work in research, in treatment, and in diagnosis of cancer—as their indispensable and vital contribution in the war we are all pledged to wage—and to win.

Generally speaking, there are four principal needs to be met in the war against cancer. First, perhaps, is the need to educate the people to the danger and, through clinics, to ascertain cancer in its earliest stages, where positive cures are practicable. I myself feel quite sure that this is a case where doing first things first will pay large dividends—educate the public so that cancer can be detected in its earliest stages. It is therefore obvious that the society could well devote a notable proportion of its funds—and of its time and attention—to attaining the earliest possible detection of the onset of cancer in the individual. Second, is the need for clinics and hospitals where treatment can be given to the victims of cancer; for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, for the services of medical secretaries, nurse follow-up workers, and technicians, and to stimulate and improve bedside nursing care in the homes of cancer patients. Third, but of not less importance is the need for research into the causes and the cure of cancer. It seems to me that in the current situation we have to rely on what are called empirical methods of treatment—methods which are the end result of trial and error. What we must do—and what only intensive research can do—is to find out the specific cause of cancer—and the specific cure. Fourth, and though last, by no means least, is the availability of funds wherewith to implement the other three needs.

At the moment we here present are concerned with the fourth, perhaps the greatest, need—that for funds. In the 1946 drive, the American Cancer Society raised some $10,000,000. The goal for 1947 is $12,000,000. This year, April has been designated as National Cancer month. New Jersey seems to have anticipated April by one day—perhaps with the intent to maintain its eminent position in this essential work.

The New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society has already made an impressive record. In 1946 the State quota of $471,600 was oversubscribed 152 percent. Though ninth in wealth among the States, New Jersey was third in total funds raised. Though sixth in income per capita, New Jersey was first in funds raised per capita. The 1946 record speaks for itself and is an inspiration—and a challenge—to you citizens of New Jersey to repeat—and even to better—your record for 1947.

UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LEGISLATION—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio interview with him on the subject of uniform marriage and divorce legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHECKS AND BALANCES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Checks and Balances," written by him and published in edition of the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRISIS IN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAYLOR

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Crisis in Foreign Policy," delivered by him on April 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING FOR VETERANS—STATEMENT BY HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS on housing for veterans before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, March 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLE OF AMERICA AS WORLD LEADER—ADDRESS BY MRS. ANNE O'HARE McCORMICK

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's new role as a world leader, by Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, before the annual convention of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRISH CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP RICHARD J. CUSHING

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Irish contribution to America by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., at a dinner of the American Irish Historical Society in Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

A MISSISSIPPI STATESMAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHERN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Mississippi Statesman," from the April 1940 issue of the Southern Agriculturist, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECHOES FROM CORNFIELD CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (IND.) HERALD

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Echoes From Cornfield Conference," from the Washington (Ind.) Herald of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER NEEDS OF THE NORTHWEST—ADDRESS BY PAUL J. RAVER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, on February 26, 1947, dealing with the power problem of the Northwest, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER USERS—LETTER FROM HILL WILLIAMS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Hill Williams, executive secretary of the Pasco (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, with respect to the statement of policy of public and private power users, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR OCCUPATION FORCES—LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter under the heading "Need for occupation forces" published in the New York Times of March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPECTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prospects for Industrial Peace," delivered by Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, to the Milwaukee County League of Women Voters at Milwaukee, Wis., on February 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN 1947—ADDRESS BY EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Labor-Management Problems in 1947," delivered by Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, at the meeting of the Business and Professional Men's Group of Cincinnati, on March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. LEISERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Government Control of Industrial Relations," recently delivered at Los Angeles, Calif., by William M. Leiserson of John Hopkins University, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CARTEL SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY EDWARD H. LEVI

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Cartel System," delivered by Edward H. Levi, of the University of Chicago Law School, before the Chicago Chapter of the New Council of American Business on March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I was about to say that I understand the Senator from Arkansas desires to proceed briefly. I merely wish to give notice that at the conclusion of his address I shall ask that the Senate proceed with the calendar, under rule VIII, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine stated he understood that I desire to proceed briefly. I think I shall take about 20 or 30 minutes. I say that so that he will be under no misapprehension.

Mr. President, the decision the Congress makes on the proposal to extend assistance to Greece and Turkey is, I think, one of the most important the Congress has had to face in the history of this Nation. I hope that the Members of the Senate, especially those who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will debate the pending measure thoroughly and earnestly, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the action we take.

With the information I now have, it is my intention to support the President's proposal. Under our system of government, the President has a particular responsibility in our foreign relations. He has access to information which, in the nature of things, we cannot have, and he is in constant touch with the members of the State Department who are directly charged with conducting our affairs with foreign nations. The judgment of these men, and of the President, should prevail, in the absence of clear proof to the contrary. In addition to the presumption in favor of his proposal, it seems to me that conditions and events which are common knowledge justify the action which we are asked to take.

The principal criticism of this proposal has been that our Government bypassed the United Nations. This criticism has, to a great extent, been allayed by the amendment offered by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This amendment clearly negatives the charge of imperialism, as well as the charge that we would, by this unilateral action, scrap the United Nations. On the contrary, in giving the majority of the Security Council, or the General Assembly, the right to disapprove our actions, I think we would strengthen the United Nations. We would reaffirm our faith in the validity of the moral judgment of that body and reassert our determination to do what we can to foster its influence among the nations of the world.

Those critics who say that the whole matter of aid to Greece and Turkey should have been submitted for a decision to the United Nations in the first instance, are either naive or are opposed to any aid to Greece and Turkey. It is no secret that until a better understanding is reached between Russia and the western democracies, especially the United States, the United Nations Security Council cannot make decisions of primary importance involving controversial matters. Russia has already used the veto on 10 different occasions and, I have no doubt, would use it against aid to Greece if she were given the opportunity to do so. In view of Russia's attitude, I think it would have been an idle gesture to submit the basic decision to the United Nations, even though we had been willing to supply the money and personnel, which the United Nations does not have.

I do not think the proposed action on our part is an admission that the United Nations is a failure. The impotency of that Organization in this instance is a contingency which many people anticipated in the beginning. It is simply one of the difficulties, and there will be others, which must be overcome in the long and tedious process of creating an effective organization to keep the peace.

In the debate on the adoption of the United Nations Charter in July 1945, I pointed out that I believed there was a misconception about the significance of the Organization. Some advocates of the Organization naturally exaggerated its powers and its virtues while others dismissed it as an idle dream. Some concluded that having created and joined the United Nations our troubles were over and that peace was assured. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Peace can never be assured by a beautiful charter or a solemn treaty with a big red seal. The achievement of peace is a continuing, day-to-day process requiring wisdom and patience of the highest order. The adoption of the United Nations Charter was but the first tentative step toward the creation of rules of conduct for all nations. Primarily, it gives us the machinery for bringing together the various nations for the discussion of the problems of the world. As the Senator from Michigan has said, it is "A town meeting of the world." However, until the various nations are willing to subject themselves to definite rules of law, positive action involving the power relationships of the great powers is difficult if not impossible. The United Nations can foster better understanding among the nations through education, the exchange of persons, economic agreements, and the free exchange of information; but until the big powers trust one another more than they do now, it cannot preserve the integrity of Greece or Turkey, or any other country.

Until such time as we are able to make the United Nations strong enough and trusted enough to deal with sovereign powers effectively, it is to our interest, and to the interest of all free and independent peoples, to prevent any single nation from being able to dictate to, or dominate, the world. The Communist party has developed a technique of aggression different from any heretofore developed, or perhaps it is more accurate to say that they have brought to a higher state of perfection than anyone else the technique of infiltration and corruption from within. The Nazis used this technique with success in Austria, Norway, Belgium, and France; but they were novices compared to the Communists.

The danger to us that arises from communism is that there is good reason to believe that the present Russian Government directs and dominates the Communist parties and their policies throughout the world. It is the concentration of control in the Politburo in Moscow that makes communism the real danger that it is. This control, coupled with the technique of infiltration and subterfuge, confronts us with the possibility of world domination without direct attack by force. Since it is an unorthodox and unfamiliar method of aggression, it has confused and divided the democratic peoples of the world and thereby weakened their power of resistance.

Mr. President, the principal reason the proposal of the President appeals to me is the fact that it is a program of positive and definite action to combat, in a vital area of the world, this gradual disintegration of independent peoples brought about by the infiltration of Communists. We have, I believe, in good faith tried to work with the Russians in reestablishing orderly governments, supported by the peoples concerned; but the Russians have not agreed. At long last, our President has now proposed that this country shall take steps to counteract the apparently unlimited expansion of communism. It is a positive program. It is open and aboveboard for all the world to see and, as now drawn, it is subject to the approval of a majority of the free peoples who constitute the United Nations.

The reason for our special concern for Greece and Turkey is that they are the key countries to the Middle East, to southern Asia, and to Africa. If these two countries should succumb to the influence of the Communists, the door would be open to Asia and Africa. If Africa, Asia, and Europe were subjected to the exclusive control we have come to know as the Iron Curtain, our future would indeed be dark. Shut off from the resources and markets of the greater part of the world, and confronted with an overwhelming power, we could not survive as an armed camp doing business only with ourselves.

In Europe, Asia, and Africa there are approximately 1,775,000,000, or 82 percent of the 2,150,000,000 inhabitants of the world. The remainder, 375,000,000, or 18 percent, live in the Western Hemisphere, the British Isles, and the Pacific islands. The proportion of inhabitants in Europe, Asia, and Africa is in excess of four to one and the natural resources are distributed accordingly. It appears to me that in view of these plain facts it is of the utmost importance that we preserve the independence of Greece and Turkey until such time as communism ceases to be aggressive, or the United Nations becomes an effective organization.

Mr. President, it is true that we have commercial interests in the resources of the Middle East as well as an interest in preventing the unlimited expansion of Russia. I, for one, am perfectly willing to negotiate with Russia for an equitable disposition of these resources, once we can be assured that she will not take over the political domination of the region. Furthermore, I think our proposal for the control of the Dardanelles is fair and just to all parties concerned, including the Russians.

But, with regard to our commercial interests, the British likewise have interests, and it seems to me that the action

of the present British Government in terminating so abruptly their aid to Greece and Turkey indicated a lack of consideration for this country. In view of our friendship and our material aid to the British, it seems to me their Government acted most inconsiderately in giving us only a few weeks to consider and decide upon our policy in the Near East. We will grant this assistance to Greece and Turkey to protect our own interests, of course, and not Britain's, although her interests are similar to ours, but that fact does not lessen my resentment at the abruptness of her decision to withdraw her support from Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, although the proposal before us concerns directly only Greece and Turkey, it does, in fact, have a bearing upon our policy in Europe. If, while we are engaged in the Near East, western Europe is taken over by the Communists we shall be cut off from our base and our efforts will be unsuccessful. At Moscow the four big powers for weeks have been striving to find a solution to the problem of Germany. From what I read in the newspapers they have made no progress. Until the fate of Germany is settled it is impossible to go to work seriously on the reconstruction of Europe.

I submit that unless we are able to create a different, a more sensible economic and political order in Europe, there is no hope for a prosperous or a peaceful solution to her difficulties. It is my belief that if all we are able to do is to recreate the prewar crazyquilt of jealous sovereignties, neither Europe nor the Near East is a good risk. If we persist in preserving an irrational and obsolete economic and political system in Europe, we can be sure that, for a third time, its internal frictions will supply the spark for world conflagration. No one can guarantee that a federation will absolutely prevent all sparks, but at least there will be a chance that it may.

Mr. President, it was in order that Congress and the people of the United States should have an opportunity at least to consider and debate the merits of European federation that on March 21, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) providing that the "Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the frame work of the United Nations." On the same day a similar resolution was submitted in the House of Representatives by Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana.

This is not a new idea. For centuries the leading thinkers and statesmen of the world have, from time to time, urged the creation of a federated Europe as the best method of bringing peace and prosperity to that unhappy region, and as one of the essential conditions for a peaceful world.

We know that both World Wars grew out of the conflicts which are inherent in the fragmented sovereignties of Europe. We know that so long as this senseless conglomeration of separate and economic entities exist there is little hope for the peace and prosperity of the world. We also know that the most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval leaving it in an unstable and fluid state.

I have noted in the press that the response to this suggestion has been that it is a fine idea, but that this is no time to bring forward such a suggestion, nor is it the time when there is any hope for its adoption. I submit that exactly the opposite is true; that if it ever is to be accomplished it can be accomplished only during such a period as this, when there is great unrest and when the treaties solidifying new regimes within the ancient framework have not been entered into. In other words, I think the only opportunity to bring the peoples of Europe together is afforded now when the necessity is impelling and the peoples of Europe are asking for assistance, which I think they should receive. Only in such a time can we be in a position to influence them in the slightest degree. Europe is in that condition today, and the time is ripe for a change. I cannot imagine that there will ever be a more propitious time to act than now. It is our job to see that the change is forward to a system of freedom and self-government rather than backward to slavery and tyranny.

No one can tell at this time how this proposal will be received by European countries. The practical thing to do would be for their representatives to meet and draw up a tentative constitution for the consideration of their own people and the people of other countries, including our own. Only by formulating a specific proposal dealing with all the questions involved in a federal union can the ideas of the people crystallize and a reasonable judgment be arrived at.

If the Congress should adopt now Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, I think it would give impetus to the calling of such a constitutional convention.

I have noticed within the last day or two that there is to be a meeting held this spring of some members of the various parliaments in Europe, where this proposal would be discussed informally. It is not in the form of a constitutional convention, and I do not anticipate that that particular meeting will reach any decision as to a specific constitution.

It is, of course, certain that many people will dismiss the proposal as naive and utopian, but we should remember that all proposals that promise any significant improvement in human affairs have always been branded utopian. The United States of America was, in the beginning, branded utopian, and its failure predicted by those who, if they were here today, would look with derision upon this proposal.

For several centuries, under the Roman Empire, Europe was united. Later, Charles the Great in the ninth century united all of Europe from Spain to the Elbe River under a single power. Europe has always been a cultural entity and, in the great days of the Renaissance, national lines were not closely drawn. Culture was not French or German or Spanish; it was European. Since prehistoric days, the inhabitants of Europe have belonged to the same white race whose branches are to be found also in northern Africa and western Asia. They possessed a common primitive civilization going back to the neolithic age and the philologists tell us that, with one exception, all their languages are derived from a common mother tongue. Their political organizations and customs developed along similar lines and throughout their history were distinguishable from the servility which characterized oriental despotism.

Western Europe, exclusive of Russia, consists of a well-integrated economy and a land mass of approximately 2,000,000 square miles with 300,000,000 inhabitants. Physically, racially, and culturally, there is no insuperable obstacle to a reasonable federation of these peoples.

There are very special reasons why the people of the United States should consider at this time the re-creation of the unity which, in ancient days, enabled the Europeans to live in relative peace and happiness. Already we have made or are committed to make enormous loans to the nations of Europe. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars feeding the people of Germany and the devastated countries. We are faced in the immediate future with the further obligation of supporting Greece and Turkey at great cost. But overshadowing all these obligations is the supreme interest that we have in creating a peaceful world. The primary reason for these loans and grants is the creation of a stable and orderly world in which we may live in peace, and yet we should know that money alone will not achieve our objective.

This proposal for a United States of Europe is not an idealistic dream to bring relief to the suffering people of Europe. Americans can be, if they are of a mind to be, sound practical businessmen. As President Truman said recently, we have already invested $341,000,000,000 in preventing tyranny from enveloping the world. In addition, we are committed to spending $600,000,000 annually to support Germany, many billions of dollars of loans to other European nations, and in the immediate future we probably shall undertake the support of Greece and Turkey. As practical people we may well ask ourselves, How do we finally work out from under these obligations?

There is no simple, all-inclusive answer to this question, but one of the essential conditions to any solution is the reestablishment of industry and commerce within the framework of a stable political system. In the Near East and in Europe a prerequisite to the revival of trade and industry is a United States of Europe. Without a prosperous Europe to consume the produce of the Near East and other countries and without the production of Europe's industry, I can see little hope for a revival of commerce on a substantial scale.

In Moscow at present the representatives of the great powers are trying to find a solution to the problem of what to do with Germany. They are confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand all of Europe and the Near East is in need of the goods which Germany could produce. Without that production, the rehabilitation of those areas will be slow indeed. But, on the other hand, the great powers

fear that if the industrial capacity of Germany is turned loose to produce at a maximum, for a third time a militant Germany will emerge to attack the world.

Mr. Herbert Hoover in his recent report to the President effectively presented the case against the present policy in Germany. Under this so-called "level of industry" policy the industrial capacity of Germany is arbitrarily reduced. For example, with a capacity of 19,000,000 tons of steel she can produce 6,000,000 tons, and the production of basic chemicals such as nitrogen which can be used for fertilizer is reduced to 40 percent of prewar production. Although we in the United States are short of these same articles we are forced to send to Germany huge supplies at the cost of the American taxpayer. In addition, the other countries of Europe are desperately in need of these articles and are unable to purchase them anywhere.

This inability to get fertilizer for food production and steel for reconstruction of worn-out factories is prolonging the chaotic conditions in Europe which is, I believe, one of the principal causes for the spread of communism. In desperation the people bargain away their freedom for a promise of food and employment. They do not know that the promise is false, but they do know that their hunger and idleness are real.

In the Near East we see another facet of the same problem. If we undertake the support of Greece and Turkey, how and when can we stop the lavish outpouring of our resources? We are not likely to stop it until those countries are self-supporting economically, which, in turn, will give them political stability. Before the war Turkey sold one-half, and Greece one-third, of her exports to Germany. Without the restoration of that market, it is improbable that either country can prosper and thereby relieve us of our burden.

The way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves is the creation of a United States of Europe. There are 14 States which are not yet dominated by the Communists. These states have a population of nearly 300,000,000 persons.

I may say that in the creation of such a federation I would not make it an exclusive federation. It should be what I would call an open federation, which would welcome the addition of nations some of which are now dominated by regimes which I believe to be communistic, and which are influenced by Russia, and which I think have possibilities of throwing off such domination. I believe that one of the greatest incentives for their throwing off such domination would be the creation of a federation with some stability which would give them an opportunity to go somewhere other than remain under the wing of the Communists. So while I mention only 14 countries as now being eligible—and by that I mean only that they have a free choice and would be able to make such a decision—I do not mean to leave the impression that this would be an exclusive federation which would not welcome additions in eastern Europe when and if those countries are able to make a choice in accord with the will of their people.

If Germany should be reorganized as a federation of states, as she was before Bismarck, and those states then merged into a United States of Europe with 300,000,000 people, there would be little danger of a revival of German militarism and slight chance of her dominating the federation.

With the federalization of Europe would come freedom of commerce, the free movement of persons, a common currency, and efficient transportation. The result would be a rising standard of living and a lowering of the political rivalries and economic tensions which generate war.

If we grant that a United States of Europe is the answer to our dilemma, we may then ask ourselves, What are the prospects for its creation? It is to be expected that Russia will oppose it. Such a federation would not threaten Russia, but it would, with the return of decent living conditions, put an end to the spread of communism in Europe. Russia's opposition, exerted through her influence on the Communist parties, especially in France, is the greatest obstacle to the achievement of federation. But even in France the Communists control less than 30 percent of the votes, and therefore with strong leadership in the democratic parties of Europe she could take the lead in promoting the union. Although France is torn by internal dissension, I cannot believe that she is through as a great nation, or that she will not develop again statesmen of the caliber of Jaures or Briand, who advocated so eloquently the creation of a United States of Europe. If France should take the lead, and were supported by this country and England, I think a federation could be created in spite of the opposition of Russia.

Since the days of Teheran, Russia has worked overtime the theme of her fear of aggression and concern for her own security. But during the intervening years we have seen that by a combination of the Red Army and the infiltration of her secret police she has acquired the domination of many smaller nations with more than 60,000,000 of people. She has professed a faith in the United Nations, but her actions in and out of that organization belie that profession. Her expansion already is so great that she threatens the power to survive of all other independent nations except our own. If the United Nations is to have a chance to succeed as a voluntary union of peoples, it is imperative that, pending the realization of its objective, the existing power relationships among the great nations be preserved. This country cannot tolerate the expansion of Russia to the point where she controls, directly or indirectly, all the resources and manpower of Europe, Asia, and Africa. If that should come about, no longer would there be an opportunity for a voluntary association of nations. The issue would certainly be decided by war. In seeking to maintain the integrity of Europe by federation, we would not threaten Russia's security, but we would make a substantial contribution to the ultimate success of the United Nations and, incidentally, assist Russia to develop the self-restraint which is so patently lacking in her present philosophy of government.

In any case, I think it has now become clear to us that Russia does not intend, if she can help it, to permit the rehabilitation of any European country, except under the aegis of the Communist Party. I do not think she will go to war in the near future to enforce this policy, but she is prepared to bring the full force of her economic and propaganda power to bear on the issue.

Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power and our talents of persuasion to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union, the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom, and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the confusion and tyranny of the Dark Ages.

Mr. President, for the convenience of those who may wish to know more about what others think of this proposal, I wish to read a few excerpts from articles and editorials written in recent months by some of the leading students of international affairs. I think it is particularly appropriate, in view of his identification with the development of our foreign policy during the past several months and in connection with the development of the bipartisan or nonpartisan foreign policy, to read a brief excerpt from a speech which has been the basis of much discussion. The speech was made by John Foster Dulles before the National Publishers Association dinner in New York, and is reported in the New York Herald-Tribune of January 18. Mr. Dulles stated:

> Peace should not be made dependent upon artificial conditions which hold only so long as there is external coercion. That was the main trouble with the Treaty of Versailles. Its terms, if enforced, would have kept Germany impotent for a thousand years. But enforcement depended upon external coercion, which rapidly evaporated. Peace conditions, to be durable, should be self-enforcing. What is needed in respect of Germany is decentralization. At the beginning that can be imposed. A large measure of political autonomy can be given to German states. But that decentralization will not stick unless also there develop natural forces which turn the inhabitants of Germany's States toward their outer neighbors. The economic forces operating upon Germans should be centrifugal and not centripetal. Only if decentralization is enforced by such forces can it be depended upon.
>
> When the German problem is thus analyzed it is apparent that it calls—

And this is the particular point which I have been endeavoring to make—

> for some application of the Federal formula. Under our Federal system the citizens of Pennsylvania share with others legislative control over the interstate movement of their coal and their steel products. The port of New York is operated by an autonomous authority established by treaty between New Jersey and New York. The Tennessee Valley development is operated by a Federal authority, not by the State of Tennessee. We propose an international authority to own and operate atomic development everywhere so

that nowhere can it fall under national control, which might use it for war rather than for economic welfare.

Such precedents suggest that it is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany, and do so without making Germans the masters of Europe.

Whether a solution along this line is practical, and the scope to be given it, will depend primarily upon our continental allies themselves. The non-continental victors—Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and the United States—cannot impose any such solution. If, however, our Continental friends are thinking constructively—and there is evidence that many of them are—we Americans ought to be able to give them precious assistance. We possess, with Great Britain, decisive power in western Germany. We have, more than any other people, experience in using the Federal formula and in developing its manifold possibilities. If we employ these assets to solve the problem of Germany, we shall have made a good start in implementing our 1947 resolve.

I have also several articles, all of which I shall not read, but I should like to read a few sentences from them; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks for the convenience of the Senate the articles which have been selected, all of which have a bearing upon this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One article is from the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1947, entitled "Europe's Last Chance," by William Henry Chamberlin. The subheading reads as follows:

Economic federation, including Germany, is essential first step; political ties could come later, creating a fourth great power.

I shall read one or two paragraphs from it which I think are especially pertinent:

There may well be a strong temptation in the United States to fall into a mood of embittered, disillusioned isolationism as disappointments and frustrations multiply in Europe. But we shall yield to this temptation at our peril. Our sense of insecurity would be greatly enhanced if western Europe should fall into a welter of social chaos or follow eastern Europe into the orbit of Soviet influence.

What we should do, in our own interest quite as much as in Europe's is to try to bring some pattern of hope and order out of the war's fearful legacy of misery and confusion. The most hopeful means to achieve this end is to subordinate the patchwork jobs of relief and rehabilitation which must be done in individual countries to a master plan for bringing into closer association those European countries which lie outside the sphere of Soviet control.

The European problem in general and the German problem in particular may remain insoluble if they are approached on the assumption that the continent must remain divided into completely independent soverign States, each with its economy in a watertight compartment. The supreme dilemma of Germany is that there can be no healthy European recovery without a revival of German trade and industry, while France and the smaller European States fear a renewal of German aggression if Germany becomes too strong.

I also have an article by Mr. Sumner Welles which comments upon the same subject. I should like to read an excerpt from it. It was published on February 5, 1947, in the Washington Post:

One of the most heartening developments in Europe in recent months has been the rapid increase in the popular demand for the establishment of a European federation.

No one who talked with the European statesmen attending the recent meeting of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs could have failed to be impressed with the sense of urgency in the opinions they expressed. They were frank in saying that only a federated Europe could survive. And these convictions were by no means voiced solely by the representatives of western Europe.

Two weeks ago it was announced in London that a Provisional British Committee for a United Europe has been established under the chairmanship of Winston Churchill. This committee is an outgrowth of Mr. Churchill's speech at Zurich last year. But it is significant that the committee is far from being an organ of the Conservative Party. Prominent members of the Labor Party and of the Liberal Party are serving on it.

Some of the chief proponents of a Federated Europe are of course obsessed with the belief that such a federation must be used as a barrier to Soviet expansion and be employed as a leverage to force Moscow to come to terms in the negotiation of the German Treaty. The violent diatribes recently emanating from Moscow against the doctrine of European federation and against its leading advocates are due in part to this fact. They are due far more, however, to the Russian recollection of the efforts of the Allied powers in 1919 to create a cordon sanitaire around the Soviet Union, and to the Russian belief that any European federation now initiated would be destined merely to serve the same ends.

The stark truth is, however, as Prime Minister Attlee said a few months ago, "Europe must federate or perish." One of the great problems which now confront the statesmen of the United Nations is how this objective can be secured in the face of Russian opposition.

I also have an article by Miss Dorothy Thompson published in the Washington Star, and I wish to read briefly from it:

Fifteen distinguished Europeans, or Americans of European background, most of them scholars, from 10 European countries, have addressed a declaration and appeal to the President and Congress, asking support for the establishment of an all-European confederation at the end of the war and setting forth 8 points in support and description of such a program.

The idea is not new. It has been advocated for years by the pan-European movement, headed by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi. It has had the support in Britain of eminent publicists, such as Sir Walter Layton. It is believed that Mr. Churchill supports it, and edged toward it in his famous Guild Hall speech, calling for a council of Europe, and a council of Asia, to be established after the war.

As the great power world emerges, the problem of postwar Europe becomes more and more urgent. Will Europe fall into social and political anarchy? Are all the petty and anachronistic sovereignties to be restored? Has not this war demonstrated the essential weakness of all the European states? And has it not also proved that this weakness is a temptation to direct aggression, and to indirect interventionisms, spheres of influence, and all the other power games which led to this dreadful struggle? Is Europe, as a civilization and culture, finished? Is it to be further Balkanized or will there again, in some future, be an attempt to write it under another domination, by force or the threat of force?

These leading questions have so far not received a statesmanlike answer. In fact, reading the various declarations, from Teheran, for instance, or from Yalta, one receives the impression that Europe, that great complex of 350,000,000 people, is henceforth of negligible importance.

Yet the answer to these questions lies in the heart of the German problem. This column has contended—with perhaps boring repetitiveness—that there is no solution to the German problem until the European problem, of which it is a part, is solved. If the European problem is solved, the German problem can be. And only if the European problem is solved can the world count on peace.

Included in the matters I desire inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks is an article by Walter Lippmann on the same problem, appearing in the January 21 issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. President, I have a considerable amount of other material giving the background of this situation and, I think, furnishing much food for thought. I shall not place it in the RECORD at this time. I intend at a later date to present further editorials and background material showing the universal approval of this proposal, but also I confess, showing a feeling of frustration and a feeling that we are unable to present and to carry through a positive program in Europe at this time. It is the same old feeling that we are unable to take the dilemma by its horns and do something positive, instead of following the program of piecemeal relief which we have followed in the past.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1947]

EUROPE'S LAST CHANCE—ECONOMIC FEDERATION, INCLUDING GERMANY, IS ESSENTIAL FIRST STEP—POLITICAL TIES COULD COME LATER, CREATING A FOURTH GREAT POWER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The preliminary auguries for the conclusion of the German and Austrian peace treaties which are an essential part of European reconstruction are not hopeful. There is the same weary bickering over procedure which dragged out to such inordinate length the discussions of the peace settlements with the minor states which alined themselves with Germany. Fantastic reparation demands are advanced at a time when Germany is in such a state of economic prostration that its people must be spoonfed from the United States and Great Britain. Small countries which seem to have learned little from historical experience propose to snip off bits of German territory here and there, creating new festering sores of nationalist discontent.

There may well be a strong temptation in the United States to fall into a mood of embittered, disillusioned isolationism as disappointments and frustrations multiply in Europe. But we shall yield to this temptation at our peril. Our sense of insecurity would be greatly enhanced if Western Europe should fall into a welter of social chaos or follow Eastern Europe into the orbit of Soviet influence.

What we should do in our own interest quite as much as in Europe's, is to try to bring some pattern of hope and order out of the war's fearful legacy of misery and confusion. The most hopeful means to achieve

this end is to subordinate the patchwork jobs of relief and rehabilitation which must be done in individual countries to a master plan for bringing into closer association those European countries which lie outside the sphere of Soviet control.

A SINGLE ECONOMIC UNIT

Some fresh, thoughtful, and constructive ideas pointing in this direction are to be found in the recent speech of Mr. John Foster Dulles before the National Publishers Association. Mr. Dulles suggested that the war victors should "think more in terms of the economic unity of Europe and less in terms of the Potsdam dictum that Germany shall be 'a single economic unit.'" Mr. Dulles added that there should be economic unification of Germany, but that there should also be, and for the same reasons, economic unification of Europe. And he offered a fresh and hopeful approach to the complex German problem when he suggested:

"It is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany; and do so without making Germans the masters of Europe."

The European problem in general and the German problem in particular may well remain insoluble if they are approached on the assumption that the Continent must remain divided into completely independent sovereign states, each with its economy in a watertight compartment. The supreme dilemma of Germany is that there can be no healthy European recovery without a revival of German trade and industry; while France and the smaller European states fear a renewal of German aggression if Germany becomes too strong.

This dilemma might appear less formidable if the vast German industrial potential of the Ruhr and the Rhineland could be linked with the industries of France, Belgium, and Luxemburg and operated under some form of international control, in which all the interested countries would have a voice. There are other projects of hydroelectric power and transportation development which could be worked out best under some method of economic internationalism. The worst of Europe's crisis will be over when there is general agreement to place the emphasis on reconstruction, not revenge, on raising living standards all around, not on artificially depressing living standards in Central Europe.

WOULD CONSTITUTE A FOURTH GREAT POWER

It is probably only through some form of political federation (although this may be expected to develop more slowly than projects for economic cooperation) that Europe can hope to make good in some measure the fearful weakening and impoverishment of the war. A federated Europe would possess sufficient population and resources to constitute a fourth great power, comparable with the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. Failing some scheme of federation it is only too probable that the weak, divided European nations will find themselves being used as pawns by the Big Three. A federated Europe would be a buffer between the western powers and the Soviet Union, would be strong enough to resist attempts of domination, and would consequently be an excellent guaranty of peace.

Amid all the desolation and hates of Europe there is a consciousness of common cultural and economic ties among thoughtful Europeans of many nationalities. The Pope has often spoken in accents of genuine concern for the whole fabric of European civilization, not of partisanship for or against any single nation. Winston Churchill has placed his influence behind a movement to promote European unity and European leaders of varying schools of thought have endorsed the idea.

What is now needed is a strong push from the country that is able to do most, politically and economically, for the realization of the ideal of a federated Europe. That country is the United States. If federation is Europe's last chance, the realization or nonrealization of this ideal may well mark the difference between success and failure in America's foreign policy, which aims, or ought to aim, at the promotion of a free, stable, and prosperous Europe.

[From the Washington Star]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Fifteen distinguished Europeans, or Americans of European background, most of them scholars, from 10 European countries, have addressed a declaration and appeal to the President and Congress, asking support for the establishment of an all-European confederation at the end of the war, and setting forth eight points in support and description of such a program.

The idea is not new. It has been advocated for years by the Pan-European movement headed by Richard Goudenhove-Kalergi. It has had the support in Britain of eminent publicists, such as Sir Walter Layton. It is believed that Mr. Churchill supports it, and edged toward it in his famous Guild Hall speech, calling for a council of Europe, and a council of Asia, to be established after the war.

As the great power world emerges, the problem of postwar Europe becomes more and more urgent. Will Europe fall into social and political anarchy? Are all the petty and anachronistic sovereignties to be restored? Has not this war demonstrated the essential weakness of all the European states? And has it not also proved that this weakness is a temptation to direct aggression, and to indirect interventionisms, spheres of influence, and all the other power games which led to this dreadful struggle? Is Europe, as a civilization and culture finished? Is it to be further Balkanized, or will there again in some future be an attempt to write it under another domination, by force or the threat of force?

These leading questions have so far not received a statesmanlike answer. In fact, reading the various declarations from Teheran, for instance, or from Yalta, one receives the impression that Europe, that great complex of 350,000,000 people, is henceforth of negligible importance.

Yet the answer to these questions lies in the heart of the German problem. This column has contended—with perhaps boring repetitiveness—that there is no solution to the German problem until the European problem, of which it is a part, is solved. If the European problem is solved, the German problem can be. And only if the European problem is solved can the world count on peace. The authors of the Declaration of European Interdependence know it. They advance the same thesis as that of Albert Guerard, in his new book published by the Stanford University Press, "Europe, Free and United." I hope it gets the attention, in high places, that it deserves.

The thesis of the declaration is:

1. That the nations of Europe constitute, by reasons of geography and history, an interdependent region of the world.

2. That nothing short of confederation can secure for Europe lasting peace, speedy recovery, and personal liberty.

3. That a confederation authority should create a confederation armed force to protect all European peoples against aggression and tyranny.

4. That no fourth Reich should ever be established, but when Hitlerism and Pan-German imperialism have been overcome the various states of the Reich should enter the confederation.

5. That the confederation should protect all Europeans against racial, social, and religious discrimination and guarantee civil liberties and cultural autonomies.

6. That a social bill of rights should aim at assuring all Europeans freedom from want.

7. That the confederation should gradually liquidate all inter-European trade barriers and transform Europe into a single market with a common currency and a coordinated transportation system.

8. That within these limits of continental solidarity the European confederation should respect the various democratic constitutions of its member states and guarantee their security and equality.

Sooner or later Europe must emerge free and united or Europe will be, as the authors of this declaration state, an all but certain source of another war, as well as a breeding ground for tyranny, putsches, and adventurisms of all sorts. Never in modern history has Europe been so fragmented, especially economically, as it has been since the last war. In England, especially, there is growing dismay lest a broken Europe slowly drag down with it the whole of western civilization.

Above all, the United States, out of her own wonderful experience of the Union of the States, should support a European confederation plan. Victory must be translated into new life, and that means a modern political, social, and economic system.

[From the Washington Post of February 5, 1947]

A UNITED EUROPE—NEED FOR EFFECTIVE FEDERATION

(By Sumner Welles)

One of the most heartening developments in Europe in recent months has been the rapid increase in the popular demand for the establishment of a European federation.

No one who talked with the European statesmen attending the recent meeting of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs could have failed to be impressed with the sense of urgency in the opinions they expressed. They were frank in saying that only a federated Europe could survive. And these convictions were by no means voiced solely by representatives of western Europe.

Two weeks ago it was announced in London that a Provisional British Committee for a United Europe has been established under the chairmanship of Winston Churchill. This committee is an outgrowth of Mr. Churchill's speech at Zurich last year. But it is significant that the committee is far from being an organ of the Conservative Party. Prominent members of the Labor Party and of the Liberal Party are serving on it.

A movement known as European Action was simultaneously inaugurated in Paris under the presidency of Professor Brugmans, an outstanding leader of the Dutch resistance and a guiding force in the Dutch Labor Party. In explaining the objectives of European Action, Professor Brugmans said: "Europe is not destined to be a western bloc set up in opposition to other blocs, but an international system composed of independent nations which freely unite. We reject the theory that we are compelled to select between the United States of America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We select Europe and a European federation because we are confident that Europe can become a factor in bringing about international agreement. The Netherlands, for instance, is at the crossroads of German, Anglo-Saxon, and Latin civilizations. If it is true to say that the Netherlands is one of those countries that has a clear mission in Europe, it is equally true to say that all of Europe has a similar mission in the world."

Some of the chief proponents of a federated Europe are, of course, obsessed with the belief that such a federation must be used as a barrier to Soviet expansion and be employed as a leverage to force Moscow to come to terms in the negotiation of the German treaty. The violent diatribes recently emanating from Moscow against the doctrine of European federation and against its leading advocates are due in part to this fact. They are due far more, however, to the Russian recollection of the efforts of the Allied Powers in 1919 to create a cordon sanitaire around the Soviet Union, and to the Russian belief that any European federation now initiated would be destined merely to serve the same ends.

The stark truth is, however, as Prime Minister Attlee said a few months ago, "Europe must federate or perish." One of the great problems which now confront the statesmen of the United Nations is how this objective can be secured in the face of Russian opposition.

There are two indispensable prerequisites to a United Europe.

Under existing world conditions, no successful European federation can be created, save as a temporary military measure, unless the Soviet Union plays a cooperative part in its establishment and operation.

The second requisite is that the provisions of the forthcoming German treaty make a European federation possible.

John Foster Dulles made a statement which is profoundly true when he said in his address of January 17: "The German settlement will not of itself bring about a federation of Europe. * * * But the German settlement may decisively determine whether the movement will be toward economic unification or toward rebuilding the whole structure of independent, unconnected sovereignties."

If the German treaty compels the political decentralization of Germany and requires a degree of autonomy on the part of the several German states sufficient to permit of a close integration of their economies with the economies of their non-German neighbors, Europe can eventually obtain economic unification. Without such a foundation there can be no political federation of Europe.

It is, of course, alleged that the active participation of the Soviet Union in a European federation would merely facilitate the consolidation of Russian influence over central and western Europe.

While this analogy, like most analogies, is far from perfect it should be remembered that the major reason for the original opposition of some of the governments of Latin America to the creation of the existing inter-American system was their fear that the preponderant power of this country, especially because of its previous high-handed policies, would make it far easier for the United States rapidly to control all of the rest of the New World, were a regional system to be established.

Europe desperately needs some effective form of political and economic federation. But it cannot be obtained unless the German treaty facilitates it. And it cannot be advanced until the present suspicions of the Soviet Union can be dispelled, and unless the Soviet Government can be convinced that its own enlightened interest will be best served by the construction of a European system founded upon political and economic federation rather than upon that anarchic conglomeration of clashing sovereignties to which so many of the ills which the peoples of Europe have suffered during the past thousand years can be directly ascribed.

[From the Washington Post of January 21, 1947]

MR. DULLES ON EUROPE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The address made last Friday to the National Publishers Association by Mr. John Foster Dulles marks a turning point of great significance in the development of United States foreign policy. His close association with Governor Dewey and with Senator VANDENBERG, as well as the timing of the address, makes it certain that he was speaking for the leading elements of the Republican Party.

As a result of the elections in November the Republicans are no longer merely the opposition, and their role in foreign policy is greatly changed. Once "bipartisan cooperation" meant that they would not obstruct and oppose. Since San Francisco it has meant that they would collaborate and support. Now, as Mr. Dulles' address shows, they have a program to propose and they will attempt to lead.

The crux of the proposal is that we should work not for another German settlement as such but for a new European settlement. The first question, of course, is whether Mr. Dulles is in conflict with the policy of the administration. The truth here is, I think, that his German and European program is entirely consistent with the best hopes and intentions of the State Department and of General Clay's conduct of military government. But for various reasons, which we need not dwell upon again, these hopes and intentions have never yet been set forth coherently and systematically as the American policy for Europe.

Mr. Dulles has now done that. He has made explicit what has been implicit. He has stated positively and constructively what has thus far been obscured and confused by an excessive preoccupation with details, with temporary difficulties of the occupation, with small expedients, and with the quest for tactical advantages in the general diplomatic conflict with the Soviet Union. There ought, however, to be no serious obstacle to a fundamental agreement. For the way Mr. Dulles asks the administration to take is the way every important person in it, who has thought much about Germany, really wishes to go.

The next question is how much support such an American policy can have among the bigger and the smaller nations who must make the settlement. Probably we must assume that the Soviet Government will begin by not liking it. But it does not follow that in the end the Soviet Government may not be induced to accept it.

The inducements are very great, and they may even be compelling. For this is not, as the Russians themselves and many others may at first think, a plan to organize a western bloc against the Soviet Union. The plan calls for a radically decentralized confederation of German states connected by political and economic ties with the surrounding countries of Europe. That would be a western bloc only if the Russians themselves made it one. It would become a western bloc only if they prevent the German states in their zone from joining the confederation, and if they compel Poland and Czechoslovakia to stay out of a European system.

The practical virtue of this approach is that a great part of Europe can be reconstructed even if the Soviet Union does not at first agree. The fact that so much of Europe can be organized without Soviet participation should act as a most compelling inducement to the Soviets to participate in this organization of the whole of Europe.

This is not, then, a tough policy in the sense that it is designed to organize a coalition to isolate Russia. But it is a tough-minded policy in that it denies to the Russians the right or the power to veto the reconstruction of that great part of Europe which they do not in fact control. The benefits of participation will remain open to the Russians and to the Germans in their zone, and to the countries in their orbit. But if they do not choose to come in, the western world could still do a great deal for itself without them.

These inducements may take some time to work. A great deal of diplomatic effort will be necessary to meet the inevitable suspicions of Moscow, and to overcome the hesitations and reluctance and the nervous lethargy which are an aftermath of the war.

Many European governments, though they agree in principle, may encounter the opposition of their own Communist Parties. But this opposition is not necessarily irreconcilable. Much will depend, of course, upon the position finally taken by the Moscow government itself. But there will be other factors. The Communist leaders in all countries may take their directions from Moscow. But their constituents are not all of them by any means thick and thin followers.

This program of a European settlement conforms to very powerful currents of thought and feeling throughout Europe. It is in the first instance an alternative to the nightmare of almost all Europeans—that their continent is to be treated as the stakes of Soviet-American diplomacy, and is destined to become the battlefield of another world war. For this is a proposal to recreate the community and the independence of Europe, not to subordinate Europe to the conflict of the great non-European powers.

Moreover, within the framework of this proposal, the vital interests of France and of the other neighbor states in respect to Germany can be satisfied. Once the proposal becomes concrete and real through negotiation, it would not be so easy for Communist Parties to oppose it. For their support in countries like France depends on their upholding the national interest. There is no reason to believe they could keep the following they have acquired since the war if, obeying orders from Moscow, they took a position openly and flagrantly opposed to the historic interests of their own country.

As long as American and British policy appeared to be merely anti-Soviet, as long as they had no constructive European program, the native Communists could follow Moscow without being in clear conflict with the national interest. But if, as Mr. Dulles proposes, we aim at a settlement for Europe, and not at a coalition against Russia, we have a good prospect of winning wide support in all parties throughout the continent of Europe.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills and other measures on the legislative calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS AFFECTING GOLD AND SILVER MINES

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine if he does not think that a quorum should be present at this time. I am sure that he does, and therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Capehart
Ball	Butler	Capper
Brooks	Cain	Chavez

Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cooper	Kem	Reed
Cordon	Kilgore	Revercomb
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Downey	Langer	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ecton	McClellan	Taft
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Green	McMahon	Tydings
Gurney	Malone	Vandenberg
Hayden	Martin	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wherry
Hill	Moore	White
Holland	Morse	Wiley
Ives	Murray	Williams
Jenner	O'Conor	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. UMSTEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the agreement for the call of the calendar, Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 27, has been reached. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GREEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I did not hear Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 5, called. I was prepared to ask that it go over. It is the first measure on the calendar that was called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed.

Mr. GREEN. It did not go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it was passed.

Mr. GREEN. Then I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to have the bill returned to the calendar?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I wish it to stay on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island that the votes by which Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 5, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, by prohibiting the importation of garbage derived from products originating outside of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 4, in line 6, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial"; on page 5, in line 2, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial"; and in line 22, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes."

Mr. CORDON subsequently said: Mr. President, during the call of the calendar a short time ago House bill 731, Calendar No. 51, was passed. There is an error in the description of the property with which the bill is concerned, which property is to be made into a national memorial park. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the votes by which the amendments to House bill 731 were ordered to be engrossed and by which the bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? Without objection, the votes by which the amendments were ordered engrossed and the bill read a third time and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now offer the following amendment in line 23, on page 5: Strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "6."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill S. 669, to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The bill (H. R. 2535) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1713) to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW CHIARODO

The bill (S. 241) for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo was considered, ordered

to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Andrew Chiarodo is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to $597.50 heretofore paid to him as a plasterer at the United States naval air station, Anacostia, District of Columbia, for the period from February 26, 1945, to March 17, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the said Andrew Chiarodo shall be considered to have been in the employ of the said air station at the rate of $1.39 per hour during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Andrew Chiarodo as compensation for such period.

LILLIAN M. LORRAINE

The bill (S. 243) for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness to the United States of Lillian M. Lorraine, and the said Lillian M. Lorraine is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to $1,794 heretofore paid to her as a stenographer and clerk in the office of the paymaster, United States Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., for the period from January 1, 1931, to April 6, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, the said Lillian M. Lorraine shall be considered to have been employed in said office at the rate of $2,160 per annum from January 1, 1931 to June 30, 1945, inclusive, and at the rate of $2,496 per annum from July 1, 1945, to April 6, 1946, inclusive, during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Lillian M. Lorraine as compensation for such period.

GLENNA J. HOWREY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the name "Colorado" to strike out "Denver", and insert "Pueblo"; on line 6, after the words "sum of"; to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$500"; on page 1, line 12, before the name "Colorado", to strike out "Denver" and insert "Pueblo", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, a minor, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of $500 in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Glenna J. Howrey against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States mail truck at the intersection of East Fourth and Erie Streets in Pueblo, Colo., on December 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a disdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COL. FRANK R. LOYD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 425) for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "property," to strike out "; and (2) the sum of $800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts expended by him in evading capture by Japanese military forces," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Frank R. Loyd, of Laramie, Wyo., (1) the sum of $604.49, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (a) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese, and (b) the amount which the War Department has now determined should have been allowed to the said Col. Frank R. Loyd as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2413) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HEATING OF PROPERTY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The bill (S. 516) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, be, and is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the use of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the property designated as square 173 in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Daughters of the American Revolution agree to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *Provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise and contract for the work necessary to connect with the Government mains and to receive payment from the Daughters of the American Revolution by the transfer of funds in advance to cover the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses: *And provided further*, That there shall be no liability on the part of the Government on account of any damages that may accrue hereunder.

ARMY AND NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1943) to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Corps in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who had to go to the Army Day parade to represent the Armed Forces Committee, I shall, at his request, attempt to answer any questions concerning the establishment of the proposed Nurse Corps.

The principal reason for the establishment of the Nurse Corps in the Army and Navy is a very simple one. It is impossible to get nurses unless provision is made for a permanent Nurse Corps. Unless that is done, very shortly the nurses will go back to their old status, with a pay level of approximately $1,085, whereas the pay of nurses today is substantially in excess of that amount.

The bill has been agreed to by both the Army and the Navy. It is drawn exactly on the same basis for the Army and the Navy, and in the opinion of the leading officers of both services it will enable them to obtain the services of nurses. It will not enable them to get the nurses perhaps as easily as they would like. The pay level which will be established, with the possibilities of retirement, will make employment in the services somewhat preferable to service in private hospitals and public hospitals today, but with the disadvantages incident to the nurses having to move where the Army and the Navy may call for them, the higher pay level seems fair.

The bill is reported unanimously by the committee, and I believe the committee in the House reported it unanimously and it was passed by the House. In my opinion the bill is a proper one and is essential in order to obtain nurses for Army and Navy hospitals.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. What advantages are given to the nurses under the bill which are not now afforded them?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They will become officers in the armed forces. If the Senator will get a copy of the report of the committee, he will find a summary of all the principal features set forth on page 2 of the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much more will it cost the Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was present at the hearings, and my recollection is that it will not cost the Army and the Navy any more than they are now paying for

nurses. It will cost them more than the prewar level. They cannot get nurses at the prewar level.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES FOR FBI PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 715) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 1 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Any special agent, special agent in charge, inspector, Assistant Director, assistant to the Director, Associate Director, or the Director, who is at least 50 years of age and who has rendered 20 years of service or more as a special agent, or as aforesaid above, in the Federal Bureau of Investigation may, on his own application and with the consent of the Attorney General, retire from the service and such annuity of such employee shall be equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30 years."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is the so-called FBI bill. Up to the present time those who work for the FBI have not had the retirement privilege. Under the bill anyone who has worked for the FBI for 20 years and has reached the age of 50 may receive a retirement pension based on 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 preceding years multiplied by the number of years of service up to 30. I might add that all civil-service employees, except those dealing with narcotics, now have the retirement privilege.

Mr. President, this is a bill suggested by the Attorney General; it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

UNITED STATES SENATE ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 723) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the direction and supervision of the Senate Office Building Commission created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), the membership of which is hereby increased from three to five members, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of $25,000.

RENEWAL OF INSURANCE POLICIES

The bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expired 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAN RIVER DAM, N. C.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 64) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across the Dan River in North Carolina, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, line 5, before the word "dam", to insert the word "low"; on line 8, after the name "Virginia", to insert "for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam electric plant"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "energy", to insert "*And provided further*, That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Philpott reservoir or of the proposed dam across Dan River at Schoolfield, Va., as proposed in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved for construction in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other Federal project: *And provided further*, That the grantee shall, at the direction of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, reconstruct or relocate the existing streamgaging facility owned by the United States Geological Survey and situated on the Dan River in the vicinity of Leaksville, N. C."; and on page 3, line 12, after the words "amend or", to strike out the word "appeal" and to insert the word "repeal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a low dam across Dan River at a point in Rockingham County, N. C., near Leaksville, and about 91 miles above the mouth of said river at Clarksville, Va., for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam electric plant: *Provided*, That work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to deviate from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That in approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States: *And provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy: *And provided further*, That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Philpott Reservoir or of the proposed dam across Dan River at Schoolfield, Va., as proposed in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved for construction in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other Federal project: *And provided further*, That the grantee shall, at the direction of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, reconstruct or relocate the existing stream-gaging facility owned by the United States Geological Survey and situated on the Dan River in the vicinity of Leaksville, N. C.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the consideration of the calendar I shall move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 814.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1017) providing for temporary continuation of rent control,

transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

WORLD JAMBOREE OF BOY SCOUTS

The bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from the transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1005) to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union," which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 5, before the word "annually", to strike out "$27,000" and insert "$30,000", and on line 6, after the word "authorized", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$15,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 425; 22 U. S. C. 276), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"An appropriation of $30,000 annually is hereby authorized $15,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Chair might be permitted to say that the bill authorizes an appropriation of $30,000 for participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Chair if that is the only change made by the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the only change.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 81, which is No. 78 on the calendar.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 83, Senate bill 814 to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the motion to take up the bill debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, sir, I hope that the bill will not be considered by the Senate at this time. I say that because the hearings on this important bill have not as yet been printed, and are not available to Members of the Senate except in typewritten form. The bill should be very carefully considered by the Senate. Furthermore, I understand that there is to be an executive session again tomorrow on the Lilienthal nomination, and that thereafter the Senate will consider and debate the highly important question of the Greek-Turkish loan.

Senate bill 814 is a departure from our whole agricultural program of support in that it puts wool on a comparable price basis rather than a parity price basis. It also involves the expenditure of a very substantial amount of money annually by the Federal Government.

I know that my good friend and colleague from Wyoming will say that unless the bill is considered and acted on at this time, unless some kind of legislation concerning wool is passed, the Secretary of Agriculture will withdraw the whole program as of April 15. I say to that argument that the Commodity Credit Corporation under the present law will continue until June 30, and that there is no reason why the Secretary of Agriculture, if he desires to continue to support the program, and if he has an intimation that Congress will take some action on this subject, cannot continue the program beyond April 15. I repeat, I hope the Senate will not take up this bill at this time, because I believe it should be very thoroughly discussed.

If the bill is taken up at this time, I say most respectfully that my colleague from Massachusetts and I, who are vitally interested in the wool trade in Massachusetts, will want to go into the bill in very considerable detail. I hope, sir, that the bill may come up directly after the disposition of the Greek-Turkish loan proposal, if the leaders in charge of the legislative program approve of that course. We shall have no objection to taking it up in a week or 10 days, when the hearings are printed, and when there will be more ample time to discuss the bill than there can possibly be this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I join with my colleague in expressing the hope that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of this bill until the hearings have been printed and until every Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to familiarize himself with the argument. I shall not enter upon the argument today. I think Members who know me will agree that I try to take a broad view of such questions, and that I have not the slightest desire in the world to antagonize legislation which is beneficial to any of the important interests of the United States; but looking back over the 7 years of my service in the Senate, I say it is most unusual to proceed with the consideration of a bill so complex as this bill is, involving as it does the philosophy of the relationship of the Government to agriculture, without waiting until the hearings have been printed so that Members of the Senate who are not on the committee and who do not happen to have any personal contact with the problem may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the issues which confront us. We want to cast an informed vote. Every Senator wants to know what he is doing. I am not asking any of my colleagues to vote one way or the other, but I think every Senator has a right to ask time so that his vote may be an informed vote based upon the facts and upon the evidence which has been no painstakingly developed by the Committee on Agriculture.

For that reason, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of this bill at this time. I have no desire at all to delay action; I shall be glad to have it come up as soon as the hearings are printed; but until that time I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE WOOL STUDY PRINTED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of my colleague to proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 814. This proposed legislation dealing with the wool industry has been before Congress and the public for many years. A special committee of the Senate gave consideration to this matter over a period of some 5 years. Volumes were printed and have been circulated all over the country. Last year the Committee on Agriculture of the House, after full hearings, gave approval to legislation of this character.

The Special Committee on Wool last year recommended legislation of this character, and that report—printed, by the way—went to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, as did the hearing also. Then the Committee on Agriculture also held hearings, which were printed and circulated, and which are now available, dealing with every question that is in

this bill. There is no reason to withhold action now because of any lack of public information or for lack of printed hearings. The volumes of the hearing of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate last year are readily available to every Senator who desires to obtain a copy; and I may say that those hearings contain a full and complete exposition of the views of the Boston wool trade, which is opposed to this legislation.

So, Mr. President, we have this situation: The Senate Committee on Agriculture last year and again this year, by an overwhelming vote, has given its approval to legislation of this character; the House Committee on Agriculture last year likewise took similar action, and this year the House Committee on Agriculture, after a hearing, reported favorably a bill to deal with the very acute problem of the wool growers of the United States. That bill is now before the Rules Committee of the House. So we can say to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture in each body has twice considered this bill and twice recommended favorable action. I said "this bill." I should not have said that because the bill is not precisely the same one that was introduced and recommended at the last session, but it is very similar. There has been full opportunity for those who are opposed to the legislation to express their point of view, and the only opposition that has been expressed throughout the consideration of this measure comes from the small group representing the Boston wool trade, which stands between the producers of wool in the United States and the manufacturers of woolen garments. The hearings are available to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that there is no reason why the Senate should not now vote favorably on the motion of my colleague and take up the bill for consideration. I hope the Senate will support the motion. If that action is not taken the domestic wool industry will be denied the legislative action it needs. The measure of stabilization proposed last year has been materially reduced by the action taken this year, but to decline now to take the bill up would be to disregard the needs of the growers altogether.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the urgency of the immediate passage of the Senate bill. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that he will no longer support wool prices after April 15 unless authorization is made by Congress. April 15 is about the time when the Southern States, especially Texas, begin to market their wool. If the proposed legislation is not passed now and no future supports are provided, the wool growers will find themselves in this situation: Unquestionably the market will drop drastically as of April 15, and the wool growers of the Southern States will then take a much lower price and within a month or two from now, if this legislation is subsequently enacted, then those producers who market their wool later will receive a higher price.

This proposed legislation has been pending for a long while. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has held extensive hearings, and I can see no reason why the Senate should not proceed now to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to what my distinguished colleague and the Senator from North Dakota have said. April 15 is the dead line for the purchase by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the domestic clip. By that time approximately 8,000,000 pounds of grease wool will have been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That includes the wool produced in the State of the Senator from North Dakota, as the Senator said, the eight-month Texas wool, most of the Arizona wool, most of the Hagerman Valley, Idaho, wool, and some of the Ohio fleece wool. The first wool to be shorn in the 1947 year, as I have said, has already probably been purchased.

All the bill does is to ask the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation purchasing program for a period of 2 years. Today the wool-producing industry is not in a position to start out on a new program. It is still more or less on a war basis. For instance, while the average increase in wages in industry throughout the United States has been between 60 and 65 percent, in the wool-producing industry today the wage increase is still 200 percent.

The cost of feeds for the sheep has greatly increased. Hay, for instance, which before the war could be bought at from $5 to $6 a ton, today costs from $15 to $20 a ton.

The industry needs the protection it received during the war years. The object of the bill is to provide that protection.

I might say that so far as the CCC is concerned there will be very little money needed, if any, to take care of this bill. I earnestly ask the Senate to proceed immediately to the consideration of this most urgently needed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that the report of the Department of Agriculture suggests that it is unwise to include the provision about a comparable price; they feel that the price should not be higher than that at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946 which, I understand, was on an average between 41 to 42 cents. The Department of Agriculture apparently recommends 44.1 cents, which they say the bill would cover. In view of the fact that the bill apparently contemplates some loss in the sale of wool at a lower price than that at which it was bought, I wonder whether it is necessary to insist upon the higher price now contained in the bill as an alternative.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I may say in answer to the Senator from Ohio that I should be glad to accept an amendment during the consideration of the bill to fix the same price for the 1947–48 clips as was paid for the 1946 clip, which was between 41 and 42 cents in the grease per pound. That is what is being paid today for the early shorn wool of 1947. I should be very glad to accept an amendment to that effect to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Wyoming will prevail. The Senators from North Dakota have been receiving telegrams and letters urging the enactment of the legislation. As my distinguished colleague has so ably said, we have a feeling in my State that unless something is done soon the farmers will suffer a tremendous loss. I have received a letter from the head of the wool pool of North Dakota and letters from various county agents and county associations recalling to us that they have directed our attention time and again to the date, April 15. We might as well dispose of the legislation now as at a future time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he would state again the amendment to the bill which he is willing to accept.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I said I would accept an amendment to limit the price to be paid for the 1947 and 1948 clips and to make it the same as the price paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1946 clip.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say that such an amendment would make the bill more acceptable, but at the proper time I shall offer as a substitute for Senate bill 814, Senate bill 917, which is a bill introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, which would fix a somewhat different price than that suggested by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Massachusetts doubtless heard the remarks of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a few moments ago on the question whether it is essential in order that the Senate may have adequate information on this subject to have before it the printed copies of the hearings recently concluded. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether in his opinion the information given by the data to which the senior Senator from Wyoming referred is in itself sufficient to inform the Senate upon the subject matter, or whether in the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts the additional hearings recently concluded are essential in order that we might have a reasonably good picture of the entire situation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say in answer to the Senator from Missouri that I believe, though I cannot state authoritatively and definitely, that questions were discussed at this year's hearings which were not brought out at last year's hearings. I refer particularly to the comparable-price question. I have read a great deal from the reports of last year. I believe they constitute a full discussion, but I do not believe that they treat some of the questions which were

raised by Senate bill 814 this year. However, I do not wish to say that definitely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri I am glad to be able to assure him that the subject mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts was fully discussed at last year's hearings. There is full information available to all Senators. I have already undertaken to obtain copies of the hearings. They are on their way to the Chamber and will be available to all Senators who desire to obtain them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The price ranges are certainly different this year than they were last year. That includes the parity prices and the prices of wool.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Prices of various commodities are changing. As a matter of fact, prices are going up at a very alarming rate, as everyone who follows our economic condition knows. But that has nothing to do with the principles involved in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is quit correct. The principles involved in the bill were discussed last year; but there is still the question of price and the question of cost to the Government under the new bill. Under the terms of the suggested amendment, if it were accepted by the Senator from Wyoming, the cost to the Government would be greater during the coming year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that that is a matter for debate when we are considering the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with a great deal of interest, and with the admiration which I always have for his eloquence and ingenuity. I believe that the speech which he made here in 1937 in connection with the bill to increase the membership of the Supreme Court was without doubt one of the ablest speeches I have ever heard in my life. It is no wonder to me that the Senator from Wyoming has had such a successful career, and that his many relatives and friends in Massachusetts follow his activities with so much admiration. But when he tries to establish the point that we can get along this year with last year's hearings, I think even he, with his eloquence and ingenuity, strains our imagination just a little.

There was an election last November. There are a few of us here who were not here last year. Some of us appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There are a few of us here who were not here last year, and who are now members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who tried to make a contribution to this problem by asking a few questions to throw light on it.

Even if the bills were identical—which they are not—even if the price figures were exactly the same—which they are not, and even if there were not a great many other differences—which there are—it would still be untenable for a Senator utterly to disregard the contribution which the new Members of this body have tried to make to this question, and to seek to create the impression in the minds of Senators that last year's hearings are perfectly adequate. If that were true, Mr. President, why did we have any hearings this year? Why did the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], chairman of the committee, and all the other members of the committee, sit by the hour taking testimony?

No, Mr. President, today we are not settling any question about wool. Today we are settling the question of whether the United States Senate is going to keep faith with its own procedure, whether the Members of this body are going to seek to cast an informed vote, and whether we are to be willing to wait for a few days—a week at the most—until the hearings are printed, and until those who are vitally concerned with this question have an opportunity to prepare their case.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to tell the Senator from Massachusetts that the stenographic reports have not even been ordered to be printed. At least 3 weeks will be required to have them printed.

Mr. LODGE. I have not looked into that question, but I should be very much surprised if the hearings could not be printed more quickly than that. I have on my desk a copy of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were printed in short order. I believe that if the Senator from North Dakota and I were to join forces in urging the Government Printing Office to print these hearings quickly, it certainly could be done.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate longer. I merely express the hope that we shall seek to cast an informed vote on this question and wait until the evidence is before us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McClellan
Ball	Fulbright	McFarland
Brooks	George	McGrath
Buck	Hayden	McKellar
Butler	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Cain	Hill	Malone
Capehart	Holland	Martin
Capper	Ives	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kem	Pepper
Donnell	Kilgore	Reed
Downey	Knowland	Revercomb
Dworshak	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ecton	McCarran	Smith
Taft	Vandenberg	Wiley
Taylor	Watkins	Williams
Thye	Wherry	Wilson
Tobey	White	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I may do so I should like to ask the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] whether or not there were any hearings held on Senate bill 2033 introduced during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that that was the number of the bill which I introduced. If my recollection is correct in that respect, the commitee held long hearings upon it. Senate bill 2033 is the bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry after it had been recommended by the Special Committee on Wool.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. My question has a bearing, I think, upon the question as to whether or not the information obtained prior to the hearings recently concluded is sufficient for the Senate. I observe in report No. 85, filed on April 2, 1947, with respect to the pending measure, Senate bill 814, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. The letter is dated April 2, 1947. I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to this language in that letter:

> The provisions of S. 814 are similar in some respects to the provisions of S. 2033, introduced during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved by your committee with certain changes. While the main provisions of S. 2033 were endorsed by this Department in 1946, a number of developments have taken place since the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress which have caused us to make certain changes in our recommendations.

I call the Senator's attention to this further language in the letter of April 2, 1947:

> In S. 2033, as originally introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, there was a provision which would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the price-support programs either by loans, purchases, support payments, or other operations. The provision authorizing that the program might be carried out by support payments was deleted from the bill reported out by your committee and has been omitted from the present bill, S. 814.

I call the Senator's attention to further language in the letter of April 2, 1947, as follows:

> In S. 2033, Seventy-ninth Congress, and S. 103, Eightieth Congress, there also have been included provisions authorizing the establishment of official wool and mohair standards. These provisions are not included in S. 814, but we feel that it would be desirable for them to be included.

Mr. President, the question I desire to ask the senior Senator from Wyoming is this: In view of those various expressions by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture as to the differences between Senate bill 814, the measure now before us, and Senate bill 2033, which was before the last session of the 79th Congress, does the Senator from Wyoming still feel that the information before the Senate, without the printed report of the hearings recently concluded, is sufficient to advise the Senate adequately with respect to Senate bill 814.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my response without qualification is yes. I believe the information is absolutely sufficient. I say to the Senator that with respect to the quotations which he has read from the letter of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, the explanation is that Senate bill 2033, as recommended by the wool committee a year ago, and as favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a year ago, was much more extensive in its favorable dealing with the domestic wool growers than is the bill now before the Senate—not because the present Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the sponsor of the bill, my colleague, desire any less protection for the domestic wool growers, but because we are speeding toward the final date when, if the Congress does not act, the domestic wool industry will face destruction.

For example, let us consider the recommended change with respect to the comparable price. I say to the Senator that practically all basic commodities have the benefit of the so-called comparable price formula. When the parity price was fixed for wool, wool was in a depressed condition. Therefore, we have asked for the comparable price because we have felt that domestic wool should have the same consideration as that given to other commodities which have the benefit of the comparable price.

With respect to the provisions of Senate bill 2033, the bill which I introduced last year, which dealt, for example, with the establishment of standards, I still believe that those standards should be fixed in the interest of the domestic industry; but we realized that with this final date bearing down upon us, it would be dangerous to take them into consideration. President Truman has indicated his willingness to act. He had directed the executive department and agencies to cooperate with me and the committee a year ago. He will sign this bill, I am confident. I regret that the committee has felt obligated to cut out some of the provisions—but half a loaf is better than no bread.

So the sponsors of this bill and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have been willing to sacrifice some of the provisions to which the Boston wool trade raised objections last year.

A few moments ago my colleague, in response to an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, said he would be willing to accept an amendment by which the comparable price itself would be surrendered. I am sorry if we have come to that position; but if it is necessary to take that step in order to secure the enactment of such legislation by the 15th of April, when the Commodity Credit Corporation will cease to support the wool industry, of course we must make whatever concessions are necessary.

But I hope the Senator will not ask the supporters of this bill to sacrifice the bill itself. Let us proceed to the consideration of the bill; and I assure the Senator again that the material available in the printed hearings covers every disputed and controversial issue in this measure.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Let me say first that during the course of this colloquy there has been handed to me a booklet containing hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Senate bill 2033 and Senate bill 1874, my attention having been directed to them by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Those hearings were held on June 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those are the hearings for which I called just a few moments ago. Those hearings show that Senate bill 2033, concerning which the Senator first interrogated me, was the one I introduced, and was favorably reported last year by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DONNELL. I should also like to state that during the early portion of the colloquy on this matter this afternoon, there was handed to me by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] a copy of the hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool. That was a Senate special committee, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 150, and it held hearings in the latter part of November and on December 6, 1945.

I now wish to ask the Senator about the following sentence which I previously read from the letter of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, under date of April 2, 1947, as set forth in Report No. 85, now before the Senate:

> The provisions of S. 814 are similar in some respects to the provisions of S. 2033, introduced during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved by your committee with certain changes.

I ask the Senator whether he thinks that is a correct recital of the facts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is substantially correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened to this debate with interest, of course. The only question is whether the bill shall be considered.

This matter has been pending before the Congress for a considerable period of time. As was pointed out by the Senator from Missouri, it was before the last Congress, and at that time there were elaborate hearings.

I very much hope the Senate will not refuse to take up the bill and give it a hearing. It is of the highest importance to the wool industry. The time is short. It seems to me that the bill is at least deserving of consideration by the Senate. Therefore, I hope the Senate will adopt the motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say, in reply to the Senator from Texas, that there is no objection on the part of the Senators from Massachusetts, I am confident, to having this matter fully discussed as soon as the hearings are printed, and I hope that will be the case after the Greek-Turkish loan is taken up and disposed of.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the meantime the 15th of April probably will have arrived, and disaster will follow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I point out again to the distinguished Senator from Texas that the present wool program can be continued until the 30th of June. There is nothing to prevent that except the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture that it not be continued. It can be continued at his discretion or if the Members of Congress ask him to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Wyoming: Have transcripts of the hearings been prepared?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Stenographic transcripts have been prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. UMSTEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr.

SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—53

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Ball	George	Murray
Brooks	Hayden	O'Conor
Buck	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pepper
Cain	Holland	Reed
Capehart	Jenner	Revercomb
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Connally	Kilgore	Watkins
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	McCarran	Wilson
Downey	McClellan	Wherry
Dworshak	McFarland	Wiley
Eastland	McGrath	Taylor
Ecton	McKellar	Young
Ellender	Malone	

NAYS—10

Ives	Martin	White
Kem	Saltonstall	Williams
Lodge	Smith	
McMahon	Tobey	

NOT VOTING—32

Baldwin	Hatch	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bricker	Lucas	Sparkman
Bridges	McCarthy	Stewart
Bushfield	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Moore	Tydings
Flanders	Morse	Umstead
Green	Myers	Wagner
Gurney	O'Daniel	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The first amendment of the committee is on page 2, line 9, before the word "may", to insert the word "and."

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 21, last, the President of the United States in a special message recommended that the Congress authorize and appropriate "not to exceed $350,000,000 to assist in completing the great task of bringing relief from the ravages of war to the people of the liberated countries." A bill—House Joint Resolution 153—to carry out that recommendation, has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress. That measure, no doubt, will soon be here in this body for our consideration and action.

On March 12 the President, in an address to a joint session, further recommended that the Congress provide authorization "for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948." Bills are now pending to carry out this recommendation of the President—H. R. 2616 and S. 938. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, to whom S. 938 was referred, has unanimously reported this measure favorably, with an amendment. The bill is now on the calendar, and I understand it is the intention of the majority that it be taken up as soon as the pending business shall have been finished.

Another bill—Senate Joint Resolution 77—providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor in the amount of $75,000,000 was passed by the Senate on March 25 and is now pending in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, these three pending proposals if enacted into law will further obligate our Government for relief expenditures abroad in the amount of $825,000,000. I do not at the moment undertake to express my opposition to all or either of these measures, but, Mr. President, I am concerned about them and deeply regret the necessity for their enactment, if, in fact, such necessity exists.

The Chief Executive, in his address to the Congress on March 12, reminded us that we contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II as an investment in world freedom and world peace. Of this war cost, our Government still owes some $260,000,000,000, the amount of our national debt, and assuming that we shall henceforth be able to effectuate reasonable economy in our fiscal affairs, it is a conservative estimate that we will have an annual Federal expenditure for many years to come of around $30,000,000,000. That means, Mr. President, a tax burden indefinitely on the American people in excess of $30,000,000,000 annually if we are to meet in full current expenditures and if we are to make any substantial progress toward retirement of the national debt.

Taking these indisputable facts into account and remembering our efforts and experience following World War I when we invested some $14,000,000,000 in loans and grants to foreign governments for world relief and reconstruction, I became curious to know, Mr. President, just how much our Government has already expended and has become obligated to spend for relief and assistance to foreign countries and peoples since VJ-day. During the past several days I have made diligent inquiry of the several appropriate departments of Government and with the aid of the General Research Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I have obtained some very pertinent information which I believe the Members of Congress should have and weigh in the course of our consideration of these pending measures and any further legislation that may come before the Congress proposing any additional expenditures and obligations on the part of our Government for world relief and rehabilitation.

I believe this information will also be of considerable interest to the people of this Nation whose earnings and taxes we are spending when we appropriate moneys from the Federal Treasury in support of these various proposals and relief programs. In order to present the facts as clearly and in as much detail as possible, I have had prepared and shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some 21 different tables of figures with notations thereon that give a pretty clear picture with respect to the assistance that our Government has given foreign countries and peoples since July 1, 1945, through December 1, 1946, together with anticipated expenditures for these purposes, including commitments already made through June 30, 1947.

The first table that I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD is one showing the total amount that our Government has expended from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. The total is $12,066,215,311. This table shows by what departments or through what departments these expenditures were made, and the amount thereof. The table also shows that since January 1, 1947, we have contributed to or invested in or paid into the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development the sum of $3,215,037,500.

Further commitments and anticipated expenditures from all sources through June 30, 1947, add another $1,506,838,500. The table shows the grand total of the expenditures that we have already made during the first 18 months following VJ-day and shall have made by the end of the present fiscal year, or within 2 years following the end of hostilities, in the amount of $16,788,091,311.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Recapitulation of all aid such as loans, property credits, advances, relief expenditures, lend-lease, and commitments to the International Fund and Bank provided by the United States Government to all foreign countries for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Department of State	$59,147
War Department	840,847,431
Navy Department	23,741,783
UNRRA	1,875,007,484
Lend-lease fiscal operations	1,438,970,972
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,005,458,616
Maritime Commission	107,197,511
Department of Agriculture	392,655,186
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	25,000,000
U. S. Commercial Company	7,458,532
Office of Metals Reserve	19,926,745
Office of Rubber Reserve	6,406,904
Export-Import Bank	2,250,710,000
International Monetary Fund	5,275,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	317,500,000

Treasury Department	$3,750,000,000
Total	12,066,215,311
Payments since Jan. 1, 1947:	
Export-Import Bank	152,812,500
International Monetary Fund	2,744,725,000
International Bank	317,500,000
Total	3,215,037,500
Further commitments and anticipated expenditures from all sources through June 30, 1947	1,506,838,500
Total	4,721,876,000
Grand total	16,788,091,311

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next table I submit and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, is a table showing the anticipated expenditures from January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, but which does not include the anticipated expenditures which will be made if the pending legislation, the three bills to which I have referred, should be enacted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Tentative estimate of aid to be rendered to foreign countries for period Jan. 1 through June 30, 1947 (not including the 3 pending bills)*

Department of State	None
War Department relief	$457,851,000
Navy Department relief	None
UNRRA	600,000,000
Lend-lease fiscal operations (estimate)	25,000,000
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (estimate)	75,000,000
Maritime Commission (estimate)	115,000,000
Department of Agriculture, 80 percent of $186,000,000 sugar crop	150,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	None
U. S. Commercial Company	None
Office of Metals Reserve	None
Office of Rubber Reserve	None
Export-Import Bank	235,800,000
International Monetary Fund	2,745,725,000
International Bank	317,500,000
Treasury Department	None
Total	4,721,876,000

The War Department relief funds represent the amount the War Department still has available for overseas relief until June 30, 1947.

UNRRA funds are on hand and uncommitted.

The estimated $25,000,000 of lend-lease is involved in a settlement with the Netherlands.

Of the $75,000,000 estimated item for the Office of Foreign Liquidation, $60,000,000 have already been committed or credit extended, leaving only $15,000,000 to be committed within the next 3 months.

The Agriculture Department item is money advanced primarily to Cuba on its sugar crop. These credits will be extended from June 1 for about a period of 6 weeks.

From January 1947 until March 15, 1947, Export-Import extended credits for $155,800,000. March 15, 1947, to June 30, 1947, another eighty million will probably be extended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since one of these measures applied directly to Greece and we proposed to authorize and expend $400,000,000 for the relief of Greece and Turkey, I have thought it would be interesting to check up and find out exactly how much relief Greece has had during the past few years. I find that during the period from July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1946, the United Kingdom provided aid to Greece in the amount of $632,380,000, and that our Government during the same period provided aid to Greece in the amount of $407,481,063, making a grand total of $1,039,861,063 in aid that has been provided to Greece by the United Kingdom and by our own country during that period.

I ask unanimous consent that table 3, which I submit, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Total financial aid rendered to Greece by the United States and the United Kingdom for period July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1946*

UNITED KINGDOM	
Waiver of 1940–41 loan	$184,000,000
Maintenance of British troops in Greece	192,000,000
Expenses of British Economic Mission	380,000
Aid to Greek Army	120,000,000
Mutual aid	136,000,000
Total	632,380,000
UNITED STATES	
Department of Agriculture (food, fats, and tobacco)	$515,750
United States portion of UNRRA	245,422,054
American Red Cross	1,420,567
Lend-lease—direct from United States	81,562,813
Lend-lease — retransferred from United Kingdom	5,000,000
United States military disbursements (cash)	1,407,653
United States nonmilitary disbursements (cash)	5,675,075
Export-Import Bank loan of $25,000,000 — utilized	3,400,000
War Department relief	3,379,658
U. S. Department of State contributions	958,039
Veterans' Administration	759,501
War Shipping Administration	304,138
Maritime Commission	109,353
Other agencies, such as Treasury, Post Office, etc	172,039
Property credits	59,394,423
Total	407,481,063
Grand total	1,039,861,063

UNITED STATES FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH GREECE FROM JULY 1, 1940, TO DECEMBER 31, 1946

The United States has received from Greece from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1946, $3,000,000 in cash receipts or equivalent, as follows: $2,000,000 in cash receipts; $1,000,000 for drachma to cover United States operating expenses in Greece.

The United States held assets in Greece as of December 31, 1946, as follows: $3,400,000 in loans outstanding; $9,300,000 in property credits; $4,500,000 in surplus-property inventories; $2,200,000 in installations; total assets, $19,400,000.

Of the $407,481,063 provided Greece by the United States $333,900,000 [1] was in the form of relief, rehabilitation, civilian supplies, and lend-lease.

UNRRA: The United States contributed $245,422,054 to Greece. Other nations contributed $83,600,000. Total contribution was $329,000,000.

Lend-lease: The United States furnished lend-lease amounting to $86,600,000 to Greece, $5,000,000 of which was a retransfer from Great Britain. Of the $81,600,000 provided direct, $75,700,000 was prior to VJ-day and $5,900,000 after VJ-day. As of December 31, 1946, Greece had repaid $105,195 of this.

Cash transactions: Were relatively small. Amounted to $7,100,000 disbursements, $2,000,000 receipts. Military disbursements were $100,400,000; nonmilitary, $500,700,000, which included $300,400,000 loans. Receipts were from sales, interest, etc.

Future commitments: Of a total of $59,400,000 in property credits, and $25,000,000 in Export-Import Bank loans (totaling together $84,400,000), property credits of $9,400,000 and bank loans of $3,400,000 have been made. This leaves total unexpended commitment of $71,600,000.

United States installations in Greece: The United States had six installations in Greece, costing $2,374,885. The Foreign Liquidation Commission of the State Department is completing liquidation of them.

World War I debt: Greece's total World War I indebtedness amounts to $37,500,000; unpaid principal, $31,500,000; interest, $6,000,000. Of the total $20,200,000 is delinquent.

Source: Office for Foreign Transactions, Business Economics Division, Department of Commerce.

[1] In addition the United States furnished the Balkans $30,000,000 in civilian supplies, but further distribution to countries, including Greece, is not known.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. During the same period it should be remembered that the United Kingdom received an enormous amount of relief from the United States; so a considerable amount of relief that the United Kingdom extended to Greece originally came from the United States also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it would not be far wrong to say that either directly or indirectly we contributed every dollar of it, in view of the $30,000,000,000 of lend-lease which we supplied to Great Britain, which enabled her during that period of time to render this assistance to Greece. Therefore, I think we can say that either directly or indirectly we provided substantially all of it.

Mr. President, we have made some other committals. In some instances they were for such purposes as will, I am sure, enable us to receive some return.

I submit table 4, which shows that the State Department has made loans and advances to Uruguay in the amount of $59,147. I ask that the table may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—*U. S. Department of State—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the U. S. Department of State for Office of Inter-American Affairs for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Uruguay (loans)	$30,163
Uruguay (advances)	28,984
Total	59,147

Mr. McCLELLAN. I now present table No. 5 showing relief dispensed by the

United States War Department in foreign areas for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, showing the countries in which this aid was given in a total amount of $840,847,431. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—*U. S. War Department—Relief dispensed by U. S. War Department in foreign areas for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Austria	$54,646,583
Germany	258,370,672
Italy	103,654,259
Japan	188,062,842
Chosen	21,959,889
Ryukyu Islands	1,110,992
Netherlands Indies	4,105,731
Philippines	28,345,232
Europe in British zone	124,872,227
Europe in United States zone	55,718,286
Europe in Balkans	718
Total	840,847,431

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table 6 shows relief dispensed by the United States Navy Department in foreign areas for the same period, July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the amount of $23,741,783. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the table at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 6.—*U. S. Navy Department—Relief dispensed by U. S. Navy Department in foreign areas for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Caroline Islands	$1,059,228
Marianas Islands	3,874,281
Marshall Islands	206,795
Ryukyu Islands	15,319,760
Ryukyu Islands, War and Navy	3,268,801
Miscellaneous Japanese Islands	12,918
Total	23,741,783

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the next table is quite interesting to me. It shows our contribution to UNRRA. The table, No. 7, shows the amount of our contribution expended by UNRRA from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the total amount of $1,875,007,484. We knew we were spending that money, Mr. President, but the significant thing, and I think something of importance as we weigh these pending relief measures, and particularly two of them, is how much of America's money contributions to UNRRA went to certain governments and countries for their relief. I find, Mr. President, that out of the total of $1,875,000,000-plus which we invested in UNRRA up to December 31, 1946, Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries which are definitely, I think we will agree, under Russian economic and political domination, received $851,647,512, or 45 percent of our contribution to UNRRA for that period of time. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TABLE 7.—*UNRRA—Portion of relief and rehabilitation supplies furnished by the United States to UNRRA for distribution in various countries for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Albania	$15,774,928
Austria	34,716,234
Belgium	898,017
United Kingdom (wheat diversion)	8,368,988
China	184,156,805
Czechoslovakia	150,362,106
Egypt	424,755
Ethiopia	44,923
Finland	1,175,337
France	2,997,352
France: Algeria	89,724
France: French Indochina	457
Germany	3,772,828
Greece	243,180,331
Hungary	1,291,985
Italy	265,401,792
Italy: Eastern Mediterranean isles	1,347,709
Japan: Korea (Chosen)	100,443
Luxembourg	27,793
Netherlands	849,133
Norway	410,600
Philippines	6,057,961
Poland	287,769,989
Sweden	549,066
Switzerland	1,802,644
U. S. S. R.	139,197,001
International organizations such as Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	216,365,929
Various unclassified areas	50,621,151
Yugoslavia	257,251,503
Grand total	1,875,007,484

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next table, No. 8, Mr. President, refers to lend-lease which we have expended during that same period of time, from July 1, 1945, through December 1946, in the amount of $1,438,970,972. The table gives the names of the nations and the amount of lend-lease provided for each.

I ask unanimous consent for its insertion at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—*Lend-lease fiscal operations*[1]*—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Lend-Lease, fiscal operations for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Australia (property credits)	$500,000
China (property credits)	58,900,000
France (property credits)	420,000,000
Iran (property credits)	8,541,041
Liberia (property credits)	6,775,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (property credits)	241,560,000
United Kingdom (property credits)	590,000,000
South America, unclassified (property credits)	715,150
Italy (relief supplies)	111,979,781
Total	1,438,970,972

[1] This Office maintains accounts and other fiscal records relating to lend-lease and reverse lend-lease and is under direct supervision of the Treasury.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table No. 9 shows the loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, totaling $1,005,458,616.

I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the table in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Figures from clearing house of foreign transactions, Department of Commerce]

TABLE 9.—*Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission for the period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Brazil (property credit)	$8,000,000
Colombia (property credit)	800,000
Panama (property credit)	121,000
Uruguay (property credit)	666,000
Austria (property credit)	10,000,000
Belgium (property credit)	49,000,000
United Kingdom (property credit)	60,000,000
Australia (property credit)	6,500,000
New Zealand (property credit)	5,500,000
China (property credit)	15,000,000
Czechoslovakia (property credit)	50,000,000
Egypt (property credit)	11,000,000
Ethiopia (property credit)	1,000,000
Finland (property credit)	15,000,000
France (property credit)	300,000,000
Greece (property credit)	45,000,000
Hungary (property credit)	15,000,000
Iran (property credit)	4,390,607
Italy (property credit)	160,000,000
Japan (property credit)	15,000,000
Chosen (property credit)	25,000,000
Lebanon (property credit)	5,000,000
Netherlands (property credit)	20,000,000
Netherlands Indies (property credit)	100,000,000
Philippines (property credit)	681,009
Poland (property credit)	50,000,000
Saudi Arabia (property credit)	2,000,000
Siam (property credit)	10,000,000
Turkey (property credit)	10,000,000
Total	1,005,458,616

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the next table, No. 10, shows the relief loans, credits and so forth, advanced by the United States Maritime Commission to the countries that receive such assistance, in the total amount of $107,197,511. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 10.—*U. S. Maritime Commission—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Maritime Commission for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Brazil (property credit)	$9,367,137
Peru (property credit)	4,103,547
France (property credit)	30,891,351
Greece (property credit)	23,708,903
Italy (property credit)	20,437,660
Norway (property credit)	15,904,101
Turkey (property credit)	2,784,812
Total	107,197,511

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 11 shows the relief loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Department of Agriculture for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 11.—*U. S. Department of Agriculture—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Department of Agriculture for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Cuba (advance)	$384,120,686
Peru (advance)	50,000
Philippines (advance)	8,484,500
Total	392,655,186

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table No. 12 refers to the loan made by our Government to the Philippines in the amount $25,000,000. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 12.—*Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Philippines (loan)	$25,000,000

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 13 lists the loans, property credits, and advances to various countries through the U. S. Commercial Company for the same period, July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the amount of $7,458,532. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 13.—*U. S. Commercial Company*[1]*—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the U. S. Commercial Company for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Chile (advance)	$6,447,387
Colombia (advance)	26,507
Ecuador (loan)	5,190
Mexico (advance)	204,786
Nicaragua (advance)	8,664
British Honduras (loan)	13,497
Canada (advance)	244,582
Northern Rhodesia (advance)	14,953
Sierra Leone (advance)	492,966
Total	7,458,532

[1] A subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and engaged on special export-import projects for the Army, Department of State, and other agencies in liberated areas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 14 shows loans and advances we have made to certain countries through the Metals Reserve in the amount of $19,926,745. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 14.—*Office of Metals Reserve*[1]*—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Metals Reserve for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Bolivia (advance)	$150,000
Mexico (advance)	6,146,745
Peru (advance)	275,000
Canada (advance)	11,955,000
South Africa (advance)	1,400,000
Total	19,926,745

[1] Connected with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchasing of critical metals and minerals.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table 15 shows advances and credits of the same nature made for the same period of time by the Office of Rubber Reserve in the amount of $6,406,904.

I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 15.—*Office of Rubber Reserve*[1]*—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Rubber Reserve for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Bolivia (advance)	$2,682,138
Brazil (property credit)	1,964,773
Brazil (advance)	475
Colombia (advance)	981,099
Guatemala (advance)	33,674
Panama (advance)	22,898
Peru (advance)	171,887
Venezuela (advance)	490,105
Philippines (advance)	3,000
Total	6,406,904

[1] Connected with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchasing of crude rubber and the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with respect to the advances by Rubber Reserve and Metals Reserve, of course, we can regard them as definite investments from which we can expect to receive full value in return. That, however, does not hold true with many of the other credits and advances to which I have referred.

Table No. 16 shows credits authorized by the Export-Import Bank for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 16.—*Credits authorized by Export-Import Bank for period July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1946, by country*

AMERICAN REPUBLICS	
Argentina	$190,000
Brazil	46,060,000
Chile	47,350,000
Colombia	3,520,000
Ecuador	1,780,000
Mexico	37,340,000
Peru	2,450,000
Total	138,690,000
EUROPE	
Belgium	$100,000,000
Czechoslovakia	2,000,000
Denmark	20,000,000
Finland	35,000,000
France	1,200,000,000
Greece	25,000,000
The Netherlands	300,000,000
Norway	50,000,000
Poland	40,000,000
Other European countries	100,000,000
Total	1,872,000,000
ASIA	
China	$66,790,000
Netherlands Indies	100,000,000
Saudi Arabia	30,000,000
Turkey	28,060,000
Total	224,850,000
VARIOUS COUNTRIES	
Canada	$5,700,000
Ethiopia	3,000,000
Smaller countries	5,000,000
Special exporter-importer credits	1,470,000
Total	15,170,000
Grand total	2,250,710,000
CREDITS AUTHORIZED IN 1947 TILL FEB. 28, 1947	
Brazil	$9,562,500
Finland	37,500,000
Italy	105,000,000
Austria	750,000
Total for 1947	152,812,500

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas has read the last report of the Export-Import Bank on the overall extension of credits direct and indirect in 1946 and 1947. If not, I wish to call his attention to the fact that that report shows that in the year 1946 we gave abroad, in goods and services, $8,200,000,000 more than we got back. It is estimated that in the year 1947 we will give $7,000,000,000 more of goods and services, including exports and the furnishing of services, and approximately half a billion dollars spent by the Army abroad, than the value of the things that we get back in the United States. I wonder how long the Senator thinks we can continue passing out our assets at the rate of $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 a year to foreign countries without return.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, that question gives me considerable concern. I think it is time for us to take some stock of the contributions which we are making abroad, and use a little more effort in trying to do it on a businesslike basis and with some hope, at least, of getting some of it back after it has been expended. That is what gives me so much concern. I think this country owes an obligation to the world, in view of our financial situation. I think the call of humanity appeals to all of us, and that we feel compelled, and desire to give assistance; but before I conclude I wish to emphasize some assistance that we have given in the past and are continuing to give, which does not comport consistently with the measures now before Congress for further relief, in their present form. They ought to be amended if enacted, in order to protect our interest and to be consistent with our welfare and national security.

Mr. President, I offer table No. 17 to be incorporated in the RECORD. It is a further analysis of our contributions to the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 17.—*Advances to three banks since July 1, 1945*

1. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

An additional lending authority of $2,800,000,000 was granted by Congress under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Credits

authorized during the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, amounted to $2,250,000,000 with an undisbursed total of $550,000,000.

2. INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Against a total subscription of $8,800,000,000 the United States committed itself to a quota of $2,750,000,000. By November 1946, the United States had deposited $5,275,000. The balance of the United States Government subscription was paid on February 26, 1947, as follows: $687,500,000 in gold, $275,225,000 in cash, $1,782,000,000 in non-interest-bearing notes.

3. INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Against an authorized capital of $10,000,000,000 the 44 member nations represented at Bretton Woods contracted to subscribe $9,100,000,000. Against this total the United States committed itself to a quota of $3,175,000,000.

During November 1946, the second 5-percent payment of $158,750,000 was made to the Bank. Total payments up to December 31, 1946, equaled $317,500,000. The third 5-percent payment was made on February 25, 1947, and the fourth will be made by May 26, 1947. Thus by June 30, 1947, the United States Government will have completed its entire 20-percent subscription of $635,000,000. The remaining $2,540,000,000 represent a contingent obligation only.

No loans have been granted to any country as of March 21, 1947. However, applications for loans and letters of intent are as follows:

Chile (for development)	$40,000,000
Czechoslovakia (for reconstruction)	350,000,000
Denmark (for reconstruction)	50,000,000
France (for reconstruction)	500,000,000
Iran (for development)	250,000,000
Luxemburg (for reconstruction)	20,000,000
Netherlands (for reconstruction)	500,000,000
Poland (for reconstruction)	600,000,000
Total	2,310,000,000

RECAPITULATION

Payments July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1946:	
Export-Import Bank	$2,250,710,000
International Monetary Fund	5,275,000
International Bank	317,500,000
Total	2,573,485,000
Payments since Jan. 1, 1947:	
Export-Import Bank	152,812,500
International Monetary Fund	2,744,725,000
International Bank	317,500,000
Total	3,215,037,500

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, while no loans have yet been granted to any of the countries as of March 21, 1947, from the International Bank fund, there are pending applications for loans in the amount of $2,310,000,000. Among the applications for loans are applications from Czechoslovakia, which asks for $350,000,000, and from Poland, which is asking for $600,000,000. We all remember that we voted to lend Great Britain $3,750,000,000. This information is shown on table 18, which I now offer for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 18.—*U. S. Department of the Treasury*

Loan to the United Kingdom	$3,750,000,000

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table 19 shows a break-down of relief expenditures by the War Department since the cessation of hostilities, by countries, from August 11, 1945, to December 31, 1946, and also anticipated War Department relief expenditures, by countries, from January 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, in the amount of $457,851,000. I ask unanimous consent to have table 19 printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 19.—*Relief expenditures by War Department since cessation of hostilities by country, Aug. 11, 1945–Dec. 31, 1946*

Germany (United States zone)	$524,221,233.26
Austria (United States zone)	50,938,682.55
Japan	176,054,237.73
Korea	30,850,705.33
Ryukyu Islands	1,110,992.00
Udine (Italy)	7,738,587.39
Venezia Guilia (Italy)	11,119,747.25
Total	802,034,187.51

ANTICIPATED WAR DEPARTMENT RELIEF EXPENDITURES BY COUNTRY, JAN. 1–JUNE 30, 1947

Austria (United States zone)	$12,443,000
Germany (United States zone)	97,961,000
Venezia Gulia and Udine	8,819,000
Japan and Korea	338,628,000
Total	457,851,000

These totals represent dollar value of goods, commodities, etc. They include actual shipments from the United States, transfers from military stock piles in respective countries, and transfers from the stock pile created by the United States, England, and Canada during the war in Europe and the Far East.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a few moments ago I referred to the assistance which had been provided through UNRRA for Russia and a number of other nations which we regard as being definitely under her domination. I now offer for the RECORD table 20, which shows the assistance which we have given through UNRRA, lend-lease, the Export-Import Bank credits, and possibly other agencies, from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, to Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. The total amount is $1,250,207,512.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 20.—*United States assistance to the U. S. S. R. and satellite nations (in dollar value) from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Russia:	
UNRRA	$139,197,001
Lend-lease (property credits)	241,560,000
Total	380,757,001
Albania: UNRRA	15,774,928
Czechoslovakia:	
UNRRA	150,362,106
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission	50,000,000
Export - Import Bank credits	2,000,000
Total	202,362,106
Hungary:	
UNRRA	$1,291,985
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission	15,000,000
Total	16,291,985
Poland:	
UNRRA	287,769,989
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission	50,000,000
Export - Import Bank credits	40,000,000
Total	377,769,989
Yugoslavia: UNNRA	257,251,503
Total assistance to Russia in dollar value	380,757,001
Total assistance to Russia's satellite nations in dollar value	869,450,511
Grand total in dollar value	1,250,207,512
Totals by classification of assistance:	
UNRRA	851,647,512
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission	115,000,000
Lend-lease (property credits)	241,560,000
Export - Import Bank credits	42,000,000
Grand total	1,250,207,512

In addition, United States assistance, amounting to $99,362,817, was given to Austria, a fourth of which is dominated by Russian influence. This total was divided as follows: UNRRA, $34,716,234; Office Foreign Liquidation Commission, $10,000,000 (as property credit); and War Department civilian relief, $54,646,583.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find from certain figures, to which I am referring in advance, that under our present commitments the anticipated expenditures from January 1947 through June 30, 1947, to Russia and her satellite nations will be $557,500,000. That makes a total, within 2 years after the cessation of hostilities, of $1,807,707,000 that Russia and the nations under her domination will have received.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator has been ably presenting figures showing the cost to the United States Government of foreign loans and relief. In that connection I should like to relate something which occurred about a year ago. A soldier in Korea wrote to me stating that we were furnishing vast quantities of food, and it was not even labeled as coming from the United States. I took the matter up with the State Department, and sometime later the State Department agreed to label all our food relief as coming from the United States.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to submit, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] an amendment to House Joint Resolution 153, which would make possible the labeling of all our relief, no matter where it goes in the world.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) to the joint

resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I cannot help feeling that the situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers is one of the great mistakes we made in connection with the administration of UNRRA. When we add the lend-lease supplies which went to UNRRA, we provided at least 70 percent, and possibly more, of the relief given by UNRRA. From reports which I have received from those in a position to know, very often we received no credit whatsoever. The people who received the goods and the relief and assistance never knew that this great democracy of ours, this capitalistic system which some so violently condemn, was the source of the very food and other necessities that kept them alive.

Mr. President, the time has come when the peoples of the world should know the source from which relief is coming, and who is alleviating their distress. I am happy to join with the Senator from North Dakota in submitting this amendment to the general relief measure, so that henceforth when we spend the money of American taxpayers to render aid and relief to peoples who are in distress, they may know where it comes from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point table 21, a tentative estimate of assistance to be rendered to certain European countries by the United States during the period January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947. This table is a break-down of the figures which I have just submitted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 21.—*Tentative estimate of assistance to be rendered to certain European countries*[1] *by the United States during the period Jan. 1 through June 30, 1947*

UNRRA (to all Russian-influenced Europe)	$200,000,000
Export-Import Bank	40,000,000
United States portion, International Bank	317,500,000
Total	557,500,000
Aid rendered July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1947	1,250,207,512
Grand total	1,807,707,512

[1] European countries which are predominantly influenced by Russia in their political and economic actions. (Satellites are those nations rotating in the orbit of Russian influence.) Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland, plus Russian-occupied zones of Germany and Austria.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, to recapitulate a bit in connection with the figures which I have submitted, the total expenditures from July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, amounted to $12,066,215,311. The total anticipated expenditures or commitments which have already been made from January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, not including the three pending relief measures, amount to $4,721,876,000, making a total of $16,788,091,000 of cost to this Government for foreign aid and assistance during the 2-year period following the war.

Mr. President, in connection with the foregoing I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a table headed "Recapitulation of United States financial assistance to all foreign nations since July 1, 1945."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recapitulation of United States financial assistance to all foreign nations since July 1, 1945

Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946	$12,066,215,311
Total anticipated expenditures or commitments from Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, not including the 3 pending measures	4,721,876,000
Expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, plus expenditures or commitments scheduled through June 30, 1947	16,788,091,000
RUSSIA AND FIVE SATELLITE NATIONS	
Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, to Russia and 5 of her satellite nations—governments politically and economically dominated by Russian influence	1,250,207,512
Total commitments and anticipated expenditures from Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, to Russia and 5 satellite nations	557,500,000
Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, plus expenditures or commitments scheduled through June 30, 1947	1,807,707,000

NOTE.—Total expenditures to Russia and satellite nations is approximately one-eighth, or 12½ percent, of all expenditures abroad for relief and assistance.

Of the $16,788,091,000 grand total, the United States expects to get back some $12,990,000,000 as repayment on loans, advances, credits, etc. This leaves total in grants of approximately $4,000,000,000 which the United States will never get back. How much, if any of the other twelve billions, will ever be repaid is highly speculative, and we stand the chance of losing substantially all of it.

Total expenditures to Greece during period July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1946, amounted to $407,481,063.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES REQUESTED OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

International Refugee Organization (H. J. Res. 77), $75,000,000; the President's world relief bill (H. J. Res. 153), $350,000,000; and aid to Greece and Turkey (S. 938), $400,000,000; total, $825,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have already given the figures with respect to the amount of aid which Russia has received and will have received by June 30, 1947. When I say Russia, I mean Russia and those countries which are under her control and domination, economically and politically. The figures amount to $1,807,707,000.

Mr. President, the three pending relief measures carry with them an authorization, if they are enacted into law, of a total of $825,000,000 additional relief.

After studying these figures and statistics and recognizing their proper significance, I approach favorable consideration of the three pending relief measures with some reluctance. I may support their final enactment for reasons which are compelling, but which are not necessarily associated directly with relief.

With respect to aid for Greece and Turkey, taking all factors into account, it may be the better course of wisdom and definitely in our national interest and security to assist Greece and Turkey to withstand the foreign pressure of communism. If I conclude that this is true, I shall support the enactment of the measures; but, Mr. President, with respect to the proposal that this Nation spend another $350,000,000 for relief in the nature of UNRRA and in continuation of that program of general relief to war-devastated countries, I have some very definite reservations. I am highly gratified that the President of the United States did not recommend a continuation of UNRRA as such, but rather that our own Government direct and supervise the expenditure of these additional funds independently of UNRRA or any other international organization or government. I opposed the original UNRRA bill because of the way it was to be established and administered. I felt that if our Government was to spend billions of dollars, representing 70 percent or more of the total expenditures which would be made from all sources for relief of distressed peoples, we should spend that money in our own name and under our own direction and supervision, in order that the people to whom relief was afforded might know and understand that the assistance was being given to them by our Government, by the greatest democracy on earth, so, Mr. President, that they might have a better appreciation and knowledge of the productive capacity that this Nation has under its free-enterprise system as compared with all other governments and countries whose ideologies clash with ours and who constantly and bitterly criticize and condemn democracies and the capitalistic system of free enterprise.

Mr. President, that money has already been spent. We cannot recall it now. I think we know that a large portion of it and the goods which were provided by us and distributed in foreign countries by UNRRA in many instances did not reach the needy and alleviate the suffering which it was intended to relieve; and certainly this Nation did not and has not yet received due credit for the contributions which it has made to the relief of human distress and for the assistance it has undertaken to give for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the devastated areas in Europe.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note from the figures that I have supplied that Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia received $851,647,512 or 45 percent of the UNRRA funds which our Government contributed. Total assistance given by our Government to these nations since July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, amounts to $1,250,207,512. In addition

to this, it is anticipated that through commitments already made and expected to be made, Russia and the five satellite nations will receive an additional $557,500,000 in assistance from our Government during the period January 1 to June 30, 1947, making a total, Mr. President, of $1,807,707,000 that this Government will have expended in or contributed to these nations for assistance, relief, and reconstruction within a 2-year period since July 1, 1945.

Mr. President, we are now asked to spend $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey, a considerable part of which it is intended will be used for armaments and military purposes to strengthen the defense of these countries in order to enable them to resist pressure from without—pressure, Mr. President, from the very sources to which we have so generously contributed more than $1,800,000,000. It is incompatible and inconsistent for us, Mr. President, to make loans or grants to assist weaker nations to maintain military strength to enable them to resist pressures from without and at the same time contribute relief funds to those countries, governments, and peoples who are known to be applying the pressure against these weaker nations.

Therefore, Mr. President, we propose an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 153, which is intended to prohibit the expenditure of any part of the $350,000,000 as proposed additional relief funds to the Governments or peoples of Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Mr. President, I am not at all unmindful of the humanitarian considerations that attend and are associated with these relief measures. I should like to see relief provided, of course, to all distressed peoples and to all suffering humanity, but, Mr. President, I cannot vote for relief appropriations to be paid from the earnings of the taxpayers of this Nation to relieve distressed peoples of a nation—and those who are under her political and economic dominance and control—that is able to spend billions and billions of dollars for war purposes so that she can carry on policies of pressure and aggression against weaker nations. According to an Associated Press dispatch carried in the New York Times on February 20, 1947, bearing a London date line, the Moscow radio was quoted as having announced that Russia's military expenditures for 1947 would total 67,000,000,000 rubles, or approximately $13,300,000,000. This sum, Mr. President, is more than $2,000,000,000 in excess of what we propose to expend on our Military Establishments during the next fiscal year. In all probability, many other billions of rubles being spent by Russia in some form or another, although not listed as military expenditures, nevertheless are either directly or indirectly used for that purpose.

Mr. President, if Russia can spend these billions in order to keep her military strength at such a point that she can apply pressure upon weaker nations and can undertake to spread communism and pursue policies of aggression, and as long as she keeps the iron curtain drawn in the face of the rest of the world and keeps concealed her plans and her aggressive program and the preparations she is making for world revolution, I cannot with good conscience bring myself to vote for one dime of appropriation and expenditures which will go for relief or any sort of assistance to her and to countries which are under her domination. The more we spend in that way, the greater strength we help her build and the more power and pressure she will be able to wield. We are just beginning the program of aid to Greece and Turkey. I do not know that it will stop there; in all probability this is only the beginning. If we spend $400,000,000 now, and more later, to build their military strength or to give them relief from their distress, and to enable them to resist the pressure to which I have referred, then, Mr. President, every dollar we spend in the other nations I have mentioned, regardless of whether we spend it under the head of relief or for any other purpose, will simply be building up the very strength and power we now undertake to oppose.

Mr. President, at the proper time, when House Joint Resolution 153 comes up in this body for consideration, I shall offer the amendment which I now send to the desk, and I shall earnestly urge its adoption. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCLELLAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the cuts in the appropriations for the Department of Labor proposed in House bill 2700, and now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, constitute so serious a threat to the national economy, welfare, and security that I propose to call the attention of the Members to the principal features of this so-called economy proposal. I hope that an ounce of nonpartisan or bipartisan prevention in the Senate Appropriations Committee will make unnecessary a pound of cure on the floor of the Senate. In my remarks, I shall endeavor to be nonpartisan.

My brilliant colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has already called the attention of his party to the damage the proposed cuts would do to our national economy and to the interest of employers and employees, alike. I am sure that other Members of the majority party will likewise give thought to the seriousness of the proposed budget cuts. As the junior Senator from Oregon said of the 77 percent cut in the budget for the United States Employment Service, from $3,900,000 to $900,000, "This is not fiscal therapy, this is not surgery; I think it is butchery of the welfare of the workers of this country."

This statement, in my judgment, applies with equal force to the entire proposal for reducing the Labor Department's 1948 budget request by 43 percent. The effect, were this House proposal to prevail, would be the destruction of the Labor Department as an effective agency charged with protecting and promoting the welfare of wage earners of the Nation. This is not economy, Mr. President; this is part of a reckless plan which, I prefer to believe, will fail in the Senate. It appears to be part of a concerted effort to destroy by indirection all the labor and social legislation passed in the last 14 years.

I prefer to believe that Members on both sides of the aisle will reject this attempt to turn back the clock. I would point out that, should the attempt by some mischance succeed, the clock would be turned back, not just to 1932, but to 1920. Is that what the Members of the Eightieth Congress want to do? Do we want to go before the country in 1948 with such a record of destruction? That question is in order in considering, as a specimen, the proposed cuts in the Labor Department budget.

Mr. President, I would remind the Members of the Senate that the Labor Department was a creation, not of a Democratic administration, but of a Republican administration. The act creating this Department, the youngest and still the smallest of all Departments, was passed by a Republican Congress. That act was the last major item signed into law by the retiring President of the United States in 1913, the father of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is both the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, and chairman of the steering committee for the majority party.

Mr. President, I ask the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to give attention to the mangled remnants of the Labor Department budget as it is now being examined by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. I ask him to see for himself the vital importance of the functions that would be abolished or made ineffective were these proposed slashes to remain, and then to relate the effect of such liquidation of the Department created in the administration of his father upon the whole problem of industrial relations to which the senior Senator from Ohio has devoted more than 3 months of hearings and study. I believe that if he will examine the record, the responsibilities, and the needs for the various services of the Labor Department's divisions and bureaus, he must reach the conclusion that any reduction in the requested $103,000,000 budget—$72,000,000 of which is for grants to States for their employment services, leaving a net budget for Federal functions of less than $32,000,000—would not be economy in any real sense of the word, but would, in fact, cost the Nation's industry and even the Federal Treasury many times the amount of the proposed reduction of nearly $14,000,000.

Before examining the cuts proposed in House bill 2700, let me point out that the Labor Department was designed and created to serve the Nation's wage and salary earners and employers. These wage and salary earners now total nearly 50,000,000. The requested budget of

$103,000,000, compared with the proposed budget for the Department of Agriculture of $900,000,000 does not look extravagant. The Agriculture Department's budget in past years has reached $1,000,000,000, whereas the Department of Labor's budget has never exceeded one hundred and fifty millions. Let me say in passing that I think every dollar of the Department of Agriculture's budget has been and will be well spent in conserving our agricultural resources, of which the most important are the farm people themselves, some 27,000,000 in number. But I submit that the comparison of the budgets for the two Departments, $103,000,000 for Labor and $900,000,000 for Agriculture, speaks for itself. It should make each one of us examine carefully every proposed reduction in the budget for the Labor Department. I say this because I have long felt that if we had a Labor Department as well adapted to the needs of wage earners as the Department of Agriculture is adapted to the needs of the American farmers, we would have fewer costly interruptions of production, of wages, of markets, and fewer drains upon our entire economy, including the United States Treasury itself. Thus, adequate expenditure for maintaining necessary services in the Department of Labor would pay dividends to every group, including industry, business, and the farmers, whose markets fundamentally depend upon the ability of wage earners to buy the foods and fibers that our farms produce.

CUTTING $14,000,000 FROM $32,000,000

Let us see what happened to the budget of the United States Department of Labor. The 1948 budget requests for the Department of Labor for operating purposes amount to $31,850,700. This amount was not reached by considering the needs of that Department as an isolated and unrelated function of Government. It was based upon the relative needs of all functions of Government in comparison with the Department of Labor. By adopting this method we are sure we get from Government the very best that money can buy of those kinds of services which the public wants and needs the most.

But what does H. R. 2700 do to that $32,000,000 requested for the Department of Labor? It sliced it by almost $14,000,000, and sent to the Senate an appropriation measure reducing the Department of Labor's operating funds by 43 percent. The recklessness of this sort of action is obvious. Here we are considering an appropriation of funds for the smallest department of Government, which is saddled with problems we all recognize as the most pressing domestic issues of our time. And to help meet these problems, the House proceeds to cut almost in half the budgetary request for that Department, which has under it the services needed in solving the problems of industrial relations, wages and hours, and employment services. It seems to me that this kind of reasoning comes pretty close to mental bankruptcy.

There are many points which I wish to emphasize today in relation to this atrocious piece of penny-pinching extravagance. I cannot overlook, for instance, the cavalier and unthinking methods used to make these cuts. Why, in once instance, by voice vote, an additional $1,000,000 has been stripped from funds of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, already reduced 50 percent by committee action, without even a moment's hesitation to consider the purposes for which this million dollars would have been used. A point which is most singular about this act of budgetary butchery, and therefore deserving of emphasis, is the fact that industry—which includes the employer himself—will be most severely hit by these cuts in the Department of Labor.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACT CUT 77 PERCENT

Because it reveals most flagrantly the character of the attack upon the Department of Labor, I want first to describe the nature and extent of the cuts in the budget for the United States Employment Service. Mr. President, if ever there was an instance of "economy on a binge," to quote the junior Senator from Oregon, this is it.

The House, in appropriating funds for the public employment service, has allowed every penny requested for the running of local employment offices by the States—$72,000,000—but has slashed 77 percent the funds requested by the Federal Government for running the national office. I repeat, grants for the States—$72,000,000—were cut not one cent; but funds for the USES—$3,900,000—were slashed 77 percent. Put another way—$72,000,000 requested to run State and local employment offices were granted 100 percent; but $3,900,000 requested to run the national office were granted only 23 percent. And where does the money come from for both the local and the national offices? Out of the Federal Treasury. It comes 100 percent out of the Federal Treasury. The Federal Government grants to the States all they need, but to the national office only 23 percent of what it needs.

It was my understanding, when the Seventy-ninth Congress voted to return operations of our public employment offices to the States, that the United States Employment Service, which is the national office of our Federal-State employment service system, would continue to perform in accordance with the responsibilities given to the Federal Government by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Action, however, by the other body of this Congress compels one to conclude that there is a desire on the part of some to repeal these acts of Congress by denying all but token funds to the USES.

It is important that members of this body appreciate the full implications of a 77 percent budget slash in appropriations for the United States Employment Service.

It is particularly important that this body review the work of the USES and what the USES supplies to affiliated State Employment Services; and that we take the relationship of the USES to the national economy into account in determining this appropriation, lest the Eightieth Congress destroy a service whose cost is minor compared to its contribution in dollars and cents to employers, workers, and to the Nation in maintaining a high level of production.

During my years of service in the House, I became personally acquainted with the work of the USES and with some of the ways in which it has served millions of workers and employers. I became particularly interested in the work of the USES because of my interest in the welfare of physically handicapped persons, both those disabled in the service of our country and those handicapped by accident and disease here at home.

The Federal-State system of our public employment service may be likened to an automobile. The motor is the national office; the chassis and the body are the State and local offices. Mr. President, the motor can be taken out of an automobile, and the automobile without the motor can still run—but only down hill. In effect, denying appropriations to the USES is taking the motor out of the Federal-State employment service, and I am sure that if this is done, the system may still run—but down hill.

Services which are today being performed by the USES for State Employment Services and for the Veterans' Employment Service are not new. The USES has been in operation since 1933. I can see no need of change in the original role of the USES that would be required by the recent return of the operations of employment offices to the States.

For each of the 1,800 local offices, or for each of the 48 State systems of the public employment service, to develop and keep current reliable dictionaries of occupational titles—such as the USES produced for all the States—would be utter folly. It is easy to see that it would be not only impractical but outrageously uneconomical for the 48 State services to develop their own and differing operating forms, job tests of various sorts, training materials, manuals of operation, job descriptions, and the many other scientific devices essential in the process of getting workers into jobs that utilize their skills and abilities.

In our modern economy, the successful placing of workers on jobs cannot be conducted as a catch-as-catch-can business. You have to have accurate and proven job descriptions. The worker's skills and qualifications have to be matched against the job requirements specified by the employer. This is possible in every local office throughout the country because of the basic occupational analysis work done by the USES in cooperation with State and local offices. The USES has organized these facts in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles which is a basic tool for all employment-service activities. As one writer put it:

> Without it, our industrial war effort conceivably might have earned the melancholy footnote of history—too little and too late. The Occupational Dictionary's importance to the future is hardly calculable.

I wish permission to insert in the RECORD the article from which I have just quoted and which appeared in the January 30, 1943 edition of the Saturday

Evening Post under the title "The Book That Went to War." I ask unanimous consent that that be inserted at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. But workers are not placed in satisfactory employment solely on the basis of job descriptions. The USES has developed and supplies to local offices oral trade questions and aptitude tests in order to assist workers in jobs for which they are qualified. The United States Employment Service also analyzes and distributes to all offices information on job opportunities for specific occupations, industries, and labor-market areas.

This type of activity is clearly required in the basic law and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and is a prerequisite to the maintenance of a Nation-wide network of employment offices and the coordination of their activity. Yet the proposal in H. R. 2700 would make the USES incapable of carrying out this specific responsibility. No economy would be effected, for the States would have to attempt to supply for themselves at a tremendous increase in cost comparable materials that are so essential to the operation of public employment offices.

I said earlier that I am familiar with the work of the United States Employment Service in aiding the physically handicapped citizens of the Nation. Since 1941, through the initiative of the United States Employment Service, over a million and a quarter such handicapped persons have been assisted in securing employment. During the war handicapped workers filled the gap in hard-pressed manpower needs of war industry. They have earned a permanent place in our economy. A large part of their achievement is attributable to the improved tools developed by the USES and used by all the local offices throughout the country. The approach has been to analyze the physical requirements of each occupation and measure the capacity of the handicapped individual against these requirements. It is an intelligent approach. It is a human approach. The Employment Service does not start with what a man has lost but with what he has left. That, they say, is what counts.

Because of the work of the USES, the disabled war veteran and other handicapped workers are not being placed in makeshift jobs, or are not being put on merely as watchmen or doorkeepers. They are being employed in all occupations—professional and semiprofessional, technical, clerical, and in trades and services of the Nation. They have been assisted to become self-supporting, taxpaying citizens rather than being condemned to idleness in homes and institutions.

It is not too much to say that without the work done by the USES, the employment-counseling program for veterans, displaced industrial workers, and youth, and the program for placement of disabled veterans and other handicapped workers, never would have been established on a Nation-wide basis as they are today. In the development of these programs, the USES has provided the necessary leadership to coordinate the activities of the affiliated State services in order to develop basic techniques, information, and procedures for these programs. Without the USES participation, these progams required by law would have been years in getting underway. Without the continued USES participation, they would deteriorate rapidly.

The record of this effort speaks for itself. In 1941, 27,000 handicapped workers were placed through the employment service, a tenfold increase in 5 years. Such things cannot happen by accident. This record is a result of a concerted effort.

I know for a fact that these efforts must come to an immediate end unless the Senate restores the funds to the USES.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS CUT 60 PERCENT

Deep and unreasoning slashes in the appropriations for the Bureau of Labor Statistics are equally damaging to employers. The budget originally called for $6,700,700 for this expert fact-finding arm of Government. When the appropriation bill reached the Senate, however, it contained an allotment of only $2,373,400, or a cut of approximately 60 percent.

It seems to me that, to deserve this kind of blow, an agency of Government must be generally recognized as next to useless to the public. But the facts show the exact opposite. Both before and during the war years the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been the brain center for collecting and analyzing statistics on our domestic economy and its relation to the economics of other nations.

Cost-of-living indexes, family budget estimates, employment and pay-roll statistics, occupational wage rates and wage-rate trends, measurement of productivity, housing and construction statistics, and wholesale price indexes have provided the Government and business in general with invaluable means for charting future business trends.

These services and also detailed information on collective bargaining agreements have aided immeasurably in the settlement of industrial disputes.

It would be impossible for Congress, for industry, and for labor to plan for our future unless these vital services are continued. Again I want to stress the harm particularly to employers who, as the business-guiding group of the management-labor partnership, have as urgent a need and as avid an interest in these figures as any other group in our democracy.

I notice that the report accompanying H. R. 2700 in the House, which recommended cuts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, gave as its reason the growth of the Bureau far beyond its original size under the law establishing it. This may be true. But it does not support a cut—rather, it seems to argue for an increase. The Bureau has year after year been charged by the Congress with increasing functions, as the reputation of the agency for accuracy and excellence grew with the years. The only reason that I can see for its present broad operations is the recognition time and again by Congress that the Government must discharge intricate economic fact-finding obligations. Why, only recently the Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946 requiring constant governmental appraisal of prices, wages, employment, and productivity. It so happens that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is one of the most efficient existing organizations for this purpose.

It is obvious that a 60-percent cut in appropriations will make it practically impossible for the Bureau to discharge its functions. This would indeed be a return to original size under the law establishing the Bureau 60 years ago. If anything could be literally a return to the horse and buggy era, this, Mr. President, would be it.

If the proposed cuts are to stand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics would have to cut the monthly national consumer price index to quarterly issues.

Retail food price indexes now available monthly for 56 cities would be issued quarterly for 34 cities.

Dollar cost estimates of family budgets would be discontinued.

The daily index of 28 important commodities would be discontinued.

Monthly national reports on national employment, hours, and pay rolls would be continued but State and area employment statistics would be discontinued.

Local information of wage rates, accepted by both employers and employees as a basis for contract negotiations, would be eliminated.

I need only indicate the result; individual employers, trade associations, chambers of commerce, and unions in cities, States, and regions would be deprived of much up-to-date information needed to plan future operations from month to month and year to year. In my opinion, we would be deliberately putting out our own eyes and tying off areas of our brain. Do the Members of the Senate wish to be a party to such action?

Certainly the Bureau of Labor Statistics has grown. So has our population, our industry, our entire economy, our industrial strength, and position among the nations of the world.

It is sheer folly to attempt to shrink this vital key service in our economy back to what it was at some point in the past.

CONCILIATION SERVICE DECAPITATED AND CUT 25 PERCENT

Now let us consider the Conciliation Service. It is proposed to reduce the appropriation $598,000, or 25 percent at a time when both bodies of this Congress are seeking ways and means of strengthening the Government's conciliation and mediation efforts. Certainly this is not a time when we want to reduce the number of conciliators who represent the public interest in seeking a peaceful adjustment of labor disputes.

The Conciliation Service did not grow overnight to its present size and importance. It grew slowly in response to strong public demand. Each step along the way is taken with the advice and often at the suggestion of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee composed of working representatives of employers and employees. The Conciliation Service

is what it is because businessmen and labor leaders have asked congress to create and expand it in the public interest.

It came as some surprise to me when just the other day the National Association of Manufacturers not only urged a committee of this Senate to continue the Conciliation Service as an integral part of the Department of Labor, but also expressed the unqualified opinion that the Service must be strengthened along present lines. What better testimony than this, Mr. President, is needed for us to conclude that even conservative employers want these destructive cuts in useful funds restored to the figures requested by the President which themselves are rock-bottom minimums.

Not only does H. R. 2700 propose to reduce the funds for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but, in so doing, it has in effect attempted to order the Secretary of Labor to tear apart that Service and to dismiss virtually its entire administrative and supervisory staff. The report accompanying H. R. 2700, for example, stipulates that none of the Conciliation Service funds for the next fiscal year shall be used to pay the Director, his assistant, the seven regional directors, the seven assistant regional directors, the chief of field operations, the chief of arbitration, the training staff, and one-third of the Service's technical conciliators—to name a few of the 102 specific positions which would be eliminated if the report should become controlling in the expenditure of Conciliation Service funds.

There is little doubt in my mind that this action would be an illegal exercise of the appropriations power. There is no doubt at all that it was unjustified and unwise. What possible good can result from a saving of a half-million dollars in a $37,000,000,000 budget when that half million is made by practically beheading an admittedly essential agency, leaving little but an amorphous group of conciliators to operate on a free-lance basis, without supervision, without direction, and without guidance? I do not propose to waste the Senate's time in further serious discussion of the administrative feasibility of this act since the real motive is so obvious. That motive, Mr. President, is to do by indirection what the Supreme Court has said cannot be done directly, to fire and blacken the reputation of Federal employees.

It is perfectly proper that this Congress should determine what Federal funds the Secretary of Labor may use in the next fiscal period in his efforts to avert strikes. If the Congress, in its wisdom, wishes to risk additional strikes by reducing the Government's mediation efforts, that is a decision for which each Member must answer to the country.

But under our constitutional form of government the actual operation of the Conciliation Service still must remain the responsibility of the executive branch. If, within the limits of the funds available, the Secretary chooses to decentralize his operation and to conduct his mediation activities outside of Washington and in the communities where the disputes arise, that is his responsibility. For the Congress to attempt through the exercise of the appropriation power to dictate who shall or shall not be used in the effort is clearly a usurpation of the executive function.

Aside from key policy-making positions subject to confirmation by the Senate, the executive has the sole authority and responsibility for hiring and firing of personnel in the executive branch. Yet the House, through the report of the Appropriation Committee, is here attempting to tell the Secretary of Labor whom he shall hire and fire in the operation of the Conciliation Service.

This attempted usurpation of the Executive authority has caused great alarm throughout the country to all people who believe in the wisdom and practicality of the United States Constitution which specifically separates the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government, and with good reason.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk by the Members of the Congress about jurisdictional disputes in labor matters. Well, here is a labor matter, and we are here being invited to engage in a jurisdictional dispute with the Secretary of Labor over how he shall organize a division of his Department. I believe we are unanimous in our opposition to destructive jurisdictional disputes. If we expect to maintain the respect of the Nation we had better stick by our principles and recognize the limits of our jurisdiction as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. I can assure the Senate that a jurisdictional dispute of this nature between the Congress and the Executive will be unpopular. To dispel any doubt on that score, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a number of editorials from some of our greatest newspapers commenting on this particular jurisdictional dispute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this point I shall read only the names of the newspapers and the titles of the editorials to indicate the amount of political dynamite that would be set off all over this country if the Senate should go along with the House proposal to wreck the Conciliation Service in order to get rid of the entire top staff of that Service.

New York Times, March 31, 1947, The Ax to Conciliation.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 24, 1947, An Ominous Rebellion.

Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., March 24, 1947, A Feud Is Served in Economy's Name.

Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, Boston, Mass., March 28, 1947, Public Disservice.

Washington Post, March 26, 1947, Abuse of Power.

Washington Post, March 2, 1947, Conciliation Service.

Evening Star, March 22, 1947, Bad Politics.

Christian Science Monitor, March 28, 1947, Saving—and Skulking.

Chicago Sun, March 25, 1947, No Witch Hunt Intended.

Minneapolis Times, Minneapolis, Minn., March 28, 1947, A Devious House Maneuver.

Post-Journal, Jamestown, N. Y., March 19, 1947, Wrong Method.

Miami Daily News, March 19, 1947, Legislation by Fiat.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS TO BE ABOLISHED

Perhaps the most revealing touch of heavy-handedness on the part of those who drafted and approved this ill-considered measure now before us is the complete abolition of the Division of Labor Standards, after that Division has been in operation for 14 years for the purpose of improving working conditions in industry. In 1913 the Department of Labor was formed to improve the conditions of wage earners. Yet it was not until 1934 that Congress appropriated funds for a separate division of the Department which would be charged with this very function.

And now, after this Division has had a real opportunity to show its ability to cut production costs by improving working conditions, a movement is afoot to abolish it completely. Probably one of the outstanding contributions of the Department of Labor to the war effort has been its national industrial safety and health program. It is common knowledge that far more man-hours of work were lost during the war because of accidents than because of labor disputes or any other single cause. Realizing this, the Department of Labor organized and successfully carried out a militant campaign to prevent accidents in war industries. This was merely a special application of its peacetime facilities for this purpose. Classes in plant safety were held, State inspectors were trained, thousands of plant safety consultations were given, and research on prevention methods was carried out. The result was that the United States was the only industrial nation that reduced accidents in the midst of war.

Mr. President, let me remind the Members of the Senate that it is not only the individual wage earner who suffers from irresponsible action wiping out these activities which are indispensable in peacetime as well as in war. It is industry that suffers, too. And here, again, the cuts the Senate is asked to accept will fall with equal harm upon the employers and workers.

In its safety and health program the Division of Labor Standards is constantly hammering home the principle that accidents cost American management and labor $3,500,000,000 a year—and that safety devices are money-saving investments. Private accident prevention activities cover only one-third of industry. These private programs do not touch two-thirds of all plants and untold numbers of workers. Here is where the program of the Division of Labor Standards comes in, and where it can really do the job.

The House committee commented that the activities of the Division of Labor Standards should be left to the States. I believe that a similar argument would be equally effective to support the abolition of the entire United States Department of Labor. In fact I am not sure whether the House committee did not

have this thought in mind when recommending the action taken on the appropriation measure for the Department. Certainly the Department will exist barely more than in name only should the Senate follow the recommendations of the House of Representatives.

The thought, the motive which appears to have dictated the liquidation of the Division of Labor Standards is in my opinion the same as that to which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] alluded when speaking on the USES cuts. He said:

> Before the issue is settled I think the truth will out. It seems to me they are determined to break up the national economic unity into 48 different State economies warring with each other for short-range advantage in labor costs and in stagnant pools of surplus idle workers in isolated towns and villages being bought and sold like commodities on the labor markets.
>
> I recognize that the same program for the break-up of our economic unity—for the Balkanization of the United States is planned with respect to other appropriations, if I judge correctly what is coming out of the House appropriations. I propose to stand up and oppose that type of budgetary cut in the Senate of the United States.

The House bill proposes to transfer another function of the Division of Labor Standards—its labor education service—to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Just as the Division's safety service prevents waste from industrial accidents, so its labor education service attempts to prevent costly industrial strife by education. Today when labor-management harmony is perhaps our primary domestic goal, the House curtails funds for this preventive service and transfers it to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is a fact-finding agency not equipped to perform this function.

The House action also halves funds for the Division of Labor Standard's child labor and youth employment branch and transfers this function to the Wage and Hour Division. This child labor functions was established as part of the Children's Bureau by the action of a Republican Congress and a Republican President back in 1912. When, as an aftermath of war, two and one-half times as many youngsters are at work today as in 1940, this is no time to reduce funds for controlling child labor. This is no time to turn research, advisory, and guidance functions for State labor departments and community agencies, over to an inspection agency which did not seek this responsibility and is not equipped to perform it.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Mr. President, I should like now to comment on the proposed 25-percent cut in the funds of the Wage and Hour Division and show what I believe to be extremely unfortunate results would result from such a cut, because of the grave weakening of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

When the Wage and Hour Division was organized to enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act, we asked that, if possible, one of the regional offices to be developed should be located in Alabama. We have nothing to fear from close contact with the Wage and Hour Division, and nothing to hide. On the contrary, the location of a regional office in Birmingham, to advise employers and employees alike as to their duties and rights under the act, has been most helpful. Should the 25-percent cut in funds necessitate the closing of that regional office, as I understand it would, we should feel a loss of much more than the few Federal employees involved in that office. We should feel, and I believe with reason, that the protection of the act to our industries and to our workers would be seriously weakened.

In Alabama, and for the country as a whole, the possible number of inspections under the reduced funds voted by the House would not be much more than half of the number of new establishments with affected employees which spring up each year. For the total of establishments already in existence, the proposed funds would allow inspection of only 5 or 6 percent. These facts, Mr. President, are uncontested.

Mr. President, in the hearings on the 1948 budgets of the various governmental agencies and in the floor discussion in both Houses there has been a great deal of talk of the need to eliminate wartime expenditures and to get back to a peacetime basis, meaning largely a prewar basis. When the facts in a particular situation support this program, I am heartily in favor of this approach, but the facts in the case of the Wage and Hour Division are quite different.

The Wage and Hour Division, year by year since the beginning of World War II, has had to get along with inspecting a smaller number of establishments. The first full year we were at war saw a decrease in the number of plants visited of nearly 20 percent, and each succeeding year saw a further decrease of 10 to 20 percent. When these cuts are added to the proposed 25-percent additional cut proposed by the Republicans in the House, the number of inspected plants will have gone down from 75,000 to 33,000, a cut of substantially more than one-half. And that is not all, Mr. President. Our economy since 1933 has been an expanding economy, and due primarily to that expansion, there are thousands more of new establishments covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act than there were before the war; there are tens of thousands more of existing establishments affected, and millions more of workers. If these additional facts are taken into consideration, the proposed additional cut in the light of the total situation means a cut to one-third of the prewar level of activity.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that there are more ways to kill a cat than by choking it with butter; and there are more ways of killing the Fair Labor Standards Act than by outright repeal. One of these ways is to deny sufficient funds to do an effective job of enforcement. The 25-percent proposed cut would have that effect, although both great parties were committed in their 1944 program to support of that act.

What would be the effect upon employers? The honest, scrupulous employer who plans his work on the basis of complying with fair labor standards will be forced increasingly to reconsider his position in the light of the successful evasion of the more unscrupulous, which frequently results in competitive harm to the law abiding. Consequently a wholesale disregard of the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be in the offing. Mr. President, instead of reducing still further the inadequate funds for the Wage and Hour Division, I believe we should give serious consideration to an increase, to the end that the fair labor standards which Congress meant should have general application in specified fields should be more generally observed.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR CUT ONE-THIRD

Similarly the Office of the Solicitor has been cut by one-third and even the office of the Secretary has been crippled. This will, of course, mean a chain reaction to the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy which all of these cuts represent.

With particular regard to the Office of the Solicitor, these cuts would come at a time when litigation under the Wage-Hour Act has reached a peak, and when new interpretations of the act may be essential by reason of portal-to-portal amendments. The House committee explains this action by pointing to reduction in services in the Solicitor's office by reason of the abolition of the Division of Labor Standards, and the end of wartime functions such as retraining and reemployment, wage adjustment, and wage stabilization.

But these wartime functions have already been eliminated. They find no reflection in the appropriation estimates. In fact, the Solicitor's office never has given assistance to the Wage Stabilization Board, which had its own legal staff. Furthermore, I am told that the Division of Labor Standards at no time has required more than the services of one attorney on a part-time basis.

A BLOW AT THE UNITED NATIONS

With the establishment of the United Nations and the coordination of the International Labor Office with its activities, the Department of Labor has been required to assume added responsibilities in the field of international affairs relating to labor and social policy. Yet these activities and their legitimate value were completely ignored by the appropriations measure which the House has requested us to consider. The entire staff devoted to these operations was dismissed as unnecessary. I wonder whether this demonstrates an intention to view the United Nations as unnecessary, as a matter of policy. Certainly the abolition of these functions of the Department of Labor is only one step removed from disapproving all appropriations supporting this country's role as a member of that great international body.

MAY COST BILLIONS TO SAVE $14,000,000

Mr. President, I have been talking about the preservation of services vital to the welfare of labor, of employers, of consumers, and essential to the maintenance of continued health in our entire economy.

These cuts, which would cost the American people hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars in increases in work stoppages due to inadequate mediation and conciliation ma-

chinery, to lack of up-to-date information on employment, wages, the cost of living and standard provisions in collective-bargaining contracts, total only $14,000,000. What we would save at the spout would run out at the bunghole. We would be doing disservice to all wage earners, to employers and to the public interest. In my opinion—and I believe many Members on both sides of the aisle will agree—such a "butchery," to quote the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would come pretty close to betrayal of the national interest and security. The penalty for that is sure in our democracy.

The Senate has long been known, and justly so, for its fairness and thoroughness in protecting the public welfare, even in times of hysteria and clamor. I know that Senators will give this Labor Department appropriation, which is a leading case, so to speak, blazing the trail for the Eightieth Congress, the careful study it deserves. I hope Senators, without regard to party, will concur in the conclusion that the cuts I have described are foolhardy, wasteful of the national welfare, harmful to management as much as to labor, and therefore totally unjustified.

Because of the intrinsic importance of the services at stake and because these proposed cuts do comprise a leading case, I suggest that Senators give the subject their attention immediately. The Appropriation Subcommittee now holding hearings may thus have benefit of their information and advice while I hope and trust the vital organs of the Labor Department are being restored in the sessions of that committee.

RELATION TO NEW LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. President, in a few days we are to begin the consideration of so-called labor legislation. I understand that some proposals that labor may consider to be unduly restrictive may be recommended by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would be unfortunate if, in addition to this recommended new legislation, the wage earners of the Nation were to be told by action of the Senate that the one Department of the Federal Government dedicated to the protection of their welfare had been gutted by flame throwers in the reckless and vengeful hands of those who in the name of so-called economy would destroy that edifice.

I think we will be wise if we make plain to the wage earners that we do not propose vengeful treatment, either in appropriations or substantive legislation, that we are concerned rather with the public interest and with the interest of labor and all other segments of our economy and our people. Because of the imminence of debate on labor legislation it is of extreme importance that we restore the functions which the House has cut out of the Labor Department by the indirect method of budget slashes.

The President has stated that the budget requested for the Labor Department is the rock-bottom minimum and is part of the $37,000,000,000 national budget, which, it now appears, will make possible a surplus of receipts over expenditures of $3,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year. I submit that, considering the critical days ahead in our domestic and international affairs, and the fact that the Labor Department has assisted materially in keeping our economy operating at near capacity, the full amount of the Labor Department budget requested by the President should be appropriated by the Senate and the Congress. Thus the welfare of labor, of employers, and the national interest and security will be protected and promoted.

EXHIBIT A

[From The Saturday Evening Post]

THE BOOK THAT WENT TO WAR—THE OCCUPATIONAL DICTIONARY GUIDED MOBILIZATION OF AMERICA'S GREATEST INDUSTRIAL ARMY

(By Warner Olivier)

Late in 1941 Gene Osmansky, 35, a hosiery knitter, lost his job with thousands of other silk workers as a result of the embargo on Japanese silk. A silk worker since he left high school, Gene could do no other skilled job—or so he thought.

Hopeless of getting another job for a long time, he nevertheless made rountine application for work at the local office of the United States Employment Service, at the same time asking for unemployment compensation.

Gene never got his unemployment compensation. Instead, he went to work 2 days later at the semiskilled job of winding coils for a company manufacturing airplane detectors. Employment Service workers consulted a book, poked needles through speed-sort cards, and were able to tell Gene and his fellow silk workers of more than 350 important war jobs they could do, with or without brief training.

What is the answer?

Six years before Pearl Harbor two men in Washington put their heads together to solve one of industry's greatest problems. The dimly foreseen result was the fashioning of what today is probably the most powerful secret weapon in the arsenal of democracy.

It does not prowl the seas or fly to rain death on war-swollen Tokyo. It will not parachute to earth to set up a second front in Europe. But it has sent, and is sending, men to do all those things.

It is a four-volume book with a title which sounds like a professor's dream: The Dictionary of Occupational Titles. It has already influenced the lives of 70 percent of the American people, though few of us have ever heard of it. Without it, our industrial war effort conceivably might have earned the melancholy footnote of history—too little and too late. The book's importance to the future is hardly calculable.

That is saying a great deal. American industry, with all the chips down, can testify it is not saying too much. So can the United States Army and Navy, whose work it has made possible. So can British and Canadian industry and the British army and navy, which have taken it over, part and parcel.

In the most dramatic industrial spectacle in history, the recruitment and disposition of American manpower and womanpower, the dictionary tells who shall man jobs, where, when and how.

When new munitions and ordnance plants began to spring up with life-or-death war contracts awaiting completion, management had to know what kind of skilled workers were needed, how many and where they could be got. Employment Service workers with the dictionary under their arms made plant analyses and job studies in similar plants and arsenals already in operation, and were able to tell the new plants what personnel was needed. They also told them to look to unemployed miners for many of the workers, for miners already have many of the skills, and the psychological adjustment needed by munitions workers.

With its aid, skilled workers long retired or drifted into other fields were recalled to the front lines of industry to do skilled and essential jobs.

Last June, when upward of a million willing-handed boys and girls came out of the high schools, the dictionary helped place them in war industries all over the land.

It has brought new recruits to industry from the ranks of handicapped persons, many of whom were considered unemployable. A legless Detroit man, who sold automobiles as long as there were automobiles to sell, is now employed as a process inspector in a factory because of latent skill brought to light with the aid of the dictionary.

Seven years in the making and not yet completed, the dictionary grew out of the great need for it. There was little or no agreement on job titles. Many employers, for example, thought they knew what a machinist was. But workmen in more than a score of widely different jobs were called "machinists." A machinist might be a bench hand. He might be a tool operator. To one mine boss a worker was a "screen ape." To another he was a "grizzly worker." And so it went.

How could employment agencies supply men for jobs when they did not know what skills were required? For years industrial psychologists, personnel men, and others stormed for definition of occupational titles.

In 1935 William H. Stead, then head of the Occupational Research Division of the United States Employment Service, and Carroll L. Shartle, now Chief of the Occupational Analysis Section, resolved to do something about it and started making the dictionary. Many agencies and hundreds of individuals cooperated.

They went down into the mines, into publishing plants, into all kinds of factories, the theater, stores, offices, hospitals, local governments, schools, and churches, and they came out with detailed descriptions of every job performed.

They defined jobs and skills ranging from janitor to judge, from clergyman to strip-tease artist, from cost accountant to minstrel, and from screen actor to caterpillar-crane operator.

Volume I and its supplement of the dictionary define 19,000 different job classifications and list 33,000 titles, since many of the same jobs are known by different names.

Code numbers were assigned to each job up to six digits. The first digit represents a general classification: Zero for professional and managerial occupations, 1 for clerical workers, 2 for service workers, 3 for agricultural, forestry, and fishery workers, 4 and 5 for skilled industrial occupations, 6 and 7 for semiskilled and 8 and 9 for unskilled. Subsequent digits define the particular skill and job.

For example 4-93-371 in the dictionary stands for a lock assembler III. The 4 means he is skilled. The next two digits, 93, mean he is a metalworker. The 371 identifies his specific job, which is to fasten together component parts of locks, using screws, bolts, and rivets. A lock assembler I is a common laborer in automobile manufacture and a lock assembler II is a furniture worker.

Volume II lists the code numbers of the jobs. Volume III is merely a translation of old codes into the new universal code. Volume IV is the entry classification volume and is designed to help classify the inexperienced worker—Bill Jones and Mary Smith, just getting out of high school or college. It is used in conjunction with aptitude tests, interviews, and other tried methods of matching personalities, temperaments, and potential skills to jobs.

Compiling the dictionary disclosed a simple fact of startling and far-reaching implications—that jobs run in families. Most

jobs probably have more cousins than you have and the blood tie is close.

This discovery paved the way for the development of a revolutionary employment technique—the job-family study—used to find workers for jobs requiring rare skills which make them difficult to fill.

A job-family study cuts across industrial lines to pick up related jobs in other industries.

The Baldwin Locomotive Works, now manufacturing tanks, needed metal lathe operators, which were not available. A job-family study showed that in the wholly different field of stone work stone lathe operators had a skill almost identical with that of metal lathe operators.

When a War Production Board order halted manufacture of radios, an eastern radio plant, converting itself into a war industry, had no further use for 1,000 skilled woodworkers in its cabinet department. The United States Employment Service made a plant-job study and learned the 1,000 workers did 98 different jobs. By related occupations, they found that 300 of the workers were qualified to work in other capacities in the plant by a slight adaptation of their skills. Another 370 were found to be doing work closely related to machine-tool occupations and, after brief training, they took over machine-tool jobs. The remainder had skills useful in shipbuilding and leather manufacture and were soon at work in these essential war industries.

The job-family study has been, industrially, a magna carta for women. To marshal all available manpower of the Nation, the Employment Service made a check to determine what industrial jobs had been or were being done by women and fanned these out in a job study. The result was the publication of a booklet listing nearly 2,000 war jobs and hundreds of nonwar jobs suitable for women.

The day of publication of the booklet, the Employment Service was swamped with requests for copies from personnel managers all over the country. The result has been a sharp upswing in the number of women placed in industrial jobs.

The Occupational Dictionary and Job Analysis have opened wide fields for handicapped and disabled workers.

Fred W., 38, blind from birth, married and the father of two children, was considered unemployable. He eked out a living for his family by playing a saxophone on the streets of New York and soliciting alms. His country went to war and he wanted to do something. Was there anything he could do, he asked the local United States Employment Service office.

He was tested and found to have, as many blind persons do have, great sensitivity in his fingers. A former washing-machine factory, now making machine guns, had sent out a call for men to check ballbearings and ball races to see if they were even. A job analysis showed that a good tactile sense rather than sight was necessary to do the work. Fred W. was given the job and subsequently other blind men filled similar jobs with the company.

Job-family studies resulted in the listing of machine feeding or tending operations suitable for totally blind persons. Similar studies resulted in the listing of fifty-odd occupations of the arc-welding family which could be performed by individuals having only one hand, if an artificial contrivance were used in place of the missing hand.

The philosophy governing placement of handicapped workers is: It is not what a man has lost, but what he has left, that counts.

A Hartford automobile-wrecking company needed a torch worker to cut up cars and stack the parts. The Employment Service had on file applications from an experienced torch man with a paralyzed arm and a man with only one eye. It added their skill and strength together and placed the two as a team to fill the job. Since together they could do far more work than a single man, their salaries were satisfactorily adjusted.

Because of the dictionary and job-family studies, some companies have found they can use handicapped workers even better than normal workers. The deaf, it was discovered, make the best comptometer operators because they are not distracted by noise.

Because of the broadened horizons of useful employment the dictionary has opened to all kinds of workers, it is expected to provide a cushion against widespread unemployment in the reconstruction years of peace which lie ahead. Probably few workers of the future will be employed without reference to it. For in its four maroon-bound volumes are the plans and blueprints of all the arts and skills that man has so far mastered on the long road from his uttermost yesterday to the tomorrow of his dreams.

EXHIBIT B

[From the New York Times, March 31, 1947]

THE AX TO CONCILIATION

Among the several follies committed by the House of Representatives in the pursuit of economy, chopping down the Conciliation Service in the Labor Department is one that calls for correction when the Senate takes up that supply bill. Edgar L. Warren, chief of the Conciliation Service, was the unhappy target of this ax swinging. It seems that some 10 years ago Mr. Warren, who has been with the Government since 1938, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the Washington Book Shop, a cooperative. These organizations were later described in some quarters as Communist fronts. Mr. Warren says that he has not been a member of either organization since 1939. In 1945 Mr. Warren said that "on a theoretical basis he saw no reason why Government employees should not have the right to strike." We do not agree with this position at all, Mr. Warren, a few months after he took it, corrected his attitude by saying: "I should like to have the record clearly show that I am opposed to strikes of Government employees."

So it is plain that Mr. Warren, like most of us, has made some mistakes. The record does not show many. Since 1945 he has been chief of the Conciliation Service, which attempts to settle disputes between labor and industry and, when they get that far, strikes. In trying, with considerable success, to improve and vitalize this agency he has apparently trod on the toes of some Members of Congress. He has brought in some bright young men, we are told, and some of these—no matter how able they were at conciliation—perhaps have not had the preliminary initialing of political patrons. This, we submit, is in Mr. Warren's favor. But the main question, in congressional action, is not what happens to Mr. Warren, himself, but to the Conciliation Service. The cut made by the House would not only eliminate his position but also those of 100 other officials and employees. It is an action that would wreck the service which has played a part in averting recent utilities strikes, has reported in a single month its settlement of 304 strikes involving 318,000 workers, and in 3 days alone last fall effected settlements in 20 strikes, all of which had lasted 30 days or more.

We believe that such an agency as the Conciliation Service is a beneficial influence in avoiding and reducing the damaging effects of strikes, and that Mr. Warren has worked hard and earnestly to improve that service under difficult circumstances. This view is confirmed in the tribute paid to Mr. Warren's leadership by representatives of both unions and industry. Mr. Warren is a loyal and patriotic American, in the opinion of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the Conciliation Service and has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1947]

AN OMINOUS REBELLION

An attempt has broken out in the House of Representatives to dictate whom President Truman can hire and fire by withholding salary funds. So far, the Appropriations Committee has cut off Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service, on charges of leftish leanings. But if the anti-Warren maneuver succeeds, the House may go on to bigger game. Thus, Southern Demagog EUGENE COX says that if the Senate confirms David E. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission, he favors refusing funds to pay him. For reasons that the Warren case brings out, this development is ominous in the extreme.

First, effective government is simply impossible if Congress sets itself up as personnel director to the executive branch. The attempt to do so is profoundly in contempt of the Constitution. Secretary Schwellenbach is right: "It is not the function of Congress to tell me who to hire or to fire."

Second, personnel dictation by Congress is in effect burning down a house to exterminate a suspicion of moths in the coat closet. The Conciliation Service is a useful agency that cuts down the frequency and severity of strikes. No bureau can operate well without a responsible head.

Third, the committee has convicted a man without fair trial or pretense of hearing in his own defense. It accuses Warren of once belonging to Communist-front groups—and uses an un-American way to oust him.

The committee's own offenses must be cleaned up before Warren can possibly be appraised on the merits. It has made charges which the Secretary of Labor and the President should sift. If their verdict does not satisfy the accusers, the case could then be taken up by the House Labor Committee. The committee could not fire Warren, but if its examination reflected seriously on his fitness, public opinion would force his superiors to do so.

Instead, the Appropriations Committee tars him and cuts off his pay. Its act is all the uglier because the committee had to use a legalistic loophole to do it. When Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd, Jr., were ousted on similar charges, the Supreme Court ruled that singling out executive employees by name for punishment is a forbidden bill of attainder. Taking profit from that experience, a committee now undertakes to fire a man by abolishing his job—which, for all moral purposes and practical effect, is the same thing.

The maneuver smells, and will smell worse if it proceeds further with Warren or to other executive officials. If the majority leadership in Congress is alert to the GOP's own interest it will be stopped and set aside right now.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of March 24, 1947]

A FEUD IS SERVED IN ECONOMY'S NAME

There are Members of Congress who apparently have learned nothing from the Supreme Court's rebuke for misuse of their appropriating power. They have veered close to the old offense in their latest witch hunt in the Department of Labor, proposing virtually to wreck the Conciliation Service because they don't like its director, Edgar L. Warren.

Two years or so ago Congress took its money club in hand and knocked three New Deal veterans, Messrs. Lovett, Watson, and Dodd, out of office. On the ground that the three were associated with alleged leftist organizations, a special provision severed them from the pay roll. Months afterward the Court held that this constituted a bill of attainder, or condemnation of individuals by legislative

action. It was expressly forbidden by the Bill of Rights.

Now the House Appropriations Committee votes to withdraw appropriation for the office of the Director of the Conciliation Service. Director Warren, it hears from a subcommittee, once belonged to a couple of suspicious societies. Once he made a speech suggesting the right of public employees to strike.

It doesn't matter that he has abjured the membership and changed his mind about the right to strike. It doesn't matter that the most substantial of testimony, coming from distinguished former members of the War Labor Board, says he is loyal, able, and fair. He must go. The committee proposes incorrigibly to move into the administrative field to put him out. He must go because of who he is and, we suspect, because he really is what his former colleagues say he is—able and fair as a conciliator and settler of labor-management disputes.

Two details of the occurrence are noteworthy. One is the committee's straight-faced acceptance of the dubious Committee on Un-American Activities as a certifying agent of national organizations. Another is the failure of the Appropriation Committee to make more than a token cut in the President's estimate for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency—and to make this partly not on grounds of economy but of personal undesirability.

Incidentally, the President's budget, which the opposition has voted to cut by $4,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000, is holding up well. Only about 5 percent has been taken out of departmental requests so far, and at this rate it begins to appear that slashing expenses in these uncertain times is not as easy as talking about it for the political record. And at that, as one sees, it wasn't economy which figured in the Conciliation Service's trimming.

[From the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, Boston, Mass., of March 28, 1947]

PUBLIC DISSERVICE

A year ago last November one of the few points on which Mr. Truman's labor-management conference agreed was that the United States Conciliation Service should be strengthened. The Nation was then heading, as it still is, into industrial controversies whose amicable solution is essential to continuity of production in a critical period. The importance of the role that the Conciliation Service plays in such circumstances can hardly be exaggerated.

Even in the disastrous strike year of 1946 the Conciliation Service was instrumental in preventing many more strikes than those that actually occurred. But its successful preventive work naturally did not capture the headlines. This year, with labor in a more conciliatory frame of mind even though it is asking for higher wage agreements, the Conciliation Service ordinarily would face a better opportunity to adjust industrial disputes before they result in costly strikes.

But the House has already acted to impair rather than strengthen the Conciliation Service. Some disgruntled Republicans, led by Mr. KEEFE of Wisconsin, persuaded the Appropriations Committee, and subsequently the whole House, to cut off the salary of Mr. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service. This attempted indirect removal of a competent and distinguished head is a clear public disservice. Its effect is to demoralize and weaken a vital service in a crucial period.

This public disservice has been compounded by a substantial reduction in the appropriation for the Conciliation Service in the next fiscal year. It raises again the question of how intelligently the Republican effort to economize, laudable in its over-all objective, is being directed.

It represents a poor response by Congress to the recommendation of the President's labor-management conference that "Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the service." It flies in the face of a recent recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development which suggests that the Conciliation Service "be staffed by persons of high professional competence and given funds sufficient to permit it to deal effectively with the responsibilities assigned to it."

Republican leaders in Congress should take sober second thought about this vitally important matter, both as to Mr. Warren and the whole appropriation, and correct the situation before it is too late. The Nation cannot afford to pay off political grudges of Members of Congress by economizing in places where the ultimate results are so exceedingly costly.

[From the Washington Post of March 26, 1947]

ABUSE OF POWER

No alien agent could devise a doctrine more pernicious or more subversive of American political principles than the proposal now being put forward by certain Members of Congress that the appropriation power be used to rule the personnel policies of the executive branch of the Government. If this proposal is permitted to prevail, Congress will have annulled the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of American freedom. The legislature, designed to serve as one of the three coordinate elements of a system delicately balanced to forbid tyranny, will have assumed absolute control through a coup d'etat. The result will be a form of dictatorship—no less dictatorial and no less alien to American traditions if exercised by a group of men than if exercised by one man alone.

If Congress can use its appropriation power to oust, say, the Director of the Conciliation Service, then it could do the same, if it chose, to the Secretary of Labor or even to the President of the United States. And if the Supreme Court interposed a judicial prohibition, Congress might sweep it aside by the same device of withholding the funds requisite to its support. That the power to do this is inherent in the appropriation power does not make the use of it any less evil and despotic. Each element of the tripartite American Government is expected to employ its power with restraint and in conformity with the spirit animating the Constitution. Our political system can survive only as this spirit is respected.

There is a lesser, yet by no means negligible danger entailed in the projected congressional usurpation of the executive power to hire and to fire. It tends to make Federal employment intolerable for all but the most docile, insipid, uninspired, and conventional men and women. Any individual whose mind transcends the bounds of narrow political orthodoxy stands liable to dismissal on the ruinous charge of disloyalty to his country. The procedures for loyalty investigation established by the President at least afford opportunity for review of charges by impartial boards. But what is proposed now is that Congress itself act at once as prosecutor and as jury, proscribing and stigmatizing Federal employees in accordance with the ideological whim of a transient majority.

Representative COX has carried this concept to its ultimate absurdity by proposing that David E. Lilienthal, even if confirmed by the Senate after the most exhaustive inquiry into his character and qualifications, be denied office through a denial of funds to his vital agency. Thus the constitutional authority of the President to nominate and of the Senate to confirm could be set aside by a mere majority in the House. Government service, subject to such hazards, would scarcely seem alluring to men of originality and initiative. This is a formula for restricting public office to the second rate.

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1947]

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Under leadership of Representative FRANK KEEFE, the House of Representatives has blandly employed its appropriation power to wreck the Federal Conciliation Service. Mr. KEEFE dislikes Edgar Warren, Director of the Service, and is not above employing his congressional immunity to call him names of which the libel laws would otherwise make him chary. Unhappily, his intemperate ill will does injury not only to Mr. Warren but to the whole country which needs the good offices of the Conciliation Service in resolving labor-management disputes. The need has never been greater than at the present time.

The President's Labor-Management Conference of November 1945, unanimously recommended that Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the (Conciliation) Service. Nearly every student of industrial relations has made a similar recommendaton. It was to effect this improvement that Mr. Warren was appointed, with a labor-management advisory committee to aid him. This advisory committee has now made a public declaration that Mr. Warren "has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office," that "substantial progress" has been made in the last year under his direction and, finally, that "all who have been associated with Mr. Warren regard him as a loyal and patriotic American."

No doubt there is room for legitimate difference of opinion about the wisdom of some of the reforms he has effected. But it is indisputable that reform was necessary, and the director of an agency is entitled to exercise a reasonable degree of discretion in the course of a reorganization. There has been indorsement of Mr. Warren's judgment and conduct from important management, and labor sources alike—a significant indication that he has dealt with both impartially. The importance of the Conciliation Service has been vigorously attested by both and in addition by men who have had long experience as representatives of the public in labor-management mediation and arbitration. Several of them subscribed their names to a letter to this effect in the Post last Thursday. We hope that the Senate will amend the recklessness of the House and restore the effectiveness of the Conciliation Service.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1947]

BAD POLITICS

The House Appropriations Committee has some color of reason to go after the scalp of Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Federal Conciliation Service.

The case against Mr. Warren is far from being a conclusive one. Some years ago he joined two Communist-front organizations, but, according to his testimony, withdrew when he discovered their true character. It is also established that in 1945 he expressed a belief in the theoretical right of Government workers to strike, although he now says that he has changed his mind about this. On the other side of the ledger are the facts that he has done a creditable job as head of the conciliation service and that he enjoys the confidence of many business leaders.

On the whole record, however, it would be difficult to say that Congress would be wholly unjustified in coming to the conclusion that Mr. Warren is the wrong man for the job he holds. But that is an entirely different thing from saying that the Appropriations Committee is justified in the action it has taken.

The committee has not been content merely to lock the door on Mr. Warren. Instead, through an abuse of its control of the purse, it has assumed a veto power over the filling of Mr. Warren's post and the posts of about 100 other executives and employees of the conciliation service. The effect of this is to wreck the service by withholding essential appropriations.

Similar action was taken with respect to the National Labor Relations Board. Some members of the committee wanted to abolish the NLRB outright. Others, presumably conscious of the absurdity of this while the Wagner Act remains on the statute books, insisted on a compromise. So the result is that an already understaffed agency finds its recommended appropriation cut in half, and is faced with the prospect of being held responsible for a task for which the committee will not provide the necessary funds.

This sort of thing is not only bad government; it is also bad politics, as the Republican legislators may discover to their sorrow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 28, 1947]

SAVING—AND SKULKING

The economy forces in Congress are showing the courage of their convictions. Under Republican leadership, the House has just trimmed $77,825,320 from a $1,500,000,000 supply bill. To do so, it has in several cases cut where it hurt. It has separated a lot of people from the Federal pay roll. It has dropped services which many citizens consider vital.

For instance, it has practically halved the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board, more than halved the funds asked for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And it has cut the Labor Department's Conciliation Service in a way to force out of office the head of that agency, Edgar L. Warren, and 100 of his aides.

In this last action the House forgot economy and took a slippery and dangerous step in the direction of intimidating officials. This was not a decision that no director of the Conciliation Service is needed. If the House had frankly abolished the office the action could have been judged squarely on the basis of economy or wisdom. But that was not the idea. The House was aiming at Mr. Warren personally.

The House may believe that Mr. Warren is a Communist sympathizer. We don't think the evidence supports any such belief. But if that was the complaint, then the charge should have been formally lodged and adjudicated. If not satisfied with the usual machinery, Congress can always resort to impeachment. The method it did use is in everything but name a bill of attainder—a historic form of injustice barred by the Constitution.

By this procedure Congress might withhold a judge's salary because it didn't like his decisions—or a President's pay if it didn't like his politics. The method would soon destroy the Constitutional division of powers.

The courage of the House in saving should be commended. The wisdom of its saving should be debated. But this punishment of persons by legislative action is not saving. It is skulking behind the pretense of saving. It can only be condemned—and stopped.

[From the Chicago Sun of March 25, 1947]

NO WITCH HUNT INTENDED

President Truman's order for extensive loyalty tests of Government employees will not be a witch hunt, says a White House official, but it is clear that the makings of one exist. The new rules for determining loyalty are so broad and flexible that they can be stretched to cover all sorts of intellectual activity which a narrow-minded administrator might construe as "subversive." The Attorney General, for example, is given blanket power to decide whether an organization is subversive; then not only its members but anybody guilty of "sympathetic association" with it become subject to the brand of disloyalty.

So a great deal of energy and a great deal of money will be spent in ferreting out Reds, real or suspected. Congress cannot bring itself to spend $25,000,000 to keep the school-lunch program going, but it will no doubt appropriate ten or fifteen million dollars for the Red hunt without turning a hair.

That disloyal persons have no place in Government employ goes without saying. That Government personnel must be scrutinized closely for evidence of disloyalty is equally obvious. But a hare-and-hounds pursuit of every minor clerk who ever handed out literature at the meetings of an alleged Communist-front organization is something else altogether. Not only will this sort of witch hunt prove a waste of time and money, in that it won't turn up enough significant disloyalty to matter. Perhaps the most serious result will be the inquisitorial atmosphere created among Government employees and the public.

A good example of what may be expected is the House Appropriations Committee's decision to withhold the salary of Edgar L. Warren, chief conciliator of the Department of Labor, one of the best industrial-relations men in Government service. Mr. Warren's loyalty was attested by five former members of the War Labor Board, and can be backed up by anybody else who knows him. But his scalp was demanded because he had once been a member of two insignificant organizations which the former Dies committee thinks were led by Communists.

Men of Mr. Warren's ability can get profitable private employment any time they want it. Certainly they are going to fight shy of public service under the conditions of intellectual tyranny now being created.

President Truman's loyalty commission pointed to the Canadian espionage expose as evidence that a threat to our system of government exists. In Canada a number of Government employees were induced, by their sympathy with communism, to reveal official secrets. For their betrayal no apologies can be made. But it is neither startling nor new to learn that where some men will betray their country for money others will betray it for ideas. The same charge could have been brought by England against the founders of the United States of America.

Are we wise, instead of concentrating attention on disloyalty itself, to preoccupy ourselves with one potential motive for disloyalty? If our Government hopes to stamp out any ideas which might lead to disloyalty it had better conduct a simultaneous crusade against the love of money, jealousy, ambition, fear, and envy—all of which may incite treason as well as communism.

The real threat to our system of government does not come from a few misguided erratics who may be induced to disloyalty by their sympathy with certain political and economic ideas. The real threat, if one ever develops, will come from our system's failure to deliver the welfare and the freedom which the people cherish.

[From the Minneapolis Times of March 28, 1947]

A DEVIOUS HOUSE MANEUVER

The Appropriations Committee of the lower House of Congress recently voted to cut the Director of the Conciliation Service from the Federal pay rolls. The Director of that service is Edgar L. Warren, and the action against him flowed from charges that he had once belonged to certain Communist-front organizations. The House as a whole has now concurred in the committee's decision. It has agreed to withhold the funds required to pay Mr. Warren's salary.

There appears to be more than a little danger in this sort of legislative whimsy. Thus it should be noted that the Conciliation Director was separated from the pay roll on charges of the most serious nature without any semblance of a formal hearing at which he might defend himself. It was simply assumed that the allegations made were true, and the lower House set itself up, in this instance, as an arbiter of personnel, and the supreme judge of an employee's fitness.

Whether Mr. Warren is as pink or red as he is painted we do not know. But we are fairly certain that the lower House has no business firing him on mere suspicion, and by such a circuitous device as an appropriations cut.

Economy for the sake of economy is a wholly admirable end. But economy which seeks to impose punishment without a fair trial, and to usurp an executive function, is only a transparent fraud.

If the Warren precedent were to be widely followed, then Congress could ultimately dictate every detai of administrative personnel by the simple expedient of granting or withholding salary funds.

Already Representative Cox of Georgia sees the point. He suggests that the lower House refuse to pay David Lilienthal's salary as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in the event the Senate confirms his nomination.

For all we know, Mr. Warren is wholly unfit for his conciliation job by reason of his personal philosophies and deserves a prompt retirement to private life.

But the facts should be established at impartial hearings, and full opportunity should be given him to testify on his own behalf.

The business of firing a man on suspicion through such a devious appropriations dodge is difficult to square either with the American system of government or the American concept of fair play. The less we have of it, the better.

[From the Jamestown (N. Y.) Post-Journal of March 19, 1947]

WRONG METHOD

A House Appropriations subcommittee, headed by Representative KEEFE, Wisconsin Republican, has gone after the scalp of Edgar L. Warren, chief of the Conciliation Service, a bureau of the Department of Labor. It is reported that the subcommittee will attempt to deprive Warren of his job by withholding funds for his salary and the salaries of 11 other top-flight administrators.

Reasons for the subcommittee's desire to add Warren to the army of unemployed Government officials are not clear although his views concerning the right of Government employees to strike are said to be involved. Also mentioned in connection with the move are reports that Warren has not been too cooperative in seeing that friends of some Members of Congress retained their jobs when budget restrictions caused reduction in Conciliation Service personnel. Keefe refers to "good and sufficient reasons which will become apparent at the proper time."

Regardless of what those reasons may be, it seems that the subcommittee is using the wrong methods in its attempts to get rid of a public servant. Precedent favors the method and possibly there are cases where the Congress can make its wishes known in no other way. If that is the case, then there is something wrong with the whole system of judging the fitness of public servants.

If Congress, or a committee of that body, withholds appropriations for salaries for a specific bureau, it should be assumed that the bureau has outlived its usefulness and should be liquidated. If the bureau or a job in the bureau is essential and desirable, then the appropriations should be made and other methods used to get rid of an undesirable appointee. The Congressmen who are op-

posed to Warren should be required to prove in open hearing that he is not fit to hold the position and should not be permitted to force his removal by chopping off his pay and without proving their case. The decisions on appropriations for any Government service should be made only in the light of value to the public.

[From the Miami Daily News of March 19, 1947]

LEGISLATION BY FIAT

At the core of President Truman's proposals for labor legislation last January was the strengthening of the Government's conciliation services for the settlement of disputes before they reached the strike stage. That proposal fell on deaf ears insofar as the Republican Congressmen were concerned.

Now, according to Washington reports, the Conciliation Service already functioning in the Labor Department will be crippled by withholding its funds, another example of the second way to skin a cat which the Republican leaders have hit upon since they obtained control of congressional committees.

Representative FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, who heads the House Appropriations subcommittee in charge of Labor Department funds, does not conceal the fiat legislation he is preparing. "I have said this before," he told a reporter at the Capitol, "and I will say it again: I intend to do everything I can to see that Edgar L. Warren does not continue as head of the Conciliation Service." Having been rebuffed, presumably, in his request to Secretary Schwellenbach for Warren's removal, Representative KEEFE will recommend withholding funds to pay the salaries of Director Warren and at least 11 of his assistants.

Congress was sat upon by the Supreme Court when it attached a rider to an appropriations bill specifically withholding the salaries of Goodwin Watson, Robert M. Lovett, and William E. Dodd in 1943. Representative KEEFE might keep his act constitutional if Warren and his aides were not named in a bill cutting the funds of the Conciliation Service. But constitutional or not, such an act is fiat legislation usurping the right of the executive department to name its own officers.

There are legal ways by which the Congress can abolish the Labor Department's Conciliation Service. There are not enough votes in Congress to do so, and Representative KEEFE's proposal is a subterfuge designed to accomplish the end without a roll call of the majority.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that, in connection with Senate bill 938, the bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, in the committee amendment on page 7 there was a technical error in the language as the result of which the purpose of the amendment is somewhat nullified. I shall move when the times comes to strike out on page 7, line 21, the words "the President is officially notified by the United Nations that," and to strike out the word "that," in line 24, on page 7, so that paragraph (2) of section 5 in the amendment will read:

If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and.

I may add, Mr. President, that this amendment has the approval of the State Department and makes immutably clear the original purpose of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator from Michigan entertain the suggestion that he have the proposed amendment, which he intends to offer printed for the benefit of other Senators?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment as stated by me be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Michigan will be printed and lie on the table.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to insert the word "and".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the word "wool" to strike out "; and may make discounts from support prices for the purposes of discouraging unsound marketing practices."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, after the word "wool" to insert "The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 6. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949".

SEC. 7. Section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Not less than $130,000,000 of the amount borrowed on such obligations shall be made available to support, as required by law, the price of wool produced in the calendar years 1947 and 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, to change the section number from "8" to "6."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, Senate bill 814 is a simple, straightforward bill. It seeks to give the Commodity Credit Corporation power to continue to purchase the domestic wool clip as it has done for the past 4 years. It also gives the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to dispose of the stock pile of domestic wool which has accumulated during the past 2 or 3 years, and which amounts to approximately 450,000,000 pounds. It gives it authority to sell the wool below parity in competition with foreign imported wool, but in such manner as is provided in the third committee amendment, which reads as follows:

The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three major commodities, each a critical material, of which we do not raise sufficient for our own consumption and which call for treatment somewhat different from that accorded to the majority of commodities which we raise. Those three commodities are sugar, wool, and rubber. The sugar bill which was passed very recently and which has been approved by the President seems to have taken care of the sugar situation, at least for the time being. But wool is probably different from all other commodities in the production of which labor becomes an important part.

As I stated earlier in the debate on this bill, while during the war period the average rise in prices in the production of various commodities was from 60 to 65 percent, the wages paid in the sheep-producing industry are from 150 to 250 percent in excess of what they were when the war started.

I can give several illustrations of that statement. For instance, prior to the war, a sheepherder, a very important wage earner in the business of producing sheep, received approximately $50 a month and his board. Today he is being paid $150 a month and his board. A year or 2 years ago that man's wages were as high as $200 a month. Today, as I say, they are $150 a month plus board. Various farm hands who raise the feed which is necessary, for those who are in the sheep business to have during the winter months when the range is not available to them, used to be paid $40 to $50 a month, and during haying time probably $2 a day. During 1946 and at present in 1947 those men have been receiving $4, $5, or $6 a day, and in many cases stackers have received as much as $7 or $8 a day.

From this it will be seen that the producer is still operating on what are definitely war terms. As a result of this situation the sheep population of the United States has dropped very materially. In 1942 there were approximately 49,000,000 breeding ewes in the United States. The number has dropped in 1947 to 32,500,000. Wool production in 1942 was approximately 455,000,000 grease pounds, and today the estimated total for 1947 is approximately 310,000,000 pounds. That drop is continuing, as will be seen from the fact that in 1946 the number of sheep in the United States dropped 4,000,000 head as compared with 1945, and the estimated drop from 1946 to 1947 is more than 3,000,000 head, and there is every indication that the drop will continue next year.

It would perhaps be well to give a few figures showing the total shorn-wool production in the United States for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945, as they will indicate better than any words of mine how the decline in wool production has been progressive from year to year.

According to the Agricultural Statistics of 1946, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, pages 352 and 353, the average shorn-wool production from 1934 to 1943 was 370,000,000 pounds. In 1944 it was down to 347,000,000 pounds; in 1945 down to 321,000,000 pounds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask a question. The distinguished Senator shows that the production of wool is down. Is it not equally true that in the past few years, when the production of wool was dropping, the production of meat was going up? In other words, the price of meat was high, and lambs and sheep were being sold for meat rather than being kept for wool.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; that is not true, Mr. President, in general. What probably caused the increase in price of lambs was their scarcity, because as the number of sheep decreased, so would the number of lambs produced, particularly because breeding ewes are the only kind of sheep kept over from year to year. So when the number of breeding ewes in the United States dropped from 49,000,000 to 32,000,000 there was a great decline in the number of lambs produced and, consequently, the price of lambs increased. Some producers were encouraged to sell their ewe lambs because of the high price which was being paid in general for lambs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The upward swing in the price of lamb is not peculiar to lamb alone; it applies to all meat.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It certainly does. I wish to point out that the particular reason it was so effective with regard to lambs was because of the shortage of them. In the case of beef it was because of restrictions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to make this comment in view of the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts. From his question the Senator from Massachusetts seems to be under the impression that wool growers were sacrificing their wool in order to sell their animals for meat. The fact of the matter is—and I am sure my colleague will concur in the statement—that the domestic sheep population has been declining because of the instability of the business as a whole including the growing of wool and the growing of lambs for meat. The Senator is mistaken if he has the impression that the production of wool would have been greater had the price of lambs been lower.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with my colleague in what he says on that question.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show the situation clearly, I should like to inform the Senate in regard to the production of wool in the various groups of States in 1945. In the North Atlantic States, consisting of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the total production of shorn wool was 4,282,000 pounds. In the East North Central States, consisting of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the production of shorn wool was 28,220,000 pounds. The outstanding wool-producing State in that area was Ohio, which produced 11,956,000 pounds of the total amount of 28,000,000 pounds.

In the West North Central States, consisting of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, the total shorn wool production in 1945 was 49,359,000 pounds—North Dakota being the outstanding State, with a production of 11,087,000 pounds.

In those three areas the total amount was 81,861,000 pounds.

In the South Atlantic States, consisting of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, the total wool production was 3,862,000 pounds, with West Virginia and Virginia producing 1,668,000 pounds and 1,535,000 pounds, respectively.

Now we come to the more prolific producers of wool. In the south central section, consisting of the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, in 1945 there was a total shorn wool production of 88,516,000 pounds, of which the great State of Texas alone produced 79,151,000 pounds.

In the Western States, consisting of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California, in 1945 there was a total shorn wool production of 146,778,000 pounds. The outstanding States for wool production in that area were Wyoming, with 25,631,000 pounds; Montana, with 23,958,000 pounds; and California, with 20,408,000 pounds. I cite those figures in order to show how great is the production of wool in the West.

Mr. President, some objection to this bill comes from the Senators from Massachusetts, really on behalf of the wool dealers in Boston. Boston is the headquarters for the wool dealers of the United States. While a considerable amount of wool is dealt with in Chicago, St. Louis, and Philadelphia, nevertheless the big central market for wool is Boston. Prior to the war our wool consumption was approximately 600,000,000 pounds. Of that amount, in our domestic clip we raised 450,000,000 pounds, and we imported approximately 150,000,000 pounds. Actually, in 1932, of our total consumption that year, only 5 percent was imported wool; whereas in 1946, 80 percent of our total consumption of wool was imported, and a great majority of it was from the United Kingdom, which sends its Australian and New Zealand and South African wool to our shores to compete with our own wool industry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite attention to the fact that the wool dealers and the textile manufacturers in the wool field in 1946 did over 40 percent more business than they have ever done in any peacetime year, and 15 percent more than in the highest year of the war and that their profits are unprecedented and the prospects for several years to come are exceedingly bright, whereas the wool growers' position in the United States has steadily declined, as the distinguished Senator has pointed out.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. I should like to make it perfectly plain that the American wool grower is not fighting the dealers in Boston in this matter, but is fighting the British Empire combined.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Wyoming point out what the wool industry means to the Mountain States. For instance, what percentage of the total income of Wyoming is derived from wool?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I cannot state the exact percentage, but it is the major industry in Wyoming.

Mr. YOUNG. Then an increase in the importation of wool would wreck the economy of those States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It would wreck the economy of the States to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Senator from Massachusetts I would say—and I am confident that I speak for my colleague—that we have no desire in the world to hurt the wool industry of the Western States or of any portion of the United States. We wish to keep the domestic wool business just as large as we can. We wish to buy domestic wool; we wish to make it possible for those who live in Massachusetts to buy domestic wool, and that is why we are interested in this subject.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am satisfied of that; but at the same time——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In view of the statistics which the Senator has given in regard to the decrease in the production of wool in the various Western States, is it not a fact that the wool industry in those States will be practically out of business if the decline continues?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senator from South Dakota that the figures I have given indicate for every year a decrease in the sheep population in the United States. Unless the wool industry is supported and unless the wool producers can see ahead a few years and can anticipate receiving prices which will enable them to sell their product at a profit, there is every chance that the wool industry in the United States will disappear.

I feel that Senate bill 814, if enacted, would encourage the wool producer to go ahead and start to increase his flocks. That is the only way the wool production in the United States can be brought back to what it was in the prewar days.

Mr. President, I spoke of the wages being paid to workers in the sheep industry. Feed that has to be fed to the sheep in the winter time, and prior to lambing, has also advanced in price from two to three hundred percent, and still remains at the high price. Before the war the wool producer in the West, in the Rocky Mountain States anyway, could buy for his flocks hay in the stack at from five to six dollars a ton. The price of that hay now is from $15 to $20 a ton, which was the price during the war.

We may be told that the sheep producer has probably made more money than he has ever made in his life. That is not true. He has probably received more money for his product than he has ever before received in his life, but he certainly has not made a greater profit. In fact, his margin of profit is so low that if we took into consideration any interest on his investment we would find he would not be making any profit whatsoever.

The thought behind the bill is that after a few years of this support price the wool-raising industry, the sheep-producing industry, will probably be on a more normal level.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With respect to the gross amount of money that has come for wool, it is my understanding that in 1942 the gross was $157,235,480, and in 1946 it was $122,713,680, which would tend to refute the thought that the grower of wool is getting more for his product than he ever got before.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. What the Senator says is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that Senate bill 814 meets the needs of the situation better and is more satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture, the wool producer, and, I will be bold enough to say, the wool dealer and the wool manufacturer, than any other bill which has been presented to this body for many days. I therefore ask the earnest support of Senate bill 814 by Senators.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am vitally interested in the proposed legislation, for it is quite obvious to me that unless the pending bill is enacted before the 15th of April, chaos will ensue not only in respect to the wool held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, but in respect to the shear or the clip which is now taking place in some of the southern and western areas of the sheep producing sections of the Nation.

In the event no action is taken by Congress we are going to find that all the wool that is today held by the Commodity Credit Corporation will remain upon the fixed shelf on which it is now resting, until such time as all the foreign wool that is in surplus in both the British Isles and other wool-producing nations shall have been disposed of.

So, Mr. President, the question before the Members of the United States Senate today is whether we shall pass some kind of legislation, or have the United States in such a position that all the surplus wool in the world will be dumped here, and our own will remain upon an inventory basis in the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is about the position in which we find ourselves.

We could continue to discuss this matter for the next 2 hours, and I think we would have to come right back to the fact that we are today holding about 2 years' shear, and we have been the market for the importation of foreign wool all the while. That is about the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. Before the war started, as I have said, our annual consumption of wool was around 600,000,000 pounds. In 1946 our consumption was around 1,000,000,000 pounds. This year the consumption is at the same high figure, 1,000,000,000 pounds.

Recurring to the figures I gave earlier in my remarks, of the 1,000,000,000 pounds consumed in 1946, 800,000,000 pounds was imported wool. As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, that resulted in but 200,000,000 pounds of our domestic clip being used, and the remainder has been stock piled, until today there is a stock pile of some 480,000,000 pounds.

One of the clauses of the bill provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation can sell that wool below parity in order to get rid of it. I do not mean by that, nor does the bill mean, that it is necessary to sacrifice this wool. It is not. There is today but 5 cents difference between the price of the domestic wool at the 1946 price level and the foreign importation with the 34-cent tariff.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did I not hear the Senator from Wyoming say to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that he would be willing to strike out the first part of section 2, which has to do with price? I ask that question because the Senator from Ohio had to go to a committee meeting, and he asked me to take the matter up with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is correct, and I ask unanimous consent to amend Senate bill 814 on page 1, line 8, after the word "at," by striking out the words "the higher of (1) 90 percent of the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced, or (2)." I ask to strike those words out so that the provision will then read:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, through loans, purchases, or other operations to support a price to producers of wool produced (shorn or pulled) in the calendar years 1947–48 in the United States and its Territories at the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

GROWERS DESERVE COMPARABLE PRICE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to say to my colleague that I regret that the situation in the Senate seems to be such that he feels it necessary to surrender this provision of the bill. I personally feel that the wool growers of the United States are entitled to the support at the comparable base. Parity does not do justice to the growers. Does the Senator feel that it is absolutely essential to agree to this amendment in order to secure action today? I realize, of course, that there is considerable pressure upon the Senate to act upon other matters which are before us.

I know how important it is to the wool industry to have some action even though it cannot get what it deserves, and I intend to take no step that will prevent action; but I feel that in demanding of us who have been sponsoring this bill that we surrender the comparable price, those who ask for that are demanding a very serious concession upon our part. Does the Senator feel that he must make this concession?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I agree with what my colleague has said, but in order to meet the dead line of April 15 I feel that it is of the utmost importance that immediate action should be taken on this bill, and I feel that by making that concession and agreeing to the 1946 price, as against the comparable price of 1947, we shall be sending the bill forward to the House, if passed here, in time for the House to act on the resolution which they have, to bring this about before the dead line of April 15.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the bill which was recommended by the Committee on Agriculture last year carried this program to the end of 1950, and beyond, for the purpose of permanently stabilizing the wool industry. The committee has before it the bill which carries the program on only until the end of 1948, so that there has been a very substantial concession in that respect. However, as I said to the Senator, I have no disposition to impede the progress of the legislation. I wonder, however, whether, in making this concession, we have any reason to believe that our friends from Massachusetts will go along with us and support the measure after we have made this additional concession. Having stripped us of almost everything that we need and that we ought to have, and that we deserve, will not the Senators from Massachusetts now be content to support the bill, if the Senator from Wyoming agrees to this considerable concession?

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope, before the Senator yields, I may have an answer to my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, for the purpose of answering my colleague's question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in answer to the senior Senator from Wyoming, I would say most respectfully that I have, at the proper time, a substitute bill to offer, which I hope will be helpful to the wool growers and helpful to the woolen trade of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, I want to point this out, that the bill which the Committee on Agriculture overwhelmingly recommended to the Senate provided for the comparable price formula. My colleague has most generously conceded the point, to abandon that formula, and to take the price at which wool was supported in 1946. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to ask that we take, not that, but 90 percent of the parity price.

I suggest, Mr. President, and my able colleague, that our friends from Massachusetts are really trying to take the short wool with the long wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say in reply to the senior Senator from Wyoming that he was once himself a Massachusetts citizen. He learned his trade with us in Massachusetts. He learned his persuasive arguments in Massachusetts, and that is what I am meeting this afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I made the suggestion originally that this amendment be adopted in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, which are contained in the report, from which I quote as follows:

> In 1946 the Commodity Credit Corporation paid on the average between 41 and 42 cents a pound for wool in the grease. On the basis of January 1947 figures, the support price for wool, as proposed in the present bill, would be 44.1 cents a pound for 1947. In order to sell domestic wools during the past year in competition with imported wools, the Commodity Credit Corporation has incurred a considerable loss. To establish the support level as proposed in the present bill would undoubtedly result in even greater losses for 1947. If the present parity-price level continues through January 1948, losses during 1948 probably would also be greater than in 1946. We recommend, therefore—

This is the Department of Agriculture of the present administration.

> We recommend, therefore, that the support price level for the 2-year period be "not less than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946." The establishment of a comparable price for wool and for lambs could then await study of the whole problem of revising the parity formula which was discussed with the House Committee on Agriculture on January 22 and with your committee on January 23.

The amendment carries out the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. Of course, this whole program is an emergency proposition; it merely takes care of the wool problem temporarily; it is certainly not a broad solution of the whole wool problem. I hope we may have time to work out such a solution, and, if possible, work it out before, at least, we confront the 1948 problem. But in this emergency situation and since under the bill the wool bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation will be sold at a loss anyway, it seems to me only reasonable to ask the wool growers that they take the 41- and 42-cent price which has been guaranteed, and we can determine later what kind of parity there should be, what kind of comparable price there should be. I certainly shall oppose the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts that there be this other basis, which would be lower than the comparable price, but it seems to me that this is a reasonable proposal at the present time, and in accord with the recommendations of the Democratic administration.

Mr. CAPPER and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, after I have yielded to the Senator from Kansas. I wish to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in which he says:

> I understand the Senate plans to consider the three important agriculture bills—S. 814, providing a program to safeguard the price of wool; H. R. 2102, providing for a temporary continuation of the farm-labor program; and S. 350, providing for the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation—all of which have been favorably reported by your committee.
>
> The American Farm Bureau Federation strongly supports and urges the speedy enactment of these three measures.
>
> (1) Wool: S. 814 establishes a comparable price for wool and directs that the price of wool be supported at 90 percent of the comparable price or at the level of the 1946 support price, whichever is higher, until the end of the Steagall period, December 31, 1948, and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wool at prices competitive with foreign wool in order to enable the Corporation to dispose of its surplus stocks in an orderly manner. The present wool program is scheduled to expire April 15 and the growers will be left without protection for their new crop unless this legislation is speedily enacted. This legislation seeks to give the wool growers comparable price support assistance that has already been extended to other commodities under the Steagall Act and the Bankhead Commodity Loan Act. We strongly oppose S. 917, which seeks to establish a much lower price support level. This would be very unfair to the wool growers because the present parity price of wool is out of line with the parity price of other commodities.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, in regard to the amendment which I proposed, which the Senator from Ohio had suggested to me, I wish to ask unanimous consent to correct the wording as stated by me, in order to bring it into line with what the Senator from Ohio had in mind and with what he pointed out the Department of Agriculture had stated in their report on the bill. So on page 2, line 2, after the word "price", I desire to insert the words "not less than that", and eliminate the word "at", so that it will read:

> The price not less than that which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment, as he has done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, now that the Senator from Ohio, in explanation of his position, has made it clear that he will not support the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to drive down further the price which the domestic producers of wool may receive, I shall not make any objection to the unanimous consent request of my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to ask the junior Senator from Wyoming a question. He has by his amendment stricken out of section 2 the reference to the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced. In that connection I ask him whether or not section 3 of the bill, which provides an obligation upon the Secretary of Agriculture to establish monthly a comparable price for wool, and so forth, should remain in the bill, or whether section 3 should be stricken out. I shall be glad if the Senator will state his views in that regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I shall be glad to state them. Section 3 is merely a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to establish monthly a comparable price for wool as with other commodities, such as cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, but it would have nothing to do with the price which would be paid for wool in view of the fact that my amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator further what useful purpose would be subserved by the establishment of the comparable price for wool if that price were not to enter into the computation to be made under section 2 of this measure?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It would give us the information which is necessary we should have to know month by month what the comparable price would be as compared to the price we are receiving.

Mr. DONNELL. So the amendment made thus far by the Senator to section 2 would not, in his opinion, make advis-

able the further amendment of striking out section 3?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I should prefer that section 3 remain in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the bill extends the support price for a period of 2 years only, and if section 3 is left in the bill, which provides for a study of the comparable price, and announcement of the comparable price month by month, it could form a valuable basis for future studies because it is perfectly obvious that after the life of the Steagall amendment expires, after 1947 and 1948, we will have to have a more permanent agricultural policy for our country and we will need all the material of this nature we can secure in order to effectuate an intelligent policy. So I think it would be valuable as a basis for future studies.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I understand therefore, and if I am incorrect I should be glad to be corrected, that the only purpose of leaving section 3 in the bill is to provide from month to month the information therein required to be obtained, and that there is no mandatory requirement upon either the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency or official to use that information in fixing prices under this bill or elsewhere. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is correct.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Chair state the question before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rise to a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order at the present time, if no amendments are pending, to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment to the bill presently being considered would be in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is in order now to present a bill as a substitute for the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As an amendment in the nature of a substitute; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself I offer Senate bill 917 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 814.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Wool Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, through loans or purchases, to protect the price to producers of domestic wool in the continental United States and Territories during the period April 15, 1947, to December 31, 1948. The loan or purchase level for wool during this period shall not be in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price for wool as determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture under the present method of computation.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized, without regard to restrictions imposed by any law to dispose of existing domestic wool stocks and such further stocks as may be acquired under this act, at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to adjust loan and purchase levels for individual grades and qualities for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the loan and purchase levels for the various grades and qualities of wool and may make discounts from loan and purchase levels for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on Senate bill 814 and the bill I have offered on behalf of my colleague and myself, as a substitute therefor. In the first place the wool industry in Massachusetts has no desire to put the wool growers of this country out of business. In fact, in ordinary times they depend upon the American wool growers to a great extent for their business. They want them to continue in business. They want the domestic production to increase. At the same time they would like this honorable body to remember that if the pending bill becomes law and the policy which it represents shall be continued, then over a period of years—I do not say it will happen in the next 2 years—but over a period of years—it will ultimately deprive approximately 3,000 workers in Massachusetts of employment and in the country at large it will deprive approximately 6,000 workers of employment. I am informed that such is the extent of the wool trade in this country as apart from the wool growers and apart from the wool manufacturers.

In substance, what this bill, if it should become law, will do over a period of years is to put the Government into the exclusive position of buying and selling all the domestic wool. The wool trade in Boston and Massachusetts is one of the oldest businesses in Massasetts. It is an honorable trade, it is a respected trade, and it has a legitimate function in the business of our country. But what we want to do——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming. I have but a few remarks to make, and I should like to finish them, but am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator, and I shall not interrupt him again. I understood the Senator to say that if the bill which has just been explained by my colleague should be passed it would result in driving the wool trade of Boston out of business and depriving some 6,000 persons of their jobs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said "ultimately."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ultimately. The bill which my colleague is sponsoring declares a policy for a period ending December 31, 1948. The substitute which the Senator now proposes provides a program which ends on December 31, 1948. The bill which my colleague has defended provides for the purchase of wool by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the level at which wool was purchased during the year 1946. The bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts provides for the support purchase of wool at 90 percent of parity. I should like to ask the Senator on what logical basis he asks the Senate to believe that the wool trade of Boston will not be driven out of business if the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases wool at 90 percent of parity, but will be driven out of business if the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases it at the price of 1946, under which the wool trade prospered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will answer the Senator's inquiry in this way: It will allow the wool trade and citizens engaged in private enterprise an opportunity to buy some of the domestic wool at market prices. At this time, in answer to the Senator's question, I should like to read some figures into the RECORD which I intend to place in the RECORD at a little later time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I realize that the Senator wishes to proceed, but I should like to ask him one question. I observe in Senate bill 814 the requirement that—

The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, through loans, purchases, or other operations to support a price to producers of wool produced (shorn or pulled) in the calendar years 1947 and 1948 in the United States and its Territories at the higher of (1) 90 percent of the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced, or (2) the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

The question I desire to propound to the Senator is, Did the Commodity Credit Corporation undertake to support wool in 1946 at one price throughout the year or did that price vary from time to time during the year 1946? If it varied, which price, in the opinion of the Senator, would govern in this particular language in Senate bill 814—the lowest price, or the highest price, or some intermediate price?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the Senator's inquiry I should say that I have only one price, that at which wool was bought in 1946. I cannot tell the Senator whether wool was bought at different prices. I do know the price at which the Secretary of Agriculture says the CCC bought wool in 1946, and that is the price I should like to use.

Mr. President, I shall now place in the RECORD the list of prices, which, to the best of my information is correct. Prices are given both for wool in grease and for clean fine wool.

The 1946 prices—which is the proposal of the junior Senator from Wyoming—are 42.1 cents for wool in grease, and $1.25 for clean fine wool. Ninety percent of parity, which is the proposal submitted by the Senators from Massachusetts, would give prices of 37.7 cents for wool in grease, and $1.11 for clean fine wool. The present price of wool on the market is 38 cents for wool

in grease, and $1.20 for clean fine wool. I shall add the price of comparable wool, which is now no longer in the discussion. Ninety percent of the comparable price for wool is 46.9 cents for wool in grease, and $1.39 for clean fine wool. All these prices are as of April 1, 1947.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator give us the source of his figures?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The source of my figures is the National Wool Trade Association.

Mr. AIKEN. The figure submitted to the committee by the Department of Agriculture for 90 percent of the price of comparable wool was 44.1 cents.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that that was the figure as of the first of the year. These figures are as of April 1, 1947.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the market price for grease wool, which the Senator gave as 38 cents, the April 1 price?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Thirty-eight cents is the present market price for wool in grease.

Mr. AIKEN. As of April 1?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As of April 1.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I did not understand that he was giving the April 1 prices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these figures, in the form of a table, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[April 1, 1947]

	Greasy	Clean fine
	Cents	*Dollars*
90 percent of comparable	46.9	1.39
1946 prices	42.1	1.25
90 percent of parity	37.7	1.11
Present foreign wool with duty (34 cents) added	38.0	1.20

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the present time the Government has approximately 480,000,000 pounds of wool as an inventory. That is 30,000,000 pounds more than was mentioned by the junior Senator from Wyoming, but I think that is the correct figure as of the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. My figure of 450,000,000 pounds was approximate only. It varies from month to month.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senators from Massachusetts are entirely in accord with the Senators from Wyoming, in that this inventory of wool should be eliminated in an orderly manner. The inventory of wool, which represents the domestic wool purchased by the Government, has been built up because the market price of wool has been under the price at which the Government could sell it. If either of the bills becomes law it will permit the Government, in an orderly way, to get rid of the big inventory of wool and make the market a more orderly one in the future.

The bill of the Senator from Wyoming also makes wool a basic agricultural commodity. I mentioned that not because it necessarily affects the price at which the Government will buy wool under the formula suggested, but because it may affect the purchase by the Government, at a different level, of many other agricultural commodities. That information is obtained from page 4 of the committee's report on Senate bill 814, and is the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

> To add wool to the six basic commodities now named in existing legislation might result in changing the computation of comparable prices and support prices for many of the other commodities which are affected by section 4 (a) and (b) of the Stegall amendment and other legislation.

I mention that that provision is still in the bill of the Senator from Wyoming, and in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture it might have the effect described on the cost prices of other commodities.

What we in Massachusetts want is to help the wool grower to make it possible for the wool trader to stay in business, and not to keep the Government in the wool business indefinitely.

As the Senator has said, in ordinary years we buy between 600,000,000 and 700,000,000 pounds of wool. During the past few years we have bought as much as 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool. When we get back to the normal level of 600,000,000 to 700,000,000 pounds, our domestic crop will be approximately half of all we use. What we want to do is to make it possible to use that domestic crop by placing a floor under the prices for the wool grower, so that the price of wool will not fall as low as 8 cents, as it did in 1932, and to keep the Government out of business so far as we can do so.

This is a stopgap law for 1947 and 1948. However, we must remember that if this bill becomes law and those who are now in the wool trade have to go out of that business, or suffer a substantial reduction in their business, we may find if we try to adopt some new system in 1949 there will not be the market for wool that there is at the present time.

As I understand, the wool cooperatives sell about 20 percent of the domestic supply. The remainder 80 percent is sold by the wool trade. They have not been able to get any of it in the last few years, because it has been off the market, and, consequently, to supply the market they have to buy foreign wools.

What the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] says as to 80 percent of the wool coming in from the foreign market is entirely correct. But that is not the fault of the woolen mills or the fault of the wool traders. It is the fault of the Government in keeping the price so high that the wool traders cannot buy the wool and sell it to the wool industry, because the industry cannot pay that price when they can obtain wool from abroad at a cheaper price.

What has been the result? The Bureau of the Budget, in response to a letter from me, states that as of June 30, 1947, it is estimated that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have outstanding in the price-support program approximately $225,970,000, of which $169,000,000 will be in wool and the balance in other commodities. As of June 30, 1948, they estimate the total price-support program will be $348,375,000, of which $116,000,000 will be in wool. Actually, as of June 30, 1946, the total price-support program was $472,987,000, of which $243,416,000, or a little more than half, was in wool. In other words, the expenditures which it has been necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make in order to sustain the price of wool under the laws which have been passed, has amounted to more than half of all the expenditures it has had to make for the entire price-support program for all commodities.

As I have already pointed out, in two particulars this bill goes further than the Acting Secretary of Agriculture recommended in his report to the committee. The Senator from Wyoming has corrected one, and wool as a basic commodity is still in the bill. The Senator has argued that the flocks of sheep in this country are diminishing. I submit most respectfully that 80 percent of the weight value and 66 percent of the money value of sheep is in meat and one-third of the money value is in wool. In the past few years meat prices have been very high, and at the same time the Government has been supporting wool. That situation has already been discussed. It does not seem that the wool producer has suffered.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the Massachusetts wool trade has no desire to put the wool growers out of business. They want to encourage the domestic supply of wool, stay in business themselves, and keep the Government out of the business. If I know anything of what is desired in this country today, it is the free-enterprise system. We do not want the Government put in the position of having to buy and sell in peacetime the ordinary necessaries of life.

The question of tariffs and quotas has been referred to. The wool traders of Boston certainly are not against higher tariffs, if that be the answer to the problem of the wool grower. They are against quotas. I think, although I do not know this, that the wool growers themselves are against quotas. The wool trade is against the quota system because the situation is too uncertain. The amount of wool used this year and the amount of wool to be used next year are so variable that it would be almost impossible for any administrator properly to fix the price quotas.

So, Mr. President, I conclude these few remarks by saying that we want some bill; we do not want to end all legislation on the subject. We want a floor put under the wool grower's prices, but we do not want the floor so high that we cannot compete in the free wool market in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question of the junior Senator from Wyoming, if he will be kind enough to answer. In 1946 was the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook to support wool the same throughout the entire 12 months?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The average price for fine wool during that period was 41.6 cents.

Mr. DONNELL. But the price itself varied in different portions of the year 1946, did it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Not materially.

Mr. DONNELL. Was it substantially the same at all times?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It was substantially the same at all times.

Mr. DONNELL. The point I had in mind was that which I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that in section 2 the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to support a price in 1947 and 1948 not less than that at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946. If the price varied at different times during the year 1946 it would seem to me that there is an ambiguity in this section which should be cleared.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There is no ambiguity. The Department of Agriculture knows very well what the price was in 1946, and that will be the price, and not less than that price, for wool under this bill.

Mr. DONNELL. In January of 1946 it was substantially the same as it was in December of 1946?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture did not support a price of 90 percent of parity, or 96 percent of parity. It supported a price at a level which is felt necessary to save a vanishing agricultural industry from extinction. At this time, as I recall, it is supporting the price of wool at 105 or 106 percent of parity. During the war it supported it as high as 118 percent of parity; but that was a price which the Department determined was necessary in order to keep the wool grower in the business of producing wool, and was not fixed according to any percentage of parity.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming one further question. There was some variation between the prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook to support wool in a number of periods in 1946, was there not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I do not think there was, for the identical type of wool. There are so many different types of wool that it is very rarely that two different types would have the same price. But for actually the same type of wool, the same kind of wool, the price was the same.

Mr. DONNELL. Throughout the entire year?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Throughout the year.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator does not regard it as necessary, therefore, to insert the words "the average" in this section?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the bill introduced by the Senators from Massachusetts and offered as an amendment to the pending bill is, I believe, written by the Boston wool trade. I need only read the first four or five words:

To encourage the production of sheep.

How is it possible to encourage the production of sheep when the purpose is to reduce the price of wool at a time when the industry is being liquidated?

Figures have been presented to show that the sheep population is now the lowest in 68 years; but still the Boston wool trade proposes to lower wool prices still more and force still more liquidation, at a time when the Boston wool trade itself is making plenty of money. In fact, the number of dealers in the Boston wool trade has increased. There are more dealers now than there were 5 years ago. They handle all the wool for the Commodity Credit Corporation on a fee basis. They store all the wool at a good profit. It is true that possibly they do not make quite so much money as if there were a fluctuating gambling market, but they make a reasonable profit with which they ought to be satisfied.

I should like to read a portion of a statement which I made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and should like to have the remainder of it inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Briefly, Mr. President, the statement to which I have referred shows that the president of Draper & Co. received a total compensation, including basic salary, bonus, and premiums paid on annuity contracts, of $161,000; and the statement also shows that other officials of his company received up to $90,000 a year and more—all at a time when the wool-growing industry in this country was being liquidated. So I cannot understand why they should appear before the Senate committee and present themselves as an industry going out of business. It seems to me absolutely absurd.

At the present time, and for many years past, the price of wool has been supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since the existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it has had an over-all net profit of $55,000,000 in its program in support of all farm prices. That is contrary to the statements made in numerous articles appearing in magazines and newspapers in the United States. Occasionally there is a little loss by the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with its support of certain farm prices, but the Corporation has had an over-all net profit during all the years of its existence, of $55,000,000.

Let us compare that situation, Mr. President, with the situation of industry, which during the war years was guaranteed a return on the basis of cost plus profit. The War Department in connection with its cancellations of contracts with business, paid business, up to February 28, 1947, $4,694,055,000. The Navy Department paid business a gross of $1,236,900,000—and that at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation, in connection with its program for the support of agricultural prices—the prices of commodities just as important to the country during the war as the production of other goods or articles needed in the war—had an actual profit of $55,000,000.

There are other subjects which I should like to discuss, but time now will not permit, to show how business constantly, and even as of today, has received large subsidies—for instance, huge subsidies have been paid to the copper, zinc, and lead producers as well as to other industries—whereas the farm price-support program has constantly shown a profit.

Mr. President, Senate bill 814 is supported by the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and every other major farm organization. It has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, and it has the wholehearted support of the National Wool Growers Association. In opposition to it there is only the Boston wool trade, which will exist regardless of whether this bill is passed.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MILTON R. YOUNG

Mr. Malcolm Green, who was asked to testify in behalf of the wool-trades position by Senator SALTONSTALL and who, it is expected will testify for the wool trade at a later date, is the vice president of Draper & Co.

Draper & Co. is one of the largest handlers of wool in the United States and in addition to handling raw wool has a subsidiary company which makes tops (known as the Draper Top Co.).

This company never attempted to become a handler of domestic wool during this war period under the Government's wool-purchase program. This program began in April 1943 and has continued since. Three domestic clips of wool handled during the war. Draper & Co. did not assist or take any part in this program.

It is difficult to understand why they now step in and oppose a program which is designed to care for the domestic producer, since they have had no interest in him during this period, unless it is for the purpose of continuing their high speculative profits.

This company had a review of its profits by the Internal Revenue Bureau just recently. A statment of this review and decision by the Bureau is attached herewith.

This statement refers only to the salaries, bonuses, and pensions of the officers. It does not show the net profit to the company, which undoubtedly must have been great considering the salaries, and so forth, paid.

Mr. Malcolm Green, when testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee, stated that the only reason for opposing the growers was to permit a good old Boston industry to live. The Internal Revenue has another name for it.

A case in The Tax Court of the United States of America, Docket No. 6376, promulgated September 28, 1945, *Draper & Co., Inc.*,

petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, respondent, in which the rather startling statement is made, as follows:

"4. Officers' compensation disallowed, $271,218.41: Officers' compensation of $156,000, representing basic salaries paid, plus bonus equal to 100 percent thereof, has been allowed as reasonable compensation for services rendered. The amount of $427,216.41 claimed in the return in excess thereof, or $271,218.41, is therefore determined to be excessive compensation for services actually rendered and not deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses."

The table gives the amounts claimed and the amounts allowed.

CLAIMED

Name	Basic salary	Bonus	Premiums paid on annuity contracts	Total
Paul A. Draper, president and treasurer	$30,000	$102,000	$29,350.81	$161,350.81
Robert W. Dana, vice president	18,000	72,000	17,579.00	107,579.00
Malcolm Green, vice president	18,000	72,000	17,579.00	107,579.00
George W. Brown, assistant treasurer	12,000	27,000	11,709.60	50,709.60
Amounts claimed	78,000	273,000	76,218.41	427,218.41

ALLOWED

Name	Basic salary	Bonus	Premiums paid on annuity contracts	Total
Paul A. Draper	$30,000	$30,000	None	$60,000.00
Robert W. Dana	18,000	18,000	None	36,000.00
Malcolm Green	18,000	18,000	None	36,000.00
George W. Brown	12,000	12,000	None	24,000.00
Amounts allowed	78,000	78,000	None	156,000.00
Amounts disallowed	None	195,000	76,218.41	271,218.41

Yet, Malcolm Green, vice president of Draper & Co., is one of the parties who has been spearheading the attack upon wool growers, and, through the wool-trades activities and their corps of attorney-lobbyists in Washington, are seeking to force lower prices on domestic wool.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I recognize that the hour is growing late, and therefore I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

I wish the RECORD to show my hope that the bill which the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I have introduced will be adopted as a substitute for the pending measure.

As the Senate realizes, my immediate interest in this measure is due to the fact that the Boston wool trade is located in the State which I have the honor in part to represent; and there are some 6,000 people, 3,000 of whom are in Massachusetts, whose livelihood is involved.

It stands to reason that a bill such as the one now pending, which would continue the Government in the wool business, is naturally dangerous to the employment of people who themselves are engaged in the wool trade, a business which has had a clean record and is more than 100 years old. Nor is it necessary to dwell very long on the fact that this wool will be sold at a loss. I believe the estimate is that $75,000,000 will be lost this year, and, of course, that loss will have to be borne by the American taxpayers.

My colleague has advanced the very valid argument that legislation of this kind is definitely a step away from getting the Government out of this type of economic activity. I understand that the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dodd, has testified that the Department of Agriculture hoped to be able to get out of the wool business. Of course, legislation of this type is not a step in that direction.

Mr. President, the longer I serve as a Member of the Senate, the more I am impressed with the fact that all of us are essentially members of one team. We have the wool growers who raise the wool; we have the people in the wool trade, who handle the wool, buy it, and sell it; we have the laborers and the management who process wool and make it into things which you and I wear; and then we have the consumers who wear it. Certainly it is entirely possible that those of us who serve in the Congress have the brains to fashion a measure which will reconcile all those different interests and place this vital activity on a sound footing, for it certainly is a vital activity and one which in time of war has shown how important it is.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate any longer, but I wish the RECORD to show my hope that Senate bill 917 will be substituted for Senate bill 814.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in support of the bill reported by the committee. I agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that Congress should do everything in its power to withdraw the Federal Government from competition with private industry or private enterprise. I wish to point out that this bill would merely continue for 2 years the Government's interest in supporting the price of wool on a basis comparable to that which already is maintained by the Federal Government for the basic commodities and the so-called Steagall commodities.

I wish to point out further that those engaged in the wool industry are asking for no special consideration at this time. In the early years of the war those engaged in the production of wool recognized the need for wool in the national defense and in the prosecution of the war. They were among the last producing groups in the United States to ask for any support or assistance or cooperation from the Federal Government in connection with handling their particular commodity.

Recently the President declared the official end of hostilities; but under existing statutes the Federal Government is obligated to support the prices of the Steagall and basic commodities during the years 1947 and 1948. The proposed legislation would merely give the same consideration to wool. Unless that is accorded the wool industry, there will, in fact, be discrimination against it.

I desire to support wholeheartedly the bill of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think its enactment is essential and vital in preserving for wool the same price protection that is given other commodities.

Mr. President, we wish this action to be taken now, so as to enable the other branch of Congress to take action prior to April 15.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate in any way, but I should like to mention that for the first time in history the Boston wool dealers are handling 800,000,000 pounds of wool a year, and many competent persons say that the consumption of 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool a year will continue. I confess Mr. President, that I am not that optimistic. I do not believe that the consumption can remain at that figure for many years. It seems to me that probably it will drop to somewhere around 800,000,000 pounds.

I cannot for the life of me see how the jobs of 6,000, or 1,000, or 100 people employed in the Boston wool dealers' business are in jeopardy in any way whatsoever.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to say just a few words in reference to the support price on wool. This is more than a support program. Under this scheme the Government is proposing to guarantee wartime prices for the next two years to a group of wool producers at the expense and to the disadvantage of all other farmers.

As has been pointed out by Senators, the act we are considering is a wartime measure. It is a measure which was passed during the war for the protection of wool farmers, with a definite understanding on the part of those farmers that it would expire when the war was over; and the war is now over. I am not arguing that the wool farmers are not entitled to some consideration, but they are not entitled to receive any more consideration than is afforded the producers of other agricultural commodities.

I have here a few figures I should like to read to show how the money under the program proposed would be distributed. The latest estimated figure I have been able to obtain as to the cost to the

taxpayers is $32,000,000, and the highest estimate from other sources is $75,000,000. For the purpose of this argument I have taken the figure of $32,000,000 a year.

The State of Wyoming would receive $2,500,000, and their proportionate part of the payment through Federal income taxes would be $30,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Where did the Senator get these figures?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Department of Agriculture Yearbook of 1946, which I have here, and I shall be glad to have the Senator from North Dakota show me wherein I am wrong.

Mr. YOUNG. Are the figures based on a loss? There may be a profit, as there has been on many commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator thinks there is any probability of a profit, then there would be no need for the support price. The farmers would make more money without it. So, all those in favor of the measure are acting under the assumption there would be a loss.

Mr. YOUNG. If there should be no bill passed at all, there would be no way of disposing of the wool. It would remain on the shelves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Government could dispose of this wool today as readily as 2 years hence when the proposed legislation is to expire. My estimate as to losses were obtained from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. As to the probable losses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As to the probable losses under the bill if it shall be passed.

Mr. YOUNG. That is entirely different from the information given to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was talking to Mr. Cooper of the Department of Agriculture today as to estimated losses.

The State of Idaho would receive $1,100,000, and its proportionate payment would be $55,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator think that 42 cents a pound for the raw wool, or even 41 cents or less, is too high for the producer to receive in this day and age?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know enough about the price of wool, and what it should be, to answer the question, but I will say that the wool grower has no more right to this subsidy than other farmers.

Mr. THYE. Again may I impose upon the Senator's time for just a slight observation on this question? During the war years there had to be held in reserve a great amount of wool for war purposes, and because it was held in reserve there was a great accumulation of foreign wool held in the British Isles, as well as the wool we had under our own Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the event the Commodity Credit Corporation were to cease the support price, then the wool price would have to drop to whatever level at which it happened to find itself, would it not? It might go to 34, it might go to 38, but it is quite obvious that it would drop until the time when foreign wool would no longer find it profitable to come to America. Only then would we commence to use up not only our own clip of today, but the clips we have in storage under the Commodity Credit Corporation holding. So the question is simply this, Should we further ruin the sheep-producing areas of the Nation, and drive them down to a position lower than that in which they already find themselves, or should we give consideration to some type of support program for the wool producer? As I see the situation, we are either going to support the price, or the price is going to drop until the foreigner ceases to export his wool to this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surprising as it seems, I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Minnesota. On the other hand, the same statement could be made in connection with any commodity that is produced here. I know the price would drop, and would seek its level, because I happen to come from the northeastern section, where the price of commodities is not held up by a support program, and I know exactly what happens to the market price. The American farmers have to bring production down to peacetime requirements as they did following World War I or Congress has to establish an over-all support program. The only way that can be done is to socialize agriculture over a period of years, because we cannot have support prices, we cannot have the Government supporting any agricultural commodity above the free market, unless the Government monopolizes the market.

To continue the statement—and I should like to get these figures into the RECORD—the State of Montana would receive $2,400,000, but its proportionate part of the payment would be only $55,000.

The State of Texas would receive $8,000,000, and pay $850,000.

The State of Utah would receive $1,800,000, and would pay only $60,000.

The State of Colorado would receive $1,300,000, and would pay $200,000.

The State of New Mexico would receive $1,300,000, and would pay $30,000.

The State of South Dakota would receive $1,100,000, and would pay $30,000.

Mr. THYE. I wonder if the Senator would yield again?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Are those figures based upon an orderly disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings, or on the basis of the wool price of today as compared to the price when the wool was purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation? Do they represent the result if we were to sell the wool on the market for just what the market would offer as of today? Mr. Dodd did not give us any such figures when he testified before the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unfortunately, I did not have access to Mr. Dodd's figures, because, as the Senator knows, this bill is being rushed through. It is another emergency. The bill is being rushed through even before we have a chance to see the minutes of the hearings. Therefore I called Mr. Cooper, who was referred to me as being the wool expert of the Department of Agriculture, and these are the figures he gave me, based upon an estimate of a loss of 10 cents a pound on all wool produced in the United States.

To return to the figures, the State of North Dakota would receive $600,000, and would pay $30,000.

To show how this is to the disadvantage of the eastern farmers, I pick three States now. The State of New York will pay $6,400,000 under the bill, and the New York farmers will receive $200,000.

Pennsylvania will pay $2,500,000, under the bill, and the farmers of Pennsylvania will receive $200,000.

My own State of Delaware will pay $320,000, and receive a little less than $1,300.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Delaware one more question. What is the wool buyer paying for imported wool of quality comparable to that the Commodity Credit Corporation now holds? The Senator said about 10 cents a pound would be the loss. Did he not say that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Cooper said it was estimated that 10 cents a pound would be the loss if the Commodity Credit Corporation were to continue purchasing all the wool and then have to sell it on the free market in competition with foreign wool. I do not know how nearly accurate that is, but those are Mr. Cooper's figures.

Mr. THYE. Then, in order to protect wool, the tariff should be upped so as to afford a retaining wall. Otherwise the wool industry would be ruined.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator on that statement, but it is discouraging to see Senators today favoring a Government hand-out who were yesterday singing the praises of the New Deal trade-agreement program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think some things pertinent to this subject have not been said which should be brought to the attention of the Senate. First, I think the 10 cents a pound, the figure given to the Senator from Delaware, is completely erroneous, and I do not think anyone in the wool trade, or any wool grower, will dispute my statement.

Next, I am afraid that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts we will be contributing very greatly to the complete decline and ultimate extinction of the wool industry of the United States.

There are wool manufacturers in my State, and at one time Vermont was the most important sheep-producing State in the Union. I think this matter is so big that we cannot look at it from the standpoint of any single area. It is a great national problem which we have to consider. We have got to consider it for this reason. Today our wool growers are not competing with the wool growers of other parts of the world or the wool dealers of other parts of the world; they are competing with the British Empire

for the wool markets of the world. What has happened is this: England has consistently sold wool on the American markets for just under the United States price for wool. Therefore our wool dealers have used a great deal more foreign wool than they have American wool.

For two or three months last summer, for some reason or other, the American price for the domestic wool and the price for the foreign wool were approximately the same, and during that period 170,000,000 pounds of American wool were disposed of for a fair price, but here is what will happen if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts: A floor under wool of approximately 36 cents a pound will be fixed. The world price today is 38 cents a pound, but if forced to do so, England will lower her price just below 36 cents a pound, and will continue to supply the American market, just as she has been doing for the last year or two, in an effort to get rid of her own tremendous stock pile of wool, which she is successfully doing.

Furthermore, the wool grower cannot produce wool on parity today. The parity formula is grossly unfair to many agricultural commodities. That is because, for most commodities, the base period goes back to 1913 when conditions were entirely different. Therefore, in order to get production during the war the Government has had to maintain a support price for above parity. Our milk producers have been getting 140 percent of parity. Our poultry producers have been getting 130 percent of parity, during most of the war. They could not have produced at parity price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, may I say that that was not true of the poultry growers in my State, because our State produces broilers, and they are not included under the support program. I would like to ask the Senator one more question. Could the Senator tell me what parity is?

Mr. AIKEN. Within 2 weeks' time, yes. I am not going to attempt to tell the Senator tonight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that answers the question.

Mr. AIKEN. But poultry growers under our parity formula received about 130 percent of parity during most of the war years. They could not have produced and made a profit at any less than that. Other producers have received less than parity. The price of wool has been supported at more than parity—105 percent of parity at the present time, and as I said a little while ago, up to 118 percent of parity. So I do not believe that it is safe for us to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and run the risk of still further reducing the domestic crop of wool.

There are two basic reasons why the wool industry in the United States should be preserved. The first is that very few materials are of more strategic importance in time of war than wool. War cannot be waged without wool, particularly wars in cold climates; and until somebody can guarantee to this country that we are not going to have any more wars, then we have no right to make ourselves dependent on a source of wool 10,000 miles away.

The other reason why we should maintain the domestic wool industry is that cutting the price away down would spell economic ruin for 11 or 12 States in the West, and would seriously injure the agriculture of some 20 or 22 other States. There are 48 States in the Union, Mr. President, and the level at which the economy of every one of them is maintained affects every one of the other 47 States. We cannot afford to let the sheep growers of Utah and Wyoming or Idaho or Oregon or California be ruined. It would have a very serious effect on the agricultural and industrial economy of all the rest of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely want to make a remark at that point.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to say, and then I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Wyoming, that the wool trade throughout the years has performed very useful service. It has bought wool from the producers here and abroad and has supplied our mills, our manufacturers, with a steady supply of wool of the grades they wanted when they wanted it. They have performed a very useful service indeed in that respect. They have made money; indeed, they have made a great deal of money during the war; but in the course of the hearings when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] engaged in a discussion with some of the wool traders and told them how much money they had made, they replied, "Yes, we have made a lot of money, but we have made it on the foreign wool; we have not made much money on the domestic wool." Therefore, I do not think our wool trade would be hurt particularly if the domestic wool growing were reduced a great deal further, and provided, of course, that we did not engage in war. Our wool trade would continue making money on the foreign wool; they told us in the committee that they made more money on foreign wool than they did by handling domestic wool, which the Commodity Credit Corporation had turned over to them to handle; but our wool manufacturers would suffer terrifically if Great Britain should ever get a monopoly of the world wool market.

We ought to remember what happened in the case of rubber. It went down to 3 cents, and then it became a Government monopoly. The price went to 22 cents, and we had to pay whatever price was asked. If any other country on earth should ever get a monopoly of the wool market of the world, our manufacturers would find that they would not be paying 90 percent of parity, but would be paying every dollar the traffic would bear, every dollar they have. They would be even greater losers than the growers who would have to go out of business.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yeld?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I made inquiry of the junior Senator from Wyoming as to the sufficiency of the general statement of the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation was undertaking to support wool in 1946. Subsequently I spoke to the Senator from Vermont, who was kind enough to check the matter to the present time. I should be glad if he would be so kind as to place in the RECORD the result of his investigation.

Mr. AIKEN. Since the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Wyoming took place, I have talked with the Undersecretary of Agriculture, and he advises me that 41.6 cents was the price for the year at which wool was supported during 1946. The only variation was a little higher for better grades, and a little lower for poorer grades; which was perfectly proper.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, do I understand that the price under this proposed bill would be 41.6 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be not less than 41.6, if it were insisted that the words "not less" be in it. We do not know whether we are headed for a depression or an inflation. There should be some leeway for the Department of Agriculture to protect the wool grower in the event the rest of the prices changed so rapidly it could not be checked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, does he not know that this computation is 12.9 cents a pound higher than the average price of wool between the years 1934 to 1943?

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say the average price for wool, 1934 to 1943, according to the Department of Agriculture, was 28.7 cents per pound, and the proposal under this bill supports the price at 12.9 cents per pound higher than the average for those 9 years. In other words, we are supposed to support wool at the highest wartime price known, is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the figures the Senator from Delaware is producing, but I will not say "Yes."

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will find the figures on page 353 of the agricultural statistics for 1946.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the figures; but I want to say that if the prices of commodities go back to the 1933, 1934, or 1935 level the economy of the country will become bankrupt. With a $260,000,000,000 debt hanging over our heads Government bonds probably would not be worth much more than the paper they are printed on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if depression prices hit 60 percent of the agriculture of the United States which is not under the agricultural support programs, and the other 40 percent of farmers are guaranteed wartime prices, how can the 60 percent keep the 40 percent going? How can the farmers of the Senator's own State help support the farmers whose prices are guaranteed?

Mr. AIKEN. We must be fair to all farmers of the country. If we continue

the use of the parity formula it must be brought up to date so as to be fair to all farmers, and we must maintain a high level of prices for farm products if we are to keep the country on an economically stable basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the Senator be willing to venture a guess as to what it would cost to maintain the level of all agricultural commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont would not want to venture a guess as to what the prices of anything should be 6 months from now. The Senator from Vermont is convinced that we cannot put the United States at the mercy of any other part of the world in respect to wool until we are sure that we are not going to engage in any future war, and we cannot put our woolen manufacturers at the mercy of any other nation of the world unless we expect them to pay more than they can pay, unless we want to see the domestic woolen industry follow the wool production in its decline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself and his colleague [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts on behalf of himself and his colleague.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say that on the voice vote on the passage of the bill I shall vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 814) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the wool bill which was just passed. Early this afternoon when there was a record vote on taking up the bill I was down town on official business in behalf of a constituent and could not be in the Senate Chamber for that vote. I was here, however, when the voice vote was taken on the passage of the bill. I want the RECORD to show that I voted to pass the bill.

NOMINATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Before Senators leave the Chamber I should like to make a request for unanimous consent as follows:

I request unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, April 9, at 5 p. m., the Senate go into executive session and proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the questions of the confirmation of the Chairman and the other members appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission, each appointee to be voted upon separately, and in the order in which their names appear on the Executive Calendar; I further ask unanimous consent that immediately thereafter a vote, without debate, be had on the question of the confirmation of the General Manager of the Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, I ask what will be done between now and Wednesday?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Between now and Wednesday I understand other business can be discussed. This request would fix the exact time for voting. Meanwhile, between now and Wednesday at 5, any Member of the Senate who can obtain the floor and desires to discuss any matters in connection with Mr. Lilienthal or other members nominated to the Atomic Energy Commission can do so. The request requires that a vote in executive session shall be taken at 5 o'clock on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 87, Senate bill 938, the bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] may be recognized when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, in order that he may have charge of and speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the senior Senator from Maine? Hearing none, the request is granted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear that while Senate bill 938 has been made the unfinished business and will be taken up at noon tomorrow, it is my understanding that it may be temporarily laid aside in the course of the day for the consideration of two or three other measures upon which there is expected to be very little controversy, but for which there is present necessity for action. The first, as I understand, will be House bill 2102, Calendar No. 49, relating to the farm labor supply. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] made a request in my behalf in connection with the program for tomorrow. I wish to say that if I can arrange it with the President pro tempore [laughter] I should like to be recognized at noon tomorrow to discuss the Greek and Turkish assistance bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan stated that the Greek-Turkish loan measure might be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of one or two other measures. He referred particularly to the farm-labor bill. I wonder if I may ask him what other bills he had in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill, for one.

Mr. WHERRY. Also the resolution of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] providing for an investigation of the appointment of certain postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that they are matters which will require very little time.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Keefe, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii. (Mr. Heine is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired June 26, 1946.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR

Carl E. Rice

DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON

Norman F. Gerrie

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Alma Coaker, Fruitdale, Ala., in place of L. J. Burnes, retired.

ALASKA

Retha M. Young, Haines, Alaska, in place of A. H. Kingsbury, Jr., resigned.

ARKANSAS

Dwight B. Witherspoon, Hunter, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Ivy A. Dahl, Mokelumne Hill, Calif., in place of F. E. Dahl, deceased.

Grace D. Hyde, Thousand Palms, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

John A. McConnell, Westley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Floyd R. Duncan, Del Norte, Colo., in place of N. M. Weiss, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Earle G. Donegan, Windsor, Conn., in place of A. E. Lennox, deceased.

FLORIDA

Robert O. Seaver, Clermont, Fla., in place of F. M. Bowman, resigned.

GEORGIA

Jessie N. Hope, Pembroke, Ga., in place of M. E. Harvey, deceased.

ILLINOIS

James A. Giesler, Cisco, Ill., in place of Marilla Clover, retired.

Donald R. Toberman, Coffeen, Ill., in place of J. H. Whitten, resigned.

John G. Robben, Germantown, Ill., in place of G. H. Henken, deceased.

Gerald L. Hamer, Olivet, Ill., in place of L. J. Willison, resigned.

Lincoln A. Hardcastle, Royalton, Ill., in place of J. S. Browning, deceased.

Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.

Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.

IOWA

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton, Iowa, in place of K. C. Warner, retired.

Clyde M. Maulsby, Plover, Iowa, in place of M. K. Bruner, resigned.

Marvin O. Larson, Thompson, Iowa, in place of O. J. Johnson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Lynn R. Rich, Jr., Barlow, Ky., in place of H. R. Tanner, resigned.

Thomas M. Murray, Prospect, Ky., in place of T. H. Skaggs, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Rosa M. Owens, Frierson, La., in place of Rusk Stallcup, retired.

MAINE

Robert M. Dolloff, Brooks, Maine, in place of F. S. Littlefield, transferred.

Emma L. Davis, Hampden, Maine, in place of A. W. Braithwaite, retired.

MARYLAND

Milton T. Holt, Brandywine, Md., in place of S. G. Townshend, Jr., transferred.

Mary R. Schmidt, Eccleston, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

William E. Spoerlein, Oakland, Md., in place of I. R. Rudy, resigned.

Cornelia W. Hickman, Point of Rocks, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edward P. Harris, Snow Hill, Md., in place of E. W. Marshall, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gertrude M. Fallon, North Chelmsford, Mass., in place of J. E. Harrington, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Isabell H. Cumberworth, Rives Junction, Mich., in place of E. M. Southworth, resigned.

John J. McLaughlin, Twin Lake, Mich., in place of W. F. Reddy, removed.

MINNESOTA

Irene Rutter, Kinney, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

MISSISSIPPI

John Cecil Thead, Crandall, Miss., in place of G. H. Fleming, transferred.

Martha M. Chapman, Friar Point, Miss., in place of T. A. Chapman, deceased.

Hilliard E. Jordan, Kosciusko, Miss., in place of R. S. Burroughs, resigned.

Oliver Theo Fowler, Sweatman, Miss., in place of L. R. Adams, retired.

MISSOURI

Lester F. Bain, Fornfelt, Mo., in place of F. F. Klughart, resigned.

Paul A. Davidson, Illmo, Mo., in place of C. V. Hollady, resigned.

Floyd J. Strain, Louisburg, Mo., in place of H. W. Atchley, resigned.

Charles N. Bruton, Rosebud, Mo., in place of E. G. Karstedt, retired.

Adrian J. D. Ockerby, Wentworth, Mo., in place of E. F. Gorman, Jr., transferred.

Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.

NEVADA

Sue Smith, Fernley, Nev., in place of A. B. Jackson, resigned.

NEW YORK

Frank H. Doyle, Stuyvesant, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Anna E. Finkle, West Copake, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Foster B. Tice, West Edmeston, N. Y., in place of O. I. Mayne, deceased.

George G. Ferrell, West Point, N. Y., in place of G. L. Harrington, retired.

OHIO

Thomas E. Sexton, Groveport, Ohio, in place of B. L. Peer, removed.

Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Paul F. Spillman, Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of T. C. Gilroy, transferred.

OREGON

Albert C. Gragg, Salem, Oreg., in place of H. R. Crawford, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nancy C. Tishue, Addison, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr., Oakford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William D. Adair, Clinton, S. C., in place of R. L. Plaxico, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Ottis C. Doyle, Jr., McEwen, Tenn., in place of J. W. Fuqua, deceased.

Fred Henry, Maryville, Tenn., in place of M. A. B. Dunn, deceased.

Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

L. H. Searcy, Stinnett, Tex., in place of W. R. Goodwin, resigned.

UTAH

Louise Y. Monson, Moroni, Utah, in place of F. T. Draper, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Gertrude G. Chinn, Hague, Va., in place of E. B. Chinn, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.

Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo, Wash., in place of C. J. Peterson, resigned.

Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith, Wash., in place of L. B. Kelly, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Farris, Capels, W. Va., in place of A. E. Dowdy, resigned.

Lillian M. Brown, Dunlow, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clifton George Bowers, Hollidays Cove, W. Va., in place of J. C. Cameron, deceased.

William A. Johnson, Layland, W. Va., in place of D. H. Beverage, declined.

WISCONSIN

William C. Carroll, Gays Mills, Wis., in place of W. B. Ackerman, deceased.

Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.

Ann O. Ball, Tomahawk, Wis., in place of T. J. Kelley, removed.

WYOMING

George P. Hicks, Jr., Casper, Wyo., in place of E. P. Landers, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King eternal, as we stand in the afterglow of the Eastertide, we praise Thee for Him who is the fulfillment of Thy prophecy of old. We are grateful that the hands which hung upon the cross have opened the gates of Paradise to all believers. Impress us, O God, with His marvelous example of self-surrender and self-sacrifice for the redemption of man. Grant that His wonderful influence may more and more envelop humanity throughout this sad, sad earth.

In the light of His triumph, we pray that we may ever be encouraged with the growing faith that truth is stronger than falsehood and that goodness is destined to live through the ages; though it may seem to be buried in darkness, yet shall it rise again to life immortal.

Let all things seen and unseen their notes in gladness blend,
For Christ the Lord hath risen, our joy that hath no end.

Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] may address the House for 30 minutes today after the dis-

position of any other special orders and business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of any other special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a radio address by Henry J. Taylor and in the other an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

ARMY DAY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago the call to arms came to a generation of Americans that knew not war. The exploits of those veterans of World War I made history. They thought they had fought that war would come no more, only to find that within a generation war had again struck and that again the youth of this Nation went forth.

The exploits of these youngsters, so many thousands of them sons of the veterans of World War I, were typical and followed the great example set by their fathers, exceeding them in many cases—bringing for a second time a glorious victory.

Today in this city a great parade takes place to show to the people of this country and to the earth that the military might of these United States is still great—strength to be used if necessary, though our prayers are that that call will not again come to our youth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances, in one to include a letter from Calvin Lieberman on coffee and in the other in include a letter from Virginia Meyer on sugar.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Norman Sweet and an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by William L. Shirer.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain correspondence between himself and Mr. Clark, the Attorney General, and Mr. Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the subject of communism.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a petition on the American Legion of Oklahoma.

THE PHENOMENON OF THE GREEK LOAN

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter presented to us of the so-called Greek loan perhaps presents to the Members of Congress a phenomenon, perhaps an enigma.

An outstanding teacher took his daughter to the pasture field one Sunday afternoon. She did not know what a phenomenon was. She said, "Some say it is this way, some say it is that way; I do not know what it is. What is it, Daddy?"

"I will illustrate it to you, daughter. See that mockingbird over yonder in the tree? That is not a phenomenon; that is natural. See that thistle? That is a weed. That is not a phenomenon; that is natural. See that cow over there mooing? That is natural; that is a cow; that is not a phenomenon. But if that cow should sit on a thistle and sing like a mockingbird, that would be a phenomenon."

Members of Congress have a so-called phenomenon and enigma before them.

They are told by one group, and even some go so far as to testify that should we not make this loan and send troops, Russia will seize the Dardenelles and the Mediterranean and by atomic weapons and otherwise will take us over and there will be world communism. On the other hand, we are told that if we do send troops war is inevitable. There are the middle-of-the-roaders who say, "Send money but do not send troops." The enigma or phenomenon is that there is no direct answer to a direct question asked by a Representative of the people. Some in the State Department say, "We do not intend that there be a war," but they do not answer, "There will not be a war is you follow our plan." There are some 6,000 of our bulldozers in Greece and equipment ready for agriculture. If troops are sent they will not be instructed to teach in agriculture and to till the soil to relieve the food situation, or will the excitement of troops be an impetus to war? No direct question is answered. Folks ask the question, "Why?" Yes, why are there refresher courses now in the Pentagon Building instructing troops—to be sent—in the Greek language and some say in the Turkish language? The answers are not clear. Some say there is practically no instruction; others claim instruction with a meaning. But no direct answer. All Members of Congress are constrained to feel that where there is distress food and instruction in agriculture will be sent if need be. The question is before a vote is taken, "What is imperative?" The representatives of the people, the Members of Congress, will stand up and be counted. They want complete answers before that day. We must answer. They must not be bewildered by a phenomenon or an enigma.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

The Honorable HOMER A. RAMEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My congratulations to you in bringing your message directly to the people you represent: Herein was founded the great faith of the people toward the late President Roosevelt.

You asked for comments on your message; I write you both as an interested citizen and as a friend of your son, Bern. I am a veteran of the last war and a student of history at the University of Toledo. Here are a few conclusions drawn from the scientific pages of history.

One of the original founders of the USSR said any state that was controlled by the military was necessarily a weak state. I am concerned by the growing power of the military in our National Government. What happened after the rule of Marcus Aurelius in the Roman Empire: A century of military anarchy and fall of the state. Why? Simply because the generals took the power invested by the people in their civilian representatives. Can you, sir, as a Congressman, see any connection between these current developments? A growing number of generals and admirals in important civilian governmental positions; the surreptitious Army-Navy merger bill; other Washington legislation granting peculiar power to the services; War Department campaigns promoting one-sided arguments in favor of universal military training; a stepped up War Department program to legislate upon colleages an ROTC program; the recent resignation of our civilian Secretary of State, Byrnes—and now a new situation in the Balkans, Greece? Is this phenomena merely coincidental? The lessons of history say not.

A word about the Greek crisis. This, as is any international situation, is not a moral question, otherwise UNRRA would not be dead and we would be putting $400,000,000 into food, seeds, livestock, and clothing for the Greeks. Can the $400,000,000 we are granting (or proposing to grant) the Greek state earn interest into itself? Can this money earn a profit for the Greek people so that they may from this initial capital establish the industrial production and agriculture required of any state for endurance? Or is this money being, potentially, used to galvanize the nonreproductive element of the Greek Government? What will happen when this primary investment in the Greek military forces has been depleted? Or is our capacity for this sort of contribution unlimited? Again, I think not. And with every gift of this sort the American standard of living is lowered just one more degree.

Now, dear sir, let us do that which many American diplomats seem incapable of doing; let us put ourselves in the Soviet Government's position. Let us face pure fact. President Truman's inspiration to feed, clothe, and arm the Greek Army while the Greek populous is starving is his threat against the expansion of Soviet influence. Now, let us see what makes it possible for this Soviet expansion.

If the economic foundations of a state are weakened, the political oundations of that state will be likewise weakened. No doubt, it was upon this premise that the Soviets came to power in Russia. It is upon this same premise that the Soviet control will either expand or contract in the future.

Very well, by President Truman's unsubtle undeclared war against the Soviets he is, in effect, saying we will send ever more and more millions of dollars and military advisors to any state anywhere which deems itself to be in fear of potential Soviet influence. In this roll, upon which we are about to cast ourselves, the potentialities are boundless, the probabilities disasterous. If the Soviet Government deems it necessary to counter our move, her reciprocity, I am sure, would be justified.

Perhaps a bit of speculation would now be in order. What would prevent the Soviets from creating other situations in a number of the other various states in Europe and the middle east? Other European and Asiatic countries, having observed our commitm nts to Greece, would cry out for similar aid. Thereafter military power in all the states concerned would grow incessantly more powerful, while the economic structure of the states concerned, ourselves included, would grow incessantly weaker. By simple logic, if the economic foundations of any state are weakened, it is potentially vulnerable to Soviet ideas. Ironically enough, President Truman's plan to save the world from Soviet domination might well lead the world to Soviet subjugation.

Finally, what of the UN's position in this whole matter? Why did not Greece appeal to the UN for financial aid from the world bank? Could it be possible that certain factions in our Government advised Greece not to appeal to the UN? Certainly we are not to believe the weak excuses forwarded to the effect that a quicker decision is needed here than the UN could give. Undoubtedly our action has been in presumptious violation of the UN, and definitely contemptuous of its ardent founder, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I feel certain that if the power of the military in the United States is not checked—and checked soon—we will have taken the irrepairable, unretractable steps toward atomic war.

Your message, to which I referred in my first paragraph, was your radio address of Saturday, March 15, transcribed via station WTOL. In closing, may I ask what your definite views are in regard to these topics I have mentioned?

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. TULLER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

REGIMENTATION AND HITLERIAN CONTROL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the believers in a planned economy are making a last ditch struggle for a chance to rule and ruin America.

The people of America are fed up with regimentation and Hitleristic controls. I wish to cite an example of such. An operator of a farmers' store in a county seat in Nebraska deposited sugar-ration stamps in a local bank in the amount of 800 pounds. The bank erroneously gave him credit for 80,000 pounds. The OPA never discovered the error, but the grocer did. He promptly returned the stamps for 79,200 pounds of sugar.

Thereafter, the OPA charged this same grocer with some trivial and unimportant errors in connection with his sugar stamps. His right to sell sugar was taken away for 60 days. At the end of that time he was required to get the consent of the OPA to resume the sale of sugar. He was informed that that consent could only be had by securing enough sugar to balance his stamp account. The OPA ought to know that the only way this merchant can get sugar to make up for a technical error is to buy it on the black market at $31 or more per hundred.

Mr. Speaker, is it the objective of the OPA to force this man into the black market, or is it their objective to force him out of business altogether?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

A CHARTER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Eightieth Congress convened we new Members were feted by the Washington Board of Trade. It was there that I first learned of my importance as 1 of 531 members of the Town Council of the City of Washington. I appreciate this high honor and will exercise my utmost to properly discharge the duties of the office, but it seems to me that, as Members of the Congress of the United States, we have so many pressing problems, national and international in scope, that we should concentrate our abilities on their solution rather than to dissipate our time and energies with purely municipal problems.

When such matters as the Greco-Turkish loan cry out to the Congress for speedy solution, why should our time be taken up with determining the feasibility of constructing an underpass at Dupont Circle? When the great tasks of reducing taxes, balancing the budget, and paying off the national debt hold first place on our agenda, why should Members of this body spend hours of their time hearing testimony concerning a bill regulating the possession of firearms in the District of Columbia? We spent almost a full legislative day last month deciding that the milk cows of the Midwest would not properly function if the citizens of the District of Columbia operated on daylight-saving time. Soon again we must decide the same issue. I voted for daylight-saving time before, and I shall vote for it again, but my point is that we should not be dissipating our precious time on matters of purely local concern when our big job is to legislate on national and international problems.

This Congress should grant the District of Columbia a charter providing for a legislative body of its own, which would have more time, more inclination, and a better knowledge of local problems with which to legislate for the good of the District. I urge that such action be taken by the Congress.

COMMUNISM—PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech made by President Truman on last Saturday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have come to a show-down between atheistic communism and Christian civilization; between oriental sovietism and the western way of life; between treason in the United States and American patriotism.

A leader of one of the great veterans' organizations said the other day that he regarded Joe Stalin as the Genghis Khan of the twentieth century. The battle we are in now is just as serious as that which confronted Europe during the terrible days when Genghis Khan and his ruthless hordes threatened the civilization of mankind.

Every Communist newspaper in America, every Communist speaker in America, is maligning and abusing President Truman because of his attitude on this proposition. They fear he is blocking their treasonable attempts to get control of this country.

Whether you propose to go along with President Truman all the way or not, the time has come when America—when the American people—must know that the most dangerous and insidious influence that ever crept into this country is this oriental communism that is plotting our destruction.

You might as well attempt to pet a rattlesnake or tame a hyena as to try to make peace with communism.

Nothing that a Communist says can be relied upon, and no agreement one would sign would be worth the paper it is written on.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting the address of President Truman which I trust every one of you will read and study carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S SPEECH AT JEFFERSON DAY DINNER

My fellow Democrats, our meeting together this evening carries forward an old party custom. In this annual tribute to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, we, who are members of the party he founded—the Democratic Party—take great pride and feel deep satisfaction.

We know that as long as we remain free, the spirit of Thomas Jefferson lives in America. His spirit is the spirit of freedom. We are heartened by the knowledge that the light he kindled a century and a half ago shines today, in the United States. It shines even more strongly and steadily than in his time. What was then an untried faith is now a living reality.

But we know that no class, no party, no nation, has a monopoly on Jefferson's principles. Out of the silence of oppressed peoples, out of despair of those who have lost freedom, there comes to us an expression of longing. Repeated again and again, in many tongues, from many directions, it is a plea of men, women, and children for the freedom that Thomas Jefferson proclaimed as an inalienable right.

When we hear the cry for freedom arising from shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote:

"Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another."

MUST MAKE PROTEST EFFECTIVE

We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

We, too, have declared our protest.

We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say "We don't want war." We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world.

We know how the fire starts. We have seen it before—aggression by the strong against the weak, openly by the use of armed force and secretly by infiltration. We know how the fire spreads. And we know how it ends.

Let us not underestimate the task before us. The burden of our responsibility today is greater, even considering the size and resources of our expanded Nation, than it was in the time of Jefferson and Monroe. For the peril to man's freedom that existed then exists now on a much smaller earth—an earth whose broad oceans have shrunk and whose natural protections have been taken away by new weapons of destruction.

What is the responsibility that we must assume?

EDIFICE OF LASTING PEACE

Our responsibility is to stand guard before the edifice of lasting peace which, after so long a time, is at last being built.

That edifice is the United Nations.

The function of the United Nations is to quench the flames wherever they may break out; to watch throughout the world and extinguish every spark that comes from a difference between governments; to do this, if possible, through the machinery of peaceful arbitration, but to do it in any case. This is so, even if armed conflict must be prevented by the use of an international police force.

We believe that formula is sound and workable. Our faith in it is strong and resolute. The United Nations is man's hope of putting out, and keeping out, the fires of war for all time. In supporting the United Nations we must, when necessary, supplement its activities. By aiding free nations to maintain their freedom we strengthen the United Nations in the performance of its functions.

The foreign policy of this country transcends in importance any other question confronting us. It would be fatal if it were to become the subject of narrow political consideration.

Our foreign policy must not be wrecked on the rocks of partisanship.

United support of a policy that serves the interests of the Nation as a whole must be our aim.

BIPARTISAN EFFORT PRAISED

I wish to commend the efforts of those members of both parties who have worked, side by side, to achieve this goal.

To meet the responsibilities placed upon us today this Nation must be strong. A strong United States means a country that maintains a military power commensurate with its responsibilities. It means a country of sound domestic economy. It means a country that holds its place in the forefront of industrial production and continues its leadership in creating the techniques of abundance. And it means, most of all, a strong, united, confident people, clear in the knowledge of their country's destiny, unshaken and unshakable in their resolve to live in a world of free peoples at peace.

No matter how great our military potential may be, military potential alone is not enough. It is necessary that we maintain sufficient military strength to convince the world that we intend to meet our responsibilities.

Now, what of our domestic economy? How strong are we at home?

As we appraise our domestic scene—our mighty array of factories, mines, farms, producing at or near capacity, and with employment at an all-time high—our doubts, if we had any, are put to rest. We are viewing a panorama of prosperity—such prosperity as no generation of Americans before us ever experienced.

CALAMITY PREDICTIONS WRONG

You may recall hearing dire predictions, in the last year and a half—predictions that the United States was heading into an economic crack-up, predictions of glutted markets, of a great deflationary plunge. It is significant that the most pessimistic cries of calamity came from men who had little confidence in our American system of free enterprise.

They were wrong in their predictions. They were wrong because they do not understand the strength of our system of free competitive enterprise. Under that system, each man is free to go where he likes, to follow the calling of his choice, and to be rewarded in proportion to the productivity of the effort or the property he contributes. Insofar as we insure that each individual has the opportunity and inducement to make the largest contribution he can to this country's total production, we not only strengthen our Nation against any possible encroachments, but we also set an example to all other peoples of the desirability of free government in the economic as well as the political sense.

Our country's financial stamina was tested in the recent war as it had never been tested before. But in spite of the tremendous cost of the war, we emerged with our financial leadership in the economic world greater than ever before. Beyond making our best effort to eliminate waste in the conduct of the war, the cost of the war was not a matter within our power to control. We emerged bearing a burden of debt, representing that cost, and what we do with that burden is a question of tremendous import, but fortunately it is a question that we have the power to decide for ourselves.

The first decision that we made was to reduce Federal Government spending as quickly as possible.

The extent of retrenchments by the Government is shown by the record.

PROGRESS AGAINST DEFICITS

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government spent $100,000,000,000. In 1946 we cut expenditures to $64,000,000,000. In 1947 we have further reduced expenditures to an estimated figure of $42,000,000,000. The budget for the next fiscal year, which I have sent to the Congress, totals $37,500,000,000.

Not only have we greatly reduced expenditures, but we have made tremendous progress toward the elimination of deficits.

In the fiscal year 1945, the Federal Government had a deficit of over $53,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1946 it was in the red by about $21,000,000,000. But now we have worked our way into the black, and I am happy to be able to say tonight that for the present fiscal year 1947 we shall balance the budget and we shall have a surplus.

I am determined that stringent economy shall govern all peacetime operations of the Government.

When the several departments and agencies were called upon, a few months ago, to submit their requests for funds for the coming fiscal year, they were told of my determination.

They responded by eliminating many of their former activities. This was not enough. When the estimates were in, I went over them, making further substantial reductions. When I finished, these department estimates had been reduced by a total of some $7,000,000,000 under their original level.

SACRIFICES REQUIRED

I was warned by some that I was going too far. I was aware of the risk. But I was aware, too, of the greater risk of a weakened postwar financial structure. I knew that in the public interest, sacrifices of some Government services had to be made.

The result was a budget of $37,500,000,000. That figure marked the border line beyond which we could not reduce the activities of our Government without entering the area of false economy. In other words, further so-called economies would not have been economies at all. They would merely have meant curtailment of services that would cost our taxpayers—all taxpayers—more than the reduction in cost that appeared on the surface.

You, my fellow citizens, are properly cautious of false economy in your daily lives. If the foundation of your house needs repair, or if the roof leaks, you know that you are wasting money, not saving it, by failing to make that repair.

So with Government. If we abandon our work of reclamation, of soil conservation, of preserving our forests, of developing our water resources, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cease our vigilance along the borders of our country and at our ports of entry, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we falsely economize by reducing the staff of men and women who audit tax returns, or who increase the country's productivity by settling labor disputes, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cut down the effectiveness of our armed forces, we run the risk of wasting both money and lives.

Any substantial reduction of the 1948 Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress, must be clearly understood by the American people as a venture into false economy. To the extent that we countenance any such reduction, we shall weaken our own house by our refusal to keep it in basic repair. At best, this is poor judgment. At worst, it is an invitation to disaster.

PROBLEM OF PUBLIC DEBT

The second decision we must make, affecting the strength and health of our economy, concerns the public debt. We must resolve to begin the long process of reducing that debt, which represents a large part of the cost of winning World War II. That debt amounts to almost $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In deciding whether we shall start substantial payment on the debt, or whether we shall reduce taxes instead, we are deciding a question which will affect the future of

every one of us. Our decision will affect the number of jobs in the future, the wages men and women will earn, what those wages will buy, and how much our savings, our insurance, and our bonds will be worth.

We, as a nation, are now having prosperous years. This is the time when we must start paying off the debt in earnest. When a man is earning good wages, and at the same time owes a lot of money, he is wise if he uses his excess income to pay off his debts. He would be short-sighted if he cut his income just because he was not spending it all at the moment. When the people, through their Government owe a lot of money—as we do today—it is the course of wisdom to make payment on our debt. It would be extremely short-sighted to cut down the Federal revenue without making a real effort toward debt reduction.

I recognize, frankly, that the present burden of taxation on our people is too heavy to be considered as permanent, and at a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust that burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

CONCERNED OVER PRICE LEVEL

In further evaluating the strength of our domestic economy, I must express to you my deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today. A system of free enterprise does not automatically work out its own adjustments without our giving thought to the process.

The main factor that can weaken our economy at this time is our own selfishness—the kind of selfishness which is now expressed in the form of unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. These prices must be brought down if our entire economy is not to suffer.

With the exception of a very few items, all price controls have been removed. But freedom from such controls, like other freedoms, cannot be abused with impunity. A profound moral responsibility rests upon those citizens whose decisions have widespread effect on our markets—to put it simply, the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits. The alternative is inflation, industry priced out of the market, and eventually, men priced out of their jobs.

The world today looks to us for leadership.

The force of events make it necessary that we assume that role.

This is a critical period of our national life. The process of adapting ourselves to the new concept of our world responsibility is naturally a difficult and painful one. The cost is necessarily great.

NOT OUR NATURE TO SHIRK

But it is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this Nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people.

We are the people who gave to the world George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We are a people who not only cherish freedom and defend it, if need be with our lives, but who also recognize the right of other men and other nations to share it.

While the struggle for the rights of man goes forward in other parts of the world, the free people of America cannot look on with easy detachment, with indifference to the outcome.

In our effort to make permanent the peace of the world, we have much to preserve—much to improve—and much to pioneer.

As we strive to reach the fulfillment of our quest we will do well to recall the words of Thomas Jefferson:

"I have sworn, upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

MAJ. JAMES G. HORRELL AGAINST ALEXANDER AKERMAN, JR.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon the Legislature of the State of Florida will meet in its usual biennial session. At that time there will be a contest over one of the seats for representative from Orlando, Orange County, Fla.

Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has injected himself into this contest without knowing the facts in the case.

In the State of Florida, where there are more than one representative from a county, they run in groups in the primaries. Orange County has two representatives. Therefore they have one from group 1 and one from group 2. The contest in this case will be between the Democrat, Maj. James G. Horrell, a former representative in the legislature from Orange County, and the Republican, Alexander Akerman, Jr., of Winter Park, a suburb of Orlando. The contest arises over the fact that Major Horrell in the Democratic primaries qualified in group 1 and Mr. Akerman qualified in the Republican primaries in group 2. Major Horrell had no opposition in the Democratic primary and so far as the public knew very little in the general election. Mr. Leland Chubb qualified against Major Horrell and Major Horrell defeated him by a big majority.

Mr. Akerman on occasion informed Major Horrell that he qualified in group 2 to avoid opposing him, according to Major Horrell's statement, and I, being present during the primaries and the general election campaign, recall distinctly in the general election campaign that Mr. Akerman continually referred to the Democratic nominee in group 2 as his opponent, appearing on the same platform with him at the junior chamber of commerce, whereas he never in any way indicated in his campaign that he was opposing Major Horrell. Major Horrell and Mr. Chubb appeared on the same platform together at the junior chamber of commerce.

The fact emerges that shortly before the election Mr. Akerman did tell Major Horrell that he felt that the two men receiving the highest votes would be the representatives, regardless of groupings—this all after he had given the public the impression that he considered himself the opponent only of Mr. Cobb, the Democratic nominee, and not the opponent of Major Horrell. At no time was it publicized that Mr. Akerman was opposing Major Horrell and of course Major Horrell's friends, realizing that he had no opposition in Mr. Chubb, did not give him the high vote that he would have received had Mr. Akerman declared that he was opposing Major Horrell and Mr. Cobb.

I venture to say without any fear of contradiction that had Mr. Akerman from the beginning declared that he was opposing both Democratic nominees, Major Horrell would have defeated him by a splendid majority. Mr. Cobb did defeat him but owing to the deceptive campaign that Mr. Akerman carried on he got a higher vote than Major Horrell.

Mr. Carroll Reece injects himself into the contest by wiring Mr. Akerman and in his wire he implies a threat against the Florida Legislature of retaliation in States where the Republicans control the legislature if the Florida Legislature fails to seat Mr. Akerman. He injects himself into the contest by saying of the contest, and I quote:

I am further informed that the contestant—

Maj. James G. Horrell—

in this case is attempting to induce the Democratic majority in the legislature to refuse to seat you under provision in the Florida Constitution providing: "That each House is the judge of the qualifications, elections and returns of its own members."

Mr. Reece also says, and I quote:

This would appear to me to be an attempt to induce the legislature to refuse to seat a duly elected member on the sole ground that he belongs to a party other than that represented by a majority of the legislature.

This is a most asinine statement. Major Horrell's brief distributed to the members of the legislature indicates no such attempt.

I have heard of no general move to seat Major Horrell instead of Mr. Akerman, a Republican. But if there were such a move, it is an insult to the intelligence of the members of the legislature to assume that they would attempt to disqualify Mr. Akerman for any such stupid reason. We have had a Republican in the legislature once before, and he was not disqualified. Mr. Reece goes further and makes himself offensive to any intelligent individual when he implies his threat of retaliation in the Republican-controlled legislatures if the Florida Legislature refuses to seat Mr. Akerman. In his telegram referring to the contest he says this would "of course be an obvious invitation to the other party to adopt retaliatory measures elsewhere." He also says:

If that same principle were applied in Washington, for example, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives could have refused to seat all Democrats elected last November, including the six Democratic Representatives from Florida.

I might remind Mr. Reece that it was just such interference by the carpetbaggers in the affairs of the Southern States which has made it possible for the Democratic Party to control these States continuously since the carpetbag days.

I may also remind Mr. Reece that in no State outside of the South has one party controlled the State continuously for that long. I would also like to remind him if his implied suggestion of retaliation had been adopted earlier, there would have been no Republican in Congress for the last 16 years. Mr. Reece's implied suggestion would set a most dangerous precedent for his own party and one which would lead only to chaos.

High officials in the Democratic Party would take no part or interfere in any way in this contest in the State legisla-

ture, and I would suggest that Mr. Reece keep out of it also.

When the Legislature of the State of Florida decides this contest between the Republican, Mr. Akerman, and the Democrat, Major Horrell, they will decide it on reasonable grounds, and if I know the people of Florida, which I think I do, being a native of that State, they will decide the contest without any suggestion or without any advice, interference, or meddling of Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOLGER (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include articles appearing in the United States News and the Washington Post.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature memorializing Congress to extend the REA program.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include clippings from the New York Times regarding the earnings of 2,900 corporations for the past year.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 1 and include tables from the committee hearings.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include Assembly Joint Resolution 33 of the California State Legislature with reference to an application of the State of California to Congress for repossession and control over certain rights-of-way concerning the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has heretofore been granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript entitled "The Forces Patterning Tomorrow's Economic Life." It is found that the manuscript exceeds a little over the two pages allowed in the amount of $193.75, but I ask unanimous consent that the manuscript be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, from many parts of the country come reports of heavy flood damage. Rains of extremely heavy proportions and alarming flood waters are sweeping parts of the Midwest, inundating towns and villages and causing loss of life and heavy property damage. From Michigan comes the word of all-time record floods. The appeal to help is with us now and will bring angry demands if this Congress is deaf to flood suffering and privation.

In the face of these ominous warnings from the Midwest, I hear disturbing reports that our own Appropriations Committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, is considering the omitting of funds which might be used in preventing such catastrophes and in bringing relief to the suffering of our own people. I hope Republican economy will not go so far as to deny the help to our own people which we freely give to other peoples of the world. I hope when the Appropriations Committee gets together on this matter, it will not stint or engage in false economy when it comes to flood control and the proper handling of the water resources of this Nation.

AMERICANISM

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest privilege any man can possibly enjoy is to be an American. This privilege was given us all by our founding fathers when they wrote the Constitution.

Today Americanism is being challenged, not only here, but in many places throughout the world. Other isms are defying and defiling our conception of government and flaunting the sacred folds of our American flag.

The call to stand fast against the forces which would destroy our country has been sounded by the President and other national leaders. They would have us adopt a strong policy of striking back at the enemies of representative government.

Today a token force, symbolic of armed preparedness, will march up Constitution Avenue and around the Capitol. This will not be as impressive as in war years. There will not be the great numbers of men or mobile weapons.

All of which brings us to ask ourselves how well equipped are we to back up the demands our State Department is making in international councils? Will we be called upon to defend the diplomatic positions we are taking on far-flung territory and issues on every continent and ocean?

We must preserve Americanism at all costs. It is our definition of freedom and liberty, and we believe is our greatest hope today in a troubled and perplexed world.

But if we expect to preserve this way of life, we must be able to answer the question I just asked, How well prepared are we, and how does our power compare with other great powers, some of whom may not see eye to eye with us on the subject of Americanism. We owe it to the Americans we represent to keep this Nation strong so that we may all be secure and our future starry and bright.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very large number of strong protests from many organizations and officials of my district against orders of the Federal Government, issued through the CPA and FHA and other bureaus, to cease construction. These protests are signed by prominent and influential men of my community. Something must be done about it. I quote from a letter signed by the town fathers of the grand old town of Brewster:

> We suggest that you either throw them out, kick them out, or vote them out.

I wish I could.

ATTENTION: APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—A SAMPLE OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the following news article which appeared last week in my hometown paper, is a good illustration of the rush on the part of bureaucrats to spend public funds and to make commitments for future expenditures by increasing Federal pay rolls. I hope the Appropriations Committee will investigate.

[From the Red Wing Republican Eagle, Red Wing, Minn.]

SEEK ENGINEERS

Five hundred and fifty civil, electrical, and mechanical engineers are needed immediately by the Bureau of Reclamation at Denver, Colo., to design dams, canals, power plants, and other engineering features for the development of irrigation works and power facilities in the 17 western States. The local office of State Employment Service is participating in the campaign to secure professional men, who will receive from $3,397 to $4,902 per year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address he delivered before the Vermont Legislature.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters registering protest about the fact that labor legislation has not been passed by Congress. May I comment, in the hope that Members will take note of this, as it might aid them in the future, that for 3 weeks we went through our period of reorganization. Then for a week the Committee on Education and Labor met and considered their plans. For 6 weeks they listened to the testimony of 137 persons from all over the Nation, including representatives of labor, management, and the public at large, and heard 2,000,000 words of testimony in addition to the exhibits that were introduced in evidence. Following that, for 1 week, the subcommittee went to various parts of the Nation to take up questions that were involved in those particular localities. For 2 weeks we have now been drafting a labor bill that we believe will reach this House next week. I think when we consider the fact that we have done this while still in a state of war, trying to write a labor bill for peacetime, to overcome the effects of 14 years of hurried legislation, we are doing the best that we possibly can for the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CONFERENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our Under Secretary of State, Mr. William L. Clayton, accompanied by a staff of assistants, advisers, specialists, and so forth, leaves tomorrow for Geneva, Switzerland, to attend an international trade conference. Mr. Clayton and his assistants propose to do two things at this conference: First, negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with 18 other nations, and, second, to set up and establish an International Trade Organization as a department or branch of the United Nations organization, said International Trade Organization to have the power and authority to regulate, supervise, and control world trade. Our people are entitled to know what this Geneva conference proposes to do, what its objectives are, and what those objectives will mean in the economic life of this Nation if the International Trade Organization becomes operative in the future. I have, therefore, asked for this time in order to discuss the situation that confronts us today in connection with this Geneva conference, and to point out the possibilities and powers of this proposed International Trade Organization.

In order to get the proper perspective for this discussion, and in order to forecast the problematical outcome of the international economic poker game that we are to sit in at Geneva during the next few months, we should first review the results of other international poker games in which our State Department took part, with Uncle Sam furnishing the chips. I propose to review the past record of the State Department in these international poker games by asking a series of questions—a series of questions I was prevented from asking Mr. Clayton at a recent hearing of the Ways and Means Committee because a point of order was made against the questions. I now ask them from this floor, directing my questions to Mr. Clayton, to the Congress, and to the people of this Nation.

Question No. I: In the pre-Pearl Harbor days was the State Department either wise or right when it protested against proposed legislation to place an embargo upon shipments of scrap iron, high-octane gasoline, airplane parts, and other war material to Japan?

Question No. II: Was the State Department right when it advised President Roosevelt at Teheran and Yalta to give in to Russia, to carry on a program of appeasement, and to forget or ignore the Atlantic Charter in connection with Stalin's ambitions in Poland, in Germany, in the Baltic nations, and in Manchuria?

Question No. III: Was the State Department right when it agreed to and approved the so-called Morgenthau economic plan for postwar Germany, a plan that was both unsound and unworkable, a plan that if carried out would have wrecked the economic life of the whole of Europe?

Question No. IV: Was the State Department right when it consented to and approved the four-zone-divided-authority plan for occupied Germany, a plan that has proved a failure in every sense of the word, a plan that has become a tremendous handicap to the recovery of both Germany and Europe, a plan that is costing and will continue to cost Uncle Sam untold millions of dollars?

Question No. V: Was the State Department either wise or farseeing when it failed to urge—yes, even demand—that Joe Stalin be required to sign on the dotted line concerning his attitude and intentions toward Poland, Greece, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Manchuria before we turned over the $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease war materials that enabled him to withstand the assaults of Hitler's battalions at Stalingrad and other points? Are we not now placed in the position of trying to lock the door after the horse is stolen?

Question No. VI: Was the State Department either wise or farseeing when it failed to advise—yes, even demand—that Great Britain sign on the dotted line concerning present unsettled, troublesome, vexing world questions before we turned over to her the $30,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease war supplies? Is this not another case of hindsight being better than foresight?

Mr. Speaker, time and subsequent events prove that there can be only one answer to each of these six questions—and that answer is "No." In view of this summary of past events showing that our State Department failed woefully in its dealings with foreign powers, can we today be optimistic over the outcome of the international economic poker game about to start at Geneva? I say Uncle Sam will in all probability lose his economic shirt.

Mr. Speaker, our American economic system has brought us to the highest plane of industrial achievement of any people on earth. It has given the American laborer a wage unequaled anywhere on the face of the globe. It has helped us conduct successfully two world wars in the short span of 25 years—neither of them of our making; and it has enabled us to feed and finance nearly every country in the world. The keystone of our economic system—at least until the advent of the New Deal—was our protective tariff. Today a new program is about to be formulated that will destroy this keystone of American prosperity and success. At the Geneva Conference our State Department proposes to negotiate trade agreements with 18 foreign countries as a prerequisite to the establishment of an International Trade Organization, which—so the State Department claims—is essential in order to bring about international cooperation, and to promote world peace. The State Department intends these negotiations to be a part of a larger plan of world economic cooperation, stemming from the Atlantic Charter. The plan calls for our participation in world currency stabilization, world banking, and other world economic, food, and social councils.

The proposed International Trade Organization has a very wide and dangerous significance. It embraces the intricate maneuverings of international-trade domination and world finance. It is essentially a scheme for America to finance the whole world. I consider it a scheme to lower our American tariff barriers, to regulate our domestic employment, and to reduce the wage scale of our American productive system—a scheme that would drag American wages, working conditions, living levels, and liberties down to the levels prevalent in Europe and in the Orient. The puzzling thing about all this is the disquieting fact that the scheme has been devised, not by foreigners, but by planners in our own State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this International Trade Organization, in effect, would be an international super state. It would take away from the American people control of American production. It would be within the power of this international super state to say what American agricultural surpluses, or manufactured goods, or both, might be exported, and how much foreign goods could be imported into the United States. Of course, our State Department theorists do not tell us that this super state would be established at the expense of our American standard of living and our American wage scale.

Originally, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was intended to expand our foreign trade, and to secure advantageous concessions from other nations. It never was intended to inflict grave—perhaps fatal—injury upon our own domestic industry and agriculture. The act gave the President the power to negotiate tariff agreements with foreign governments without Senate approval. He was empowered to adjust tariff rates either upward or downward. However,

since the inception of the act, 12 years ago, never once has one single rate been increased. The act was intended to relieve unemployment in this country. It is quite obvious, however, that it did not alleviate unemployment in this country during the time it was operative, between 1934 and the start of the war in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, if a planned world economy is once established and given over to an international authority, a planned national economy will be inevitable. In view of this fact, I ask: How can we so soon forget the bitter fruits of our New Deal planners? Only a short while back they experimented for us, and on us, upon a national scale, and they almost ruined us. Today we have the most crushing tax burden and the most monumental debt in history. They now want to broaden the scope of their experimentation to an international scale even if it means the sacrifice of our American way of life. World planning entails national planning. Our State Department visionaries now hope to force national planning through the medium of international planning, with world trade as a starting point.

Mr. Speaker, America today remains the only surviving democracy among the great nations of the world. In the chaos of present-day world trade, we alone remain the bulwark of free enterprise. Can free enterprise as we know it today live alongside and compete with the socialistic set-up of the British Empire? Can it live alongside and compete with the Russian plan of economic totalitarianism? Those questions await an answer.

To adopt the proposals advocated by our State Department for an International Trade Organization would mean to transfer our governmental powers to a world economic authority. If the proposals are adopted, we shall be hard hit in our daily lives, even to the point of being no longer free to do as we would with our own possessions; no longer free to act upon our own problems in our own way. The plan, if put into operation, would completely destroy what is left of our system of tariff protection. Already present agreements are listed with 27 foreign governments and cover about two-thirds of the United States foreign trade, which this year may reach $11,000,000,000 in exports and $6,000,000,000 in imports. In numerous cases tariff reductions of 40 or 50 percent have already been made during the past 12 years. And it is now proposed further to reduce the rates even on these items by a substantial amount up to 50 percent of what protection is left.

Mr. Speaker, in a planned world, free American enterprise could no longer exist. Look at the Orient after five or six thousand years. Look at Europe after more than a thousand years. Then look at America after a hundred and sixty years. Compare the progress—the conditions—and take your choice.

We must halt this vicious plan for an International Trade Organization before it goes too far or it will be the undoing of everything that we have built up and developed under our Constitution. By reducing the tariffs we would be destroying the very heart of our American domestic economy. The idea of international participation at the expense of our own welfare is an idea repugnant to American tradition. It is wholly hostile to American ideals and accomplishments. It is a move to absorb our free economic system into an international scheme of experimentation which has yet to prove it has anything better to offer us than the bitter fruits of the New Deal planned-economy scheme which proved so disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a plan, but a plot to destroy the American way of life. It is a plot designed to force us to share the poverty of the world through curtailment of American production and trade, commerce, and agriculture at the order of the International Trade Organization. It is inconceivable to me that the American people would ever knowingly permit American production to be placed under the control of an international organization. Why should the one Nation in which free enterprise still lives lead the movement to create a planned world economy which is utterly hostile to the philosophy of free enterprise? Why should the United States give in to other nations who favor world participation only because they fear American competition—if free enterprise survives in this country?

Mr. Speaker, we must unwrap and examine carefully this Pandora box of international control which the State Department has taken the pains to wrap up for us in so much secrecy. Let us study its contents before we turn them loose upon the world, lest they prove an economic atom bomb of destruction to our free democratic form of government.

The all-important question to be settled at Geneva is, Shall the United States surrender control of its tariff completely; shall it give up the regulation of its own trade, industrial production, labor, and agriculture, to an international organization that does not care a rap for Uncle Sam? The economic pattern for the world of the future depends upon the answer to that question.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I hope the gentleman will bear with me for a minute or so.

We have now before the Committee on Agriculture of the House a perfect example of the results of this reciprocal-trade program. I speak of wool.

We have two crops of American clip and a third one coming up, and we are unable to sell it.

We have one law that requires that a farm product may not be sold at less than the parity price yet we have the most perfect tariff law in the world, an elastic one with an escalator clause that works both ways. As we sit in this committee our Democratic friends are in a quandary. They have got their feet all tangled up and their eyes dim with the mist of the halo that has been around the head of Cordell Hull for so many years. They do not know where they are going. They want to charge it up as a war casualty.

As a matter of fact the wool trade is going out of business in this country. It is only 31 percent. This problem is a postwar problem. They want to solve it by going to the Treasury of the United States and bailing out the American wool grower, yet today we have all the legislation necessary to raise the price of clean wool 17 cents a pound, 8½ cents a pound on grease wool, and wool as it comes off the sheep 4 cents a pound. If that is still not enough to save the American wool grower we can raise it another 4 cents.

I am intrigued this morning by this talk on communism.

It seems to me that during the time I have been down here our Presidents do not know any good Democrats. Whenever an appointment is made, they find an ardent left-winger or one of these one-world do-gooders or a fellow traveler. Whenever an appointment is made on a board, even involving the safety of the world, they do that. They are always good to us when they reach into this Pandora's box and bring out one of these emergencies to put us on the spot. They give us an alternative, however. We may take this or chaos. We always have the choice.

I want to remind my Democratic friends that you cannot lie down with the dogs and not get up with fleas, you cannot play with these Communists and left wingers, and you and I have met them in every election, then suddenly wish them off. When they are still under your tent you are playing ball with them. It is about time that we discovered there are old-fashioned Democrats that some of these appointments might be given to, men whom we could believe in, men who have the interest of their country at heart.

Mr. MASON. I say that the New Deal domestic planned economy brought chaos to us and now the planned international economy will bring chaos to the world involving us.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I say something else?

Mr. MASON. Yes; go ahead.

Mr. CLEVENGER. According to the Agriculture Department, one of the greatest shortages is in connection with fats and oils in the last week of this month that we have ever seen. There is a shortage of lard and all cooking fats we use. It is because of a board in which one American sits down with 43 foreigners. The Chairman is a Belgian. That board allots this oil that belongs to Americans to the people all over the world. It is time that somebody rub a little Americanism on this party that rules the other end of the Avenue in order to get them to think America and work for America and protect America.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I have two questions I would like to ask the gentleman, who has evidently made quite a study of this matter. First, will the Congress have an opportunity to pass upon the plan?

Mr. MASON. There is a difference of opinion on that. Some claim that this international agreement setting up

this International Trade Organization at Geneva will have to be submitted to the United States Senate for confirmation before it can be approved. Others say that is not so, that the United States Senate and the Congress can be sidetracked. I am not an international lawyer, so I cannot say.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Under Secretary Clayton made the flat statement to us on the Ways and Means Committee that he would submit that to the Congress of the United States. I think that is something that we must take him at his word on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The administration is now negotiating 18 reciprocal trade agreements. When they do that they can carry into effect the agreement made over at Geneva, so it will be an accomplished fact, and there will not be any necessity for Congress to pass on the final agreement.

Mr. MASON. That is one viewpoint.

Mr. VURSELL. We have had an experience with our products and with our finances being handled in a great brotherly fashion around the table of many nations through UNRRA, which has been a complete failure. We are outvoted, if there was anyone in UNRRA to vote for us, which I doubt that there has been. We have contributed greatly to the building up of the strength of Russia and her satellite nations at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Here is the question I want to ask: If we go into this thing how many votes will we have or how much control will we have in view of the fact that we are the Nation that will probably suffer the most?

Mr. MASON. Well, I would answer that very bluntly and directly by saying that in this International Trade Organization we would have the same amount of say-so and the same vote exactly in proportion to the rest of the world as we had in UNRRA, and that was very, very small, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. VURSELL. Would we not go on a world free-trade basis, and no doubt find that we had reduced the standard of living in this country through the power of this organization to the detriment of the American people?

Mr. MASON. That is my opinion, and that is why I am opposed to it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am on the committee with the gentleman from Illinois. I recall appearing before that committee some years ago bewailing the fact that we had transferred from our jurisdiction the protection of our industries to the State Department. I want to ask the gentleman, concerning the condition of all other nations today, as portrayed to us—and in that I am reminded of a statement I read last year—how can you do business with a poorhouse.

Mr. MASON. Well, of course, we can do business with the poorhouse providing we provide the funds to the poorhouse to do business with us, and that is part of the program.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I have felt for a long time that this House ought to have a stronger voice in the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. I introduced in the last session of Congress and also on the opening day of this session a bill that would provide for a select committee of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to make a study and report on the foreign policy of this country, both economically and politically, in every country and every section, and with full power to investigate the State Department and the Foreign Service. In view of what the gentleman has said today, I want to ask him this question: Does he think that such an investigation and study by a special committee of this House would help in formulating a better foreign policy for this country?

Mr. MASON. I certainly do, but I think it is a belated effort. I think it should have been done long ago. But, of course, we could not expect any such resolution as that to go through under the New Deal regime.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Aside from the fact that the executive department has emergency powers during wartime, is there any question in the gentleman's mind but that this Congress has the right to make laws and have the executive department enforce them, and that it is about time that we begin to do that in order to save our national policy?

Mr. MASON. Of course, for 150 years that was true, but that has not been true during the last 16 years, because not only has the judiciary department interpreted the laws and said what the Congress should have put in, whether they put it in or not, but our executive departments have been interpreting the laws to suit themselves, and the business of the Congress today is quite largely the vetoing of department rulings which misinterpret the laws, and even vetoing some of the rulings of the Supreme Court on the laws that we have passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I could not keep track of all the items the gentleman had numbered, but I noticed one of them. He referred to the Morgenthau plan and to Mr. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, in connection with it. I do not understand that Mr. Clayton ever subscribed to the Morgenthau fiasco.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Clayton never subscribed to the Morgenthau fiasco, and the Morgenthau fiasco was discarded by the executive department of this Government after it had been adopted, because it proved so unworkable.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood that Mr. Clayton—whom I know quite well; we came from the same town—stated to the committee that whatever agreements were made should come back to Congress for ratification; at least, to the Senate.

Mr. MASON. He did this on this International Trade Organization. He said he would submit that to the Senate for approval before it would go into effect. He said, however, that as to the 18 reciprocal trade agreements which they expect to put into effect before this International Trade Organization is set up, they, of course, would not go to the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. One or two gentlemen indicated that Mr. Clayton is communistic. I want to say that Will Clayton is as far from being a Communist as any man in America.

Mr. MASON. In my opinion, Mr. Clayton is one of the biggest and soundest businessmen in America today.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the way I feel about him.

Mr. MASON. That is my personal opinion of him.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from a magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is not on the floor at this hour. I notified his office that I expected to direct my remarks particularly to the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service carried in the Labor Department appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder when the gentleman notified the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. STIGLER. I did not notify his office until this morning.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is chairman, I feel that I should remind the gentleman that the gentleman from Wisconsin since the first of the year has been expending his whole energy and all his time, as have the other members of the subcommittee, on the appropriation bill that recently passed the House. I think

the gentleman from Oklahoma, if he expected the gentleman from Wisconsin to be here today, should have given him more notice. After all, the gentleman remembers that the gentleman from Wisconsin, shortly before the bill passed the House, stated that he was quite tired. He is not in his office because he is taking a little rest from the almost 3 months of very hard work he put in on the appropriation bill to which the gentleman from Oklahoma refers.

Mr. STIGLER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that no one more than I appreciates the diligent effort and the long hours spent by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on that bill, as did the gentleman from Illinois himself.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will remember that the gentleman from Wisconsin took the floor here one day and talked for an hour without referring to notes, which indicates his knowledge of the subjects dealt with in that bill.

Mr. STIGLER. Yes; and I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his knowledge of the bill. Further, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I sought and made every effort to obtain recognition at the time an effort was made to cut off debate. I never had a chance to answer the argument the gentleman made on the floor at that time with reference to the Veterans' Employment Service. Therefore, I feel within my rights in taking the very first opportunity I could get to speak on this subject. I, too, have spent some time since the bill was passed in research work, in getting material which I expect to deliver to the House at this hour.

Mr. Speaker, a challenge was issued by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Labor Department, on Tuesday, March 26, which cannot go unanswered. In the discussions concerning the Veterans' Employment Service under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 there were statements made and definitions given that were in some sense harmful to a service whose record in behalf of the veteran is impressive—an old service established following the First World War and continued under the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 establishing a Nationwide system of public employment offices.

Under the more recent legislative mandate as contained in title IV of Public Law 346, passed in June 1944, Congress declared its intent and purpose unequivocally. It is specifically stated in that act, and I quote:

> The Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policies shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them (the veterans) the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

In order that these policies might be sound and that the USES might be rendered maximum assistance, the Veterans' Placement Service Board was established and there were designated as members of that Board men of recognized administrative ability. The present members of that Board are: Gen. Omar N. Bradley as Chairman, and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, and Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach as members.

And mind you, Mr. Speaker, this law was passed without a dissenting vote. As a matter of record, the gentleman from Wisconsin was at that time a Member of Congress. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was a far different thing then to cast an "aye" for a beneficial law in behalf of our fighting men and women. How different from the chorus of "nays" produced the other day at the cracking of a party whip. And what a sad commentary that is on the Republican Party.

The gentleman from Wisconsin boldly stood before this House a few days ago and, perhaps thinking that his words might go unchallenged, defied any Member to justify the continued existence of an expanded Veterans' Employment Service. I made an effort to accept his challenge then, but the gentleman seemingly wanted to cut off all debate after he finished and made his motion that all debate cease. His party having the votes, the motion prevailed. In his brief hour of glory he accused us of failing to read the record—and when I am finished I believe you will agree with me that he must surely have uttered those words with a fervent prayer that none accept his challenge for the record has revealed some very interesting things. When the gentleman issued this challenge he was well within his rights but we cannot be so certain about his reason.

We cannot believe that there was an intent to be pompous, but if so, it was only exceeded by the implied cruelty in threatening a service to veterans which the Nation cannot afford to abandon. The economy that comes to the country at the expense of veterans can be costly indeed. If the pruning knife of false economy is to sever the service of a small organization within the structure of government that is rendering so large a service to the veteran, then this same knife may well slip and stab our economy in a vulnerable place.

It is a mere pittance in the cost of overall government. The Government dollar here buys more than perhaps any other place in our Government—and yet I speak more to the issue involved than the so-called economy.

There have been some rather shaky reasons advanced as to the legal aspects of this expansion. There has not been advanced, however, a single excuse for the cheap and sordid economy that would deprive veterans of their rightful and promised opportunity to be placed in the best job possible. This sort of economy would be on a par with the wretched undertaker who withholds a portion of the embalming fluid in the certain knowledge that it will never be discovered by the bereaved. Rest assured that in 1948 the veterans will know any niggardliness on the part of this Congress in denying them rights which are plainly theirs under the law. If this is a criterion on what is to come on other needed appropriations, we may expect to see a complete break-down of our economic unity. If this is part of the Republican political program written for the 1948 campaign, then I say we on this side welcome such an issue.

But, now, let us look far back into the record and see what we see, for the gentleman from Wisconsin has demanded an answer and I think those momentarily deluded will be interested in the whole story. If they blush today, let that rest upon their own conscience for I will have rendered service to my people.

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, the basic legislation under which the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service operate, provided under section (a) as follows, and I quote:

> It shall be the province and duty of the Bureau—the United States Employment Service—to maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans * * * establishing and maintaining a system of public employment offices in the several States and the political subdivisions thereof in which there shall be located a veterans' employment service.

Note well those words, Mr. Speaker, for I am now going to quote for this body some pertinent discussions before the House Committee on Labor which held hearings back in 1933 on this particular piece of legislation.

On Thursday, May 18, 1933, Mr. John Thomas Taylor, representing the American Legion, said:

> We feel that there should be a separate and distinct service maintained for veterans. It is purely a Federal function. The veteran, particularly the disabled one, suffered his disability or employment handicap as a result of military service.

Mr. Dunn, of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, said:

> In my opinion, we should have at least one such office—

Meaning a Federal office for veterans—

> in each State and one in each large town of each State of the Union, and I would be willing to vote for five times the amount expended for that purpose at the present time. If these offices are abolished the veterans will be coming to Washington, and that would make an impossible condition for us.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in these discussions they were referring to the then existing Federal offices—30 in number—located throughout the country to serve exclusively the employment needs of veterans.

The following colloquy is particularly significant:

> The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor, do you feel that there is a special reason why veterans' employment agencies should be kept open? You feel that the veteran is a case by himself. The opposition to keeping the veterans' employment offices open comes along this line: The veteran could go to the ordinary labor office set up under this bill; but that does not take care of the veteran.
>
> Mr. TAYLOR. I think that the veteran is a Federal charge, a Federal responsibility, due either to his physical or employment handicap caused while in the service.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Not only that, but many persons would not want to place a disabled veteran in a position. You have to make it known that he is a veteran in search of employment and——
>
> Mr. TAYLOR. There has to be an agency in sympathy with him and his condition.

And so that discussion continued along those lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote for you the words of the ranking Republican member of that committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]:

Mr. WELCH. My experience and contact with the veterans' contact bureau in San Francisco, which is headed by Mr. Richard Stillwell, leads me to believe that they have been doing an excellent work, and such is, I believe, the opinion of everybody who knows the work of the bureau. It has been the means of securing employment for untold numbers of veterans. They go to a great extent to assist the veteran. I am told that such is the history of the veterans' employment service throughout the country.

And so on along these lines the discussion continued. Virtually every member of the committee had something to say along these same lines, clear evidence of intent, if ever there could be intent, on the part of a committee drafting an important piece of legislation.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is another interesting colloquy involving Mr. L. S. Ray, speaking for the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Mr. DUNN. Did anybody ever raise the question of the constitutionality of your law, alleging that it appropriates money for a certain class of persons? Did anybody ever tell you that an attempt will be made on the floor of the House to have the law providing for these offices abolished because it is class legislation?

Mr. RAY. Do you refer to the employment offices?

Mr. DUNN. Yes.

Mr. RAY. I never heard of it.

Mr. DUNN. Be on our guard, because somebody may in the very near future say that this is unconstitutional because it is class legislation, that the United States has no constitutional right to appropriate money for any special class of people.

The CHAIRMAN. Except bankers.

A MEMBER. And officers of the Economy League.

Mr. DUNN. Yes. But I will be for you, constitutional or unconstitutional. I understood you to say that if we should abolish these regional offices it would be a serious mistake.

Mr. RAY. I was discussing the employment offices at that time.

Mr. DUNN. You say that it would not only be a mistake; it would be inhumane.

Mr. RAY. It would be a very serious mistake.

They were speaking of the Veterans' Employment Service. And how fortunate it is, in a way, that only one or two members of that great old committee survived to suffer here the other day the fulfillment of that dire prediction in a burst of oratory from the lips of the gentleman from Wisconsin. How truly painful it must have been to them, having seen another frightful war engulf us and the ranks of our veterans increased from less than 5,000,000 at that time to something approaching 20,000,000 today.

I say to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, if the House cuts of the Employment Service budget shall be concurred in by the Senate, the Wagner-Peyser Act will have been, in effect, nullified or repealed and a Federal-State Employment Service will have been destroyed.

Going further, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the senior statesman of that earlier day, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, thought last week of the actions of his fellow party member from Wisconsin? You will recall, no doubt, that during his term of office Mr. Hoover vetoed a bill similar to the Wagner-Peyser Act which did not contain provision for a veterans' employment service. However, if the gentleman from Wisconsin and his party leadership so soon forget their own promises to the veteran, it should not be expected of them that they would remember the stand taken by the leader of their own party some 16 years ago in vetoing a bill that did not provide for a veterans' employment service—and Mr. Hoover gave that as his principal reason for exercising his veto. The action taken by his party the other day now raises serious question as to his motives.

I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, with what care our predecessors made provision for a veterans' employment service at the community level as part of the Federal operation. They recognized a Federal responsibility even in those days of relatively few veterans. I am told by those in authority who have followed the development of the Veterans' Employment Service that now, for the first time in history, it has approached the expanded operation originally contemplated. That it has done so in accordance with a more recent mandate—under title IV of Public Law 346—is only incidental. We should only be thankful that it has finally been done and that the foresight of those wise old planners of yesteryear is finally bearing fruit.

And now, Mr. Speaker, now that I have laid before you the legal basis for this important agency of government, it would appear appropriate that we look further into the record and find, if we may, the reason for this sudden defection on the part of the gentleman from Wisconsin. And sudden it was, for it was less than a year ago that the gentleman as a member of his present committee supported an appropriation for the expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service. And it was not so long ago that he was lauding the virtues of our fighting men as they held the enemy from our shores. If the gentleman questioned the moral or legal basis for this meager service to our veterans, why did he not a year ago raise the question he now raises under the guise of economy? I cannot conjecture as to why he did not then raise the issue, but I think the record reveals some startling reasons for his raising it at this time, and economy does not have a thing to do with it.

I deeply regret the necessity for presenting these facts, but the gentleman asked for it in no uncertain terms, so here it is. Here is what the gentleman said on Thursday, May 23, 1946, as a member of this same committee considering appropriations for the Veterans' Employment Service. This is taken from the official report of those hearings:

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say this. I have received innumerable complaints from veterans and from others, that they go to the office here in the District of Columbia and to other offices seeking jobs, and they are asked to fill out a card. I do not know the name or the number of the card or the description of it. They are told to sit down and cool their heels; and they sit around and sit around. Men have come to me and said that they have become so disgusted that they just walked out and threw up their hands. I have received such complaints and I know that other Members of Congress have.

Apparently the gentleman did not think that routine service in a local public employment office would be quite enough service for the veteran—or was he speaking for the benefit of his veteran constituents? I believe he was sincere in his desire to see something done for the veteran and I recognize his gesture at that time.

Again, the gentleman made some right pungent statements about the Veterans' Employment Service that same day as Mr. Perry Faulkner, Chief of that agency, was testifying in support of his request for funds to expand his service. The gentleman said, and this is from the committee report:

Mr. KEEFE. I want to see a system established that will perform the service of seeing to it that these veterans are given the service that the Congress intended they should have in this field of employment and job counseling and job placement, and I do not care, as one member of the committee, how it is done.

Again, I commend the gentleman and give him the benefit of doubt and say he must have been speaking in all sincerity. I congratulate him at this late date for his wisdom in supporting an appropriation for the expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service, and that is all the more reason to marvel at his reversal this year. I wonder why?

This may be a bit painful to the gentleman in his position of party leadership, but let us look a little further into the recent record and see what we can find that will shed some light on this chameleonic action of our colleague. The public employment service was returned to State operation last November, and I think it is generally recognized there has been some slight friction between some of the interested State agencies and the Director of the United States Employment Service. That was to be expected.

In this connection we see a new individual on the horizon of strategy. By chance he happens to live in Wisconsin, and somehow he happens to be a rather close personal friend of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin has said that he considers him the most intelligent and competent person he knows.

It seems from the records available, from his public and private utterances, that this gentleman out in Wisconsin has a burning and consuming hatred for the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, and Federal agencies in general. But let us look at the record of the hearings before the subcommittee this year. How different they are under the new leadership. The gentleman from Wisconsin, now chairman of the subcommittee, calls in his old friend from Wisconsin purportedly to testify and speak for the Interstate Conference, which is a body composed of employment-security agencies. His name is Stanley Rector, and early in the

hearings he indicates that he is speaking for the entire membership. Let us look at his testimony and see what his motive really is. There are pages and pages of his testimony regarding the activities of the United States Employment Service, but we are now primarily interested in his role insofar as the Veterans' Employment Service is concerned. There can be no doubt from the report of the committee that he succeeded momentarily in his effort to destroy the United States Employment Service as an effective agency of government.

Beginning on page 350 of the report of the hearing we find a most interesting dissertation under the heading: "Veterans' Employment Service, legal justification for the Service." Imagine if you will, a Member of Congress—chairman of a subcommittee at that, calling in from his State an old friend to testify as to the legality of a Federal agency and to give his own interpretation of existing law. I wonder for what purpose? In the course of his testimony this gentleman from Wisconsin goes into all of the fine details of the Veterans' Employment Service, being very careful at first to avoid an open attack upon its program. As a matter of fact, on page 353 he says:

I am not at all prepared to say that something like this number may not be necessary on either Federal or State pay roll. It is a matter for the Congress and those who advise the Congress who know more about it than I do.

At one point in his testimony—and he was very hard to pin down, Mr. Rector said in reply to a question regarding the staffing of the Veterans' Employment Service, and I quote:

Mr. RECTOR. I am not prepared to answer at all. It might be necessary to add to it.

Mr. Speaker, this was all very interesting to me, and I am glad that the gentleman from Wisconsin brought it to my attention. If you will read the testimony of this Mr. Rector on pages 356 and 357 of the committee report you will find that he finally is cajoled out into the open. Listen to this:

Mr. ROONEY. You think the Veterans' Employment Service set-up should be federalized rather than under the control of the States?
Mr. RECTOR. I do not think anything should be federalized.

Certainly an unbiased witness, once you get him out in the open. After some more hedging and back-tracking:

Mr. ROONEY. So, finally, you do think it should be turned over to the States?
Mr. RECTOR. It is my own opinion.

And now, in the event he should attempt to get out of it, we quote the chairman of the committee as he comes to the rescue of his witness:

Mr. KEEFE. May I interject at this point? The purpose in calling this witness on this particular point was on the question as to the legal authorization for any appropriation under the existing law which is on the statute books.

And so forth. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, this is going far afield and something new in legislative history. If, under the new leadership, we must resort to calling admittedly prejudiced and biased witnesses who hate anything done by the Federal Government from our home States to advise us as to the meaning and intent of our own laws, I think the people should know about it. Our Federal Government, particularly insofar as it proposes to serve veterans, is too vital to us to permit such tampering with its functions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman has taken any time to look into the background of Mr. Rector, and look into the basis for the authority upon which he can speak on unemployment compensation matters and on the operation of employment offices.

Mr. STIGLER. I will say to the gentleman that I have not. The only information I have is in a general way which was taken from the record.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is very apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this information about Mr. Rector is very general, because if the gentleman will take the time to look into Mr. Rector's record he will find that he is an outstanding man in the United States on the subject of the operation of employment offices and on the operation of unemployment compensation in the various States. I further say to his credit, and in fact to the credit of the State of Wisconsin, you bet, we do not want federalization of that agency or any other agency of the State government and bringing them down here to Washington rather than having them administered at home.

Mr. STIGLER. No doubt, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Rector, may be distinguished in his own line; I am not questioning that at all. But the point that I am trying to make is this, which is something new in legislative history, that the chairman of the subcommittee brings somebody from his own State to tell the Congress whether or not there is some legal basis or justification for the existence of some law which the Congress is called upon to legislate. That is the point I am making.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has implanted his foot upon the prostrate body of the veteran and stamped out a service which is vital to the welfare of the veterans. I hope the gentleman's conscience will not suffer when he reads about and sees thousands and thousands of our heroic veterans trudging our highways and byways in search of employment with no governmental agency to sympathetically administer to their needs.

In defense of his actions, as he prepared to crack the partisan whip to close off the debate he obviously feared, the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to the organizations of veterans as pressure groups. And he told you that they should be ignored as they protest his actions.

Now, this term "pressure groups" is one to conjure with. As the troops under General Pershing met, held, and drove back the Huns, we called them valiant heroes. As the legions of Gen. Omar N. Bradley in the Battle of the Bulge exerted pressure on the enemy we called them gallant fighting men—not vulgar pressure groups—and as they work within their organizations as veterans today they will resent the implications of the gentleman. Already there is a rising tide of bitterness—and it bodes no good for the Nation.

The reason the gentleman can stand with safety in the well of this House and malign the veteran and all those interested honestly in his welfare is because American troops on hundreds of forgotten battlefields were a marvelous pressure group exerting pressure upon the enemy with gun and bayonet, and in many cases their bare hands. Perhaps he does not now appreciate their sacrifices, or maybe appreciating them, he still yields to the pressure of the Republican high command.

If the policies promulgated by the gentleman from Wisconsin are not those of his party, then let the Republican leadership disavow that which he has done. If they are the policies of the Republican Party in Wisconsin, then that is something for the people of that State to pass judgment upon. However, if these policies are to prevail in the Halls of Congress under its present leadership and permeate the minds of the American people, then God save us because no mortal man can.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate will make the necessary restorations as they consider this appalling thing that has been done by the lash of the majority. If that be done—and I am sure most of us hope that it will be done—then perhaps we can, by voicing our agreement, salvage some of that which was lost to the American people by an ill-conceived action under the guise of economy just a few days ago.

There is no greater advocate of true economy in Government than myself, but why go on an economic binge where our stalwart defenders are concerned? Let us not commit economic butchery by a cloak of false economy. The Republican leadership needs no advice from me today, but may I say be not deluded, our veterans have grown wiser and have learned to appreciate the benefits of good government—they will not be deceived by these vainglorious attacks upon their rights.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MR. CONGRESSMAN, YOU ASKED FOR IT

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago in my own home city of Toledo, one of my constituents caught me in a restaurant and held me from 11:30 until nearly 3 o'clock. He had been reading. In fact, when I repeated the incident to a friend of mine, he said, "That so-and-so has been reading, He's been reading a book. It's as clear as the nose on your face, he has been reading."

Well, as a matter of fact he had. He had been reading about the days when Calhoun, Clay, Webster, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, and a few others were alive and active; all at the same time. In those days, he said to me, there were statesmen. He had also been reading of the days when Lincoln, Seward, Jefferson Davis, Judah P. Benjamin, Salmon Chase, Stanton, Fessenden, and the Blairs were all active. In those days, he said accusingly, we had statesmen. "You Members," he said to me, "ought to be statesmen. You were sent down there to be statesmen. Are you?" I started to answer, but he stopped me. "You are not," he said. He cited Clare Booth Luce, Walter Lippmann, Leo Pressman, Westbrook Pegler, Colonel McCormick, Ralph Ingersoll, and the Readers' Digest to prove that the crying need of the hour is for statesmen.

"You as good as promised," he said, "when you ran for office that you would be statesmen."

I said, "We are! Did we not set a ceiling on the spending in spite of its unpopularity? Have we not said 'No' to the spenders who claim to have bought the last few elections? This is one Congress which is thinking of their country and the next generation—not the next election!"

But I did not get very far. He kept after me, and when the clock had gotten around almost to 3 p. m., I gave up and told him I would try, and did he have any suggestions as to how I should go about it.

"Read, reflect, think," he said. "What is the Congressional Library for? Go there, sit there, study. Keep informed. Learn another language. Map out a program and fight for it, a broad, statesmanlike program. Ignore your mail, telegrams and visitors. Real constituents do not write—they rely on your good judgment."

So, I finally said "Yes." Then he said, as I paid the check, "By the way, Homer, my sister's aunt and her family from Ottawa County are going to be down there week after next. She will be at the Mayflower, and I told them at home to never mind, you would look after her. She wants to see the town and she would like to visit the House in session, and the Senate, too, and Mount Vernon and a few places. She would like to meet the President, but I cannot expect too much of you, so maybe the least said about that the better. Anyway, she will be there 3 days and you and your good wife, I know, will do things up brown."

So I said "Yes" to that, too. Now, what bothers me is how I am going to be a statesman, and at the same time look after his sister's aunt. I also wonder about who is going to pay for it, but the main thing is that I cannot read, reflect, and think, and entertain this lady, who is a very nice lady, at the same time.

Last week I entertained and schooled 42 parents and children. I was most happy to. They inspired me. When all reached the other body the school children on vacation said, "Where are they?" Only two are on the floor while one is making a speech against Lilienthal. I answered, "They are busy in committee or answering their mail." They answered, "They are not here to answer mail but be statesmen. If they answer mail, they can do that at night." I answered. "They average several hundred letters daily. Most letters require research. Do you not want your letters answered?" Whereupon they said, "They asked for it, did they not?"

One of my devoted friends, and I may add with personal pride that I am proud to call him a devoted friend as well as a constituent, called me by phone the other day. He asked me to do a good deed, which I am happy to do. I was indeed quite weary inasmuch as an irritating delegation had called on me the day before; one of those delegations that stay for 3 hours and want to hear nothing only what they want. They were not from the Ninth Ohio District. They asked questions, but I was unable to answer them because they constantly interrupted an answer just as I would start. After the conference I felt as though there was no marrow in my backbone.

The repercussions of that conference were with me the next morning. When my friend called I told him about these interruptions, and he said, "Well, h——, you asked for it; didn't you?"

I reported the conference to several others, and Members of the House, of course, said, "Well, Homer, a Congressman is here to legislate, not to run errands. Why didn't you have sense enough to allow them 15 minutes and quit; that's what we do." Therefore, Members of the House, my object in this address is to ask, what do we ask for? Approximately a dozen magazines in the country and a majority of the newspapers in their criticism say in substance, "Members of both branches of Congress are a sincere, devoted group of persons. They are interested in good government. They are the hardest-working group of persons we know. However, they are not, as a rule, statesmen, and for one reason. They work too hard. They work too hard at errand-running as well as taking care of individual chores by mail and otherwise, that they deprive themselves of time to study, or are so tired that they cannot study. What does a Congressman ask for?

In his addresses in a campaign, one speaks of what is needed of government. He aims to point out errors existing and state how the errors will be corrected. However, when he leaves these addresses, he is met by a score of good constituents who say, "Just a personal favor, will you help me on this, will you help me on that?" Most of the requests are proper and the Congressman is able to save folks trips to Washington, secures information, and does things that are right to do. Clare Booth Luce has spoken of the sincerity of the men and women in Congress but she states that they work so hard they are unable to think, then she says, "Folks who are not in public positions have time to think while those who are in public positions it seems have no time to think." Do we just listen to the radio and propaganda and act or do we still think? So many are saying to the Congressman, "Well, you asked for it." After all, what does he ask for and what should he do? Where do the errands stop and statesmanship begin and can he do both? The reorganization bill sought to cure some of it by a new committee arrangement whereby each member will be on only one committee, yet that committee meets daily. Scarcely any Congressman attends a committee meeting but what his secretary phones him that several are waiting in his office from his home town. Some of these constituents have matters of importance in government. A great many more have to be entertained.

I am well aware, though a lot of people are not, that the death rate among Congressmen is unusually high. It is a hazardous business that we adorn. The "bust up" rate is even higher. By bust-up rate I mean the speed with which Congressmen break down nervously, go bankrupt, and reach that hazy stage where they go around talking to themselves and in nightly wakefulness pick imaginary tufts off the counterpane.

I desire neither to die nor crack up. I am told time and again that we asked for it. And ask for it, we did. However I do not propose to accept it all complacently. I asked for it and I got it. And my constituents asked for it, and they are going to get it. They are going to get a combination of errand boy and statesman. That is the best I can do. I have read three books since the conversation I referred to 3 weeks ago. That is a book a week. That is pretty high. I do not think Clifton Fadiman does any better.

I do not know that these three books helped a lot. One of them was Lincoln's War Cabinet. Another was a very intriguing volume about Thurlow Weed. A third was entitled "Experiment in Rebellion."

These books, if you please, touched the period when Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and Jackson were bowing out. Lincoln, Seward, Jefferson Davis were coming on stage. These were statesmen all, to hear my friend tell it, and some of them undoubtedly were. But the message that I got out of these three books was that the Congress of those days was liable to error in high degree. It seems to me that both the Union and the Confederate States had at least a dozen chances each to win the Civil War and they kicked them away. How either one of them won is a mystery to me.

There is nothing in the Harding era of the twenties quite equal to the shenanigans of the Weed period, which incidentally ran almost to the 1900's. There is nothing in the Garson-Elliott Roosevelt-Pendergast-John Jewis period quite equal to the high jinks of the southern war profiteers or Simon Cameron from Lincoln's own cabinet. In short, I am impressed by the fact that Congressmen of today are far better men, more honorable, freer from treachery, more devoted to the cause of national safety and progress than were the men, with few exceptions, of the hallowed era when everybody was supposed to be a statesman.

We think of Lincoln as the great emancipator freeing the slaves, preserving the Union, delivering masterpieces in prose poetry. We never hear of him as the man, inflexible only as to the preservation of the Union, trading, compromising, gaining his objective step by step. His

greatness is doubly great to me not only because of his enemies but because of those who supposedly were his friends.

The mistakes these men made were monumental. Their blunders were colossal. And in the more intimate histories of them I find that they too had to look after the business of their clients and had to entertain Aunt Hattie around the Capital.

I reached the conclusion that we are not so bad. I reached the conclusion that we will try as hard as we can to be a statesman and to have a statesmanlike view. We also are going to run errands. We are going to be guided by the principles of our party, by the wishes of my constituents, by my own opinions, and to some extent by the still small voice. I might even say, to a great extent by the still small voice. I pass these comments along to other Congressmen, who I am sure are afflicted as I am. They have a double job to do—to be statesmen and to look after Aunt Hattie. Most of them are incorruptible. Some of them are foolish and given to errors, but on the whole I think they rate pretty high.

I do not know of any easy jobs that are at the same time important. My experience has been that the men who are always doing things are the busy men. The man who says he has not the time often has more time than the busy man ever conceived of anyone having. I feel better because of reading. It did not turn out like my Toledo friend implied it would. I got something else out of those three books. The only thing I am worried about is that we will not be misunderstood. However, I suppose that we asked for that, too. And so as long as I am here, I doff the white plume to my contemporaries, and in a way to myself. That quotation "doff the white plume" I did not get from reading. It is a line in a play, Cyrano de Bergerac. Cyrano was a great lover—for another man. He also was a ghost writer. I wrote this speech myself, to which remark I presume the ghost writers' union will stand up and declare, "We'll say you did."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes

PUT TEETH IN THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the Monroe Doctrine is to be enforced, it must be implemented by law. For 110 years it has been one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy.

That part of the doctrine, which is aimed against attempts to destroy the American system of government, and up to now has been and still is of greatest importance to ourselves and recognized by the rest of the world, is its declaration that the United States would consider as dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt by European powers to extend their political systems to any portion of this hemisphere.

At the time when the doctrine was proclaimed, the great powers—and especially the aggressive powers—of Europe were monarchies, while the American Nations were then, and have remained with few and transient exceptions, republics.

During the first hundred years of its existence, the knowledge or belief that the United States would support the Monroe Doctrine, if necessary by force of arms, protected us, as well as these republics, from either European colonization within our or their territories, or European efforts to transplant the monarchical principle among them.

The doctrine was vindicated by force of arms when our troops were sent against the Emperor Maximilian of Mexico, who had been established upon his unstable throne by Napoleon the Third of France, while our own Government was desperately engaged in the War Between the States.

Since that historic episode there has been no similar armed invasion of the Americas, and it must now be assumed that there will be none, so long as the United States remains strong, independent, and true to its traditions and obligations.

Furthermore, the entire group of American Republics has become, under the aegis of the Monroe Doctrine, virtually a regional league of nations pledged to respect and to defend each other's freedom and sovereignty and to promote concord and peaceful commerce among themselves.

We have the Pan American Union to guide and cement friendly and cooperative relations.

We have had the several diplomatic conferences at Montevideo, at Buenos Aires, at Lima, at Habana, and at Mexico City, with their significant results.

We have the Act of Chapultepec by which the pan-American alliance has been formalized, and which has been given global sanction in the Charter of the United Nations.

In its military aspects, therefore, the Monroe Doctrine has been fully and completely established in international law.

Our own interests and our own security now require that the Monroe Doctrine be made a definite, effective, and enforceable part of the domestic laws of the United States.

And an ample basis for this proposed action is to be found not only in the purposes of the Monroe Doctrine, but in the very language of the doctrine itself.

The Monroe Doctrine forbids foreign powers to attempt to extend their systems to this hemisphere.

But colonization and conquest are not the only means by which a prescribed system may be extended.

Such an attempt may be made by corrupting officials, or even a substantial portion of the citizenship of a nation by the use of money or of favors and rewards.

Hitler used that method with some of the quislings and their partisans in his satellite states.

Such an attempt may be made by seducing the loyalties of certain elements of the population—by sedulously substituting in their minds devotion to a system which is utterly alien and hostile to their own.

Hitler used that method too, and so did Mussolini.

Such an attempt may be made by propaganda, both from abroad and within the violated country.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

Such an attempt may be made by boring into, or getting control of one or more of our political parties, through underground wire pulling and propaganda, by fomenting or creating political puppet parties and related supporting organizations in the affected nation, and by founding or subsidizing a servile press to further their intentions and efforts.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

Such an attempt may be made by planting fifth columns in prospective victim countries, to create dissension and carry on social and industrial sabotage and to precipitate and utilize a revolutionary situation.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

These techniques of invasion by subterfuge and of conquest by subversion, by fomenting disunity, weakening by disorganization, creating and stirring up discontent among our people, must not be permitted to occur in the United States.

Since 1934 we in the United States and our neighbors here in the Americas have been increasingly infected by Communist propaganda.

We must protect ourselves from all alien Fascist movements whether they be nazism, fascism, or communism.

Our present laws are insufficient for our defense.

Yet they need not be if we will but apply and enforce the Monroe Doctrine.

For the Monroe Doctrine applies to and forbids any attempts of any European nation to extend to the United States the Communist system today of Soviet Russia, as clearly as it applied to the monarchial and imperialistic systems of other European nations in the past.

The phraseology is unmistakably clear and precise—

"We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Reaffirmed as it has been before the United Nations with its Court of International Justice, the Monroe Doctrine is unassailable as belonging to this present day.

Translating the Monroe Doctrine into Federal law by prohibiting, through an act of Congress, foreign nations or their agents from organizing or abetting political parties or committees in the United States or its territorial possessions; from publishing therein subversive or fifth-column propaganda; and from influencing or attempting to influence American legislation or electoral or governmental procedure—this will constitute a strong step in stamping out totalitarianism, communism, or other similar froms of government which now threaten democracy.

Congress should enact a new law which should prohibit the use or employment by any foreign nation, as such, within the United States or any of its territories, of any money or propaganda, oral or

written, for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence United States citizens and voters to change the American form of government as created and established by the United States Constitution, into a totalitarian, communistic, or any other form of government.

Such legislation should also provide that any foreign nation or any of its agents, employees, or representatives acting for and on its behalf who commits any of the above-mentioned acts is guilty of a hostile act against the United States, equivalent to an act of war, and any individual directly or indirectly engaged in the commission of or participating in any such act as such agent shall be regarded as a public enemy of the United States and treated as such.

Such legislation should further provide that the penalty for the commission of any such act shall be a severe one punishable under some circumstances by death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment for such a lesser period of time, as the court in the exercise of its good judgment, on the facts in any particular case, may consider to be just and proper, and subject as well to a heavy fine in addition to imprisonment.

There may be some cases where the acts committed may be very serious, and other cases where they may not be.

It is wise, therefore, to provide in any such legislation for a large latitude, in which the court will be able to fit the punishment to the crime.

Such legislation should provide further that any foreign nation violating the statute or any of its provisions may be indicted in accordance with due process of law by a grand jury of the Federal district in which the act may be committed and, if found guilty, punished by a fine of $100,000 or some other substantial amount to be fixed by Congress for each offense, and that in order to enable the Government to collect any such fine or fines, the new legislation should authorize the United States to seize any money or other property located here and owned by such offending foreign nation and apply such money, or sell such property and apply the proceeds thereof to the payment of any fine or fines imposed on such foreign nation. The new legislation should further provide that, within the discretion of any Federal court of the United States, any employee or citizen of such offending foreign nation found guilty of having committed any such act or acts while temporarily or permanently residing in the United States may be deported therefrom on such notice and at such time as any Federal court of the United States may determine.

At present the Monroe Doctrine is merely a national policy.

It is not a part of our statutory or constitutional law.

The enactment by Congress of such legislation as is herein recommended would translate the Monroe Doctrine into law.

There is nothing in our Constitution to prevent Congress from taking such action.

And there would be no infringement whatsoever of the proper rights of persons.

An individual citizen of a European nation has to obtain the right to sojourn within the United States, and if he be legally permitted to come within our borders, he has while here the right to express his own opinion in favor of the people of the United States changing their form of government to such other form that he might advocate.

He would have the right to publish his own ideas in the United States and disseminate them by propaganda or otherwise. The United States Constitution gives him such right as an exercise of personal liberty or freedom of speech. He would have no right to do that, however, as the agent of a foreign nation which used him as its tool to stir up dissension and disorganize our people.

A foreign nation as such has not the right under the Monroe Doctrine to intermeddle in the domestic affairs of the United States or of any of the other republics in the Western Hemisphere. If it were shown that an individual national were acting as the agent of his government by spying or issuing subversive propaganda for the purpose of creating disturbances, disorganization, and disunity in our midst, that would be considered an intermeddling by such foreign nation through such agent in our domestic affairs and would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Concerning the indictment of such a foreign nation by a Federal grand jury, there is no reason why a foreign nation which is a governmental corporation might not be indicted in the United States just as an individual may. Business corporations are frequently indicted charged with the commission of crimes as corporations. There is no reason why a foreign government as such, which is nothing more nor less than a corporation although it has governmental power, can not be indicted.

If there are any treaties between the United States and any foreign nations which would prohibit their indictment here, such treaties, or the part of them applicable, may be abrogated or canceled by act of Congress.

The Monroe Doctrine should be enacted into law, and enforced. We should urge that all Western Hemisphere nations follow our example.

A BILL TO BE INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN ALVIN E. O'KONSKI ON MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947, TO ENACT THE MONROE DOCTRINE INTO LAW, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Criminal Code of the United States of America is hereby amended as follows:

SECTION 1. That the use or employment by any foreign nation within the territory of the United States or any of its possessions subject to its jurisdiction, of subversive activities, or attempts to create discontent, disunity, and disorganization of our society by or through the planting of what are popularly known as fifth columns in the midst of our people, or agents of any kind, or by the use of money to influence political parties, or any of them, or by advocating policies which may result in the overthrow of our form of government and the establishment of a foreign form of government in its place and stead, and the use of money for propaganda consisting of the composition, issuance, utterance, publication, or dissemination of any matter, oral or written, caused to be issued, disseminated, published, or communicated by any foreign nation for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence our citizens to change our form of government, as created and established by the United States Constitution, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. That any foreign nation or any of its agents, employees, or representatives, for and on its behalf, which or who commits or attempts to commit any of the afore-mentioned acts, is guilty of a hostile act against the Government of the United States, and shall be regarded as having committed a crime against the United States, and any individual or foreign nation directly or indirectly engaged in the commission of, or participation in, such an act, shall be regarded and treated as a public enemy of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the penalty for the commission of any of the aforementioned acts by any individual shall be death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment in one of the Federal penitentiaries, prisons, or jails, for such period as, in the discretion of the Federal court in which the defendant shall be found guilty, may be just and proper, and the said guilty person shall also be subject to a fine in addition to such imprisonment of a minimum of $10,000 for each offense.

SEC. 4. That any foreign nation violating such act or any of its provisions as above herein specified may be indicted in accordance with due process of law, by any grand jury of the Federal district in which any such act or acts has been or may be committed, and if found guilty of the commission of such act or acts shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100,000 for each offense committed by such nation, and that in order to satisfy any fine or fines imposed thereon, any money or other property owned by said nation within the territory of the United States or any of its Territorial possessions shall be subject to immediate seizure, and in the case of property, whether same be real property or personal property or intangible rights, the same shall be sold in order to obtain the necessary money from the net proceeds thereof to satisfy any fine or fines imposed on such foreign nation, and it is within the discretion of any Federal court of the United States to determine if any citizen or citizens of such offending nation or nations found guilty of having committed any such act or acts, who may be temporarily residing in the United States, may be deported therefrom on such notice and at such times as any Federal court in the United States, in the exercise of its best judgment and discretion, shall determine.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman is doing the Nation a service in reciting these points categorically. I wonder if he intends to recall to the Members of the House the time the State Department was asking for money for an organization like UNRRA for relief, they were refusing aid from individuals and groups in the United States who wished at their own expense and through their own efforts to provide help for their relatives and friends in other countries.

Mr. O'KONSKI. It was not a relief organization. It turned out to be an organization to finance communism in the Balkans and in Europe. If it was not for the money which Tito got through UNRRA, which amounted to $650,000,000, he would not today have a standing army of 700,000 men threatening the peace of Greece and Turkey because he just would not have had the funds with which to do it. Not only that, but if we had not bolstered the

Communists and Tito in Yugoslavia with $650,000,000 worth of UNRRA goods very likely today he would not even be a leader in Yugoslavia, because the people would have overthrown him a long time ago. The only reason he keeps his power is because he can do so with the power of American money and UNRRA goods and UNRRA food.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I wonder if the gentleman remembers during the time that the question of a world bank was being discussed on the floor of the House the statement was actually made in the well of the House that the establishment of that world bank would make it unnecessary to have individual loans to any of the countries.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I have two questions in mind which I intended to get further information on before taking them up with the gentleman, but may I ask the gentleman whether or not to his knowledge the Army is now giving intensive refresher courses in both the Greek and Turkish languages at the Pentagon Building on the assumption, of course, that through the propaganda agencies this bill is going to pass easily?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I understand they are. That program was started long before the message was brought to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RAMEY. Has the gentleman received any guaranty that if the troops and other people are sent with money that the 6,000 bulldozers that are rusting and which are ready for agriculture will be greased up and put into agricultural work to help rebuild those countries, or will we be warlike and forget about these bulldozers?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentleman and I agree on that point perfectly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know any way that we can make some gentlemen in the other body who were elected on the Republican ticket read what you are saying? I would like to get them to do it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. What I have to say about gentlemen of the other body cannot go in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on Thursday next, after the completion of the regular business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, April 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

516. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

517. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings; and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1 to December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

519. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of the audit report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, together with a copy of the statement of the Acting Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, filed by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 10, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

520. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

521. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Alfred Thomas Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

522. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

523. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. First intermediate report filed pursuant to Public Law 486, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the effectiveness of the antiracketeering laws and the administration thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pony Express National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2963. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2964. A bill providing for the conveyance to the regents of the University of Texas of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 2965. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2966. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2967. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2968. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by floods occurring in 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2969. A bill to grant to the State of California a retrocession of jurisdiction over certain rights-of-way granted to the State of California for the purpose of widening and extending the right-of-way constructed in the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2970. A bill to provide for the review of the cases of officers removed from the Regular Army pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), and for their restoration if justified; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2971. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2972. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2973. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2974. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2975. A bill to exempt from tax the transportation of persons on boats used for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2976. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the issuance of public improvement bonds of the Territory during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, without regard to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exercise a policy of moderation and of careful

and deliberate consideration of all pending and proposed measures seeking to restrict or deny rights of members of organized labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the salmon industry to its former productivity; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore to the Bureau of Customs the funds cut from its 1947–48 appropriations by the National House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating funds to continue the Rural Electrification Administration and provide funds for loans to rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support Senate bill No. 715; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the term of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the horse-breeding program of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal leave pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 577 or similar legislation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETERSON introduced a bill (H. R. 2977) for the relief of Lloyd Barnet, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

302. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 95 residents of the community of Bowerston urging the passage of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

303. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Department of California, Blue Star Mothers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing all subversive and un-American actions in our Nation; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

304. Also, petition of Mr. M. E. Rothget and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the 1-cent increase in the local gasoline tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

305. Also, petition of Mrs. Marie A. Wood and others (members of Townsend Club No. 22, of Miami, Fla.), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eighteenth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

306. Also, petition of Mrs. F. B. Turner and others (the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council of the State of Florida), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eighteenth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Thou who alone knowest what lies before us this day, grant that in every hour of it we may stay close to Thee. Let us today embark on no undertaking that is not in line with Thy will for us here, for our country and our world. Bestow Thy grace upon the Presiding Officer, the Members, and the servants of this body. Illumine our minds and direct our thinking, that our thoughts and our actions may merit Thy blessing. For our Lord Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PENALTY MAIL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the quantity of penalty-inscribed mail on hand or on order June 30, 1946, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and estimated cost of handling for the period of July 1 to December 31, 1946, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to support Senate bill 715, providing retirement benefits for the investigatory staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

"Whereas the investigatory staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the sterling leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, has achieved an enviable and remarkable record of efficiency, success, and heroism in its relentless war against crime and espionage, thereby earning the gratitude and esteem of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas this present high standard in criminal investigatory activities is endangered through the numerous resignations of experienced agents of the Bureau to accept positions with attractive security features in private industry; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States Senate bill 715, which amends the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide liberal annuities for the investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has previously enacted legislation providing retirement benefits for representatives of the Foreign Service of the State Department, and numerous State and local police agencies provide similar benefits for their personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to support Senate bill 715 of the Eightieth Congress, first session, to the end that the purpose therein sought to be accomplished may be enacted into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 68

"Resolution relative to continuing the horse-breeding program of the United States Army

"Whereas during the last 25 years, the United States Army, through the Remount Service of its Quartermaster Corps, has carried on a horse-breeding program by making available to livestock growers in various parts of the United States the services of selected stallions for breeding purposes; and

"Whereas this program has resulted in a very great improvement in horses produced throughout the United States, particularly in the Western States, including California, where the growing of livestock is an important part of the economic life of the country; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable that the best possible breeds of horses be developed to meet the growing demand for better stock for general use as well as for recreational purposes, the latter use developing constantly and so popular that a program is under way to develop a whole system of riding and hiking trails throughout the State of California; and

"Whereas the program of horse breeding carried on by the United States Army is far too extensive to be maintained by any private breeders or organization of livestock growers, and the discontinuance of the program will result in a deterioration of quality of horses produced in the United States, which will in turn result in great economic

loss to the people of California and the Western States generally: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the United States Army is hereby urged to continue the horse-breeding program of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, and to maintain a sufficient number of remount depots to carry on the service, in order that the quality of horses raised in the United States may continue to improve; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by members of the West Palm Beach (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 3, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Alabama Cattlemen's Association, Demopolis, Ala., favoring appropriation of additional funds for the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, so that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the admission of persons and the importation of animals and materials carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Yuba City, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 53. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean; without amendment (Rept. No. 92);

S. 135. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler; without amendment (Rept. No. 93); and

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor); without amendment (Rept. No. 94).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1023. A bill to amend the act of March 14, 1944, to include Coast Guard personnel in the exemption from payment of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge; without amendment (Rept. No. 95).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

S. 1067. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Gertrude Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1068. A bill to provide for the more expeditious disposal of surplus personal property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1069. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 1070, to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

CAPITAL STOCK OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill. The bill is entitled "A bill to provide for the cancellation of capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received under such stock, and for other purposes"—the other purposes being to set a limit of $1,000,000,000 on the reserve for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, at which time there would be no premiums collected from the participating banks, unless at such time the fund were to go below $1,000,000,000.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENTERTAINMENT OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 102), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the unexpended balance of amounts made available under Senate Resolution 163, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to July 1, 1943, shall remain available for expenditure during the remainder of the Eightieth Congress for the purposes stated in said resolution.

MEETING OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee be authorized to sit between 3 and 4:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, such authority is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate at 3:30 this afternoon, to look after state business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

DIAMOND JUBILEE CELEBRATION OF ARBOR DAY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that Thursday, April 10, will be the seventy-fifth anniversary of the celebration of the first Arbor Day at Nebraska City, Nebr.

Arbor Day came into being very largely as a result of the initiative and enthusiasm of one of the most distinguished early citizens of Nebraska, J. Sterling Morton, who later became Secretary of Agriculture. In 1872, J. Sterling Morton, then a young pioneer editor in Nebraska, succeeded in persuading the State board of agriculture to proclaim the Nation's first Arbor Day. The movement spread rapidly to other States. Today, 75 years later, we find it celebrated in practically every one of the 48 States and all over the civilized world. The widespread adoption of this idea is a great tribute to the pioneering vision of this distinguished Nebraska citizen.

On Thursday of this week, Nebraska is planning a celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of Arbor Day. Here in Washington the members of the Nebraska delegation will plant a 6-foot burr oak near the northeast corner of the Capitol Grounds at 4 o'clock, Thursday afternoon. This tree is being flown to Washington by the United Air Lines from the National Arboretum in Illinois. My distinguished colleague [Mr. WHERRY] and the other members of the Nebraska delegation join in this announcement, in order that the Members of the Senate, as well as the general public, may know of our plans.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article describing the original Arbor Day, together with an explanation of its present-day significance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL—SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ARBOR DAY

April marks the diamond jubilee of Arbor Day, the world-wide tree-growing observance which started in a treeless American plains State. During this month, most of the 48 States and many foreign nations will honor Julius Sterling Morton, founder of Arbor Day, and the State of Nebraska, which on April 10, 1872, planted a million trees to start one of the world's greatest tree-growing movements.

When in 1854, Morton broke the virgin sod of his quarter-section Nebraska homestead, the land was rich but treeless. It contrasted sharply with the timbered slopes of the Appalachians and the wooded valleys of the Ohio which had sheltered and provided for the West-moving stream of immigrants. Essential forest products were brought hundreds of miles to supply the daily needs of the growing numbers of prairie families.

Some talked of planting trees—"but it takes years to grow a tree." Others were satisfied with the "great American desert" as it was. "It's nature's will, no trees will ever grow here," they said. But Morton had other ideas and he carried them beyond words. He planted trees. He encouraged his neighbors to plant trees. Wherever Sterling Morton went, trees began to grow.

From the first spring in his prairie home, Morton planted timber and fruit trees, shrubs, hedges, and any other growth which might take root. Into the new turned soil he thrust cuttings and seeds of every kind of tree he could lay his hands on. He determined to learn which trees would thrive, would protect Nebraska crops and homes from the icy northwest wind which howled across the open prairies in winter. Livestock must have protection, too, from the hot, dry winds of summer. And farmers must have firewood.

Young Morton was already campaigning for more trees, by means of a struggling

newspaper which he edited on the second floor of the old Fort Kearney blockhouse in Nebraska City. In his news columns and editorials, he urged that trees would speed the Territory's development. Sounding the feverish expansion of the growing West, he outlined the bright future of Nebraska City, where streets were still of mud, and cowpaths meandered to the doors of homesteaders' cabins.

Again and again, Morton's enthusiastic Nebraska City News told how timber was growing on nearby homesteads, to prove how much firewood a quarter-section of prairie land would produce for the farmer. By 1870, the tireless young editor-farmer had determined to wage a full-scale "campaign for tree growing." He sounded a call for a "grand army of husbandmen" to join in the "battle against the treeless prairie."

"Our seedling forests," Morton pleaded, "will nurse great timbers, from which will come sills and joists to build the homes of thousands of new Nebraskans."

Bringing his campaign to a climax, on January 4, 1872, Sterling Morton went before the Nebraska State Board of Agriculture at Lincoln, to urge that body to proclaim the world's first Arbor Day. There was debate, but Morton prevailed. At his suggestion the board offered a special prize of $100 to the county agricultural society, and a farm library worth $25 to the individual, "that on April 10 shall plant properly the largest number of trees."

Alert to the value of trees in prairie Nebraska, the State's newspapers now gave prominent space to Morton's unique tree growing campaign. When the first Arbor Day came around, public enthusiasm for the planting was at a high pitch.

All over Nebraska, on April 10—three-quarters of a century ago—farmers and townspeople went out onto their lands, to plant more than a million seedlings, oak, pine, willow, elm, cottonwood. They had begun a long and determined battle to make Nebraska a finer place in which to live, had launched a ceremony destined to spread to the far corners of the world.

Yet, strangely enough, the father of Arbor Day himself was denied a part in the first historic celebration. Sterling Morton had ordered 800 seedlings, and made great preparations for the planting ceremony on his farm at Nebraska City—but the seedlings failed to arrive until the world's first Arbor Day had passed into history. Yet, Morton's enthusiasm ran undiminished, for his tree-poor plains State had auspiciously launched one of the greatest tree-growing movements in history.

Two years later, by proclamation of the Governor of Nebraska, the second Wednesday in April was set aside as Arbor Day, and this date was observed until 1885, when the Nebraska Legislature changed it to Sterling Morton's birthday, which falls on April 22.

Tennessee and Kansas began to celebrate Arbor Day in 1875, and Minnesota joined the procession of Arbor Day States in 1876. By 1893, Arbor Day had spread to almost every State in the Union. In the South it was generally celebrated early in the year. In the North, somewhat later in the season.

Arbor Day, by 1892, had crossed the Pacific to New Zealand. Canada observed a day for tree-planting in 1895, and the next year King Alfonso XIII was ceremoniously planting a pine sapling 2 miles east of Madrid. World-wide observances of Morton's tree-growing campaign were now making the founder of Arbor Day something of a legendary figure in his own time. Arbor Day was bringing a new understanding of forest and fruit trees to millions of school children the world over. Yet, Morton himself by no means claimed that he was a plaster saint.

Born in Adams, N. Y., on April 22, 1832, Sterling Morton at an early age went west with his parents. Entering the University of Michigan in 1850, he embarked upon a lively career as a student. Annoyed by a chapel bell which aroused the student body to morning prayers at a distressingly early hour, Morton determined to silence it. Forming a committee on acoustics, he tried to shackle the unwelcome bell with chains and padlocks. One winter's night, his committee tipped the bell and filled it with water, which froze hard. But next morning, alas, the janitor thwarted the scheme, waking the students with a hand dinner bell.

Always a center of controversy, young Morton found his enterprising scholastic career was suddenly interrupted a few weeks short of graduation by an invitation to leave the university. This he did, amid a storm of protest which his departure caused.

Striking out for Nebraska Territory shortly after it was opened in 1854, the high-spirited Morton speedily became one of the best-known men in the Territory. He not only sponsored tree growing, but took a leading role in all the pioneer civic issues. He championed the entrance of railroads into early Nebraska, and became a storm center in Nebraska's early controversy over the location of the State capital.

In 1893, already a national figure, J. Sterling Morton became Secretary of Agriculture under President Cleveland. In Washington, where he distinguished himself, he carried on his tree-growing crusade, which he always felt was his major achievement.

The father of Arbor Day pursued his tree growing as a religion to which he was passionately devoted. He saw the planting of trees as a means of bringing millions of school children closer to the love and beauties of nature.

Morton's own love of beauty may be seen today in Arbor Lodge, his home just west of Nebraska City, which in 1923 was made into a State park. The magnificent results of his early plantings may be found in the 130 varieties of trees and shrubs which make Arbor Lodge a shrine of quiet woodlands.

"Here are a few acorns today; in time to come they will be sturdy oaks, then railroad ties, ships, and timbers to build homes," said Morton, speaking on an Arbor Day long ago. He saw in the forests perpetual crops of wood to make man comfortable, to keep him warm, to serve him in thousands of wood products, as well as to inspire him to lead a richer spiritual life.

It is an extraordinary tribute to Morton's crusading zeal that he achieved world-wide success with his tree-growing campaign, launched at a time when there were great areas of untouched virgin forest across the United States—when wood was cheap and there was little dollars-and-cents profit in growing trees.

Morton preached that trees must be planted properly, must be cared for all year round. Slowly his message of tree growing gained ground, spurred by the rapidly increasing demand for wood for new uses.

In 1872, when Arbor Day was first celebrated, the United States used little more than 2,000 cords of wood for paper making. Now we use more than 16,000,000 cords a year for this purpose. This is but one example how our uses of wood have increased—whether for construction, paper making, or many new chemical applications. Farmers and other small wood-lot owners, as well as the men who own great tracts of timberland, are learning that trees are a highly profitable "crop" to grow. In a modern version of Morton's tree-growing campaign, which already extends into 16 States, owners of more than 13,000,000 acres of America's privately owned woodlands have dedicated their forested acres to growing perpetual crops of timber under a national "tree farm" banner.

The protection of our tree-growing lands has also come a long way since the first Arbor Day. In 1872 almost no money was being spent to control fires in our forests. In contrast, today private industry, State and Federal Governments spend more than $27,000,000 a year to protect our woodlands from fire. And to enlist the cooperation of the public in reducing the number of man-caused fires which every year take heavy toll of American forest lands a national movement for practical fire prevention has spread into 18 forested States, under a "Keep America green" slogan. In such State campaigns, forest-industry groups team with State and Federal forestry agencies and civic groups. Working together to spread the gospel of being fire careful in our forests, such campaigns have already helped lower our forest-fire losses.

The big job of tree growing in the United States is primarily the task of the owners of tree-producing lands. While Arbor Day embraces the idea of trees for beauty and decorative purposes, the first thought of the founder was for trees for use. In the United States we have some 460,000,000 acres we call commercial-forest lands, where our trees for use must be grown. Sixty percent of these forest lands consists of small wood lots, owned by more than 4,000,000 farmers and others; 14 percent by forest industries; and 26 percent by Federal, State, and local governments. While most new tree growth is started by natural reseeding, it has been estimated that 75,000,000 acres of these lands need to be planted. Of these acres, 44,000,000 are on farms. To this time, the largest production of seedlings was in 1941, when forest nurseries grew 98,000,000 young trees. While the war slowed this work, it now is being expanded again.

With increased scientific knowledge of timber growing wood-lot owners are finding that they can raise trees on soil not suited for other purposes. This, together with today's strong demand for wood, for housing, for pulp on which the world's newspapers and books are printed, has lent strong impetus to the movement to grow trees with year-round care—and profit.

Spurred by 1947's exceptional demands for wood for thousands of uses, America's owners of timberlands are growing trees—and caring for them—as never before, carrying on the time-honored traditions of Arbor Day, which Julius Sterling Morton launched in tree-poor Nebraska exactly three-quarters of a century ago.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and

the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in response to the urgent recommendations of the President of the United States, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously reported the bill (S. 938) entitled "A bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey." It could be alternatively titled "A bill to support the purposes of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security," or it could be titled "A bill to serve America's self-interest in the maintenance of independent governments."

The committee makes this report primarily in response to direct appeals to our Government from heroic Greece which, by her sacrificial World War loyalties, has richly earned the right to perpetuate her proud, historic independence. It does so in response to direct appeals from Turkey, which is the only truly independent nation left on the borders of Soviet Russia from the Baltic to the Black Sea. It also does so in the presence of the overriding strategic fact that the fall of Greece, followed by the collapse of Turkey, could precipitate a chain reaction which would threaten peace and security around the globe. It does so in the profound belief that we Americans have an unescapable stake in all human rights and fundamental freedoms; and that they were better saved—for us as well as others—by adequate and timely support than by waiting for cumulative hazard to magnify the risk. It does so not only in the name of the liberties for which the Allies said they fought two World Wars, but also in the name of the intelligent American self-interest which prefers an ounce of precaution to a pound of cure, and which believes "that a stitch in time saves nine."

I am not one of those, Mr. President, who conceive that we are launching what has been called, by some, a new doctrine in any such unique sense as did James Monroe a century and a quarter ago. Rather, in my opinion, we are launching a plan which has numerous precedents—although we must frankly and honestly assess the fact that it has new and "broad implications," as President Truman himself declared in his message of March 12. There is no new doctrine in American aid to distressed nations. There is no new doctrine in striving for "the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a life free from coercion" or in "supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation," again quoting the Presidential message. The pending plan unquestionably broadens our precedents when it enters the Mediterranean—although the Navy and the marines were there in the earliest days of the Republic and in the finest American tradition. The plan broadens geographically, although we long since pronounced the open door for China. It broadens when peacetime military missions, heretofore largely confined to pan-America, enter the Near East. But it is not new in concept. Certainly there is nothing new in our opposition to communism outside of areas where it is officially embraced. We have always done these things. It would be new only if we now were to desert these ideals. In any event, in whatever degree it is new, it is necessary.

But it is much more than a plan for relief of human suffering in Greece and Turkey. Let us be totally plain about it. It is a plan to forestall aggression which, once rolling, could snowball into global danger of vast design. It is a plan for peace. It is a plan to sterilize the seeds of war. We do not escape war by running away from it. No one ran away from war at Munich. We avoid war by facing facts. This plan faces facts. But of course there are other facts to face. No plan can guarantee peace. The most it can do is to take the better calculated risk. That, I believe, is what this plan does. It is a plan, I repeat, for peace. It is a plan to strengthen the United Nations by supporting its objectives in respect to immediate necessities, pending the time when the United Nations can take over.

The Senate, in turn, faces an additional fact. It faces the fact that if we were to reject the plan in its basic purpose we would give the green light to aggression everywhere. Our moral authority and leadership would die on the spot. We would multiply our own hazards. We would weaken the United Nations by multiplying its subsequent responsibilities.

This is not an imperialistic plan. It covets nothing for America but honorable peace in a free world of free men. That is not imperialism. I like what Elihu Root once said of our Monroe Doctrine:

> It rests upon the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself.

That is not imperialism. That is intelligent self-interest. That is what we here propose.

I recall that President Monroe himself declared that the impulse of his "Doctrine" was to prevent the aggressive extension of alien systems "dangerous to our peace and safety." This is not imperialism. It is prudent common sense. It is the pattern of this plan. Curiously enough, one of the things contributing to the birth of the Monroe Doctrine was old Russia seeking to fish in North American waters. Communism thrives on "fishing in troubled waters" today. It is not imperialism to calm the waters. Our purposes are the exact opposite of imperialism. So is this plan. This truth shines through every word of the statement made on March 28 to the Security Council of the United Nations by our American Ambassador:

> The United States * * * does not desire to dominate, intimidate, or threaten the security of any nation, large or small. The United States will support collective security for all nations—large as well as small. The United States respects the rights of all members of the United Nations to follow whatever way of life or system of government they choose, so long as the choice is freely made without intimidation and so long as such nations do not interfere with the rights of other countries or the liberties of other peoples.

I say once more, Mr. President, that we here confront a plan—a special and particular plan. I do not view it as a universal pattern but rather as a selective pattern to fit a given circumstance. We are not suddenly resolved to underwrite the earth. That would be fantastic, improvident, and impossible. What we do is to underscore once more a principle long ingrained in the American character—namely to "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation," again quoting the Presidential message. We point the general direction we propose to go. We do not, we cannot, chart the total course. This plan fits a key, strategic need. Undoubtedly there will be other problems facing other and different needs. For example, our occupational responsibilities in Korea unquestionably will soon demand positive support. It is part of World War II—unless we propose to lose the peace.

It would be a fraud upon our people to pretend that this plan ends all need for aid. Our people prefer the truth. The truth is we do face the fact that Greece and Turkey are not isolated phenomena—even though they involve a unique and emphasized importance. We must face the fact that other situations may arise which clearly involve our own national welfare in their lengthened shadows. Let us harbor no soft illusions. But I emphatically repeat that we do not here set a universal precedent, except in basic self-defensive purpose. We shall always react; but we shall react as any given situation seems to require. Meanwhile, it is to be fervently hoped and prayed that we may have enough foresight hereafter so that we do not always have to react on a "crisis basis."

This plan requires complete candor with ourselves and with the world. It requires prudence lest we overextend ourselves or overpromise others. Equally it requires courage and tenacity of democratic purpose. But I cannot believe it would be intelligent self-interest to deny the plan and thus invite the

earth to think that our divided government is impotent. I believe that "standing up" is a better risk than "lying down." I believe that we either take or surrender leadership—and I can find no intelligent, American self-interest in any such surrender.

But the situation, Mr. President, requires something more than is in this bill. It calls for two collateral efforts on our part: First, to strive for the honorable removal of underlying friction, if mutually possible, between the two greatest powers on earth; second, to strive for the closest possible integration of all our plans with the collective responsibilities of a strengthened and matured United Nations which is the world's prime hope for peace.

I shall return to both these propositions before I have concluded. At the moment I now address myself to the specific plan for which the approval of the Senate is now sought.

Aid for Greece is aid for a brave war ally which suffered war invasion; then 4 years of cruel enemy occupation; then bitter internal terrorism which the President identifies as of Communist origin; then Communist-inspired violation of its hard-pressed borders. I have no doubt there also has been terrorism on the right. In any event, Greece is prostrate. British support, assigned to Britain by the Allies as a postwar responsibility, is being withdrawn because Britain herself is in economic straits. In this dire emergency Greece appeals to us to save her political and economic independence. This bill is our response. We are not bailing out the British Empire. We are not perpetuating Greek monarchy. We are making it possible for the Greek people to survive in stability and self-determination.

It is highly important at this point to note that financial and other outside aid for Greece is recommended in a powerful contemporary report of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations itself—with an appeal to the United States for special aid. The report frankly recognizes this need for special aid from the United States. Then, praising the Grecian tradition of self-reliance, this international report says that "democratic and voluntary methods of future development, rather than compulsory dictation or direction, are in keeping with the century-old characteristics of the Hellenic temperament." Remember, this is the United Nations speaking. From no other possible source could Greece be quite so sure of democratic aid looking toward self-reliance as from the United States. It is a precise prescription from the United Nations itself for the thing we here propose to do.

We need not condone the present Greek regime, though clearly chosen in a free election, in order to come to the aid of the Greeks themselves. We are entitled to expect that the Greeks themselves, responding to the advice they voluntarily have sought from us, will build a more efficient and equitable democracy when relieved of the pressures which have driven them to any sanctuary that has been presently available. But such precious objectives are impossible so long as Greece is torn by externally and internally stimulated civil war. Therefore aid to Greece must include means to develop adequate Greek defense in behalf of lawful peace. In the absence of lawful peace, our aid would be no more than a transient bounty—as has been the case for the last 2 years.

Peace is prerequisite. So is helpful guidance in the establishment of a sound national economy. Greece turns to the United States as the only source of these imminently necessary helps. These comprehensive purposes are the program of the pending bill. Lest there be overemphasis in the wrong place, I hasten to add that our contemplated military mission involves only from 10 to 40 officers and no combat troops. The naval mission contemplates nonbelligerent craft like mine sweepers, in the main. The military effort, though accounting for $150,000,000 of this grant, is to help Greece to help herself to be self-reliant in defense of her self-chosen government, whatever that may be.

The sum of $130,000,000 is for basic reconstruction; $20,000,000 for agricultural rehabilitation; plus $50,000,000 for relief in the general relief bill now pending in the House.

But that is not all. The plain fact seems to be that if the Greeks, in their extremity, are not successfully helped to help themselves to maintain their own healthy right of self-determination, another Communist dictatorship will rise at this key point in world geography. Then Turkey, long mobilized against a Communist war of nerves, faces neighboring jeopardy. The two situations are inseparable. Turkey confronts no such internal extremity as does Greece; but it requires assistance to bulwark its national security. The President says that the maintenance of its national integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East. If the Middle East falls within the orbit of aggressive Communist expansion, the repercussions will echo from the Dardenelles to the China Sea and westward to the rims of the Atlantic. Indeed, the Middle East, in this foreshortened world, is not far enough away for safety from our own New York or Detroit or Chicago or San Francisco. That is where we come in. Do we face it now or later? Which is the wiser course? Which holds the better promise of honorable peace? Which is recommended by intelligent American self-interest? The President's answer is this: "If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation." He adds, "Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events." Gods knows these responsibilities are great, no matter what our course. God knows that this would be an infinitely happier land if it were physically possible for us to close our tired eyes, retire within what were our bastions of yesterday, and shut out the external menace of shapes and forms which we abhor. God knows that we painfully search our hearts for wisdom. May His way be the way we choose.

This plan is for 15 months. Can this job be done in 15 months? I do not know. I doubt it; although in 15 months both the United Nations and the World Bank should be able substantially to take over. But I ask neither Congress nor the country to ignore the nature of this obligation. I say again that I trust them to prefer the truth.

In a sense we are a tragic generation, despite our blessings and our place in the sun. We have been drawn into two World Wars. We finally won them both, and yet we still confront a restless and precarious peace. Something has been wrong. It is our supreme task to face these present realities, no matter how we hate them, and to mend the broken pattern if such be within human power.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say again, let us all face facts. The problem involved in this bill—like the problem involved in every other phase of languishing peace—is the persistent controversy between what we loosely call eastern communism and western democracy. From it inevitably stem persistent difficulties between the Soviet Union and its satellites upon the one hand, and the United States and like-minded non-Communist states upon the other. Still more explicitly, it involves hostility to Communist expansionism and infiltration. This expansionism, in turn, arises, we constantly are told from Soviet fears of resurgent aggression by her neighbors and from fears of encirclement looking toward her destruction. If Moscow really has those fears, she is entitled to have them dependably removed. She cannot be expected to react any differently than we do under like circumstances. Given a fair chance, on a two-way street, we should be able to mitigate those fears because we believe in self-determination for Russians precisely as we insist upon it for Americans and others. We plot no offense against the Soviet Union. We are not hunting world dominion. We are not seeking dictation anywhere. But what we deny to ourselves as a matter of morality we also must deny to others as a matter of conquest.

It may be remembered, Mr. President, that as long ago as January 10, 1945, I discussed this same, identical theme in the Senate. I said then that if Russia pursues expansionism through fear of a reborn Axis, we should offer her a hard and fast alliance against a reborn Axis. We have made that offer. It still stands. It has not been accepted. We can expand that offer. We can sign anything at Moscow which guarantees the independence of the Soviet Union within its own legitimate domain. But there must be two signatures—and they must both be good—better, I regret to say, than signatures at Yalta or at Potsdam. We, in turn, have the reciprocal right to demand effective proof that Moscow is not plotting to encircle us in a Communist-dominated world; that Communist assaults upon us, within and without the United States, shall cease; and that our mutual pledges to the Atlantic Charter and to the principles and purposes of the United Nations shall be reliably honored in behalf of all concerned. I do not mean in words alone. I mean in deeds. I mean the rebirth of international integrity.

It still seems to me, Mr. President, that the great need is comprehensively candid discussions between us, if possible, with all the cards face up upon the table. Although we cannot wait for any such negotiations before proceeding to mend the imminent situation in Greece, yet this is the fundamental objective which I should hope might be pursued. Let us not again drift into misunderstanding of what America means when it speaks. The Greek crisis or the Turkish crisis or any others among potential crises will largely disappear if the mutual will exists between Washington and Moscow. If it cannot exist, even that ominous knowledge is worth having. While we cannot avoid the eternal rivalry of these incompatible ideologies, there ought to be an honorable way to live and let live within the rules of the United Nations. We should mutually strive to search it out on the basis not only of salvaging the ideals of World War I and World War II, but also and particularly on the basis of the self-interest of the two greatest nations on earth—neither one of whom wants any part of another war. But we, for our part, will never find it through equivocation which will be misread as timidity. We shall never find it except as we succeed in convincing Moscow, first, that we have absolutely no ulterior designs; and, second, that we shall not compromise or whittle away the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms which we both have pledged in the most solemn peacetime commitments of which honorable nations are capable.

But we shall never again be able to convince anybody of this latter, vital fact if, at the instant moment, we refuse our solid backing to the President of the United States when he speaks in this behalf. It is the task of statesmanship to stop these present trends or lay bare the alternative. It is time to agree, or to agree to disagree. It is our own task to say what we mean and mean what we say in friendly but incorrigible firmness regarding the only way to establish the realities of peace.

At this point, Mr. President, I want to say a final word about aggression, the major sin against a peaceful world. We did not write a definition of "aggression" in the San Francisco Charter, because we feared our own inability to find adequate words. Yet it needs definition. One of the best attempts was the Convention for the Definition of Aggression, signed at London, July 3, 1933, by the Soviet Union and, among others, ironically, the Balkan states. By this definition, an aggressor is one who commits acts including the following:

> Provision of support to armed bands formed in its territory which have invaded the territory of another state, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded state, to take, in its own territory, all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection.

I content myself with the observation that, in the case at hand, somebody is an aggressor on these violated Greek frontiers, according to the Soviet's own specifications.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the most important of all considerations that have been raised by the pending plan. The United Nations, the voice of collective security, must always be our first reliance and our prime concern as far as possible in every problem of this nature. It must be used to the maximum of practical possibilities. In no available aspect should we bypass its functions. But in no unavailable aspect should we ruin it by assigning to it functions which it does not possess. Such an assignment would destroy it for keeps. Meanwhile, under such circumstances as in the present instance, Greece would sink into the Communist orbit and the fateful chain reaction would set in both East and West.

Under the amended bill, now pending in the Senate, this whole situation is honestly and faithfully assessed. The Foreign Relations Committee has added a preamble which recites the facts. It asserts our belief and purpose that this bill "will contribute to the freedom and independence of all members of the United Nations in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter. The committee has added an amendment which stops the functions of this bill whenever the Security Council, without counting vetoes, or the General Assembly finds that "action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of assistance—under this bill—unnecessary or undesirable."

Mr. President, far from bypassing the United Nations, this amended bill is the greatest act of voluntary allegiance to it in the whole story of the United Nations. It even goes to the heart and core of the veto controversy. In the first great test which the Security Council ever faced Britain and France demonstrated their good faith by accepting a Council verdict regardless of vetoes in the case of little Lebanon and Syria. We now do so in advance in the case of Greece and Turkey. We accept the untrammeled judgment of the organized conscience of the world on what we do, and we invite it to intervene at its own will. A technical error in the wording of the committee amendment has been corrected. This is not a weasel-worded gesture. This is an act of total faith. Microscopic analysts may try to find hypothetical flaws in it. But no such flank attacks can dull its purpose and effect.

Now let us examine the facts. I speak first of what the United Nations cannot do and what no wise well-wisher will ask it to do. It is not and was never intended to be a relief organization. It has no such funds and was never intended to have such funds. It could get the funds only by an assessment in which we would carry the heavy share and thus face, all over again, the vicious dissatisfactions which we suffered through UNRRA, despite its notable humanities, when we put up our money for others too frequently to maladminister to suit themselves. It has no sustaining military force because the Soviet representatives thus far have declined to permit these plans to materialize. If it had either the funds or the force, their use would depend upon the Security Council. In the Security Council this use would face a veto. Any frank assessment of realities, in the light of experience to date, must concede that the veto would be used by the Soviet Union in any phase of conflict between communism and democracy. These are the facts. There is no way to bypass these facts. Greek independence cannot be saved, at least for the time being, in any such fashion, no matter how adroit the scheme of reference. The implications to which the President refers cannot be met by any attempts, no matter how nobly meditated, to misuse the United Nations as of today. The United Nations itself cannot be sustained by any such misuse. The most we can do at the moment is to leave certain special phases of the problem in United Nations jurisdiction; and to leave an over-all authority in the Council and Assembly to hold us to strict accountability for what we do.

Mr. Sumner Welles recently pointed out what he said will be the line that Soviet propaganda will follow in its efforts to combat the administration's present foreign policy. He cited Izvestia and Pravda—both official Moscow publications—which charge us with destroying the United Nations. He was a good prophet. This argument has met with much popular and often innocent support in the United States. On the one hand, this support is a precious tribute to the faithful hopes of humankind. On the other, it is a cunning backfire to becloud the issue. I know of no better way to destroy the United Nations than to give it a specific job which it is neither intended nor prepared to do. The only better way to destroy the United Nations of which I know is to overuse the veto. Indeed, it is a significant thing that this plan is opposed by two totally opposite and incompatible groups in the United States. As has been well said, it is opposed, first, by those who hope it will not work but are afraid it will, and, second, by those who hope it will work but are afraid it will not.

It is no depreciation of the United Nations to frankly recognize the fact that the Greek petition to us seeks primary relief which the United Nations cannot provide. It is of no small significance, in this connection, that Greece and Turkey, both members of the United Nations, did not themselves apply to the United Nations, but applied direct to the United States.

But, Mr. President, the United Nations does have its important place in this prospectus even as things are today. It is already rendering important aid. Its Security Council has had a commission on the Greek border investigating disturbances between Greece, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania. This commission will report within a few weeks. It will establish truth and responsibility at this point of major friction. If a veto does not subsequently intervene, the Security Council may well establish a permanent border commission whose moral authority and whose sanctions may well minimize this phase of the Greek hazard. If the Security Council is permitted to function in this regard,

it will greatly simplify the Greco-Turkish problem and greatly hasten success for our own peaceful adventure. Surely it does not destroy or remotely hamper the United Nations, in this phase, if the United States simultaneously is helping Greece to rebuild her own competent independence and helping Turkey to preserve hers. On the contrary, it is what would be called, in American idiom, "team ball."

Nor is that all. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has submitted a 25-year long-range program for Greek economic rehabilitation. And mark this! I repeat that this important instrumentality of the United Nations has specifically recommended that Greece should apply to the United States, among others, for temporary aid in launching this rehabilitation. It frankly recognizes the present limitations within which the United Nations operates.

Nor is this all. It is definitely anticipated that the World Bank will step into this situation and carry the major rehabilitation load just as soon as the imminent crisis is surmounted; just as soon as peace and preliminary stability are restored; just as soon as there is any basis whatever for banking credit.

So, Mr. President, the United Nations does have its important place in this historic prospectus. It can do things to help as of today even though its larger availability is a matter for tomorrow. We must use it to the maximum of its possibilities. We must use all of its functions which are available. We must take no unilateral or bilateral action without full and constant notice to this world fraternity, and with full and constant eagerness to have it succeed to our separately assumed responsibilities whenever and wherever this can be done. I frankly regret that when the President spoke to Congress on March 12, he did not simultaneously advise the Secretary General at New York of our intentions, instead of waiting to present indirect notice through our representative on the Security Council 16 days later. It might have allayed needless misunderstanding. Any such misunderstanding is needless because the President himself clearly indicates that he is wedded to the United Nations. Nothing could be clearer than our message delivered to the Security Council by Ambassador Austin on March 28:

> The program of economic assistance contemplated by the United States is of an emergency and temporary character. The United States believes that the United Nations and its related agencies should assume the principal responsibility, within their capabilities, for the long-range tasks of assistance required for the reconstruction of Greece. * * * The United States is giving momentum to the United Nations by its present policy. * * * We look forward to the time when such burdens may be carried through the United Nations.

If that is not clear and adequate, Mr. President, certainly nothing remains unsaid in the preamble and amendment which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has added to the pending bill. Certainly I would be the last man in America to sanction any blow at the prestige and authority of the United Nations. But I also hope I would be the last man in America to drain off that prestige and authority by assigning them a total task which, in point of time and resources, would be foredoomed to sinister failure. I am unable to understand how we could undermine an institution dedicated to human rights and fundamental freedom, to independent governments of free men in a free world, when we supplement these dedications with our own direct succor to those who are imminently threatened with their loss, and when we ask the United Nations to hold us to strict accountability for what we do. No, Mr. President, we are not bypassing the United Nations. We are sustaining them. We are serving peace—emphatically including peace for ourselves—when we strive, in prudent time, to arrest those frictions and disintegrations which otherwise could culminate in an atomic war which must never happen.

Mr. President, as I conclude, let me say that your Foreign Relations Committee unanimously recommends the passage of this amended measure. It is regrettable that policies of such magnitude could not have had more time for consideration. I knew nothing of the matter until we were called to the White House on February 27. I repeat, it is unfortunate when such important decisions have to be made on a crisis basis. But we confront a condition, and not a theory. We have made extraordinary efforts in the committee to let in the light. We held public hearings. We heard every citizen who asked to be heard. We resorted to the novel technique of inviting all Senators to contribute to a questionnaire; and we have made public the State Department's categorical replies. We are suggesting some amendments to the bill, aimed generally at tighter controls and specific liaison with the United Nations. But, sir, the truth of the matter is that, even though we had had months of study at our command, Congress does not have an unprejudiced chance to exercise truly independent and objective judgments in such circumstances as we here confront. This statement leads to the final consideration which no Senator can ignore in respect to his decision.

Congress does not enjoy original jurisdiction in foreign relations. That is the prerogative of the Chief Executive. We come in, usually, only at the eleventh hour, when our choice is the lesser of two evils—as in this instance, when we must decide which is the wiser "calculated risk" for us. To be or not to be? To do or not to do? As when we have been asked, upon other occasions, to declare war, the fact is that by the time these issues reach us for ultimate conclusions, we are heavily precommitted by the very fact of the Presidential request. I do not for an instant mean to say we cannot act on our own independent judgments. I do not mean to say that it is not still our solemn duty to act in keeping with our own estimate of the national welfare and security. I do not mean to say that we can either shift or dodge our share of responsibility, and I would not attempt to do so. But I do mean to say that among the paramount factors to which we dare not deny due weight is this: To repudiate the President of the United States at such an hour could display a divisive weakness which might involve far greater jeopardy than a sturdy display of united strength. We are not free to ignore the price of noncompliance.

In my view, Mr. President, the price of noncompliance in the instant case—in addition to all other reasons for prompt passage of this bill—would be the forfeiture of all hope to effectively influence the attitude of other nations in our peaceful pursuit of international righteousness from now on. It would stunt our moral authority and mute our voice. It would encourage dangerous contempts. It would invite provocative misunderstandings of the tenacity with which we are prepared to defend our fundamental ideals. Mr. President, what would you think if you were a citizen of Athens? Where would you be forced to turn in your hopeless extremity? What would you think if you were a citizen of Ankara? What would you think if you were a citizen of any other of the weary, war-worn nations who are wondering this afternoon whether the torch still burns in the upraised hand of Liberty; whether it is hopeless to struggle on toward democratic freedom? And what would you think, Mr. President, if you were the Politburo in Moscow's Kremlin?

The Foreign Relations Committee, without political division, supports the President of the United States. It does so for the sake of the humanities. It does so for the sake of peace with justice. But above all else, it does so for the sake of the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday, during the call of the calendar, the Senate passed House bill 2535, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. I had been asked to object to the consideration of the bill when it was reached on the call of the calendar, but I was off the floor when it was reached, and I confess that I defaulted in the request that was made of me.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate passed this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. What is the bill?

Mr. WHITE. It is House bill 2535, a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. I had agreed, as I have said, that I would object to the consideration of the bill, but in the confusion of the day I was off the floor, and I missed the opportunity, and failed in the obligation to ask that the bill be passed over. I now ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? In the absence of objection, the request is granted, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. WHITE. I now ask that the bill be restored to the Senate Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 49, House bill 2102, the so-called farm labor bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I find it necessary to object to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It was not a motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk is about to state the bill by title for information only. The Senator's objection can be entered at a later time.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102. However, if the Senator from Missouri objects to the unanimous-consent request, it will be necessary for me to move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49, House bill 2102. So long as objection has been raised, I do so move.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

Mr. KEM. I should like to be heard on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, House bill 2102 is the so-called farm labor bill. It provides for an extension of the farm labor program for a period of 6 months after the 1st of July of this year. If this program is to be effective and do any good to the farmers this year, it is essential that the bill be acted upon at this time, because planting is already under way in many parts of the country.

Mr. President, in January 1943 the War Manpower Commission by directive transferred responsibility for farm labor placements from the United States Employment Service to the United States Department of Agriculture. Senate bill 724, which we are now considering really under the title of House bill 2102, would extend for 6 months the farm labor program which has been conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the several States since 1943. The program has provided much-needed labor for the planting, the cultivating, the harvesting, and the processing of food crops vitally needed for domestic consumption and for export.

According to the testimony adduced at the hearings on the bill, sufficient labor of the kind required by producers and processors of agricultural commodities is not available where needed at the present time. According to the recent surveys made by the Department of Agriculture and the State extension services, an adequate supply of farm labor will not be available during the remainder of this year unless the labor supply program is continued. The present program will continue until July 1 of this year, Mr. President, but, as I have said, planting is already under way, and the farmers do not feel free to go ahead with their full planting until they know whether the farm labor program is to be continued so that they will have labor available for harvesting next fall. It is obviously not to be expected of them that they will proceed to plant crops which they will be unable to harvest.

The need for farm labor is particularly acute in connection with the production of sugar beets, fruits, vegetables, and canning crops. The labor requirement in connection with the production of many of these crops is largely seasonal, but laborers are needed in particular areas for short periods only at this time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does this program cost the Government anything? Can the Senator tell us what the cost is to the Government?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. The first such public law was approved April 29, 1943, and it provided $26,100,000 for the 8 months remaining in that year. Under the next law, approved February 14, 1944, the cost was $30,000,000. The next law was Public Law No. 529, approved December 22, 1944, which was presumably for the next year, and which carried an appropriation, representing the cost, of $20,000,000 for the calendar year 1945. There was $25,000,000 required for the calendar year 1946. The last law, which was approved July 23, 1946, carried an appropriation of $12,000,000, extending until June 30, 1947.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is any of the money appropriated paid to the imported labor in the way of wages, or does it represent the cost of transportation and administration?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand—Senators who are present will correct me if I am wrong—that at times it has been necessary to pay some of the imported labor for days between jobs, when they were not assigned to employment. I assume that what was thus paid was a minimum amount.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, when an imported laborer is working on a farm, be it a tobacco, beet sugar, or any other kind of farm, he is paid by the man who employs him, and he receives a full day's pay, the full amount; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that. The laborers have to be paid the prevailing wage for the community. I have a statement showing some of the prevailing wages, which I shall place in the RECORD a little later on. I should like at this time to show the dependency of such crops upon imported labor. I have before me a table setting forth the estimated farm value and the percentage of the total value of the crops which are dependent on transported foreign workers for their harvesting. The table shows 34.2 percent of the sugar-beet crop dependent on such workers, 15.8 of the sugarcane crop, 31.3 percent of the sweetpotato crop, 16 percent of the snap-bean crop, 21 percent of the asparagus crop, 56.5 percent of the green-peas crop, and so on. I ask, Mr. President, that this table giving the estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers for the calendar year 1946 be inserted in the RECORD at this point, because it gives the percentage of all that was harvested by foreign workers, including tomatoes, onions, celery, and citrus fruits. Thirty-one percent of the citrus crop has depended upon foreign workers for harvesting.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers, calendar year 1946

Crops	Estimated total farm value for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest of crops indicated (1)	Estimated total farm value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers (2)	Estimated value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers as percentage of total farm value [1] (3)
	Thous. of dol.	*Thous. of dol.*	*Percent*
Field crops:			
Cotton	85,200	2,366	2.8
Corn, field	350,616	1,443	.4
Corn for seed (hybrid)	26,235	787	3.0
Hay, alfalfa	112,876	5,471	4.8
Hay, other	145,796	2,950	2.0
Tobacco	485,433	5,585	1.1
Wheat and small grains	287,552	3,967	1.3
Miscellaneous [2]	171,342	2,722	1.6
Total	1,665,050	25,291	1.5
Sugar crops:			
Sugar beets	145,361	49,677	34.2
Sugarcane	45,968	7,271	15.8
Total	191,329	56,948	29.7
Vegetables:			
Potatoes, Irish	539,646	44,826	8.3
Potatoes, sweet	9,080	2,850	31.3
Snap beans	63,074	10,151	16.0
Asparagus	30,817	6,481	21.0
Green peas	42,622	24,105	56.5
Sweet corn	137,322	14,261	10.4
Tomatoes	127,051	31,390	24.7
Onions	12,253	2,766	22.6
Carrots	3,084	425	13.8
Celery	16,001	4,206	26.3
Lettuce	1,236	194	15.7
Miscellaneous [2]	537,526	120,634	22.4
Total	1,519,712	262,289	17.3

Estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers, calendar year 1946—Con.

Crops	Estimated total farm value for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest of crops indicated (1)	Estimated total farm value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers (2)	Estimated value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers as percentage of total farm value (3)
Fruits:	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Percent*
Apples	251,354	23,638	9.4
Peaches	126,659	18,227	14.3
Pears	39,750	6,465	16.3
Apricots	34,329	5,302	15.4
Cherries	32,596	5,844	17.9
Grapes	193,736	13,262	6.8
Citrus	381,528	120,809	31.0
Prunes and plums	64,215	7,200	11.2
Miscellaneous [2]	168,136	12,318	7.3
Total	1,292,303	213,065	16.5
Grand total	4,668,394	557,593	11.9

[1] Column 2 divided by column 1 rounded to nearest whole number.
[2] Includes only those crops in which transported foreign workers assisted.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add, in further reply to the Senator from Connecticut, who asked about who paid the workers, that they are paid, as has been said, by the employer, at the prevailing wages for the community, which varied from 30 cents to 45 cents an hour, in Louisiana, up to $1 an hour and even $1.05 an hour, on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The reason I raise the question is because some point has been made in my State to the effect that there is involved an exploitation of cheap labor. Does the bill itself guarantee that the farmer who uses imported labor shall pay the prevailing rate of wages for labor of similar kind in the particular locality?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is provided for by agreement entered into with the Department of Agriculture. We have had no reports that there has been an abuse under this program. I think the employer has had to pay the prevailing wage.

There has been one complaint that, by paying the prevailing wage and having an adequate supply of labor available, the wages of local workers are prevented from rising to higher levels. As I recall, such a complaint came from California.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if I may refresh the recollection of the Senator from Vermont, the complaint was made by the CIO.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The CIO appeared before the committee in opposition to the pending bill; but it was supported by the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service directors, and the farm organizations of the country.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it a fact that the Farm Extension Service that handles this matter, as I understand they do, examines very thoroughly into the situation to determine whether or not local farm laborers are available in a particular area before labor is imported?

Mr. AIKEN. That is claimed to be the fact, and as I recall, last year, the Extension Service of the State of New Jersey reported that sufficient domestic labor was available, and some of the imported labor was transported from that State, either back home or to other sections of the country. The local extension service of the State extension service is required to report immediately when sufficient local labor becomes available.

I believe that the State of Connecticut has had some of the foreign labor. I know that my State of Vermont has had a few hundred foreign laborers, but the number has been decreasing until it reached a low point of approximately 25,000 for the entire United States, last December. It is expected, however, that $10,000,000 will be required for the last 6 months of this year, but it is also contemplated that there shall be an orderly tapering off of the importation of foreign labor, to come to an end on January 1 of this year, with 30 days of grace, or until February 1, during which time the foreign labor employed in the beet fields may conclude their work in the northern fields and factories and be transported back to their homes in the countries of their origin.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, this is merely an extension to cover this particular season?

Mr. AIKEN. It is merely a 6 months' extension, because it is perfectly obvious that with this labor available until July 1 for the planting season, and perhaps the first weeding, no farmer wants to proceed with his planting until he knows whether he is going to have sufficient help to do the harvesting for him next fall.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that, so far as imported foreign labor is concerned, the conditions under which such labor works and the wages for which it works are the subject of negotiation between the labor departments of the foreign governments and our own State Department. Those matters receive very careful consideration, and after the foreign labor comes here, the agreements are subject to constant policing.

Mr. AIKEN. I should also like to say that the production goals for oils and sugars have been set very high this year, and they are two types of crops which depend upon transient, migratory labor, some of it foreign labor, to carry them through from the time of planting until the time of harvest.

The emergency farm-labor program, however, is divided into two parts. It does not concern itself wholly with foreign labor, but one part of it deals with domestic labor, labor that is local, intrastate, or interstate, moving between the States. The foreign labor, of course, is brought in from outside the country.

Answering the Senator from Connecticut still further, I will say that, under the Agricultural Extension Service, each State is responsible for the conduct of the farm-labor program within its borders; the county agent is in charge in each county, and he is assisted by an advisory committee of farmers and other leaders, including the neighborhood-leader system of the Extension Service. When a State cannot meet its farm-labor requirements by transferring labor between counties, the State director of the extension service certifies to the Federal Extension Service in the case of workers from other States, and to the labor branch if it is a question of foreign workers, the need for additional workers.

I should like to point out also that during the war American farmers and their families contributed approximately 2,150,000,000 man-days of labor each year, whereas the labor which was supplied through this program contributed only from 130,000,000 to 160,000,000 man-days of labor; but it contributed those 130,000,000 to 160,000,000 man-days of labor during the period of the war at strategic places, and at strategic times. Nationals were brought in from the Bahamas, Barbados, Canada, Jamaica, Mexico, and Newfoundland. During the war a total of 278,763 were imported. As I have said, only about 25,000 remain in this country today.

It has been said, and it was testified by one witness, a very capable witness representing the CIO, that there is now surplus labor in the country. He pointed out industrial centers in California where there already is a surplus of labor. I do not question that. I believe there are many workers who during the war received from $75 to $100 a week who are still staying in industrial war plant centers hoping that the days when they earned so much money will return. They are reluctant to return to North Dakota, or South Dakota, or Colorado, or Vermont, and take less money. Consequently the problem of where to obtain the labor still remains.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the problem is not entirely controlled by general surplus or lack of surplus of labor. Even when we have a surplus of labor, generally speaking, it often is impossible to get that labor to do the stoop labor required in the beet fields. So the two things do not necessarily control each other. We have known periods in Colorado when there was a very generous excess of general labor supply but that labor could not be induced to go into the beet fields and do that type of work.

Mr. AIKEN. That fact was pointed out quite vividly by the director of the Extension Service from the Senator's State of Colorado, that while labor might be available it was still impossible to hire the labor that would do, as the Senator says, stoop labor, the weeding and the picking up and the topping

of the beets which must be done in the sugar-beet field.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator will recall that some of the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was to the effect that there was much unemployment in California. This morning the USES and also the veterans' division of the unemployment service testified that California was the center of the largest general unemployment and that it was also the center of the greatest veterans' unemployment. The witnesses also testified that none of the unemployed veterans are the kind who would be accepted for or who could do the stoop labor. I merely bring that out to refute the argument which was used previously in our committee, to the effect that there was unemployment in California of the nature that could take care of the stoop labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I well recall the testimony referred to by the Senator from North Dakota, and I appreciate the information given by him as to the labor situation in California. I agree that while there are undoubtedly getting to be pools of surplus labor in certain localities, such labor is not farm labor and is not available to the farmers to use in caring for and harvesting their crops.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The total unemployment in the United States as of today is a little in excess of 2,000,000. Of that number of more than 2,000,000 unemployed, 800,000 are veterans. Those figures indicate that our unemployment is probably the lowest, with the exception of a brief period during the war, that it has been for years. They also indicate that there is still a problem incident to supplying the necessary labor for the production of crops if we are going to feed the world and take care of our own needs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is largely a problem of adjustment and reconversion at present; there is no question about that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that very often too much is made out of general labor-surplus statistics. There is not enough selectivity in the figures. There may be a number of metal miners who may not be working, but it does not follow that they are available for work in the sugar-beet fields, nor does it even follow that such workers are available in other types of metal mining. We learned that in a very graphic way during the war. There were some theorists here who thought that if some of the gold mines and the silver mines were closed down, the labor in those mines would at once become available for work in the copper mines. But it did not become available in the copper mines. Those men stayed where they were or went to work on neighboring ranches. There is a vast difference between working in a copper mine and working in a gold or silver mine. I am merely suggesting that one can be very badly misled by general over-all statistics as to surplus labor.

Mr. AIKEN. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to repeat that while agricultural production in this country has been unprecedentedly high during the last 2 years, farmers have had goals set for them this year which require that this very high level of production be maintained, and in the goals set for this year unusually large amounts of sugar and oil must be produced. The production of sugar, both cane and beet, in this country requires the type of labor which, while it may be in surplus in some industrial centers, is not available for the fields.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator mean to imply that the ten or twelve million veterans who have returned home are not available for farm labor?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, many of them are engaged in farm labor already.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Are not most of them?

Mr. AIKEN. I would not say that most of them are, but of the 2,000,000 unemployed just referred to by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] it is doubtful that a very large percentage of them are presently available for farm labor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it not a fact that nearly always 2,000,000 people are unemployed in this country?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is true. If we had no more than 2,000,000 unemployed we would consider we were having pretty good times.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of how many are unemployed, the fact is that the labor that will be performed by imported laborers is not the kind of labor that such unemployed individuals would perform anyway. Is that not true?

Mr. AIKEN. They may not be so located that they can do the farm work needed to be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean they are not located in the sections of the country where farm laborers are needed, and they are not the type of workers who will get down on their hands and knees and work in the sugar-beet fields?

Mr. AIKEN. I further call attention to the fact that the farm-labor program provided by this bill includes domestic labor, and for the transfer of labor in one State to work in another State. It is not confined strictly to the importation of foreign labor, as many think it is.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator understand, as I have been led to believe, that the administrators of the farm labor recruitment program in this country are actively engaged in endeavoring to secure all the domestic farm labor that it is possible to obtain; and based upon past experience, the foreign importation of labor is simply that which is absolutely necessary to supplement the local labor?

Mr. AIKEN. I so understand.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. YOUNG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The emergency is that we must know what labor is available now if we are to plant crops. It is desperately needed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I am seeking to have action taken on the bill at this time. It should be acted upon today. It should have been acted upon a week ago; but it is better to take action now than a week from now.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. As an example of the critical labor shortage which existed last year, and is practically as bad this year, southern farm boys had to be taken to the northern harvest fields to help for 6 or 8 weeks. It is necessary to have this kind of a program in order to furnish transportation for the workers. The program is handled through the Extension Service, which can best contact the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. We must have labor on our farms when it is needed. Last year there was a peak of foreign labor of 63,736 during the month of September. Apparently that was the most important harvesting month. The number dropped to 25,013 in December. I understand that approximately that number are still in the country, and that for 6 months beyond the time when the farm-labor program expires according to existing law we shall require about the same number we had last year. It is believed that by the end of this year there will be no further necessity for the importation of foreign laborers, barring unforeseen developments in the agricultural field. The farm-labor program will then be turned back to the State employment bureaus, where it used to be.

The Government is calling for peak production of certain crops which require a high percentage of hand labor. The Government is asking for peak production in order to help avert hunger and suffering in all parts of the world. Therefore I believe, as the committee believes, that it is only good business to assure the farmers that when they plant this spring they will be able to harvest their crops next fall. This program should be continued for another 6 months.

Some data which I had asked for earlier have just been handed to me. This information relates to the domestic farm-labor program, not the foreign farm-labor program. In 1946 there were requests for domestic labor amounting to 1,100,000 farm hands. Those requests

resulted in the placement of domestic labor with 476,000 farmers in this country.

There may be other information which I may give if questions are asked. I have not had time to go over it. I simply offer that information at this time to show that in continuing this program we are still placing several times as much emphasis on recruiting farm labor within our own country as we are in importing it from other countries.

I believe that the bill should be passed today. I renew my motion that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the parliamentary situation? Has not a motion been made prior to this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was made some time ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the motion acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the motion is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this is really a very acute situation. There is a shortage of sugar, and there are demands for it from all over the world. We have statements from farmers in various parts of the country that unless they know within a few days with respect to the farm-labor situation they are going to plant grain. I have received such messages from the farmers of my State. Grain requires very little labor as compared with sugar beets. Utah is a great sugar-beet-producing State. With the situation as it is, farmers are not going to plant unless they know something about the labor situation. So it is imperative that some action be taken now.

Something has been said as to the cost of foreign farm labor. I can testify as one who has used such labor. It is more expensive than our own labor, and farmers would not use it unless they were compelled to do so. It is necessary, when such labor is brought into the community, to provide barracks. A large part of the cost of such barracks falls upon the farmers. The farmer must transport the foreign workers from the barracks to his farm and back again. This he does not need to do with his local labor.

It seems to me that this bill should be passed today in order that the farmers of the United States may promptly go to work and grow the crops which it has been contemplated they would grow and which are needed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe that the bill has been adequately explained. I will say for the information of the Senate that the bill was endorsed by the Farm Bureau, by the Grange, by the Extension Service, and many other agencies and individuals.

Lest there be some who might call this another subsidy to the farmers, let me explain that it is in no way a subsidy. It is simply another service to farmers, similar to the service rendered to business by the United States Employment Service and other agencies. I hope that on the floor of the Senate it will not be termed a subsidy.

It may be said that this service could be performed by the United States Employment Service. In looking over the budget of that agency I find no provision for it. The United States Employment Service has not had the experience which the Extension Service has had in this work for the past 2 or 3 years.

This situation affects particularly the sugar-beet industry. Increased production of other farm crops is also demanded. The problem can best be handled by the Extension Service. Through the county agents, the Extension Service has perfect contact with farmers in every area of the United States. Through its facilities it can better transport surplus labor from one area to another.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102, providing for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. I rise to address myself to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I realize that the Members of this body are anxious to serve the best interests of the American farmer. He deserves our consideration, and I join the other Senators in that anxiety. I shall enthusiastically support any measure which I deem to be for his best interests. I think what the wise American farmer is most interested in today is that the Government be kept in such condition that it will be able to render him assistance in the future, as it has in the past, if again he should need it.

I do not regard the measure presently under discussion as being for the best interests of the American farmer. The proponents of the bill have been particularly interested in the welfare of the beet-sugar producer. Under a bill passed a few days ago, there will be no ceiling prices on sugar after October 31 of the present year. All reports indicate that a record crop will be planted. The producer will be prosperous and should be in a position to employ labor at his own expense at the market price. The sugar, the end product, will be bought largely by the American housewife, in the open market, at prices in all probability substantially higher than those which now prevail.

Mr. President, the bill for which present consideration has been moved may accurately and intelligently be described as being a bill, first, to import foreign contract labor into the United States to compete with the American workingman, in violation of established American principle and tradition that such shall not be done except under the emergency of war; second, to subject the small-scale American farmer who works with his hands to unfair competition by granting to the employer of foreign contract labor a subsidy not granted to others; third, to deplete further the Treasury of the United States; and fourth, for other purposes and with other effects which do not readily appear on the surface.

Mr. President, the hearings on this bill were completed on March 12, 1947. On March 25, at the request of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the committee ordered the hearings to be printed. They have not as yet been received from the printer, and are not yet available to the Members of the Senate. I am not unmindful of the fact that yesterday the Senate took up for consideration the wool bill, without having before it the printed record of the hearings. It did so after it was stated on the floor that the matter had been fully and adequately covered in extensive hearings held over a period of years, with which the membership of the Senate was largely familiar; and it also appeared that there had been no order to print the hearings on the wool bill this year. However, such is not the case in the present instance.

The foreign contract-labor program was a war-emergency measure which began in 1943, and has continued 4 years. The law provided that it should terminate at the expiration of 6 months after the end of hostilities. Consequently it will go out of existence on June 30 of the present year unless it is extended by Congress. The question is whether the foreign contract-labor law should be continued in peacetime, and no previous hearings of the Senate can possibly shed any light on that question.

Furthermore, Mr. President, minority views have been prepared by three members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which considered the bill. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking minority member of the committee, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and I, myself, joined in the minority views. The minority views have not yet been printed, and therefore are not available for consideration by Members of the Senate.

What good is it for one of the committees of this body to conduct long hearings, taking up the time of Senators and witnesses, and why should Senators take the time and trouble to prepare minority views, if the Senate is going to rush into the consideration of a bill before either the report of the hearings or the minority views are before Senators or can, in the nature of the case, be made available?

This body prides itself on being the greatest deliberative body in the world. Certainly its power and prestige were never higher than today, when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made a memorable speech on this floor. Surely the Senate is too zealous to maintain its reputation for careful and informed action to be willing to rush into the consideration of a measure, Mr. President, of vital importance, without Senators having had an opportunity to read the report of the hearings, or the minority views of three members of the committee to which it had been referred.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is a matter of vital concern to the American people and to their representatives. My reasons for that statement are, first, that this is the first time, except during a war emergency, when the question of authorizing the importation of foreign contract labor into the United States has come before the Senate. We protect our American labor with tariff walls. If we are to import foreign contract labor to compete with the American workingman in canneries, in citrus orchards, or in sugar beet fields and refineries, are we willing to import labor to work in automobile factories, garment factories, steel works, and elsewhere in our industrial life?

Mr. President, involved in this bill is a principle of far-reaching implication which should not lightly be considered by the American people or their representatives. There is already evidence of an oversupply of labor in the over-all picture. If Senators want the facts, let them read the excellent statement and brief filed on behalf of the CIO at the hearings.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there anything in that statement which shows that there is an oversupply of beet-field labor?

Mr. KEM. There is a great deal that shows an oversupply of labor in different parts of the United States, particularly in the State of California. I should be glad to read some of the evidence to the Senate, if the Senator would like to have me do so. I plan to do so in the event the motion of the Senator from Vermont shall be sustained and the Senate shall proceed to consider the bill on its merits.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we were importing labor which would compete, in the actual sense, with our own labor, I should be in hearty accord with the sentiments which the distinguished Senator has expressed.

Mr. KEM. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there can be no question of that, on the record made in this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may say so to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, having lived in a beet-sugar State for a long time, I have seen again and again a surplus of general labor and an acute shortage of labor in the beet fields which could be remedied only by imported labor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is the "stoop" labor argument. That condition will be with us for a long time to come. It will exist next year, it will exist the year after, and the year after that. There is an indisposition on the part of the native-born American to do labor of that kind; but the record shows that the development of mechanization has overcome that, and that one American laborer, with the proper kind of mechanical equipment, can go into the sugar-beet fields and do more in less time than a much larger number of imported foreign contract laborers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the bill of which the Senator is speaking is a war measure, which did not go into effect until—when?

Mr. KEM. It went into effect in 1943. It has been in existence for 4 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been very much interested in the statement of the Senator from Colorado, and with the permission of the able Senator from Missouri, I should like to ask what was done with respect to the supply of labor in the beet fields prior to 1943. May I ask the able Senator from Colorado on that point?

Mr. KEM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it has been customary for many years to import foreign labor for work in the beet fields. Is the Senator directing his question to the intervention of the Government in that matter?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; if it was done prior to 1943, why, then, was the act brought into force in 1943, and why is the extension of this act necessary if prior to 1943 such labor was available in the beet fields?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may answer?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. During the war, the Government set up production goals for beet sugar and other crops, and some exist at present. The Government had a direct interest in the stimulation of the crops which were subject to those goals. Beet sugar was one of them. In view of that fact, it was felt warrantable for the Government to intervene to aid in putting the necessary labor at the places where the labor was needed.

The Government now is setting beet-sugar goals, and there is dire national need of increased beet-sugar acreage. The Government again has a direct interest in rendering service to those whom it expects will produce the goals.

My information from Colorado is that farmers are withholding the planting of crops awaiting the outcome of action in the Senate on this subject. That is a fact. We are dealing with facts. My question is whether we want to get the kind of labor we have had in the past, or whether we want to abandon the sugar-beet crop.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that we are all dealing with facts. We are trying to look at this very realistically, to "look the horse directly in the mouth."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if I may make one more observation, I should like to confirm what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said about the growth of mechanization in beet production. When I was in the beet fields last fall, practically every beet farmer with whom I came in contact told me that the machines then operating were doing a very good job, and that we could expect, over a reasonable period of time, to get rid of a substantial part of our problem. But we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if I understood him correctly to say that foreign contract labor was brought into his State prior to the Enabling Act of 1943.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. How was it brought in? Under what law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The private contractors themselves brought in foreign labor.

Mr. KEM. How did they get the foreign laborers through the Immigration Service?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They went down into Mexico and made contracts to import the labor, and it was imported, but there was a great amount of dissatisfaction about it, because it was claimed that the labor that came in was not properly treated, in some instances, after it got here, and there was a considerable opinion that it would be better to have Government regulation of the matter.

Mr. KEM. If it was done prior to 1943, is there any reason why it cannot be done now?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator talking about "right now"?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The answer to "right now" is that, in fact, we are at a point where we cannot retrace the steps necessary to assemble the labor in Mexico and bring it in on an entirely different basis. We have got to know right now whether we are going to get the labor. We have got to know right now whether we are going to take advantage of the actions which the Department of Agriculture has taken in Mexico to render this labor available; which I understand have been successful. I understand

that there are trainloads of laborers ready to be brought in. Now, to strike that all down, and to say that it must be started over on a different approach, might solve the problem next year, but it will not solve it this year, I suggest.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should prefer not to yield further. I should like to complete my remarks on the motion.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri decline to yield?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I should like to complete my remarks, Mr. President, on the motion. If the motion is sustained, then I shall expect to discuss the subject on the merits, and I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota at that time.

I should like to say, in reply to the suggestion by the Senator from Colorado, that no reasons appears to me why what has been done along this line during the past few years could not now be done by the private individuals who are engaged in this business; in other words, they could take over, through their associations, just where the Government leaves off.

Furthermore, I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the Government is to handle the matter, then the foreign contract labor ought to be brought in at the expense of the employer who uses the labor. The evidence is that it costs the Government about $200 for each laborer brought in—that is, $200 for the season—and he works a little less than 100 days during the season. In other words, the Government pays about $2 a day for each laborer brought in, for the actual time he works in the fields.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the second reason why I think this question is vital. It is because this is the first time, to my knowledge, the question of granting a direct subsidy has come before the Senate for decision, as the Senate is presently constituted.

On March 15 of this year a Pittsburgh man wrote an open letter to Congress, in which he said that he was astonished to find that his Federal taxes for the present year, payable on March 15, were 37 times as great as his State, county, and city taxes. He said, "A comparatively small amount, one-thirty-seventh of the amount of my Federal taxes, is paid for all school facilities, all police protection, sanitary service, including street cleaning and garbage collection."

One reason for the astonishment of this Pittsburgh citizen at the size of the Federal taxes is the payment of subsidies by the Federal Government. He will continue to be astonished so long as Federal subsidies and similar expenditures are authorized by Congress.

I know, Mr. President, in view of the matters presently before Congress, that there is no time for us to wander in the wonderland of Federal subsidies. One difficulty of such an adventure is that none of the departments of the Government agree as to what a subsidy is. The Bureau of the Budget, on request by the senior Senator from Virginia, has worked out a list of 31 subsidies. There are about 13 different ways of paying the subsidies. The purpose of some is to keep prices up; the purpose of others is to keep prices down; but the purpose they all have in common is to siphon money from the Treasury of the United States.

Subsidies, Mr. President, are part and parcel of the system by which Hitler undermined the self-reliance and destroyed the personal initiative of the German people. Surely we should not today make such an eventful decision as we are called upon to make, without a thorough examination of the facts, and a careful weighing of the arguments pro and con. Obviously this cannot be done without the report of the hearings, and without the views of the minority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope that the motion to consider Senate bill 2102 today will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think that we are all somewhat confused on this question. It has been referred to as a subsidy, it has been referred to as an expenditure on the part of the Federal Government to import foreign labor. I do not believe it is either one. It is a question of concentrating in the harvest fields at the time when the harvesting must be done in the various sections of the Nation available workers from other areas where they may not be needed. Prior to the war, there were workers on the Pacific coast who were ready to engage in harvesting in the citrus area. Prior to the war there were workers in the Southwest at the time when sugar beets were to be harvested. Prior to the war there were workers in the Midwest, ready to help in harvesting green peas and sweet corn and sugar beets, as they came on in season. The war dislocated all that. The war took the youth of the Nation into the Army. They are coming back today and availing themselves of the GI educational program in many instances and are not available in the rural areas for farm work. The war took our young men away to the factory, and those youths have not returned. The fact of the matter is, the greatest part of this service is to concentrate workers in the areas in which they are available, and transport them to areas where the crops are ready to be harvested.

Like the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], if I thought this were a subsidy to the farmer, I should be opposed to it. Like the Senator from Missouri, if I thought it was designed to import foreign workers, I should be against it. It is for the purpose of assuring ourselves, at a time when we need food more acutely than in any prewar year. We must have certainty, and the assurance that the harvest will be properly conducted in season. The other great question is, that we must conserve the food in order to prevent prices from rising any higher than they are at the present time.

So I say, Mr. President, that this program should be permitted to continue another 6 months, and the farmer must know now that it is to be continued, because we are in the midst of the planting season. Either we must designate acres to the crop which is going to require all this extra labor, or we will designate our acres to the type of crop of which we have a surplus planted at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that in our more than a week of hearings the only opposition to the bill was from the rather pretty CIO girl from California? Her testimony was not very pertinent to the bill, but those seeking enlightenment on the opposition to it will find practically nothing in opposition in the entire hearings, except the testimony given by that CIO representative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have one thing more to say and that is that the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers for peak production of certain crops this year, and the Department of Agriculture has estimated that it will require 55,000 additional workers to harvest the crop which the Department of Agriculture has asked the American farmers to produce. They are going to ask for $10,000,000 with which to administer this program. About $4,500,000 of it will be used in recruiting domestic labor in one section of the country for the harvesting in other areas. The other $5,500,000 dollars will be used in recruiting and importing foreign labor to help harvest the peak load which is now being demanded of the American farmers. I think these figures are real enough so that we may accept them. This matter of farm labor has been before the Senate for 4 years now. I think all the old Members of the Senate are entirely familiar with it. I presume that most of the new Members are also.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think I might inject an economy note into this debate. In many of the States during the past year there has been an overproduction of potatoes, I think approximately 100,000,000 bushels, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture have spent upwards of $75,000,000 to support the potato prices at 90 percent of parity and to remove surpluses from normal channels of trade. The proposal before us now would have the effect of reducing the potato acreage in many of the Western States and would encourage a larger production of sugar beets. To that extent this labor program will minimize any potential problem resulting from an overproduction of potatoes during the current crop year. Unless this foreign labor is made available I am fearful that we will accentuate the problem and that more potatoes will be produced than we have during the past year, instead of producing more sugar beets. This would help to alleviate the

shortage of sugar which has existed in this country for several years.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. If the farmer cannot secure labor for the hand work, to grow the crops which require hand labor, he will devote his land to the production of crops which can be grown with what machinery he may have on hand or which he may be able to obtain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such act, shall be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 30 days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until 6 months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier." Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as this is an amendment which strikes out and inserts, the amendment itself is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: *Provided*, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, very briefly this amendment provides that foreign laborers who are already in the country and are at work in the agricultural field, when they finish the particular work in which they are engaged will not have to be shipped out of the country and then reimported. For instance, in my State—and the same situation prevails in a great many other States—when foreign labor comes into our country for the purpose of harvesting a certain crop, as soon as that crop is harvested they must leave, although there may be another crop which must be harvested perhaps 5 or 10 or 20 miles away, yet under the existing regulations when the workers have completed harvesting the crop on which they were engaged it is necessary to ship them 500 miles down to the Mexican border, and then to reimport them and bring them back perhaps within 10 miles of the point at which they were previously working. My amendment will eliminate the necessity for doing that. To that extent I believe it is an economy measure. It provides the necessary safeguards of the posting of a bond with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and it requires that the conditions of employment be satisfactory to the Mexican Government as well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is not intended by the Senator's amendment, is it, that it shall remain in effect longer than the rest of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. It will expire with the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is a temporary measure just as is the main bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield ?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was this amendment proposed in the committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the amendment was not proposed in the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment was proposed by the Senator from California yesterday. I have read the amendment. It has not been acted upon by the committee. But after reading the amendment, and reserving the right to be mistaken, I can see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) No worker recruited in a foreign country under the provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall be employed by any employer after June 30, 1947, unless such employer shall agree to pay to the United States for each day of such employment an amount equal to the average cost per worker to the United States, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the recruitment and transportation of, and of the services and assistance furnished to, all such workers under such act, divided by the average number of days of employment of all such workers within the United States under such act, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the collection of amounts payable by employers under this subsection. All such amounts collected shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the purpose of the amendment is obvious. It is designed to prorate among employers of contract labor the cost to the Government of the United States of bringing the labor into this country and taking it back again when the time of employment is over.

I shall not trespass long on the time of the Senate. I shall devote such time as I feel at liberty to take to reading certain portions of the testimony and evidence which would be available to Members of the Senate if they had copies of the hearings on their desks and had an opportunity to read them before considering the bill.

The principal argument advanced by the proponents of the bill is that there is a crying need for labor throughout the United States. Mr. President, the desire is not for labor, but for cheap labor. That is what is prompting the demand for the bill. It comes from those who want to employ labor at rates below the market price for the available labor supply.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. THYE. The provisions of the bill make it mandatory that the employer pay the prevailing wage in the community for such labor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the argument has been made that there is no "stoop" labor available in certain communities, and that the American laborer does not want to work at the price that is offered him. It seems to me that the argument answers itself.

After the hearings on the bill were completed two very important incidents occurred. One was the passage of the act eliminating the ceiling price on sugar after October 31 of this year. In other words, sugar produced in the present crop will be sold in the open market, and in all probability the price will be much higher than the presently prevailing price. What a travesty it will be if that sugar is produced by labor subsidized from the Treasury of the United States, and sold to the housewife at from 20 to 50 cents a pound.

There is no question that the bill is a subsidy. The money is obtained, Mr. President, from you and from me under the taxing power of the United States, and it is to be distributed under the War Emergency Act, to certain producers throughout the United States. The question is whether money obtained under the taxing power of the United States should be distributed to producers when the war emergency has ceased.

There has been considerable said as to the situation in various States. The second incident of importance which occurred after the hearings were completed, or which came to our attention after they were completed, was the arrival of a report from the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, dated March 15, 1947. The address of the committee is 740 Hilmer Street, Santa Clara, Calif. The report is issued under the name of Mrs. Grace McDonald, executive secretary. I should like to read the entire report, but I shall not do so. I shall read one brief excerpt, which is very much to the point:

Efforts of certain California Congressmen to stampede for the importation program are deplorable in the face of the growing unemployment situation in California today. During the year 1946 it is estimated that some 5,000,000 persons entered California by car. Of this number from 250,000 to 500,000 were potential farm workers and their families. As of March 1 there were some 36,000 applicants filing with the California Farm Labor Office, Agricultural Extension Service, for jobs which could not be filled. These applicants are absolutely without economic resources. They have no social security benefits to fall back upon, and probably there is very little in the way of income from other members of their families.

A recent lay-off of 500 cannery and packing-house workers in Santa Clara County, due to curtailment of operations in anticipation of lower consumer demand is a case in point. Farm job seekers are offering to work for their food, in many instances. If the situation reflects conditions in the Middle West and South, California may well face a new Grapes of Wrath in migration, with a new rural housing and health crisis. To superimpose a farm labor importation program on this unstable social structure with critical potential racial and national tensions, would be dynamite.

Something has been said about the "stoop" labor argument. Of course, that argument can be made next year and the year after. If we are to be influenced by it, we shall be influenced by it next year and the year after, as much as we would be today.

In that connection a very interesting statement was made by Representative PACE in the hearings on the bill before the House committee. I quote from the statement of Representative PACE:

I am sure you realize that the farms of this country are being mechanized just as rapidly as the labor unions will permit them to be and we can buy the farm machinery. Within a period of 5 or 10 years there will be between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 surplus people on the farms of this Nation, for the very simple reason that they will not be needed.

Members of this committee had an opportunity during the fall to visit different sections of the country and saw many mechanized farms in operation. I had an opportunity to visit the High Plains of Texas, where one man cultivates 200 acres of cotton, where I rode for 4 long days and I did not see a mule and I did not see a horse. You look across the plains and you can see a dust cloud, and when you get close you see 3, 5, or 10 tractors drawing 8-, 10-, or 12-row cultivators. Now that is going on all over the country. The population on the farms during the war went down to 25,000,000 and it is probably up to 26,000,000 now. I think one of the most serious problems facing the Nation is going to be the surplus people on the farms of the Nation because of this mechanization, which will further aggravate the concentration of our population in the extremities.

It strikes me as strange that you should be here now, long after the termination of hostilities, trying to bring in more foreign people to work on the farms when we now have, including the unemployment of veterans, thousands of unemployed among our civilian population, in the total running into millions of people who are without employment; and with this serious problem facing us, what are we going to do with the surplus people on the farms of this Nation in the near future? I don't understand why we should be called upon to give our time in bringing in more foreign workmen.

I can understand why the farmers like it because the Federal Government goes and gets the foreign workers in Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, and other places and brings them in, puts them down at the farmer's door, provides a place for them to live, provides medical attention, doctors' expenses, burial if they should die, supports the members of their family, and provides them food; and when the crop is harvested takes them somewhere else. I think every farmer would like to have that service, but my information is that it is enjoyed by only a handful of what we call the big operators.

Mr. President, that brings me to the second point, and that is that the small-scale American farmer who works with his hands is subjected by this program to unfair competition by granting to the employer of foreign contract labor a subsidy which the small-scale American farmer does not get. Of course, it is an economic law that every producer is in competition with every other producer of the same commodity. It is likewise an economic law that every worker is in competition with every other worker in the same field of business. How can it be argued that bringing in foreign contract labor does not affect the supply of labor in the United States? If it affects the supply of labor, does it not result in lowering the wage scale? In that connection, the testimony of the representative of the CIO who appeared before the committee has been referred to. I have the statement before me now, and I wish I felt justified in reading it at length—which I shall not do. I think any Senator who is interested in it and who examines it will come to the conclusion that it is a well-considered, temperate, intelligent statement of a highly intelligent person. That witness was Miss Elizabeth Sasuly. She is the Washington representative of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers' Union, an affiliate of the CIO. She pointed out:

I should like to point out to begin with that our organization supported this program during the war. We supported it in spite of the fact that we felt there had been no adequate efforts made to mobilize domestic farm labor within the country for war-food production. Even at the peak of the very real farm-labor shortage, which did exist in some areas during the war, there were still many agricultural workers, particularly in certain regions of the South, who were making very low wages. There was a surplus supply of workers who, if there had been an over-all program, could have been brought into the areas where there were real shortages.

Then she discussed the fact that the States in which recently there has been the loudest demand for imported labor are California and Arizona, and she stated that the reasons are very simple. She said:

They have been trying to create a surplus pool of labor so as to depress wages.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not pretend to know the conditions in all the places of which the lady speaks; but during the war, in order to harvest our sugar beets, in Colorado we closed the high schools and got children out of the schools to help in that work. We closed the stores in the beet-sugar towns so that the businessmen could help in that work. That, it seems to me, utterly refutes the argument as to surplus labor, at least insofar as my own State is concerned.

Mr. KEM. I take it that the witness was not speaking of the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure she would not have been. Otherwise, although I would not say the lady was "talking through her hat," I would say that if she made such a statement in referring to Colorado, she did not know what she was talking about.

Mr. KEM. I take it that the Senator from Colorado, with his customary gallantry, will give her the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If she was "talking through her hat," I am sure it must have been a very attractive hat. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Following the Senator's chain of thought as to the vast number of unemployed persons in certain areas of the Nation, I wish to ask the Senator whether he agrees that such an Employment Service is necessary, in view of the fact that in certain areas there are unemployed persons seeking employment which they cannot find. Also, if we have the Employment Service which the bill provides, does not the Senator agree that

that type of service would bring an unemployed person to the job which is waiting and crying for a worker who will perform it? That is why I support this measure, in the present emergency and dire need for abundant food production. I support it in order that the worker may find the job which needs a worker.

Mr. KEM. I take it from what the Senator from Minnesota says that he will support my amendment which, in turn, will pass the cost to the Government over to the employer of the labor, so that the Government will not be out of pocket as a result of the operation, but the cost will be borne by the producer and, in turn, passed on to the consumer, where, under the American free-enterprise system, it belongs. Am I correct in that assumption? I ask the Senator from Minnesota that question.

Mr. THYE. I think this is the question: If in Kansas City there are 500 unemployed persons, and if in California or in Colorado there is sugar-beet acreage ready for the harvest, or a citrus crop ready for harvest, should we expect the producer to assume the responsibility of taking such unemployed persons from Kansas City and paying their transportation to the harvest field?

Mr. KEM. I am afraid that I have failed, as I often do, to make myself clear.

Mr. THYE. I understood the Senator's question to be primarily that.

Mr. KEM. My question was whether the Senator would support an amendment to pass the cost of this service on to the producer who, in turn, could pass it to the consumer, where, under the American system of free enterprise, it belongs.

Mr. THYE. I still go back to the same question, namely, whether it is the Government's responsibility to transport unemployed people from Kansas City to the harvest fields where the jobs are waiting for them.

Mr. KEM. I do not want to pursue the question unduly, but I desire to clear it up as far as possible.

Mr. THYE. I cannot answer the Senator's question any more clearly than I have.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator care to answer it "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. THYE. The question is so simple: If in Kansas City there are 500 unemployed people, and if in Colorado the sugar producers are ready to harvest their beet-sugar crop and cannot get help, should the producers in Colorado pay the cost of transporting the unemployed people from Kansas City, when the Government itself would have to pay unemployment compensation to those persons if they did not find jobs?

Mr. KEM. The able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota does not state the question as I see it. The question is this: If there is available labor in Vera Cruz or in Barbados or in the Bahamas, outside the tariff wall of the United States, and it becomes advisable, in the opinion of the Congress, to import it into the United States to compete with free American workers, who shall pay the cost of bringing the workers to the place in the United States where they are needed, and the cost of providing them with subsistence and medical care, and the cost of eventually returning them whence they came? Shall it be paid by the producer who employs the workers or shall it be paid out of the Treasury of the United States? That is the question. It is not a question of transporting labor from Kansas City to Colorado. It is a question of bringing the labor from Vera Cruz or the Bahamas or Puerto Rico to Colorado.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question has become so much broader since the last statement of the Senator from Missouri that it would require a much different approach in order to reply. But, in the event the food situation were such that every pound of food which could be produced was absolutely needed, and if we could not afford to lose any of it as a result of the lack of help to do the harvesting, and if then it were a known fact that the food would go to waste because of the lack of adequate help—regardless of whether the area concerned were in California or in Colorado—in that event, if this employment service were established, the Federal Government would have the responsibility of bringing the necessary available help, whether it were brought from Kansas City or from Philadelphia or from some foreign country, in order to salvage the food which has already been mentioned in this debate, and thus prevent the danger of having the price of sugar increase after October 31. Mr. President, we must not permit sugar to increase in price because of the lack of acreage of sugar beets or a lack of the labor needed to grow the sugar beets at that time of the year.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the question to which I am addressing myself is this: Who shall pay the expense of bringing the labor into the United States from foreign countries?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that if the farmer wants the labor badly enough, and if he has no choice, there is no question as to who will pay the expense. But if the farmer is trying to accommodate himself to a Government program, which is the case insofar as sugar is concerned, and if the Government primarily wishes to have the acreage of sugar beets increased, and if the farmer has a choice as to the crops which he may plant, then the question is entirely different. It is the latter case which poses the question. The Government is trying to get the farmer to plant increased sugar-beet acreage. The farmer has half a dozen crops which he can plant with family labor or with nearby labor. When we suggest to the farmer that he pay his share of the cost of bringing in labor from Mexico, for instance, he says, "Why should I do that? I will plant something else, and will use my family or will use village labor."

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether he believes that with the opportunity held out to the producer to sell his sugar at a scarcity price in a free market, there will be very much difficulty in getting him to plant sugar beets.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the answer to that question is, so far as my own State is concerned, that I am besieged by anxious inquiries about what is going to happen here; and the statement is frequently made by responsible people that if the Congress does not enact this legislation, they will not plant sugar beets.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the able Senator from Colorado whether in his years of service in the Senate he has not heard many similar threats from people who wanted advantageous legislation enacted by this body and by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not preclude the possibility that someone who wants advantageous legislation enacted will ask for it. But I am simply stating that so far as my own State is concerned and so far as our sugar-beet labor problem is concerned, the information is incontrovertible, so far as the record of information which I have in my office is concerned, that they will not plant sugar beets unless they have the assurance of sufficient labor, and that if they were compelled to do the thing the Senator from Missouri wishes them to do, they would not accept that alternative and they would not plant. That is the situation.

Mr. KEM. Of course, I might suggest to the Senator from Colorado the adage that mere assertion is nugatory; and if I know the Senator from Colorado well, I do not believe he is the sort of man whose judgment would be influenced by a threat.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that during the war the farmers in my State and, I think, in the other sugar-beet States had the same choice; and because of the uncertainty in regard to the labor supply and because of the very problems that we are now considering, they did not meet their sugar-beet quotas; and that is one of the reasons why we have a sugar shortage in this country.

Mr. KEM. While the Senator from Colorado is on his feet, I should like to ask him whether he believes that an entirely different question is involved since the passage of the law lifting the controls on sugar, as compared with the question which was involved at the time of the hearings on this bill, when the sugar producer was asking for pecuniary assistance from the Government because, as he said, he was selling at a ceiling price in a rigged market.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that the need for the enactment of this bill has been accentuated by the enactment of the legislation to which he has just referred. Controls will be removed at the end of October. Unless we have a plentiful supply of sugar in October, we shall have a disastrous price rise. This temporary legislation will enable us to get the sugar

crops planted, and will aid in alleviating that situation, if it should occur.

Mr. KEM. I believe that any farmer who has acreage available for raising sugar and has the necessary knowledge and equipment to plant it, with the very alluring prospect of being able to sell it in a scarcity market with no ceiling price, will avail himself of that opportunity and take his chance with the labor supply.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation, as distinguished from a question?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator frequently has referred to this matter as a subsidy. I suppose a rather broad definition of the term "subsidy" can be given. I suggest that the present proposal is, in fact, a service which the Government offers in connection with a program which the Government proposes. How does it differ in real essence from the service the Government offers, and from which the farmer benefits, when a good Federal-aid highway is built through a State? How does it differ in real substance from the benefit which a shipowner or a port city receives when a harbor is improved? How can it be distinguished from any one of a hundred services which the Government provides in order to give background help, in assistance of the general public welfare, in hundreds of different directions? Are we not going too far when we call this a subsidy, when it is not, in fact, something which goes directly to the farmer, but merely aids him in this indirect way in a Government program?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has invited me to wander in the wonderland of Federal subsidies, which I said earlier in the afternoon was a pleasure which I would deny myself.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I withdraw my remarks regarding the definition of "subsidy," will the Senator from Missouri refrain from wandering? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. I shall not agree to do that entirely, Mr. President, because the prospect is so alluring. I have had an invitation which I did not expect to receive.

Mr. President, as I said earlier in the afternoon, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] some time ago asked the Bureau of the Budget for a statement of the subsidies now being paid by the Federal Government. The Bureau of the Budget replied that it was difficult to do so because no two departments agreed as to what were and were not subsidies. However, finally the Bureau of the Budget submitted a list of 31 subsidies. It said there were 13 different ways of paying those subsidies.

I think the proposal now before us is probably as direct a subsidy as any we are likely to find. It is to be paid directly for the transportation, subsistence, and medical care for such foreign laborers who are brought into the United States from foreign countries and are put to work in canneries and fields and groves in the United States.

The President's budget for the year ending June 30 last identified subsidies as totaling $2,500,000,000. The figure dropped to $718,000,000 for the current 12 months, and the President's budget for the ensuing 12 months' period provides for $442,000,000.

Mr. President, this is the first time, so far as I know, when the question of whether we are going along with the subsidy program has come before the Senate for decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming, for the purpose of the argument only, that this is a subsidy, does the Senator believe that we should raise that enormous subject and try to reach a decision on it in connection with this temporary legislation?

Mr. KEM. I believe that the way to resume is to resume. The way to stop subsidies is to stop them, to consider the first one that comes up and lop it off, and then continue the process until we return to the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Missouri does not wish to be unfair to anyone, and I notice that he has given great thought to problems of some portions of the Nation. But I wonder if he has given thought to the situation I now present to him.

There are in my State of Florida large additional plantings, not of beets for sugar, but of cane for sugar. Those plantings were invited by the Department of Agriculture because of the shortage of sugar. The plantings were made before the recent legislation to which the Senator referred, because it takes considerably more than a year to bring the planted cane to the stage where it can be harvested for sugar.

There is no pool of trained sugarcane field operators available in this Nation, and our people, if they are to be at all assisted in the effort which they are making at the invitation of the Government to help meet the sugar shortage, must be helped during the next season by workers from Jamaica, or some like place.

I wondered if the Senator had thought of that situation, and how he would feel about the withdrawal from those people of the opportunity to import labor? They have had no previous experience in bringing in labor from that field, because there had been no need to bring them in prior to the war; but they had to step up production because of the war, by invitation of the Government. Would the Senator feel that it is fair, with the cane already planted, coming toward the time when it must be gathered next fall and winter, to withhold from those people access to the only pool of labor where they can find trained persons who are accustomed to that particular type of work? I am asking the Senator the question because I know he wants to be fair.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the suggestion, and I am glad to have the question.

Of course, I defer to the knowledge of the Senator from Florida as to labor conditions in his own State. However, I would invite his attention to the testimony of the representative of the CIO before our committee on that subject. She had a good deal to say about the conditions in the State of Florida. She said, as appears on page 192 of the testimony:

> For example, in Florida in 1942, I believe it was, several thousand Bahaman workers were brought in at a time when our people right there on the spot in Florida were available for work. There were literally thousands of agricultural workers within the State itself who were available for work. However, in spite of that, we did support most aspects of the program during the war, although we did oppose the importation of Bahamans I have just described, but we cannot see any excuse for continuing the program at the present time as a peacetime measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I wish to complete my answer to the point which the Senator raised, and then I will yield.

I do not think it is necessary to pass the bill as it is in order to have the advantage of the Mexican labor, or the Barbados labor, or whatever is used in Florida.

In the first place, the Senator from Colorado has told us that prior to the wartime measure foreign labor was brought into his part of the country under a free-enterprise system, by free agencies. If we want to do that now, there is no reason why the Government Employment Service or the State employment services cannot assist in that work. There is no reason why Congress cannot pass an enabling law which will make an exception of the present laws which have been on our statute books for many years against the importation of foreign contract labor. So that if the need is present, and if it cannot be supplied by the market, I do not think there is any reason for saying we have to take this bill "as is" in order to meet the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is confusing the issue a little by referring to the Bahaman labor. That has no relation at all to sugarcane fields. The Bahaman labor was imported from just across the Gulf stream from our southeastern shore, about 90 miles, to meet the need for workers in general vegetable production, and then they moved on up the seaboard, going as far as Connecticut, I believe. The sugarcane labor comes only from Jamaica, because that is where there are heavy sugarcane plantings.

As to the Bahaman importation—so as to keep the record straight, because I know the Senator wants it kept straight, and not finding fault with the witness, because I do not know her—I know that in the year in question we called for help from States as far off as Missouri, the fine State from which the Senator comes, and Maryland, and imported laborers to the number of many thousands, and still

we were short, and had then to ask the Federal Government to help us by securing, through international arrangement, the importation of Bahamans.

Particularly in view of the heavy sugarcane plantings made at the Government's request, which can be utilized adequately only through the importation of Jamaican labor, I do not believe the continuance of the law for 6 months, or 7 months, which would make that possible, should be turned down by the Senate. I believe it is a fair request.

I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture prefers that the extension be up until the end of June 1948, but for some reason in the committee the time was cut down. Is that correct, I ask the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will agree with me that the date of January 1 was arrived at as a compromise date for the ending of the farm-labor program, with an additional 30 days in which to get the workers from the beet factories back to their homes.

Mr. KEM. I think it was a compromise with the idea of some other persons. It was adopted by the majority of the committee, and not agreed to by the minority.

Mr. AIKEN. It was agreed to by the majority of the committee.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was one of those who did not look with too much favor upon our bringing foreign labor into this country to compete with American workingmen and workingwomen unless there was an absolute necessity for it. There were some who thought the period should be extended beyond the 6 months, and 1 month for liquidation. There was a compromise of views. Some of us felt it should be extended as a permanent policy. It never was intended as a permanent policy. It was an emergency policy. It did great good during the war. Without this policy untold quantities of foodstuffs and agricultural commodities would have wasted in the fields or never have been planted or harvested at all. But at the same time we felt that it was probably desirable that the program be continued for a limited time, so that some additional harvests might be assured, and that was the basis of the compromise of 6 months with 1 month for liquidation.

I should like to say to my able friend from Missouri that while some of us did not want it extended permanently or for a long period of time, we heartily agreed to this limited extension and it would be a great disservice I think to the agriculturalists of this country if the program were not carried out as the committee has recommended.

Mr. KEM. I will say that the Senator from Florida made a similar statement before the committee at the time the bill was being heard.

I desire to make two more points, Mr. President, and then I shall be through. Much has been said about the difficulties in which the beet-sugar producers find themselves. I am not shedding any crocodile tears for them, and I will tell the Senate why. Sugar beets are generally sold under a prearranged contract at a figure to be determined. The contract generally provides the basis paid to the farmers, which shall be determined by the amount the refiner receives from the sale of sugar. Most of the contracts provide for a definite percentage of the return, usually around 50 percent.

The sugar content of beets varies materially, but generally speaking 1 ton of beets yields 300 pounds of sugar.

Following are the OPA ceiling prices on beet sugar at the refinery:

	Per hundredweight
1945	$5.40
1946:	
Feb. 10	5.90
Feb. 24	6.00
Sept. 18	7.50
Nov. 20	7.90
1947:	
Jan. 18	8.10
Mar. 30	8.15

In other words, the refiner is already receiving 50 percent more for beet sugar than the 1945 price.

In regard to the support price for sugar beets, in 1945, it was $12.50 per ton; in 1946, $13.50 per ton; and in 1947, it is estimated it will be $14.50 per ton.

The farmer's full price for 1946 has not yet been determined. The contract between the refiners and the farmers apparently contains a minimum price, but the actual figure is not determined until the beets are harvested and refined, and the product sold. So that if the high prices which are anticipated for the refined product are attained this year, the beet-sugar producer will do very well indeed. He will need no relief from the Government.

The average production of beets is 12.41 tons per acre. If the farmers paid $2 per day per worker, which is the cost to the Government, it would increase the cost of production about $10 or less per acre. This is less than $1 per ton. It will be noted that the 1947 support price is $2 per ton greater than in 1945, and that the sugar controls will expire October 31, 1947, which is prior to the time the price of the 1947 beet crop will be determined.

If the taxpayers foot the bill for foreign laborers as provided in this bill, and the consumers foot the bill following the removal of sugar ceilings, the public, Mr. President, will pay double. My whole point is that if foreign labor is to be brought into the United States, it ought not to be brought in at the expense of the Federal Government. The cost should be allocated among the producers who avail themselves of it. They in turn can pass it on to the consumer.

I hope that my amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, printed in the report on the pending bill, in which the Secretary of Agriculture strongly favors the enactment of the bill now pending. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1947, for a report on H. R. 1388, a bill "to provide for continuance of the farm-labor-supply program up to and including June 30, 1948." The bill authorizes the appropriation of "such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance of such program as provided in this act."

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply program have been provided to June 30, 1947, through—

Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session—$26,100,000 for 8 months of 1943;

Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—$30,000,000 for calendar year 1944;

Public Law 529, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—$20,000,000 for calendar year 1945;

Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session—$25,000,000 for calendar year 1946; and

Public Law 521, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session—$12,000,000 to June 30, 1947.

Favorable action on H. R. 1388 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm-labor-supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurance at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946 and the type of labor brought in under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the supply of agricultural workers available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

Extension of the authority for the farm-labor program, contained in Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented, during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1948 will make possible continuation of the farm-labor-supply program during the winter harvest season in certain Southern and Southwestern States. It also provides ample time for the Congress to consider whether any farm-labor program is needed in the postwar years, for the orderly transition from emergency to peacetime activities, and the liquidation of the program during the last 6 months of the 1948 fiscal year.

In extending the program it is necessary that existing facilities continue to be provided for proper housing and feeding of agricultural workers. Those facilities have been made available through permanent and mobile camps. Such facilities are subject to liquidation commencing July 1, 1947, as provided in Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. In order that the necessary housing will be available through the extended period, the amendment to section 2 (d), Public Law 731, as provided in H. R. 1388 is necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I want to speak for a very few moments on the pending bill as it appears before the Senate. No Member of the Senate is more deeply interested in agriculture than I am. As a member of the Agricultural Committee, I have taken part in all the hearings which have been held on this type of legislation since I entered the Senate. I am deeply interested in agricultural production, but I wonder if the Senate is not somewhat confused about this particular piece of legislation. As at present constituted, the importation of foreign labor into this country is subject to complete termination within a very few months. This matter has been under consideration since 1943. In 1943 $30,000,000 was appropriated for that purpose; the next year, $26,000,000; the next year, $30,000,000; the next year, $20,000,000; and finally, this year, $12,000,000.

This bill definitely provides for complete termination of the program within a very few months; I believe, on January 1, 1948. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 10 or 12 million veterans have returned to their homes during the last few months, and that most of them are available for farm labor. It has been suggested that Mexicans are the only ones available for what is called "stoop" labor.

I remind the Senate that this program, established only in 1943, is to be terminated on January 1, next. But do not overlook the fact that the beet sugar areas, of which my State has one, have been continuing for many years. We have never needed to employ Mexican labor to carry on that type of work. My contention is that our veterans themselves, who have returned home, can do all the farm labor that is needed. So long as we are engaged in an economy program we should terminate this particular program now without continuing it indefinitely. Apparently there are those who think that the fact that we have appropriated money to carry on the program for another year justifies continuing it for still another year, and then for still another year more. If we are going to terminate the program, now is the time to do so.

I suggest that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri be adopted, and that the bill itself be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. I became quite familiar with this program because it originated in the Committee on Appropriations during the war. I recall that last year when the program was extended for 1 year, the proponents of the program of importing farm labor, "stoop" labor, so-called, were put on notice that that was the last extension they were going to receive.

I am inclined to support the bill because I think we made a mistake in cutting off the program on June 30, in the middle of the crop year, instead of on January 1. I think there is some justification for extending the program to include the current crop season.

There is no question, however, Mr. President, that it is a subsidy for the Government to provide this kind of "stoop" labor which Americans do not seem to want to perform any more. The testimony before our committee was that it cost the Government approximately $1 per day of work done by these imported laborers to bring them into the country and house them and provide medical services and other expenses involved.

Now that price controls are off all agricultural products except sugar, and they are going off sugar on October 31, I see no reason why the purchaser and the eventual consumer should not pay the cost of this program. As a matter of fact, there was some discussion in the committee last year as to why the users of this labor should not pay the cost instead of the general taxpayer paying it. But as it had been a war program, brought about by the shortage of labor supply during the war, there was some justification during the war for the Government assuming the whole cost. The war has been over for more than a year and a half, and there is no longer any excuse, in my opinion, for the general taxpayer being called upon to pay the cost of this bill.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. Not only would it amount to changing the rules in the last 10 minutes of the game, or in the last few months in which this program is to be continued, but it would be very highly inequitable. Probably between 35 and 40 percent of the laborers who would be used this year are already in this country. They have been brought in at Government expense. Are we going to ask the farmers who have not secured their help yet to pay the cost of bringing in the remainder while those who already have their labor have had it brought in free? Or are we going to hire a great number of bookkeepers to figure our their cost and make a retroactive charge against the farmers who already have the help?

Furthermore, this program is not confined to foreign help. Out of 4,900,000 placements last year, 4,627,000 placements were of men and women and boys and girls recruited within this country. Are we going to say to one farmer on the Eastern Shore of Maryland who needs help to harvest his string beans, "We will recruit help in Washington, D. C., and charge the cost of bringing it across the bay," and perhaps tell the man on the next farm, "We will secure help for you from Jamaica, and let you pay the cost of bringing the workers in from Jamaica"? There is no way of working out that plan equitably, so far as I can see.

We had approximately 5,000,000 placements last year at a cost of $12,000,000. It will be a little less this year. I say it would not only be impracticable but inequitable as well to attempt to change the rules while we recruit and place the last 55,000 of these workers who will be required for the harvest in the fall.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish the Senator would make a little clearer his observation that out of some four million-odd placements a certain number of the workers came from outside the country. Will the Senator give us the figures more exactly.

Mr. AIKEN. It was testified before the committee that there were 4,900,000 placements in all. That means that the same workman was placed more than once.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I want to know is what proportion of the placements were made, even though they were repetitions, of laborers who were brought in from outside the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. The figures which are given me by the Department of Agriculture show that 4,627,000 of those placements were the men and women and boys and girls recruited within this country and moved from one State to another.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then that would leave approximately how many that were made from labor brought in from outside the United States?

Mr. AIKEN. Approximately 300,000. The greatest number of foreigners employed at one time, as I recall, were 63,000 in the month of September.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator further break down that figure by telling us how much of the appropriation was used on workers who came from outside the United States and how much of the appropriation was used for workers from within the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. I could probably hunt up those figures, but let me give the Senator the estimate for this year. The Department of Agriculture expects to ask for $10,000,000. Of this total the domestic part will cost about $4,469,796. It may be a few cents one way or the other. That would mean that five and one-half million dollars would be for the imported labor and four and a half million dollars for the domestic labor.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many laborers does the Department estimate it will bring in this year from outside the United States?

Mr. AIKEN. The Department estimates that 55,000 laborers will be required to harvest the crops which the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers of the United States to produce.

Mr. TYDINGS. And that will cost—what was the figure again?

Mr. AIKEN. Five and a half million dollars for the laborers brought in from outside the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much would that average per worker—$100, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. It would average $100.

Mr. TYDINGS. How long are they in the country as a rule from the time they come into Florida and work north with the season?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I have the break-down of the number employed month by month. It runs from

63,000 in September down to 25,000 in December for the year 1946.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. My recollection of the testimony before our committee was that the cost was $200 per worker per season, and, furthermore, that a worker during the season works not to exceed 100 days. So that the cost for the time actually employed in the cannery or in the field or in the refinery to the Government is approximately $2 a day.

Mr. AIKEN. The fact remains that with a total appropriation of $12,000,000—and I assume that nearly half of it was used in recruiting labor within the country—the number employed varied from 25,013 in December up to 63,736 for September. That does not figure out at $200 each, in spite of the testimony.

Mr. KEM. I will ask the Senator if he does not recall that testimony before our committee, that the cost was $200 per worker?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall the testimony, but I do not question the Senator's word. There was one hearing at which I was not present.

Mr. KEM. I think the record will show that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor were agreed that it would cost approximately $200 per season per laborer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not find myself out of sympathy with the intention of the amendment primarily, but I believe from some slight knowledge of Washington procedure that it would be almost impracticable to attempt to pass on to each person who employed these workers a proportionate part of the primary cost, or the over-all cost, or whatever formula is adopted.

For example, laborers who come from foreign countries go first to Florida. There they work in the early truck development, orchard picking, and so forth. Then they move up into Georgia, where they pursue similar work. Then they go into South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, and finally they get to Maryland and Delaware, which are in the same vegetable zone, so to speak. Later they go to New Jersey, and still later to New York. It seems to me that we would have to provide such a force to figure out costs that in the end it would probably cost us money. Under that procedure we would have a new bureau firmly established, and we would have more employees than if we did not follow such a system. I have not made any particular examination as to what the cost would be, but knowing Washington as I do, I know that if we write a requirement of this magnitude into the law it will require a great many clerks and calculators to follow the railroad fares and other transportation costs which enter into the problem. While I see merit in the Senator's amendment, I doubt very much whether it would operate as he conceives it. If laborers were coming into only one State and remaining there, the problem would be simple. Who would pay the costs in connection with a laborer coming from Jamaica to Florida if he were to move from Florida into Georgia? Would the cost of moving from Florida to Georgia be a part of the cost which would be apportioned?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Let me read to the Senator a part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. None of the imported laborers shall be employed after June 30, "unless such employer shall agree to pay to the United States for each day of such employment an amount equal to the average cost per worker to the United States, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the recruitment and transportation of, and of the services and assistance furnished to, all such workers under such act, divided by the average number of days of employment of all such workers within the United States under such act, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

It seems to me that that is plain as to what the Secretary shall do. If 55,000 laborers are to be imported, he will figure that it will cost $200 per worker.

Mr. TYDINGS. From the time they come in until they get back home.

Mr. BALL. On the average, for all of them. Then he will figure what he is going to spend, divided by the number of days worked, and each employer will pay so much per day, as estimated by the Secretary. There is no requirement that the estimate be an accurate reflection of the cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Senator's definition, I take it the situation which I have described would not obtain. Instead, this situation would occur: Whether a man employed 100 Jamaicans in Florida or in Charlotte, N. C., or Salisbury, Md., or York, Pa., or wherever it might be, the cost would be the same for each of them during the entire season, and the railroad fare from one point to another would not be added, but the average would prevail all the way through.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The Secretary would make an average estimate in advance. If the average were a dollar a day, which was the testimony before our committee a year ago, then each employer of this type of labor would contract to pay the Government a dollar a day for each laborer employed.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are agreed on that. Let us pursue the question a little further. Let us suppose that the average cost is $2 a day. How much salary do these men usually receive?

Mr. BALL. The testimony was that their wages ranged from $5 to $7 a day last year. They may be higher this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the cost would be between $7 and $9 in the aggregate. Is the Senator of the belief that farmers would employ such labor if they had to pay $9 a day?

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Minnesota is of the opinion that if the employing farmer had to pay the real cost of importing laborers, he would increase the wages which he paid, and would find that he could obtain much of the necessary labor in the local community, which is what the Senator from Minnesota is after.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me make one concluding remark. In the neighborhood in which I live there is a very large and efficiently operated apple orchard. Last year the owner of that orchard tried to obtain labor from every conceivable source, at very high wages, in my opinion, to help harvest his apple crop. He drew upon women's colleges and almost every other source. The work is clean. He was unable to obtain sufficient labor, and finally got a number of imported workers who had never before picked apples. Strange as it may seem, one cannot simply go up to an apple tree and pull off the apple. The imported laborers did not like to leave the ground and go up on ladders. They had not been used to such work. The result was a very low yield per unit of expense. The operations of foreign imported laborers in that particular field were not efficient. The owner would have been nearly as well off financially if he had let his apples rot on the trees rather than pay the wages and other additional expenses which entered into the harvesting of his apple crop.

So there is a point at which such labor will not be employed because of the expense of bringing it into the country and paying the other incidental expenses.

Furthermore, under the rules of the Government, the employer is required to maintain shower baths for the employees. He is required to furnish housing, which is pretty fair housing, if I may describe it. He is subjected to other expenses. After having gone to all that expense and then finding that the labor is inefficient, if the employer must pay an additional penalty of $2 a day, I am afraid that the help will not be usable. Therefore, we either ought to prohibit such labor from coming into the country or, if it is to come in, we ought to make it possible for the farmer to utilize it 100 percent. Otherwise we shall be cutting down the area of availability of such laborers by imposing penalties.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly what happened in my area. In the first place the employer must pay the prevailing wage, which in my part of the country is approximately $9 a day and board. In the second place, in these imported workers, the employer has inefficient help. The farmer is very reluctant to employ such labor unless he absolutely has to do so. Last year during our harvesting season the schools and colleges were closed so that the students could aid in the harvest fields. There was no additional help available. Rather than employ imported laborers, the farmers left thousands of acres of grain on the ground. Some of it was harvested in the spring, with tremendous loss of food. If we want loss in food crops and high prices, this is one way to accomplish that result.

Mr. TYDINGS. Another thing about imported help from the West Indies is that such laborers do not take kindly to occupations like pitching hay, lifting, and other things to which they are not accustomed. In my part of the country we find that some of them will not do that kind of work. There are certain kinds of harvesting that they will do.

My thought in raising this point is that I should like to see the program placed on a self-sustaining basis. I think there is a good argument in favor of doing so. However, if we are to bring this kind of help into the country we ought to do it with the realization that we are not dealing with American labor, which has a certain know-how in a wide range of agricultural occupations. We are dealing with help which has very little experience in many fields of agricultural work. I believe that in this particular case the amendment, if carried out, would to a large extent defeat its purpose, which is to provide help for the farmer. Under the present arrangement he can use such labor if we do not increase the expense, and he can somehow manage to get along. But I am afraid that if we increase the cost he will refuse to use such labor, and in many cases will let his crops rot in the field. I have seen examples of that attitude in my own county with my own eyes, and I could cite many such instances.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly subscribe to the statement which the Senator just made, but I wonder if this has occurred to him: Under the amendment, which applies only to labor which may be brought in from another country, whether it be the Bahamas, Jamaica, or Mexico, would not this situation probably result, namely, that a market gardener on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, getting labor coming from offshore, would have to pay a premium of $1 or $2 a day, as it has been estimated, whereas his neighbor, getting labor that had been brought there by the Government from unemployed persons in some other area, perhaps hundreds of miles away, would not have to pay such premium, and the result would be that they would not have been treated with any degree of equality by the Federal service in an effort to help them. Would it not result in unequal treatment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that in the area which the Senator has described it would be a prevalent condition. It might happen in a few cases. But the truth of the matter is that these crops come on with great suddenness. On the Eastern Shore there are some communities which raise celery, cantaloups, watermelons, snap beans, and vegetables of that sort, which come into the harvest period with great suddenness, depending upon the weather. There is not sufficient labor available for the extra work which must be done within a period of a month or less, or it cannot be done at all. It is not like taking cans off a production line which runs all the year round. The crop is ripe on such and such a date, and it must either be harvested, as in the wheat fields or many other places, or be lost. Perhaps the situation will clear up this year. I should like to dispense with this activity if I could.

I think there is a great deal in what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has said, that if there are people in this country who can do this work we ought to pay them wages and utilize them. This was a war measure. I am not certain in this period of readjustment that we shall have the help necessary to harvest the crops. The thought runs through my mind that if, for one reason or another, a large percentage of the crop is not harvested because help is not available at the moment when the harvest should be made, and it is lost to the food supply of the Nation, I am not sure that it will not cost the users of food, who, after all, are taxpayers, more in dollars and cents than if we carry along one more year of readjustment and then see if we can dispense with it. The policy of importing labor at a time when we have available domestic labor is not a wise one. We should adjust our economy so that our own citizens can be employed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland permit me to bring forward one point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to.

Mr. THYE. This Employment Service is not solely for the purpose of importing workers from foreign countries; it is a service in every State to concentrate the workers who may be unemployed in their respective communities or States and transport them to an area where there is a job to be done in the harvesting of a food crop. The entire reason why we should give consideration to the continuation of this service for another 6 months is that the various communities have not the normal number of the young people and the workers they had in prewar days. We should not be confused by thinking that it is entirely a service for the purpose of importing foreigners to do a job in this Nation. It utilizes our own people who may be unemployed and helps them to find employment where jobs are waiting for them.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator. As one who has heard most of the testimony for the last 5 or 6 years I freely admit it is a combination of utilizing our own people and bringing in other people. I have served on the committee with my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for many years when we have had the same problem before us. I fully appreciate that the service is not devoted to bringing in people from the outside; but I say to the Senator that a considerable part of the appropriation herein made was made for the purpose of bringing in people who are what we call off-shore people, and that the percentage of cost which is reflected against them is several times higher than the percentage of cost involved in placing one of our own citizens at a place where he may be employed. It is for that reason that the cost has been shoved upward, and it is for that reason that I am directing my remarks to that particular phase of the employment matter. As one who served on the committee for 5 years, when we were providing helpers during the war, I am thoroughly familiar with the fact that it involves both off-shore and in-shore employment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In order to give the Senator an illustration of why farmers will not employ Mexicans when they can hire someone else, I will cite my own experience. During last summer's recess, when I was at home helping on my farm, we were short of help, and the only available help we could obtain was Mexican laborers. We signed a contract to pay these Mexican workers so much a day, whether they were working or not. We had to take with us cook book giving recipes for Mexican dishes, and try to provide them with food comparable with that which they had in Mexico. Portions of the book were in English and portions in Mexican. I frankly admit that I could not attempt to hold a conversation with these Mexicans. When I brought them to the farm, the cook said, "You brought the Mexicans here; now you tell me what to cook for them."

That is the kind of problem we had. When I took them out into the field to show them how to shock grain, I had to put the bundles in shocks myself, to demonstrate how it should be done. As a result, I put up more shocks than they did. If I could hire an American worker I would let the Mexicans go. Just the same, in the emergency they came in very handy.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator proves the point. This is not a case of utilizing labor that can go right into the field and harvest the crop. Any farmer who utilizes help which comes from off-shore must make a considerable investment. He is at a tremendous expense if he wants to harvest his crop. In many cases he is somewhat sorry, after the harvest is over, when he looks at his bank balance, that he did not let the crop go, because the cost of harvesting his crop, in many instances, is such that he has not accomplished anything but saving the food, without a profit on his operation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think, before the Senator entered the debate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] gave substantially these figures; that the report of last year showed that somewhat more than 4,000,000 workers were moved by this service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not 4,000,000 separate persons, but 4,000,000 separate operations, involving quite often the same people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Four million placements; and that the maximum number of off-shore laborers at any time was around 66,000.

The amendment offered requires the payment of a premium only in the case of a farmer or gardener who gets one of the off-shore laborers. The question

which I am addressing to the Senator is: Does he think it is fair and right, in a program which is directed to helping our farmers market these heavy crops in this disjointed period following the war, for one neighbor getting one class of labor to be required to pay a premium of one or two dollars a day, and probably have labor which is less effective, and another neighbor paying less for better labor? It seems to me it is an unequal handling of the problem and will be sure to bring dissatisfaction and trouble. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has asked me a question and has pretty well answered it himself. At this point in the discussion I am not disposed to take issue with him. I hope that answers his question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to point out one of the reasons for the continuation of this program. It is made clear in the bill itself. It is in order to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program. That is one reason that I am for the extension until there can be an orderly way worked out to handle the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I wish merely to make a brief statement. All of us know that this program has been in existence for several years. The beet growers of the West have come to depend upon it, and at this particular season of the year they are exercised as to whether they will be able to harvest their beets if they plant them. The Senate took considerable time last week to discuss the sugar situation. Today the inference has been made here that the United States has not returned to a peacetime economy. Inasmuch as sugar controls were extended by the bill which was before the Senate last week, I wonder whether we can conscientiously say that the United States has returned to a peacetime economy.

Today we still have sugar rationing in the United States. If we are to get away from sugar rationing next fall, our people had better produce a considerable quantity of sugar this summer. This bill will assist in doing that.

My particular State has tried to maintain full production during the war years, and I think it has done so. If our people can receive assurance, under the extension of the program by this bill for a mere 6 months, the State of Montana can be expected to contribute an additional 270,000,000 pounds of sugar. That will help give the housewives of the United States a little more sugar, and it will also help the sugar-beet industry, and it will also help get rid of some of the rationing.

I am very sympathetic toward what the distinguished Senators from Missouri and South Dakota have advocated this afternoon. It seems to me that this program should be extended for 6 months, under a continuation of the present law. The machinery is already set up, and the people of the country, especially the sugar-beet producers, are looking to the Congress to extend the program for 6 months, so that they can meet the sugar quotas which have been asked of them by the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment to the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment as amended?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, as amended, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment as amended will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4 of the committee amendment, as amended, it is proposed to insert the following after line 14:

> The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment merely seeks to reinsert in the bill section 2 (a) of the House version of the bill, which was stricken out by the Senate committee's substitute. That paragraph merely provides that this act and the preceding appropriation act shall not prohibit the State employment services from operating farm-labor supply services.

My reason for offering the amendment to the committee amendment is a bulletin which I have received from the Minnesota Division of Employment and Security, dated March 26, 1947. In Minnesota, as in most other States, the State employment offices are integrated with the State unemployment compensation division. They pay unemployment compensation to unemployed workers; they also have been given the responsibility, by the Veterans' Employment Service, of paying the servicemen's readjustment allowances of $20 a week. The reason for this bulletin was the fact that there was a shortage, in various communities, of 149 farm workers. That was on March 26. In those same communities there were 1,576 veterans drawing servicemen's readjustment allowances, whose records showed that they had been quoted as farm hands, and under the bill of rights they should have been offered those farm jobs which were available.

I do not see how we can hope to administer efficiently and economically an unemployment-compensation set-up and the servicemen's readjustment allowance program, both of which are contingent upon the recipients being offered any jobs that are available, for which they are suited, when the farm-labor placement set-up is completely separate from the State employment service. I suppose there was some justification for it during the war when there was a great movement of people across State lines; but now that the employment services in the various States have moved into smaller communities and are close to the farms, with their offices usually in the same block in the same community, and simply operated by different State agencies, it seems to me that if the States, in anticipation of the end of the present law on January 1, wish to turn over the regular recruitment job to their State employment services, they should be permitted to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the committee gave full consideration to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, which was section 2 of the bill as passed by the House. We could see no need for conducting a duplicating service as between the State employment services and the extension services during the 6 months this program is to remain in effect. We believe that section 2 of the Senate version of the bill, being the committee amendment, adequately covers the situation.

So I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be rejected. At any rate, on the first of next January the farm-placement work will revert to the State employment agencies, where it used to be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment on page 4, as amended.

The amendment to the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment as amended?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Nevertheless I wish to make one or two observations with reference to the proposed legislation.

I am sure that at the termination of the 6 months' period, we shall have another bill of this kind again before the Congress of the United States. I do not underestimate the necessity of having sufficient labor to take care of certain perishable crops which are necessary to our economic life. In the State of Illinois a number of farmers and canning industries during the war period used prisoners of war, as well as foreign labor, to care for these perishable crops during a period of some 2 months of each year. But I think the evidence before our committee will disclose that this type of labor is known as stoop labor, and that the time has almost come in the United States when it is difficult to persuade the average agricultural worker to go into the fields and do the kind of menial labor that must be done to produce this crop.

As a result of the last 5 or 6 years of importations of foreign labor from the Bahamas, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, it will be found more and more troublesome for those who produce sugar beets in the Western States and those who produce other and different perishable crops in this country, to get the average American agricultural worker to go into the fields and do the stoop labor.

I hope that those who are responsible for the production of these perishable crops and who are compelled to employ this kind and type of labor will begin now to adjust themselves to the time when sooner or later this kind of an appropriation must by necessity be denied. In my judgment now is the time for those people to begin to set their house in order, for sooner or later the Government of the United States must cease to appropriate millions of dollars each year to bring to this country these migratory workers. That is especially true if we have heavy unemployment in this country.

I merely mention this in passing because as I said before I am going to support the bill. While this may be in vain, I do hope that at the end of 6 months we will not be faced again with a similar measure for a continuance of the importation of labor of the kind we have been discussing, necessitating an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury of some fifteen or sixteen million dollars.

I appreciate that this is still a part of the war program and in this reconstruction era I am willing to go as far as any one in appropriating the necessary funds to produce sugar and the other perishable crops which are vital to our economy and to our way of life. But I repeat what I said before, those who are engaged in this great industry throughout the United States should begin to find ways and means of finding their own labor in the shortest period of time, because this cannot go on indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 2102) was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 78, Senate Resolution 81, authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "investigation", to strike out "as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed" and to insert "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters."

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senate in executive session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the chairman of the committee before we vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to make inquiry with respect to the budget the Senator has submitted. Through inadvertence, the budget was not printed in the report. I am sure that was unintentional on the part of the Committee on Rules and Administration, because my understanding is that when an investigating committee asks for money from the contingent fund a budget must be submitted and the budget is to be included in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That was done in the case of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and it has been done a number of times. Through inadvertence, the budget was not included in the report on the pending resolution, and therefore the Senate has no knowledge as to that.

I am not blaming anyone. The budget provides for an expenditure of $35,000.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. A chief counsel at the rate of $10,000 a year, a chief investigator at $7,628, three investigators at $5,695, four assistant investigators at $5,116. I should like to inquire of the Senator, because I have made some inquiries in the committee, whether this budget was considered by the Committee on Civil Service and approved by it.

Mr. LANGER. No; they simply told us to go ahead and prepare it and submit it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I make a point of order, Mr. President. I call the attention of the Chair to Senate Resolution 77, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on February 15, 1945, and reported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], without amendment, considered, and agreed to, on June 28, 1945. It is now a standing rule of the Senate. It reads:

Resolved, That the Senate shall not (1) authorize the payment from the contingent fund of the Senate of the expenses, in excess of $5,000, of any inquiry or investigation hereafter authorized, or (2) increase the amount heretofore authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with any inquiry or investigation, unless, prior to adoption of the resolution authorizing such payment or providing for such increase, the committee or subcommittee thereof authorized to conduct such inquiry or investigation shall have submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—

Under the Reorganization Act that jurisdiction is transferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration—

a budget, in such form as the committee may require—

There is no question as to the form—

setting forth its estimates of expenses proposed to be incurred for personal services, hearings, and travel, and such other information as the committee may require.

So it is provided that the Senate shall not consider a measure appropriating money from the contingent fund of the Senate unless in conformity with the rule prescribed. My contention is that the Senate is prohibited unless the Committee on Civil Service has approved this budget; and the Committee on Civil Service has not approved the budget.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee has.

Mr. HAYDEN. I inquired of every member of the committee I could reach, and none of them said he had even seen the budget.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and myself, and at the time the matter was agreed on it was said we could go ahead and submit whatever the budget was to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Arizona is a member, and we took the matter up.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, and I assumed the necessary action had been taken, but actually the budget was never submitted to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. None of the members of the committee ever saw it——

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Prior to the time the Senator took it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee saw it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I make the point of order that until the committee meets and approves this budget the Senate cannot appropriate any money under the pending resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair's ruling turns, of course, on the question of fact. Is the Chair correct

in his understanding that the Senators agree on the facts?

Mr. LANGER. We agree on the facts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. TAFT. What is this rule of the Senate? Is it a rule of the Senate today?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Was it not superseded by the La Follette-Monroney Act, section 134 (b)?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the resolution is still in force.

Mr. LANGER. I shall bring the matter before the Committee on Civil Service tomorrow.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the next point I wanted to make——

Mr. LANGER. So long as the point of order has been raised, I think that is right.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to suggest that the budget be reexamined. In my opinion $35,000 is not needed to get the answer as to why so few Republicans have been appointed postmasters in the past 14 years. It is for the same reason that so few Democrats were appointed postmasters from 1921 to 1933. There were Republican administrations in those years. There have been Democratic administrations from 1933 to this time, and naturally, of course, a majority of the appointments have been Democratic.

I suggest further to the Senator that there are now pending before his committee some 639 postmaster nominations. I am sure that there would be no occasion whatever to investigate the great majority of them. By mere inquiry of the Civil Service Commission it can be ascertained in how many instances there was but one examination, and in what cases the high man was appointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask, for the record, at what time were postmasters put under civil service?

Mr. HAYDEN. The history of that action very briefly is this: They were first put under civil service by Executive order issued by President Wilson in 1917. Prior to that time, in the McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft administrations, and in the first 4 years of the Wilson administration, they were considered political patronage. I know that, because I was in the House of Representatives and I appointed about 300 of them. I picked out friends of mine in the various towns and appointed them. But Mr. Wilson grew tired of the postmaster controversy. After his reelection he issued an Executive order providing that thereafter all postmasters should be appointed as the result of a civil-service examination, and that the high man should be appointed. During the last 4 years of his administration that is exactly the way it was done. No Representative was consulted. No Senator was consulted. No Democratic national committeeman was consulted.

When Mr. Harding became President he issued an Executive order changing it, retaining the civil-service examination, but providing that, as in all other instances, any one of the three highest persons certified as qualified might be appointed. The effect of that worried the Civil Service Reform League greatly. They pointed out in a report that, under 4 years of the Wilson administration, in the 2,000 post offices they had checked over in the Northern States, 800 Republicans had been appointed, whereas only 600 Democrats had retained office. That was in the section where the Republicans predominated. It really was done on the square, but they greatly feared that this method of allowing the choice of any one of the three highest on the list would result in politics entering into the selection of postmasters. A few years later their fears were realized, according to a subsequent report, which shows that the Post Office Department, when the three names came over from the Civil Service Commission, immediately notified the Republican Representative, or, if there was no Republican Representative from the district, the Senator; if not, the national committeeman; and he made a recommendation as to which of the three should be selected.

That was carried on through the Harding administration; the Executive orders issued by Coolidge carried on the same plan; and Hoover carried it also. When Franklin Roosevelt became President, he issued an order of the same kind, which was in effect until 1936, at which time he reverted to the original Wilson idea and provided that there should be a civil-service examination, the high man to be selected.

That did not suit the House of Representatives, and a bill was immediately introduced to provide the present way of handling it. That bill was passed by the Senate and became a law, I think, sometime in 1938. Since that time postmaster appointments have been handled just the same as any other civil-service appointments; that is, one of the three highest names is selected.

Of course, in the meantime, an Executive order has been issued giving preference to veterans. That preference is now conferred by law, and in the case of the 639 nominations now pending, about 250 of them are veterans. That is why I want the Civil Service Committee to look into this matter very carefully. I am sure if they will go through the 639 names they will find comparatively few that are questioned. I doubt very much whether it will require $35,000 to ascertain in those few cases what ought to be done. Of course, it is a matter for the committee and for the Senate to decide. That is my judgment about it.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION UNTIL JUNE 30, 1948

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 350.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after "June 30", to strike out "1949" and insert "1948", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948."

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other legislative business to come before the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator that the Senate recur to the unfinished business, which was displaced temporarily so that other matters could be considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to follow with that suggestion. I know of no further legislative business to be taken up at this time. I was about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 938 was temporarily displaced.

Mr. WHITE. The Chair is quite correct. I move that the Senate resume consideration of Senate bill 938.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nicaragua, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay;

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador;

Williamson S. Howell, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay;

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Costa Rica;

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia;

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Siam;

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Hungary;

Henry F. Grady, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India;

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ireland;

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia;

John F. Simmons, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador;

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria;

Cecil Wayne Gray, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general;

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal; and

Elmer H. Bourgerie, of Maryland, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

PROTOCOL FOR REGULATION OF WHALING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive K, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol for the regulation of whaling, opened for signature at Washington on December 2, 1946, and signed under that date for the United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the message of transmittal from the President; and, without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol for the regulation of whaling, opened for signature at Washington on December 2, 1946, and signed under that date for the United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The protocol extends until October 31, 1948, the provisions of the protocol signed at London, November 26, 1945, amending the agreement for the regulation of whaling, signed at London, June 8, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State in explanation of the objectives and provisions of the protocol of December 2, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of protocol, opened for signature December 2, 1946, for the regulation of whaling.]

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive L, Eightieth Congress, first session, an international convention for the regulation of whaling, opened for signature at Washington on December 2, 1946, and signed under that date for the United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the message of transmittal from the President; and, without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of an international convention for the regulation of whaling, opened for signature at Washington on December 2, 1946, and signed under that date for the United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The purposes of the convention are explained in the report of the Acting Secretary of State, which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

I also transmit a certified copy of the final act of the International Whaling Conference held at Washington from November 20 to December 2, 1946, at which the convention was formulated, and a copy of the report of the delegation of the United States of America to that Conference. The final act does not require ratification and is transmitted as of possible interest in connection with the consideration of the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of Convention for Regulation of Whaling, opened for signature December 2, 1946. 3. Certified copy of final act of International Whaling Conference held at Washington November 20 to December 2, 1946. 4. Copy of report of the United States delegation.]

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN TREATIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

Because of changed conditions affecting their provisions since they were submitted to the Senate, a number of the treaties now pending in the Senate have become obsolete. The situation with respect to several other pending treaties would be clarified if they were withdrawn for further study and consideration in the light of developments since they were formulated and, if found advisable, resubmitted with a fresh appraisal of their provisions.

I therefore desire to withdraw from the Senate the following treaties with a view to placing the Treaty Calendar on a current basis:

Agreement between the United States of America and Costa Rica regarding an interoceanic canal across Costa Rican territory, signed at Washington February 1, 1923—Executive B, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and the Traffic in Obscene Publications, signed at Geneva September 12, 1923—Executive M, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session.

Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925—Executive G, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session.

Convention and protocol between the United States of America and Canada for the preservation and improvement of the Niagara Falls, signed at Ottawa January 2, 1929—Executive U, Seventieth Congress, second session.

Protocol of revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice—World Court—signed at Geneva September 14, 1929; protocol of signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva December 16, 1920; and protocol of accession of the United States of America to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva September 14, 1929—Executive A, Seventy-first Congress, third session.

Treaty between the United States of America and Canada for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway, signed at Washington July 18, 1932—Executive C, Seventy-second Congress, second session.

Bern Convention of September 9, 1886, for the protection of literary and artistic works, revised at Berlin, November 13, 1908, and at Rome, June 2, 1928—Executive E, Seventy-third Congress, second session.

International convention for the suppression of the traffic in women of full age, opened for signature at Geneva October 11, 1933—Executive H, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Argentina with reference to sanitary regulations concerning plant and animal products, signed at Washington May 24, 1935—Executive O, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

International convention relating to economic statistics and a protocol thereto, signed at Geneva December 14, 1928—Executive S, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama for the regulation of radio communications in the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone, signed at Washington March 2, 1936—Executive C, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

International convention for the unification of certain rules to govern the liability of vessels when collisions occur between them, and a protocol thereto, signed at Brussels September 23, 1910—Executive K, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Draft convention, No. 56, concerning sickness insurance for seamen, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-first session, held at Geneva October 6 to 24, 1936—Executive Y, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Draft convention, No. 61, concerning the reduction of hours of work in the textile industry, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-third session, held at Geneva June 3 to 23, 1937—Executive J, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

Draft convention, No. 63, concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session, held at Geneva June 2 to 22, 1938—Executive L, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

International sanitary convention, signed at Paris October 31, 1938—Executive J, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Convention for the establishment of an inter-American bank, signed on behalf of the United States of America May 10, 1940—Executive K, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland providing for the exemption of taxation on property or transactions connected with defense, signed at Washington October 17, 1941—Executive H, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Supplementary protocol concerning whaling signed at London October 5, 1945—Executive J, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar, with the exception of those to be voted on tomorrow.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Holt, of Nebraska, to be Associate Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis J. O'Marr, of Wyoming, to be Associate Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no further business to come before the Senate at this time, so I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Marshall Sylvester Carter (captain, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Edgar E. Witt to be Chief Commissioner.

William M. Holt to be an Associate Commissioner.

Louis J. O'Marr to be an Associate Commissioner.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, to Thee, who art the author of our liberty, and under whom we have our freedom, we make our prayer. Make us ever mindful of the price that was paid to obtain that freedom and the cost that must be met to keep it. Help us in this Nation so to live it that other men shall desire it and seek after it. Believing in it, give us the backbone to stand up for it. Loving it, may we be willing to defend it. In the strong name of Him who said, "If ye continue in My word, ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—NOTICE OF SPEECH

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume that the debate will progress on the pending bill to provide aid to Greece and Turkey. I should like to say that if I can obtain recognition tomorrow when the Senate convenes, I desire to address myself to that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take notice of the suggestion, and it will be responded to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will go into executive session at 5 o'clock, and, without further debate, proceed to vote on the nominations of the various members of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the General Manager.

At the moment the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the first amendment to Senate bill 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Lands Committee, that a subcommittee of that committee, to wit, on irrigation and reclamation, be permitted to hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order will be made respecting the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask permission that the committee may hold a meeting this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Appropriations Committee may meet this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate on Thursday and Friday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is given.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to continue the availability of funds provided for airport construction in Hawaii as legalized by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress

"Whereas from news dispatches it has come to the attention of members of the Territorial Legislature now assembled that it has been suggested by a subcommittee of the United States Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that funds provided for improvements of airports during the year 1947 be diverted and used for aircraft aids and safety devices; and

"Whereas the transportation of persons and island produce between the islands is becoming more and more dependent on air transportation; and

"Whereas in order to furnish the necessary facilities for airplane operations so that the transportation of island produce and persons may be more efficiently handled, the Territory has looked with great favor on the national airport program and has provided funds with which to match Federal funds on the improvement of Kalaupapa Airport, Lanai Airport, Lihue Airport, Hana Airport, and Kailua Airport, and has under study the provision for additional funds for the improvement of other airports; and

"Whereas due to the ideal flying conditions within the Territory of Hawaii such aids and safety devices are not required to be installed here; and

"Whereas if the diversion of funds allocated or to be allocated to the Territory are to be expended for such aids this community will neither receive its just share of funds provided for it under Public Law 377, nor will it be able to proceed with its airport-improvement program now being planned: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to make no changes in funds provided for airport construction under the provisions of Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress, insofar as the purpose of expenditure of such fund within the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall forthwith be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; the Secretary of the Interior; Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 3d day of April A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Townsend Clubs of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida, West Palm Beach, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the conservation assistance to Minnesota farmers under that program

"Whereas the proper land utilization and conservation of soil resources of this State are necessary for its prosperity and agricultural development; and

"Whereas 90 percent of the farmers of this State farm 80 percent of the land and participate in this program; and

"Whereas financial assistance to farmers through a soil building program of national scope is necessary to productive soil for the benefit of generations of farmers; and

"Whereas the present form of administration of this program is entirely satisfactory to the farmers of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Minnesota (the Senate concurring) memorialize the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and not to reduce conservation assistance to Minnesota farmers under that program nor remove the local authorities from the administration of said program; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to send copies of this resolution to each Minnesota Member of Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States."

PRACTICE BOMBING IN MARTHA'S VINEYARD AREA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the news that the Navy plans to practice bombing on the island of Marthas Vineyard has caused a great deal of consternation. I express the hope that upon reconsideration they will decide not to conduct bombing in that area. I ask to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, an

editorial from the Boston Express, and another from the Vineyard Gazette, Marthas Vineyard, Mass., on that particular topic.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Express of April 7, 1947]

VINEYARD BOMBING

The Marthas Vineyard area would seem to be a poor place in which to carry out practice bombing. In response to protests from that section, the Navy has ordered a stop to such operations pending investigation. With the approach of the vacation season, such bombing becomes particularly unwelcome and even dangerous. It is hoped that the investigation planned by the Navy will bring a permanent halt to the Marthas Vineyard bombing.

[From the Vineyard Gazette, Marthas Vineyard, Mass., of March 28, 1947]

ILL WILL AND THE NAVY

The reinstatement of naval air targets in Tisbury Grea Pond and Squibnocket Pond will restore a wartime state of affairs certain to be bitterly resented on the Vineyard. We had thought that we were through with bombings and bombing runs for a while. It goes without saying that these naval air activities are incompatible with the normal pursuits by which Marthas Vineyard earns its living—fishing and recreation—and with the safe use of natural resources here.

During the war it often seemed that the Navy deliberately and unnecessarily chose areas for target bombing and other exercises which would disturb civilian life. While the war was in progress nobody kicked. But the close view which the public thus gained of various Navy activities built up adverse opinion and an awareness of wasted money and matériel. This feeling on the part of so many patriotic citizens is a liability the Navy could have avoided.

A continuation of the wartime program will intensify and increase public ill will, and we doubt if the Navy can afford such a burden. Certainly a sound policy would be to develop a feeling of partnership and understanding.

It is perfectly obvious that the coast, at no great distance from Quonset Point, affords areas which can be used for bombing without offense and without danger to civilian flying and civilian pursuits. We hope the Navy will make use of such areas promptly, and abandon its ill-advised program for an island which is one of the most important resort areas of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1071. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1072. A bill to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1073. A bill to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1074. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Thomas Tohru Ogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1076. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CORDON introduced Senate bill 1077, to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1078, to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1079. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 1080. A bill to authorize temporarily the voluntary transfer of newsprint used by the publishing industry of the United States notwithstanding the provisions of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1081. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution designating the period from Thanksgiving to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on the Judiciary a bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Administrative Procedure Act contains, among other provisions, a requirement that all examiners of fact be civilians. In connection with the Coast Guard that provision of law will require the employment of a considerable number of civilian examiners in cases arising under the provisions of law which require the Coast Guard, among other things, to conduct disciplinary proceedings looking to the suspension or revocation of seamen's licenses or certificates on grounds of incompetence, misbehavior, negligence, unskillfulness, endangering of life, or violation of various laws and regulations governing the merchant marine.

Mr. President, it will be a waste of money to require the Coast Guard to employ civilian examiners because in many instances their time cannot be fully occupied in the work for which they would have to be employed, and their time would be utterly wasted. Quite evidently, the situation as it now exists was not foreseen at the time that the Administrative Procedure Act was before the committee and was enacted into law. The Coast Guard will require about $280,000 annually in addition to its other necessities in order to maintain this group of civilian examiners. If, on the other hand, the Administrative Procedure Act can be amended so as to exclude the Coast Guard from its operation in connection with this handling of inspection of merchant marine this amount can be saved each year.

The bill I am introducing provides for exemption of the Coast Guard officers from the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. I particularly call the attention of any members of the Committee on the Judiciary to the amendment, and I hope they will expedite its consideration.

This is one of the situations which continually confronts the Appropriations Committee. We are faced with requests for funds which have been authorized, funds which are needed unless substantive law can be changed, and I feel it to be the duty of the members of the several subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, as rapidly as situations of that character come to their attention, to attempt corrections in substantive law so as to bring the law into proper relationship with the appropriative matters under the control and supervision of that committee. I ask particular attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to the bill which I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1077) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CORDON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 2 months ago I introduced a joint resolution which had as its purpose the establishment of civil government in our Pacific islands. My resolution suggested that the President proclaim interim civil governments in Guam and American Samoa and in the former Japanese mandated islands. That resolution resulted, Mr. President, from my conviction that it is high time for the United States to provide a form of civil government for the civilian populations on the Pacific islands.

At the time I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 51 I was not unmindful of the fact that the President already has all the authority he needs to establish temporary civil administrations in these island areas. He could have established

interim civil governments for these peoples with a stroke of his pen. In fact my resolution was intended as a form of Congressional approval of that authority as well as an indication of Congressional disapproval of the continued government of civilian populations by military governments in Guam and American Samoa. It was also notice to him that at least one Member of the Senate of the United States favored the early establishment of civil governments for the civilian populations of the mandated islands.

Mr. President, my hopes have not materialized. The President has indicated no desire to establish civil governments in these islands. At the very moment that the President is stumping for democracy in Greece and Turkey to the tune of $400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money, he is perpetuating a form of American military autocracy which has existed under the executive authority of the President for almost 50 years. While he bemoans the fate of democracy in Greece, he ignores the cries of some 40,000 American nationals in Guam and American Samoa who have not known democracy in all the years they have been under the American flag. At the very moment that he invokes the ghost of Jefferson to bless the campaign for democracy in Greece, he blithely ignores every tenet of Jefferson's philosophy of government as it should apply to our own possessions. While he exhorts Americans to fight totalitarianism in Europe, he deliberately overlooks the military dictatorships which exist on his own authority in Guam and American Samoa.

In article IX of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, the United States pledged herself to define the civil rights and political status of the local inhabitants of the islands which were ceded to us by other provisions of that same treaty. We have fulfilled our pledge with respect to Puerto Rico. We have gone far beyond our pledge with respect to the Philippine Islands. We have utterly disregarded our pledge with respect to the island of Guam. Since 1898 the American Congress has stood by while the executive branch of our Government has ruled the island through naval officers in whom it has vested plenary powers of local government. For almost half a century the executive, legislative, and judicial powers of local government in the island of Guam have been combined in one man who at the same time has been military commandant of the island.

The naval officers who have served as Governors of Guam have, as a rule, been kindly and considerate. Their errors have on the whole resulted from an overzealous regard for the welfare of a people, who through the years have been regarded as wards of the United States Navy. The wrong, Mr. President, is in the system itself—not in the individuals who execute it. It is the naval governments of Guam and American Samoa which are undemocratic and un-American. They are absolutisms beyond compare. We should act now to eliminate these monstrosities from the American system.

It was during my Pacific inspection tour of several months ago that I became acutely aware of the enormity of the wrong we have perpetrated on the people of Guam since 1898. To this date I have hesitated to take action to correct that wrong because I feared that public criticism of the form of government we have imposed on these people might serve only to invite attention to this blot on the record of American democracy. I have now changed my mind. The time has come for action from this end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

To that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I hope will become an organic act for the island of Guam. It is a bill which will give to Guam the same democracy which other Americans enjoy. It is the Senate counterpart of a bill recently introduced in the House by Representative NORRIS POULSON, a California Republican. In introducing this bill, Mr. President, I am endorsing the principle that there must be civil governments for civilian populations under the American flag in time of peace. I am endorsing that principle as it applies to Guam and American Samoa and the other Pacific islands which have been placed in our trust by the United Nations.

How can we preach—or should I say purchase—democracy in the Near East when we practice autocracy in the Far East? How can we advocate democracy for the Greeks and the Turks when we practice autocracy on our own nationals? How can we stand before the world as champions of the democratic way of life while we perpetuate military absolutisms in our own non-self-governing territories? Mr. President, I am proud to give my name and my support to a measure which will extend the basic human freedoms of the Constitution and laws of the United States to the 23,000 loyal American nationals and the many American citizens who live under the American flag on the island of Guam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Times, entitled "News From Guam," which strongly urges enactment of some such measure as the one I am introducing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1078) to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The editorial presented by Mr. BUTLER and ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1947]

NEWS FROM GUAM

A report of the Eighth Guam Congress, recently come to hand, offers convincing evidence of the ability of the people of that island to deal with public affairs in an orderly and competent manner. A joint session of the House of Council and the House of Assembly debated several controversial measures having to do with the rebuilding of Agana, including the allotment of land and the zoning for business and light industry. One by one the disputed points were disposed of by reasonable compromise. A proposed petition to the Navy Governor of Guam requesting the setting aside of 10 percent of tax collections to provide scholarships in the United States for Guamanians choosing professional studies, such as medicine and law, was carried over for further consideration when some members found flaws in the petition as worded. A communication was received from Navy Governor Rear Adm. C. A. Pownall, acceding to their request that all ordinances for governance of the island be presented to them for their comment before promulgation. There was no discussion, although the qualification by Admiral Pownall that in certain circumstances this might not be possible must have been somewhat galling.

On Guam more than 20,000 people have lived under the United States flag for almost half a century. They are still second-class citizens, with only an advisory voice in their affairs, ruled by laws that are what the Navy Governor or the Navy Department says they are. Navy Government of Guam has been, on the whole, benign, contrary to some exaggerated reports. Most Navy Governors have been conscientious men. Some of them, such as Admiral Pownall, have been deeply interested in the welfare of the Guamanians. But it still has been government without the consent of the governed, taxation without representation and a violation of fundamental democratic principles.

The Guamanians have been governed largely for the benefit of the United States, in order to make the most efficient use of Guam as a forward military base. That is the situation today. The military comes first in everything. Guam is now one of our most important naval bases in the Pacific. It is all the more important that the United States should practice there the democracy it preaches. Congress would do well to grant citizenship to the Guamanians and give to the Eighth Congress of Guam the right of local self-government to which the Guamanians are entitled and for which we believe they would prove their competence.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF SENATE BILL 1024

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1024, to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd, introduced by me on April 2, 1947, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be indefinitely postponed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National

Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ENTITLED "TERMINATION OF WAR CONTROLS" (S. DOC. NO. 42)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 8, 1947, I presented to the Senate a report entitled "Termination of War Controls."

At that time, I received permission from the Senate to print, as a Senate document, a report setting forth the provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, or the emergency.

This latter information relating to the termination of war controls was subsequently printed as Senate Document No. 5.

Today, I received a report prepared by the Department of Justice on provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, or emergency.

This study by the Department of Justice is based on Senate Document No. 5.

The information outlined in the report of the Department of Justice has a definite historical value and, aside from that, will undoubtedly serve as a very effective working tool for the Senate and for the House in connection with the consideration of wartime controls.

The data were also submitted to the House Committee on the Judiciary in response to an informal request by Representatives MICHENER and SPRINGER.

The report, apparently, represents the views of the various interested agencies.

At a later date the Senate Judiciary Committee will, in all probability, prepare its own report which will deal with the same items but will present the conclusions of the committee rather than the conclusions of the various agencies involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, as a Senate document, the report prepared by the Department of Justice, which I send to the desk at this time, and I request that my remarks be incorporated therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago a group representing various shades of political opinions and social points of view sent to the Honorable Herbert Hoover a tribute in appreciation of the wonderful service he has recently rendered at the invitation of the President of the United States in making a survey of food conditions in Germany. I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks there be inserted in the RECORD the letter addressed to Mr. Hoover, together with the names of the signers, representing an important cross section of American citizens.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable HERBERT HOOVER,
The Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Representing various shades of political opinions and social points of view, we ask you to accept our profoundest gratitude for the latest proof you have given of your unselfish and patriotic readiness to serve your country and humanity at all times. At an age when most men are thinking only of rest and freedom from responsibilities, you immediately responded to President Truman's call and went overseas, in the face of the worst winter weather known abroad in decades, to report upon the German situation and what must be done by our Government to make that conquered country able to maintain itself.

This you did in an amazingly short time, in a brief but compact and convincing study which could hardly be equalled by any other American since no other citizen has had so extensive an experience in dealing with foreign food and economic conditions as you. Your report is also a model in the complete detachment with which you wrote it, your refusal to yield to hate or bitterness, or even to dwell upon the sins of those whose plight you studied in order to protect yourself from the charge of showing undue favoritism to the nation which plunged the world into its present desperate and desperately alarming misery.

Instead, you stressed the indubitable fact that if western civilization is to survive in Europe, it must survive in Germany. You have brought out that its people have "sunk in food, warmth, and shelter" to the lowest level known in a hundred years, and that their being made into a cooperative member of western civilization is the hope of lasting peace. Then, in the finest historic American spirit of benevolence and justice, you ended with these words: "After all, our flag flies over these people. That flag means something besides military power." Nothing else that has been said gives a similar expectation that our experiment in controlling a European nation will in the end be worthy of our country and its ideals.

In your entire career you have shown your realization that the greatest glory of the American flag has been its humanitarian leadership wherever need existed. Your vision has never been restricted to the confines of the American hemisphere, or to those whose ideals were ours—witness your magnificent aid to starving Russia after the First World War. But this is only one way in which you have set a most admirable example to our Nation. It has been recently said of you that you have been personifying the conscience of America in international affairs. We are happy to approve this characterization, to express to you again our sincerest gratitude for the enlightened service with which you are rounding out your years of patriotic devotion, and to assure you that it will never be forgotten.

Sincerely and cordially yours,

Charles C. Burlingham, Peter Grimm, George McAneny, Eugene Meyer, Oswald Garrison Villard, Dorothy Thompson, Henry R. Luce, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Philip D. Reed, Winthrop W. Aldrich, Anne O'Hare McCormick, Lucius M. Boomer, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., John Haynes Holmes, Shepard Morgan, Frank D. Fackenthal, James T. Shotwell, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Nicholas Murray Butler, Roger N. Baldwin, Harry Woodburn Chase, Walter Damrosch, Norman Thomas, George N. Shuster, Ray Morris, Felix Morley, Walter Rosen, Christopher Emmet, Jr., George J. Gillespie, James Marshall, Charles F. Darlington, George A. Buttrick, Oswald W. Knauth, Allen Dulles, Clare Boothe Luce, George Roosevelt, Eustace Seligman, Arthur Dean, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Jeremiah Milbank, William M. Chadbourne, Adriaan J. Barnouw, Carl Ackerman, Frederick G. Clark, William J. Donovan, Horace M. Albright, Vincent Sheean, Thomas J. Watson.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Aid for Education," delivered by him at Teachers College, Columbia University, April 7, 1947, under sponsorship of Phi Delta Kappa, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION FOR DESIGN FOR FEDERAL MEMORIAL TO THOMAS JEFFERSON—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 30, 1947, announcing an architectural competition for a design for a Federal memorial to Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE MUST CONQUER FEAR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "We Must Conquer Fear," recently issued by him to the press, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROBERT E. LEE, THE AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY FRED P. MYERS

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Robert E. Lee, the American," delivered by Fred P. Myers, commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, in Statuary Hall, United States Capitol, on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, which appears in the Appendix.]

POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject of popular election of President, one from the Herald-News of Fall River, Mass., and the other from the Gazette, Haverhill, Mass., which appear in the Appendix.]

WAR OR PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM CAMDEN (N. J.) NEWS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will It Be War or Peace?" published in the Camden (N. J.) News of March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACK TO THE UNITED NATIONS—ADDRESS BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Back to the United Nations," delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, editor of the

New Republic, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD FEDERATION—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on federal world government by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, in Asheville, N. C., February 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE LEWISTON (IDAHO) MORNING TRIBUNE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to proposed assistance to Greece and Turkey, from the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of March 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPLICATIONS OF GRECIAN-TURKISH LOAN PROPOSAL—EDITORIAL FROM STATEWIDE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peace—It's Monotonous," from Statewide, of Boise, Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 18, it is proposed to insert "and (5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the President has submitted his message to the joint session of Congress requesting a loan or a gift of $400,000,000 for the use of Greece and Turkey, to be divided $250,000,000 for Greece and $150,000,000 for Turkey. The President based his request upon the statement that this money was needed to combat spreading communism in the Eastern Hemisphere. The UN, or United Nations, was not mentioned in the message nor has any request been made to the United Nations to take part in this problem. Hon. Warren Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, has just stated that it is the purpose of the administration to notify the United Nations that we expect their assistance if and when we request it. Only now, weeks after the President delivered his message, has any official statement been made to place the United States in the United Nations set-up. It seems to me that the United States should have first applied to the United Nations before embarking upon this unilateral project. It has been said that the United Nations has neither the power nor the available money to act positively. Nevertheless, the United Nations was set up for this particular purpose, and apparently the administration is bypassing the United Nations in this unilateral proposal by the President. It would have created a better feeling both in this country and in the United Nations had the President applied to them to take part in this action.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, testifying before a congressional committee, recently asserted:

I wish to reiterate that the United States in undertaking aid to Greece and Turkey is not assuming British obligations or underwriting British policy there or elsewhere.

In spite of Dean Acheson's statement that the United States is not undertaking aid to Greece and Turkey and is not assuming British obligations, we have the President's own statement:

No other nation except the United States is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek government.

The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no financial or economic aid after March 31. Great Britain finds itself under the necessity of reducing and liquidating its commitments in several parts of the world, including Greece. The British Government has informed us that owing to its own difficulties it can no longer give financial or economic aid to Turkey.

As in the case of Greece, if Turkey is to have the assistance it needs, the United States must supply it.

The American people do not object to aiding starving people either in Greece or Turkey, if they are starving, but the President's message goes far beyond that. Does he not, in effect, place us in the position of inviting every country in the world to make a like request for money from the United States?

It was stated by the Christian Science Monitor on March 20:

Current estimates assume that Congress will disgorge the $400,000,000 requested for Greece and Turkey, but this will only start the operations on one small sector of the front. It is believed from preliminary estimates that the total cost of waging a counteroffensive against Russian influence by means short of war would run to about $5,000,000,000 a year.

Obviously we will not be confined to this single request for Greece and Turkey, but will have to underwrite all the European and Asiatic countries, and I doubt if the United States is either able or willing to engage in that sort of program. I fear that our attempt to enter the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey inevitably means another war. Oh, I know there is tremendous pressure being exerted now upon the Congress to approve this move by the President. Our top-flight statesmen have been repeatedly telling us that we must approve. Still if it is the duty of the Senate either to approve or reject this proposal, we must not be rushed into something in which we do not believe. We must not accept the statements of our eminent statesmen simply because they say we must do so.

The President says in his message that we will be obligated to provide the personnel for these two countries. Does not personnel mean soldiers and armament? No other construction can be placed upon his words. No other construction can be placed upon his intent. Undoubtedly the United States is heading once more for a world war, regardless of the protestations of the statesmen who urge us to do what the President requests.

What difference is there in the pattern of this request than the pattern of former President Roosevelt in World War II? Were we not assured over and over again by him that our boys would not be required to take part in another war? The record is full of such protestations and yet in the end we entered the most terrible war in history. Is that to be the outcome of this move into the Mediterranean area? Apparently this has the same pattern as that of World War II.

Our distinguished leader has told us that it is the duty of each individual Senator to examine the facts for himself and then make up his own mind as to what judgment should prevail. I have done exactly that. I have taken the facts as they have been discussed in the hearings and I can arrive at no other conclusion than that it is a serious mistake for the United States to enter this movement into the eastern European area. After examining those facts it appears

to me that only one conclusion can be arrived at by a conscientious Member of Congress, and that is that we should deny the President's request.

If this proposal of the President's is made for the purpose of stopping communism from spreading in Europe, what about communism in the United States? J. Edgar Hoover and other able men have stated publicly that communism has become infiltrated into many walks of life in the United States. On every hand we hear of Communists here at home gradually, but certainly, working into our Government and our industries.

We have been told repeatedly that the President's hands must be upheld for the purpose of helping free people everywhere. Let me remind the President that the Greeks are not a free people; Greece is a monarchy. Nor are the people of Turkey free after the pattern of the United States.

Many have forgotten that the famous Monroe Doctrine, which has become a settled policy of the United States, is a two-way highway applying equally to Europe as to the Western Hemisphere. Europe is notified by that doctrine to keep out of South America. By the same policy the same doctrine applies to Europe. It is a two-way highway, and if we are to insist that Russia and other European countries keep out of South America, it is equally true that we should keep out of Europe. But those who are insisting that the Monroe Doctrine only applies to the Western Hemisphere have apparently forgotten that it applies equally to Europe and Asia.

It is difficult for Senators to understand the necessity for this sudden action on the part of the President. True, we are now told that most of the spade work of drafting the Truman message was done by the State Department financial and economic and political experts, under the chairmanship of Loy O. Henderson, Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, but is that the real reason for this sudden activity on the part of the administration? One has a right to wonder.

As Frank Waldrop says in the Times-Herald on March 16:

> Mr. Truman has discovered all of a sudden that the Communists of the world are dangerous people, and so they are.
>
> But why is it the Communists are more dangerous in Greece and Turkey than they are in Washington, D. C.?
>
> Here he comes to Congress and asks approximately half a billion dollars to start an anti-Communist program abroad that says to Russia plain as day, "If you want a war, we're ready."
>
> Yet, right now, today, there are on the pay roll of the taxpayers of the United States Communists who are for Russia first, and have been ever since Mr. Truman came to Washington, a freshman Senator from Missouri.
>
> In fact, they were in Washington long before him. They came here with his predecessor in the Presidency and laughed at Roosevelt as "the Kerensky of our revolution."
>
> They demonstrated their power in the Roosevelt administration right at the start. Who remembers the late Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, Ind.? Dr. Wirt was a distinguished and liberal educator of world renown.
>
> He came to Washington to see what the brand-new deal was like. He didn't come as a pay-roll patriot, but as a plain patriot, wanting to find out what kind of people had risen to power.
>
> What he found out was that the Communists and their fellow travelers had at last, with Roosevelt, got themselves into places of power and importance in our Government. So he gave warning.
>
> Did the newspaper editors and college presidents and Members of Congress and other such opinion makers take him seriously? Well does this writer remember how, for instance, the distinguished Baltimore Sun and New York Times gave out gentlemanly haw-haws at Dr. Wirt and how college presidents the country over followed up the cue. As for Congress, it was just as guilty as Roosevelt in those days, and it deliberately made Dr. Wirt a laughing stock.
>
> He went to his grave a bitter and frustrated man, while the editors of the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times and all such noble-minded heavy thinkers continued to say that we must worry about fascism and nazism abroad, but, as for communism, why, it is not a problem and, besides, to criticize the Communists would be Red-baiting, and who wants to be a Red-baiter?

This proposed aid for Greece and Turkey is a complete change of policy from anything that the United States has ever engaged in. I want to say now categorically that I am opposed to this loan, or gift, by whatever name it is called, and urge Senators to join me in voting against it.

I am not an internationalist, nor am I an isolationist. The Republican Party now believes, and always has believed, in refraining from meddling in the affairs of other countries. I am an American, first, last, and all the time, believing in our form of government and the welfare of America before that of any other people.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, within the next few days the Senate will pass upon the proposed loan or grant to the Greek and Turkish Governments. This will be a critical hour. America will then take a new course.

The world is truly at the crossroads. There is hunger, cold, and sickness in practically every part of the world. The aftermath of war, the most destructive war of all time, and the thought that we may have another war are causes of unrest, uncertainty, and confusion. Unfortunately this applies even to the United States.

For the first time in civilization's history the world is looking to the Western Hemisphere for hope, guidance, and peace.

As a newcomer to the Senate I had fully intended to remain silent during these deliberations. But world conditions and what I have observed on the home front compel me at this time to offer some observations for the consideration of Senators in connection with the discussion of the Greek-Turkish loan.

When the President recently called upon Congress to spend $400,000,000 to prop up the existing regimes of Greece and Turkey he turned a new page in history for the United States.

It seems to me that in our study and discussion of this proposed loan—or shall I say grant or gift—to Greece and Turkey, we should consider it not as an isolated plan but as a tile in a large mosaic. If the United States proceeds to take the step requested, it should not do so with blinders on. The Nation should act only after a careful look around the barrel. Before we sign on the dotted line we should lay down firmly and understand clearly the terms and conditions upon which we embrace this new policy. The searchlight of truth should be turned on in full force for the benefit of the American people.

Through much of its history, the United States has been the victim of fuzzy diplomacy. We have never lost a shooting war, but we have won few diplomatic battles. Invariably this has left us out on the end of a limb when we should have been resting comfortably in the shade at the foot of the tree.

If we had been more practical and hard-boiled in demanding adherence to the ideals of our people in 1917, our allies would then have committed themselves for the postwar period. But we waited until the shooting was over. Then they did not need us any more. They were not interested in our wishes, and as a result we found ourselves in the unholy mess of the Versailles Peace Conference.

If during World War II we had been tough-minded enough to lay down conditions for our help and lend-lease, we would not find ourselves in the unholy mess of today at Moscow and generally about the world. We would not have secret conditions, spawned in secret conferences, bobbing up to haunt us. We would not be discovering belatedly that we were promising and giving away everything without proper regard for our own national safety and the peace of the world.

In 1942 and 1943, for instance, we might have settled with the British the troubled and important Palestine issue in which real red-blooded Americans are greatly interested.

Today we face a new situation in which British interests are prime. Are we to jump into this thing blindly as though it had no connection with anything else in the world? Or are we going to consider the collateral aspects before it is too late? I think there is similarity between the troubles faced by the British in Greece and their problems in Palestine. So far as I am concerned, there is no time like the present for being hard-boiled and for having a clear understanding. If we are going to be soft-brained and merely let ourselves be swept along, we are due for another round of regrets and recriminations. I hope we have learned our lesson.

This is a good time for the British to make clear once and for all their attitude on Palestine. It is a good time to let them know that America expects them to comply with their solemn obligations as set forth in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. In bringing these matters to the attention of the Senate, I am not unmindful of the fact that the problem has been submitted to the United Nations.

Mr. President, recently I issued a statement on the Palestine situation. I now ask unanimous consent that this

statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON PALESTINE ISSUED BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Consideration of the British proposal with respect to economic and military aid for Greece inevitably centers attention upon the course they have taken in other lands where downtrodden and oppressed people placed their trust, confidence, and their hope of survival in the pledged word of the British Government.

In view of Great Britain's appeal that the United States assume her commitments in Greece, I cannot resist the opportunity of discussing her policy toward Palestine.

Such discussion does not, in any way, reflect on the merits of the request for our Government's assistance in Greece and Turkey.

I have long been interested in the matter of helping the unfortunate children of Israel who need help so desperately.

During my term as Governor of Pennsylvania I urged that the President and the Secretary of State take a very firm position with our friend, Great Britain, in order to relieve and correct the horrible plight of the persecuted Jews of Europe.

In fact, before the British Foreign Secretary's attack upon our President, I wrote to both President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall urging a firm stand by our Government toward the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in displaced persons camps of Europe.

To desire for these homeless Jews a peaceful haven in the Holy Land is not partisan; it is not political—it is humane, it is a legal and spiritual obligation of both America and Great Britain.

Both the Republican and Democratic Parties made solemn pledges in their 1944 party platforms.

The Republicans spoke in these words: "In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth." The Democratic platform used the following language: "We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

The time has come to stop giving these unfortunate men, women, and children mere lip service. The time has come to stop sending greetings on the occasions of their high holidays, but rather to supplant them with such action that may prove more beneficial.

The time has come for our Government to treat the British attitude toward Palestine not only as a diplomatic and humanitarian matter, but also as a legal matter. Under the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 and subsequent arrangements, the United States has a right and a duty to insist that the international obligations assumed by Great Britain be no longer disregarded by the British Government.

Our general friendliness with Great Britain should not deter us from protesting illegal conduct by our friends across the ocean. We certainly have had no hesitancy in protesting against other nations. Injustice is injustice by whomever committed and nothing but good can result in the long run if our Government takes a firm stand.

In Europe today, in camps for displaced persons, and wandering the highways of a torn continent are a few hundred thousand homeless Jews—all that are left after the awful sin against their people by Hitler and his Nazi hordes.

For them, in a very real and not merely in a symbolic sense, Palestine is the end of the road for the wandering Jew. It is a place they can call home. It is their last hope on earth.

Yet—and this is such a bitter mockery—Britain permits only a trickle of immigration into the Holy Land.

Under the mandate, Britain must facilitate Jewish immigration and settlement. If Britain desires to ask the United Nations to change the terms of the trust which she is supposed to execute, well and good; but until this has been done, Britain has a legal obligation to continue fulfilling that trust.

The immigration of 1,500 persons a month is not fulfillment. It is one more brutal jest against a people whose sufferings in the past decade have been without parallel in modern history.

There is a doctrine of law common to England and to this country—that anyone who seeks equitable relief from a burden alleged to be too heavy must come into court with clean hands. I think we have a right to expect clean hands from Britain before she submits her request regarding Palestine to the United Nations. We have a right to expect this—not coarse attacks by the British Foreign Secretary.

It is intolerable that the immediate movement into Palestine of the first 100,000 Jewish refugees at a speedy rate should be dangled as bait and made conditional upon everybody else accepting British ideas of future policy. After all, a mandate over a country is not a fee simple title to that land and its people.

This movement of the 100,000 should start at once. Neither the Government of the United States nor the United Nations as a whole should agree to entertain the British request to study the long-range Palestine problem until the United Kingdom has shown that much evidence of good faith.

In view of Mr. Bevin's statement, I feel that Congress has a definite right and duty to demand that provisions of the mandate be taken from the shelf and brought to life. We have a right and duty to demand also application of the portions of the mandate which deal with equal rights for inhabitants of Palestine.

The mandate and the Anglo-American Treaty direct the British government to facilitate Jewish settlement on the land in Palestine. They provide also that no discrimination should be shown among the inhabitants of the country by reason of race or religion. Actually, however, Jews are being prohibited by regulation from settling and acquiring land in most of Palestine.

In this respect, Britain brazenly violates the elementary civil rights of the Jewish population of Palestine.

This is being done in a country upon which the Jews have special claims—only one of which is international law. It is being done by a socialistic government supposed to be particularly sensitive to human rights.

Aside from every other reason which has been mentioned, I insist there is a special reason why all Christian people should extend a helping hand to the unfortunate Jews of Europe.

It is from the loins of that ancient race that our own faith has sprung. They are a part of the basic history of Christianity and, indeed, have become our historic responsibility.

We owe it to ourselves as well as to them to meet this responsibility by firmly and fearlessly declaring to the British Government that America expects the fulfillment of this legal and moral obligation.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Palestine issue illustrates one of the two points I wish to make—that this country's policy makers have a habit of swandiving into the pool without first looking to see whether there is any water there. This is an important collateral issue. It is likewise an issue on which we have long had Britain's promise, but never Britain's fulfillment.

The second point is that the policy makers take the American people with them blindfolded. Our leaders fail to disclose all the facts.

The proposed $400,000,000 expenditure has been frankly described as a barrier of gold to keep communism out and to permit free governments an honest opportunity to grow and spread.

I am not opposing this loan—or gift—to Greece and Turkey. I, too, have a desire to keep communism out and to water the roots of free government abroad, because that helps free government at home. But, I would like to know that it is free government that we are helping, government which respects the dignity of the individual man and which does not seek to subjugate him under an autocratic state. To bolster and prop up tottering governments which oppress the great masses of their people and deny minorities their rights is not in keeping with American ideals. This is something we should settle now—not later, when they do not need us any more.

But, Mr. President, it will take a vast amount of gold to build that high wall against communism. I wonder if any Member of the United States Senate, or anyone in President Truman's administration, can say how high and how long the wall must be. From such information as I have been able to gather, the $400,000,000 is only the beginning. Shortly after the President's address to Congress, the Acting Secretary of State announced that an additional $600,000,000 would be required for Korea.

If those were the only requests to be made, perhaps I would not be so deeply concerned, but only recently I was advised by a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the over-all program for aid and development of foreign nations will represent an investment of $31,885,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. This statement, while shocking to me, was reiterated at great length and in detail in the March 21 issue of the United States News. Yet back of all that, in the shadows, are the yet unvoiced requests for more and more for this place and that place all over the globe.

Mr. President, as I said, I am not opposing the $400,000,000 expenditure. But first I should like to have some idea of how much we may be called upon to vote during the next 2 or the next 4 years. I do not want to be told 6 months from now, "You helped get us into this thing with your vote for the $400,000,000. We are now in it up to our necks and it is up to you to sign a blank check for funds to finish the job." It seems to me that we should not be called upon to legislate on any such basis.

Not only the Senate of the United States but, even more important, all the people of the United States have a right to all available information on this matter. Our folks back home are the ones who must carry the new burden on their

backs, loaded atop the present $258,000,000,000 national debt. They have a right to know what is at the end of the road for them if they say "No." They also have a right to know what is at the end of the road if they provide the $400,000,000 and then stop Finally, they have a right to know what awaits them if they give the green light for full speed ahead.

I admit that all the answers are not known, but the best available information should be given.

We all have a right to know just how much burden the United States as a whole can bear.

Before we can answer this question we must make a survey and inventory of our financial condition, and we must determine whether we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices.

It is a time when the global picture should be revealed.

Let us know of all our commitments, wherever made.

What financial commitments have been made in Europe and the Far East?

What expenditures are already made, and what additional commitments are contemplated?

How long shall we continue relief in Greece, Turkey, and the other countries of Europe and the Far East?

What personnel, civilian, and military, is contemplated to administer and carry out the policies adopted or to be adopted?

What estimate has been made of the cost of rehabilitation of Germany and Japan?

We must know all these things, because governments can go broke the same as can individuals.

In very recent days we have had a grim graphic demonstration that there is a bottom to the pocketbook of even the richest nations. We have learned that wealthy world empires can suddenly find themselves poor.

During the lifetime of all of us it was the proud boast of a great people that the sun never sets on the British flag. Britain was the great world empire. It was the balance of power. From the ends of the earth—from the tropics, from the temperate zones, and from the frozen polar areas—wealth funneled to Britain. In exchange this empire worked and spent ceaselessly to maintain stability and balance around the globe. Many figured all this would last forever.

But in the month of March 1947—last month—Britain sighed and laid down her burden, announcing to the world, "It is too heavy; we cannot go on."

Mr. President, Britain, which during our lifetime was the richest and most powerful country on earth, had filed what amounted to a voluntary petition in bankruptcy.

As I see it, from their experience should come the warning and the proof that it can happen here, as well.

The people of the United States and the Congress of the United States should be told the facts. They should be advised that they cannot burn the candle at both ends, or we shall find ourselves tomorrow where Britain finds itself today.

Our people must learn that there is a bottom even to the American pocket. I hope we shall not have to learn it the hard way, as the British did.

Our people must be told without equivocation and without deceit that if they spend abroad, they must pinch at home. I understand I am saying things that many people do not like to hear. Perhaps many will resent my saying these things. However, I am not engaged in a popularity contest. I am after facts. I am gravely concerned, just as all other Senators are, about the future of America.

Our people must be made to understand that if we build that barrier of gold in Greece and Turkey and Korea and elsewhere, we cannot spend the same money twice; we cannot use it to buy comforts and luxuries for our homes.

Our people must realize that they cannot expect new and expanded services from Washington.

Our people must be made to understand that it will be necessary to cut, and cut sharply, into Federal services which have been built up in the past 15 years. They must be told now that sacrifices will be in order on the home front.

They must learn that local communities, counties, and State governments must assume a greater share of the responsibilities, and that many of the services which they expect from Uncle Sam must be furnished at the local levels.

Let me point out that it makes no difference how strong financially each of the 48 States remains; if we undermine and destroy the financial structure of the Federal Government, each and every one of them will be caught in the backwash and will be destroyed.

I notice with surprise that many of the same persons who are foremost in the fight to save Greece and the other countries from communistic domination are also foremost in calling for maintenance of all existing Federal services and for the adoption of new ones. That is the kind of thing which will pitch our ship of state high on the jagged rocks of financial disaster.

This statement would seem to be a direct thrust at the present Democratic administration, for certainly the shoe fits there, and fits perfectly. But I do not mean it as such. I have no intention of belaboring the obvious. I am speaking of people outside of government and outside of Washington—the folks back home in the districts.

Some of them, for instance, are placing considerable pressure upon Congress for elaborate new educational assistance for the States. We are being asked for a new appropriation for this purpose. But that is only a starter. I have been advised it is merely the first step, the first request. I have been told that after this beachhead is established an even larger sum will be asked next year, and the year after, and so on.

I say that our people should be informed honestly and completely that if we give or lend this $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey—which apparently will commit us to greater sums as required—they cannot expect additional educational benefits from the Federal Government, because the cupboard may be bare.

It has been estimated that the GI bill of rights and other benefits already voted for our veterans will eventually cost the country $30,000,000,000 or more. But if we check on the bills already introduced this session to help veterans—and there are plenty more to come—we find that additional billions would be required. America cannot do too much for its disabled veterans and the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice, but our veterans and taxpayers should be given a very clear picture of what this contemplated new plunge will mean to them.

And so it goes down the list for the various requests that have been made.

During the New Deal era, our Government blossomed out on all sides with new tinsel and services. They have appeared in every department. Entirely new agencies have sprung up. Each of them cost money. In the aggregate they cost billions.

Somebody has got to step up and say to our people: "If we go into this thing, you will get no new services or new benefits from the Government. In fact, if we go into this, we will be compelled to cut out some of the things to which you have already become accustomed."

Otherwise we will head down the road taken by Britain. We will spend more than we can afford. We will seek to keep alive and vigorous by drinking our own blood for nourishment. For us, the question will cease to be: "Will excessive Federal spending break us?" Instead, it will become, merely, "How soon?"

Mr. President, I said a few moments ago that there may be much merit in propping up Greece and Turkey at this time. That is not the question on which we seek the pros and cons. What we want all the facts about—for and against—are these questions:

What is the bill going to involve—not merely for the first treatment, but for the entire course of treatments?

How much of our household budget money must we sacrifice for this course of treatments?

And what is the alternative if we do not sign up for the course?

Even if no one has all the answers, I call for a public airing of those which are available. We should have answers, not only from Members of the Senate, but also from the persons in the administration who know the most about the situation.

If we are to be an influence for good in the world, we must remain strong. We cannot help others if we destroy ourselves.

Mr. President, I do not favor isolationism and I am not opposing the proposed expenditures, but I make these observations because I do know there must be a strong, solvent, dynamic America if we are to bring happiness to the peoples of the world, as well as to our own folks at home.

Mr. President, I know that all the Members of this body, as well as all the people of America, were greatly impressed by the magnificent address which you, as the head of the great Foreign Relations Committee, delivered in the Senate yesterday. But what I am now urging is that all people in America shall understand the situation which now confronts us. We cannot spend

the money for two different things, one for foreign aid and the other for domestic improvements. We must keep America dynamic and solvent. We must get back to the old ideals of thrift, prudence, hard work, and love of God, which made this the greatest Nation on the earth. It is the only beacon of hope in the whole world, it is the only instrumentality whicl can protect us and the rest of the world from chaos, disorder, and probably disaster.

Again I say, Mr. President, that I am not opposing this loan, but I am hoping and praying that this body, the House of Representatives, the members of the executive departments, and all the people of the United States may seriously consider the situation now approaching in America and its meaning to America's future.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator in his address, which is most thought provoking, and manifests great sincerity, brought out one point which I should like to emphasize. As he presented the subject, he spoke of the need for thrift, prudence, and economy, stated that our national economy is threatened, and adverted to the large sums being paid our veterans through legislation enacted by the Congress in the aftermath of the war. That was a part of the evidence he adduced.

I point out that the eminent statesman Briand, of France, made a trenchant statement some years ago to the effect that in modern warfare no nation wins. During the recent war the United States was spending $8,000,000,000-plus every 30 days to carry on the war, and $100,000,000,000-plus every year. All that money is destroyed capital, destroyed forever. Our boys went overseas and won the war, if any nation ever can be said to win a war. Now they are back in the United States. Certainly I do not think for a moment the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes his speech to be construed as meaning that there is any lack of understanding on our part as citizens and Members of Congress that whatever is required to rehabilitate shattered lives and to reinstall the servicemen in civilian life should be provided, insofar as the Members of Congress can see that it is provided. Does not the Senator from Pennsylvania agree?

Mr. MARTIN. Absolutely.

Mr. TOBEY. Perhaps I got the wrong impression, but in calling the roll of the items the Senator brought in the veterans' matter, and I did not want to let that go unchallenged, because I did not think for a moment the distinguished Senator had any lack of sympathy for the veterans. Merely to clarify the RECORD, I mention the point.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much. There is no Member of the Senate who is more enthusiastic about making contributions for the benefit of the disabled veteran, or taking care of the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice, than am I, and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator and I both appreciate, as I am sure our colleagues do, that the cataclysmic effect of the hell we call war is now coming home to us as never before. We realize that when we go into war, when we open the door to war, God only knows what the end will be. The repercussions will continue from generation to generation. Yet, on the horizon still is the danger of a third world war. I agree with the Senator that God only knows what is ahead of us, so we must live day by day as best we can, and always with a sense of our responsibility to those who bore the heat of the battle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the intention of the majority leader that the Senate proceed with the bill at this time?

Mr. WHITE. A number of Senators have indicated a desire to speak upon the bill, and, so far as I know, no one of them is prepared to go forward at this time. I think that means that we must either proceed to vote—and I take it there might be more or less serious objection to that—or to stand in recess until 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the able majority leader that we might continue with the committee amendments, and adopt them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I see no reason why we should not complete at least the committee amendments today. I have no disposition to hurry any Senator into a premature decision in respect to the bill, but it is acknowledged that we are not entirely free agents in respect to the time we can spend on it. I know there are a number of speeches to be made which are not ready today, but I should hope we might complete the committee amendments, and I am wondering whether some of the individual amendments could not be presented today, such as those which may be submitted by my able friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has just risen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not quite ready to present my amendments. I have five of them, and they will be presented with a full explanation. Of course, I should be very glad to see the committee amendments out of the way, so that the track would be cleared for my amendments. However, if we are going to do any work on the committee amendments, or anything else, or take any action pertaining to this bill, I think we ought to have a quorum call, so that the Members may be advised that we were taking action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will yield further, of course, I have no objection to a quorum call, and I realize that Senators have not been on notice that we probably would be down to actual work on the bill today. If we can complete the committee amendments today, so far as I am concerned I should be willing that it go over until tomorrow, but I should certainly like to have it understood that commencing tomorrow we may devote continuous, full-time attention to the bill until it is out of the way. So, I suggest that we proceed with the committee amendments. I think there is no controversy respecting them, and I doubt whether even a quorum call is necessary for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan. The amendments have all received full consideration at the hands of the committee. They come with the unanimous approval of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan is chairman. I think we might very appropriately proceed with the committee amendments, and that, at the conclusion, unless there are Members who desire to discuss the bill further, a recess be taken until, say, a quarter to 5.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the only difficulty I see is that it seems to me the committee amendments raise some of the principal questions involved in the whole debate. I wonder whether if the debate were to be continued it ought not to be continued also at least on the two amendments on pages 7 and 8.

Mr. WHITE. Would it be agreeable to the chairman of the committee that we proceed with unobjected-to committee amendments?

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to the amendments. It merely seemed to me they were such an intrinsic part of any further debate that it might be questionable to foreclose ideas that may arise as the debate goes on, as to possible modification of the amendments. If they are adopted now, they cannot be amended again; they could not be exchanged in any manner except by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. They could be passed over now, if any Senator desired.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senate is going to pass over any of them, we might as well pass them all over and do nothing today, because there are only two or three amendments. It had not occurred to me that the amendments involve any points inherent in the amendments themselves upon which there can be any dissent. If the Senator from Ohio objects to proceeding, I certainly shall not insist, but I shall have to submit to him with great candor that I am not impressed by the point he makes.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw the objection, Mr. President. There are very few Senators present, and I would think the amendments involved rather important points.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no disposition to press, Mr. President. May we do this? I should like to get the amendment on page 7 in the final form which the committee desires to place it. May we at least do that? That means the amendment which I have submitted to section 2 of the amendment, at the bottom of page 7. May I suggest that that

be submitted to the Senate, so that then the bill is at least in the form which the Committee on Foreign Relations intended to have it presented. I ask that the amendment, which I have offered, at the bottom of page 7, be submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Michigan? Hearing none, the clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and

(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the committee amendment the Senator from Michigan offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 7, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "the President is officially notified by the United Nations that"; and on page 7, line 24, to strike out the word "that", so that paragraph (2) of section 5 of the committee amendment will read: "If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, is agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on the amendment to the amendment and the statements that have been made by other Senators, I really do not see how we can proceed further this afternoon, although I deeply regret any delay in the consideration of the bill. I should like to say again that I think we should be prepared to proceed from tomorrow noon with unbroken continuity until this matter is concluded.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to take 5 minutes of the Senate's time. From all available evidence, this great legislative body is all set to act in a way which will reflect little credit on itself as a body or on its Members as individuals.

It has been agreed that at 5 o'clock the Senate shall vote on the nomination of David Lilienthal to the most important appointive office with which we have ever been concerned. The test vote of last week gives a definite indication that unless something extraordinary takes place, the nomination will be confirmed. Mr. President, I make an earnest plea for an extraordinary action between now and the time set for voting.

Let me again call the attention of my fellow Senators to the astonishing proposal which has been made to us. The committee to which this nomination was referred held hearings for many weeks. In the course of its hearings and at an early stage charges of dishonesty were made against the candidate. These charges were specific, not general. They were made by Dr. Arthur Morgan, a man of honor and of good repute. Yet these charges were never followed up by the committee. They were dismissed; they were dropped; they were ignored. I doubt if it would be possible to find a comparable situation in any committee in any recent Congress. One would expect that there would have been at least an endeavor to brush a thin coat of whitewash over the incident, but even this was not done.

What seems to have happened, Mr. President, is that the committee was hypnotized into a failure of performing its plain and obvious duty. It was hypnotized by great names in engineering, business, and science, a handful of whom had themselves been hypnotized by the undeniable abilities and the persuasive words of the candidate. These few and eminent men judged him, so far as his character is concerned, on casual acquaintance and on his words rather than his deeds. The opinions thus formed were transmitted to their peers in the fields of engineering, business, and science. The whole effective force of this authoritative opinion was focused on the committee. It deluded them. It blinded them. It persuaded them to neglect their duty to this body and to the Nation.

Mr. President, Dr. Morgan's specific charges of dishonesty against David Lilienthal are too serious to be treated this way. Let me earnestly entreat the members of the committee for their own sakes, for the sake of the faithful discharge of the duties committed to them, to ask that David Lilienthal's name be withdrawn from this action for confirmation and referred back to the committee to see whether it can be cleared of the serious charges against it before we are again asked to vote upon it in this place.

I do not see how the members of this committee, I do not see how the Members of the Senate, can clear themselves with their own consciences in the performance of the duties to which they have solemnly sworn to devote themselves until this nomination has been reconsidered.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKE AT BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that apparently a number of Senators are not ready to speak upon the Greek-Turkish loan, I want to take a little of the time of the Senate to discuss the very serious jurisdictional strike which is now under way in the State of Illinois. The strike has been going on for a number of weeks, and the longer it continues the more difficult it seems for the two crafts in the union to adjust or settle their differences.

The way I came into this dispute was through a letter dated February 3, 1947, addressed to me by the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill. In order that I may do justice to the statement I am making, I shall take the time of the Senate to read this letter into the RECORD:

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUCAS: We have had a jurisdictional dispute for the past 3 weeks at our new bottling plant, and it is most unfair to us. Furthermore, it is beginning to cost us several thousand dollars. In view of pending congressional legislation, it occurs to me that if you had a thumb-nail description of this controversy, that you could settle this matter easily. We respectfully request that you use your good offices in helping to expedite the settlement of this dispute.

The dispute is jurisdictional over the installation of bottling machinery in our new bottling-plant building. The past 15 years we have had a contract with the machinists' organization who do all our maintenance work, and their contract covers the erection of all metal machinery. The millwrights, who are a member of the Brotherhood of Journeyman, Carpenters, and Joiners, also claim this work. The millwrights' claim is based on the fact that this work was awarded to them by the building-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, of which the machinists are not a member. We have made every endeavor to bring the two organizations together, and have even gone as far as agreeing to let both crafts do the work at the same time. In this day and age, neither one of the organizations are interested in this. They are more interested in setting a precedent in the Belleville area as to who installs new machinery. The consequence of the dispute has stopped all work in our new plant. If the machinists do the work, then the building trades will picket our plant, and no tradesman, of course, would work. If the millwrights do the work, our brewery workers and bottlers will not work.

In view of your liberal views toward labor and management, it occurs to me that a word from you to the following two men would carry a lot of weight, and, no doubt, will settle this matter. We would appreciate it very much if you would telegraph or write the following: Mr. Harvey Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; Mr. William Hutchinson, president, Brotherhood of Journeyman, Carpenters, and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.

Regarding Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill., jurisdictional dispute over the erection of bottling machinery, I suggest that you endeavor to compromise this matter and settle it as soon as possible.

That letter appealed to me because of its fairness and its sense of wanting to do the right thing. I therefore took it upon myself to write the two gentlemen named in the letter, Mr. William Hutchinson, president of the Brotherhood of Journeymen Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind., and Mr. Harvey Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C. The letters are identical. I read one of them into the RECORD:

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: It has come to my attention that there is a jurisdictional dispute over the erection of bottling machinery

in the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill. I am advised that this dispute is one of long standing.

Is there not some way you can compromise this matter as soon as possible? I do not hesitate to say that the matter of jurisdictional disputes is one of the things that Congress will probably outlaw when new labor legislation is written.

Trusting something will be done that will be constructive for both management and labor in this Belleville problem, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

SCOTT W. LUCAS.

This letter was written on March 17. Mr. Hutchinson has never replied to my letter. A similar letter was addressed to Mr. Brown, and a reply was received from him, which is as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have before me your communication addressed the writer February 17, and I am pleased to learn of your interest in the dispute over the erection of bottling machinery in the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill.

Be advised that a convention of the American Federation of Labor, by unanimous vote, declared as follows:

"The International Association of Machinists has jurisdiction over the building, assembling, erecting, dismantling, and repairing of machinery in machine shops, buildings, factories, or elsewhere where machinery may be used.

* * * * *

"The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners is fundamentally a craft composed of men skilled in the erecting, forming, and assembling of wood materials, and has never been recognized as a metal-craft organization or granted jurisdiction over the making, repairing, erecting, assembling, or dismantling of machinery.

"*Resolved*, That the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners be, and is hereby, instructed to discontinue the infringement complained of."

Note that that was a resolution which was passed by the American Federation of Labor in its annual convention in Miami, Fla., in February last. Yet notwithstanding that resolution instructing the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners to desist from the infringement upon the other craft organization, which claims, and apparently should have the right to make this construction for the Griesedieck Brewery Co., nevertheless the strike in that community still continues.

On February 22 Mr. Jones, the president of this company, wrote me another letter, in which he stated:

The jurisdictional controversy that we have had between the machinists and the millwrights has not been settled. As a matter of fact, we received an ultimatum from the representatives of both unions that they would not adjust their differences or divide the work, and that each craft demanded all the work or none.

In other words, the president of the company was willing to permit a division of the work so far as these two crafts were concerned, but neither would yield to the division of the work, both claiming that they had the sole right to do the same.

On March 18, 1947, Mr. Jones again wrote to me. His letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: Enclosed find a clipping from our local newspaper which pretty well states the jurisdictional controversy that we are encountering between the machinists and millwrights.

We respectfully request that you use your good offices to bring about legislation that will outlaw jurisdictional disputes.

The next sentence is very important:

We have a new building costing in the neighborhood of $500,000, and we are unable to use it. Our machinery has been moved into the building, but we cannot set it or erect it. Consequently, many people are standing idly by waiting for this machinery to start running.

If we had this new plant running, we could employ more people, pay more excise taxes, and begin to get a return on our investment. As it now stands, everyone is losing by this work stoppage. Both crafts have threatened us with overwhelming picket lines, and with this established, our own workers would not cross the picket line; subsequently, it would stop our entire production.

There are two things that we would appreciate your doing for us.

First, if you can, prevail upon the following gentlemen to share the work, or in other words, let both crafts divide the work: Mr. William Hutchinson, president, Brotherhood of Journeymen, Carpenters, and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. Harvey Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

Second, cooperate with Senator TAFT in giving us Federal legislation immediately against jurisdictional strikes, mass picketing, and union strike violence.

Won't you please give us and our 400 employees relief from this jurisdictional dispute?

Here are 400 employees who want to work every day. Here are individuals who have a large investment in the business, and because of this outrageous jurisdictional strike arising from a dispute between the millwrights on the one hand and the machinists on the other, there is an impasse on the labor front which is causing distress in that community from every conceivable angle.

Mr. President, I did not write Mr. Hutchinson another letter, as requested by Mr. Jones, because he ignored my previous letter in which I asked him if something could not be done to adjust this dispute between the two crafts.

I bring this subject to the attention of the Senate to show what is going on in one section of the country with respect to these outrageous jurisdictional strikes.

In that connection, this morning I received a letter from a gentleman living in Belleville, Ill. He sent me another clipping about the brewery dispute which has been in progress for so long. He writes as follows:

This jurisdictional racket consists of which craft is to erect equipment in the new bottle shop which has been completed some three months past.

I ask you to use your influence to have these union representatives share this work or have some legislation that will definitely eliminate work stoppage in event of jurisdictional arguments.

As a contractor for buildings and heavy construction for the last 30 years, it has been my experience that all craft unions are becoming more and more aggressive to grab something from one another with no regard for the builders, owners, or public rights. It is my belief that unless something is done to correct this evil practice the public and the building construction industry might just as well cease operations until such time as conditions warrant new construction.

There is another quotation which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. It is in a letter written by one of the gentlemen whom I have mentioned. He says:

Again referring to the shop at Belleville, Ill., if members of the machinists' union would pay tribute to the carpenters' union for the privilege of working at the machinists' trade there would be no dispute.

Mr. President, is this the real reason for this dispute? Are we to infer that if the carpenters' union was paid money as a tribute, work would proceed. In other words, if the machinists were to pay cash "on the barrelhead" they might be able to proceed with the work. That is apparently what this man is suggesting.

Mr. President, I hope that this jurisdictional strike in my State will be settled. It is inconceivable that such an impasse between different crafts in the same labor organization should occur. It is a shameful episode which has no justification in a free society. Such useless disagreements are giving the cause of labor a serious set-back in America. That such jurisdictional strikes will be outlawed soon is a certainty. In the meantime I call upon William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to use his good offices to settle and adjust this violent dispute. I do this not only in view of the resolution which was adopted at the convention held in Miami, Fla., of which Mr. Green was chairman, but because of the power Mr. Green wields as president of the AFL. Mr. Green can settle this strike if he will. It is my conviction that he has the power to do so, and it should be done in the interest of the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., which is entitled to relief. It should be done in the interest of the laboring men and their families, who are also entitled to relief. The company's investment was made in good faith and should not be further jeopardized by this useless, vicious, and un-American jurisdictional dispute.

In conclusion, I wish to say that when the time comes when labor legislation is before the Senate, the Senator from Illinois will vote to outlaw jurisdictional disputes of this character and all other disputes similar in character such as we have experienced in the United States in the past few years.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM TO HOOVER DAM

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45, Calendar No. 52.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam, reported with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think there will be any objection, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
Hayden	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the call for a quorum, I have discussed with some Members on this side of the aisle the question raised by the able Senator from New Jersey. It is my understanding that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is not here at the present time, is very much opposed to the measure which the Senator from New Jersey desires to have considered and will wish to discuss it at some length. Under those circumstances, I should feel constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request, and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from New Jersey whether he intends to proceed with a motion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Nevada is not present and is opposed to the joint resolution, let me say that I knew he was opposed to it, but I did not know he was not present and available this afternoon; and I thought we might utilize the next few hours by considering and passing the joint resolution, which I have been working on for more than a year. However, I do not wish to take unfair advantage of anyone. I wish to play according to Hoyle and according to decent cricket. That being the fact, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request to have the Senate consider the joint resolution at this time, and I make no further motion now under the conditions surrounding the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] be excused from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of today and tomorrow because of his attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Nevada.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that I am very sorry we could not go forward this afternoon with his proposal, because I am anxious to join with him in naming the dam at Boulder Canyon Hoover Dam. I think the services which ex-President Hoover has rendered to the Nation, and particularly his point of view in the field of reclamation and power development in the great western country, more than justify the naming of the dam in his honor.

I understand that there is a little hiatus in the business of the Senate this afternoon, while awaiting the hour of 5 o'clock, and that almost any speech on any subject would be welcome. Mr. President, I have a very dry academic lecture on a very vital problem, namely, industrial safety. I am very glad to take advantage of this particular time, when there is a momentary lull in the conduct of Senate business, to make my speech on the subject of preventing industrial accidents. I do so, not only as a matter of making a record for future reference, but also because I think it is most important that the Senate pay very careful attention to the problem of industrial accidents as we enter upon the consideration of various appropriation bills, particularly those dealing with appropriations which affect the Department of Labor. It is under that Department that the most effective work, insofar as educating the country in regard to industrial accidents, has been done for many years past.

Hence, Mr. President, I shall proceed to place in the RECORD what I consider to be some very important objective data which Senators should have in mind as we come to pass final judgment on what sums of money should be appropriated to the Department of Labor in order to support its various activities, particularly those in the field of industrial safety education.

Let me say further that later this week, or the first part of next week, I shall introduce a measure dealing with the subject of industrial accidents in the field of mining. I shall also urge the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to proceed as rapidly as possible with the bill which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] introduced some time ago for himself and in my behalf on the question of safety appliances.

Let me digress long enough to comment on accidents in the mining industry. I have been quite impressed with what I think has been a change, which I am afraid is only temporary—but it is well that it could come even for a short period of time—in the attitude of the American public about passing some drastic and punitive labor legislation seeking to prevent coal strikes by use of Government compulsions.

Since the great tragedy in Illinois, where once again many American miners lost their lives the people of our country have been reflecting rather thoughtfully on the plight of our miners. They are beginning to appreciate the fact that in the mining industry as an industry there is a need for more rigid enforcement of laws requiring devices for the safety and protection of the miners. I think the American people are beginning to appreciate that fact, and I believe they are beginning to appreciate that, in the last analysis, our entire industrial economy, rests on coal. The great mass-production industries of America would be utterly impossible were it not for the services of the thousands of men who go down into the bowels of the earth and dig out the fuel which makes the great American production machine go.

We the public, as their employers—because in the last analysis we are their employers—have during the decades been very bad employers. We have been selfish and greedy employers. A visit to any coal town and an observing of the conditions under which the miners and their families have to live and work, should make us, the public, ashamed of ourselves. We should be particularly ashamed of ourselves when industrial strife develops in the coal industry, and we start demanding long before we know much about the facts that some drastic action be taken against the coal miners. What we should have done 25 and 30 and 40 years ago was to establish an industrial system under which those men could get decent pay for the immensely important public service they render to our entire economy when they mine coal under the extremely hazardous conditions which characterize every deep shaft mine.

Oh, yes; it is easy for us to castigate their leaders. I hold no brief for some of the mistakes of John L. Lewis. I have never hesitated to disagree with Lewis when I thought he was wrong, but I do not promise to ignore the merits of his contentions in support of a fair deal for the miners of America. I do not know where the miners of America would be today if it had not been for the leadership John L. Lewis has given them during the last 20 years. I care not what his critics may say, there is one fight Lewis has made which they cannot condemn, and that is the magnificent fight he has made for safer working conditions in the mines of America. He has pleaded over the years for safety devices and for safety measures which would protect the miners from our thoughtlessness; and when I say "our thoughtlessness" I mean that of the American public. We the public have not been fair to the miners of America. We owe them much. We owe them more than we do any other group of workers in the United States, for they have made possible the great American industrial economy. We have not given

them the protection or the support or the working conditions to which they are entitled. We could well have afforded to heed the warnings which leaders such as Lewis gave us as many as 20 years ago about the plight of the workers in the mines. Much of our labor trouble in the mines would have been avoided if we had insisted upon safe working conditions and high wages which the miners certainly deserve.

I think the time has come when the members of the public should make very clear to the mine operators that no longer can there be any justification for maintaining unsafe mine conditions. The members of the boards of directors of the mining companies should be held responsible for such unsafe conditions. Hence the bill I shall introduce later this week or next week will seek to place criminal responsibility upon the owners and the members of the boards of directors of the mines for the unsafe working conditions which characterize too many mines.

In other words, Mr. President, I say the time has come for the public, for 140,000,000 American people, to measure up to their responsibilities in this field of industrial safety. We have no right to sacrifice each year the great number of men who are sacrificed in the mines of the United States in order that we may obtain coal a little cheaper.

I think Lewis is quite right when he uses the figure of speech—and I paraphrase him—that too much coal goes into the homes of American citizens and into the factories of America "covered with blood." We can cleanse that coal, or rather we can keep the blood off it, Mr. President, by seeing to it that legislation is passed which will require effective enforcement of safety legislation and safety devices in the coal pits of America.

Differ with Lewis as I may on some matters, I do not differ with him when he is fighting to protect the safety and the lives of the rank and file of the coal miners of America, nor do I differ with him when he is fighting to raise the economic level of the miners by getting for them better and more decent wages than they now receive. If we are so dependent as I say we are on the coal miners of America—and no one can successfully dispute that we are, it is an unanswerable premise, for our whole economy is dependent upon them—then they ought to be among the best paid workers in America. I wish that some of the critics of the coal miners could be required to spend just 30 days mining coal or could be required to endure the standards of living which thousands of families of coal miners have to endure now, even in these days. I am satisfied that at the end of the 30 days they would have a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the part coal miners play in America's economy.

In considering labor disputes we should not allow ourselves to be diverted from the fundamental issue; that is, whether or not after one has all of the data before him, after he has had a look into all the facts, can he actually say to himself, "I think the workers in this case are receiving all they are entitled to receive." I am willing to take that issue any time, as it relates to the coal miners, before any impartial jury in America. I think I know what the verdict will be, because, once given all the facts, the average American who sits on a jury is a very just, fair-minded man. I think the unanimous verdict on this issue will always be, before any jury of Americans, "The coal miners have never received, and they are not now receiving fair treatment at the hands of either the operators or the American public."

Oh, I know long and difficult is the argument when one undertakes to improve the working and safety conditions and the wages of American miners: It is said: "Coal mines cannot operate at a profit and pay better wages." What a sad confession that is! What an unfortunate accusation that is against the private-property system in America!

Senators have heard me say before, Mr. President, and I repeat now, that if we are going to make the private-property system work, then it must work in cooperation with a friendly Government. If it be true that in a given case the coal mines cannot operate at a profit and assure the miners a high standard of living then the Government should spread the cost among us all by an adequate support price. I am talking about a high standard of living for the miners because that is what they are entitled to, in view of the perils of their work, and its tremendous importance to our entire economy. I say if the coal mines cannot operate at a profit and assure the workers a high standard of living, then a friendly Government must come forward and help. Call it anything—"subsidy," "support prices," I care not what—I shall never be a party to any proposal that seeks to require the coal miners of America to subsidize the American people by mining coal at wages which do not permit of a decent standard of living, in order that the rest of us may have cheap coal.

That is a sound premise, that does not do damage to our conception of a private property economy. It is not a socialist premise as some have been want to charge. It is a recognition that, after all, coal is so vital to all of us that we, the public, become employers once removed in the coal industry of the country; and we owe a clear obligation, which is more than a moral obligation, to the miners of coal, to see to it that governmental funds if necessary are used to support the mines, in order that decent wages may be paid.

I think that is better than Government ownership, Mr. President; and yet, mark my words, if we continue down the road we are presently traveling and continue to subject the miners to substandards of living and unsafe working conditions, there will be leftists who will start pleading for Government ownership. I am absolutely opposed to public ownership of the mines because I am an ardent advocate of the private-property system and our system of private enterprise. Yet I do not take the position, Mr. President, that under a so-called free-enterprise system American employers have any right to be free to exploit American workers on the theory that if they pay them better wages they cannot make a profit out of their labor.

In more than one decision I have taken the position that if a particular industry cannot pay a decent wage to free workers, and if it is an industry that is not of sufficient importance to entitle it to Federal aid through some such system as a subsidy or a support price to which I have just referred, then it is better for our economy that such an industry go out of business. I say that because, if we are going to make the private-enterprise system work, it can never survive or justify itself in the exploitation of workers. In this instance, however, we are dealing with an industry of such vital importance to all that we cannot justify letting it go out of existence. Therefore, in order to assure a decent standard of living for the workers in the industry, if it be true—and I use the word "if"—if it be true that the operators cannot pay a decent wage and maintain safe working conditions, then I say it is the obligation of the public, through the Government, to give to this industry whatever aid it needs in behalf of the public, so as to make it unnecessary for the workers in the industry to subsidize the rest of us.

I close this digression, Mr. President, by asserting that for at least 20 years the coal miners of America have to a very large degree been subsidizing the American public by being forced to accept wages and living conditions below that which we, the public, should require of them, and, therefore, we owe a tremendous debt to the coal miners of America to see to it that from now on they shall not be required to work under unsafe mining conditions.

I use that statement, Mr. President, as the introduction to a speech I now desire to make on the question of adequate appropriations for the Division of Labor Standards of the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that in connection with the appropriation bill there has developed on the House side a tendency to cut the Labor Department below a minimum amount needed for it to perform efficient service in the year 1948. I understand from the press that the Labor Department appropriation was cut by the House committee 44 percent, and that it was cut later in the House itself another $1,000,000.

I sympathize with the terrific problems of effectuating economies that the committee faced. If we cut anywhere, we are deluged with telegrams—many doubtless inspired by the agencies cut—crying about the loss of this service or that. I do not envy the job of any member of the Appropriations Committee—House or Senate. They need the wisdom of Solomon and the courage of Daniel.

But I think this body ought to look closely at the Labor Department appropriation bill. I am as opposed to waste and inefficiency as any Member of the Senate, but I seriously doubt whether it is sound public policy to single out the Labor Department for a 47-percent cut when appropriations for the Post Office, I understand, are curtailed by only 1 per-

cent, and for the Treasury less than 5 percent. If the Post Office and Treasury appropriations are to set the pattern, then I do not think the country will understand or approve such a severe cut for the Labor Department. Americans have a great sympathy for what they regard as the "underdog," and I do not believe Congress means to "take it out" on the one agency of Government which the Democrats have starved for years and which serves the largest segment of our people, the wage earners of the United States. In fact, I am very proud, Mr. President, of the record the Republicans made in the early history of the United States Department of Labor. It has been pretty much a child of the Republicans, and I want to say to this new Republican Congress that I think they ought to clothe well their own child. The Democrats have been hard enough on this Department—let us not be worse.

We of the majority have in this appropriation bill a great opportunity to promote and assist in achieving industrial peace in the country. You and I know that such peace is essential to the stability of our economy, to the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. It is essential to meeting our grave and growing international commitments as the greatest industrial nation on earth and is the greatest bulwark against the spread of Communist philosophy. Industrial peace at home is essential to world peace and security.

So I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will hold public hearings on this appropriation bill. The organization of the other House does not facilitate the holding of public hearings and I believe that, before it acts, this body ought to have before it the facts on the usefulness or otherwise of the Labor Department's services to the wage earners of America I do not believe we ought to depend solely on the testimony of Labor Department officials. I think they appear before us necessarily as special pleaders, and I always view with some reservation the testimony of a special pleader. But I think we can bring before us, Mr. President, at hearings in the Senate committee, a great many citizens who will not be special witnesses or special pleaders, but who can give impartial and objective testimony as to the value, for example, of the Division of Labor Standards to American industry. Let us find out whether their official testimony is corroborated by those, or representatives of those whom their services are supposed to benefit.

I will have more to say later about other aspects of this appropriation bill. Today I want to confine my remarks to my concern over the proposed elimination of a little agency in the Labor Department which I have always thought of as the ounce of prevention that is better and certainly cheaper than the pound of cure in labor disputes. I refer to the Division of Labor Standards. Now I venture to guess that some Senators may never have heard of this agency because it works basically through other people. It works to strengthen State labor departments, helps them to develop tested and economical administrative methods. Through them, it strives to reduce industrial accidents which cost American industry and labor $3,500,000,000 a year. Through its labor education service, it helps prevent costly strikes by helping management and unions train responsible and competent representatives in the peaceful administration of union contracts. It provides the only information available in the Federal Government on State labor laws and administration. It promotes close Federal-State cooperation. On all this service, it is expending $652,000 for the current year and has been allotted $865,000 for 1948.

I know this agency well. I have long used its services and so have many of my constituents. I have referred to it many times, Mr. President, when I have been faced with the problem of writing an arbitration decision in a labor case involving data on which this particular agency could give me expert advice.

In the first place, the Division of Labor Standards was created by congressional funds in 1934 as an arm of the Secretary's office. It acts as a service agency to State labor departments, management and labor, and civic organizations in the fields I have mentioned. Last July, when the Children's Bureau was transferred to the Federal Security Agency under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, as approved by the Congress, the administration of the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the research and promotion of standards in the child-labor and youth-employment field were amalgamated into the Division of Labor Standards. That is one reason, Mr. President, why additional rather than less funds will be required for 1948.

The Division was set up in response to repeated appeals from State labor officials and labor organizations for a Federal agency to act as a clearinghouse for sound, tested experience in our most advanced industrial States, in the Federal field, and even in other lands. They wanted an agency that was not supposed to be a policeman and enforce a considerable body of law, that did not want to take over State functions, but one to which they could go with their problems, whatever they were in job-safety or labor-law administration, and get technically competent assistance in solving them. One of the formal recommendations for the establishment of the Division was made at the first National Conference on Labor Legislation called by the Secretary of Labor in 1933. The Governors of the States were asked to send State labor commissioners and representatives of organized labor, and there was initiated what has become an annual institution arranged by the Division of Labor Standards. The value of these conferences is repeatedly attested by the demands of delegates for their continuance.

The Republican Party has for years opposed the further encroachment of the Federal Government in the field of States' rights. It has wanted to strengthen the States. The Division of Labor Standards has been an effective instrumentality for furthering that purpose. Busy State labor officials cannot write to the 48 States every time a problem, say of drafting a safety code or meeting some child-labor situation develops, in order to find out how their neighbors handle it. And if they did find out, they still would not know which was the best practice. It is far more economical to have a little clearinghouse in the Federal Government whose technicians have that information on tap at all times. We do not want Federal agencies taking over State functions; so it would seem the part of wisdom to meet the State labor officials' repeated requests for assistance in solving their problems so that they can perform their work creditably. It is where the States could not do or have not done a necessary job creditably that Federal encroachment has grown. It will grow in this field—there will be irresistible pressure upon the Congress one day to take over many of the things State labor departments are now trying to do unless they do such a good job that no one will challenge their jurisdiction. To do this job they need help.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain communications I have received from State labor officials of my home State, which prompted me to make the speech I am making here this afternoon; communications in which these State officials and labor leaders plead for the continuation, adequately financed and supported, of the various services in the United States Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE COUNCIL,
LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD CARPENTERS
AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., April 2, 1947.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have received information that the Senate Appropriations Committee will consider the appropriations for the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act in its next session to be held Monday, April 7.

I have also learned that in accordance with the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in reducing appropriations by 25 percent, it would necessitate the closure of some regional offices, and likewise would force the closure of several subregional offices, one of which would be the Portland office.

The closing of the Portland office would be a very grave mistake inasmuch as the expansion of industry in the State of Oregon no doubt exceeds that of any State on the Pacific coast. I have particular reference to the expansion of the lumber and logging industry in the State of Oregon. The production of lumber and logs in the State of Oregon will be far greater than any other State in the United States for the next several years. In addition, there are numerous other industries either already in the category of being transferred or constructed within the State of Oregon.

The records of the United States Conciliation Service as well as the records of the National Labor Relations Board will show that there has been far greater activity in the

State of Oregon than in the States of Washington, Idaho or Montana.

This is equally true of the wage and hour office in Portland, and any action which would necessitate the closure of the Portland office would greatly handicap both labor and industry in this State.

I believe it to be imperative that regardless of the appropriations which are allowed that the wage and hour office should continue in Portland so as to provide sufficient service to labor and industry in this State.

I believe the same to be true of both the United States Conciliation Service and the National Labor Relations Board. If the State of Oregon is deprived of either of these offices it would render a great hardship upon all those who are dependent upon these offices for efficient service.

I therefore respectfully request that you give careful consideration to this matter, and if it is possible, that you contact those who are members of the Senate Appropriations Committee who may be interested in taking such action that will give the best service where it is needed most.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and with the very best personal regards, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

DOYLE PEARSON,
Secretary.

GRANTS PASS, OREG., *April 4, 1947.*

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you take action to restore cut in appropriations for Bureau of Labor, National Labor Relations Board and Wage and Hour Division.

LOCAL 9-308, IWA,
ALBERT A. CLARK, *Secretary.*

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR COMMISSION,
Salem, Oreg., March 13, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I understand that Congress is considering eliminating the appropriation for the Division of Labor Standards of the United States Department of Labor.

The Division of Labor Standards has very materially assisted the State labor departments with their activities in assuring safe places of employment, and I am certain that the labor departments will rely on the service provided by the Division of Labor Standards to an even greater extent in the future.

Any effort you may make to assure an appropriation sufficient to enable the Division of Labor Standards to continue this service will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

W. E. KIMSEY,
Commissioner of Labor.

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR COMMISSION,
Salem, Oreg., March 29, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I doubt if any State has an adequate industrial safety program, or personnel for administering it, which is due to the reluctance of the States to properly finance such programs.

We have relied on the Division of Labor Standards for advice and statistics on a national scale to supplement local efforts to provide protection to our industrial workers. That Department has been very cooperative in supplying statistics, charts, and personnel, when needed. Since last fall the Division of Labor Standards has been assisting in the preparation of a program, educational in nature, which, it is felt, might result in a reduction in accidents.

The assistance offered by the Division of Labor Standards is important.

Very truly yours,

W. E. KIMSEY,
Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what the House Appropriations Committee says in its report is quite true, that industrial safety is a field in which the States have supreme authority. But I think the Senate ought to examine carefully whether it is in the interests of true economy to eliminate, as the appropriation bill now does, all Federal funds for assistance to the States in industrial safety and health.

The House Appropriations Committee in its report continues:

> While it may be said that the advice of a few experts in safety and sanitation is perhaps in the public interest, the committee feels that the Federal Government should in the interests of economy curtail many functions that might be considered worth while when the Government is not burdened with debt as it is at the present time. The committee therefore feels that inasmuch as industrial safety must be accomplished by State law, that any efforts of the Federal Government in this field are gratuities extended to the States and can safely be discontinued until some future period.

Let us examine the record of the Nation's industrial accidents. The facts are all contained in the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, which I have examined very carefully.

Last year 2,000,000 workers were injured in the factories of America. Two million injuries are a great many injuries, Mr. President. Sixteen thousand of those injuries resulted in deaths. I am talking about injuries in the factories of America. I am talking about the terrible cost to life and limb of our mass production system. I am talking about an obligation on the part of all the people to do whatever can be done through legislation to reduce to a minimum this fearful toll of industrial accidents. I am pleading here this afternoon—in a very academic way, I admit—for money in the pending appropriation bill adequately to support the one little division in the United States Department of Labor which is doing such a fine job in carrying across this land the lessons of industrial safety.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics such injuries cost American wage earners more than one and a half billion dollars in 1946. They cost American industry more than $1,800,000,000, or a total waste to the Nation of about three and three-fourths billion dollars. The irony of this picture is that at least 90 percent of this waste was preventable. We know how to prevent accidents. A generation of safety experience has developed tested techniques. The job is to apply the know-how to industry itself. The fact is that 70 percent of the injuries occurred in plants which have not been reached by the safety movement. I think that is a very vital statistic. I believe it is very important that we adequately support the little agency which makes available to us such objective data as these, because the fact that 70 percent of these accidents occurred in factories which have not yet been reached by the safety movement constitutes a powerful argument for continuation of the service.

It is the job of the Division of Labor Standards to assist the States in reducing an appalling and needless toll; and yet, to carry on a job of this magnitude, the Congress has appropriated $80,000 for this Division in 1947. I understand that for 1948 the House proposes to give them nothing, on the theory that the States can best carry on the work of safety education. What I am arguing is that the States and the Federal Government, in friendly cooperation, with the Federal Government working as a clearing house of information, must do this job as partners. Many social and economic problems involve dual attack if they are to be successfully solved—attack both by the States and by the Federal Government.

The Division of Labor Standards, at the urgent request of State labor departments, has attempted to reconvert its magnificent wartime experience into peacetime usefulness. What was the wartime record of the Division in accident reduction? Alone among the great industrial nations of the earth, the United States reduced job accidents in the midst of a war. England's accident rate soared until the end, as did that of Canada.

If I were asked where I obtained these data, my reply would be that I obtained them from the records of the very agency for the continuation of which I am pleading. I do not know where we would get this evidence if the House proposal to eliminate entirely appropriations for the agency should finally prevail. But how can we intelligently gage the problem of industrial safety in this country unless we have the basic data on which to work?

As for Germany, available facts make us almost believe that no effort was made in Germany to conserve industrial manpower during the war. It was said that it could not be done in America, but it was done. In 1942 there was a terrific accident rate in this country. That rate was slowed down in 1943. In 1944, in the midst of the war job, accidents actually decreased 8 percent as compared with what they were in 1943; and in 1945 there were 200,000 fewer accidents than in the previous year. What happened during that period? What is the explanation of this fine record?

When defense and war production got under way, the Division of Labor Standards realized that industrial expansion would mean increased accidents. It knew there were not enough trained safety engineers in the country to stem the tide. So it organized the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries. It enlisted the services of over 600 of the best safety engineers in private industry who volunteered 20 percent of their time to assist smaller plants in reducing accidents. That was a fine type of civilian wartime service.

The Division worked closely with the war safety units hurriedly created in the War, Navy, and other procurement

agencies. It worked with State labor departments and private safety organizations. In cooperation with the Office of Education, it inaugurated the greatest safety training program this country has ever had. About 65,000 key plant supervisors and union representatives were trained in some 116 engineering colleges in the analysis of plant accident experience, the detection and control of plant hazards and unsafe work practices, the establishment of plant safety organizations, the training of foremen and workers on the job, and the general enlistment of worker cooperation in safety. Some half million foremen received on-the-job training. The organization of classes, the teaching of classes, the preparation of text material all came from the Division's national committee.

That is what turned the tide of job accidents in America during the war. If that had not been done, if the accident rate had continued to go up in 1944 and 1945 as it had in previous years, it would have resulted in a loss of something like $1,500,000,000. If this little agency—this ounce of prevention—was responsible for only a fraction of the drop—say 10 percent, which I believe grossly underestimates its effectiveness—the savings would have been $150,000,000. That is a pretty good return on the $300,000 the Federal Government was then investing in the Division's war-safety work. Of course, far more important than dollars and cents was the precious manpower required for war production. I am stressing dollars because we are talking about appropriations and there seems to be a tendency to be very dollar-conscious in regard to certain types of savings.

Let me digress, Mr. President, to say that I hope the time has not come when we shall place a dollar value on the life and limbs of the American worker. If I can sustain my premise, if I can sustain what I believe to be true—namely, that this little division in the United States Department of Labor has made a material contribution to the lessening of the industrial-accident rate in this country—then certainly we Members of Congress should not attempt to evaluate it on a dollar basis. We should evaluate it in terms of the human values that have been saved as a result of the work of this little division.

If such a program as this is dispensed with, we shall have a hard time—and we should have a hard time—explaining to the industrial workers of America, who have to suffer from such accidents, why we paid tribute to dollar values when we considered the appropriation bill, but overlooked the great human values which are protected by an adequate Federal safety program.

With the end of the war, the emergency safety agencies of the Federal Government, including the Division's manpower conservation committee, were liquidated, and the major burden for accident prevention returned to State labor departments. That liquidation meant that the Division's $300,000 wartime safety appropriation was reduced to $80,000. Despite this fact, the States when confronted with sole responsibility for such a burden, urgently requested technical assistance from the Division.

Why did the States seek this assistance? Because they have only about 500 State inspectors to safeguard the working conditions of upwards of 40,000,000 workers subject to the protection of State safety laws. The accident rate began to go up as soon as Federal services were removed. Now obviously the States are inadequately staffed at present to meet their responsibilities and their labor commissioners have repeatedly admitted it.

The letters which I have placed in the RECORD already attest to that in language much more persuasive than any I could possibly use.

Yet these State labor departments are the only agency of State governments that cannot get assistance or any funds from the Federal Government.

From this review of the Nation's industrial accident problem and of the record of the Division of Labor Standards, I think the Senate ought to examine carefully the elimination of this agency's service in the appropriations bill. I fear it will be difficult to convince workers and employers that the bill's sole motive is economy. If it is, it is a false economy; it is a penny-wise and pound-foolish economy. There is no field in which the expenditure of a few thousands will bring such dividends as in the field of industrial safety. Therefore American management and labor—which have an equal stake in safety—may well interpret this bill as a deliberate desire to withhold vital Federal services.

They will perceive inconsistencies in this bill too. It eliminates Federal funds for accident prevention on the grounds that such work is a State function. But it also appropriates $18,000,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over present funds to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for grants to States to carry on rehabilitation programs which have for their purpose the restoration to employable capacity of persons injured in industry.

Of course, that is an inconsistency that cannot be explained, Mr. President. If we are willing to appropriate Federal money—and we should—to rehabilitate those who have been injured in industry, then we ought to be willing to appropriate adequate sums to help prevent injuries in the first instance.

Vocational rehabilitation is as much a State function as is accident prevention. On what grounds, we shall be asked, does the same bill withhold funds for assisting States in accident prevention and grant them with such a generous hand, to mop up after the accidents occur? Do not misunderstand me. I am for vocational rehabilitation, but I suggest that we shall be open to justifiable attack for confining our concern to locking the door after the horse is stolen. We shall be accused of other motives than economy. Here again is where the ounce of prevention—the Division of Labor Standards—in my judgment, ought to be supported.

This same appropriation bill also grants funds for work with the States in vocational education, in apprentice training, and in public health—all of them as much State functions as industrial safety. I repeat my earnest hope that the Senate will examine this bill with great care and recognize these inconsistencies.

I say again that I am very much in favor of adequate support for apprentice training, vocational education, and public health; but I see no justification for supporting those services and at the same time discriminating against the one division of the Department of Labor which has done such a magnificent job in protecting health and preventing industrial accidents.

Another field in which the Division of Labor Standards has saved the Federal Government money is in working out agreements with State labor departments whereby State inspectors inspect plants for violations of the safety provisions of the Public Contracts Act. There have been some 15,000 such State inspections which have saved the Federal Government some $750,000. Not only that, but having qualified State inspectors inspect for Federal as well as State laws saves duplicate inspections by both agencies and confusion and annoyance to employers which result from one inspector after another running into their plants.

Yet this work of strengthening State labor departments by eliminating duplication of inspections is eliminated entirely in this appropriation bill, and I am pleading for its restoration by the Senate.

Another provision of this bill will be questioned, I think, by labor and also by management in this country. It is the transfer of the labor education service from the Division of Labor Standards to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In its report, the House Appropriations Committee says that this service is "almost a complete duplication" of the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If that were so, I certainly would be in favor of consolidating them.

I suppose it well might appear so to a committee so overburdened with work and responsibility for reviewing so many detailed budget estimates, and who do not hold themselves out as authorities in the growing and complex field of industrial relations. But those of us who have spent our lives in this field and been close to the work of the Labor Department for years, can assure you that nothing could be further from the facts.

I suppose every Commissioner of Labor Statistics from Carroll Wright, the Bureau's first and very distinguished chief, on down to the present one, has had to defend and protect the purity of the Bureau's fact-finding function. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' sole purpose is to collect and analyze facts and let the chips fall where they may. It does not exist to recommend public policies that may be indicated by those findings of fact. It does not exist to advise groups of any kind on the development of programs and activities that it or somebody

else might think desirable as a result of its findings of fact. If it did any of these things, its whole value as an impartial fact-finding agency whose analyses are accepted by everybody, management, labor and the public alike, would be forever lost.

I digress to pay a very deserved compliment to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. President, because as one who has participated in a great many hearings in the field of labor disputes I have found that both attorneys for employers, and attorneys for labor equally cite and stand upon the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Certainly it has won for itself the hearty approval of industry and labor alike as to its impartiality and as to the reliability of its statistics. If one offers in evidence in any major labor arbitration case an exhibit based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, he very quickly can obtain from opposing counsel a stipulation that he will not be required further to identify the exhibit or to offer further proof in substantiation of its factual basis. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has made a great record in that respect.

Therefore, I do not think the Senate should, as the appropriation bill passed by the House of Representatives does, append to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the function of applying its statistics to controversial or educational issues and making recommendations for State action on the basis of its statistics. It should not enter into the field of controversy, because the moment that is done I think the tremendous prestige which the Bureau of Labor Statistics now enjoys among both labor groups and employer groups will be greatly weakened.

Mr. President, the Bureau of Labor Statistics must be, like Caesar's wife, wholly above suspicion. The Bureau must be wholly above suspicion as to its accuracy and objectivity. I doubt very much that the present Commissioner of Labor Statistics would want this extension of function, and he should not have it thrust upon him.

It is not necessary to ruin the reputation for objectivity of the Bureau of Labor Statistics by giving it an advisory and developmental job like the Labor Education Service. Let us return it to the Division of Labor Standards, for it is certainly not in the interest of economy to tear this 3- or 4-year-old baby from the arms of its mother and thrust it upon an unwilling foster parent. The Division of Labor Standards has developed this experimental program, and has given it leadership and planning. Its administrators have gained experience in what is a new and untried field. Transferring this service to the Bureau of Labor Statistics will not be economy, but will compromise its foster parent, and possibly will deprive some 15,000,000 Americans of the chance to become responsible union members, and will deprive their leaders of the opportunity to become technically competent officials in the peaceful art of labor-management relations.

I repeat, Mr. President, the Republican Party has committed itself to the attainment of industrial peace. Did we mean what we said, or did we not? The country is awaiting with interest the answer to that question. I have given much of my professional life to devising policies and methods for the attainment of industrial peace. A number of us in the Senate have spent considerable time during these last months in attempting to devise public policies which will promote it, through fair legislation. But I am prepared to state that there are only certain things we can do by law which will help and not hinder in the effort to attain that goal. Along with most of American management and labor, I am convinced that there is much that can be done by education, and that if the Government and the Republican Party are really sincere in their desire to foster industrial peace, they will support this pioneer agency which is helping management, unions, and universities to promote industrial peace by means of education.

The Labor Education Service of the Division of Labor Standards advises with universities, unions, and other interested groups on the establishment of labor education programs.

There must be some agency of the Federal Government which is free to give guidance and advice in the development of the schools which are to provide this education. This function cannot be performed either by a fact-finding agency or by our regular educational authorities without assistance from persons skilled in industrial relations problems. For many reasons, labor is suspicious of certain schools. Management is suspicious of others. Many universities are suspicious of labor, while others hesitate to make their facilities available because they fear controversies within their cloistered walls.

The Division of Labor Standards has already had notable success in bringing these parties together in several States so that the end result was the establishment of a sound industrial relations program in those States.

Finding reliable, simply written, unbiased text material is also a problem for these educators and these workers and these employers. As we know, libraries on the study of labor and industry problems are very extensive. Much less is there text material prepared for the use of workers—men and women whose life has not brought them into contact with the language of the academicians.

I recommend the text materials written by the Division of Labor Standards for workers for adult education programs, which are used in the institutions I have mentioned and a great many more.

Mr. President, I have brought some of that material with me, although I shall not take time to read many excerpts from it. I recommend to all Members of the Senate a reading of the evidence and of the material which the Division of Labor Standards has made available to the various labor education institutes and conferences throughout the country. If Senators read it I think they will agree with me that the small amount of funds used to publish the material was well used. These texts represent a part of the investment by the people of the United States in this labor education agency of theirs.

For example, I have before me an excellent bulletin entitled "Federal Labor Laws and Agencies, a Guide for Shop Stewards and Supervisors." This is the basis for a course on the all-important subject of Federal labor legislation about which workers in so many factories in the United States are constantly asking their shop stewards. We frequently find that when their stewards are in a position to give them accurate answers to their questions a potential labor dispute or a potential labor grievance is killed at its very beginning. This bulletin is in use by thousands of persons and hundreds of educational institutions, although it has been published for only 2 months. The demand for this guide is enormous. Why is that so? Because an objective, readable, easily understood digest of Federal labor laws and agencies has been badly needed in our industrial system. I think many of my colleagues will find it helpful to their reading, too. It would not have been published by and State agency. Here is a good example of the need of a cooperative Federal-State program.

I read the following from it, for example:

> Many serious plant grievances, unnecessary appeals to Government bodies and much litigation can be averted, we believe, when stewards and supervisors have a clear understanding of their mutual rights and obligations and know what agencies can help them with special problems.

With all of the discussion we have heard of the foreman's right to organize, there has been little discussion of the foreman's function in labor relations. Many training programs for foremen had been worked out by private publishers and by management itself, but none of them even touched on the foreman's job as a leader of men in plants operating under a collective-bargaining agreement. It took this little Division of Labor Standards to provide a guide to the foreman in the field of labor relations.

Mr. President, I shall not take time to read extensively from the guide, but I recommend it to my colleagues, for here again, I think they will find that the money required for its publication has been well spent, because a great deal of use is being made of this little guide in thousands of plants in the United States. A foreman using the guide which the Division prepared will have a better understanding of the position he holds as a direct representative of management in all matters involving the application of the company's labor-relations program.

This pamphlet, as well as other publications of the Division, was not developed by a swivel-chair artist. It was gone over word for word and revised again and again with the help of some of the leading industrial-relations directors of the country. As a result, it has been widely used by management throughout the United States. Many large plants, such as General Electric, have reprinted it for use by all of their foremen. Others have bought thousands of copies for distribution. Wher-

ever it has been used, it has brought about better understanding between management and labor.

Here is a fundamental approach to the solution of troubles resulting from grievances. As a member of the War Labor Board, and throughout my career in the field of industrial relations, I have seen grievances built up into major catastrophes—and often because there was no understanding of the issues at the moment an alleged grievance was charged. Many times I have wished for some educational material in this field. And here it is—simple, accurate explanations of these Federal laws—laws which are sometimes so difficult to interpret as written that even we cannot understand them at the first reading.

I refer to another new text of the Division of Labor Standards, Arbitration of Grievances. The value of arbitration is unquestioned by students of industrial relations. But how many workers put their faith in arbitration? How many fear that third party? How many would rather just fight it out themselves on the picket line? This pamphlet contains the advantages, and disadvantages, of a number of types of arbitration proceedings. How many workers and how many employers really know this subject so that they will be convinced it is a good system and ought to be written into every labor-management contract? This booklet is their education. I want to see this used all over this land—in colleges and universities who are helping to teach workers and employers, in union halls, and, yes, at executive board meetings of giant corporations. And it might not be amiss for Members of Congress to know the various types of arbitration proceedings which have developed to suit a particular situation.

I say that, Mr. President, because, as my colleagues know from remarks I have made on the floor of the Senate in times past, I believe that voluntary arbitration is the best last step for the settlement of labor disputes. I am convinced that once the employers of America, the labor leaders of America, and the rank and file, come to educate themselves on the advantages of arbitration, which are set forth so clearly in this book issued by the Division of Labor Standards, we will find more collective-bargaining agreements containing arbitration clauses.

I do not want to be a party, when it comes to acting on the appropriation bill this year, to voting out of existence a division in the Federal Government that is serving such a much-needed educational work for American employers and labor in the field of arbitration.

These are only three of a number of good, simplified, understandable texts that are an answer to a puzzled man's dreams.

I maintain that these pamphlets are admirably objective—more so than any union or management pamphlet on these subjects that I have seen. The fact that management uses them as generally as does labor would verify my statement.

The Division of Labor Standards has developed the experience and leadership in this field and should in my opinion be permitted to continue. I can see no economy but rather an expensive disruption of service in shifting this activity to a fact-finding agency which ought not to be burdened with giving the kind of guidance that unions and universities request from the Division. I call the Senate's attention to the type of requests submitted in evidence at the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. The Senate will find them not only instructive but interesting, I am sure. Let me read a few excerpts from those hearings.

Here is one from management—from the industrial relations director of a Northwest shipyard:

We are very much interested in a program for labor education to help the company and the union start a labor-education course. We are interested in outlines of courses as well as text material. Please furnish us with any information you may have along these lines.

Immediately there went out such bulletins as I referred to earlier in my speech.

Here are examples of what union officials request.

A Midwest State federation of labor:

We are interested in getting information and background material for a worker educational program in our State, and we would be happy to receive any material or outlines that have been developed in your department.

An education director for a CIO international union commenting on what is needed:

I would stress basic collective-bargaining aids, available at no cost or at little cost. The material should be prepared for workers with little or no education in unionism. If the material is highfalutin' or expensive it will prove of little assistance to those who need it most.

An A. F. of L. international officer in Philadelphia:

In the immediate near future many of our locals in this area are contemplating educational programs, and we would appreciate if you would send us some outlines that your Department may have available for such an undertaking.

And now from universities and colleges. The University of Illinois:

One of the most urgent needs at this time is the establishment of a really comprehensive central clearinghouse which will have available information on all programs both in unions and in universities. I am sure that is a function which can be most effectively carried out through your Division.

The University of Colorado:

The University of Colorado has been interested for some time in this phase of adult education work and has cooperated with labor groups in holding institutes on a number of occasions. We have not, however, had anything in the way of a continuing program, although we feel we are now beginning to get the foundation on which one can be built. We are very much interested in the development of your services in the field of workers' education and hope that you will keep us informed concerning them.

The University of Wyoming:

As you probably know, we are planning a program of labor education which includes extension courses in various centers and a labor college or workshop in our summer camp for 1 week this summer. We are, therefore, very much interested in materials which will help us in this enterprise.

Xavier Labor School, New York City:

These pamphlets (published by the Division of Labor Standards) have been of great assistance to us in this volunteer work of running schools to train union men in the tools of running their organizations. Here we have more than 200 men to whom we offer 19 courses. * * * We've found that the pamphlets dealing with the work of shop stewards and with grievance procedures have been extremely helpful. From my own knowledge I know what a change in relations has ensued in several shops, where the men of the school introduced orderly handling of beeves as your booklet outlines. These have been of great help.

Brooklyn College:

It has just come to my attention that the Division of Labor Standards is in a position to give assistance to groups planning classes in labor legislation and collective bargaining. Brooklyn College is initiating an extensive program of adult education in March 1947. We are intensely interested in any material you have which will be of help in this type of work.

Senators will notice that what these groups ask for most is advice and guidance in planning educational programs—and it can be seen from the hard-boiled union official I quoted that neither the advice nor the pamphlets will be useful if they are "high-falutin'." The kind of help they want is what the Division of Labor Standards is peculiarly equipped to give. I hope the Senate will examine the appropriation bill's proposed transfer of labor education to the Bureau of Labor Statistics with great care before committing itself to the change.

Finally I come to the last proposal of the House Appropriations Committee, which is not going to be understood or, I think, accepted by the women's organizations and other groups in the country dedicated to the control of child labor and the advancement of employment and educational opportunities for the Nation's youth.

As I mentioned previously, when the Children's Bureau was transferred last July to the Federal Security Agency under Reorganization Plan No. 2, the child-labor and youth-employment functions of the Bureau came to the Division of Labor Standards. The Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division administers the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, does research on undesirable and hazardous employments for children and youth, and works with State labor departments and labor and community organizations in improving standards and promoting educational and employment opportunities for youth. The 1947 appropriations for this function totaled approximately $300,000. The House Appropriations Committee proposes to halve this amount and transfer the whole business to the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department.

I understand there is an inclination to increase the amount somewhat, the exact figure I do not know, but I am informed it still is a very slight sum.

Now let us examine to ascertain what this means. In the first place, these child-labor functions were originally set up in the Children's Bureau, which was created by a Republican Congress back in 1912 and approved by a Republican President. Thus a long and outstanding record of service to the Nation's youth has been built up. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was under consideration by Congress—I remember because I followed the deliberations very closely by reading—Congress had a series of proposals before it. It carefully considered whether to place administrative authority for the enforcement of the act's child-labor provisions in the Wage and Hour Division or in the Children's Bureau. In every proposal, as I recall it, the experience of the Children's Bureau was called in to some degree. The final proposal was to place full administrative authority in the Children's Bureau. That is the function now performed by the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division of Labor Standards. So what the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill proposes to do by appropriation is actually to contravene the considered judgment of Congress.

It even goes further. In addition to placing the difficult enforcement job that surrounds child labor in the hands of an agency which has carried the far simpler techniques of wage-hour enforcement, the bill proposes to place the research and youth-employment functions in the same agency. I do not know how many women's organizations and youth-serving agencies other Senators have heard from but I have already heard from a good many. The cry is essentially a simple one. They say, what do a bunch of inspectors—accountants, if you please—who are accustomed to checking pay rolls know about ferreting out dead-end jobs for kids, investigating hazardous jobs for youth, advising State labor officials and groups in developing child labor, labor standards, and educational opportunities. They say such servants know nothing about the basic problems. They say, the battle for the abolition of child labor has not been won entirely. As a result of war, there are some two and one-half times as many youngsters at work today as in 1940. A million less are in high school than in 1941. Experienced advice and guidance such as has long been developed in the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch and the Division of Labor Standards is still very much needed, say these women's organizations. I believe they are entirely right about it. It is not economy to halve the appropriations for the protection of the country's most valuable asset—its future citizenry—and put administration in an agency that is not equipped to handle it.

I must say I agree basically with these protagonists of the Nation's youth. Of all the charges that we should scrupulously avoid having leveled at the Republican Party, the exploitation of children and the encouragement of sweatshops should be the first. I think as a party we should make doubly sure that we are seeing to it that adequate appropriations are granted by the Congress to maintain the vigilance necessary to prevent exploitation of the children of America. All one would have to do, to see what would happen without an alert and an experienced child-labor agency, is to look at certain maps that I have in front of me, but which, again, I shall not take time to describe in any particular detail, though I do want to point out an objective statistic or two shown by these maps.

Only 14 States today have a 16-year minimum age for the employment of youth in factories. Only 4 States have a 16-year minimum for all employment during school hours. A few others have such a standard during school hours but permit a number of exceptions.

As a people we are likely to sit back complacently and think we have the highest child-labor standards on earth. We have not, and the Republican Party cannot afford to be charged with deliberately lowering them by not providing at this session of Congress adequate funds to continue these child-labor services.

In summary, may I say that I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate itself will carefully scrutinize both the functions of Government for which 1948 funds are requested and also the appropriations bill as approved by the House. We cannot afford to require the greatest sacrifices from one element of society, namely, the working people of America. Let us be realistic about it. We are not going to cripple seriously the agency that serves the Nation's businessmen, if we exercise good judgment. We should not hamstring the agency that serves the Nation's farmers. I am sure we will not. If 16,000 cattle were dying of hoof-and-mouth disease somewhere in the United States, we would leap to our feet on the floor of the Senate to urge a hasty appropriation to prevent such a plague from overtaking the livestock industry of the country. In fact, it was only a few weeks ago that some of us in the Chamber now, including myself, stood up on the floor of the Senate and pleaded for the quick passage of a bill to make available to the United States Department of Agriculture any sum of money necessary to protect us from a threatened hoof-and-mouth disease invasion from Mexico. We did not even stipulate how much, Mr. President; we were very careful not to stipulate how much; we simply said, no matter what the cost, we must give to the United States Department of Agriculture whatever it may need to stop the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease among the cattle of Mexico. I was for that because it is very important that the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease from Mexico into the livestock industry of America be prevented, because it would cost us a tremendous economic loss if we failed to prevent it. I pleaded for that bill. I am pleading now, Mr. President, also, for funds to help prevent the exploitation through child labor of American boys and girls. I think we must always be ready to appropriate whatever funds are necessary to protect human values, as I said earlier in my remarks this afternoon.

Thus, I say I think we Republicans, who are a majority in the Congress, should not hesitate to do all we can to prevent 16,000,000 human beings from being killed and injured in American industry. We should appropriate adequate financial support to our industrial accident-safety program. The Bureau of Labor Standards is vital to such a program.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say a word of appreciation to the members of the Appropriation Committees because I know how difficult is the job that confronts the members of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. I know we have the responsibility bringing about economies in the cost of administering the Federal Government. As I said before, I shall favor economizing if the economy does not involve a "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy. But as I have said previously of the great wealth-producing projects which are being slashed too drastically in the name of economy, I now say in regard to such services as I have pleaded for here this afternoon, we cheat the American people if we seek to give them the impression that by reducing or eliminating appropriations for those services we are saving them money.

We are not saving them money; we are costing them in my judgment many values which they are entitled to receive even from an economy-minded Republican Congress. But I want to say to my colleagues of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that they will have my cooperation in eliminating services which can in fact be dispensed with without costing great values. But the services of the Labor Department, particularly in this time of great industrial unrest in the country, we cannot afford to destroy. I have no doubt that some economy may be exacted in some of the labor services; but I am afraid that if we go forward with the appropriation bill which the House seems to approve in regard to the labor services, we will be guilty of causing labor unrest.

I have one more point on this subject, and then I am through.

The maintenance of industrial peace is going to cost money. We are now dealing with the problem of labor legislation. Still if the National Labor Relations Board is going to be enlarged, as is proposed in one bill, for example, so that it can exercise greater jurisdiction over certain types of disputes—and I certainly think it should, and that is why I have introduced the bill—we shall be obliged to give it more money so as to perform the duties called for by the bill. Yet it is another service which finds itself thus far at least in the appropriation hearings confronted with a drastic budget cut. I think that is another example of false economy.

I was told this morning as I was seeking additional data for my speech, that the National Labor Relations Board is now from 4 to 6 months behind in its simple election cases. What does that mean? Mr. President, imagine yourself for a moment a union organizer; you have organized a plant and you know for an absolute certainty that, let us say, 70 or 80 percent of the workers in the plant wish to have your union be the certified collective bargaining agent for the workers in the plant. However, your employer refuses to accept your state-

ment that you have the workers organized, and he says, "I will not bargain with you until you can obtain an election from the National Labor Relations Board." You check into the matter and are told by the National Labor Relations Board that because of the backlog of election cases already on the docket the Board cannot get to your case in from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. President, what do you think you would be tempted to do? I think you would be tempted to do what a great many labor leaders are doing. You would pull the plug, so to speak. You would "hit the bricks". You would say to that employer, "We are not going to wait 4 months or 6 months to be certified by the National Labor Relations Board in order to get a fair contract with you. We are going to get it from you by strike action right now."

That, Mr. President, is the relationship, and it shows the very direct relationship between appropriations and labor peace in this country. The Congress must assume its fair share of the responsibility for some of the strikes because to the extent that we do not appropriate the necessary funds for these labor agencies which are charged with the responsibility of administering the labor laws, we are responsible for some of the strikes.

My friends on the National Labor Relations Board tell me that there is an increase in the number of strikes against delays by the Board, because the Board cannot get to the cases fast enough to hold elections quickly enough. I do not condone that type of a strike any more than I condone the employer who uses the backlog of cases which confronts the National Labor Relations Board as a stall and a delay in entering into negotiations with a union which in many instances he well knows has the majority of his employees. But he has the right, under the law, to say "I do not have to bargain with you until you are certified by the National Labor Relations Board." I do not condone the conduct of either group any more than I condone the conduct of either group in the present telephone strike, about which I have spoken on the Senate floor heretofore. I digress only to repeat my statement to both groups, that I think neither group can justify its failure to agree to a reasonable arbitration agreement to be drafted by the Secretary of Labor. But that is another story.

I close on this point, Mr. President, by saying that we Members of Congress cannot shuffle off our responsibilities for labor unrest if we fail in the appropriation bill this year to appropriate the necessary funds so labor agencies created by law can dispose of their cases quickly, expeditiously, and in an efficient manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of March 28, entitled "Penny Pinching." It summarizes very well the main thesis of my remarks this afternoon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNY PINCHING

The saving of money is not necessarily economy. When it is accomplished at the expense of vital and valuable services, it may prove very uneconomical indeed. Need is a relative thing, of course, and the importance of desirable services must be weighed against the importance of tax reduction and budget balancing. We can call to mind at least two Federal undertakings now threatened with extinction in order to save money, the abandonment of which, in our judgment, would be plain penny-wise foolishness.

One of these is the school-lunch program. This involved, for the fiscal year 1946–47 less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the Federal Budget—actually about $75,000,000. The program will come to an end on March 31 unless a deficiency appropriation is provided to carry it on. The money that will be saved by withholding an appropriation will be paid for in the health of some 5,000,000 school children now benefiting from nutritious lunches furnished at their schools through intelligent Federal-State-local cooperation. In a good many cases, these lunches have meant the difference between physical well-being and malnutrition. It would be an exceedingly myopic economy to cut off this sound investment in the health of the country's school children 3 months before the school year ends.

It seems to us that there is equally short-sighted penny pinching in the proposal to liquidate the Division of Labor Standards by excising from the Labor Department's appropriation the $800,000 needed for the Division's work. Here is a modest Federal agency functioning in close cooperation with State agencies, helping them to develop sound administrative standards and to keep work places safe and healthy. Along with State labor departments, it works with management and labor to reduce industrial accidents, to minimize the evils of child labor, and to encourage peaceful and productive collective-bargaining procedures by training representatives of both sides. The cost of carrying on this Division is far less than the cost of industrial accidents and strikes which its activities prevent. Economizers would do well to remember the shoe that was lost for want of a nail, the horse that was lost for want of a shoe.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying to my Republican colleagues in the Congress that I hope they will not be guilty of penny pinching in the name of economy.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 2 years ago, on February 26, 1945, I addressed the Senate on the subject of our foreign policy. I quote a few words from that address. At that time I said:

A great portion of the membership of this body, and I believe an equally great portion of the American people, are viewing with increasing misgivings the foreign policy which is being followed by the American Government. Many of us suspect that the Government has no policy at all and is simply floundering in a gigantic maelstrom of events which is forcing our hand everywhere and making our policy for us.

It is my hope that this estimate is an incorrect one and that it will be proven, despite the disturbing circumstances with which we are now acquainted, that the Government of the United States does indeed have long-range goals and clearly defined views as to how these may be attained.

I then went on to make some comparisons between the actual results of our appeasement policies toward Russia contrasted with the sanctimonious words of our many official declarations of policy beginning with the Atlantic Charter.

It may be that the President's address of recent date and the measure now before us are in the nature of an answer to my call for a definite policy with long-range goals and concrete measures to reach them. One paragraph from the President's speech of March 12 has been widely proclaimed as a new "Truman doctrine," which now at least provides us with a firm principle on which to stand. On that day the President said:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

He then went on to say that our help should be extended through economic and financial means.

It is certainly worth our while to inquire carefully into the implications of this so-called Truman doctrine. It has been referred to as a new departure. What specifically are the new elements about it?

We have already committed ourselves, by joining the United Nations, to creating a system which would guarantee the security of all nations against "attempted subjugation," subject to our own use of the veto, of course. Adherence to that Charter was agreed to by an almost unanimous vote of this body. As practical men, I am sure we realized, at the time we accepted the UN Charter, that the United States would have to play the leading role since we are the strongest military power on earth.

I will assume that when we made that agreement we meant what we said. We pledged ourselves to support action in defense of sovereign nations threatened with aggression. In my speech of 2 years ago, to which I have referred, I also said:

I am satisfied that the world cannot safely return to the old business of power politics or to the old isolationism in any guise. There is, therefore, nothing new about our supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation.

Those elements of the Truman doctrine which are new can be summed up in two sentences. First, we propose to bypass the United Nations, disown the cooperative organization through which we have been working to date, and accept for ourselves the entire burden for remaking the world. I shall have more to say about that in a moment. Second, the Truman doctrine proposes, for the first time, that we should adopt a permanent policy of spending hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of dollars of American money in this world-wide crusade.

It has been said that the money involved in this bill is small compared with the costs of the war or the costs of our other activities in the international field. I am well aware of the fact that we have spent billions of dollars for lend-lease and billions of dollars for UNRRA and

other forms of relief. I am also acutely aware of the fact that we have lent abroad billions of dollars through sale of surplus property and surplus ships, through the continuation of peacetime lend-lease, through the British loan, through the Export-Import Bank, and through other channels. I am aware that we have committed ourselves to the loan of billions more through operations of the International Bank and Fund. But all of these operations, Mr. President, were in fulfillment of either wartime necessities or urgent relief needs or else were supposed to be self-supporting, reimbursable propositions. They were supposed to be temporary. We had hoped that this spending—at least that part of it which is not to be repaid—would come to an end with the end of the war, or with the end of the need for relief. Now we find that the spending is to go on and on, as a permanent fixture on the American scene, without even any real hope of repayment. Let me point out that there is not one cent for relief in this bill.

This bill is a return to the basic philosophy of the New Deal—that the way to meet any problem is to spend Government money. A few years ago, it was first seriously proposed that America should undertake to raise the standard of living of the rest of the world up to our own level. The idea was laughed out of court at that time. "A quart of milk for every Hottentot" became a standing joke. It is now apparent that that idea has been revived in a serious way as a basic part of our national foreign policy, but with new arguments behind it. Immediately following the President's speech, the press of the Nation began to fill with new proposals for spending abroad. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations came through with an idea for building hydroelectric plants—little TVA's—all over Greece. A columnist pointed out the tremendous increase in the production of food which could be attained by investment of $100,000,000 of American money in reclaiming the deserts of Iraq. A serious magazine article in a responsible periodical began to talk of the need for spending millions and billions of American dollars in such widely separated places as the Philippines and Italy. All this was to be done in the name of a crusade against communism.

On numerous occasions in the past I have spoken out in favor of a strong stand against further Communist expansion. I opposed the decision at Teheran, and I opposed the Yalta agreement. If our administration has really determined to stand firmly against further Communist aggression, I will gladly support it. But I am not yet completely convinced that the only way to fight communism is to pour more billions of American dollars out of our unbalanced budget.

I recall that only a few months ago the nation of Iran was in grave danger from Russia. Russian troops in large numbers were actually inside the country. I recall that we found it possible, working by diplomatic measures through the United Nations, to put a halt to that aggression. The Government of Iran was subsequently able to establish its sovereign authority firmly over every part of its own nation. If the United Nations was good enough to save Iran, why cannot it save Turkey? Is Turkey now in greater danger than Iran was at that time? Is Greece in greater danger? At that time subversive and foreign elements actually controlled a large part of the territory of Iran. Frankly, I do not believe we have fully explored the potentialities of the United Nations.

The State Department has made a case that the United Nations is not yet strong enough to guarantee the security of Greece. At the same time, they have given us no indication as to how soon the United Nations may be expected to acquire the necessary strength. We have been told that our foreign policy is based on adherence to the principles of the United Nations. If the United Nations is not strong enough to work, we had better change it to make it work.

We return to the fact that the proposal is a typical New Deal method of approaching any problem. In other words, it involves spending gigantic sums of money. It is not yet clear to me, however, whether we have arrived at the clear-cut definite foreign policy we need. Our measures of economic assistance to strengthen democracy in Greece and Turkey are still being balanced by measures of economic assistance to strengthen communism in Russia and her satellites. The same State Department which is sponsoring this program is simultaneously trying to extract $25,000,000 from the Congress to settle up accounts on an old and rather shady deal with Russia involving final settlement of the lend-lease operation. We are still planning to send thousands of tons of potatoes as a gift to Stalin's leading puppet, Marshal Tito, in Yugoslavia. Meanwhile, two other puppets, Poland and Czechoslovakia, are negotiating for loans of good American dollars from the World Bank, while Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, members of the International Monetary Fund, are no doubt preparing at the present moment to draw down their quotas of our money in that institution.

It may be that our new-style diplomats have become so lost in the jungle of their own financial creations that they have forgotten that all this money comes eventually from the American taxpayer.

The whole matter boils down to this: We are staging the world's biggest prize fight and financing both sides. This proposal is of the same pattern of financial irresponsibility with all the rest of the New Deal from beginning to end.

Mr. President, the American people have voted for an end to financial irresponsibility and for a reduction in taxes. They gave us a mandate to reject the spending philosophy of the last 14 years. They did so, I believe, because they had come to realize fully that Government spending must come from taxes paid by the people—not merely a small proportion of the people, namely the rich, but by all the people. More than half our revenue from the individual income tax comes from persons making less than $5,000 a year. At the present time we in the Finance Committee are studying various proposals for tax reduction, and trying to determine what tax relief we can grant to our people. It has been hoped that we could increase the individual exemption by $500. Mr. President, we cannot afford to do that. Such an action would more than wipe out the entire surplus we hope to obtain. We must continue to tax not only the average man, but the poor man, to support this spending. We must continue to tax the married man making only $25 a week. It is not the rich who will pay the cost of this enterprise; it is the poor.

Mr. President, I have hopes that before this measure is brought to a final vote it will be substantially amended on the floor of the Senate. The proposal may have within it at least the seeds of a sound foreign policy. In my judgment, however, much more is needed to construct that policy than the ideas that have been presented to us. I should like to mention a few of the elementary facts which have been almost ignored in this controversy.

First of all is the absolute necessity of maintaining unimpaired the financial strength of the United States. This world today would be a place of chaos if our Nation had suffered from the inflation, radicalism, and destruction that have beset almost every other nation in the world. The mere existence of the United States as a strong, solvent, going concern is the greatest element of stability left on this earth. If we sacrifice that stability in foolish, wasteful adventures abroad that bring us no return, we shall have done the world no service at all. Communism will be defeated if we keep faith in our own system. Let us not permit that system to be wrecked on what President Roosevelt once called "the rocks of a loose fiscal policy."

A mere glance at the problems of some other countries which may even now be lining up at the State Department to share in the American largess should make us consider carefully what we are doing. Take China, for example. Conditions in China, both economic and political, are probably even worse than in Greece. Inflation has run to an even greater extent. The Communists actually control a substantial part of China's territory. China's population is roughly 60 times that of Greece. Whether China would require financial assistance 60 times as great as is proposed for Greece would be hard to say, but certainly her needs are vastly greater. We are proposing to spend $275,000,000 on Greece as a first installment. If China's per capita needs are as great, the cost there would run between fifteen and twenty billions.

Or take India, for example, which seems to be rapidly descending into chaos. India's population is nearly as great as China's. Her standard of living is probably the lowest in the world. The tensions and antagonisms among her population appear to be as great as in any other country on earth. What would it cost to sustain democratic forces in India?

Mr. President, out in the West it used to be a common practice among ranch-

ers and farmers to offer a bounty for the destruction of predatory animals, such as wolves and coyotes. The bounty would usually be paid upon presentation of the scalp or pelt, and the total cost depended on how many pelts were turned in. This scheme was moderately successful in some cases, but it ran into great difficulties with the perversities of human nature. Too many men figured that it would be most profitable to kill the wolf cubs for the bounty, but to leave the parent wolves alive, so that there would be more cubs and more bounties later.

I wonder if we may not have the same problem with the bounty we are offering on Communists. Communists can be found, to at least some slight extent, in practically every country in the world. In many devastated countries around the world raising a domestic Communist menace may become one of the most profitable enterprises tha such countries could engage in, judging by the example of Greece. It will obviously be practical for each small country to preserve and protect its own small Communist group, not large enough to be a serious menace, but large enough to draw American dollars. I suspect that as soon as we have passed this bill, we shall suddenly find that communism is a tremendous danger in many other countries of the world. We shall have country after country trotting out its Communist menace for our inspection, and we shall be told that only American dollars can save democracy in each case. No doubt before we are through we shall be subsidizing Franco in Spain.

I suggest that we should not take this first step until we have some idea of the ultimate cost of the whole program and an opportunity to measure the effect of a continued tax load on the poor of our own United States. Remember that poor, ordinary, hard-working Americans are paying half the total tax collected here.

Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] publicly urged that Mr. Bernard M. Baruch be appointed to conduct a survey of our national assets and obligations. More than a year ago an almost identical proposal was made in the Senate. At that time, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in an address to the Senate, called for an official statement of all the relevant information regarding our financial transactions with other nations, together with a statement of our current financial situation, both internationally and internally, all the facts to be brought together into one convenient summary, so that they could be considered and studied together, and their significance and relationships clearly understood. At that time, on his own behalf and on behalf of a number of other Senators, he submitted Senate Resolution 231 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, requesting such a study. That Senate resolution was referred to committee, where it slumbered peacefully until the end of the session. Long before that, similar information had been requested by such distinguished figures as Mr. Bernard Baruch, without any more success. We still do not have a picture of our over-all position, of our financial resources, and of our obligations. Until we have such a picture, I cannot see how we can intelligently embark on this vast new international spending program. At this time, therefore, I am resubmitting, for study by the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Resolution 231 of the last Congress, with certain minor changes made necessary by the passage of events.

I am impressed with the fact that every area of the world we touch suddenly becomes a major drain on the American taxpayer. Under Hitler, they were all at least self-supporting. For that matter, when the Russians move into a country, they do not find it necessary to lend it assistance—quite the contrary. Only Americans manage to discover that every country they enter is a liability and must be subsidized.

It may be that relief was and is an urgent necessity in certain countries, but there seems to be no time limit over which this assistance must be extended. We are now told that western Germany is in worse shape than when we first arrived, and that it will be several years before it can become self-supporting. Korea, Italy, Japan, and other countries still will be in desperate need of assistance during the third year of peace. There seems to be no end to the process.

If we are ever to get the world back on its feet, we must recognize that the only answer in these devastated areas is a new emphasis on production out of their own resources, slender though they may be. This may seem a harsh prescription. It is not more harsh than the facts justify. It is, in fact, the only path to salvation. American money cannot continue to flow forever. In fact, we already have proof that American money alone cannot do the job. It is time to quit relying primarily on American loans and gifts.

I would suggest therefore that our responsible officials start to make it clear that the salvation of Greece is largely in the hands of the Greeks, not in our hands. I have yet to see any coherent plan explaining concretely what contribution the Greeks expect to effect to their own reconstruction. Inflation in Greece has been raging for many months. Concretely, what internal measures does Greece expect to take to put an end to it? We are told that much of the revenues of the Greek Government goes into political graft for Greek officials or is dissipated in unnecessary expenditures among favored groups. What plans have been formulated to put a stop to that? We are told that Greek capital has fled the country or is in hiding. Has the present regime in Greece devised any plans for inducing this capital to invest in productive enterprise at home? Exports of Greek products, such as tobacco, are apparently held back by high prices caused by inflation and other factors. Greece will never recover until she restores her exports to prewar levels. What plans have been made to facilitate the marketing of such products as Greece may have for sale?

These questions should be answered before we advance this money, not afterwards. We cannot afford to extend aid unless there is some evidence that the money will be used to bring about recovery. The situation in Greece will not be cured solely by American dollars. It can be cured only by restoring production in Greece of the items of commerce.

Mr. President, we have already poured out immense sums of money all through the world, through lend-lease, through UNRRA, through an extension of lend-lease into peacetime, through sale of our war surpluses, through sale of our surplus ships, through the British loan, through the International Bank, through the International Fund, through relief in the countries we have occupied, and through many other channels. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] yesterday inserted in the RECORD some revealing figures showing the tremendous extent of the aid we have already given to the rest of the world. We are now told that these contributions are not enough. We are told that now almost 2 years after the end of the war in Europe that we must embark on a new spending campaign to protect the world from communism. If this is to be our policy, I only ask that we keep two fundamental facts in mind: First, we must not destroy our own solvency; and second, we must insist that our money be put to better use than it has been in the past. Certainly the results we have obtained with the money we have spent to date have not been encouraging.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as being unfriendly to the people of Greece or to the people of any other needy area. Where American aid can relieve a situation on the basis of relief, I, for one, am willing to give all that I personally can afford to give, just as most of the American people have done in the past. But I wish to have the giving done, not on a Government level, but voluntarily through organizations such as the American Red Cross which the American people have supported very well during years past, and will continue to support. The drive of the American Red Cross in the ordinary community in the United States is an annual event in which practically everyone in the community takes part.

All of us have faith in the statement that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." I was reminded very definitely of the truth of that statement during the trip around the world which I took last summer. We stopped in Shanghai, and were there several days. From a vantage viewpoint I looked out over the harbor filled with ships, one of them a magnificent American battleship. Most of the ships were UNRRA ships, supposedly still loaded with UNRRA material. The admiral in charge of the battleship told me that when the ships finally reached the docks to be unloaded it was discovered that a large portion of the material, if not all of it, had already been taken from the ships. Where had it gone, Mr. President? I do not believe anyone knows officially as yet. At least there has been no public statement regarding it. Within 2 or 3 weeks of that time—in fact, I think it was a shorter period than that—relief material going to China by the UNRRA route was stopped because of poor administrative handling. I doubt that the flow of UNRRA material to China has even been started again.

That is an indication of what giving does to a people when it is done on a government level. America has performed a wonderful service to the great nation of China through past decades, but that service has been rendered through organizations made up of individuals who gave because they wished to support a work of that kind. If today the American people are to be sold the idea of furnishing relief to Greece and to any other country which really needs aid—and I think undoubtedly the Greeks are in great need of aid of certain kinds—it should be aid properly given through individual channels, not on the government level. Such aid, properly distributed and properly administered over there, will do more to stop communism than anything we can do on a governmental level.

Mr. President, I now submit the resolution and request that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 103) submitted by Mr. BUTLER was received and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government has already extended financial and economic aid to certain foreign countries and to international organizations to a total of billions of dollars; and

Whereas our Government is committed to additional aid on a large scale; and

Whereas additional commitments and requests for assistance are constantly rumored; and

Whereas Congress is lacking information as to the current and probable future total of such requests and commitments; and

Whereas the question has been raised as to the ability of the United States to meet all the demands arising from existing international commitments and from future requests from abroad for financial and economic assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and is hereby, respectfully requested to direct the Bureau of the Budget, as promptly as possible, to report in detail—

1. The grand total of indebtedness on loans, investments, commitments, or other obligations outstanding as of December 31, 1946, of all foreign governments, their agencies, and their private citizens to the United States Government, its agencies, and its private citizens; and the same shown separately for public indebtedness and for private indebtedness.

2. The total loans made by the United States Government to foreign governments and agencies thereof from 1914 to 1932, inclusive, and from 1933 to the date hereof; itemized for each country, with the repayment history of each.

3. Existing commitments of the United States Government or representatives thereof, including alleged moral commitments, to extend American financial and economic aid to foreign countries and international organizations.

4. The amounts of American portfolio and direct investments abroad, by country, as of the end of 1914, 1932, 1939, and 1946.

5. The amount of foreign portfolio and direct investments in the United States, by country, at the end of 1914, 1932, 1939, and 1946.

6. Gold reserves, dollar balances, and other hard-money assets, as of the end of 1946, of countries whose governments are now in debt to the United States Government or with whom loan and investment discussions have been held by any American official since 1939.

7. The legal and actual status of American direct investments under the laws and current practices of the respective foreign countries in which such investments have been made.

8. The value, classification, and location of United States Government-owned property in foreign countries to December 31, 1946, including installations and surplus property.

9. So far as possible, the total value of American goods exported and services performed for foreigners, excluding reexports and financial and security transfers, annually from 1914 to 1946; together with the corresponding items supplied by foreigners to the United States in the same period.

10. The effects of the war on the public debt of the United States.

11. The per capita tax burden of the people of the United States classified as (1) Federal, (2) State and local, and (3) total; and the total per capita tax burden of the people of each of the countries now in debt to the United States or with whom loan and investment discussions have been held by any American official since 1939.

12. The total per capita debt burden for each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

13. The latest reasonably reliable report on the national income, reduced to a per capita basis, for each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

14. The average interest rates for Government borrowing, according to the latest reasonably reliable report, in each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

15. An estimate year by year of the probable expenditures of foreign countries for American goods and services as a result of the loans, credits, grants, and other forms of financial aid, contracted with this country publicly or privately since VE-day.

16. Assuming the ultimate necessity of gold settlements under estimated total economic transactions (exclusive of extensions of American loans and credits) between foreign countries and the United States within the next 5 years, what gold is available for such settlements and how is it distributed so that nations likely to be liable for gold settlements to the United States will have the gold to make them?

17. What changes are necessary in this country's import tariffs to make possible the repayment of the loans and investment already made as contemplated by the United States and by private American interests; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon the receipt of the foregoing data and information from the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Senate shall cause the same to be printed and published as a Senate document in the number of 2,500 copies for the use of the Congress and the public.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; and

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, Friday, and Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate, leaving here Friday evening and returning about 1 week later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, such consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John Price Gregg, of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported favorably the nomination of Col. Marshall Sylvester Carter (captain, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States, to be brigadier general, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire what happened to the nomination under the general title of "Tennessee Valley Authority" and the nominations under the title "Atomic Energy Commission"? Those nominations should go over for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be called for vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the nomination under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority" should likewise go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination under that heading will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. I now ask unanimous consent that the nominations under the heading "Diplomatic and Foreign Service" be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I also ask consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 4:50 o'clock today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess until 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to inquire of the able majority leader what the program for tomorrow will be.

Mr. WHITE. The program for tomorrow, Mr. President, as I understand it, will be the continued consideration of the Greek-Turkish loan bill. Let me express the hope that the consideration of that measure will be continuous until it is disposed of. I hope there will be no interruption of that program.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the majority leader advise me whether it is expected that the Senate will complete the consideration of that measure tomorrow, or whether it will take longer?

Mr. WHITE. It is hoped to complete consideration of that measure tomorrow, but it might take until Friday.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." If the Senator from Washington were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. OVERTON'S name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. If the Senator from Louisiana were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, in the absence of this pair, I would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If the Senator from New York were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The previously mentioned Senators are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea." The Senator from West Virginia is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce the following pairs on this vote:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay"; and

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Holland	O'Conor
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Smith
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
George	McGrath	Thye
Green	McMahon	Tobey
Gurney	Maybank	Umstead
Hayden	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hickenlooper	Morse	Watkins
Hill	Murray	Young
Hoey	Myers	

NAYS—31

Bricker	Dworshak	O'Daniel
Bridges	Ecton	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Flanders	Stewart
Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Bushfield	Jenner	Wherry
Butler	Kem	White
Byrd	McClellan	Wiley
Cain	McKellar	Williams
Capehart	Malone	Wilson
Cooper	Martin	
Cordon	Moore	

NOT VOTING—14

Barkley	McCarran	Revercomb
Brewster	McCarthy	Russell
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ferguson	Overton	Wagner
Hatch	Reed	

So the nomination of David E. Lilienthal was confirmed.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of any kind are contrary to the rules of the Senate.

The remaining nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission will be stated in order.

ROBERT F. BACHER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Bacher, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

SUMNER T. PIKE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sumner T. Pike, of Maine, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

WILLIAM W. WAYMACK

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William W. Waymack, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CARROLL L. WILSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson, of Massachusetts, to be General Manager within the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the action of the Senate in confirming these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

John Price Gregg, of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

GENERAL MANAGER WITHIN THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Carroll L. Wilson.

MEMBERS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR TERMS EXPIRING AUGUST 1, 1948

David E. Lilienthal
Robert F. Bacher
Sumner T. Pike
Lewis L. Strauss
William W. Waymack

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES NAMED

Willard L. Beaulac, to Colombia.
Walter J. Donnelly, to Costa Rica.
John F. Simmons, to Ecuador.
Albert F. Nufer, to El Salvador.
Paul C. Daniels, to Honduras.
Henry F. Grady, to India.
Fletcher Warren, to Paraguay.
John C. Wiley, to Portugal.
Edwin F. Stanton, to Siam.
Williamson S. Howell, Jr., to Uruguay.
Cavendish W. Cannon, to Yugoslavia.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES NAMED

Selden Chapin, to Hungary.
George A. Garrett, to Ireland.
Paul H. Alling, to the Republic of Syria.

CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cecil Wayne Gray

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Elmer H. Bourgerie
George A. Morgan
W. Leonard Parker

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James D. Bell
Frank P. Butler
Nat B. King
Harold H. Rhodes
Roy Richard Rubotton, Jr.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

David M. Bane
William G. Gibson

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Theo C. Adams
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.
William B. Connett, Jr.
John I. Fishburne
John E. MacDonald
Gilbert L. Newbold
John B. Young

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we draw near to Thee with thanksgiving and praise for all Thy unnumbered mercies Thy blessings roll on and on forever, giving strength for every weakness, rest for every sorrow, and hope for every wanderer on this mortal sphere.

O Thou deliverer, while we see Thee not, yet we trust and pray that Thou wilt help all who struggle with jealousy, all who struggle with avarice, and all who struggle against doubt and fear. O direct those who know not how to minister unto their perplexities, lingering on the stepping stones of self; but enable us to mount to higher levels of patience, knowing that with Thee "a thousand years in Thy sight are as yesterday when they are past." We rejoice that the day will come when we shall rebound from the limitations of earth and behold our full stature in the light of a good God, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948; and

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

SENATE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

APRIL 8, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on April 2, 1947, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate a message attesting to the passage of the following bills:

Senate bills:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine;

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union."

House bills without amendment:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

House bill amended:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on April 8, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from tr sportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on April 2, 1947, he did, on April 8, 1947, sign the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the New York Times.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HENRY FORD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the master of mass production left this world last Monday night. Henry Ford passed away peacefully in his Dearborn, Mich., home.

He was one of the world's great men and the world is better because he lived. He was a benefactor of mankind. Simplicity was the keystone of his life.

Born of humble parents, and with meager education, he rose from obscurity to build the greatest industrial empire of his time. It began in an alley barn. It began with bolting a piece of water pipe and flywheel to the kitchen sink. It began with Mrs. Ford holding a lantern over her husband's experiments, which later revolutionized world transportation.

The poor man should never forget him. He provided transportation for him at a cost within his reach. The laboring man should never forget him. He doubled his wages voluntarily.

Henry Ford and his family have been manufacturing cars, not because they needed bread but to provide employment for those who needed it.

Our State of Michigan has lost its most distinguished son, and the world has lost one of its greatest men.

FLORIDA

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions I have invited the individual Members of this House and the House en masse to come to Florida. Many of you have availed yourselves of that opportunity, and I am glad that they have had the pleasure of going down. Others have found themselves so busy that they could not go.

Now, for some of you people who have not been to Florida, may I tell you that on tomorrow night The Yearling, based on a Pulitzer-prize-winning play by Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, is opening at the Palace Theater, and in view of the fact that some of you have never been to Florida, I invite you to go down and see a part of Florida, and visualize the beauty of that great State.

Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings was born in Washington, D. C., and lived here and on her father's farm on Rock Creek, near Garrett Park, Md., for 18 years. In 1928 she bought her orange grove in north-central Florida with her inheritance which represented half of the Maryland farm. She felt that she had come home again.

She had been a writer literally all her life, her first commercial sale being to the children's page of the Washington Post at the age of 11. Her remuneration was $2, and she reports that the movie sale of The Yearling did not seem nearly as important.

Her first 10 years on her mortgaged orange grove were years of struggle and poverty, for the "golden apples" do not infallibly place an orange grower in the 75 percent income tax bracket. During those years she lived intimately as one of the Florida rural folk, loved them, studied their Shakespearean speech, listened to their tales of hunting, fishing, and of nature lore. She wrote of the Florida backwoods country, and of the people, in two books and many stories.

The story of The Yearling can be traced directly to her close relationship with her father, and to the love of nature he taught her on the Maryland farms. For its background, she used the Big Scrub section of Florida, wild, lonely, still sparsely inhabited, where the battle for existence is only more difficult than in her native city of Washington, D. C. The boy Jody in the tale is derived, she says, from the memories of two old men. She hunted, fished and camped with them, relived with them their early and exciting lives, and the little boy, doomed by tragedy to early maturity, took shape before her eyes She used a true locale for the story, and the Baxter clearing in the Florida Scrub still stands, desolate and beautiful.

Mrs. Rawlings has seen the film of The Yearling, and is gratified that the country, the life, the people, have come to life with complete faithfulness. Time Magazine complained that in the picture the Florida skies were "Too breathtakingly blue," the "piercing green palm fronds arranged in composed landscapes," the "dusty good earth downright gorgeous."

She answered simply, "But it is true."

I want you people to go down and see some of beautiful Florida.

ADDRESS BY MR. GAEL SULLIVAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at the Jefferson day dinner last Saturday night

a speech was delivered by a gentleman whom I have known from his youth and who is now very active in the interest of our country, Mr. Gael Sullivan. It is an outstanding speech, one that I believe every man interested in the welfare of our Nation should read. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MAINE TOWNSHIP, ILL.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today in Washington we have the pleasure of being host to students of various high schools and colleges throughout the Nation. Among those students are approximately 50 from Maine Township, Ill.

Maine Township is located in the northwest section of Cook County, in the heart of the Seventh Congressional District, which I have the pleasure and honor to represent. The Seventh Congressional District, as you know, is the largest in population in the United States, with over 1,000,000 people living within its borders at the present time. Maine Township is a fine farming and industrial community, with two very beautiful cities, Park Ridge and Des Plaines.

I like to think about Maine Township especially since my mother lives in Park Ridge. We in Washington greet our visitors who are going to be the leaders of tomorrow and trust that they will enjoy their visit and that their vision will be enlightened by their contacts in the National Capital, and that they will be more prepared to meet the important duties of tomorrow.

VETERANS' ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have this day filed a petition for discharge—No. 4—on the Speaker's desk to bring to the floor of the House H. R. 246, a bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job and for other purposes.

I have placed the discharge petition on the Speaker's desk for the reason that H. R. 246 was reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee by a unanimous vote on February 26, 1947, after having been carefully considered by the full committee in several hearings. Under the rules of the House, House Resolution 159 was filed on March 21, 1947, and seven legislative days having elapsed without consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee, I now offer the membership of the House the opportunity to sign the petition for discharge, thereby dispensing with further consideration of the bill by the Committee on Rules.

It will be remembered by the membership that during the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill was passed, known as Public Law 679, placing ceilings in on-the-job training at $175 for single veterans and $200 for veterans with dependents. H. R. 246 provides that the ceilings for veterans undergoing training under this law shall be increased to $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $350 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents.

I invite and urge my colleagues to sign this petition in order that a great injustice to veterans be righted.

SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this just applies to the Senate committee?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. It is applicable to the Senate committee operating under Senate Resolution 46 of the Eightieth Congress, which as I understand is the so-called War Investigating Committee. The resolution was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and a similar resolution (H. J. Res. 165) has been introduced in the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who is very eager to have the matter disposed of, and so communicated to me. It refers only to the operation of the Senate committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the resolution which the gentleman from Indiana spoke to me about?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it is.

Mr. SABATH. I think he is a good man for that purpose, and I think the resolution should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address made by him last night over the American Broadcasting Co. on the subject of communism.

STOPPING COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities this morning cited for contempt of Congress Eugene Dennis, national secretary of the Communist Party. We also recommended to the Attorney General that he be prosecuted for conspiracy to incite contempt.

During the testimony this morning, among other things, it was revealed that Mr. Eugene Dennis secured a fraudulent passport under the name of Paul Walsh. This is one additional link in the long series of fraudulent passports which the Communists of this country have obtained, including Browder, Eisler, Josephson, Weiner, and many others.

I have today introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, which would put an end to this kind of fraudulent passport racket by requiring finger printing as a part of the process of securing a passport. It also extends the statute of limitations for the prosecution of passport cases.

May I add, however, that in the meantime I recommend that President Truman issue an Executive order stopping the issuance of passports to American Communists. We have had American Communists creeping all over Europe of late on official passports issued by the American State Department. In fact, W. Z. Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, is now conferring with European Communists with the aid of an American passport. The State Department does not have to issue these passports. The President can stop it today if he wants to. I call upon him now to exercise his authority to do so.

If we are serious about this business of stopping communism, let us curtail its effectiveness in America by an Executive order by the President on this important matter now. There is no need to wait for legislation. By this action the President can curb Communist influence and conspiracy without waiting for his loyalty purge to be made effective. By this action the President can decrease Communist effectiveness without sending soldiers to the Balkans or

spending $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey. Mr. Speaker, it is time America got serious and became consistent in this matter of communism. While trying to stop its aggressive march abroad, let us at least have an Executive order from the President which will deny further passports to American Communists who go overseas to aid and abet the cause of the aggressors we are now being called upon to stop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American magazine on labor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ON GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF STRUCK UTILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the current telephone stoppage illustrates again what should already have been amply clear from the railroad and coal general strikes—that the basic and justifiable fear of the country is labor strife resulting in national paralysis. Therefore, if the Congress is to legislate on labor in the national interest it must first lay at rest this fear by passing a bill for seizure of any plant, mine, or facility by the Government, the immobilization of which threatens to paralyze the national economy. This done, we can consider other labor legislation to deal with collective bargaining, union democracy, and union responsibility without trading on this overriding fear of national shut-downs. A Government-seizure bill must provide only for that minimal operation by Government essential to the public health and safety. Compensation to owners should be limited to the use value of the enterprise taken over as shut down, and not of the going concern. We must have plans and skeleton staffs for direction of properties so taken over in the appropriate Government departments, or in a department, just as we have staffs for industrial mobilization in the War and Navy Departments. The injunction bills now being talked about say they do not propose to make any employee work against his will, but they propose nothing less than that. Government seizure and emergency operation promise results, not punishment or Government strikebreaking.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOLCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two speeches.

Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Kansas City Star.

FISCAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit this afternoon notwithstanding the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LOAN TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the farmer is the strongest fiber in the web and woof of our economy. He is hard working. He is independent. Perhaps he is a little more American than some of the rest of us because he is nearer the soil and therefore nearer to nature.

The farmers in my district take a keen and intelligent interest in politics, particularly during the winter months when their work is less arduous. Since one of their greatest problems is paying off their mortgages and keeping out of unnecessary debt, it is difficult for them to understand a Federal Government, the objective of which seems to have been to get into more and more debt. I asked one of those farmers what he thought about the President's proposal with regard to Greece and Turkey. He said he was perfectly willing to give something to feed hungry people, but he said we could not give them everything; they will have to do something for themselves. He said, "As for messing in with military affairs, I am against it."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

NAVY DEPARTMENT PICKETED BY ILWU LOCAL 10 OF SAN FRANCISCO WITH BANNERS READING "THIS ESTABLISHMENT IS UNFAIR TO LABOR"

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, prior to the war the loading and unloading of Navy ammunition at Mare Island or Port Chicago was handled by civil-service workers, specially trained for the job. During war and immediately following, so much ammunition was handled that regular employees were unable to take care of all of it. The Navy then hired, through the longshoreman's union, some temporary employees to handle this work.

Recently a ship was unloaded at Port Chicago by regular employees. Immediately the union threw a picket line at the United States naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., carrying banners reading "This establishment unfair to labor."

One of the regular workmen sent me a very interesting and shocking letter, which I am including in these remarks, telling about the incident. Incidentally, by using the regular employees, all of whom have been certified by the Civil Service Commission, the saving to the Government on one shipload was $58,000.

This situation is food for thought because here is a private organization picketing the Navy and calling the Navy unfair for handling its work with regular employees selected pursuant to law. In other words, a union is proposing to tell the Navy who they shall hire to unload ammunition, even though by statute the workmen for this job and other Navy work have been provided for and are entirely satisfactory to the Navy.

This is the letter:

UNITED STATES NAVAL MAGAZINE,
Port Chicago, Calif., April 1, 1947.

Hon. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I ask you to come and see for yourself the unbelievable. Picketers patrolling the streets at this station carrying banners, "This establishment unfair to labor." Can any governmental instrumentality be unfair to labor while following the laws of Congress and rules and regulations of civil service?

The picketers in this case are members of the ILWU, Local 10, of San Francisco. Mr. Bulcke, president of this union, has made attacks on the integrity of civil service by calling civil-service workers incompetent. He has, or at least has countenanced the publication of the statement that members of unions employed at this station have been discharged simply because of union affiliations. It goes without saying these statements are utterly untrue and unfounded. In the first instance, all workers used on this station must meet the minimum requirements for their particular jobs as prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. In the second instance, all hands on this station are well aware of the fact that they may continue their particular union affiliations, and are doing so.

Unfortunately, the civil-service workers as a group cannot go out and fight the statements made by this CIO union as a privately employed group might. Who is going to represent us? Our station commanding officer, Capt. John B. Taylor, is doing all he can do officially, but he cannot run paid advertisements in the papers, and we as civil employees cannot band together and raise

funds to tell our side of the story. Solicitation of funds for other than specific purposes is prohibited by the Navy Civilian Personnel Instructions.

Your support as a civil-service employee is requested in this matter. Are you going to stand by and allow the CIO union to drive home the entering wedge on a union shop for civil service? Worse still to think about is the opening gun for a closed-shop drive.

I write to you, for while employed at Mare Island as a foreman I received letters from you that proved to me your great interest in the civil-service system and employee.

THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in a broadcast made over the Mutual Network the morning of April 8, 1947, commentator George Reedy, a veteran Washington correspondent, made the following observations of the importance of the small businessman in our American economy.

I quote:

The large, black, screaming headlines of the day have led many to believe that this is the country of big business. Every paper that we pick up tells us of the blistering fights between huge corporations and huge unions.

In the middle of all this storm and fury, we have tended to forget that this country is based on the small businessman, the American who has a few dollars and is willing to take a few chances. Today his plight often seems to be desperate.

The small businessman, with the end of the war, was caught in a maze of conflicting economic forces. And in the sweep of reconversion from war to peace, he has almost been forgotten. The public eye has been caught by problems of a greater magnitude.

To find out just what his problems are, committees have been set up in both the House and the Senate. These groups are charged with the special duty of helping the small businessman keep his head above the economic waters.

Despite the importance of their work neither committee has had very much publicity. So, in an attempt to learn how they work, I visited the chairman of the House group yesterday.

He is WALTER C. PLOESER, a Missouri Republican, who believes that a flourishing small business is necessary to maintain the liberties of a country. On that theory he is bending every effort to give the little man a break. He has already accomplished a lot. He plans to do much more.

His first problem, paradoxical as it may sound, is to find out just what the problem is. In other words, just what are the needs of small business and how can they best be met. Without the answer to these questions action can only be taken blindly.

It is obvious, of course, that a principal issue is the effect of wartime economic controls over the Nation's small business. Possibly an even more difficult question is the effect of the relaxation of those controls. The committee will cover these subjects intensively.

In many cases the problem of small business is the problem of adequate financing. Even the veteran, with the many benefits guaranteed him by the Government, finds it hard to scrape up the necessary money to get started.

A surprising fact is that a large number of the Nation's 500,000 small businesses are less than 5 years old. The mortality rate has not been high yet. But the prospects for the future are not altogether encouraging.

The purpose of the committee is to make those prospects encouraging. And with any sort of cooperation from his fellow legislators, Mr. PLOESER hopes to be successful. To put it in his own words, he says:

"The committee will endeavor to correct our free, competitive enterprise system so thoroughly that never again will we as a nation be tempted to compromise it with alien theories of dictatorship, monopoly, wasteful spending, and fiscal dishonesty."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Brookville American.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a talk given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, after the disposition of the business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today after the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts has a special interest and a special regret at the passing of Mr. Henry Ford. He bought the historical Wayside Inn at Sudbury which used to be in my district. He was tremendously interested in all the old traditions of the country. He was interested in art in all its forms. The Ford Sunday symphony orchestra is heard by millions. Much has been said about his interest in industry, his contribution to industry. I doubt if so much has been said about his contribution to agriculture. He had some of the finest cattle in the United States. He made splendid contributions to agriculture, and the agricultural fairs in Massachusetts were very proud when he sent his famous pair of oxen.

Those of us whose first ride in an automobile was in a model T Ford and who owned one will never forget that car or the man who made it possible for us to see the country and the world.

All that could pass physically of Mr. Henry Ford is gone, but what he has done for the country will live on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

REPUBLICAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Hannegan-Sullivan high command, aided and abetted by a few so-called newspaper columnists and commentators, continue to snipe at the Republican program and are still using the smoke emerging from the dying, smouldering New Deal fire which the people put out very effectively last November to cloud the issues and attempt to confuse and mislead the people concerning the accomplishments of the House of Representatives during the first 90 days of the new Congress.

Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, writing in the Washington Times-Herald under date of April 8, makes a very able summary of the accomplishments of the House thus far this session. I ask unanimous consent to include this summary in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's paper the President has called the Cabinet in to devise some means, method, or manner to control soaring food prices. It is true that the cost of food is getting out of hand, it is too high; but these same fellows who are asking for the cut today are the fellows who jacked prices up. They asked for subsidies, to support prices; they destroyed food in large quantities to boost prices up. They got subsidies and paid producers to curtail production. They are blowing hot and they are blowing cold. When prices are up they want to put them down. When prices are down they want to put them up. So the rest of us in the meantime find ourselves getting hungry. Production and more production and no Government interference is the answer. High prices of pork and scarcity of fats are directly due to Government interference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as an extension of my remarks

a column by the greatest analyst of the country, Mark Sullivan, which appears in the Philadelphia Inquirer of today. The column deals with this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TODAY

DRIVE TO CUT PRICES; BIG FACTOR IGNORED; FOODSTUFFS TOO HIGH; FOUNDATION OF SPIRAL; UNITED STATES BARS REDUCTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—A score of outgivings about prices—the excessive height of them and the evil and danger of them—came last week from many sources. One was from President Truman, several from business leaders.

The statement of one business leader had the status of a public event. The head of a great department store in New York, J. I. Straus of R. H. Macy & Co., published a full-page advertisement in newspapers. To give it the momentum it deserved and received as a matter of public interest, he called a press conference.

What he said was sound and needed to be said The spirit and content of the advertisement are suggested by two of the headings in it: "Are prices too high? Yes, they are." And "Why prices must come down." This was not said as a prophecy but as meaning that lower prices are an economic necessity, almost a moral one.

Straus dwelt at length and thoughtfully on the factors involved in high prices or affected by them—cost of living, wages, profits, the interest of consumers. He urged upon business the view that increases in industrial efficiency should be turned "into lower prices rather than into additional profits." He said that "the only way we know to retain prosperity * * * is by producing more units at lower prices." He declared that some goods were much overpriced."

But in the several hundred words in Straus' statement, one word was missing. Nowhere was the word "foodstuffs" or its equivalent "farm products." Yet about farm products, foodstuffs, these statements can be made:

Of all prices of all goods the most overpriced, the ones most out of line with other goods and with the past, are farm products, foodstuffs.

Of all prices of all goods the ones that contribute most of the high cost of living are farm products and foodstuffs. For of all expenditures that Americans make the largest proportion is for foodstuffs. They are 40 percent of the cost of living.

Of all prices of all goods the ones that work strongest for inflation are the prices of foodstuffs. For the prices of foodstuffs, because they bulk so large in the cost of living, do most to cause complaint on the part of workers, hence do most to cause demands for higher wages.

If the spiral of inflation is to be broken, the point of attack that is at once most vulnerable and most effective is prices of foodstuffs. So far as the vicious circle can be stated as a sequence, it begins with prices of foodstuffs, which cause high cost of living, which leads to demand for higher wages, which leads to higher prices of manufactured goods, which in turn contributes to still higher cost of living.

Among last week's important outgivings about high prices, one was by President Truman. It was true and it was forceful. He spoke of his "deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today." Warningly, he said "these prices must be brought down." To do this and prevent inflation he said "there is a profound moral responsibility."

So far as Mr. Truman alluded to the fields in which prices are too high, he merely spoke in a generality about unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. Many manufactured articles are too high, and these are the most frequent object of justified attack.

But Mr. Truman made no allusion to prices of farm products and foodstuffs, except as these might be implied in his use of the word "commodities."

That Mr. Truman made no specific allusion to foodstuffs and farm products may not be due to any political self-consciousness about the relation of Government to prices of farm products.

In any event this can be said:

The principal cause of high prices of farm products is Government. Government works directly, with conscious and specific purpose, to prevent prices of farm products from going lower. It is done for many crops and under policies of Government written into statutes.

What Government did last year about one crop, potatoes, is an illustration. The crop was large, the price was certain to fall. To keep the price up, Government bought vast quantities of potatoes. Some it sold at a loss for use in manufacturing alcohol and other products. Some it gave away. Some it left in the ground to rot. All told, about 20,000,000 bushels went to waste completely. The total loss to the Government was $80,000,000.

AMERICAN PROPERTY IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, an AP dispatch from Manila of the date of April 3 states that $623,000,000 worth of American property in the Philippines has been looted and stolen until only $100,000,000 worth is left.

In February 1946 the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments called before it high ranking officers of the Army and the Navy to investigate numerous reports of the loss and destruction of American property in overseas theaters, particularly the Pacific theater. We insisted that this property be disposed of or brought home. These officers agreed to immediately order the return to this country of usable supplies not needed in the foreign theaters. They assured us that orders to this effect were then going out to all overseas commanders.

The Philippines Rehabilitation Act of 1946, in addition to authorizing the appropriation of $400,000,000 to pay war claims in the Philippines, also authorized the transfer to the Philippine Government of $100,000,000 in surplus property. Now it appears we have permitted the theft and destruction of enough property in the Philippine Islands to almost liquidate our one-half-billion-dollar commitment.

Mr. Speaker, this Manila report should be thoroughly investigated. Apparently the Army and the Navy have not carried out their promises to the Congress. All persons guilty of negligence in these particulars should be relieved of their jobs. All persons guilty in any way of any participation in these thefts should be prosecuted to the full limit of the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Make the Names Public."

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials from the Evening Star.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article entitled "The Post-Dispatch Platform."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a 3-cent stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Pulitzer will be placed on sale. This stamp will be the first American postage to bear the likeness of a journalist with the exception of Franklin who has been honored as a statesman rather than as an editor. Ceremonies at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, which Mr. Pulitzer founded, will mark the first day of sale and thereafter the stamps will be available in post offices throughout the country.

This stamp will serve to renew public interest in the career of Joseph Pulitzer. Coming to this country an immigrant from Hungary in 1864, he served in the Civil War. At the end of the war, in his search for employment, he came to St. Louis. There young Pulitzer became a reporter for the Westliche Post, and it was not long before he advanced himself to the position of co-editor of the paper. There he found himself. Newspaper work was not only the means of his livelihood but it became the lifeblood of his existence. Journalism was no longer a trade but became a profession—one of the most important professions in the world. Appropriately the commemorative stamp bears the quotation, "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together," which is an expression of his conviction that a free press and a democratic government are inseparable.

After a decade of successful reporting which led him into politics and many other fields, he bought the St. Louis Dispatch, which was then in financial distress, and merged it with the St. Louis

Post. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was the first of the modern newspapers. It became in his day, and is still, one of the beacons of American journalism. Later he purchased the New York World, which under his leadership shared a common virtue with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—a sincere adherence to the cause of the under dog.

His death in 1911 brought to an end the career of one of our most distinguished journalists. Perhaps there have been more spectacular men who have built newspapers, and perhaps some were more successful in profits and circulation. But Mr. Pulitzer brought to the profession a rare combination of integrity and idealism and the press of the United States is better for his having lived. It is fitting and proper, therefore, to honor him by the issuance of this stamp.

No statement I might make could better describe the character of this man than the platform he left the Post-Dispatch, which is familiar to the readers of that newspaper and which I include as a part of my remarks:

THE POST-DISPATCH PLATFORM

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

APRIL 10, 1907.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, April 16, and on Thursday, April 17, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was asking some of the Members on our side of the House in reference to a bill passed by the Senate regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation buying all the wool in this country and selling it at any price it might see fit. To think of the tariff being reduced on wool when it was made to protect the sheep growers and the wage earner. It is just ridiculous to permit the State Department to reduce tariff on wool, then have the Commodity Credit Corporation buy up all the wool, sell it for any price they want to less than their guaranty price—wrecking the Treasury. Oh, what poor business. Oh, what a sin to our people. Oh, what legislators.

Now, being in the wool-manufacturing business, I like to buy wool as cheap as I can, but when I do that from the CCA I am going to let the Federal Treasury be the goat and be stuck for all that they sell, that is, the difference in the price that they paid for the wool and the price they sell it for. But, we do not have any money to take out of the Treasury. No money to waste. What we want to do is to get the Committee on Ways and Means to insist that this tariff is not going to be reduced. We want to get after the Committee on Ways and Means and tell them that the only thing we can do to protect American industry and American labor is to keep the tariff on the things that we want to support in this country. That is the right and honest way to do it, and I want the Committee on Ways and Means to get busy.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. That power is not in the Committee on Ways and Means. The Congress gave it to the President under the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934.

Mr. RICH. Well, if we have a Republican Congress, we want to take it away from the President. That is the point I want to drive home. It is our business to change that law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a letter and comment on soil conservation and in the other a resolution adopted by the Ninety-third Legislature of Maine.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Tyrrell Krum.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the President is becoming alarmed about the increase in the cost of living and that he is holding a conference at the White House today. May I point out to the Members here and to the Nation that so long as the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, continues to go into the markets all over the United States and buys millions of bushels of wheat and thousands of tons of fats and oils and foodstuffs of every kind, as it has been doing for the past 3 years, and gives it away to all the countries in the world at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, they should understand that the Federal Government, more than any other agency at the present time, is responsible for the soaring of prices which may touch off later a demand for wage increases that will bring about greater inflation dangers than ever before.

The give-away, ship-away policy of the Truman administration is the only real cause of increase in the cost of living.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects and final tribute to my fellow townsman, Henry Ford, who passed on to his heavenly reward Monday, April 7. His unexpected death came as a great shock to a grateful community. A mantle of grief covers the populace of Detroit and of Michigan. Friends and beneficiaries of his great accomplishments the world over mourn his passing.

He had vision, courage, and perseverance that were an inspiration to all who came in contact with him. His faith in the future and his confidence in his fellow man inspired him to plan and project into the distance ahead. He rose higher in the estimation of his country each time he announced another plan or project to benefit humanity.

Henry Ford was a practical idealist who believed in helping his fellow man to help himself. How well he succeeded can be judged by the prosperity of hundreds of thousands of his workers, associates and coordinated industries. The Ford industries under his direction have become the marvel of the age and a paragon in the field of mass production. As Henry Ford grew and prospered so did everyone who worked and associated with him. Men and communities prospered and expanded beyond their most sanguine plans. He planned for permanence with the aid of his late departed son, Edsel, who was a worthy son of a great father. Farsightedly, he passed on into the hands of his grandson, Henry Ford 2d, the great Ford empire, which I am sure, under his guidance, is safe for the future.

I am certain that under the directing genius of Henry Ford 2d the Ford enterprise will continue to expand and prosper to the benefit of the millions of our people.

Today the rugged remains of the great builder and industrialist which housed his noble soul lie resting in serene calm after more than fourscore years of tireless and uninterrupted effort. Henry Ford's work is done. I offer my humble prayer that God will rest his weary soul and that the perpetual light will shine upon him forever.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just called upon the House to make the Committee on Ways and Means go to work. He has evidently some solicitude for the woolen interests of this country, whom he mentioned in his talk. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania should remember that this Congress put itself on record a couple of years ago as not wanting to travel the road of economic isolationism. If we follow the policy suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania we would kill off the export trade of this country, we would have paralysis of the great industrial output of this country, we would suffer a serious business depression, and mass unemployment. History has proven that. The reciprocal trade agreements program has been in operation since 1934, and practically every economist in the country agrees that the more we can have international trade the better it will be for ourselves and for the entire world economy.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am curious to know, and therefore make the inquiry, when we are going to fulfill the promise made to the people of the country last fall with respect to the adoption of sensible and effective labor legislation. I am likewise curious to know if emphasis is to be put upon the adoption of a measure that will accommodate the needs of peace, business, and security in this country, or if emphasis is going to be put upon the writing of a bill mainly political in character. The responsibility that rests upon us is a heavy one. The country is confidently looking to this Congress, with the Republicans now in the majority, to keep faith and fulfill the commitments they made and which the people have the right to expect.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, elaborating somewhat on the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] for early recognition by the Committee on Ways and Means of the situation we are going to face in the postwar days as a result of the type of competition we are bound to face from foreign sources with the industries and the workingmen of this country, it is my fervent hope that the committee will watch this international situation very carefully and see to it that industry and the industries and working people of this country get a square deal.

We are all familiar with what is going on throughout the world today in the setting up of totalitarian governments with their subsidized industries and their desire to expand their world trade even to the great markets of the United States.

We know that unless the situation is watched very carefully by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, we are bound to be sold down the river as we were in 1939 when a segment of the shoe industry in our part of the country nearly succumbed.

LABOR LEGISLATION—THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. A year ago the Congress passed with the help of Members on both sides of the aisle a bill which would have offered a direct answer to the problem with which we are confronted today—the national telephone strike. The bill, when it went to the White House, contained a definite provision for the handling of disputes in public utilities where the rates are fixed by a public body. The Congress offered a specific remedy for the situation and the problem with which the country is faced today. Unfortunately that bill was vetoed.

I am not a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, but I am familiar with the fact, however, that they have been diligently engaged in conducting hearings which were concluded a week or 10 days ago, and that they have been at work drafting a committee bill. It is my unofficial information that within the next few days the results of that labor will be before the House for its consideration. I have confidence that the House, as well as the committee, is going to discharge its responsibility again.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COX. I had no intention of creating the impression that I have the slightest doubt concerning the purposes of the committee that is considering this whole question. I think the committee is all right. I hope other influences will not lay their hands on the committee.

RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to state to my distinguished friend from Pittsburgh that I cannot quite agree with him in his remarks this morning concerning my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It is my opinion that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a sound, clear-thinking, honest patriotic American who is unselfish in his motives and who has no other desire, so far as the reciprocal trade treaties are concerned, other than to protect the economic and industrial life of America and the people who are dependent on it.

At the present time we are $260,000,000,000 in debt. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million so this old ship of state is wallowing now in a sea of bankruptcy. Now, it is proposed that we enter into reciprocal-trade treaties that will wreck the economic and industrial life of the Nation so if we are financially wrecked and industrially wrecked we can all go down together.

So far as the reciprocal-trade treaties are concerned, there are some 76 glass manufacturing plants in the United States. Nineteen of them are in Pennsylvania and eight of them are in my district. They employ in my district some three or four thousand people. If we lower the tariffs on glass bottles and flood this country with cheap glass the result will be that you will wreck the glass bottle container plants, lower the standard of living of the people of my district who are dependent on this industry for their livelihood. I say we are not going to lower the standard of living of the people of our country. If these trade treaties go through it will be at the expense of American labor, and it is time that the Congress of the United States acted accordingly. The Congress elected by the American people to represent them should have the final say on reciprocal-trade agreements.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without authority to speak for anyone, would the gentleman from Georgia permit me to say that if the leadership and the House will accept a bill which the Committee on Labor has written and which will be ready in the coming week, you will for the first time since 1935, when the Wagner Act was passed, have legislation designed to protect the public, the man who does the work, rather than legislation designed to protect the union racketeer or the union official.

The bill which has been agreed upon by a majority of the Republican members of the committee will protect the public interest and the men and women who do the work. It will protect all of the citizens of America and will be fair and equitable to everyone if enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

HIGH PRICE OF FOODSTUFFS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] pointed to the rapidly ascending price of wheat with some great alarm, and indicated it was the exportation of wheat alone which was the cause of the rising price of wheat. The gentleman should have shown his concern last year when the price-control bill was gutted on this floor. As a matter of fact, not only has the price of wheat risen unconscionably but also ham and butter and all other foodstuffs that the American family uses. Many of those foodstuffs are not being exported to foreign stores. Also the profits of corporations and of the sellers of those commodities have doubled and trebled since the price-control law was gutted on this floor. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to consider that point as well as the exportation of foodstuffs to starving people, which incidentally is concurred in by a gentleman whom we all respect, Mr. Hoover, a member of his own party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include my cross-examination of Eric Johnston before the Committee on Un-American Activities on the subject of communistic activities in Hollywood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to join in paying tribute to one of our greatest Americans, Henry Ford, a man of genius unsurpassed, who did more to usher in and develop the motor age than any other man who ever lived. If it had not been for Henry Ford the average American would not be able to ride in an automobile today.

There is one thing characteristically American about Henry Ford's death. I believe it was Oliver Goldsmith who said:

And, as a hare, whom hounds and horns pursue,
Pants to the place from whence at first she flew,
I still had hopes, my long vexations past,
Here to return—and die at home at last.

The thing that struck me most was the statement that Mr. Ford died in the humble home in which I believe he was born, or near the place where he was born and reared, and a strange coincidence of fate had cut off the electricity and the heating system.

This man, who had amassed a fortune, died in his simple home, lighted only with tallow candles and oil lamps and heated only with a wood fire, typical of the simplicity of Henry Ford, one of the greatest Americans this Nation has ever seen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TARIFF ON WOOL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself, primarily, to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. It is true that the Congress authorized the President to reduce tariffs or to raise them for that matter by 50 percent under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that very definite assurances were given at that time both by the Executive and by your Committee on Ways and Means when the matter was before the House that no action would be taken. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that within the last 2 weeks the United States Tariff Commission issued its report after exhaustive study showing that the wool growers of this country are losing 9½ cents on every pound of wool they produce. How in the name of common sense and in the light of that report can the State Department enter into negotiations to reduce the tariff on wool. Yet that is precisely what they propose to do. Our sheep population has dropped from 49,000,000 head in 1943 to 32,000,000 head today. Our production of wool has dropped from 450,000,000 pounds annually to 300,000,000 pounds during the same period. The Army and Navy Munitions Board has declared wool to be a strategic and critical commodity essential for the security of this country, yet we are slowly liquidating that great domestic industry. I think that the Committee on Ways and Means has a distinct duty to call the attention of the State Department to the fact that assurances were given this Congress at the time the act was extended that nothing would be done to impair the condition of agriculture in this country, and we expect that promise to be honored.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It has been called to the attention of the State Department time and time again.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman's committee should bring out a resolution expressing the intent and the will of this Congress that no reduction should be made on the tariff on wool at this time. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is unduly alarmed about the proposal authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stock pile of wool at competitive prices on foreign wool. The duty paid on foreign wool coming into this country amounts to around $100,000,000 per year, and the loss, if any, on the sale of domestic wool, if any, would be negligible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, this is the day for the calling of the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was first called on the Consent Calendar objection was raised to the report accompanying the bill for the reason that it did not conform to the rules of the House by setting forth the changes in existing law. A supplemental report has been filed which conforms to the rule and, therefore, the objection to the consideration of the bill is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act established a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122–1124), as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(A) By striking out the proviso in section 3, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "*Provided*, That whenever the head of any agency shall specify in writing restrictions on the use of examination of records being considered for transfer from his custody to that of the Archivist that appear to him to be necessary or desirable in the public interest, the Archivist shall impose such restrictions on such of the records as are transferred to his custody; and restrictions so imposed shall not be removed or relaxed by the Archivist without the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material shall have been transferred unless the existence of that agency shall have been terminated: *And provided further*, That restrictions on the use or examination of records in the custody of the Archivist heretofore imposed and now in force and effect under the terms of section 3 of the National Archives Act, approved June 18, 1934, shall continue in force and effect regardless of the expiration of the tenure of office of the official who imposed them but may be removed or relaxed by the Archivist with the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material has been transferred or by the Archi-

vist alone if the existence of that agency shall have been terminated."

(B) By inserting after section 6 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6a. Whenever any records the use of which is subject to statutory limitations and restrictions are transferred to the custody of the Archivist of the United States, permissive and restrictive statutory provisions with respect to the examination and use of such records applicable to the head of the agency having custody of them or to employees of that agency shall thereafter likewise be applicable to the Archivist of the United States and to the employees of the National Archives Establishment, respectively."

(C) By inserting after section 8 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8a. Any official of the United States Government who is authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records in his custody is hereby authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records that have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the custody of the Archivist of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING CEILINGS ON WAGES AND ALLOWANCES TO VETERANS UNDERGOING TRAINING ON THE JOB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 246) to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has promised to have a hearing on the bill and I believe a rule will be granted.

It is vital that this legislation be passed quickly. Many veterans have had to give up their training because there was a ceiling on the amount of money they could secure in the colleges, also in on-the-job training. Many have had to give up the training because the ceilings were not raised. I think that when the House understands the bill there will be absolutely no objection to it. That is why I have asked that it go over without prejudice.

I also ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks at this point a very fine article by Catherine Coyne, of the Boston Herald, who speaks of the plight of one family, and the difficulties they are having in trying to continue. Whether they will make it or not is problematical. The veterans started their training under different legislation. It was unfair to pass the bill which became law last summer. It should be repealed. It was a stab in the back. Many Members of Congress during the recent elections pledged themselves to repeal that unjust law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to extend her remarks in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

VETERAN FAMILIES AT HARVARD FIGHTING FROM NEW FOX HOLES

(By Catherine Coyne)

That brave new world everyone talked about during the war years still seems a long way off to many veterans studying at Harvard University. The fox holes they dug in the volcanic ash of Iwo Jima or in the snow of the Ardennes have been replaced by psychological fox holes into which fighters-turned-students have crawled for their battle for a better way of life.

It is a battle. Go into any one of the temporary yellow houses in those Cambridge rows, such as Jarvis Court, and you will sense the atmosphere of battle—the gay, high courage, the dogged determination that defies weariness, and the hard concentration on optimism.

A few have quit the battle. More will surrender because they are stalled by lack of funds.

Myles and Marguerite Boylan wearily confessed yesterday that if they could get a house with one of the several jobs put in their way, they would snap it up. As things are now, however, they will struggle on through another year until Myles gets his degree in city planning.

Many Americans have had the mistaken idea that students studying under the GI bill of rights are completely subsidized. Even some of the students themselves thought that $90-a-month subsistence allowance for married veterans would carry them and their families while they acquired their education. Most of those who tried out that theory gave up long ago.

Myles and Marguerite Boylan knew it couldn't be done. They planned on that $90, of course, to eke what they felt they could earn while he prepared to plan cities of the future.

While he concentrated on his degree thesis, she undertook the task of planning, with the desperate urgency of a military strategist, how to stretch out that GI allowance with her small salary as a part-time teacher and the $110 a month her husband is able to earn on the side to cover the costs of living.

The struggle was intensified by their determination not to abandon any of the insurance commitments they undertook while Boylan was a Naval Reserve officer. After all, they had the future of their children—4-year-old Gerald and 3-year-old Ann—to consider.

"We have no real complaints," Mrs. Boylan said. "It's been a difficult winter, however, partly because the cost of food has skyrocketed, but primarily because we've had so much sickness. We'd get along if only we could remain healthy."

MRS. BOYLAN TEACHES

"I haven't any gripes," her husband said. But there was a look of discontent on his serious face. "It's just that I can't see the fairness of the Government putting such a low limit on what we can earn on the side. Sure, I know there were some taking advantage of the Government, but I feel they were few in number.

"I could work for a Boston architectural firm without interfering with my studies," he explained. "But the Government stipulation is that my gross income—not my net, after deduction for taxes—cannot be in excess of $200. That means, I'm limited to earning $110 on the side."

They tried living on that $200, but they couldn't do it. Mrs. Boylan took a job as part-time teacher of French and mathematics in a private school, which provided the family with another $90 a month, less taxes, of course.

Living costs and insurance total between $300 and $350 a month for the Boylans. They can get by on $250, but that amount makes no provision for clothes cleaning, shoe repair, newspapers or for what Boylan described as an occasional splurge necessary for the maintenance of their equilibrium.

That splurge takes the form of an infrequent movie, perhaps; or a better selection of meat after the monotony of the cheapest cuts week after week; or bacon for a rare, scrumptuous breakfast. The Boylans justify that bacon—about a half a pound a month—by pointing out the bacon fat makes a good substitute for expensive shortening.

Things were going along fairly smoothly until after Christmas. Then the children got colds, one after another. Mrs. Boylan became ill—the doctor said it was physical and nervous exhaustion. She became well again, but the family savings, carefully accumulated during years of separation during the war for a home of their own, began to disappear.

According to their present schedule, they can keep going until a year from June. By then, their savings will have been exhausted.

They were grateful to Harvard for its cooperation with these fighters seeking education. They have a three-bedroom apartment, with a large general room for cooking, dining, and living, which costs them $35 a month. This is heated by an oil space-heater. Cooking is done on two electric plates. Mrs. Boylan does the family laundry with an electric washing machine, bought on the installment plan, to save high laundry costs.

Their experience is fairly typical of the married students with children. Some have better backlogs of savings. Some have an even more precarious existence.

Up the street, pretty Mrs. Jacob Lynch stopped rearranging her baby's room long enough to admit that without the savings of the war years, when she worked while her husband fought in the Pacific, living and studying at Harvard probably would have been impossible.

"We're living on those savings now," she said.

Little Jerry Lynch, who is almost a year old, gurgled with glee to attract attention. He was sticking out his chest with show-off pride.

"And, of course," she said, with a giggle at her baby, "Grandma comes through again and again, now with gifts of food and every now and again with clothes for the baby. We'll make it."

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Is there objection?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—I do not know whether she was here this morning or not when I informed the membership of it—that a discharge petition was filed on the Speaker's desk today. In view of this fact I would rather see the gentlewoman modify her request and ask that the bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York would rather have the bill stricken from the Consent Calendar? The bill was introduced by the gentleman from New York and passed with an amendment. It passed the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously. He always works tirelessly for the veterans. The House

knows his gallant and distinguished war record.

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to modify my request if that is agreeable to the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York should make it plain that he is not speaking about a petition to discharge the Veterans' Committee, but the Committee on Rules.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think the House realizes that, but I would like to have that definitely understood at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported the bill out unanimously. The committee is very anxious to have the bill pass the Congress at once. Delay is unjust.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESERVING THE CONTINUITY OF RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES FOR NATURALIZATION PURPOSES IN THE CASES OF ALIEN RESIDENTS WHO DEPARTED FOR SERVICE IN ALLIED ARMED FORCES DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2032) to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to interrogate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] in reference to this bill. May I ask him whether or not a report of the Justice Department has been given in connection with it?

Mr. MASON. Yes. This bill is the same bill practically as H. R. 513 which was passed by the House last year and which did have a report from the Attorney General giving full approval to it. I read from that report:

> This bill is identical with legislation which was introduced at my request and favorably reported by the committee on February 25. Accordingly, I recommend the enactment of the bill.

Then he stated that the Bureau of the Budget has been consulted and the report approved.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I am thinking of some Italians who were drafted by Mussolini. They went over to Italy, they fought in the Italian war against the French and against the Americans. Now they want to come back to this country as good American citizens. If this bill is going to permit those fellows to come back, I do not want any part of it.

Mr. MASON. The bill absolutely and unequivocably does not cover that type of person. It only covers those who left here in order to join up with our Allied armies between 1939 and 1941, when we got into the war, to protect their residence for naturalization purposes and only those who fought with our allies and with us are covered by the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 307 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1142; 8 U. S. C. 707), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:
>
> "(e) The continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes shall not be considered as having been interrupted by the action of an alien who was a lawful permanent resident of the United States in departing from the United States (1) after September 1, 1939, and before December 7, 1941, for the purpose of serving in, and if he was honorably discharged from, the armed forces of a foreign country at war with a country which declared war on the United States, or (2) on or after December 7, 1941, with the consent of his local draft board, the Director of the Selective Service System, or the appropriate military or naval authorities of the United States if the alien had been inducted, for the purpose of serving in, and if he was honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the country of his allegiance, such country being at war with a country at war with the United States: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only to those aliens who return to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year from the date of the enactment of this subsection and are lawfully readmitted into the United States as immigrants."

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "declared war on" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thereafter declared war on or was at war with."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION OF PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask those who are advocating the enactment of this proposal whether or not it is intended by the bill or by amendment thereto to change the present operation of the farm that is operated by the Navy at Annapolis?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. No. It has no relationship to any farm at Annapolis, but pertains to farms at Puerto Rico and Trinidad, in the Caribbean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 624), is hereby repealed.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Strike out the last word and substitute the following in lieu thereof: "amended to read as follows:
>
> "'SEC. 2. After the termination of the present war the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm for which appropriations made available by this act are used shall be accomplished, insofar as practicable, through the instrumentality of a private contractor, lessee, or operator, with or for the Government, and to this end the Secretary of the Navy shall make reasonable effort to enter into said contract, lease, or agreement with a person, partnership, or association in civil life for his or its services upon terms advantageous to the Government for such management, operation, maintenance, and improvement before employing naval or Marine Corps personnel for that purpose: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Navy as to reasonableness of effort to enter into such contract, lease, or agreement, and as to the advantageous nature of the terms thereof shall be final.'"

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, perhaps a brief explanation of the purpose of this amendment is advisable at this time to clear up any misunderstanding or doubt that may exist in the minds of interested members regarding the purpose and effect of the amendment.

In connection with the acquisition of a military site at Trinidad, which was a part of the exchange of destroyers negotiated with Great Britain in 1940, the United States Navy Department acquired a tract of land of some 3,000 acres which, though a part of the larger Naval Establishment, was a tropical citrus farm or plantation. The military use of that area was such as not to seriously interfere with the agricultural operation of the area but was an essential military use.

Subsequently the Navy came to the Committee on Naval Affairs seeking legislation to permit the Navy to operate that farm by its own personnel. The Navy Committee through a subcommittee made an investigation and came to the conclusion that if the Navy Department fully performed its job of running an effective Navy and was not expected to branch out into agricultural and agrarian pursuits, the Navy would have accomplished its public mission. Therefore, the Committee on Naval Affairs disapproved the bill authorizing the Navy to go into the farming business.

However, since we at that time were at war—the continuance of the operation of this farm and other similar truck-garden areas in the south Pacific islands was a part of the war operation—the Congress did put a limitation on the authorization given to the Navy that that authority should terminate with the war. Now the Navy comes again to Congress seeking to remove that limitation which was imposed back there 3 or 4 years ago by giving the Navy full authority to operate any areas that it may have under its jurisdiction located outside of the United States for agricultural purposes. No one disputes or questions the necessity or the desirability of obtaining fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, eggs, meats, and citrus fruits for our military people, but to have

that work done by naval personnel seems altogether unnecessary and unreasonable and uneconomical.

A striking illustration of the ill-advisedness of having the work done by the Navy is one which I noticed in the most recent visit I made to the Trinidad plantation 2 or 3 years ago. The Navy man in charge of this 3,000-acre farm, for which the Government has paid around $200,000, and which we are trying to operate on a profitable oasis, was a very junior officer of the Navy, who had been trained by the Navy in radio technology. It is unthinkable and not to be expected that a Navy man should know how to operate a farm profitably or economically.

The purpose of the amendment I have offered is to require the Secretary of the Navy to endeavor to obtain this work through private contract either by lease, by management contract, or by some contractual arrangement by which the influences of private enterprise will be applied to the operation of the farms. After the Secretary has made a reasonable effort to have that work done by private enterprise and has failed, then the Navy is authorized to go ahead and use public funds for the farming business.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the gentleman, the purpose of his amendment is to give an alternative method of operating those plantations.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is to require an alternative method, but in the event of inability to pursue that alternative method the Navy is authorized to go ahead and operate the area.

Mr. BROOKS. Has the Navy passed upon the amendment? Is it acceptable to the Navy?

Mr. COLE of New York. As far as I know, the Navy still wants to be farmers, but I can assure the gentleman that from my own standpoint I still want the Navy to be sailors, not farmers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment although I believe it is the best part of valor to accept it, because the gentleman from New York is going to object to the bill anyway. I am given to understand that the Navy does object very strongly on the ground of security to having any private operation on this farm. There is one thing we must keep in mind, that these two farms, at Trinidad, and San Juan, Puerto Rico, returned a profit of $10,000 from their operations as of the first of January of this year.

In the area there is no fresh fruit available. There are no fresh vegetables available. The funds that are given for what we call naval subsistence are being used for this purpose. There is a very extraordinary situation in that area as far as the availability of fresh foods is concerned. The Navy firmly believes that they ought to be permitted to continue on these farms as they have in the past. With all the magazines and other naval facilities in that area, they look with some disfavor on the private operation of the farms, for the reason, first of all, that the whole area is plowed up, with ditches running all over it, which makes it impracticable to have large-scale operations. Further, the fact that they have been able to operate these farms at a profit of $10,000 since they have begun shows that they are doing a fairly good job and serving the purpose of getting fresh fruits and vegetables, eggs and chickens that they cannot get unless they are given permission to operate these farms that they have developed on this land that was leased for 99 years from the British Government during the war period.

I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I am sorry the gentleman offered it as the Navy does not approve it. Under its provisions, the Secretary of the Navy must make a reasonable effort to enter into a contract, but his word is final as to the reasonableness of his effort and the advantages to the Navy. As long as the gentleman from New York has those provisions in the amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from New York. There is no possibility of the amendment having anything to do with the operations within the continental United States?

Mr. COLE of New York. No. I endeavored to convey that answer to the gentleman in my discussion of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was quite sure the gentleman did, but I wanted the answer in the RECORD in such a way that there can be no question in the mind of anyone about it.

Mr. COLE of New York. The statute this bill seeks to amend applies only to areas under the Navy Department located outside the continental United States; therefore, very definitely this does not apply to the Annapolis operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, we accept the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. My only reason for asking for the division is that the gentleman from Massachusetts made the statement that he personally is opposed to such an amendment. I should like to have an expression from the House. Therefore, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION OF NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1369) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 494), is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the following words: "to serve during any national emergency declared by him to exist, including the present limited emergency."

With the following committee amendments:

That the following new section be added:

"SEC. 2. The act entitled 'An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties,' approved December 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 1224), as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) By striking from the title thereof the words 'during national emergencies';

"(b) By striking the first sentence from the last paragraph of section 2 thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties,' approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1 of the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the phrase "including citizens of the Philippine Islands who are members of the naval service at the time independence of the Philippine Islands becomes effective," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "including citizens of the Philippine Islands who were in the naval service on July 4, 1946, or, who having been discharged from the naval service on or prior to this date, reenlisted therein subsequent thereto but before the expiration of 90 days following discharge."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "this" and insert "that."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "90 days" and insert "3 months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 534, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1564) to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 363) to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946, Public Law 534, Seventy-ninth Congress, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong., be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill, or other shipping document, of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which and to which such shipment was made."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1564) was laid on the table.

FORT WAYNE MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2183) providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Wayne Military Reservation is located in my district. When this matter first was brought to my attention by the Mayor Edward Jefferies and president Edwards of the Common Council of the City of Detroit there seemed to be some misunderstanding between the National Guard and the city as to its use and disposition. I was informed that the matter was discussed also with Senator FERGUSON, who in all likelihood would prepare a bill. I said if that were the case I would withhold the introduction of a bill favoring the transfer of the property to the city of Detroit or such portion of it as could be agreed upon between the War Department and the city of Detroit. I stated, however, that in order to expedite the passage of the bill, it would be wise to introduce a companion bill in the House with no difference in the phraseology or conditions in order that it might forestall the possibility of a conference between the two Houses. I informed the mayor that if he would tell the junior Senator from my State that if and when the bill was prepared he would notify me I would introduce a bill to that effect on this side of the Capitol. I was assured that would be done. I have not heard about it until the bill was before the committee. However, precedent to that I did talk to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a member of the Armed Services Committee, and explained to him my interest in the favorable consideration of this bill. The interest of the city of Detroit and the War Department, I am certain, are carefully protected in this bill, but what I want the RECORD to show, and I would like to have some assurance, particularly from my colleague from the Fourteenth District of Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD], that this thing happened as he assured me at the time, without any collusion or understandings that were outside the customary procedure and the ordinary observation of courtesies between Members. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if that is true.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Does the gentleman raise objection?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not raising any objection. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. This was brought before me by the mayor of the city of Detroit. It was supposed to be a companion bill. So far as I know, two amendments had to be placed on this bill in order that it be passed. Otherwise the War Department would not give a favorable report. So I explained the situation to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and I would like the explanation I gave him placed in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. I just wanted the RECORD to show that this matter was not any unusual or collusive procedure; that it was without any manipulation whatsoever. I do not want to be placed in the light of being derelict in my duties.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I might say to my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that I introduced the bill in good faith at the request of Mayor Jeffries and other city officials who called at my office. In doing so, I had in mind the ethics of Congress established by custom and practice, and I assure the gentleman that there was no manipulation, politically or otherwise, on my part. I recognize the need of this property for use by the city, and, as I previously stated, I sponsored the bill at the request of these responsible Detroit officials and did so only with the interests of the city of Detroit in mind.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does this bill call for the War Department giving land to the city of Detroit or are they going to buy it?

Mr. DINGELL. No. A portion of it is given to the city of Detroit for public purposes. It is a small area that is hemmed in by industries, and for all practical purposes it will never make a useful military site.

Mr. RICH. Is the land valuable?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, doubtless riverfront property in the city of Detroit will have some value, but it will be of more value for public purposes than to remain idle and to be maintained by the Federal Government. If it is taken off the hands of the War Department and put to public use, there will be material savings as far as the War Department is concerned. The bill has within it ample provision to protect the War Department, as I am sure the chairman and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will testify, to protect the interests of the United States Government. So, meantime, I assume the bill provides merely a sort of trusteeship of the property until such time as it may be needed by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say with reference to this matter that it came before the committee in the regular course and was heard like any other bill. It was explained to the committee that the surplus property there had very great historical value and that if it were turned over to the city it would not injure the Army in any way. It would save the Army money. Actually, it would accomplish a very fine public purpose if it were used as a park in the city of Detroit. I am glad the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is in favor of the bill. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I desire to confirm what has been said, especially by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. This property not only has a very fine value for park purposes but it also has a value in that they can use the barracks for housing purposes in the city of Detroit, and the hospital that is within the fort for hospital purposes. In addition to that, it will preserve a very historic shrine, and also strengthen that bond of friendship that exists between the United States and Canada, in removing one of those border forts that exists in an expanse of 3,000 miles.

I hope the bill will be passed without any objection whatever.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD], who introduced this measure, both on the measure and on the manner in which he produced his witnesses before the committee and the subcommittee, the mayor of Detroit, and the common council.

I may say that this bill emanated from one of our subcommittees headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], one of the best lawyers in the House of Representatives. The entire matter was thoroughly investigated by the committee. There was complete unanimity of opinon everywhere along the line, and it was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Detroit, Mich., that portion of land constituting the Fort Wayne Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the city of Detroit shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", insert "without compensation."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "right", insert "without paying compensation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the statement I had reference to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PAY OF CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN OF SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill would result in an annual cost to the Treasury of $1,300,000. There does not seem to be any great shortage of applicants for the Academies. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee exactly what the need is for passing the bill at the present time?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The fact is that there has been no increase in the allowances for cadets at the Military and Naval Academies since prior to World War I, I believe, not since 1907.

It has been shown that the allowances to the young men at the Academies is so low that it is not sufficient for them to save enough money during the 4 years of their attendance at the Academy with which to purchase uniforms to become second lieutenants, or ensigns, as the case may be. At the present time it is requisite and mandatory for those young men to buy their first set of uniform to become officers.

The purpose of the bill is merely to equalize the allowances between the two services and to raise it to such an amount that the cadets and midshipmen will have enough saved up at the end of their 4 years of training to be reasonably expected to buy their own uniforms.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. Ordinarily when a person is commissioned in the Army or the Navy he receives an allowance for uniforms. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is after he becomes an officer of the Army.

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They do not become officers until after graduation.

Mr. KEAN. Then would they not have this uniform allowance?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Not with which to buy their first set of uniforms.

All of the boys who go to the Academies do not come from wealthy families. It is assumed that they should be able to save from their allowances a sufficient sum by graduation to buy a set of uniforms to become an officer. These boys must purchase their uniforms out of the allowance we give them.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Government spends $19,000 during the 4 years one of these boys goes to one of the academies. That is what it costs the United States Government per man to educate a young man at either of the academies. They receive this splendid free education for a life's profession. Certainly the least he can do is to buy his uniform.

By not passing this bill we can save a million dollars. We have got to save every penny we can. We are not taking anything from that boy by not passing this bill. He is getting a $19,000 education paid for by the Federal Government. He ought to be willing to go out and work and save some of his money to buy his uniforms. I do not think it is a practical thing to do under present conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman modify his request and ask that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF TECHNICAL ERRORS IN ACT APPROVED AUGUST 13, 1936 (PUBLIC LAW 729, 79TH CONG., 2D SESS.)

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "6 (a)" in paragraph (a) of section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "(a) of section 6."

(b) Insert a comma between the second occurrence of the word "work" and the word "and" in clause (1) of paragraph (b) of section 3.

(c) Strike out the first occurrence of the word "and" and substitute in lieu thereof a comma in clause (2) of paragraph (b) of section 3.

(d) Strike out the word "part" wherever occurring in section 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(e) Strike out the word "part" in section 5 and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(f) Insert between the letter "(a)" and the word "Midshipmen" in subsection (a) of section 6 the following: "1."

(g) Strike out "section 3 (a)" in the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph (a) of section 3."

(h) Strike out "section 3 (b)" in paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph (b) of section 3"; and in the same said paragraph strike out the word "part" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(i) Insert a comma between the second occurrence of the word "year" and the word "and" in subsection (d) of section 6.

(j) Amend section 7 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Any officer commissioned under paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6 or under subsection (b) of section 6 may, upon his own application, after not less than 15 months or 2 years, respectively, of satisfactory service as a commissioned officer, have his commission in the Regular service terminated and be commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve, and in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be released from active duty. The date of rank in such commission in a reserve component shall be the same as that of the commission previously held in the Regular service."

(k) Strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" in section 8 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6."

(l) Strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" in subsection (a) of section 9 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6."

(m) Strike out "subsection 1 of section 6 (a)" in the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 9 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6." In the same said first sentence strike out "section 6 (b)" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "subsection (b) of section 6."

(n) Strike out "subsection 9 (a)" in section 10 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "subsection (a) of section 9."

(o) Amend section 16 to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) The President may appoint annually 75 midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel.

"(b) The act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows: 'There shall be allowed at the United States Naval Academy 5 midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and from the District of Columbia, 160 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, and 160 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and

Marine Corps Reserve by the Secretary of the Navy under similar conditions so far as applicable as prescribed by law for appointments from enlisted men of the Navy.'"

(p) Strike out the word "not" in section 19. Substitute the word "and" in lieu of the word "nor" in the same said section.

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall be effective from August 13, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO GRANT TO SAN DIEGO A RIGHT-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 231) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant to the city of San Diego, Calif., upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, a right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, operation, and repair of a water pipe line or lines within a strip of land 50 feet in width and 2,650 feet in length, more or less, which strip traverses land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF LUGERT-ALTUS IRRIGATION PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 797) to change the name of the Luget-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1556) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands whether or not the presentation of this bill may be interpreted to mean that the committee does not expect to report any bills providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims generally? This bill is limited to suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims in the Territory of Alaska. In the past few years we have been told this suspension of annual assessment work should be discontinued in order that miners might know whether their claims were in good standing or not and that locators might know where they stood in locating new claims, but the waiver of the requirement for annual work has been carried through one pretext or another, the war, the depression or whatnot.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and received very careful consideration by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and again by the full committee. It has the approval of the Department of the Interior, and was unanimously supported by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the gentleman from Arkansas has already asked that it go over without prejudice, to which I have no objection, but I was hoping that we might know whether or not this is in the nature of an exception and whether the people who are interested in mining claims in the States should be told to plan to do their assessment work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the second bill in succession reported by the Committee on Public Lands as to which requests have been made that be passed over without prejudice. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members of the House that the present Committee on Public Lands is made up of six former legislative committees. The committee is divided into five subcommittees and they have been working every day in the week except Sunday. Sometimes two or three committees are working at the same time. Over 200 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee. I have no objection to the request that a bill go over without prejudice, but I do think the committee is entitled to know the reason for the request.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, my request to pass the bill over without prejudice came about by the fact that my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] was assigned to study this bill, but he is not present today. I have not had the opportunity to look at it as closely as I should, but after the discussion and discussing it with my colleague from Colorado and others I now understand the purpose of the bill, and therefore I withdraw my request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object because I have no particular concern about what happens to the mining claims in Alaska. If there is some reason for continuing the suspension of work there, well and good. I would object, however, if this was setting a precedent, however, to continue suspension of assessment work in the States generally. When the suspension question has come up in recent years, the Committee on Mines and Mining, which is now absorbed in the Committee on Public Lands, has been saying, "We are not going to do this any more," and Members have been advised to tell the claim holders that they should prepare to do their assessment work again. But as I say, because of the depression or the war this waiver has been extended from year to year. Now, we ought to keep faith, I think, with the people who have been told that and not suspend the assessment work any further on claims in the States unless there is some exceptional or extraordinary circumstance connected with it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to my colleague from South Dakota that there was a bill before the Committee on Public Lands to suspend the assessment work on mining claims in the continental United States and also in Alaska. There was some objection raised at the time to the suspension of assessment work on claims in the continental United States, and consequently a new bill was drawn that granted that right solely to mining claims in Alaska. I might say on behalf of the bill that the evidence disclosed that it was practically impossible at the present time to get the help in Alaska to do the assessment work, and the committee felt that for one more year this privilege should be extended to the owners of mining claims in Alaska.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Wyoming has given the information I desire, and therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the Territory of Alaska, until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1948: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1948, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES TO PRISON INMATES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1999) to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I point out that this bill, while technically it does not amend existing law, actually the effect of it is to amend existing law. Under present law inmates in our prison institutions are given certain deductions for good behavior and for certain types of work. This bill would include other types of work for which credit or allowances against the penalty or sentence could be made. If the bill amended existing law the rules of the House would require that the changes which this bill makes in existing law be shown in the report. Since the bill actually does not change existing law, the rules of the House do not make that requirement, but the effect so far as the Members of the House are concerned, is the same.

I, for the moment, would ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, solely for the purpose of calling attention to the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees of the House that where bills have the effect of amending existing law but actually or technically do not, at least the spirit of the Ramseyer rule should be observed and the report show the change that is made by the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the rule to which reference has been made does not require, where there is not in fact a change in the existing law, that the existing law be set out. The exact, factual situation is set forth in this report which is submitted. I want to call that to the attention of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to divide the trust funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the joint credit of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., including the unexpended balance of the treaty funds arising under section 12 of the act of June 7, 1897 (30 Stat. 93), between the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe, crediting one-half of the total amount to a trust fund account for each tribe: *Provided*, That in dividing the funds there shall be taken into consideration in determining the amount to be credited to each tribe the outstanding loans made from joint trust funds to the Indians of each tribe.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized and directed to establish a trust fund account for each tribe and to make such transfer of funds on the books of his department as may be necessary to effect the purpose of section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That interest earned at the rate of 4 percent per annum shall be credited to the principal trust fund accounts established by this section: *Provided further*, That all future revenues derived from the Wind River Reservation under existing law shall be divided in accordance with section 1 of this act and credited to the trust fund accounts established herein.

SEC. 3. That notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, one-third of the trust funds credited to the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe by this act shall be available for expenditure or for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or such official as may be designated by him, and the other two-thirds of said trust fund shall be paid semiannually, on the 1st day of September and the 1st day of March each year, per capita, to the individual members of said tribes.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 17, after "That", insert "for a period of 5 years from and after the enactment of this legislation."

Page 3, at the end of the bill insert ": *Provided, however*, That said per capita payment shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such members unless the tribal council of such member shall consent thereto in writing, except as to reimbursable Treasury loans made to individual members of either tribe which may be due to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: Strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the trust funds credited to the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe, respectively, under the provisions of this act, shall be available for expenditure or for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or such official as may be designated by him: *Provided*, That two-thirds of said trust funds as initially established, and two-thirds of all sums credited thereto during a period of 5 years from and after the enactment of this act, shall be paid on the 1st day of September and the 1st day of March each year, per capita, to the individual members of said tribes, and any sums distributed per capita out of the funds described in section 1 of this act on or after April 1, 1947, shall be taken into consideration in determining the sums to be distributed under this proviso to the same effect as if this act had been in force on and after April 1, 1947: *Provided further*, That said per capita payments shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of the members of said tribes unless the tribal council of such member shall consent thereto in writing, except as to reimbursable Treasury loans made to individual members of either tribe which may be due to the United States, and except as to irrigation charges owed by individual Indians to the United States, but this latter exception shall not become operative until a report upon irrigation charges within the Wind River irrigation project has been made and becomes effective in accordance with the act of July 1, 1932 (ch. 369, 47 Stat. 564)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTODIANS WHO NEGLIGENTLY SUFFER PRISONERS TO ESCAPE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently suffer prisoners in their custody to escape.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish someone would explain how broad that liability is.

Mr. KEATING. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman may I say that the present law makes it a criminal offense voluntarily to allow a prisoner to escape from custody. However, a case arose here in the District where a couple of prisoners were held on a murder charge and they got to playing cards with the guards and escaped through the alleged negligence of the guards. The guards, however, could not be prosecuted because it was not an intentional and a willful case. It has been held in Zimmerman against United States that the section relating to voluntary escape has no application to a negligent escape. It is in view of that decision that this bill has been introduced and has been passed in the Senate in exactly this form.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have in mind a prison break at the Rock in San Francisco where it was charged that some of the guards were negligent and as a result the prisoners overpowered them. Would that kind of case be covered by your amendment to the law?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. If it was held in an appropriate prosecution that the guards were negligent, they would be subject to the penalty provided in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then, in the trial of a man for the violation of this statute, the jury would determine whether he was negligent under all the circumstances.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill in any way apply to a State-enforcement official?

Mr. KEATING. It only has relation to Federal prisoners.

Mr. BROOKS. Could it be construed in any way to cover a State-enforcement official who in the course of his duties negligently releases a prisoner?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; if he had in custody a Federal prisoner, then it would apply to him, as I read the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. It would not apply to a State prisoner in any way?

Mr. KEATING. Not to a State prisoner, no. The process under which he has been taken into custody must have issued under the laws of the United States.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill in its relation to court-martial prisoners?

Mr. KEATING. I should assume that prisoners in custody under court martial, if they are under military custody, would be governed by the Articles of

War, but if they are turned over to the custody of a Federal enforcement official, such as a marshal, then I assume this section would apply to them.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that explanation is satisfactory as applied to enlisted men charged with custody of court-martial prisoners.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the apprehension entertained by the gentleman is unfounded. The bill is aimed at the gross negligence of Federal officials such as marshals and deputy marshals.

Mr. MACKINNON. I believe it may go further than that and apply to enlisted men who are charged with custody of prisoners committed to confinement by a military or naval court. In those circumstances the enlisted men are not professional jailers, their security facilities are not the best and the prisoners are allowed considerable freedom on the base or station. I believe the bill might apply to them.

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not think so.

Mr. MACKINNON. From my reading of the bill I believe it would apply to such situations.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am sure the gentleman has read the bill, but I believe he is wrong.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the explanation is satisfactory. The bill may not apply to such situations when we examine the provisions of other laws, but until the House can be assured on that point, I believe we should pass it. Therefore, in order to permit the House to be correctly informed on that particular point, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2109) to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In case of through service by air carriers and common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, it shall be the duty of the carriers parties thereto to establish just and reasonable rates, fares, or charges and just and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices affecting such rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service thereunder, and if joint rates, fares, or charges shall have been established with respect to such through service, just, reasonable, and equitable divisions of such joint rates, fares, or charges as between the carriers participating therein."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "sentence" and insert "and third sentences," and on page 2, line 4, after the period and before the quotation marks insert the following: "Any air carrier, and any common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, which is participating in such through service and joint rates, fares, or charges, shall include in its tariffs, filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board or the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the case may be, a statement showing such through service and joint rates, fares, or charges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2086) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 516) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator through the Public Buildings Administration be, and is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the use of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the property designated as square 173 in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Daughters of the American Revolution agree to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *Provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise and contract for the work necessary to connect with the Government mains and to receive payment from the Daughters of the American Revolution by the transfer of funds in advance to cover the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses: *And provided further*, That there shall be no liability on the part of the Government on account of any damages that may accrue hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2086) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SATURDAY LEAVE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1636) to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to the application of such section to rural carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 547 for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title "Annual Leave":

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That only 4 days' continuous leave shall be necessary to permit the exclusion of Saturday as a charge against the carriers' leave when a holiday falls within the period of the leave."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect February 1, 1947.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain the provisions of this bill. In 1945 this House passed Public Law 134. Section 6 of that law provides that postmasters and employees shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year, and sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days a year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative.

Thereafter, on or about February 1 of this year, an opinion was rendered by the Comptroller General in which he holds that the provisions of this section 6 shall not apply to rural mail carriers. According to that opinion, rural mail carriers would be deprived of the benefits of section 6 of Public Law 134.

H. R. 1636 and S. 547 simply provide in clear and distinct language that our rural mail carriers shall be provided the same benefits of Public Law 134 as was intended by the Congress when that law was passed.

It will entail no further expenditure of moneys and has the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget. I think H. R. 1636 makes the intent of Congress in this matter more clear than S. 547. For that reason I offer an amendment to the Senate bill, to include the provisions of H. R. 1636, making it unquestionable and clear that our rural mail carriers shall benefit by the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 134. I will read the provisions of H. R. 1636 and ask that they be annexed to S. 547 as an amendment.

That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title "Annual Leave":

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or 4 days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of February 1, 1947.

There is no objection to this amendment or to the bill by the Department or the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title 'Annual Leave':

" 'The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or 4 days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of February 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING THE AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1888) to incorporate the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is one of the very few instances where the Congress enacts a charter for a semipublic or nonprofit corporation. To the best of my recollection, this is the first instance of such a charter being approved for an organization composed of veterans of this war.

My reason for rising is to inquire of the Committee on the Judiciary if it has formulated any more or less flexible policy with regard to the issuance of Federal charters for veterans' organizations which might serve as a guide to other applicant organizations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, is here. I believe he is ready to make some statement.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the committee has no definite policy yet formulated with respect to this matter. It intends to and does consider each application on its merits. Naturally we must be satisfied after a very full examination that the purposes of the organization are sound, that its membership is representative of the group for which it seeks a charter, and that it is wholly patriotic and altruistic in its make-up. We have made that investigation in the present instance and feel that the organization has grown to the point in strength and suitability where its recognition is fully justified.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I introduced this same bill in the last Congress after carefully investigating this organization, the American Veterans of World War II. We are merely doing for them what we did for the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. This is an organization comprised exclusively of veterans of World War II. I hope the gentleman will not object to it.

Mr. COLE of New York. I shall not, of course, object, but there are a number of bills pending before the Judiciary Committee for the incorporation of other veterans' organizations, and it was for the purpose of the RECORD and the information of the public through the RECORD that I thought it advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to make an expression of its general policy with regard to applications of this sort.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not on the Judiciary Committee, but it is my experience that the Judiciary Committee considers and passes on each one of these bills on its merits.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Judiciary Committee—he may have answered it, but I would like it to be very clear. As I understand it, this is not intended to preempt the field of veterans' organizations representing World War II veterans. It will still be possible for other veterans' organizations representing World War II veterans which can qualify within the definition given by the gentleman from New Jersey also to get a charter?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I cannot, of course, speak for the other members of the committee, Mr. Speaker, but I can answer the precise question as to whether this preempts the field. My answer to that definitely is "No." Neither does it set a precedent for the granting of any other charter. Each one will have to be considered on its own merits.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill which will incorporate the American Veterans of World War II because of the worthy purposes for which this organization was founded and also because many of the original incorporators are from California and several of them from my district, the Fifteenth Congressional District of California.

The first national commander was Mr. Jack W. Hardy, of Los Angeles, Calif., a practicing attorney whom I have known for a number of years. The present California State commander, Mr. Frank Dee Scriven, is a constituent of mine.

It is singular and historic that the Amvets will be the first veterans' organization following World War II to be incorporated by the Congress. It is a highly patriotic organization dedicated to upholding and defending the basic truths and enduring principles on which this Nation was founded. The AMVETS have dedicated themselves to the fraternity and welfare of all veterans of World War II and to the service and best interests of the community, State, and Nation. There is no distinction between men and women veterans because both are permitted to be elected and hold office in the AMVETS.

Because of the lofty ideals and the high principles upon which the Amvets were originally organized, and as a cosponsor of this bill, having introduced the first bill in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 120, to incorporate the Amvets, I believe they are entitled to the recognition of the unanimous support of the House of Representatives to grant them the privilege of incorporating, and I therefore urge the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, to wit, Jack W. Hardy, 7421 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elmo Keel, 4085 Minnesota Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; William Enters, suite 1509–1511, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Gerald I. Cetrulo, 166 Bloomfield Avenue, Newark, N. J.; Norman Clock, 125 South Fourth Street, Reading, Pa.; Floyd Williams, C–2, 704 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.; Rev. Joseph T. O'Callaghan, United States Navy Department, Washington, D. C.; George R. Porter, 1730 South Adams Street, Fort Worth, Tex.; Robert E. McLaughlin, 800 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.; Ray Sawyer, Plymouth, N. H.; James C. Tate, 2 Wilton Road, R. F. D. No. 5, Alexandria, Va.; George E. Burke, 1126 Central Avenue, St. Petersburg, Fla.; A. Ronald Button, 6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.; Americus Lamberti, 515 West Seventh Street, Plainfield, N. J.; Emory S. McNider, Coffeyville, Ala.; Allen Hansen, 815 East Broadway, Tucson, Ariz.; Edward S. Shattuck, 1400 North Hobart Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elvon L. Howell, 652 Gilpin Street, Denver, Colo.; William N. Welsh, 21 Bristol Street, West Haven, Conn.; Francis D. Odell, 18 Lawson Avenue, Claymont, Del.; George Lewis, 125 State Capitol, Atlanta, Ga.; Lee Witaski, 1438 Thorndale Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Clyde Iongstreth, Atlantic, Iowa; Harry N. Gillig, Jr., 612 Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; John H. Ostertag, 955 Charles Street, Louisville, Ky.; Otto E. Passman, 114–120 Walnut Street, post-office drawer 1833, Monroe, La.; Dr. G. E. Marrone, 610 Fairview Avenue, Frederick, Md.; Howard J. McDonald, 4 College Street, Lewiston, Maine; Edward J. Beauchamp, 4 College Street, Lewiston, Maine; Albert J. Reynolds, Tremont Temple Building, Boston, Mass.; Neil Holland, 401 Charlevoix Building, 2033 Park Avenue, Detroit, Mich.; Monte M. Korn, 18041 Washburn, Detroit, Mich.; Raymond D. Vosburgh, 222½ West Lewis Street, Mankato, Minn.; George R. Gess, box 47, Mount Olive, Miss.; Henry W. Simpson, room 500, 119 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Mo.; R. C. Letcher, Billings Fire Department, Billings, Mont.; Dr. A. D. Faier, 1102 Medical Arts Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Jay J. Strode, Wells, Nev.; N. L. Samaha, C–1, 1 Keeble Street, Plymouth, N. H.; William Hepp, 1918 Liberty Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.; Huston W. Galyen, 1121 Sixteenth Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.; Carl Freudenberg, 1298 Michigan Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio; Fred Milligan, attorney at law, Columbus, Ohio; Joseph D. Stafford, route 2, box 662, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Anthony R. McGrath, 609 Plaza Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harry M. DeWitt, Jr., 2316 Fortieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert W. Donald, post-office box 2, Easley, S. C.; Dick Kelly, Shaw Insurance Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Alex Bullocks, 1464 Washington Street, Memphis, Tenn.; Thomas J. Russell, Burlington, Vt.; John E. Fletcher, 806 North Eye Street, Tacoma, Wash.; R. L.

Stubbs, Professional Building, Fairmont, W. Va.; Walter L. Thompson, 1316 Lombard, Everett, Wash.; Robert A. Garrett, 163 Eccles Building, Ogden, Utah; Searcy Johnson, 805 Mercantile Building, Dallas, Tex.; Hampton C. Godbe, 116 P Street, Salt Lake City, Utah; Allen P. Solada, 311 Dauphin Building, Harrisburg, Pa.; George Vukmanic, 221 Martin Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Royce C. Granger, 102 East Eighteenth Street, Tulsa, Okla.; Charles E. Nassif, 1023 Thirteenth Street North, Fargo, N. Dak.; Paul D. Higgins, 104½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.; Edmund P. Radwan, 906 Broadway, Buffalo, N. Y.; Alexander J. Matturria, 234 Mount Prospect Avenue, Newark, N. J.; J. F. Roche, Bond Building, 1015 Elm Street, Manchester, N. H.; Kenneth A. Van Vorst, 114 East Bonanza Road, Las Vegas, Nev.; Julian C. Harvey, 1731 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.; John Wesley, box 482, Picayune, Miss.; Claude C. Morgan, 810 Hammond Building, Detroit, Mich.; Edward A. Trudell, 26 Horan Way, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Vincent C. Neeson, Labelle and Bellona, Ruxton, Baltimore, Md.; R. L. Huot, 106 Elm Street, Biddeford, Maine; John E. Sutherlin, Sutherlin Sales Co., Industries Building, New Orleans, La.; Thomas Wilkerson, 1600 Washington, Henderson, Ky.; John C. Junkins, Cherokee, Kans.; Dr. C. W. Hoffman, 1340 Forty-first Street, Des Moines, Iowa; Allen W. Jenkins, 1015 Cherry Street, Evansville, Ind.; Edwin I. Bruder, 6837 Clyde Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Harry P. Orcutt, Fort Benning, Ga.; Arthur Di Vincent, post-office box 4579, Miami, Fla.; Maurice B. Marholin, 176 McClintock Road, New Britain, Conn.; Harry Steinbery, First National Bank Building, El Dorado, Ark.; Jess Curtiss, 807 North Third Street, Phoenix, Ariz.; Edward S. Coston, 69 Ninth Street North, Birmingham, Ala.; Anthony O. Jones, 315 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.; Frank Dee Scriven, 8474 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Allen C. Hessier, 1275 Clarkson Street, No. 4, Denver, Colo.; Michael Dzamki, 3912 First Street, East Chicago, Ind.; S. Howard Rudolph, Jr., Atlantic, Iowa; Fred K. Greer, 427 East Market Street, Princeton, Ky.; Roy Morgan, Winnfield, La.; James C. Wilt, 842 Columbia Avenue, Cumberland, Md.; Chester Modzelewski, 67 Davenport Street, Chicopee, Mass.; Arthur Madar, 9166 Yorkshire, Detroit, Mich.; John J. Clark, 257 Harrison Street, Biloxi, Miss.; William E. Blake, 73 Grey, Buffalo, N. Y.; Albert Geremia, room 303, 17 Exchange Street, Providence, R. I.; Frank E. Richter, 3, 12–14 West Sixth Street, Evansville, Ind.; Frank J. Ross, 1020 East Pleasant, Milwaukee, Wis.; Conrad K. Strauss, 160 Holland Avenue, Cowesett, R. I.; Paul S. Limerick, 456 Catalina, Webster Groves, Mo.; Raymond O'Brien, 22 North Ryan Street, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dallas P. Richeson, post-office box 2226, Phoenix, Ariz.; Fred Nimz, route 6, box 815A, Phoenix, Ariz.; Tom Bulman, 243 East Fifteenth Street, Tucson, Ariz.; Charles E. Brode, 15 North Lee Street, Cumberland, Md.; Clyde B. Blanton, 2095 Seventh Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Floyd Cooper, 912 Polk Street, Amarillo, Tex.; Paul Moody, 548 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Oliver A. Farabee, Lexington, N. C.; Thad Males, 329 West Valerio Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.; and such persons who are members of the Amvets (American Veterans of World War II) and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession of the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. That a majority of the persons above named and other persons selected from among the membership of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), an unincorporated association as set forth in section 1 hereof, met in national convention in Chicago, Ill., on October 12, 13, and 14, 1945, and then and there, by and through duly elected delegates representing 131 posts throughout the United States adopted a national constitution, bylaws, and declaration of principles and duly elected national officers for said organization, all as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings and debates of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on November 6 and 7, 1945.

SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation shall be as follows:

(1) To preserve for ourselves and our posterity the great and basic truths and enduring principles upon which this Nation was founded.

(2) To maintain a continuing interest in the welfare and rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of World War II and to establish facilities for the assistance of all veterans and to represent them in their claims before the Veterans' Administration and other organizations without charge.

(3) To dedicate ourselves to the service and best interests of the community, State, and Nation, to the end that our country shall be and remain forever a whole, strong, and free Nation.

(4) To aid and encourage the abolition of prejudice, ignorance, and disease. To encourage universal exercise of the voting franchise, to the end that there shall be elected and maintained in public office men and women who hold such office as a public trust administered in the best interests of all the people.

(5) To advocate the development and means by which all Americans may become enlightened and informed citizens and thus participate fully in the functions of our democracy.

(6) To encourage and support an international organization of all peace-loving nations, to the end that not again shall any nation be permitted to breach their national peace.

(7) To continue to serve the best interests of our Nation in peace as in war.

(8) To develop to the utmost the human, mental, spiritual, and economical resources of our Nation.

(9) To perpetuate and preserve the friendships and comradeship born on the battle front and nurtured in the common experience of service to our Nation during time of war.

(10) To honor the memory of those men and women who gave their lives that a free America and a free world might live by the creation of living memorials in the form of additional educational, cultural, and recreational facilities.

(11) To operate as a corporation not for profit and that no part of the income or assets shall inure to the benefit of any of its members, directors, or officers, nor be distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation; and that such corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for charitable, educational, patriotic, and civic improvement purposes.

SEC. 4. That the corporation hereby created shall have the following powers: To have perpetual succession with power to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction; take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State; to ordain and establish bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs; to use in carrying out its purposes such seals, emblems, and badges as it may lawfully adopt; to establish State and regional organizations and local posts; to publish magazines, newspapers, or any other publications consistent with the purposes of the corporation and to do any and all such acts and things as may be necessary and proper to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 5. (1) No part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda.

(2) The corporation and its officers and the members of its executive committee as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(3) The current executive committee consists of 40 members, namely, Ray Sawyer, Plymouth, N. H.; Jack W. Hardy, Title Guaranty Building, Los Angeles, Calif.; Albert J. Reynolds, 3117 Washington Street, Roxbury, Mass.; L. M. Hinshaw, box 558, Asheboro, N. C.; J. M. Crespi, Sims Building 12 Auburn Avenue NE., Atlanta, Ga.; Arthur J. Madar, 9166 Yorkshire, Detroit 24, Mich.; Kenneth A. Anderson, 7166 South Penn Street, Denver, Colo.; Anthony O. Jones, 315 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.; Agnes Frazee, post-office box 751, Uniontown, Pa.; Floyd Williams, C–2, 704 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.; William Kipp, 1032 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; John J. Carney, 308 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. John S. Weir, 618 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.; Rev. Sam Hill Ray, Loyola University, New Orleans, La.; Nathan Gordon, Little Rock, Ark.; Thad Males, 329 West Valerio Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Al Grossi, Farmington, Conn.; Harry M. De Witt, Jr., 2316 Fortieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; George E. Burke, 1126 Central Avenue, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Charles L. Crowley, 935 Oglethorpe Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.; L. Harlan Swisher, 306 Davidson Drive, Champaign, Ill.; Arthur Schnipper, 4334 Ivy Street, East Chicago, Ind.; Robert Buckmaster, 158 Woodstock Road, Waterloo, Iowa; William C. Moss, Bogalusa, La.; Edward J. Beauchamp, 163 Lisbon Street, Lewiston, Maine; Thomas Burke, 222 South Street, Fitchburg, Mass.; Milton F. Cooney, 55 Naomi Street, Pontiac, Mich.; Paul Limerick, 456 Catalina, Webster Groves, Mo.; Louis W. Zaris, 331 Guarantee Trust Building Atlantic City, N. J.; William Hepp, 176 Lafayette Street, Buffalo, N. Y.; J. C. Powell, box 830, Winston-Salem, N. C.; E. L. Hallowell, 455 Forest Avenue, Dayton, Ohio; K. L. Shirk, 33 North Duke Street, Lancaster, Pa.; Albert Geremia, 277 Webster Avenue, Providence, R. I.; Richard H. Dewey, 251 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.; Ivan Stone, 2708 West Lamar, Houston, Tex.; Dr. M. H. Seidner, 406 First Security Bank Building, Ogden, Utah; J. C. McCaughan, Jr., 1904 West Broad Street, Richmond, Va.; John E. Howell, Jr., 1110½ Seventeenth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va.; and Kenneth Kunde, Quonset Park, Oshkosh, Wis.

(4) The headquarters office and principal place of business of said corporation shall be located in Washington, D. C., but the activities of said organization, as set out herein, shall not be confined to the District of Columbia, but shall be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on, active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, or our allies, on or after September 16, 1940, and who served between this date and the date of cessation of hostilities, as established by the Government of the United States. Service with the armed forces must have been terminated by honorable discharge or honorable separation from the service: *Provided, however,* That persons otherwise eligible for membership who are on active duty or who must continue to serve after the

cessation of hostilities are also eligible for membership.

SEC. 7. (1) Each member of the said corporation shall have the right to one vote in the conduct of official business at the post level. Each post shall have the right to elect delegates to national conventions of the corporation, which delegates shall each exercise one vote in the conduct of business of the respective convention to which he is elected.

(2) The executive committee of the said corporation shall consist of one member duly elected to represent each department, and, in addition, all elective officers shall be members of the executive committee, ex officio.

SEC. 8. The said corporation may and shall acquire all of the assets of the existing unincorporated association known as AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) upon discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities.

SEC. 9. In the event of a final dissolution or liquidation of such corporation, and after the discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities, the remaining assets of the said corporation shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration to be applied to the care and comfort of disabled veterans of World War II.

SEC. 10. The corporation shall have the power to—

(1) Have succession by its corporate name;

(2) Choose such officers, representatives, and agents as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

(3) Contract and be contracted with;

(4) Transfer and convey all real or personal property;

(5) Borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State laws.

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officials, representatives, and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall maintain in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept services of processes for such corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mail to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice or service upon the corporation.

SEC. 13. The following national officers of the said corporation shall be elected by the chosen delegates thereof in annual national conventions, each official delegate casting one vote, to wit: National commander; first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth national vice commander, one of whom shall be a woman; finance officer, adjutant, judge advocate, and provost marshal.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, executive committee, and committees having any of the authority of the executive committee; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and permit all books and records of the corporation to be inspected by any member or his agent or his attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 15. The corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

SEC. 16. No loan shall be made by the corporation to its officers or directors, or any of them, and any directors of the corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of a corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 17. The financial transactions of the corporation may be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians.

The corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit of the financial transactions of such corporation as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 18. The corporation and its State, regional, and local subdivisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and use in carrying out its purposes the name AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

SEC. 19. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) shall serve notice on the secretary of state, in each State, the name and address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against this corporation may be served.

SEC. 20. Such provisions, privileges, and prerogatives as have been granted heretofore to other national veterans' organizations by virtue of their being incorporated by Congress shall also be granted and accrue to AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

SEC. 21. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 12, line 16, strike out "States;" and insert "States."

Page 14, lines 17 and 19, strike out the words "first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth" and insert "seven."

Page 14, line 19, strike out the word "commander" and insert the word "commanders."

Page 15, line 17, strike out the balance of page 15.

Page 16, strike out from lines 1 to 11, inclusive.

Page 16, line 12, strike out "18" and insert "17."

Page 16, line 17, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 16, line 24, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 17, line 2, strike out "shall also be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 17, line 4, strike out "21" and insert "20."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING BENEFITS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT TO CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1368) to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) (3) of section 1 of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended by Public Law 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 679), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(3) civilian officers and employees of departments and civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam, during such time as they may be assigned for duty or serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, exclusive of part-time or intermittent employees or native labor casually hired on an hourly or per diem basis;".

SEC. 2. Appropriations which have been made or which may be made for the Navy Department and the naval service shall be available and may be used for the payment of such sums as may have accrued prior to July 21, 1944, to the credit of, and which remain unpaid to, civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam under the provisions and the authority of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as heretofore and herein amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING TIME OF APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR ARMY OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.).

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to try to get some information. The bill speaks about the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army. Will the author of the bill tell me how many additional commissioned officers will be authorized?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that it provides for no additional officers. This merely amends the act passed last year under which the Army is authorized to eventually, in 1949, I believe it is, attain the Regular Army commissioned ranks to include an increase of 25,000. Since the act was passed 2,000 have been taken in and another increment will be taken in during the next few months. This merely fixes the time of appointment from which they take rank as between the day their nomination is sent to the Senate and the day it is approved.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is then to amend the act of December 28, 1945, in which there were provided additional officers in the Regular Army?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Our officer strength at the end of the war was sixteen-thousand-odd. Toward the end of the war we increased the Regular

Army commissions by eight-thousand-odd, to 25,000, of which approximately 4,000 officers went to the Air Corps and another 4,000 officers were allotted to the ground forces. That brought the Army up to approximately 25,000 Regular officers. There were 110,000 applications, roughly speaking, from among officers on temporary duty who desired Regular Army commissions. The Congress authorized an increase by 25,000 over a period of years so that ultimately we will have officers to the number of around 45,000. Those men are being taken in by increments. About 2,000 have been taken in so far and another 2,000 will be taken in this spring.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know how many officers are presently in the Army? How many are in line for discharge?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The present number of Regular Army officers is 16,000, plus 8,000, plus 2,000. An increment of 2,000 has been taken in. It is roughly 26,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. According to the testimony given before the Military Affairs Committee, when we established the Army at 1,070,000, General Paul testified they wanted 100,000 officers and 970,000 men. At the present time they are carrying under the budget 146,000 officers and plan on that number for the next year. That includes warrant officers and nurses.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes; that will go to the figure announced by General Paul on July 1.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. One hundred thousand?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say in conclusion that I have been somewhat concerned about the slowness of the armed forces in getting some of its officers separated, especially in the higher levels. We find on examining the records that many of these officers are waiting around hoping to get a discharge for disability reasons and on a pension. I understand that the reasons for disability and the pension cannot be reviewed for 15 years. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is rather disturbing to one looking at the number of officers who are waiting to get out on account of disability of some kind so that they may be discharged from the Army and draw a pension for the rest of their lives. The records will show a large waiting list, all hopeful that their physical condition will warrant a pension on discharge; and this is not subject to review for 15 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct. I sympathize with the gentleman. This bill has to do with those who are in the future named as Regular Army officers up to the grade of major and has to do with the date they are nominated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective December 28, 1945, the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.), is further amended by inserting after section 8 thereof an additional section as follows:

"SEC. 9. For the purpose of administering the provisions of this act, the date of nomination by the President if the Senate is in session, or if the Senate is in recess the date of a recess appointment by the President, shall be considered as the date or time of appointment in determining eligibility for appointment, permanent grade in which appointed, date of rank in such grade, period of service to be credited under section 5 hereof, and eligibility for promotion of each person appointed as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no person appointed under the provisions of this act shall be entitled, by reason of such appointment, to any pay or allowances for any period prior to the date of acceptance of such appointment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO GRANT TO COUNTY OF PITTSBURG, OKLA., A PERPETUAL EASEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1807) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the County of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey to the County of Pittsburg, State of Oklahoma, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway upon and over a strip of land containing three and twenty-two one-hundredths acres, being a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla., the metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20A OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2331) to amend section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves a subject matter which is altogether too important and too complicated to justify consideration on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2336) to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 327), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "327." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of radio stations and apparatus owned by the United States and under the control of the Coast Guard, shall have the same authority as that granted to the Secretary of the Navy by subsection (a) in the case of radio stations and apparatus owned by the United States and under the control of the Navy Department, such authority to be exercised subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are prescribed in subsection (a)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2758) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 686), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator, and any Civil Aeronautics Administration employee appointed to protect life and property on the airport, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the airport any person accused of having committed within the boundaries of the airport any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without warrant any person committing any such offense within the limits of the airport, in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within the limits of the airport any person whom he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony within the limits of the airport.

"(b) Any individual having the power of arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Administrator may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

"(c) The United States Park Police may, at the request of the Administrator, be assigned by the Director of the National Park Service, in his discretion, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to patrol any area of the airport, and any members of the United States Park Police so assigned are hereby authorized and empowered to make arrests within the limits of the airport for the same offenses, and in the same manner and circumstances, as is provided in this section with respect to employees designated by the Administrator.

"SEC. 5. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation prescribed under this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

"SEC. 6. The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Administrator as provided in section 4 may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act, for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with the United States commissioner at Alexandria, Va.

"SEC. 7. The Administrator may enter into agreements with the State of Viriginia, or with any political subdivision thereof, for such municipal services as the Administrator shall deem necessary to the proper and efficient government of the airport, and he may, from time to time, agree to modifications in any such agreement: *Provided, however,* That where the charge for any such service is established by the laws of the State of Virginia, the Administrator may not pay for such service an amount in excess of the charge so established. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the making of payment for services under any such agreement."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill likewise is of such a complicated nature as to require a more extended explanation than can be had on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE CREDIT IN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 603) to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II," approved September 27, 1944, are amended to read as follows:

"That any person who has served or may serve in the military or naval forces of the United States, or in the United States merchant marine, for a period of at least 90 days during World War II, and is honorably discharged or has been separated from the United States merchant marine, and who makes homestead entry subsequent to such discharge or separation, shall have the period of his military or naval service or service in the United States merchant marine, not exceeding 2 years, construed to be equivalent to residence and cultivation upon the land for the same length of time. In the case of any such person who served in the military or naval forces, credit shall be allowed for 2 years' military or naval service (1) if such person is discharged on account of wounds received or disability incurred in the line of duty; or (2) if such person is regularly discharged and subsequently is furnished hospitalization or is awarded compensation by the Government on account of such wounds or disability. No patent shall issue to any such person who has not resided upon his homestead and otherwise complied with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year. No person shall be ineligible for the benefits provided by this act by reason of being married; and, where both husband and wife are entitled to such benefits, the aggregate of their periods of service may be counted as the period of service of one of them for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 2. In the case of any person who would be entitled to a homestead under the provisions of this act, his or her surviving spouse, or in the case of the death or marriage of such surviving spouse, then his or her minor orphan children by guardian duly appointed and officially accredited at the Department of the Interior, shall be entitled to all the benefits enumerated in section 1 of this act. An entry made by such surviving spouse or guardian shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 1 respecting compliance with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act approved September 27, 1944, is amended by inserting the words "or service in the United States merchant marine" after the words "military or naval service."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II,' approved September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 747), as amended June 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 308, 43 U. S. C., sec. 279), is amended to read as follows:

" 'That any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and is honorably discharged from the military or naval forces and who makes homestead entry subsequent to such discharge shall have the period of such service, not exceeding 2 years, construed to be equivalent to residence and cultivation upon the land for the same length of time. Credit shall be allowed for 2 years' service to any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the above period (1) if such person is discharged on account of wounds received or disability incurred during the above period in the line of duty, or (2) if such person is regularly discharged and subsequently is furnished hospitalization or is awarded compensation by the Government on account of such wounds or disability. When the homestead entry is made by a husband or wife whose spouse is entitled to any service credit under this section, such credit shall, with the consent of the spouse entitled thereto, be available to the husband or wife making the entry, in addition to any service credit to which he or she individually may be entitled under this section. No patent shall issue to any such person who has not resided upon his homestead and otherwise complied with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year: *Provided,* That no person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and is honorably discharged shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act merely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act (43 U. S. C., sec. 280) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 2. The surviving spouse or the minor children, as hereinafter provided, shall be entitled (1) in case of the death of any person as the result of wounds received or disability incurred in line of duty while serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the period specified in section 1, to credit for 2 years' residence and cultivation on a homestead entry, or (2) in the case of the death of any person after performing service that would be a basis for credit under section 1 of this act, to the amount of credit which would have been allowable to such person. The credit provided by this section shall be available to the surviving spouse, or, in the case of the death or marriage of the surviving spouse, to the minor children by a guardian duly appointed and officially accredited at the Department of the Interior. An entry made by such surviving spouse or guardian shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 1 respecting compliance with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year.'

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act (43 U. S. C., sec. 282) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. For the period of 10 years following September 27, 1944, on the revocation of any order of withdrawal or the filing of a plat of survey or resurvey opening lands to entry, the order or notice taking such action shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective, in which persons of the classes entitled to credit for service, under the provisions of this act, shall have a preferred right of application under the homestead or desert land laws, or the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended (59 Stat. 467, 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), subject to the requirements of applicable law, except as against the prior existing valid settlement rights and preference rights conferred by existing laws or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation, and except where a revocation of an order of withdrawal is made in order to assist in a Federal land program other than one authorized by the homestead or desert land laws or by said Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended. During the same period if the Secretary of the Interior shall, without a prior petition thereof, classify any land as being suitable for disposition under the said Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended, the order of classification shall provide a similar preference right of application under that act, subject to the exceptions contained in this section.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1099) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon, and proceeds from rents and sales therefrom, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and of section 55 of title I of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), lying and situate within the State of Minnesota, administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 16, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for

the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to proclaim such lands as an addition to the White Earth Indian Reservation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1584) authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $85,000, for the purpose of erecting a memorial museum, in commemoration of old Fort Hall, and a shop for the sale of Indian handicrafts, on land set aside for that purpose by the business council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation. The museum and shop shall be supervised, managed, and controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$85,000" and insert "$150,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING OF VIRGINIA SUN-CURED TOBACCO

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 152) relating to the marketing of Virginia sun-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves a change in policy, and it should not be on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I would like to state to the gentleman from New Jersey that this legislation does not in any way change the policy of the tobacco legislation.

Mr. KEAN. It brings in a new type of tobacco.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It only covers four or five counties in Virginia, chiefly in Mr. SMITH'S district, where they raise dark fire-cured tobacco, and the growers, to come under the tobacco program, ask for the two-thirds allotment that the other growers produce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE OF ENLISTED MEN OF MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1375) to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the last paragraph of the said section to read as follows:

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMY MAIL CLERKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved August 21, 1941, chapter 392 (55 Stat. 653), be amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills eligible to be called on the Consent Calendar today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senator KNOWLAND, of California; and further to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. A. F. Whitney, who was the first leading labor official in the country to speak out against the cuts in the appropriations for the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RELIEF AND BETTER SAFETY CONDITIONS FOR MINES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation was shocked with the great loss of lives in the tragic explosion in the No. 5 Coal Mine at Centralia, Ill., which caused the death of 111 miners. The death of these men leaves 97 widows and 78 dependent children to face a sad and difficult future. These men lost their lives while employees of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court confirmed this statement when it said in a recent decision with reference to the authority of the Government in dealing with the coal strike:

Congress intended that by virtue of Government seizure, a mine should become, for purposes of production and operation, a Government facility in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government took over these mines a safety code was agreed upon between the Government and the representatives of the United Mine Workers. This code laid down certain safety standards to protect the lives and safety of the coal miners. It was a binding contract signed by Mr. Krug, representing the Government, and Mr. Lewis, representing the miners. Investigations of the Centralia coal mine in November 1946 disclosed that the mine was in an unsafe and dangerous condition. In fact, the Federal inspectors reported some 50 violations, all of which were dangerous to the safety of the miners and called upon the Federal Government to take notice thereof and to correct such conditions. The Government failed to correct these conditions and on March 25, 1947, this disastrous explosion occurred with this great loss of lives.

In the Straight Creek Coal Co., Kentucky, mine disaster which occurred on December 26, 1945, it was practically impossible to rescue all of the miners and that mine was sealed leaving 21 men dead in the mine. This disaster left 23 widows and 69 dependent children. The bodies of the 21 men have never been removed from that mine.

By reason of these two disasters there are left a total of 267 widows and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring some meager relief to these families so that their widows may carry on with proper food, clothing, medical care, and educational opportunities for their children, I have introduced a bill asking for an appropriation for $735,000, which equals the amount assessed in fines against the United Mine Workers organization, providing that this amount of money which comes to the Federal Government by reason of such fines be set up in a special fund to be administered on the basis of need, to provide relief and aid to the widows and dependent children of these two mine disasters, to be administered by the Social Security Administration. While this seems a rather large amount of money it, in fact, only utilized the use of money which comes to the Federal Government from the United Mine Workers organization, money contributed by the various coal miners of the Nation. It is not a large amount when you take into consideration the needs of 267 dependents. With the best administration and care it will probably all be expended within the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has given in relief to other nations billions of dollars. In fact, over $1,500,000,000 is requested and earmarked for relief to the people of foreign countries for the

coming year. There is recommended an additional gift of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey.

This bill simply seeks to set aside money contributed over the years by the men in the mines who dug the coal, to offer some meager relief to the unfortunate widows and children of their fellow workers who lost their lives because they worked under hazardous conditions, which conditions were a violation of the contract on the part of the Federal Government in not correcting these dangerous conditions in the Centralia mine and upon the part of the mining company in not removing the dangerous hazards and conditions in the Straight Creek Co. mine in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that it in no way affects or includes the $10,000 fine assessed against Mr. John L. Lewis. This bill does not touch or include that personal proposition in any way. It proposes to place this money in the administration of the Social Security Board, which will cause a study to be made of the financial conditions of the various widows and families of the men who lost their lives, and aid will be rendered on the basis of need in an effort to help provide food, medical care, and other necessities of life which will help the widows to properly take care of the children under 18 years of age so that they may have the benefit of a high-school education where desired.

I decided to introduce this legislation solely from a humanitarian standpoint. There are very few miners in my congressional district, and there are 111 less miners since this tragedy happened. I do believe that the Government can afford in these two particular instances to render the aid provided for in this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to include in the RECORD the list of fatal and nonfatal accidents occurring in the coal mines during the years 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946.

This will give you an idea of the unsafe working conditions and the great loss of life and limb endured by the miners.

This will show that there was a total of 322,637 accidents of which 6,229 were fatal, leaving thousands of widows and orphans.

The figures show that every man who goes to work in a coal mine, considering the number employed, will be hurt or killed in a period of 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the question and points to the absolute necessity that the Federal Government and the States cooperating must speedily enact such laws and enforce them as will bring greater safety to the miners of the Nation in the future.

The following is a tabulation of lost-time injuries and fatalities at the United States coal mines in the past 5 years:

1942

Fatal accidents	1,471
Nonfatal accidents	69,564
Total accidents	71,035
Permanent total disabilities	65
Permanent partial disabilities	2,045

Seven major disasters with toll of 132 lives.

1943

Fatal accidents	1,451
Nonfatal accidents	64,594
Total accidents	66,045
Permanent total disabilities	26
Permanent partial disabilities	1,287

Eight major disasters with loss of 175 lives.

1944

Fatal accidents	1,294
Nonfatal accidents	65,900
Total accidents	67,194

Four major disasters, 94 lives lost.

1945

Fatal accidents	1,079
Nonfatal accidents	59,350
Total accidents	60,429

Five major disasters, 68 lives lost.

1946

Fatal accidents	974
Nonfatal accidents	57,000
Total accidents	57,974

Two major disasters, 27 lives lost.

The fine of $735,000 was assessed against the United Mine Workers of America upon the finding of the majority of the Supreme Court that the miners were employees of the Federal Government. In other words, it cost the United Mine Workers of America $735,000 merely because they were Government employees. Surely, if the fact of Government employment entails such a heavy responsibility these persons should be entitled to some of the protection and benefits afforded every other Government employee.

If a regular Government employee loses his life in the course of Federal Government employment the Government pays his widow $61.25 per month during the remainder of her life or until she remarries. If she has dependent children under 18 years of age, each dependent child receives $17.50 a month, if the employee has been earning a salary of $175 per month.

When you compare the coal miners who were in fact Government employees in the Centralia mine with this allowance granted regular Government employees, it seems to me to completely prove the justice of setting aside the coal miners' own money to help provide sustenance and relief for their widows and children.

I repeat the United States Supreme Court in the decision assessing this $735,000 fine seemed clearly to prove the justice of this reasoning when it said, "Congress intended that by virtue of Government seizure, a mine should become, for purposes of production and operation, a Government facility in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership."

Mr. Speaker, I understand a bill has been introduced providing that Federal inspectors may close down mines when they find that safety conditions demand it.

I believe it is the duty of the Congress to enact legislation along this line and other legislation to insure more safe working conditions. It is to be hoped that out of this recent tragedy at Centralia, Ill., in the loss of 111 miners that the miners of the Nation will be benefited in the future through legislative action that will force and compel better working and better safety conditions throughout the coal mines of America.

Such legislation is imperative not only from the humanitarian standpoint but from an economic standpoint as well. One of the greatest natural resources left in America today is the coal in the earth. Billions of tons of coal, worth countless billions of dollars, coal enough to supply the United States for thousands of years in the future is one of our priceless great natural resources left.

Mr. Speaker, a doubt has been raised whether we have enough oil in this country to successfully defend our Nation if, unfortunately, another war should come upon us, but we do have the coal which can be converted into gas for power and heat, to gasoline and other synthetics, much of which we must depend upon in the future.

Unless better safety conditions are provided, the sons of miners and others will not go down into the earth to bring up the coal. No other group of men in the factories of the Nation are permitted to work in the face of such hazards to life and limb as are the miners.

They have mined the coal which has powered our great steel and industrial developments, which has lighted and illuminated the countryside through rural electrification, lighted and powered the great cities through public utilities, that has brought untold comfort to millions of our people. They have furnished the power that has largely developed our great railway and transportation system. Our industrial progress in the future depends more upon coal than upon any other natural resource. The steel industry is basic and fundamental to the success of the industry of this Nation. Coal must power the great steel industry and other industries of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the miners of our Nation, as to their safety at their work, have been too long overlooked. Through their sweat and toil they have made a great and tremendous contribution to the development of our Nation and to the comfort of our people. There must be better safety conditions thrown around them to induce their sons and other young men to work in the mines of this country. I repeat, it is an economic problem as well as a humanitarian problem. Unless better conditions are brought about, this great wealth hoarded under the ground so necessary to the future development of our Nation will not be brought to the surface in sufficient quantities to drive America forward to its greatest destiny in the future.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I ask the gentleman to yield for information. Do these miners have any special insurance or special fund through the United Mine Workers, or through some insurance company of their own, for their protection in accidents of this kind?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I hope they have. I hope that these widows and orphans may be administered to through that fund. That fund was established in the bargaining, when the Government seized the mines, between the Federal Government, represented by Mr. Krug, and by Mr. Lewis for the mine workers. The plan called for the administration of the fund, I think, by a committee of three which was to be appointed. That was in May, almost a year ago. Mr. Krug was so busy in the campaign out West and then out inspecting our possessions in the Philippines later, that he had never found time to appoint the Government member that the safety code and agreement said should be appointed. I understand that tomorrow, after this thing has happened, perhaps this committee will be organized. There has been considerable money impounded. I do not know how that money is to be used.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say I am thoroughly in accord with the statements of the gentleman from Illinois and I just merely asked the question for my own information.

Mr. VURSELL. It is entirely possible that something might be worked out through this fund, that would make legislation of this kind unnecessary. I do not think, however, that it would go that far. But may I go further and say that these miners did have workmen's compensation under the Illinois law, but they paid for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDONOUGH). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 12 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's Jefferson Day address was in line with traditional democratic formula—claim credit for all the good and blame somebody else for all the bad.

His address was noticeably lacking in comment on the strike of telephone workers—the first general strike of telephone workers in our history—and the dismal failure of his administration to prevent this drag on the Nation's economy.

Nor did he shed any light on the failure of his administration to save the country from the latest walkout of soft coal miners—a strike that has begun to slow down steel and other industries.

These two paralyzing blows to our Nation's economy did not share the President's glowing tributes to his administration, in whose hands is the machinery for mediation and corrective action.

Mr. Truman has been very quiet of late about labor legislation, though we have strike after strike. Some weeks ago he submitted some puny proposals for solution of a situation that requires two-fisted handling. Oh, yes, he asked for a commission to study the problem, when across the country there is a roar for constructive action.

The American people know that the Republican Congress they voted for last November has not been idle in the face of management-labor disputes that end in business-paralyzing strikes that cut down the production of goods and thus give inflation another whirl with everybody a loser.

Hundreds of witnesses from labor, management, and the public generally have been heard by congressional committees. Congress will pass in two or three weeks a constructive, fair, labor bill to establish sensible relationship between employers and labor unions.

Then President Truman will have his opportunity to sign or veto it. Then he will have his opportunity officially to pass upon comprehensive legislation to curb the strife between management and organized labor that was generated by the New Dealers' un-American labor laws.

President Truman also will have an opportunity soon to sign or veto a bill from the Republican Congress to scotch the portal-to-portal pay racket. Everybody remembers how these portal suits piled up in the courts to the fantastic total of more than $5,000,000,000. The people know that it was the swift action of the Republican Congress that slammed the brakes on those monstrous suits by pushing along legislation toward Mr. Truman's desk.

Yes, the American people are sick and tired of employer-union labor disputes that tie up the Nation's economy and give aid and comfort to the Communists.

We all have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The public will not stand for any headstrong minority groups hamstringing their happiness.

Mr. Truman used the $100-a-plate Jefferson Day dinner of his partisans to declaim on the pending aid for Greece and Turkey. The American people know how to view that subject, too.

They know that the United States since its establishment has been the beacon light of oppressed peoples everywhere. The United States always has been and always will be kindly disposed toward small countries when they are shoved around by big nations.

American food for starving peoples is not a partisan issue.

It is a Republican Congress that is putting through the measure for aid to Greece and Turkey, and we shall continue to cooperate with the Democratic administration in presenting a united, American front to the world.

President Truman consulted Republican as well as Democratic leaders before he submitted the recommendation for help to Greece and Turkey. I hope that his remarks before the partisan, politics-minded Jefferson Day Democratic fund-raisers, were not meant to be a political gesture. Let us keep politics out of the Greece-Turkey bill.

The American people know how to evaluate the purely political parts of Mr. Truman's amazing address—and virtually all of it was old-fashioned politics. They know that he spoke before a partisan audience, many of whom no doubt still think that the Democratic Party received a vote of confidence in last November's election, and not the landslide that hit them.

Of course, Mr. Truman would like to claim that his administration is responsible for the removal of shackles from our free competitive business. Since the grand jury of the people spoke last November he has been making some selective appropriations of Republican doctrines. But Mr. Truman's repentance is too little and too late.

The American people already have assigned to the Republican Party the job of casting out of the Government New Dealers who still yearn to control the people from cradle to grave.

Mr. Truman was late, very late in recognizing what the Republican Party has been proclaiming for years—that Communists and other alien-minded rascals have infested the administrative branch. The people have given the Republican Party a mandate to clean house.

The Republican Congress has begun to do so and wants the cooperation of the executive branch in doing a thorough job.

The President's proposal that a loyalty test be given to Government employees was applauded by the people generally. Extremists in the Democratic Party—the tail that wags the dog—protested through their usual method of indirection and fault-finding on the way the test is to be made.

Presumably, these torpedo tactics by the left-wing Democrats have caused some wobbling by the Presidential brain trust; for, Mr. Truman, subsequent to his broadside against Communists and other subversives, was revealed to have written a letter to former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, saying the country was perfectly safe against communism and that the subject was a mere bug-a-boo.

The President, in his February 28 letter to Mr. Earle, an ardent foe of communism, went on to say that he did not believe the time ever would come when anyone—mark you he said anyone—will want to overthrow the American Government.

That letter was disheartening to the country. It raised doubt on just how far Mr. Truman will go in carrying out his announced program to rid the temples of Government of disloyal employees.

Mr. President, when you adopt a Republican campaign promise such as this one to toss the commies out of your administration, we Republicans hope that you will embrace it wholeheartedly.

There will be no doubt in the minds of the people on what will be done about disloyal employees when the Republican President moves into the White House in January 1949.

Now, on the Federal budget and tax reduction. The American people know that for years the Republican Party, though having a minority in Congress, have battled for drastic reduction in Federal expenditures. Now that we have been voted control of Congress, we are doing something about it.

The country also knows how vigorously Mr. Truman has protested against cutting his budget estimates for the next fiscal year. He made the amazing argument in his Jefferson Day address that he had cut the budget to the lowest total and that it was the duty of Congress to take it as he submitted it.

Every schoolboy knows that the Constitution specifically places control of

the Nation's purse strings in the hands of Congress; also that all revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. The former rubber-stamp New Deal Congresses were used to abdicate their responsibilities. This Republican Congress will not abdicate its constitutional duties.

The automatic effect of Mr. Truman's persistent insistence that Congress approve his budget as presented has been a signal to bureaucrats to charge upon Congress with pleas that their pet money-spending projects be spared from the Republicans' economy ax.

In fact, there has been a reluctance of administration employees to cooperate with the Republican Congress in searching out the deadwood in the administrative branch. And the New Deal Democrats in Congress have done nothing except balk at every move we Republicans make to slash the budget. The record shows efforts from the Democratic side to load up the appropriation bills.

But we Republicans are driving ahead with our economy program as ordered by the people. If President Truman in his Jefferson Day address had given a signal to his Democratic officeholders—and they were numerous in the assemblage—to help reduce appropriations to the absolute minimum necessary to carry on the Government, then he would have made a worth-while contribution.

He is going to have his opportunity, officially, to pass upon the budget slashing now on in Congress. The appropriation bills are beginning to roll. Soon they will be reaching his desk. Then it will be up to him to sign or veto.

Yes; records are being made. The Republican Congress will make its record and when the session ends the people will judge whether the Republican Party has been true to its trust.

President Truman seems to be doing a little wobbling on tax reduction. It will be recalled that in his January message to Congress he said that currently high taxes were necessary for the security of the Nation. He said that it was no time to cut taxes.

He told press and radio reporters last month that he still stood on his January message. But in his Jefferson Day address—to his partisan followers and after the country applauded the Republican House-passed tax-cutting bill—Mr. Truman had this to say:

> At a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust the burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

Please note that phrase: "At a proper time." Why, praise be, now is the accepted time. Now is the time to get our Government structure on an efficient peacetime basis.

The time is rotten ripe for reduction in bureaucracy and for lightening the tax burden that the New Dealers, with their crackpot schemes, piled onto the people in their tax, spend, and elect program. Mr. President, Senator BYRD, of your own party, says there are more people on your executive branch pay roll now than there were at the war's end. Obviously, that is exclusive of the armed forces, which we all know have been reduced.

The American people last fall indicated what they thought of the way their hard-earned money was being soaked up by taxeaters in Washington. And when the Republican Party took over control of Congress, a great sigh of relief went up from the people.

New Dealers have been on top a long time. Now it is open season for them. Mr. Truman presumably thinks that the proper time to cut Government expenditures substantially, and taxes, is next year—an election year. He may think that is political timing.

But if he does, and the evidence seems to indicate that he does think next year would be a good time to put the ax earnestly to the taxeaters in Washington, he is sadly mistaken. The right thing to do is to cut expenditures to the bone and lighten the tax burden on the people now.

Yes, the Republican Party pledged tax reduction. It already has put through the House a fair tax-reduction bill. Congress will soon send a tax-cutting bill to President Truman and he then will have his opportunity to act officially—to sign or veto.

It is going to be very interesting to see how this matter of sign or veto works out on a lot of measures.

With a show of pride the President told his Jefferson Day admirers that there would be a surplus in the Federal Treasury at the end of the present fiscal year. Smilingly, he remarked in an aside that the Republican Party could claim no credit for the oncoming surplus of revenue over expenditures.

Again praise be. Mr. President, the common man knows what happened last November, because he did it. He knows that the rain of ballots in repudiation of your administration electrified the Nation and gave free men a chance to breathe again, knowing that the GOP economy ax soon would be swinging.

While the Republican Congress is perfecting its legislation on labor, budget-slashing and tax relief—and many other necessary measures—it is to be expected that the Democrats, too, would have a breathing spell—time to whistle as they go through their endless political graveyard.

And among the thinking, patriotic common people of our country there must be much curiosity today over whether the effected honeymoon between the Republican Congress and the Democratic President that was predicted by some last January, is ever going to take place.

I am wondering whether the bridegroom, faced by the issue of sign or veto, will show up for the wedding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDONOUGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXPORT LICENSES TO RUSSIAN-OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the President of the United States and the State Department began to move in one direction instead of in two opposite directions.

We have under consideration here in Congress a proposal to send a certain amount of aid to Greece and Turkey. The thing that has impressed me in connection with this situation and which the State Department does not seem to have grasped, is that there is planned for the next 3 or 4 months the shipment of $50,000,000 worth of food and supplies to Poland, $50,000,000 to Yugoslavia, $22,000,000 to the Ukraine, and $11,000,000 to White Russia.

These shipments are to be made from this country and out of our stocks, although a major part of the payment for them would come out of the funds that were appropriated in one way or another to UNRRA. All would require an export license.

Why we should be sending things to those places when Russia is back of the guerilla warfare in Greece; when Russia violates her Potsdam and Yalta agreement repeatedly; when she fails, as she agreed, to have a free election in Poland and Yugoslavia and fails to live up to her agreements of the lend-lease program—it seems to me that our diplomatic representatives should tell Mr. Stalin that unless these irregular practices cease; unless we have free elections in Yugoslavia and Poland and unless Russia ceases to foment trouble along the northern Greek border, that it would be impossible, longer, for us to permit export licenses to be issued for such things as this.

It seems to me that it is about time that we began to play our cards. If we were to play our cards, the Greek and Turkish situation would rapidly clear up and we would be able to solve our foreign problem in a much more satisfactory way.

I do not make this statement critical of General Marshall because I do not believe that he has had an opportunity to go into a lot of these matters as he should, and which I know he will when he gets around to it, but am trying to help solve the terrible situation that we are in at this time.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that those programs were UNRRA programs?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I thought UNRRA was supposed to end on March 31.

Mr. TABER. UNRRA probably has a billion dollars' worth of stuff to ship yet, and on top of that they require export licenses from the United States to do it. We are sending this to Soviet-controlled and occupied countries at the very time that they are a menace to the peace of the world.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I agree with what the gentleman is saying 100 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Under the old lend-lease program, since July of last year we have sent to Russia proper $45,000,000 worth of industrial equipment, machine tools, and things of that sort. How do you reconcile that conduct with this plea by the President to stop Russian communism in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. TABER. I am in favor of stopping Russian communism in Greece and Turkey, but I believe we cannot expect Russia to take us seriously unless we stand up for the right and move in just one direction and unless our State Department and our administration moves in one direction alone.

This is just exactly like the operations of the President in blowing hot and cold on the question of communism in the Departments. On March 22 the President issued an Executive order providing means for getting rid of Communists in the Government and asking for about $45,000,000 to do it.

The situation very evidently is, in his opinion, serious at the present time. On February 28, 1947, he wrote a letter to former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, saying:

> People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bugaboo," but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe, so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people. Our Government is made for the welfare of the people, and I don't believe there will come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it.

This indicates that the President does not appreciate fully the dangers we are in from Russia.

Why cannot he stop export licenses to Russian occupied territory and move in one direction on our foreign affairs?

No more apt proof could be asked on the incompetence of the Democratic Party to govern.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDONOUGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COAL PRODUCTION IN EUROPE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be divided into three separate statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made a very able statement regarding our international affairs. I would like to state that last August or September I took up with one of the President's chief advisers the question of the mining of coal in the Ruhr area in Germany. At that time, lower than 100,000,000 tons of coal were being mined. My understanding is there are only 109,000,000 tons of coal being mined in Germany today. That is only about half of the coal output that could be secured in Germany if those in charge were willing to use more influence in getting the coal out of the mines. I think the British are in charge of that area at the present time. It would make an enormous difference in the conditions in France, for instance. France could secure more coal that way. France herself at that time was not getting all the coal out of the mines that could be secured. I understand that situation has been cleared up somewhat.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that about the same number of miners operating in Germany as we have in this country produce only about 20 percent of our production?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely correct, showing that there is something radically wrong in the way the production is managed. I am not entirely sure. Perhaps the gentleman has figures on whether all the coal is being mined in France today that could be mined.

Mr. TABER. I think in France they are up to somewhere around 80 percent of what might be expected, but in Germany they are producing only about 50 percent of what is expected, and they are only producing one-fifth as much per miner as we produce in this country, which is absolutely ridiculous.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. It seems ridiculous and worse than that that we should be shipping coal abroad when we have needed it very much recently in our own country. Over in France last winter there was very great suffering, and there was suffering in England from the intense cold weather and the shortage of coal. We have shipped coal abroad at great expense when it was needed at home. Again I say coal should and must be mined in foreign countries. The gentleman agrees that undoubtedly warm people are much less liable to become Communistic than people who are suffering from the cold. I think it would have a great deal to do with stabilizing conditions abroad if coal could be mined in every country where it is possible to secure it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I am very glad the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is working on this matter. The gentleman is a tireless worker. It seems to me there is no reason why this country should not insist that coal in Europe be mined.

CANCER CONTROL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on a matter that relates to the control of cancer. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that as a part of my remarks I may include a condensed article in Hygeia by Lois Maddox Miller.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

THE SMALL TOWNS TACKLE CANCER

(Condensed from Hygeia)

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

The most original caravan ever to pioneer the roads of Oklahoma is a big school bus that has been converted into a mobile cancer clinic. Inside, it is partitioned off into four completely equipped examining rooms, each presided over by a specialist—a surgeon, an internist, a skin specialist, and a gynecologist. Efficient white-clad nurses stand by.

This cancer-detection unit, the first of its kind in the United States, is Oklahoma's answer to the need in rural regions for a medical service that can spot cancer in time to arrest it. The Oklahoma chapter of the American Cancer Society converted the bus; the State Medical Society rounded up specialists to serve on a rotating basis, and the State nurses association supplied nurses. An itinerary which blankets the State was drawn up, and advance publicity was spread by newspaper and radio. Local doctors were urged to visit the clinic and learn the latest cancer-detection techniques.

Oklahoma's solution of the problem is typical of the resourcefulness shown in the small towns' war against cancer. Sylacauga, Ala. (population 6,300), arranged to have a cancer clinic added to the hospital facilities of the nearby Avondale Mills. Semiannual examinations are now routine for both employees and the general public.

In Parsons, Kans. (population 18,000), a committee enlisted the support of fraternal organizations and women's clubs to provide Mercy Hospital with a full-fledged clinic. The widow of a prominent businessman who had died of cancer started the drive with a check for $2,000; benefits and public collections raised $12,000 more. By the time doctors had been lined up to serve in the clinic, a modern 250,000-volt X-ray had been installed. Parsons is now prepared not only to spot early cancer but to treat detected cases.

In Mineola, a suburb of New York City, Dr. Evelyn V. Berg, head of the Nassau-Suffolk Planned Parenthood Center, had been providing routine pelvic examinations of married women. Why not also check them for indications of cancer?

Of the first 1,000 women thus examined, 525 were sent to their own doctors or to clinics for further examination. Throughout the United States there are over 500 similar planned-parenthood centers, each of which could become a powerful instrument for cancer prevention. That possibility is now to be realized.

The most heartening thing about all these brave projects is that today none of them needs to languish for financial support. Last year the Nation-wide campaign of the American Cancer Society raised more than $10,000,000. This year the goal of the drive that will run through April (designated by Congress as cancer-control month) is $12,000,000. Of this sum, 60 percent will remain in the State where it is raised, to be used by chapters of the society to carry on their vital work. The remainder will be used by the national organization for the research program now under way in scores of laboratories.

Recently New York's Memorial Hospital opened the first cancer-prevention clinic for children. Few people think of cancer as a children's disease, yet it outranks diphtheria, measles, polio, and rheumatic fever as a killer. This means that children must be added to the hosts of women, and the increasing number of men, whose names crowd the appointment lists of the cancer-detective agencies. Can the doctors cope with the job? Well, 2 years ago many experts regarded broad-scale cancer detection in small towns as almost impossible. And look at it now. Resourcefulness is what counts—and triumphs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Some years ago the House passed my bill which authorized the President to declare the month of April Cancer Control Month. He was to issue a proclamation stating that all organizations, all newspapers, all radio stations, all means of communication should be used for the dissemination of information concerning the control of cancer. As a result of that each year in the month of April there has been a concerted drive against cancer. Last year under the direction of Mr. Eric Johnston, chairman of the drive, $10,000,000 was raised. This year the goal of the drive in April is to be $12,000,000. Of the sums raised, 60 percent will remain in the State where it is raised to be used by the chapters of the society to carry on their commendable work of cancer research and control. The remainder will be used by the national organization for the research program now under way in scores of laboratories.

Recently New York's Memorial Hospital opened the first cancer-prevention clinic for children. Few people think of cancer as a children's disease, yet it outranks diphtheria, measles, polio, and rheumatic fever as a killer. This means that children must be added to the hosts of women, and the increasing number of men, whose names crowd the appointment lists of the cancer-detective agencies.

This article I spoke of mentions the cancer drive in Oklahoma and some other communities' educational drives. And they are very effective.

I have always been grateful to Senator GEORGE, the member of another body—I believe I can speak of him and it in this connection—for securing the passage of this cancer-control bill that passed in the Senate in just 24 hours.

CONTROL OF BARBITURATES

Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a bill, and I have done so again this year, for the purpose of controlling the use of barbiturates and derivatives of phenobarbitol, requiring a doctor's prescription for their use.

I do not believe it is generally known how many persons have become addicts to the use of phenobarbitol and its derivatives. People do not realize that it is a cumulative drug which stays in the system. If a person takes too much of it he will become an addict. This shows the need for its use only by prescription. Barbiturates have even changed personalities. Right here in the city of Washington there have been two deaths due to overdoses of barbiturates. I have letters from all over the country telling of persons who have become addicts without realizing what they were doing.

The managers of drug stores themselves are becoming very much worried because so many people use barbiturates without a doctor's prescription or direction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the New York Times on April 3 entitled "Barbiturate Curb Backed by Doctors."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe that the object of the bill is approved by every doctor—at least by all those of whom I have any knowledge, and also by pharmaceutical organizations. They realize that if they sell these drugs it will hurt the drug stores and the drug industry apart from killing many persons. How frequently when you pick up a newspaper or magazine you read of some person who has died from an overdose of these drugs. They seem very innocent. The other day a woman told me that whenever her baby was a little fretful she gave it a dose of phenobarbital. I asked her if she had a doctor's prescription and she said "No."

We must do something to curb this abuse. The only real remedy I know is Federal legislation. The States are passing legislation too slowly.

The article from the New York Times is as follows:

BARBITURATE CURB BACKED BY DOCTORS—MANUFACTURERS, PHARMACISTS OPPOSE PLAN TO AMEND CITY SANITARY CODE

The barbiturate addict is just as much a danger to society as the narcotic addict, Dr. Charles Solomon of the Kings County Medical Society declared yesterday at a hearing by the board of health on proposed legislation for the control of the sale of barbiturates, the sedatives known commonly as sleeping pills.

Health Commissioner Israel Weinstein called the hearing at the Health Department Building, 125 Worth Street, to outline his proposals for amendment of the Sanitary Code in regard to barbiturates, and to permit spokesmen for pharmaceutical manufacturers, pharmacists, physicians, and hospitals to voice their opinions of the new program.

All speakers agreed on the need for stricter control of barbiturate sales. When it came to the health department program, however, opinion was divided, with the pharmaceutical manufacturers and pharmacists lined up almost solidly against it, and most of the doctors favoring it.

WOULD CURB REFILLS

Under the proposed amendments, prescriptions for barbiturates could not be refilled unless the doctor so ordered in writing on the prescription. The State law now in operation permits the refilling for 6 months unless the doctor specifically orders the prescription not to be refilled.

Pharmacists would be required to keep records of purchases and sale of barbiturates, as well as an original inventory. This would be required of wholesalers also. Neither of these provisions is made in the State law.

Pharmacists would be required to keep barbiturate prescriptions on file for 5 years and be prohibited from filling telephone orders for more than six doses. The State law does not limit telephone orders, although it requires pharmacists to report physicians who fail to provide a written prescription for a telephone order within 72 hours.

Supporting Dr. Solomon, Dr. Harry Gold, of the Cornell Medical College, said that barbiturates are habit-forming drugs in the purest sense.

"They produce dependence indistinguishable in many respects from dependence on morphine and opiates," he asserted. "Anything that would make them more difficult to come by would have a salutary effect."

Col. Garland H. Williams, Chief of the eastern division, Federal Narcotics Bureau, declared that more than 90 percent of persons involved in the violation of narcotic laws used barbiturates also. The chief objections to the proposed legislation, he added, were its weakness and the difficulty of enforcing it.

"Laws based on good faith are hardly worth the paper they are written on," he said. "Laws are not written for people anxious to do the right thing, but for those who are not going to act in good faith. Not only would this law be ineffective, but it would be absolutely unenforceable."

The law, as now written, would not provide control of barbituates at the manufacturing level, he noted, urging inclusion of controls similar to those provided in existing narcotic legislation. On questioning by Board of Health members, he said he did not believe that the proposed amendments would be harmful.

Representatives of the pharmacists and the manufacturers suggested that action be deferred until the State Legislature could consider the present laws. For the sake of uniformity of regulations, they held, all legislation should be on the State level.

Commissioner Weinstein, in a statement issued after the hearing, declared that the Department of Health would continue to enforce existing controls. It will present to the Board of Health at its meeting on Tuesday its recommendations for more stringent control, he added, asking that final action be deferred until the May meeting to give interested persons and associations time to present additional material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania, for 7 days, from April 7 to April 14, on account of official business.

To Mr. HESELTON, for April 9 and April 10, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 8, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of paid passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer to the employees' compensation fund the payment of benefits in certain cases arising under the civilian war-benefits program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

525. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1997. A bill to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2978. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2979. A bill to provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $65 per month to needy citizens 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2980. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2981. A bill to authorize registered owners of United States savings bonds to change the beneficiaries of such bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2982. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 2983. A bill to provide that the expiration date of the subscription shall appear on the label or wrapper accompanying each piece of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 2984. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1910, so as to regulate the installation of radio or television transmitting antennas, masts, or other structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr TEAGUE:

H. R. 2985. A bill relating to appointments of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2986. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide for renewal of certain copyrights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2988. A bill to amend an act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes, approved July 5, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2989. A bill to provide for award of accrued pension, compensation, or retirement pay authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration in the event of a veteran's death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY (by request):

H. R. 2990. A bill to provide automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2991. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to permit assignments of insurance benefits by widows or widowers who have remarried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2992. A bill to grant certain veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2993. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2994. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property reserved by the United States pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2995. A bill to provide annuities for certain former postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2996. A bill to authorize an appropriation for public-school facilities at Owyhee, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 2997. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2999. A bill to furnish financial assistance to victims of the mine disasters at Centralia, Ill., and Straight Creek, Ky.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3000. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 so as to provide terms of office for members of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3001. A bill to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3002. A bill to increase the rates of service pension for veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 174. A resolution to authorize the printing of 13,000 additional copies of House Report 238; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 175. A resolution to authorize payment of $350.84 on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under authority of Public Law 601, rule XI; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 27 of the Jones Act to remove the present discrimination therein contained against the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of the hoof-and-mouth disease of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the availability of funds provided for airport construction in Hawaii as legalized by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Szaie Kacowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3004. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Henryk Zalewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3005. A bill to provide for the payment of a retirement annuity to Hedley E. Redmyer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Adolph Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Angelo Miletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Ninteau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of James L. Stice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

307. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with the effect of empowering without restrictions each State to provide in accordance with its needs for the financing from State sources of its unemployment insurance and employment service programs, either through taxation under its unemployment insurance law or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York urging the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 577 or similar legislation designed to safeguard existing military graveyards that are given proper and adequate care by States and/or communities wherein they are located; to the Committee on Public Lands.

309. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 18 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning and urging the Congress of the United States to enact certain amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

310. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of the highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock, known as epizootic aphtha or, more commonly, hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

311. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 19 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed, or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

312. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, recommending that adequate funds be appropriated to enable all Air Reserve officers who desire to maintain and increase their flying skill and proficiency to do so, and urging the continued maintenance of adequate Air Reserve flying training facilities at the Newark Municipal Airport until such time as equally adequate and accessible facilities are made available for such Air Reserve flying training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

313. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by executive committee, Department of Wisconsin, American Legion, on September 30, 1947, endorsing Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military training center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

314. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Kenosha, Wis., protesting against the proposed loans to Turkey as being against the best interests of American democracy and world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. Also, petition of a group of citizens in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

316. Also, petition of groups of citizens in First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

317. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Van Newkirk, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

318. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

319. Also, petition of Austin L. Love and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 3), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

320. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we give Thee thanks for good weather and the lovely promises of spring. We thank Thee for good health, good friends, and all the things we so often take for granted. We thank Thee for the keen challenges of this hour, for work to do that demands the best we have and still finds us inadequate. Then may we seek Thy help, knowing that in partnership with Thee, in applying Thy will to our problems, there shall be no dull moments and no problems beyond solution. God bless us all and help us to be right and to do right. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 9, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 516) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

H. R. 1099. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1888. An act to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2032. An act to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2183. An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 2336. An act to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the roll is called, may the Chair recognize the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] so that he may have the floor?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas. Does he yield for a quorum call?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	George
Baldwin	Chavez	Green
Ball	Connally	Gurney
Bricker	Cooper	Hawkes
Bridges	Cordon	Hayden
Brooks	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Buck	Downey	Hill
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hoey
Butler	Eastland	Holland
Byrd	Ecton	Ives
Cain	Flanders	Jenner
Capehart	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Kem	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Knowland	O'Conor	Thye
Langer	O'Daniel	Tobey
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Lucas	Pepper	Umstead
McCarthy	Reed	Vandenberg
McClellan	Robertson, Va.	Watkins
McFarland	Robertson, Wyo.	Wherry
McKellar	Saltonstall	White
Malone	Smith	Wiley
Martin	Sparkman	Williams
Maybank	Stewart	Wilson
Millikin	Taft	Young
Moore	Taylor	
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 11

"Whereas under our present Federal income-tax laws there exists an area wherein the personal income-tax burden exhibits a gross inequality; and

"Whereas this gross inequality of personal income-tax burden is based on the fact that some of our States by law have adopted a so-called community of interest in property as between husband and wife, giving each spouse a half interest in income of the other; and

"Whereas this community of property interest permits the husband and wife in the community-property States to file separate Federal income-tax returns showing a division of the income between them and thereby to make lower income-tax rates applicable; and

"Whereas in all other States, including Illinois, which do not recognize such community interest in property, the husband and wife are not permitted to divide a spouse's income and a single income-tax return accordingly results in higher tax rates being applicable; and

"Whereas such provision in the Federal income-tax law discriminates against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law to the extent of approximately $1,000,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas this inequality and discrimination have resulted in recommendations for remedial legislation by the American Bar Association, tax administrators, and others: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That to allow such discrimination and inequality to continue to exist is undemocratic, discriminatory, burdensome, and contrary to the very essence of a tax system which purports to place a fair and equal tax burden on all citizens of the United States, regardless of the State wherein they may reside; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take such steps as may be necessary to remedy this unfair and discriminatory tax burden which is unjustly placed on the citizens of the State of Illinois and that full and favorable consideration be given to proposals allowing division of income for tax purposes between husband and wife in all States of the Union; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Congress of the United States, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas various acts of Congress have imposed certain restrictions and limitations upon the benefits and awards which are to be paid to veterans of the armed services of the United States and to their beneficiaries, which benefits and awards are to be determined upon an individual income basis; and

"Whereas these said limitations and restrictions result in a virtual nullification of most of the said awards and benefits to veterans of the armed services of the United States who reside in Alaska, due to the fact that the cost of living is higher than within the continental limits of the United States; and

"Whereas the United States Government is cognizant of the fact that such a condition exists within the Territory of Alaska and has made provision for its employees therein to receive a differential of 25 percent of their base salaries:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the necessary steps be taken to remove all limitations and restrictions as above set forth imposed upon all veterans' benefits as applied to those veterans of the armed services of the United States and their beneficiaries who reside within the Territory of Alaska, and further, that all such benefits and awards to Alaskan veterans and to their beneficiaries be increased by 25 percent.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"To the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and Delegate from Alaska:

"Whereas section 27 of the Jones Act (Merchant Marine Act of 1920, 48 U. S. C. A., secs. 861–889) is grossly discriminatory against Alaska in that it requires all shipments originating in the eastern United States and carried across the continent in bond by Canadian Railway to be carried north in American-flag ships, although similar shipments destined for Pacific coast ports in the States may be hauled south in Canadian bottoms; and

"Whereas the original purpose of protecting Puget Sound shipping interests to foster an American coastwise merchant marine as necessary for the national defense has been clearly superseded by the present involvement of the national interest in the growth and development of Alaska; and

"Whereas the strategic importance of Alaska was demonstrated in the last war so that development of Alaska into a strong buffer state is now indispensable to the national interest, and the Territory cannot become a bulwark of strength unless its development be treated as a matter of national policy; and

"Whereas the discrimination of the Jones Act in favor of a few run-down Puget Sound ships is blocking movement of goods and passengers to Alaska in derogation of the Territory's development and the national security; and

"Whereas high freight rates have obstructed Alaska's development for over 30 years, notwithstanding which substantial increases are proposed to bail out the present monopoly of the port of Seattle at the further expense of the industries and consumers of Alaska, and at the cost of sacrificing the otherwise inevitable development of the Territory which is of paramount importance to the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas restoration of Alaska's so-called lifeline, which broke down as a result of long-time shortsightedness and as a consequence of intensive war use and employer-employee controversy, should not be undertaken at the sole expense of Alaskans in the guise of increased rates, especially since the ruinous effect on the Territory would be a serious detriment to the national interest; and

"Whereas freight rates under free competition would open up hauling of cargo from the eastern United States to the port of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and thence in Canadian bottoms to Alaska coastal points at two-thirds of the existing rates from Seattle; and

"Whereas the Territory declines to be browbeaten, and does propose to fight increased freight rates with all weapons at its disposal, with the view that the problem should be solved on the national level with temporary relief forthcoming as a sensible, foresighted investment which would pay off manyfold in the years to come, and as the only solution compatible with the national interest:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialists, do respectfully pray that section 27 of the Jones Act be amended to remove the present discrimination therein contained against the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of 290 citizens of the city of Holton, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT FOR PALESTINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, headed by a former distinguished Senator, Guy Gillette, of Iowa.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH LIGHTS OF THE PLAN FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE

A plan for the immediate establishment of a provisional government of Palestine was submitted by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to the General Secretary of the United Nations and to all the individual member governments of the United Nations.

The plan advocates the termination of the British mandate over Palestine and the establishment of the Hebrew national territory as a free democratic republic. It calls for the early convocation of a Hebrew representative assembly which, as the ad hoc representative body of the Hebrew nation, will proclaim to the world the reestablishment of the sovereign state of Palestine—as a free democratic republic with the fullest equality before the law of all citizens, irrespective of creed or national extraction.

It envisages the establishment of a United Nations supervisory board to advise and assist the provisional government in the transition from the mandatory regime to a constitutional republic.

An advisory national council and a temporary judiciary will assist the provisional government in the carrying out of its duties.

The plan stresses, amongst the principles which would constitute the policy of the provisional government, the separation of church and state and universal suffrage, regardless of sex, creed, or descent, to all literate citizens of Palestine; freedom of worship and equality before the law of all citizens, regardless of extraction and religion.

The plan thus envisages a Hebrew Palestinian republic free from either Jewish or Moslem religious domination.

It lists 13 tasks which would be amongst the first to be undertaken by the provisional government. These include the granting, upon application, of Palestinian passports to all Hebrew displaced persons in Europe and the organization of their speedy repatriation to Palestine; the organization of a Palestine army to safeguard the security and tranquillity of the country, and the dispatch of diplomatic emissaries to the various capitals of the world as a preliminary to obtaining membership in the United Nations.

The plan offers a complete solution within a period of 2 years, during which all of the Hebrews in Europe would be repatriated to Palestine and become free and useful citizens of an independent republic. The Hebrew Committee points out that no other complete solution has been offered and that the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry merely proposed a continuation of the present unbearable state of affairs.

It will require, the plan states, a smaller effort on the part of the United States Government to have this complete plan carried out than to carry out any one of the fragmentary proposals on which it now works and which leave the question unsolved.

Action on this plan is well under way, and it will be carried out irrespective of the anticipated rejection of the plan by the British Government which had entirely abandoned the mandate and had turned Palestine into an occupied territory ruthlessly subjugated by a military force. It must now be realized, the Hebrew Committee emphasizes, that the issue is a conflict between the oppressed Hebrew nation and the oppressor—the British Empire.

According to the plan, it would most probably become imperative to convene the Hebrew national assembly abroad and to establish a provisional government in exile with several members of the cabinet functioning underground in Palestine.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 460) to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 96) thereon.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the bill (S. 28) to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes, reported it without recommendation, and submitted a report (No. 97) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

James M. Alsup, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii, to fill an existing vacancy.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1082. A bill to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1083, for the relief of William Gerald Bishop, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States

shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1085. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of Jon Ovezea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1087. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WILLIAM GERALD BISHOP

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of William Gerald Bishop.

I wish to have it clearly understood that I do not know Mr. Bishop. However, I understand that if he is deported, it will be tantamount to a sentence of death. That is what his lawyer tells me. I believe that in this country every man is entitled to take advantage of every avenue available to him so that he may obtain justice. I am informed by his attorney, whom I have also never met before, that this man has not had justice. By introducing this bill and having the subject brought up before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary, that subcommittee will have charge of this matter and will have an opportunity to investigate it thoroughly. He is to be deported this evening, I understand, and therefore I am introducing this bill at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1083) for the relief of William Gerald Bishop, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1073) to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has agreed this action should be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

H. R. 1099. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 1888. An act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II; and

H. R. 2032. An act to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 2183. An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2336. An act to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; and

H. R. 2753. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to meet at 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

THE LILIENTHAL NOMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confirm Lilienthal," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

REASON FOR AID TO GREECE—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the proposed aid to Greece written by William Philip Simms and published in the Pittsburgh Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we are considering the bill which is now before the Senate in response to President Truman's eloquent message of March 12 appealing to Congress for emergency aid to Greece and Turkey. Mr. President, I desire to express my satisfaction and sense of appreciation at the widespread support by Senators of the President's policy without regard to party affiliations. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in an able and comprehensive address has given wholehearted support to the President's policy. It is gratifying to know that on both sides of the aisle the plan is receiving the approval of the Members of this body. It is of the highest importance that the foreign relations of the United States be conducted without partisanship or political division. Our voice is more persuasive and our influence more compelling when a united Nation and a united people support and sustain them. Our policy is then an American policy without regard to party or faction. Having sat in a number of international conferences, I know how imperative are national unity and cooperation when we face the other nations of the world. I am gratified beyond measure that our foreign relations are

upon a nonpartisan basis and have the support of both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the beginning—and I hope the press will note this statement—that today I speak only for myself. My remarks have not been cleared by anyone save myself. I represent no one here today but myself and, I hope, the American people.

The purpose of the bill in the case of Greece is to extend aid in the amount of $300,000,000 to the Greek Government for relief to its citizens until Greek economy can be rebuilt, and funds for the equipment of the Greek Army and for its training.

In the case of Turkey, the relief of $100,000,000 is intended for assistance in Turkey's military program of modernizing its military equipment and in training the armed forces.

The economy of Greece is threatened with total collapse unless emergency aid is quickly granted. Her people suffered the rigors and misery of years of warfare. Attacked on her northern borders and invaded by Italy and Albania, her gallant soldiery fought valiantly and heroically in defending her soil. Finally overwhelmed by the Nazi invasion, her territory was devastated, her people stripped of their possessions, her transportation system and highways largely detroyed and her people plunged into the agonies and horrors of years of a cruel and hostile occupation. She now lies broken and bleeding with her people in dire need of the primary necessities of life. Her government's activity is helpless to restore normal conditions because of the lack of resources and facilities to meet the emergency that threatens her very existence—an emergency that unless aid is granted will submerge that ancient and unhappy land in chaos, confusion, and ruin. These are the fertile soils in which germinate and flourish communism and tragic dislocation of order, of law, and of government itself.

Mr. President, in this connection let us not forget what Greece during the course of her long and distinguished history has done for the world. We must not forget that the very term "democracy" itself comes from two Greek words. We cannot forget that in classic and ancient days Greece, with her literature, her oratory, her statesmanship, her public activities, her literature, her architecture, her sculpture, and her painting contributed mightily to the culture and advancement of civilization. Rome conquered her with armies, but Greece imposed upon Rome the dominion of the mind and spirit, enriching and enobling the civilization of that era. Greece has been our friend throughout the years, notably since she gained her independence from Turkey in 1820. She is our friend; we have been her friend. We do not today desire to see her become the tragic victim of dark and cruel forces and conditions which would bring about her ruin.

It may be asked why should funds be extended to Greece and Turkey for their military establishments?

The answer is that in Greece armed bands of guerillas operating chiefly in the north along the borders of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria have been and are now making war on the Greek Government and people with the intent to overthrow it and to erect in its stead a communistic state.

There is ample evidence that these armed bands are being encouraged, stimulated, and motivated from the states of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, all of which are under the domination of Russia and her communistic system.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article published in last night's Washington Star and written by Constantine Brown, whom many Senators know. The dispatch is from Athens, where Mr. Brown is on tour, surveying world conditions. I quote very briefly:

> Estimates of the strength of the Communist military forces which are supporting the Greek guerrillas operating from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania vary from 100,00 to 250,000.

As to those figures, of course, I cannot give approval. I do not know the number. The number, however, is much larger than we had been led heretofore to believe. But here is the main point:

> The general headquarters is located at Skoplje, Yugoslavia.

The Communist army, the Communist host that is attacking Greece and sowing disaster and disruption throughout Greece, has its headquarters in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia, as all Senators know, is a sycophant of Russia and her communistic system. Through UNRRA we gave Yugoslavia $400,000,000, so the testimony of Mayor LaGuardia before the committee disclosed. Of that sum the United States paid 70 percent, or $280,000,000. Today Yugoslavia denounces us and abuses us and challenges us. I shall not mention the incident of the shooting down of our aviators. But, Mr. President, that shows the attitude of Yugoslavia, and when it is known how subservient she is to Russia it is not a very radical conclusion that her conduct now in tolerating the headquarters of the Communist army opposing Greece shows her approval and commendation.

If Greece is to survive as a free nation, if her integrity is to be maintained, if her sovereignty is to be respected, she must have the military means to suppress these lawless bands and to maintain her government and the integrity of her territory and the safety of her people against these evil and insidious influences that seek by infiltration and absorption to pull down the Greek flag and to lift in its stead the banner of communism and chaos and confusion and misery.

Mr. President, by the enactment of this bill we do not send a single combat soldier to Greece. There has been complaint by Mr. Gromyko and others to the effect that we were proposing to send military aid to Greece. Not a single combat soldier will be sent; only a small group of military men to assist in the training of the Greek Army and in teaching it how to utilize the weapons which it has in its hands. The naval forces we propose to send will also be very small; principally for the aid of Greece in minesweeping and activities of that kind, landing craft—all of a very minor character.

It would be futile indeed for economic relief to be extended which would serve the necessities for only a brief period and to permit the submergence of the people and Government to the waves of armed communism beating at their doors and ending in final triumph for these alien and evil influences. In other words, merely to extend small amounts of economic aid to supply her needs for a brief period would be of little avail if in the meantime her Government collapses and the forces of communism take over her Government. If Greece is to live, if there is to be a Greece, she must be given aid to maintain the essentials of law and order, to suppress outlaw bands making war upon her.

The United States is not seeking to intervene in Greece. Whatever we shall do in Greece will be done at the urgent request of the Greek people. We do not propose to dictate to Greece as to the form of government which she may have, or as to her institutions. We do mean to have control of the expenditure of these funds under American supervision in order that they may be utilized for the purposes intended. But the Greek people ought to remain entirely free without any political control or dominance by the United States.

In the case of Turkey, it is in the national interest of the United States that she be extended aid in the form of military equipment or supplies and the training of her armies in order to maintain her sovereignty, her territory, and her security. Turkey, since the beginning of World War II has maintained a large armed force. It has entailed a severe strain upon Turkey's economy. Her need for mobilizing and keeping under arms her military forces is imperative. It is well known that Turkey is under constant threat from abroad and that her security is endangered.

It is well known that Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria are completely under the domination and control of Soviet Russia. They have embraced, either willingly or under the threat of overwhelming armed forces, the doctrines and ideologies of Soviet Russia. They are the obsequious sycophants of Soviet Russia and her doctrine of infiltration and military and political pressure looking to the subjugation of its victims. The world needs but to look about at the unfortunate situation of Poland, of Czechoslovakia with a great and glorious history, and of Rumania, to know how the Russian system has engulfed these unfortunate lands and broken the spirit of their people. In the case of Poland a tremendous Russian army is on her eastern border. Other Russian occupation armies in Germany are on Poland's western border. She is within a vise and is absolutely compelled to respond to the wishes of the Soviets.

Even now in Moscow, Soviet Russia is delaying and blocking action on a peace treaty for Germany. She has an ambition to establish a dominant influence in Germany and to bring a large part of

the territory of Germany within the Soviet system. We want to see Germany reestablished, but she must be stripped of her military power. We want to eradicate the war fever and her ambition for world mastery. We want Germany's economy lifted to a high level. Her continued existence is necessary to European economy.

Soviet Russia, however, wants to implant her ideology, her communistic system in that unhappy land and to bring her people within the Soviet orbit.

Soviet Russia, by her system of spreading creeping paralysis among smaller and weaker nations, hopes to bring about world dominion and to control the destiny of Europe. She hungers for "all the land that joins me." Those words are taken from the story of an old farmer who, upon inquiry, stated that all he wanted was "all the land that 'jines' me."

If Greece and Turkey should fall under the sway of Soviet Russia, Italy would be the next victim of this system of economic, military, and political aggression. "Aggression" is the word, and the correct word. Across the Adriatic from Italy lies Yugoslavia, subservient and obedient to the Soviets, with Marshal Tito, who thinks he is a great military figure, ready to leap at the throat of Italy instantly when the opportunity is presented. That was made clear at Paris, at the Foreign Ministers Council, which some of us attended. Yugoslavia has its hungry eyes set upon Italy. If Greece and Turkey fall, Italy will be the next victim. Should Italy fall, France would be the next objective. From the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, communistic patrols and detachments would cover with their propaganda and their illusive promises that historic land. Austria would succumb to these enervating and weakening influences until her sovereignty was destroyed and her Government dissolved.

The United States wants Russia to have her own Government within her own borders, but no farther. Russia has a right to select her own system of government, but she has no right by political pressure, by the threat of armed force, to sap the strength of independent and sovereign peoples and to so enervate them and strip them of their strength as to be able to bring them under her dominion. Yes, we want Russia to have her own form of government. We want her to be secure within her own boundaries. We should give her assurance of that desire. No one wants to invade Russia, or hamper or interfere with her internal affairs.

During World War II, we sent, from March 1, 1941, to September 30, 1946, $11,297,883,000 in lend-lease to help Russia maintain her integrity and preserve her Government and assure her security. Is there any hostility in that? We were ready to send lend-lease assistance to Russia in order that she might survive, in order that she might have her own Government, in order that she might have her own institutions. We did not question her form of government or her institutions when we sent that aid. We did not equivocate. We did not hesitate. We did not inquire as to the form of her government or her institutions. Why does she now oppose our extending similar aid to Greece for the same purposes—for the purpose of maintaining her integrity, of giving security to her people, and of implementing her own institutions?

Russia was an ally during World War II. She was an ally when our country was under arms, fighting the common enemy. We have indulged the hope that in peace she might be our ally as well as in war. We had based our hopes on the thought that the unity of the great powers in the United Nations would preserve peace, would preserve the sanctity of sovereign nations and would guarantee their security and safety.

We want to be friends with Russia. If she wants United States friendship, let her (a) cease to infiltrate other countries; (b) cease to employ her armies as a threat to her neighbors; (c) respect the sovereignty and integrity of other nations; (d) perform her obligations to the United Nations to promote peace and peaceful settlements.

Mr. President, in World War II, we sent our armies and navies to many parts of the world. We poured out in treasure more than three hundred billion dollars. And why? We made these tremendous sacrifices to prevent conquest by arms. Why shall we not now send not armies, not soldiers, but dollars to Greece and Turkey to prevent conquest by all of the devices and methods employed to subjugate peaceful peoples by communistic ideologies? Why shall we not give aid to these countries to enable them in their own right, and in their own dignity and under their own sovereignty, to maintain their integrity and security against the vicious and destructive attacks that threaten them?

Mr. President, in all candor and frankness, one of the motives that prompts me to support this measure is resistance to the aggressive expansionist doctrines of Soviet Russia. Free and independent nations must not be destroyed. Her conquest of these keys to the Mediterranean, to the Middle East, and to the Far East in her mad march toward world dominion must be arrested.

Let me observe here that Greece and Turkey are almost indissolubly linked. If Greece should fall, with her chain of islands extending to the boundaries of Turkey, it would be only a little while until Turkey would be forced to succumb. Aggression feeds upon each success. It is urged on to other conquests, to greater dominion, to a more sweeping extermination of governments and systems, until an outraged world resists and overcomes and drives back its barbaric system.

Greece, unaided and alone, cannot successfully resist the tidal waves of communism nor the sweep of armies supporting it. Turkey, unaided, cannot arrest an attack by a great military power. The aid proposed by this bill must be granted, and granted speedily, if Greece and Turkey are to survive.

There is no conflict between what is proposed in this bill and the functions of the United Nations. The President in his address to the Congress pointed out that the United Nations was equipped with neither the facilities nor the funds with which to meet the emergent conditions in Greece and Turkey.

President Truman is not justly subject to criticism in this regard. He knows, as we know, and as the United Nations organization and the Security Council know, that the United Nations is not equipped with either the funds or the facilities to render this aid. The United States, through former Senator Austin, its representative in the Security Council, officially advised the Council of the proposed action of the United States and gave assurances to the United Nations that there is involved no desire nor attempt to invade the jurisdiction or authority of the United Nations.

The bill provides, out of an abundance of caution, out of a desire to meet the criticisms, attacks, and suggestions that the problem should go to the United Nations, that whenever the United Nations, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, decides to act upon a proposal to extend aid of the kind proposed in the bill, the United States, through the President, will withdraw further aid.

Mr. President, we have gone to the extreme limit in our respect for the United Nations. No one wants to hamper the United Nations. The United Nations, within its particular sphere and within its appropriate jurisdiction, has the loyal support of the United States now, and has had it ever since it was founded at San Francisco. At an early period the United States was one of the leading nations to propose the formation of the United Nations, and we gave it our hearty support in the period of its formation. We have given it our hearty support ever since.

On Monday Mr. Gromyko, the representative to the Security Council from Soviet Russia, made an attack upon the United States because of the provisions of this bill. He asserted that the enactment of the bill would by-pass the United Nations and that any action taken should be by the United Nations. He charged that our aid would constitute intervention in the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. Mr. Gromyko, of course, does not want Greece or Turkey to receive aid either from the United Nations or from the United States. That is my considered belief. If a proposal should be made to the United Nations organization to supply the aid carried in this bill, Mr. Gromyko, as a representative of Soviet Russia, would, according to my belief, promptly interpose a veto as he has done on a number of occasions heretofore. Ten times the Soviet has vetoed action by the Security Council. Mr. Gromyko knows that the United Nations does not possess the funds nor the facilities to grant the required aid. He knows it does not have a dime nor a single soldier to devote to such a cause. He wants to send Greece and Turkey for aid where he knows there is no aid. Mr. Gromyko's sally is a flank movement.

We made loans to Italy, to France, and to other countries, and every one of them was based upon the implication that by the extension of those loans the respective countries could stabilize their economy and prevent or override agitations

of a communistic nature. Who complained that those loans ought to have been made through the United Nations? Where was the champion standing forth then to demand that the appeals of France, Italy, and Great Britain should go to the United Nations? The press carried reports that Russia had made loans to Poland. I never heard of their being submitted to the United Nations.

It is my view that the United States must be frank with Russia and that we must demand frankness of the Soviets. We must proclaim the truth. Let them know where we stand. There is no denial that one of the cardinal purposes of this bill is to enable Greece and Turkey to resist the encroachments of Soviet Russia and her satellite states. Russia is not unaware of this purpose. We should make that purpose clear. We should demand of Russia that she abandon the methods by which she subjugated the satellite states. We should make it plain that as a Nation and a people we shall resist this effort to destroy the independence or integrity of free peoples.

We are devoted to the cause of peace. We have pledged our support and our loyalty to the United Nations as an organization for the promotion of peace and for the support of free governments.

Read the Charter. Written into that document in the most solemn fashion is the statement that one of the obligations assumed by members of the United Nations is to protect and defend the sovereignty of free peoples and free nations. These are the great objectives of that organization. We shall continue in our devotion to it and its purposes.

We fought World War I and World War II to secure world peace. We came out of those wars without any added territory, without any bounties or reparations. We came out with nothing but enormous sacrifices of blood and treasure which we made toward the establishment of the principle of world peace and respect for nations and their territories and institutions. The aid proposed in this bill is in the interest of and will contribute to world peace. Without such aid war might ultimately develop in those areas. War anywhere on earth is a threat to our peace.

In World War I, by reason of an incident in an obscure town in Europe, we were drawn into that world conflict. In World War II, difficulties over the Polish Corridor, trivial in themselves, finally engulfed us in the most stupendous war in all the pages of history. If we can maintain peace in Greece and Turkey, we will have contributed to the peace of the world. In contributing to the peace of the world we will contribute to our own peace.

However, Mr. President, our own security and the integrity of our territory and our institutions call for our supreme sacrifice and constant concern. We want peace. We crave dominion over no other land. We look with hungry eyes upon no foreign territory. We do not dream of tribute or bounties or subsidies from any other people. We want peace. But there is no absolute assurance of peace unless we in our own strength and resources possess the means of insuring peace. So long as there exists in the world the evil influence of national ambitions to conquer or subjugate other lands or nations, we must be alert to the dangers to our own security and to the peace of the world. In these troubled days, the United States must maintain its defenses and its armed services. It is the imperative duty of the United States to maintain an army adequate for our defense and capable of being expanded to meet our national requirements. We must maintain the greatest navy that floats upon the seven seas—not for offense, not for conquest, but for the defense of this land and the safety of our people. The United States must maintain the greatest and most efficient air force in the world. World War II has demonstrated the military power of the air services. It wrote a new and startling chapter in the history of warfare. It will grow and develop as a result of scientific invention and through the daring exploits of that arm of the service.

The highest and most compelling duty of the Congress of the United States is to provide for the protection and security of our beloved land and the people of these United States. We must not, we shall not, neglect the imperative duty of adequate national defense. It will not alone give us security at home, but will invest our voice with a strength necessary to carry conviction to lands abroad that we are prepared to fulfill our commitments and obligations in the international field.

Mr. President, throughout the centuries run the dreams of would-be conquerors. Plans for conquest and dominion fill many pages of the solemn history of the world. These dreams were dissipated by outraged people who resisted and crushed them. Communism cannot conquer the world by the devices she now employs. The free peoples of the world are determined to remain free. They will not be deluded by the false and fatuous promises that communism offers. They will resist unto the death. They will determine their own destiny. They will not be coerced by any foreign power or influence.

Let Russia reflect that Mussolini had a dream to build an empire on the ruins of conquered lands. Mussolini's empire was shattered and broken; and Mussolini, its master and author, was interred amidst its ruins.

Let Russia reflect that Hitler, with tremendous resources and a superb army, sought to dominate the world with the sword. He drove his military minions into the heart of Russia itself. But Hitler's far-flung campaigns ended in disaster; and Hitler, the author, perished in the storm that wrecked and destroyed them.

Let not Russia blind her eyes to recent history, nor close them to the lessons of the past. World dominion by a single power will not be achieved as long as freemen know how to resist tyranny, whether threatened by arms or by pressure, infiltration, or absorption. Russia should know that world empire is dead. It must remain dead.

Mr. President, we are standing on the world stage. Small nations and free peoples everywhere on the globe are looking to us with hope in their hearts and a prayer upon their lips. What we shall do will be recorded in the solemn annals of our time. The United States, with a glorious tradition, faces the judgment of history. The United States, the nursery of liberty since Jefferson flung his flaming declaration into the face of a British king; the United States, the strongest, the richest and the most powerful Nation on the globe, must answer the cry of impoverished and shattered Greece for aid to alleviate the sufferings and hunger of her unhappy people and to strengthen her armed forces, to suppress rebellion, and to preserve her life. We must answer the appeal of Turkey to strengthen and equip her armies, to preserve the integrity of her soil and her rights as a nation. Mr. President, as the greatest champion of democracy in all the centuries that have passed over the hoary head of mother earth, we cannot, we must not, say "No."

HENRY FORD

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at 2:30 this afternoon the State of Michigan is standing by in a memorial moment of devoted tribute to Henry Ford. It is the hour of his funeral. I join in this memorial to a great American, with this brief benediction, though words would be inadequate, even if multiplied ten thousand times:

Mr. Henry Ford's death ends one of the greatest and most thrilling careers in the life of this country. It is the vivid epitome of what one man can do for himself and for his fellow men under our system of American freedoms. Through his own irresistible genius and courage he not only rose from humble obscurity to fame and fortune, but he also founded a new national economy of mass production which blessed his hundreds of thousands of employees with high wages and his millions of customers with low prices. He has probably had as great an impact on his times as if he had been a President of the United States. With it all, he continued always to be a modest, kindly, gentle friend with constant interest in the welfare of his country and of his fellow men. He was a giant in a day of giants. He will never be forgotten.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the amendment submitted by the committee on page 7, which I perfected yesterday in one instance. I am desperately anxious to be very sure that the words are utterly beyond any possibility of misunderstanding as to their meaning; namely, that the attitude of the United States is to recognize any action taken by the Security Council with respect to this problem, without counting vetoes. After a further conference with the Acting Secretary of State this morning, I am going to change one more word in the amendment on page 7, in line 24, so that there can be no possibility of doubt as to its meaning.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make such a motion

at the present time, so that we can perfect this document before the general debate begins. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to submit to the committee amendment an amendment changing the first word "the", in line 24, to the word "any."

Mr. PEPPER. Let me inquire what the page is, Mr. President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is on page 7.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the point. Is the word "the" to which the Senator refers, the one appearing in the phrase "exercise of the veto"; and would the change suggested by the Senator from Michigan make those words read "exercise of any veto"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator restate that? I did not quite understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The words in parentheses at the bottom of page 7 will then read as follows:

(with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto.)

That change would be made so that there can be no question of the fact that we are not hiding behind someone else's veto when the time comes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say in this connection that I shall not object, but I think I approach this matter from a standpoint somewhat different from that of the Senator from Michigan. I do not agree that the Congress can by its enactment waive or in anywise infringe upon the action of the Security Council. Under the Charter, if a nation votes "no"—I refer to any one of the five permanent members—that is a veto. But I agree to the proposition that we can condition our own action with any future event, just so it is an event.

So it is in that spirit that I go along with the Senator, but not with the idea that we can in any wise prescribe how the Security Council shall act or shall function or how it shall count vetoes or not count vetoes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the analysis made by the Senator from Texas. There is no suggestion here of any attempt to invade the authority of the Security Council to write its own rules. The sole attempt is to set up a rule of conduct by which we shall interpret a vote that is taken in the Security Council under the circumstances indicated. The purpose is that we shall count it as a straight vote, regardless of anyone's right to have his vote counted as a veto within the operations of the Security Council itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean to say, then, that his construction of this provision is that, notwithstanding the fact that any other nation, which we could not, of course, affect, should exercise the veto, we would not regard that as anything except a negative vote?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The question has occurred to me, and no doubt it occurred to the able Senator in charge of the bill, that this declaration is on the part of Congress. Of course, this is a bill, and therefore it would require the signature of the President. I have no positive views about the subject, but it raises an interesting constitutional question as to whether our veto in due course should be waived by the President of the United States giving direction of our representatives on the UN, or whether the Congress by the enactment of legislation could waive the veto of the United States. I should like to have the views of the able Senator from Michigan upon that point, if it was within the mind of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to debate any constitutional question with the able Senator from Florida, because I fully realize that I would have two strikes on me before I started.

I do not think the situation we are considering involves any necessity for that sort of what might be called microscopic examination, because I think this is fundamentally and essentially an assertion of an attitude of good faith. We would say by an act of Congress, signed by the President of the United States, that if "the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto), or the General Assembly finds that action taken, or assistance furnished, by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable," then "the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein."

Mr. President, I think that is the definition of an attitude. I am perfectly sure that so far as the authors of the bill are concerned it is an attitude which is assumed in 1,000-percent good faith. I am sure it will be accepted on that basis and interpreted upon that basis if any occasion ever arises to challenge it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one remark?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I myself do not think there is a constitutional question in this declaration at all. All that the Congress is doing is laying down a policy. It is constitutional to the extent that Congress, of course, has the right to authorize the President to act, it has the right to direct the President to act. Those things are constitutional. So that the writing of the provision itself is, of course, in keeping with constitutional practices. But the declaration is merely a declaration of policy which implies a consent to a theory. That is as far as this goes. To assume that it takes away the discretion of the President, to assume that he cannot act within his field, a field which is his under the Constitution, that we are trying to limit that, would be entirely wrong. It is a declaration of the good intent of Congress to live in harmony with past declarations which the Congress has made in adhering to the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I agree with his analysis, and I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 4, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, after the word "act", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "and any necessary expenses related thereto" and the comma.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we face the usual embarrassment and dilemma which usually at about this hour of the day confront a Senator presumptuous enough to think that anything he can say will satisfy Senators as well as the good things they can eat at their lunch period.

I wish to address myself generally to the pending proposal, and I am prepared to do it now; I suppose it will be necessary to do it now, although it is a very unhappy time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Smith
Bushfield	Jenner	Sparkman
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	Knowland	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Connally	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	McClellan	Tydings
Cordon	McFarland	Umstead
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Moore	Williams
Fulbright	Murray	Wilson
George	Myers	Young
Green	O'Conor	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, for a few moments I shall address myself in general terms to the proposal which is now before the Senate, and thereafter I shall address myself to the specific amendments, or substitutes, as they may come severally to the attention of the Senate.

Like millions of other Americans and millions of nationals of other nations

over the world, I keep asking myself what President Roosevelt, as the one principally responsible for the United Nations, would have done, faced with the same situation which faces our Government now in Greece and Turkey. And the reply which keeps coming back to me is the statement of the Manchester Guardian, a world-honored English newspaper, which said, as quoted on March 21 by the New York Herald Tribune:

One feels that, faced with the same situation, President Roosevelt would first have tried to do the same things through the United Nations by enlisting the support of other nations, including Russia if possible. Peace, the status quo, the integrity of nations—these are not exclusively American interests, but the interest of us all.

What is this proposal we now have to approve or reject? It is not a relief bill—because no relief is asked for Turkey, and half of what is asked for Greece is for equipping, training and maintaining a Greek army of 125,000.

Some say it is a momentous new doctrine and they compare it to the Monroe Doctrine except that it extends to the whole world and not merely to the Western Hemisphere. Some say it is a showdown with Russia and that we have determined to join issue with the Russians at every point of their circumference.

Others say that we have determined to stop communism and now accept its challenge in every continent and country and clime.

Others say it divides the world into two spheres, the East and the West. For example, the Stockholm Expressen says:

In the long run, the speech—

Referring to the President's address—

has merely increased the difficulties and deepened the disagreements between the East and the West, which are shaking the postwar world.

From many parts of the world come the rising murmurs that it is the expression of a new and expanding American imperialism, while a French newspaper adds that the President's—

concern is not for democracy but for the interest of American big businessmen who are in full action in the Near East.

Mr. President, I have before me a publication entitled "The Value Line—Investment Survey"; it is further entitled "Fortnightly Commentary." It states itself to be published in New York, and purports to be an expression of the business point of view. I read the first paragraph—"Intervention in Greece" is the heading:

After this letter goes to press, President Truman will address Congress on the subject of American intervention in Greece. We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world, and such extensive undertaking would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing they would prove to be self-defeating.

I shall read another paragraph in this periodical. The heading is "The Shift of British Power":

The No. 1 fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustments is that the British are shifting their empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa. From a speculative standpoint, it seems to be good strategy. Britain has neither the economic sinews nor the fire power to hold India and the Far East or to defend Australia and New Zealand. Her land-based planes probably could hold Africa. There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor, to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization. Their political life is a jigsaw of feudal rivalries. Their economy is totally undeveloped.

The letter goes on to infer, Mr. President, that Britain is constantly changing and shifting the point of her emphasis geographically in that remote part of the world.

I read another paragraph:

How then will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm-water outlet? Imagine, for a moment, that the United States of America were a land-locked Nation without Atlantic or Pacific seaports and that our only outlet to the Atlantic was through the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. Imagine then that Russia, disapproving the Aleman regime in Mexico, decided to intervene with arms and money to unhorse Mr. Aleman and substitute a regime sympathetic to and in close collaboration with one of the totalitarian governments, let us say the Argentinian. Even without the Monroe Doctrine, America would spring to arms.

I read another paragraph:

The upshot cannot be favorable to the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look at Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

And the last quotation from this publication:

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Communist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians, but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to "contain" Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

And one other quotation. The publication from which I am reading now is the U. D. A. London Letter, published by the Union for Democratic Action Educational Fund, Inc., in London. This letter makes commentary upon what has been happening in England under the British Government.

Unlike Britons, Americans never really believed that labor meant what it said about breaking with the old English imperial traditions. Hence, when successive steps were taken toward India's freedom, they always flattered themselves that they could detect in each decision some subtle English trick; some new way of holding India against her will. As labor, with gathering speed, disengaged itself of empire (the setting of a near date for Indian independence followed hard on the agreement for Burma's freedom) they found it increasingly difficult to discover equivocations. The coal crisis gave them an excuse for seeing necessity, not design, in Britain's actions; a foolish notion, because far weaker countries (France and Holland) were hanging on to their empires for dear life. The proposal of President Truman to assume responsibility for Turkey and Greece took them utterly by surprise; almost, as it were, between the words "British" and "imperialism." The burden America thus proposed to take up was one of the most unpopular—

Speaking of the British occupation of Greece—

Britain had ever carried. English troops entered Greece to keep it from falling into the Russian sphere. In so doing, they arrested in mid-course a Communist-led revolution. Britain did her best to support what moderate elements existed, but without success; only the Royalists and the Communists were strong in the countryside, and whatever cabinets were put together at the top, the actual administration of the law fell (if Communists were excluded) into Royalist hands. The memory of communistic excesses, and fear of the Slav bloc with its extravagant claims on Greek territory, drove many sincere Republicans to vote for the return of King George. As Britain gradually relaxed her influence, and the Royalists gradually got a freer hand, they in turn proceeded by their harshness and incompetence to turn Republicans into Communists.

I hope that will not be accomplished in the United States.

The British decision to withdraw altogether was logical and expected. As America moved hastily into action, Britain enjoyed the luxury of a sideline seat.

Mr. President, surely a doctrine subject to so many different interpretations—and I am giving them to the Senate only for what they are worth—which has aroused such sincere concerns and fears from noncommunistic sources in so many parts of the world, which has illimitable and incalculable implications, as admitted by its own proponents, should not be adopted without the American people taking ample time to debate and to weigh the solemn judgment they shall cast upon it.

The Congress and the country debated lend-lease, another momentous American policy which had my hearty support, for many months before we enacted it. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted hearings before it recommended it. Those of us who are deeply disturbed by this momentous proposal now before us protest against the effort to secure its hasty passage by the Senate without adequate opportunity for debate in the Senate and in the country.

Especially is it regrettable that the Senate, where the privilege of debate can be unlimited according to the rules, has chosen to act first upon this measure instead of following the practice we used in connection with lend-lease and letting the measure first pass the House and then come to the Senate after the Nation has been more fully advised of its significance and implications.

Let me hasten to assert that in these observations in no sense of the word do I cast any disparagement upon or direct any criticism to the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. VANDENBERG] or to the distinguished members of that committee. On the contrary, the chairman has been characteristically distinguished in the fairness with which he has approached every aspect of this question. He has already told the Senate that the committee heard every witness who asked to be heard. Yet it is a fact—and I am sure it was a necessity on the part of the committee—that in many cases the witnesses were limited in the time they were allowed before the committee. I feel that, if the hearings are considered by the committee to have been adequate, surely here in the Senate, Senators should search their souls and minds upon this momentous proposal and give the American people an opportunity to express their sentiments to their Congress before we launch America upon a course, the implications of which no honest man can foretell.

From church people, from those whose faith in the future is pinned to the United Nations, from those who both love America and love peace, there is a rising tide of opposition to this measure as it is now before the Senate, in spite of the generous gesture which the Foreign Relations Committee, in the utmost of good faith, has extended to the United Nations. I believe Senators will have to go no further than their own mail to affirm the growing opposition to the proposal, the end of which no one can honestly foretell.

Robbed of the military aspects, this measure would have had no opposition in Congress, for we all favor Greek relief to the utmost. In 1945 I had the privilege of spending a few days in Athens. I saw the horror which those people had experienced as the Germans sought to wreak their vengeance upon them for knocking out of order Hitler's timetable to invade the Soviet Union. I heard this at Nuremberg in 1945 from the mouth of General von Brauchitsch, who had been commander in chief of the German Army. The timetable called for an attack upon Russia by the Germans on the 8th of May 1941. Then they determined to occupy Greece and Yugoslavia. Hitler gave the order to General von Brauchitsch for execution. He occupied those two countries. But Von Brauchitsch was a good enough general and an able enough commander to anticipate the difficulty of this assignment. Perhaps he sensed ahead of time the glorious and heroic defense which would be made by the peoples of Greece and Yugoslavia. He called upon Hitler, he said, to allow him to withhold the attack upon Russia until the job in Greece and Yugoslavia was completed. He testified that Hitler finally acquiesced. The result was that the Nazi assault upon Soviet territory was launched on the 22d of June 1941, instead of on the 8th of May. Because the Germans were aware of what the Greeks had done to upset their timetable, they wreaked every barbaric form of vengeance that they could possibly conceive upon the Greek people. I know, therefore, how dire is their distress and how great is their need.

Relief for Greece could have been continued through UNRRA, which was set up by the United Nations organization, and to which we generously contributed. But the Government of the United States is responsible for the termination of UNRRA, giving some justification for asserting that, in the dispensation of relief, we were not thinking solely about human need and the suffering of men, women, and children, but those who obtained relief had to be politically acceptable to our dispensation. Relief could have been provided through an international relief fund set up in the United Nations, as other nations wished to do, upon the recommendation last year of former Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, the head of UNRRA, pursuant to the directive of UNRRA itself in the United Nations.

But, Mr. President, United States representatives prevented that resolution setting up an international relief fund from being adopted, though Mayor LaGuardia asserts that he had visited Stalin beforehand and that the head of the Soviet Government had given his commitment that the Soviet Union would participate in setting up such an international relief fund.

I hold in my hand the resolutions and official documents showing who proposed to set up an international relief fund and who killed it. This material comes to me, upon my request, from the United Nations organization itself.

We are already undertaking to provide $50,000,000 outside this bill for immediate relief to Greece, and that is all that is asked to relieve distress in Greece. It will be recognized that I refer to the general relief bill providing $350,000,000 for relief of other distressed nations and peoples of the world. But again, Mr. President, while that bill allows $50,000,000 for Greece, there is some justification for the assertion that we recognize human misery and need only when it happens to occur in a country whose political policy is agreeable to the State Department of the United States.

When the Good Samaritan was on the way to Jericho and heard a cry to his conscience, he did not ask whether the recipient of his charity was on his political side. It is a good lesson for America to recall today, like other Biblical illustrations, in the dispensation of Christian charity.

The $150,000,000 which this measure requests for economic rehabilitation in Greece should be and can be provided through the World Bank in the form of a loan, a part of which, at least, could be paid back, and would not in the first instance be an outright gift, provided at the expense of the American taxpayers.

It is well known that the International Food and Agricultural Organization set up under the United Nations organization sent a mission to Greece to make a study of short-term and long-term needs in that war-torn country. That mission submitted a report, which was recently published. In its report, it asked for two kinds of relief—perhaps I should say three kinds: First, they appealed to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and to the United States and Britain, to provide Greece with short-term relief in the matter of food and other imports which they were not otherwise able to get to cover the period following UNRRA's withdrawal until international assistance and an expanding economy would no longer require such special aid. I understood that type of aid referred to the kind of relief contemplated in the $50,000,000 appropriation which is being made available by Congress for assistance to the distressed Greek people, outside the proposal which is now before us. But, the burden of the recommendation of that mission of the Food and Agricultural Organization was that the World Bank make a loan of $100,000,000 to Greece for long-term rehabilitation of her economy.

It is said that the World Bank cannot give this assistance, that it cannot extend this loan. No one denies that it has many billions of dollars in its treasury. One reason it is not able immediately to give this assistance is because there has been some delay on the part of our Government in recommending some of the officials of the institution. It is said it is a lending organization. Several weeks ago the bank announced that the Greek Government had notified it that it intended to apply for a loan and would do so as soon as it completed a study of its needs and its reconstruction program. Surely the Greeks could pay something back. The United States is the major stockholder in the World Bank. If the bank should lose the fund, we would lose the major part. But is not that preferable to giving it all without any hope of reimbursement to the American taxpayers?

So I say, Mr. President, that the relief needs of Greece, short term and long term, could have been taken care of through UNRRA had we continued it. They could have been provided for in an international relief fund had we not killed it. They could be aided now in connection with the $50,000,000 which Congress is in the course of providing. The long-term relief can and should be provided through the World Bank set up for the express purpose of giving such assistance to those who require it.

Even if the President had asked the Congress to make a direct grant of money to Greece for both relief and rehabilitation, he could have got the money by a simple request. Congress is not going to deny a request of the President that we do our duty in an economic way to the other peoples of the world. But—

What has deeply moved and disturbed the American people and people all over the world is the unprecedented proposal, first, that we send a military mission to Turkey; second, that we give Turkey

$100,000,000 for the equipment and support of her army for the next 15 months; third, that we send a military mission to Greece; fourth, that we give Greece $150,000,000 to equip, train, and support a Greek Army of 125,000 for the next 15 months.

I know we are moving in a fast world. I know especially that the international scene is kaleidoscopic in its changes; but I will say candidly, Mr. President, that, if 6 weeks ago anyone had suggested to me that the President would propose or that the American Congress would countenance our sending a military mission to Turkey, paying the major part of the support for the equipment and maintenance of a Turkish Army, I would have thought that the suggestion was unthinkable. It is so linked with the animosity that is directed against some nations and some peoples, it is so delicately interwoven with a nation like Greece for which we have such supreme respect and affection, that we seem to take it as a matter of course that today there are no geographic limits to where America may go in giving aid and armed support for things which we approve of in various parts of the world.

There is an axiom in the law that what we do by another we do ourselves. If we finance another nation's army by providing money for its support, by giving them the equipment, by providing training in the use of the equipment, through the medium of an American military mission, can it be denied that to a very practical degree the foreign army becomes our army because we are financing it, we are equipping it, we are training it, and we are providing supervision in certain ways through an American mission? Above all, we are helping to continue its existence.

What deeply frightens the American people is that, if Congress adopts this measure, it will make the United States the principal founder of the United Nations, repudiate its solemn covenant to act through the United Nations for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

I have before me the Charter of the United Nations organization. I merely want to read article 1 of that Charter:

> The purposes of the United Nations are:
>
> 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. President, the effect of this proposal, if enacted, is officially to brand the United Nations as a failure, and of no force or power to achieve the sacred functions for which it was founded—the protection of the security of peoples and the preservation of the peace of the world. This proposal has disappointed the hopes of the American people for peace more than any other single event since the establishment of the United Nations.

Mr. President, let me summarize the results from the last Gallup poll on that subject. The poll indicated that 56 percent of the people queried favored the bill asking for $250,000,000 to give aid to Greece, but the poll report also indicated that a majority of the people regretted that we had not gone, in the first instance, through the United Nations organization, and the poll further disclosed that an overwhelming majority opposed our sending military missions to Turkey and to Greece.

Mr. President, the question of sending military missions might be adverted to at this point. At the present time there is no statute which authorizes the President of the United States to send a military mission to any country outside the Western Hemisphere. There was a statute, enacted several years ago, which permitted us to send military missions within the Western Hemisphere, but not outside it. On the contrary, the fact that the Executive recognizes that he has no authority to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere is best attested by the fact that there is now pending in the present Congress a bill to authorize the President to do that very thing—to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere.

I recall that in 1945 I was visiting in Syria and was talking to the highest officials of the Syrian Government. To the American minister whom I accompanied in the conference and to me—with the idea that in some way I might be able to help in the accomplishment of their recommendations—they pleaded that two American officers in American uniforms be permitted to go there, to help them achieve their emancipation—from the Russians, Mr. President? No; from the British troops. But our officials had to report to them that our Government had no authority to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere, even though they sympathized with their aspirations. Help later was given. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had a very great and excellent influence in the United Nations in bringing about a decision by which British and French troops did leave Syria and Lebanon.

But I am saying that this bill proposes a new principle; namely, to allow military missions to be sent outside the Western Hemisphere. Where will that course lead us?

We are told that not more than 30 or 40 American officers will be sent. Mayor LaGuardia has said that that will mean the sending of 300 or 400 personnel, because every officer will have at least 10 aides. But, Mr. President, if an American officer in the uniform of the United States Army or Navy is placed there, America will be there, with all that that means and with all that it should mean. In many instances it will mean that the American uniform will be the leverage by which reactionary and perhaps corrupt governments may at least psychologically intimidate the opposition to their own domestic policies.

Mr. President, it is not true that the United Nations is incapable of meeting the present problems of the eastern Mediterranean unless the United States makes it so.

If we rob the United Nations of the stalwart support of the strongest nation in the world and then condemn it as being incapable of acting, the fault is upon us, not the United Nations. We shall have to bear upon our hearts and consciences the immeasurable consequences, not only of this new doctrine which now is proposed, but the mortal blow that we strike at the United Nations, which is our one great gain from all the blood and treasure the war has just cost us.

The leaders who have proposed this measure to us, however earnest and sincere and patriotic, I fear are not aware of what they have done. In an honest but misguided zeal to strike out against what they call communism, as one does against horrible shapes and forms which accost one in a nightmare, they would sabotage the United Nations, destroy any hope of reconciliation with Russia, launch the United States upon an unprecedented policy of intervention in remote nations and areas of the world unilaterally, ally us with the reactionary and corrupt regimes of the world, subject this Nation to the serious accusation of aspiring to become the new Rome or the old Britain, and risk for the American people a war which may destroy civilization.

Against such a policy, small wonder that the protests of those groups who believe in peace and the United Nations, those who want America to hold firm to its old democratic traditions, are rising to a higher and higher pitch.

Surely the Senate will not adopt in haste this policy, the end of which no Senator can foresee.

Mr. President, let me digress here to observe that, as I said to the Foreign Relations Committee the other day, a committee characteristically courteous in their reception, I supported lend-lease. I saw Senators on this floor search their souls for the right decision on that policy. They saw its implications and where it might lead. So did I. But I supported it. I thought that at that time, under those circumstances, there was nothing else to do. But, Mr. President, to those who too rashly condemn some of us who were so hardy in our support of lend-lease and are so reluctant in any support of this measure, let me remind them of the action I took about the 20th of May, 1940, when I stood on this floor and announced to the Senate that the Germans had reached Abbeville, nearly on the Atlantic coast of France; and that they were about to pinch off the whole British Army and that Dunkerque was in prospect. I did not announce that, but that was what was inevitable. Then I announced the purport of a resolution I contemplated submitting, not upon the direction of President Roosevelt, but at least having communicated it to him and having advised him that I would submit it on my own responsibility at noon that day

unless he requested me not to. I read it over the telephone to Miss Margaret Le Hand, his personal secretary. After I had finished she probably disclosed what may have been the thinking of the President, when she said, "It would be great if we could get that, wouldn't it?"

We authorized the President to let any allies who were the victims of Hitler's aggression have any airplanes in our own possession that could be replaced by manufacture in the United States. A little later the authority was extended until it embodied the spirit and the purpose, if not the letter, of the eventual lend-lease law.

What I wanted to emphasize, Mr. President, was that on that day Denmark was under the cruel heel of the Hitler hordes, as was Norway, likewise Holland, likewise Belgium, likewise all eastern France, and it was inevitable that the German Army should sweep over probably all of France. It was thought by a great many at that time that it was only a question of time until Britain herself would fall.

I will say, therefore, that, whenever Russia undertakes, even in a small way, to do the same thing, I shall try to be as diligent in rejection of such action on her part as I was at that time in resisting the actual military aggression of Hitler's hordes upon the people of western Europe.

Let me remind the Senate that there was no United Nations in 1940. Today no military assault has been hurled, and to my knowledge, no ultimatum prophesies such an assault in the immediate future. Today we have taken a solemn covenant that we will collectively keep the peace of the world through the United Nations organization.

I say, Mr. President, against a policy such as that now proposed, small wonder that the protests of the groups who believe in peace and in the United Nations, those who want America to hold firm to its old democratic tradition, are rising to a higher and higher pitch. Surely the Senate will not adopt in haste this policy, the end of which no Senator can foresee.

Let Senators who give their unreserved approval to the pending measure be prepared for the full implications of it, as those of us who supported lend-lease were prepared to accept the utmost implications of that measure.

The American people believe in the United Nations for they know it is the only rock upon which they can base their hopes of any peace. A majority of the people have recently attested their grievous disappointment that the United Nations was bypassed, and their overwhelming opposition to our sending military missions, without precedent, to Turkey and Greece. Now the Foreign Relations Committee, in an attempt to assuage the grief and to satisfy the protest of the American people, ingenuously, and with the best motives—and undoubtedly the committee wishes the matter had been handled differently from the beginning—proposes that the United States go ahead sending military missions to Turkey and Greece, supporting Turkish and Greek armies, and for all practical purposes administering the Government of Greece, but that it be subject to the veto of the United Nations by a majority vote.

Mr. President, this may soothe our consciences, but it does not correct our conduct. There is no substitute for the United Nations; there is nothing just as good. It is like going through the courts of law—you either do or you do not. You either act according to law or you act outside the law. This proposal, despite the Committee amendment, is still outside the charter of the fundamental law of the United Nations.

It does not discharge our solemn obligation to act through the UN "for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression" and for the "adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" by acting unilaterally and then telling the UN we will stop if a majority of the UN ask us to discontinue what we are doing.

We solemnly agreed to article 24 of the UN Charter, subparagraph 1 of which provides "in order to insure prompt and effective action"—mind you "prompt and effective action"—"by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

Mr. President, that is what we agreed to. I wish to read that again. Paragraph 1 of article 24 of the UN Charter reads:

> 1. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

We solemnly agreed to article 25 of the Charter, which provides "the members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

We solemnly agreed to article 39 of the United Nations Charter providing that "the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations and decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain and restore international peace and security."

We agreed to article 33 of the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

> 1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.
>
> 2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Mr. President, have we exhausted every effort in a peaceful way to settle this dispute as between those who are parties to it, or, if we do not regard ourselves as a principal party, have we done everything we could by arbitration, conciliation, negotiation, and all the other methods provided in article 33, to bring about a peaceful settlement? If we have not, we have not, in my humble opinion, fully discharged either the obligation or the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

By chapter 6 of the United Nations Charter, if, as is charged, Russia is the real threat to the security of Greece and Turkey and those two nations so charge in the United Nations organization, that organization has the express authority and power, which Russia could not veto, to make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of the dispute or the situation that endangers the maintenance of international peace and security.

I cannot make it too clear, Mr. President, that the Security Council can make recommendations for peaceful settlement respecting any matter, and a party to the dispute cannot vote upon the action of the Security Council. So that, as was brought out in the Committee on Foreign Relations, if Russia is charged by Greece or Turkey, or by any other nation, with being a party to this dispute, she cannot vote in regard to the action of the Security Council in an effort to find a peaceful adjustment of the dispute or the situation which is likely to engender the dispute.

What is the occasion of our alarm respecting the security of Greece? It is that Albania and Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are alleged to have given training, encouragement, and some equipment to certain Greeks alleged to be led by Communists in the northern part of Greece, said to number 13,000. So far as I am aware, nobody has charged that these "armed bands," so-called, consist of anything but Greeks in Greece. But Greece appealed to the United Nations against this aggression. The United Nations took jurisdiction, quite properly, and appointed a Commission of Inquiry. The Commission has been on the spot, made its findings, and is now preparing to report. Can anyone with justice say that the United Nations has failed in this matter? Shall we, before the report of the Commission has been filed, before the United Nations has had a chance officially to know the facts and to take any action, presume that it will not act at all? Can anyone justify the United States in unilaterally sending a military mission to Greece, equipping and training a Greek army of 125,000 as an answer to an alleged intervention now being investigated by the United Nations? On the allegation of small-scale intervention in Greece, I am afraid, Mr. President, we in Congress are being asked to authorize the unprecedentedly large-scale intervention by the United States.

And what is the aggression, or what is the situation threatening the independence and the security of Trukey? There have been no excursions into Turkish territory by the forces of Russia or any other nation. There is no Communist threat in Turkey. The totalitarian government there has seen to that. The assumed threat in Turkey is that certain requests have been made by the Soviet Union to Turkey that the four

Black Sea powers—Turkey, the Soviet Union, Rumania, and Bulgaria—without the western powers having anything to do with it, shall determine the control of the Dardanelles. For over 200 years Russia, feeling that the Dardanelles is essential to its security as well as to its welfare in affording access to the Mediterranean, has either been trying to acquire or to obtain a dominating influence in the control of the Dardanelles. That may be bad policy, but it is not Communist policy—it has been Russian policy for over two centuries. It will be recalled that Russia won the Dardanelles in 1854 in a war with Turkey, and the British and the French then sent their fleets into the Black Sea, sank the Russian Fleet, and forced the Russians to agree to a new treaty taking away from them the Dardanelles, which they had secured by their victory over Turkey and through their treaty of peace with Turkey.

In World War I the Allies solemnly agreed to give Russia the Dardanelles in compensation for Russia entering the war on the Allied side against Germany, while Turkey fought with Germany. And I need not add that Turkey did not fight with us in this war at all, so far as I know, although she did declare war technically toward the end of the conflict. Russia got out of World War I before it was over through her revolution, although, said Sir Bernard Pares, the brilliant British historian, she gave two and one-half million killed and two and one-half million wounded to the Allied victory before she got out, and the British historian Pares says she saved Paris twice by what she did in World War I. But Russia did not get the Dardanelles, and it is my information that the revolutionary government did not ask for it.

Since World War I, the Dardanelles have not been controlled exclusively by Turkey; they have been controlled by a convention of powers called the Montreux Convention, and the dominating powers in that convention have been Britain and France. In short, western European powers have used Turkey as a bastion against Russia. The United States was not a party to the Montreux Convention, but it was agreed at Potsdam that Great Britain and the United States support liberalization of the Montreux Convention and that concessions be made to Russia. This is one of the pending issues yet unsettled among the big powers. But there has never been any ultimatum. There has been no new demand to my knowledge. What precipitated the present proposal was not a new threat by Russia, but notice to Turkey by Great Britain that she was no longer able or willing to pay the major part of the expense of maintaining the Turkish Army. That expense we now propose to assume.

Mr. President, I do not presume to pass judgment on what Great Britain does, but I think the British imperial record discloses to fair critics of history that the British have played the game of power politics, having been in power for centuries. In international affairs they do not have the same tradition we have. If they support a revolution to aid British prestige or further British interests, that is not a strange doctrine to them. If they finance a foreign army to serve their ends, their people and apparently their parliaments do not object to that. If they even influence internal affairs of other peoples, they have precedents, Mr. President, for such policy, which America, thank God, does not have. And it is a peculiar thing that Britain, which has been in Greece for years, has been there, I dare say, more to serve British policies than to save Greece; and if Britain has been in Turkey helping to support the Turkish Army as well as backing up the Turkish position with the British Fleet and with British bases in the eastern Mediterranean, I presume, Mr. President, that Britain has been doing it to serve Britain's national interest. Call it "imperial," they have not objected to that.

The strange thing is that, though we may be activated by different motives—and I know we are—when we do substantially the same thing, yet is there not some justification for suspicion being attached to our own motives of serving similar purposes on the part of the United States?

I say, Mr. President, let the British do what they choose to do; that is their business. But I have the greatest reluctance to have the charge made against my country that, to a phenomenal degree, we are stepping into empty British footprints in the imperial quicksands of the world.

Mr. President, before I get away from the Dardanelles, though I do not have the clipping before me, let me say that I remember reading last year, about September or late August, in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the integrity of which no Senator would question, an editorial which said that Americans in considering the Dardanelles' problem might well think of it as if a foreign power possessed the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. How would we feel about that? And how would we feel if we asserted the right of this government and that government to determine the defense and the control of the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, and Britain, France, or Russia said, "No, you are not going to arrive at that settlement unless we have a voice in it."

Mr. President, I live down in that golden part of this country, that blessed part of this earth called Florida. Instead of thinking about the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, as does the Richmond Times-Dispatch, I think of the Gulf of Mexico. I look at it on the map. I see that Mexico and the United States of America are the powers which border on that great body of water. I see the mighty Mississippi, which opens up the heart of America, emptying its colossal waters into that great gulf. I see, Mr. President, the Straits of Yucatan and the Straits of Florida, which form the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico. Suppose—God forbid—that in an earlier day we had not wisely acquired Florida and made it a part of the United States of America, but having been Spanish in its early settlement it had remained Spanish in association and come to belong to the Republic of Mexico. Suppose, therefore, the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico was controlled by Mexico, except insofar as it was regulated by a convention which was entered into, we will say, in the old days when the great European powers were the mighty forces of the earth.

Then suppose that, looking backward historically, we saw a great giant—the United States—arising upon this continent, growing stronger and stronger, and suppose, becoming more and more sensitive to our own security, we had said to Mexico, "The mighty Mississippi opens its arteries to the heart of America. We demand, Montreux Convention or no Montreux Convention, Congress of Vienna or no Congress of Vienna, compact of the nations of Europe or no compact of the nations of Europe—we demand that America, as the mightiest Nation on this waterway, the mouth of which is in your control, shall share it with you, if not dominate it with you, to the exclusion of all the powers of the Old World altogether." Would men who proposed that in the American Congress, would those of our military and naval staffs who advocated it, would those of our State Department who urged it, be called warmongers, subject to denunciation around the world as aggressors against Mexico? I can hear Senators making these steel rafters ring with the defense of American policy calculated to secure the heartland and the homeland of America.

Mr. President, I am not saying that in any case the Soviet Union is justified in coming down and attacking the Dardanelles. I think if she were to do so it would raise the supreme test of what the United Nations would do. For my part I would vote to furnish America's share of the forces necessary to resist that kind of an aggression. But so far it is still in the stage of negotiation. It is a request—call it a demand, if you like—made by Russia upon Turkey. We ourselves admitted that the Montreux Convention should be changed. The Russians truly feel—and there is much ground for such feeling—that the Turks, who in the last war gave raw materials to the Germans and aided them, permitted German ships to slip through this waterway which they presume to protect.

Stop to think about Russia's situation. Take a map and study it. It will be seen that a merchant ship today cannot leave any Russian port and go across any sea of this earth without the permission of the British or the American or the British and the American Fleets.

If I may quote it without impropriety, I will say that I was rather amused at a point of view expressed to me by a lady in Great Britain one evening in 1945 at a dinner. She had heard I had been to Russia as well as to some other countries. She said, "Senator, what do you think of these Russians wanting a navy and everything?" That lady was honestly shocked at the suggestion that Russia should even have a navy.

The other day our own Secretary of the Navy was testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee. I was by the great kindness of that committee permitted to ask a few questions. I said, "Mr. Secretary, I have read in the papers from time to time about American naval

craft going into the eastern Mediterranean. Have we a squadron or task force of any sort in the Mediterranean? I was just wondering if we are correctly informed by the press from time to time, which tells us about certain demonstrations made by American naval forces."

The Secretary, with the ability which is characteristic of him immediately replied by making a very patriotic statement: "I said last autumn that it was my feeling that we should accustom ourselves and the world to the sight of the American flag anywhere in the world that it would not be conspicuous where it went—wherever there is a sea."

I said, "So you deem that that is the role of this country to have the naval craft wherever there is a sea?"

He answered, "I think so; yes, sir."

I said, "Do you deny to other powers the same right?"

He indicated that the seas were free and accessible to all nations.

I wondered what those naval forces would do if the Russians decided to put a navy in every ocean and sea of the world—I wondered if that would be considered an act of aggression on their part. Suppose a Russian ship wanted to leave Murmansk, which is icebound for many months of the year, to go through the Atlantic Ocean, the North Sea, either through the English Channel or to the north of Britain. Does anyone think it could do so without the approval of the British Navy?

Suppose a Russian ship desired to leave a Balkan port, for which Peter fought a war, to go out through the Baltic, through the Kattegat and the Skagerrak, the entrance to the North Sea from the Baltic, does anyone think it would be able to do so without the permission of other powers?

Suppose a Russian ship started from the Black Sea, which laves Russia's homeland, to go into the Mediterranean, could it get through the Dardanelles without Turkey's permission?

If a Russian vessel got through the Dardanelles, could it pass the eastern Mediterranean without the permission of the British Fleet established at Cyprus and with access to Greek bases?

I think if Senators will look at a map they will not have serious cause to wonder why it is that the British have always been so interested in Greece. For, if they will examine closely, they will see that it is not so much the adjacent shores but the Greek islands in the eastern Mediterranean that really dominate the Dardanelles and keep ships from coming through from the other side. Suppose, Mr. President, Russian ships came out of the Black Sea and got through the Dardanelles; suppose they got past Cyprus and it was intended that they should go to the Indian Ocean; could they get through the Suez Canal without British permission?

If the ships got through the Suez Canal and down into the Red Sea, could they negotiate the Indian Ocean without British permission?

Suppose the ships decided to go straight west in the Mediterranean, could they get by the British Navy based at Alexandria? Could they pass Malta, a British base? Could they, without British approval, get through Gibraltar, which, so far as I can read the map, is a part of the Spanish mainland, but has been a British bastion for centuries? If they got into the Atlantic Ocean, how far could they go without the approval of the British or the American Navy? If they started from the other side, at Vladivostok, and came across the Pacific, we know, of course, that it is our country which dominates that ocean.

If the Russians do what Hitler did, I shall try to do against them what I tried to do against Hitler. The Sudetenland had never been a part of Germany in history. Neither had Denmark. Neither had Norway. Neither had Holland. Neither had Belgium. Neither had eastern France, which Hitler had overrun with force of arms and with Nazi barbarity, when I introduced the genesis of lend-lease and later fought for the bill which was introduced by someone in a position of leadership. However, while I will oppose the exertion of Russian armed force in the acquisition of the Dardanelles, what I think my country should do toward recognizing some elemental justice in her claim is another proposition.

I am not unaware of all the epithets I have had to bear, all the contumely I have had to bear, all the bitter denunciations that I have had to experience from certain sources, to the delight of some publications which call themselves fair, but wish to apply one appellation or another.

All I have ever said is what I think is good policy for the United States of America. As a citizen and as a United States Senator I have the right, if not the duty, to express my opinion. I am saying that it is an act of fairness and justice for the United States of America, in determining what a sound policy shall be, to take into consideration the aspirations, aims, and situations of other peoples of the world, their background, their history, their peculiarities, and their interests and fears.

I have been troubled by the fact that America did not always take an independent position in these issues. America did not say to Britain, "We think Russia is entitled to a large part of what she asks in connection with the Dardanelles, and we are going to support her in an international council in the United Nations." That is where the question ought to be settled. Then we should turn to Russia and say, "You have no right to take the Suez or attempt to take it, or to attempt to take the Middle East. The British have certain interests there which are legitimate. The native peoples have certain interests which are entitled to protection. If you assault them, we are your enemy. We will throw the American Fleet, the American Air Force, the atomic bomb, and American men between you and them; and, God giving us the strength, we will stop you to the best of our ability."

It seems to me that our fundamental error has been that we have taken up where Britain, France, and other European powers have been going for centuries, and have identified ourselves with them, rather than looking at these age-old conflicts and issues from a detached American point of view. I do not see how we can always say logically, and with force, that no one can venture to question our complete supremacy over the Panama Canal; no one can dare to challenge the absolute sovereignty of Britain over Gibraltar or Suez, or other important and strategic areas of the world proximate to their homeland and their interests, and then say to the Russians, "No; you may have dreamed for two centuries of this control. For two centuries you may have fought for it in war and negotiated for it in peace because you consider it essential to your welfare and security. Despite these facts, we are going to line up behind the old western European powers which have always made it their principal policy to keep you out of the Dardanelles, out of the eastern Mediterranean, out of the oil fields, and out of the trade of the Middle East."

That is where America stands. Today we are not only implementing that policy by sending warships and carriers to the Mediterranean to make demonstrations, but we propose to go a step further. We propose to send a military mission in American uniforms, a little farther to the east than we ever did before; and we propose to put up the money to equip and pay a large part of the expense of maintaining the Turkish Army in Turkey.

Mr. President, if I am oversensitive in feeling concern over a proposal so momentous, I am sorry. But the American people want peace. They want to do what is right. They do not want America to become another great imperial power. They do not care to see the imperial eagles of America floating over far-flung possessions all over the world. They would rather save one ignorant country boy than to have the whole world as an empire. They know that world empire is fool's gold. They know that it leads to desolation and eventual death for every nation that has ever followed that path.

Those who sit in high places in other lands like to play this game as one would play chess. They move a piece here, and push a pawn there. They put a knight in a certain position, and a bishop in another. They seem to enjoy the magnificent game of prestige and power.

After executing a beautiful military maneuver, Robert E. Lee, looking upon the battlefield, felt his exultation at his brilliant success subdued by the carnage he beheld. He said, "It is good that war is so terrible. Otherwise we should like it too much."

I hope those in high places will realize that they are not dealing with pawns, knights, bishops, castles, queens, and kings—although a king is involved in this situation. I hope they will realize that the things they are moving are human beings, the men and women, the boys and girls of the United States of America, and that what they are toying with is a fuze that may set off an explosion which will engulf mankind in the utmost of destruction.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator allow me to finish?

It is true that a civil war in Greece, if only a domestic controversy, is outside the scope of the United Nations. It is certainly outside the interest of the United States, which is solemnly committed to a doctrine of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other peoples.

I remind my colleagues that a few years ago it was common practice for our Government to interfere in the affairs of our sister nations. We did not feel too sensitive about it. Sometimes we encouraged a revolution if we thought we would get a strategic gain from it, such as the Panama Canal. If we did not like one regime, but liked another, we would support the one we liked with money, and sometimes with the marines. What did it do for us? I think, by and large, we tried to follow as honest a judgment as we could when we did that sort of thing. For a long time we really thought when we did it that we were carrying out our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine. We actually helped collect debts with the marines, always fearful that, if we did not ourselves do it, foreign nations might come in. At one time we nearly had trouble with Great Britain, which insisted upon the protection of her rights of a commercial character in Venezuela.

But, Mr. President, time passed. We saw we had won the hatred and the fear of nearly all the countries of Central and South America. Then what did we do? We changed our policy. At the Montevideo conference we announced a solemn agreement with all the nations of the Western Hemisphere that there would be no more American intervention. That was the policy of the good neighbor. We agreed not to use the power of recognition as a means of interfering in the politics internal of these countries. That policy won the Latin-American Republics to our side during World War II. Many times, I am sure, we may have had a certain regret for that policy. We saw Peron come into power in Argentina—a man, in my opinion, if I must speak my sentiments, of fascistic tendency, association, and purpose. Yet we have not sent an army or a navy down there, much as in our naturally impulsive way we might like to do it. If we take on Turkey as a partner, how will we explain our Argentine policy in Argentina, which also remained neutral and played with the Nazis?

We have not thrown Franco out of Spain, although documents in our possession have convicted him of collaboration—not merely acquiescence, but direct collaboration with the Axis in a military way. He refueled and supplied German submarines. Our own State Department has told us that, and I read it on the Senate floor. Yet we have not thrown him out. We did not want to intervene. We felt that in the long run it was better, as Shakespeare says, to "bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of."

In this case, are we intervening in Greece? Are we intervening in Turkey? I realize what my able and distinguished friend, for whom I have both great admiration and affection, has said: That there is no precedent in this respect, because we have been letting Britain have money; we have been letting France have money. But, Mr. President, so far as I know, we have never taken over the job of equipping, financing, and attaching a military mission to the British Army. We have never done that with respect to the French Army. What would our people back home have said to us if it had been believed that we were supporting the French Army that was in Indonesia, shooting down with modern weapons of war the natives who were seeking to lift themselves out of their slavery to emancipation as a new people?

I am not aware, Mr. President, that we have done anything through UNRRA or in these other instances except honestly to lend or give money. If the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will say now that everything will be stricken from the bill except the provision for the money that we propose to give Greece for relief and the money that we propose to give or loan for rehabilitation, I shall sit down and join him in moving the unanimous passage of this measure. No, Mr. President, we do not object to giving relief to Greece. We do not object to lending money to Greece to rehabilitate her war-torn economy.

To be perfectly candid, it has been very embarrassing to me to appear in opposition to this proposal which has been so forthrightly, so sincerely, and so patriotically presented to the Congress by our great President. But what we object to is the principle; and what I am afraid of is that, if we start sending military missions to European countries, if we start equipping, training, and maintaining foreign armies, we shall have taken a step that will hurl us over a precipice and we shall never, in my humble opinion, be able to recover.

Take Greece, for example. The money is to be used to establish an army of 125,000 in Greece.

How many guerrillas are there in Greece? It has been said that there are 13,000 Greek guerrillas. They may have had a few arms; they may have had some training; they may have had some other aid or assistance from Albania or Yugoslavia or Bulgaria, either singly or altogether. But I think that by and large everyone admits that the Greeks are fighting amongst themselves. There are approximately 7,000,000 people in Greece, and there are 13,000 guerrillas, all of them Greeks. There is a United Nations Commission there now preparing its reports based on what it found when it went there for the United Nations. Although the United Nations has not yet received that report, yet suddenly the United States resolves to send a military mission to Greece and to give the Greeks money, arms, and training in order to have an army of 125,000.

Mr. President, the Senate does not need to take my word for it. Read the dispatches which have come from Greece. There have been excesses on both sides. I think that is the truth of the matter. As General Marshall found in China, the extremists on both sides take positions which are contrary to our ideas of what should be done or what people should stand for.

So we are establishing a Greek army of 125,000. For what? To restore order in Greece? To eliminate the guerrillas—or what our Secretary of War called armed bands or bandits—or whatever we want to call them? I shrank a little when he used the word "bandits." I believe an honest appraisal will reveal that many of the so-called bandits bared their breasts to the Germans and fought for Greece against Germany in the early stages of World War II and were partisans against them during the German occupation. I feel that it is fair to say that most of those people are patriotic, and that, while there may be, and no doubt are, some Communists leading them, some communistic influences encouraging them and directing them, many of those men are quite as honest—I have been told some things about them—as the ragged army that followed George Washington for the freedom and independence of the Thirteen Colonies so long ago.

It troubles me sometimes to wonder whether we have forgotten that at one time we were not free, but were governed by a king, and that there were Americans who would rather die than have to live that way. There may be Greeks who feel the same way.

Mr. President, this is no new experience for the Greeks.

Let me quote from the annual message to Congress of President James Monroe, in which he expounded the Monroe Doctrine:

> A strong hope has long been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. * * * there is good cause to believe * * * that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

In that document we agreed not to interfere in the internal affairs of any European power.

Sometimes, perhaps, we are not realistic. After all, the little tea tax which George III imposed on the Colonies was a mere bagatelle. The little stamp tax that the Parliament imposed on the American Colonies—"taxation without representation"—did not amount to a pittance. It was not the amount of the tax that was of importance; it was the principle for which Patrick Henry sounded the tocsin of American sentiment, when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death!" I do not care what anyone says in commentary upon the statement, but I believe that today in the mountains of Greece, awaiting the first shot of the American Army—not in the uniform of America, but facing American equipment, for which America is morally responsible—awaiting the first shot of the first American gun that will throw its shells among them—are those who also waited, one day, for the German shells to explode. They waited the Germans out; and I predict that time will show that they will wait the others out, for there will come a time when the Americans, too, will leave. I do not know how long they will stay.

If I am not mistaken, we are headed toward that course. There is nothing I can do, and, so far as I know, there is nothing that anyone who is raising his voice today, or is troubled in his heart,

can do. In the sheer momentum of our power, we are bound to a destiny that will mean, first, empire, and then, the same disillusionment that has been wrought in the full tide of time upon everyone who has pursued that illusive and delusive snare.

So, Mr. President, all that I am saying is simply for the record, I suppose. I think I would feel better, perhaps, sometime, to be able to say that I was against it, and that I said so and that I said I did not think it was a good policy—not that I have any aspiration of stopping it or very perceptibly slowing it down. The die is cast, Mr. President; we are off. We shall not see the end, unless some great conflagration consumes us all.

But I see mankind locked in a power struggle against which, and beside which, the Peloponnesian Wars and the other struggles of antiquity shall be but the play of children's soldiers. There has never been anything like this before—when, standing on one hemisphere, one giant of the earth extends its sword in mortal combat with another giant of the earth, the master of three continents, to be a battle to the death. The world has never seen that before.

Mr. President, a civil war in Greece, if only a domestic controversy, of course, is outside the scope of American intervention, if we do not depart from our noninterventionist policy of the past.

I started to say that the army in Greece, which we are to finance, will be supposed to get rid of the Greek guerrillas. That will mean shooting them if they do not surrender. Are we going to be there to tell them which ones to shoot? Are we going to distinguish between the Communist and the Republicans? Or are we just going to let those fascistic-minded Royalists take our guns, that we put in their hands, and our ammunition that we put in their guns, and with skill and training acquired from us, directed by our military mission, shoot down anyone they want to shoot down? Is not America going to revolt at that? Unless we are going to deny the freedom of the press and the radio, which I am sure we are not, there will be a picture, some day, of those who were lined up against the wall; and reports will come trickling through that the Royalists are doing with skilled fanaticism what they have been doing ever since they got notice that probably we were going to give them this support—getting rid of their enemies, killing them with our weapons.

Mr. President, does not it seem reasonable that if we give Greece all the economic aid she needs and if we feed them and clothe them and shelter them and help repair their railroads and give them ships and rebuild their docks and wharves, they could at least, if they needed to, take sticks and staves, and thus, 6,987,000 of them could survive and protect themselves in the enjoyment of the kind of government they want, against 13,000, without having our Army over there? Mr. President, people who really want democracy must be ready to fight for it, in the first place; and in the second place, they must deserve it. We cannot give anyone democracy unless he wants it. People do not deserve it unless they are prepared to fight for it.

If Russia, with her great might, were on the threshold of that heroic little country, threatening her independence with her might and power, then I would say God speed our weapons to arrest their progress and to preserve that little country. But 6,987,000 Greeks, in my opinion, with all the economic aid we can give and with the United Nations behind them, are not ready to succumb to 13,000 who are alleged to be led by Communists in the mountains of Greece.

So, Mr. President, I venture to say that we are doing this more to protect the strategic and economic interest of the United States of America than we are to protect the Government and the people of Greece. We are trying to maintain a power position in the Middle East, vis-à-vis Russia. That is what it is about, really.

Mr. President, if that ever becomes necessary, we shall have to face it. But let us not put it upon the pretense that it is charity that we are extending or that we are trying to save Greece. Let us say nakedly that it is a power struggle with Russia and that we are determined to fight it out wherever the issue is joined.

Mr. President, I wish to state my idea of the best way to handle that matter if we are to come to such an issue. I do not exclude it; it may be necessary. I think it can be avoided, and I pray that it can. I am not very far away from the position of the able Senator from Virginia in saying that this matter should be put squarely in the hands of the United Nations organization and should be settled there, for better or for worse. But, as I have said, if 7,000,000 Greek people have so much as lost their classic love for democracy and their ancient hate of tyranny that they are powerless before these 13,000 in the mountains, and if the matter is such as to threaten the peace, the first and square duty to meet that threat is upon the United Nations, and the first obligation of every member state is to act through the United Nations in its solution. That we have failed to do. No amount of backing up, no amount of collateral jurisdiction that we voluntarily extend, no amount of good will which the Foreign Relations Committee has earnestly and ably intended to exhibit, can conceal the fact that we did not go through the United Nations, and we have not yet gone through the United Nations, and we do not propose to go through the United Nations.

Let me run the risk of being tedious by reading again from chapter I, article 2, of the Charter of the United Nations:

> The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles.

It goes on to say that—

> 2. All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

Mr. President, what is the obligation that is assumed? I am reading now from article 1:

> The purposes of the United Nations are—

Surely every Member subscribes to the purposes of the Organization. I read them:

> 1. To maintain international peace and security—

Mr. President, would not international peace and security include peace and security in Turkey and Greece?

I read further—

> and to that end: to take effective—

Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the next word, for it is the key to this question. The Charter does not say there "effective measures," but it says "effective collective measures." That is what it says—

> to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace—

Are not these alleged to be just exactly that—threats to the peace? Are not these alleged to be acts of aggression or other branches of the peace?

I read further—

> and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes—

Is not this an international dispute? If it is not, I read further—

> or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Can anyone deny that this thing in Greece is a situation, that this case of Turkey is a situation, at least, which might lead to a breach of the peace? We have the words of the President that that is the significance of both of them—aggression against the northern boundary of Greece, the possibility that if Turkey should fall, it would produce disorder in the whole Middle East. Is not that a situation which threatens or is likely to endanger the peace of the world? If it is, have we not solemnly obligated ourselves to act collectively, through the United Nations, in time to solve it, and can we say we have discharged our obligation when we have never even asked the United Nations to take it up, and to work with us in its solution, except in respect to the border commission in Greece which was the result of a request by the Greek government to the United Nations. We were a party to that, that objective is being carried out, but the commission has not had a chance to report. The United Nations has not failed to act, it has not failed. We have not pleaded and then had our pleas scorned. We have not petitioned the United Nations and had our petition denied, as Patrick Henry said the colonists had done before they were forced to act as revolutionaries.

As I said a while ago, Mr. President—and I say it again, with all respect and deference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, every member of which I honor—this attempt on the part of the committee, however honorable and laudable it is, does not cure our conduct. It

may soothe our consciences, it may exemplify the good will the committee has toward the United Nations—and it has unquestioned good will—but it does not change the fact, I have the testimony of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the President proposed this message to Congress, and for 16 days the United Nations was not even notified, let alone consulted, or made the instrument of collective action, in an effort to solve this threat to the peace of the world.

So, Mr. President, as I said, I honor the committee. It has done the best it could, unless it had gone a little further and just flatly provided that this matter will have to go through the United Nations, and shall not take effect unless the United Nations, after a fair petition on the part of the United States, has refused to act collectively in the matter. The situation would be different if they were to ask us to act, if there had been first a failure on the part of the UN in these cases, and the President came to us and said, "What else can I do? I put it up to the United Nations. Our representatives sought their assistance. We tried to discharge our obligation, to take effective collective measures to save Greece and to save Turkey. Day in and day out, week in and week out, we pleaded in the Security Council and in the Assembly for the other nations to stand with us to save the situation, and they failed. They have spurned our plea. They have refused. What else can I do but ask you to join me in the solemn responsibility I take when we go it alone in this treacherous field?"

The President has not done that, and we know he has not done it. I do not say that critically. I know the President's motives could not be higher, his patriotism could not possibly be more pure, his intentions could not be more laudable. He is honest and sincere. But this is not the first time that Senators on this floor have had conscientious disagreement, in the matter of policy, with the Chief Executive, and I am not the only one ever to have been in that position in the Senate; and Senators who have taken that position are no less Americans for having an honest difference of opinion.

The Congress is the one which has to take the responsibility. We are now in an embarrassing situation, we are told; but embarrassment is no excuse for failure to discharge a duty. The President, too, has expressed his fidelity to the UN. Perhaps he was pressed by counselors who might have erred.

Mr. President, at least all of us gain by reflection, we gain by counsel and debate, and especially we gain when we let the wise heads and the strong hearts of the American people be heard. Their judgments are fundamentally right, and, as Lincoln said, while not always the wisest, they are in the long run the safest depository of power. The American people have not been so troubled by anything since the end of the war as they are by the bypassing of the United Nations in the making of this decision by the Government of the United States.

Nor, Mr. President, has one the right to assume that there would be a veto by any member in any aspect of the situation before the Security Council. There might be, but I say we have no right officially to act upon the premise that there would be. The United Nations got Russian troops out of Iran without a veto. The moral opinion of the world was mightier than an army, and, let me say, we did not send American troops to Iran, nor did we finance the Iranian army to build it up to throw the Russians out. We turned the scrutiny of moral condemnation upon their violation of their treaty, and they got troops out of little Iran without a veto and without the use of force.

The UN got British troops out of Syria and Lebanon without a veto, and without our giving any money to either one of them to build up a bigger army, nor did we send a military mission to either one.

Mr. President, Senators will remember the old debate we used to have over the proposition that the pen is mightier than the sword. There is nothing on earth as powerful as the moral judgment of mankind. A little while ago it looked as if no force under Heaven could stop the Nazis. In terms of troops and weapons and the matériels of war we were doomed. Everything except the heart and the spirit, the will for freedom, of the people of the world, seemed to collapse before them. But resurgent democracies eventually vanquished them. I cite merely for the record that the UN, without more troops than they have now, without more authority than they now possess, got Russian troops out of Iran, and British and French troops out of Lebanon and Syria.

Let us first get all the foreign troops out of Greece. Let me say again that when I have tried here to be condemnatory of one country as against another, I said, as Senators will see if they look up the words I used, we should have the United States lay down a single standard of international morality. Let us get foreign troops out of every nation. We cannot leave British or other foreign troops in some other people's country, and have some of our own there, and then expect to carry conviction in our condemnation of the Russians for doing some of the same things. I repeat, let us get all foreign troops out of every nation, and I will pledge, Mr. President, any possible contribution I can make, in support of that kind of a policy. So I say, before we start to settle the situation in Greece, let us get foreign troops out of Greece, any country's troops out, including our own, and keep them out.

Let us keep out of Greece and out of Turkey, all foreign money to maintain armed forces. Let us honestly, and according to the rules of justice and fairness, seek to settle the issues involved in the present dispute, including the Dardanelles, and in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, and equalize access to the oil resources of the Middle East. Let us then see whether any of the permanent members of the United Nations organization prevent effective action by the Security Council in the discharge of its obligation to preserve the peace. I shall deal later with what we should do in case they do that.

Mr. President, we all know that the situation with respect to oil in the Middle East is substantially this: Probably the greatest undeveloped oil preserve in the world is in Saudi Arabia. Two American companies, the Texas Co. and the Standard of California, have total concessions in that field. There are two other oil companies, the Standard of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum of New York, which have attempted to buy into this concession.

In southern Iran is one of the great oil preserves of the world, one of the great oil-producing fields of the world, and there the British Government owns nearly 55 percent and thus has control. In Iran, another one of the great oil areas of the world, four principal countries are represented in equal shares—the Netherlands, Great Britain, France, and the United States—and an individual, who I think got the original concession, has a small percentage of ownership. In other areas in that region, Mr. President, the ownership is similar. Now of all that vast area, although Russia occupies the same relation to Iran as we do to Mexico—it is proximate; it borders it—the only concessions the Russians have is in the northern part of Iran, which finally grew out of the dispute the Russians were having with the Iranian Government a little while ago.

Not only that, Mr. President, but Russia once had that concession, and Lenin and his revolutionary government gave it up. At the same time the Russians got their northern concession, the British got a southern concession. They developed theirs; the Russians gave theirs up, but later on undertook to demand it again, I believe, partially at least because of the terrific loss or impairment of their oil production which they sustained by the destruction of the Germans during the war. I have read in Washington newspapers statements issued by American oil authorities, that the Russians were suffering a shortage of oil; that the production cost of oil in their country was high; and that they were seeking outside territory or areas in which they might replenish their own resources.

Mr. President, I merely say that in the Atlantic Charter we spoke about equality of access to the "have-not" nations. I am not saying that we should turn over to the Russians any of our concessions, but I do think that the oil of the world should not be monopolized by any nation or group of nations. It tends to encourage conflict in an effort to obtain what it should be possible to get by working out a sensible arrangement, the way we do in our commercial transactions. Yet today there are people who charge that what in part is really behind this policy and other acts similar to it in the Middle East is the fact that today we are a middle eastern power, due to the concessions that American oil companies have in Saudi Arabia and the interests they have in other areas in the Middle East, rich with oil reserves.

Mr. President, is not that the old way rather than the new way? Is not that the pre-Atlantic Charter way, rather than the post-Atlantic Charter way of working out these things?

Again I ask, are we following in the footsteps of imperial Britain? She embarked upon her imperialistic program in order to protect her lifelines, then justified everything she did on the grounds of necessity. Are we justifying what we are doing upon the grounds of necessity, American pecuniary interest, due to the necessity of our maintaining the oil fields and concessions we have in the Middle East?

Mr. President, is there not some way, besides conflict, by which a question or dispute of that character can be settled honorably to all?

I was saying, Mr. President, the UN, by chapter 7 of its Charter, has authority by the vote of the five permanent members and two others to use economic sanctions or necessary force to maintain or restore international peace and security. If Russia or any other permanent member should prevent the Security Council from determining "the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" and from making recommendations or deciding "what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42 to maintain or restore international peace and security" under article 39 of the Charter, then, under the interpretation of the Charter recently announced by Senator Austin, our representative in the UN, the other member nations are still obligated under article 1 of the Charter "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression"; nor does such a veto relieve all members of the UN of their duty under article 2 of the Charter to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered."

Nor does such a veto under article 2 relieve all members of their duty to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations."

In other words, instead of our Government telling the world that the United Nations cannot function, our solemn duty is to make it act effectively. It is time for the United States to take the lead in saving the United Nations. Lincoln assumed that his first task was to save the Union. Before Congress had conferred upon him any authority to raise an army, he, as Chief Executive, called for volunteers to save the Union.

This is the supreme challenge to the United States. We must not finish the rending of the United Nations by this blow. We must not lead those who would destroy the United Nations by unilateral action. As the strongest member of the United Nations, we must take the lead in making the United Nations function as it was intended to function. If, Mr. President, the Charter needs revision or modification, it is equally our solemn duty to take the lead in the project that will accomplish that, as well.

But shall we be so presumptuous as to believe that we are the only member of the United Nations which either believes in peace, or is prepared to resist aggression, or loves democracy, or wants peace?

Do we have such a monopoly of virtue in all that vast organization that not one nation among its members could be found to remain true to its solemn vows to the United Nations?

We know otherwise.

Indeed, as President Truman addressing the final plenary session of the UN Conference in San Francisco said:

> You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world.
>
> The world must now use it.
>
> If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it.
>
> If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.
>
> The successful use of this instrument will require the united will and firm determination of the free peoples who have created it. The job will tax the moral strength and fiber of us all.

How prophetic are those words.

> We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can or should expect, any special privilege which harms any other nation. If any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all. That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace.

Mind you, Mr. President, the President said that each nation will have to share security with all. He continued:

> That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace. Unless we are willing to pay that price, no organization for world peace can accomplish its purpose.
>
> And what a reasonable price that is.

Field Marshal Smuts, the grand old man of collaboration in the world for the past decades, in addressing the final plenary session at San Francisco, speaking of the Charter, said:

> It provides for a peace with teeth; for a unified front of peace-loving peoples against future aggressors. * * *
>
> It is for our peace-loving people to see that this peace plan is backed with all their energy, all their heart and soul.

That is what General Smuts said; that is what he said was the obligation of us all. Have we discharged that obligation?

If now, instead of acting through the United Nations, we repudiate it, then we are destroying it the same way that the League of Nations was destroyed. Mr. President, it was the decision of the big nations to act unilaterally outside the League instead of making the League act collectively; for example, against Japan when it invaded Manchuria, and Italy when it invaded Ethiopia, and Germany and Italy when they invaded Spain, which sounded the death of the League of Nations and made World War II merely a matter of what year.

The United States and the Soviet Union not only can but must live in the same world. There is no other world to which to go and in which to live at all in the human sense.

We not only should but must together work toward the world's peace, security, and prosperity. But each of us has vital interests which the other must recognize. Each has fears which the other must respect. Each has concerns which the other must neither deny nor disparage. Each, in judging the other, must first look at that nation's past, its history, its peculiarities and, above all, what it has suffered and by what dangers it believes itself to be beset.

It cannot better our relations with Russia for the United States in the Dardanelles to take over the role of the old western European powers who made it the cardinal principle of their policy to keep Russia shut up in the Black Sea, out of the Mediterranean and the Middle East—without an ice-free port. If we take over the role of the British, which was admittedly in furtherance of their imperial interests, how can we escape at least the charge of ourselves following an imperial policy?

Is all of the fault on Russia's side that Soviet-American relations today are so bad? Is Russia totally to blame for the wasting of the legacy of good will and confidence which President Roosevelt transmitted as his immeasurable inheritance to his fellow countrymen and to the world? Have those in the world, indeed in America, who hate Russia, who magnify our differences with Russia, who would like to destroy Russia, or those who do not understand Russia, made no contribution to the present enmity and strife which provokes this dangerous doctrine?

Russia is constantly denounced as having been engaged in a protracted course of conquest since the end of the war. Yet, she has today less territory than she had at the beginning of World War I. Mark those words, Mr. President. The Soviet Union today has less territory than she had at the beginning of World War I. Does that look like a protracted course of aggression? And it must be admitted that in reaching out for security, the United States, since the war, has reached thousands of miles farther from its homeland than has the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I am not saying we should not have had the Marianas and the Carolines, which we insist upon as being placed in our exclusive control. I know the blood those islands cost us. But when we reached for them we did not call ourselves aggressors. We thought we were doing something essential to our own security. It may be that Russia has something of the same feeling, rightly or wrongly, about what she does.

Those who know the measure of Russian suffering—that Russia bore the brunt of the war in numbers killed and forces engaged, must know that no nation in the world needs peace as does Russia; that none has more to gain from peace than she.

Any man who loves peace must appreciate the vital necessity of the United States and Russia coming to a successful common recognition of each other's

place and function in the world. I am no less exacting in my demand that they recognize our place and our interest than I am that we recognize theirs. If we work together, we can give mankind the longest peace and the highest level of life it has ever known. But if we, by the enactment of this proposal immeasurably set up and intensify the undeclared war which is going on between the United States and the Soviet Union today, the area of conflict will broaden and broaden and broaden until it shall soon stretch around the world, and all mankind will be forced to take one side or the other in an approaching war, which the Senator from Michigan, himself, has said, "Civilization cannot survive."

Mr. President, let us make this clear. We will not allow Russia directly or indirectly to dominate the world, but if she threatens aggression, the instrument now to check and to hold her or any other aggressor is the United Nations or at least those who shall rally to the standards, like Lincoln's volunteers, of the United Nations.

We are not going to see the world overrun by communism. But the spread of ideas cannot be stopped with guns or bayonets or even atom bombs. Even all the wealth of America is not enough alone to hold off the surging forces of the people, only a small part of whom are Communists, who are reaching out, some of them blindly, some frantically, some in desperation, many misguided, for the rungs of hope upon which to pull themselves from their misery. Only through the United Nations, through the Social and Economic Council and through all the other agencies of the United Nations, through wise leadership and planning and intelligent and sincere cooperation with all of us doing our utmost, can we really establish in the world conditions under which democracy can hope to live.

I cannot half so well state the basic fallacy of this proposal as a battle for democracy, as it was stated in the Washington Post of April 8 by Mr. Walter Lippmann when he said, "What bill?" referring to the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to know what we were going to do, and an inquiry to determine whether we had the resources to accomplish it:

> What bill? The immediate bill for Greece alone is nearly $300,000,000. But under the administration policy this can be only the first installment. The money is to be used to balance the Greek budget this year on behalf of a government which collected almost no taxes and is, with our approval, conducting a civil war. Conceivably this installment would pay the Greek bill if there were set up promptly in Athens a government which can collect taxes and can unite the bulk of the Greek people. But the deficits of this government, which protects the profiteers and is trying to crush the Republicans—

Again I hope that will not be taken too literally in this country. I suspect that there are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who would be shot with some of the shells we propose to send over there, because they were Democrats or Republicans whom the royalist, fascist-minded government in some respects, did not like. This is not my word. This is the word of Mr. Walter Lippmann, a competent observer. I continue:

> But the deficits of this Government, which protects the profiteers and is trying to crush the Republicans as well as the Communists, will continue as long as the Government, as now constituted and conducted, exists.
>
> Yet Greece is only a pinpoint in the Truman global policy. There can be no end to the financial costs of that policy because adequate precautions have not been taken to see to it that the money will accomplish the purposes for which it is given. Unless the Greek Government is reformed, Greece will not be stabilized by our meeting the deficits of that government.
>
> The case of Greece illustrates concretely the basic fallacy of the Truman doctrine in its present uncorrected, unqualified and unbalanced form. It is that the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism can be checked by subsidizing all the governments, parties, factions, which are most undeniably anti-Communist. A policy of this kind is bound to fail because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world and alienates the moderate and democratic forces.
>
> It assumes that mankind is divided into totalitarian Communists and Jeffersonian Democrats. It is not. There are also Nazis, Fascists, feudal lords, war lords. There are also Republicans, enlightened conservatives, liberals, progressives, social Democrats, Socialists, Christian Democrats, cooperators, labor parties, democratic planners, and whatnot.
>
> If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally—and in his heart a Jeffersonian Democrat—we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people almost everywhere. We shall have embraced the extremists of the right as against the extremities of the left, when it is our interest and our duty to aline ourselves with the middle and the moderate parties.

I interpolate that that is what General Marshall recommended for us in China. That is what we are not doing in Greece or Turkey.

I continue to read from the editorial:

> They are our real friends in the struggle for freedom, and they will decide the issue.
>
> Rich as we are, and powerful as we are capable of being, we are not rich enough to subsidize reaction all over the world or strong enough to maintain it in power. The American people and the Truman administration do not want to do that, of course, nor do they think they are doing it. But that is what we shall be doing, nevertheless, if we entrust the formulation and execution of the new policy to men whose zeal has gotten the better of their judgment.

Let America remember, as we make this solemn decision, that we cannot, with arms, cram democracy down people's throats. They must want it and be willing to fight for it, either to be able to gain it or to deserve it.

Today our great country stands at the Rubicon. Flushed with our victories with our loyal legions clamoring to follow us, we can, like Caesar, not only take Rome, but begin what some historians have called, the glorious journey down the glamorous path of empire. No nation started out to be a great empire, but those who came to the purple and the ermine took decision after decision, never going at once the whole way, until eventually there was no turning back, short of their tragic dissolution. Is there anything about any empire of the past that America desires to emulate? Could anybody seriously suggest that we should follow that fool's gold or that our quest would end differently from that of all others who have pursued it? Yet this proposal so hastily urged upon us would clearly set us on the path of empire.

Can the world's greatest empire, now our contemporary, teach us nothing? Have we not the good sense and the good spirit to curb our own power and to make it humble, to make America come as humbly to world leadership, in the Council of Nations, as Thomas Jefferson came riding on his horse to his inaugural?

The implications of this measure reach beyond the prediction of any man. Senators declaring their support of it with honest candor have said it might mean war. Is this issue one upon which we can hazard that event?

Does the pending issue in the Dardanelles demand that we challenge in mortal combat a nation occupying one-sixth of the earth and containing one-tenth of the world's people? Is Russian access to the eastern Mediterranean such a violent invasion of our rights and interest that it demands we risk war? Are we prepared to thicken the sands of the Middle East with American blood as the price of our exclusive enjoyment of the oil resources of that area?

America's role is to lead the world to peace, not war; to help mankind up, not to push it down; to build, and not to destroy. If there be those who will not hearken to the appeal of right or respect the sentiments of justice, if there be those who would trample upon their fellow men as aggressors, we shall not be slow to defend the cause of the oppressed. But we have not been singled out alone to stand in the Thermopylae of right against the invading hosts of wrong. We have solemnly pledged that we will work—and, if needs be, fight—with the other members of the United Nations against war makers if all possible methods of peaceful adjustment have failed. That is the kind of team ball to which we have already committed ourselves. That is truly befitting the American character. That is in the American tradition. There, in the United Nations, is America's rendezvous with destiny.

It has been said that our refusal to adopt this measure would repudiate our President. The world knows that we do not differ here in this debate about objectives; it is essentially about methods that we argue. We have in the Congress the sacred duty to determine the best way to preserve the Nation's peace and security, the peace and security of all peoples. We do not have the fearful alternative of rejecting the President or repudiating the United Nations, for the President, too, is wedded to the United Nations. Congress has the power—yes, the challenging opportunity—to make the United Nations able to function as it was intended to function. We can give it the strength it is alleged to lack. We can supply the very force which it is alleged not to have. With the unstinted support of this Congress, the United Nations can realize its full vigor and

promise. It can become, as it was intended to be, the last best hope of peace on earth. The question is, Shall Congress destroy the United Nations, or shall it build it?

I proclaim that there is nothing that this Congress could do in its whole life which would so hearten mankind as to rededicate this country to the United Nations and to its high purpose to maintain international peace and security. The world would know that when required to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression in the name of this noble charter, we have again pledged our lives, our fortunes and our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor; that America is, and before God and man will continue to be, a Democracy dedicated to the people, the servant of their hopes and their dreams, the friend of all the peoples who live in the houses, big and little, beside the roads of the world; that no overweaning ambition, no lure of profit or power, no fool's gold of empire shall tempt us to betray our dead or our destiny; that America is not soft, that it is not afraid to fight either for the poor, the oppressed, or the victims of aggression, that we realize that we can neither lift up mankind nor protect their security, strong as we are, alone; and that therefore we shall keep our pledge to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; that we turn our faces toward the future with confidence; that we are on God's side because we are on man's side, and as our cause is just we are strong in His strength. If, God forbid, we shall ever have to fight, let us fight to save the Union, as did Lincoln, because the Union is all that can save men. As Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the just may repair." And now, as it was when Washington rose to defend the new Charter of the United States, "The event is in the hands of God."

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Standing Committee, the senior Senator from South Dakota, be excused from all sessions of the Senate the remainder of the afternoon and the week. He is on official duty in connection with the work of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. COOLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 10, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 1, after the word "act", to strike out the comma and the words "and any necessary expenses related thereto."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today on the general question of the proposal which is now before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not wish to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator would like to have an audience.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I know that Senators have a great deal to do. If they are not here it will be their misfortune.

I am approaching this question, which has many phases, by addressing amendments to it. I have five or six such amendments, and it is my plan to speak on them as they are called up; and in that way I shall be able to touch on all the vulnerable points which are encompassed in this extremely important question which the Senate must decide.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator propose any amendment this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall talk about an amendment. That is the reason I did not want to discuss the general subject this afternoon. This is not the time to bring up amendments, but we have run out of speakers for today. Several speakers will be ready tomorrow. I think perhaps it would be better that I talk about one of my amendments today. I shall not call it up, but shall talk about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was going to take the liberty of suggesting that there are only two or three committee amendments which I am sure everyone, whether in favor of or opposed to the bill, agrees should be in the bill, and that we might immediately adopt those amendments and let the Senator then offer one of his amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to have that done. I shall not offer any particular objections to the committee amendments. I do not think they go far enough. I am not satisfied with them, but I am not opposing them.

I think, however, perhaps it would be just as well for me to go ahead with my discussion of one of my amendments—not calling it up at the present time, but discussing it, nevertheless, and calling it up at a later time.

Mr. President, the amendment about which I shall talk today is one which I have submitted. It has for its purpose the exclusion of Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938. If my amendment is adopted to Senate bill 938, under the bill, as thus amended, Turkey would not receive any loan or gift or money from the United States.

This amendment is the most important amendment, in my estimation, which I shall have to offer because there is no part of this entire matter that is as fundamental as is our proposal to give money and aid and military assistance to the Republic of Turkey. To my mind, that is the most important feature of this bill; it is the heart and soul of it.

Although I may be mistaken, I believe that the references to Greece are simply thrown in as a sort of camouflage or as a sweetening for the bitter pill, an attempt to throw dust in our eyes, an attempt to drag a red herring across the trail, so that we shall not see what the real issue is. The real issue, as I have said, is aid to Turkey; and implied in the aid to Turkey, I find a military al-

liance between the United States and Turkey. That is not spelled out in the bill; it has not been entered into and agreed to by the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, a military alliance is implied, just as certain as that we are sitting here today discussing this question. A military alliance is implied in the measure. We cannot give military assistance to another nation without having a military alliance some place in the background. That is the situation we are facing today in this whole great question.

So the particular amendment I shall discuss today in my opinion is the important one—namely, the amendment providing for the exclusion of Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938.

I noticed the other day that the newspapers carried great headlines and lengthy articles to the effect that Governor Dewey had endorsed President Truman's proposal. I read everything I could find regarding the Governor's statement, but I did not find one line or one hint that the Governor endorsed anything with respect to Turkey. He talked about Greece; yes. He endorsed aid and assistance to Greece; and I, too, endorse aid and assistance to Greece. I think almost every citizen of the United States endorses aid and assistance to Greece under certain conditions. Greece is one of the idols of this country. Greece has made great contributions to civilization, both in ancient and in modern times. In the United States there are many people of Greek ancestry. All of us have close personal friends among the Greeks in this country—men who have come to the United States from Greece and have made good here and have contributed to our civilization and our kind of life. They are good citizens; they have done a grand job here. So, of course, all of us have great sympathy for them.

Furthermore, the Greeks fought a great war. They held the Italians at bay; they threw Hitler off his schedule and made definite changes necessary in his time table. By their violent opposition to the Italians they delayed him, which was a very great contribution, indeed, so much so, that Hitler had to send his forces into Greece before the Greeks succumbed. The Italian soldiers could not do the job.

So Greece played an important role in the Second World War, as she did in the First World War; and today the conditions in which the Greek people find themselves—the poverty, the suffering, the wreckage which was left behind by the Germans as they retreated—all appeal strongly to our hearts.

So we wish to help Greece and help restore Greece and put her back on her feet. But in my opinion, provision for aid for Greece is included in the pending bill simply to appeal to our sympathies, and to line us up for the more important purpose; namely, a military alliance with Turkey. I know of a great many reasons why there should not be a military alliance between the United States and Turkey, and I desire to touch upon some of them this afternoon.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to have the Senate consider the amendment which I have proposed to exclude Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938.

Mr. President, I do not wish to review the history of ancient persecutions. I scarcely think that the religious persecutions which Christians suffered from the Turks for a thousand years should in any way determine our judgment on this bill or upon my amendment. Nor do I believe that the fact that Turkey was our enemy in the first World War should be a consideration of any great moment; nor do I think that the fact that the present Turkish Government does not permit private enterprise in great areas of its economy, should militate against Turkey. After all, that is her business. Likewise, the fact that the Turks have had treaties of friendship with Soviet Russia and with Nazi Germany in the past, or the fact that they have always and persistently acted in behalf of themselves alone, should have little bearing on the pending proposal.

However, Mr. President, I do believe that the reliability of the present Turkish Government should be carefully considered before the Senate rejects my proposed amendment. For my own part, I do not believe that Turkey is a reliable confederate.

Mr. President, in the secret documents which the State Department attempted to present to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in strict confidence, and which it afterward made public to a select group of 10 newspapermen, are to be found some very interesting summaries of Turkish activity during the recent World War. In 1939, on May 12, the Turkish Government concluded an agreement with England for mutual assistance in case of aggressive war in the Mediterranean region. We discovered that on June 10 of 1940, on the occasion of the Italian declaration of war against Great Britain and France, Great Britain asked for implementation of its alliance for mutual assistance with Turkey. The Turkish Government declined to act. That is when they showed their true colors; that is when Germany looked as if she might be successful in her wild venture to conquer the world; and in that great hour of German supremacy, the Turkish Government declined to act.

Shortly thereafter, on July 18 of 1940, Turkey signed a commercial agreement with Germany.

On June 18 in 1941, the Turkish Government signed a 10-year friendship act with the Nazi government. On October 9 of 1941, the Turkish Government signed a commercial agreement with the Nazi government providing for an exchange of goods valued at 100,000,000 Turkish lira. Germany was to provide steel and war materials in exchange for Turkish raw materials, including 90,000 tons of chrome in each of the years 1943 and 1944. Turkey entered into a lend-lease or a lease-lend agreement with Germany in those days, for an exchange of war goods with the Nazis. On June 2, 1942, a new commercial agreement between Germany and Turkey was arrived at. On September 29, 1942, it was announced that Turkey had contracted to send about one-half of its annual production of chrome to the Krupp munitions plant in exchange for German arms. In April 1943 a new Nazi-Turkish trade agreement was signed. What was that chrome to be used for? It was to be used to make superior weapons with which to destroy American youths, and the youths of other countries.

During all this time, Mr. President, Great Britain and the United States and the Soviet Union were desperately and continuously attempting to prevent the shipment of chrome and other raw materials to Germany through the expedient of preclusive purchase. The Turks were able to hold us up for an extravagant price, and did so without batting an eyelash. During all this time, Mr. President, the British, the Russians, and the Americans were attempting to have Turkey enter the war on the side of the Allies, and Great Britain in particular was continuously attempting to persuade Turkey to honor its treaty agreement of mutual assistance signed with the British on May 12, 1939. Indeed, at the conference of Tehran, the Allies agreed that Turkey should enter the war, and President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Inonu of Turkey had a conference in Cairo on December 4, 5, and 6 of 1943, reviewing the general military and political situation.

Nothing came of this; exports to Germany were not stopped, and on February 10, 1944, since Turkey refused to budge from a policy of inaction, Anglo-Turkish military staff talks, which had been underway for several months, were suspended. We gave them up as a bad job. We finally decided that there was no hope that Turkey would come in on our side at that critical moment in World War II.

Finally, on April 20, 1944, under intense Anglo-American pressure, the Turkish Government announced that it was stopping the shipment of chrome into Germany. On May 24, 1944, Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons, denounced the Turkish Government, and attacked its policy during the war. On June 14, 1944, Foreign Minister Eden stated that the British Government was profoundly disturbed by the fact that the Turkish Government, by allowing German vessels to pass through the Dardanelles from the Black Sea into the Aegean Sea, had helped to increase German naval strength in the Aegean Sea.

That is the way they used the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is an important point in the whole controversy, the whole issue. We must bear in mind what happened according to Foreign Minister Eden. He told what use they had made of the Dardanelles. Finally on August 2, 1944, when it was apparent to everyone Germany had lost the war, the Turkish Government severed economic and diplomatic relations with Germany. She of course continued those relationships with Japan. The German spy system in Turkey was simply transferred to the Japanese, and it was not until February

23, 1945, that Turkey declared war against Germany and Japan.

Mr. President, is there anybody in the Senate of the United States who is willing to stand up and justify on any basis the course of action pursued by Turkey during the past war? I ask the question, Is there anything in the record of the present Turkish Government which leads any Senator to believe that Turkish Government is reliable?

Mr. President, it is one of those small ironies of history that the German military equipment which the Turkish Government obtained during the war cannot now be supplied and serviced by the arms manufacturers of Germany. It is ironic that the Senate is now asked to supplement with American equipment the Nazi military equipment obtained at the expense of double-crossing her allies, of bleeding the American taxpayer, of sending to their death additional American boys. But that is the proposal before us.

Apparently Turkey believed that the Nazis were going to win the war, because they geared their military equipment to Nazi production. Turkey in reality was accepting lend-lease from Germany. Of course, some Senator may suggest that we were unable to supply the Turks with arms during the war. Is there anybody in the Senate who believes that at a time when we were distributing lend-lease to all parts of the world we would not have supplied the Turks with arms if the Turks had been willing to enter the war?

As I see it, Mr. President, there is nothing in the history of Turkey in which the American people can place their confidence. A nation that violates its sworn agreement and supplies essentials to our enemies, a nation that made a choice of the Nazis against America in the last war, does not deserve selfless consideration from us now.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the fact that the Russian Government has demanded a revision of the Montreux Convention of July 1936, which returned the Dardanelles to Turkish sovereignty. That agreement also permitted Turkey to rearm the Straits.

Both Britain and Russia protested against the manner in which Turkey permitted Nazi war vessels to pass through the Straits during the war. The United States, Russia, and Great Britain have all three stated over and over again that the Montreux Agreement must be rewritten. A number of notes have passed back and forth between the British, American, Russian, and Turkish Governments, in accordance with the agreement of these governments to review the whole question of the status of Turkish control of the Straits.

Mr. President, our State Department and our Chief Executive agreed to review the question of the Dardanelles at Potsdam, and in a series of diplomatic notes since that conference everybody acknowledges that the manner in which the Turkish Government handled the Straits in the last war was reprehensible. Yet, today the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is asking us to arm the Turkish Government, to assume its military obligations, and, in effect, to throw the weight of America solidly behind exclusive Turkish domination and armed control of the Dardanelles.

We agreed to review the question. Now, in effect, we refuse to review it. We voted to bring before the United Nations any situation endangering the peace. Now we refuse to do so. If the Dardanelles is a possible cause of war, why does not the administration bring the question before the United Nations? Why does our State Department, in its unlimited arrogance, assume on behalf of the world to make a unilateral decision to maintain Turkish sovereignty and armed control over the Dardanelles? In effect, Mr. President, this is the decision which the Senate is being asked to make in voting to arm the Turkish Government.

And who, Mr. President, asked us to do this? Has the Turkish Government in the past 6 months appealed to us for aid? It is my distinct impression that we have received no request whatsoever from the Turkish Government, except a request to our Export-Import Bank for a loan. The British did not ask us to lend money or to send a military mission to Turkey. They did not ask us to arm the Turks, so far as the record is concerned. I think that statement stands up. Something might have been done behind some kind of curtain other than an iron curtain, but I have no knowledge of that, and so I am presuming that Britain did not ask us to arm the Turks.

After Turkey declared war on February 23, 1945, the whole question of the Dardanelles was discussed at Potsdam, and President Truman stated his belief that "one of the persistent causes for wars in Europe in the last two centuries has been the selfish control of the waterways of Europe. We proposed that regulations for such navigation be provided by international authorities."

I recall that we fought World War I for the freedom of the seas. That was the real issue. If Germany had not violated the freedom of the seas I sincerely doubt that the United States would have gone to war with Germany. Freedom of the seas was the issue that brought us into the war, and now we are attempting to deny to the great Soviet Union freedom of the seas.

I have no particular love for Russia. They have done many things that I do not like. I often heard my father say, when I was a small boy, that he would be glad to return to his native land of Sweden to fight the Russians. He had an intense hatred of Russia, as most Swedes do—a great fear of them. They have had many an unpleasantness, many a war in the past. I was brought up in that kind of atmosphere and taught at my mother's knee not to like the Russians. One does not get away from those old prejudices very easily. But, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], stated a few moments ago in the most eloquent speech I have heard in this Chamber since I have been a Member, we are attempting to deny Russia the freedom of the seas by one subterfuge or another. "Do not let them go through the Dardanelles. Bottle them up. Encompass them. Encircle them. Keep them out." We do not even want them to have a navy. And yet we fought World War I for freedom of the seas. We have slipped a long way since Wilson made his pronouncement and laid down his ultimatum based on the freedom of the seas.

After the Potsdam Conference on October 2, 1945, Turkey asked the United States for a $500,000,000 loan to be granted for 30 years. Again, on February 6, 1946, Turkey submitted a detailed list indicating capital goods that she wished to obtain. Since over a year ago, Turkey, so far as I know, has made no request whatsoever for a loan, for a military mission, or for any other assistance from the United States.

Mr. President, in substance we have bluntly told the United Nations: we have decided that the Dardanelles shall remain in Turkish hands. Our State Department has decided to take over the armed forces of the Turkish Government, to arm, advise, guide and direct the military preparedness of Turkey. Mr. President, who asked us to do that? The Turks? The British? The British, Mr. President, already have a military mission in Turkey. The British have already extended a dozen separate loans to the Turkish Government, in practically every case for armaments.

Mr. President, the Turkish Government is a member of the International World Bank and of the International Monetary Fund. The Turkish Government has apparently over $200,000,000 of gold reserves. The Turkish Government is in a good financial position. Why, Mr. President, does not the Turkish Government seek a loan from the International Bank? Of course, if it obtains such a loan our Army and Navy could not attach as a condition to it that an American military mission should be permitted to run loose in Turkey. There is no question, Mr. President, but what, with the excellent financial position of the Turkish Government, that the International Bank would grant the loan.

Why then, Mr. President, has our Government, when it has not been requested to do so, and when an adequate alternative exists, why does our Government, in a passion of fear and hysteria, attempt to stampede the Senate of the United States into a decisive and far-reaching change in our national foreign policy? Is there somebody in the State or War Department with an inferiority complex, who feels that we must wave our massive Navy and Army and air power over every village and crossroads in the Near and Middle East? Has the Hitlerian ego, has the hunger for military glory, has the passion for expansion infected the souls of our military high command? What in God's name could cause us to propose such a policy without regard to the history of the Turkish nation, especially its actions in the last war; without regard to our commitments to the United Nations, without regard to our own often repeated declarations that the Dardanelles must be reexamined, without regard to the financial security of the Turkish Government, without waiting for any request from the Turkish Government, in what frenzied night-

mare, in what smoke-filled room could such a policy have been conceived?

I say, Mr. President, that the financial position of the Turkish Government is excellent. When we look at the export and import records of Turkey for the past 10 years we find that their exports in 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 far outstrip their imports. Indeed, for those 4 years their exports were millions of lira above their imports, and roughly, 80 percent greater than were their exports between 1936 and 1941. Their exports have increased 80 percent over what they were just a few years ago. Where can one find another country in the whole world, outside the United States, in that favored condition? The exports from the United States have been due to the amount of money loaned to every other country with which to buy our exports. We have not sold very much for cash on the barrel head. All our sales have been instigated, inspired, and stimulated by loans.

When we examine the Turkish expenditures for armaments we discover that their expenditures run almost one-half of their total budget. We discover also that that budget has substantially increased as the years have gone by. We discover that the millions of lira in circulation in Turkey have risen from 194,000,000 in 1938 to 931,000,000 lira in 1946. We discover that the foreign exchange holdings of the Central Bank in Turkey are at the all-time high. In 1938, for example, they held 5,700,000 lira, and on December 7, 1946, their holdings in foreign exchange were 201,900,000 lira. They have a positive foreign trade balance with high foreign exchange holdings. They settled their lend-lease account in cash, the first nation to do so. In fact, they paid within 30 days after the effective date of the agreement.

Mr. President, from those famous secret documents that the State Department gave to the 10 newspapermen I wish to quote a section on public debt on Turkey:

> Turkey's foreign debt is approximately 268,000,000 lira. This will be increased to the extent that Turkey draws on recent credits. The bulk of the foreign debt is an obligation to Great Britain, and some of it is repayable in Turkish lira. The estimated annual burden of service charges, including retirement of principal, is approximately 17,000,000, lira, only about 25 percent of which is said to be payable in gold or foreign exchange. Turkey at present can meet these obligations.

Here is an additional paragraph from the section in this secret document entitled "Turkey's Economic Position":

> Turkey's principal difficulty is that of meeting the economic and financial burden of maintaining a large standing army. This expense costs the Turkish Government not far from one-half of its annual revenues and requires foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income.

Mr. President, this is one of the most damnable propositions ever presented to the Senate of the United States. The State Department itself, in its own secret document, demonstrates that the present foreign exchange holdings of the Central Bank are 201,900,000 lira. It then points out that the annual payment on the foreign Turkish debt, including payment on principal, amounts to 17,000,000 lira per year, only one-fourth of which is payable in gold or foreign exchange. And, finally, the State Department document states that the Turkish military expenses require "foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income."

Mr. President, our national debt is $260,000,000,000. Our debt is measured in billions of dollars, not millions. One billion dollars is 1,000 times a million dollars. Turkey's national debt is 268,000,000 lira. We pay six or seven billion dollars a year in interest; they are paying 17,000,000 lira. They have holdings of over 200,000,000; yet our State Department, without any request from the Turkish Government, asks us to pay for the Turkish armaments because the Turkish Government "requires foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income."

Mr. President, is not that a damnable proposal? The American people, suffering under heavy taxation, poured out their blood and wealth while Turkey profiteered. The Turkish Government today is in the best financial shape in its history, with available foreign exchange—plenty of it—and our State Department proposes that we subsidize everything the Turks need over and above their foreign exchange "available from current income." The American people are tremendously interested in current income. The American people want to see our budget balanced. As a matter of fact, the American people would like to see our taxes lowered; they would like to see our national debt retired. As one Congressman said, "We should be asking for a loan from Turkey."

Mr. President, perhaps the American people would be more sanguine, more ready to take funds from their current income to pay the bills of the Turkish Government if that Government were a democracy. But when, as is well known, these funds from our "current income" are to be expended in behalf of a Government which has been a dictatorship for 24 years, some doubt arises, even in the minds of the most fearful of our countrymen.

The New York Times of March 29, 1947, carried a startling story about the so-called freedom of the press in Turkey. I ask that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASING OF TURKISH PRESS CONTROL IS SOUGHT WITH LOAN PLAN AS LEVER—PROGRESSIVES DECRY "CHINESE WALL" AROUND COUNTRY—SEVERE PENALTIES PRESCRIBED FOR REPORTS DEEMED OBJECTIONABLE

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, March 28.—In the light of the latest developments in Turkish-United States relations, progressive individuals and newspapers are renewing their efforts to ease what is considered to be the difficult position of foreign press correspondents here.

A leading opposition paper, Vatan, which is campaigning for freedom of the press, editorially urged the government today to accord more facilities and cheaper cable rates to foreign correspondents "if we want to pull down the Chinese wall surrounding us."

Interpretative reporting here is hazardous in view of the Turkish law relating to the dissemination of information. Although unofficial censorship of cabled press messages ended last June and no signs of visible, direct censorship exist, correspondents still face what is known as the German system: Censorship at the source, which puts correspondents on the carpet for printed cables judged by the authorities to be objectionable.

The Turks, who still are shy of foreigners, consider the correspondent as a sort of spy, one to be avoided. No government officer except the Premier is allowed to make a statement to the press without authorization from the top and it took the proposed American loan to induce Premier Receppeker to grant an interview recently.

The penal laws that apply to foreign correspondents and the local press have convinced reporters that an assignment in Turkey is no easy job. Article 140 prescribes a minimum of 5 years in prison for anyone sending abroad unfounded or exaggerated information on Turkey's internal political situation that might harm her dignity in foreign countries. The penalty applies to the person giving such information and to the correspondent who sends it.

Article 158 prescribes a minimum of 3 years in prison for anyone insulting the Turkish President or writing aggressively about him. A penalty of 1 to 6 years' imprisonment is provided in article 159 for any person insulting the moral personality of the national assembly, the Turkish Republic, the government, the armed forces, the police, or the judicial system.

Article 162 provides that the act of transmitting a story or information that the law considers criminal is a crime.

The government has argued that the laws are not invoked. They are enforceable, however, and hang over every reporter's head.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this report demonstrates clearly that there is no real freedom of the press in Turkey. The Turkish Government promptly suspended the correspondent's privileges to file cables because he wrote the article. This, I believe, happened on April 3. On April 5 his rights were restored pending the arrival of another correspondent from Athens. An American correspondent was gagged because he told the truth to the American people.

Mr. President, the secret documents which our State Department furnished to 10 newspapermen, in its summary of the present situation in Turkey, have some other interesting things to say. Permit me to quote:

> While the Turks are almost unanimous in supporting the government's foreign policy, there is considerable difference of opinion among them about the direction of internal affairs. Less than 2 years ago the Turkish Government took the courageous step of licensing the existence of opposition political parties.

That is from the Department's report, which is doubtless authentic.

I trust that the Senate notes that the adjective "courageous" comes from our State Department, also, that they see nothing strange in the fact that a license for a political party is necessary. Again:

> One major opposition party emerged—the democratic party—which was well supported in elections to the National Assembly in the summer of 1946. Other political groups, however, have not won many adherents, while such subversive and antigovernment minority groups as do exist, are not powerful, and

are under effective control by the police and security services.

In other words, Mr. President, the police suppress all political parties and groups that do not agree with the government. Why does not the State Department say so and get it over with? Permit me to quote further:

The Democrats insist upon the removal of certain restrictive laws which they regard as unconstitutional, such as the press law, by means of which the government exercises somewhat arbitrary control over the Turkish press. They also strongly condemn the Government for its inability to take effective steps to improve critical economical conditions and to halt the rising cost of living.

It is a terrible crime, is it not? Quite a few Members of the Senate would run into difficulty if ours was that kind of a government.

From the Newsweek magazine of May 27, 1946, pages 41 and 42, I find this statement:

When the Democrats began to organize, however, they ran into trouble. They accused civil authorities of preventing them from setting up headquarters on a nationwide scale. They declared provincial state governors refused to allow Democratic rallies, and constantly intercepted mail and telephone messages. They said policemen beat up their followers. Finally, as a protest, they issued a manifesto declaring the Government nondemocratic, and decided they would boycott both municipal and national elections. President Inonu seized upon this action to imply that the Democrats were actually Communists who wanted to discredit the Turkish Government in the eyes of other states. He promised Turkey would fight political parties inspired from abroad and acting as foreign instruments.

That goes to show how governments nowadays, whenever they encounter any great difficulty, simply yell "Communism, communism, communism!"

Mr. President, these same Democrats, whom President Inonu of Turkey called Communists, drew up a program in the elections of 1946 opposed to the present governmental ownership of mines, public utilities, textiles, and shoe factories. That is quite a crime, is it not? They are opposed to the government operation of businesses, factories, and industries, and for that crime they are termed "Communists." These free-enterprise advocates must be a queer breed of Communists. A political party opposing a government's total ownership of utilities, mines, factories, et cetera, is called Communist by the ruling political clique. That is name-calling with a vengeance. We do not even go so far over here.

By no stretch of the imagination can Turkey be said to be on the road to democracy, even though our State Department gracefully approves the brutal, harsh, and ruthless dictatorship that controls that nation. The Senate ought to be more realistic. Military aid and assistance to this Government is aid and assistance to a Fascist military dictatorship.

Mr. President, a heavy and serious responsibility has been thrust upon us without rhyme or reason. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has asked us to take from the pockets of the American taxpayers millions of dollars to support a government whose political irresponsibility is demonstrated by historical fact. He has asked us to support a government which is essentially military and dictatorial. He has asked us to give money to a government in excellent financial position; indeed, in better financial position than is the Government of the United States. We are asked to repudiate our commitments to the United Nations and, in effect, to guarantee Turkish control of the Dardanelles. We are asked, in effect, to assume responsibility for the maintenance of Turkish mercenary Janizaries. It is my fixed conviction that the American people want no part or parcel of this proposal. I urge the Senate, in all good conscience, to adopt the proposed amendment, striking Turkey from the pending measure.

I now send to the desk the amendment which I have discussed and ask that it lie on the table, to be called up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other Senator who wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am still wondering—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]—whether we cannot at least move forward to the extent of adopting the committee amendments. It is my understanding that even those who hold the position of the able Senator from Colorado are in favor of the committee amendments, and I should like to get the bill to the point at least where we can start tomorrow with the real debate, which will be upon just such amendments as the able Senator from Colorado proposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I join the Senator in that desire. I shall be glad to have the committee amendments adopted. I shall not oppose them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that the Senate proceed with the committee amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume that will not foreclose amendments to any part of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 11, after "government", to strike out "and" and at the end of line 14, to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and "and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act; and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert the following language, as heretofore amended:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectiveiy, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

(2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and

(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this act as the President shall prescribe.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. This amendment does not make it perfectly clear whether there must be a chief of mission to a country, or exactly what his powers are to be. I wonder if the Senator has been informed as to what sort of an organization we are to have in Greece.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Committee on Foreign Relations was advised that the form of the administrative organization will be a chief of mission in Greece and a chief of mission in Turkey, and that the chief of mission shall organize his own staff.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the question whether we can avoid what has happened in so many places throughout the world, where three or four different departments of the Government have representatives, sometimes each of them handing out money and working at cross-purposes. I wonder if there is any assurance that in this case that will not occur, and that all Americans will substantially be under the direction of a chief of mission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, after line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] be made the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have sent the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out "and Turkey,"; in line 6, to strike out "their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government"; in line 9, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 10, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; on page 2, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 15, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 17, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; on page 3, line 5, to strike out "or of Turkey"; in line 6, to strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country"; in line 8, to strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country"; on page 4, line 4, to strike out "or of Turkey"; and in lines 12 and 13, to strike out "to either Greece or Turkey."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

SALE OF COAST GUARD SITE AT FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1009, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the bill be presently considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the base six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is of purely local interest. For some time there has been authority in the Coast Guard to transfer sites in Florida to other locations. Several years ago legislation was passed authorizing the sale of one of these sites to the city of Fort Lauderdale. Financial arrangements have all been completed, and the transaction is ready for consummation. The difficulty is that there must be authority both to sell and to acquire the property. That right expires on the 29th of this month. The bill must go to the House. I therefore ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes," as amended (Public Law No. 655, 79th Cong.; 60 Stat. 901), is hereby amended by striking out "6 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 months."

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 11, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Anton J. Lukaszewicz, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Mr. Lukaszewicz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 10, 1946.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
William F. Busser, of Pennsylvania.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.
Bolard More, of Ohio.
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor, of Indiana.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
Halleck L. Rose, of Nebraska.
Fred K. Salter, of Georgia.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Classman, Delwin W.
*Grening, George M.
*Joyce, Theodore W.

ENSIGNS

Albert, William H.
Alderson, John T.
Applebach, Richard O.
Armstrong, Richard G.
Bagger, Gilbert D.
Baker, Morton S.
*Banner, Roy R.
*Barber, George C.
Barbour, Neil G.
Bauch, Leland W.
Betts, Joseph E.
Bishop, Lewis S.
Bohmert, Gerald G.
Bueler, Charles M.
Carment, Frederick, Jr.
Carter, Wallace R.
Cartright, Richard L.
Chillemi, Richard L.
Cohn, William P.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
*Colenda, Frank
Condra, Kenneth I.
Cook, Berdel A.
Cramer, Maley O., Jr.
Cunningham, Thomas F.
Curless, James P.
Davis, Leslie D.
*Davis, William J., Jr.
*Deibler, William D.
DeWerd, Theodore J.
Doling, Lloyd L.
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
Drake, John D. K.
Dwyer, William V.
*Egeland, Andrew M.
Faulk, Joseph R.
Fitzwater, Harry E.
Flanigan, Frank, Jr.
Freeland, Harold H.
Friedrichsen, Leslie P.
Fuller, Richard, Jr.
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.
Gibbs, John D., Jr.
Goelz, Herbert E.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gray, Gordon L.
Gray, Theodore R.
Gresham, John I.
Grove, Nevett S.
Harmon, William C.
Harrison, Alan W.
Hart, Harry S.
Hause, Joseph R.
Hoover, John R.
Hughes, Thomas J., Jr.
Jackson, James A.
Johnstone, Frank L.
Jones, Edward H.
Kearny, Francis C., Jr.
Kebort, Leo R.
Klippstein, Thomas A.
Krueger, Roland E., Jr.
Kwitkcski, Walter J.
Lamb, Arthur W.
Landess, Herbert S.
Markham, Paul E.
McGucken, Paul M.
McKinney, Clyde B.
*Mize, Louis R.
Morgan, Lawrence E.
Mosser, Douglas
Murrill, Robert L.
O'Meara, Charles K.
Powell, Arthur E.
*Quick, Thomas J.
Rappuhn, Alfred A., Jr.
Riggan, James M., Jr.
Riordan, Gilbert A.
Roberts, William K.
Rogers, Donald L.
Ryder, Donald F.
*Sar, Raymond V.
Schmucker, Stanley K.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
Schwartz, Mathew J.
Serrie, John A., Jr.
Sholes, Charles W.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisterhenm, William H.
*Slattery, Francis L.
Smelz, Jervis L.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, George E.
Smith, James J.
Smith, James V.
Smith, John E.
Smith, Wendell K.
Spruit, Robert E.
Stair, Robert N.
Stassevitch, Paul S.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stout, Harry R.
Sup, George C.
Swanstrom, Willis E.
Sweeder, Stanley E.
Taylor, Huling F., Jr.
*Torrey, Julian A.
Tribble, Gordon B. B.
Valentine, Earnest
Vehorn, Charles M.
Vrolyk, Raymond F.
Walery, Kenneth F.
Waring, Everett D.
Warren, Burtis "W"
West, Gordon R.
Whitely, Joseph M.
Whitney, William J.
Whittaker, Gordon S.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, James E.
Wilson, James G.
*Windley, William D.
*Wooldridge, Arthur R., Jr.
Caskey, James C.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Chace, John F.
Moorman, Elmer R.
Watkins, George S.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

McCreary, Arthur D.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Babler, Richard F.
Bach, Charles F., Jr.
Beamon, Charles W.
Benz, Norman E.
Carothers, Rodney P.
Comfort, John R.
Curtis, Ralph E.
Day, Robert D.
De Pourtales, Louis J. E.
Fairfield, George W.
Fargason, James E.
Farnham, Benjamin L.
Goodreau, George H.
Harris, Melvin W.
Hart, Billy W.
Holland, Donald E.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kees, John D.
Keidel, Charles J.
McAdams, Robert J.
McKenna, James E.
Mulvee, Paul L.
O'Leary, Joseph J.
Pooler, Richard P.
Pope, George S., Jr.
Primm, Jules R.
Robinson, James A.
Ronayne, William D.
Sampson, William J.
Schmidt, Maurice L.
Schmitt, Joseph D.

Senulis, Alexander D.	Bauer, Allen F.
Sherrell, David P.	Hill, William H.
Simpson, Harvey	Odell, Jack G.
Slater, Thornton L.	Parfitt, Arthur R.
Smith, William C., Jr.	Scott, Joseph E.
Smith, William C.	Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Starbody, John L.	Smith, Frank W., Jr.
Taylor, William L.	Crowell, Julian R., Jr.
Williams, George W.	Jordan, Robert L.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Burch, Bobby F.	Michael, Edwin M.
Chadwick, Dean O.	Mulder, William H.
Daub, Leland A.	Ross, Willard A.
Ellis, Darl A.	White, Richard D.
Hoskins, Dalton	Young, Robert "C"
Malvin, David W.	Scanlan, Melvin E.
Marron, James P.	

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Brimer, Eugene L., Jr.	Nystul, Oliver G.
Carney, Bruce H.	Sancier, Henry J.
Crossmire, George B.	Scrivener, Charles A.
Fowler, James M.	Shearn, Raymond S.
Kraske, Leonard M.	

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

Van Gorder, Keith R.

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Baker, Lewis G.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In the secret of Thy presence, O Lord, how our souls take delight, and how precious are the lessons we learn at Thy feet. Even in the shadows Thou abidest and aboundest. Keep alive in our hearts the One who faced failure, unsealed earth's tombs, and brought to man an abiding faith and an enduring courage.

Our Father, we seek today for urgent wills and for constructive spirits in all that we do, that the Congress may have a most honorable part in our national life and character. Do Thou sustain us in mind and heart that, being submissive to Thy wisdom, we may be led to the solutions of the provocative situations in which we are placed.

In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. National Archives.
6. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
7. Railroad Retirement Board.

JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of April 2, 1947, the Chair designates the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to read Jefferson's first inaugural address on Monday, April 14, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Saturday to file its report on H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity for the purpose of announcing the program for next week, and particularly to announce that if the Committee on Education and Labor reports the so-called labor bill before Saturday midnight it is proposed that a request be made for a rule on Monday, and then to call up the bill on Tuesday. I do not know how much time will be given for general debate, but it is expected that the consideration of that bill will continue through next week to Thursday or Friday, or for such time as may be necessary to complete its consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give us the number of that bill?

Mr. HALLECK. H. R. 3020.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the rule be taken up on Monday in the House?

Mr. HALLECK. No. It is expected that the application for the rule will be made on Monday. If the rule is granted, it will be filed on Monday and then could be called up on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the program for Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot give an answer to that at the moment. As I understand, it is District day, so any District business would be in order for Monday. Beyond that I know of nothing further. If there is anything further to be considered on Monday, I shall later announce it. I wanted to make this announcement relative to anticipated consideration of the so-called labor bill as the program for next week.

Mr. RANKIN. If the rule is granted, as I understand, the labor bill will be taken up on Tuesday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. It will probably take several days to dispose of it?

Mr. HALLECK. I would assume so. I do not know how much time will be allowed under the rule that the Rules Committee may report. Certainly, a considerable amount of time will be taken under the 5-minute rule in the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. The chairman of the committee is present. I wonder how much time he is going to ask for general debate.

Mr. HARTLEY. That has not yet been determined.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just want to serve notice on you that I want you all to be here on next Monday, because I am going to read to you one of the greatest documents ever promulgated in all the history of this Government, Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

I want every one of you to hear it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 12, 2 years will have elapsed since this Nation and the world lost one of its greatest citizens, an outstanding man who devoted his life to the cause of humanity, to preserving freedom in

our Nation, and to bringing freedom and the democratic way of life to the world. Since the House will not be in session on Saturday, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes in connection with Pan-American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WOODWARD, OKLA.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assume that many of you have noticed in the press this morning the report of a terrific tornado which struck the very heart and center of my congressional district last night. The city of Woodward, Okla., a little city of about 7,000 people, one of the most progressive, up-to-date, and wide-awake cities in the State of Oklahoma, was in the very center of this tornado. The latest report I have is that they have counted 100 persons killed and over 800 seriously injured. According to the meager press reports available at this time approximately one-third of the town was completely devastated by this storm. Red Cross officials have today advised me that substantial funds have already been allocated to aid and assist in the disaster, and that other funds will be available to meet the necessities. Seven hundred and fifty tents, 2,000 cots, and 6,000 blankets have been moved into Woodward and a tent city is being established to temporarily house the destitute. An Army field kitchen is being set up to take care of the food requirements.

One of the striking things heard over the radio was a report from two ex-combat servicemen who survived and said that in their experience overseas they had never witnessed anything more horrifying or more devastating than this tornado that struck in the night without warning. Some smaller towns over in the State of Texas, right near the Texas line, were completely annihilated by this terrific storm.

From reports thus far available, this is perhaps the most tragic and far-reaching disaster ever inflicted on any community by a tornado.

I have assured the citizens of Woodward that I am certain the Congress of the United States stands ready to provide any emergency assistance needed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon-address delivered by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay from the pulpit of the First Presybterian Church, Nashville, Tenn., on January 19, 1947, entitled "Private Property."

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on H. R. 495 and H. R. 1448.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW: AFTER GREECE, TURKEY, KOREA, AND INDIA, WHERE DO WE GO?

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country who are searching for light on the global proposal of the President have found little in the news, or in the Congress, to help them come to any firm conclusion.

Most of the speeches around Washington supporting the proposal have been very much on the rabble-rousing side and fail to explore the basic facts concerning the issue.

In the morning paper we find two or three items of great interest. First, the AP dispatch from London quotes a highly placed British Government source as saying that the American State Department official in Greece took a much graver view of the internal and international ramifications of the Greek situation than did the British.

The British, according to this authority, did not think their withdrawal would pave the way for Communists to seize control of the Greek Government or that guerrilla fighting, while a considerable nuisance, is great enough to constitute a danger of real civil war. While they call it an Anglo-American policy, they make it clear that they did not ask for it, or propose it.

There is no doubt that a transfusion for Korea and a blood-letting for Uncle Sam to the tune of $600,000,000 is in the making and will be presented to Congress after the disposal of the Greek-Turkish question.

Another item by the UP quotes Indian sources as saying that the United States, in another anticommunism move, joined recently in Anglo-Indian Army talks in London on the defense of India, after the British withdrawal in June 1948. The talks were reported to have revolved primarily around the question of what American and British assistance might be necessary for India to guard the northern "back door" against Communist infiltration after the British leave.

The American people would like to know: After Greece, Turkey, Korea, and India, where do we go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Frank Walrop in this morning's Times-Herald.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Brigadier General Kelser of the United States Army.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief filed by Mr. John C. Williamson, of the national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, before the Committee on Ways and Means, with a copy of a newspaper article which is part of the brief.

HENRY FORD

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in my home city of Detroit funeral services are being conducted for a fellow townsman whose record as an industrialist, philanthropist, and humanitarian stands unequaled in modern times. I speak of the late Henry Ford, whose name is known the world over and is synonymous with the best traditions of good citizenship and progressive business. He was a pioneer in an industry which brought growth and wealth to Detroit and credit to himself and his family. His death is Detroit's and the world's loss.

Before sundown this evening, all that is mortal of Henry Ford will be lowered into a grave in Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Mich., in a small family plot not far from his birthplace. Henry Ford made this world a better place in which to live and his passing will be

felt in every walk of life for many, many years to come.

I am one of the many thousands of Detroiters who count Henry Ford as a former boss. It was my privilege some 12 years ago to work in the vast Ford plant at River Rouge. There I had an opportunity to see at first hand and to take an active part in the mass-production program of this great automotive genius. It was an experience that I shall not forget because I felt myself a part of this great industrial empire and joined hands with countless thousands of my fellow citizens who depended upon Ford for their daily bread.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two editorials which appeared in the Washington Star of April 8 and the Washington Daily News of April 9 and which I believe typical of the editorial comment carried in virtually every newspaper in the country when the passing of Mr. Ford became known.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 9, 1947]

HENRY FORD

It was 83 years from candlelight to candlelight for Henry Ford. He was born 15 years before his friend, Tom Edison, invented the electric light. As he died, at his home Monday night, a flood had cut off electricity and heat, thus dramatizing the changes of his lifetime and our dependence upon them.

Mr. Ford must be listed among the few great mechanical geniuses of history. It even may be conjectured that his effect upon the trend of human affairs perhaps was as great in its way as that of Napoleon, or Genghis Khan, or of Caesar.

At least his record is more remarkable in that it did not involve, as it did in the other cases, war or conquest.

All he attempted to do, as he said, was to take the heavy burdens from men's shoulders and place them upon machines.

Henry Ford did not invent the mass-production system. Eli Whitney introduced that technique a long time before, in the manufacture of Army muskets.

But Henry Ford developed it on a mass scale. He lightened men's labors, improved their efficiency, their wages, and their living standards. He shortened their hours of work.

By mass producing a car to fit the average pocketbook, he put the Nation on wheels. His was the imagination and driving force in creating our vast network of hard-surfaced roads and our great oil industry.

As a byproduct of his endeavors, he created a fortune so vast it is beyond imagination. Yet he lived frugally. His hobby was collections from the past, antiques remindful of the good old days which his imagination had helped hasten into limbo.

Is it good for one man to accumulate so much wealth, or bad? Money is power and we hold, in this country, that too much power in any man's hands is evil. Under present regulations it would be impossible to amass this amount of wealth or anything approaching it.

It also would be impossible to build the industrial organization which has been so beneficial. Our present system, though it seems sound and fair in many respects, is not favorable to the development of Henry Fords. Tax laws and social regulations work against the rugged individualist, which Henry Ford certainly was.

Perhaps this is good. Such power as he has had, in evil hands, could be destructive. But we should give thought to the circumstances, none the less.

The country which Henry Ford helped transform by no means has reached perfection. It must grow. New and improved techniques for working and living must be developed. The last word has not been spoken on industrial techniques, on labor relations, on anything else for that matter.

We must prevent obvious abuses. We must outlaw obvious exploitation, but we must leave the way open for the play of such genius as was Henry Ford's.

[From the Washington Star of April 8, 1947]

HENRY FORD

Henry Ford was a living proof of the efficacy of Emerson's saying about the building of better mousetraps. His career, when summarized, was a demonstration of the ancient law of supply and demand in its best, most notably constructive form. He was one of the principal architects of the modern mechanical age, and his enterprises enriched his country and the world at large in spiritual and cultural as well as in material ways. The inexpensive automobile gave plain people the power to go places quickly, and the effect of its invention has been revolutionary beyond the hopes of its sponsor.

A dreamer in many respects, Mr. Ford, even as a boy, visioned improvements of far-reaching significance. His capacity for imaginative thinking undoubtedly led him astray on occasion, but to it he owed the ultimate dimensions of his empire. Fortunately, a talent for tireless labor matched the genius of his mind. Not until he was very old was it possible for him to rest. Protected from public intrusion at Dearborn during nearly half a century, he spent his time and energy in ceaseless pursuit of ideas. Some of his notions were quixotic. The Peace Ship of 1915 was an example of his tendency to err romantically. His political views often were ruggedly individualistic. He opposed collective bargaining after it had become the standard practice of the Nation. Federal interference in industry irked him. He had made himself a symbol of private enterprise and to him there was no other answer.

Meanwhile, the growth of his interests continued. By 1930 Mr. Ford was regarded as the richest man in the world. His personal tastes and habits remained simple and unpretending. He was devoted to "the old days" and assembled Dearborn Village to prove it. Paradoxically, he favored the latest instruments, the most recently perfected methods of production. His laboratories and experimental shops, barred to outsiders, are a legend. In them things truly magical happened. During the Second World War he lived to see the mass-production systems and methods, of which he was a pioneer, become a major factor in the defeat of our enemies.

The final judgment of the role he played in the American scene may not be feasible at present. He had his fair share of critics, some of them uncharitably bitter. But if he be appraised in terms of increased national wealth, convenience in travel, progress in the making and distribution of useful articles of commerce, rational philanthropy, and patriotism, he must be conceded to have been one of the giants of his era of history.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Evening Star of yesterday.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press concerning the recent proposed tax bill.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a speech by Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, in another a speech by Admiral Clark of the Navy, and in the third a speech by Mr. John F. Vickery.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of social security.

AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO GRANT EASEMENTS IN LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1844) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to say that this bill, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary. It was reported by the committee unanimously, and I do not think there can possibly be any objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he deems it advantageous to the Government and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable, is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to grant to any State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or to any public-service company, easements in and rights-of-way over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control. Such grant may include the use of such easements or rights-of-way by public utilities to the extent authorized and under the conditions imposed by the laws of such State relating to use of public highways. Such partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction over the areas covered by such easements or rights-of-way, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs deems necessary or desirable, is hereby ceded to the State in which the land is located. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to accept or secure on behalf of the United States from the State in which is situated any land conveyed in exchange for any such easement or right-of-way, such jurisdiction as he may deem necessary or desirable over the land so acquired. Any such easement or right-of-way shall be terminated upon abandonment or nonuse of the same and all right, title, and interest in the land covered thereby shall thereupon revert to the United States or its assignee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two separate editorials on two different subjects.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, this is the time set for the calling of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

FRANCESCO AND NATALIA PICCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 422) for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it cnacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889-890; 54 Stat. 671-673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155) the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Francesco and Natalia Picchi, of Rockford, Ill., to remain permanently in the United States if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "States", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9 and 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE PORTLAND CEMENT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 654) for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $24,355.06, to Lawrence Portland Cement Co., of Thomaston, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942, to June 1, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES A. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Charles A. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Charles A. Clark, of Ridgewood, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of a collision between the car which he was driving and a United States Army vehicle near Wurtsboro, N. Y., on May 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "a collision between the car which he was driving and a United States Army vehicle" and insert "an accident caused by several deer running into the highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF HUNTER A. HOAGLAND, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 723) for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor of Glen Rock, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of an explosion of a discarded shell in an old abandoned United States Army Camp on Harristown Road, Fair Lawn, N. J., on February 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California the sum of $478.13. Such sum represents the total amount paid by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as follows:

(1) To Allen D. Cameron, California, and Earle P. Schouten, California, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on February 3, 1939, when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with a truck operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. At the time of such accident, the said Allen D. Cameron and Earle P. Schouten were employees of the San Rafael Military Academy, San Rafael, Calif., and the sum of $382.10 was paid to them by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy with the said San Rafael Military Academy;

(2) To Officer Everett Ingram, of the California Highway Patrol, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on August 25, 1941, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge with a truck operated in the service of the United States Army, and the sum of $81.78 was paid to him by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy; and

(3) To the State Department of Motor Vehicles for damage to the motorcycle on which Officer Ingram was riding the sum of $14.25.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 21, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE CORENEVSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of George Corenevsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Corenevsky, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of $1,906.07. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on July 5, 1942, when he was struck while at his home at Ashley and Lowela Avenues, Peninsula, Pearl City, Oahu, T. H., by a stray bullet fired in a fight nearby between two enlisted men of the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,906.07" and insert "$1,905.07."

Page 2, line 1, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED E. WEBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1064) for the relief of Fred E. Weber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred E. Weber, Bradley Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., the sum of $7,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Fred E. Weber against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him when the automobile which he was driving on Central Avenue, in the borough of Bradley Beach, was in collision with a United States Army truck on January 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,000" and insert "$4,226."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARSON REMEDY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1068) for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Pearson Remedy Co., Burlington, N. C., for drawback, pursuant to section 3250 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, of tax with respect to distilled spirits used in the manufacture or production of nonbeverage products during the quarter beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944, filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the month of April 1945, is authorized to be considered and acted upon as if it had been filed within the period of limitations properly applicable thereto. The general manager and secretary and treasurer of the said Pearson Remedy Co., C. M. Houser, was unable on account of illness to file such claim on or before March 31, 1945, the date of the expiration of the period of limitations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GEORGIA LANSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1091) for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,500, to Mrs. Georgia Lanser, of Elkhorn, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and loss of services sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Navy bus en route from Hertford, N. C., to the naval auxiliary air station at Harvey Point, N. C., on August 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$6,500" and insert "$4,304.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE SPITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Eugene Spitzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Spitzer, of Lake Placid, N. Y., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of bond declared breached August 13, 1940, because of his failure to depart from the United States on or before December 11, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DEPENDENTS OF CARL B. SANBORN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 389) for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 751–791), the late Carl B. Sanborn, who died as the result of an explosion which occurred June 16, 1942, in Eaton Canyon, near Pasadena, Calif., while engaged in scientific research for the United States, shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of his death, and compensation for death payable under said act shall accrue from the date of his death and shall be payable to such of his dependents as may qualify under section 10 of said act, under the conditions therein provided, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed by said act upon the basis of the monthly pay, respectively, of such Carl B. Sanborn in his employment under the direction of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office for Emergency Management, or upon the basis of monthly pay of $175 in the event that at the time of death he was serving without compensation. Any compensation for death received by any such dependent under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited against any compensation which such dependent may receive by reason of this act. No right to benefits shall accrue under this act unless a written claim for compensation is filed under such act of September 7, 1916, as amended within one year from the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENJAMIN GORDON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 400) for the relief of Benjamin Gordon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Benjamin Gordon, Chelsea, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss in salary sustained when claimant was struck by a United States Coast Guard motor vehicle while alighting from a taxi at or near the intersection of Saratoga and Prescott Streets, East Boston, Mass., on December 6, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account

of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE H. ASHLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 986) for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,042 in full settlement of all claims against the United States, due to Leslie H. Ashlock, of Cecelia, Hardin County, Ky., to compensate him for the loss of his right eye which occurred on February 6, 1945, at about 10 o'clock a. m., while and during the time that the said Leslie H. Ashlock was an employee of Gastan & Co., of Louisville, Ky., which company was operating under a contract with the War Department and the United States Government for the baling of all waste paper at Fort Knox, Ky.; the exact injury sustained by the said Leslie H. Ashlock having been caused by a small bomb buried in the paper, which the said Leslie A. Ashlock was handling during the performance of his duties and which bomb exploded and particles thereof striking the said Ashlock in the right eye, thereby producing a contusion of the right eyeball, a partial dislocation of the lens of the right eye, and hemorrhages in the anterior chamber, which has resulted in his complete and total blindness in the aforementioned right eye, all of which was not due to, or caused by, any negligence whatsoever upon the part of the said Leslie H. Ashlock. A search of the waste paper on the floor revealed several whistling bombs of a type used on the infiltration course at the station, upon the Government reservation at Fort Knox, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount herein appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered directly or indirectly to any agent or attorney on account of any service or services claimed to have been or actually rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,042" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,042 to Leslie H. Ashlock, of Cecilia, Ky."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "States", strike out the bill down to the word "*Provided*" in line 17, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as the result of the explosion of a small bomb at Fort Knox, Ky., on February 6, 1945, while the said Leslie H. Ashlock was engaged in work as an employee of Kastan & Co. in connection with the baling of waste paper at the post dump at Fort Knox."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS GAMBACORTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1065) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Thomas Gambacorto, the sum of $6,200.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Thomas Gambacorto and hospital and funeral expenses and property damage sustained when the deceased was driving his wagon on State Highway No. 35, near Eatontown, N. J., and was struck in the rear by an Army-owned vehicle on January 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,200.75" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONNA L. I. CARLISLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Donna L. I. Carlisle, of San Jose, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation on account of the death of her son, Arthur W. Lawrence, who was killed on July 22, 1929, by being crushed underneath an Army truck while a trainee at a Citizens Military Training Camp at Fort Missoula, Mont.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

HENRY BIG DAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

MRS. ELIZABETH KEMPTON BAILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1176) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey as having entered the United States for permanent residence on July 28, 1938, the date on which she was temporarily admitted as a student.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FUKU KUROKAWA THURN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1937, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1222 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 576), and the provisions of section 1223 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 577), and the provisions of section 1224 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 495), or any other provisions of law, or any rules and regulations issued thereunder, the President is authorized to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, a general officer in the Army of the United States, as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and Major General Kuter's appointment to, acceptance of, and service as such representative shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Army of the United States or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he remains United States representative to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, Major General Kuter in lieu of his military pay and allowances shall receive such compensation and allowances as the Secretary of State shall prescribe from appropriations made by law for the Department of State.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, Major General Kuter shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the War Department, the Military Establishment, or the Army of the United States, or any component thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "State", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That Major General Kuter shall not remain in this position for more than 2 years after the date of the approval of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISIANA POWER & LIGHT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2248) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a perpetual easement for a right-of-way for transmission-line purposes in, on, and across a portion of Camp Livingston, La., and convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co., its successors and/or assigns, by quitclaim deed, a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston, La., being 200 feet wide and 400 feet long and located adjacent to and on the north side of the Beaver Creek electrical distribution substation of the Louisiana Power & Light Co., on which land to be conveyed the said Beaver Creek substation has been enlarged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF REUBEN MALKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 341) for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the widow of Reuben Malkin, who was killed by being electrocuted on May 28, 1943, while engaged in painting the United States post office at Cumberland, Md., when in the course of his work and without warning the said Reuben Malkin contacted a high-tension feeder line carrying 2300 volts of current into the Federal building. The payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "widow" and insert "estate."

Page 1, line 6, after "Malkin", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of the said Reuben Malkin."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "the payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVA GAVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 437) for the relief of Iva Gavin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Iva Gavin, of Muncie, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses suffered and incurred by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army Air Corps bus at or near Dayton, Ohio, on August 18, 1943; *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and loss of earnings."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. ORVILLE E. McKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARY JANE SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 704) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THERESE R. COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 925) for the relief of Therese R. Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, an he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Therese R. Cohen, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Therese R. Cohen, resulting from her being thrown from a United States Navy truck on April 14, 1944, on the grounds of the Floyd Bennett Naval Air Station, Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000", and insert "$3,304."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. LANE POWERS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1093) for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

sum of $992.90 to D. Lane Powers, to pay the sum of $4,337.12 to Elaine Powers Taylor, and to pay the sum of $500 to Monroe W. Taylor, all of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle along a highway in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945. Said vehicle at the time of the accident being controlled and operated by an employee of the Government who was not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning with line 3, strike out the balance of the page down to and including the word "employment" on page 2, line 7, and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $552 to D. Lane Powers, of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between his automobile and an Army vehicle parked at night without lights on State Highway Numbered 33 in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945, and to Elaine Powers Taylor, of Trenton, N. J., the sum of $2,117, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, pain and suffering and disfigurement sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of said accident: *Provided*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA BILOBRAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1221) for the relief of Eva Bilobran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eva Bilobran, 940 South Bouldin Street, Baltimore, Md., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries suffered as a result of having been struck by a United States mail truck at the intersection of East Avenue and Dillon Street, Baltimore, Md., on December 14, 1943, and for medical services, hospital bills, and loss of salary during her illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $10,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$1,646."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GILDA COWAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of Gilda Cowan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gilda Cowan the sum of $10,000, as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by her when, on April 28, 1934, a Navy Department trailer attached to the dirigible Macon, at Opa Locka Flying Field, Miami, Fla., ran over her right leg: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW CHIARODO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 241, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Andrew Chiarodo is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to $597.50 heretofore paid to him as a plasterer at the United States naval air station, Anacostia, District of Columbia, for the period from February 26, 1945, to March 17, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the said Andrew Chiarodo shall be considered to have been in the employ of the said air station at the rate of $1.39 per hour during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Andrew Chiarodo as compensation for such period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN M. LORRAINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1510) for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 243, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness to the United States of Lillian M. Lorraine, and the said Lillian M. Lorraine is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to $1,794 heretofore paid to her as a stenographer and clerk in the office of the paymaster, United States Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., for the period from January 1, 1931, to April 6, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, the said Lillian M. Lorraine shall be considered to have been employed in said office at the rate of $2,160 per annum from January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1945, inclusive, and at the rate of $2,496 per annum from July 1, 1945, to April 6, 1946, inclusive, during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Lillian M. Lorraine as compensation for such period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. T. H. Chambers, Finance Department (now retired), $43.73; Col. R. D. Daugherity, Finance Department,

$22.53; Col. Maxton H. Flint, Finance Department, $37.65; Col. L. P. Worrall, Finance Department (now retired), $594.60, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, as listed in letter, of the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in determining amounts due individuals.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. D. F. Boichot, Finance Department, the sum of $200, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing two counterfeit $100 Federal Reserve notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of $200 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 3. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. C. R. Orem, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of $50.44, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing four counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of $50.44 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. Shirley N. Black, Finance Department, the sum of $30.26, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing three counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of $30.26 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Jesse P. Bellamy, Finance Department, the sum of $97.10, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing German mark notes received by him in the course of business and later determined to be unacceptable as legal tender: *Provided*, That the sum of $97.10 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. L. H. Van Horne, Finance Department, the sum of $1,917.34, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing the value of three counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business, and five guilder notes which were unacceptable as legal tender: *Provided*, That the sum of $1,917.34 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. Elton Hall, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of $72.15, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him to an imposter representing himself to be an officer of the United States Army.

SEC. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. W. M. Dixon, Finance Department (now retired), the sum of $10.30, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him for newspaper advertising for and in behalf of the United States, said advertising having been published without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for said sum of $10.30 or any part thereof.

SEC. 9. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. Arthur Willink, Ordnance Department (now retired), the sum of $26.49, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum has been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States on account of failure to purchase from a contractor listed in the General Schedule of Supplies: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payment.

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga., $93.65; to the Greensboro News Co., Greensboro, N. C., $28.83; and to the Raleigh Times, Raleigh, N. C., $13.48, which amounts are due to the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Louis C. Simon, Jr., Air Corps, the amount of $200, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage in pay-roll funds delivered to him.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. J. F. Stone, Finance Department, the amount of $42.77, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed in the course of conversion of large amounts of French currency.

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. A. W. Glienke, Finance Department, the amount of $20.17, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when a counterfeit 5-pound note was discovered among English currency accepted by him.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Elton Hall, Jr., Finance Department, the amount of $201.75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when a counterfeit 50-pound note was discovered among English currency accepted by him.

SEC. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Julius A. Stern, Air Corps, the amount of $1,059.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which was later ascertained to be the result of a theft of the funds by another person.

SEC. 16. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Oliver H. Hunter, Jr., Finance Department, the amount of $20.18, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when two counterfeit 500-franc notes were discovered among French currency accepted by him.

SEC. 17. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Walter S. Barnes, Air Corps, the amount of $895.45, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage resulting from the theft by some person unknown.

SEC. 18. Any amounts which otherwise may have been due any of the disbursing officers mentioned herein, or, in the case of deceased officers, may have been due their heirs, for any other purpose, and which amounts or any part thereof have been used as a set-off by the Comptroller General to clear disallowances in said officers' accounts mentioned herein, shall be refunded to such disbursing officers or their heirs: *Provided*, That any amounts refunded by any of said disbursing officers, or their heirs, to the United States on account of said disallowances, shall also be refunded to such disbursing officers or their heirs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after "letter of", insert "January 8, 1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, the War Department has requested that an amendment be offered to this bill in view of the fact that this particular claimant is not entitled to the sums set forth in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 20, strike out line 20 through line 3 on page 8.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. THEODORE A. GEISSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Theodore A. Geissman, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dr. Geissman against the United States arising out of personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained by him in April 1944 as a result of an explosion in a laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., during OSRD project OEMsr-934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person vio-

lating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,500 to Harriet Townsend Bottomley, in full and final settlement for damages to her home grounds and property at Old Brookville (Glen Head Post Office) Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the crash of a naval airplane on May 28, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$8,500" and insert "$7,790."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "settlement", insert "of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY BIG DAY ET AL.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 39, the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, namely, Jennie Smart Enemy; Miles Fighter; Mrs. Foolish Bear; Medicine Crow; Naomi Foolish Bear; Twin Woman; Frank He Does It; Michael Big Hair; Peter Big Hair; Harriett Little Owl; Josephine Big Hair; Jacob C. Big Hair; Mary Big Hair; Paul Hill; Velma Big Hair; Karen Big Hair; Dennis Big Hair; Aloysius Big Hair; Jacob M. Big Hair; Michael Big Hair; Peter Big Hair; Agnes Shaffer Big Hair; Velma Big Hair; Dennis Big Hair; Karen Big Hair; Aloysius Big Hair, Jr.; Jacob Big Hair; Jacob Charles Big Hair; Harriet Big Hair; Josephine Big Hair; and Mary Big Hair, a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted Catherine Shield Chief, allotment numbered 236, on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 14, township 3 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 120 acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY JANE SHERMAN

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 47, the bill (H. R. 704) for the relief of Mar Jane Sherman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Jane Sherman, of Northbrook, Ill., the sum of $35,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Jane Sherman against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained as a result of a collision on May 18, 1943, involving the automobile she was driving, a tractor and trailer owned by the Kool Rite Sales Co., Chicago, Ill., and a United States Army truck, at the intersection of Waukegan Road and Shermer Avenue, Northbrook, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$6,203.20; to pay W. D. Sherman the sum of $311.11."

Line 9, after "Sherman", insert "and W. D. Sherman."

Line 10, after "expenses", insert "and property damage."

Page 2, line 2, after "involving", strike out "the automobile she was driving, a tractor and trailer owned by the Kool Rite Sale Co., Chicago, Ill."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOYALTY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting our country today is the extent to which employees who are disloyal to our Government remain on the Federal pay roll. I had hoped that the recent Executive order upon this subject would solve the problem, but it does not do it.

The principal weakness of this Executive order is that it does not place upon any single person, department, or agency the affirmative responsibility of seeing to it that disloyal employees are removed from the Federal pay roll. Under the provisions of the Executive order the head of each department and agency is responsible for discharging disloyal employees in his agency. It is this very situation, combined with the failure of the Civil Service Commission to take affirmative action, which existed during the war and resulted in the employment of persons whose loyalties have been seriously questioned and who still remain on our Federal pay roll.

Because of the failure of the executive branch to take proper action with respect to this serious matter, I have today introduced legislation which in my judgment should be acted upon promptly. As I view it, the situation is of such serious nature that immediate legislative action is necessary. It is our duty to rid the Federal pay roll of subversive and disloyal persons who are in strategic places in our Government.

The main provisions of the bill I have introduced are as follows:

First. All Federal employees and applicants for Federal positions shall be subject to a loyalty investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; second, a loyalty review board composed of five members is created as a part of the Civil Service Commission and will review investigations conducted by the FBI; third, the Board shall make findings and decisions which shall be final, and if the Board finds that the person investigated is disloyal to our Government the head of the department or agency involved shall either not employ the person, or if employed, he shall be discharged; and, four, the standards which the Board shall use as a basis for the refusal of employment or for the removal from employment shall be that, on all of the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person investigated is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

The bill also contains provisions giving affected employees and applicants the right of appeal, and affords them every opportunity to present evidence showing their loyalty to the Government of the United States.

I am convinced that the solution to this problem lies with the Congress in providing adequate legislation under which the executive branch can discharge disloyal employees, since it is clear that the executive branch is reluctant to assume this responsibility on its own initiative.

In this atomic age when the very existence of our country might well depend

upon a single employee who might reveal extremely secret and confidential information it occurs to me that we cannot take our responsibility lightly. We must provide adequate safeguards for the security of our Nation.

I am opposed to "Red baiting" and "witch hunting," but I do believe there is a reasonable approach which recognizes that the security of our Nation depends in large measure upon the loyalty of each Federal employee.

I am convinced that the vast majority of the Federal employees are loyal to our Government beyond any question of doubt, and I am certain too these loyal Americans will welcome an investigation of their loyalty since such investigations will protect their Government from being destroyed by subversive employees.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at the point of the passage of the bill H. R. 1844 a letter written to the Speaker by General Bradley asking for its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Plain Dealer.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the National Bakers Supply House Association to the President of the United States.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a resolution adopted by the British Cooperative Party attacking President Truman for having recommended aid to Greece and Turkey, and anonymously circularized among Members of Congress by someone in New York, nauseates me. This resolution shows two things:

First. What craven cowards communism has made of a segment of a once proud people who did not quake when living under the muzzles of German guns, and,

Second. Communism must be routed out of England as well as every other part of the world if liberty is not to perish from the face of the earth.

The President's proposal will come to the floor of this House for consideration in a few days, and while I support the proposal, there are many of us that are anxious to know what, if anything, is being done toward making good the promise of the President to put pro-Russians out of the Government.

A statement allegedly made by the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission several days ago was not encouraging. I am wondering if we are going to be compelled to entirely depend on legislative outlawing, communism in this country.

This is the resolution to which I have referred:

BRITISH CO-OPS CALL UNITED STATES POLICY MENACE

LLANDUDNO, WALES, April 8.—The Cooperative Party, which usually reflects the opinion of non-trade-union rank and file in the Labor Party, has passed a resolution condemning President Truman's proposed aid to Greece and Turkey as a "menace to world peace."

The resolution was passed by the party's annual conference yesterday despite objection by its own national executive that such an attitude would hinder Foreign Secretary Bevin at the Moscow Conference. The resolution said:

"This conference is firmly of the opinion that the method of the proposed American aid to Greece and Turkey constitutes a menace to world peace and a negation of the democratic principles for the preservation of which the grave sacrifices of the last war were made.

"Further, the conference insists that this attempt to bypass the United Nations organization will seriously impair the authority of the organization and destroy the confidence and hopes of free peoples everywhere.

"President Truman has betrayed the trust that history has placed in his hands and has been guilty of a piece of statesmanship without parallel in its irresponsibility in the postwar world."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I said on the floor the other day, if the administration is going to make this a full-dress affair and drive communism from every department of this Government, from our educational institutions, from the moving-picture industry, and off the radio, save America for Americans, save our Christian civilization and the American way of life, we will go along with it; but if we are merely going to adopt a soup-kitchen diplomacy, we had better think twice.

Mr. COX. I, of course, agree with the gentleman. I trust that the matter is not going to rest with the simple words of the President but that something is going to be done by the people in the Government who operate under the President's orders.

DISLOYAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 I introduced a bill in the House to comply with Presidential Executive Order No. 9835, which sought to rid our Government of subversive employees. This bill will revoke the United States citizenship of all former aliens and it directs the Department of Justice to deport all those naturalized citizens found guilty of being disloyal and subversive to our American way of life. It instructs the Attorney General to deport also all aliens and persons whom he believes, or has reason to believe, will endanger the public safety or welfare of our country. Due to some recent developments, and in order to make my bill complete in every respect, I have redrafted it and am reintroducing it today. I sincerely believe that in its present form that it covers the situation thoroughly and will rid our country of these dangerous termites.

I think that during World War I Irving Berlin hit the nail on the head when he wrote this little song. If my memory serves me correctly, it goes this way—

If you don't like your Uncle Sammy, then
go back to your home o'er the sea—
To the land from whence you came, whatever be its name,
But don't be ungrateful to me.
If you don't like the stars in Old Glory, if
you don't like the red, white, and
blue,
Then don't act like the cur in the story,
Don't bite the hand that's feeding you.

I hope the House will support this bill when it comes out of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, April 10, 1847, in the little community of Mako in Hungary a great American was born.

A century later the name of Joseph Pulitzer shines with as much luster as that of any of those who have made America great—with the names of all those through whose efforts our land was handed down from generation to generation as the "home of the free."

Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and the others fought to give future generations of Americans a land in which their freedom and liberty would be forever sacred. Men like Joseph Pulitzer carried on the fight in another way, a fight which must be never ending, if the truths which our founding fathers held "to be self-evident" are to prevail.

How often have we heard the expression that it is time for our country to get back to normal? Those who ask for such a course are not imbued with the fire and zeal of the men who founded a strong Nation—nor with the progressive energy of the men like Joseph Pulitzer who encouraged their fellow Americans to go forward to great achievements. America is a land that lives in progress—every step must be forward. To clear thinkers and great leaders there is no normalcy except stagnation which in due time would sap the strength from our national life.

Many journalists have played important roles in the building of America. None has played a greater part than this immigrant son of Old World parents. His entire life as a newspaper publisher was dedicated to the service of the people, and in serving the people he contributed in no small measure to the national welfare.

Joseph Pulitzer's idea of how to best serve the people is given in the platform which he promulgated for his St. Louis Post-Dispatch on his retirement April 10, 1907, his sixtieth birthday. In a few words he set forth his credo, as follows:

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform,

never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

This platform of the Post-Dispatch is now printed daily as the masthead on the editorial page. Under the policy set down in Joseph Pulitzer's legacy to those who followed him in the direction of this great daily newspaper, the Post-Dispatch has fought corruption in local government, supported numerous programs in the interest of civil improvements, and, most of all, has fulfilled Mr. Pulitzer's belief that the press should exercise its power to mold public opinion to "make for justice in government, for purity in politics, and for a higher morality in the business and social life of the Nation."

The whole press of the United States has been the better for the combination of integrity and idealism which Joseph Pulitzer brought into the newspaper world with him. Few men who have been prominent in journalism during the last century are more worthy of honor than Pulitzer, and it was fitting that the Government of the United States should recognize this fact.

The Post Office Department has issued a 3-cent commemorative stamp to be released for issue today. Only one other journalist in the history of this Nation has been so honored, Benjamin Franklin.

And it may be noted here that the honor went to Franklin in tribute to his endeavors in the fields of diplomacy and politics rather than because of his journalistic activities. Actually, the Pulitzer commemorative stamp is the first newspaper stamp in the history of the United States postal service.

The Statue of Liberty appears in the design because Joseph Pulitzer, the immigrant boy who enlisted in the Union Army in the Civil War within a month after his arrival in this country, raised the money for the pedestal on which the Goddess of Freedom stands in New York Harbor. Appeals to Congress and other sources had failed before Joseph Pulitzer began a campaign through his New York World to raise $100,000 for the purpose.

The pedestal incident gave a good insight into the character of Joseph Pulitzer, revealing his deep gratitude to his adopted country for the opportunities it had afforded him. The French nation had given the Statue of Liberty to the American people and our Government has set aside space for it on Bedloe Island, but efforts to raise funds to construct a base had failed.

Mr. Pulitzer remembered how he, as a boy of 17 entering Boston harbor, had looked eagerly for the land of promise to rise upon the horizon. Liberty's statue, he determined, would be the future beacon of welcome to immigrant boys.

A quotation which appears on the stamp fits well into the motive of any tribute paid to Joseph Pulitzer: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

Joseph Pulitzer did all within his power to make certain that both would rise.

In New York today there will be a commemorative observance at Columbia University, where Mr. Pulitzer endowed the School of Journalism. Mr. Pulitzer was not only a crusader through his newspapers but he was a public-spirited citizen who was a benefactor of many worth while movements.

Mr. Pulitzer died on October 29, 1911, aboard his yacht *Liberty*, Charleston Harbor, S. C. Announcement of bequests under his will included $2,000,000 for the Pulitzer School of Journalism; $500,000 for the now world-famous Pulitzer prizes in journalism and literature; $1,000,000 for the Philharmonic Symphony of New York, and $1,000,000 for the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Add to these memorials the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World, in its day, as splendid monuments to him.

Like so many foreign born who chose America as their home, Joseph Pulitzer had a deep appreciation of what it meant to be an American citizen. In his enlistment in the Union Army, almost as soon as he set foot on American shore, he quickly pledged an undying allegiance to his adopted country and from that moment never ceased to be a credit to it.

When I hear some men in public positions speak disparagingly of our foreign-born citizens—and the occasion is all too frequent—I think of the contributions men like Joseph Pulitzer have made to our American way of life, in contrast to the feeble contribution of the bigots and narrow minds who bask in the glory of a distant forebear who happened to secure passage on the *Mayflower*.

Some of our superpatriots are quick to yell "foreigner" when the name of any foreign-born person is discussed. But let them remember that the *Mayflower* was a mighty small boat and some mighty fine people had to take a later boat. How could even a descendant of a *Mayflower* passenger surpass in Americanism the thousands upon thousands of foreign-born who now are American citizens and who have contributed on occasion after occasion to make this the greatest Nation on earth?

Joseph Pulitzer is only one example of an immigrant boy who believed in America—who gave as much to his adopted country as he received from it.

The career of Joseph Pulitzer was amazing. While it is true that Pulitzer arrived in St. Louis in October 1865, as a penniless, mustered-out Union soldier from New York, his birth in far-off Hungary 18 years before had not been in the environment which would qualify him as a Horatio Alger rags-to-riches hero. He came from a family of more than comfortable circumstances and was educated in private schools so that when he arrived in America he was not the usual uneducated type of immigrant. But his education was all that remained with him as he started life in a new land.

As a boy he left home when his mother remarried some time after the death of his father. Because of slender physique he failed in his effort to get into the Austrian Army. In Hamburg he talked to a United States recruiting officer and soon was on his way to America.

After the war he returned to New York where efforts to secure employment failed. The story is told how the threadbare youth in his worn uniform hung around City Hall Park and was asked by the porter of French's Hotel in Park Row to stop having his shoes polished there—the site he afterward bought for the World Building.

On October 10, 1865, young Pulitzer reached East St. Louis. He had headed West on the advice of a practical joker who told him he could learn English better in St. Louis because there he would hear only English spoken. He worked his way across the Mississippi River on a Wiggins ferryboat.

But from here on Joseph Pulitzer was on his way. It was not an easy road and he did not look for any short cuts. He worked as a mule hostler, waiter, roustabout, stevedore, hack driver, and on other lowly jobs. His newspaper career began in 1868 the year following his naturalization as an American citizen, when he became a reporter on the German-language Westliche Post. Three years later, after being elected to the Missouri State Legislature, he became part-owner of the Westliche Post.

That was his real start as a great publisher. In 1874 he bought the bankrupt St. Louis Staats-Zeitung and sold its Associated Press franchise. But he did not continue immediately in the journalistic field. Before finally convincing himself that his only career was a career as a journalist he was active in politics and in 1876 he was admitted to the bar in Washington, D. C.

On December 9, 1878, he bought the St. Louis Dispatch for $2,500 at a sheriff's sale on the steps of the courthouse. Harold Stanley Pollard, Mr. Pulitzer's last literary secretary, wrote:

> The next 5 years showed St. Louis and Missouri what kind of newspaper his was. Never in the history of the country had any paper put itself so close to the people of a community, understood so well their thoughts and needs, fought their battles so vigorously, pursued their enemies so relentlessly. The early annals of the Post-Dispatch read like the annals of another Seven Years' War.

The St. Louis Post and Dispatch, as such, was created 2 days after the purchase of the Dispatch through a merger of the new Pulitzer-owned Dispatch and the Post, then owned by John A. Dillon, and on March 10, 1879, the name was changed to the Post-Dispatch.

From that beginning the St. Louis Post-Dispatch went on to become one of the Nation's greatest newspapers. Still Pulitzer-owned it carried on in the Pulitzer way, ever crusading in the interest of the public welfare—always a guardian of the public interest, progressive in its policies and fearless in its action. No newspaper has been more vigorous in its defense of the public. None can point to a longer list of achievements in the interest of the public.

The first issue of the Post and Dispatch bore Joseph Pulitzer's declaration

of purpose which remained the guiding policy of his newspaper thereafter:

The Post and Dispatch will serve no party—

He wrote in that initial publication after the merger—

will be no organ but the organ of truth, will follow no caucuses but its own convictions, will not support the administration but criticize it, will oppose all frauds and shams, wherever and whatever they are, will advocate principles and ideas rather than prejudice and partisanship. These ideas and principles are precisely the same as those on which our Government was originally founded. They are the ideas of true, genuine, real democracy. They are the doctrines of hard money, home rule, and revenue reform.

On the second day the Post and Dispatch went further with a declaration of complete independence in politics:

If Democracy means assent to the management of the State treasury, we are not Democratic. If Republicanism is formulated by Blaine, we are not Republican.

Pulitzer's new paper urged the politicians to "give us honest elections, an income tax, a reformed civil service, a reformed tariff."

Instead of the bloody shirt—

Pulitzer wrote—

improve the Mississippi, build another road to the Pacific, open Indian territory, restore our American merchant marine.

Seems we are always crying for a restoration of our merchant marine. We could be giving some serious thought to the matter now. America is, has always been and probably always will be a generous nation, but in the giving away of merchant ships to competing-trade nations, or selling them at ridiculously low prices, we would do well to be cautious. In the not too far distant future we are likely to see many of the vessels released by us for the rehabilitation of the commerce of others sailing the seas in competition with American shipping.

Like Pulitzer over 80 years ago it might be wise now to consider the future of our merchant marine before we cripple it too greatly and sink it to the low prewar level. We have the tonnage now—but to hold it we must keep strings even on the ships we may find it necessary to loan to foreign nations in time of their need.

Mr. Pollard, in telling of Joseph Pulitzer's purchase of the New York World in 1883, says he made it a newspaper that doubled its purchase price in annual earnings after 3 years because of three things which Mr. Pulitzer learned in St. Louis: First, the responsiveness of the people to a paper that fought their battles openly, honestly, untiringly; second, the prosperity such a newspaper could count on; third, the power of independence in politics.

Joseph Pulitzer, an immigrant boy who could not speak too much English until well after his eighteenth birthday, undoubtedly contributed more to American journalism than any other person. Without question he was the first to show the press which had been granted so much freedom by our Constition that it owed its greatest responsibility to the people of the Nation who had insisted upon the guaranty of the freedom of the press.

Joseph Pulitzer was the father of modern journalism. America honors this typically American's memory today.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether all of the Members received the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch such as the one which comes to my desk about three times a week?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I was informed by a member of the editorial staff of the Post-Disptach that a special supplementary issue was being sent to every Member of Congress.

Mr. HAYS. I wish to thank the gentleman for his comments and join with him in the tribute which he has paid to Mr. Pulitzer and the Post-Dispatch. In my judgment this editorial page is one of the most stimulating sheets in America and I think the service rendered in making available their statements along with their cartoons by their brilliant cartoonist, Mr. Fitzpatrick, is an excellent one.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

UTAH, THE FRIENDLY STATE

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this year, a sturdy band of Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley. Brigham Young, their leader, had envisioned the spot they were seeking many months before. On July 24, 1847, they reached the summit overlooking the Great Salt Lake Basin. Young rose in his carriage to view the valley below and said, "This is the place." To less hardy individuals this desolate expanse of sagebrush, bordered on the west by a sea of salt, could hardly be termed a paradise. Those who visit the same spot today will agree that "this is the place," for the desert has been made to blossom as a rose. Countless visitors to this paradise of the West have termed Utah "The Friendly State." We are proud of this designation and intend to demonstrate to Utah visitors during this centennial year that ours is truly "The Friendly State."

This commendable characteristic is not of recent origin. From the dawn of the white man's history in Utah friendliness has been a practiced virtue. Escalante, with his Spanish missionaries on what may be called a "good will" tour, spent the summer and fall of 1776 in the valleys and mountains of Utah visiting with the Ute Indians on very friendly terms. Fur trappers and traders, the pathfinders of the West, led by such men as Jedediah S. Smith, Jim Bridger, Etienne Provot, Peter Skeen Ogden, and William Ashley, then entered this primitive area, one of America's last frontiers. In general their relationship with the red men was friendly. Government explorers, Frémont, Booneville, Stansbury, and others followed. Their relationship with the Utahans as a whole was friendly. The Indians themselves may at times have scalped some of their enemies, but they didn't skin their friends, like some whites do today.

The motto of Brigham Young was: "Feed the Indians rather than fight them." The building of an inland empire from a desert wasteland was only accomplished by a friendly, cooperative, brotherly attitude. As the forty-niners marched westward to the California gold fields the Mormon settlements in Utah were like an oasis in the desert and served as a base of supplies. It was a friendly lift that carried them on to their destination. Since 1847 the leaders and citizens of this thriving Commonwealth have extended a friendly hand to all who have visited the beehive State.

Utah's 100 years will be observed with a full schedule of events that does honor to the pioneers who carved out the destiny of the State and intermountain empire. Major events throughout the State include parades, pageants, exhibits, an air show, auto races, sports, fairs, concerts, operas, dramas, musical, and dance festivals. It may be of interest to enumerate some of these outstanding events: The official centennial opening is the pioneer program to be held in the world-famous Salt Lake Tabernacle May 1, where about 200 living Utah pioneers who came to Utah before 1869 are to be honored.

From May 3 until June 15 the Library of Congress will feature a Utah centennial exhibit.

The pageant, Message of the Ages, featuring 600 performers, will be held in the Salt Lake Tabernacle May 5 to June 6.

A giant centennial exposition on the Utah State Fairgrounds will be a beehive of activity from June 2 to September 20.

The national collegiate track and field meet will be held in Salt Lake City June 20. This will serve as the try-outs for the Olympics of 1948.

On July 15, 72 canvas-covered cars will leave Nauvoo, Ill., in a caravan commemorating the Mormon trek. They will travel westward over the Mormon Trail and arrive in Salt Lake City July 22, the day the advance company arrived 100 years ago.

Two mammoth parades are being staged on July 23 and 24 in Salt Lake City.

The United States Post Office Department has promised a centennial commemorative stamp to be issued on July 24. Appropriate ceremonies are planned to be held at the Salt Lake post office that day.

September 1 has been set for a 500-mile auto race at the Bonneville salt flats. Also, an attempt will be made to break John Cobb's world record for the measured mile made on these flats several years ago.

A brilliant air show is being planned through the cooperation of the National Aeronautics Association in Salt Lake City. The date has not yet been announced.

This is Utah's centennial year. A friendly invitation to visit "the friendly State" is extended in a friendly way.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for this afternoon be vacated and that it be transferred to Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Miami Herald.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by C. N. Woods, former regional forester, USFS.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and to include my letter to the Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are now at the crossroads in this country when we have a labor bill being brought up within the near future on the floor of the House of Representatives which will change fundamentally the relationships between labor and management in this country. Because of that crossroads I am stopping to call attention to the fact that here is a Congressman that is going to listen to his district and the voters in the district on what to do. I am sending out a questionnaire to 60,000 separate registered voters in the Thirty-first District of Pennsylvania this week. I am enclosing that questionnaire in the RECORD so that they can see what the questions are and tell me how they want me to vote, as their Congressman from the southern district of Pittsburgh.

The questionnaire reads as follows:

APRIL 1947.

To My Friends:

Here is your opportunity to tell your Congressman how to vote; what to do in regard to your job, your rights, and your duties. We are at a crossroads in this country. It's your future, so what do you want? Tell me; I'm open-minded.

Your Congressman,

JIM FULTON.

Do you want your Congressman to (oppose—favor) passage of a labor bill now?

Are you satisfied with United States labor-management law as it is now? Yes. No.

Should there be (less—more) United States controls on (labor—management—both)?

Shall we continue—	Yes	No
(1) Closed shop (must be a union member to be hired)		
(2) Union shop (hired without being union member but must join after short try-out period)		
(3) Check-off (employer collects union dues by deducting from member's pay)		
Shall we permit—		
(1) Industry-wide strikes on a national scale		
(2) Strikes by law only in local plants		
(3) Government employees generally to strike		
Do you favor (1) present power to strike or (2) compulsory arbitration for—	**(1)**	**(2)**
(a) Public-utility employees		
(b) Public-school teachers		
(c) Basic industries:		
Automobiles		
Electrical products		
Coal		
Steel		
Manufactured products of steel-fabricating companies		
Shall your Congressman vote for a bill to outlaw—	**Yes**	**No**
(1) Jurisdictional strikes		
(2) Sympathy strikes		
(3) Secondary boycotts		
(4) Picketing of homes		
Should the proposed bill require before strike—		
(1) 30-day notice		
(2) Secret vote of union		
(3) 50-percent favorable strike vote by majority of union members		

Name _____

Address _____

Union member _____

This is your own personal crossroad. Your views are important as the vote in Congress on these issues will be close.

Mail to me at Washington, D. C.

Congressman JAMES G. FULTON.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, FLANNAGAN, and COOLEY.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. RUSSELL]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts and editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

FRANKLY SPEAKING

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the heart of the present debate on the foreign policy of the United States, frankly speaking, is to be found in the relations between the United States and Soviet Russia. In the consideration of this question we must not be blinded by extraneous matters and collateral issues. I propose to speak as clearly as I know how and with utter and complete frankness. The current critical world situation has resulted from an unwillingness on the part of Communist-controlled Russia to live up to agreements solemnly made plus a desire on the part of Moscow to take advantage of the post-war world dislocation for the express purpose of achieving a world dominated by communism. The world crisis will be resolved when the United States comes to grips with the realities of the situation and makes a determined stand against Soviet aggression and the advance of communism.

RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The political and strategic aspects of Russo-American relations are all-important. From observations made and information received by visiting over 30 countries in Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East during the summer and fall of 1945, I have been forced to the inescapable conclusion that there are two basic principles in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The first principle is expansion—since 1939 Russia has annexed 273,947 square miles of territory, an area more than four times that of the New England States, with an aggregate population of 24,355,000. In addition to this, 12 nations with a total population of 165,000,000 have been forced under Russian domination through Soviet-controlled governments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does that include the part of Korea that Russia presently controls?

Mr. MERROW. Yes, that includes part of Korea.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe. Can the gentleman tell the House what arrangements have been made and when the arrangements were entered into for Russia to occupy part of Korea?

Mr. MERROW. I cannot.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does anyone know? Does the State Department know whether it was a secret agreement entered into at Yalta or Potsdam, or where it was entered into?

Mr. MERROW. I presume the State Department knows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has not been made public, as I understand.

Mr. MERROW. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it be possible for the committee to question the State Department and perhaps get some information as to when the agreement was reached on Korea?

Mr. MERROW. I think it would be possible, and I would be very glad to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be interesting to know.

Mr. MERROW. According to William Henry Chamberlin in an article which appeared in the American Mercury, May 1946, the lands annexed since September 1939 are:

	Area in square miles	Population
Eastern Poland	68,290	10,150,000
Finnish Karelia	16,173	470,000
Lithuania	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia	18,353	1,120,000
Bessarabia and Bukovina	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia	13,124	2,200,000
Petsamo	4,087	4,000
Koenigsberg area of East Prussia	3,500	400,000
Carpatho-Ukraine	4,922	800,000
South Sakhalin	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands	3,949	4,500
Tannu Tuva	64,000	64,000
Total	273,947	24,354,500

The territories over which Moscow has extended domination by puppet governments and Communist influence include:

	Millions of inhabitants
Poland	20 to 25
Czechoslovakia	12 to 15
Hungary	9 to 10
Austria	3.5
Yugoslavia	14 to 16
Bulgaria	6 to 7
Rumania	13
Eastern Germany	25
Finland	4
Manchuria	40
North Korea	10
Outer Mongolia	1

The second principle underlying Russian foreign policy is to spread communism whenever and wherever possible. In 1945 I was with a congressional committee in Ankara and Istanbul. The Turks expressed great fear that their powerful neighbor to the north would move on them in an effort to take the Dardanelles. Constantine Brown, in a dispatch from Istanbul which appeared in the Sunday Star, published in Washington on April 6, stated:

Yet Turkey's financial position is shaky because the bulk of the national income has to be spent on military preparations. The Turkish Prime Minister told this correspondent that if it had not been for this precaution, the Russians would have entered Turkey last summer.

In Teheran many members of the Parliament informed us that the Soviet Union would ultimately try to annex that country in order to reach the oil of the Persian Gulf. In the Balkan states it is evident that free elections would turn out the Communist parties now in power. The people cannot rid themselves of rulers who dominate them by force. From east to west and north to south there are active Communist parties. One has only to visit the countries in Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East or to observe the activities of the Communist Party in the United States to be convinced that the spreading of communism to every country is a cardinal principle of the Moscow foreign policy.

In my opinion Mr. Stalin and his associates will not stop their program of aggressive expansion and of spreading communism until the United States takes a firm stand. I believe this is the time for a show-down. This is the time to make the position of the United States absolutely clear.

Mr. Chamberlin in his article to which I have previously referred concludes in the following words:

Russia's human and material losses in the war have been too great. Stalin is too well aware that Soviet technique in aviation and industrial production is inferior to America's. So far as we know he does not possess the atom bomb. Russian naval power is negligible. Besides, the Soviet Union needs time to digest the immense areas it has already swallowed. We must assume, therefore, that the current Soviet dynamism will stop short of a line where, in Stalin's judgment, America and Great Britain will fight rather than yield.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

On November 29, 1945, 16 months ago, I introduced a resolution providing for a select committee of 23 Members of the House to make a study of the foreign policy of the United States and to investigate the Department of State. I regret that the Seventy-ninth Congress did not act upon this resolution. Such a study would have been most helpful in developing a firm, realistic, and intelligent foreign policy to meet the exigencies of the present hour. Over a year ago, on January 22, 1946, I said on the floor of the House:

If I have gained anything in traveling in over 30 countries, if I have gained anything from being in London as a delegate to the Educational Conference, it is this: We must move immediately to see if we can develop a firm, realistic, objective foreign policy for the United States.

On January 3, 1947, I reintroduced my resolution, which was referred to the Rules Committee. Recent events have emphasized the importance of the study I propose. I am including my bill in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world; such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan states, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days; the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

There is now greater urgency for the adoption of my resolution than ever before. I shall continue to press for a complete and thorough study of the foreign policy of the United States, both economic and political. As the matter stands there are five committees of the House making attempts at studies and investigations of certain phases of the activities of the Department of State. They include Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Post Office and Civil Service, and Un-American Activities. One committee, and it ought to be a special committee, should be given full and complete power to study and report on the foreign policy of this country and to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. We need only to review the events of the past few months and to point to the critical current world conditions to be convinced of the necessity of acting on the proposition I have set forth.

Such a committee as I have requested ought to be authorized at once to make a thorough investigation of our foreign policy both economic and political. By such procedure we would be able to determine with intelligence our course of action for the future. We need to secure an over-all world picture. Our interests are global and unless we have a wise foreign policy based on a most careful study of our interests around the world, we could well lose the position destiny has given to us as the leading nation of this earth in man's struggle to obtain a lasting peace.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's idea on this resolution for an investigation. I am somewhat disturbed by the argument the gentleman has presented with reference to the spread of communism. Do I understand that it is your position that we proceed at once to stop communism in Greece and Turkey and then move into other areas where communism arises?

Mr. MERROW. That is my position. I think the issue is clearly drawn and we should speak very frankly about it. We should move into Greece and Turkey, and then if it is necessary, move into other areas to prevent this aggressive expansion and spread of communism throughout the world. I think that is our responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is a terrific responsibility, is it not?

Mr. MERROW. It is a tremendous responsibility but with world leadership comes tremendous responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That means there are possibilities of our moving into every country that is occupied today in Europe.

Mr. MERROW. I do not know how far our action will extend. A study of the type I have suggested would reveal it. The Middle East is at stake. Western Europe is at stake, and the Far East is at stake.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Can we embark on such a program?

Mr. MERROW. If we cannot, I hate to think of the alternative, which will be a Russian-dominated world. We must make up our minds to embark on a program to halt communism. Of course, I think if we call the bluff of the Soviet Union now we will avoid a lot of trouble in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope that is true, but I have grave doubts about it.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman advocate doing something to stop the encroachment of communism in our own country first?

Mr. MERROW. Simultaneously; yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I noticed in the press a day or so ago that we were committed to supply Korea with about $600,000,000 to go in and stop communism. I also noted that when the British give up India we have some commitments to go into India. I assume that is for the same purpose as we are now called to go into Greece and Turkey. Does the gentleman think we ought to go into France where the Communists have taken over or into Cuba, our own back door, where the Communists are having a fight with the government down there, or into Latin America, South America, and Central American countries where the Communists are very active?

Mr. MERROW. You have asked several questions. To help guarantee the security of the United States, I think we must do something in Korea. If it were not for the British and the Americans, I am confident that France would go communistic. Wherever there is danger of countries being taken over and subsequently being used against us, we must take a stand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How far would you go? Of course they say we are a wealthy country. Nobody knows how wealthy we are. We know what our debt is. We know we are going to have a day of reckoning sometime. The gentleman knows the way to stop communism is to fill them full of good food and keep them filled with good food. Of course, there is a limit to what we can do in that respect. Would the gentleman muster the young men of America to go into all of those countries and put on the fight that we have got to put on?

Mr. MERROW. I do not think it is necessary to muster the young men of America at the present time, but if we do not act now I am afraid of grave consequences in 15 or 20 years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am profoundly impressed with the statement that the gentleman makes. If I understand him correctly it is that we should challenge communism wherever communism threatens our security.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

Mr. COX. Many embarrassing questions have been propounded to the gentleman, but to all of them he makes a direct and responsive answer, evidencing, in my judgment, a farsighted statesmanship on the part of the gentleman. I agree with the gentleman that the alternative would be too awful to even attempt to describe. As for sending the youth of our country, our young manhood, into other parts of the world to fight communism, I think an appropriate answer should be that all of the people of this country should give their all, whenever necessary, to save America.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his complimentary words and for the lucid way in which he has stated this issue. I wish we could have it so clearly stated that there would be no question in the mind of anybody as to the importance of this issue.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to express my interest in what the gentleman has to say. I would like to ask him, on the basis of information that he may have, just how well prepared the American Nation is to defend Americanism, not only here but all over the world. I ask this because 2 years ago when the war ended we represented the most powerful military nation in the world. In the meantime, of course, we have disbanded and dismantled many of our war plants. We have mustered out many of our soldiers, and there is no question but that we are not as well prepared today as we were 2 years ago. Can the gentleman enlighten me on that situation?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I am coming to this in my speech.

I will say to the gentleman that I was in several theaters of warfare in 1945. I was exceedingly proud of the United States of America. We had the largest, the best-equipped, the best-clothed, and most efficient army in the world. We had the greatest air force, we had the greatest striking power ever developed by any nation; yet within a short period of time we, a nation of extremes, mind you, established the world's record for stripping ourselves of our armed strength, for scuttling our power, and demobilizing our armies. We are now in a much inferior position than in 1945. We should keep this in mind. We should be determined to maintain the strongest navy in the world, a powerful and efficient army, and above all things, maintain—and I have said this before on the floor of this House—air supremacy at all costs.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. One further question, if the gentleman will permit. Does the gentleman have any doubt, as a result of the painstaking work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, about the military strategy and preparedness of Russia and some of the other great powers?

Mr. MERROW. I have no detailed information on that question. That is a good question. We should have detailed information on the subject. I asked Secretary Patterson when he appeared before the committee the other day this question: Have you any idea as to the magnitude of the Soviet strength on the Turkish borders?

He said, "No," but it is considerable.

We have a pretty good idea of her land army, but I understand we do not have the information on her air-borne force, although it is said in some quarters that she has the largest air-borne force in the world.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. My reason for asking these qestions of the gentleman is that I think Americanism is something which should command the admiration of the entire world. I think we have got to be in a position not only to defend it but to carry the principles of Americanism to the other parts of the world.

Mr. MERROW. May I say to the gentleman that I think the historians of the future will record our hasty demobilization and the rapid deterioration of our armed strength after World War II as one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell our Republic.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The same situation exists after World War II that existed after World War I in the matter of the depletion of the armed forces.

Has the gentleman ever figured out how many men it would take to carry out the foreign policy he feels we should have?

Mr. MERROW. I have not. I believe a thorough study of our foreign policy will give us some idea of what we need. We all know we need more strength than we have. We should keep it at a very high point. If we do this we probably will have not have to use it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that the Armed Services bill which was introduced recently and which gives such vast powers to the head of the Armed Services was introduced having in mind some such thing as this?

Mr. MERROW. I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That the reason such vast powers were given to one man by that bill was to face exactly the situation the gentleman presents?

Mr. MERROW. I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That bill fits exactly into the picture, does it not?

Mr. MERROW. I believe it does.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover states that there are more Communists per capita in the United States of America today than there were in Russia per capita at the the time communism took over Russia. We have a Committee on Foreign Affairs that has the right to ask the State Department questions and to require them to give answers. The questions have been asked but they have not been answered. One of their oldest dodges of robbers and burglars when they want to burglarize a home is to cry, "Fire, Fire!" some place else, and while the homeowner is off fighting that fire the robbers burglarize his home.

Is there not the possibility that we have been hearing this cry of communism in the Middle East when there is more in this country than there was in Russia at the time the Communists took over? May not the Communists plunder us here while we are over there? We hear rumors of that. They say, "No answers, my dear Mr. Congressman."

Mr. MERROW. I believe we ought to have the information, but talking about Communists in this country does not answer the foreign situation. As I said before, we should proceed against communism at home and abroad simultaneously.

Mr. RAMEY. Why not do it here first?

Mr. MERROW. We should do it simultaneously. I thank the gentleman for his excellent observations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It is because of the high order of the gentleman's intellect and his understanding of this whole problem, which his remarks reflect, that I would like to identify myself as being on his side. As regards the State Department, I am not disposed to combat the argument advanced by many that up until the latter days of the Byrnes occupancy of the office of Secretary of State that our policy as regard Russia was not intelligent, was not forthright, and was not honest; but since that time when it was found that Mr. Secretary Byrnes had come to a realization of what was going on, and on up until the present time when General Marshall, as head of the Department, is the gentleman prepared to agree that the State Department is making a somewhat better showing?

Mr. MERROW. I am. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate the comments that the gentleman has made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman sure that all of the Communists are out of the State Department?

Mr. MERROW. No; I am not. I have not made any assertion that they are in there. We have heard rumors to this effect, and that is why I would like an investigation to find out.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Following up the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] it has come to my notice that the activity of the Communist element in this country, in Detroit, for instance, under the name of the American Youth for Democracy, they were insolent enough the other day to notify the Governor of my State that they were operating in Detroit, for him not to waste the taxpayers' money, that they were going to continue to operate in spite of his investigation and threat to take them off the campus of our colleges and universities of learning in the State of Michigan.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I want to compliment him on the fine work he has been doing in combating communism in this country.

THE PROGRAM TO AID GREECE AND TURKEY

On Wednesday, March 12, 1947, President Truman asked the Congress for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey. In his straightforward address, the President evidences a clear conception of our position as a responsible power in the world. He used these words:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. * * *
>
> * * * totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.
>
> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I wish to compliment and congratulate the President of the United States and the Department of State on the firm and realistic approach that has been made to the question of aiding Greece and Turkey. I am in complete accord with the program and have been ready to vote "yes" on the proposal ever since it was made. I made speeches calling for action in this crisis days before the delivery of the Presidential message. I would go even further than President Truman suggests. I would extend aid to any country where it is is necessary to halt the march of communism. If by appropriating the funds requested for aiding Greece and Turkey or by appropriating several times the amount asked for, should it become necessary, we can succeed in arresting the drive of Soviet communism and domination in the Mediterranean area, it will be money well invested.

FOREIGN POLICY IMPROVISED

For several years we have been improvising a foreign policy. In fact, as commendable as is the President's Greek and Turkish program, it is still an improvisation. It is designed to meet the present crisis. We must develop a long range foreign policy to prevent the repeated occurrence of crises. Many are asking, and rightly so, what are the future implications of our foreign policy? What are the limits of our ability to extend financial assistance to countries in danger of aggression and just where will such a course as we are embarking upon lead us? In an effort to provide the answers to some of these questions this House could make an invaluable contribution to the development of our foreign policy by immediately setting up the select committee for which I have asked. This committee will report every 90 days on matters of foreign policy, both economic and political, in relation to the various countries of the world. This House should have a greater voice in the formulation of foreign policy. A select committee empowered to study our relations with every country and empowered to investigate the Department of State would give us that voice. There are already four precedents in the Eightieth Congress for special committees. The Senate has created two select committees, namely, the Brewster Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business. The House has voted two select committees, the Select Committee on Small Business and the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supplies. To implement the President's plan and to give this House a voice in developing an intelligent foreign policy designed to protect American interests, I believe that immediate action in establishing a special committee to do the things I have outlined in House Resolution 28 should immediately be created.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be extremely valuable if the House also ratified treaties? I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as the House should be given a great deal more information regarding our foreign affairs, and it would be extremely valuable if they had a hand in the ratification of treaties.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And that the State Department should be obliged to do it.

Mr. MERROW. I am very glad the gentlewoman made that comment. Two year ago we sent an amendment to the Senate which would give the House a voice in treaty ratification. The amendment provided that treaties would be ratified by a majority of both Houses. I wish that the House would again pass such an amendment and send it to the Senate. Such an amendment will be adopted some time. I do not know how long it will take. This will give the House a voice in treaty ratification.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I am sorry to have missed the first part of the gentleman's speech. But, did the gentleman state his position in regard to Poland, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Estonia, and the other countries over which Russia now has domination? What would be the gentleman's action there? In other words, the gentleman seems to argue now that Russia has gone so far, "Thus far you shall go and no farther and we shall stop you with $400,000,000." Personally, I think that is wishful thinking, and I do not agree with the gentleman at all in saying that this $400,000,000 is going to stop Russia doing anything she wants to do in Europe. What is the gentleman's attitude in regard to Poland? What would the gentleman do there now, since Russia already has taken over?

Mr. MERROW. I introduced a resolution in the House several weeks ago stating that it is the sense of Congress that the whole Polish situation should be referred to the United Nations Assembly. I have often said that I think we should go even further and withdraw recognition from the present government in Poland. We should exercise in every possible way pressure to make the Soviet Union live up to agreements solemnly made. There have been violations of the Yalta agreement, the Potsdam agreement, the Atlantic Charter, and the charter of the United Nations in the establishment of Communist-controlled governments, such as Poland.

Mr. BREHM. Would the gentleman go so far as to wage war against Russia in order to stop its advancement, if necessary? Suppose our intervention fails, which in my opinion it will fail, then would the gentleman go so far as to have a war with Russia?

Mr. MERROW. If this policy fails we may be forced into war, because if Russian domination continues, how are we going to avoid it when she gains control of the Mediterranean, when she cuts off the oil in the Middle East, and when she goes down and takes India and tries to extend her influence all over the world?

Mr. BREHM. In my humble opinion—and I do not want to be accused of being an isolationist by this remark, because I do not think there is such a word any more—I would keep strong internally. I would be strong by having a two-ocean navy; I would make America the greatest Nation on earth, and I would protect the Western Hemisphere. There could be no wars unless America financed them, as she has done in the past. I would be strong here and say, "Do not tread on me," and if we maintain that position and stop financing wars, we can also stop communism and bring lasting peace to a troubled world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. In response to what the gentleman from Ohio has said, let me state that I am in accord when he talks about making the United States strong. As far as staying at home and minding our own business is concerned, which is a phrase often used, we tried that when Mr. Hitler was rising to power. We, of course, did not take any action when he occupied the Rhineland. It was not our business, yet we were forced into war, were we not?

Mr. BREHM. If England and France had gone along with us things would have been different. We offered to stop Hitler then. The gentleman knows we did. Our Secretary of State at that time absolutely made a proposition to Great Britain, "Let us tell Hitler off now; let us stop him now." But they refused to go along with us. Instead of that Great Britain went ahead and financed Hitler to arm for the next war with money which the United States loaned or gave to Great Britain.

I return to my original premise. If we stop financing these damnable wars they will stop existing and so will communism which breeds and thrives in war's aftermath.

Mr. MERROW. We should not finance wars, but let us not forget that we were not ready and we were not willing to fight when Mr. Hitler invaded the Rhineland. Let us not forget also that the Soviet Union, with three times the territory of the United States, is potentially more powerful than we are. I would not be so much alarmed about Russia if it were not for the principle that underlies the whole Marxian philosophy, that capitalism and democracy must be destroyed. If we do not act in this crisis, what is going to happen? The Communists, trained in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and the rest of the Balkans, will take over Greece. As soon as they take over Greece there is nothing to prevent Turkey's downfall. As soon as Turkey is gone then the Middle East is in danger. You would be surprised to see the fear in the hearts of the people of the Middle East, fear of Soviet pressure, which, according to my information, is constantly increasing. When the Middle East goes, and the oil of the Persian Gulf, our security will be imperiled. In a short time we are going to be an oil-importing nation. Great inroads were made on our reserves during the last war. If the Mediterranean Sea becomes a Soviet lake, and the Middle East is dominated by Russia, and India falls to the Soviets, and Russia takes France and Spain, trouble will certainly be brought very close to our doors.

Mr. BREHM. I believe if we had had the atomic bomb at the time that Mussolini went into Albania and over into Ethiopia, and at the time that Hitler went into Poland, and at the time that Hirohito went into Manchuria, and we had said to those men at that time, "Now, you get back in your shell and you stay there or we are going to drop an atom bomb on you," they would have gone back home and stayed back home, and World War II would never have occurred. If this loan of $400,000,000 is eventually going to lead us into war with Russia, then I think we should be realistic and say to Stalin, "Now, brother, you pull out and get back home or we are going to drop a bomb on you now." We might as well have a showdown now as in the future, and save $400,000,000 of our money in so doing as well as thousands of our young men and women. I never went in much for bluffing, so if we really intend to stop communism then let us stop it and not make an idle gesture by furnishing more money and lend-lease goods to further it.

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman and I are in pretty close agreement on some matters at least. I feel that we had better have a show-down now, because it is going to cost us much less money to do so at the present time than if we wait until sometime in the future.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am sorry I did not hear the entire discourse of the gentleman. I should like very much to have heard it all. In discussing this Greek-Turkish loan especially, I think that is the wrong way to try to stop communism. I think communism is a threat in the world today because we have permitted communism to feed and finance itself off other nations and to feed and finance itself primarily from the Treasury of the United States. I am of the firm and frank opinion that if we want to stop communism and destroy communism, it will stop and destroy itself if we quit feeding and financing it. For instance, if we had not given that Communist Tito $650,000,000, today he would not be a threat to the peace of Greece and Turkey. What makes my blood boil, for instance, is this: We hear talk about stopping communism at the same time that UNRRA officials were making arrangements to provide $75,000,000 more for Communists in China on the very day that the President here was asking for $400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, and a representative of our State Department was asking for $25,000,000 more to send to Russia. Now, what kind of business do you call that?

Communism has thrived; communism has succeeded; and communism nas become a threat to the peace of the world because it has had access to the Treasury of the United States of America, and if we wake up and quit financing it and feeding it, it will crumble.

I am of the honest opinion that if we had not bolstered the Communist government in France with $750,000,000, the people of France would have overthrown that government a long time ago. The

same applies to Tito. If we had not given him $650,000,000, the people of Yugoslavia would have overthrown him a long time ago, and you would not have communism in Yugoslavia.

We do not have to fight communism. We do not have to go to war to stop communism. It will die; it will rot; it will destroy itself if we are just smart enough to quit feeding and financing it. Let us stop talking about stopping communism, but let us talk about stopping the financing of it, and then communism will not be a threat throughout the world.

Mr. MERROW. Whereas I am in agreement with the gentleman as far as stopping the financing of communism is concerned, that is only a part of this broad over-all picture. However, it would not be an argument against our action in Greece and Turkey in the Mediterranean area. What you have said in reference to the situation in Yugoslavia is correct. As for the situation in Yugoslavia, a year ago I introduced a resolution to investigate the operations of UNRRA. Yes, I agree that we must stop financing communism. That is a part of this picture.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. I have been greatly interested in the discourse of the gentlemen. If I am informed correctly, since the time we went into Greece after the Germans withdrew, and our Government with the British Government has been in command there, we have expended some $700,000,000 in a country with a population equivalent to the city of New York. Now, we propose further expenditures. The question comes to mind, so far as the expenditure of money is concerned: When do we start holding back communism? Another question comes to mind. The same minds and the same hands that have been in Greece for these 2 or 3 years will be the same minds and the same hands that will continue to dish out our dollars. How can we hope to improve the situation under those circumstances.

Mr. MERROW. We need safeguards in spending money in Greece. If we do not assist Greece, then that Communist minority which is armed and ready to take over will seize the country. Then, Greece will be in the Moscow orbit. It is well for us to keep in mind that the only place there is an opportunity for Anglo-American influence to exert itself in the entire Balkan area is in tiny Greece.

Mr. ELLIS. I hold in my hand a news item by the Associated Press this morning's newspapers from London where they quote a high British authority as stating that the American State Department is taking a graver view of the Greek situation, a much graver view, than the British, and that while the guerilla operation is a nuisance they do not consider it as grave as a civil war and they do not believe their withdrawal will necessarily deliver the Greek Government to the Communists. That is the news statement that I hold in my hand.

Mr. MERROW. That is exceedingly optimistic. The Communists are well trained and well organized. There is a tremendous relief problem in Greece. By establishing a stable economy there, we are going to have a country which will resist the threat of communism. But the strategic political implications of this situation are so important that we must devote our attention to what will happen if the Mediterranean goes into other hands.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. How far does the gentleman propose to fight communism? Would you extend that program to include France, Italy, China, India, Spain, and Korea? Has anybody given this Congress or the American people an estimate of how many billion dollars it would take to do that?

Mr. MERROW. No; I do not think we have at the moment; but this is certain: If we do not begin somewhere, you have an alternative, and that alternative is that the countries you have named will be taken over by a power that is unfriendly to us.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Is there any record in history anywhere that the mere spending of billions of dollars has stopped communism? Can you point to any nation or any country in Europe where that has happened? Has it done it in France or in China?

Mr. MERROW. In order to answer your questions, it is necessary to take into consideration the rehabilitation of the economies in the countries you have mentioned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that from now on at least we ought to loan our money on a business basis?

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Under lend-lease I maintained, and I still maintain, it should have been on a business basis.

Mr. MERROW. I agree all aid should be on a business basis.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If Russia had been loaned money with the understanding that we should get something back, we would have had a different situation.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Instead of draining us and draining us as she is today, and not cooperating.

Mr. MERROW. If we had settled some of these problems while extending aid, it would have been much easier.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. From now on we should have a different policy; a self-respecting policy.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE DOES NOT BYPASS THE UNITED NATIONS

The program of extending aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations. To be perfectly realistic, we are involved in power politics outside the United Nations. It is exceedingly important that every American recognizes this. To wait until negotiations with the UN could be completed before aiding Greece would cause unnecessary hardship for the Greeks. Congress is spending weeks debating before acting. An even longer delay would be experienced in the UN. It would become a case of too little and too late. Such a delay could easily be construed by Turkey as British and American indifference about the Dardanelles and the Black Sea. Such indifference might prompt Turkey to yield to the aggressive demands of Russia.

The United Nations organization is impotent to act in the Mediterranean crisis. The organization does not have an armed police force, it is without agencies for law enforcement and it is not in a position to extend financial aid or other assistance to countries in danger of totalitarian aggression. The existing UN agencies as now constituted are inadequate to deal with the proposed assistance in all its aspects. It has been argued by some that the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Bank could handle the entire matter efficiently. Neither of these agencies are organized to carry out the work. The Economic and Social Council, under which the FAO operates, is only advisory and the International Bank is still in the process of organization. Furthermore, the latter has not contemplated handling financial matters of the kind here in question. To depend on these two agencies would spell trouble for the program.

The veto power, which Russia has used not once but 10 times—and most recently in the case of Albania—is an illustration of what we can expect were this issue referred to the United Nations. To give the question to the United Nations could very well result in Russia using her veto power to check the needed aid. It is true that according to article 27, paragraph 3 of the Charter, that any member of the Security Council "a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting." On the face of it, this would seem to be a positive check on the use of the veto in this case. But this view is not correct. The clause in question is only applicable to chapter VI, which deals with the "Pacific Settlement of Disputes," and to paragraph 3, article 52, which is concerned with "Regional Arrangements." It does not include chapter VII, which is devoted to "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of

aggression." Thus by insisting that the loans have a strategic and combative significance—which President Truman has openly admitted they do possess—Russia would be able to use the veto, and the United States would be faced with a choice between her own strategic interests and a breach of the UN Charter. Referring this problem to the UN would be disastrous and end in complete failure.

Strategic and tactical considerations are involved. The President's message occurred after General Marshall had reached Moscow and after the peace negotiations had begun. Russian diplomats were engaged in a blunt offensive on Britain and the United States evidently calculated to give them a favorable position in the negotiations of the Austrian and German treaties.

Russian forces occupy the major part of eastern Europe. Communism is being spread at a rapid pace in the Near and Middle East. Consciously or unconsciously the message was directed at Russia where she is the most vulnerable. It states in effect that the Black Sea ports and the Russian southwestern areas are wide open to attack by Britain and the United States if war should come. Likewise it places Russia on notice that even Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other Communist Balkan satellites—which there is reason to believe Russia thinks gives her control of the eastern Mediterranean—would be of no avail in a conflict between Russian and the Anglo-Saxon countries. Thus from the standpoint of political pressure the President's approach relieves pressure upon our diplomats in Moscow in a way that the United Nations could never have done.

The United States is the only country possessing the prestige, the ability and the power to act in this crisis. It is the only country capable of halting the march of communism and preventing a Soviet-dominated world. Those who contend that the UN has been bypassed and that the question should have been referred to it for action are simply beclouding the issue and are unwilling to face the facts in the serious international political situation. The program suggested by the President will strengthen the United Nations. To refer the question of Greek and Turkish aid to the United Nations would be another step along the road of postwar diplomatic appeasement which we have followed in our relations with the Soviet Union.

THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT WISH TO DOMINATE ANY NATION

The United States does not wish to force democracy on any people. Neither will we stand idly by and see the Soviet totalitarian regime pressed upon nation after nation by force. We do not object to the type of government Russia maintains in her own country. But the Stalin government influences the Soviet foreign policy so that it is aggressive and expanding. Our security is thus threatened and this causes us anxiety. When the Soviet Union insists that capitalism all over the world must be destroyed and that communism must replace it, it becomes a matter of grave concern to this country. We wish people to be free to select their own governments. It is evident that were nations free to do this the people in many of the countries now under Russian-controlled puppet governments would not support these governments.

An illustration of the ruthless Russian methods is found in Poland. The events leading up to the elections in Poland on Sunday, January 19, 1947:

(a) Violated the third principle stated in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, to which the members of the United Nations are committed, namely:

> They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

(b) Violated the purpose of the United Nations stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely:

> To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

And, (c), violated the agreements made at Yalta and at Potsdam. Russia has taken great pains to see that the Polish Government is Moscow-dominated and directed.

IF WE DO NOT ACT

Turkey and Greece are the outposts against the march of communism in the Mediterranean area. If we do not assist Greece, Communists trained in Yugoslavia and other Balkan States, taking their orders directly from Moscow, will seize control of the nation.

If Greece falls to the Moscow-controlled Communists, Soviet influence will soon extend to Turkey, the eastern Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the whole Middle East, and India. Spain will ultimately fall. Russia will soon have the western gateway to the Mediterranean and will be master of most of Europe. The Mediterranean Sea will become a Soviet lake. This will imperil the security of the United States.

We must act immediately, not for the purpose of underwriting the British Empire, but for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism, for the purpose of ensuring our security and for the purpose of maintaining our present position of world leadership for human freedom.

In an editorial of the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 18, 1947, published in Manchester, N. H., the critical international situation was admirably stated in these words:

> If we do not assume leadership in these lands abandoned by Great Britain, there is no question as to whom will assume leadership there, and that will be Russia. They will impose on these lands a system which is the opposite of everything we stand for, and they will use these lands to strengthen them in their attempt at world domination.
>
> Therefore, there is only one alternative. That is for America to move in and move in fast. This applies to Greece, to Turkey, and to the Near East. It applies to China. It applies to all those lands where Russia is attempting to press on and overcome and destroy the independence of small states.
>
> It applies also to the backward countries, such as India and Africa. In those countries the United States must assume a position of leadership.

The strategic importance of the Greek-Turkish question is well stated in an editorial which appeared in the Carroll County Independent of March 21, 1947, published in Center Ossipee, N. H. The editorial is as follows:

> The discussion on help to Greece and Turkey goes on and on. While we are debating whether or no we shall help those countries, we are also debating whether or no we shall take our place as the world's leading power or hand that position over to Russia.
>
> Russia is a powerful, expanding nation, ruled by men who are intensely ambitious. Russia's leaders secured their background and training in the pitiless school of European power politics. They are avaricious, cynical, and ruthless.
>
> If we give Russia free rein in Europe we can expect to wake up 10, 15, or 20 years from now and find that Russia has organized, consolidated, and rebuilt Europe to further her own objectives with regard to no other nation or people.
>
> In the States we have always considered England and France as our bulwarks against aggression. That is, they have always given us time to train and equip our armies.
>
> Today France is disorganized, with no money, no equipment, and torn by political strife.
>
> England is almost bankrupt. During the war she sold her investments in foreign lands to meet the expenses of defense. Her standard of living is almost lower than it was in wartime' She owes huge sums on her one-time colonies. She is withdrawing from some of her great possessions. In no sense can England be rated the great power that she was in 1937, 10 short years ago.
>
> That puts the United States squarely on the spot. It is not a question of where the balance of power in the world is going to rest and who is going to have control of that power.
>
> We in the United States have been luckier during the last three decades than any other people in the world. We have not been invaded, bombed, burned out, pillaged, or occupied as have nearly all the nations of Europe and great sections of Asia.
>
> Because misfortune has never come to us is no reason that it cannot or will not come.
>
> From now on we have no great nations to protect us while we prepare to resist an aggressor. We are strictly on our own.

AIR SUPREMACY

In 1945 I had an opportunity to travel thousands of miles with the ATC on an inspection trip to several theaters of warfare. I marveled at the tremendous might of the American air power. We had the finest planes and the best air fields all over the world. Our air strength was far beyond anything one could have imagined a few years before. After returning from the journey, which took us from London to New Delhi and from the Scandinavian countries to Cairo, I said on the floor of this House on January 22, 1946:

> We have air supremacy everywhere in this world, and I think this air supremacy should be maintained at all costs. In other words, by maintaining air supremacy and by insisting upon it we can make the greatest contribution to the protection of American interests and the greatest contribution to the building of an organization which will preserve the peace of the future.

At the end of the second world war we had the largest, the best equipped, the best fed, the best clothed and the most efficient Army in the world. We had the largest Navy. We possessed the greatest industrial machine. We had the most effective striking power ever developed—and what did we do? We, a Nation of extremes, established the world's record for demobilization, for dismantling our armed strength and for stripping ourselves of power so necessary in the modern world. The amazing and rapid scuttling of our strength and the all too swift demobilization of our forces will be recorded by future historians as one of the greatest tragedies to ever befall the republic.

It is not too late to regain our strength and to retrieve the position we have lost. We must develop a powerful Army, continue to maintain the largest Navy in the world and ensure air supremacy at all costs. Air supremacy by the United States in this day of guided missiles and atom bombs, will be one of the greatest guarantees in maintaining peace.

To emphasize the points I am making I am including an editorial from the Evening Star, published in Washington, of April 4, 1947, entitled "Our Air Strength":

Not long ago the United States had by far the greatest air strength in the world. Today, however, it does not have as many operational planes as Russia. Indeed, according to Senator BREWSTER, its military aviation is rapidly falling behind not only Russia's but Britain's as well.

Of course, with the war over, there is no reason why our armed forces should have scores of thousands of planes. If the Russians and the British are ahead of us merely in quantity, Senator BREWSTER's statement need not be taken too seriously. Numbers alone do not count for much if they cover only the types of planes used against the Axis—types that may be regarded as largely obsolete now. What counts is quality, plus the ability to convert readily to the production of advanced aircraft of every description. If we hold the lead in that respect, we can feel reasonably secure.

The truth seems to be, however, that we are not holding the lead. At any rate, Senator BREWSTER's statement has been underscored by some highly disturbing figures from General Echols, our wartime deputy chief of air staff for procurement. According to General Echols, our plane production in 1946—a total of 1,330 military planes and 467 transports—was worse than in peacetime 1939, when we built 2,500 aircraft. In his judgment if something isn't done about the situation, and quickly, we're going to be right back to the point we reached after World War I when we had only three manufacturers in the business. To support this warning, he has estimated that we are now turning out only about 400 plane engines a month, with half of these produced by a single company. As he sees it, most of our heavy aircraft industry is operating in the red, and the danger is that little will be left of it, or of its know-how, if it continues to lose money and is deprived of other incentives.

In terms of the future, this is a potentially serious situation. We cannot keep on producing planes at the wartime rate, but certainly there ought to be a systematic minimum flow of orders for new and experimental types—orders designed to give us a lead as regards both the quality of our aviation and our ability to convert swiftly to large-scale output. The air age makes this a security essential.

OIL

Failure to adopt the President's program for extending aid to Greece and Turkey means that Soviet Russia with her foreign policy of expansion and aggression will control the Mediterranean Sea and the Middle East.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman take the position that if Russia does not heed our entrance into Greece this country is prepared to go to war immediately; and is the gentleman willing to go to the American people and tell them that when we send military forces there we are not fooling, we are not kidding, that we are actually getting into a military, aggressive war?

Mr. MERROW. If that situation arises I will face the problem very frankly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that this will imperil American and other western oil interests in the Middle East. To make sure that this vast source of power remains in thoroughly friendly hands we must be firm and resolute. During World War II great inroads were made on the oil reserves in the United States. About 80 percent of the Allied supply of petroleum was furnished by the United States. In addition to this we fueled the war machine in the United States. In the event of future trouble the loss of the almost illimitable supply of oil in Arabia could well be crucial. To protect our national interests and to help guarantee our security we must not allow the Middle East to be overrun by a power whose actions clearly indicate an unfaltering determination to dominate all the earth. It is not only oil but vital sea and air routes which are involved. We do not wish to wake up some morning and find the world broken in two in the Middle East area.

The estimated oil reserves in the Middle East according to the New York Times are as follows: Arabia and Bahrein, 6,000,000,000 barrels; Iran, 6,000,000,000 barrels; Iraq, 4,750,000,000 barrels; Kuwait, 4,000,000,000 barrels; and Qatar, 500,000,000 barrels.

In 1941 the United States had a reserve productive capacity of over 1,000,000 barrels a day. This was dissipated during the war and at the present time our domestic resources are being overproduced to the extent of 200,000 to 300,000 barrels a day. During the past 8 years the discovery of new reserves has fallen short of our requirements domestically. The United States in the near future will be forced to look to foreign petroleum resources for a large part of our petroleum requirements. Since oil is essential for our economy, it is clear that the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf area are of grave importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Oil affects everyday living and were it not for petroleum and its products life would be much less pleasant. In preventing Russia from overrunning the Middle East we are acting in the interests and for the well-being of every American.

Cabell Phillips, in an article recently published in the New York Times on oil in the Middle East, stated:

According to the best estimates available in Washington today, private United States investments in the countries of the Middle East—Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Bahrein—total about $250,000,000. Between 90 and 95 percent of these investments are in oil, and these oil holdings are concentrated in the hands of the four or five titans of the United States petroleum industry.

* * * * *

In its simplest terms, the Middle East is a vital source of a vital military commodity—oil. Already it is fueling and lubricating our entire naval force in the far Pacific, using but a fraction of its vast potential for the purpose. It is the major source of supply for Britain. Should that source be cut off, the British Navy would be brought virtually to a standstill. And for every barrel of the "liquid gold" pumped from the ancient sands of Arabia by American drillers, an equivalent amount of this country's waning reserves stays in the ground in Texas and Oklahoma.

With the might of the British Empire steadily declining throughout the region, the Soviet Union, whose borders impinge upon the Middle East at the Caspian Sea, emerges as the great power tactically situated to exert its dominance.

Last year the "Azerbaijan incident" sent shudders through the spines of British and American statesmen and military leaders. It is not too much to suppose that it is against a repetition of that event, and upon a grander and more catastrophic scale, that the Truman doctrine is aimed.

Thus, whatever the private commercial stakes of American investors in the Middle East may be, national security remains the overriding consideration of our new policy there.

When in 1950 the proposed 1,000 mile, 30- and 31-inch pipe line, at a cost of $115,000,000 extending from Saudi Arabia through Trans-Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria to the Mediterranean, is completed the production of oil will be stepped up from 200,000 barrels a day to 500,000 barrels a day.

We must not allow the security of the United States to be endangered by the possible cutting off of this oil supply. We must prevent the Mediterranean and the Middle East from falling into the hands of a power who refuses to honor her agreements and whose policy is, through Moscow-dominated Communist parties, to control the entire world.

ACTION NOW WILL PREVENT A THIRD WORLD WAR

By aiding Greece and Turkey we will call the bluff of the Soviet Union. The Russian foreign policy of expansion, of spreading communism, and of world domination will be checked without the

firing of a gun or the shedding of a drop of blood. Russia is in no position to fight at the moment but may be in such a position 15 or 20 years from now. Let us not forget that potentially the Soviet Union is the strongest power in the world and were she on an industrial par with the United States we would have much to fear. I have long been pleading for a firm and realistic foreign policy. I believe that action now will definitely prevent a third world war. Let us not forget recent history. Firm and resolute action before Nazi Germany occupied the Rhineland in 1936 or before the many other annexations of territory by Germany would have, in my opinion, avoided the second world war. This is an all too recent bitter lesson of history. We must move now and move quickly in an effort to stop another world war, yes, in an effort to save millions of American lives in the future.

DIPLOMATIC APPEASEMENT

There must be an end to diplomatic appeasement. The agreement that Pola, an Italian naval base at the Istrian tip of the Adriatic, should go to Yugoslavia, the agreement that Russia should collect German assets in Austria as reparations, and the splitting of Germany into three zones are glaring examples of our attempts to appease the Russian bear. Many more illustrations could be presented. The more we appease, the more Russia wants. Her appetite for expansion can never be satiated.

OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP

We now have an opportunity to exercise world leadership. By doing this, we will make it possible for nations to select the type of government they wish. By rising to this historical occasion, we will prevent the spread of totalitarianism and will help guarantee freedom in this world. We must make an unyielding stand for liberty. We should move at once and with determination. It will be far less expensive to act now than sometime in the future. By being firm and realistic, we will be able to prevent a third world war. I, for one, am not willing to see, through our timidity, hesitancy, and unwillingness to make a bold, decisive move, the center of political gravity shift from Washington to Moscow. This is precisely what will happen if we do not act now.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

HIGH PRICE LEVELS NECESSARY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am much concerned, but not surprised, at the sudden drive on the part of the eastern interests to bring down our raw materials price levels. This is very reminiscent to me of what happened in May 1920, during the last year of the Wilson administration. We should proceed with extreme caution before we decide as a nation to again allow anything other than the law of supply and demand to dictate our price levels.

Our national income finds its source in the new wealth production from our natural resources. During the past 25 years our gross farm income has been in an almost direct ratio of $1 of farm income to $7 of national income. To those of us who come from the Middle West the fact is well known that the gross farm income of the Nation is the weathervane of our country's prosperity. At no time in the history of the United States have we had a depression or unemployment with farm prices at parity or above.

With $259,000,000,000 of national debt, accompanied with a minimum probably of from twenty-five to thirty billions of dollars for the next 10 years as a national budget, we cannot afford to permit our national income to fall much below the figure that today is prevalent. The drive on the part of Eastern interests to knock down the prices of raw materials for their own selfish purposes will eventually result in a Nation-wide slump in prosperity. All of the new wealth in our Nation is created from the production of our farms, forests, and mines, and lower prices for this production simply means to me the forerunner of a depression. Frankly, with our enormous national debt, and our necessarily high budget, we cannot afford at this time, above all, to risk a depression through unwise price manipulation.

It is my opinion that the Members of Congress from the raw material producing States should be alert to protect our future interests and the foundation of our national income, from the attacks of those who, for selfish reasons, can see only their own immediate interests. Neglect on our part may find us going back to the price level of the 1930's, and that, with our national debt and budget conditions such as they are, will result in national bankruptcy.

If we wish to give the rest of the world peace and prosperity, which so many so glibly talk about and promise, our first step must be to protect our own price level and our own national prosperity. With a bankrupt United States the rest of the world will be plunged into chaos.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out the fallacy that exists in the minds of the American public that higher farm prices mean increase in the cost of living. The reverse is true.

A 10-percent increase in farm income results in 10-percent increase in national income as farm prices increase. As a result, the percentage of the national income spent for food when farm prices are low is greater than when farm prices are high.

For the record, I would like to present a tabulation which shows the percentage of national income spent for food during the period 1929–45.

The figures for 1946 are not yet available but can be estimated at approximately 22 percent.

Year	Expenditure for food (billions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income
1929	$19.0	$83.3	22.8
1930	18.5	68.8	26.9
1931	15.4	54.4	27.7
1932	12.1	39.9	30.3
1933	11.4	42.3	27.0
1934	12.5	49.4	25.3
1935	13.9	55.7	24.9
1936	15.2	64.9	23.4
1937	16.2	71.5	22.5
1938	15.1	64.2	23.3
1939	15.3	70.8	21.5
1940	16.5	77.8	21.2
1941	19.0	95.6	19.8
1942	23.8	121.5	19.5
1943	27.8	147.9	18.8
1944	30.4	160.7	18.8
1945	31.8	161.0	19.7
1946	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Figures not available.

Source of data: U. S. Department of Commerce (Survey of Current Business).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Drew Pearson and a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

526. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $590,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

527. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 493. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); with amendments (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2659. A bill to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 3015. A bill to revoke the naturalization of persons who have been discharged from the United States Government service in compliance with Executive Order No. 9835; to deport such persons; and to deport aliens concerning whom the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe their presence in the United States may endanger the public safety or welfare of the country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3016. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3017. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3018 A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and promote peace; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3020. A bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3021. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain lands which formed a part of the original Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation in Oklahoma to the city of Lawton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3022. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3023. A bill providing for a Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the services rendered to the cause of the American Revolution by Haym Salomon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. Res. 176. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 177. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 176; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to discrimination against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of James W. Taylor 3d; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Robert Ernest Beadle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Simon J. Kirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

321. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to expedite the passage of S. 866, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come in prayer to Thee, Lord Jesus, who never had to take back anything spoken, to correct anything said, or to apologize for any statement. Wilt Thou have pity upon our frailties and deliver us from pitying ourselves.

Bless the Members of this body as they think together and work together in this Chamber, in committee rooms, and in their offices. Help them to stand up under the strains and the tensions of problems and decisions, of meetings and conferences, and the endless demands made upon them. Teach them how to relax and to take time to turn to Thee for guidance and for grace, and thus discover the secret of power. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 437. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 722. An act for the relief of Charles A. Clark;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 986. An act for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock;

H. R. 1064. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1068. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; and

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, amounting to $15,101,739, fiscal year 1948, in the form of an amendment to the budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service, amounting to $1,000,000, fiscal year 1948, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in this country in 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS OR RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the members of the Boynton Beach (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to transfer the selective-service office furniture and equipment to the various counties in this State in which the offices were located

"Whereas during World War II the various counties in this State furnished offices, heat, etc., to the selective-service boards; and

"Whereas the selective-service law has terminated and it is thought that it would be only fair for the various counties to have the office furniture and equipment used by the various boards: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress

of the United States of America, in consideration of the fact that the counties of this State furnished offices, heat, etc., to the Selective Service System, is requested to provide means of transferring to the various counties in this State the furniture, equipment, etc., used by the selective-service boards in the respective counties."

(Mr. MAYBANK presented a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 11, which was adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on February 18, 1947, and concurred in by the senate on March 12, 1947. This resolution requests Congress to remove the inequality of the personal income-tax burden occasioned by the discrimination against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on April 10, 1947, p. 3272, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 273. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1072. A bill to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 100).

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and I submit a report (No. 98) thereon. I request that the report be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The report (S. Rept. 98) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the present acute shortage of copper in the United States by suspending certain import taxes on copper. Your committee has amended the bill as passed the House so as to exclude from the suspension copper sulphate. This would retain the tax on all forms of copper sulphate, including that known as blue vitriol.

Testimony before the committee indicated there was no shortage of copper sulphate in this country. In the last 5 years our total production of copper sulphate has averaged around 200,000,000 pounds annually, and exports for 1946 were around 82,000,000 pounds. In view of this, your committee deemed it inadvisable to suspend the import tax as applied to copper sulphate.

A detailed explanation of the bill (which, except as indicated in footnotes, is equally applicable to the bill as reported by this committee) and the considerations which justify its enactment appear in the House report which is incorporated and made a part of this report as follows:

"REPORT (TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 2404)

"The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the present acute shortage of copper in the United States. It relieves, until April 1, 1950,[1] copper, copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and various articles containing copper, from the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code, but does not in any way change or affect the tariff duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified by reciprocal trade agreements, or transfer any article from or to the free list.

"Appended to this report are sections 3420, 3425, and 3430 of the Internal Revenue Code, as well as the various paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930 specifically mentioned in section 3425.

"The import taxes in question are—

"1. Four cents a pound on the copper content of copper-bearing ores and concentrates and of the articles specified in certain enumerated paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"2. Three cents a pound on an article not taxable under (1) above, if it is dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, and if copper is the component material of chief value; and

"3. Three percent ad valorem, or three-quarters of 1 cent per pound, whichever is the lower, on an article not taxable under (1) or (2) above, if it is dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, and if it contains 4 percent or more of copper by weight.

"The committee was unanimous in its favorable report on the bill. Representatives of several Government departments and agencies, Members of Congress, and others furnished testimony at a hearing conducted by the committee, which was conclusive in establishing the critical need for a suspension of present import taxes on copper.

"The current shortage in domestic copper supplies, while only temporary in nature, is nonetheless extremely serious. Copper is vital to the Nation's building program, to automobile production, and to other major manufacturing operations. Curtailed domestic production of copper and a substantial drop in imports over the past years have resulted in exhaustion of Government-owned stocks accumulated during the war.

"In 1946 the production of refined copper from domestic sources totaled approximately 604,000 short tons. This was 240,000 short tons below the amount produced in 1945. Deliveries in 1946 of refined copper to domestic customers totaled approximately 1,261,000 short tons. The difference, namely 657,000 short tons, had to be supplied from Government-owned stocks purchased and stock piled without payment of import taxes. Government purchases were discontinued in November 1946 when copper prices were decontrolled. Government-owned stocks of copper in the hands of the Office of Metals Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have been reduced to 55,000 short tons as of March 1, 1947, or to less than one-half of 1 month's domestic requirements. During April 1947 Government stocks of copper are expected to be completely exhausted and domestic consumers will then become entirely dependent upon domestic production and current imports.

"Estimated domestic production of refined copper for 1947 is placed at approximately 950,000 short tons maximum. Domestic consumption for the same period is estimated at approximately 1,400,000 short tons. The minimum estimated deficit of 450,000 short tons must, therefore, come from private imports of copper. Current imports of copper are negligible largely because the world price of 22.85 cents per pound ($22.85 per short ton) exceeds the domestic price of 21½ cents. Foreign producers prefer to sell to foreign buyers at the world price rather than to American buyers who must add to their cost the import taxes levied under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code. These increased costs would, of course, be reflected in increased costs to the small, independent fabricator in the United States and in higher prices on articles containing copper.

"Domestic production in the United States is not currently at normal levels largely because copper mines have become depleted at an accelerated rate during the war, and for the further reason that most of the labor force normally employed in development and exploration was transferred to production activities. While basic copper deposits were not seriously depleted, the developed portions of existing deposits were worked down to a low producing level, which leaves the industry with insufficient developed openings to support the heavy postwar needs for copper.

"According to witnesses appearing before the committee it will be several years before domestic production can balance domestic requirements for copper, and considerable time is required to realize on foreign purchase commitments which must be made long in advance of deliveries. It is vital to the Nation's economy, therefore, that everything possible be done to stimulate both domestic copper production and imports of copper in the next few years. Temporary removal of the import taxes for a 3-year period[2] as provided in this bill should clear the way for increased imports of copper while domestic producers are catching up with the domestic market.

"TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

"Under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code an import tax is imposed upon copper-bearing ores and concentrates, upon articles provided for in paragraph 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and also upon all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, if copper including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value, or if the article contains 4 percent or more of copper by weight. Section 3430 of the code provides that this tax shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, and shall be treated for the purposes of all pro-

[1] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, the suspension of tax would terminate on March 31, 1949.

[2] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, period of temporary removal of tax would be 2 years.

visions of law relating to customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act, with certain exceptions.

"The bill reported provides that this tax shall not apply with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.[3] The term "articles" mentioned in the bill includes everything that is taxable under section 3425 as above described. If on or prior to the date of the enactment of the act an article has come into the United States but has not been entered for consumption, or if put in bonded warehouse has not been withdrawn for consumption, the tax will not apply if the entry for consumption or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption occurs after the date of the enactment of the act and before April 1, 1950;[4] but an article put into bonded warehouse during the abovementioned period and not withdrawn from warehouse for consumption until after March 31, 1950,[3] will be subject to the tax.

"Under the act of March 13, 1942 (Public Law 497, 79th Cong., 56 Stat. 171), no import tax under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be levied, collected, or payable on nonferrous-metal scrap entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with March 14, 1942, and ending with the termination of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941. If the unlimited national emergency is terminated before the close of March 31, 1950,[3] nonferrous-metal scrap to the extent that it is subject to tax under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code will still be free of import tax under the provisions of the bill as reported, until the close of March 31, 1950.[3] If the unlimited national emergency has not been terminated before the close of March 31, 1950,[3] the act of 1942 will continue to relieve any nonferrous-metal scrap subject to the import tax under section 3425 from such tax until the termination of the emergency.

"EXCERPTS FROM EXISTING LAW

"For the information of the House there are set forth below certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code and certain paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930:

"'INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"'SEC. 3420. Imposition of tax.

"'In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there shall be imposed upon the following articles imported into the United States unless treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide a tax at the rates specified in sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive.

* * * * *

"'SEC. 3425. Copper.

"'Copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles provided for in paragraphs 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 4 cents per pound on the copper contained therein: *Provided*, That no tax under this section shall be imposed on copper in any of the foregoing which is lost in metallurgical processes: *Provided further*, That ores or concentrates usable as a flux or sulfur reagent in copper smelting and/or converting and having a copper content of not more than 15 percent, when imported for fluxing purposes, shall be admitted free of said tax in an aggregate amount of not to exceed in any 1 year 15,000 tons of copper content. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, in which copper (including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value, 3 cents per pound. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight, 3 percent ad valorem or three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, whichever is the lower. The tax on the articles described in this section shall apply only with respect to the importation of such articles. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe all necessary regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

* * * * *

"'SEC 3430. Applicability of tariff provisions.

"'The tax imposed by section 3420 shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 590, 672; U. S. C., title 19, ch. 4) and shall be treated for the purposes of all provisions of law relating to the customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act, except that—

"'(a) the value on which such tax shall be based shall be the sum of (1) the dutiable value (under sec. 503 of such act) of the article, plus (2) the customs duties, if any, imposed thereon under any provision of law;

"'(b) for the purposes of section 489 of such act (relating to additional duties in certain cases of undervaluation) such tax shall not be considered an ad valorem rate of duty or a duty based upon or regulated in any manner by the value of the article, and for the purposes of section 336 of such act (the so-called flexible tariff provision), such tax shall not be considered a duty;

"'(c) no draw-back of such tax (except tax paid upon the importation of an article described in sections 3422, 3423, 3424, and 3425) shall be allowed under section 313 (a), (b), or (f) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any provision of law allowing a drawback of customs duties on articles manufactured or produced with the use of duty-paid materials;

"'(d) Such tax (except tax under sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive) shall be imposed in full notwithstanding any provision of law granting exemption from or reduction of duties to products of any possession of the United States; and for the purposes of taxes under sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive, the term "United States" includes Puerto Rico.'

"PARAGRAPHS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED IN SECTION 3425 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"NOTE.—It should be noted that the various rates of duty set forth below may have been modified by a reciprocal trade agreement:

"'*Title I—Dutiable list*

* * * * *

"'Schedule 3: Metals and manufactures of—

* * * * *

"'PAR. 316. (a) Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than ninety-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than ninety-five one-thousandths and not smaller than sixty-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, 1¼ cents per pound; smaller than sixty-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, 1½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That all the foregoing valued above 6 cents per pound shall be subject to a duty of 25 percent ad valorem; all wire composed of iron, steel, or other metal, not specially provided for (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum); all flat wires and all steel in strips not thicker than one-quarter of 1 inch and not exceeding 16 inches in width, whether in long or short lengths, in coils or otherwise, and whether rolled or drawn through dies or rolls, or otherwise produced, 25 percent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all wire of iron, steel, or other metal coated by dipping, galvanizing, sherardizing, electrolytic, or any other process with zinc, tin, or other metal, shall be subject to a duty of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; telegraph, telephone, and other wires and cables composed of iron, steel, or other metal (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum), covered with or composed in part of cotton, jute, silk, enamel, lacquer, rubber, paper, compound, or other material, with or without metal covering, 35 percent ad valorem; wire rope, 35 percent ad valorem; wire strand, 35 percent ad valorem; spinning and twisting ring travelers, 35 percent ad valorem; wire heddles and healds, 25 cents per thousand and 30 percent ad valorem.

"'(b) Ingots, shot, bars, sheets, wire, or other forms, not specially provided for, or scrap, containing more than 50 percent of tungsten, tungsten carbide, molybdenum, or molybdenum carbide, or combinations thereof: Ingots, shot, bars, or scrap, 50 percent ad valorem; sheets, wire, or other forms, 60 percent ad valorem.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 380. German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured, 20 percent ad valorem; nickel silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire, 30 percent ad valorem.

"'PAR. 381. Copper in rolls, rods, or sheets, 2½ cents per pound; copper engravers' plates, not ground, and seamless copper tubes and tubing, 7 cents per pound; copper engravers' plates, ground, and brazed copper tubes, 11 cents per pound; brass rods, sheet brass, brass plates, bars, and strips. Muntz or yellow metal sheets, sheathing, bolts, piston rods, and shafting, 4 cents per pound; seamless brass tubes and tubing, 8 cents per pound; brazed brass tubes, brass angles and channels, 12 cents per pound; bronze rods and sheets, 4 cents per pound; bronze tubes, 8 cents per pound.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 387. Phosphor-copper or phosphorus-copper, 3 cents per pound.

"'*Title II—Free list*

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1620. Bells, broken, and bell metal, broken and fit only to be remanufactured.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1634. Brass, old brass, clippings from brass or Dutch metal, all the foregoing, fit only for remanufacture.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1657. Composition metal of which copper is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for.

"'PAR. 1658. Copper ore; regulus of, and black or coarse copper, and cement copper; old copper, fit only for remanufacture, copper scale, clippings from new copper, and copper in plates, bars, ingots, or pigs, not manufactured or specially provided for.

"'PAR. 1659. Copper sulphate or blue vitriol; copper acetate and subacetate or verdigris.'"

DIRECTOR AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported a bill previously introduced by me as Senate bill 28, a bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported the bill without recommendation. I have conferred

[3] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, date referred to would be March 31, 1949.

[4] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, date referred to would be April 1, 1949.

with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, and it is entirely agreeable to him, as it is also agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, that the bill be taken from the calendar and be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. In view of the situation I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that both chairmen involved were agreeable to the reference of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. I have conferred with both chairmen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 11, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

John B. Alsever, Minnie E. Pohe, Carl E. Rice, and Norman F. Gerrie, for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Leonard H. Male, and sundry other candidates for appointments in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1088. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1089. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. BALL):

S. 1090. A bill to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 1091. A bill to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Oklahoma;

S. 1092. A bill to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 1093. A bill to provide for the leasing of the lands and real estate of members of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma who do not have certificates of competency, and for other purposes;

S. 1094. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

S. 1095. A bill to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; and

S. 1096. A bill to prevent the imposition of restrictions against alienation of certain classes of personal property acquired from the restricted funds of members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment and Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 437. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 722. An act for the relief of Charles A. Clark;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 986. An act for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock;

H. R. 1064. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1068. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; and

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretory of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TAFT LABOR RELATIONS BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, to have included in the body of the RECORD a statement by him on the labor relations bill proposed by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for committee consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER ON THE PROPOSED TAFT LABOR RELATIONS BILL

The omnibus labor bill offered by Senator TAFT for consideration by his committee has already served a useful public purpose. It has cleared the air of all the sham, pretense, and demagogery of the last few months that the Republican leadership seeks to modify the labor laws only to promote equality in collective bargaining and industrial peace.

The bill would turn the clock back in labor relations, not to conditions that existed before the National Labor Relations Act was adopted, but in many instances to those that obtained more than a hundred years ago when labor had to fight for its right to organize.

The bill is a very thick one, so I can only discuss a few of its high lights. It contains a confused hodgepodge of wholesale rewriting of our labor law, in language so ambiguous and complex that it would require at least another decade of extensive, costly, and exasperating court litigation to determine the full meaning and impact of the legislation. It would be a Roman holiday for high-priced lawyers.

Those who remain under the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act will have only nominal protection, for the heart is cut out of the statute. But under a catch-all definition of supervisor, the bill would exclude from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act foremen and a great many classes of minor clerical employees.

The bill excludes agricultural workers and the other classes of workers now covered. It is a strange way indeed to prove one's faith in the fundamental right of self-organization and collective bargaining by limiting and restricting the number of those who are to enjoy this precious right.

Company-dominated unions which have enslaved labor in the past are to be brought back, for they will be able to participate on the same footing with legitimate unions in an employee election. The employer will again be able to sit on both sides of the bargaining table.

No longer will good faith in intent to enter into an agreement be the test of bargaining. All that will be required will be to meet at reasonable times and confer. How will industrial peace be promoted by a provision which leaves the shell of collective bargaining and cuts out the core?

By substituting the narrower term "working conditions" for the present broader term "conditions of employment," the bill would narrow the scope of collective bargaining to exclude many subjects, such as, perhaps, pension plans, insurance funds, which properly belong in the employer-employee relationship and in regard to which the employer should not have the power of industrial absolutism.

Even when a contract is entered into, the bill would undermine its effectiveness by undermining the position of the union in seeing to it that the contract is carried out in its application to specific cases. This the bill accomplishes by rendering unnecessary the intervention and presence of the union when individual grievances are being settled. The picture of the unequal struggle between the powerful corporation and the helpless individual employee is once more restored.

The real purpose of the bill to break the back of labor is shown also by other provisions. Instead of enacting some guaranties against possible abuses the bill would eliminate the closed shop as a subject for required collective bargaining. How would industrial peace be served when the employer would not even have to sit down and talk the matter over? He is not even now required to agree to a closed-shop contract or to any agreement, for that matter.

The prize exhibit is the attempt of the bill to break up national unions by preventing them from acting as a unit in collective bargaining. This attempt to eliminate industry-wide and regional collective bargaining would play havoc with many industries, such as the needle trades, where this type of bargaining has contributed to industrial peace and prosperity. It is unthinkable that in our economy where businesses are operated on a national scale, a serious proposal shall be made to break up labor unions and put collective bargaining back on the company-union basis so dear to the heart of that colossus of industrial might, the National Association of Manufacturers.

The same purpose to destroy labor's hard-earned rights is apparent in the bill's procedural provisions. I shall mention only two. By placing a limitation of 6 months on the bringing of unfair labor practice charges, the bill rewards the unscrupulous employer who by duplicity and concealment can cover his actions which have deprived his employees of their legal rights. Why place such a premium on illegality?

Another provision of the bill would render the NLRB procedure rather futile, for each fact in each case would be reviewed all over again in the courts. This is achieved by depriving the NLRB of the authority now enjoyed by other administrative agencies composed of specialists, to appraise the evidence and determine the facts, if supported by substantial evidence.

While weakening the NLRB the bill would throw the problem of labor relations into the inexperienced hands of the courts and would revive the widespread use of the labor injunction. Is this calculated to achieve cooperation between labor and management?

No constructive approach to the problem of labor relations is made by this bill. In some respects it is ludicrous. For instance, it prohibits labor organizations from "interfering" with the right of employers to self-organization—as if any worker ever acted to interfere with the incorporation of companies or the formation of trade associations. Would solicitation by a labor organizer to join a union be an interference?

There is no fresh point of view evident in the approach to the problem of the settlement of labor disputes. Reliance is placed on cooling-off periods which our war experience proved to be actually heating-up intervals.

The few proposals that are found in the bill, such as those pertaining to jurisdictional disputes and arbitration of controversies arising under a contract, which have been raised by President Truman and could serve as a basis for deliberation, are so deeply buried under a cluster of antilabor measures that they are lost sight of.

By fostering uncertainty and confusion and narrowing the scope and effectiveness of collective bargaining, this bill would contribute not to the evolution of a just and satisfactory national labor policy, but to industrial chaos, strife, and violence. As such, this bill cannot serve even as a basis for discussion.

This bill constitutes a grand assault on our industrial democracy. It is an attack further to undermine the forces which could help to raise the purchasing power of the people at the very time when business itself is becoming alarmed by the inordinate profits it is reaping.

If the Republican leadership in Congress wants to assist the Communist Party in the promotion of widespread class warfare, industrial chaos, and economic depression in this country, they could not devise a better method of doing so than recommending the enactment of such legislation.

All who are interested in the basic human rights of the ordinary citizen should diligently and vigorously resist such legislation.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to sit this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Labor Department appropriation bill made by him before the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LILIENTHAL NOMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Lilienthal Debate Ends," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States of Europe," written by him and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEWSPRINT AND NEWSPAPERS — STATEMENT BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of newsprint and newspapers, made by Col. Robert R. McCormick on March 17, 1947, before the subcommittee investigating the newsprint shortage, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALISM IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S TEN LEGAL COMMANDMENTS—ARTICLE BY ALBERT BRICK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "America's Ten Legal Commandments," written by Albert Brick, of Washington, D. C., and published in the April issue of the Public Service magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites, which was, on page 2, line 18, after "State", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That Major General Kuter shall not remain in this position for more than 2 years after the date of the approval of this act."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I favor the passage of the pending bill and the granting of the aid to Greece and Turkey which the President has requested, because, in my judgment, if the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union are not effectively checked, then war between the Soviet Union and the United States is inevitable. If the present drift continues, if Russia continues to pursue her avowed objective, which is simply chaos, revolution, and aggression leading to world domination for communism, there can be no peace. If we sit idly by and permit Russia to pick off free peoples one by one, and meet these aggressions with weak, vacillating appeasement, as France and England in their attitude toward Hitler prior to 1939, and as we have met the aggressions of the Soviet Union up to this time, then we permit Russia to become stronger and more powerful with the digestion of each conquest, and the conflict between us will thereby come at a time when we are placed at a great disadvantage.

There is no sense in American appeasement of Russia, because we are the strongest and most powerful nation in the world, much stronger and more able at the present time to wage war than is the Soviet Union. Russia realizes this, and she attempts to weaken us by creating internal strife and discord; and exactly as the Axis Powers did, proceeds to pick off her neighbors one by one, digest their resources, and feverishly build up her industrial capacity to wage war. Her policy is to bide her time, and to become a stronger nation through conquest and preparation at home, until her strength is greater than our own. Our policy of appeasing her will not lead to peace, but is certain to cause war; and therefore I say President Truman's present program to prevent Russian aggression and stop the spread of communism is a program of peace and not of war.

Mr. President, the bipartisan foreign policy which the bill embodies will, if it is possible to do so, avert World War III, which otherwise seems inevitable. It strengthens democratic governments to the point where they can resist aggression. It seeks to build a stable economy under which mankind will prosper. After all, the best weapon against communism is the establishment of prosperous peoples and strong democratic governments. This we attempt to do.

In this connection I quote from an article by Winston Churchill which appears in the current issue of Life magazine:

> It is certainly not strange that American opinion should be greatly influenced by President Truman, General Marshall, Mr. Baruch, Senator VANDERBERG, Senator CONNALLY, and other champions of peace and progress in trying to nip evil in the bud, quench fire at its outbreak, and stop pestilence by timely inoculation.

That, Mr. President, is the wholesome foreign policy of the United States.

Our memory is indeed short if we cannot recall the quiescent policy which was adopted by the leading nations of the world when Italy attacked Ethiopia, and when an upstart Hitler, with his regime in swaddling clothes defied the world and marched into the Rhineland in defiance of the Versailles Treaty. We remember that it was the pacifist and the idealist who adjured the policy upon France and England not to resist this treaty violation. What was the result, Mr. President? Hardly had the cobblestones of the Rhineland ceased ringing with the echoes of Prussian boots when thousands of miles away the Japanese aggressor, taking heart from the weakness displayed by the world powers, attacked China, and World War II had in reality begun.

Yes, at that time the same cry was heard, "This is aggression! This must be turned over to the League of Nations." The League met at Geneva, and the world remembers that, notwithstanding the position of the United States, friends crept to the side of the aggressor within the sanctuary of the League and the rape of China was condoned. The League of Nations met, argued, bickered, and that was all. There was Axis and Communist agression in Spain.

Mr. President, with arguing and shadow boxing on the part of the League of Nations, with the cry of nonintervention in the air, who can say they were surprised when Hitler made his demands on Czechoslovakia? More than that, Mr. President, who was surprised when Munich came, and the capitulation occured? And who was surprised at what happened to Austria and Czechoslovakia? And finally came that grim day when Hitler marched into Poland because of his connivance with the Soviet Union. We all remember a dazed world tolerated the months and months of the phony war. But, Mr. President, that war was not phony. It was merely the Gethsemane prior to the crucifixion; then war in all of its devastating fury burst upon mankind; all of which sprang from appeasement, and the failure to stop aggression before it was too late.

Mr. President, we have now seen what has recently occurred in the Balkan and Baltic countries, in Finland, and in Korea. We have seen the tentative aggression into Iran and, Mr. President, we are today feeling the totalitarian pressure in Greece and Turkey, so that the peace-loving people of the world realize that we are once more confronted with a Rhineland, a Manchuria, an Ethiopia, a China, a Czechoslovakia, and a Poland.

Mr. President, who can deny that today the heel of a totalitarian tyranny is poised upon the boundary of Greece? Overwhelming odds stand pointed today upon the boundaries of Turkey. Pressure constantly maintained, pressure of the threat of invasion, is gradually eating away the economic foundation of those two nations.

Russia's position is simple: "I have a slave economy and because I have slavery I can maintain large armies and create discord throughout the earth." Then she says, "To meet my threats you, too, will have to adopt slavery or perish." This is the battle between Russia and the world.

This threat of war is real. It follows the pattern used toward all those countries which have succumbed within the rigid confines of the iron curtain. Yet again today we hear the same voices which we heard amid the sounds of the Prussian boots in Vienna and Prague. We hear the voices of nonintervention; we hear the voices of millions of good people who hate and detest war, but who persist in living in a world of fantasy and wishful thinking.

Yes, we all want peace; but we should not be timid about its preservation. Peace is not bought at the price of timidity. Peace is a constantly challenging thing and we must pay the price of peace in courageous and realistic action, which alone can assure its realization.

Mr. President, at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam our country consummated agreements with Russia. It was solemnly agreed, among other things, that the people of liberated areas would be free to set up governments of their own choosing and that there would be no government forced upon them by any other power. One of the great war aims of the United States was to assure that mankind would be free—free from fear; free from tyranny; free from oppression; that all peoples in liberated areas would be free to set up governments of their own choosing, and to go their own way without coercion and without domination by any other power. This was the pledged word of the Soviet Union. Our Government relied upon it and accepted in good faith their promises. Moreover, Mr. President, in addition to formal agreements, Mr. Stalin assured President Roosevelt at Tehran that he desired no territories in Europe; that his own country was only half populated and that Russia would spend her efforts in developing her own country, and would cooperate wholeheartedly with the United States and Great Britain in setting up a well-ordered world where mankind could grow and develop in peace and security. These were the solemn pledges of the Russian Government, and our own Government placed faith and reliance therein. Ah, Mr. President, how that faith was wholly misplaced.

Our Government and people had then and now have nothing but friendship and admiration for the Russian people. We have never sought anything from them. We greatly helped them both during the war and since at great material sacrifices to ourselves. As peoples we are friends today. We desire the continued friendship of Russia, but we demand that the Russian Government cease aggression and the threat of war. But, Mr. President, the conduct of the Soviet Government shows that its word is worthless. Its solemn aggreements are broken at will.

Pope Pius XII wrote at Christmas 1945:

> The indispensable element in all peaceful living among nations—the very soul of juridical relations among them—is mutual trust based on the belief that each party will respect its plighted word.

Of course, Mr. President, treaties, agreements, the plighted word of Communists are worthless because it is part of official Soviet policy to deceive. Lenin revealed in 1920 the real foundation of Communist tactics, strategy, and inter-

national diplomacy when he stated, and set it down as official Communist doctrine:

> We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of truth.

This is the reason why we can never have a binding agreement with the Soviet Union until they prove by actions the integrity of their pledged word. All the proof to date shows that they follow this line of deceit and falsehood set down by Lenin. They heed not the injunction of justice and morality. The will to use superior force is the only power on earth that they heed.

We have the promise of peace, but we do not have peace. We are still face to face with totalitarian aggression; the aggression of the left instead of the aggression of the right. Italy and totalitarian Germany are gone. The menace of totalitarian German and Italian imperialism is gone. In its place there has arisen the expansionist totalitarian imperialism of the Soviet Union. Solely because of Russian predatory conduct, its policies of conquest, its intent of world domination, there is no peace. There do not exist in the world today the conditions by which mankind can develop, can recreate its prosperity, and work out its destiny in freedom. The better world, for which we sacrificed and fought, is not here. The peace of the world, Mr. President, is threatened today by the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union just as it was by Hitler. Hitler was no more unscrupulous than the Soviet Government. Of the two Russia is better organized, has greater resources, and more numerous fifth columns. The safety and security of mankind are certainly in as much peril today from Stalin as they were yesterday from Hitler.

What has been the conduct of Russia, Mr. President? Since 1939 the following countries with populations as indicated, were either annexed, occupied by the Red army, or taken over by Soviet Russia through the installation of puppet regimes which are controlled by Moscow and which have been placed by force over their unwilling populations:

Asia:	
North China (area held by Chinese Soviet Red army)	75,000,000
Manchuria	45,000,000
North Korea	10,000,000
Total in Asia	130,000,000
Europe:	
Poland	35,000,000
Eastern Germany	25,000,000
Rumania	20,000,000
Yugoslavia	15,700,000
Hungary	10,000,000
Bulgaria	6,300,000
Lithuania	2,000,000
Latvia	2,000,000
Estonia	1,000,000
Albania	1,000,000
Total in Europe	118,000,000

In addition the following European countries are today under partial control by the Soviet Government, and threatened with complete control by the Soviet Government:

Czechoslovakia	15,000,000
Austria	7,000,000
Finland	3,800,000
Total	25,800,000

Thus 16 nations or parts of nations, inhabited by 273,000,000 people have come under the dominance of the hammer and sickle as a result of recent aggression. Russia has more than doubled her population and tripled her resources. Is it not time to call a halt?

In these vast areas, Mr. President, as in Russia herself, every last vestige of human liberty has been suppressed. Thousands upon thousands of the best people of every class who opposed the imposition of the atheistic, godless Communist dictatorship, and those who sought to preserve their freedom, have been ruthlessly murdered or shipped off to Siberia as slaves. A ruthless dictatorship has been imposed on these peoples by force against their will. Their rights and liberties are denied, and in reality they are held in slavery by the Communist dictatorship. These Communist dictatorships, under the control of Moscow, and by Moscow itself, are guilty of every crime which was charged against the Hitler regime in Germany. Terror and violence hold sway, and the crimes committed are just on as large a scale as those committed by the Axis countries.

Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia are the first nations in modern history which have recognized and practiced the doctrine of human slavery as applied to the white race. Normally, in the prison camps of Russia in the past 15 years there have probably never been less than 10,000,000 men and women working in semistarvation, often in the Arctic north, where the average expectation of life is 6 years. These were citizens of the Soviet Union. Their only crimes were opposition to communism, and the love of liberty and the rights of man. The number of slave laborers is much greater today, due to the millions of slave laborers from what we naively call liberated countries and the nationals of former enemy states. Indeed, there is more slavery on the earth today than at any previous time in the world's history, because communism is the greatest of all enslavers.

In addition to the vast human misery within the fiery furnace of communism, there is the imminent threat of the conflagration spreading; establishment of a puppet government in Iran was attempted by Russia in flagrant violation of her pledged word. Demands are being made upon Turkey. Armed Communist bands equipped by Russia or her satellites are violating the territorial integrity of Greece and attempting to set up a Communist dictatorship there. Russia is demanding the control of Tripolitania under trusteeship. She seeks a base in Eritrea. Throughout the whole Middle East Communist agents work to bring this vast area under the control of Moscow. Civil war inspired by communism flares up in China, and peace is denied this unhappy land. In every country in North and South America Communist agents, under the direction of Moscow, are at work to create strife and discord and to bring those countries within the Russian orbit. Spies directed from Moscow attempt to ferret out the military secrets of friendly states and allies. In France, Italy, the American, British, and French zones of Germany, and in other countries the attempt is being made to infiltrate and to take these countries from within, or to weaken them so that, like ripe plums, they will fall to Soviet Russia. A desperate, hungry people calculate not where they go. Mr. President, the United States is the only power remaining in the world strong enough to prevent Communist expansion, and throughout the whole world their propaganda preaches hatred against us and is attempting to inflame the peoples of the world against the United States.

All of this fits into a common plan. Soviet communism is pursuing its original and fundamental Communist policy—the conquest of the world for communism, the domination of the world for communism, the destruction of the countries of the world. And it is reaffirming its doctrine that war will be resorted to where necessary to carry out this program.

In my humble judgment this is the greatest crisis in the Christian era. Oriental communism directed from Moscow seeks to destroy Christian civilization and western culture. It has made great progress; our danger is greater than at any time in modern or medieval history. This is the third invasion of the west. Vienna has fallen. Eastern and central Europe are occupied. The danger is greater than at any time since Genghis Khan was thrown back in Poland.

Take the case of Greece and Turkey. These are very poor countries without resources. What does Russia want with them? She says she wants the port of Salonika in Greece. But it is economically unprofitable for the Soviet Union to operate this port instead of Odessa. This is not the reason. Greece has military position. The control of Greece would outflank Turkey and the Dardanelles. Air power in Greece would control the entire eastern Mediterranean. Our communications through the Mediterranean would be cut.

Mr. President, what are the reasons for the Soviet desire to control Turkey? The claim that she desires the Dardanelles in order to obtain access to the open seas falls flat when one understands that the control of the Dardanelles would not give her access to the high seas. The Mediterranean would still be controlled by the fortresses of Malta and Gibraltar, and access to the Indian Ocean would still be shut off by the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, Turkey and Greece, poor though they are, have great military significance. He who controls them controls the eastern Mediterranean. Land-based aircraft from those countries would seal off much of North Africa and the Near East. In fact, we would

be shut off from vital oil supplies. If those countries were to fall, the whole Middle East would fall under Communist control and this great area, with vast resources, would fall under the dominion of the hammer and sickle. The Soviet Union would be made stronger for the inevitable final conflict for world dominion which communism decrees. The Soviet Government's attempt to absorb Greece and Turkey is a military plan greatly to weaken the United States and to strengthen the Soviet hand for prospective conflict.

Mr. President, all of this fits into a common pattern. This is all part and parcel of the great objective for which the Politburo is driving. There is no mystery about the ultimate objective of Soviet foreign policy. It is today what it has always been, and that is world domination.

Time and time again the leaders of communism have stated and reiterated that their aim was world communism. The Official History of the Communist Party states:

> Study of the history of the Communist Party strengthens the certainty of the final victory of the great task of the Lenin-Stalin Party: The victory of communism in the whole world!

Mr. President, this is the aim of communism; and the policy and actions of the Communist dictatorship of Russia have always been to carry this program to its ultimate conclusion. It is carried out by infiltration when control can be gained by this method, and if not by infiltration, by military occupation and by war where war is necessary.

Stalin, in his book Problems of Leninism, which is the Mein Kampf for Russia and the Bible of world communism, states:

> The basic fact * * * is that there no longer exists a world-wide capitalist system. Now that a Soviet country has come into existence * * * world-wide capitalism has ceased to exist. The world has been severed into two camps, the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp (vol. 1, p. 369).
>
> We are living, not merely in one state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or another must conquer. Pending this development, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states must inevitably occur. (Vol. 1, p. 56, quoting from Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. XVI, p. 102.)

I quote from Lenin:

> From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country, questions must be determined * * * solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist revolution which has already begun. The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. (Lenin, Twenty-one Theses, January 20, 1918.)

To give a further insight into their program I quote from a September 1929 issue of Pravda, one of the official Soviet Government publications:

> The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. It cannot be otherwise * * * Our ultimate aim is world communism; our fighting preparations are for world revolution, for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale, and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship.

This is a fundamental Soviet policy, Mr. President. These are the goals to which the Communist hierarchy is driving.

Stalin's statement is that war between the Soviet Communists and the democratic states is certain. All the actions of the Communist Government show that she has embarked upon her program of world-wide conquest, and that when she is strengthened and has had time to digest the resources of the countries which she has overrun, and had time to build up her own shattered economy and industrial capacity, she hopes to carry to the ultimate conclusion her policy of world domination for communism.

On February 10, 1946, in order to reiterate that the policy of Communist expansion had not been abandoned, Stalin stated:

> It would be incorrect to think that the war arose accidentally or as a result of the fault of some statesman. Although these faults did exist, the war arose in reality as the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism.

No doubt remains of Stalin's determination to persist in his policy of aggressive Soviet imperialism. Stalin believes, and sincerely so, that the only road to permanent peace is the destruction of the democratic states and the conquest of the world for communism. In 1946 he announced as one of the objectives of the new 5-year plan the development of a steel production of 60,000,000 tons a year. This is three times the Russian steel production of 1940 and is greater than the combined steel production of Germany, Japan, and Great Britain in 1940. In addition to this, Stalin now controls the steel production of Silesia, Manchuria, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary. A nation's steel production is the basic measure of industrial capacity to make war. The Russian people are desperately in need of consumer goods, but giving up the production of consumer goods, the goods of peace, and concentrating on building up a basic industry for war makes plain the Soviet Government's intentions. In addition, it is interesting to note that Russian purchases from abroad are chiefly machinery and industrial equipment to be used in building up basic industry for war. Since 1939 the Soviet Government, without provocation, has waged aggressive war against six free, independent, and sovereign peoples—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Finland—states which were unable to defend themselves. Her failure to live up to her agreements regarding them and her purpose to dominate by force Yugoslavia, Austria, eastern Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, and northern Korea are aggressions which show her purpose to dominate the world. In fact, she intends to control by force all areas which she has occupied and ultimately to make them a part of the Soviet Union. Her aggressions are larger than the aggressions of Germany. She is truly an enemy of civilization.

Mr. President, the argument is made that we should turn the Greek-Turkish question over to the United Nations, and that if aid is given it should be supervised through the instrumentality of that organization. The charge is made that President Truman in his recommendations to Congress has bypassed the United States organization. Let us not be naive. What is the cause of present conditions in Greece and Turkey? It is Communist pressure on those two countries. It is armed Communist intervention in Greece. This is a condition which must be met at once. I do not think anyone can seriously say that at the present time the United Nations could solve any great question. Of course, the United Nations today is weak and ineffective. It could not even fix the blame for the placing of mines which took the lives of 44 British sailors. It could not place the blame because of the veto by Russia. It could not place the blame because to do so would be contrary to Communist policies. We are in the same situation here. Our Greco-Turkish policies run head-on into Communist policies. To be perfectly frank, the United Nations cannot be a great factor for peace until Russia desires peace, until Russia stops aggression, and through the United Nations organization cooperates for stability and peace. The United Nations cannot be effective until the Soviet Union stops sowing strife and discord and permits the peaceful recovery of the world. When that condition arrives, questions of this nature can and should be referred to the United Nations. At the present time, however, to refer this question to that organization would be playing into the hands of Soviet Russia, because it is evident that Communist obstructionist tactics in the United Nations organization would delay the program until communism attained its ends in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, throughout all the vicissitudes of the foreign policy in the development of our Nation from 13 remote Colonies on the shore of the Atlantic seaboard to the greatest power in the history of the world, a country to which most of the world looks for guidance and hope in all the problems that beset the world, Americans have always considered that whatever differences may divide America, those differences cease at the water's edge.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator's statement is correct—and I agree that it is—if communism finally reaches Greece and Turkey and overruns both of those nations, what next will happen, in the

Senator's opinion, so far as concerns nations on both sides of Turkey and Greece?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think that aggression feeds upon aggression, and that Russia will take the next nations in her schedule until she controls all of Europe and a large part of Asia, and then she will want us.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not true that at the present time Communist elements in France and Italy are virile and active?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And once Europe comes under the domination of Communist influence, it seems to me the same influence will spread in both directions, until eventually it probably will reach South American countries as well, and will become more active here in the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Illinois has said is true. If the Communist activities become greater in France and Italy, the Communists probably will come to control those countries and also other countries of Europe, even including Spain, and eventually there will be Communist control of western Europe, which President Roosevelt time after time said would threaten this country.

As I have said, Mr. President, the people of the United States, a country to which most of the world looks for guidance and hope in all the problems that beset the world, have always considered that whatever differences may divide America, those differences cease at the water's edge. Throughout our history I think one of the greatest manifestations of that historic policy is the present bipartisan foreign policy of the United States, so thoroughly exemplified through the coordination of the leaders of the two great parties which make up our political system. It is a patriotic policy. It is a policy worthy of the finest traditions of American history.

America has grown and thrived upon the political differences of its citizens. It is the earmark of the stability of our system that it can withstand differences of opinion and contrarieties of thought. Any American citizen, be he proud or humble, great or small, is privileged to criticize, vociferously if he will, any policy of the American Government; but, Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country that I do not believe that our history records an instance of a man who has been honored by the people of the Nation to the extent that the former Vice President of the United States, Henry A. Wallace, has been honored, who has flown to a foreign country, and has attempted to induce the friends and allies of his country to desert her. No American citizen has the moral right to conspire with foreign peoples in order to undermine and to weaken the hand of his country. The least that can be said is that Mr. Wallace is performing a grave disservice to the American people when he attempts to induce Great Britain to desert the United States and thereby force us to sail the perilous seas alone. Everyone admits that the foreign policy which this bill represents has grave implications, that, while it is the least dangerous, it has its hazards. The fights between Americans should be at home; and the American citizen, whoever he may be, who attempts to induce our friends abroad to leave us, and who attempts to prevent a united front to a common foe, to say the very least, is not serving the best interests of his country. Mr. President, no American has the right to attempt to array foreign peoples against his country. We know that conditions in France are delicate; yet the statements and activities of Mr. Wallace are in accord with the principles and policies of the Communist Party of France; and it is interesting to note that one of those who invited Wallace to visit France was Duclos, the leader of the Communist Party in France, the man who is reputed to be the head of the Third Internationale, and who was strong enough to dethrone Mr. Browder as head of the Communist Party in the United States and to establish in his stead Mr. Foster.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In no sense do I wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, because I think he probably would prefer to make it without interruption——

Mr. EASTLAND. That is quite all right.

Mr. PEPPER. But since, from the Senator's remarks, one would infer that Mr. Wallace went to France only by the invitation of Mr. Duclos——

Mr. EASTLAND. I said Mr. Duclos was one of the men who invited him to France. That statement is true, as reported in the Daily Worker.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; but all I wish to say upon this point is that on Saturday, before he departed for England on the following Monday, Mr. Wallace told me that he had had invitations to visit France from the heads of all the French political parties, including Mr. Leon Blum, the head of the Socialist Party, and also the head of the M. R. P. Party, the Popular Republicans. So although the Senator is incorrect in that Mr. Wallace was also invited by Mr. Duclos, yet I am sure the Senator would not want us to infer that Mr. Wallace did not have invitations from the other parties and groups that compose the French Government and the French political parties.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, by the furthest stretch of the imagination, no one could infer that from what I have said. I said that Mr. Duclos was one of those who invited Mr. Wallace, and I also say that the policies that he advocates are in keeping with the policies advocated by the Communist Party in France.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Mississippi also would want the RECORD to show, I am sure, that the Communist Party is officially represented in the Government of France at the present time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sorry to say that is so. That is all the more reason why Mr. Wallace should not go to France and attempt to undermine the hand of his country.

Mr. President, the people of England and France do not realize that Mr. Wallace does not enjoy the confidence of the great majority of American citizens. By his attempts to make it appear that there is grave division in the United States, Henry Wallace weakens the hand of those who seek to retain the great French Nation within the orbit of western civilization.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more, and then I shall not interrupt him further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think we might remember that Mr. Winston Churchill came to the United States and spoke at Fulton, Mo., at a time when he formally had been adjudicated not to have the political confidence of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the people of Great Britain.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, he has the confidence of Great Britain, and I am proud to say that he has the confidence of the people of the United States, and that his speech at Fulton, Mo., mobilized this country to such an extent that the Turkish Government says, so I am informed, that that prevented an invasion of that country by the Soviet Union. Mr. Churchill is a great man, one of the leaders for human liberty in the world.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the people of England and France do not realize that Mr. Wallace does not enjoy the confidence of the great majority of American citizens, that his policies have been repudiated in this country. Mr. President, to use an old proverb, if his activities are not inspired by the devil, they serve him equally as well.

Mr. President, it has been stated on the floor that this is an expensive program and will cost the Nation a great deal of money before we are through. But what is the alternative? I can see none except even greater expenditures later if we fail to act now. If we had stopped communism at Yalta, it would have cost us nothing. If we had stopped communism at Potsdam, it might have cost us no more than a stiff assertion of our rights. If we had stopped communism before the present Red government took over Poland, it would have cost us less than it will today. The bigger we let the communistic tiger grow, the more it is going to cost us to stop him. Since we cannot turn back the clock, let us seize what remains of our opportunity, and, without grieving at the expense, act boldly now.

I accept this program of aid to Greece and Turkey because it will cost less in the long run than any other program that is available now, or that will be available in the future. Mr. President, I fear the ultimate cost of further appeasement of Russia if we fail to act now. That cost in blood and treasure may even surpass the cost of World War II.

What is more, what shall we say about the cost of maintaining huge standing armies and the loss of world trade behind the iron curtain if we fail to stabilize the world?

Another criticism that has been leveled at this plan is the charge that there is no use in stopping communism in Greece and Turkey if we aid it elsewhere.

With this statement I emphatically agree. I hope we have heard the last of efforts by our State Department to unseat the governments of Argentina and Spain, because those governments are doing a fine job of combating communism. I hope the effort now under way to clean out the Reds who have infiltrated into our government will proceed apace. I want to see an end of left-wing directives from a certain clique in the State Department for our foreign wards, like Korea, the American zone in Germany, and Japan. I want to see communism resisted on every front in the world, but the points of greatest importance to the United States are, just at this moment, the Greco-Turkish sector, and right here at home. There is no reason why we should not be true to American interests everywhere. There can be no compromise with communism, because one cannot compromise with death.

Mr. President, the American people have a historic decision to make. We must either stop Russian imperialism, or submit to it. We have no other choice. Their object is plainly world domination. We cannot get off this planet. We must either stop aggression or submit. When we permit Russia to pick off areas piece by piece, absorb them, absorb their resources, and grow stronger and stronger, we make inevitable the day of armed conflict between us. If we permit her to take over Europe and a large part of Asia, our doom is sealed. We cannot stand against the whole world. The Western Hemisphere cannot stand with a Communist world arrayed against it.

I support the pending bill because if Russia is not stopped, war between Russia and the United States is inevitable, and to stop her effectively now is the only preventive of World War III. We must learn from the errors of the 1930's. Appeasement failed then. If Hitler had been stopped when he marched into the Rhineland, the great tragedy of World War II would not have occurred. God has placed within the hands of the American people the sole power to cope with atheistic communism. Our country is not worth its salt if we fail to protect our civilization, our culture, and our way of life. Our task is a double one: to stop aggression, and to turn the present uneasy armistice into a lasting peace.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Committee on Foreign Relations in the stand it has taken, and I shall support the bill as it has been amended. I cannot refrain from saying that I am sorry, exceedingly sorry, at the way in which the matter has been handled from the beginning. I do not refer to the time since it came to the Senate; but since the President of the United States delivered his message, I think the American people have had to attempt to live down many of the statements made by columnists and by radio commentators concerning what we were about to do. I do not agree with many of the things which were said before the President spoke. In fairness to myself and to everyone else, I must say that I do not share the view that America is merely stepping in to continue the policy of Great Britain. We have a policy of our own, and we are going to carry on in accordance with that policy.

I regret that after the passage of the Reorganization Act, and the creation of a Policy Committee, which was established primarily to furnish counsel for the President, that committee was not consulted in the earlier stages of this development. I think much of the trouble—and I am sure much of the need for amendment—would have been overcome had we heard the whole story, had we gotten a real understanding of the facts from the beginning.

Mr. President, I shall support the bill primarily because the first thing we need in the United States, above all other things, is unity. The President has spoken, and the President's words are in the minds and hearts and understandings of all mankind. He spoke for his country. I deem it our duty to stand by the President in what he has said, and it is for that reason that I have gone to the trouble of trying to work out what I think is a consistent background for what the President has said.

I stand by the President, and I want unity in America for another reason. In the first place, no treaty has yet been ratified or consummated. We are in a state of war. The shooting war is over, to be sure, but we are in what the aftermath of the last war taught us is the most deadly period. We are in the time of the riding of the Four Horsemen.

It is necessary for those nations which have some stability, which have real control of their affairs, which have won the war, and therefore laid down certain propositions for the world, to stand as a unit to assure the fulfillment of those propositions.

Wherever I look in the world I can see tremendous danger if there is not some place where nations that are weaker, that have lost faith, that have lost property, and have become completely discouraged as the result of the destruction wrought by war, may turn for guidance and understanding I believe that today America stands as a beacon, as she has always stood, for those who are seeking opportunity to develop their own natures and to promote their own welfare. It is well that we keep leadership.

Mr. President, as I have said, no treaty has been ratified and no boundaries have been determined following the upsetting of the old boundaries by the war. But the establishment of boundaries does not mean peace. There will always be two kinds of war. At the present time we are faced by ideological warfare which has followed actual warfare. The boundaries of ideological warfare are not set; they cannot be set, and they never will be set. I do not know of very many kings who have been overthrown as the result of actual warfare, but I know that the progress of democracy has been certain, the notion of popular sovereignty has developed; and I know that nothing can stop the ideological trend of the world.

Today Russia, the political entity, in spite of changed ideology, is carrying on in international relations in much the same way and with much the same ideals as existed under the czarist regime.

Russia has embraced the concept of communism; and connected with communism is the political theory and the political fact of the single will dominating the proletarian dictatorship, and dominating the political actions of the state, and, therefore, all citizens within the state. In referring to Russia, then, we think of the political entity, we think of the concept of communism, and of a form of government subject to a single will. So far as America is concerned, she need not be antagonistic to political Russia; but, if she adheres to what have been her fundamental ideas, she must be antagonistic to communism, and, so long as her Constitution endures, she can never submit to the concept of the single will.

It is strange, and yet it is proper, both from the standpoint of military strategy, which has been mentioned here this morning, and from the standpoint of politics, that Greece and Turkey should be bound together in the same bill. That could not always be said, although there was a time when Greece and Turkey were one. It should be pointed out that one of the reasons for now linking the two nations, in spite of the fact that they were antagonistic in the war, is that after World War I a working arrangement between Greece and Turkey was consummated, and there was a virtual alliance between the two; a rather happy alliance, because it resulted in more friendly relations, better trade, rising standards of living, and the actual saving of life.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] yesterday eloquently referred to the traditional Greece, the idealistic Greece, the mother of western democracy. It might be well to extend the idea further and to suggest that the fact that Greece and Turkey are linked together in this bill is perhaps a symbol, as it should be, of a new world, of new ties.

To leave Turkey out of consideration, Mr. President, would be to break down the theory in regard to nations working together; because one of the fundamental concepts back of the United Nations is that nations stand out as complete, independent entities. It is our duty to support those independent entities which have already been recognized and which form a part of the sisterhood of the nations; otherwise, there will be utter confusion in the world, and it will never be possible to reduce to practice the theory of the United Nations.

With reference to military missions, may I, as the author of the Chinese military-mission bill, say that I still believe in that bill? I think that, had General Marshall had the benefit of the provisions of that bill in the beginning of his negotiations in China and in the beginning of his sojourn there, he probably would have achieved a greater degree of

success. The Senate did not see fit to pass the bill.

The general military-missions bill, dealing with missions in South America, is a bill which I think Senators generally should support. Had there been more time, the general military-missions bill, which was before the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session, would undoubtedly have been passed. It is a bill which I think is exceedingly constructive, in the light of the extension of international understanding and the hope of lifting standards throughout the world.

There are military missions and military missions. A military mission does not mean a military expedition. It was pointed out by the Senator from Texas yesterday that under the pending bill we are not going to send military expeditions to either Greece or Turkey.

Mr. President, let me here say a word about intervention. It is not intervention to enter a country at the invitation of its government. It is technically erroneous to use a word which has a definite meaning, so loosely as the word "intervention" has been used. Technically, it is not planned to intervene in Greece or Turkey. If a loan is made or if a military mission is sent, it is by an understanding with the existing governments. Of course it is said that the purpose in doing this would be that democracy might be extended in the world. It happens that probably two of the worst illustrations of what we consider a good democratic government have been chosen. There is theory, there are ideals, there is history, and there are a number of other things which should be kept in mind in considering what constitutes true democracy. Sometimes there is a deliberate attempt to get away from democracy both in theory and in practice and sometimes there is a deliberate attempt to adhere closely to democracy in both theory and practice. The intent of other countries should be recognized in a proper evaluation of democracy. The United Nations stands today, and we are its greatest sponsor. The retreat from collective security in 1919 brought on World War II.

It has been said by some that we have bypassed the United Nations in the present case. Of course, the amendments which have been adopted show that that is not the case, that the American Government declares that it is ready to fit into the scheme of the United Nations when it can become operative.

What if the United Nations had attempted this great task, in order to keep alive what ultimately would be two of its members, and had failed? Wherein would the United Nations have become strengthened? Is it not better that the United Nations should follow the leadership of one of its strong members in support of the fundamental theory upon which the organization is based and which makes it an acceptable institution, rather than to attempt to aline the United States in support of a program which might not be practicable? There is a place for the small nations in the United Nations; there is a place for the great nations in the United Nations. If the United Nations is to succeed and become strong it must always recognize that there is a place in its organization for both great nations and small nations.

Conflicting theories exist, of course, within the United Nations. America faces a dilemma with respect to these conflicting theories. America stands as the leader of the democratic forces in the world and also as the chief architect of an international structure in which nations living under opposing systems, democratic, totalitarian, autocratic, monarchial, are members. But can we not find an answer to the dilemma? We cannot choose our neighbors. We cannot assume that all members of a community of states shall always be in agreement with us. Under the American theory we cannot insist that there shall always be agreement.

Mr. President, we have lately had presented to us in a striking manner the American theory of what we consider our democracy to be. It may be of interest from the ideological point of view to call attention to the real conflict existing between the two theories which underlie and support the two greatest and strongest nations in the United Nations. In theory they can never agree and work together because they are so completely diverse, and will remain so at all times.

I shall not try to lay down the fundamental doctrine of the "single will" states, or the fundamental notion of communism either as an economic theory or as a political concept, but I wish to present two contrasting statements. I have chosen what I think are quotations which illustrate exactly the position in which we now find ourselves. The Communist who writes and thinks about his system in contrast with the democratic system says:

> Capitalism separates countries in order the better to exploit them, but communism unites them, the better to defend them.

That is the theory on which the ideological approach of communistic conquest must ultimately rest.

Lenin had such faith in the extension and the universality of the acceptance of his theory that at one time he wrote:

> No matter if three-quarters of mankind disappear the important thing is that what is left should finally be incorporated in communism.

Mr. President, it is extremely encouraging to an American to be able to turn to a last-minute definition of what constitutes our ideals. This definition is found in the words uttered by the spokesman of America who is today in Europe, our Secretary of State, General Marshall, who echoes and reechoes the words of the founding fathers when the American system was erected, when the American theory had its origin. General Marshall as late as March 14 told the representatives of the only other independent great powers left in the world, sitting in conference in Moscow—and listen to these words and see if as Americans we do not thrill under their influence—

> I realize that the word "democracy" is given many interpretations. To the American Government and citizens it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away.
>
> They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the ways of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home and family. To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. President, if General Marshall never utters any other words, those words will mark him as one of the greatest of Americans. Every American heart will respond to that statement made by him. We Americans who read it realize that we are represented by a true spokesman for us in the councils of the world.

At this point it will be interesting to point to a bit of history, the first bypassing of the League of Nations, and to show the difference between what happened in the case of the League of Nations and what some now call a bypassing of the United Nations. One who will take the time to read about the Corfu affair will realize that it is not now proposed to bypass the United Nations; that everything that has heretofore been done or that is proposed to be done will be in harmony with the fundamental wishes, hopes, and aspirations of the United Nations.

The seed of defeat for the idealized procedure created under the League of Nations Covenant for keeping world peace was planted in 1923—the year of the celebrated Corfu incident. For it was in handling this so-called incident as it did that the League proved in practice a disregard for the equal rights of small nations seemingly preserved inviolate in the terms of the Covenant.

The Corfu incident arose out of the activities of the commission appointed by the conference of ambassadors to fix the frontiers between Albania and Greece. The commission was headed by an Italian, General Tellini, who was accused by the Greeks of deciding all disputed points in Albania's favor. On the morning of August 27, 1923, Tellini was murdered near the village of Janina, on Greek territory. The Greek Government expressed its profound regret to the Italian ministers in Athens and pledged itself to do all in its power to apprehend and punish the culprits. Patriotic indignation in Italy reached white heat. Here was an opportunity for the Fascist regime, not yet a year old, to play a strong hand by proceeding from sword rattling to action. On August 29 Mussolini sent an ultimatum to the Greek Government expressing Italian demands, several of which were so severe as to provoke the reply that these particular demands were an infringement on Greek sovereignty and injury to the honor of Greece. At the same time the Greek Government addressed an appeal to the Secretary-General of the League to bring the matter before the Council. And there was a real test, Mr. President.

Almost immediately the Italian Government rejected the Greek reply as unsatisfactory and ordered its naval forces to occupy the Greek island of Corfu, situated near the mouth of the Adriatic. The occupation was completed only after a bombardment in which a number of Greek and Armenian refugee children on the island were killed or wounded by the exploding shells. Italy's honor was thus happily vindicated, from the standpoint of those who constituted the new Fascist regime.

Greece notified the Council through its representative that it was ready to accept and execute in good faith any proposal the Council might make to give Italy full satisfaction. The Italian representative presumptuously contested the jurisdiction of the Council over this matter, on the ground that Italy had not intended to commit an act of war.

The British representative answered this contention with the observation that there was no tenable distinction between the bombardment of Corfu and an act of war. Although that seems an appropriate assessment of Italy's act the Council nevertheless proceeded to enforce the Italian demands on Greece. There was no decree of indemnity to Greece for the loss of life and destruction of property at Corfu. The Italians did evacuate their forces from the island.

Peace had been preserved and territorial conquest averted. But Greece was obliged to bow to superior force. By this exercise of grotesque self-deception the League had set a course for war because, as Vanzetti has said, men were not sufficiently heroic for a life which does not need war.

When the expression "bypassing" is used, those who remember a real bypassing and a real spirit of utter contempt for what the world was trying to do in organizing itself cannot help thinking of that incident and note the difference. I do not think any serious student will ever purposely speak of the action of America in the Greek-Turkish affair as a bypassing of the United Nations.

Mr. President, in a situation of this kind some constructive things must be done. There must be a continuation of the organization of the world to implement and make stronger the United Nations. One such continuation has been suggested by a resolution introduced in this body. It is an old idea, an idea advocated 25 years ago, following the last war, by Briand, in his suggestion for the creation of a United States of Europe. Many suggestions have been made in the making of the peace which might bring about such a happy situation. One such suggestion deals with the waterways of Europe. If we could honestly tackle the problem of the waterways of Europe, we could probably bring about unity in Europe. Control of the waterways furnished one of the reasons for the meeting of the First Constitutional Convention, so that the waters which touched various States might be controlled to the advantage of all the States. The world has an opportunity now, not only in relation to the Dardanelles and the changing of the treaty with respect thereto, but also in connection with waterways. Something ought to be done. If it could be done, and if some agreement could be arrived at which would be lasting in its effect, it would be possible to transport wheat by water, without touching the Mediterranean, practically all the way to northern Europe, through the Danube, the Ludwig Canal, and the Rhine. There has been an effort throughout the years to bring about arrangements under which the waterways would be internationally controlled, thereby creating the beginning of a United States of Europe. If that were done, that which is called western civilization in Europe might be saved, even if the worst comes to the worst, and even if, as was suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] a few moments ago, the start of the conquest of Europe is now well under way.

There are those who point out that in ideological warfare the world will ultimately be divided into three parts, following the various ideologies. They give control of all of Europe to the Russian states. They leave with us North and South America and most of the commonwealth states. Then they forget the mass of the world so far as population is concerned, and leave that as a unit by itself. My feeling with regard to the future world depends upon the unit which is left. I think the future world will be formed and judged primarily on the basis of the actions of the great Asiatic nations of the world.

I should like to repeat the statement that keeping America united until there is a peace should be our great objective, both for our own sakes and also for the sake of the world and especially for the sake of the entity of the United Nations. The community-of-states idea is one which must prevail in the world; and the community of states must lay down the standard for individual states. Then we shall have decent, respectable, and proper international law. The policy which America must follow must always be an American policy.

I come now to a series of quotations which I wish to read. I shall try to point out that what has been recommended by President Truman is a natural growth and continuation of what has been American policy almost from the very beginning. In order to do so I think we must lay down certain simple morals of history in order to understand why nations fall into certain ways and habits. If we study the history of nations throughout the ages, we discover that, first of all, if they are to last, there must be, as Oppenheim says, "an equilibrium, a balance of power, between the members of the family of nations."

One of the aims of the President of the United States is to continue that equilibrium.

Second:

International law can develop progressively only when international politics are made the basis of real state interests.

If we accept the theory and the philosophy of the previous speaker the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], surely America never faced a greater problem than she is facing now, and never did she need a better background of her own original policy and its expansion.

Third:

The program of international law is intimately connected with the victory everywhere of constitutional government over autocratic government.

We can never have a successful community of nations until governments actually speak for the people. That is the aim, and ultimately it will come; otherwise we cannot go forward with the United Nations to a successful consummation.

Fourth:

The principle of nationality is of such force that it is fruitless to try to stop its victory.

That is a moral of history that we ought to respect at this time. We cannot curb the growth of ideas; and ideas which are followed by better living conditions and happier people will encircle the world.

Wherever a community of many millions of individuals who are bound together by the same blood, language, and interests, become so powerful that they think it necessary to have a state of their own, in which they can live according to their own ideals and can build up a national civilization, they will certainly get that state sooner or later.

Fifth:

That every progress in the development of international law wants due time to ripen.

Sixth:

That the progress of international law depends to a great extent upon whether the legal school of international jurists prevails over the diplomatic schools.

The school of expediency and self-satisfaction. Law must take the place of expedient action.

Seventh:

That progressive development of international law depends chiefly upon the standard of public morality, on the one hand, and, on the other, upon economic interests.

In that case we go into Greece and into Turkey with clean hands, for the benefit of the world, the benefit of the two countries, and the benefit of ourselves.

Is President Truman's policy recommendation an expression of American policy? I desire to take some time to discuss this question, Mr. President, because I believe we have in President Truman's recommendations and the action which is to follow one of the most splendid natural enlargements of American policy that has been presented for a long time. This little essay may seem tedious to those who know their American diplomacy and their American history, but I believe it to be worth while for us to have it in the RECORD as the opinion of at least one Senator. Here I should say that I am in hearty agreement with the stand which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] took yesterday, and especially with his words when he said that he spoke only for himself. I hope, nevertheless, Mr. President, that while in this statement I speak only for myself, there may be an echo or two in the hearts and aspirations of the average American citizen who believes in the growth, the development, and the purposes of his Government.

Our famous Secretary of State, John Hay, once described our foreign policy as being summed up in the phrase, "The Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule." The latter rule is one which should modify the foreign policy of all members of the so-called family of nations. And with regard to the change that this Nation has not adopted a principled, consistent foreign policy an examination of the extent to which the Monroe Doctrine has influenced our course of international action may be in order.

The celebrated doctrine enunciated by President Monroe was a natural outgrowth of the situation in which the young American Nation found itself in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Here let me pause long enough to say that if those who wrote that the President of the United States was adopting an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, and glibly and quickly named it the Truman Doctrine, had given attention to all that Monroe said and had paid attention to the first parts of Monroe's pronouncement, it is likely that many things which have been said would not have been said regarding the meaning of the President's proposal. Monroe was very careful to point out that his doctrine must have the support of the people. He went so far as to talk about popular sovereignty in such a way that it is indeed worth while for us to read his words now:

> The people being, with us, exclusively the sovereign, it is indispensable that full information be laid before them on all important subjects, to enable them to exercise that high power with complete effect. If kept in the dark, they must be incompetent to it. * * * To the people every department of the Government and every individual in each are responsible, and the more full their information the better they can judge of the wisdom of the policy pursued and of the conduct of each in regard to it. * * *
>
> Their interests in all vital questions are the same, and the bond, by sentiment as well as by interest, will be proportionately strengthened as they are better informed of the real state of public affairs, especially in difficult conjunctures. It is by such knowledge that local prejudices and jealousies are surmounted, and that a national policy, extending its fostering care and protection to all the great interests of our Union, is formed and steadily adhered to. A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers as respects our negotiations and transactions with each is thought to be particularly necessary.

Mr. President, that part of the Monroe Doctrine should be read and reread by everyone in authority in connection with international negotiations conducted for the American Government. A proposition has been presented to the Congress of the United States and action by the Congress is requested. Why does it come to the Congress? Because of constitutional provisions. The President cannot act in certain matters without instructions. He cannot spend the people's money, and so forth. But, Mr. President, if the Senate or if the Congress has the last word, why should we not develop the idea that the representatives of the people may have the first word once in a while and act in unity, a condition we are trying to bring about in this instance.

The celebrated doctrine enunciated by President Monroe was a natural outgrowth of the situation in which the young American Nation found itself in the early part of the nineteenth century.

We were as yet comparatively weak and were conducting in the New World an experiment in democracy, the success of which might be endangered through becoming embroiled in European political quarrels. Jefferson declared in 1808 that one of the objects of our foreign policy should be to exclude European influence from this hemisphere. I refer briefly to Jefferson in order that the theory may be better understood.

In a message to Congress in 1811 President Madison advanced the idea that it was the paramount interest of this Nation to resist imperialistic encroachment. Congress thereupon passed a resolution expressing cognizance of the threat posed by a foreign power and providing for the temporary occupation of adjacent territory to countermand the threat. President Madison's idea was not one-sided. The territory which we then occupied was later acquired through peaceful negotiations, and it is essential at the outset to recognize that the Monroe Doctrine has never served as a cloak for territorial aggrandizement.

It also should be pointed out here, Mr. President, that the whole philosophy of the Monroe Doctrine, as announced some 12 or 13 years after that time, was incorporated both in Jefferson's pronouncement and in Madison's recommendation to the Congress and in the resolution which the Congress passed.

When he spoke in 1823, President Monroe added to the elements of isolation and paramount interest the principle of non-intervention, to constitute the famous doctrine that bears his name. The essential import of the declaration was to advertise this Nation's assistance for the smaller nations in the hemisphere in resisting the imposition of despotisms. Although the doctrine was intended to meet a particular emergency, it was couched in general terms, and was thus broad enough to state our position whenever encroachments of a particular character might be threatened in the Western Hemisphere. The smaller American nations were thus assured of respect for their sovereignty on a plane of equality with the larger nations of the world. That is one of the theories that President Truman is working on as he moves into the Mediterranean sphere.

In 1845 President Polk declared, in his annual message to Congress, that—

> it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established in any part of the North American Continent.

That is probably a better statement than the Monroe Doctrine itself, insofar as the average layman's interpretation of that doctrine is concerned.

In one respect that this was narrower than the Monroe Doctrine, since it did not include South America; but it was broader than the Monroe Doctrine in another respect: It prohibited the voluntary cession of American territory to any European power. Such cession could not be made with our consent, regardless of whether the territory in question was already under the control of some other European power or belonged to an independent American republic.

A case of the latter sort was that of Yucatan, one of the provinces of Mexico, which, on account of an Indian insurrection, offered itself to Spain, England, and the United States. With reference to the offer to the other powers, President Polk declared in a message to Congress of April 29, 1848, that—

> according to our established policy, we could not consent to a transfer of this "dominion and sovereignty" to either Spain, Great Britain, or any other European power.

A bill was introduced in Congress enabling the President to "take temporary military occupation of Yucatan;" but before anything could be done, the collapse of the insurrection brought the incident to an end.

In the disputes over the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty in the fifties, the principle of the Monroe Doctrine was invoked against the British colony in Honduras, on the ground that it was an extension of European influence.

Secretary Seward, undoubtedly in accord with President Lincoln, from 1861 to 1865 warned the French not to force a foreign empire upon unwilling Mexicans; and in 1865, Seward gave formal notice that the French must leave Mexico, and that was backed up by a display of military force on the border. Though Seward avoided mention of the Monroe Doctrine, he applied its principles very effectively.

President Grant in 1869 repeated President Polk's earlier warning by announcing that no territory in America could be transferred to any European power, regardless of whether the inhabitants were willing or unwilling.

Secretary Fish in 1870 proposed that the United States should take the lead in a general political and commercial policy for the republics of America. That was the first distinct statement of a policy of leadership by the United States, but it was undeniably in the minds of President Monroe and John Quincy Adams at the time when they were formulating the message promulgating the Monroe Doctrine.

Secretary Evarts in 1880 was the first American statesman to see the relation of the Isthmus Canal to the Monroe Doctrine. He claimed "paramount interest" for the United States in any land or water communication across the American isthmus. President Hayes added the significant declaration that any interoceanic canal would be virtually a part of the coast line of the United States. Secretary Blaine in 1881 made the position of the United States more precise by stating that for any European power to share in the construction and control of the canal would be an introduction of the European political system. He then drafted for the Pan-American Congress of 1889 the statement that the "principle of conquest" should not be considered as admissible under American public law. That was intended to apply to the wars between Latin-American powers, and also to foreign invasion.

Its significance in relation to the matter presently before us is the declaration

that we recognize a political and an economic reason for the actions we take, and that such actions can be taken against political or economic ideologies.

That series of utterances, along with others of a similar tenor, clearly show a steady growth of responsibility and authority in American affairs. The mandate of the Monroe Doctrine had been developed sufficiently by 1895 to enable President Cleveland to assert its principles in definite and unequivocal terms, despite the fact that he was virtually without an army to back him up. The fact that Great Britain paid respect to the stand of President Cleveland and acceded to his request was a great tribute to the Monroe Doctrine, which had determined his course of action.

When we go further, to the writing of the Treaty of Versailles and the incorporation in that treaty of the concept of the Monroe Doctrine, we find that it became universally accepted by the nations of the world. It is that sort of procedure which brings about a peaceful acceptance of an idea which makes for better understanding between nations, and develops, of course, the possibility of world peace.

The interpretation and application of the Monroe Doctrine, with which President Cleveland's name is associated, was occasioned by a dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain in regard to the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana. That dispute had dragged along for many years without attracting any popular interest or attention either in England or in the United States, when, in 1895, it was suddenly brought into the limelight by the determined stand which President Cleveland took in declaring that the dispute should be submitted to arbitration. In July of that year his Secretary of State, Olney, sent to London a dispatch in which he argued that if, as Venezuela alleged, Great Britain was encroaching upon Venezuelan territory under the guise of a boundary dispute, such aggression was an attempt to extend European power and control over American territory, and therefore was clearly a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. He suggested that an investigation of the conflicting claims be made as the only way of determining whether Great Britain was within her rights or was seeking to extend her territory. He declared that Great Britain had thus far refused to arbitrate the controversy except on condition that Venezuela renounce a large part of her claim, and pointed out that the great disparity of strength between the two countries left Venezuela no hope of establishing her claim, insofar as it was just, except by peaceful means.

Here is another fine expression of the sense of the Monroe Doctrine that in legal contemplation all independent states are regarded as equal, and that the rights of each are not deemed to be dependent upon the possession of power to insure their enforcement. Mr. President, to have that principle recognized at that time was an exceedingly great step forward in the establishment of international understanding and international law throughout the world. Chief Justice Marshall may have been expressly cognizant of this aspect of the new doctrine when he gave voice to the famous legal pronouncement in an admiralty proceeding before the Supreme Court in 1825. Chief Justice Marshall said:

> No principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations. Russia and Geneva have equal rights. It results from this equality, that no one can rightfully impose a rule on another. Each legislates for itself, but its legislation can operate on itself alone. A right, then, which is vested in all by the consent of all can be divested only by consent.

Mr. President, if we have to assert a right which we have not yet had to, and which no one has asked us to assert, in regard to the President's prounouncement, I think we will find it can be justified, and justified completely, by a law which has been on our statute books for much more than 100 years, and what was law long before that in international society.

So far as the relation of Great Britain to American affairs was concerned, the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine by President Cleveland and Secretary Olney was successful. Great Britain took the lesson to heart, accepted the arbitration with Venezuela which was thrust upon her, and the findings of the arbitrators, and prepared to give up that joint control of the Canal which was embodied in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850. During the Spanish War of 1898, Great Britain made it clear that other European powers must not interfere with the American policy of the United States. The next step was for Great Britain, in the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1900, freely and without consideration to give up joint control over isthmus transit. The Senate insisted that there should be a formal abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and Great Britain gave way and accepted the second Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, by which the United States was left free to control any isthmus canal that might be constructed and to "neutralize" it in her own way.

President Theodore Roosevelt transformed the Monroe Doctrine from a negative into a positive policy. By his construction of the doctrine the United States assumed the positive responsibility of maintaining stable conditions in otherwise turbulent Latin-American States so as to avoid any excuse for European intervention in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Prior to this time our Government did not maintain that armed collection of private debts contravened the Monroe Doctrine, in the absence of any occupation of territory. President Roosevelt, however, at the time of the Venezuelan affair of 1902, came to be of the opinion that such armed intervention directed against a Latin-American State would substantially involve a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and consequently we could not permit European powers to exercise force in the collection of debts in Latin-American countries. Here, again, is an assertion of the equal rights of small nations. At the same time, we could not deny that debts properly contracted ought to be paid. We could not allow any country to hide behind us so as to avoid the discharge of their just obligations. In various speeches and messages, and particularly in his messages to Congress in 1904, President Roosevelt declared that the Monroe Doctrine was intended to be one of peace, and that to keep the peace the United States might be forced in flagrant cases to "the exercise of an international police power." This is the so-called "policy of the Big Stick."

President Taft inherited the Roosevelt principles. He endorsed the latter's positive interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, and applied it to new situations arising in the Caribbean region. He summed up as follows the doctrine underlying American intervention in that region:

> Now when we properly may, with the consent of those in authority in such governments and without too much sacrifice on our part, aid those governments in bringing about stability and law and order, without involving ourselves in their civil wars, it is a proper national policy for us to do so. It is not only proper national policy but it is international philanthropy. We owe as much as the fortunate man owes aid to the unfortunate in the same neighborhood and in the same community. We are international trustees of the prosperity we have and the power we enjoy, and we are in duty bound to use them when it is both convenient and proper for us to help our neighbors. When this help prevents the happening of events that may prove to be an acute violation of the Monroe Doctrine by European governments, our duty in this regard is only increased and amplified.

Mr. President, that doctrine is up to date. That is, what we are doing today is merely an enlargement of the same philosophy and the same idea.

In 1912, under the lead of Senator Lodge, the Senate itself took the initiative in adopting a new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. The new policy was embodied in a simple Senate resolution, and did not receive the formal support of the Taft administration. The resolution asserted that—

> When any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

The adoption of the resolution seems to have been due to newspaper reports that a Japanese corporation was attempting to secure control of land on Magdalena Bay in Lower California, Mexico. This resolution differs from previous interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine in extending it to a "corporation or association" under the practical control of a non-American government, rather than to the government itself. This seems to be logical extension where, as in this case, it is thought that the corporation is a mere disguise or subterfuge, and is really acting on behalf of the foreign government. The Doctrine is thus interpreted as preventing such a government from doing indirectly what

it could not do directly without violating it.

Truly the Monroe Doctrine has not been a static affair: it has been growing. It has evolved from time to time, rather consistently. But it has been since the great pronouncement of Woodrow Wilson at Mobile in 1913, when what is now called the good-neighbor policy had its origin, that the foundation was laid for the Monroe Doctrine as it is understood today. For at that time the United States, by the words of its Chief Executive, announced to the world that the day of aggression, the day of advantage taking, was gone, and could no longer obtain condonation. Emancipation for the small nations was his keynote.

Referring to President Wilson's statement at Mobile, President Roosevelt said in 1933:

> It therefore has seemed clear to me as President that the time has come to supplement and to implement the declaration of President Wilson by the further declaration that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is not a sacred obligation devolving upon the United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly processes of government in this hemisphere is the concern of each individual nation within its own borders first of all. It is only if and when the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress is that in such an event it becomes the joint concern of a whole continent in which we are all neighbors.

From that time on the Monroe Doctrine ceased to be a unilateral affair. It became a multilateral understanding, and from that day on it has moved more and more into that sphere.

This Nation follows neither a policy of conquest or imperialism, nor does it condone such a policy on the part of other large nations. The straightforward manner in which this Nation honored its agreement with the Philippines to assist in establishment of independence definitely militates against the possible supposition of an imperialistic policy.

There need be no suggestion of exploitation with regard to this proposal to extend economic aid to Greece. Nor should there be the insinuation that this Nation will thereby shoulder the burden of furthering the imperialistic policy of Great Britain. Both ideas are in derogation of this Nation's consistent policy. But it is quite consistent with the policy of this Nation to go to the aid of a smaller nation, to lend its aid in enabling that nation to maintain its political independence by solidifying its economic position. This is America at her very best. The nations of the world are neighbors today, and much more so now than in the time of President Taft we are the international trustees of the prosperity we have and the power we enjoy. We cannot make the world over, but we can advance that which is in the American interest whenever it is our right or our privilege to do so.

Mr. President, the good-neighbor policy, based upon the fundamental theories of the Monroe Doctrine, is not an affair which merely extends north and south; it is a policy which ultimately and actually extends east and west as well.

In relation to the feelings of our country toward the areas of Europe and Asia in which we have now become so interested, it is well worth while to emphasize what the Senator from Texas so well pointed out yesterday—that our action in going to the aid of Greece can be a new light on the road to the coming of a better world.

It is interesting also to note, in connection with what I said in the first part of my remarks, that if we separate, instead of mixing up the words "Russia," "communism," "single will," "proletarian dictatorship," and so forth, and confine ourselves to the real matters to be discussed, it is interesting to note how old the rivalry has been around the eastern part of the Mediterranean. We are all, of course, familiar with what Napoleon said about that section of the world, and I think everyone who has read a textbook on history and the conflict of nations realizes what it would mean if these states could not survive as independent entities.

I have said at other times, and I said at the beginning of these remarks, that I do not think our action in going to the aid of Greece and in giving aid to Turkey means the assumption of the responsibilities of any other nation. It does not mean the continuation, through adoption and use, of any policy practiced by any other nation. My whole thesis in this discussion has been devoted to showing that that which we are doing is consistent with what has been American policy from the very beginning and will remain American policy so long as we have America.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement concerning rivalry between Russia, Greece, and Turkey in the 1840's and the 1850's.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA, GREECE, AND TURKEY (1840–50)

When the western powers, under the influence of Canning, intervened on behalf of Greece in 1827 Russia proposed that, instead of creating one free Greece there should be created a number of independent Greek provinces—a proposal to which Canning replied: "The support of this country should never be given to any scheme for disposing of the Greeks without their consent."[1]

In 1833 Czar Nicholas I favored Greece as a possible heir to the European possessions of Turkey, although he was far from wishing a sudden dissolution of the Turkish Empire. "The Turkish Empire," said Nicholas to the Austrian Ambassador Count Ficquelmont on February 18, 1833, succeeded to the Greek Empire by means of conquest. Its roots do not go deep; the populations of the provinces of the old Greek Empire, even on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, are mostly Christian. When the Turkish Empire destroys itself by its own incapacity, why should we not try and reestablish a Greek Empire? There are the beginnings of a Greek state. I do not know King Otto; I do not know if he is able to support such a destiny. I see for my part nothing better to do." The Greek Empire was presumably to include the small kingdom of Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, and both shores of the Bosphorus.[2]

By 1840 Greece was abandoned by the Czar. His attitude in the forties to Greece and Turkey was best expressed in his conversation with Lord Aberdeen in 1844 during the Czar's visit to London. Nicholas said: "Turkey must fall to pieces. Nesselrode denies this, but I for my part am fully convinced of it. We cannot preserve its existence, no matter how hard we try. I do not want a single inch of Turkish soil, but I shall not permit any power to alienate Turkish territory. Among the powers there are only two which are able to play a truly tutelary role: Those bordering on Turkey. I do not want Constantinople. But if the Ottoman throne falls by its own fault, if it succumbs as a result of its lack of vitality, in a word, if the empire is dissolved, never shall I permit Constantinople to fall into the hands of England or France. Nor would I favor the reconstruction of the Byzantine Empire. It is Austria which, in the general interest, must fall heir to European Turkey. If the English, French, or any others wish to take Constantinople I will expel them; and I do not think expulsion would be a hazard, for I would be on the ground before either of these forces. Once in Constantinople I shall never leave!"[3]

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There was another time when Russia again figured in the economy of nations and in a conflict to which we were a party.

I have pointed out time and time again, and I now repeat that what I am saying is about Russia, not about communism, not about the "single will" theory of the state, or anything of the kind. Russia has a foreign policy which is based upon the position of Russia in the world. That policy of a nation with the population of 190,000,000 will find its ultimate fulfillment as surely as the policy of other great nations have found fulfillment. We cannot stop the destiny of 190,000,000 people, in trying to find a place for themselves in the sun.

I repeat what I said in committee, and it must never be lost sight of that until World War II, Russia—and I am talking about Russia, not about communism, not about the "single will," not about Stalinism or Leninism—has not won a war for more than a hundred years. All the previous wars resulted in what Russia deemed an unjust peace. She has been hedged around. She has sought a place in the sun. She has wanted an outlet into the Atlantic, an outlet into the Mediterranean, an outlet into the Indian Ocean, and an outlet into the Pacific Ocean. She has been deprived of all those things. It was glibly stated by French authorities when the League of Nations was set up that it was a League against Russia. The plan of French alliances was aimed to stop Russia. Japan was given her place after the last war, very much along the same principle, although Russia herself had collapsed. Russia did not have the outlet into the Atlantic, the outlet into the Mediterranean, the outlet into the Pacific, or the outlet into the Indian Ocean.

In World War II, Russia is a victor, one of the greatest victors from the

[1] G. F. Abbot, Turkey, Greece, and the Great Powers, London, 1916, p. 333.

[2] Harold Temperley, England and the Near East, London, 1936, pp. 68–69.

[3] Vernon John Puryear, England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844–56, Berkeley, 1931, pp. 48–49.

standpoint of accomplishing things, throwing off bonds, and allowing herself "elbow room," as she would call it. She has won the greatest victory of all victories. Ultimately, therefore, Russia will be in the Pacific, or have access to it; she will have free access to the Mediterranean, she will have free access to the Atlantic. She will be a party to an arrangement, which must be had, that will enable her to get into the Indian Ocean.

The day of buffer states is gone. The day of drawing up anti-Comintern pacts or their equivalent is gone. The notion of bottling up nations is gone, even if it should be attempted by military force or by agreement. It cannot be done now because Russia has two great allies, allies which know no boundaries.

Her concept of communism thrives upon distress, and upon conditions which grow, as they alway have and always will, whenever the four horsemen are loosed upon the earth. So her objectives will be accomplished in one way or another. She has been recognized as an equal by all the nations of the world, and responsibilities must be placed upon her.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have insert in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, showing Theodore Roosevelt's attitude toward Russia and Japan during the Russo-Japanese War 1904–05. I think the statement has a bearing upon what we are discussing today. The day of choosing sides merely for the purpose of talking is gone. The day has come when we must stand for principles because they are a part of life, a part of our national experience. In order to illustrate my point, I ask that the words of Theodore Roosevelt, as contained in the statement I present, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RUSSIA AND JAPAN DURING RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR, 1904–05

Prof. Edward H. Zabriskie, in his study "American-Russian Rivalry in the Far East, 1895–1914" (Philadelphia, 1946), calls the American policy during the Russo-Japanese war 1904–05, "Roosevelt's policy of balanced antagonisms."

In a letter to Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, dated December 27, 1904, Roosevelt expressed freely his unflattering opinion of the Russians and his doubts of the Japanese. "Russia, for a number of years," he wrote, "has treated the United States as badly as she had treated England, and almost as badly as she has treated Japan. Her diplomatists lied to us with brazen and contemptuous effrontery, and showed with cynical indifference their intention to organize China against our interest. * * * I should have liked to be friendly with her; but she simply would not permit it." * * * "The Japanese, as a government, treated us well. * * * But I wish I were certain that the Japanese at bottom did not lump Russians, English, Americans, Germans, all of us, simply as white devils inferior to themselves * * * to be treated politely only so long as would enable the Japanese to take advantage of our various national jealousies, and beat us in turn * * *." Roosevelt, summing up the matter at the end of the letter, decided the course for the United States was "to trust in the Lord and keep our powder dry and our eyes open."

However vigorous President Roosevelt was, especially in the early stages of hostilities, in expression of both his official and unofficial anti-Russian bias, he at no time favored Japanese predominance in Manchuria. His purpose, as shown at an early stage of the war, was to give Japan a free hand in Korea, to render her assistance, both morally and financially, in her fight to loosen the clutch of Russia in Manchuria, with its menace to American commercial and industrial interests, to prolong the war for a sufficient length of time to exhaust both Russia and Japan, and to leave a weakened Russia and a strengthened Japan facing each other at the end of the war, thereby equalizing the Manchurian balance of power.

In a conversation held with the German Ambassador von Sternburg on March 21, 1904, during the second month of the war, Roosevelt, as reported by the Ambassador, stated that "it is to our interest that the war between Russia and Japan should drag on, so that both powers may exhaust themselves as much as possible and that their geographic areas of friction should not be eliminated after the conclusion of peace; and that, as regards the limits of their spheres of influence they should remain opposed to each other in the same way as they were before the war. This will keep them on a war footing and reduce their appetite for other territories."

During the war Roosevelt's attitude toward Russia and Japan underwent several changes. At the beginning of the war Roosevelt's sympathies were with Japan. "Between ourselves—for you must not breathe it to anybody," he wrote to Theodore Roosevelt Jr., on February 10, 1904, "I was thoroughly well pleased with the Japanese victory, for Japan is playing our game."

Later in the war, when the balance of power which Roosevelt sought in the Far East was threatened by the sweeping Japanese victories, his sympathies shifted somewhat to Russia. He considered the "complete exclusion of Russia from the Pacific Ocean most undesirable in general, and particularly unwelcome to the United States." He was ready for the war to end and accepted the role of a peace-maker.

However, on August 29, 1905, the day of the final session of the Portsmouth Conference, he wrote to W. W. Rockhill: "I was pro-Japanese, but after my experience with the Peace Commissioners I am far stronger pro-Japanese than ever."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I repeat what I said previously respecting the dilemma in which America finds herself. The American dilemma today is that we find ourselves standing as the leader of the democratic forces of the world, and also as one of the chief architects of an imposing international structure intended as the bulwark of peace. In this structure the opposing systems of democratic and totalitarian systems are supposed to work together. The clash of these opposing systems is the chief source of weakness in the foundation we are helping to build for the United Nations Organization.

But because the United Nations Organization is young and weak is not an excuse for using it as a refuge for isolationistic thinking. It is intended only as the working ground for the internationalist. At the present time, however, the issue raised over the proposal to extend economic aid to Greece demonstrates that it is not enough for us to belong to the United Nations and to participate in furthering the purpose of that organization. Our future in the world neighborhood is dependent in large part on the proper functioning of the United Nations Organization, but our membership therein need not preclude our continuing to act as an individual Nation at a proper time and for a proper cause.

We are in a period of profound struggle. A serious contest of ideas is being promoted by apparently incompatible systems of government. However, these clashing forces have never met before. If we were to convince ourselves that the struggle we are now engaged in is the only kind of war we are going to fight for years to come we could adapt ourselves better for taking it in our stride and give greater effect to the work for peace.

We in the United States may be too much afraid of communism, Russia, and war—in the sense that too much fear usually inspires misdirected thinking and unwise action. Today, more than ever before, we need careful thinking to make our determined course of action proper in the national interest, which must be coincident with propriety in the international interest.

To repeat, Mr. President, the world is still at war. There has not been a single treaty consummated. We are passing through the aftermath of the shooting war and into the midst of the talking and ideological-conflict war. American unity is, therefore, the prime necessity. To fail to follow the leadership of our President at this time would be a backward step for America to take. What we do must be done in accordance with American policy. Ideological controversy is probably the most striking.

According to one Communist, the progress of America in her one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years of growth, was too rapid for stability. Yet he speaks of a new measure of time of which the world must become conscious; thousands of years must be seen as an hour or two in the new "rhythm of time." At the same time, he speaks of the history of Russia as having covered a hundred years in the last decade or two in her efforts to catch up with the advancement of America and the rest of the Western World. He says that during this period Russia not only caught up with America and the western civilization but also developed the technique which will eventually pervade the whole earth and bring world stability, but that this stability will only be brought about through the processes of another war, the constructive war, which according to him, we must now prepare ourselves to execute. Those are the words of the most idealistic writer I know of concerning the present mission of communism in the world. Can it be forgotten so soon that the world has already fought one war to end wars, only to be followed by another war within a single generation, a war instigated and waged by an ideology permitting the domination of a single will.

There can be no peace and stability in the world unless there is a desire for peace and stability in the hearts and minds of men. There can be no peace unless there is faith in the ideal of peace. There can be no peace unless there is faith in the human race that it has the

potentiality and ability through proper education and development of ideals to produce a whole world-citizenry with a social conscience. A faith which admits that necessity is its only law is nothing more nor less than the old forced salvation idea, which, from the beginning of time, has been the great provocator of war; it is nothing more than the means for the establishment of the single will, of which the world so recently grew weary. Faith in mankind based upon the power of the machine leaves the spirit of man cold, and that thing we call the milk of human kindness will be skimmed to a very pale hue under its influence. What is the difference between the caste mentality and caste spirit of India, and the mass mentality and mass spirit idea of Russia, if individualism in the mass mentality and mass spirit is denied expression. Limitations, other than those endowed by nature, would remain the same. Single-will dominance will always prevail until mankind, individually and collectively, learns the technique of molding many wills into a single wish. That is the theory upon which our Government operates—liberation, and then understanding.

The process of deliberation and discussion which brought into existence the greatest country in the world, uniting 48 small States into one great unit, creating a peace-loving nation, a country sought as a haven for the oppressed peoples of the earth, a nation abhorring war since its inception, yet a nation which surprised the world with her ability and speed to wage a successful war against an aggressor enemy, is decried by Communists because they claim that such a process is too far removed from human misery and hardships. Yet, through this process, America established the highest living standards for the greatest number of people anywhere in the world. America does not yet claim to have reached her zenith in growth and development, but history gives us America as the classic example of a land where men have worked out a technique of living in peace with one another. Differences we have it is true, but at least one does not see tanks in our streets, nor their design for immediate production in our factories, nor does one hear the roar of gunfire the day after an election to obliterate the man who had the strength of his convictions.

To say that idealism has no place in human affairs, that we are weary of dreamers and idealists, is not only folly but stops short any hope for a better race. If America had ignored the force of idealism we would have still been chasing individual Japanese in foxholes and burning them up man by man, and we would never have obtained a surrender from Japan. That is, surrender definitely came as a result of the recognition of the fact that they, as a nation, were bad in having forsaken their past ideals in becoming followers of false leaders. Surrender in Japan, despite the fact that the Emperor said it came as a result of the atomic bomb, could never have come without the unity of the autonomous generals in the field. It came about through our efforts in psychological warfare, constantly sending radio messages to the people of Japan themselves, giving them the truth about themselves—that they had betrayed their heritage in their adoption of apostate leaders.

As I see it, we are indeed staying with first principles, probably returning to basic American theory; rushing, as it were, to the defense of democratic freedom and for the preservation of dollar democracy in the world. Liberty without property is a vain hope. To have and to hold are the bases of true liberty. There may be a mingling of political thought and economic theory, but it is a healthful mingling. From it all the earth may have a new baptism of freedom. In this battle we must win. Freedom, liberty, and private property are the stakes. America, therefore, cannot stand by without going back on her destined leadership in the world.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	Myers	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to say a very few words in order to keep the record clear, because I think if we are going to clarify this question, we must all mean the same thing when we use certain words.

I have noted that there seems to be a good deal of confusion about the word "military." I have heard some Senators in the last few days tell us they favor relief aid to Greece but that they are opposed to military aid, as though relief aid is necessarily good but when it has the word "military" in it, it is necessarily bad.

So I think we must have an understanding as to what we mean by the word "military." If by that word we mean the setting up of a force consisting of large units which are capable of undertaking combat operations on an international scale, we mean something which can be very dangerous indeed. But if, on the other hand, by the words "military aid" we mean the equipping of Greek personnel, which is equivalent to a constabulary, so that it can keep order, put down banditry, prevent highway robbery, and other forms of illicit interference with vital communications, and patrol the borders, we mean something beneficial and, incidentally, something without which no relief at all is possible.

It is my understanding that the military aid to Greece which is contemplated in this bill consists entirely of furnishing equipment to the Greek Army and teaching them how to use it—largely a supply function. I understand that there is no training whatever in the accepted sense of the word "military"—no maneuvers, no field exercises, no tactical problems, and nothing which in any way suggests large units or combat operations. When we see a group of uniformed men armed with pistols or rifles going down the road in an armored car, we are undoubtedly seeing a military activity. But if those men are protecting a convoy which is bringing milk and other foodstuffs to women and children, we are seeing something beneficial. On the other hand, if they are the advance elements of a battalion engaged in hostile activities, then we are seeing something entirely different.

Secretary Patterson, in his statement to the committee on March 24, pointed out, for one thing, that about one-half of the Greek requirements would consist of civilian type supplies. He stated:

> The proposed assistance will enable the Greek Government to procure equipment and supplies not obtainable in their own country, as well as assistance in the training and instruction of key personnel in operation and maintenance of equipment so procured. The material required is principally repairs and gasoline for airplanes, weapons and ammunition, vehicles and fuel, clothing and food. In money value, weapons and ammunition account for about one-third; vehicles, fuel, clothing, and food for another one-third; the balance would go for such items as engineering supplies, communications equipment (such as radios, telephones, and wire), mules and horses for use in the mountains, and miscellaneous supplies.

To be specific, when it comes to training, our American military personnel in Greece will instruct the Greeks largely in the use of signal equipment—"the walkie-talkie" and all other types of radio equipment, which, as all who have been in the service know, is usually the most complicated thing that the soldier has to learn. It would be my guess that three-fourths of their time would be taken up with that kind of instruction.

There may be some instruction, of course, in maintenance of vehicles and in the mechanical handling of weapons.

So far as the Navy is concerned, Secretary Forrestal, on the same day, said this:

> As regards Greece, preliminary departmental studies based on the limited information now available indicate that Greek naval needs will consist principally of certain types of amphibious vessels such as tank landing ships, personnel boats, tugs, and other minor

craft. There also appears to be a requirement for minesweepers and mine-sweeping gear to sweep mines from coastal waters to clear the way for coastal shipping needed to support the Greek economy.

It is perfectly evident from that quotation that there is nothing at all in such a naval contribution which could in any way involve offensive operations of any kind. It would be purely supplementary to the constabulary activity which is what we mean when we talk about military aid in connection with Greece.

We can, therefore, safely conclude that there is nothing whatever in this bill which involves the United States in combat operations in Greece or which by any stretch of the imagination could put Greece in a position to undertake offensive international action.

Now let us consider Turkey for a moment. In the case of Turkey also a great part of the American contribution will be in civilian type supplies, such as transportation equipment, telephone and road-building equipment, and materials for the improvement of railway and port facilities. All those things have military value, but they also have economic and general value. Some weapons which are surplus over here, such as antiaircraft artillery, may be made available; but, of course, none of that can possibly be construed as American participation in the formation of large units trained for offensive combat operations on an international scale.

Mr. President, I have already made a general statement on this subject, so I shall not further detain the Senate by another general statement at this time, particularly in view of the fact that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has covered the subject so admirably and so completely. But I wish to point out that we always run into trouble whenever in considering international policies we try to draw a sharp line between what is political and what is military. It is like trying to cut a pail of water in two with a knife, because the fact is that the two factors are constantly merging. There were times in the Army when I felt strongly that our professional soldiers were not sufficiently aware of this inter-relationship and tried constantly to treat the military as something utterly separated and unrelated.

I remember an instance during the war which illustrates this point. An order had been given to fall back, and one of our ablest staff officers had proceeded to draw on the map the exact line to which the troops were to withdraw. The line was drawn in accordance with the best military thought, taking advantage of natural obstacles, winding along rivers, using the cover of forests, the high ground afforded by mountains, and the strong holding positions made possible by using defiles and mountain passes. Another officer, one who was much less well informed from a military standpoint, watched the line being drawn on the map, and noticed that a withdrawal to that line meant that a great and famous city which had been conquered a few weeks earlier would have to be abandoned to the enemy. That city was a symbol to the French people, who for years, when Germany occupied it, bemoaned its loss. It was also somewhat of a symbol in the reverse sense to Germany. For the Germans to reenter that city would have far-reaching effects in depressing French morale and in reviving German spirit—all of which would be damaging to the Allied cause. When that was pointed out to the professional staff officer who was drawing the line, he remarked that those were political considerations which should not have a place in a decision of that character; that he knew what the best defensive line was; that he had selected it on the map; that for us not to evacuate the famous city would leave a difficult salient, and so forth, and so forth.

That was an instance in which the political and military factors were merged. If the city had been allowed to revert to the Germans, incalculable military harm would have been done. The general, a wise man, decided to hold the city. A few weeks later the advance began and was never stopped.

It is true, of course, that the pending bill is not an ordinary relief bill. It is not a bill for economic revival. I think that "strategic" is as good a word as any to describe it, if we had to describe it in one word.

It is undoubtedly not the last action of its kind which we may be called upon to take. We shall have to meet future challenges to our security as they arise; and I trust that we shall not only have the intelligence and the ability to do so, but that we shall also have the material resources which are necessary to preserve our national existence in this troubled world. We are already a "have not" nation in many important respects. Our wealth and our power are not inexhaustible, and we must husband our resources.

Our President pro tempore, the able Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was wholly right, in my opinion when he said that this action does not constitute a new doctrine, in the sense of the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe. In this country we have always been interested in our own self-preservation, just as we have always been interested in bringing about conditions in which all nations can live their lives in peace and freedom, or, as the President said in his message, "a life free from coercion."

After all, Mr. President, I am speaking of the Mediterranean. The marines landed at Derna, in Libya, in 1805. So there is nothing alarmingly new about the pending proposal. It is one thing, however, to proclaim these purposes; it is another thing to serve them intelligently.

I hope that in the future we shall not be caught by surprise and forced into action without enough time for full deliberation.

I trust that our American diplomats will not interpret this policy as meaning that the United States automatically joins and supports any force in Europe, no matter how degraded or squalid it may be, provided only that it is anti-communist, because, very frankly, Mr. President, these elements are often just as obnoxious—although from another standpoint—as the communists themselves. We would certainly be doing our country a very bad turn indeed if we were to get it lined up with the forces of European reaction whose cynicism, intellectual brutality and indifferences to human values is as great as that of the Communists.

Mr. President, I think Americans must always be "pro" rather than "anti." We are a constructive people. That is how we have achieved what we have achieved, and we must always approach foreign problems in a constructive spirit.

Finally, I hope that in the future we will seek to achieve permanent results by our expenditure of money and effort as the result of forethought and far-reaching plans, and not be constantly surprised by a succession of expensive rescue parties in which we simply pour money down a rat hole and achieve no basic improvement. For example, I believe that in western Europe there are many people who would like to see some sort of integration among the nations of that unhappy region. There are some who would undoubtedly go as far as the Senator from Arkansas who, in his able speech, came out categorically for a United States of Europe. There are surely many more who would favor a less overt and comprehensive type of integration.

It would be my hope that, without, of course, forcing anything, our good offices could be used to encourage such a step, without which no basic revival of economic life in Europe is possible. I give that as an illustration of how we might achieve concrete gains as a result of our effort, and not merely throw good money after bad. There is not sufficient money in the world, and there is certainly not sufficient money in the United States, to pursue such a course.

By being foresighted, and by keeping ouselves strong, we can have some real hope for the future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask my colleague one question which I have been very anxious to ask some member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. At this time, as my colleague has just stated, the Members of the Congress, and perhaps the people of the country, have been caught by surprise at the speed of the action of our President. One reason, and a very fundamental reason, which influences me in voting for the pending bill, as I expect to do, is that it will maintain the prestige of our country in the eyes of the other nations of the world.

My question is, Is there any method, either formal or informal, by which it is possible for individual Members of Congress to discuss with those in authority in the executive branch such a question as that now before the Senate before, so to speak, it is sprung on the Congress?

This is not a question of declaring war, it is a question of action in peacetime, and it seems to me that it would be far wiser for the Executive, if it were possible, in some way, formally or informally, to

get the advice of leading Members of Congress before action is taken.

I should like to ask my colleague if that question was discussed at all in the committee, or if he has any opinion as to how such a course could be followed?

Mr. LODGE. I think that question has been discussed a great deal. I believe there is a general feeling that in situations affecting foreign policy we in Congress are often placed on the horns of a dilemma, and have only one of two choices, either to go along and support the President, or to repudiate him before the whole world—and the latter, of course, to me is unthinkable.

Mr. President, I have never liked to see this country or its representatives in a position where they have only two alternatives. I think that is one of the vices inherent in the European conditions, namely, that nations there can go in only two directions. It is like troops caught in a tunnel. They can go forward or back, and the machine guns will get them whichever end they come out. In this country we can go around, or in any other way we wish. My colleague has put his finger on an important point. It it not satisfactory for us to be on the horns of a dilemma, as I think we are somewhat in this case.

While I am not well-advised on this point, I think the President might well take into his confidence the senior Members of this body, and I think he has done so in some cases; indeed, it is a matter of public knowledge that that has been done in many cases. I share my colleague's hope that it will be done, and that the American people will be left as much freedom of action as possible.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LUCAS. Before I propound my inquiry to the able Senator, I desire to congratulate him on going into the military and naval phases of the bill, because there is no Member of the Senate who is better qualified to discuss those two features than is the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, one condition that exists today is that Great Britain has between ten and fifteen thousand troops in Greece at the present time. Under the program laid down by Great Britain, she being unable financially to rehabilitate herself, as I understand, she will soon withdraw all those troops. Does the Senator understand that to be the proposal?

Mr. LODGE. That is the plan.

Mr. LUCAS. The British have had at least ten or fifteen thousand troops, and probably more, in Greece since the war closed in Europe, and she had them there for a purpose. Great Britain proposes now to recall those troops from Greece, and what we are proposing is to send 40 or 50 or 100 technicians to take the place of all those troops. Is that what the able Senator understands the situation to be?

Mr. LODGE. Broadly, yes. The plan is that the Greeks themselves shall take over the burden of keeping order.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; the Greeks do have an army at the present time, and all we propose to do is to give the Greek Army certain military equipment which will aid them in keeping order in Greece.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I wish to reiterate, and which I think exceedingly important, is this: Great Britain has had her soldiers in Greece before and since the close of the war. Russia has never protested, at least so far as I know. Now we do not propose to send any combat troops into Greece to take the places of British combat soldiers who are now there, but all we propose to do is to supply certain military equipment to Greece, and to send certain technicians there to see that the military equipment is properly operated and understood, so that if we should send a tank some inept soldier would not drive it into a tree or into a creek.

Mr. LODGE. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is planned to send any tanks.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely used that as an example.

Mr. LODGE. I think the largest weapon planned to be sent in is mortars, but of course the Greeks will need some instruction as to the manipulation of those weapons, otherwise they will be blowing their own hands off.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator, and I used the tank only as an example. I do not know what is to be sent to Greece, but if whatever is sent there is new and modern, and the Greek soldier does not know anything about the use of such equipment, it would obviously be foolish to send it without at the same time sending someone to provide instruction as to how to use it.

Mr. LODGE. Most of the training is going to be in radio. I do not know whether the Senator comes to the Senate Office Building in the morning in a cab equipped with a radio. Of course, radio installation is very useful to a police force, constabulary, or any military group that is trying to put down a disturbance of the peace. Most of the training is to be in radio.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his last contribution. I was not certain exactly as to the purpose for which the technicians were to be used. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that we are sending a very few men, and no combat troops, and that as we send technicians into Greece to operate the new military equipment, the British are at the same time withdrawing at least 10,000 or 15,000 combat troops that have been there from the beginning, and that during all of this time I have never heard Russia make one protest because of the presence of British troops.

I do not view this as many people do. In my opinion, it is not at all a step toward war. In my humble opinion, it is a step toward peace. What is the alternative if this step is not taken? The alternative is to permit, not Russia, perhaps, but communism, let us say, to go into Greece and Turkey, and allow Greece and Turkey to sink in the communistic mire. When they do that all of Europe and Asia will go down with them.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator. I think he has made a good point about the withdrawal of the British troops.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to say that I have great respect for the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, because his opinion is based not only upon study but upon his personal experience with these people while he was in the military service and his knowledge of their countries. I was greatly interested in the statement made by the Senator, which seems to me to have been unique in this debate. As I have heard the speeches made, it seems to me that in nearly every speech it has been said that there is a possibility of achieving democratic stability and democratic government because of achieving economic stability. I think I just heard the Senator say that in the long run there is not much possibility of achieving economic stability without achieving democratic stability. I believe there is a great danger that any money spent will go down the rat hole unless there is the possibility that democratic stability will be achieved.

I should like to ask the Senator, from his own experience and study, and from his own knowledge of these countries and his service with their people during the war, and from the hearings which have been had, if he is convinced that in Greece there is a real desire and a real effort on the part of the people and of the government to work toward and to achieve democratic stability and democratic institutions?

Mr. LODGE. I believe there is a real desire to create conditions under which a certain minimum standard of decent living will be possible. Of course, a country which has been completely ruined, as Greece was by the Germans, with all its bridges out and every conceivable installation destroyed and its people hungry, is not at first going to be so much interested in democracy or in the niceties of life as in trying to grab something to eat, and there will be a dog-eat-dog attitude. So the first thing to be done in order to make democracy possible is to bring about such a state of things that the people will be able to obtain food.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that, but I understood that in the course of his remarks the Senator also argued that as another condition there must be an underlying desire and effort to achieve democratic institutions.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I think that is so, and I believe we must try to use our good offices to promote that desire. I was referring particularly to the crazy quilt of Europe, all the countries speaking different languages and hating one another, which has already caused World War I and World War II. Like one who in rebuilding an old tenement house constructs the same kind of firetrap, we

run the risk of the same old fire if we do not try to work with the people in Europe who are undertaking at least to break down the economic walls and to bring about a measure of unity which will enable them to have an economic life that may possibly support them. If that is not done, then we shall be pouring money down a rat hole, in my opinion.

Mr. COOPER. Then, let me ask the Senator another question. From evidence which came before the committee in the course of the hearings, does the Senator have any assurance that the people of Greece and the Government of Greece actually desire and are working toward a live democratic institution?

Mr. LODGE. We heard our Ambassador to Greece, we heard some other very well qualified witnesses, and I think I report correctly when I say they gave me the impression that the Greeks would like to work toward that end. They cannot do it alone. They cannot even organize. If we were merely to supply the goods, the personnel of those countries has been so decimated that they could hardly organize delivery. They want our help, but I am convinced that they do want to move in the direction of the kind of living we have here, where there is respect for individual rights and respect for the integrity of the human being. I think they want to move in that direction.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator will agree with me that the evidence shows that those who were in charge of the elections in Greece last year have said definitely that in their opinion the elections which resulted in the installation of the present regime were free elections. But, be that as it may, the Senator knows, as everyone else knows, that liberty was practically born in Greece. She has been a liberty-loving country throughout the ages, and if there is any place in the world outside the United States of America where it would be possible to build a democracy, in my humble opinion, it is Greece. All the Greeks want is the opportunity to go forward again, to rehabilitate their condition. As the able Senator has said, those who have been in Greece know what the Nazi army did to Greece and to her economy and her transportation system, in fact, to her way of life. She is struggling to get on her feet and to become a democracy again. It is my humble opinion that if the Greek people can have the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves through the medium of this proposed loan, administered under American supervision, they will again move forward along the path of liberty and democracy according to American ideas of those terms.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is an interesting observation. I shall not say anything either in extenuation or in derogation of the present regime in Greece, but I certainly agree with what the Senator says about the Greek people. In the population of Massachusetts there are many who who were born in Greece. I know some of them very well. I have great faith in their love of liberty and love of democracy and in the high price they set on human rights. I have noticed that in the Old World when a country has experienced the horrors of a dreadful war, with its destruction, devastation, and death, inevitably there ensue poverty and bitterness, and the country is quickly split up into two factions, neither of which gives one a great deal about which to enthuse; but as things get better, the constructive forces of the community usually get under way. I hope that will happen in this instance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask my colleague one other question which perhaps may have already been answered. As a member of the committee, who listened to the testimony before the committee, does my colleague entertain any feeling that there is involved a moral or an implied commitment to afford military or economic or any other kind of aid to any other country in any other section of the world, if we now commit ourselves to extend assistance to Greece and Turkey? In other words, will not each case be considered by itself afresh?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly there is no commitment at all to go outside the terms of the bill, and I do not think there are any hidden meanings in the bill. Every Senator must decide for himself, but so far as I am concerned this particular case stands on its own merits, and other cases that come along will have to stand or fall on their own merits. That has been our policy right along.

Take the question of military missions. We have sent military missions to Latin America, to the Philippines, and to China. We have not made any classification of places or areas where we would or where we would not send them. I think that is the realistic, intelligent way to go about it.

So far as I am concerned, this is not a doctrine in the sense of the Monroe Doctrine at all. This is a continuation of our effort toward self-preservation, a continuation of our effort to help create world conditions in which people who respect the Christian concept of the dignity of man will have a chance to live.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I plan to vote for the loans to Greece and Turkey. They can be and should be effective in pushing the possibility of war farther and farther away. Those who deny the possibility of war are living in a dream world—a dream world from which twice within the memory of every man on the floor of this House we have had rude awakenings. We must not dream again. We must keep awake. We must be alertly awake. We must be actively awake. The proposal we are considering requires alertness and gives an opportunity for highly useful activity.

While the loans will have my vote—and I believe a vote of the majority of my fellow Members of the Senate—the support which we give them should not be uncritical. Our restraining doubts and our hopeful suggestions should, both of them, be fully expressed. Not to express them would be unfair to the Chief Executive who, by our Constitution, is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. Should he fail properly to estimate the temper and state of opinion of the legislative branches of the Government, he might well find himself at some point asking for authority which would be denied him. That is the negative service rendered by a free expression of opinion on this floor. In addition, there is the positive service which can be given to the future development of policy by the expression here of divergent opinions derived from wide ranges of experience.

The administration does initiate and execute foreign policy. For much of that foreign policy responsibility is shared with the Senate. At other policy levels the responsibility is shared with both Houses of the Congress. While recognizing this I, for one, find it difficult to go all the way with the senior Senator from Michigan in his masterly presentation of this undertaking to the Senate 2 days ago. If I understood him correctly, he was suggesting a degree of subservience to administrative policy which was almost complete. He compared this particular situation with a request from the President that the Congress vote a declaration of war.

I submit that the two situations are not the same. A declaration of war comes after a long series of events of which the public has been continuously kept apprised. More and more the whole mass of citizens of the Nation have seen the inevitability of war in advance of the declaration. In our most recent declaration the steady build-up of public support was given a sudden definiteness by the event of Pearl Harbor. That crystallized a sentiment which already was becoming more and more definite.

This situation is different. We are embarking on a long, new adventure. We have set out to achieve peace actively, rather than enjoy it passively and precariously. We must shed on this long, new adventure every ray of light which can be gathered from every source. Those rays of light must be directed onto the dim, difficult path which lies ahead.

What is the situation we face? Putting it briefly, we are trying to halt the progress of a new totalitarian power bent on expanding its rule to the furthest limits possible and using communism as its principal means for so doing. This great power is telling its own people, and has been telling them for years past, that communism and free enterprise cannot live peacefully together on our globe. The limits of its expansionist ideals are the uttermost bounds of the earth.

Communism is not the primary enemy. It is only a tool for world domination; but it is a dangerous and effective tool. The possessor of this tool is seeking domination, so far as possible, by political rather than military means. Communism is the inexpensive, pervasive, destructive infection by which the great totalitarian power seeks to effect its ends.

Communism, as practiced by the great country of Russia, has undergone radical changes in the period between the two

wars. It would not now, in fact, be recognized as communism by the old-time leaders who developed the doctrine. Old-time communism went out when Trotsky was banished from Russia. What is left is a national socialism of the type best adapted to military offense and defense. It is the ideal form of government for a militant nation.

What happened when Trotsky was exiled was shown by the experience in Russia of engineers employed by the company with which I was for many years connected until I resigned to take my seat on this floor. In the Trotsky-Lenin days our machine tools shipped into Russian plants were operated at an incredibly low degree of efficiency. Our engineers, sent over there to train Russian supervisors and workmen in their use, found that only a small percentage of the average workman's time was devoted to production. Every man in the plant was concerned with production but he had another important concern as well. He was a member of a committee which ran its part of an industrial establishment.

The problems of running such an establishment were very great. Decisions and policies had to be made by the workmen themselves. Hours of oratory and endless discussions were required for an agreement. Meantime the machinery stood idle.

Our men soon learned to use women operators on their machines. The women were patient, strong, and tireless. For generations they had listened to the endless conversations of their menfolks, while going about their work in the house or on the farm. They continued to go patiently on with their work in the factory, and were fully the intellectual equals of their more voluble mates.

Trotsky was exiled and conditions were changed. In an astonishingly short time the old industrial organization of Russia was reshuffled so that it was directed from the top. From the 5-year plan in Moscow the orders went out to the heads of different industries. From there they went to the individual production plants. From the head of each the word was passed down to superintendents, foremen, subformen, and wage-earners. This is national socialism. It is more effective than the old communism. That old communism is retained for the export market and is not practiced at home.

Now let us look next at the situation in Greece. We have here a people who throughout their history have been willing to fight for their freedom. Their history is one which the world must admire, whether it be that of ancient times or the history of the last century and a half. The passion for freedom in Greece is a fierce passion.

Greece made, on our side of the war, proportionately greater sacrifices than those made by any other of our allies. She fought on her boundaries. She fought on her beaches. She fought on her plains. She fought from her rugged and inaccessible mountain ranges. She asked for and received no reward in new increases in territory. She fought for her own freedom and for the cause of freedom the world over.

The war ended and she found herself impoverished and disorganized. Much of her resistance had been underground in the cities and concealed in the ravines and caverns of the mountains. These groups, separated from each other, had hard work coming to a common understanding or working peacefully together with each other when freedom was achieved. There is nothing strange in this. It was the well-nigh universal experience in invaded and looted nations. A strong endeavor was made to find out the will of the people of Greece. Elections were held there about a year ago to choose a government which would bring internal peace and order. The elections were held by secret ballot under the administration of a foreign commission of which we were members. The present Greek Government was elected by a large majority, with only the Communists refusing to vote.

Last fall a second election was held to determine whether the Government should operate as a republic or as a constitutional monarchy. The voting again revealed a heavy majority, and this time for the monarchy. In this election the Communists did not abstain. Much has been written and more has been said with regard to the fairness of this election. It was not held under the supervision of outsiders. It was held under the observation of other nationals. There are reports that the ballots were taken under conditions which rendered secrecy difficult. It is reported, for example, that voting for the monarchy could be done by making a simple mark, while the longer time required to write out an alternative form marked the voter as not having voted for the monarchy. It is also reported that the ballots were required to be put in envelopes, the walls of which were so nearly transparent that the will of the voter could be plainly observed. Yet with all of this, it is not unfair to assume that there was a strong sentiment for a constitutional monarchy.

It is not true that the people of Greece have had foisted upon them an undemocratic form of government. The form is democratic. The king reigns, but does not rule. It closely resembles the British model. So far as the form of government is concerned, the people of Greece can make it do anything which they agree on as being what they want.

The form does not assure the reality. Had the elections turned out in favor of a republic, the opportunity for that republic to become an oligarchical tyranny or a police ridden and controlled state was just as possible—no less, no more—than is the case with the constitutional monarchy which was selected. Let us cast aside without hesitation the assumption that the form of the Greek Government precludes the freedom of the Greek people.

The trouble lies not in the form of government but in external and internal conditions which are the aftermath of the war.

Guerrillas infest the northern border—the mountainous range which separates the fertile fields of Macedonia from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. No one can doubt that these guerrillas are inspired by the Russian-dominated countries in their rear. There can be little doubt that they are financed and equipped by them. There can be little doubt that the intention is to disrupt the production of the most important agricultural region of the country and to extend the poverty and confusion which that country is suffering from, so that communism and its supporting great power may penetrate ever deeper and deeper into the unhappy lives of the Grecian people.

But there is another group of guerrillas who cannot so easily be classified as being supported and inspired from external sources. These bands control the central mountains. East of them are the plains of Thessaly, the only other rich agricultural region of the country. The evidence is that these bands are disaffected Greeks, not primarily or originally Communists but susceptible of becoming so. These bands are the remnants of irregular troops whom the whole combined might of Italy and Germany was unable to subdue throughout the long years of the war.

The endeavor to assimilate them has been put in military terms. That endeavor has reduced the democratic form of government of Greece to a close approach to what may be called a "police state," in which the rule is not by the duly constituted authorities but by a large police force acting on its own and directed from a centralized and irresponsible authority.

Almost all the news from Greece sustains this point of view. Reference may be had, for instance, to the article on page 6 of the New York Times for Tuesday, April 8. Raymond Daniell, a correspondent in Greece of that journal, writes:

> Greece has the appearance of a democracy, but the appearance is deceptive. It would not be fair to describe her as a police state, but under the stress of domestic crisis and foreign threats a large measure of the freedom associated with a democratic state has been suspended.
>
> But while the major leaders are unmolested, lesser persons who are followers, including many who are not Communists, are persecuted, terrorized, and deported without trial, and sometimes even killed. Not even liberal newspapers, let alone Communist ones, can be distributed in some areas where rightist sympathies are strong.
>
> Under the security decrees now in force, open-air public meetings are prohibited without a permit, and citizens can be deported without trial on police denunciation. There is no protection against search and seizure without a warrant. The security police, which functions under Gen. Napoleon Zervas, Minister of Public Order, has used methods reminiscent of the Gestapo.
>
> Members of the Government publicly deplore such conditions but assert that they are necessary for the present for the security of the state. However, the fires of civil strife are being fanned by excesses of both sides, including the extreme right wing, which seems to have immunity from punishment even when it resorts to murder, as it did recently in Gythion, where a rightist band, as a reprisal for the killing of a rightist leader, raided a jail and slaughtered thirty-two prisoners who were suspected of being Communists.
>
> The spirit of intolerance seems to be increasing. The Government seems to tend to the belief that all who are not actively for it are its enemies. Consequently, the civil service is being purged of all dissenters,

as the Army and the gendarmerie have been. According to Themistocles Sophoulis, Liberal leader, officers have begun to dictate what newspapers their soldiers can read.

Our task is complicated and difficult. We cannot indefinitely support the Greek population by donations of the necessities of life. They must be put in the way of gaining their own living through the normal processes of agriculture, industry, and trade. This they cannot do until they are free to live and work on their land and in their villages. This in turn they cannot do until they are assured of security from attack or arrest in their homes and on their land.

What makes the task difficult is that in the present political atmosphere there is no hope this can be accomplished by arms alone, except at a cost and with a fullness of military action on our part which we should not be willing to undertake. We might pour into the military situation many times the amount of the loan which is sought. There would still be no peace, no production, no relief from distress, no protection from the communism which thrives in distress and no resulting safety for us or the rest of the world.

Is not our task of another sort than the simply described provision of relief and military assistance? Will we not have to interpose in the government of Greece? With the enormous good will which is our greatest asset in that unhappy country can we not bring about a cessation of hostilities between the Greeks themselves, leaving only the outside disturbers of the people on the northern border to be dealt with in a military way? We must change the attitude of the police. We must seek to heal rather than to liquidate. We must see to it that the amnesty offered is a real amnesty. We must insist that the Government be composed of officials representing the whole of Greece and working together for its best interests.

We must make these internal reforms the price of our assistance. Our right to do so rests on the fact that our assistance has been asked for. Should we fail in effecting these internal reforms, we must recognize that our main task is beyond our powers. The promise of our administration that we will not concern ourselves with the political conditions of Greece is a promise based on shallow and untenable optimism. Wednesday, the Greek representative to the United Nations made constructive suggestions looking toward this necessity.

This undertaking is the testing point of our ability to intervene successfully in the affairs of the world for the good of the world. This testing ground presents no difficulties which are not present elsewhere. It has the great advantage of a population which looks up to us with faith and hope. If we fail here, we can win nowhere.

This leads us to another serious thought. Should we undertake the support of Turkey at this time? The case is by no means so clear. While her military organization is a heavy drain on her resources, she is not economically in anything like as serious a situation as that in which Greece finds herself.

Furthermore, and most important of all, there is no active band of invaders hanging on her borders, making forays into her thickly populated areas and threatening, at a moment's sign of weakness, to overrun the country.

Our support of Greece is logical and necessary. Our position with the United Nations in rendering that support, if given along the lines here suggested, is correct in every particular. It is made doubly so by the suggestion made by the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, that the United Nations hold a veto over our activities there.

Is the case anywhere near so clear so far as Turkey is concerned? Instead of appearing in the defense of a weak country actually in the initial process of invasion, we find ourselves furnishing military support to a nation which is not being openly threatened. This, to my mind, comes dangerously near the border line of provocative military action. This is a dangerous invasion of a responsibility which we are morally bound to leave under the authority of the United Nations.

In view of this, should we not make clear our intentions in the Greek situation, indicate that they are applicable to the Turkish situation should similar occasions arise, and then hold ourselves in readiness to act, instead of rushing forward in advance of the actual necessity? If we do so, our record is that much more clear and, in the long run, the effects of our policies will be that much more sure and less costly. I leave this thought with the administration.

What about Russia? We are placing ourselves in open opposition to her. We must continue to do so on grounds which have the approval of that part of the world which is not dominated by Russia. She has certain great advantages over us in the pursuit of her policies. A principal one is the cheapness of her strategy in terms of money, material, and men. It is far cheaper to support guerrillas and foment disorder than it is to put down insurrection and establish peace and prosperity. She can cause far more trouble in the world as a whole, at far less expense, than we must incur in curing a single trouble spot which she has generated. It is the expensiveness of the direct action on our part which leads to the great necessity for us to deal so far as possible with the intangibles, with the methods of government, with the reservoirs of good will—the methods which are here proposed for dealing with Greece. Only thus can we compete in putting out the fires which even an impoverished Russia so easily can start.

It is also possible for us, at little expense, to organize an effective counterpart to Russia's pervasive ideological infiltration. We have no quarrel with the Russian people. Our interests do not clash. Our interests are identical. We both want peace. They do not know that we want peace. They are not allowed to know that we want peace. They are not allowed to know that we have no policies, no projects, no ambitions for anything that is not equally to their advantage and ours.

Rather than putting all of our defensive and offensive preparation into military terms, let us practice something of the economy of means which the Russians use to generate so much trouble for the world. Let us find a similar economy of means for reducing the hostility—for putting further and further off the prospects of war.

One means for doing this, at a minute fraction of the cost of military preparation, is by means of the radio. In the last months of the war and after its end, Russian soldiers looted every available radio in the territory which they overran and occupied. These radio sets are scattered all over that vast country. We have in them a means of talking to the people in the great cities, in the industries, in the provincial towns, in the villages and on the collective farms.

It would be useless for us to beam to them propaganda in the ordinary sense of the word. We can, with growing skill and wisdom, provide them with programs which will interest and inform them; which will give them a more clear picture, which will tend to bring our two peoples together rather than divide them. This undertaking is a part of our new project of waging peace as actively and skillfully as we wage war.

Waging peace is a new undertaking. We are having our first try at it in the endeavor to get in touch with the Russian people on one hand and to bring relief and economic and political strength to Greece on the other. If these projects are bungled, we will be led into an endless succession of enormous expenditures without useful results. Unless we can successfully carry out our present undertakings, we had better withdraw from them and conserve our resources for inevitable war. This is the terrible alternative.

We must not bungle this waging of peace. We must watch this critical enterprise. We must, on the floor, keep in touch with it and give it helpful suggestion and criticism. If it succeeds we must encourage it. We must be generous in support and praise.

To this project of waging peace must be brought every intellectual and spiritual resource of this Nation as well as her material resources. Men must be as ready and willing to go to distant places under disagreeable conditions and sacrifice themselves for their Nation's good as they were ready and willing to make these sacrifices in the waging of war.

If we can work out this problem successfully, we will have been working toward a strengthened and more effective United Nations, which, in the years to come, can carry a large share of the burden which the special circumstances of this time make it necessary for us to carry alone.

ARE THE POLITICAL PRODIGALS RETURNING TO STAY?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, we have just witnessed in Washington a sudden and great mass political conversion. Not that there has been an old-fashioned soul cleansing, nor a serious confession of error, but from those highest in government down to the little "me too" boys there has come an admission that communism has entered into the sacred precincts of the innermost councils of our Government. These come-lately con-

fessors charge that this infiltration has saturated the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce. Their charges indicate that the doctrine of Stalin's totalitarianism has had a happy home in the executive branch of this Government, lo these many years. I can add that there are some of us, in and out of Congress, who have long believed that this fifth column should never have been tolerated in our Government in the first place. Repeatedly we have shouted the alarm from the housetops.

Time after time I have warned the people of this Nation, over the radio, through the press, and on the floor of the Senate, that this country was being destroyed from within; that our Government had been salted down with Communists and fellow travelers to the point where, should we be forced into war with any country supporting the communistic ideology, our whole defense activity could easily and quickly be sabotaged by insiders. The situation has become comparable to that of France when she was fatally crippled from within by a fifth column of Communists and Nazi sympathizers so Hitler could unleash his hungry war dogs to swarm across the Maginot line to pillage and murder helpless men, women, and children from Sudan to Dunkirk and the English Channel.

History informs us, Mr. President, that a mere handful of revolutionists overthrew the Czar and raised the red flag over Russia. Revolutionists are always a decided minority, but what they lack in numbers they make up in zealousness, and thus are able completely to destroy established government. In Russia today the Communist Party is but a trifle in numbers in comparison to the noncommunists, but the Communists have the guns and the determination to use them. They have killed millions of inoffensive Russian citizens; and the moment they seize power in other lands, they indulge in these terrible blood purges until they have wedged fear into the hearts of every human being within the sphere of their activity.

Mr. President, I did not rise especially to talk of the bestialness of the egomaniacal Communist doctrinaires, but, if you please, to welcome back into the ranks of those of us who love the United States Constitution these brethren who strayed from the house of our fathers into strange and fearful byways. We who have kept the faith have often prayed long and soulfully that before it was eternally too late these brethren would recognize the error of their way and would return to the fold, contrite and duly humble.

So, Mr. President, I want to inform this great deliberative body, the United States Senate, that when I read in the daily press that President Truman was to launch a campaign to dislodge the disloyalists from the Government pay rolls, a great peace of mind came over me, for I felt sure that we stood at the portals of the new utopia.

And then, day after day, the confessions came fast and in multitudinous proportions. They packed the daily press until, I am sure, every top hand in the executive department had made public his determination to rid the other fellow's department of all red termites. Today, these Government modern Diogeneses with their gum-soled shoes and lanterns are furtively peering into every crack and crevice of this Capitol's catacombs in search of that honest Communist who will admit he is the holder of a hammer and sickle card. If one of these subterranean gnomes flashes a lamp in your face, Mr. President, have no fear, for it is possible that he is simply putting on an act for the benefit of the press and radio. He may hiss and recoil from you, but be not afraid; he will disperse into thin air, and you will see him no more.

So, Mr. President, today we have the prodigal sons of the New Deal trekking home after a long and fateful hibernation with the "pinkos," Reds, and all breeds of synthetic Communists. Of course, we, like the fond father of Biblical times, bid them welcome home. But I am just wondering whether we should clasp them to our breasts with fond embrace ere we have been convinced that their contrition is sincere and not for the purpose of distracting our attention from some overt act they may have committed during their feasting and riotous living far from the parental roof.

Therefore, I suggest, Mr. President, that we take them in on probation. They should not be denied communion, nor should they be kept from our councils; but it might be well for us to keep one eye on them, lest they stray again. In the past they succumbed to political amnesia, and when in that sad state they fell easy victims to alien ideologies. We must watch over them tenderly and make every effort to guide them away from the shoals of wasteful spending and nonproductivity. We must remove from them all temptation to seek security from those who will sell out to the highest bidder. We must fumigate them and make them immune to Kremlin propaganda.

For years, those few of us who dared to stand here in these Halls and denounce such fraternization by public officials with the enemies of this Republic were made objects of attack by the domestic smear bund of hate. Our names were held up for derision by collaborating columnists and radio blabbercasters, and our every act came under the attack of an occupant of the White House and his stable of propagandists.

Into the inner circles of the War Department, into the braid and brass of the services, were gathered the "pink" of the fellow travelers. They were placed in swivel chairs, propped up in front of typewriters, and leashed to microphones. Few, if any, crawled on their stomachs up Iwo Jima, or swarmed over the beach of Normandy, or rolled in the muck and mire of the Belgian Bulge. They fought the battle of the Pentagon or the battle of Hollywood, or gained a beachhead in the night clubs along Broadway. That is where these "pinkos" and fellow travelers bared their breasts. In Washington they hid behind the secret files in the executive department. They rummaged in top drawers and carted off State secrets; and for their treasonable perfidy they received a citation for bravery and were admonished "to go and sin no more." In Russia, the country for which they were stealing, for such an offense they would have been purged and their ashes thrown to the winds of the steppes.

Mr. President, I am sick and tired of hearing American citizens continually refer to the Communists as a miserable minority, and not dangerous to our way of life. I say to you that they are dangerous. They are extremely dangerous.

Mr. President, a few days ago a representative of the American Legion testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that there are at least 100,000 first-line Communists in this country. It may be said that that is not so many for a Nation of 140,000,000. That may be true; but when those 100,000 Communists are able to infiltrate every branch of this Government and intrench themselves in our labor unions to the point where they are in absolute control of some of our biggest unions, it seems to me it is high time that we in the Congress, the representatives of the people, should sit up and take notice. Remember that Hitler with 30,000 Nazis took control of Germany's millions.

Back in 1941 I thought it was time to take notice of the Communists and their treasonable activities. Even before that date, when I was Governor of Texas, I set about to bring into being legislation which would take care of Communists working inside labor unions to gain places where they could practice sabotage. Since coming to Washington I have continued my fight upon Communists and their comrades, the labor-leader racketeers of this Nation, but here my efforts have been blocked at every turn. I wish to say here and now that most of that blocking was done by some of our present ranting prodigals who now scream to high heaven, "Let's do something about the Communists." These prodigals, however, were not so vociferous on the side of "let's do something about these Communists" when the late war President was opening the armed services to Communists and their fellow travelers, people who had, but a few short months before, denounced the President and the American Government from every quarter. In fact, some of them even picketed the White House bearing signs denouncing the late Franklin D. Roosevelt as a warmonger.

About that time the Daily Worker, the leading official Communist publication in the United States, called upon the comrades to join the armed services to fight for the democracies, which, of course, meant Russia, England, the United States, and all our allies. Ponder, Mr. President, the ridiculousness of placing Russia, England, and the United States in the same category, when Russia is a totalitarian nation if there ever was one, and England was then slipping into a totalitarian socialism.

The Daily Worker has often admonished the Communists to join up with the armed services so that they could take revolutionary control and conduct propaganda and agitation from within the Army, Navy, and all branches of our

military service. This miserable publication was the first to agitate a program to abolish disciplinary punishments and the necessity of saluting. What a different picture is presented when we turn to look upon the armed forces of Russia. There the strictest discipline is maintained. There is no fraternizing between officers and enlisted men. In addition to this, the Russian soldiers are poorly paid in comparison with the enlisted men of our American forces. The Russian soldiers do not enjoy the liberties granted to the men of our armed forces, yet the Communists infiltrate our armed forces to agitate for things for which they would face a firing squad in the Russian service. The Communists have also infiltrated some of our veteran organizations. They have been rebuffed by the American Legion and other loyal groups. Yet we find them in control of alleged veteran groups whose main mission in life seems to be the destruction of all organized government and authority.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned against martyrizing these low-bred humans. I find myself in accord with the Hoover sentiment, for there is nothing a fanatic enjoys more than to be martyrized. The "Commies" thrive on small martyrdoms, hence we should do nothing to heroize these hoodlums, but we should deny them fraternization with honest and upright men.

And, Mr. President, we should stop doing their bidding here in Congress. And here in Congress we should also speedily repeal all the communistic labor laws which have set up a super-kingdom which is more powerful than our Government and is ruled by the iron hand of communistic labor czars who completely control the production line of our Nation and hold the destiny of our people in the palm of their hand. If the returning prodigals are completely cleansed and sincere they will promptly join us in purging our statute books of this putrid un-American class legislation.

Our Republic is a government of laws, and not a government of men. The citizen is the master, the public official is the servant. We must repeal these labor slave laws and honor the working men and women of our Nation by elevating them to the position of master, and demoting their union officials to the humble status of their servant.

Yes, Mr. President, we need something more than a purge of Communists who have infiltrated our governmental departments. We need also to purge our lawbooks of all communistic legislation that has been enacted during the past 14 years by the left-of-center prodigal sons who are now returning for their share of the fatted calf.

According to published statements, the FBI has from time to time submitted names of various Federal departments and agencies where Communists and their fellow travelers hibernate. I have a file in my office which shows that these Communists are holding top jobs. One, I find, is a big-time attorney in the Rural Electrification Administration. These high-ranking jobs have been passed out to enemies of our Government in practically all the departments. What is to be gained by firing the little file clerks and stenographers who are caught in the act of reading the Daily Worker and retaining the big shots on the job to put other Communists in the places of those fired? It is a joke, Mr. President.

When I was a boy on a big cattle ranch I learned that I could not mess around with skunks without getting some of their highly perfumed musk on my clothes. I also learned that until I had thoroughly cleansed myself and had removed all odor I remained an outcast so far as my family was concerned. So should be, I believe, our practice in dealing with our prodigals now clamoring for readmission under the parental roof. We should know positively that they have cleansed themselves of all stinkish-pinkish aroma.

I am unable to see the necessity for the enactment of additional laws to regulate the American Communist. Instead of enacting new laws, we should repeal the old ones. In the first place, no Communist, outside of a few who manipulate the party's machinery, will admit membership. To deny their affiliation is one of the tenets of their atheistic philosophy. So I say let us see to it that we place men and women in public office who consider their oaths to uphold and enforce the laws of this country as binding obligations. The treasonable acts of the despicable Communist ingrates can be easily traced. When found guilty they should be given the punishment that is justly due traitors.

Now that some of our prodigals are back at our front gate asking to be enlisted under the banner of constitutional government, let us first resolve to purge our Nation of all communistic sympathies. Let us further resolve to desert that famous track "just a bit left of center" which would surely precipitate us in a headlong pitch into the bottomless pit of bankruptcy, heathenism, and world war. Let us hear no more defense of an ideology that spreads the virus of imperialism across the face of the earth. Let none among us rise to exhort in defense of a nation that lives by chicanery, deceit, plunder, and murder, but let us unite in promotion of the virtues of constitutional government. Let us return to the fundamentals of our government as set up in the Constitution and be done forever with the foreign "isms" of those who promote only the rule of the sword.

If the returning prodigals are sincere, communism, like its counterparts, socialism, nazism, and fascism, is headed for the fate that overtook its counterparts. Molotov, the hammer head, and Joe Stalin, the sickle-grinder, are on their way to join their plundering pals, Hitler and Mussolini.

Our form of government has survived to this date because it has recognized the dignity of man and the supreme power of God Almighty. So, let us return to the fundamentalism of the Constitution, and live by its precepts. If we continue to run off after false gods, we will wind up in the same pitiable condition in which all Europe finds itself today.

We cannot be half Communist and half constitutionalist. These ideologies will not mix. They are incompatible, and when brought together become highly explosive. So, I want Joe Stalin and his ungodly hordes to stay in Russia, and let peoples of other nations alone to choose the kind of government they prefer. We cannot appease Communists any more than Chamberlain was able to appease the Nazis. Let us stop appeasing, stop spending and wasting our resources, and begin now to build up our domestic economy so as to make ourselves invincible. This, Mr. President, I believe to be the best example we can place before the people of the world as to why they should forsake the rule of the jungle for government of law—laws enacted for the people, by the people, themselves.

The most terrible threat to our existence as a Nation of free people, Mr. President, is not the atom bomb, but instead it is our lop-sided communistic labor laws, our confiscatory tax laws, our crushing public debt, and our habit of meddling in the affairs of other nations.

When President Truman asked for authority to send $400,000,000 across the Atlantic to Greece and Turkey, it was reported we had discovered that Old Joe Stalin was pouring his sons of hate into those states and preparing to take over. England had sent our State Department word that even by using our money the load was too heavy and she was going to have to pull out of the Mediterranean-Red Sea area. Mr. Bevin's government expressed the fear that the instant England backed out Stalin would back in, buckle his belt around England's life line, and choke John Bull to death. So, it looks as though the United States will go on guard in the Mediterranean to keep the Communists pushed back beyond the Black Sea.

But hardly had the ink dried on the press release from the White House before the people of the United States began asking the question: "Yes, Mr. Truman, but if it is good to check atheistic communism in the Balkans, how about checking atheistic communism on the home front?" Mr. Truman came up promptly with the right answer. We would fight communism on two fronts—at home and abroad. It was then, Mr. President, that we began to see the prodigal sons returning to the fold. Also, in bitter anguish these prodigals cried out against their former chums. Now they want no more of their former Red pals, either in high places of state or in the councils of the party. But let us be cautious. Are they sincere, or are they only fooling?

I say, let us examine the record and ascertain whether or not there has been a true confession by these backsliders from the faith of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, before we trust them out of our immediate sight.

Followers of the Kremlin line are afraid of a "witch hunt," when and if the administration begins to hunt out the Communists. Well, I am not afraid there will be a witch hunt, but I am afraid that a few "Little Red Ridinghood" clerks and stenographers will be pitched headlong into the street while their sanctimonious superiors still hold down the red-plush seat jobs. What I am

wondering about is, will the Army textbook writers remain at their posts pouring out literature designed to destroy a love for our American form of government in the hearts of our boys wearing the uniform?

Will we see an evacuation of the State Department by those titled boys with the stiff shirts and striped pants who spill inside information to the left-of-center columnists—those gentlemen of the press who head the legion of smear?

Will the big-shot desk executives in the Labor Department, who spend an hour or so each day of the Government's time in reading the uptown edition of the Daily Worker, remain at their desks to dish out a steady stream of anti-American propaganda?

Will the solons of the Kremlin-hue of this Congress, who get their orders from Moscow, be carefully investigated with the aim of severing the pipe line that flows their daily political diet to them from the heart of the Communist world?

These are some of the questions that should be definitely answered before our prodigals are received back into full communion by us who dwell in the house of the founding fathers. This is a serious proposition and should be treated as such.

Mr. President, I want my country to be friendly but firm in all its dealings with other nations, great or small. I want the United States to be so strong that no other power or combination of powers can successfully strike at us and escape a swift and merciless defeat. But we cannot have such a country if we keep wasting our substance upon alien people, who carry revenge in their hearts and look forward to the day when they can strike back at an adversary, even if in so doing they again plunge the world into war.

Theodore Roosevelt gave voice to a great truth when he said:

> We cannot permanently shape our course right on any international issue unless we are sound on the domestic issues.

Now, before we take our truants back to a table loaded with the meat of the "fatted calf," let us be sure that they are not denouncing communism right now during the preelection season, only to backslide after the election is over and they are safe for another term. Such a scheme could degenerate this Nation into a complete collapse such as is now being experienced by socialistic England. Communism does not feed and grow and expand upon prosperity, but it does thrive and fatten upon the putrid carcasses of decadent nations, undermined from within by treachery. Therefore, I say we must be sure of ourselves and know that we are not being deceived by tricky politicians. Every move we make must guaranty the safety of our Republic and insure peace and tranquillity for our people.

I say to you, Mr. President, we need no apologists for our form of government. There is no form of government on this globe that can surpass ours in any way, shape, manner, or form. It did not grow by accident, but it came to greatness because of careful planning by the wise forefathers who gave to us our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. It came to fruition because they believed in their own strength. They knew that it had integrity because they, themselves, possessed integrity. And, not until the coming of the soothsayers of the false doctrine that "the Government owes every voter a living" did we swerve from the precepts of our founding fathers. The people of the United States want to get their Government back upon the Constitution, and only last November they spoke in no uncertain terms against the rule of bureaucrats, spendthrifts, and regimenters.

Constitutional government is the beacon light to the oppressed of the world. It has ever been so since its adoption March 4, 1787, and America will continue as the haven of free men if we will shun foreign isms of the Old World. But, if we continue sapping the resources of our land, tolerating defamation of our Christian philosophy, and continue ravaging our public treasury and mortgaging our unborn posterity, we will inevitably crumble and fall apart. President Washington never feared the foe from without, but he did express grave fears that some day we might bring about our own destruction through internal decay.

Several years ago internal decay started. Foreign ideology worms began to bore at the roots of this Republic. A second world war was thrust upon us and the communistic worms emerged from the underground roots and began boring into the innermost sanctums of high Government offices. This has long been known by our people and recognized by some Members of Congress, but we sat here in Congress and did nothing about it because we were outnumbered. We could have stopped this boring from within long ago if a majority of the Members had desired to do so. It seemed to be the popular thing to do, however, to take these worms of alien hate into our Government. Once in, they soon buried their filthy heads in every bureau and agency of any considerable importance.

When some of us protested against this infiltration we were scoffed at by most of the prodigals who are now proclaiming their anticommunistic protestations from stump, radio, and press.

If communism was good for us in 1941, why is it bad for us in 1947? I said in '41 that it would destroy our Nation if we did not clean house. I repeat, in 1947, communism will destroy our Nation if we continue to accept its missionaries in our governmental councils.

Time after time I have inveighed against the New Deal's embracement of communistic and totalitarian ideas. A few other Senators also did; but where did we get? We got nowhere; and not until last November 5 did the people of this Nation get a fair chance to demand a house cleaning. They spoke then in no uncertain terms, and I hope that there will be no betrayal by those in whom they placed confidence. Yet, Mr. President, we see signs of such a betrayal, and I fear ere the cock crows thrice on election morn of 1948 there will be many, many more betrayals. If there be—and mark these words well, Mr. President—the house cleaning of last November 5 will be but a firecracker in comparison to the political bombs that will be dropped on November 2, 1948.

So I say let us welcome the return of our prodigals who ran off after false gods, welcome them back into the fold, but let us not forget the fire and brimstone we have gone through because of their defalcations. I have a thorough distaste for anything or any "ism" that is un-American. I despise alienisms, regardless of name or brand. They all nurse the same milk, for they are of the same spawn. There is no place in constitutional government for such foreign "isms," but room only for Americanism. There is no place in American government for dishonesty, deceit, or deception, but room only for decency, honesty, truth, and justice.

Our constitutional government was founded upon God's word as contained in the Holy Bible. Therefore, the milk and honey which flows freely in this great Christian Nation will not mix with the Vodka of atheistic communism. Let us keep our Government clean from here on out. If we do this, our Republic will be safe, and will survive, God willing.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to support Senate bill 938 which is described as a bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

All of us here in the Senate on both sides of the aisle are, I am sure, more concerned about keeping world peace than we are about any other single subject. Therefore, in whatever discussion we have in regard to these proposed aids to Greece and Turkey, I hope we will constantly keep that in mind. I hope that we will constantly keep in mind that we are all Americans seeking to preserve our national security by preserving the peace in the world. Whatever suggestions are made, or whatever amendments are proposed in regard to this aid, I hope we will, each of us, objectively apply two questions to each proposal. The first is, will that suggestion or proposal lead to a better chance of continued peace? The second is, will that suggestion or proposal lead to a better chance for national security?

I believe that by now we are almost all convinced that in this modern world we cannot isolate ourselves from other nations. As soon as war breaks out in any part of the world our own national security is immediately threatened because that conflict can spread to us through modern weapons with incredible swiftness.

As we all know, the United States has in the past gained a reputation abroad for having inconsistent partisan foreign policies. We have, here, tried in the last 2 or 3 years to make it clear to the peoples of the world that we are no longer going to act in international affairs as a Democratic Party or as a Republican Party—that we are going to act as a Nation.

This proposed aid to Greece and Turkey has come to be called by some the Truman Doctrine. I think that is most unfortunate for two reasons. This

should be presented to the people of the world as an American doctrine. More than that, it should be presented to the people of the world as a doctrine motivated by the American people through their representatives. Therefore, I would like to propose that whatever action we take be hereafter known as the American doctrine.

I think there is another good reason for that. The original proposal by the President had in it some indication of lack of due consideration for the United Nations. The American people immediately made it clear to all of us that they were deeply concerned about that phase of the President's action. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, and I speak particularly of the senior Senator from Michigan, have proposed certain changes that shift the emphasis of this proposal—that make it clear that, not only are we interested in bolstering the United Nations to take over this obligation, but we are insisting that action be taken to give the United Nations greater authority and greater strength. I say we Republicans proposed those changes. I think they could have just as well been proposed by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, since they were the reflection, not of party thinking, but of American thinking. Therefore, because of the danger of the peoples of Europe misinterpreting our action in this matter as partisan, and so not taking seriously enough our intent, and because the President's original proposal has been fundamentally changed, I sincerely believe that it is to the best interests of all concerned that even the official name of this action be changed further to emphasize our unity and our determination.

As Americans we stand for freedom—for freedom of religion, and of speech, and of assembly, and of enterprise, and of opportunities. We believe that these freedoms belong as his right, to every man, whether he be born in America or in some other country. These freedoms belong to every man because they give to him his rightful dignity as a human being, as an individual, as a son of God. We do not strive to enforce our ideas about freedom upon the rest of the world by the strength of arms, of economic power, or intrigue. We do strive to perpetuate freedom, and all it means, by our own example of the rightful exercise of freedom. As we cherish it for ourselves, we hope that all men may achieve it. We believe that freedom, perpetuated through the processes of democracy, can make the world safe for peace.

This policy has, as its true basis, the preservation of our own independence and our own freedom. It recognizes the independence and freedom of all nations large and small. It has, as its purpose, the prevention of aggression and the keeping of the peace. It was in that spirit that we gave aid to Britain and to Russia. We did not question their internal institutions. Those institutions belong peculiarly to their people to maintain, or to change, as they might see fit. But we did want to preserve the sovereignty and independence of both Russia and England because we believed that preservation essential to peace—peace which is so essential to the world and to us.

The policy we have adopted with reference to Greece and Turkey is not new. We have always believed these things. The loan to Greece and to Turkey is merely an implementation of this basic American policy. For that reason alone we cannot call this policy anything but the American doctrine.

Another point that has bothered me about this proposed aid to Greece and Turkey is in connection with the danger of our becoming involved in local political disputes. It seems to me it would be very easy for us to get into the same position in Greece, particularly, that caused us to withdraw from China recently. For myself, I am prepared—right now—to say "a plague on both your houses" to the extreme elements in Greece. It seems to me we must give serious thought to insisting that the Greek Government show its good faith by demonstrating immediately its desire for civil peace. I am not prepared to see our money used for the relief of only those starving people who will agree to aline themselves politically on the side of the monarchy. Nor am I willing to see our assistance used in the payment of interest on a national debt to some other nation or some other group, or for any other purpose that we do not intend. I do not go along with the philosophy that we can stop the spread of communism only by bolstering reaction. Neither extreme is consistent with our philosophy and republican form of government. Both seek to rule by minorities, and both seek to take away the rights and privileges of the people. If we seek to preserve peace, which is what we intend to do, we must also see to it that political conditions in countries we assist are such that a civil war is not either actively going on or pending.

Another point that bothers me about the proposed aid to Greece is in connection with the actual money. I do not propose that we should try to save money at the risk of war. But it seems to me that there is another consideration that we have so far ignored. I believe we will all agree that while this four hundred million will be given partially as humanitarian relief for a needy people, it is essentially and substantially a move calculated to preserve our national security and world peace. Which departments of our Government are concerned with national security? The Army and the Navy. Therefore it seems to me that we should inform the Army and the Navy that since we will provide them with a very large budget for the purpose of maintaining security, they are expected to use that budget for that purpose. I have great faith in our Army, Navy, and Air Force. But I think past history has demonstrated there is a great deal of unproductive spending, and I personally propose to do whatever I can to discourage that kind of spending. I believe, therefore, that we should extract from the budget proposed for the Army and the Navy about 10 percent, to be set aside for such purposes as Greek and Turkish aid. In the President's proposed budget approximately eleven and a half billion was provided for this purpose. Ten percent of that would be a little in excess of a billion dollars. From that billion dollars, or from 10 percent of whatever sum is appropriated, should be taken the four hundred million for aid to Greece and Turkey, since we agree that this is a security matter.

It seems of tremendous importance to me how the mission to administer aid to Greece and Turkey is to be composed. Is it to be merely an executive agency? Is it to be an agency of the State Department alone? Is it wise to make it an agency of the Congress as well? The Congress must provide the money. The Congress must stand responsible before the American people for adopting this policy. The Congress must have all the facts. It seems to me, Mr. President, that Congress should choose some representation on these missions so that the report of the activities and effect of the mission may be made not only to the State Department, but to the Congress itself through the respective Committees on Foreign Relations in both the Senate and the House. If we are to take the leadership in world affairs which has come to us—indeed, which seems to have been thrust upon us—then we must develop a new technique, an American technique, in diplomatic dealings. We have seen the tragic failings of the old diplomacy in two World Wars in a generation. It is high time to deal openly and frankly, with all the cards on the table face up, as the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has already said. Since the lives and fortunes of all the American people are at stake in every war, and most assuredly will be at stake in any war to come, it is time that all the people of our Nation should have the opportunity of knowing what our purpose is, and what the program is to put that purpose into effect. We ask the same frankness and the same candor from all our neighbors in the world.

I believe that this development has opened our eyes to the lateness of the hour. It has made us uneasily aware that war can easily come again. Several hundred thousand American young men spent their lives on what may turn out to have been a futile effort to preserve peace. In gratitude we can at least do everything in our power to continue the peace. We have all agreed that the United Nations is today the only real hope for peace. Isolationism, appeasement, power politics, have all proven failures. We cannot afford another war; but another war will surely come if we and all other nations do not do more than talk about peace. I have been deeply impressed by the arguments of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who has proposed that we lay our cards openly on the table in regard to real international cooperation and then see who objects to continuing the game—and a deadly serious game it is. Moreover, there is a real danger of the United Nations building around itself a sealed wall and so becoming like the League of Nations—just another debating society. If the United Nations is to work, it must become a part of our daily living. It must become more important to us than any other matter we might

discuss on the floor of the Senate. To keep ourselves constantly aware of its difficulties, its problems, and its developments, I believe that we must establish a closer liaison with the United Nations. We represent the people of America. We have had representatives assigned to the United Nations conferences, and I think their work has been eminently able. I say, in no disparagement of them, that we must have more regular representation and more frequent reports from the United Nations. The activities of the United Nations must become our daily problems if we are to prevent war through that Organization. We represent the most powerful nation in the world today. If we will take upon ourselves the responsibility of making the peace by enforcing the strength of the United Nations, other countries will follow the example set by us. Our strength, our size, give us that responsibility. I am far more concerned about failure of the United Nations to act in the preservation of peace than I am about the failure of most bills to pass in this body.

God give us the knowledge, the courage, and the faith to help a discontented and doubting world achieve freedom and peace.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am anxious to speak this afternoon, but the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has stated that he would like to have the Senate take a recess at approximately 5 o'clock. I can speak for a while, hoping that I may again obtain the floor to complete my remarks when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. President, when the Allied armies were beginning to beat down the wall of Hitler's Fortress Europa, Goering threatened that if Hitler and his men had to leave the scene, they would slam hard the door behind them.

This was one boast which the Nazi leader was able to make good. Europe today, almost 2 years after VE-day, remains a shambles. Her people are homeless and starving, families are scattered, and children wander the highways and the byways in search of lost parents. Hunger, ignorance, superstition, want, and immorality are everywhere.

President Truman has called our attention recently to the particular needs of Greece; and Greece certainly is a country whose plight deserves our consideration and generosity.

Insofar as the President's proposals are designed to alleviate that human suffering and to eradicate its causes, I am in full agreement. But his proposals go further than that. They would create a completely new doctrine in American foreign policy: armed intervention in the internal and external affairs of another country. They involve yet another grave departure from our present foreign policy. They would bypass the United Nations as the instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

I may say, Mr. President, that I do not believe that any amount of amending of this original proposal can remove the injury which has been done to the United Nations. Only turning this over to the United Nations can remedy the injury. In fact, I feel that amendments simply tell the United Nations what we will permit them to do; and I feel that they should have higher authority. It is simply adding insult to injury, in my estimation.

They call upon us to take unilateral military and economic action rather than to use the machinery of the United Nations, which has already successfully solved similar disputes in Iran, Lebanon, and Syria.

I may say, also, Mr. President, that the United Nations did not do a great deal to solve those disputes. The fact that they were referred to the United Nations seemed to have almost in itself a magical effect. The parties concerned hastily put their houses in order, withdrew their troops, and ceased their meddling, simply because of the moral prestige of the United Nations. I hate to see our country take any steps now to undermine that moral prestige, because certainly the United States is the predominating factor behind the success or failure, the prestige or lack of prestige, of the United Nations.

I feel, Mr. President, that this new doctrine—call it the Truman doctrine or the American doctrine or whatever we will—will seriously weaken the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

Public opinion polls indicate that the American people are aware of this and strongly prefer action through the United Nations to unilateral action.

Frankly, Mr. President, I feel that the action which we are about to take may be the beginning of the end of all hope of reconciliation in the world. It may be the beginning of tensions in this atomic age which will eventually lead to the complete collapse of civilization in a great atomic holocaust.

Let me give my reasons for opposing this new foreign policy:

First, the State Department admittedly has as one of its purposes the preservation of the monarchy formerly represented by the late King George of Greece, and now by his brother, King Paul. I am opposed to that monarchy as are the people of Greece, his unwilling subjects. Paul, like his late brother, George, does not have one drop of Greek blood in his veins. He comes from one of Europe's perennial royal families which was foisted upon the Greek people in one of the typical intrigues which characterized nineteenth century diplomacy. The full family name is Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Glucksburg. The late King George was deposed in 1923 because of his pro-German intrigues in the last World War. In 1935 with the help of British politicians and a sham plebiscite he was restored to the Greek throne. Again last year, after another sham plebiscite during which opposition forces were exiled, jailed, or intimidated, the crown was again placed upon his head.

In 1776 our forefathers fought for the right to govern themselves. Another George, George III of England, who also had German blood in his veins, looked upon them as ragged terrorists and irresponsible radicals.

How ironical, then, that the government which the antiroyalists of Valley Forge made possible should now use its money and influence to bolster a tyrannical twentieth-century monarchy.

I know from dozens of eyewitnesses whom I have interviewed in recent weeks—newspaper correspondents and American citizens who visited the country on relief missions for our Government, for UNRRA, and for the United Nations—that the present administration in Greece is corrupt, inefficient, and ruthless.

In an official report issued earlier this month the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations stated—and here I am quoting from that UN report:

> Present Greek taxes fall heavily on the poor people and far less heavily, in proportion to their income, on the well to do. * * * Most local revenues come from commodity taxes.

The UN report continues:

> Over four-fifths of the total tax revenues thus come from taxes which either reduce incomes to producers (especially farmers), or raise costs to consumers (mostly farmers and low-income city workers). Less than one-fifth of the taxes is of the type that bears primarily on well-to-do persons receiving large incomes. * * * The tax structure is responsible, in part at least, for the present exceedingly unequal distribution of wealth and income in Greece, far less equal than that in more highly industrialized countries. In every part of the country the great majority of farmers are poverty-stricken and destitute. City factory workers or public employees are not in much better shape. Yet it is on these two classes, farmers and low-income city workers, that present taxes fall most heavily. * * * At the same time that this widespread poverty exists the stores are full of all kinds of goods at high prices and the restaurants are thronged with well-dressed people, enjoying the good food and wine, who live very comfortably despite the poverty all around them. Yet the tax burden falls on them far less heavily in proportion to their incomes than it does on the low-income farmers and workers.

That is the end of the quotation from the official report of the Food and Agriculture Organization mission for Greece.

I wonder, Mr. President, if we had a government in this country which permitted conditions like that to exist, and even nurtured them, how many people possibly would be violently against our Government. I do not believe they could all be called Communists, either.

It is obvious that the Greek Government has never evolved a modern tax structure because to do so would antagonize the British interests who own the great wealth of Greece.

It is the protection of those British interests which is at the heart of the British control of Greece. And there is one other factor which is equally important. Greece strategically controls the land, sea, and airways to the great oil fields of the Middle East.

Giant and powerful monopolies are interested in the acquisition of that oil. I, for one, am unwilling to send American troops to protect the interests of those oil monopolies.

It has been contended that the State Department's proposal is necessary to curb the spread of communism in Greece. But I say to you that for every Communist made in Greece by Russian propaganda a hundred have been made

by hatred of the monarchy and its terrorist regime and the foreign governments which have imposed it upon an unwilling people. By aiding a weak and inefficient government to suppress opposition by force of arms, we are eliminating the only real alternative to communism—a liberal, progressive government responsive to the needs of Greece. By eliminating a middle-of-the-road possibility of peaceful change, we force the Greek people to choose either the extreme of Fascist monarchy or the other extreme of revolutionary communism—we would leave them no other choice. That is not the effective way to stop communism in Greece.

The present Greek Government has driven many a conservative businessman in Greece to feel that, although he hated communism, he would accept any help that enabled Greeks to throw out the fascism of the monarchy.

An UNRRA worker recently returned from Greece told me of a conversation with a prosperous Greek who is the head of a large Greek shipping firm, who said, "I am an EAM because I feel as you Americans did in 1776. We want to govern ourselves. We do not want these foreigners pushing us around and enriching themselves on our country any more than you Americans did."

Mr. President, these are people who would not support a Communist Party in Greece or a Socialist Party in Greece. They are people who want a middle-of-the-road government. But they passionately insist upon self-government; and if we insist on supporting a monarchy which suppresses all opposition, we shall drive them to take the only alternative—the extreme revolutionary course. If we endorse the King's government as our concept of democracy, we shall have given Europe a false impression of our own great country, and shall have forever discredited our own philosophy in their eyes.

Mr. President, I think that when we give financial aid to Greece, we must insist that the money contributed by the American taxpayers is wisely used, and is used for the benefit of the needy people of Greece. It should not be controlled by the royalist members of the Greek ruling class who, as collaborationists, fared as well under the German occupation as they did under the British. Almost all qualified observers will state, as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization stated, that aid to Greece should be conditioned upon the adoption of a more efficient and more democratic government in Greece.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about Turkey. It is often forgotten that half of the President's proposal is concerned with Turkey. Turkey has absolutely no relief needs. Not a single bomb dropped on Turkey. During the war it enjoyed one long, lush, uninterrupted war boom. It sold supplies to both sides; and both sides paid, and paid very well. The only purpose of aid for Turkey is a military one.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and I have introduced an alternative resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 93, to deal with this great problem. Briefly, our resolution would, first, appropriate funds for relief and rebuilding of Greece; second, provide for the administration of that relief by the United Nations; and, third, request the General Assembly of the United Nations to institute a full-scale investigation with a view to resolving not only the Greek crisis but the problems of Palestine, the Dardanelles, and Middle East oil. I should like to point out that our joint resolution provides for immediate assistance through a stopgap advance of $100,000,000 by the RFC. It does not delay this assistance until after the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

Our joint resolution is equally important for the things which it does not do. These are: First, it does not provide any funds for relief or military intervention in Turkey; second, it does not provide for the sending of American military forces into Greece; and, third, it does not provide for unilateral action by the United States or for bypassing the United Nations.

A momentous decision lies ahead of us, Mr. President. Upon it hangs the future of the great idea of permanent peace through international organization. Let us not abandon that great hope so soon after its birth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two resolutions which were unanimously ordered to be reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire when the resolutions were ordered to be reported favorably.

Mr. BROOKS. The day before yesterday.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to object, but I would suggest to the Senator from Illinois that at the present time there is a rather small attendance in the Senate for the transaction of business.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I recognize the principle the majority leader is trying to uphold, and I subscribe to it. So I shall wait until Tuesday to take up these matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine, the majority leader, for the course he is following. There are not many in attendance on this side of the aisle at this particular moment. I also thank the Senator from Illinois for not pressing his request.

Mr. WHITE. If there is no other business to come before the Senate, I shall move a recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before the Senator from Maine makes the motion, I wonder if he can tell us when we are to have another executive session.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, there are only three nominations on the executive calendar. I shall move an executive session when the number of names on the calendar seems to justify it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is on the calendar the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on which the committee made an adverse report. I think the Senate should act on that nomination, one way or the other, at a reasonably early date.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with the Senator from New Mexico. The nomination has been on the calendar for some days. I agree with the Senator that at an early date the Senate should devote itself to the consideration of the nomination, and if I can further that end, I shall be most happy to do to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the chairman of the committee which considered the nomination, is not present at the moment. I am sure that he would like to get action on the nomination one way or the other as soon as possible.

Mr. WHITE. I shall cooperate in any way I can to get action on that and the other nominations on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, April 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
Daniel J. Daley
William J. Brown
Luther L. Terry

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

SCIENTISTS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Howard L. Andrews
Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Carruth J. Wagner
William L. Hewitt
Robert W. Rasor
George A. Shipman

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Frank Tetzlaff
Albert H. Stevenson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs and rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty Father, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all

the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Remembering the devoted cooperation of the other American Republics and Canada in an hour of trial, we beg the help of Thy grace on Pan-American Day for constancy in the cause of Western Hemisphere solidarity.

Bestow Thy benediction, dear Saviour, upon all peoples who honor their obligations as good neighbors. Instruct their minds and guide their hearts in the courses of true friendship. Inspire the children of the Americas with the love of truth, justice, and freedom. Grant that they may fit the values of inter-American friendship into the framework of world order.

This we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1947, was read and approved.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on April 10, 1947, he did, on April 11, 1947, sign the following enrolled bills:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 12, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on April 10, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate, namely:

On April 11, the engrossed bill of the Senate, S. 1009, entitled "An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale," attested as having passed the Senate on April 10, 1947.

On April 12, a message that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 875) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE LABOR BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 178, Rept. No. 248), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to read Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, perhaps the greatest political philosopher of all time.

The Communist propagandists throughout the world, and especially in this country, are using every method to try to convince the people of the earth that both Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln were Communists at heart. If Jefferson and Lincoln were here today, they would both spurn communism as they would spurn poison.

This address of Thomas Jefferson has been referred to by historians as having the greatest influence historically of any address ever delivered in either ancient or modern times. It is his first inaugural address of March 4, 1801, in which he said:

Friends and fellow citizens: Called upon to undertake the duties of the first Executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising Nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the Nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law and unite in common effort for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measure of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all republicans—we are federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not, I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own Federal and republican principles—our attachment to our Union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one-quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an

overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the gener.l government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of dispotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil, over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power, which rules the destinies of the universe, lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on Pan-American Day to record our appreciation for the work of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, an apostle of the good-neighbor policy. Years before inter-American friendship was recognized as a vital phase of hemisphere defense, Dr. Thorning was lecturing in the universities of Central and South America, in Portuguese, Spanish, and French. His chief purpose has been to interest young people in the opportunities for building friendship in schools, colleges, and universities. His articles on Costa Rica, Uruguay, Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, and Cuba have been translated into numerous languages. Everywhere in the other American Republics this great priest, scholar, and educator has emphasized the importance of sound social legislation on behalf of the miners, farmers, and factory workers. He knows that property and income are sure foundations for democratic thinking and living. His efforts have been progressive and liberal in the best sense of those terms. I am happy that he is with us on Pan-American Day and trust that his health will support numerous future labors in a noble cause.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us enjoyed listening to the message of a great American as read by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Last Saturday was the second anniversary of the death of another truly great American and a great humanitarian. Shortly before he quietly passed away 2 years ago last Saturday in Warm Springs, Ga., Franklin Roosevelt wrote a brief message to the American people. I desire in this 1 minute to quote the closing lines of that message. President Roosevelt said:

> The only limitations to our achievements of tomorrow are our fears and doubts of today. Let us move forward with a strong and active faith.

Mr. Speaker, in a day when we are beset by fears and uncertainties, that challenge from President Roosevelt rings with strength, clarity, and courage as a guide for this hour. Let us, indeed, move forward with a strong and active faith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Evening Star April 11, 1947.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Michigan State committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

NATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL WEEK

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this day, April 14, marks the opening of National Sunday School Week, an annual observance sponsored by the Laymen's National Council.

Founded in England, the Sunday school became firmly established in this country in the early nineteenth century. More than one-half of all Sunday schools in the world are in America. It would be helpful to know how much of the greatness of America stems out of this little-known fact.

Certainly no movement has contributed more to the moral advancement of our civilization than the Sunday school. With inspired energy and prayerful devotion the Sunday schools of America have taught unnumbered millions the true ends of life and the spiritual laws governing the universe.

The Sunday school teaches the faith of our fathers. The Sunday school, like all Christianity, teaches that man lives best by that great injunction of the lowly Nazarene:

> Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

This observance calls attention to a solemn truth—that unless we quickly dedicate our national life to His teachings, our physical and material well-being must soon disappear. There is no way of obtaining God's blessing but obedience to His laws.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we again welcome the opportunity to celebrate Pan-American Day. So on this April 14, 1947, it may be well for us to pause and reflect upon its truly historical significance. For us in the New World it is a day peculiarly our own—the day of the Americas—when Americans both to the north and south can join hands to bring about a better understanding of one another, and cement hemispheric solidarity.

Let us therefore briefly review the progress which the Americans have made in the past, examine the problems of today, and our plans for the future.

It seems particularly desirable that we do so because next to the ultimate goal of a successful United Nations, hemispheric unity is of the utmost importance to the people of the Americas. Just as during the war the Western Hemisphere was the second line of defense and progress for the United States, so it can be a bulwark for peace and progress in the world under the framework of the United Nations.

In these anxious times when nations are wearily striving for an enduring peace in spite of overwhelming difficulties, the example of the Americas might well be taken as a guiding light for this troubled world.

Painfully, with measured steps, and in spite of many weaknesses and misunderstandings, the nations of the Americas have progressed along a weary road until now they clearly understand that while they are equal independent and sovereign nations, at the same time they are interdependent neighbors with similar problems. The crucible of the war brought them together to find victory through their united front.

As far back as 1810 the eminent Chilean Don Juan Egana made the first proposal for pan-American unity, foreseeing with statesmanlike outlook the importance of unity of purpose and policy of the American Republics.

Many important steps have been taken to increase the effectiveness of the inter-American system and of course one of the greatest of these was the founding of the Pan American Union 56 years ago today.

Another was when President Hoover, 16 years ago, proclaimed April 14, 1931, as Pan-American Day.

From a series of inter-American conferences a better understanding was brought about and the keystone for closer ties of friendship was the machinery set up "for prompt consultation on matters of common concern."

In 1940 at Habana it was recognized an aggression on the territory or sovereignty of any nation in the Americas should be considered as an aggression against all.

These policies led ultimately to the Act of Chapultepec at Mexico City where it was agreed not only acts of aggression from without should be the concern of all, but also acts of aggression from within the hemisphere against another American state.

The United Nations at San Francisco recognized the importance of such regional arrangements by approving of such agreements in its Charter just as the signers of the Act of Chapultepec recognized the United Nations by agreeing its activities should be "consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization."

So today the Americas have adopted a charter of their own to keep the peace. The 3,000-mile unfortified border between Canada and the United States, the towering figure of the Christ of the Andes high on the border between Chile and Argentina take on a new and added significance.

As I have indicated there have been many factors which have tended to bring about hemispheric security and to consolidate the ties of understanding and confraternity.

Among these is the fact that the Americas of all the areas of the world are best suited for geographical unity. Without the racial and historic prejudices of the Old World, they comprise an area equal to 25 percent of the globe—consisting of 12,000,000 square miles of the richest and most diversified resources of the world. Their climates and crops supplement each other which in and of itself draws the peoples of the hemisphere closer together and creates bonds of solidarity.

Just as we, in the years past, fought and died for our independence in the New World, so did the patriots of our neighbors to the south fight for the independence of their respective countries. This, too, provides a common bond of understanding as all these countries have heritages dedicated to the same ideals of independence of nations.

I need not add that in the fields of culture, music, art, and sciences there are great opportunities for progress because contacts of this character ignore national borders and local differences.

One of the best examples of the friendly feeling between ourselves and our American neighbors is that in the Americas alone of all the world there are no quota restrictions on immigration to this country.

While I have recited many instances of progress which we in the Americas have made in the past it does little good to blink at the fact that there are still many problems to be solved.

All too often, up to the present time, there have been entirely too many coups, revolutions, and internal troubles in many of the countries of this hemisphere, including our own. There has been serious penetrations of both Red fascism and Red communism with its usual exploitation of false hope for the improvement of social and economic conditions for the people.

Certainly there can be great improvement on the part of the responsible governments so infested to aline ourselves against these totalitarian and foreign doctrines, and to continue to be identified with economic progress, liberalism, and liberty rather than opportunism.

Certainly the United States, through its technical genius and know-how, can do much to bring about the economic improvements to which the Communists only give lip service. But if such aid is rendered, it must be on a truly reciprocal basis. It can no longer be on a one-way street, disguised as a good-neighbor policy. One cannot have good neighbors unless you keep good fences, and that means each must do their part in keeping them in repair.

There is another situation that currently exists which is hurting our friendship with the nations to the south of us. That is the present misunderstanding between our country and the Argentine. This problem is entirely too important to be decided by personalities, and I am hopeful our State Department will make every effort to settle this dispute on a friendly and equitable basis. It must, however, be settled right. Every nation in this hemisphere has the right to expect other nations to live up to and carry out their international agreements and to determine for itself when those promises have been complied with. But if on a high policy level our State Department has reached an impasse because of sincere differences of opinion as to the facts of the case, I strongly urge that other methods be devised so that we can determine case by case whether there has been actual implementation of the international obligations agreed to by the Argentine.

It is all-important that this should be done immediately. To settle this dispute would be to the mutual advantage of all concerned. Already the Rio Conference has been delayed too long. We should be getting on with the mutual-assistance pacts for our common security. Certainly there is sufficient basic convergence of hemispheric interests to make this military cooperation mutually desirable.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, which passed unanimously the inter-American military cooperation bill on June 5, 1946, I urge our State and military departments again to get behind this all-important bill for hemispheric security.

Also as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, whose functions deal primarily with inter-American affairs, I urge not only our Government to implement the Act of Chapultepec by ratifying it in treaty form, but urge the appropriate legislative bodies of the other American Republics which have not already done so to do likewise in accordance with their constitutions.

In closing may I add one other word. The so-called good-neighbor policy is not dependent on any one administration for its execution. This policy is a continuing one and rests upon a much sounder foundation. It is the universal desire of the vast majority of our people, which transcends partisan considerations, to have hemispheric unity for the betterment of us all—not just for the present but as a permanent policy.

Therefore, let us improve the inter-American system and remember its

interdependence is its foundation, cooperation is its keystone.

CHICAGO, THE PROGRESSIVE CITY

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, various Members of the House have risen to tell about the beauties of their States or their districts. I rise to tell of the enterprise and progress shown in the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, in the great city of Chicago. The motto of the city of Chicago is "I will." Right in my very own district, plans for a $200,000,000 development of upper Michigan Avenue, from the Chicago River to Oak Street, were presented on Wednesday, April 9, to business and financial leaders of the district at a luncheon by Arthur Rubloff, a Chicago realtor. The program calls for a series of office buildings, shops, hotels, and apartment buildings, as well as underground parking facilities. This project has been described as an effort to turn this stretch of Michigan Avenue into the most modern mile in the world.

I am happy to call your attention to the enterprise being shown in the great city of Chicago and my own congressional district. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a $200,000,000 project. This should serve as an example to the rest of the United States.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 5, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 1, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 21, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 22, strike out "5" and insert "6."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that this is simply concurring in the Senate amendments, and the gentleman has already discussed this matter with the minority leadership; is that correct?

Mr. LEMKE. I have.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frederick C. Othman of the United Press.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include excerpts.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Donald R. Richberg.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three resolutions adopted by the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a report from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] before the Connecticut Air Power Conference, and further to extend his remarks and include a radio interview.

A BANKER'S VIEW OF THE GRECO-TURKISH LOAN PROPOSAL

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I asked an official of a small-town bank what he thought about the President's proposal with regard to Greece and Turkey and all its implications. He said that unless there was some good secret reason for it, he was opposed to it. He said he had heard no good reason and therefore supposes that if there is one it must be secret. He further said that the proposition of trying to buy friendship and buy off communism had been tried by us in South America without outstanding success. He said there is a grave question in his mind as to how far we can go with this thing without upsetting our own financial stability. He suggests that perhaps we had better concentrate on the Communists at home first.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if Henry Wallace were a citizen and former high official of the country whose cause he now espouses and had followed the inexcusable course of attempting openly to alienate a friendly country, he would be shot, or otherwise liquidated, as soon as he returned home. Fortunately for him, we do not employ such extreme measures. Probably he has contravened no criminal statute. At any rate, that is for the Attorney General to determine.

Certain it is, however, that Mr. Wallace has earned for himself the unenviable position of a pariah among patriots of either political party. Only last fall this same spokesman gave our party an unsolicited boost by his infamous speech to his radical cheering section in Madison Square Garden when he tried to pull the rug out from under the feet of Secretary Byrnes, who was then striving to represent this Nation as best he could at the Paris Conference under the most trying and difficult circumstances. Those of us who were candidates for office, though sincerely regretting the incident, and in many cases frankly stating so, were not blind to the service, no doubt, unwittingly rendered our cause.

But none of us can now feel anything but national shame over the spectacle presented by a man who has been honored by the second highest office in the land traveling to a foreign country with which we have enjoyed cordial and intimate relations and seeking withdrawal of its support for us and our policies because his country has embarked on a program of "ruthless imperialism" as he puts it. His overworked apologists may attribute his remarks to pique, frustration, or befuddlement. In any event they are disgraceful.

Another unfortunate result is that such a disloyal outburst militates against a consideration of the program for aid to Greece and Turkey on the merits. Mr. Wallace has done more to advance that cause than perhaps anyone else. Many of us are still studying the proposal, and all the suggested amendments and modifications, and have not yet taken a final position. But none of us, even those violently opposed to the program, wants to be associated in the public mind with Mr. Wallace or his kind.

It is reported that the Manchester Guardian, traditionally liberal, was sarcastic in its pointed rebukes for the round denunciation of the selfishness of the United States by one described as "so distinguished an American," adding that it was not necessary to win their attention with such bait and describing his talk as "more picturesque than exact."

"Befuddled" is the charitable adjective selected as appropriate to describe this outburst in the editorial from the Washington Post which, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote:

BEFUDDLED MR. WALLACE

Just what Henry Wallace hopes to accomplish by denouncing abroad the foreign

policy of the Government of which he was so recently a part is a mystery that we do not pretend to fathom. It may be that he is only trying to enhance his popularity among the left-wing groups who are fighting the foreign policy of Britain's labor government. Or he may be sincerely seeking to drive a wedge between the United States and Britain as a means of defeating the policy to which his own country is committing itself. The one thing certain is that his indiscretion has thwarted any worthy purpose—however muddled the thinking behind it may have been—which could be reasonably attributed to him.

The pertinent facts about Mr. Wallace are these: Last September, while he was Secretary of Commerce, he attempted to modify the direction of American foreign policy by making a speech sharply at variance with the views of the State Department. He claimed Presidential approval for his utterance and President Truman unwittingly reinforced that assumption without knowing the full implications of the Wallace speech. When the subsequent controversy brought a showdown, the President asked Mr. Wallace to resign. Since that time he has in various ways carried his case to the American people with disappointing results for himself. Now, having failed to make any real impression on his countrymen, he is carrying his case to other nations. His speech in London can be read in no other light than as an attempt to induce the British to run out on the United States after this Government has agreed to share what has heretofore been a British obligation of preserving the independence of Greece.

This is such atrociously unstatesmanlike conduct that it appears to have shocked many Britons who share Mr. Wallace's dislike for what has now become known as the Truman Doctrine. Worse still, in carrying this fight over domestic policy to foreign shores Mr. Wallace is employing methods that are discredited in even our domestic political squabbles. He bases his whole argument upon a gross distortion of the President's policy. He is quoted as saying that it "offers unconditional aid to anti-Soviet governments" and as implying that the Administration has "set out to police Russia's borders." Coming from a Moscow propagandist, such wild misstatements could be properly discounted by the peoples of other countries. But when uttered by a former member of Mr. Truman's Cabinet, even a sour and disgruntled member, they will inevitably deceive many people and put the country which once elected Mr. Wallace as Vice President in a false light before the world.

It is difficult to see, therefore, how Mr. Wallace could have rendered a greater disservice to his country than he has done by carrying his confused and tortured protest abroad. While proclaiming the idea of one world he is trying to create new areas of disunity. While asking $50,000,000,000 for reconstruction, he is opposing smaller-scale reconstruction on the only feasible basis that it can be granted to such countries as Greece. His performance is so flagrantly incompatible with the idea of world freedom and peace, which he professes to sponsor, that its chief effect may well be to add to the befuddlement which surrounds the name of Henry Wallace.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from New York has just said, I should like to make the observation that Mr. Wallace has been talking as if he were on his way to Moscow with no intention of coming back, for certainly he has made of himself the proper subject matter of attention by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Department of Justice. I should also like to express the hope that the President will cease to hope for his recovery from his Communist entanglements.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I have a post card from someone in my district this morning which I think refers to the same individual that the gentleman from Georgia is talking about. It says:

Hadn't you better yank our big mouth home? He doesn't look nice with his spite showing. Better men have been hung for less.

I wonder if United States good-natured fools are going to forget and forgive again.

Mr. COX. No; I would let him go.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, there could be an endless parade of speeches here on the subject of one mendacious idiot, Henry Wallace. He may not be guilty of treason; I have not looked into that: but he is guilty of unquestionably showing the world the spots beneath his raiment. He never got out of his craw the fact that one Harry Truman defeated him for the Vice Presidency in the days of that now famous remark, "Clear everything with Sidney." I think his speeches in Europe clearly indicate that they have been cleared with Joe Stalin. Apropos of what my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia said, now that he is in Moscow or on his way there, the President should do him the favor of revoking his passport and leave him with a long-lost friend with whom he is more at home than he is with the American people. He does not express the feeling of the people of my State, and I venture to say, with the exception of a small bunch of pinks in certain areas of this country, he has the unqualified, unquestioned, unmitigated disapproval of the rank and file of the honest-to-God American people of this country.

HENRY A. WALLACE VIOLATING THE LAW

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department should revoke the passports of Henry Wallace and his pal, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party. I call your attention to the fact that they are both violating the law. I want to read the law to you. Page 459, of title 18, Criminal Code, chapter 1, section 5, which is known as the Logan Act, reads as follows:

Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and every person, being a citizen of or resident within the United States or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and not duly authorized, who counsels, advises, or assists in any such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years.

That is the law today.

We should wake up the Department of Justice and tell them to quit following around after the antidefamation league and enforce the laws enacted by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters, one from the Secretary of War, and an answer thereto from Mr. Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the newspaper of our distinguished former colleague, Bert Snell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DAVID LILIENTHAL TO HIRE DAUGHTER

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lilienthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lilienthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In this connection, the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her

strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to endorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism. The fight against the endorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several "front" organizations.

I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God himself can explain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the dean of the University of Connecticut with reference to certain educational measures now pending.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article from today's Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota and certain excerpts.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and other members of the overall committee, have returned from a visit to the Panama Canal, where we inspected all facilities. As you know, betterments of the Canal are proposed, ranging from improving the present Canal to building a sea-level canal at different places, and including Panama. This will cost all the way from $200,000,000 to $2,700,000,000 on original estimates.

I am sure our visit will prove very worth while in appraising any of the projects as they are finally submitted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] has expired.

ARMY UNIFORMS IN EUROPE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement entitled "The Army Seeks Uniforms in Europe."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this article entitled "The Army Seeks Uniforms in Europe" was taken from the Boston Herald of April 9, 1947. It states that the Army wants to spend $10,000,000 buying cloth for our own Army. It seems to me, when we have a bill pending before the Congress to try to keep up the price of wool, in order to keep labor employed in Massachusetts and other States of the Union where the woolen mills are running only part time, that the Congress should see that legislation is enacted to retain the tariff on merchandise, or the first thing we know the plants of this country will be closed down; we will be buying our materials in foreign countries, and our own people will be walking the streets looking for work. It is about time we looked after America.

I want you to know that I am for America first, last, and all the time. The quicker the rest of you get on that bandwagon the better it is going to be for the country.

The news article to which I referred follows:

ARMY SEEKS UNIFORMS IN EUROPE

LONDON.—An American Army purchasing mission was reported heading for Germany with a $10,000,000 cloth order that neither United States nor British manufacturers wanted.

The British board of trade confirmed that it turned down an American request for 5,000,000 yards of olive-drab worsted to be delivered within the next 6 to 9 months.

A board of trade spokesman said he heard that the buying mission, headed by a Colonel Steadman, had gone to Frankfurt in the hope of getting the goods from German textile mills. The American Embassy said it had no knowledge of the mission.

British manufacturers turned down the order, the board of trade spokesman said, because it was too large to fit into the strictly regulated manufacturing program without upsetting export quotas or the already short domestic market.

An informed source said it was understood the Army buyers came to Britain for the cloth—needed for winter uniforms for American Army—because the United States Army now had to compete in the open market with private buyers for American cloth.

"Governments always have a hard time buying," a board of trade spokesman said. "Manufacturers would rather sell to private buyers and thereby build up good will."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a copy of a speech.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio speech delivered last Friday, April 11.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, be given leave of absence for a period of 3 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a message to this Congress from the legislature of the great State of South Carolina, that State which produced John C. Calhoun, Wade Hampton, and our former Secretary of State, Jimmy Byrnes. The message to this House is a concurrent resolution requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

This House has been in session since the 3rd of January on which date I introduced H. R. 3, providing for payment of these bonds in cash. H. R. 3 has been pending all that time, yet Congress has done nothing. This resolution from the Legislature of the State of South Carolina was introduced in the Senate on March 11, 1947, and was passed on March 12; and sent to the House and considered on March 27 and adopted April 1, 1947. They do things in South Carolina, but here Congress seems to be laying down on the job in providing cash payment for terminal leave bonds, for the boys who deserve cash if they want it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the legislature had anything to say about the need of returning the atomic bomb to the hands of the Army?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They did not express themselves on that but they did express themselves on the matter of paying terminal-leave pay in cash to the veteran.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as was said by the Chaplain in his most appropriate prayer, this is Pan-American Day, which has become a very significant anniversary and a powerful influence in bringing about closer understanding between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It is the one day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize their common bond and their common hope for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation. In that direction lies peace.

The legislative situation was such this year that it did not seem appropriate to ask that today be set aside exclusively for the commemoration of Pan-American Day as occurred the last 2 years. I cannot, however, permit the occasion to pass without further calling attention to it and expressing the hope that the situation may be such next year that this day may be set aside exclusively for that purpose and that such may become an annual custom in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 180), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas the Pan American Union was founded on April 14, 1890, and the anniversary of that date is by custom and by designation of the Governing Board of the Union observed throughout the Republics of this hemisphere as Pan-American Day; and

Whereas at this time it is appropriate to recognize the high value of the work of the Pan American Union in furthering the close association of the American Republics: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That—

1. The House of Representatives hereby extends to the other popular representative organs of each of the other American Republics its cordial good wishes on this auspicious day; and

2. The Pan American Union is felicitated on this occasion of its anniversary; and

3. Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed to the legislative bodies of the other American Republics, and one copy shall be transmitted to the Pan American Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one entitled "Can an Economic Depression Be Avoided," and the other entitled "Who Said Prices Would Fall?"

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Marine Corps League Bulletin, entitled "The Hatchet Men Are Out Again."

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Report 209 from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DR. JOSEPH FRANCIS THORNING

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, may I say for myself, and I am sure I speak for the other Members of the House, that it was with extreme pleasure today that we listened to the beautiful prayer of the Reverend Joseph Francis Thorning. We want to extend our thanks to Dr. Montgomery for having made the visit of Father Thorning possible.

It is my opinion that Father Thorning is one of the outstanding men of the Nation on Latin-American relations, and knows as much as or even more, than any man in America today concerning our Latin-American neighbors.

I trust we shall have the pleasure of seeing and hearing him again on Pan-American Day next year.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 179.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, the 19th day of May 1947, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provisions of clause (1) (j) (2) (C) of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for sixty legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and approved by such committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is the usual resolution for memorial services in the House of Representatives?

Mr. BISHOP. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reference I made to the passage of the Pan-American resolution a few moments ago follow immediately after the remarks I previously made on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., entitled "Gentlemen of the Congress" and in the other an article appearing in the same publication entitled "Flood Waters Rising in Sny Valley."

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it appears today that we have an open season on Henry Wallace. Now, I never voted for Henry Wallace for Vice President. As a matter of fact, I was not a member of the Democratic Convention when they almost renominated him for Vice President again, and as far as he is concerned he never did me any harm. As a matter of fact, on my desk this morning, when I returned to Washington, I found a package of excellent Golden Bantam seed corn from Henry Wallace, so that I am not quarreling with him today. But I do not want to submerge the issue on this Greek-Turkish deal with any attack on Henry Wallace. I want to stick to the subject, and I want to cite the words of substantial American citizens like John Knight, of Akron, the publisher of the Akron Beacon-Journal, who in Sunday's issue of that newspaper stated that he was opposed to the Truman doctrine because—

(1) It destroys the original and fundamental concept of the United Nations; (2) commits the United States in the role of world policeman; (3) stems from the idea that you can buy good will and fight communism with dollars; (4) misleads the American people into believing that this is another glorious triumph for democracy; (5) issues an open invitation to war.

Mr. Speaker, does the bill proposed by President Truman make us a military ally of the present dictatorial Turkish Government? Is the bill for Turkish-Greek aid a military alliance? In effect, does not this bill make the Turkish Army a part of the American armed forces? In effect, are we not guaranteeing Turkish armed control of the Dardanelles? These are questions that need an answer.

A poem sent to me by another substantial citizen is as follows:

If a man has no freedom to fight for at home,
Let him battle for that of his neighbors;
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on his head for his labors.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] received the same or a similar box of corn that I did. These samples of corn are a hybrid developed by the Wallace family. I regret these attacks that have been made upon Mr. Wallace today.

I agree to some extent with the position that the former Vice President has taken but I have some doubt of the propriety as to time and place. I certainly do not want to have this issue of a loan to Turkey submerged by attacking a great, good, sincere American Christian gentleman such as Henry Wallace. I think Mr. Wallace has as much right to advise the British people as Churchill has to advise the American people. It is regrettable these unwarranted attacks have been made as I think that those who attack him are far more vulnerable than is this distinguished American.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills that will be called up by their respective subchairmen, and I first yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up H. R. 492, to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment, and ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask in connection with this bill and three other bills, Mr. Speaker, that we may consider them in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act of June 1, 1938, 52 Stat. 599 (11 D. C. Code 914), be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"SEC. 13. If a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult, or any child charged with an offense which if committed by an adult is punishable by death or life imprisonment, the judge may, after full investigation, waive jurisdiction and order such child held for trial under the regular procedure of the court which would have jurisdiction of such offense if committed by an adult; or such other court may exercise the powers conferred upon the juvenile court in this chapter in conducting and disposing of such cases."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, this is a permissive bill to permit the judge of the junvenile court to waive the jurisdiction of the court in connection with a juvenile 16 years or older, if charged with an offense which would amount to a felony. This is brought about by the situation that under the present law the court cannot waive jurisdiction, and as a result a child who commits murder would only serve up to 21 years of age and then would be permitted to be at large.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 6, strike out "chapter" and insert "act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT TO CONTROL DANGEROUS WEAPONS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), be amended by changing the last period to a colon and adding the following language: "*Provided*, That arrests, searches, and seizures for violation of this section may be made by police officers upon probable cause, as for a felony."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "*Provided*", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "That arrests, without a warrant, and searches and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for violation of this section, by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause, that the person arrested is violating this section at the time of the arrest."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a brief word with reference to the reason for this legislation has been requested by the district attorney and by the corporation counsel, because of the situation which exists under present law, that arrests without a warrant cannot be made of persons carrying a gun. Obviously, in many cases these people of the underworld are carrying guns. This bill permits the police to make arrests of such persons, but only on condition that guns are found upon them and they are without a license for them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 495) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 826 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2201), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 826. Grand larceny: Whoever shall feloniously take and carry away anything of

value of the amount or value of $200 or upward, including things savoring of the realty, shall suffer imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 10 years."

SEC. 2. That section 827 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2202), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 827. Petit larceny; order of restitution: Whoever shall feloniously take and carry away any property of value of less than $200, including things savoring of the realty, shall be fined not more than $200 or be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. And in all convictions for larceny, either grand or petit, the trial justice may, in his sound discretion, order restitution to be made of the value of the money or property shown to have been stolen by the defendant and made way with or otherwise disposed of and not recovered."

SEC. 3. That the first sentence of section 842 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1301), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 842. False pretenses: Whoever, by any false pretense, with intent to defraud, obtains from any person anything of value, or procures the execution and delivery of any instrument of writing or conveyance of real or personal property, or the signature of any person, as maker, endorser, or guarantor, to or upon any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft or check, or any other evidence of indebtedness, and whoever fraudulently sells, barters, or disposes of any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft or check, or other evidence of indebtedness, for value, knowing the same to be worthless, or knowing the signature of the maker, endorser, or guarantor thereof to have been obtained by any false pretense, shall if the value of the property or the sum or value of the money or property so obtained, procured, sold, bartered, or disposed of is $200 or upward, be imprisoned not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years; or, if less than that sum, shall be fined not more than $200 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both * * *."

SEC. 4. That section 847 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 3108), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 847. Whoever maliciously cuts down or destroys, by girdling or otherwise, any standing or growing vine, bush, shrub, sapling, or tree on the land of another, or severs from the land of another any product standing or growing thereon, or any other thing attached thereto, shall, if the value of the thing destroyed or the amount of damage done to any such thing or to the land is $200 or more, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years, or, if such value or amount is less than that sum, shall be fined not less than $5 nor more than $100, or be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 5. That section 848 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 403), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 848. Whoever maliciously injures or destroys, or attempts to injure or destroy, by fire or otherwise, any movable property not his own, of the value of $200 or more, shall be imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, and if the value of the property be less than $200 by a fine not exceeding $200 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both."

SEC. 6. That section 851a of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 851a. Whoever shall be guilty of any offense defined in sections 834 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1202), 835 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1203), 836 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1204), 837 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1205), and 838 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1206) of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia shall, where the thing, evidence of debt, property, proceeds, or profits, be of the value of less than $200 be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than $200, or both."

SEC. 7. That section 851b of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 851b. (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2203) That if any person entrusted with the possession of any thing of value, including things savoring of the realty, for the purpose of applying the same for the use and benefit of the owner or person, so delivering it, shall fraudulently convert the same to his own use he shall, where the value of the thing so converted is $200 or more, be punished by imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 10 years, or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both; and where the value of the thing so converted is less than $200 he shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than $500, or both: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to alter or repeal any section contained in subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of this code."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$200" and insert "$500."

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 3.

Page 3, line 10, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, line 22, strike out "$100" and insert "$500."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 4, line 8, strike out the second "$200" and insert "$500."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "$200" and insert "$500."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is legislation to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal courts of the District of Columbia in larceny cases, raising the amount from $50 to $200, so that many of these small and rather petty cases will not have to be referred to the United States district court. It has been recommended by the judges of the district and municipal courts and as well by the district attorney and the corporation counsel. The bill also increases the maximum fines that may be imposed, as indicated in the committee amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING APPROPRIATION ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H. R. 1448, a bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph No. 2 of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," as amended by an act approved July 1, 1932, is further amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 2. No license shall be issued to any person for the operation of a business in any building or part thereof containing living or lodging quarters of any description required to be licensed under authority of this act, nor for any place of public assembly required to be licensed as hereinafter provided, nor for any other building or place mentioned in an act entitled 'An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved December 24, 1942, required to be licensed as hereinafter provided or required to be licensed in any other act of Congress, until the Director of Inspection, the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department, and any other official of the District of Columbia who shall be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, have certified in writing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent that the applicant for license has, as to such building or place, complied with all laws enacted and regulations made and promulgated for the protection of life and property."

SEC. 2. Paragraph No. 4 of said section of said act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after the words "without the payment of a separate fee or tax for each" the words "and if a business is conducted in more than one building, a separate license shall be required for the business in each building:", so that the paragraph as amended shall read:

"PAR. 4. When more than one business, trade, profession, or calling for which a license is prescribed in this section shall be carried on by the same person, the license fee or tax shall be paid for each such business, trade, profession, or calling, except where otherwise specifically provided in this section: *Provided*, That licenses issued under any of the provisions of this section shall be good only for the location designated thereon, except in the case of licenses issued under this section for businesses and callings which in their nature are carried on at large and not at a fixed place of business, and no license shall be issued for more than one place of business, profession, or calling, without the payment of a separate fee or tax for each, and if a business is conducted in more than one building a separate license shall be required for the business in each building: *Provided further*, That no person holding a license under the terms of this section shall willfully suffer or allow any other person chargeable with a separate license to operate under his license."

SEC. 3. Strike out paragraphs Nos. 28, 29, and 30 of said section of said act, as amended, and in lieu thereof add a new paragraph to be No. 28 and to read as follows:

"PAR. 28. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to classify, according to use, method of operation, and size, buildings containing living or lodging quarters of every description, to require licenses for the business operated in each such building as in their judgment requires inspection, supervision, or regulation by any municipal agency or agencies, and to fix a schedule of license fees therefor in such

amount as, in their judgment, will be commensurate with the cost to the District of Columbia of such inspection, supervision, or regulation: *Provided, however,* That no license shall be required for single-family or two-family dwellings."

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective 60 days after it passage and approval.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the last licensing act was passed in 1903, and the Commissioners have requested the committee to modernize the present licensing system so as to get away from some difficulties which have arisen as a result of the old language as interpreted by the courts. This bill has the recommendation of the Commissioners, and it is felt it is in the interest of health and safety that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, if no Member desires to discuss the bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] to call up bills from his subcommittee.

PROGRAM FOR THE REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the full Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc.—

PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purpose of this act is to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical, psychiatric, and other scientific treatment of chronic alcoholics; to minimize the deleterious effects of excessive drinking on those who pass through the courts of the District of Columbia; to reduce the financial burden imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia by the abusive use of alcoholic beverages, as is reflected in mounting accident rates, decreased personal efficiency, growing absenteeism, and a general increase in the amount and seriousness of crime in the District of Columbia, and to substitute for jail sentences for drunkenness medical and other scientific methods of treatment which will benefit the individual involved and more fully protect the public. In order to accomplish this purpose and alleviate the problem of chronic alcoholism, the courts of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to take judicial notice of the fact that a chronic alcoholic is a sick person and in need of proper medical, institutional, advisory, and rehabilitative treatment, and the court is authorized to direct that he receive appropriate medical, psychiatric, or other treatment as provided under the terms of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. The term "chronic alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages, or while under the influence of alcohol endangers the public morals, health, safety, or welfare.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to establish and equip a clinic in connection either with some existing hospital or with some correctional institution or other facility for the diagnosis, classification, hospitalization, confinement, treatment, and study of persons who are found to be chronic alcoholics, as defined herein, by the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

(b) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are also directed to utilize the alcoholic clinic services for the treatment of the chronic alcoholic as authorized by this act and for the purpose of preparing and administering a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics and the promotion of temperance through teaching and training of professional personnel and use through community organization.

SEC. 4. In any criminal case, brought to trial before any of the judges of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, in which the evidence indicates that the defendant is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of section 2 above, the judge may after a hearing commit the person found to be a chronic alcoholic to the clinic for diagnosis, classification, and treatment as his condition may require, provided the term of commitment shall not exceed 90 days.

SEC. 5. Any court in the District of Columbia having original jurisdiction of the offenses of drunkenness and intoxication may, upon its own motion, or at the request of any police officer or any representative of the Board of Public Welfare, issue a warrant for any person who has forfeited collateral upon a third arrest for drunkenness or intoxication within any one year and may then determine whether such person is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act. If the court shall find the person to be a chronic alcoholic, he may commit him generally to the clinic for a term not to exceed 90 days.

SEC. 6. (a) Any resident of the District of Columbia who is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act may voluntarily submit himself for admission and treatment in the clinic. Any such voluntary applicant shall be examined by the director of the clinic under such rules and regulations as the Commissioners may approve. If he is found to be a chronic alcoholic, the Commissioners may in their discretion admit the applicant to the clinic for such period of time as is estimated by the director as necessary to effect a cure. He may be given such treatment, guidance, and help as the director deems appropriate except that he may not be committed to a correctional institution. The Commissioners may require any such chronic alcoholic voluntarily applying to pay the cost of his subsistence, care, and treatment. All such money shall be covered into the credit of the appropriation from which the expenditure was made.

(b) Any resident of the District of Columbia who voluntarily submits himself for admission and treatment in the clinic shall not forfeit or abridge thereby any of his rights as a citizen of the United States, nor shall the fact that he has submitted himself for admission and treatment or that he has been given help or has submitted himself to any study, treatment, or guidance be used against him in any proceeding in any court. The record of any application under this section by any individual for admission and treatment in the clinic and the record of any study of, or treatment, guidance, or help furnished to, any individual admitted in the clinic under this section shall be confidential, and not be divulged. No order may be made under section 8 with respect to any such individual except as provided under the rules and regulations of the Commissioners in effect at the time such individual voluntarily submitted himself for admission and treatment in the clinic.

SEC. 7. The director of the clinic shall provide a classification and diagnostic center. Every person committed to the clinic shall first be sent to this classification and diagnostic center for observation, examination, and classification. The classification center shall make a complete study of each person committed, including mental and physical condition, personal traits, pertinent circumstances of school and family life, and any delinquency, criminal experience, or other factors contributing to his addiction to alcohol.

SEC. 8. (a) The director of the clinic may then make an order (1) permitting the chronic alcoholic to remain at liberty conditionally and under supervision, or (2) direct that he be committed to another appropriate agency, hospital, or institution for treatment, or, with the approval of the court, order him confined in a correctional institution under such conditions as the director of the clinic believes best designed for the protection of the public: *Provided,* That commitment to the clinic, an institution, hospital, or other facility shall not exceed the term specified by the court.

(b) The Attorney General of the United States may, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, designate the director of the clinic as his authorized representative under section 11 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved July 15, 1932, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 24–425).

SEC. 9. At the expiration of the term of commitment the chronic alcoholic must be discharged, unless the director of the clinic recommends to the court prior to the expiration of the term of commitment that he is in need of additional treatment in an appropriate hospital or institution, in which event the court will conduct a second hearing as to his condition, and may order the chronic alcoholic recommitted for an additional period of 90 days or less as his condition requires.

SEC. 10. A chronic alcoholic committed to the clinic and who is permitted to remain at liberty or conditionally released shall be under the supervision of the probation office of the court in which he was sentenced, or the clinic, or such other agency, public or private, as the director of the clinic may determine.

SEC. 11. No chronic alcoholic shall be committed under the terms of this act until the District Commissioner shall certify to the municipal court of the District of Columbia the extent to which proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel have been provided to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may contract with any appropriate agency not under its control for the custody, care, subsistence, treatment, and training of persons committed to the alcoholic clinic herein authorized.

SEC. 13. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to appoint a director of the clinic, who shall be a qualified medical man, the necessary medical officers, psychiatrists, probation officers, social-case workers, and other personnel needed to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 14. The director of the clinic shall from time to time submit to the Commissioners such recommendations as will further the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, prevent the excessive and abusive use of alcoholic beverages, promote temperance, and

he shall also gather and publish as complete and accurate data as is possible relating to the physiological, psychological, economic, and social effects of the abusive use of alcoholic beverages and shall prepare and publish materials, data, and information to be used in a program of public education in the District of Columbia directed toward the prevention and use of alcoholic beverages excessively and abusively.

SEC. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and thereafter such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Section 3 (a), page 3, line 7: Strike out "the municipal", insert the word "any" before the word "court."

Section 4, page 3, line 17: Strike out the words "the municipal", insert the word "any" before the word "court."

Section 6 (b), page 5, line 13: After the word "divulged", insert "except on order of the court."

Section 8 (a), page 6, lines 3 and 4: Strike out the words "an order", insert in place thereof the words "a recommendation to the committing judge."

Section 8 (a), page 6, line 5: Change the word "direct" to "directing."

Section 8 (a), page 6, beginning on line 7, strike out "with the approval of the court, order him confined in a correctional institution under such conditions as the director of the clinic believes best designed for the protection of the public: *Provided*, That commitment to the clinic, an institution, hospital, or other facility shall not exceed the term specified by the court" and insert in place thereof the following: "(3) directing that he be confined in a correctional institution, and the court may then determine the conditions under which a chronic alcoholic shall be committed and order such commitment."

Section 10, page 7, line 8: Strike out the word "sentenced" and insert in place thereof the word "committed."

Section 10, page 7, line 9: Strike out the words "director of the clinic" and insert in place thereof the word "court."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, the bill is one that sets up a rehabilitation program for chronic alcoholics in the District of Columbia and provides for their scientific and medical treatment when so designated by the court. It might be of interest to the Members of the House to know that in 12 years' time there have been 318,000 arrests in the District. In 1946 there were 30,321 arrests. There are a great many arrests for alcoholism. The police in the District of Columbia have done a very fine job of keeping the staggering drunks off the streets and out of public view. However, many of these people who are intoxicated are brought to the court and sent to the workhouse where they have a daily average of about 550 people all there for drunkenness. Many of them have been sentenced 10 to 20 times in a few years. Sixty percent are repeaters and they are turned out after serving a mild sentence and no effort is made to treat them. The chairman of the committee that had this matter under consideration in the Seventy-ninth Congress appointed a committee to make a study of this problem. The personnel of the committee was Representative Hébert, of Louisiana; Judge Laws, chief justice of the district court in the District of Columbia; Mr. Bennett, of the Bureau of Prisons; Mr. Morse, chairman of the Board of Public Welfare; and Vernon West, corporation counsel. This group did make a very careful study of the problem. They brought in a bill which the committee feels ought to be adopted for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

This bill presents new legislation and a new approach to the problem of alcoholism. I think it will probably be the means of saving the District some money. It is estimated that these 137,000 who have been in jail in the last 10 years have cost the District between five and eight million dollars.

This bill sets up a clinic for the treating of chronic alcoholics. It is under the supervision of the Commissioners, and it has not only their approval but is given the green light by the industry. It provides for the scientific treatment of these chronic alcoholics. They can be assigned to the clinic when in the judgment of the court that is where they belong and then through scientific approaches try to cut down the number of individuals who might otherwise be sent to jail. There were 2,750 alcoholics at Gallinger Hospital in 1943. This last year there were 4,000. Many of those alcoholics are there because of excessive use of hard liquor. The best medical opinion before our committee was to the effect that from 30 to 50 percent of the chronic alcoholics could be helped. We feel that this bill is one which will be a step forward in an attempt to rehabilitate some of the chronic alcoholics of the District of Columbia. The bill calls for an appropriation of $100,000 from the general fund. When the clinic is fully established more money will be needed. It will be money well spent. The committee feels that in the end money will be saved, society will be benefited, and a forward step taken to do something definite about treating these chronic alcoholics, who are really sick individuals. Jail is not the answer to their trouble. We think they are sick people and need scientific and technical attention of psychiatrists and medical personnel. This will be done under the supervision of a qualified medical director in the clinic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am very strongly in favor of this bill. I think it a marked step forward. I think other States in the United States are coming to a realization that the way to meet this issue is through clinics. I hope this bill will be passed.

However, I do want to say this, that I think it unfortunate, when this bill did go through the committee, that the cost of maintaining the clinics was not provided for by deriving the money from the industry which creates the necessity for the clinics.

Here is a great opportunity in the District of Columbia to prove the advisability of that method of payment for these clinics. An effort is being made in California today to secure the cost of the clinics from that source. It has already been done in the State of Connecticut with marked success. It was proposed but not passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts, all of which are indications that the thinking of the people is that the cost of the clinics should be laid directly upon the industry which creates the necessity.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I wish to say to the gentleman that I agree wholeheartedly in what he has said in connection with the taxation feature, but after extensive hearings it was decided that the best way to get the bill passed at this time was to change that particular section of the original bill and draw the funds out of the general fund. The original bill contained a section directly taxing the industry, the place from which I think the money should come.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. As I say, as far as I know, Connecticut is the only State so far that has actually done it, but it has been done there very successfully and other States will follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENIORITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1997) to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia whose name appeared (as a result of a regular competitive examination for promotion) on any civil-service register with respect to such force or department for promotion to a higher rank or grade, while he was serving in the armed forces of the United States during the period beginning May 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946, shall, for the purpose of determining his seniority rights and service in such rank or grade, be held to have been promoted to such rank or grade as of the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same promotion register received a promotion, to such rank or grade.

(b) No officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to the benefits of this section who has reenlisted after June 1, 1945, in the Regular Military Establishment or after February 1, 1945, in the Regular Naval Establishment.

SEC. 2. No officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, by reason of the enactment of this act, be (1) reduced in rank or grade, or (2) entitled to any compensation for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the title of the bill explains the bill. This merely gives those members of the police force who are veterans of World War II the right to retain and maintain their seniority when they return from the service.

The bill has been approved by the District Commissioners, by the Chief of the Police Department, and the Chief of the Fire Department, with the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "promotion", insert "either permanently or temporarily."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF STONE PIERS ON WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the National Park Service is hereby authorized and directed to remove the stone piers from West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy about the bill. It simply directs the removal of two stone piers which are traffic hazards in West Executive Avenue.

The bill has the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker that concludes the business of the Commfttee on the District of Columbia for today.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, as I have had the pleasure of saying before in this well, Alabama is proud of the splendid work of the able Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama, the Honorable PETE JARMAN.

Particularly has his service been outstanding as a member of our great Committee on Foreign Affairs. In that field one of his notable contributions has been to the cause of the good-neighbor policy that has meant and is meaning so much toward the establishment of friendship in the Americas.

It gives me great pleasure therefore, on this Pan-American Day, to call the attention of those of us who may not have been privileged to hear it, to Mr. JARMAN'S address to the Club de las Americas, delivered in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior in Washington, on March 13, 1947:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first, I wish to heartily congratulate each member of this excellent club on your fine interest in pan-American affairs and in the study of Spanish. Just as these affairs will remain all important so, in my opinion, will Spanish be the most valuable foreign language for citizens of the United States in the future.

It is pleasing to note that you have designated this night as The Night of the United States and I appreciate very much the privilege you very kindly afford me of participating therein. This is particularly true since you have dedicated it to the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary. Having long been rather active in the former, my local post of which did me the honor of electing me its original commander at its organization meeting while I was still in France, and having enjoyed the privilege of serving as department commander of Alabama and in other official capacities, I yield to no man in my loyalty to the Legion and to the principles for which it stands, and I am always happy to be associated with Legionnaires and their ladies under any circumstances. My attitude toward pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy is a very similar one.

You Spanish speakers are particularly aware that Pan-American Day has become a very significant anniversary. Commemorating the political, economic and spiritual unity of the Americas, based on the doctrine of absolute juridical equality and respect for the sovereignty of each, it has become a powerful influence in bringing about closer understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It is the one day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize their common bond and their common hope for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation.

In 1944 the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited the Speaker or President and one other member of similar bodies in the other Americas to attend the celebration of this day by his group. It was my good fortune to have been selected, together with Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, now the ranking majority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, who succeeded me recently as Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee thereof, for this mission. It afforded me much pleasure to speak for our country on that festive occasion, my one regret having been my lack of knowledge of Spanish which necessitated the translation of my speech.

It was agreed at a conference on the following day that we would request ratification by our various bodies of the creation of an American Interparliamentary Congress to promote a movement of continental unity on the parliamentary level. The resolution included the setting up of a permanent commission consisting of the senior delegates from the countries represented. Our House of Representatives readily and unanimously ratified the creation of this commission and I am confident that it will prove quite fruitful during the years to come even though the circumstances have prevented it being very active as yet.

In 1906, at the third American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, Elihu Root said:

"There is not one of all of our countries that cannot benefit the others; there is not one that cannot receive benefit from the others; there is not one that will not gain by the prosperity, the peace and the happiness of all."

Thirty years later, President Roosevelt said at another Pan-American Conference at the same place:

"The interdependence of nations is the major premise upon which the whole system of inter-American relations is based. No nation can live entirely alone. No people is sufficient unto itself."

In proclaiming Pan-American Day in 1945 Mayor Burke, of Cleveland, very appropriately said:

"Nature has made us neighbors. Let good will and cooperation make us good neighbors."

There are so many reasons in addition to those of geography, for the solidarity of the Americas and the good-neighbor policy, that it is rather difficult to select from among them. However, it occurs to me to mention the reciprocal character of their economies and the close parallel of their political evolutions. As you well know, they were are at one time colonies of European states. The basis of the revolutions which caused their independence was practically the same. They were based on the dissatisfaction of the peoples of the colonies with the economic, political and intellectual restrictions of the mother countries.

There is no one of the American countries which produces everything it needs, but the Americas produce practically everything they all need. Stated in another way, there is no American country that is self-sufficient, whereas the American continent is practically so. To illustrate, where would we have been during the recent war—I mean the United States—but for the magnificent cooperation of our sister American Republics? Where without the tin of Bolivia? Where without the cooper of Chile and Peru? Where without the quinine of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia? And where without those bases and that life-line down through Brazil when we entered Africa, to say nothing of the magnificent Brazilian Expeditionary Force which so long and so valiantly fought as a part of General Clark's army in Italy and those excellent Mexican aviators? These are but illustrations of the great contributions made by the Americas to the war effort. In addition, we of the United States will, of course, never forget the speedy declarations of war by so many of our good neighbors. It will be recalled that little Costa Rica declared war several hours before we did with the statement that an aggression against any American country was one against them all.

The degree of economic development in each of the Americas is, of course, different, some having developed to a much greater extent than others. That will continue. What it behooves us all to do is to see that the development of all the Americas continues apace until at least something like full advantage of the fine possibilities of each one of these great countries is taken. While all countries must, and I am sure will, do their parts, I am impressed that it is the duty of the United States to continue its

leadership in fostering this development, not only within our boundaries, but throughout the hemisphere.

With that background it is not at all unnatural that the statesmen of the Americas have been pan-American minded. It was quite natural for President Monroe when promulgating the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 to have been thinking of the interests of the other American countries even though he naturally had first in mind the welfare of his own. It was equally so for the activities of the liberator Simón Bolivar to have spread throughout South America and not be confined to his native Venezuela. In fact, it spread much further as illustrated by the identity of the great American soldier, who was in command of the Tenth Army practically throughout its conquest of Okinawa until a Jap shell laid him low only a few days before final and complete victory. I refer to that outstanding American lieutenant general, Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., whose father was named for the great liberator.

The American system of international relations had its foundation more than 100 years ago. It took more tangible form more than 50 years ago and at the 1945 Conference on the Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City it reached a degree of development which is outstanding in the history of the world. Let us hope, believe, and reverently pray that it will continue so. Despite the existence of pan-Americanism and its comparatively slow progress for more than a hundred years, it remained for the leadership of two great citizens of the United States to sufficiently accelerate the movement to bring about the possibility of such development. I, of course, refer to our lamented President Roosevelt and that great Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Very shortly after having entered office in 1933 they formulated the good-neighbor policy, the greatest step toward good relations between the Americas that ever has occurred or can ever occur. Furthermore, who can deny the possibility that it will in time be reflected upon as one of the greatest contributions toward permanent peace? Senator Austin, our able delegate to the United Nations said Saturday: "The world security for which the United Nations is striving rests on the oaken beam of Western Hemisphere solidarity."

I am aware that some think too little attention has been paid since the advent of the United Nations, the Charter of which specifically provides for such regional systems, to pan-Americanism. While it is natural for all to have been thoroughly engrossed in an effort to preserve civilization by making the United Nations succeed, I do not believe either the statesmen or the general population of the Americas have overlooked its importance, or will permit the success of any effort to divide and conquer.

One of the first implementations, and a very productive one, of the good-neighbor policy, was the withdrawal of the Marines from Haiti under the provision thereof that henceforth no American republic would interfere with the internal affairs of another.

I am reminded of an interesting experience. When the boat on which I was proceeding to Panama docked for several hours at Port-au-Prince, in August 1939 we immediately learned that they were celebrating a national holiday and were at first somewhat disappointed that the stores would be closed. This disappointment was soon allayed, however, by the realization that, though we would not become acquainted with the shops, we were seeing practically the entire population in the streets. Were they celebrating their original liberation from the French? Were they celebrating their second liberation from that country? Was it a celebration of the conclusion of one of their numerous conflicts with their neighbors on the same island? No; they were celebrating the day on which the United States Marines were withdrawn.

There was a time when it was well nigh impossible for the good-neighbor policy to function as it now can, since the people of the Americas could not know each other very well because of the great distances, the sparseness of the population of many, in fact most, of the countries and the difficulties of transportation. Fortunately that defect has been very largely remedied by the radio and airplane. I learned of Secretary Knox's death by a radio announcement at Arequipa, Peru. We know much more of each other now, even if we never visit one of our neighboring American Republics, than we could possibly have known before. These developments of science can but contribute much toward the continued progress of, and improvement in, pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy.

It is most interesting to trace developments of the pan-American concept from the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, to the Act of Chapultepec. I referred to the fact that the Monroe Doctrine was a proclamation of a President of the United States which said to the rest of the world in behalf of his country alone, "Hands off of this hemisphere. Posted. There will be no more colonization. If you have any idea, you of countries who had had colonies over here and have lost them, of regaining them, you had just as well forget it, because you will not do so." This policy so remained for years. In the conference at Habana, however, in 1940, just after France fell, when we of the Americas probably first realized the great danger which confronted us, the other American Republics joined with the United States in saying to the world, "Hands off of this hemisphere. Any aggression by you against one of the American countries will be considered by the others as an aggression against us all. You shall not pass."

Then in 1945 came the Mexico City Conference, which resulted in the all-important Act of Chapultepec. This act, you will recall, extends the Monroe Doctrine and the Habana Conference resolution so that every American Republic now guarantees every other one against aggression from within as well as from without this hemisphere. In briefly discussing it on the floor of the House shortly after having read of it, I hailed the Act of Chapultepec as a new Monroe Doctrine, as a new good-neighbor policy, and, mark this, I referred to it as probably a forerunner of things to come. This was shortly before the convening of the San Francisco Conference and I had in mind the hope that this action of the American Republics, which I felt quite confident would forever banish war from this hemisphere, would be followed at San Francisco by similar action on the part of all the peoples of the world. We were aware then that the civilization we know could not survive another war and that it was, therefore, imperative that the leadership of the world do whatever is necessary to prevent one. I hoped then, and still hope and believe, that this was the first step. If this hope materializes, which, or something like it, must occur if civilization is to survive, pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy will go down in history as having been most instrumental in the preservation of permanent peace, not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world. In this event, all other practical aspects and benefits of this policy will fade into insignificance in comparison with its influence on this great accomplishment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM TODAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today Pan-American Day to commemorate the date in 1890 when the Pan American Union was first created. We do honor today to our 20 sister republics of the Americans, republics which have gained their freedom through that same exaltation of the spirit shown by us in 1776; republics which by much sacrifice have adhered to their original principles of freedom throughout their histories. Truly all of us in the United States and in the 20 other American Republics may take pride in calling ourselves American. It should be made clear once and for all that this word is equally applicable to every citizen of every American Republic.

It is interesting to recall that it was a Republican Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, who issued the call for the first conference in 1889. But great as was the contribution of Secretary Blaine and President Arthur, the idea of a common interest among the nations of the Americas came from the great patriot and liberator Simon Bolivar, who proposed the First Congress of Plenipotentiaries from all American Nations in 1826. The Pan American Union itself truly states that Pan-American Day "is the only day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize our common bonds and common hopes for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation." The President of the United States has proclaimed this week to be Pan-American Week and that proclamation refers to the "inter-American system which has developed around the Pan American Union."

On such a day as this it is fitting that we should reexamine the foundations of the inter-American system, the glorious history upon which it is based, and the goals toward which we shall move together in the days to come. All of us here, regardless of party, are faithfully devoted to the good-neighbor policy, the Montevideo policy of nonintervention on which it is based, and the strengthening of our ties with our sister republics. Such a policy involves first, freedom from interference in and the highest respect for the internal management and affairs of each of the American Republics; and, second, a correlative obligation to consult with and to work with each other in the interests which concern us collectively without selfishness and without dictation. It involves, too, a willingness by some to defer to the judgment of others even though they may disagree, in order to advance the cause of all. Elihu Root, another great Secretary of State, said at the Pan-American Conference in 1906:

> We neither claim nor desire any rights, or privileges, or powers that we do not freely concede to every American Republic.

The inter-American system has had splendid fruition in the programs for inter-American cultural and educational exchange, in the reciprocal trade program, in the international conferences of the American states, and in many specialized fields—in medicine, law, science, religion, labor and civil rights.

It is especially timely now to appraise our common future in view of the postwar strains and pressures which are beginning to show up. It is becoming clear that our kind of constitutional democracy which is based on individual freedom, is being challenged as never before by a form of society which considers it desirable to subordinate individual human rights and democratic processes to attain what is claimed to be a better and more secure economic system. Not only is this thesis, which is broadly the Communist thesis, being propagated overseas but it is being propagated right here in the Americas. An outstanding leader of the Communist party in Brazil is authority for the statement that there is a hard core of militant members of Communist parties totalling about 390,000 in the other American republics; that of these, 130,000 are in Brazil, 50,000 are in Chile, 150,000 are in Cuba, 25,000 are in Mexico and 35,000 are in Argentina. The voting strength of these parties is politically more significant than their membership would indicate. In the Presidential elections of December 1945, in Brazil the Communist party claiming a membership of 130,000 actually polled 586,000 votes or about 10 percent of the total cast. In Chile with a claimed membership of only 50,000, the Communist party polled about 9 percent of the votes cast in the Presidential election in 1946, but provided the critical total needed by the Presidential candidate of one of the older parties and obtained 3 posts in the 11 man cabinet of the President. We have had other experiences with totalitarian ideologies in the other American republics, and we are probably not yet through with those either. Relentless investigation, diplomatic action and the white light of publicity did much to lessen the threat to our security of Nazi and Fascist penetration in the other American republics—a penetration powerful in economic, social and political circles, though not as strong in numbers. But the same technique does not suit every ism nor is the issue always timed the same.

The activities in the Americas of the indigenous Communist Parties may not constitute an imminent threat to our security; nor do I believe that this movement can be dealt with by force or repression. I believe rather that Communists in this hemisphere represent in the American Republics a new influence to be taken seriously as resulting from low standards of living and semifeudal economies in many countries; which seem hardly credible when found so close to our own borders by thousands of our citizens who work in or visit the other American Republics. For example, the life expectancy of the average citizen of the United States is 65 years; the life expectancy of the average Mexican is 34, and of the average Brazilian 43 years. The reasons for this are not organic but are found in undernourishment, bad housing, bad sanitation, and inadequate medical care. In Brazil, for example, malaria is a major disease occurring in millions of cases and causing 35 percent of the total deaths every year, whereas in the United States deaths from malaria are very rare and the disease is well under control. In the United States we have 1 doctor for every 700 inhabitants and in Brazil they have 1 for every 2,000; then, too, although 3 hospital beds per 1,000 population is considered an absolute minimum, we find in a country like Colombia exactly one-half of that. Infant mortality shows the same pattern. In the United States infant mortality averages 40 per 1,000 live births; in Brazil the comparable figure is almost five times as great—185; and in Colombia it is 154. That these problems essentially have an economic base is clear when we consider the per capita incomes in the other American Republics as compared with our own. According to the latest figures, our own per capita income has climbed to approximately $1,150 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This compares with a per capita income in Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and practically every other Central and South American country, except Uruguay and Argentina, of under $100 per person, or less than one-tenth the United States figure.

We are at present engaged in the consideration of a vast program for economic and other aid to Greece and Turkey designed to fortify the national integrity of these countries and to prevent their collapse as independent and democratic states. We know that this may well be the forerunner of obligations of the same general character to be undertaken in other parts of the Middle East, Europe, and in Asia, and possibly in Africa. If the areas of vital interest to us include Thessaly and the Black Sea, they certainly include the Caribbean, the South Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. and yet we countenance right here in our own back yard the continued existence of economic conditions which lend strength and support to a system of society we consider to be antithetical in every respect to our own—we seem to be quite unmindful of the fact that the Communist ideology is gaining, not losing, ground throughout the other American republics. Here more clearly than anywhere else in the world the answer is dictated by basic facts we know so well—low standards of living, leading to despair, leading to the refuge of despair which is communism.

Linked closely with insufficient income in producing low standards of living is the illiteracy of large masses of the population of the other American republics. Here, too, there are enormous advances to be made. Compared with a literacy of 96 percent of the population in the United States, literacy in most of the other American republics averages about 50 percent of the population, rising to a high of 85–90 percent in Argentina and falling to lows in the 30-percent bracket in other countries.

During the recent war a great effort was made by United States agencies, in full cooperation with and on the invitation of most of the other American republics, for the improvement of their standards of living, standards of education, and standards of health. It is estimated that the United States spent $76,000,000 on these programs from 1942 to 1946. For example, $16,000,000 were spent by the United States in cooperative health and sanitation programs alone, and millions of citizens of the other American republics were benefited in this way. Large contributions were made by the other American republics toward this program. In Bolivia contributions were about equal between the United States and Bolivian Governments; Mexico contributed 40 percent of the total cost, and in every case the Government benefited made substantial contributions. In Brazil alone 370 health centers were established. But these programs are gradually terminating—most of them in 1948—and what shall succeed them? In most cases it is doubtful that the health and sanitation programs can be carried on with local resources and local technical personnel; practically every participating government invites the United States to continue its interest and the program on a long-term basis and until higher standards are achieved and given permanence. Another example is the Inter-American Highway, now well along but still needing $65,000,000 and 4 years' work to become a complete connecting link. This does not mean that we should go on forever supporting such operations, but it does mean that we should go on until they can or reasonably should be able to stand on their own feet.

In the field of education the same is true. Our educational missions in Peru, Chile, Haiti, Costa Rica, Honduras, Brazil, and other countries will be pulling out in about 1948, unless they are extended. They have had enormous effect in raising the level of education, vocational training, and normal-school training, and in supplying competent instruction through teacher-training programs in all of these countries. It is very clear that practically everywhere the job is just about started—not even well started—as in most cases the program has been for 2 or 3 years while what is needed is a 10-year program. The governments concerned want us to go on, yet, the war being over, they are afraid that our interest in them will lag, just as it did after World War I, and that we will not think of them in terms of mutual helpfulness again until another crisis comes upon us.

I wish to make it clear at this point that the other American republics have not been the recipients of favors from us in respect to these programs but have been full partners, cooperating in every way, including their money contributions.

Together we have recognized the fact that improvement of the health, sanitation, education, and living standards of all Americans in the Western Hemisphere is of equal importance to the security and well-being of every country in the hemisphere.

To those who say that these programs take large sums of money, let it be made clear at once that World War II cost us $100,000,000 per year, and that when the attack came at Pearl Harbor it was to the other American republics we looked first—their friendship, their loyalty to the common cause assured us at once that we were safe in our own homes. From that point on we could mobilize our resources freely and go on to win. Continuance of our program in the other American republics on the basis of full

and continuing cooperation with them should not cost us more than about a hundred million dollars a year—one-fourth of the Greek-Turkish assistance program for 15 months. The results of our own security, in the successful demonstration in this hemisphere that our form of society is the best on earth and in the general happiness of living with neighbors who also are healthy and prosperous and well educated, will repay any such investment many times over—and this is quite apart from the very tangible benefits in trade which would flow from a prosperous, literate, and healthy Latin America.

Few of us recognize the size of the markets to the south of us and what they mean to us in terms of trade. In a normal year like 1939, 9.6 percent of our total exports, equaling $329,127,000, and 13.7 percent of our total imports, totaling $317,267,000, were with the other American Republics; while in the first 8 months of 1946 we shipped $94,000,000 of goods to Argentina alone. For their development the other American Republics need our agricultural and industrial machinery, power, transportation, and commercial equipment, chemicals, paper products, and many other items. We, in turn, need their raw materials, mineral and oil resources. There is, too, the opportunity for an enormous trade among the other American Republics, such as that now growing between Brazil and her neighbors in cotton textiles. Progress in industrialization within the other American Republics will materially raise their standards of living and per capita income. It will go far toward creating a middle class—now practically nonexistent in the other American Republics—and yet in every democratic country the bulwark of democracy and individual freedom.

Money alone will not do our job in the Americas, but technical help—engineers, doctors, dentists, sanitation experts, metallurgists, factory managers, business supervisors, and a host of other specialists—are necessary. These men should be trained especially for the purpose of working in the other American Republics and should consider themselves as soldiers of democracy, and not just as workingmen. For this purpose a great training organization in the United States is essential. The possibility of having citizens of the other American Republics study in the United States and learn our techniques for use in their own countries has not begun to be adequately utilized, nor have cultural and educational exchanges taken place on nearly the scale essential to the common destiny of the Americas.

Much oratory has been lavished and much discussion stimulated by the failure so far to undertake the final implementation of the Act of Chapultepec of February 1945 in negotiating a hemisphere defense treaty among the American republics. Such a treaty is essential to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere and fits into the structure of the United Nations Charter, which was designed to accommodate it. It should be effectuated as soon as possible. An essential element, however, in the negotiation of such a treaty lies in the need for joining together American nations whose internal economies and well-being is more nearly approaching comparability than is the case now among the other American republics and the United States. To enter into such a treaty in any other context would be to endeavor to build upon sand a concrete structure of hemispheric security, and possibly to contribute within each of the other American republics to a continuance of the economic status quo. The final negotiation of the hemisphere defense treaty designed at Chapultepec should go hand in hand with an Inter-American Conference for Economic and Cultural Cooperation and the reorientation of the United States inter-American program of World War II to the peacetime needs of the other American republics. Then we would have no need to fear totalitarian ideologies in the Western Hemisphere and we could march together with our brothers of the other American republics toward our common destiny of peace culture and prosperity.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT BUILDINGS ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the colleges and universities of America face a crisis. GI enrollments throughout the land have soared to unprecedented levels. The educational institutions acknowledge that their buildings are woefully inadequate. For at least 5 years they shall be confronted with the need for additional buildings.

There were 100,000 more veterans in colleges and universities this past February than there were last September. At least another 100,000—and probably more—will be enrolled by next September.

But all this, I am sure you will agree, is exactly as it should be. A grateful nation is fulfilling a promise to its young men and young women who left their classrooms to serve their country. Many times over have they earned the right to a college education.

I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who would want us to go back on our word. Yet, gentlemen, unless action is taken, that will be the result.

A few days ago I introduced legislation which would provide grants-in-aid for construction of permanent buildings on college and university campuses. H. R. 2845 is not a general-aid bill for higher education; it is a tool which Congress must have to carry out its responsibilities under Public Law 16 and Public Law 346, the so-called GI bills.

Educational institutions of college grade have done their part to meet the challenge Congress gave them in passing veterans' legislation. They have increased their capacity more than one-third above that of 1939 and 1940. Meanwhile, their enrollments have doubled and tripled.

I am sure that each of you is fully aware of what is happening in the colleges and universities within your own districts. The facts show that the situation is peculiar to no one district. It is peculiar to no single State. We are facing a problem which is national in scope.

Housing is congested. There is also a real shortage now in classrooms, study halls, infirmaries, libraries, and other buildings. These, as well as dormitories, are essential. An academic plant can no more operate without them than an automobile can run without a motor.

We have already added temporary facilities, both housing and nonhousing, on many campuses. The institutions have matched the Federal expenditures almost dollar for dollar. It was the only way to provide buildings during the lean period of critical materials. Now, however, permanent building materials can be acquired.

I have been advised that the temporary buildings cost five-eighths as much as permanent structures. That is why I am opposed to putting any large amount of additional funds into temporary classrooms, libraries, and other buildings. I have never believed in buying shoes with paper soles for $5 when a pair made of leather could be bought for $8. It looks like poor economy to me, both for the colleges and for the Congress.

The measure which I have introduced has safeguards to make certain that it would not establish a permanent policy.

No grant-in-aid would be approved unless the need were certified by the Office of Education as resulting from veterans' enrollment. Construction must get underway by December 31, 1948, and the buildings must be completed in time to be of service to veterans. No grant-in-aid may exceed 50 percent of the cost of the building.

I have reason to believe that this bill will have the strong support not only of the colleges and universities but also of veterans' organizations. They share the belief that there should be adequate facilities for veterans to pursue the educational courses which their Government promised.

They need our help. They need it now.

I strongly urge consideration of H. R. 2845 without delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with regard to Hon. D. Emmert Brumbaugh, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

RABBI ALEXANDER D. GOODE INTERDENOMINATIONAL MEMORIAL CHAPEL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish communities of York, Hanover, and Gettysburg in my congressional district

are responsible for some noteworthy work which is deserving of recognition.

I am referring to the $15,000 interdenominational chapel which has been presented to the new Boy Scout camp near Dillsburg, Pa. Announcement of the presentation was made recently by Attorney Horace G. Ports, president of the York-Adams area council.

This chapel will commemorate the heroism of Rabbi Alexander V. Goode, onetime Scout committeeman for troop 37, and the three other chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the transport *Dorchester* off Greenland in February 1943. The other chaplains were the Reverend John P. Washington, Catholic; the Reverend Clark V. Poling and the Reverend George L. Fox, Protestants.

In making the announcement, Mr. Ports revealed that the chairman of the chapel fund campaign, Mr. Mose Leibowitz, prominent York merchant, had reported 91 percent of the fund-raising drive completed with $12,975 contributed by 675 individuals. Children ranging in age from 4 to 12 accounted for $400 in contributions.

Serving on the Goode Memorial Chapel committee are: Sidney Bernstein, Ben Sevel, Philip Bernstein, Rabbi M. N. Friedman, Rabbi Leonard Rothstein, Arthur Markowitz, Louis Hollander, A. D. Cohen, Oscar Kranich, E. A. Freedman, Maurice Lavetan, Bernard Zuckerman, Morton Kagen, Louis Mavetan, Mose Leibowitz, Joseph Lehmayer, Joseph Sperling, Ben Lavetan, and Ben Landi, all of York; Nat Ginsburg and Jerome Sherman, Hanover; and Irving Bierer, of Gettysburg.

The chapel project, undertaken by the Jewish community, is only one part of the general fund-raising campaign for the new camp by the York-Adams council. The chapel will be built on the new camp site as soon as materials become available. The proposed chapel has a main edifice 92 feet in length and 42 feet in width, with meditation wings connected by cloisters, each being 16 feet by 24 feet. The chapel will be of log and native wood construction, with concrete and flagstone floors. The outdoor assembly will be built on an inclined surface rising away from the sanctuary to form an amphitheater. The chapel will contain offices, studies and vessel and vestment storage rooms.

Services may be conducted in the interior if weather should not permit outdoor services. Both the auditorium and the outdoor amphitheater will seat 300. Separate services may be held in each section at the same time, without interfering with the other. The altar may be revolved to face either an inside or outside service. The sides of the sanctuary being on hinges, this area may be closed off if desired. Although designed as a place of worship for all faiths, the enclosed pavilion may be used for entertainments or as a workshop.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these gentlemen in behalf of the Goode Memorial Chapel to be erected for the Boy Scouts is a fine example of community spirit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Preparatory Committee set up by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations convened in Geneva to lay the foundations for multilateral expansion of international trade. Under Secretary of State Will Clayton and his staff are conferring with representatives of 18 other countries in an effort to do two things: First, to conclude preparations for an International Conference on World Trade and Employment and drafting of a charter for an International Trade Organization, along the lines proposed by the United States Government in November 1945; second, to undertake to negotiate with these other countries, who will also negotiate with each other, trade agreements providing for the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers and for the substantial elimination of trade discriminations. These are the purposes outlined by Mr. Clayton before the Committee on Ways and Means prior to departure for Geneva.

Now, you might wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Under Secretary of State, busy as he must have been preparing for the Geneva meeting, should have to appear on three successive days before our committee. Nothing was said that was not already common knowledge. The operation of the trade-agreements program has been publicly aired during the congressional consideration of four successive extensions of the reciprocal trade program. The draft of a charter of the International Trade Organization has been publicized and hearings have been held in selected cities from coast to coast to enable interested parties to present their views.

So why detain Mr. Clayton? And why are we having the current hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means on the reciprócal trade program? Since the committee is not considering specific legislation, we can only conclude that their intention is to snipe at Mr. Clayton's efforts at Geneva. This conclusion is supported, Mr. Speaker, by the flood of propaganda that is being released upon the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress, and by some of the slanted statements, many of them wholly in error, being made in the House by a few Members of the majority.

To set the record straight then, let us analyze first the figures on foreign trade with specified countries inserted by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1947, at page A1370. The heading of this insertion reads:

> America's share in the total out-of-country purchases of all the principal trading nations of the world grows smaller under the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. Instead of expanding it, our foreign trade is now threatened with extinction.

How utterly misleading and inaccurate this heading is we shall see in a moment.

There is an impressive-appearing tabulation. It is impressive in the sense that the number of years and the results which the author desired to show are uniform. When this table is casually analyzed it is found that it completely misses the mark intended.

In the first place this table was presented to show that the results of the trade-agreements program has been unfavorable. Of the 13 countries shown in the table, 4 were nonagreement countries, 3 of which were Germany, Italy, and Japan, our recent enemies in World War II, and which did not believe in our type of reciprocity and conducted trade warfare against the system; the fourth was the small country of Denmark. With respect to two others, the United Kingdom and Argentina, not a single trade-agreement year was shown in the figures; the agreement with the United Kingdom went into effect January 1, 1939, while Mr. GEARHART'S figures ended with 1938; the agreement with Argentina went into effect in 1941 and the last figure he used was also 1938; so that nearly half of the countries, 6 out of 13, must automatically be eliminated as outside of the trade-agreements program for the period given.

That legitimately leaves in the list France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, and Brazil where the trade agreements might have had direct effect on the commerce with the respective countries.

Far different results are shown with respect to the trade of these countries when pertinent years are given and not concealed by tricky averages made of agreement and nonagreement years jumbled together. Take, for example, 1929, the last full year before the Hawley-Smoot Act went into effect and 1933, the resulting depression low and the last full year before there was any trade agreement, and 1938, the last year used by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], we get the following encouraging results:

Percent of imports from the United States

	Percent
France:	
1929	12.3
1933	10.3
1938 [1]	11.4
Canada:	
1929	68.5
1933	54.1
1938 [2]	62.6
Netherlands:	
1929	9.8
1933	6.4
1938 [3]	10.8
Belgium:	
1929	9.5
1933	9.3
1938 [3]	11.0
Sweden:	
1929	14.6
1933	10.2
1938 [3]	16.2
Switzerland:	
1929	8.9
1933	5.8
1938 [4]	7.8
Brazil:	
1929	30.1
1933	21.1
1938 [5]	24.2

[1] 1.1 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

[2] 8.5 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

[3] An increase above banner year, 1929.

[4] 2.0 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

[5] 3.1 points increase over Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

It will be noted that with respect to the Netherlands, Belgium, and Sweden, the percent of imports from the United States was above the alleged prosperity year of 1929. Those who worship at the shrine of 1929 prosperity should not forget so soon the calamitous consequences in 1933 and 1939—the greatest depression and the most horrible war the world has ever known—and all directly related to the Hawley-Smoot economic isolationism of the Tariff Act of 1930.

No; the high-tariff, high-pressure boys will have to do better than this in their efforts to obstruct the reciprocal-trade program.

So, Mr. Speaker, statistics do not lie—but they sometimes do not bear up under the light of objective analysis. Also, to set the record straight, let us turn to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] on the International Trade Conference, beginning on page 3182 of the RECORD for April 7. Mr. MASON, amid a great deal of emotionalizing against the State Department, made the following statement about the Geneva Conference and the proposed International Trade Organization. I quote:

Mr. Clayton and his assistants propose to do two things at this Conference: First, negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements with 18 other nations, and, second, to set up and establish an International Trade Organization as a department or branch of the United Nations Organization, said International Trade Organization to have the power to regulate, supervise, and control world trade.

In another part of the same speech Mr. MASON said:

Mr. Speaker, this International Trade Organization, in effect, would be an international super state. * * * It would be within the power of this international super state to say what American agricultural surpluses, or manufactured goods, or both, might be exported, and how much foreign goods could be imported into the United States.

And further on he said:

To adopt the proposals advocated by our State Department for an International Trade Organization would mean to transfer our governmental powers to a world economic authority.

What are the facts? Under Secretary Clayton, himself a successful businessman of unquestioned integrity, testified before our committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois is a member, as follows:

I might add here, that contrary to some misunderstandings, the International Trade Organization will not be an international supergovernment in the economic field, with power to fix tariffs of member countries or control either their foreign or domestic trade. Tariff adjustments under the charter—the matter of most interest to the United States—will be made by negotiation and only in return for comparable advantages, just as the United States has been doing for 13 years under the trade-agreements program. Member nations will voluntarily agree to refrain from imposing quotas and certain other trade restrictions and discriminations. The International Trade Organization will impose no new international controls or regulations on trade. Under its charter only one penalty can be incurred by any country which violates its commitments. Member countries may, with the concurrence of the organization, withhold from such a country the trade benefits which they have agreed to extend to each other.

And further, Mr. Clayton testified:

The whole aim and purpose of the International Trade Organization and of the suggested charter is to reduce and minimize, not to increase, governmental interference with foreign trade carried on by private traders, and to guide that trade on economic, not political, principles.

That is what we are going to Geneva for—to bargain for a chance for American private enterprise to continue and to benefit the American economy through expanded foreign trade.

I also feel obliged to relate, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], in response to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] as to whether the Congress will have an opportunity to pass upon the plan for an international trade organization, replied as follows:

There is a difference of opinion on that. Some claim that this international trade organization at Geneva will have to be submitted to the United States Senate for confirmation before it can be approved. Others say that is not so, that the United States Senate and the Congress can be sidetracked. I am not an international lawyer, so I cannot say.

It is to the great credit of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that he brought out that Under Secretary Clayton made the flat statement to us on the Ways and Means Committee that he would submit the ITO charter to the Congress of the United States. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] added: "I think that is something that we must take him at his word on."

No, Mr. Speaker; no attempt will be made by Mr. Clayton to subvert the constitutional processes of this Government, regardless of all the inflammatory and ill-advised oratory; we may be assured of that.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to point out before the rest of the House these misstatements of fact by my fellow members of the Committee on Ways and Means about the reciprocal trade program and the Geneva Conference. But too much is at stake to allow the charges to go unanswered. Fortunately, the people of the country are well-informed about the Cordell Hull policies of reciprocity in our economic relations with other nations. A poll by the National Opinion Research Center of Denver (considered by many to be the most scientific of the samplers of public opinion), released on February 22, 1947, reveals that almost three out of every four people in the United States favor reciprocal reduction of tariffs placed on goods imported into this country. And there is no partisanship among the people on this issue, Mr. Speaker, for 74 percent of the Democrats, 72 percent of rank and file Republicans, and 73 percent of the public as a whole endorse the continued lowering of tariff barriers under a reciprocal trade program.

Mr. Speaker, with the American people so overwhelmingly in favor of a program of reciprocity, it would indeed be a travesty upon the democratic process for anything to be said or done in this House, or in one of its committees, that should impair the efforts of Mr. Clayton and his staff in the slightest. For the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements with the 18 other countries represented at Geneva, is essential to the establishment of the International Trade Organization whose function it will be, within the United Nations, to avoid economic warfare.

As President Truman said so well in his address at Baylor University on March 6, 1947:

The policy of reducing barriers to trade is a settled policy of this Government. It is embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, fathered and administered for many years by Cordell Hull. It is reflected in the charter of the International Trade Organization. It is one of the cornerstones of our plans for peace. It is a policy from which we cannot—and must not—turn aside.

To those among us—and there are still a few—who would seek to undermine this policy for partisan advantage and go back to the period of high tariffs and economic isolation, I can say only this: Take care. Times have changed. Our position in the world has changed. The temper of our people has changed. The slogans of 1930 or 1896 are sadly out of date. Isolationism, after two world wars, is a confession of mental and moral bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, the selfish little pressure blocs should be sent home and the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means should be postponed until the next session, when the question of extending the reciprocal trade program will again be before the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman actually believe what he is saying there, that he wants to reduce tariffs?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I definitely do and I positively mean it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman wants to put the American workingman who is getting one or two dollars an hour in direct competition with the slave labor of the Orient and Europe?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am afraid the gentleman is thinking in the terms of the 1930's.

Mr. GROSS. No. I am thinking in terms of today, when you have more cheap slave labor in the world than you ever had before.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Let me answer the gentleman's question. It has been proven by history that the industrial production of the United States, in spite of the high wages, is so tremendous that no other nation in the world can compete with us in any respect whatsoever when it comes to industrial production. There is never any danger of the United States having unemployment when we increase our foreign trade. Our economic history shows that, and every economist will agree with me on that. The only people who come to this Congress and seek to have the tariffs raised are those people whose particular business will especially benefit by that, and I can name some of them.

Mr. GROSS. The greatest exponent you have for this program is Mr. Clayton?

Mr. EBERHARTER. He is one of the present exponents of it.

Mr. GROSS. He profited more than any other man in the country in the cotton game when he could get cotton sent in here cheap, when he himself goes down into Brazil and spends his millions to develop the cotton industry down there to bring it in in direct conflict with the very people he is supposed to protect. That is the way it works.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Let us not indulge in personalities. I cannot yield further if the gentleman does not give me a chance to answer. You know, since 1934 we have had this reciprocal trade agreements program in effect and nearly every country with which we have had these agreements has come to purchase a higher percentage of its imports from the United States. It thus expands our trade and helps our economic condition in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Be fair in your argument.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Seventy-three percent of the people of the country are educated to it now, and approve.

Mr. GROSS. During the war we did not feel the effects of it, but now we are feeling the effects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether the increased amount of goods that these countries bought from the United States was due to the reciprocal trade agreement arrangement or was it due to our pouring the immense amount of funds into those countries which we have?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Nobody can prove absolutely that any one single factor caused the expansion of the export trade of the United States, but it is admitted by everybody that the reciprocal trade agreement program was one of the important factors that helped to increase the export trade of the United States. The United States, in spite of its strong position, cannot exist economically healthy and financially healthy unless it has a large export trade. That is admitted by every economist, every financier, every industrialist, and every businessman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have always felt that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act did not have an opportunity to demonstrate that because we got into the war and previous to the war we began to lend a lot of money to countries scattered all over the world. I am wondering how the gentlemen can prove his point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to say that in the years it was operating it did expand our trade tremendously. We have had enough experience with it, I think, that that must be admitted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman seems to me to be putting this reciprocal-trade question on a party basis. I wonder whether that is, in fact, an accurate way of putting it, in view of the positions that Senator VANDENBERG and Senator MILLIKIN have taken with respect to this matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think, or, at least, I did not want to give the impression that I was putting it on a partisan basis. I quoted that 72 percent of the people of this country who are Republicans favored this program, and that 74 percent of the people who are Democrats favor this program. So it is not a partisan issue at all. But I found it necessary, because of the statements made by these two gentlemen whom I mentioned earlier in my remarks, to stand on the floor of the House and refute what I considered misstatements on their part.

Mr. LODGE. I just wanted to make it clear in the RECORD that there is a large section of Republicans who favor the principle of reciprocal trade.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct about that, and I am happy that that is the situation. I know that there are some members of the Committee on Ways and Means who, at one time or another during their service in this House, voted for an extension of the program. But there is no use whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in having committee hearings this year when the question of the renewal of the program will not come up until next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

IS THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT LABOR'S BILL OF RIGHTS OR ITS DEATH WARRANT?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present to the House the testimony I gave before the House Committee on Education and Labor on February 19, 1947, relating to H. R. 3020 entitled Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. In my judgment the National Labor Relations Act, commonly called the Wagner Act, does not bestow upon wage earners the benefits claimed. I am convinced, from as careful and unbiased a study as I have been able to make of this act and its operation, that, instead of being helpful to those who earn their living by physical exertion, it is doing them the greatest conceivable harm. Furthermore, I am certain that the procedures under this act have developed to a stage that menaces our social order. The reason why this is so and cannot be otherwise becomes clear when one understands the true nature of this law and its long-run effects.

The Wagner Act starts by saying:

> Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

There was no experience that proved compulsory bargaining does the things alleged in this preamble. If there was, I have been unable to find any evidence of it in any of the literature bearing upon this subject. So far as I can ascertain, this enunciation professing what experience had proved was wholly without foundation.

But now we have had experience with the "right of employees to organize and bargain collectively," protected by law. From the evidence at hand, it appears that this experience has proved just the reverse of what the proponents of the act alleged had been the case in the past.

I am convinced that protection by law of what the Wagner Act calls the "right of employees to organize and bargain collectively" has had the effect of producing the wrongs which the act says were caused by the absence of such right.

Instead of safeguarding commerce from injury, impairment, and interruption, it has so endangered commerce as to interfere enormously with its free flow. Instead of lessening and mitigating industrial strife and unrest, it has increasingly produced these evils. Instead of creating friendly relations between employers and employees, it has incited workmen to dislike and harass their employers to a point where strained relations between these groups have become chronic in a large segment of industry. Instead of reducing industrial disputes and strikes, it has greatly increased and made them pandemic.

The rank and file of unionized and free wage earners and the public in general have not been unaware of these developments. They have observed with misgivings the ever-mounting tide of strikes and their evil effects: Direct loss of income to persons on strike; indirect harm done to others, such as the causing of unemployment in plants depending on parts from strike-bound industries; aggravation of existing material shortages and the causing of new ones; the lowering of output by stifling the more efficient workers and reducing all to a dead level of production, and so forth.

Unionized workers are beginning to wonder whether the raises in wages they have been getting represent real gains, seeing as they do that such raises are always followed by rises in prices.

I think it would be a great mistake to assume that the rank and file of unionized workers are not doing some serious thinking about this whole problem. The frightful spectacle of the threatened paralysis of the entire productive and distributive system caused by the railroad strike last May, and the incipient paralysis brought on by the recent coal strike must still be fresh in their minds. Surely they, as well as all other employees, saw and have not forgotten that they were the first to feel the evil effects of the coal strike and the last to be benefited by its discontinuance.

In referring to unions I wish it understood that I do not include those of a purely local character, voluntary associations of workmen formed for the purpose of improving their employment status and maintaining healthy relations with their employers.

It is also hardly likely that the miners feel elated and more content over their experience in 1943, when they were

daily reminded by seeing the Stars and Stripes and a poster with the legend "Government property" on every tipple, that they were working under what their union leaders considered duress.

Is it reasonable to suppose the events connected with the recent coal strike are heartening to the miners? Suppose the Supreme Court upholds Judge Goldsborough's decision? Will the miners cheerfully submit to paying the fine imposed upon them and peacefully and enthusiastically return to work? Could this be expected? Assume the high court reverses the lower—what will be the situation. Will the case then be settled on Lewis' terms and the miners continue on working, or will the whole controversy again flare up and the miners once more stay away from the pits?

No one—certainly none on the outside—can predict with any degree of certainty what will come of the situation. One thing, however, is as probable as anything can be: The authoritarian regime in control of the Government will avail itself to the fullest extent possible of every opportunity the case presents to absorb as much additional social power as it can. Therefore, however the Supreme Court decides, it becomes almost certain that the regime in control of the Government will come through with its power enhanced and resistance to its progressive encroachment upon the social body further enervated.

The final disposition of the case by the highest tribunal, since the foregoing was written, registered a highly significant and far-reaching advance toward statism.

We should also consider the alarm occasioned employees—especially railroad workers—by the almost successful attempt made by the President last May, during the railroad strike, to pass what high union officials called a slave labor bill. It will be recalled that the railroads were then under Government seizure, presumably to meet the strike situation. The President urged with all the force and strategy he could command the enactment of legislation which would authorize him to indefinitely suspend the railroad labor unions and conscript all railroad employees and employers into the Army, where they would be subjected to working under compulsion. In that position they would be under military rule and discipline and amenable to trial by court martial, perchance even shot for violations.

The President's bill would have empowered him to seize any and all plants and to treat the workers the same as he sought to do with the railroad employees.

Surely this frightful proposal with its potential danger to the rank and file of railroad and all other employees could hardly help arousing in their minds grave misgivings and cause them to wonder where they were being led—whether into the green pastures they had been promised or possibly into some region of darkness and despair.

The new Congress sufficiently recognizes the overwhelming sentiment that has been precipitated by the railroad and coal strikes for the enactment of measures to correct the evils caused by the Wagner Act and to prevent another crisis, such as we experienced in connection with those strikes, to impel it to act.

But now arise some important questions. It is clear enough that the public wants Congress to provide a remedy for the removal of the strike menace. But is it certain the public knows what it would take to eradicate this economic malady? Furthermore, does the Congress know the answer? And, if so, do we possess the determination and courage to apply the appropriate remedy? These are pertinent and serious questions. Depending upon the responses given them, the earnest prayer that is coming from the souls of our people, and not the least from unfree as well as free workers, for real and lasting relief from the strike menace will either be answered or this Nation will, in my humble judgment, continue right on moving further toward chaos and absolute dictatorship.

Candor and forthrightness are prerequisite to a factual statement of the nature of the Wagner Act.

It is basic to a correct diagnosis of the underlying cause of what is called industrial strife that we fully grasp this one central fact: The real issue involved is not between employers and employees or between capital and labor; the real and only material issue is between employers and the rank and file of both unionized and free employees and the general public on the one hand, and the authoritarian regime in control of the Government on the other hand. We are here primarily dealing with a political, not a management-labor problem. The industrial strife which besets the Nation does not spring from conditions that inhere in employer-employee relationships, or in private capitalism, mass production, the wage system, or technological advance. Furthermore, it does not have its origin with the rank and file of wage earners. Its primary source is political and its seat is located within the structure of the regime directly controlling the Government.

It is the authoritarian power which has intruded itself into the field of employer-employee relations that we must attack. Until this fact is realized and the Congress takes steps to eradicate the power over management and labor, which it and the persons operating the other two branches of the Government have built up, we shall not only continue to misdirect our efforts to restore industrial peace but we are bound to aggravate the trouble.

The body of union officials is but an intermediary of the authoritarian regime.

The Wagner Act legalizes compulsory bargaining on both employers and employees but does not define such bargaining.

It empowers a majority of the employees in a plant to bargain not only for itself but to make such bargaining compulsory on the minority also. It imposes upon the employer the duty of enforcing the latter provision.

It prohibits the employer from engaging in what the Labor Relations Board considers unfair labor practices; interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the right of self-organization to form, join, or assist labor unions, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or for other mutual aid or protection; dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contributing financial or other support to it; encouraging or discouraging members in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment; discharging or in any manner discriminating against employees because they filed charges or gave testimony under certain sections of the act; refusing to bargain collectively with the representatives of the employees. The act in fact prohibits employers from exercising their constitutional right of free speech.

The act legalizes the "closed shop," which anticipates the destruction of all independent unions and forced unionization of all employees, just as developed under communism in Russia, nazism in Germany, and fascism in Italy.

The act sets up an agency, the Labor Relations Board, to operate it. This agency is empowered to exercise any or all of its powers at any place in the United States. One or more of its members may prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions anywhere. Any member who participates in such an inquiry does not disqualify himself from subsequently participating in a decision of the agency in the same case. Thus the agency becomes prosecutor, judge, and jury at the same time.

The agency is given liberty from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out what it interprets to be the provisions of the act. Mere publication of such additions and changes make them law.

The agency is empowered to decide in each case whether the unit appropriate for collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof.

The agency is further authorized to take a secret ballot of employees or utilize any method it elects to ascertain the representation of the employees in any and all questions relating to "unfair labor practices," and so forth.

The power vested in the National Labor Relations Board to prevent an employer from engaging in what it determines to be an unfair labor practice "shall be exclusive and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise." This is an amazing provision of law, to say the least. According to this the Congress has no business to even consider modifying or repealing the Wagner Act.

It is all the more astounding when we read another provision of the act in connection herewith; namely, the following:

The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof * * *

Perhaps nothing quite so much exposes the spirit of the forces in control of the Government, when the Wagner Act was written, to annihilate the Constitution and assume authoritarian power as the two last above-mentioned provisions. They are a veritable pronouncement of contempt of law and order, private capitalism, and ownership of property, competition, and everything that even smacks of liberty.

Shades of Louis XVI: "The state, the state; I am the state."

The agency is empowered to serve notice upon any person against whom complaint has been made for "unfair labor practices" and other acts which it deems violations. It is authorized to amend at its discretion such complaint which must however be effected prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. But—

In the discretion of the member, agent, or agency, conducting the hearing or the Board, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceedings and present testimony. In any such proceeding the rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity shall not be controlling * * *

And—

The findings of the Board as to the facts if supported by evidence shall be conclusive.

It is further provided that either party to a dispute may apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, that the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the agency, but whatever the new findings may be, such agency still determines the validity of the evidence from which there is no appeal.

This puts the political agency, the Board, in a position to go back and rig up anything it deems to be evidence, and the matter stands as it did before the court granted leave to adduce such additional evidence.

The act declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and protecting the exercise of workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment and other mutual aid or protection.

From a reading of the Wagner Act and an evaluation of its operation since its passage, the conclusion is inescapable that, whether the objective sought by the persons primarily responible for its passage was the annihilation of independent employee associations and the unionization of all employees by compulsion under domination of the political forces controlling the Government, it has unmistakably materially developed in that direction.

Legalizing the strike weapon provides those forces with the necessary power to effectuate that purpose. True, the law—if law you can call it—does not directly put them in the business of actually calling strikes. It does, however, put them in the business of producing all of the conditions which make strikes inevitable. De facto the Federal political regime is engaged in the work of calling strikes and sanctioning all the evils attendant thereto. It is, however, not accountable for anything that happens in connection with strikes. Only State laws can reach the violations connected therewith. It has in the last 10 years set in motion forces which eventuated in the destruction of billions of dollars worth of property, loss of billions more in wages, mutilation of persons and even death, besides seriously disrupting industry and threatening collapse of the very means by which workingmen earn the daily bread for themselves and their families. Later on I shall mention the ultimate end achieved in carrying out this program.

There are several rough measures for determining the share of the damage done by the use of the strike weapon in the last 10 years which is directly chargeable to the authoritarian regime which we call our Government. Dr. Willford I. King publishes some statistics which I believe are on a reasonably sound basis and which appear to me to be suggestive of the part which such regime has played in the great increase of strikes. He shows that while the total labor union membership increased from 3,889,000 in 1935—when the Wagner Act was passed—to 16,000,000 in 1945, or 311 percent, the number of persons habitually working as employees increased during the same period from 39,600,000 to 44,635,000, or only 12.7 percent. Dr. King shows that the average annual percent of all employees unionized during the 35-year period 1900–35 was approximately 10 percent, while the percent of employees unionized over the period 1936–45, inclusive, averaged approximately 24 percent. Or, the average annual percent of all employees unionized over the period since the enactment of the Wagner Law was approximately two and one-half times that of the 35-year period preceding the passage of this law. The highest percent of employees unionized in any single year before the Wagner Act was 17 percent in 1920, while the figure reached 36 percent in the year 1945. I think it is fair to say that the legalizing of compulsory union membership and the strike to make this effective, together with other provisions of the Wagner Act, are responsible for most of the increase in union membership since its passage and that this, therefore, in large measure reflects the great increase in strikes and the consequences that resulted therefrom during the last 10 years.

I think the great increase in the cost of operating the National Labor Relations Board over the 10-year period of its operation roughly reflects the part played by the authoritarian regime in producing the increase of labor-management difficulties or so-called industrial strife which has taken place during that period. There is no more accurate means for measuring the damage which political forces controlling governments do to social progress than the rate of taxation. The lower the rate, the greater the progress, and vice versa. The cost of operating this political agency increased steadily each year from $713,342 in 1936 to $4,307,330 in 1946. The very nature of the function of this agency compels it to incite employees to conduct that leads to the evils which it is claimed the Wagner Act was set up to prevent. If this is true and the above data and conclusions are correct, it should suggest to the sitting Congress its duty in the matter.

It should not be overlooked that the interests of wage earners are not the same as those of aspiring politicians and union officials. Indeed, basically the interests of these two groups violently clash. Friendly relations between employees and employers and a willingness to cooperate with each other to iron out whatever differences that may arise between them, to mutually strive for common advancement by increasing production and expanding plant facilities, are not only of great advantage to employees, but they are absolutely prerequisite to a sound and growing social organism, an ever-rising living standard. Such relations are a veritable anathema to ambitious politicians and union officials. The existence of the former largely and that of the latter almost wholly depend upon ill will and strife between employers and employees. Herein lies the reason why these two elements make a profession of preaching class hatred and inciting employees to violence against their employers. There can be no question that both of these elements in the body social batten on conflict between employers and employees. Practically all of the serious industrial strife and turmoil that now prevails has been artificially produced by these two groups.

Looking at the objective that is being achieved by the Wagner Act, I cannot conceive how it is possible to escape the conclusion that it derives directly from the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist means to political power; or if it does not stem from such procedure it nevertheless duplicates it.

Compulsory unionization of workers was perhaps one of the key devices, if not the principal one, used by the Communists in Russia, the Nazis in Germany, and the Fascists in Italy to build their totalitarian regimes. Unionization was made compulsory on all workers in those countries. As this procedure developed, political power expanded with correlative suppression of freedom of employees. Intolerance to strikes grew apace until a stage was reached where they were prohibited by law. Thereupon unions were entirely blacked out and the process of liquidating union officials was in full force. Those who survived by finding favor with the ruling clique—we shall perhaps never know their number—became integrated with it and took their places as drivers of the very souls they had but a short time previously allegedly befriended.

At about the time unionization became complete the power of the regimes in the totalitarian countries was sufficiently developed to permit them to purge all recusant elements, thus completing the one-party system and abolishing the franchise, or what amounts to the same thing—controlling it.

Manya Gordon in his book, Workers Before and After Lenin, says that as far back as 1922 the eleventh congress of the Communist Party under the guidance of Lenin, in defining the position of the party on strikes, resolved that:

Neither the Communist Party nor the Soviet government nor the trade-unions can

under any circumstances forget that the resort to strikes in a country with a proletarian government can be described only as a bureaucratic assault on the proletarian government and as a survival of the capitalist past and its institutions on the one hand, and as showing a lack of political development and the cultural backwardness of the toilers on the other.

Gordon quotes further from resolutions of the ninth congress as follows:

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the trade-unions cease to be organizations which sell labor power to an employing class. There can be no question of trade-union opposition to the institutions of the Soviet state. Such opposition is a deviation from Marxism to bourgeois trade-unionism.

Gordon further quotes Stalin and his associates as having declared:

The trade-unions are called upon to play a decisive role in the task of building socialist industry by stimulating labor productivity, labor discipline, and socialist competition, and extirpating all remnants of guild isolation and "trade-unionism."

Henceforth the trade-unions—

says Gordon—

were compelled to drive the workers, to organize "shock brigades" and "socialist competition" and bring to trial workers who lagged behind their quantitative "norms" or in quality. As a result the trade-unions in Soviet Russia are today a misnomer, and have nothing basically in common with similar organizations in other countries. They are merely a whip over the workers as plainly shown in the resolutions adopted in the second year of the 5-year plan, at the sixteenth congress of the Communist Party in 1930.

Union officials in our country should be aware that the trend is definitely in the direction of complete political control over unions and their activities. Strikes are being tolerated by both the public and the authoritarian regime less and less and if the drift continues, the time is not too distant when they will not be tolerated at all.

The political forces in control of the Government are well aware of the situation and are losing no opportunity to take advantage of it to further socialize the industry of the Nation. They know that as disorder of the economy increases, the public's resistance to collectivization weakens and as this proceeds such forces covertly usurp control over unions as well as the economy in general. The end will be the absolute state which does not tolerate unions. Their leaders perish with its creation; they serve to construct it but in doing so destroy themselves.

With our own eyes we have seen this happen in Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy. And do we not even now see signs of the same development in England? It seems to me our union leaders should be able to see growing evidences of the same kind in our own country. Was not the attempt by the President last May to suspend the railroad labor unions, conscript the employees into the Army, and compel them to work under military orders enough notice to them of the ominous trend? Can the procedures attending the President's handling of the coal strike be otherwise interpreted than a determination on the part of the authoritarian regime to put the miners' union directly under its control?

It is a stratagem, and we fear an all too effective one, on the part of the authoritarian regime, to single out a few top union leaders for castigation, as though they were primarily to blame for the dangers attending the strike movement. Of course, they are presumptuous men. But how did they get that way? From whence did they derive the power that causes them to be so bold as to challenge the regime controlling the Government except from such regime itself through class legislation? The rationale of chastising a handful of union leaders is to make scapegoats of them to atone for the wrongdoing of the authoritarian regime.

I think it can be laid down as a certainty that if the Wagner Act, along with much other legislation, of course, is not repealed and matters are permitted to drift on, liquidation of unions and union officials and what is left of representative government and free enterprise will follow as surely as night follows day.

It is the grossest delusion to suppose that we can permanently adopt a part of the authoritarian system. Union leaders, intellectuals, and politicians in Russia, Germany, and Italy were shortsighted enough to think they could. That erroneous belief is written on almost every page of the record of communism, nazism, and fascism. There just is no such thing as limited authoritarianism. You are either in it all the way or out of it all the way.

Now let us go to the essence of the Wagner Act and see just what it ultimately does to the working people. Bear in mind that the act makes it a function of the authoritarian regime controlling the Federal Government to destroy independent local unions and associations of employees, to coerce employees to join international and affiliated unions, and put all employees under compulsion to bargain collectively. The effect of these and other procedures under the act is to annihilate the wage earner's instinctive and inalienable right to bargain for the sale of his own services to sustain self and family, and permit the authoritarian regime to attain monopoly power over the sale of his toil for its own aggrandizement. Always keep in mind that it is the forces controlling the Government that in the end hold this power, not the officers of so-called labor unions.

This involves slavery. The same technique has been used to bring this about as was used by Lenin and Stalin to perfect the dictatorship of the proletariat. I have already mentioned that it was declared in the ninth congress of the Soviet Union that:

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the trade-unions ceased to be organizations which sell labor to an employing class.

The Soviet regime seized that power from the labor unions simply by taking over—lock, stock, and barrel—both unions and their officials.

It cannot be too much stressed that the monopoly power of the union hierarchy to sell labor to employers is but a delegated power and of a temporary nature in any event. The authoritarian regime farms out to union officials the power to collect tribute from laborers something like the Roman emperors used to farm out to their favorites the power to collect taxes in the provinces.

Take from a person the power to sell his labor, and you make him your slave. Sir Henry Maine, in his work entitled "Ancient Law," gives a clear and concise definition of slavery.

The simple wish to use the bodily powers of another person—

he says—

as a means of ministering to one's own ease or pleasure is doubtless the foundation of slavery and as old as human nature.

Compulsion is necessarily the controlling element of the institution of human slavery. Since compulsion is the thing that makes monopoly power over the sale of labor possible, the conclusion is inescapable that the political regime controlling our Government is in the process of completely enslaving the wage earners of this Nation. Of course, it cannot enslave some people and not all.

Let us glance at what is happening to the wage system under the Wagner and other acts. In my judgment, one of the most glorious chapters in the history of social progress is that which traces the evolution of the wage system. Most people, perhaps without thinking, take the wage system for granted, as though it had always been with us. This is a mistake. Time was when nothing even remotely resembling it existed. Like all other social institutions it is the result of evolution and has its roots deep in the past. Frederic Bastiat, the great French student of the social organism, sketched its origin and development. He showed how man's instinct of security created that association which lifted him from the fortuitous mode of existence that prevailed in primitive social organization, where all share risks and catches alike, up through the long and arduous process of division of employments, culminating in a system where one group of workers called employers specializes in taking all the risks in anticipation of securing sufficient profits to provide for personal wants and the tools of production which are essential to a healthy, vigorous, and expanding social organism, whilst securing to another group of workers called employees the advantage of regular wages—that is, fixity or security.

Voluntary association, cooperation, and mutual exchange of services under competition—that is, under conditions free from political constraint—are the sources of all real social security. Out of this complex of relationships evolved the wage system and the security to the wage earner which it affords. Herein is to be found the living magna carta of wage earners. Was not this superb social institution made possible by free, laissez faire behavior? I have not been able to adduce from my studies of the evolution of the social organism any evidence that the political element ever contributed anything of value to its development. It seems to me that if there is one fact recorded in history that stands out more prominently than any other it is that the political element has

always been in conflict with social progress. Demagogy to make political capital by attacking industrial capital seems to be an ever-present plague upon the social body.

Of course, the wage system is not perfect. No social system is. Like all other social institutions it is not static but continually undergoes change which inherently is in the direction of betterment. It has undergone a wholesome change in our generation. Much evidence is at hand to support this contention. But look at the record and see how people with small means hold investments in stocks, bonds, insurance companies, and so forth. Note also how the organization of private capital under voluntary contract makes possible the continuance of wage payments over periods of years by large segments of industry operating at a loss, as we saw in the 1930's, in anticipation based on experience of probably being able to recoup such loss at some future time. These and similar other developments have largely taken place within the last century. Surely no argument should be needed to show that they have greatly added to the security of all the low-income groups. If the process had been left to develop in its natural way—that is, if the political element had been kept out of it—there is little question but that the gains of working people would be much greater than they now are.

The point I wish to make here is that the authoritarian regime controlling the Government is using the Wagner Act to destroy the wage system and is throwing the workman back into a status of serfdom. There is no substitute for the wage system but slavery.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the problem before your committee can be boiled down to this simple proposition: Would it be better to repeal the Wagner Act, retain the wage system, give back to the working people their self-preserving right to bargain for the sale of their own toil, and allow them to hold onto the social gains they have made over the centuries, or would it be better to leave this measure on the statute books to completely destroy the wage system and the right of individual bargaining, and cause the working people to revert to a status of serfdom? I think the question before you is just that simple.

Far be it from me to avow that the lot of all wage earners is an easy one. I know from experience that the contrary is true. All who have been compelled to rely upon the wages of day labor for a livelihood in industries such as coal mines, refractories, steel mills, and so forth, will agree to this. All sensible people would like to see the condition of those workers bettered; if not for their sake, then for their own. The higher the plane of living of wage earners, the higher must be that of all groups, and vice versa.

All this, however, is entirely beside the point. The truth is that the workmen's status has progressively improved over the many centuries, always in proportion to the degree of freedom enjoyed by him. What we are deliberating now is whether to try to hold onto the social processes which have improved the posture of day laborers or to permit those processes to be destroyed and cause them to lose all their hard-earned gains.

The Wagner Act should be repealed outright. It is an authoritarian and completely antisocial device through and through. Every part of it operates to destroy the tools by which the workman earns his livelihood; to annihilate his God-given right to sell his own labor; to destroy his security; to snatch from him the fruit of his own toil and to reduce him to the status of a slave.

To establish means for arbitrating so-called industrial disputes would be to make more complete the authoritarian regime's monopoly power over the sale of human toil. This would enormously add to its power of corruption. Disputes would not and could not be settled fairly. It is contrary to the nature of things for this to be possible. Every school child knows that disputes would be settled in favor of the side that promised the most votes, regardless of which political party happened to be in power.

A mediation board might be a sop to the public. Like an arbitration board it could settle nothing fairly and it would also be something to play politics with.

Should the Congress give the authoritarian regime in control of the Government power to seize plants where strikes are threatened or in process and arbitrate disputes involved in the controversies that led to the impending or actual stoppages the end of all hope to restore constitutional government and free enterprise might well be in sight. If the Congress wants to take drastic action to greatly increase the power of the authoritarian regime over the lives of our people it would do well to provide legislation to permit such regime to seize strike-bound plants on the pretense of settling so-called labor disputes.

It is being suggested by persons in high official quarters that strikes should be directly outlawed in critically essential industries, railroads, coal mines, and so forth. How possibly could this be done without the authoritarian regime sooner or later taking these industries over and making the employees connected therewith a part of the Federal bureaucracy with all the inefficiency and circumlocution that goes with it? Should these industries become a part of the bureaucracy there is every reason to believe all industries would progressively be made to follow suit.

Industry-wide strikes should be prohibited, but on the same principle that corporations, partnerships, and individuals are prohibited from acting in concert to fix prices. Labor wages are but the obverse and commodity prices the converse of the same coin. Wages are prices. The Norris-LaGuardia Act should be repealed and the antitrust laws applied to prevent both the union officers and the authoritarian regime controlling the Government from attaining monopoly control over the sale of human labor.

Legislation should be enacted reasserting and guaranteeing to every citizen his constitutional and self-preserving right to work when, where, and at whatever occupation is open to him for employment, at any wage he can individually and voluntarily agree upon with an employer, without having to pay tribute to anyone or belong to any organization. Every vestige of coercion in the field of employer-employee relationships should be annihilated. Anything less than this is slavery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the plan of the President to expand our international policy to aid and defend, if necessary, the nations of the world by starting off with the Greek-Turkish deal of $500,000,000 is only a down payment. It is a first step on the plan which will most likely be followed with huge expenditures in aid to the rest of the world within the next few years of five to ten billion dollars in money. And, if we are drawn into a military conflict the expense will be colossal.

One of the most reliable economists and financial writers in the Nation whose name I will not quote, takes this view and says, the State Department which has drawn the blue prints for this expanse of international policy, is so afraid of public opinion that it and the administration are withholding the larger plan until they get started on the road and that they desire to bring on the additional costs later in piecemeal, on the theory that the Congress and the people will accept a constant trickle of expense rather than the deluge which the sum total would amount to. He says that Russia does not want peace or agreements now, believing that by delaying tactics within the next 2 years that England, France, and other European nations will be hopelessly bankrupt by that time, and that the United States will have extended herself so far financially that we will then have to back away in order to prevent financial bankruptcy at home. That when this occurs Russia expects by such delaying tactics to have brought about a world financial condition that her expansion in Europe and Asia can be accomplished without serious opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the above predictions will not come to pass but they are worthy of consideration coming from a source that makes a constant study of domestic and world problems, a source that is in nowise influenced by a partisan political outlook. We do know that England and France who have engaged in two world-wide wars are both bled white financially and that their financial situation is so bad that we have been compelled to make huge loans to each of these nations in the hope that maybe we can help them to regain some sort of financial solvency. We do know that we have shipped and shot away billions of dollars' worth of the resources of this country and that thousands of our young men have already given their lives on the European Continent, a loss that can never be repaid.

We do know that our international debt stands around $260,000,000,000 and that we are committed to $1,500,000,000 in relief to the rest of the world for the coming year without considering the Greek-Turkish loan.

Mr. Speaker, the question this Congress representing the people has to decide is whether the President's approach is the right approach to this question. There is a great desire upon my part and upon the part of every Member of the House and Senate in a crisis like this to uphold the hands of the State Department and the President as well. We would like General Marshall, our Secretary of State now in Berlin, and the world to know that the American people are united, that they are opposed to Russia dominating other smaller nations in Europe, Asia, or anywhere else. Yet, at the same time, the sovereign power of our country is the people of the United States.

This proposal has been thrust upon the Congress, the representatives of the people, with such urgent haste for action and with such a force of publicity back of it that the people have not had time, or have not had the facts as to both sides of the problem upon which they can base their fair and accurate judgment.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two choices that can be made under the present situation. We must either vote favorably to this expansion of our international policy or we must vote against it. Obviously in dividing on this question a mistake is bound to be made. It seems to me the most important service the representatives of the people can render is to obtain all possible facts before they make their decision.

Our leaders must not make a mistake this time. Let us look at the record and see how well they have led us up to date.

First. Before we entered World War II we were asked to repeal our neutrality laws so the ships from other nations could come to our shores and buy implements of war. We were assured that would not in any way tend to get us involved in the conflict.

Second. Later we were told that the extension of lend-lease to the nations opposing the Axis Powers would more likely tend to keep us out of the war than to get us into it. Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job."

Third. We were told that the arming of our merchant ships would not get us into the war.

Fourth. That the principles of the Atlantic Charter were endorsed by all of the Allied Nations which provided for self-determination of the people as to their governments and for governments of freedom.

Fifth. Our slogan to bolster the morale of the people and our soldiers was that we were fighting to destroy dictatorship in the world. We did destroy the Axis dictators, but in Europe we now face a totalitarian, dictatorial form of government that threatens to enslave all continental Europe and Asia.

Sixth. Our representatives at Tehran and particularly at Yalta partitioned Poland without her knowledge or consent in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter in a secret agreement that was not known for 2 years thereafter.

Seventh. Also, at Yalta, Korea, without her knowledge or consent, and in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, was partitioned between Russia and the United States for a 5-year occupancy by these two governments.

Eighth. Russia was also given the Kurile Island bases, dangerous to the future peace of the Philippines, other strategic port advantages, participation in the ownership and operation of the Manchurian Railway, and was so firmly established in Manchuria that she is reported to have looted billions of dollars worth of the resources of that country.

Ninth. At the Potsdam agreement, in connection with the prior Yalta agreement, Russia was given further German territory and, in addition to the Silesian coal fields of such great importance, Russia was largely given control of the agricultural section of Germany.

The result is that the Potsdam agreement was so loosely drawn—and from an economic standpoint, so far as Germany and Europe are concerned, is so unworkable because of the lack of cooperation on the part of Russia—that the question confronting Britain and the United States at the peace table today is whether or not, with the control of the agricultural and food supply of Russia, with her delaying tactics, will she be able to prevent the reconstruction of Germany to the point where finally the United States and Britain will pull out so that Russia may then take control of all of Germany.

Mr. Speaker, the mistakes of our leaders and the State Department up to date have got us into a position where Britain and the United States have been expending, and will have to continue to expend, each, $400,000,000 a year for food for the German people in their territories, while Russia controls the food producing and a lot of the industrial area of Germany given to her under the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any reason why Russia should have been given the Kurile Islands, other strategic parts of Manchuria, and certainly no reason why she should ever have been invited as one of the occupying forces of Korea. By the same divide-and-conquer tactics in Korea, we have put our section of Korea on the pension list for about $400,000,000 a year, at least, for the near future because Russia refuses to cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, we were promised peace through the United Nations organization. The world was promised peace. We find that the United Nations organization has been so loosely drawn that any one of the Big Five, which means Russia, England, United States, China, or France, has a veto power in the Security Council. Russia has used its veto power until no agreements worth while can be made either at the peace table or within the United Nations organization. There is less peace, less freedom from want and fear in the world today than there has been in many years.

This is only a part of the record of our leaders and the State Department in handling international affairs. In viewing this record I think one is justified in seriously asking the question, Are they sure they are right this time when they ask the American people to underwrite with finances the military and manpower necessary to a world-wide extension of our international policy?

Then the next question I would have follow, that is, Can the United States afford to obligate itself to try to back up these commitments world-wide, taking into consideration the fact that our national debt now stands at $260,000,000,000?

Mr. Speaker, can we continue to finance the world and increase our obligations throughout the world at the rate we have been going without dragging our 140,000,000 American people down into abject poverty? I think the basic question is, Can we finance such a program?

We are all opposed to communism and we can all endorse the laudable ideal of the President to stop communism in the Middle East. Ideals and realities are two different things. The reality of this attempt must make us think the thing through further than the ideal. We must consider the cost in millions, and possibly billions, of dollars. If the expending of $500,000,000 with Greece and Turkey would stop the expansion of communism in the Middle East it would be well spent. If it does not, but, to the contrary, brings us nearer to a clash with Russia, then we must consider whether or not the fathers and mothers of this country are willing to see the draft boards go into action again with the drafting of millions of our young men. It might be the means of bringing on a world war between this country and Russia in the near future. Of course, we all hope it will not, but this problem is so involved and so complex that if the majority of the House and Congress votes to back up the President, not a Member of the House or Senate, or the President, will definitely know whether it is the right step to take. History only will record whether or not our Nation followed the right course.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a better course our Nation can follow.

In December 1945, I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I pointed out that the delaying tactics and objections by Russia had proved that Russia had never honestly intended to help form a United Nations organization to keep the peace of the world. That having the veto power, she would continue to delay the organization and block its effectiveness, while at the same time she would grab all territory she could in Europe and expand greatly before the organization could be completed. That is what has happened.

I urged the American members to join with the British members and offer amendments to the United Nations organization—first, that would do away with the veto power in the Security Council; second, an amendment to compel all nations to agree to world-wide

inspection as to atomic-energy development from the mines through the laboratories and to the factories; third, that a world-wide limitation or quota on armament be agreed upon.

I urged that such amendments could be passed, and if Russia opposed them and walked out of the organization, then the other peace-loving nations should complete the organization, which, at that time, held about 70 percent of the military power of the world. I advocated leaving the door wide open with a standing invitation to Russia to come in and that if she desired to remain out, this 70 percent of world military power could brand her an aggressor nation any time she disturbed the peace of the world, and by international law hurl the military might of the rest of the world against her.

I said this would leave Russia the alternative to come into this organization for peace, to commit national suicide if she became an aggressor nation.

I believe it is not too late to take such action now, and that if such action were taken it would be the most effective way to call Russia's bluff and at the same time appeal to world public sentiment which is still a tremendous force that would carry the United Nations organization rapidly forward in power and prestige throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, if this course is followed it would offer new hope for freedom from the domination of Russia to millions of people in Poland, Austria, Hungary, Germany, France, Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Turkey, China, and all of the people of the world seeking liberty. It would build up a resistance in these countries against the further spread of communism in my opinion, a hundred times greater than the proposal to move into Greece and Turkey. I believe it is the only move that will ever place the United Nations organization in a position to control aggressors and bring peace to the world.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the economy of the Pacific Northwest, as well as all of the Western States, is largely dependent upon full use of its water resources. The development and use of the waterways of the Northwest for navigation, hydroelectric power, reclamation, irrigation, and for domestic use, farming, and industry is the key to the success and prosperity of the inhabitants of this vast area. The congressional district I have the honor to represent borders on the Columbia River and the Bonneville project is located therein. Next to the Mississippi River, the Columbia is the largest river in the United States in water volume and is the largest in potential hydroelectric power, containing approximately one-half of our available supply.

While the people of the West in the last election expressed a desire by their votes to support a program of economy in our Nation to the end that cost of government might be decreased, wasteful and extravagant expenditures eliminated, taxes and the national debt reduced, and the budget balanced, they did so on the assumption that the wealth-producing public works of our country which are self-sustaining should be fostered and developed. The greatest of these in the West are our water resources. It would be ill-advised and poor economy not to appropriate adequate funds for carrying forward as rapidly as the need requires, the development of these great water resources for our self-sustaining projects which return to the Federal Government with interest all the moneys expended thereon. Among such projects is Bonneville, which at the existing rate for hydroelectric energy of $17.50 per kilowatt-year will return to the Government all of the moneys expended by it for the development of the power facilities.

Both the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants are now loaded to an overload capacity. The industries which take a large portion of this power are not industries that have moved from other sections of the country, but are industries that originally located in the Northwest because of resources such as I have named and the factors governing world-wide industrial development and competition. The large going industries using this power would locate in foreign countries rather than other sections of this country if the power rate was arbitrarily elevated above the cost of production.

In the first place, anyone who has made a study of industrial migration will find that, as a general proposition, any industry which moves into any locality on wheels generally moves out on wheels or eventually closes down. Industrial placement depends largely on location of natural resources, an ample supply of of cheap power, water and rail transportation, and access to markets. Those who wish factual proof on this point can find the same in the hearings before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the Senate Small Business Committee when the matter of critical and strategic materials and light metals was under consideration in connection with the late war effort.

When the Bonneville Act was under consideration by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, and likewise the Senate Committee on Commerce, these groups spent nearly a year and a half exploring all the points embraced in power rates. These points were exhaustively debated, both on the House and Senate floors. The ablest men on both sides of the aisle participated in drafting the Bonneville Act. The policy governing contracts, rate-making, full return to the Federal Treasury, and return insurance are all adequately covered in the Bonneville Act. Furthermore, the Bonneville Act guarantees full and complete repayment of all items of cost covering all power features of the applicable Federal construction. Specifically, the congressional policy governing power contracts is covered in sections 2–F and 5–A of the Bonneville Act. Rate-making is covered in sections 5, 6, and 7, and rate adjustments to guarantee a return to the Treasury are covered in section 5–A, and reimbursability requirement appears in section 7. These statute citations are full and adequate. The State of Oregon has nothing to fear in any equitable consideration of the electric rate applying to federally owned Columbia power.

When the European War started in 1939, this country was ill-prepared to fight a modern war, due to the lack of electrochemical and electrometallurgical plant capacity. The Members of Congress who sponsored the Bonneville project and enactment, which started some 12 to 15 years ago, were absolutely clear as to the future use of this large supply of low-cost power. It was fortunate for the country in the last war that Congress exercised this early vision. Without this vision, the air program in the last war would not have been possible.

The electrochemical and the electrometallurgical plant capacity now on the Columbia is associated closely with the atomic bomb. The Hanford plant producing the atomic bomb uses Columbia River power. We might just as well give the secrets of the atomic bomb away as to enact legislation which would drive such basic defense industries out of business or cause them to move outside of the United States. Fifty percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the United States is in the Columbia River Basin.

The situation, briefly, is both optimistic and uncertain, so far as aluminum is concerned. A competitive situation has replaced the half-century Alcoa monopoly, with Reynolds Metals Co. and Permanente Metals Corp.—Kaiser—capable of producing about as much metal as Alcoa. The tremendous, unanticipated postwar market for aluminum has changed the picture completely since the autumn of 1945, when most Government plants were down and prospects for disposal uncertain. If Reynolds and Permanente hit their scheduled stride, production will be about double a year ago and four times the best prewar year. The Government's vast war stockpile and aluminum from scrapped planes and other war material have been gobbled up by the hungry market. The price of pig aluminum has held steady at 14 cents a pound, lowest in the metal's history, while prices for steel, copper, lead, and zinc have increased considerably.

Aluminum is pouring into automotive products, including trailers, trucks, and busses, and the European trend to aluminum in passenger cars is expected to reach the United States soon, in which event "the present capacity of the aluminum and magnesium industries will be utterly inadequate"; into railroad rolling stock including passenger, hopper, tank, and subway cars; into superstructures of large ships, lifeboats, and interior partitions of vessels; into residential construction, including windows; hardware, awnings, blinds, storm sash and screen; into general structures and buildings using flat and corrugated sheet for roofs and siding.

Aluminum fabrication of small articles has increased to the limit of the sheet and ingot available from the three basic producers. NHA plans to use 400,000,000 pounds of aluminum in prefabricated houses for veterans this year. Producers and fabricators are making money, and expect to be able to maintain favorable competitive prices.

These are factors on the optimistic side. The danger of an inept, short-

range policy by the Government disposal agency already has been mentioned on the side of uncertainty. Facilities in high-cost power areas might be junked or sold for other purposes, for instance, instead of being shipped to the Northwest and added to plant capacities here. The supply of soda ash, essential in aluminum reduction, is precarious so far as Alcoa's competitors are concerned. There is an import tariff on bauxite and the Japanese islands have not been opened to exploitation. Reynolds and Kaiser still are dependent largely upon raw materials controlled by Alcoa, and binding agreements have not been completed. The Government plants awarded to the two companies are operated on short-term leases, with cancellation provisions.

But possibly the greatest danger faced by the newcomers in the tough game of aluminum is that adequate supplies of hydroelectricity for the necessary expansion of production will not be made available in the Northwest, or being made available will be forced upward in price by political and economic pressure. Every kilowatt of Northwest power available now is being utilized, and nowhere else in the Nation is there any hope of getting power at a cost approximating that in the Northwest in the next few years. Light metals cannot expand much in this area until more power is available, according to the Murray report. This should provide food for thought among those opposing more dams on the Columbia.

It would be a serious mistake to fail to provide for the construction of additional generating facilities in the Columbia River Basin to meet the demand for hydroelectric energy that will soon be with us and with no opportunity to supply the needed power. It will take some 2 years to construct and install generating facilities in existing plants and from 2 to 4 years to provide such facilities in dams to be hereafter constructed. It would be a great mistake to fail to provide now the authority and funds with which to complete installation of the remaining generators in the Grand Coulee project. The McNary Dam, construction of which is now starting, should be carried forward as rapidly as possible so that the hydroelectric power it will supply will be available when the project is completed, at which time there will be, according to the present outlook, a demand for all the energy made available.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ivan Bloch, Chief, Division of Industrial and Resources Development of the Bonneville Power Administration, on April 4, last, made an outstanding contribution to this whole subject of power and industrial development in the United States. I include as part of my remarks the following excerpts from his discussion of this important subject:

[Excerpts from Pacific Northwest Industrial Development, a paper delivered by Ivan Bloch, Chief, Division of Industrial and Resources Development, of the Bonneville Power Administration, before the Chicago section of the Electrochemical Society, Chicago, Ill., April 4, 1947]

In this paper, I will describe the growth of Pacific Northwest power supplies and electroprocess industries, and the national need for more power supplies in that region.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GROWTH

From the time I first met with your society, some 9 years ago, the power sales of the Bonneville Power Administration have increased between 50-fold and 70-fold. The revenues from power sales, of course, reflect this growth. They have increased 70 times. From the beginning of power operations in 1938 to the end of 1947, we have sold a total of 35,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, with a total revenue of over $90,000,000. Our generating capacity has increased from roughly 100,000 kilowatts at Bonneville Dam in mid-1938 to a total name-plate rating of 1,176,400 kilowatts at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Our transmission system has kept pace with this growth. In 1940, we had about 200 miles of high-capacity transmission lines. Today, the entire system is almost 2,900 circuit miles.

On the basis of energy deliveries, this system is now the third largest in the United States. Together with other publicly owned systems, it is supplying well over half of the total generation of the combined power systems of the Pacific Northwest.

The expected slump in power use upon cessation of hostilities did materialize in the region, but was of surprisingly short duration. At the present time, the demand on the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system is so great that all equipment is being used to full capacity, without reserves. And the region is clamoring for more power.

The growth of electric-power consumption in the Pacific Northwest is indicative of what is happening to industrial and economic expansion in the region. In our annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1946, which ended in June of 1946, it was shown that during the period of maximum peak demand for that year of 1,346,000 kilowatts, 44.7 percent of the capacity was utilized for Pacific Northwest industry on our system; 35.2 percent was utilized by the private power utilities of the region; 12 percent went for publicly owned power utilities; and the remainder, 7.9 percent, was divided between requirements of Military Establishment and system losses. Further analysis reveals that of the total peak distribution referred to above, 37.3 percent was for aluminum production, 7.6 percent was for other major electroprocess industries.

During the closing years of the war, many skeptics railed about this fabulous growth. We had expected to hear from the prophets of doom on our power system—after all, was it not a Government operation? We were not disappointed: "Power to burn"—we were told, "white elephants." In answer, we stated, and I think we demonstrated conclusively, that this war growth was the result of a pent-up potential which was bound to be satisfied. The war, we averred, had accelerated an eventual development.

To be sure, after VJ-day many of our war plants closed down. Our load dropped. We thought we would have a breather to rehabilitate electrical equipment which had been overloaded by as much as 25 percent for months on end. But our breather didn't last, and today we are facing a power shortage in the region.

At the present time, the Pacific Northwest aluminum plants are all back on the line, with the exception of the Tacoma plant, which is to resume operations within a few weeks. Not only that, but the aluminum producers are constantly hammering at us for additional power supplies for new pot lines in addition to those now in the region. We have had to turn them down.

Most of you are familiar with the fact that aluminum consumption in the United States, instead of collapsing, as many skeptics proclaimed, has already expanded four to five times prewar loads, far beyond most optimistic estimates. Although a portion of the market was created by shortages in other materials, notably sheet steel, the places where aluminum is now used profitably are legion.

The same general story applies to other electroprocess industries which located in the region during the war. However, some have closed down; one of the calcium-carbide plants, one of the ferro-alloy plants, and the magnesium plant. On the other hand, since VJ-day, new major plants have established operations in the Pacific Northwest, and others are in active stages of consideration. These additions largely make up power consumption loss by the closing down of certain other units. Additional production of carbide, electrolytic iron, and chlorates is now under way. Numerous other smaller industries have sprung up in every section of the area, adding to power consumption considerably. As was expected, but in greater degree, the commercial, small industrial, domestic, and rural loads have jumped up. This, of course, is true of the entire Nation, but the Pacific Northwest, because it is so power conscious, is outstripping the rest of the country. These, therefore, are the reasons why the Pacific Northwest does not have a surplus of power but rather faces a deficit.

NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

I would not deny a natural urge and motivation to argue the necessity for the industrial development and economic growth of the Pacific Northwest. But, it seems to me there are compelling reasons beyond those which might be termed somewhat provincial: the national well-being and security demand an expansion of Pacific Northwest power supplies. By and large, only in this area of the Nation can be found the hydropower potentials—of firm power at low rates—which can assure the required national expansion of electroprocess industries.

Before proceeding with the analysis which I believe sustains this claim, let me state frankly that the statistical bases are far from complete. However, the extrapolations I must undertake reflect wide contact with those individuals throughout the United States who maintain a current awareness of conditions in electroindustries and in power supplies. Without more exhaustive studies than we have been able to undertake, the level of estimates cannot be gaged accurately but the general character of the trend can be indicated.

The total power requirements of electroprocess industries have increased at a rate somewhat more rapid than those of industry as a whole. With war demands, this would be expected. For instance, from 1939 through 1943, the total annual power requirements of national manufacturers increased from 71,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 147,000,000,000—about two times. For the same period, the total annual requirements of national electroprocess industries increased from slightly over 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to almost 38,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—almost four times. From our contacts with industry, it is our belief that the difference in trends in power consumption by all manufactures and electroprocess industries has not slackened appreciably. It is our expectation that this trend will continue. Perhaps a few examples may give the foundations of this belief.

National aluminum production consumed between almost 1,000,000,000 and 2,500,000,000 kilowatt hours per year during the period 1926–36. Upward progression of requirements starting in 1939 reached a total of over 18,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year in 1943. At the peak of war production, we estimate that the requirements of the aluminum industry were around the 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hour mark—representing a production of 1,800,000,000 pounds of metal per year.

Estimated primary and secondary aluminum production for 1947, after a short slump, may reach 1,700,000,000 pounds, with total actual demands of 2,300,000,000 pounds. This latter figure does not include possible expanded demands for housing, estimated at 400,000,000,000 pounds. That is to say, the

apparent deficit of national production over national consumption in 1947 may be as high as 1,000,000,000 pounds.

In addition, the automotive and transportation field has not yet begun to make minimum feasible use of aluminum. Its feasible requirements alone, with lower primary costs of the metals and its fabrications, may require over 1,000,000,000 pounds per year. In other words, a total national aluminum market may develop, by 1960 or so, of 3,000,000,000 pounds requiring 30,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year.

Magnesium has had its ups-and-downs. During the period 1927–32, its annual power requirements were only between three and nine million kilowatt hours. The war shot these requirements up to almost 5,000,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1943. Production has slumped but our preliminary studies make us confident that "Maggie" is going to go through a resurgence in importance which may be startling. This will be due to the development of new alloys, new fabricating methods, and the growing realization by industry of magnesium's significant advantages. The fact that there is no real limit to the supply of basic raw materials for the production of magnesium has important bearing on its growth in the light-metals field. By 1960, national magnesium markets may be as high as 300,000,000 pounds, requiring 3,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year.

Electric furnace alloys power requirements have grown also. In 1936, for instance, these requirements were on the order of 1,750,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1943, they had increased about three times. We feel that increased demands for alloy and stainless steels for rapid transport units on our highways, railroads and airways, for jet propulsion and for household uses will continue the upward trend in this industry.

In copper and zinc, electrothermal and electrolytic reduction power requirements have continued to climb. At least as far as zinc is concerned, the depletion of Tri-State district ores makes it imperative that the industry utilize the complex lead-zinc ores found in the Pacific Northwest and from Australia. This places a premium on electroprocess methods. The steady upward trend in power consumption in these two industries cannot fail to continue. From about 500,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year during the period 1926–39, these requirements reached almost 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1943.

For calcium carbide, chlorine and caustic, electrothermal steel, and other electroprocess industries, the story is pretty much the same: A steady rise prior to the war, rapid expansion during the war, and continued rise since the war. To these must be added numerous relatively new products of the electric furnace and electrolytic cell, such as metallic calcium, metallic lithium, metallic sodium, elemental phosphorus and electric furnace fertilizer, electrolytic iron, chromium and manganese, and chlorine derivatives such as chloroethylenes and DDT. These are industries in relative infancies and, as they grow, so will their national power requirements.

NATIONAL POWER SUPPLY

The question arises whether national power supplies are rising to keep pace with this expansion. It is first necessary to review, however, the kind of power which electroindustry demands. Manufacturing industry power requirements generally are not too selective as to kind and price. On the other hand, the very nature of electroprocess industry, where power is a basic ingredient and raw material, demands extremely low unit cost, uninterrupted supply, and large homogenous blocks of power. For example, an aluminum plant must have blocks of at least 20 to 35,000 kilowatts for each production unit. The power supply must be continuous—it cannot be shut off at will, whatever the reason, without expensive restarting of operations. Inasmuch as 8 and 10 kilowatt-hours are required per pound of aluminum, the cost in mills, not cents, cannot be much more than 2 to 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, depending on location. Even at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, this power requirement represents between 20 and 25 percent of the production cost. Aluminum illustrates well the kind of power supply and price which is needed for the whole range of electroprocesses.

The major existing and potential locations for electroprocess industries in the United States are well known. In general, these have been hydro centers. In the East, Niagara Falls and surrounding territory has been a traditional center for this type of industry. The Tennessee Valley and surrounding area has become another important center since the building of the power facilities of the TVA. There are other rather isolated centers of major electroprocess industries.

But the limits of expansion at Niagara Falls have been reached. The potential development of the St. Lawrence waterway may not offer much relief because of the rapid expansion of nonindustrial power requirements of New York State—a market which cannot be stifled much longer by inadequate power sources. The TVA in its splendid job of river control has about reached the maximum of its hydro-power capabilities.

The general conclusion which can be reached is that, with the exception of Texas and the Southwest as a very great potential, particularly for chemical production, the West remains as the principal location for major electroprocess industry in terms of power supplies, of the kind and price required. Of the West, there is no question; as to the Northwest—it has the almost fabulous potential of some 25,000,000 more kilowatts of firm capacity beyond that already developed. The price will probably remain at the generally low levels which now exist.

FUTURE PACIFIC NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

For the past year and a half, some of us at Bonneville Power Administration have been trying to visualize what industrial expansion might be expected in the Pacific Northwest by 1960. We have searched the literature; we have ransacked files of Federal agencies; we have talked to industrial groups. We have tried to interpret technological and market trends in some 50 groups of electroprocess and satellitic industries. We have tried to analyze markets in the Pacific Northwest, on the west coast, the Nation, and for export. Then we have attempted to fit those basic industrial facts to Pacific Northwest power, raw materials, markets, and freight-rate factors.

The preliminary estimates of industrial potentials provided in our staff work are food for the imagination. Several important assumptions were made—some of which you may question, others on which there can be no disagreement. First, we assumed a reasonable and steady growth of national industry based on a similarly reasonable and steady growth of population. This gave us a base for minimum estimates. Secondly, for maximum estimates, we assumed a more rapid and prosperous development of national and international trade. Thirdly, and this certainly is a point which utility experience bears out consistently, we averred that it is necessary to plan and install power generation and transmission facilities in advance of market.

We believe that, given the power supplies, industrial use of power in the Pacific Northwest will double by 1960. The increase could occur in plant expansion and establishment for the needed national production of light metals, rolled and stainless steel, ferro-alloys, nonferrous metals, nonmetallics such as abrasives, phosphorus and phosphates, and other electrochemicals. We feel confident that more than 1,000,000 kilowatts could be used in the Pacific Northwest for this type of industrial development—which, as I've pointed out, has national significance.

Some of the plant expansions listed are now under active consideration, and if interest and inquiries continue at present intensity, I am of the opinion that our estimates may become fact before 1960. Of course, it may be that the precise industries or the precise amounts will not follow our time table, but there are many other industries and industrial-power uses we have not detailed. For instance, we cannot ignore the region's peculiar energy situation.

The Northwest has long depended on wood and petroleum products for industrial and domestic fuel. Last year we made some intensive analyses, which revealed that the present consumption of energy in the region is roughly divided as follows: 37 percent from wood, 32 percent from petroleum and gas, 18 percent from coal, and, amazingly enough, 13 percent from hydroelectric sources. The depletion of timber resources, coupled with an intensive drive for more complete utilization of the full tree, are rapidly affecting the economic supplies of wood for fuel uses. Pacific Northwest petroleum consumption depends on California reserves, which are known to be declining. Oil prices are increasing. Thus, we are forced to conclude that petroleum's contribution, although it will continue to be a major and important part of our Pacific Northwest energy pattern, may decline gradually. Coal is another energy source which is uncertain. Local supplies are of high price and not always satisfactory. We hope that modern technology in the processing of sub-bituminous coal will open up the potentials of our local reserves. But no matter how optimistic we may be on these other fuels, the fact remains that hydro is the most dependable source of energy for the region's future needs.

If today we had sufficient supplies of secondary power, we would have relatively little difficulty in disposing of as much as 500,000 kilowatts for electric steam boiler operations, mainly for the region's growing pulp and paper processing. Railroad electrification—despite the difficult problem in its financing and general economics—is certainly due for expansion. Electric house heating, which is no longer subject to doubt, would absorb a veritably huge quantity of hydro energy.

In conclusion, I hope that I have been able to describe some potentials the like of which I feel sure have no parallel in the world. None of us in the Pacific Northwest make any bones about our vigorous expansionism. But we have emerged from a strictly provincial outlook to one of national appraisal. We are not now, nor have we been, of the opinion that the Nation's horizons have been shrinking. On the contrary, we believe they are expanding as never before, and that we on the west coast have a significant contribution to make to the national welfare and security. We certainly believe that the race is to the swift—and that the progress of the Pacific Northwest cannot be slowed down without impairing seriously the progress of the Nation as a whole.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, in cooperation with the State Department, announced several weeks ago that as a part of the

foreign policy of this country, that this Government would assist Greece and Turkey by affording military and financial aid.

Regardless of what we may think of the policy of the President, it is the announced policy in respect to one phase of our foreign policy. This being true, it is my position that no citizen of this country has either the moral or legal right to carry on a speech-making tour abroad in foreign countries and attempt in so doing to challenge the good faith and integrity of the United States; and by the spoken word and through the foreign press and radio, attempt to influence the conduct of foreign governments and their officers and thus incite hatred and ridicule of those in charge of our governmental affairs.

According to AP reports with date lines from Manchester, England—and I quote:

> Henry A. Wallace renewed a slashing attack today on President Truman's proposal to aid Turkey and Greece, declaring it was a commitment to rush to the aid of dictators. * * * The United States, the former Vice President charged, is being directed along a road of ruthless imperialism, reaching from China to the eastern Mediterranean and from pole to pole.

Mr. Speaker, these words from a former Vice President and Cabinet member, uttered on foreign soil against those in charge of the affairs of this Government, are in my humble opinion slanderous if not treasonable.

President Truman has the power to cancel the former Vice President's passports and call him home, and break up this attempt of sabotage and fifth-column propaganda in Europe.

Let Mr. Wallace come home and write in his New Republic to his heart's content about the ideals of communism, but stop his questionable conduct in Europe.

If you, Mr. President, are going to ask the people of this country to dig into their pockets deeper and deeper to carry out your commitments abroad, and if you are to use the military in foreign lands to direct the use of the aid you propose to give, surely you can put a stop to these rabble-rousing tactics over there by our own citizens working at cross-purposes and attempting to defeat and destroy the very things you are attempting to do.

CONTROL OF THE DARDANELLES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, for 250 years, the control of the Dardanelles has been a matter of international dispute. Peter the Great, seeking warm water ports for the Russian Empire attempted to obtain control of the Straits of the Dardanelles. For over 100 years, Mr. Speaker, the British have regarded control of these straits as essential to the maintenance of their empire. For this reason, the British fought several wars, and numerous wars have been fought by the various Balkan countries. The ancient Ottoman Empire was based around the control of the straits.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that in 1926 the present Turkish dictatorial government obtained control of the straits by international agreement—the Montreaux Convention, which permitted the Turks to rearm the Dardanelles.

It is important, also, Mr. Speaker, that the House should consider that both the British and Russian Governments objected to the manner in which the Turkish Government permitted Nazi war vessels to pass through the straits during the last war. Let us, as a matter of record, recall now that the Turks violated its sworn agreement during the war. It directly and flagrantly assisted the Nazi military forces and permitted them to shift troops and naval vessels from the Aegean to the Black Sea more or less as they chose. Foreign Minister Eden and the Russians during the course of the war vigorously protested these violations.

Mr. Speaker, following the conclusion of this war, the American, the British, and the Russian Governments have all demanded the rewriting of the Montreaux Convention. All three of the great powers are opposed on the record to continued Turkish military control of the Dardanelles. We have asked that the Dardanelles be internationalized. The Russians have asked that the Dardanelles be controlled by the four Black Sea powers—Turkey, Russia, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Frankly, if anyone is ever to launch an attack upon Russia, it is logical, as Mr. Walter Lippman long ago pointed out, that the most vulnerable part of Russia is her soft underbelly bordering on the Black Sea for 1,000 miles. Close to the Black Sea are the great oil fields of Baku, the large grain fields of the Ukraine, the industrial areas of Stalingrad, Karkov, Kiev, Odessa, and other areas.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the Russians view with some alarm the exclusive control of the Straits in the hands of a power which during the war gave assistance to the Nazis in their assault upon Russia.

Obviously, the Turks might well permit at some future time an enemy fleet with aircraft carriers and battleships to attack Russia through the Dardanelles. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Russians apparently worry about huge air fleets armed with atomic bombs based on the plains of Turkey, striking across the Black Sea at their vitals.

Mr. Speaker, these are the realities, the geographic and military realities, of the position of the Turks.

As a matter of fact, when the false news of the fall of Stalingrad came, the Turkish Army was ordered mobilized on the Russian border, prepared to strike, but when Stalingrad did not fall, the Turkish Army was withdrawn from the Russian border. This also, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of record.

We find then that the Dardanelles now controlled exclusively by Turkey, could become the cause of another war. We find also that America, Britain, and Russia have agreed that they will revise the international covenant which has given Turkey control because of the Turkish violations of that agreement during the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we propose to rearm the Turkish Government. We propose to send a military mission. We propose to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the Turkish armed forces. What, Mr. Speaker, does the present bill before the Congress imply as to our intentions? In effect, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the passage of the present bill as it includes Turkey, means that we have established a military alliance with the Turkish Government. The passage of this bill will mean that we guarantee continued Turkish exclusive armed control of the Dardanelles. It will mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Turkish armed forces will have become the responsibility of the American Government and of the American taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, it can only mean that our armed services have decided that Turkey shall be the battleground of a new world war against Russia.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, there is another course open to us. Under the UN we are committed to present before that body any condition—economic, political, or military—which threatens the peace of the world. If we believe that the Dardanelles is a cause which might lead to war, why does not our good President, Mr. Truman, request our delegate to the UN to present the question before that august body? Why have we in violation of our commitments to the UN decided to take unilateral action in respect to continued Turkish armed control of these straits? The course of the administration means war. On the contrary, to present this question before the UN means peace. Collective action against aggression; collective actions to remove the causes of war; collective action to eliminate those problems such as the Dardanelles—this is the way to maintain peace. It is the way to build up the UN; but the course that we have proposed is unilateral action. We and we alone have made the decision. We alone have decided to maintain and continue Turkish armed control of the Dardanelles. We and we alone have decided to build a military alliance with a dictatorial and Fascist government on the border of Russia and the Black Sea. We, in so doing, have violated our commitments to the UN; this policy, if continued, means the death of the UN and it means the destruction of international peace. Let every Member of the House, Mr. Speaker, consider well what is implied by the inclusion of Turkey in a bill which has been described to the American people as one which brings food to the hungry and clothing to the naked. Let us not construct a military alliance with a Fascist government under the guise of aid to the relief and food for the poor. Hypocrisy is not the basis for constructive international policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I know, of course, there is a ball game, and I know also that some of us want to see the cherry blossoms and I assure you I am not going to keep you very long. In any event I am terribly distressed about this issue.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman said about the people in his district being disturbed about these emergencies. I am sure the people in most districts are disturbed over the emergencies. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if, in his opinion, there is not a real emergency in the Turkish-Greek situation today? Would he call it an emergency or would he say it is not an emergency?

Mr. BENDER. I say to the gentleman there is no emergency beyond that of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have listened to the gentleman with much interest. As a matter of fact, we debated this issue the other night. I would like to know what the gentleman proposes as an alternative? Does he propose appeasing Russia?

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman know that there is an appropriation now before us involving some $350,000,000 for appeasing Russia's satellite countries?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If there is such an appropriation I am against it.

Mr. BENDER. There is such an appropriation and the administration is asking us to support it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I can assure the gentleman if that is the intent and purpose of the particular appropriation I am against it. But will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. BENDER. I think it was a mistake that we appeased her to the extent we already have. It was Mr. Roosevelt's mistake.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. What does the gentleman think will happen if we allow Russia to take all of Europe?

Mr. BENDER. We have already allowed her to take most of Europe.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman continue to allow her to take Europe?

Mr. BENDER. No; but I do not think that is involved in this issue at all. I think the gentleman is reading something into this that is not there.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman from Louisiana asked for an alternative. England is broke, so she is getting out of Greece. Two hundred miles away England is fighting an aggressive war in Palestine. Why not take the Palestine troops and put them over there in Greece and you have the problem solved?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. There is a hundred thousand British troops in Palestine. We have stated our policy. Mr. Truman has said he disagrees with Great Britain on Palestine. The British say they cannot afford to carry on the 10,000 troops they have in Greece. If Mr. Truman is consistent then he would call on the British to take some of these troops out of Palestine and settle that problem over there and do something about that situation. We disagree with their position there and they could send their troops into Greece.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that the emergency exists in Greece but it is not our emergency, that the British ought to take care of it?

Mr. BENDER. The British emergency is this: The banks in England have hundreds of millions of dollars in Greek loans. They hold a mortgage on Greece that we do not have. We are underwriting that mortgage to the British bankers.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Let me get the gentleman's premise correctly. What does the gentleman advocate; that we do nothing about Greece?

Mr. BENDER. I am interested in feeding the hungry and clothing the poor. To feed the hungry and clothe the naked, I would be willing to vote for an appropriation of $50,000,000 for Greece, and that is all, for this year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Who would administer that appropriation? Would you not have the same situation that you had under Tito?

Mr. BENDER. I most certainly would not have the monarchy that now exists in Greece administer it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Journal of the American Bar Association.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the National Policy Committee.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base 6 property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

528. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

529. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

530. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780, 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

532. A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting a report of the National Park Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

533. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764), relating to the arming of American vessels; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

534. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

537. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

538. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State and Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in this country in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

539. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the bimonthly report of the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation small-business activities during the period December 1 through 31, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

540. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942, exempting certain real property from taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

541. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

542. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision for the fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment to House Document No. 100, Eightieth Congress, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

543. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 193); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

544. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $28,800, together with a proposed provision affecting an appropriation for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 194); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3020. A bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 495. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1448. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution to provide for the consideration of H. R. 3020, a bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1465. A bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1467. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1565. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; with amendments (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1566. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1567. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2083. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; with amendments (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2084. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3028. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3030. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3031. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 so as to express the policy that surplus property suitable for educational uses may be donated to the several States, or to certain educational institutions thereof; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3032. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3033. A bill relating to assignments of claims against the United States for consideration for performance of personal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3034. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3035. A bill providing for payments to the State of Wyoming and for rights-of-way, including stock driveways, over and across Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3036. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3037. A bill to increase the categories of property which may be donated by the Army and Navy to schools, colleges, and universities, and the purposes for which such property may be used; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of House Report No. 209, Eightieth Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 181. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill H. R. 3020, relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to authorize the payment of 6 months' salary and funeral expenses to the widow of the late R. C. Hicks; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning the use of surplus military lands for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

in relation to appropriations affecting the United States customs service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Lillian Jeffries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

322. By Mr. COTTON: Petition of New Hampshire State Board of Education, recommending that Congress amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

323. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 14 residents of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

324. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of Rev. O. H. Spence, of Salisbury, Md., and 53 others, in support of S. 265 and any other bills of similar character, to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of Collegiate Deans and Registrars in Negro Schools, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for liberal financial grants to the States for elementary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

326. Also, petition of Miss Pearl Arnold, secretary, Lake Worth Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

327. Also, petition of Mr. Anthony Nicastri, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the 1-cent increase in the District of Columbia gasoline tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Lindsey B. Trone, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Carlsbad, N. Mex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, enable us so to put our trust in Thee that we may be aware of Thy presence in our hearts and lives and that we may worthily magnify and glorify Thy holy name.

Help us to be humble in Thy sight, for we know "the higher we are placed, the more humbly should we walk."

Deliver us from pettiness. Help us to see all things in their proper perspective—thus shall we be delivered from "majoring in minors." "In all our ways may we acknowledge Him and He shall direct our paths."

Forgive us of our sins. Empower us by Thy spirit. Strengthen us for every task, we pray, in His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 11, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; and

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 495. An act to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1448. An act to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further anounced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF NIGHT SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to announce that we expect to hold and will hold a session of the Senate on Wednesday night of this week, and that the Senate will not recess for the dinner hour but will run right through that time. I desire further to announce that there is a probability that there will also be a night session on Thursday of this week if the Grecian loan measure is not concluded by that time.

POLLUTION CONTROL IN STREAMS—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to give notice, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, that public hearings will begin on Tuesday, April 22, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 412 Senate Office Building, on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with pollution control in the streams of the country. The hearings will be held before the Subcommittee on River and Harbor Improvements, of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is chairman.

CONTROL OF EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (H. DOC. NO. 195)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 3422.)

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AND REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual reports of the Librarian of Congress and the Register of Copyrights, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION SMALL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Corporation's small business activities for the period December 1 through December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to migratory wild fowl

"Whereas the flight of wild fowl through California from the breeding grounds in the north to their wintering places in the south is largely through the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys; and

"Whereas since irrigation for 60 or 75 years in the western part of the San Joaquin Valley has supplied water for resting and feeding places for such fowl in what is now known as the grasslands; and

"Whereas since the inauguration of the Central Valley project, the grasslands used for grazing of livestock and for the conservation and preservation of migratory wild fowl are not assured of a permanent water supply but are furnished with water from year to year; and

"Whereas a lack of water in this area would doubtless destroy this, one of the nation's large assets and thereby bring large financial losses to all lines of business in California and elsewhere; and

"Whereas the California Legislature, being mindful of the magnitude of the impending peril and damage to the economic well-being in this State and to the Nation, believe that proper action should be taken to permanently remedy this situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature respectfully memorializes the President, Secretary Krug of the Department of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States, to take whatever action is necessary to furnish a permanent supply of water equaling 100,000 acre-feet annually to the grasslands in the western San Joaquin Valley; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is authorized and directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning the use of surplus military lands for national cemeteries

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado that there should be established throughout the United States national cemeteries for the burial of those killed in the recent World War and for the burial of others entitled to be buried in national cemeteries; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Colorado is advised that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposed legislation under which the Secretary of War will be given authority to turn over surplus military lands for the establishment of national cemeteries; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Colorado is advised that if said legislation is approved the War Department intends to establish a national cemetery at Fort Logan, Colo.: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve said legislation or so much thereof as is necessary to authorize the Secretary of War to turn over surplus military lands for the establishment of national cemeteries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

Petitions of members of the Lake County Townsend Club, Eustis, and the Lake Worth Townsend Club of Lake Worth, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Territory of Hawaii, Chapter No. 7, of the American Veterans Committee, Lower Manoa, Honolulu, T. H., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 857) to remove the racial restrictions upon naturalization and to amend the immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 14

"Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

"Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

"Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of the State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER known as S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, which bill is now in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine is the chairman: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa hereby urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence and support in behalf of S. 265, to the end that the general welfare of the people, and especially the youth of Iowa, and of the United States, be safeguarded and protected.

"Furthermore, that a copy of said resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Iowa and the United States Representatives from Iowa, to the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., Senator from Maine, and to the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator from Kansas."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress a plan calling for the unification of the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the said plan in one form does not make adequate specific provision for the recognition of the United States Marine Corps as a distinct unit of the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the Marine Corps has established itself over a period of more than a century as one of the greatest fighting organizations in the world and should be continued in its traditional status; and

"Whereas the security of the United States requires the continuation of a unit versed through experience and training in the art of amphibious warfare; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has since its organization, in 1775, distinguished itself as the greatest and best-versed amphibious force in the world: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate favorable action toward specifically establishing the United States Marine Corps and making adequate provision for its continuation in any plan for unification of the armed forces of the United States.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 15, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj.

Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEM:

S. 1097. A bill to incorporate the American War Dads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. REVERCOMB introduced Senate bill 1098, to create a Department of Peace, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1099. A bill to facilitate the investment of venture capital in new enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1101. A bill to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to call a convention of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1103. A bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1104. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.

S. 1105. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780, 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes;

S. 1106. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

S. 1107. A bill to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764), relating to the arming of American vessels; and

S. 1108. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1109. A bill for the relief of Szaie Kacowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 1110. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1111. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1112. A bill providing for the transfer of a part of Fort Douglas, Utah, to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and conveyance of part to the State of Utah, and public agencies of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1113. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide automobiles or other conveyances for certain disabled veterans of World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a Department of Peace, and I wish to state at the time of introducing it that an identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1098) to create a Department of Peace, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and I request that it be printed and lie on the table.

This amendment would raise personal exemptions from the present $500 per capita level to $750 for a single person and $1,500 for the head of a family. The allowance for dependents would remain at the present level of $500.

This is the most logical step the Congress can take toward a reduction in taxes. Such an increase in the amount of personal exemptions treats all individual taxpayers alike—all benefit accordingly. Next, the raising of personal exemptions provides a measure of definite relief for the wage earner and other citizens in the low-income bracket. They are the ones who need tax relief most.

A family whose income does not exceed an allowance of $1,500 for a husband and wife and $500 for each dependent cannot purchase more than the actual necessities required for a minimum standard of living. All their income is required for food, shelter, clothing, and other such necessities incident to a minimum standard of living. This is where tax relief is most urgently needed and where relief will provide the most benefit to the greatest number.

We are all anxious to see a general tax reduction, but we must maintain sound fiscal policies. That means it is of highest importance that we balance the budget and keep it balanced. When we shall have accomplished this, then there can be a general tax reduction across the board in proportion to the reduction we are able to make on Federal expenditures. If we are successful in substantially reducing the cost of Government, then general tax reduction can follow proportionally.

I have considered several levels to which personal exemptions might be raised. I first intended to propose an amendment raising personal exemptions to $1,000 for a single person and $2,000 for the head of a family, but found that these figures would bring about the removal of between eighteen and twenty million people from the tax rolls and would reduce Treasury receipts from five to six billion dollars annually. The amendment which I now propose would remove only about 9,000,000 taxpayers from the rolls and would decrease Treasury receipts from two and one-half to three billion dollars. In my judgment, this reduction in revenues would not jeopardize national income or sound fiscal policies and would provide tax relief where it is most needed for the greatest number of people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 495. An act to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1448. An act to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building.

MEETING OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may be given permission to meet at 2 o'clock in the old

Interoceanic Canal Committee room for the purpose of considering the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor and Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that one of the subcommittees of the Committee on the District of Columbia may hold a meeting at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG BEFORE PAN AMERICAN UNION

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Pan-American Day," delivered by Senator VANDENBERG before the Pan American Union on April 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT BY POPULAR VOTE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Majority Rule," published in the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of April 1, 1947; also an editorial entitled "Why Not?" published in the Worcester (Mass.) Labor News of April 4, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY GAEL SULLIVAN

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day address delivered by the Honorable Gael Sullivan, vice chairman and executive director of the Democratic National Committee, at Providence, R. I., April 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND HENRY WALLACE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman and Wallace," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1947, and an editorial entitled "No Cause for Hysteria," published in the Washington Post of April 15, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

MARGARINE AND THE FARMER—ARTICLE BY MRS. CORRIE T. PLYLER

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Margarine and the Farmer," written by Mrs. Corrie T. Plyler, of Columbia, S. C., and published in the South Carolina Farmer, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AND SENATOR O'CONOR BEFORE THE PITTSBURGH AMEN CORNER CLUB

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Saturday night in Pittsburgh, Pa., a very important dinner was held by the Amen Corner Club, and it was addressed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and also by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Unfortunately I do not have a copy of the remarks of the Governor of Pennsylvania, but I do have copies of the addresses delivered by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from California, and owing to the fact that they are so much in keeping with the problems we are now considering and discussing in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

ADDRESS OFF SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND

As free men, proudly conscious of our heritage of national and individual liberty, we like to think of ourselves as captains of our souls and absolute masters of our fate. When we pause today to contemplate the future of America and of the world, however, we find ourselves captives of the forces of fate, and faced with decisions which none of us want to make, and which few, indeed, ever thought we should have to make.

Through the years we Americans have considered our country a world apart. We did not feel that it was necessary to concern ourselves with the problems of the rest of the world. Now it is a shock to find that we must so concern ourselves. The oceans which once were so potent to protect us from surprise attack have shrunk to insignificance. The world which only recently was so immense that we could pursue our way regardless of what happened to nations and peoples elsewhere, is now no larger by comparison than the crowded Europe of colonial days.

Atomic research has forced the world to acknowledge its oneness. One day the atom bomb will reduce it to nothingness unless all peoples, recognizing the portents, can bring themselves to forego age-old hates and rivalries and to dwell in peace and cooperation, or, at least, tolerance.

America, as a nation, has attained the fullness of its destiny. This was inevitable, though we sensed it not. Fabulously wealthy as we were with a profusion of Nature's bounties; endowed with unbounded initiative and enterprise, to enable us to make the most of these resources—it had to be simply a matter of time before American energy and know-how would place us in the forefront of the nations of the world.

Having attained to full maturity in physical development, America must now evidence a commensurate growth of mind and spirit if we are adequately to discharge our newly acquired responsibilities.

During the years of our national adolescence there were so many matters to claim our attention—the vast West to explore and conquer, the boundless wealth of forest and prairie and mines to utilize, the beckoning industrial empire to develop. Little wonder it was that our ancestors, looking upon America as the garden spot of the world, an Eden of complete self-sufficiency, found it beyond their ken to give thought to the troubles or quarrels of other nations.

Today, all has been changed. Facing the future squarely and realistically, we must accept certain facts. First, that America is today the No. 1 democratic nation of the world, with only one contender for world leadership; secondly, that Russia, the other claimant to world eminence, is violently and unalterably opposed to all those ideals and principles which are the very sinew and fiber of the American body politic.

The inevitable result is, that with World War II still fresh in our minds, World War III is threatened. The prelude to that possible conflict is already in evidence, in the struggle now in progress to capture and hold the minds of men. It is a struggle that finds the democratic nations and all who enthrone reason and individual liberty, ranged against the exponents of another ideology. I won't say it is a new ideology, because is as old as time itself. But today it has been developed and strengthened to a point far beyond any previous progress in this field in all the world's history.

In the new nations which are coming into existence throughout the world, and in the older, long-established nations as well, there are liberal leaders who look to the foremost of all democratic successes—to the United States—for guidance and good will. During the war, the American people learned their greatest lesson in geography and learned it well. We are now challenged to extend those lessons, to project the knowledge gained, into affairs of the world we hope will be peaceful. To pull our cloaks about us and to see no farther than our own immediate interests would be, today, both short-sighted and unwise.

We cannot wait until the shock of war startles us into a broad concept of world action. We are living in unreality, unless we recognize that starvation and plague, as well as corrupt and inept governments beyond the oceans, make rotten spots in a world in which we have a large share. Nothing these days is so far away that it does not come remarkably close to our own lives.

What does that mean for America? It means that at this very moment America, through no desire of its own, has to decide * * * to take the most important step in foreign policy in all its long history. It means that, in an effort to head off a third world war before it reaches the shooting stage, America must now give attention to the world-wide defense of democracy and call a halt to the ever-spreading threat of Communist expansion.

Our old outposts are gone. Down through the years, and particularly in the early days of World Wars I and II, the power and might of Great Britain was there, to hold back the pressure of alien doctrines and ideas, until America could arouse herself to the point where positive action could be taken. You now know that Great Britain no longer stands as the world's bulwark against disaster. Utterly exhausted by her heroic stand against the mighty Nazi hordes, Britain has "thrown up the sponge" of world leadership. Spent and weary, she has passed on the baton of leadership to America, the one nation capable of accepting such a vast commitment on behalf of freedom.

So today Fate presses upon us for decision. Shall freedom have a chance to survive in small nations everywhere, or are we to sit back, as France and England did in the days of Hitler's rise, and watch another mighty threat to world peace and integrity develop and expand before our very eyes?

This must not be allowed to happen. Thank God, it will not be allowed to happen. The American proposals for aid to Greece and Turkey, to save them from chaos and ultimate lapse into communism, reveal a definite recognition of America's new role in world affairs, and a readiness to accept the responsibility devolving upon such leadership.

After thorough consideration and study of the broad issues involved, I am firmly convinced that the policy of assistance to Greece and Turkey not only is vital to the security of our own country but also to the survival of the United Nations. Let me add too, that it is vital likewise, and in a very particular way, to the self-respect of the American people, many of whom are finding it difficult to live with their own consciences after our

failure to insist upon the democratic principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter.

Coming directly from the Senate, I can assure you that when the President delivered his message to Congress, on March 12, proposing aid to Greece and Turkey, many of us had the gravest reservations as to the wisdom of his proposals. This was hardly surprising. What the President proposed represented a drastic change in foreign policy. It seemed to propel us into one of the trouble spots of the globe. Some thought we had dealt a serious blow to the the United Nations by not approaching it first. Others felt that we might be preparing to prop up reactionary regimes in various part of the world. Still others feared it might lead to war with the Soviet Union.

These were grave fears. Congress could not ignore them. Committees in both Houses have held hearings on the program. The members of the committees have given the matter unusually searching study. Partisanship has been conspicuously absent.

Let us cut through the fog of controversy which has settled around this question and do what we can to see its basic elements clearly.

Greece has suffered to an unimaginable degree from war's devastation. It is riven by civil war fomented, at least in part, from outside the country. The economic assistance rendered by the British and by UNRRA was scheduled to end on March 31. Greece seemed headed for economic collapse and political chaos, which would pave the way for totalitarian dictatorship, possibly under outside control.

Turkey, unlike Greece, is not destitute. But the Turks have been forced to keep their army fully mobilized in time of peace as they did in war, because of Soviet pressure for territorial changes on their borders and in the status of the Dardanelles. If the Turkish economy is to stand the strain of full military mobilization, it must be supported by resources from the United States.

The bill now under consideration in the Congress authorizes the President to extend financial and other assistance to Greece and Turkey when he deems it to be in the interest of the United States, and upon the request of those countries. Both the Greek and the Turkish Governments have requested such assistance. An appropriation of $400,000,000 is authorized in the bill. The President may furnish financial aid to Greece and Turkey in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise. He may detail persons in the employ of the United States Government—civil servants—to these countries to assist them in meeting their problems. He may also detail a limited number of military personnel for advisory purposes only. Troops are not to be sent.

Essentially, the bill is an authorization to the Executive to render emergency aid in the interest of this country. It is not a threat to anybody. It menaces no one. It is to be used to prevent economic and possibly political collapse in a highly strategic area. A collapse in that area would have incalculable results. If, through misery and want, the population of Greece is reduced to utter destitution, and if, through infiltration from outside, Communist agents gain control of the country and wipe out free institutions there, the effects will be felt in all the countries of the eastern and central Mediterranean.

We cannot, and we would not, attempt to tell the peoples of any country how they should govern themselves. But we can see to it by every appropriate means that they retain the power to make a free choice in the matter. We do not think that the Greeks, or the Turks, or any other people of the near and middle eastern region—nor, for that matter, any nation anywhere in the world—should be pushed around. We do not think that they should be forced by outside pressure to abandon free institutions if they desire them. We know that, in a sense, their fate is linked with our own. An explosion which would put out the light of freedom in Greece or Turkey might start a chain reaction in many another land.

There has been considerable discussion over four problems having to do with the methods and the ultimate results of the program.

The first question is whether we are bypassing or weakening the United Nations by proposing to act on our own.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee made an exhaustive examination of this problem. It concluded that the President's proposal represented the only possible method of coping with the emergency situation which now exists.

What agency of the United Nations could do the job within the brief period of time at our disposal? The answer is that the United Nations can do, and is doing, part of the job; but that we are the only country which can do the rest.

The United Nations is equipped to deal with the more overt threats to the territorial integrity of Greece. The Greek Government has charged before the Security Council of the United Nations that armed bands operating within its territory are partly supplied, trained, and given refuge across the border in Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. The Council has appointed a commission which has just investigated the Greek charges on the spot. It is writing its report, which will soon be presented to the Security Council.

This would deal with one of Greece's problems. But it would not be a substitute for the assistance Greece has asked from us. By itself, it would not halt internal disorder or prevent an economic collapse. What Greece needs in the immediate future is economic and financial aid to take the place of the UNRRA and British funds no longer flowing to that country. Only the United States could furnish the necessary aid in time to be of assistance.

On March 28, Senator Austin, our representative in the Security Council, gave a full description of the proposals to the Council. He stressed this point: That the aid we extend to Greece and Turkey is temporary emergency aid. It is designed to tide these countries over until the United Nations can act. Then, on a long-term basis, the new United Nations agencies would be expected to assume the burden of assistance.

As a matter of fact, what we propose to do to aid Greece will set the stage for United Nations action. It is the blood transfusion which will give Greece the strength to work out its economic salvation. It will give Greece the productive capacity to qualify as a good risk for a loan from the International Bank. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has already prepared an extensive program of measures which the United Nations can take, over the long run, to rehabilitate the country.

To make assurance doubly sure on this score, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has added to the bill language directing the President to withdraw the authorized aid if a government representing a majority of the Greek or Turkish people so request; or if the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable. Under the bill as it now stands, we are pledged to respect such a finding, notwithstanding any veto in the Security Council.

If this is violating the Charter or disregarding the United Nations, then words have lost their meaning.

The second important question which arose in the Senate committee hearings was whether this program would result in simlar requests for assistance from other areas, with expenses which might become unbearable. Some suggested we might be starting a new gravy train for suppliant nations.

This policy, if supported by Congress, involves a readiness to help other nations under certain circumstances. But it is clear that each case would vary, and that each request for assistance would have to be handled on its particular merits. The Department of State has assured the Senate that it has no plans at present for the extension of aid similar to that proposed for Greece and Turkey to any other country.

This brings me to the third great question raised in the Senate. Will this program endanger world peace? Will it force us into war with Russia?

The answer is "No." Let us not pull any punches in discussing so vital a matter.

Anyone who will take the trouble to examine the record of history since the war will be driven to the conclusion that Russian foreign policy is aggressive and expanding. This is true whether we consider the territorial gains made by the Russians as a result of the war, the progress they have made in dominating large areas in eastern Europe, or the activities of Communist agents in all parts of the earth.

The United Nations cannot survive, and the United Nations cannot be secure, if any great power pursues expansionist aims. When Adolf Hitler was having his heyday we discovered all too clearly where that type of policy leads if it is allowed to proceed unchecked.

We discovered that you do not stop aggression by yielding to it. You do not stop expansion by turning a blind eye to the infiltration of subversive elements into a country.

That is not the way to obtain stability and peace.

The Greco-Turkish aid program does point the way to stabilization. It does not attack Russia. It does not disturb the Soviet Union in the enjoyment of any rights and privileges to which that country is entitled.

There are certain risks involved in any policy adopted by the United States today. But I firmly believe that the Congress and the people of this country are convinced that the most risky adventure, the most dangerous and irresponsible course, would be to do nothing.

This is the time to make our policy clear. I believe that our action in aiding Greece and Turkey, and its sequel—United Nations action—offer the best hope for reaching a real understanding with all other countries, including the Russians, for the maintenance of the freedom of all nations and the preservation of peace.

Let us now turn to the fourth important question considered in the Senate. Are we justified in extending aid to Greece and Turkey on the ground that we are aiding democracies? Are these countries as presently organized true democracies?

Who is qualified to judge in such matters? Perhaps their democracy is imperfect. So is our own. But both countries hold elections. Both have opposition parties. Both tolerate criticism. I believe that, if they can feel secure politically and economically, both peoples will continue on the road of democracy, on which they have already made such progress.

The choice we have to face is not a choice between a perfect democracy and an imperfect democracy. The question is whether there shall be any democracy in Greece or Turkey at all. If Greece succumbs to the armed minorities which threaten its political and economic stability, if Turkey cannot support the weight of full and prolonged military mobilization, then free institutions and human freedoms would disappear in these countries and the way would be paved for further Communist inroads into Italy and possibly France, in the Near East, and in Africa.

As we face this new crisis in a world fairly bristling with uncertainties it is imperative that we stand united in what we do. We can ill afford to be divided. We can ill afford the luxury of partisan politics. Last Tuesday I was thrilled when Senator VANDENBERG rose to magnificent heights to support the President's program of assistance to Greece and Turkey. He and Senator CONNOLLY have been working together as a team. At San Francisco, at London, at Paris, at New York, and in Washington these Senators have stood shoulder to shoulder in their battle for world peace.

Nearly 2 years have elapsed since the Senate, by the overwhelming vote of 89 to 2, ratified the Charter of the United Nations. On that day Democrats and Republicans alike pledged themselves to help make the United Nations an effective instrument of world peace. On that day the Senate voted not as Republicans and Democrats—they voted as Americans. And the spirit of the Congress today is to continue along that road of bipartisanship.

To effectuate our goal of world peace, I submit, we should commit ourselves to the following program:

1. We must scrupulously abide by the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and insist that other members of the United Nations do the same. These principles and purposes are the ten commandments of the United Nations and unless they are respected by all, the organization will wither away and the vision of world peace will become a mirage.

2. We must support to the hilt the social and humanitarian work of the United Nations and thus help lay a solid foundation for lasting peace. The war-torn lands of hungry Europe and Asia look more than ever upon the United States as the symbol of their hopes and aspirations. They feel that only through our leadership will the human rights and fundamental freedoms envisaged in the Charter be realized.

3. We must support unequivocally the projected International Trade Organization and its efforts to reduce obstacles to world trade. We might just as well face the facts; it is no longer possible in this shriveled-up world to have political peace unless we have economic peace as well. A freer flow of goods and services across national boundary lines for the economic well-being of all must be our goal.

4. We must insist upon the speedy conclusion of the agreement providing for the armed forces which the Security Council needs to maintain world peace. For more than a year now the Russian members of the military staff committee have dallied and delayed. As a result, the Security Council, like a policeman without his club, remains without the power it needs to enforce the law. We must leave no stone unturned to convert the Council into that powerful guardian of world peace it was planned to be.

5. We must push to conclusion plans to eliminate from national armaments both atomic and other weapons adaptable to mass destruction. Obviously, this calls for the creation of an adequate system of inspection and controls at the international level. The alternative is a terrified world, already bled white by two major wars, cringing in the deepening shadow of the atom bomb.

6. We must strengthen the regional peace machinery of the Americas and make it an integral part of the United Nations system. In the Act of Chapultepec the 21 American Republics agreed that an attack against any one of them would be considered an attack against all. But that was only a wartime expedient. We must now put the act in permanent treaty form, thus transforming it into one of the enduring cornerstones of the United Nations.

7. We must ratify at once the agreement placing our mandated islands in the Pacific under United Nations trusteeship. Very recently the Security Council approved the agreement which would permit the United States to fortify the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the Carolines, but would make us responsible to the United Nations for the welfare of the people there. The measure will soon be before the Senate. We should place our stamp of approval upon it without delay and demonstrate once more our confidence in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

8. We must conclude and ratify, with all possible speed, the peace treaties both with the satellite countries and with Germany, Austria, and Japan. To a very great extent, the success of the United Nations will depend upon the kind of peace that is established in Europe and in Asia. Of this much I am sure; the peoples of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria cannot breathe freely again until Russian troops have left their soil and the iron curtain is drawn back. These are the first conditions for a stable world order.

One of the heartening things that has stood out in all emergencies of American history has been the availability of adequate leadership to enable us to cope with any emergency. In the War of the Revolution, George Washington was the rock around which the forces of freedom rallied. In the War Between the States, Abraham Lincoln, majestic in his simplicity of mind, stood firm for the right and integrity of America. So, too, in all succeeding crises there have been leaders at hand, ready and capable. Today we are similarly blest.

One has but to read the news reports from Moscow to realize that in Gen. George C. Marshall America has the ideal Secretary of State to check Russian aggression. He is the perfect example of the calm, judicial, unperturbed leader. Convinced of the justice of America's position, he stands like the Rock of Gibraltar, an unyielding exponent of democratic ideals, a symbol of hope for all who are threatened by Russia's aggression.

Why has it fallen to America's lot to champion the cause of world freedoms? It isn't solely because of our military might, our vast economic resources. There are moral causes as well. By our very nature, by the consecrated blood of our forefathers, by all our creeds and covenants, we are the moral enemy of all tyranny. We are the moral opponents of any nation or any government which sets itself up as master of mankind.

For it is our national faith that men shall be free, and not slaves; that they shall be equal before their fellowman as they are equal in the sight of God. We are the spiritual antagonists of racial hatreds and religious intolerance, of all who would trample and destroy the dignity of man the wide world over.

Nor are these moral issues by any means one-sided. Our dislike for oppressors is as nothing compared with their blood-hungry loathing of us. For as long as America stands she is a beacon in the sky, a promise in the heavens to all down-trodden peoples of the earth. As long as the torch of liberty burns in our land, there is light upon the earth, there is hope, and there is incentive to rise against the oppressor.

There is no denying these moral enmities. There is no dodging the responsibilities entailed. Even if we wished it, America could not avoid being the symbol of world-wide hope. We have been just that for 300 years and more. It was to the New World that the victims of old oppressions looked back in the 17th century. It was to the American Colonies that the exponents of democracy first came and established constitutional, responsive governments.

It was on this continent that the first great and enduring union of free peoples was instituted. It was to this country that the fugitives from oppression migrated in search of what they could not obtain at home.

Small wonder, indeed, if the eyes of oppressed people everywhere still turn, instinctively, toward America. We, of this generation, must keep faith with our forefathers. To do so not only must we preserve the nation they founded, and pass on to our descendants the same democratic form of government and the same individual liberty and freedom which have been our heritage but, God willing, we must be ready to answer when victims of oppression clamor for our aid.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. President, Governor Duff, distinguished guests, and members of the Amen Corner, it is good to be with you here in the great State of Pennsylvania whose cities and towns are a major part of the epic of America.

As a boy in the schools of California the name of Philadelphia brought to mind the Declaration of Independence, the Liberty Bell, the Constitution and the early days of the Republic; Gettysburg meant the high-water mark of the Rebellion, one of the world's decisive battles and Lincoln's immortal address while Pittsburgh brought forth a panorama of the industrial productivity of twentieth-century America.

From the State of California whose political and economic growth has been so greatly contributed to by sons and daughters of Pennsylvania I bring greetings and symbolic "hands across the continent" pledge of friendship.

It took the "forty-niners" and the early pioneers who followed them many months by covered wagon to make the long trek westward. Now we fly the same distance in half a day.

Yes, we of this generation live in an accelerated age. In the nineteen hundred and forty-seven years since the birth of Christ the annihilation of space has been largely concentrated in the last 47 years. The radio, airplane, television are inventions of this century. There must be added the mass production of the automobile which while invented earlier did not reach maturity until after the eighteen hundreds passed into oblivion.

Not yet to the halfway mark of the nineteen hundreds we have already entered, for better or for worse, the atomic age. Within our hands we have the power to destroy civilization as we know it or to contribute to the opening of a new golden age.

A year ago I made a 30,000-mile trip around the world as a member of the War Investigating Committee. While in Japan I had the opportunity of seeing Nagasaki, where the second atomic bomb had dropped. During the war I had seen much destruction in England, France, Belgium, and Germany, but never such destruction as in that Japanese seaport.

The community looked as though it had been put through a coffee grinder and the remains scattered over the landscape.

As far as the atomic bomb is concerned there are three things we must keep in mind:

1. It is a weapon hitherto unknown by mankind.

2. There is no known defense against it.

3. No nation can have a permanent monopoly. What one nation and group of scientists can discover other nations, given time, industrial productivity and the resources, can discover.

What we do have is an element of time. It may be 2 years or it may be 10. Somewhere in between that narrow range other nations will have what we now like to think of as exclusive possession.

There can be no tranquility for ourselves or our children in a world which has embarked upon an atomic armament race. The Pearl Harbor of the future will not be a torpedo bomber attack upon a few sitting

duck warships in a distant Pacific harbor. Rather it will be rocket-guided-missile atomic attack upon every industrial and communications center in America on the same day and perhaps at the same instant. Pittsburgh, Detroit and San Francisco will almost certainly be on the same would-be aggressor's priority list.

Hence the need for using the relatively short time which remains to us to establish a system of international law and order wherein the peace of the world will be secure to ourselves and our children. In addition to adequate controls it is essential that no potential aggressor be able to block collective security by the use of the veto.

As a Member of the Senate of the United States and of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of the Congress I wish to make crystal clear that until and unless such adequate controls are established I am unalterably opposed to the surrender of our atomic secrets to any other nation on the face of the earth.

Yet atomic power is not all-restrictive by any means. In the field of industry and medicine it offers great possibilities. Within 7 years atomic power will be used for generating electricity and to power ships. What significance will this have on the coal fields of Pennsylvania or the oil fields of both of our States? An adult cannot return to childhood by pushing back the hands of the clock.

To meet the problems of the atomic age we need to streamline our governmental and economic facilities. Yet in so doing we must not cast off from the solid truths that neither time nor space can change. The multiplication table has not changed by the transition from the horse-and-buggy generation of our grandfathers to our jet-propelled era. Two and two still make four in spite of the utopian theories of squirrel-cage thinking that has sometimes prevailed in high places. So too, freedom is better than slavery behind the iron curtain.

Nor is security a good substitute for freedom. The most secure man is the inmate of the State penitentiary who has his food, clothing, and lodging guaranteed for life.

There is no doubt that the great economic and political problems that confront us can be solved in one way or another. The challenge we face is to solve them under our constitutional form of government and within the framework of the American system of personal liberty and free enterprise.

We are faced with postwar problems of no less magnitude than some of those which confronted us during World War II. The intelligence we use as a people in the solution of these problems will determine the future of our Republic.

We need some of the same patriotic cooperation on the part of our people that we had in winning the war. It is no time for narrow partisanship. The stakes are too high. If we fail here there is little hope for liberty or free enterprise elsewhere in the world.

One of the greatest contributions we can make to world peace is to maintain a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government. Both are essential if we are to meet our commitments at home and abroad.

Our national income approaches $170,000,000,000 per annum. To keep our employables employed, to enable the Federal Government to meet necessary commitments at home and abroad and to keep both small and large enterprise functioning there are significant indications that the national income must approximate $150,000,000,000 a year.

But such a huge national income may allow the inflationary forces to get out of hand unless the Nation maintains a high degree of productivity. Work stoppages and slowdowns are not a constructive approach to the problem which is of vital concern to every man, woman, and child in America. At the same time both industry and Government have a responsibility to encourage a rising standard of living for all of our people through increased purchasing power and lower consumer costs which can best be achieved by more and not less productivity.

For the security of our economic and political system what we desperately need now is for labor and management to pull together instead of pulling apart.

If they do this I am convinced that we need not fear the communism of Russia or the socialism of any other section of the world. The American system of free enterprise will lead the way. It is also my very strong belief that the best defense we have against communism and the best medium of propaganda for our way of life is to make certain that the American system functions at a high rate of efficiency. Also our people must understand that they have an expanding stake in the preservation of our free-enterprise system.

Congressional mail indicates that there is a considerable amount of disappointment that the Eightieth Congress has not already solved most of the problems facing us. I can fully understand the viewpoint of the person back home who is impatient at what he considers to be the lack of adequate progress.

However, I wish to point out that for the last 14 years the Government of the United States has been dominated by the executive branch. During most of that time we were either in a state of emergency growing out of one of the major depressions with which this Nation has been confronted, or out of the dislocations caused by the beginnings of World War II and our own later participation in that conflict.

During that entire period of time, on many occasions, bills were proposed by the executive branch of the Government and hurriedly passed by both Houses of Congress. This, of course, made for action. In some instances, such hasty action was justified by the critical problems which faced us.

But too often bills were sent up and passed with alacrity because strong pressure by the executive branch of the Government prevented or discouraged mature consideration by the Congress. This tendency led to the criticism that Congress in those days had degenerated into a rubber stamp for the executive branch of the Government, which, indeed, to a considerable extent, it had.

This, of course, is not in keeping with our Constitution. Representative government, by its very nature, requires time to process bills through the committees of both Houses of Congress and through the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Provided that there is not unnecessary delay, I firmly believe that in the long run, when given due and serious consideration, better legislation results and, as a result, the fundamental liberties of the people are more secure. Compared with the lightning-like speed growing out of congressional activity under executive pressure, I am frank to admit that the Eightieth Congress has not passed to date as large a volume of legislation. However, this is the price we must pay unless we are to surrender our representative form of government.

During the time that I have been in Washington, I have had the opportunity to discuss this problem with Members of both Houses of Congress, with representatives of the press and with many individuals in and out of public life. Almost without exception they agree that the Eightieth Congress has accomplished in the same length of time more than any normal peacetime Congress in the Nation's history. The Members of both the House of Representatives and of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, have worked hard in committee and on the floor and have devoted their efforts to meeting the tremendous volume of postwar problems with which we are now confronted.

In the first place, when the Eightieth Congress met we were faced with the need for the complete reorganization of the committee system which grew out of the passage of the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act by the Seventy-ninth Congress. In the Senate, the number of standing committees was reduced from 33 to 15. The number of standing committee assignments for each Member was cut down to two in the Senate and to one in the House of Representatives. This meant a complete reshuffling of committee assignments and responsibilities that had grown up during the period of many decades. Since all legislation must pass through the committee process, this meant that there was a delay in the start of committee hearings.

The record clearly shows that since the committee reorganization was accomplished the Members have been hard at work. Many hearings have been held and much valuable information gathered. Several of the committees have now closed the public hearings on some of the major legislation and are in the process of drafting or redrafting bills to be presented to the two Houses of Congress.

In the final analysis, the real test as to the capacity of the Eightieth Congress to do its job must rest on its final record. I firmly believe that it will be an exceptionally good record.

The Congress will make a substantial reduction in the Federal budget and will do this without endangering the national defense or the essential governmental services.

Provision will be made for a substantial reduction in the Federal public debt which now amounts to over $259,000,000,000. Certainly during relatively good years, prudent judgment would dictate that governments as well as individuals should reduce their indebtedness when they have an excess of income over expenditures.

The Eightieth Congress will pass tax-reduction legislation. While this will not be, in my opinion, as large a reduction as some Members of the House have advocated, it will amount to a real saving to the taxpayers, and at the same time will not undermine a sound fiscal policy. It is quite possible that tax reduction will be made in two parts. A moderate reduction at this session and another reduction next year after we have determined what the final budget figures will be and after we have seen what progress the world has made toward peace and economic stability.

Each House of Congress has already passed a so-called portal-to-portal bill growing out of the Mount Clemens decision. The bill is now before a conference committee. Without such legislation, the economic existence of many industries would have been in jeopardy. The failure of an industry in turn means a loss of jobs to workers and the loss of revenue to the Government.

The Congress has also initiated a constitutional amendment limiting the Presidential term to two elective terms plus not more than 2 years of an unexpired term. This constitutional amendment was made necessary by the fact that for the first time in the history of the country we had a clear demonstration that the "no third-term tradition" was not a sufficient guaranty against a President being elected for four terms which involved a period of 16 years. Already this constitutional amendment has been ratified by eight States.

Within a very short period of time, labor legislation will be passed by both Houses of Congress. It is my belief that such legislation will firmly establish the fact that with power must go responsibility. There is every indication that at a minimum such legislation will make contracts between employers and employees equally binding on both parties, will outlaw jurisdictional disputes, and will place substantial restrictions upon the use of secondary boycotts. In addition, the Wagner Act will be amended so that employers and employees are on a more equal footing with the Government acting in the general public interest rather than as a partisan of one side or the other. In addition, I be-

lieve that the Congress will make it crystal clear that no man or group of men will ever again have the power to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans on any pretext whatsoever.

During this same period, in addition to meeting the problems growing out of reconversion from war to peace, we have had to formulate some important policies governing our foreign relations. As one of the victorious powers, we have assumed certain responsibilities which we cannot and should not evade or avoid. My colleague, the Senator from Maryland, has discussed some of the problems in that field.

It is my firm belief that the functioning of our representative republic is largely dependent upon having a fully informed electorate at home. They must recognize both the problems involved and the necessary steps that must be taken for their solution. The long panorama of history clearly shows that freedom is not something that once achieved can be thereafter taken for granted. Not continual adolescent dreams of easy solutions, but rather hard work and sacrifice are required if we are to preserve our institutions and fulfill our destiny.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The question is on agreeing to a series of amendments submitted by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to Senate bill 938. Inasmuch as all the amendments constitute one united purpose, namely, that of eliminating Turkey from the pending bill, without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. Therefore, without objection, the pending question is on agreeing to the series of amendments submitted by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from New Jersey informs me that he must attend a committee meeting, and that he desires to make some remarks on the pending bill. If it is agreeable to the Senate that I may have the floor when the Senator from New Jersey concludes his remarks, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator asking unanimous consent that he may have the floor at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask unanimous consent that I may retain the floor after the Senator from New Jersey shall have concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made, and the Senator from New Jersey will be recognized.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the courtesy of the Senator from Idaho in permitting me to address the Senate for a few minutes without prejudice to his right to the floor.

Before I proceed with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate at this time, as they are engaged at the moment in completing the labor bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks I may rejoin the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to state my position as clearly as I can with regard to the pending legislation which provides emergency aid for Greece and Turkey. The passage of the bill involves issues comparable in importance with the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the Senate in June of 1945. Every Member of the Congress must pass on this proposed legislation after the fullest consideration of all the implications of the pending action. The responsibility is particularly on the Senate of the United States, because we are more immediately concerned with matters of foreign policy. This responsibility applies particularly to members of our Foreign Relations Committee, which has had the duty of considering the proposed legislation in the first instance, and reporting to the Senate thereon.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has so ably presented the arguments for the passage of the pending measure that it is not necessary for any of the other members of the committee to deal further with the details of the bill. There are, however, some over-all considerations which we must all face, particularly as there is inherently involved a new extension of the foreign policy of the United States.

I feel it is my responsibility, as a Member of this distinguished body, to report to my constituents and to explain the development of my own thinking which has led me to support the program involved in the proposal before us.

President Truman's message of March 12 to the joint session of Congress, asking that Congress pass the pending bill providing for aid for Greece and Turkey, came as a profound shock to me and to many others who felt that we might be entering into new and untried experiences for our great country, and who felt that these new adventures should only be undertaken after full and prayerful consideration.

The proposals of the President called primarily for relief for Greece and Turkey in order that their economies might be stabilized and that they might be helped to help themselves in recovering from the dreadful shock of the war.

But beyond mere rehabilitation relief, which we can all heartily support in principle to the extent of our national financial ability, the message presents a new doctrine of foreign policy for the United States. In connection with both of these important approaches to the existing world chaos, many questions arose in the minds of our people, including, of course, the press and the many Nation-wide organizations that have been supporting collective action for the preservation of the peace and the development of the spirit of the United Nations.

As has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, these issues were of such importance that our committee felt it wise publicly to ask questions concerning problems that were involved in the new proposals, and to have those questions publicly answered. As has been stated, some 400 questions were propounded by Members of the United States Senate, representing their various constituencies, and ultimately 111 consolidated questions were presented to the administration with regard to the new program.

Out of these questions there emerged what I feel are a number of key questions, such as:

First. The precedent that might be set by the relief program.

Second. What is the so-called Truman doctrine? Is it an extension of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine to the continent of Europe? Is it inconsistent with the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine?

Third. Why does the United States take unilateral action in matters of such profound importance without submitting the entire program first to the appropriate organs of the United Nations?

These are intelligent questions, and deserve the most serious consideration.

It has been deeply gratifying that there has not been the slightest evidence of any attempt during the discussions to approach these issues from a partisan political standpoint. So far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, all of its members, Republicans and Democrats alike, have asked these questions together and have found the answers together. Together we are supporting the President's policy, implemented, as I shall try to point out, by the step-by-step developments since March 12, the date of the President's appearance before the joint session.

Immediately following the delivery of the President's message, the most significant reaction was the raising of the third question which I have mentioned above, namely, Why was the United Nations organization bypassed? On further study, the Truman message indicates the answer to this question and lays the foundation for what might be called a new application of policy rather than a new doctrine. Let me quote a few significant paragraphs from the President's address:

> We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required.

A little later in the President's address he used this significant language which begins to give form to the policy:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the war with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other nations.
>
> To insure the peaceful development of nations, free from coercion, the United

States has taken a leading part in establishing the United Nations. The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members.

Further emphasizing this same principle, the President said:

The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forces upon them against their will. The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

And finally in line with the same approach, the President used this pointed language:

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.

Every true American would of course endorse these principles so forcefully expressed by the President. My only concern, when I first heard his address, was that any action we might take should be in full and complete accord with our representatives on the UN.

As the discussion of the President's proposals proceeded, Mr. Austin, the United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, became a key figure in the deliberations. On March 28, 1947, Mr. Austin, speaking before the Security Council, made a very significant announcement with regard to the facts and objectives of the President's proposals. In the course of his address, Mr. Austin said:

The proposed program of assistance has a specific and direct bearing upon the central objectives of United States foreign policy—to strengthen the United Nations and to advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

Later in his address, after referring to the responsibility of the Security Council for the Greek border situation and recommending that a continuing Commission to observe the border situation be established by the Council, Mr. Austin said:

Action along these lines by the Security Council, combined with the proposed emergency program of assistance by the United States, would advance the prospects of peace and security in that part of the world.

Without such measures, each supplementing the other, there is grave danger that the situation which is now before the Security Council might deteriorate.

Finally, Mr. Austin pointed out clearly that the action by the United States is of an emergency and temporary character, and he stated that ultimate responsibility is with the United Nations. In this connection, he said:

The program of economic assistance contemplated by the United States is of an emergency and temporary character. The United States believes that the United Nations and its related agencies should assume the principal responsibility within their capabilities, for the long-range tasks of assistance required for the reconstruction of Greece.

Summing up Senator Austin's address, two important facts are brought out:

First. The program presented by President Truman is completely within the spirit of the United Nations Charter; and

Second. The program is temporary in purpose and will be discontinued when and if the United Nations organization is prepared to accept its responsibilities in the matter.

But, in addition to the development of the policy as evidenced by both the address of the President to the joint session of the Congress and by former Senator Austin's statement to the Security Council, the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the amendments to the original bill which it reported to the Senate, takes certain additional implementing steps such as the following, which put the United States on record as authorizing the United Nations to determine when, in its judgment, the aid given by the United States should be discontinued. These amendments are so important that I shall read them:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

1. If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

2. If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto)—

That means a veto either by the United States or by any other power—

or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and

3. If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

For example, if the World Bank should come to the rescue of Greece at that stage of the game, the United States could withdraw.

Mr. President, in view of what seems to be a clean-cut presentation to the American people of what this policy is, I am amazed over the shocking misrepresentation of his country by Mr. Henry Wallace in his recent statements in England. In telling the people of Europe that the United States is committed to a ruthless imperialism and a war with the Soviet Union, he completely misunderstands the spirit and purpose and, yes, the very soul of his country. And he renders his own people a great disservice at a time when our united American front in the cause of world peace is so vitally necessary. He would deny to his country the positive, aggressive position of leadership that we must take if the United Nations organization is to live and fulfill its destiny.

Coming now to the consideration of my second question with regard to the consistency of the Truman doctrine with the Monroe Doctrine, let me emphasize at once that I feel that the expression "Truman doctrine" is not properly applicable to the present situation because such an expression suggests that the policy has some sort of analogy to the Monroe Doctrine and may or may not be consistent with that doctrine. What we are establishing is simply a reemphasis of our determination to put an end to the causes of war. We recognize that in the possible economic collapse of the smaller countries, especially such countries as Greece and Turkey, there is real danger of war.

There is no territorial doctrine involved because the problem is not localized and might present itself in other parts of the world. The new policy is not negative, such as the Monroe Doctrine was, but rather a positive, offensive one for the cause of peace in the world. We are simply saying that we will do all in our power to strengthen the United Nations to handle these problems in the troubled areas of the world, and until they are prepared to act, we are willing to act in the emergency. There is no inconsistency with the Monroe Doctrine.

And let me consider for a moment the situation in Turkey and the Dardanelles. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in his remarks in the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, discussed at some length this Dardanelles question. He endeavored to draw an analogy between Russia's desire today to control the Dardanelles and what would be our position if a foreign power or powers controlled or sought to control access to the Gulf of Mexico. The analogy, I submit, is not an apt one. We must deal with these problems as we find them in different parts of the world and in light of the historical background.

The Dardanelles has been an international danger spot throughout the centuries affecting many countries, and has been a subject of international control culminating in the Montreux Convention of July 20, 1936, which allowed Turkey to refortify the Straits and eliminated the International Straits Commission, thus giving Turkey full control. This whole situation was considered at the Potsdam Conference of 1945, where it was agreed that each of the three interested powers—United States, Great Britain, and U. S. S. R.—should discuss the subject individually with Turkey. The United States immediately took the position that the Black Sea Straits should be controlled by international authorities, which led to the proposals by the United States of November 2, 1945. In those proposals we recognized clearly Russia's interest in the Dardanelles. We insisted that there should be a revision of the Montreux Convention, and we laid down four pinciples as a basis for the international revision of that Convention. A brief summary of the United States proposals indicates our sincerity of purpose and our friendly interest in helping to get this vexing international problem straightened out.

The revision which the United States suggested is based first on the opening of the Straits to the merchant vessels of all nations at all times; secondly, on the opening of the Straits to the transit

of warships of Black Sea powers at all times; and thirdly, on the denial of passage through the Straits to the warships of non-Black Sea powers at all times without the consent of the Black Sea powers, except when they are acting under the authority of the United Nations. Clearly that is a proposal to protect Russia as much as the other countries concerned with this important area of the world.

Russia was not interested in these proposals, and she made it apparent that Moscow thinks the statute of the Dardanelles, in spite of the world convention governing it, is purely an issue among the Black Sea nations. What Russia desires is a control by the so-called Black Sea powers, which means Russia and her two satellite countries, Bulgaria and Rumania, would clearly have Turkey at their mercy.

The American policy, therefore, is not denying Russia an equitable adjustment of the Dardanelles controversy, but is simply indicating that we propose to maintain the status quo in the Dardanelles area until Russia is willing to cooperate with the United Nations in settling this problem.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I desire to review some of the circumstances, as I understand them, which have led to the recommendations of the President that we take the proposed action. As one of the leading nations in the dramatic series of events leading to the ratification of the United Nations Charter by 55 nations, we have been most eager to bring about wholehearted and sincere international cooperation in the determination of all postwar issues. This includes the setting up of the various intergovernment organizations, including the completed development of the United Nations organization itself. It also includes the creation of the atmosphere of "one world" and the frank facing of all problems that might endanger the peace, by honest discussion at the conference table.

Let us recall again the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations:

We the peoples of the United Nations determine—

To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small; and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

And for these ends—

To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and

To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples

Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

The Charter was signed by 55 nations, including Russia.

Unfortunately the spirit and purpose of the Charter have been obstructed by the attitude of Russia, one of its authors as well as one of the great powers, whom we had hoped would cooperate wholeheartedly in these endeavors. We have felt that Russia has abused the so-called right of veto; she has opposed the effective organization of the Security Council by an unwillingness to agree to the setting up of the necessary armed quotas to give the Security Council authority; she has been unwilling to assist in the writing of the peace treaties in the spirit of what we believe was the intention of the Charter to protect the freedom and self-determination of the peoples involved; she has not joined in the International Bank. Russia, in short, has seemed to be more interested in what might be called destructive divisiveness than in cooperation. This has planted the seeds of disintegration and chaos in many of the smaller border countries.

Russia, as I have indicated, has consistently vetoed every attempt to bring the United Nations together and has adopted stalling tactics while through the back door she has been strengthening her hold on her satellite countries and trying to penetrate into other countries. It is not a question, as Mr. Wallace has suggested, of Russian imperialism against United States imperialism or British imperialism. It is a question of whether we, as a member of the United Nations, are going to tolerate in this world the domination and exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger nations. The totalitarian approach, whether nazism, fascism, or communism, is one of suppression of freedoms. This issue has been the cause of all important wars, and especially World Wars I and II. There is no hope for peace in the world unless this subtle movement is nipped before it gets further strength.

We of the Western World and the United States in particular, throughout our long history, have believed that fundamentally human beings can survive together and find common grounds for progress if they can be free and united. One of the miracles of history is that a wilderness settled by peoples of so many different national and racial strains has succeeded in demonstrating that out of diversity can come unity. This evolution in our history, which was not fully premeditated but was the expression of the yearning of the human heart down through the centuries, brought us to this profound realization. Our Civil War was really fought that our Union might be preserved because we knew that if we were divided we would fall. We Americans have come to revolt instinctively against divisiveness because divisiveness is a threat to freedom.

This American vision is engendered in every one of us from birth. Fundamentally the reason why we engaged in World War II was because we recognized atheism and divisiveness in the Hitler-Nazi doctrine of race supremacy and in the complete disregard for the rights and dignity of the individual.

And now we feel the same resistance to communism, which again divides, aiming to array class against class, and having as its objective the same atheistic conception—the complete disregard for the rights and dignity of the individual. We would deny our heritage of freedom if we permitted the "creeping paralysis" of totalitarianism, in whatever form, to destroy the sacredness of the individual human soul.

This is what troubles the conscience of America today, and this is why the peoples of all countries are looking to the leadership of our great country to demonstrate that human freedoms can survive.

This is opening for us a new chapter in our destiny. As the strongest survivor in the late war, we are being called upon to unite the world. We oppose Russia today, not fundamentally because we covet the material things that Russia covets but because communism, of which Russia is the symbol, is divisive and is not the champion of freedom. We believe that the state was made for man and not man for the state, and so we clash with Russia.

As we face this great responsibility, we must make sure that our people, dedicated to unity, shall not be torn asunder by any internal divisiveness which could threaten both our powers of leadership and our very future survival. We have two problems then. One is to set our own moral house in order and reunite our own people. The other is to let Russia know our real purposes, and that we are prepared to implement them with concrete action where necessary. Otherwise, small nations all over the world may justly accuse us of failing to practice what we preach.

We want the cooperation and assistance of the Russian people to work with us and with other nations to protect them, as well as ourselves, against the dangers of a divided world. We want their cooperation in the writing of the peace treaties, and in the activities of the United Nations organization. We have no desire to take over the control of any other country. We do not want a rule of force even to maintain the peace. What we do want is a peace built on the rule of justice and sanctioned by a voluntarily united world.

If the Russian people desire within their own boundaries to retire behind an iron curtain, that is their privilege, much as we regret it. But we must say to the Russian people with a definiteness that we mean, that the iron curtain cannot be extended into other quarters of the world where it may mean the suppression of fundamental freedoms inherent in the United Nations.

Mr. President, I will therefore support the pending legislation with the implementation of the doctrine as developed in our debates and in the amendments which our committee has proposed. I shall support this legislation because I feel it very definitely reflects the spirit and purpose of the United Nations.

In supporting this legislation, I am aware at the same time that it is not possible, even for us, with all our vast resources, to relieve the suffering of the

entire world and to continue to help peoples of other countries with an endless chain of financial appropriations. Not only is it not possible, but if we are to work toward a united world, all the members of the United Nations collectively must take their full share of the responsibility to relieve world distress.

In conclusion, the destiny of America is to help bring unity to the world. We must prepare ourselves to meet this challenge. We should be rejoicing at home over the great victories that we and our allies won in the late war, and in the fact that we were saved from the devastation that other countries of the world suffered. At the same time we should close our ranks and forge a united front so that we may demonstrate the power of a free people to produce and to share the product of their enterprise for the winning of the peace as effectively as they ever did for the winning of the war.

I cannot help but feel that many of those who first settled this great continent of ours amid the hardships and sufferings of the early days were led by something that was deeply spiritual and were pointing a direction for mankind which might be a light in the darkness.

If this is true, then we have much more to give to Greece and Turkey—and, yes, to Russia—than mere temporary material aid. Through our representatives in foreign countries, and especially the Commission which we set up to carry out the purposes of this legislation, we can give to these other despairing people something very real that we have inherited from our forefathers. That something is the true soul of our united America which has evolved through the years of our history and which at its best, it seems to me, has been the expression of the eternal purpose of Almighty God in the evolution of the human race—the brotherhood of man. And this indeed is the goal of the United Nations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, this is a critical moment in our nation's history.

This week the Senate will vote upon the proposal for military assistance to Turkey and Greece.

Its decision will affect the future course of our nation's foreign relations, and in the long run, as you know, the question of foreign relations boils down to a question of peace or war.

Since this proposal to Greece and Turkey was first advanced, I have done my utmost to warn the American people that it involved a dangerous course, that the Greek and Turkish Governments were corrupt, fascist tyrannies that did not deserve our support, and that the best way to avoid the threat of Communism was not by armed suppression, but by offering something better to the people. And, above all, I warned that the new doctrine would by-pass the United Nations and would weaken the prestige and authority of that great body, for which all of us hold such high hopes.

The American people, Mr. President, share my concern. Twice the Gallup poll has asked the question: Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations Organization?

On March 28, 56 percent of the people questioned said, "Yes"; that is, that it should be turned over to the United Nations. Only 25 percent said "No."

Last Sunday the "yes" vote in the Gallup poll on the same question went up from 56 to 63 percent, that it should be turned over to the United Nations, and the "no" vote fell from 25 percent to 23 percent. Fourteen percent said they had no opinion.

I could only wish, Mr. President, that the Congress had a mind as open as the American people seem to have and could be convinced on this matter. I hold small hope of changing the votes by my remarks, but I feel that the matter is sufficiently important so that it should be thoroughly discussed, even if I have to do most of the discussing myself.

I should like to read the report accompanying the latest Gallup poll, principally for the reason that the takers of the poll have seen fit to edit the results and give them a slant not warranted by the figures themselves nor by the question asked.

The heading is "Nod to UN popular."

I think that is very significant. It states the facts of the case. Everything which has been done here simply amounts to this, that we have given a nod to the United Nations, and now we are going to slug it out to suit ourselves. It was their job originally, but we took it over and acknowledged their presence with a nod; and now we are going ahead.

Then the article proceeds as follows:

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG'S proposal to bring in the United Nations on our program to aid Greece closely reflects the present attitude of the American people.

Ever since the discussion of helping Greece began institute surveys have found the people anxious to see that the United Nations was not entirely bypassed. The Vandenberg amendment would give the UN power to review our actions in Greece and Turkey.

The first Nation-wide survey by the institute found that a substantial majority of voters wanted the problem of aiding Greece turned over to the UN as reported March 28. This did not mean that the country opposed having the United States take the initiative in giving aid to Greece.

Judging by an analysis of the ballots, it simply meant that people felt Washington should consult closely with the UN and should not take actions which a majority of UN members might disapprove.

A subheading says: "Proportion mounting."

The latest survey, just completed, finds that an even larger proportion of voters feel this to be the proper course. In short, there can be little doubt that the Vandenberg amendment is endorsed in principle by the majority of the country.

Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations Organization?

That is the question: Should it be turned over to the United Nations? There is nothing in this question with reference to consulting them or giving them a veto power or anything of that nature.

The question is very plain, and on March 28, 56 percent answered "Yes." Last Sunday about 63 percent said that this matter should be turned over to the United Nations. On March 28, 25 percent answered "No," as I have previously stated. Today the percentage has fallen to 23.

The "No opinion" vote on March 28 was 19 percent. Today it is only 14 percent.

The people are making up their minds. A considerable number of those who previously wanted to bypass the United Nations or to ignore it have now reformed their thinking and want the matter handled by the United Nations.

I read further from the analysis by Mr. Gallup:

Under the Vandenberg plan, the United States would keep its initiative in Greece—

Mr. President, that means we would hang onto the ball—

While at the same time giving the United Nations the right to call a halt if the members so decided.

The great loyalty of the American people to the United Nations, which has been demonstrated by the discussion of recent weeks, is not surprising in the light of the recent past.

I am still quoting from the Gallup poll:

The idea of having an international organization to handle squabbles between nations was strongly approved by the American people as far back as the earliest days of World War II. Consistently, in every poll taken by the institute, overwhelming majorities backed the idea of a United Nations organization.

After the United Nations had begun to function, the American people were by no means satisfied with the progress it was making. As recently as January 1947, polls found 39 percent satisfied with the progress of the UN up to that time, 33 percent dissatisfied, and 28 percent without opinions.

Mr. President, let me digress at this point to say that to my mind that certainly does not indicate that the people want to scuttle the United Nations. If it indicates anything, it seems to me it indicates that the people want the United Nations strengthened or they want a much stronger organization—possibly a world government with powers to enforce the edicts of its legislative bodies and judicial organs.

I return to the analysis of the Gallup poll, as prepared by Mr. Gallup:

But this did not mean that the public had any desire to see the UN abandoned.

He agrees to that.

Other surveys found the country just as strong as ever in its belief that peace for the United States lies in cooperating with other nations, rather than in returning to the isolationism that characterized the 1920's and early 1930's.

Mr. President, I submit that the step we are about to take in Greece is isolationism, because to be an internationalist in the true sense one must have regard for the opinions of other countries and other peoples of the world. In this instance, I do not believe we are in that position, as I can substantiate by newspaper clippings from newspapers published in foreign countries, relative to the position we are now taking toward the United Nations.

I return to the analysis in the press report from which I have been reading:

It is mainly because of that belief that the country today is so anxious to avoid bypassing the UN in the aid to Greece proposal.

Mr. President, here is another instance in which the Gallup poll's editors run off at a tangent from the facts collected by its poll takers. It asked the question: "Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations organization?" It found that 63 percent of the American people thought that the problem should be "turned over to the United Nations organization" as against 23 percent who did not. The poll also reveals a substantial increase in sentiment for United Nations' operation of the aid plan since March 28. That is the fact. Mr. Gallup then proceeds without any basis in fact to argue that the "Vandenberg amendment is endorsed in principle by the majority of the country."

The Vandenberg amendment does not turn over the Greek-Turkey aid program to the United Nations. It does not even commit the United States to taking any step within the United Nations which would give the United Nations the power and support required to handle this program. It merely gives the United Nations a veto over our program. I believe the American people should know that the only legislative proposal now pending which actually turns over to the United Nations organization the aid to Greece program is Senate Joint Resolution 93 introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself in the Senate, and by Representative BLATNIK in the House. That measure directly authorizes the appropriation of American money for the relief of Greece through an appropriate United Nations organization. American representatives to the United Nations would be required to take the initiative in the United Nations toward the establishment of the appropriate operating agencies.

My quarrel with Mr. Gallup is not that he interprets and editorializes on the figures developed by the poll takers. I argue only that the editorial comment should be fair and accurate. If Mr. Gallup's figures mean anything, they mean that a substantial majority of the American people prefer the Pepper-Taylor bill to the Vandenberg amendment.

Mr. President, we stand at a crossroads in history. This is the most portentous moment since Japan was allowed to invade Manchuria in 1931. That was a unilateral action, taken in defiance of the League of Nations. It undermined the League, which then gradually disintegrated into the old power blocs, and finally into war.

Today, in the terrible age of atomic power, and with the scars of the last war still disfiguring the earth, we of the United States are asked to take the first—and most destructive—step toward dissolution of mankind's last hope for peace: the United Nations. We are asked, after delivering a formal bow and some pious humbug to the United Nations, to take unilateral action in the traditional tinder box of Europe: the Balkans. On various pretexts of sympathy and false morality, we are asked to commit this Nation to a course from which there is no turning back—a course that has never in the history of Europe failed to end in war.

Yet, strangely, Mr. President, we are told that there is no time to discuss this question; that we must decide in a matter of days, if not minutes; that if we do not act instantly to place American dollars in the hands of those who have squandered $200,000,000 in the past year, if we do not place American bayonets in the hands of King Paul's soldiers so that they may kill fellow Greeks who disagree with them about the privileges of the monarchy, then all will be lost.

We are told that the 13,000 Greek guerrillas will sweep down on Athens; and the 120,000 men of that arch Fascist, King Paul, aided by 10,000 British troops and equipped with the latest British arms, will be helpless before them.

We are told that the 13,000 will defeat the 130,000, and will establish a Communist dictatorship in Greece—even though it is admitted that most of the 13,000 guerrillas are not Communists.

All that, in the language of the theater, Mr. President, is pure hokum.

So was the attempt to railroad through this War Department bill on the grounds that British relief to Greece would cease on March 31. That fateful date has come and gone. Nothing happened on that all-important day. No one even mentioned that that was the day. The British stayed on.

Mr. President, it reminds me of the college boy who wired his father, and said, "Dear Dad: Please send $100. I am starving." But his father was out of town, and did not get the young man's wire for 2 weeks. Then he wired back, "Just got your wire. You must have starved by now, so I'm not sending the $100."

However, the Siamese twins which our War and State Departments give evidence by this action of having become will not let us forget this matter so easily. The heat is still on.

I must say, Mr. President, that our foreign policy is certainly bipartisan. Every way we look we find the figure "2." Literally our foreign policy has become a veritable Noah's Ark.

The War and State Departments cook up the mess—and this crisis would indicate the War Department has more to do with our foreign policy nowadays than has the State Department.

After this unholy amalgamation has cooked the unpalatable, unilateral, red-rot tamale, it is served by the bipartisan hierarchy of the GOP and Democratic Parties.

The ingredients, of course, are two also: Greece and Turkey.

They try to hide the Turkey with the Greece, but it will not work because there is just as much Turkey as Greece, and the Turkey smells worse.

Mr. President, simply because a proposition is bipartisan does not make it a wise policy. Many suicide pacts are bipartisan.

But to return to this phony date of March 31—and I apologize to my wife for speaking so disparagingly of the day because it happens to be our wedding anniversary—the British Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. McNeil, announced that Britain would discontinue "substantial" subsidies after that date, but he made it clear that there would be no sudden withdrawal of aid.

Mr. President, it has been well established that the Greek emergency and the British position were known to our militaristic State Department long before March 12. This is no sudden development. Why has this most important decision of our times been placed before us on a quick take-it-or-leave-it-but-do-not-talk-about-it basis?

Is not this a rather transparent device on the part of those who would have us compromise our country's future without looking twice?

Can we not detect a rather oily smell here?

The contention that oil reserves of the Middle East are a basic element in the Greek-Turkish aid plan has been persistently denied.

However, an official Navy document recently distributed to members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate strips from the proposal its cloak of relief to war-harassed peoples. I have the document here. It states that it was prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence, and that it is based on statistics furnished the Navy Department by the United States Steel Export Corp.

However, the passage I regard as most significant needed no statistics. The fact that the passage appears in a document prepared by the Navy Department and distributed to a committee of the Senate by W. John Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, is significant enough. Here is the statement, couched in most undiplomatic language:

> Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked.

Then this Navy document nails down the plank. It continues:

> Any possible future war will undoubtedly conform to historical precedent.

In other words, the future war will be for economic reasons, and the people who are trying to get us into war will bring in ideological equations.

There is no doubt in my mind that the proposal before us is a long step toward war—atomic war.

Certainly, every effort has been made to render this proposition "politically and socially palatable," to quote our friends of the Navy Intelligence Office. And certainly ideological issues have also been invoked.

The Office of Naval Intelligence has given us the inside thinking of the militarists who dominate our State Department. If we blindly and blithely proceed on down the path to war we cannot say that we were not warned.

This document which I hold is entitled "United States Imports of Strategic Materials—1938." It consists mostly of huge charts showing the large imports of various metals and minerals vital to the Nation's entire economy.

In its preface, the Navy document continues with these words:

> The purpose of the presentation which follows is to create in your minds an acute

awareness of what might happen should we fail to protect and guarantee our raw-material sources and the lines of communications between those sources and our shores.

That phrase, "lines of communication," is a significant one, I think, with regard to this matter of military intervention in Greece and Turkey.

Insofar as the position of our War and Navy Departments is concerned, the Greek-Turkey program is merely a tactic in the power-politics strategy of securing our lines of communication to the great oil reservoirs of the Middle East. And does it not become increasingly clear every day that the position of the Army and Navy carries decisive weight in the shaping of our foreign policy?

This policy, formulated in the dark corridors of our combination War and State Department, is not an American policy. It is not hard to see in it the hand of the big oil monopolies, who would like to perpetuate the status quo in the Middle East in order to hang onto their enormous profits there—profits recently mentioned by James Moffett before the Senate War Investigating Committee. But it is the people—not the diplomats or the oil millionaires—who pay for foreign adventures, in taxes and in blood, and it is the people, in a democracy, who should make foreign policy, and certainly the Gallup poll demonstrates that the people do not favor the policy upon which we are now embarking.

We are acting in the name of democracy. We have the right—and the duty—to demand that our aid is not used to promote fascism.

We are asked to underwrite backward regimes, intervene in a civil war, and jeopardize the peace of the world—mainly on the basis of hints and innuendoes, broad generalizations, and half-truths; but very few facts.

We have certainly not been given all the facts at the disposal of our brass-bound State Department; because reputable newspapermen present a very different picture. Obviously certain quarters hope that the Senate of the United States will be so panic-stricken at the mention of the words "Soviet expansion" that we will renounce our powers of judgment, and reach for any half-baked formula offered us.

I personally do not believe this body is so weak-kneed, so paralyzed by fear of the Kremlin, that it would have us hide behind the skirts of any petty tyrant who came along, just so long as he promised faithfully to fight communism.

Of course, there is that other very compelling reason for voting for this delayed-action declaration of war, for this strange disparity between the will of the people and the stand being taken by the Members of Congress. That reason is the fear of being classed as a Communist, or accused of following the party line. It is all a part of the hysterical witch hunt going on at the present time.

I might say, Mr. President, that there have come to me from the departments several people who I know are not Communists. They are liberals, no doubt, but they have been fired. Somebody said he saw them at a meeting sometime where there were some Reds, and so they have been fired. They cannot ask who said this about them. They do not have the privilege of facing their accusers. They do not have the opportunity to say one word in self-defense. They are out, and it makes no difference how much seniority or any other advantage they may have had.

A situation that would be funny if it were not so tragic came to my attention a few days ago. A gentleman who happened to know someone I knew came into my office and said he worked in one of the departments, that he had been there for quite some time, and he said, "Senator TAYLOR, I am through. They have discharged me. I am through Monday." He continued, "Senator TAYLOR, I am a conservative man, but the men above me are radicals, and are using this witch hunt to fire me. They have accused me of being a Communist and kicked me out, and I cannot even have any redress, or ask who testified against me, or anything of the kind." So it looks as though this witch hunt backfired, at least on occasion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As a member of the Committee on Civil Service, let me inquire, Would it be possible to get that man's name?

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the Committee on Civil Service be equally interested in liberals who have received the same treatment?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am asking the Senator from Idaho, with all due deference, if it would be possible to get the name of the man to whom the Senator just referred?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Committee on Civil Service demonstrates to me that they are interested in the welfare of all civil-service employees, even though they are liberals, if they are not Reds, then I shall be glad to give the Senator the names of all the people who have come to me; but I will not give the committee the name of one man.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator that the Committee on Civil Service is interested in all employees of the Federal Government. We should like very much to have the name of the particular man to whom the Senator has referred.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the Senator assure me that all the people who have come to me will be accorded a public hearing at which they can face their accusers, or that as much will be done for the others of them as would be done for this man?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I cannot speak for the whole committee; but if the Senator will yield further, I may say that any Federal employee who feels he has been aggrieved has a right, under the Civil Service System, to take an appeal; and he certainly has a right to present his case to the Committee on Civil Service, or to his Representative in Congress or Senator. Certainly I think it is a matter of importance. We should like very much to have the name of this man.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, surely the Senator from Connecticut realizes that the Committee on Civil Service could not begin to hear the pleas of the people who are going to have the accusing finger pointed at them by somebody lower down in the scale who would like to have a job—somebody who simply says, "I saw that man at a meeting once at which a Red spoke, and I want him discharged." The committee cannot hope to review all those cases. If they would set up machinery to review all the cases, I should be glad to tell the people who come to me that they have a court of last resort. They do not have it now. But I say to the Senator: No; I will not give the name of one man simply because he happens to be a reactionary caught in their own trap; I will not give that one name, to make a special case of him.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to have it appear for the benefit of the RECORD, if I may, by way of suggestion, that under the civil-service laws of the United States any employee in the civil service who is discharged has redress, through the prescribed methods of appeal, and an opportunity to present his case.

Mr. TAYLOR. Under the Red hunt that is going on?

Mr. BALDWIN. I should certainly think so, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not the way I understand it. At the present time an accused civil servant has no right to a bill of particulars; he has no right to confront the witnesses against him or to cross-examine them; he does not have the safeguards which the accused always enjoys in American criminal trials in spite of the fact that the sanction is much greater than that in many criminal cases.

Mr. BALDWIN. If there is no such remedy, there certainly should be provision made for it under the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like very much to have the Senator furnish me with this man's name, or the name of any other man whom the Senator believes to have been aggrieved.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the Senator. Certainly this is an undemocratic procedure on which we are embarking. I think I read in the press recently that bills were being introduced to extend to industry the privilege of discharging a man with no explanation given, merely on the strength of a statement that he was a Red, with no proof. If that is done of course labor unions will be wrecked, because anyone who starts to organize or agitate for a labor union in any way will immediately be called a Red, and kicked out.

No; I am willing to go as far as anybody to see that our democratic rights and civil liberties are maintained, but I am not going to favor one class of people over another, reactionaries over liberals, or liberals over reactionaries.

Mr. President, the Associated Press stated recently that few Senators would dare vote against this measure for fear of being called Communist. Let me read from an Associated Press dispatch clipped from the Washington Star of March 16. Here is what it says:

President Truman's request for $400,000,000 to help Greece and Turkey looks as

though it will slide through Congress without too much trouble. The only possible danger is a filibuster in the Senate, which could delay aid for weeks beyond March 31—

Would it not be terrible, Mr. President, if there should be a filibuster in the Senate delaying action on this proposal until after March 31? We know how serious that would be—

beyond March 31, when British aid stops.

That is a dogmatic statement by the Associated Press. They do not say that anybody said it was going to stop; they say it is going to stop.

But Capitol Hill veterans doubt a filibuster will materialize.

Anyone who stood out against Mr. Trumans' request would be in danger of appearing to favor communism.

The United States News went them one better the other day, and in discussing this Greco-Turkish proposal, said that the Democrats would be forced more or less to go along, because it was Trumans' proposal, and that Republicans would be taken care of because it was unlikely that there would be a Republican-Communist axis on this measure.

They got the Democrats into such a position they could not vote against it, and the Republicans could not vote against it for fear of being a part of the Communist-Republican axis. I think it is a sad state of affairs, Mr. President. I am not proposing that we turn our backs to the world once again.

That is impossible in this age. We must begin to play a role commensurate with our power instead of drifting aimlessly, or tagging along behind the British Foreign Office. But it is the earnest desire and the fervent prayer of the American people that we exercise our strength within the framework of the United Nations. If the UN cannot work—and I am unwilling to admit that it cannot—then let it be clear to the world that it is through no fault of ours; that we have exhausted every effort to make it work, and that our national conscience is clear.

Mr. President, I may say here that to my mind the saddest thing about some men who attain high positions of great responsibility is that they forget we are all children, older in years perhaps, but with the same mental processes primarily, if we would listen to the fundamental urgings of our consciences.

A few days ago I read an article in the Washington Post describing an interview with a number of kindergarten children in New York. The children were asked what they would do with the international situation. Every one of them said, "Well, I would sit down and talk to the man about it, or I would find out what he was mad about." Not one of them said he would go down to the man's front gate and stand there with a shotgun and then try to talk to him about it. That is the strange thing about grown men. They become involved in a crisis like the present one, and instead of sitting down and calmly thinking, "What should I do about this matter? What is the right thing, the honest thing, the straightforward thing for me to do?" they say, "Well, I am a man, I am a great statesman. I want to handle this as statesmen do. I remember reading that Napoleon did so and so, that Charlemagne did so and so. They are now remembered in history. Pretty soon history will record that Hitler did so and so. In situations similar to the present one these men did so and so. What they did does not look exactly reasonable to me, but they did it and as a result received considerable space in the history books, so they must have been pretty smart men, they must have been great statesmen."

Mr. President, I feel that the problems of this world could be solved if statesmen would examine and study each problem and before acting would first ask themselves the question, "What is the right thing to do about this problem?" instead of trying to figure out something clever to do. If we do not think before we act we will simply outsmart ourselves in this Buck Rogers world of ours and wind up with practically the extermination of civilization.

We have a tremendous responsibility. The position we adopt here will have repercussions in every corner of the earth. We must therefore examine carefully just how we exert American influence.

Shall we shut our eyes to existing historical forces and scatter our dollars, along with our bullets, to the winds? Or shall we throw our weight behind the United Nations and behind the traditional American ideals?

Are we ready to intervene in a complex and bloody civil war, and dispatch American planes and warships to be used against one side in that civil war, without the most thorough exploration of the issues?

Remember, Mr. President, although the War-State Department spokesmen are increasingly reluctant to mention the point, and although Mr. Austin's statement to the UN never once referred openly to military assistance for the Greek Royalists, we are being asked to send $150,000,000 worth of arms and military supplies to Fascist King Paul. It is proposed that only $150,000,000 worth of food and needed supplies shall go to Greece out of a total of $300,000,000 proposed to be sent to Greece. One hundred million dollars would go to Turkey. I believe the total is $400,000,000 altogether. Only $150,000,000 of that amount is to go for civilian relief. The remainder of it is for war materials. The ratio is almost $2 for arms against every dollar for bread.

Mr. President, nobody has even invented a neutral bullet.

We have been told numerous stories about the right of the present government in Athens to speak for the Greek people; about the wicked plots of the so-called Communist guerillas; about the urgent need for economic assistance in Greece; about the dangers of disorder in the entire Middle East, if the War-State Department plan is not carried out.

What we have not been told is the truth about last year's crooked and terroristic Greek elections, as testified to by Greek leaders themselves; the truth about these guerilla bands, whose membership is overwhelmingly non-Communist and in many cases anti-Communist, and whose real solidarity lies in opposition to Greece's imported Danish King; the truth about the fantastic corruption that made it possible for Greece's Royalist millionaires to get richer last year, while the population was starving; and the truth about the appalling social conditions in the Middle East, which are the real ally of communism and which the War-State Department asks us to help perpetuate, instead of allowing the UN to solve.

What about these free and democratic elections of a year ago in Greece?

The War-State Department told us that American and British observers sent to supervise the polling, reported practically no disorders or intimidation on election day.

The War-State Department made no attempt to describe the conditions that existed in Greece, particularly in the provinces, in the weeks before election day, before any of our men arrived on the scene.

It is of some interest to know that almost none of our observers spoke Greek, and very few of them had any background in Greek affairs.

Our Government did get some reports from its military branches concerning the terror which existed during that period, but for some curious reason these reports have remained permanently secret. Perhaps the War Department never passed this information on to its civilian mouthpiece.

Fortunately, however, I am able to provide the Senate with some testimony on this subject from a most expert source: No less a personage than the man who was then Prime Minister of Greece, Themistocles Sophoulis. Mr. Sophoulis, I should like to point out, is no wild-eyed Communist. He is the old and respected leader of the Liberal Party, which represents the political center in Greece. He has never been identified with either the monarchists, on the extreme right, or the leftist coalition of EAM, which includes Communists, Socialists, Agrarians, and others.

This is what Prime Minister Sophoulis had to say on the eve of the elections last year:

The conditions for a free election do not exist in Greece, particularly in the countryside.

One week before that Mr. Sophoulis announced over the Athens radio:

I have no intention of concealing, or of representing as normal, the irregular situation prevailing in the countryside.

Later in the same speech he referred to the "lamentable situation in the countryside," and said his Government had been prevented from establishing "equality of treatment of all citizens" because of interference by Royalist gangs.

This is what the Prime Minister had to say about the Royalists, who are today in undisputed control of the Greek Government:

The extreme right is an organized violence and terrorism, supported by the tolerance as well as the active backing of the state organs.

These statements by Mr. Sophoulis are a matter of record; they can be read in

the public library, in the March 1946 reports of our Government's Foreign Broadcast Information Service.

Sophoulis was talking about the Royalist campaign of terror which preceded the Greek elections and which had the full connivance of the British occupation forces.

I have the word of one eminently qualified American observer as to just what conditions prevailed during the Greek elections. Jerzy Neyman, professor of mathematics and director of the statistical laboratory at the University of California, was a member of the Allied mission to observe last year's Greek election. This is what he had to say upon his return to California, as reported by the University of California daily newspaper:

The proposal of a loan to the Greek Government is based on the premise that the Greeks have a democratic government and that it was put in power by the majority of the Greek people in reasonably free elections. I am convinced that this premise is wrong.

Mr. President, those are the words of an American observer at those elections. Professor Neyman's report continues:

While in Greece I witnessed fraud and terrorism on the part of the Royalist group surpassing everything I could imagine. To whoever chose not to close his eyes, it was clear that both the terrorism and the fraud were highly organized.

In one village I personally found that 30 voters out of a sample of 38 were fake.

On the upper level it was established that the number of registered voters—only males—exceeded the number of living Greek males by roughly 50 percent.

On the question of communism in Greece, Professor Neyman had this to say:

The position in Greece is described as a division between the anarchistic "reds" and the rest, headed by the king.

When I was there the division was different. On one hand there was a small group of royalists supported by the British and on the other was the rest of the population. They had a great confidence in and admiration for the Americans. Wherever we went we were greeted with ovations.

After we go ahead with this foolhardy course which we are bound to pursue, it seems, and have firmly fastened Fascist King Paul upon the rebellious Greek people, giving the Greek Government ammunition to kill off all those who have minds of their own and are able to think and leave the opposition, I wonder how well the Greeks will love us then? What kind of ovations or greetings will we get when that sad state has come to pass?

I continue to quote from Mr. Neyman:

On my return I expressed my opinion that, should the Allies uphold the elections, there would be trouble in Greece.

He was right.

I expected that the ordinary man in the street with a basically moderate attitude—but opposed to the king—would be driven to the left and that the struggle against the king would drift into a social struggle.

Thus far this prediction seems to be correct. Should we persist in supporting the regime hated by the population, the results could not be attractive.

That gentleman held a very responsible position at the University of Southern California, and he was over there himself.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have not heard all the Senator's speech, but has the Senator commented on the fact that the Russian Government was asked to send observers to the election which he criticizes, and that it sent no observers?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I have not commented on that fact.

Mr. McMAHON. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the Russian Government was asked to send observers to look over this election, and that it did not do so?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that does not alter the nature of the election as reported by Professor Neyman.

Mr. President, this is just the sort of thing our press complains so bitterly about in Poland—threats, intimidation, murders—exactly the same pattern of preelection violence, making the election outcome inevitable.

But apparently where Britain is concerned—as in Greece or Palestine or Egypt—we have different standards for what constitutes justice.

It has never been a secret that Britain was determined to bring King George back to Greece, whether the people wanted him or not. This modern Greek tragedy has developed from that single fact. It began the day that British troops marched into Athens late in 1944. They did not waste a minute to show where their sympathies were.

The Greek Army, the police force, and the provincial gendarmerie were promptly loaded with Royalists, regardless of their past records regarding collaboration with the Nazis.

Even today the head of the Athens police, Evert, is the same man who performed the same job so efficiently for the Nazis. The present Greek Minister of Public Security, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, held the same job during the German occupation.

The British Foreign Office has just publicly admitted that 228 former security police who worked for the Nazis now hold active commissions in the Royalist Greek Army. If someone were trying to force such a regime upon the American people, I would wager that what is going on in Greece would look like a Sunday-school picnic compared with what would take place here in America.

The British Member of Parliament Lyall Wilkes, who fought in the Near East from 1942 to 1945, claims that the actual number of former collaborators now in the Greek Army is nearer 1,000. But even the figure of 228 is far greater than the number of former resistance fighters now in the Army.

The coddling of collaborationists has not stopped there. It is a fact, known to the authorities of our Government, that in the months preceding the Greek elections any bloodthirsty monarchist in the country could obtain a special police badge and a British Army revolver, and go on a rampage against Republicans in the countryside. All he had to do was join the so-called X-ites, a gang of Royalist cutthroats whose crimes have never been surpassed even in the bloody Balkans. I have the word of reputable witnesses that men were murdered by X-ite gangs during those preelection months for no greater offense than the refusal to shout "Long live King George."

This, then, is what the Greek Prime Minister meant by "illegular" and "lamentable" conditions in the countryside. This is why he begged the British Government to postpone the elections—a request that was ignored. This is why 30 percent of the Greek people stayed away from the polls—a fact that has been conveniently overlooked in all this hypocritical talk about free elections.

This is why the late George Kafandaris, another Greek moderate who has never been accused of Communist leanings, declared in March 1946 that it was "a mockery" to send Anglo-American observers to the elections, since their outcome had been determined in advance by the beatings and murders carried out by the Royalists.

These are the free and democratic elections so glibly held up by Mr. Acheson and others as the reason we should demand no change in the government of Greece.

As to the Greek guerrillas, to begin with, we have been told that they constitute a "militant minority" under foreign direction. This is a staggering statement, if only because of its flagrant disregard of the United Nations organization, which we profess to uphold. At the very moment when a UN commission, whose creation was suggested by the United States, is attempting to adjudicate this highly complex question, we gratuitously insult the United Nations by announcing we have already reached a decision.

The hearings are still in progress; an international body, on which we are represented, is attempting to ascertain the facts about Greek border clashes.

I wonder if that might not be another reason for the great hurry. Senators remember March 31. The world was going to fall to pieces if we did not get this thing through by then. That date has come and gone. I wonder if they are not trying to hurry this through before we hear from the United Nations Commission, which has our own representatives on it. We all know that an attempt has been made to discredit it. We have read stories in the newspapers as to who some of the members are.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that under this bill, if the Commission should report to the United Nations, as it is undoubtedly required to do, and should recommend that American aid be withdrawn, under the amendment to the bill a majority of the Security Council and a majority of the Assembly could require the United States to withdraw?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a fact; they could, but it is very, very doubtful that they would, Mr. President. The United States being the most powerful nation

in the world, exercising the great influence which it has over many other countries, and having an atomic bomb at its disposal, I am afraid that Mr. Trygve Lie, of the United Nations, is in perhaps the same position as that in which my father used to find himself. He was a minister of the Gospel. He was a good minister. He could wring tears out of a turnip, and he converted and baptized thousands of sinners, but he could not hold a job, for this reason: He would go into a community, and it would not take him long, of course, to find out who the scoundrels were, who it was that had an interest in the bawdy house down the street, who it was who was foreclosing on widows and orphans. Frequently those big shots, with a great amount of money, would be pillars of the church, heavy financial contributors, just as we are to the United Nations, Mr. President. It is the same predicament in which Trygve Lie finds himself. Is he going to criticize the heaviest financial contributor, the pillar of the United Nations, and take the consequences? He will probably get booted instead. They are branding him as a Red and trying to bait him because he spoke up very mildly the other day—sort of slapped us on the wrist a little bit.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand that the Senator believes in strengthening the United Nations in every way he can?

Mr. TAYLOR. Absolutely.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does he not think that the remarks which he has just made cast very serious aspersions upon the seriousness of its deliberations and the good will of its intentions?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think so. They are deliberating very seriously, and I imagine a good part of their deliberations is devoted to the question of what will happen to them if they try to tell us where to head in.

What I started to say about my father is this: I have a high regard for Trygve Lie. If my father were in his place, I know what he would say. In the church he would get up and point out a scoundrel and say, "Brother So-and-So, you own a share in this house down the street. You had better change your ways or you are going to hell."

Next Sunday my father might be looking for another place in which to preach, but he would not stop speaking God's truth. But when it comes to the practical diplomats in the UN, we cannot be self-righteous and blame them if they want to stay preaching where they are.

Yet, we have the boldness to pronounce a unilateral judgment.

In a lesser matter, this might be contempt of court; here, it is open contempt for the United Nations.

What urgency could possibly prompt this flouting of every American tradition of justice, this savage blow at a young world organization that desperately needs our help?

That kind of undermining cannot be compensated belatedly by pious resolutions reaffirming our faith in the UN.

When you hit a man on the head, it is no good to tell him you do not really mean it.

The act is what counts, not the conversation.

And if it be argued that there was no time to wait a few weeks for the UN verdict, I would remind the Senate once again that mythical date of March 31 has come and gone with no dire consequences and besides Britain has specifically said it would not discontinue all aid to Greece after March 31, but has merely said it could not vote substantial appropriations after that date. In other words King Paul and his rowdies will have to get along with fewer bullets.

Apart from this, there are some facts the Senate ought to have about the Greek guerrillas, before we send American planes and bullets to be used in slaughtering them.

Because—make no mistake—that is what the War-State Department program proposes that we do.

Mr. President, the name War-State Department which I earlier gave to what used to be two separate Departments of our Government is a little confusing, so from now on I will refer to it as the State-of-War Department.

American military equipment, if placed at the disposal of King Paul and his British military advisers, would be used to kill dissident Greeks.

We Americans would be in the moral position of waging war against the Greek left.

It seems to me that before we embark on this very serious business, we ought to know what kind of people we are shooting at.

It might be very tragic indeed if it turned out we were contemplating the execution of people not very different from ourselves—antimonarchists, believers in democracy.

Such a course would be not merely immoral, but politically suicidal—we would in effect be turning our guns on ourselves.

We all recognize that guerilla warfare is not necessarily criminal. That depends on circumstances. The American Revolutionists used it against British mercenaries, and democrats all over Europe used it against the Nazis.

We cheered it, then.

It should certainly give us pause when, on examining this question, we see that today's guerilla fighters in Greece are made up largely of the same people we admired so greatly when they were fighting the Nazis.

During the war, Allied leaders repeatedly applauded the mountain fighters of the EAM, the Greek leftist coalition, for its operations against the Nazis.

British Gen. Sir Maitland Wilson publicly acknowledged that Rommel's defeat was made possible largely by guerrilla operations in Greece, which cut the rail lines along which German reinforcements were being sent to Africa.

Now suddenly we are told that these picturesque heroes have become villainous bandits; that our aid is needed in exterminating them; that they stubbornly refuse to lay down their arms and trust to the mercies of the X-ite gangsters, because Joe Stalin tells them not to.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that the truth is not so simple.

At the time of Greece's liberation, the proportion of Communists in EAM was estimated by American intelligence agents at a possible maximum of 20 percent—one fifth of all the guerrilla fighters.

We have the word of the former finance minister of Greece, Constantine Rendis, that today "the countryside is filled with partisans who are not Communists." My source is the Government monitoring service again.

Rendis said all sorts of opponents of the royalist government were taking to the hills to avoid deportation.

We have a report by a qualified American observer, John Donovan of the National Broadcasting Co., who made a tour of the fighting areas and then wrote:

> The Government is recruiting converts for the left by its oppressive measures.

Mr. Donovan continued:

> A lot of well-meaning people who refuse to be pushed around by security battalion stooges—

Mr. President, that means men who served as stool pigeons and informers for the Nazis, and are now in the Royalist forces—

> are joining the guerrillas. There is a strong Communist clique, but there are many who are not Communists and would in all probability fight communism in the future.

Are these the people against whom we want to send American bullets?

Again, the New York Times of March 16 confirmed that only the "hard core" of EAM is Communist and all the rest are simply people who are tired of being hounded by the Government.

Are we, Mr. President, going to help the Royalists of Greece shoot down all those who disagree with them politically—we, who had our own revolution against Royalist dictatorship 170 years ago?

Are we not impressed by the fact that, shortly after the State and War Department policy was announced, Greek Royalists broke into a prison in Lakonia and massacred eight alleged rebels who were supposed to be released that day?

Do we really expect anybody to have faith in an amnesty offered by these Royalists?

Must we close our eyes to dispatches like the following from William Laurence to the New York Times:

> There is little hope of lasting peace in Greece without considerable more bloodshed so long as the present government is in power, and follows policies which inevitably will increase the forces of resistance.

Mr. President, would we not be wiser to insist on peaceful termination of the Greek civil war and genuinely free elections as a condition of our economic aid?

The well-known newspaperman, Leland Stowe, for instance, called the elections of March 1946 "phony and a farce." He pointed out that the "electoral lists in Greece have not been revised. They are

still filled with the names of persons long since dead."

The present situation in Greece cannot be honestly portrayed if we neglect to mention that the British waged a full-scale war against the Greek resistance movement, the EAM, in Athens, in December 1944. The EAM, according to the then British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, in April 1944 constituted 75 percent of the underground forces fighting the Germans. There can be no question that the EAM represented the Greek people.

The correspondent of the London News Chronicle wrote of the British battle against the EAM:

> Make no mistake about it, our soldiers are fighting the Greek people. It is a barefaced lie to pretend either that they are fighting a "gang of Communist revolutionaries" or that they "are preventing civil war between two equally matched factions."

This war ended in the Varkiza agreement which provided that the resistance movement lay down its arms and that the government purge its ranks of fascists and grant political amnesty. The resistance forces kept the agreement; but the government, according to Thomas E. Healy, correspondent of the New York Post, and others, almost immediately arrested 18,000 of these people. In January 1946, the right-wing extremists began an organized terror campaign which according to Mr. Healy, was to "prepare psychologically" for the elections.

The terror was so great that the Deputy Premier Kaphandris resigned, stating that under color of legality an attempt was being made to strangle the will of the people. Several other ministers also resigned. The then Foreign Minister Sofianopoulos warned that the fake elections would intensify civil war. In England, some 70 members of Parliament declared that efforts to create an honest election register had failed. The London Times wrote on March 8, 1946, that "it should be clear to the British Government that free elections cannot be held March 31."

The anti-Fascist parties of Greece agreed that free elections were impossible in the midst of the terror, and they refrained from voting. The royalists under Constantine Tsaldaris claimed victory. Immediately, in the words of Mr. Healy, "they set about obliterating their opponents as a political force, pursuing the 'Communists,' which became a generic term covering any democrat who was against the King."

It has gotten almost that bad in this country. Anyone who does not think as the National Association of Manufacturers does is called a Communist, in this country.

American correspondents reported that the plebisicite held in September was conducted with terrorism and oppression, which made free voting impossible. What, then, is this democracy in Greece that we are asked to defend?

The New York Herald Tribune correspondent, Seymour Freiden, in a cable from Athens, September 16, 1946, gave the answer. He wrote:

> The fury and hysteria attendant upon the Greek Government's campaign to efface the opposition to the restoration of the monarchy are cutting entire communities off from food, wrecking the UNRRA antimalaria program, and consigning thousands of innocent women and children to prison.
>
> In their intense fear and desperation, moreover, the Government leaders have permitted the most spurious slogans and propaganda against the concept of democracy to ride rampant, so that among the majority of a politically bewildered people and among the most impressionable youth the word "democracy" is becoming synonymous with death and slavery. * * *
>
> Not only northern Greece but virtually the entire nation is being deprived of the UNRRA antimalaria program because the Government has systematically removed trained workers on charges that they were Communists. * * *
>
> The Ministry of Hygiene, which supplies the workers for training and which like all present Government bureaus consider all nonroyalists Communists summed up the situation with this pungent statement: "Greece has had malaria for a thousand years. It is more important to get rid of communism."

That statement reminds me of one made the other evening by a Republican Member of the House of Representatives. I was on a radio program, and after the broadcast we had a question-and-answer period. The question of the Red witch hunt in the United States came up. I made the statement that under the guise of hunting Communists, we were going to legislate ourselves right out of our civil liberties and all of us would lose our civil liberties. That Republican Representative then said, in effect, "Well, we may lose our civil liberties, but we are going to get the Communists."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. A moment ago the Senator from Idaho stated that on a radio program a Republican Member of the House of Representatives said that they would "get the Communists," even though in doing so civil liberties would fall. Is that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what he said.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know what the Senator meant to imply by that statement, but I could gather from his remarks that it was a Republican movement to do away with civil liberties, or to do so along with attacking communism in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; on the program were some Democrats who were sympathetic with him. He happened to be the one who said it.

Mr. COOPER. At this time I should just like to remind the Senator from Idaho, for the sake of the record, that the proposal about which he is talking is the proposal of the President of the United States; is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. And the proposal which has been made to outlaw the Communist Party is a proposal of the Secretary of Labor; is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I merely wanted to remind the Senator of the source from which the proposals came.

Mr. TAYLOR. I continue reading from the cable of Mr. Seymour Freiden to the New York Herald Tribune:

> Among communities visited in Thessaly and Macedonia, here are some of the pithiest slogans which also are mouthed constantly by government officials: "Democracy equals murder," "Democracy equals the hammer and sickle," and such signs as a skull and bones with the caption, "That is democracy."
>
> Although declared pariahs politically by the government, the Communist Party is profiting by the terror and injustice being inflicted upon the rank and file Greeks who are interested only in establishing a sound republic and hoping to get a little more to eat. * * *
>
> As a high Allied intelligence officer said: "These people, most of whom are not Communists, are being driven to fight in self-defense."

Those are the words of a responsible American correspondent who was on the spot, Mr. Seymour Freiden, of the New York Herald Tribune.

In a dispatch dated September 19, 1946, Mr. Freiden again emphasized that in the eyes of the Greek Government everyone not a monarchist is a Communist today.

The New York Post correspondent, Mr. Healy, reported October 19:

> Six months of Tsaldaris' administration finds Greece under repression such as is associated with totalitarian rulers. Civil liberties and rights are withdrawn, replaced by brutal persecution of the political opposition which, far from abating, is being intensified and will be further intensified until the conscience of nations calls a halt.

It seems, Mr. President, that our conscience has been aroused and we are about to bring the earliest possible end to this persecution and murder of anti-royalist Greeks by supplying the King's men with plenty of arms so they can kill all objectors quickly and have done with the unpleasant and embarrassing business.

The New York Times columnist, Arthur Krock, in his column March 31—there is that magic date again—quoted an informed and trained American observer as reporting:

> All responsible and reasonably disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present government and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty.

This observer, Mr. Krock, of the New York Times, also reported—and remember, Mr. President, this was after we had launched this great program—

> In one 3-day period after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professionals—doctors, lawyers, etc., and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the Government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation. And the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the Government.

Mr. President, it seems that the Greek Royalists are getting almost as irresponsible in classing all opposition as Communist as are our own reactionaries here at home.

Mr. Krock reports that the observer concluded with the statement that, much as he detests Communists he would "go to the mountains" if he were a citizen of Greece.

So, when we are told that we are going into Greece to fight the Communists, we must remember that these so-called Communists are simply all those people who oppose the monarchy. In other words, we are, in actual fact, going into Greece to destroy democracy and the Greek democrats.

We are going to give money and supplies and weapons to the Greek army. Yet the core of this army, as was reported in the New York Herald Tribune, March 16, consists of the Royalist Mountain Brigade and the German-trained quisling security battalions, which took an oath to Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Lyall Wilkes, the member of Parliament to whom I have already referred as having fought throughout the war in Africa, Italy, and Greece, reported in a British publication recently that:

> These security battalions were not only used for the hunting down and execution of resistance men, but were also used to round up and organize the deportation of Jews from the Athens railway station to the extermination camps in the north.

Let us send them more guns, Mr. President. They are experienced men. They know their business. Let us help them out.

He said that almost a thousand former members of these battalions hold active service commissions in the Greek army. It is to such men that we propose to give additional arms so that they may kill Greeks who oppose the monarchy.

The present chief of the Greek Army general staff, Spiliotopoulis, served the Germans as colonel of the gendarmerie during the occupation, and Mr. Wilkes reports that not a single quisling of officer status has been executed. The prisons of Greece, however, are so overflowing with anti-Fascist prisoners that unused factories and mansions have had to be improvised as jails.

Every attempt has been made to present the choice now before us as one of two alternatives, namely, the "State of War Department" policy, or Soviet domination of Greece and the eastern Mediterranean. Existence of the third course, the middle-ground democratic course, which would bring stability to Greece and would not imperil the United Nations, has gone unmentioned—one can only think, deliberately. Are there forces who are anxious to present this to the American people as a program which we cannot escape, who are anxious to develop this theme of American resistance to Soviet aggression, and who would only really be satisfied if we declared war on the Soviet tomorrow?

It is hard to find any other explanation for the deliberate campaign of misrepresentation regarding Greek affairs, the deliberate snubbing of the center political forces. I see where Mr. Charles Lindbergh, who so bitterly opposed our fighting Adolf Hitler, is heart and soul behind this new venture.

Of course, Mr. President, it has been argued that we cannot insist on free elections in Greece as a condition of our aid because that would be interfering in the internal affairs of a foreign country. If that be true, it is to my mind merely another very good reason why this whole thing should be channeled through the United Nations.

Mr. Acheson has appealed to our sympathies. He says the Greek treasury is practically empty. He has been less eager to explain how it got that way—how the Government dissipated the $800,000,000 poured into Greece by Britain and America in the past 2 years. He has not pointed out what a tiny part of that relief got into the stomachs of the Greek people for whom it was intended, and how much got into the pockets of the Greek millionaires—the same boys who run the Government and are so anxious to get their hands on more American dollars today.

In fact, statements have recently been emanating from official sources in Greece suggesting that we should attach no strings to our aid, but should continue to pour money down a rat hole in order that some rats might continue to grow fat.

Let us look at the record. In January 1946, the Greeks had two hundred millions in foreign exchange. The country, except for a handful of merchants and industrialists in Athens, was starving. The drachma was inflated sky high. How did the Greek Government meet the crisis? Did they impose a tax program, tighten up on the black market, control their currency and their imports? They did just the reverse. Imports in recent years have been completely uncontrolled. Luxury goods were brought into Greece, while the people went begging for necessities. The black market boomed. The shops of Athens were full of fancy clothing, while the farmers went barefoot. The rich grew fatter with unheard-of profits, and the people grew leaner.

But that is not all. This "free and democratic" Government of Greece made sure that the rich would not be stuck with any bad Greek currency. They announced a year ago that they would sell gold, pounds sterling, and dollars over the counter to anybody who wanted to get rid of his drachmas. The Greek millionaires who took advantage of this were able to ship their money out of the country. They did not have to worry about taxes, either, the way we do. There is no income tax in Greece, and the Royalist government has not bothered to create one. Why should they, as long as American taxpayers are willing to carry the load? They have got a good deal, they figure; they scream, "Down with communism," and eat their caviar—and we pay the bills.

I have forebodings that this is going to be the pattern all over the world. The Royalists, the dictators, the Fascists, and just plain exploiters will cry out that they are threatened by communism, and move up to the trough.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall appreciate the Senator doing so.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	O'Conor
Baldwin	Ives	O'Daniel
Ball	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Buck	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Langer	Saltonstall
Chavez	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Malone	Watkins
Green	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hawkes	Millikin	Wilson
Hayden	Moore	Young
Hill	Morse	
Hoey	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(At this point Mr. TAYLOR yielded to Mr. MAYBANK, who addressed the Senate on the Grecian-Turkish aid bill and whose remarks, at his own request, appear at the conclusion of Mr. TAYLOR'S speech.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, whatever pressures the royalists, the dictators, and Fascists may have been under to liberalize their government in any degree will vanish because of the support we shall be forced to give them.

Why has De Gaulle come to life so suddenly in France?

Is it because he recognizes that this is a golden opportunity to set up a military dictatorship over the hapless French people? If he can provoke violence in the name of fighting communism, there will be as much, if not more, reason for us to send him money and war material as there is for us to help Fascist King Paul or reactionary Turkey. De Gaulle knows he has not a chance by ballots.

But let us return to Greece. There are Greeks living outside the country, like Theodore Cozzika, of Cairo, Egypt, who could buy and sell any resident of Washington. Cozzika pays no income tax on his enormous fortune. Why should he? He supported King George for years—one good turn deserves another.

It is understandable that our "State-of-War Department" has not been anxious to make this situation public. It was willing to tell some Members of Congress about it, but only through a so-called secret report. The House thought the whole country had a right to hear the story. So on March 24 the secret was out.

While we are on the subject of the House, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to another unusual procedural matter with respect to this bill. The House, of course, traditionally acts in greater haste. I do not know why that is, but in the case of many important bills the House has always acted first. Perhaps it is because the House restricts debate and otherwise limits the freedom of action of the membership on the floor.

Then, traditionally, the Senate has taken bills as they came from the House and has subjected them to searching committee inquiries and the unlimited debate which is our privilege in this body.

For some unexplained reason the usual procedure has been reversed in the matter of the Greece-Turkey proposal. We in the Senate are forced to consider this all-important measure first. It will then go to the House.

I hope the membership of the House will not be overly impressed by the one-sided vote in prospect here and that it will give this measure the careful consideration it should have had in this august body. They will have a little additional time to hear the voice of America which is growing louder each day in opposition to this ill-conceived measure.

Perhaps to the House of Representatives will go the honor and the thanks of the American people for saving our Nation, the United Nations and the world from the evil consequences of our haste and folly. Mr. President, here are some passages from our own Government's official release to the press:

> The Greek Government has embarked on a disastrous program of across-the-counter sales of gold; this, combined with reckless and unsystematic licensing of foreign exchange transactions, has resulted in an almost complete exhaustion of Greece's foreign exchange resources.
>
> Inefficiency and mismanagement have prevented the country from receiving the maximum benefits from United States credits already extended.

"We know how to handle this," says the "State-of-War Department." "We just send experts to keep an eye on the Greeks." I submit that when one finds crooks conducting an operation he does not hire detectives to watch them 24 hours a day; he throws the crooks out!

If we really want to help the hungry Greeks, the first and biggest favor we can do them is to put our weight behind the formation of a government they can trust—a government that will not cheat them or persecute them.

Our "State-of-War Department" has just refused to help the Yugoslavs on the ground that they have mismanaged the relief we have given them in the past. It is contended that the Yugoslavs have given our food only to those who support their government. If that is true, then we are perfectly justified in withholding further aid.

But, Mr. President, in Greece at the present time there is a Nazi-type dictatorship which we propose to aid. If, indeed, it is to be our policy to support any government, no matter how corrupt or wretched it may be, simply because it is anti-Communist, then we may be forced to agree with the confirmed isolationists of the Chicago Tribune stripe when they say that the greatest mistake we ever made was fighting Hitler in the first place. Why defeat the fascism of Mussolini and the nazism of Hitler and then turn around and start supporting scoundrels of exactly the same type, even though they may be of lesser magnitude?

Our "State-of-War Department" has an answer for that, too. We must aid Greece and Turkey, whether we like them or not, in order to prevent disorder in the Middle East.

We will back all comers, so long as they promise to fight communism. We do not even insist on investigating their definition of communism.

In Greece a Communist is any member of a guerrilla band, any agrarian reformer, any democrat who resents the imposition of a royalist dictatorship. In Spain the definition is about the same: if one is opposed to Franco, he is a Communist. We ought to be hearing from Franco any time now about a nice, big, fat American loan.

Then there is the whole miserable, disease-ridden Arab world, where millions of peasants are beginning to grumble against the feudal dynasties that rule them. Of course, all those peasants are Communists, we will be told; and if Uncle Sam wants to be sure they do not sign up with Joe Stalin, he had better send some cash along to the kings and sheiks and effendi—not much: just a couple of hundred million for a starter. After all, the more money we send, with perhaps a few tanks to cover emergencies, the harder these free democratic governments can sit down on the Communists.

It should not be long before we are hearing from the Japanese barons, either. I see by the United Press that a spokesman for General MacArthur has announced we will oppose communism "anywhere in the world".

That means a few millions for Japan—well, no; it might take more than that to suppress the trade-unions there and keep all the opposition parties quiet—and then we shall be ready for the grand finale; the resurrection of Hitler.

What is illogical about that?

After all, we could hardly find a more determined enemy of communism, and since we are willing to back anybody with an anti-Communist program, why not go back to the real expert at this sort of thing?

Why be satisfied with imitators like Franco and Peron and King Paul? Remember, the Cliveden set in British backed nazism on exactly that basis: it was the antidote to communism.

Is that not what we are suggesting when we say, as Maj. George Fielding Eliot said recently in the New York Herald Tribune: "The character of the present Greek and Turkish Governments has little importance."

Eliot has stated bluntly "what the State-of-War Department prefers to lather with hypocritical hogwash."

No one can pretend seriously that Turkey, any more than Greece, is a democracy.

All the things that we object to so strongly in Poland and Bulgaria, have been going on for years in Turkey.

One party runs the show there; not even a theoretical opposition existed until last year.

Secret police operate in every village.

The press is muzzled; no criticism of the government is allowed.

Trade-unions are prohibited by law; workers are not even permitted to meet in groups.

So it is not a question of saving democracy in Turkey.

Nor is it a question, in Greece, of our rushing in idealistically to save a legally elected government from overthrow by a minority.

If we were really interested in protecting legally elected governments, and enabling peoples to make a free choice, the case of Spain has been before our eyes a long time.

Franco seized power there. With the aid of Hitler and Mussolini, he threw out a republican government elected by the people.

No one has ever challenged the validity of those Spanish elections.

Let me read the words of a very wise man, a genuine expert in Balkan affairs, Stephen K. Bailey, who during the war was chief of Balkan Intelligence for our famous Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. Bailey writes in a recent letter to the New York Times:

> I came to realize that the basic problem of the Balkans was the fact that long-overdue revolutions against feudal social and

economic systems were occurring at a point in history when external powers were finding it expedient, power-politically, to control the governments of these volatile areas.

While worrying about the dangers of Russian expansion, America and Britain have placed themselves in the untenable moral position of clamping lids on the social and economic changes which alone can produce the conditions of democracy and world peace.

Anyone who views communism in the Balkans as the result of simple Russian machinations is overlooking the centuries of poverty and aristocratic corruption which have characterized those countries.

Instead of recognizing the revolutionary nature of the postoccupation Balkan peoples and attempting to channel their legitimate drives where we had the opportunity, Britain and the United States have backed the remnants of a decaying system.

We must make clear to all weak peoples who need our aid that we are fighting communism not with atomic bombs and strategically backed military dictatorships but with economic reform and social rehabilitation. We must search out those political leaders who until now have been crushed between the millstones of reaction and communism and give them power.

Mr. Bailey, like many other students of Balkan history, warns us against unilateral action in Greece.

He says such action is "bound to be interpreted by the Russians as an overt military challenge."

Then, Mr. President, we will have the whole vicious cycle again of big power meddling in the Balkans, until the day of explosion.

It was precisely to prevent such an explosion that the United Nations organization was created.

Unilateral American action on Greece would certainly relegate the UN to a minor role; all the pious expressions of good will in the world would do nothing to change that fact.

It would usher in a period of dog-eat-dog power politics, and make peace an uncertain dream.

Is that what we want to do, Mr. President?

Idaho's most noted author and columnist, Mr. Vardis Fisher, says in a recent article published in Statewide, a news weekly published at Boise, that he believes this country has 565 generals devoting their time to planning the war with Russia. I may say, Mr. President, that Mr. Fisher is a very bitter political opponent of mine; so he does not share my liberal views on a great many things. Then Mr. Fisher says:

> It is not my opinion that we could win it. It would rapidly become a war, not against Russia, but against Asia, and our allies would be a bankrupt Britain, a neutralized Australia, and a few squads from South America.

He has been just as harsh and even harsher to me in many articles as he has with the proposed Greek policy to which he refers in this article.

Then he says:

> On the first World War we spent $30,000,000,000.
>
> On the second World War we spent $342,000,000,000.
>
> On the next World War we'd probably spend $1,000,000,000,000, and end up bankrupt under a dictatorship, with our dollar reduced to a nickel or less and our standard of living about equivalent to that of a Mexican peon.

Then Mr. Fisher adds:

> Even if we suppose that we could win a war against Asia's countless millions, nearly all of whom despise us already, what would we get? We'd get the job of managing the entire world—and we can't even manage our own country without so many Bilbos and Talmadges and Hagues that we have a bad odor that reaches around the earth.

I read further from Mr. Fisher's statement:

> We have made a mess in Korea. We have made a mess everywhere we have troops stationed with the possible exception of Japan—and MacArthur wants to get out of there before an explosion blows him out.
>
> We could no more manage the world than we could seize our bootstraps and leap to the moon. A Macedonian named Philip, and his son Alexander, set out to take the world over. They didn't. The Romans tried. They couldn't. Napoleon tried. Hitler tried.
>
> So what do our brass and braid and our politicians think they are doing? If you ask Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co., they'll tell you we are protecting their huge interests in Middle Eastern oil. Some other big businessmen know exactly what they want. We talk out of one side of our mouth about four freedoms and ideals, and out of the other we establish military outposts to protect American dollars.
>
> Russia has no military outposts more than 500 miles or so from her border. We have them from hell to breakfast. We have them in Europe, in Asia Minor, in Asia, in South America, in the South Seas—where indeed don't we have them except in Russia or the countries bordering on Russia?"

That completes the quotation from Vardis Fisher, who is generally a rather conservative sort of gentleman, and on the other side of the political fence from me.

Mr. Fisher could have added, of course, that if this committee bill is approved, we will shortly have outposts at Russia's back door—in Greece and Turkey. Last week I read in the press that we were going to supply heavy tanks and other weapons of war to Iran.

Let us examine, for a moment, the question of the Greek debts. These debts, accumulated for the most part between 1823 and 1898 under unbelievably onerous conditions, amounted by 1900 to some $400,000,000. They are owed to British bondholders and banks in Britain and other countries and have borne an interest burden which has condemned Greece to perpetual poverty and political vassalage.

Every year one-third of the Greek budget has gone to pay interest charges to these foreign bondholders. Even during the world economic crisis in 1931 3,000,000,000 out of a total budget of 10,000,000,000 drachmas were paid in interest on these old debts. These debts have, in fact, been paid three and four times over, but the interest rate has been so high that the principal has not been cut down.

There was a time in the mid-thirties when the Greek Republic decided to cut down service on this debt, for it faced economic ruin and knew that economic stability was impossible unless this drain on Greek economy could be greatly reduced. This decision, however, was never carried out. The foreign bondholders raised a great protest and were instrumental in getting the late King George—who, by the way, was listed by the London Times as the sixth largest private depositor of funds in the Bank of England—back on the throne of Greece. The plebiscite in November 1935, which permitted his return, was reportedly held at bayonet point. The Encyclopedia Britannica describes it as having been most "irregular," with the King winning something like 97 percent of the vote.

King George soon installed General Metaxas as dictator, dissolved Parliament, took away the civil rights of the people, and abolished the constitution. Although not exactly a king of the people, he was, as a custodian of foreign interests, eminently satisfactory. Interest payments on the Greek debt were kept up, and the tax system was so arranged that the rich paid practically nothing at all, while the burden fell on the middle class and the poor.

When war broke out payment on the debts was waived. But toward the war's end the British Foreign Office presented to the Greek Government-in-exile a demand that it continue "to safeguard the rights and securities at present enjoyed by Greek external loans and protect the general interests of the bondholders and maintain unchanged the rights, privileges, and conditions of service which have applied to the Greek Government since 1898."

That was the British Government's ultimatum to the Greeks about their debts.

The bondholders' committee was as determined as Winston Churchill to get George back on the Greek throne, where he had served foreign interests so well before. George went back. His brother, the present King Paul, who headed the prewar Fascist youth movement in Greece, and had his picture in the newspapers giving the Fascist salute and all the trimmings, can be relied on to be equally amiable, as far as foreign interests are concerned.

We are entitled to know, Mr. President, whether the money of American taxpayers is going to be used—directly or indirectly—to pay off these old debts. The bill we are considering now has an amendment which forbids Greece to use our money to pay off the interest or principal of loans and debts owed to other countries. This amendment does not, however, afford any real protection against the indirect use of our money for this purpose. As long as the Greek Government has to meet this obligation it is just a matter of bookkeeping to say that our money will not be used to pay off this debt. The Greek Government can simply earmark other money for the debt payments and can use our money in place of that it assigns to the debt.

I very much suspect that a lot of this talk about a Greek crisis is put out by people who oppose any Greek Government other than the present dictatorial set-up, for fear that a Government representative of the people might force a cut in these debts or even repudiate them altogether.

This foreign economic tyranny has played a large part in Greece's economic ruin. There is another related factor equally important. That is the policy

of the present unrepresentative regime which, with occasional shuffling of personnel, has ruled Greece since the British took over from the Germans in late 1944. Actually, much the same group of people held sway in the King George-Metaxas dictatorship, the quisling regime under the Germans, and the present regime under the British occupation.

The economic policy of this regime is revealed in the great disparity between wealth and poverty in Greece; in the fact that the rich pay no income tax at all, and that not a single new factory has been built since October 1944. Greece as a nation is very poor, but its rulers and their friends are very rich indeed.

American bankers estimate that private Greeks hold some $50,000,000 in American banks and $150,000,000 in London banks. In Greece itself, private interests have a hoard of some $25,000,000.

By the end of 1946, Greece's foreign exchange was almost exhausted because the rich had been permitted to import luxury and consumer goods, to sell them on the black market at unbelievable profits, and allowed to convert their profits into foreign exchange and so enormously enhance their personal fortunes. Yet we now propose to give to these very same men, who pay no taxes and have profited by their country's misery, millions of dollars out of the pockets of American taxpayers. American bankers and businessmen have refused credits and loans to the Greek Government because it is too poor a risk.

Even the New York Herald Tribune has warned that we may find ourselves in the position of the bluejays described by Mark Twain in A Tramp Abroad. The jays, you will remember, worked very hard to fill a knothole before they discovered the knothole was in a roof and that they were actually trying to fill a house.

Foreign economic tyranny and the irresponsible greedy policy of the royalists are the cause of Greece's economic bankruptcy, and merely to state this fact is to prove that our concern for Greece is not primarily, if at all, to rehabilitate its economy.

Mr. President, I am particularly shocked at the conduct of the Senate majority leadership with respect to this bill. While the majority leadership supports the bill, it seems to be at great pains to absolve itself from responsibility for it. In effect it says, "We have no choice. The President has announced his position, and it is not for us to dispute him. It would weaken our national prestige to betray any lack of unanimity on this subject. So, while the course may not be a wise one, and while we had nothing to do with its adoption, we are forced to support it."

Mr. President, this is a clever political maneuver. But it will not deceive the American people. The people know that this is a Republican Congress, and that it can take no action that is not approved by the Republican majority.

They know, too, that the formation of our foreign policies by the State Department has been strongly, if not decisively, influenced by the Republican leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee, and they know that this was so even before the last election.

The able senior Senator from Michigan, in his very excellent presentation of his report a few days ago, specifically disclaimed any advance participation in the drafting of the Government proposal. But he cannot fail to realize, as all of us realize, that those who did draft the proposal asked themselves every minute of the day: "How will this sit with VANDENBERG? Will he oppose this? Does this follow the general policy pattern which he supports?"

They say, too, that we must present a bold and undivided front on international matters, that reports of debate on these measures will give heart to those who would fight us.

This, Mr. President, is a new interpretation of the old maxim that politics stops at the water's edge. I thought that that rule applied only to policies once adopted; I never before heard that it applied to policies in the process of formation. Certainly that is not the meaning attributed to it by the senior Senator from Michigan in 1940 and 1941.

Mr. President, I thought that our democratic process was the pride of our country. I thought that the give and take of this great body was regarded as the inspiration of the world. Are we then suddenly to remove foreign policy from the scope of Senate debate, and to settle it in dark silence behind the hideous renaissance facade of the State Department Building?

No, Mr. President; the majority cannot escape responsibility for this bill, nor can it escape responsibility for any policy of the State Department, whose very highest policymaker is the eminent Republican strategist and Wall Street jurist, John Foster Dulles.

But, Mr. President, the excessive modesty of the Republican leadership with respect to the authorship of this bill is certainly revealing. It reveals that the seasoned observers of the political scene who shape the majority policy have observed an important fact, that is, that this is a highly unpopular proposal. It is unpopular because the public fears that this is a bill which will lead to war. It is unpopular because the American people have come to know and love the United Nations, and to cling to it as their last bulwark of hope for a peaceful world. It is unpopular because the public resents the devious manner in which it is being presented—in the ill-fitting guise of a humanitarian aid proposal.

Let me warn my colleagues on the majority side that this is their bill as much as anyone's, that they constitute the majority party, which can accept or reject any proposal, and that the mandate of the people of last November, of which they remind us so often, carried with it the responsibility for congressional policy.

Mr. President, I shall never be able to forget the shock I received on the floor of the Senate on March 25 as I listened to the speech of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee was heaping scorn upon those of us who still, in our faith, were clinging to the hope that the United Nations might yet be saved from this devastating blow, when, with all the great irony of which he is a master, he said, as his words appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. President, we face a reality. Shall we face it with courage, with patience, with determination, or shall we face it by beginning to trim and hedge and say, "Oh, no; wait a minute, this is not our obligation. This is the obligation of the UNO. The UNO what.

And then in parenthesis is the one word "laughter."

Mr. President, my mail would seem to indicate that the people of America are not ready to write off the United Nations with a scornful "UNO what." Ninety-five percent of the people writing to me plead that we do nothing to harm the United Nations.

I would that there were some way we could turn over this task of building a lasting edifice of peace to young men—men who have recently known the real and actual horror of wallowing in rain-filled foxholes for days on end—to men who have seen their closest friends die in the name of truth and justice. Yes, young men who have lost limbs, and been maimed, and had time to think, who have not as yet been overcome by the vast cynicism that so often fastens its coarse tentacles about otherwise able statesmen until they are reluctant to strike out boldly for fear of being called idealists or dreamers.

The peacemakers should be young men—and women—who have children to protect from the awful consequences of another war, young people with imagination, vigor, and a determination to establish lasting peace.

Mr. President, there comes a time in the life of nearly every man when he reaches that place where he has not the heart to look ahead to the rugged peaks that must yet be scaled, but, rather, he is inclined to look back upon the lower ground from whence he came, and survey with satisfaction the monuments erected there to his past successes and accomplishments.

It becomes so difficult to fight endlessly on against great odds when it is so easy to rest with honor among worthy deeds already done.

Men who have been to war long years ago eventually begin to remember the din and furore of battle as things of glory. The muck and vermin, blood and pain, become lost in the mists of time, and only the heroics remain, magnified and glorified by a thousand stirring orations. Fourth of July. Decoration Day. Armistice Day. High-sounding metaphors thundered to alternately weeping and madly cheering crowds. Glorious victory, supreme sacrifice, eternal reward, rest in peace, this mighty Nation, Old Glory, sovereignty.

Mr. President, I have said the pending bill sets a booby trap in the structure of the United Nations. Let me now hasten to say that I believe that among the Senators who will vote for this measure are many whose loyalty and allegiance to the UN is beyond question, whose

hopes for the success of the UN are true and deep.

What, then, has blinded them to the danger this measure holds for the United Nations? Why do they ignore the voices of Americans in every walk of life who warn that the UN must not be bypassed?

Behind all the argument and rationalization, behind the afterthought amendments and the perfecting amendments to these afterthought amendments are an old fear and suspicion—suspicion of Russia and fear that her Communist system threatens our cherished democratic way of life. And this fear and suspicion stampede the supporters of the bill into irrational countermeasures and paralyze their ability to detect that the United Nations is being gravely undermined.

Mr. President, I have been talking about the various amendments which have been offered to this bill; the Vandenberg amendments and a number of other amendments. I do not think they serve the purpose at all. The matter is either to be given to the United Nations for handling, or it is not; and that ends it. It reminds me of something that happened yesterday. My 5-year-old son came over to visit me in the Senate Office Building. His mother took him down into the basement to get something from the stationery room. When she boarded the elevator coming back, the lad struck out up the stairs; he was going to run upstairs. He went one floor too many, and became lost. He did not show up for a long time. Finally, when he did, he came running. He had a few tears in his eyes. We asked him what had happened. He said, "I thought I got to the floor all right, and I thought I could tell our office, because it has that big shiny can outside the door." He referred to the cuspidor, Mr. President, in front of the door. It is a handy landmark. I do not have to look at the door, I simply walk to where the cuspidor is, and I know I am at my office. The boy thought it would work for him, too. But he was on the wrong floor. He said, "I went in, and there was a man with a great big mustache." He was in the wrong place. That situation may be compared to one of the amendments which have been offered to the pending bill. It looks pretty good, the "cuspidor" is there, but it is not the same, when one comes right down to brass tacks. He said he went on up to the next floor; there was another shiny brass can, so he entered the door at that place. He said there was a lady with big thick glasses in that office. It looked almost like the real article, but it was not; he was in the wrong place again. We asked him, "What did you do then?" He said, "Well, I went out in the hall and I hollered 'Mamma' a couple of times. I thought maybe some lady that had a little boy would hear me and would come out, thinking I was her boy, and would help me find where I belonged." He said, "Nobody came."

We said, "Then what did you do?" "Well," he said, "then I went to the elevator and told the man to take me to the subway. When I got to the subway, I said, 'two floors'." So he went clear down to the bottom and started all over again. I think that is what we ought to do with this proposition—forget the whole thing, go back to the subway, start all over, and try to wind up in the right place.

If there are those who entertain doubts about the effect on the United Nations, they finally convince themselves they have calculated the risks and chosen the lesser of two evils.

I have already discussed the fallacy of fighting the Communist philosophy with bullets, of attempting to restore order and stability by strengthening regimes whose tyranny inevitably produces opposition, whose corruption inevitably produces the economic misery in which revolutionary protest is born.

Now I want to address myself to those who are genuine friends of the UN, but who support the pending measure. I want to recall to them the lesson—no, let us be blunt—the warning—that recent history affords. Only a generation ago the world that emerged from World War I bravely launched a new experiment to enforce the peace by the collective action of the nations of the world. There are men in this Chamber who helped to write the history of that League of Nations.

I am confident that the historians of the future will agree on at least one factor in the chain of events that brought on World War II—the failure of the League of Nations. And there will be little dispute that the two causes of that failure were, first, the repudiation by the United States Senate of Woodrow Wilson and the League; and, second, the bypassing of the League by the major powers, their refusal to submit what they called their vital interests to the judgment of the organized conscience of mankind. If we want to know who killed the peace, we must see who killed the League.

Let us turn back the clock and review the events of 1919. We seem bent on retracing the missteps of that day; let us then see where those missteps led.

In 1919, as in 1947, the American people wanted America to join with other peace-loving nations in an organization to enforce the peace. The leader of the fight against President Wilson, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, acknowledged in 1919:

> I think a majority of the people of the country desire a League.

A year earlier he had waxed eloquent about the infamy that would stigmatize America if it signed a separate peace with Germany and ignored the covenant of the League. He said:

> If we sent our armies and young men abroad to be killed and wounded in northern France and Flanders with no result but this, our entrance into war with such an intention was a crime which nothing can justify.

Soon, however, a small but deadly clique was formed to oppose and kill the League of Nations. Its members included unreconstructed isolationists, Wilson-haters, and partisan politicians who placed political advantage above peacemaking. They knew their followers were in a minority and that they could not defeat the League by a frontal attack. They fell back on the ancient tactic of "divide and conquer"—and the dividing was effected by the device of unilateral American reservations to the Covenant of the League, already approved by the major powers at Versailles. Of course, the clique protested its unstinting loyalty and devotion to the League idea, but they nibbled away at genuine support for the League by appealing to every isolationist and party prejudice. The world knows, to its sorrow, how well they succeeded.

What were those reservations? In essence they provided:

That the United States should be the sole judge as to whether it had fulfilled its obligations under the Covenant.

That the United States assumed no obligation to carry out decisions which it deemed to be beyond the jurisdiction of the League.

That no mandate could be accepted without the consent of Congress.

Consider, Mr. President, these reservations, which President Wilson called a "knife thrust at the heart of the Covenant," the reservations which prevented American entry into the League and shortened the life of the League. Are they not an attempt to retain freedom to act unilaterally? Are they not a refusal to submit vital American interests to the determination of a League that may not always agree with us? Are they not a demand for a preagreed American bypassing of the League? Are they not, therefore, Mr. President—these reservations that kept America out of the League—dangerously similar to the policies we have now announced concerning the United Nations? And is not that why the sound instinct of the American people has spurred them to protest against the bypassing of the UN?

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations did yeoman service in securing American participation in the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask, for what purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to make a statement respecting one phase of the pending question, that is, pertaining to oil. It will probably take 20 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I may resume the floor when the Senator from Colorado has completed his statement, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield to me, and regain the floor after I shall have concluded my statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not going to object to one further performance of this character, but he thinks latitude has been extended about as far as it is fair to permit it to be extended in farming out the floor. The Chair is sure even the Senator from Idaho will agree with that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is immaterial to me, I will say, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is sure the Senator will agree. The Chair does not believe it is sound parliamentary practice to proceed as we have

been proceeding. He is sure that the Senator from Colorado himself would agree with that statement if he were asked whether he would agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I agree with that statement. However, it would be a considerable accommodation to me if I were permitted to make a statement on one phase of the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not going to object this time, but he will suggest that from now on the Senator from Idaho continue and conclude his address.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Presiding Officer for the consideration he has shown me.

Mr. President, I have several amendments to the pending bill as is well known. The amendment I am now offering perhaps is not of major importance, but it does pertain to one phase of the pending question which seems to me requires some consideration by the Senate. For that reason I bring it up. The amendment I am now going to discuss is as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments, or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments.

Mr. President, I am aware that an oil treaty is now pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That treaty has not been acted upon yet by the Senate of the United States, and for that reason I desire to be certain that the status quo with respect to oil is not changed by the passage of the pending bill.

President Truman in his message to the Congress on the Greek-Turkish situation stated:

Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting that modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity. That integrity is essential for the preservation of order in the Middle East.

Further on in his speech Mr. Truman stated:

It is necessary only to glance at a map to realize that the survival and integrity of the Greek Nation are of grave importance in a much wider situation. If Greece should fall under the control of an armed minority the effect upon its neighbor Turkey would be immediate and serious. Confusion and disorder might well spread throughout the entire Middle East.

That is where the oil region comes in.

Mr. President, I think that it is quite clear from Mr. Truman's own statement and from the testimony before the two committees of the House and Senate that our State Department and Mr. Truman in proposing the Greek-Turkish deal to the Congress are of the opinion that without such action the entire political and economic and military situation in the Near and Middle East will be made fluid, with the possibility that a chaotic situation there might very well jeopardize the Anglo-American exploitation of Middle East oil.

Since I do not believe that adequate time and opportunity has been given to the Congress to discuss the whole Near and Middle East situation; since I do not feel that the American people have been told the truth about the situation in the Near and Middle East; and since an international oil agreement is still pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate with its final outcome in doubt, I submit the amendment to Senate bill 938 which I have just read. If the amendment is agreed to it will, in my opinion, maintain the status quo.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who in the last Congress was chairman of the Senate Special Petroleum Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 2, 1947, Senator O'MAHONEY declared in part:

"Thus elements of the old Standard Oil Co. which was split up by decree of the United States Supreme Court in 1911 are again uniting in a joint venture by which they will be in a position to direct the production and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products throughout Europe and possibly throughout the world.

"This has been achieved by the unexampled efficiency of the American experts of the oil industry, and though it has come about in all probability by force of circumstance, nevertheless it illustrates the greatest danger that the capitalistic system now faces.

"The small independent enterprise is incapable of competing successfully with a combination like this which has the resources of capital and personnel upon which many cities and most States cannot call. It dramatizes the fact that organized business beginning with a small corporation has now become so great that it enters into agreements with governments affecting the economic lives of millions.

"It is but a step from giant combinations of this kind to the authoritarian state. That is the fact which the people of America must realize if they intend to save the capitalistic system of private property

"An organization such as this new oil combination with four great corporations with more than 400,000 stockholders is a collective enterprise.

"The American way of life is founded upon individual enterprise. The authoritarian governments which are spreading over the whole world are collective political institutions. If the people of the United States want to preserve individual business and local business, there is no way to do it except to define the powers and responsibilities of the giant collective enterprises which have secured so dominant a position in our economic life."

On March 17, 1947, Senator O'MAHONEY said:

"The forthcoming hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey will involve questions concerning the control of the oil industry.

"A consideration of the Middle East crisis reveals the essential identity between self-determination in the political sphere and free competitive enterprise in the economic sphere. The State Department will be asked to give its version of the effect on the political situation in the Middle East of the oil industry agreements by which the vast oil resources of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia are administered by a small group of large international oil companies.

"It will also be asked to state whether the Greek and Turkish loans involve any implication of a change of the previously announced economic policy of this Government by which it has been understood to desire to promote international trade free from the restrictions of all cartels and combines and to promote competition.

"Persian oil is handled by the Anglo-Iranian Co., which is dominated by the British Government. The oil of Iraq is handled by another international company in which the British, the French, the Dutch, and 2 American companies, the Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Company, are equal partners. The huge deposits of Saudi Arabia are handled by the Arabian-American Oil Co., which is owned equally by the Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co.

"Recently Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum signed a contract to purchase over a long period of years to come, 40 percent of the output of the Anglo-Iranian Co. At the same time they agreed with the Standard of California and the Texas Co. to purchase a 40-percent stock interest in the Arabian-American Co.

"The oil resources of the Middle East are vastly greater than those of continental United States and the disposition of these huge deposits is a question of such magnitude as to be inseparable from any effort to determine the future international policy of the United States.

"It will be observed that the British-controlled Anglo-Iranian Co. is selling oil to Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum, but the Arabian-American Co. is selling stock ownership, which of course involves ownership of the company as well as the oil.

"The representatives of all four American companies when they appeared before the Special Senate Committee on Petroleum declared their belief in competition and free enterprise. The control of oil, however, lies at the very basis of the British Empire. The Government of Russia believes, as do all Communists, that business should be carried on by the state and our American companies dealing abroad are frequently required to carry on their trade with what are in fact state monopolies."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, an understanding with respect to Middle East oil is pertinent right now since far more than 50 percent of all the known world oil reserves are to be found in this area. Five giant American oil companies have been using our State Department as their errand boy for the past 28 years in the attempt to obtain rights and exclusive concessions for the exploitation of that oil. The attitude of the big oil producers toward our State Department is well illustrated by the testimony of Mr. Edward F. Johnson, general counsel of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, before the special O'Mahoney oil committee in 1945. Mr. Johnson's testimony begins on page 76 of the volume of hearings entitled "Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries," and he opens his remarks with the following statement:

At the outset it seems to me that it might be useful to state two underlying principles that I consider to be the foundations on which sound diplomatic policy in relation to foreign oil must rest:

1. The operating programs of American private companies engaged in the oil indus-

try abroad should be in accordance with clearly defined policies of our Government, broadly conceived, consistently maintained, and based on complete understanding and cooperation between such companies and the Department of State. Such coordination is essential in view of the importance of oil to the economic well-being and national safety of this country and its relation to the peace of the world. The effect of operating programs of private companies on governmental policies and of these policies on such operating programs cannot be ignored. The objectives of the American oil industry abroad and of the Government's foreign policy cannot be separated into two different compartments without impairing the effectiveness of both

2. The oil industry in its foreign efforts should receive the wholehearted backing of its Government. Since no degree of organization will help unless the men in the Department of State know the industry is worth helping, it is obvious that the industry must see that its conduct continues to be such as will warrant Government support. Not only is Government backing in itself important but the whole world ought to know that the industry has consistent and continuing governmental support.

I repeat the closing sentence of the quotation:

Not only is Government backing in itself important but the whole world ought to know that the industry has consistent and continuing governmental support.

It is natural, Mr. President, that the foreign holdings of big oil corporations should play a large part in American foreign policy. Of the total of eleven or twelve billions of American dollars invested abroad, more than two and one-half billion dollars are invested in petroleum reserves by the Big Five.

These five major companies are the Standard Oil of New Jersey, the Socony Vaccum of New York, the Texas Oil Corp. of Texas, the Sinclair Oil Corp., and the Standard of California. To protect their $2;500,000,000 invested abroad, the big five may be expected to bring constant, steady pressure upon the State Department to modify, change, or develop international diplomacy in a manner best calculated to be of direct assistance to them. That has been done and is being done.

Without question, petroleum is the basic consideration in American foreign policy for the Near East, and we find that the spokesmen of the "big five" demand that the State Department back up officially whatever they attempt because the "whole world ought to know that the industry has consistent and continuing governmental support." The Senate, I presume, will have adequate opportunity to study American foreign policy in terms of oil when the international oil agreement is presented to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee. However, since more than half of the known world oil reserves are to be found in the Near and Middle East, and since the President has stated that "order" could not be maintained in the Middle East unless funds were advanced to the Turkish and Greek Governments, the Senate is compelled to face the facts of oil here and now. We must determine the extent of the influence the "big five" have on our State Department with respect to our policy in the Middle East, and what effect have they had in the formulation of the Vandenberg bill providing assistance for the Turkish and Greek Governments.

In these circumstances the American people are entitled to know exactly what the connection is between the new Greco-Turkish policy and the exploitation of Middle East oil by private American companies. Therefore, to clarify the oily atmosphere of the Vandenberg bill, I have presented this amendment in order that no one shall assume that its passage in any way implies that the United States Government is obligated to support any and all private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments.

Since the President delivered his message and since he made it a part of the whole program of stabilization of the Middle East, and since the stabilization of the Middle East must necessarily be very closely connected with our private operations in oil, I believe that a clarification of this point is very important.

It is my suspicion that in many cases our foreign policy in the past has been affected by the private influence of these big oil corporations. The Congress will be confronted with accomplished facts and the American people forced, through their Government, to back them up with their lives and fortunes. Let it be understood now, by the adoption of this amendment, that the United States Senate does not imply by passage of this Greek-Turkish loan act that we in any way commit ourselves to support private agreements between the Big Five and foreign governments.

A few days ago I noticed in the press that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made the statement, if I correctly recall the press report, that through our antitrust laws in this country certain great oil companies were dissolved, and now we find them united in the Middle East. The dissolution affected only their operations in this country. In the Middle East and in world petroleum circles they are just as much of a trust as they were before we required them to dissolve.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think perhaps I am obligated to say that while it is true, as I have pointed out following studies of the Special Senate Committee on Petroleum, that some of our oil companies are becoming as large as some governments, and that in the Middle East three units of the old Standard Oil trust which was dissolved by a decree of the Supreme Court back in 1911, namely, the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, the Socony-Vacuum, and the Standard Oil Company of California, now are uniting in the ownership of a substantial oil concession in Saudi Arabia. I did not mean to imly by that statement that any of those companies was by that fact violating the antitrust laws, although it is clear that the companies are in a position to make restrictive agreements. I was pointing out the fact that in the modern world the process of organization has gone so far that many corporations have become much larger than most cities and many States, and that in Saudi Arabia and in the Middle East these companies have control of oil reserves much vaster than those of the old Standard Oil trust.

In connection with the middle eastern oil situation, it may be worth while to point out that Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony Vacuum have agreed to purchase about 40 percent of the stock of the Arabian-American Oil Co., which holds the Saudi Arabian concession, but have not carried out their agreement because of a lawsuit pending in the London courts. However, with the assistance of approximately 19 American banks, these same companies have undertaken to make a loan of $102,000,000 to the Saudi Arabian Co. in order to enable it to build a pipe line across the Arabian peninsula to the Mediterranean. What struck me about that report was that it was evidence of the fact that these great corporations have become wealthy enough and powerful enough almost to be entitled to ask for admission to the United Nations. It is only fair to say that the companies have displayed the utmost frankness in discussing their plans with the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman.

Still, Mr. President, I am convinced that that has nothing to do with the question at issue here, namely, the loan to Greece and Turkey. I have found nothing in the investigation that I have made to give me any reason to feel that the loan to Greece and Turkey is anything more than evidence upon the part of the United States of a desire to continue its traditional stand as a defender of the right of self-determination by all peoples and all nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado. The remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming are highly helpful in the RECORD. However, he was not present when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] yielded to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. The Senator from Idaho yielded only for a statement. If it is to induce a general debate, the present occupant of the chair in his capacity as a Senator from Michigan will have to ask for the regular order, which is the right of the Senator from Idaho to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I assure the Chair I shall not permit any further interruptions until I have finished.

I am indebted to the Senator from Wyoming for making the statement which he made. I referred to the Senator from Wyoming in my remarks. It was entirely proper, and, as he stated, it was quite necessary, for him to clarify his position, for inadvertently I may have misstated the press report concerning what he had to say.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. LUCAS. This is very important

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I promised the Chair that I would not yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make an inquiry as to whether or not there is any possibility of voting on this amendment this afternoon. Several Senators have asked me about it, and as acting minority leader I wish to make that inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is already an amendment pending which has been submitted by the Senator from Colorado. It is not the amendment which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment which I am discussing is brief, and I should like to read it once more so that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] will understand exactly the point I am talking about. I stated in the beginning of my remarks that the oil question in the form of a treaty is now pending in the proper committee of the Senate, but, due to the general statement which the President made in his message pertaining to the whole Near East area, I felt that there should be some clarification now with respect to oil. So I have drawn up this amendment to the pending measure, Senate bill 938:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments, or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments.

I did not and do not want any of the oil companies to be able to fall back upon the President's message and say that the United States Government has committed itself to stabilize conditions throughout the whole Middle East in this program, and that is the reason I offer this amendment.

The Senator from Wyoming says he has examined the pending measure carefully and that he has found nothing in it which in any way affects petroleum. I am glad to have his statement on that question, because, frankly, I was troubled by it.

I have noted that Mr. Alf Landon, one of the greatly respected and properly respected citizens of the State of Kansas, has made several speeches. He made one the other day in Denver in which he wholeheartedly endorsed the program which is now pending before the Senate. Quite naturally he did not say anything about oil in his address, but I have noticed from long observation that where there is oil there you will find Alf Landon, and wherever you find Alf Landon you are pretty apt to find oil. I recall that Alf Landon did not have a word to say about our policy when Russia was coercing the people of Finland, when Russia was driving them to the wall, when she was taking the food out of their mouths. Nothing was said about that. I do not know that Mr. Landon had anything to say when Russia gobbled up Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania. I did not hear him say anything about it; I did not hear him complain about what was happening at that time. Of course, there is no oil involved there. There was oil in Rumania, but American and British interests, so far as I know, had no interest in the oil in Rumania. At least there was no American interest in it.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point some statements, observations, and testimony found in the report on petroleum interests in foreign countries made by the O'Mahoney committee.

There being no objection, the statements, observations, and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN OIL INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The purpose of this memorandum is to demonstrate that the State Department has fully and actively supported all efforts of American companies to secure concessions in the Middle East.

Iraq Petroleum Co. (formerly Turkish Petroleum Co.): After the last war the British Government took, in effect, the position that since the American Government had never ratified the Versailles Treaty, and had not become a member of the League of Nations, it was not entitled to participate in the development of the mandated territories. To this position the State Department took strong exception, and our foreign-relations volumes for the period 1920–28 devote considerable space to the long and protracted negotiations which took place between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain regarding concessions in Iraq. Throughout these negotiations our Government insisted on the maintenance of an open-door policy as far as concessions went, which would permit American companies to participate on an equal basis with those of other countries.

The American Government's position in this matter was very clearly stated in a telegram to our Embassy at London, dated September 20, 1922 (Foreign Relations, 1924, vol. 2, p. 233), namely, that "this Government has contributed to the common victory, and has a right, therefore, to insist that American nationals shall not be excluded from a reasonable share in developing the resources of territories under the mandate. * * *

"In Mesopotamia (now Iraq) the principle of equality of commercial opportunity and of the open door should be maintained * * *."

After prolonged negotiations, agreement was finally secured in 1927, and an American company (the Near East Development Corp.) secured a 23¾-percent interest in the Iraq Petroleum Co. This was secured entirely as a result of the insistence of the State Department that American firms be given equal opportunity in obtaining concessions.

The field which has been developed by the Iraq Petroleum Co. at Kirkuk is one of the largest proved fields in the world. American participation in this venture would never have been secured without the strong, consistent, and frequently insistent pressure brought to bear by the Department.

Furthermore, as the Iraq Petroleum Co., itself or through subsidiaries, has spread its operations in other areas of Iraq, and the Persian Gulf, American participation in these new areas has been insured by the terms of the original agreement.

Bahrein concession: Because Bahrein is under British protection by virtue of a treaty which provides that its foreign affairs shall be conducted by the British, American companies desiring to obtain concessions in Bahrein were confronted with the initial difficulty that they were entering into an area in which the British had long been paramount.

The concession at Bahrein was originally obtained by a British group (the Eastern and General Syndicate) on December 2, 1925. On November 30, 1927, the Eastern Gulf Oil Co., an American corporation, secured two option contracts from the British syndicate, which covered the existing concession at Bahrein, and a concession as yet unsigned for the Kuwait area. Because of the so-called Red Line agreement (an agreement binding the participants in the Iraq Petroleum Co. not to singly seek concessions in roughly the Arab part of the former Turkish Empire), the Eastern Gulf Corp. (then a participant in the Iraq Petroleum Co.) was contractually prevented from holding the Bahrein concession, and on December 21, 1928, it transferred the Bahrein contract to the Standard Oil Co. of California.

The Standard Oil Co. of California then organized a wholly owned subsidiary, the Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., and nominated it to receive the assignments of the concessions. To conform to the British political position in Bahrein, this company was registered as a British corporation under the laws of Canada.

In the meantime the annual payment of rental had become due, and this payment was made by the British syndicate in order to protect both the Eastern Gulf Co. and its prospective nominee, the Standard Oil Co. of California. However, by this time the British Government had become aware of the fact that the American oil interests were seeking to enter the Persian Gulf territory. On the date that the money was paid, the syndicate received notice from the British Colonial Office that it would agree to the extension only on certain conditions; these conditions not only threatened to annul the entire transaction but raised a question of policy which engaged the immediate attention of the Department of State. After consideration of all the factors involved, our Embassy in London was instructed in March 1929 to request a statement of policy from the British Government with regard to the granting of concessions, such as the one in Bahrein, in the semi-independent Arab states of the Persian Gulf. At the same time our Embassy was instructed to point out the liberality of our own laws in this connection.

In a note dated May 30, 1929, the British Foreign Office replied that it was prepared in principle to admit the participation of United States interests in the Bahrein concession, provided that it could be satisfied as to the certain conditions including those under which American capital would take part.

At the suggestion of the British Foreign Office negotiations were then initiated between the American company and the British Colonial Office, which were carried to a successful conclusion. In May 1930 the first representatives of the Standard Oil Co. of California arrived in Bahrein, and the field has since been developed very successfully and refining facilities installed which have played an important part in the Allied war effort.

Here again the prompt and positive action by the State Department had secured results favorable to an American-owned company. By securing the entry of American oil interests into Bahrein, the way was paved for some American interests to obtain concessions in nearby Arabia.

Kuwait concession: Kuwait's political status is similar to that of Bahrein, and this shiekhdom has long been under British influence. On November 27, 1931, the Eastern Gulf Oil Co. formally called the Department's attention to the fact that the so-called British Colonial Office was insisting on the so-called "nationality clause" in the Kuwait concession. This clause in effect prevented anyone except a British subject or firm from obtaining a concession in Kuwait.

The Department's reaction to this information was prompt, and on December 3, 1931, the instructions were sent to our Embassy in London to make representations with a view

to securing equal treatment for American firms.

These negotiations were long, and were complicated at a later date by the fact that the British-controlled Anglo-Persian Oil Co. (now the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.), which had previously expressed its disinterest in Kuwait, suddenly endeavored to secure a concession from the sheikh of Kuwait. Here, again, the Department insisted on the open door policy, and our Embassy in London was assiduous in its endeavor to expedite a settlement, and continuously and frequently pressed the British authorities for action.

Finally agreement was reached, and on December 23, 1934, a concession was granted to the Kuwait Oil Co., which was 50 percent British (Anglo-Persian Oil Co.) and 50 percent American (Gulf Oil Corp.). Thus, the continued representations of our Government had secured equal American participation in this important field, which otherwise might now be wholly British held.

Saudi Arabian concession: This concession was obtained in 1933 by the company now known as the Arabian-American Oil Co. (a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Corp.). While no intervention by the Department was necessary in order to secure equal opportunity for the American company interested in this concession, the Department's earlier efforts which had resulted in the Bahrein concession put the company in a favorable position in its negotiations with the Arabian Government. It is probable that the total absence of any pressure on the part of the American Government was one of the deciding reasons for the award of the concession to an American company. In fact, when extended concessions were negotiated in 1939 Ibn Saud awarded the concession to the Arabian-American Oil Co., even though this private company offered less than Government-controlled Japanese and German companies, whose diplomats at Jidda were extremely pressing with their offers.

This concession and its extensions give the Arabian-American Oil Co. one of the most promising fields in the world.

Realizing the American national interest in the concession, and the importance thereto of economic stability in Saudi Arabia, the Department in 1941 strongly recommended that a loan be granted to that country by this Government having control of funds.

Measures are now being taken, with the cooperation of the appropriate agencies of this Government, which it is hoped will help Saudi Arabia to establish a stable currency system. An agricultural mission has also recently been in Arabia, and the Department has done its best to see that the country obtains the necessary equipment with which to put into effect the recommendations of this mission.

Other concessions: American companies, or companies with a part American interest, have obtained concessions in Iran, Afghanistan, India, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Qatar. While no direct diplomatic intervention has been called for, these companies have kept the Department informed of their progress, and the Department's good offices have been used many times in straightening out minor difficulties which these companies were experiencing.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask Mr. Rayner, if, in the matter he has presented to us, he has covered all the phases of what he had in mind when he referred to a strong foreign oil policy.

Mr. RAYNER. I think I might add a little to that. The Department has recently appointed some 13 or 14 petroleum advisers or attachés who are located at the important points world-wide to assist the ambassadors in handling oil problems. The Department has very actively carried on its policy of assisting the American companies in securing concessions abroad and has been very much alive to the perpetuation of their interests insofar as they pertain to the national interests of this country.

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was it presented?

Mr. RAYNER. February 10, 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. So, you are presenting it now to be included in the record so that there may be available in one place the whole story?

Mr. RAYNER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any matters in that addendum which ought to be developed now? I have not had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. RAYNER. I think not, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you examined it, Mr. Fraser?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points which you think ought to be brought out?

Mr. FRASER. We could go into a lot more detail, if the committee wished to do so. This is rather a general history of the years involved in these different countries, and if it were desired to expand the detail that could be done. Of course, we might get into matters that were more or less confidential.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think it is necessary for us to go into matters of history.

(The addendum submitted by Mr. Rayner is as follows:)

"ADDENDUM—UNITED STATES FOREIGN PETROLEUM POLICY

* * * * *

"(b) The active, energetic, and consistent support rendered by the Department of State to the United States petroleum industry in its foreign operations and problems.

* * * * *

"Both before and after 1920 the Department of State demonstrated that it was ready to intercede by diplomatic measures in protection of the legitimate marketing interests of United States oil companies. * * *

"3. The period from 1918 to about 1924 was characterized by widespread pessimism about future oil supplies in the continental United States and in nearby Latin-American producing areas. * * * Consequently, American oil interests began to look abroad for sources of crude and in so doing found themselves from time to time in need of the diplomatic support of their Government. This period was remarkably similar to the present period. Examination of the record will show that the activity of the Department of State was prompt and firm. Reference should be made to the accompanying memoranda on the American oil interests in the Netherland Indies, in the Middle East, and in Latin America. For a more detailed documentation of the activity of the Department during this period reference should be made to the State Department publication entitled 'Oil Concessions in Foreign Countries' (68th Cong., 1st sess., Doc. No. 97) and also to the diplomatic correspondence in connection with the Palestine mandate.

"4. About 1924 and thereafter, public interest in overseas petroleum reserves began to wane. * * * Nevertheless, in specific instances and upon request, the Department of State would employ its good offices to strengthen the hands of such members of the American oil industry as desired to acquire foreign sources of supply in order to facilitate their foreign marketing operations. Throughout the entire interwar period the Department uniformly insisted, in its diplomatic correspondence, on the open-door principle of equal opportunity for United States petroleum interests in areas newly opened to concession. Specific instances of diplomatic intervention are to be found in the record connected with the acquisition of concessions in Bahrein Island and in the Sheikhdom of Kuwait.

* * * * *

"CHARLES RAYNER,
"Petroleum Adviser, State Department."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in order that the Senate and the public may clearly understand that this question is not an incidental side issue, I have asked that the document submitted by Mr. Charles Rayner, Petroleum Adviser of the Department of State to the special O'Mahoney committee on oil, be included in my remarks. This document appears in the volume entitled "Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries," beginning on page 19. Mr. Rayner carefully states that his paper in compact summary contains the record of: "The active, energetic, and consistent support rendered by the Department of State to the United States petroleum industry, in its foreign operations and problems."

Mr. Rayner carries us from one period of time to another, points out time after time how the State Department intervened, not just in the Middle East but throughout the world, in Venezuela, in New Guinea, in India, in every single place where petroleum is produced anywhere in the world, giving the constant, steady support of our State Department to the private activities of the big oil corporations. Mr. Rayner has a special section, Mr. President, entitled "American Oil Interests in the Middle East." This reading of the record written by the State Department itself, Mr. President, demonstrates without any question, that our State Department has acted as the advance and rear-guard agent, the protective agent of the Big Five for the past 20 years in their attempts to obtain oil concessions in the Near and Middle East.

The State Department through intervention in Kuwait obtained after years of protracted negotiations a most extensive and valuable concession in 1934 for the Gulf Oil Corp. Today the Gulf Oil Corp. of America has a 50-percent interest in that rich field. In Bahrein, the Standard Oil Corp. of California was able to arrive at an agreement in 1930 after years and years of protracted negotiations by the State Department.

Once again with the help of the State Department, over British opposition, we heard much in the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations about Iran oil deposits. The British Government today has concessions for over 600,000 square miles of territory. Incidentally, the Big Five are urgently pushing the British to obtain equal shares in the oil reserves of Iran on the basis, I am told, that the American flag in that area would insure stability.

Of course that is a fact well known to all oil producers. I do not condemn them for that. But the American flag makes their investment in those areas very valuable indeed, and the Senate of the United States certainly cannot be criticized when it considers where the American flag shall fly and why it shall fly there.

The Arabian-American Oil Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of California, and the Texas Oil Corp., have today uncovered the greatest oil reserves so far discovered in the Middle East in Saudi Arabia. The Arabian-American Oil Co. has oil rights to 440,000 square miles—an area almost twice the size of Texas. This area alone is estimated conservatively to hold more than 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

As we here discuss the Greek-Turkish loan, the Arabian-American Oil Co. is in negotiation with the British Government in London. Within the past 6 months, Standard of California and the Texas Oil Corp. agreed to cut the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. of New York in on the Arabian-American Oil Co., but that agreement, now several months old, is delayed pending the outcome of current discussions and legal action in London concerning a group agreement reached in 1928 among participants in the Iraq Petroleum Co.

In 1928, after 8 years of State Department protest, the British finally yielded and agreed that the big American producers should receive a 23½-percent interest in the Iraq Petroleum Co. This achievement, as the State Department and the big producers will acknowledge, was entirely due to the pressure of the State Department. Five American companies sliced this melon.

For 25 years the State Department has actively protected, defended, and advanced the interests of the Big Five companies in the Near and Middle East. As we debate this policy here, these powerful international oil companies are meeting in London to decide policies over which we, the Senate, have no control, but which policies they expect our State Department to fully back up with economic, political, and, if necessary, military forces. Many, many commentators and newspaper columnists have reached the conclusion somehow that the Greek-Turkish so-called assistance bill is nothing short of an outright subsidy to the Big Five oil producers of America. As the junior Senator from Maine has suggested, the whole situation has a strong odor of petroleum.

For 25 years the State Department has been aggressively forcing the British to cut the Big Five in on the oil loot of the Middle East. Now, with exclusive control over the world's greatest known oil reserves in Saudi Arabia, the big Standard companies find themselves in a highly favorable bargaining position with the British. They will not permit the British to enter Saudi Arabia unless the British are willing to cut the Standard companies in on the exploitation of the exclusive British concession within the nation of Iran. Do not overlook the important factor of the American flag in the negotiations. This is what concerns the international oil monopolists as they sit tonight in London making decisions for the State Department and the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, on the evening following the appearance of Mr. Truman before the Congress, Mr. Charles Rayner, petroleum adviser of the Department of State, in a speech at Mount Vernon, Ill., said:

Oil has become more of a vital force in influencing peace and prosperity throughout the world, for its ramifications go far beyond those of other commodities. It reaches and brings its influence to bear upon the economic welfare of nations, and it involves political and military considerations of far-reaching potentialities.

Mr. President, Mr. Rayner goes on to point out that the Near East and Middle East have become the center of the world's oil industry, that half, and potentially much more than half, of all known oil reserves are to be found in this area; and he observes:

It is not difficult, therefore, to appreciate how important may be our political relationship with the various countries and the small sheikdoms that make up that part of the world.

Mr. President, Mr. Rayner makes quite clear that the big oil producers today are in the dominant position throughout the world. As a part of my remarks at this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Malcom Hobbs, able Washington correspondent of the Overseas News Agency, be included in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR EXPANDING OIL INTERESTS

(By Malcolm Hobbs)

WASHINGTON.—The dramatic political developments surrounding the new United States foreign policy in the Near East have overshadowed recent economic developments in which America has strengthened its holdings in rich Middle East oil fields.

These significant and important economic steps have taken place coincidentally with the evolving of President Truman's policy to secure America's political frontiers in Greece and Turkey.

Two weeks ago, two important American oil companies—Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.—joined with Britain's Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. to form Middle East Pipelines, Ltd. The purpose of the new company is to construct another 1,000 miles of pipe line to connect the oil fields of Iran and Kuwait with the Mediterrancan. Stock in the company will be distributed so that Jersey will have 40 percent, Socony 10 percent, and Anglo-Iranian 50 percent. In return for financial backing, Anglo-Iranian has agreed to provide the American companies with "substantial quantities of crude oil for a period of years."

This represents the first return for American oil interests from the deal signed last December 26 in which British interests agreed to share with the Americans in the development of Middle East oil resources. This agreement culminated the uphill struggle of the Americans—started shortly after World War I—against the exclusive control by the British of Middle East oil concessions.

Three weeks ago, contracts were placed for the construction of another pipe line to be controlled by the Arabian-American Oil Co., which has exclusive rights over Saudi Arabian resources. Arabian-American is owned by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co. Its pipe line is a big 30-inch project costing $80,000,000, scheduled to be completed by the end of 1949. It will cross the Arabian Peninsula to the Mediterranean.

Completion of the two new pipe lines will give American interests a hold on three vital lines stretching into this rich region. American companies already have an interest in the line which carries oil from the Iraq fields to the Mediterranean.

On March 12 the Arabian-American Oil Co. announced that an agreement whereby Standard of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum would join Standard of California and the Texas Co. as stockholders of Arabian-American awaited only the satisfactory solution of certain British objections to the deal. An agreement in principle giving Jersey 30 percent and Socony-Vacuum 10 percent of Arabian American's capital stock had been announced last December. This arrangement will bolster Arabian-American's financial structure by about $227,000,000.

Another American oil company—Gulf—has joint control with Anglo-Iranian of the Kuwait Oil Co. Its fields are the newest in the Middle East, located at the head of the Persian Gulf.

The welter of developments in international oil serve to accent two facts: That American oil interests are increasing their international holdings and control by leaps and bounds; and that the American rise is coupled with a British decline. Up until the 1920's the United States had no significant foreign oil supplies. Diplomatic protests over Britain's monopolistic position in the Middle East secured a concession for the United States in Iraq. American engineers discovered the richest reserves in the world in Saudi Arabia after Britain had concluded that the region was unproductive. The recent deals with Anglo-Iranian have strengthened the United States position considerably. The two new pipe lines will bring Middle East oil direct to the Mediterranean, eliminating tanker shipments through the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Suez Canal, where the British have been able to collect a toll levy of 18 cents a barrel.

In contrast to the picture after World War I, American oil concessions abroad now equal, if not surpass, those of the British. There is added significance to this in that the United States is a big oil producer within its own borders, while Britain has relied completely on foreign oil for security since Winston Churchill's decision as First Lord of the Admiralty to convert the Royal Navy from coal to oil.

Today British companies have concessions in Iran, North Borneo, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, India, Malaya, Ceylon, Netherlands East Indies, Trinidad, Colombia, and Venezuela. Americans have properties in all these countries except India and Iran, with additional holdings in Canada, Bahrein, and Saudi Arabia.

In an unheralded but significant speech at Mount Vernon, Ill., on the 13th of this month, Mr. Charles Rayner, the State Department's petroleum adviser, stated that United States interests now own or control 59 percent of the total known oil reserves in the world. He stressed "the increasing importance of our foreign reserves to our national economy."

In terms of the Middle East, Mr. Rayner said: "I cannot stress the importance of this part of the world too strongly. With oil reserves known to be in excess of the known reserves of the United States * * * it may well be that the Middle East will ultimately become the center of gravity of world oil production. It is not difficult, therefore, to appreciate how important may be our political relationship with the various countries and small sheikdoms that make up that part of the world."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Mr. Hobbs calls attention to the fact that two important American oil companies have just joined with Britain's Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. to form Middle East Pipelines, Ltd. The purpose of the new company is to construct another 1,000 miles of pipe line to connect the oil

fields of Iran and Kuwait with the Mediterranean. Mr. Hobbs states:

> This represents the first return for American oil interests from the deal signed last December 26 in which British interests agreed to share with the Americans in the development of Middle East oil resources.

I take it, Mr. President, that because of the powerful position which the Standard companies today occupy in the Near East and Middle East, the British have finally agreed to cut them in on the development of the vast oil fields of Iran over which the British since 1901 have held exclusive control.

Mr. President, I believe that the material that I have submitted in the discussion of this amendment raises certain basic questions in regard to the Turkish-Greek loan and to our Nation's foreign policy in respect to the Near and Middle East. First, I wish to call attention once more to the fact that an international oil agreement is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Second, I wish to raise the question of the propriety of having the Big Five dictate American foreign policy. Third, I wish to raise the question of why our State Department acts as a messenger boy, a front man, a salesman, a protector for whatever deals the Big Five attempt to negotiate with foreign nations. I raise now the question of an international oil cartel, a combination of the British oil monopolies and the five major oil companies in America. What are the arrrangements? What was the agreement of 1928 which has lead to the discussions now under way in London; what agreement have they reached in regard to markets and the development of the oil reserves of the Near and Middle East? I question the binding nature of those agreements on our State Department and the American people. And what have the Standard Oil companies got to do with the pending measure?

Mr. President, I suggest that the Greek-Turkish deal has been proposed as a political insurance policy for the Standard Oil companies. It carries out the pledge of the State Department to them that the American flag will continue to protect them and it demonstrates that American fortunes and lives stand ready to protect their interests. In all good conscience to clarify this situation and in order that our State Department shall not become a way-station for the lobbyists and agents of the oil cartels, I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment I have offered. There is full and adequate time to discuss the effect of international oil cartels on our foreign policy when we debate the international oil agreement. At least now, in order to make clear to the American people that it is the actual poverty, hunger, and destitution of the Greek people which move the Senate, I urge that we adopt the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield, to permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has been farming out the floor all the afternoon. The Chair has been very generous about it because he wishes to cooperate. But the Chair thinks both the Senator from Idaho and the Chair agree that he should conclude his address now without further interruption.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I was discussing our reservations to the League of Nations. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did yeoman service in securing American participation in the United Nations. I want to acknowledge my own admiration for the part he played in that matter. But I cannot conceal my disappointment to find that now, confronted with the opposition of the American people to the bypassing of the United Nations, he sponsors an amendment which, in its effect, is no different from the old League reservations. I recall that in 1919 he fought valiantly for putting reservations into our League adherence. I recall that as editor of the Grand Rapids Herald, he insisted that America, and America alone, should decide whether or not she had lived up to her international obligations, if she decided to leave the League. The Vandenberg amendment, the Vandenberg reservation to our participation in the UN, is more skillfully drawn. He would leave to the UN a veto over our Greek-Turkish aid plan, provided the UN sets up its own system of aid which makes our own unnecessary or undesirable. But was it not our duty under the UN Charter to take the whole problem to the UN from the beginning? Did we have the moral right to confront the UN with an accomplished fact, and then stand back and say that if the UN itself, without our aid, can match our own prodigious effort we will pull out? Are we not setting up a new kind of reservation to our participation in running the machinery of international cooperation. Are we not, therefore, following a tragic course parallel to our League action in 1919?

The League of Nations that began to function without the participation of the United States, the strongest power in the world, the power that had initiated the League idea and had renounced every selfish territorial demand at Versailles and had asked only for the universal adoption of that idea, was off to a difficult start. But it did get into successful operation and it did settle a number of lesser international disputes that threatened to burst into large-scale war. It is not without its symbolic implications that one of the conflicts it settled was between Greece and Bulgaria.

What killed the League and, therefore, the peace? It was the decision of the great powers to act outside of the League instead of acting collectively within the League. Frequently the decision to ignore the League was not motivated by selfish aggrandizement, by sinister ambition, or ulterior motive. Frequently the bypassing of the League was done for the best of motives—for peace, for order, for stability, for justice. But whatever the motive, the bypassing of the League weakened it and helped to kill the peace.

Consider, for example, the Locarno Pact, signed in 1925 by the major European powers—all members of the League of Nations. The pact renounced war and guaranteed frontiers. Its objectives were beyond reproach. But listen to the testimony of Sumner Welles as given in his book The Time for Decision:

> The agreements signed at Locarno were acclaimed throughout the world as a great achievement. * * * Yet, in retrospect, one is again bound to ask why the provisions of the Covenant of the League were of greater value merely because they were written at Locarno. * * * In reality, the only practical results of the Locarno treaties were to weaken gravely the authority of an already sadly undermined League.

But, of course, it was the sinister bypassing of the League—by Japan in Manchuria, Italy in Ethiopia, and Germany and Italy in Spain—which gave the League the death blow. And we might cite also the damage done by England and France in refusing to permit the League to take more effective action against the aggressors. Here is Sumner Welles' analysis:

> In 1931, the international horizon was still further darkened by Japan's decision that the moment had arrived when her ambition to extend her hegemony over the Asiatic continent could safely be carried out. Her rape of the three Manchurian provinces, and her subsequent decision to abandon the League because of the mild reproof administered, brought the League face to face with its greatest issue. The Baldwin government in England refused to countenance any forceful action. Notice was thereby given to the rising forces within Germany and Italy that the League of Nations was impotent in the face of the most flagrant and brutal aggression.
>
> The failure of the League to take action in this case was the chief cause for Mussolini's aggression against Ethiopia; for the triumph of fascism in Spain; and for Hitler's decision to proceed with the creation by force of his "greater Germany." Never was any decision more fatal in its consequences than that reached in 1932 by the Governments of Great Britain and France when they permitted the League to be emasculated.

But why did France and England permit the League to be emasculated? The policy of League emasculation was another phase of the Munich policy of German appeasement. And both of these policies were motivated by a pathological hatred of Russia. The ruling cliques in France and England at that time, supported by powerful commercial financial interests in this country, wanted a strengthened Germany turned toward Russia; they wanted Germany to destroy Russia after a great struggle from which Germany itself would emerge so weakened she would be incapable of turning westward. How futile that policy proved to be, we all know now. How immoral that policy was we are all agreed now. But how many lives were twisted, maimed, and destroyed before we learned those lessons. How much misery and heartache were sown for other generations to reap before we saw the light.

Yet what is proposed now? It is hard to believe—and many will resist believing—that we are following the tragic course of the twenties and thirties, that we are repeating the measures we have just learned to condemn for their incalculable folly.

Motivated by fear and hatred of Russia, we are undermining the United Nations. Remember the League? Motivated by fear and hatred of Russia we are arming Fascist reaction in Greece and Turkey. Remember Germany? Motivated by fear and hatred of Russia, we are giving aid and comfort to corrupt and dispossessed warmongers throughout the world who see in a Russo-American struggle a chance for them to recapture power. Remember Hitler?

But it will be charged I am looking at only one side of the picture, that I am ignoring the role of Russia and the growth of communism in recent years, that I am appeasing Russia. Let us be clear about appeasement. It has become a historic word with a settled meaning. It means making concessions, not justified by morality, in the hope of satisfying the demands of an aggressive nation, a nation whose appetite is merely whetted by the concessions.

Now who can honestly say that reference of the Greek-Turkish dispute to the UN would be appeasement? Who can fairly say that throwing the spotlight of the organized conscience of mankind on the true nature of the Greek or Turkish problem would appease anybody? No, the issue is not appeasement; it is peace through international cooperation.

Nor is it appeasement to discuss with Russia claims based on history, claims whose justice was once tacitly conceded by Great Britain, as in the case of the Dardenelles. Nor is it appeasement to discuss with Russia the protection of her security in a world still haunted by atomic warfare.

No; the issue is peace through international cooperation. That is the real issue, the only issue—and I want to quote the prophetic words of Woodrow Wilson, uttered during the fight for the League of Nations:

> The imperialist wants no League of Nations, but if, in response to the universal cry of masses everywhere, there is to be one, he is interested to secure one suited to his own purposes—

Those words sound strangely as if they might have been uttered with reference to the present situation. Mr. Wilson continued—

> one that will permit him to continue the historic game of pawns and peoples—the juggling of provinces, the old balance of power, and the inevitable wars attendant upon these things. The reservation proposed would perpetuate the old order. Does any one really want to see the old game played again? Can any one really venture to take part in reviving the old order? The League is the bulwark, and the only bulwark of the rising democracy of the world against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

That uncannily prophetic warning went unheeded in 1919. Shall we make the same mistake again?

Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the reaction to what is now contemplated, especially in foreign nations.

We cannot fly in the face of history. In the Near East and Middle East change is long overdue. Bottling up the forces of unrest is the surest way to cause an explosion. Britain has pursued such a policy for 2 years, with tragic results. But are we under any illusions as to the fact that it is proposed that we carry on the British policy intact? Listen to this recent Athens radio broadcast, quoted by CBS:

> It must be emphasized that the American policy outlined by Truman is a considerable improvement over Winston Churchill's Fulton speech. * * * Churchill made statements about friendship with Russia, stressing the necessity of having a general understanding on foreign policy. Truman made no mention whatsoever of any getting together with the Soviet Union, or of any direct effort to improve understanding between America and Russia. Churchill had taken good care to fit his plan into the United Nations framework. But Truman decided to follow an independent policy. * * * He places at the disposal of every endangered state collossal material, and if necessary, the military might of America.

Yes, indeed, Mr. President, our unilateral policy is proving a great boon to the reactionary, royalist Fascist in Greece.

Listen to this echo from the other end of the Mediterranean. The Spanish radio said on March 17:

> If any man has cause to rejoice intensely over Mr. Truman's message, that man is Winston Churchill. What Mr. Roosevelt made him suffer, Mr. Truman is making amends for.

From the Arab Middle East, we have this observation made over the Jaffa radio, on March 14:

> Truman's speech bodes no good for the possibilities of maintaining peace in the world. Such a problem should be submitted to the most competent organization so far established for settling these matters: the UNO. If Greece and Turkey fear aggression, they should resort to the UNO.

Our friends in France are not happy. The newspaper L'Aurore—meaning "the dawn"—commented on March 15:

> United States foreign policy seems to have resolved the world into two blocs. If that is so, there is no hope of establishing a lasting peace and collective security.

Another French paper, Les Echos, charges that America is determined to create markets for its exports, and says:

> If this kind of distribution is to become a coherent system throughout the world, it should not be organized by one country alone but by the United Nations.

And we have drawn a very solemn warning from the Dutch. Their international commentator, de Jong, predicted in a broadcast March 15:

> The new American policy would encourage the die-hard reactionary elements in all countries, who are not even capable of settling their own domestic affairs, let alone international issues.

He predicted that—

> The American people will certainly be surprised some day when the repercussions of its strong-arm policy become apparent to all and sundry.

I think you will find these other observations of de Jong, reported by our Government monitoring service on March 17, of interest. I quote:

> The corrupt and reactionary Greek ruling class is left free to carry on. * * *
>
> If one pictures how America would feel if masses of Russian weapons and military instructors were poured into Cuba or Mexico, one can imagine what Soviet reactions to the President's speech were like. * * *
>
> The Americans would do well to realize that a mere anti-Communist policy is not enough. It is bound to be ineffective and of no constructive value whatever. The crux of the whole issue is whether the United States will be able to stamp out misery, hunger, starvation, and squalor in those countries which have now become American protectorates to all intents and purposes. It is also that particular aspect of American policy, which has aroused doubts in the minds of those who know the socially ruthless character of present-day America.

And here is comment from Italy:

ITALIANS SEE IMPORTANCE

> In Rome, the independent newspaper Il Messagero said the President's message was the most important one since promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823.
>
> "It took more than 100 years and two great wars for the United States to abandon its isolationism so resolutely, proclaiming that henceforth its policy assumes world-wide scope," said Il Messagero, the only paper in Rome to devote an editorial to the message.
>
> "The speech and the program it represents are important and impressive because behind respectable arguments of general policy lie the influence of colossal economic interests—industrial, banking, and commercial—which, united and fused with the principles of democracy, constitute that formidable mechanism of global expansion, which is American imperialism."

Our friends across the seas are not pleased at all, Mr. President.

Here is comment from France:

L'Orde—De Gaullist:

> We don't know what repercussions the speech will have on the Moscow Conference, but we don't think it can serve the cause of international peace.
>
> The harsh truth is that the United States is establishing its influence in the Middle East on the ruins of British influence, but face to face with the Soviet thrust. There is nothing in all this on one side or the other which resembles the peace of right and freedom.

L'Epoque—right-wing:

> A UN commission is at present investigating the question of the responsibility for the disorders in northern Greece, and after the Truman speech it would be difficult for it to put the Athens Government in the wrong and exonerate the rebels.

French radio—in German to Germany:

> Truman's statement that United States interests were extending far beyond Greece and Turkey and were including all the world, is astounding because it represents the undisguised proclamation of a right of world control (weltaufsichtsrecht) by the highest United States authority.

That is the reaction everywhere of the peoples of other nations, that we are setting out to conquer the world.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry, but the Presiding Officer has ruled that I am not permitted to yield any further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. May I put an address in the RECORD?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; unless the Senator from Idaho wishes to yield the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not want to yield the floor. I should like to yield to the Senator to put the material in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will it be agreeable to the Senator if I place something in the RECORD?

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be agreeable to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated in the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho will lose the floor if he yields for the purpose of the transaction of any business.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well. Then I cannot yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield, then, for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question, but no business—no monkey business here.

Mr. LUCAS. There are no monkeys in the Senate; there is no monkey business here at all. But will the Senator tell me who is going to take the floor when he yields the floor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the distinguished Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it possible that the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate will take the floor, in the event the Senator from Idaho should lose the floor or yield it? Can the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. Anything is possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure it is, as the result of what is going on here now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The French radio, beamed to the Germans, in German, went on to say this:

This right would finally lead to a claim for world domination. The envisaged help to Greece and Turkey entails an advance of United States power toward the frontiers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It cannot be expected that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will regard this as anything but a provocation. She will never understand why the United States security must be defended immediately outside the Russian frontiers. * * *

The United States is prepared to come to an understanding; that is, they want to maintain their predominant position under all circumstances.

I quote from Canadian newspapers. The Montreal Star was inclined to agree with the need for such action, but added, in discussing Canada's participation in European relief:

There is no question of Canada being asked to take part in the additional American project of providing assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

This United States action is regarded here as being strictly in the field of power politics.

That statement comes from Canada, our next door neighbor. Her people should be tolerant to us if any people are going to be.

The Montreal Star continues:

This is not a league in which they let us play around, our external-affairs expert told the Star.

The Victoria Colonist:

The effect of President Truman's request * * * could, in the long run, have an adverse repercussion on the United Nations as an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace.

The London (Canada) Free Press:

If Russia and the United States meet in a naked clash of power politics, the future of the United Nations is dark indeed.

These statements are all from our neighbors, some near, some far, some friendly, some not so friendly, but one theme runs through all the statements, namely that we are setting out to conquer the world. They fear us because of the atomic bomb, and we are in danger of turning all the peoples of the world against us.

The Vatican radio has this to say:

After pointing out that unless concrete action is taken, world peace will be endangered. Truman said that the free peoples must be helped to maintain their freedom. This means that the incessant efforts of the past year through an almost uninterrupted series of conferences have led to nothing. * * *

Now the peoples see with terror that the leaders who hold the world's fate in their hands and who will decide the triumph or failure of peace are more or less powerless to stem the water which inundates the ship of peace on all sides, and are forced to tell those who confidently embarked that the vessel threatens to capsize, dragging all within it into the vortex.

Mr. President, I wish I could find one cheerful note in all the foreign press.

Tyoekansan Sanomat, Helsinki, Finland, says:

A stupefying point in Truman's speech is the part where he refers to totalitarian states and in this connection mentions Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In the opinion of an ordinary European, there are not in Europe, with the exception of Spain and Portugal, any other totalitarian states of a Fascist type than Greece and Turkey.

Naturally, the buying of two complete nations—

Hear that, Mr. President, the Finnish newspaper says:

Naturally, the buying of two complete nations for the purpose of military bases will seriously injure the pacific development of international relations.

The London News Chronicle—that is a liberal newspaper—says:

It seems that the United States has become aware of the burdens and responsibilities which moral and material power entail. But the mantle of power is not easily assumed, and the absence in Mr. Truman's remarks of the slightest subtlety or diplomatic finesse may involve the State Department in unexpected difficulties.

That is of great significance, Mr. President, in the eyes of our British friends. They are always very subtle in their diplomacy, and our brutal approach really has them worried.

The Daily Herald, Labor Party organ:

The most disturbing aspect of Mr. Truman's statement is its pessimism. The question is, To what extent will the American people as a whole accept the thesis that the well-being of the world rests mainly on the might of the United States as a counterforce to the might of Russia?

If that belief takes hold—and is matched as it will be by increasing anti-American reaction in Russia—the prospect of an armed clash between the two greatest powers on earth becomes frighteningly clear.

The Manchester Guardian:

This is not the moment for hasty judgment. It would be absurd and unworthy for us to condemn the United States for trying to do what we have tried and failed to do. At most, we can criticize the method chosen.

Even though we support the American point of view and welcome American help, we cannot easily accept a balance of power which would leave Russia and the United States face to face in Europe and the Near East.

The Bulgarian Telegraph Agency quoted former Greek Foreign Minister Sofianopoulos, and this is what the Greek Foreign Minister had to say:

The American loan (added) to the gift of military equipment will be a catastrophe if, as a preliminary condition, the basic change of the existing regime in Greece is not stipulated. It will make the repressive measures against Greek democrats still harder and will increase tensions in the Balkans. Continuation of the present regime is a calamity for Greece and a threat to peace in the Balkans and in the world.

Mr. President, the United States News, published here in the Nation's Capital for a business clientele, in its issue of March 21, 1947, blueprints a grandiose scheme of American imperialism, the same thing of which we have been accused by our foreign friends, calculated, it says, to cost American taxpayers $31,885,000,000. I have not checked its figures with the various departments, but in the article the United States News tells where the money is coming from and where it is going.

Under the heading of "Aiding deserving people," the article has this to say:

It isn't going to be so bad—this job of trying to run the world.

Then the article speaks of the money and goods we are going to ship all over the world. In another part of the article appears the following:

Americans are to be forced to take an interest in the outside world. Trade will be high and active wherever the dollars flow. Businessmen will do well to get deeply interested in world trade to find where they may fit into what obviously is to be an expanding field of United States interest and activity abroad.

I am still quoting from the United States News, and listen to this next sentence, for it is important:

It is to be settled now that the flag will follow the dollar into the far reaches of many areas in the world.

But, of course, we all know that the word "flag" in this context is a polite word for American boys—your sons and mine.

Frankly, I believe that this is a rather truthful statement of one of the principal reasons for our new imperialistic foreign policy. The economic royalists, whom Franklin Roosevelt so aptly named, are back in the saddle and are setting out to exploit, not to help, the world, and the first step in this grand scheme is to be certain that we are in a position to defend our Middle East oil investments.

Barron's financial paper said March 17 that Truman's speech "in effect creates an American-trained Turko-Greek Army between Russia and the world's largest oil reserves."

The Wall Street Journal March 14 quoted a man described as "a big oil executive" who exclaimed, "Hallelujah; it's about time."

Mr. President, I am convinced that our State Department has become subservient to the War Department.

The attitude has been adopted that it is hopeless to try to get along peacefully with Russia, and therefore our foreign policy is to be predicated on the assumption that war is inevitable.

If it had not been for the great outcry from the American people I do not believe the present bill would have been amended in any way to even make a gesture toward the United Nations.

I want to impress upon the American people that, in my opinion, the amendments in no way alter the original proposal and that by dragging the United Nations into the picture by way of the back door we have only added insult to the injury already done to that organization which represents mankind's only present hope of maintaining peace in the world.

According to the Gallup poll, the American people are demanding by increasing majorities that we turn over the whole problem to the United Nations. Unless that demand becomes a crescendo that cannot be ignored, present indications are that Congress, fearful of being labeled as Red sympathizers, will overwhelmingly approve this plan to start our Nation on the road of power politics from which there can be no turning back short of atomic war.

There are many among us who have in their hearts recognized this bill for what it is, and some have had the courage publicly to lay bare the true purposes and effects of this bill. They have denounced it as an adventure into power politics and imperialism. They have pointed up its detour around the United Nations which can only result, finally, in the wrecking of that great organization for world peace.

They have not hedged. They have not said, This bill is perhaps workable, but I would prefer it to be strengthened thus and so. They have denounced it for what it is. It is my hope that those Senators will continue in the final vote to stand by their convictions. It is my hope they will not vote for the bill which they have rejected so categorically. It is my hope that having identified a potential threat to the peace, they will not aggravate that threat with the prestige of their vote.

I beg each Member of this honorable body to take inventory of the effects of the grave decision which we are about to make. Let him listen to the voice of the people of the United States as expressed in their letters to him. The people are weary and sick of war. The people are crying for peace.

The world started on the long one-way street to World War II when Japan was allowed to take unilateral action in its invasion of Manchuria in 1931. Is each and everyone of us willing to examine this proposal and deny that it will place us on a similar one-way street to World War III?

One may say that Japan's action in 1931 was an act of aggression whereas our action today is not. Japan did not so regard what we now call the invasion of Manchuria. It called it merely, an "incident." The unholy imperialist invasion of China was, to the Japanese war lords, merely the "China Incident." It thus succeeded in justifying its action to itself and its people. Some of us may similarly succeed in justifying to ourselves the sending of arms and troops to Greece, but we have not succeeded in justifying it to the American people. We cannot pass this off as a mere Greek incident. Japan's action wrecked the League of Nations. It was immediately apparent only to the few who were willing to see, but now we all acknowledge its far-reaching effects. Our action will just as surely wreck the United Nations, which Franklin Roosevelt termed the one great asset won by the blood and treasure of World War II.

The United Nations is not a thing apart. It is not a debating society. It is not a musty library, or an international archive for the repository of state papers. It does not exist for the sole purpose of being informed of accomplished facts. Neither is it something which will grow in a vacuum independent of the actions of its members. The United Nations is its members. Insofar as it limits the actions of those members, it involves the surrender of some of their freedom of unilateral action, or sovereignty. If its members refuse to be bound by it at this early stage of its development they do not leave the United Nations untouched. The very fact that the United States is a member of the United Nations means that it is a part of the United Nations, and—more than that—one of the principal components.

When the United States withdraws its support of UN by taking unilateral action it removes one of the principal foundation stones of that international structure. Without the United States there is no United Nations. It may become some other kind of an organization but when we take this step we will have automatically disintegrated the UN which we now know.

All of the other saddening effects of such an action on our part are corollary to that one great step backward into war. But they are no less real.

If we send guns and troops to Greece and Turkey to bolster corrupt and inhumane governments we automatically place our stamp of approval on those governments.

Are we trying to sell democracy—our democracy—to the peoples of the world? It has been said that we are, and that is certainly a laudable endeavor.

But how strangely we implement our purpose. Is the Greek monarchy which starves its poor and jails its political opponents of all complexions our kind of democracy? I think not. But what will the people of Greece think with no criteria for judgment except what they see in their own country? And what will all of the downtrodden, oppressed peoples of the world who are fighting various degrees of fascism think?

We had a sample of that in the clippings which I read a moment ago.

Surely democracy is a stronger weapon against communism than is fascism and monarchy. Surely we will create more Communists if we represent to the people of Greece and to the oppressed peoples of the world that the only alternative to fascism and Royalist oppression is communism. If that is their only choice they will have little trouble in making up their minds. Why must we present to them this impossible dilemma?

The essence of a democracy is its free elections. Without that instrument there can be no democracy. That is almost a complete definition of democracy. And yet we have accepted, with straight-faced righteousness, the results of an election which every newspaperman in Greece knew to be a sham. An election which was preceded by mass arrests of all opposition leaders. An election based on registry lists heavily padded with the dead, the absent, and the incarcerated. An election before which the Greek people were intimidated by months of military display, of strong-arm force. An election which followed campaigns by bands of brutal ruffians, known as "X"-ites, who roamed the countryside beating and killing those who were unwilling to espouse the medieval idea of royalism.

And finally, Mr. President, an election which took place on the very day when the Prime Minister of Greece, Souphoulis, said in a radio broadcast, "The conditions for a free election do not exist in Greece today."

We say in effect, that is the kind of election which makes up democracy. That is the kind of thing we offer you to show you that our system is better than communism. Again by presenting a false dilemma we misrepresent democracy far more effectively than could any Communist agent.

Indignation throughout our country reached terrific proportions when it became apparent in 1946 that threats of force and violence kept American citizens from voting in the State of Mississippi. The Senate took cognizance of that irregularity in its failure to administer the oath of office to THEODORE G. BILBO. We reaffirmed that a free election is the foundation stone of democracy and we took action to guard that sacred function.

But how different do we appear abroad if we take the step proposed in the bill offered by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee?

It is not enough that we take this action with regard to two small Mediterranean countries remote from our shores.

The proponents of this bill admit freely that if we embark on this course with respect to Greece and Turkey we will

have set an entirely new course for our ship of state.

Our foreign policy will consist of an entirely new doctrine which will find ready use in crisis after crisis. The reports in the press of the world which I have summarized show what cheer this policy brings to the remaining outposts of fascism and oppression. Our new definition of democracy encourages the Francos, the Perons, and Chiang Kai-sheks, to rely upon a new arsenal of autocracy—certainly not the arsenal of democracy which Roosevelt described.

And who, if he read Business Week, a respected organ of the business community, would think that the American action which would be authorized in this bill was aimed at relief for starving Greeks. Business Week's heading for the article announcing the new proposed policy was:

New Diplomacy, New Business. United States Drive To Stop Communism Abroad Means Heavy Financial Outlays for Bases, Relief, and Reconstruction. But in Return American Business Is Bound To Get New Markets Abroad.

The Wall Street Journal—than which there is no more astute financial voice—reported on March 14 that a big oil executive greeted the new policy with these words:

Hallelujah! It's about time.

And the Wall Street Journal went on to explain:

The United States needs to guard its growing vital oil interests in the Middle East.

I might add by way of further explanation that United States oil companies own or control about 40 percent of the Middle East Oil. And Greece and Turkey are strategic points from which to guard the communication lines to those oil fields.

But these business publications do not mention the price of this kind of new American imperialism. Neither in official circles have we seen any estimate of the amount of money which the adoption of this proposal can eventually cost.

Mr. Joseph C. Harsch writing in the Christian Science Monitor edition of March 20 gives us one estimate:

It is believed—

Mr. Harsch says—

that the total cost for a few European countries would run about $5,000,000,000 a year.

I said billions, not millions, Mr. President. Mr. Harsch then adds this comment:

Planners are of the opinion that all they dare at this moment is to ask for the first $400,000,000.

What then is the alternative?

The bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida and myself provides for full relief funds to aid Greece. It provides no relief funds for Turkey, and neither does the bill offered by the Senator from Michigan. His bill provides a lot of money for Turkey, but it is not relief money, it is money to build armies and to buy guns.

Under the terms of our bill that relief would be administered by the United Nations in the case of Greece under a commission similar to UNRRA which was killed at the behest of the United States Government. All military supplies and aid are specifically excluded. Our resolution requests a full-scale investigation of the whole Near East and Middle East problem by the General Assembly of the United Nations, supplementing the UN investigation already under way in Greece.

The resolution directs the United States representatives to UN to request an emergency meeting of the General Assembly to consider any situation in the Middle East which threatens the peace between large nations or small in the Near East and Middle East areas. I wrote this before the meeting was called, Mr. President. It has already been called I understand on the Palestine question.

It requests that the funds for relief which would be appropriated to UN should be augmented by contributions from other member nations. The United States contribution for relief would be $250,000,000. The purely relief provisions of the committee proposal amounts to only $100,000,000, I am advised. The rest of the $400,000,000 would go for military expense of one sort or another.

Our resolution would make the United States relief contribution to UN contingent on the receipt of assurances from Greece that supplies will be distributed without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

The alternative resolution likewise incorporates the section of the committee bill which provides for immediate aid through an advance of $100,000,000 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With trained UNRRA personnel still available to UN the setting up of the UN commission, thus, could be accomplished even more quickly than would be the case if the United States attempted to do the job by itself.

Thus there is a way to help Greece, promote the cause of democracy, and still not plunge the world into another nightmare of fear and violence.

That way is to rely on the democratic elements in Greece, the great mass of the people, who have thus far been unable to express themselves through normal democratic channels.

They want peace, not the intensification of civil war which American arms would bring.

They want bread, not the merciless exploitation of the black market.

They want political freedom, not the rigid dogma of communism or monarchism.

And they have leaders, men who have been thrust aside by the British but who have clung to middle-of-the-road democratic principles.

There is former Premier Souphoulis, and there is the former foreign minister, John Sofianopoulos, now in Paris, a man of admitted integrity who has never been associated with extremism.

To such leaders the guerrillas would surrender their arms, confident that they would not be shot the next day.

Such leaders could form a coalition government which, with the assistance of American technical experts, could get the country back on its feet financially and prepare it for genuine elections—this time supervised by the United Nations.

To such a government the United States could extend an RFC loan immediately, and more economic aid through the United Nations later.

The huge proposed expenditures for military items would be eliminated by a peaceful settlement of the civil war.

Industry could be developed and agriculture reorganized with American guidance, and a modern educational system could be instituted under supervision of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Such a solution would serve the long-suffering Greek people, the taxpayers of America, and the cause of world peace.

America is at the crossroads.

We can spread democracy through the world or help destroy it.

We can use our great economic strength to promote better living standards, and to eliminate the international slums that breed war; or we can place American dollars and American prestige behind outmoded, decadent feudal systems.

We can look forward, or we can fix our eyes on the past.

The choice is ours.

During the delivery of Mr. TAYLOR'S speech,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. For what purpose, may I ask?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make a short statement, with the permission of the able Senator from Idaho, to follow his remarks.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I may be permitted to retain the floor I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, during the past few weeks all of us have been extremely busy, and I did not have an opportunity, because of conflicting committee assignments, to attend personally the hearings in connection with the Greek-Turkish loan legislation.

When this proposed legislation, with its broad implications, was first proposed, I was considerably concerned. At that time I stated that the President of the United States was the initial author of our foreign policy and that it would be my purpose to vote for this legislation and to cooperate with President Truman and the State Department. Since then the proposed legislation has been improved by the so-called Vandenberg amendment which the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously adopted in the finest nonpartisan tradition.

Let me turn back a few years and call to mind one of the finest examples of nonpartisan action, in the highest, most statesmanlike tradition, when the original B_2–H_2 foreign-policy measure was introduced in the Senate by two distinguished Republicans, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and by two distinguished Senators on this side of the aisle, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. In those days, Mr. President, it was my privilege to be associated with those Senators in working on the resolution. Later I spoke at length in the Senate on the resolution and in the summer of 1943

I toured New England with Mr. HALE, a distinguished Republican Congressman, in the interest of nonpartisan foreign politics by the Congress.

Neither the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party has a foreign policy. We have an American policy, without partisanship; and I am certainly happy to be in the United States Senate, where there is such a great nonpartisan policy, because only through an American policy—not a Republican policy or a Democratic policy—can we expect to continue with the United Nations organization in the hope of preventing another war.

Turning to the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I am happy that these amendments, which so eloquently reaffirm the full American support of the United Nations, have been included.

After reading most of the testimony presented before the Foreign Relations Committee, I have been reinforced in my purpose to support this legislation as recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee without any further amendments. I do this with full appreciation of the obligations which I am certain will be incurred, and I do this unreservedly in the interest of the democracies that remain outside the Russian sphere of influence.

It had not been my intention to make any statement on the loan, but to let my vote speak for itself as, of course, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but for the record I make this statement today in the interest of fair play and, further, because of the unwarranted attacks upon the administration and the attacks upon the Congress of the United States by Henry Wallace, former Cabinet Member and Vice President. In my opinion, Mr. Wallace has acted in bad faith and has rendered a great disservice to his country. His remarks are without foundation of fact, utterly uncalled for and unnecessary.

It is one thing for an American to criticize his own Government in his own country, but to me it is unbelievable that one would criticize his country on foreign soil.

I regret that Mr. Wallace was given a passport and permitted to travel in Europe for the purpose of breaking down the ideas of a majority of Congress. It is also a source of sadness to me that he should have been permitted to travel abroad and use his efforts to cause mistrust and confusion against the aims and purposes of our country as well as our Congress. It is our desire only to continue to be of assistance to the free peoples of the world and I do trust that there will be no further amendments adopted and that the bill will pass the Senate at an early date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Colorado which have been ordered to be considered en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the desire of the present occupant of the chair that an attempt be made to secure a vote on the pending amendments before a recess is taken today?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senator, the present occupant of the Chair would suggest that it would be desirable to fix an early hour tomorrow for a vote on the pending amendments, if the Senator from Nebraska is willing.

Mr. WHERRY. There are very few Senators now in the Chamber. I suppose it would be necessary to have a quorum call before making a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum call is not required before asking unanimous consent to fix an hour for voting on an amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the pending amendments at not later than 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as there seems to be no Senator who wishes to proceed now to discuss the pending business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Nebraska when the Senate may expect to vote on the nomination of Mr. Clapp?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that it was the intention to have the Senate proceed with the nomination of Mr. Clapp at the conclusion of the so-called Greek-Turkish loan bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, any Senator has a right to move the consideration of other matters; but it was not desired to interfere with continuation of consideration of the pending business until its conclusion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

THE ARMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall Sylvester Carter to be brigadier general for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Alsup to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations made this afternoon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that we cannot obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate vote on the pending amendments by 1 o'clock tomorrow. The debate on the pending measure has been proceeding for days. I appreciate and understand the importance of the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate. However, it seems to me we should expedite the handling of this measure and should obtain a vote upon it as early as possible. There is not one Senator who does not know how he will vote on this question; every Senator has made up his mind; yet we proceed here, day after day, and delay the vote upon this question, which is one of the most important that has ever come before the Senate of the United States. I am not one who opposes any legitimate debate at any time, but I hope that the majority—and I know it is their intention to do so—will keep the Senate in session, if necessary, day and night in order that we may secure action on this bill at the earliest possible time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I agree with the Senator from Illinois that we should expedite as much as possible the handling of this matter. But there are at present 95 Senators, and everyone took the oath of office to do his duty. I am not one of those who think that things should be decided as soon as a few so-called leaders have made up their minds about them. In the present case I have made up my mind and I am ready to vote now, but I insist that if any Senator, no matter how he stands with the leadership on either side, believes he has to state his views on the pending question either way, nothing should be done to prevent him from having a chance to do so.

As I have said, I, too, wish to expedite the handling of the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that the notice which was given at the beginning of today's session relative to night sessions will at least be pondered by all Members of the Senate. I announced that there would be a session on Wednesday night of this week and probably Thursday night if the question now before the Senate had not been finally acted upon by that time.

I ask now for the full cooperation of all Members of the Senate in regard to the night sessions. It will be our intention not to have recesses taken for dinner, but to have the session proceed right through until the Senate either takes a recess or adjourns at a later hour, possibly 9 or 10 o'clock.

I wish to say to the Senator now presiding, the President pro tempore, that there is no one who is more in agreement with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois than I am, and I am sure he has expressed the sentiment of all those now present—namely, that we should continue with consideration of the pending business until final action is taken upon it.

I assure you, Mr. President, that the majority—I know I speak the sentiments of our distinguished majority leader, who is absent today—will cooperate as much as possible with the requests of Senators to have the Senate continue in session; and I, for one, would like the Senate to remain in session until this matter is disposed of.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further discussion?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make a further observation with regard to this matter, in the way of a statement regarding what the able President pro tempore of the Senate is doing insofar as enforcing the rules of the Senate is concerned.

I think that is one of the ways to expedite action on the pending amendments and to reach an early vote—in short, by doing exactly what the President pro tempore has been doing in the late afternoon today; namely, strictly enforcing the rules of the Senate insofar as debate is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will indulge the Chair, to permit the Chair to make a brief observation, let the Chair say that from the very beginning of this very unusual and critical proposal there has been an element of time pressure upon us which cannot be ignored. In spite of that pressure, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has gone to extreme lengths to provide the greatest possible illumination of the subject, as the RECORD clearly shows. When presiding over the Senate this afternoon, he has been quite willing to accommodate the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] who, in turn, has been quite willing to accommodate his colleagues in a certain ultraparliamentary generosity which does not comport, frankly, with the critical situation which we confront.

So it was that late in the afternoon—and, the Chair is sure, with the entire acquiescence of the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I told the Presiding Officer it was immaterial to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was willing to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is quite correct. It was under those circumstances that the Chair insisted on strict enforcement of the rule.

Commencing tomorrow, when obviously we must move into a deliberately serious effort to conclude the consideration of this proposed legislation, the Chair will have to ask for strict adherence to the rules.

If the Chair may be permitted one further observation: The Chair totally agrees with what has been said by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Even those who oppose this proposed legislation certainly would not wish, if it is to be passed, that it should not be passed under the most favorable possible circumstances and auspices. It is perfectly obvious that if it is to be passed, it should be passed as promptly as possible, after the lapse of a month since the President's message on the subject was received. There will come a time very promptly now when the situation abroad will deteriorate in a fashion which will substantially magnify our problem. Therefore, regardless of what one's attitude may be toward the proposed legislation itself, I hope we may have mutual cooperation in finding out what the Senate wishes to do, and shall do so as swiftly as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I totally agree with the statement just made by the President pro tempore, the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The only reason why I mentioned the fact that the Chair was enforcing the rules of the Senate strictly was primarily because of the magnitude and the importance of the measure now pending before the Senate. I think it is the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate that I have ever suggested that the rules be enforced strictly according to parliamentary law and the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel, seriously and conscientiously, the necessity of the Senate proceeding with dispatch and expedition, and moving to a vote as soon as possible because of what seems to me to be a very serious and critical situation with respect to the matter we are considering.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate should proceed with some night sessions. I only hope he will make it perfectly clear that we may have night sessions in any event, so that we can arrange our work accordingly, because even if we should dispose of the pending amendment we will still have the bill to consider, and I seriously doubt that we can get through with the amendments and complete action on the bill prior to Thursday night. I think we should agree now that we will proceed Wednesday and Thursday nights as a certainty, not merely as a probability.

Mr. President, secondly I desire to express my entire agreement with the statements made by the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan. In fact, I think my views are in the RECORD. Within an hour of the President's speech a month ago, on a Wednesday afternoon, I indicated that I thought the Senate should proceed to consider the subject matter. I know of no business the Senate has transacted in the last month that is, relatively speaking, of any great importance compared with the particular issue we are now debating. I think we have been very remiss, I may say, in not proceeding after the President's address to make this the No. 1 item of business of the Senate. Had we done so, I think we would have had it disposed of by now, and it should have been disposed of. But the point the Chair makes, which I think is of great importance, is that if we continue to delay, the international situation will deteriorate in a manner which will not be in the interest of this country.

I believe the American people are becoming very much confused by the delay, and it is confusion among our people that results in disunity. Regardless of differences of opinion that may exist in the Senate, I think the Senator from Michigan is absolutely correct when he points out that if the bill is to be passed—and I think we can take judicial notice of the fact that it is going to be passed—it should be passed under the most favorable circumstances, and further delay will not result in favorable circumstances, so far as world opinion is concerned. I think that not only is opinion in this country becoming greatly confused, but I think we can assume that today opinion elsewhere in the world must be somewhat confused because of what I consider to be very unfortunate representations which are being made abroad by very sincere-minded persons as to the meaning of the course of action America is pursuing.

In my opinion, the sooner we end the confusion, the better for a strong and secure America; and the best way to end the confusion is for the Senate, before Thursday night comes and goes, finally to pass the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the acting majority leader, if he

is in a position to do so definitely this afternoon, will give assurance that the Senate will have sessions on Wednesday and Thursday nights.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to restate the announcement made at noon today, that there definitely will be a session of the Senate Wednesday night, and that Senators should hold themselves in readiness for a session Thursday night, because if the pending bill is not terminated by that time I at least will ask the Senate to remain in session that night. I should like to see a final determination on the question of a night session on Thursday left to the majority leader, but I have talked with the Senator from Maine, and I am quite satisfied that if the consideration of the bill shall not be concluded in the Thursday afternoon session, we will be called upon to have a session Thursday night, and Senators should make their arrangements accordingly, and be ready to attend a session that night if necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the pending bill, but I wish to say that if—as I fear it will—it should get us into war, atomic war, one of these days, my services will be available wherever I am, if I do not happen to be a Member of the Senate. Wherever I am, my services will be at the disposal of my country. I have three sons, one 11 years old, one 5 years old, and one 9 months old. They will be ready to fight some of these days. I will curse the day they have to, but I will send them if their country needs them. There will be no doubt of the unanimity of our country after the policy is adopted, but I am opposed to the policy, and I am going to vote against the bill.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate tomorrow, Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence from the Senate from this afternoon until Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection. leave is granted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence until Friday or Saturday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be the alternate representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the date stated:

Richard J. Sullivan, from the 16th day of November 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James M. Alsup to be a collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be a medical director

Carl E. Rice

To be a temporary senior dental surgeon

Norman F. Gerrie

To be a temporary senior surgeon

John B. Alsever

To be a temporary senior nurse officer

Minnie E. Pohe

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be a senior sanitary engineer (lieutenant colonel), effective date of oath of office

Leonard H. Male

To be a senior scientist (lieutenant colonel), effective date of oath of office

Justin M. Andrews

To be scientists (major), effective date of oath of office

Sidney H. Newman
Samuel W. Simmons

To be surgeons (major), effective date of oath of office

Alexander A. Doerner
Russell E. Teague
Abraham Wikler

To be a dental surgeon (major), effective date of oath of office

Norman F. Gerrie

To be a nurse officer (major), effective date of oath of office

Hazel A. Shortal

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be a brigadier general

Marshall Sylvester Carter

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

POSTMASTERS

Miss Ellowene Zinke to be postmaster at Hamlin in the State of Iowa.

John R. Johnson to be postmaster at Fairview in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Eternal Spirit, Thou hast laid the foundations of heaven and reared their walls in power and glory. Forever shall our praise ascend and forever let the tides of blessing come down. O Thou who art the inspiration of all that is good and the glory of all that is beautiful, send forth Thy light, reminding us of our place and our calling. Do Thou open the windows of our minds that we may receive the spirit and the love of truth, thus turning hesitation into fortitude. Undergird and uphold our firm belief in the ultimate triumph of the good, for nothing else in equal measure has ever taught us so much how to live. In every situation, inspire us to think truly, to speak and live truly; then shall our daily lives be open books of great and noble creeds. In the holy name of Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 14, 1947:

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

On April 15, 1947:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; and

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a

speech I made last evening before the Ohio Society of New York City, in which I discussed the challenge that the spread of communism presents to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate on the bill H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

[Mr. TWYMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 181 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill (H. R. 3020) relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial from a New Jersey newspaper and in the other to include a resolution passed by the New Jersey State Legislature.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by Roger Brucker, winner of the American Legion contest.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], that the committee may be permitted to sit during general debate on the pending measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Henry Wallace is out sowing the seeds of hate in the world, I believe he should be recalled and made to account for his actions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a radio address made by him last Thursday in Boston over radio station WMEX.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial comments.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the State of South Carolina requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a review on the disposition of OPA cases, the general sanction policies, and various exceptions granted.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Army Day address made by him.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial material.

THE GRECO-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a man who has had considerable experience in refrigeration and heating engineering. He told me he has been talking to men in the steel industry, and they were very much concerned about the President's program for Turkey, Greece, and other countries, because they said that what those countries needed most are railroad rails, engines, cars, and other things manufactured from steel. They were afraid if the program were carried out the steel industry would be back in the same condition it was during the war, with limited allocations to the industries in this country; that is, the railroads, the automobile industry, the refrigeration industry, and the like, so that we would have shortages and perhaps another OPA or something like it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities; and also an article from the April issue of Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we go to war with anyone it might be well to set our own house in order. Today and tomorrow there will be general debate on the labor bill. If there is anyone in this House who has any doubt as to the need for legislation, freeing American businessmen and American workers, including union men, from dictators and racketeers, it is suggested that you read not only the Labor Committee's report and as much of the hearings as you can, but that you go over in the northwest

corner of this room and get a copy of the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which has been investigating racketeering. If a reading of the report does not satisfy you, then read the record of the hearings and you will get the story. If you will do that you will have no doubt about the absolute necessity for labor legislation now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Rev. Geoffrey C. Stone.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the text of the recent address by President Truman relating to our beloved leader and late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 178 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this is a subject of such importance that I believe we should have a quorum present. I therefore make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Battle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Bender	Hart	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Havenner	Rayburn
Bland	Hull	Rayfiel
Boykin	Jennings	Sanborn
Brophy	Johnson, Tex.	Sasscer
Buckley	Jones, N. C.	Scoblick
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Clark	Kefauver	Short
Clippinger	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Combs	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Lynch	Stanley
Coudert	McGarvey	Stockman
Cravens	McMahon	Talle
Crawford	Mansfield, Tex.	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Md.	Tollefson
Domengeaux	Merrow	Vail
Fallon	Mitchell	Vorys
Fuller	Morrison	West
Gallagher	Norrell	Wood
Gerlach	Norton	Woodruff
Gifford	Patman	Worley
Goodwin	Poage	
Grant, Ala.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 357 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks in the Committee of the Whole a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to the bill H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by Mr. Adolph Berle on displaced persons.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I also yield myself such of my 30 minutes as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of H. R. 3020, a bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

This, undoubtedly, is one of the most far-reaching and one of the most important bills that any Member of this Congress will be asked to vote on. The bill was written as a bill of rights for the laboring man; to protect him from exploitation by employers and from encroachments on his individual rights by radical labor union leaders. Realizing that conclusions reached after fair and open discussion will produce a superior bill, the Committee on Rules has provided 6 hours of general debate on H. R. 3020. In these 6 hours, the general provisions of this bill can be explained adequately and debated extensively. Each Member of the House will have an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill; and each will be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes on each amendment offered. This rule is the most liberal that can be granted; and it needs no defense. Points of order have not been waived; amendments are in order; and one motion to recommit the bill has been provided. I do not see how any minority Member of the House—even the most adamant—can raise any objection to this rule; nor can minority Members say that they have not been given fair treatment or ample opportunity for presentation of their views on this bill.

I would like to point out that this bill redeems the third major pledge which the Republican Party made to the Nation last November. We promised, first, to reduce governmental spending. The Republicans in the House redeemed this promise when they passed House Concurrent Resolution 20, which cut the administration's budget estimate by $6,000,000,000. We also promised to relieve the taxpayers of some of the heavy burden they have borne for a number of years. The Republicans in the House made good on this promise when they passed H. R. 1, the bill reducing individual income taxes. We also promised that we would write a law establishing a fair and equitable relationship between management and labor. H. R. 3020 redeems that promise.

Since the Republican Party assumed control last January, the left-wing propagandists have resorted to sniping tactics in an effort to belittle Congress. They paint lurid pictures of confusion and intra-party strife which, they claim, stymie all important legislation. In the next breath these propagandists charge that a few powerful men dominate the Republican Congress, and that these few steamroller bills through the House and the Senate. From these conflicting statements coming from the administration's propaganda machine in the Government departments and from other sources close to the Democratic National Committee, it would appear that it is the propagandists who are confused. Between now and the next national election you can look for an endless succession of inspired pronouncements from the White House designed to make the Republican effort seem small and trivial.

During the national election of 1932, the Democrats made a number of prom-

ises to the voters, and on the basis of these promises they assumed control of the Federal Government. I would like to read for you the first two paragraphs of the 1932 platform of the Democratic Party. These are the exact words:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditure by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

That is what the Democrats promised when they assumed control of the Government in 1933. Now let us see how they kept those promises. First, they promised an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures. At the time the Democrats made this promise, the annual cost of the Federal Government was $3,363,000,000. In the first full fiscal year under the Democratic administration, Federal expenditures nearly doubled, and appropriations increased steadily in each succeeding year. In the fiscal year 1934, for example, Federal expenditures amounted to more than $6,000,000,000; in 1935, seven billions; in 1936 the New Dealers spent more than $8,500,000,000. Well, that takes care of the first campaign promise of the Democrats.

In a solemn covenant with the people the New Deal promised to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government. To redeem this promise, the Democrats increased the cost of government by more than 250 percent in the first 4 years of their administration. As for abolishing useless commissions and offices, and consolidating departments and bureaus—which the Democrats also promised—I would merely like to point out that the number of Federal agencies doubled under the New Deal.

I do not know where all of this propaganda is coming from, charging that the Republican Congress is doing nothing—but I think that the 45,000 propagandists on the Federal pay roll have a great deal to do with it. Through all of the devious devices at its disposal, the administration is trying to make the efforts of this Congress seem trivial. Almost every report or press release issued by a Government department "snipes" directly or indirectly at this Congress. The administration has utilized every possible method to obstruct the Republican Congress in carrying out its promises to our citizens. Pressure groups from Federal bureaus have converged on Congress to prevent reductions in appropriations; the entire administration has united to prevent a reduction in Government personnel; the New Deal obstructionists in Congress have opposed every measure, but despite all of these obstacles the Republican Congress has redeemed the promises made last November.

Now, let us look at the work record of this Republican Congress, which the left-wing propagandists charge "has done nothing." As of April 1, 3,265 measures had been introduced 16 bills had been enacted into law; 99 House bills had been reported from committees, and 59 of these had been passed; but, most important, we Republicans in the House have done our level best to fulfill the promises we made to the people of the United States.

This bill does not seek to curb any of the legitimate rights or privileges of labor or labor unions. Its sole purpose is to eliminate the injustices arising out of conflicting provisions in the two basic Federal statutes regulating labor relations, the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It is not my intention to attempt to fix responsibility for the present hodgepodge laws defining labor's rights and management's responsibility, but to point out why we have not a basic, unified statute insuring industrial peace.

Neither Congress nor the Executive has the power to regulate labor relations. Such power is not specifically granted by our Constitution, and therefore it remains within the jurisdiction of the individual States. Consequently, in order to regulate labor relations, Congress has used its powers to regulate interstate commerce, and its powers to define and control the jurisdiction of the courts. The Wagner Act and the Railway Labor Act, for example, are both based on the authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce; and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is the result of the power of Congress to define the jurisdiction and procedure of the courts. As a result of this limitation on the powers of Congress, and the necessity of using other powers that have been specifically delegated by the Constitution, national labor policy has been expressed indirectly and in a somewhat fragmentary manner.

These unrelated laws, enacted at different times, and to attain various objectives, have always been shaped by what appears to be the most needed reforms of the moment, and they are seldom suitable to accomplish long-range objectives. Such laws must be revised from time to time to meet the needs of changed conditions, and to solve contemporary labor problems. When the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932, followed by the Wagner Act in 1935, labor was the underdog, and such legislation was needed to equalize labor's bargaining position. Until then, management was able to control the conditions of labor, and these laws were drawn entirely for labor's benefit. Neither law put any restrictions whatsoever on labor unions. Under the interpretation of these acts, unions can do no wrong. But public opinion at the time favored these laws to counterbalance the tremendous advantage of management over labor. Had Congress the power to regulate labor relations, per se, a bill that was just to both management and labor might have been passed instead of the fragmentary acts of 1932 and 1935, and such a law might still have stood—and continue to stand—as a guide to the fair settlement of labor disputes. But as Congress can attack the problem only in an indirect manner, we can settle only the pressing problems of the moment.

In justice to ourselves, to the national economy, and to the public welfare, and in the interest of both labor and management, Congress must work out a national labor policy providing justice to all. Because of the constitutional limitations on our power in this respect, such a policy can only result from careful experimentation. Congress can only throw its weight on the side of labor or on the side of management, as inequalities on either side of the industrial scale manifest themselves. In this way we can strive for eventual balance.

Inconsistencies in the provisions and interpretations of our present laws sometimes cause gross injustice to innocent persons, and some labor disputes simply cannot be settled at all under present laws. It probably seems inconceivable to most of you that any situation could arise to which there is no solution, but it is possible, and I will give you a specific example to prove it.

Let us take a manufacturing enterprise employing, say, a thousand people. We will suppose that 900 of these employees are members of the CIO and that 100 of them are members of the A. F. of L. Because the plant is predominantly CIO, the National Labor Relations Board would certify the CIO as bargaining agent for all employees. Under the Wagner Act, as interpreted, the employer cannot bargain with anyone but the certified bargaining representative. But suppose the 100 A. F. of L. members should insist that the employer make a separate contract with them. The employer cannot accede to their wishes, as this would be a violation of the Wagner Act. So the members of the A. F. of L. go on strike and put a picket line around the plant. All union members will honor the picket line. Not even the 900 employees who are members of the CIO will cross the picket line to go to work—even though the employer has a contract with them, and even though the strike is the result of the employer's desire to abide by the contract. The employer is now faced with this situation. He cannot manufacture anything; he cannot close his plant, because this would be a lock-out, which is forbidden by the Wagner Act; he cannot bargain with the striking union, as this would be unlawful under the Wagner Act; and he cannot get an injunction to stop the strike, because injunctions are forbidden by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. So you can see there is just no answer to this man's problem.

I am certain that those who drafted our present labor laws never envisioned a situation such as I have just cited, or they would have made provision for it. But the inequalities and injustices that

have made themselves apparent cannot be completely ignored. Adjustment must be made in the basic laws. If these adjustments do not completely solve all the problems that come within their purview, then the laws must be adjusted again and again, until they become the standard of justice that laws should be.

In drafting laws, we sometimes make the mistake of thinking that fair-minded men will use them in good faith to resolve their differences with justice to both sides. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Unscrupulous men on both sides of the dispute will disregard the intent of Congress and seek to enforce their will through the technicalities of the law. As this is the case, Congress must define and spell out the details of such laws so that they cannot be misunderstood or misinterpreted. But Congress must never assume that all unscrupulous men are on one side or the other of any disagreement. Unfortunately, that is the assumption of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. But we—here, now—do not want to make the same error. We do not want to penalize labor for any gains they made under existing laws. It should be our goal to keep all of the good provisions of existing law which benefit labor and labor unions, and at the same time to provide methods and procedures for resolving disputes which cannot be resolved under present law. This is the kind of a law fair-minded union leaders want, that management wants, and that the public wants—and this is the kind of labor law Congress should give them.

THIS RULE MAKES IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF THE MOST VICIOUS, RESTRICTIVE, AND DESTRUCTIVE ANTILABOR BILL EVER BROUGHT BEFORE TH HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this rule is open; but under the bill the rights of labor are closed.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that regardless of what I may say or advise, you are fully set to pass the most vicious, restrictive, and destructive antilabor bill every brought before this House, and to adopt this rule which will make its consideration in order.

Consequently, I shall not use my full time, and request that I be reminded when I have consumed 15 minutes. I also ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain editorials and articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

"I FEAR THE GREEKS WHEN THEY BEAR GIFTS"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago someone circulated a mimeographed sheet which purports to set forth the 18 points of this so-called "bill of rights" for labor. I do not know whether this circular was prepared by some member of the committee or by the Association of Manufacturers; but I am inevitably reminded of Virgil's admonition, "I fear the Greeks even when they bear gifts." Certainly, the "gifts" of this bill to labor should be feared.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has stated to you that this bill was brought in after due and careful consideration and in accordance with promises made to the American people before the last election. I concede that you made enough promises; but were they all made to the American people? You promised many things to the American people which you have not fulfilled. You promised that if the Price Control Act were repealed American housewives—for restaurants, clubs, and hotels seemed to have no scarcity of meat—would be able to buy all the meat they wanted at reasonable cost, and that the black market in commodities would be wiped out. Well, price control was ended; the packers called off their strike against the public; and cattle, hogs, and sheep did begin a wild stampede to market; but at what prices. You wiped out the black market by making black-market prices legal.

BUSINESS NEVER FREER THAN DURING LAST 14 YEARS

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asserted that this bill will free American businessmen from what he called labor racketeers.

Mr. Speaker, business has never been freer than during the past 14 years of Democratic administration.

Business has been freed of bankruptcy; of ruthless competition from monopolies; of the vicious cycles of boom and bust which we fear are now returning to us; of exorbitant interest charges and collusive securities rigging. Business has never been so free to accumulate huge surpluses, and to make high profits, with a virtually guaranteed mass market.

LABOR NOT THE RACKETEER

Yes, Mr. Speaker; I will admit there has been some racketeering, but not by organized labor. Look at the wartime profits rolled up by respectable and powerful business firms; look at the concessions lobbied through Congress in the way of tax forgiveness, rebates, carry-back credits, repeal of excess-profits excises, and most recently generous reductions in tax rates.

I concede that during the war there were some restrictions on business and industry. There were controls on what could be made and how it could be sold. Would you have had it otherwise? Are profits more important than the safety of our beloved country? God alone knows how this Nation would have fared had those controls been removed in the first year after the war. We can get some hint by seeing how commodity prices have shot up 70 percent since last June and how business profits have climbed up and up and up, until the staid, respectable, and reliable City Bank of New York can report in its monthly letter that the average profits of 237 concerns were, in 1946, 36 percent above the profits of 1945 after all taxes were paid.

Where have working people increased their take-home pay 36 percent in only 12 months?

SOME INDUSTRIES ALMOST DOUBLED NET

You need only to read the daily newspapers, or the publications of big financial reporting houses, or the business magazines, or official and impartial Government reports to learn how corporate earnings have climbed up and up and up, as rapidly and as high as prices of the things we have to buy to eat, while wages and salaries have stood still, or even slipped back.

I present here a brief table, abstracted from published reports, showing how the net profits, after taxes, depreciation, interest, and reserves, have almost doubled in nine selected industrial groups. While I have selected deliberately some of those with highest return, I have not by any means exhausted the list of increases in net earnings exceeding 50 percent over 1945, and have not touched those which increased from 10 to 50 percent.

Net income of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946

Industrial groups	Net income after taxes		Percent of increase
	1945	1946	
Furniture and wood products	$6,316,000	$11,915,000	88.6
Household equipment	16,927,000	32,618,000	92.7
Printing and publishing	17,647,000	31,478,000	80.2
Paint and varnish	20,675,000	36,682,000	77.4
Office equipment	31,052,000	58,173,000	76.0
Dairy products	38,989,000	65,454,000	67.9

A. T. & T. RESERVES EQUAL THIRD OF PLANT VALUE

I know that before this debate is over we shall hear much of the only important strike now in progress—that of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, an unaffiliated national union—against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and many of its operating subsidiaries.

That is the only strike there is to talk about of any size.

We have read the company side of the disputes in expensive paid advertisements, which doubtless will be deducted from taxable income.

Who has heard the side of the workers—for the most part girls and women trying to maintain their families single-handed, or to help share the burden of existence in a struggle for existence where the dollar has lost over half its buying power in 12 months?

Here are a few facts: Year after year, through depression and through boom, A. T. & T. has paid 9 percent dividends; yet the United States Government can sell its bonds at 2½ percent without difficulty. A. T. & T. has cash reserves for depreciation of $2,200,000,000—$2,200,000,000—which amounts to exactly one-third of its physical plant value of $6,600,000,000.

Despite this obvious prosperity, the average weekly income for all Bell System employees, which includes many high-salaried experts, is less than the national average for all manufacturing, and the average weekly wage of the women operators is $13 less than the average of all industry.

PAY CHECKS THIRD BELOW AVERAGE

The average pay check for the "hello girls" in January of this year, as shown by official figures, was $33 a week—considerably under the minimum income required to maintain a family of three at minimum comfort.

The average pay check for all telephone employees was $43.19 a week.

At the same time, the national average for all manufacturing was $46.94; the average in the bankrupt Western Union Telegraph Co. was $46.83; the average in the light-and-power industry was $54; and in the rubber-goods industry, which is perhaps the closest to the telephone industry in its proportion of low-paid woman operators and highly paid technicians, the average weekly pay was $54.26.

Western Electric, a 99-percent-owned subsidiary with a monopolistic control of manufacturing and supplying the Bell System, has the astounding depreciation reserve of $121,000,000—over 60 percent of the invested plant value of $194,000,000.

While underpaid telephone operators walk the streets in picket lines, a Bell System subsidiary out in Cincinnati, practically a family affair of a Republican leader, is cutting a juicy stock melon dripping with a virtual 100-percent profit—but limited to one share of new stock for each six outstanding shares held. That keeps the profit out of the hands of employee owners. This particular company, Cincinnati & Suburban, has not one dollar of bonded indebtedness.

I hear no censure of the Bell Telephone System, no threats, no denunciations.

LABOR DOES NOT LIKE STRIKES

We have heard much in this House in recent years about strikes, as if workers were horses and mules with no right of protest save to die.

Labor does not like strikes. They bankrupt the unions, bankrupt the workers. They fall with devastating burden on the women and children—on the families. But it is the duty of a man to earn a living for his family. When he cannot maintain his family in decent American style, and when he has exhausted every resource of negotiation with an employer with millions to his pennies, the strike is his weapon of last resort. Violence is unfortunate; I deplore it; but it is inevitable when he sees strikebreakers going in to his job. The Bible tells us, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." When a man works all day and cannot pay rent, buy food and clothes, and protect his children, and the company he works for makes high profits, he has only the right to abstain from work to gain that hire of which he is worthy.

He must organize to make his protest effective.

And make no mistake about this: Labor organizations have helped business, have stabilized working conditions, reduced turn-over, increased production, reduced expenses, and created better workmen.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] stated that the New Deal promised to reduce expenditures as far back as 1932. The gentleman in the well of the House now addressing us was here in 1932. I ask him, what did it cost to feed the 14,000,000 idle people that the Republicans left us with in 1933?

Mr. SABATH. I did not wish to go into that matter, but to the query of the gentleman I will say that by 1932, when the Democrats were swept into power by a people outraged by such perverted ignoring of the national problems as is represented by this bill, we had more nearly 18,000,000 than 14,000,000 people unemployed, farmers without markets, food spoiling for lack of buyers, milk strikes everywhere, foreclosures, empty office buildings, closed factories, vacant dwellings, and a national income which had shrunk to about one-fifth of that which we anticipate in 1947. The crash began, it is true, in 1929; but it came because we had been living for 10 years in a fool's paradise of unreality. The Republicans believed then, as now, that all we had to do to maintain prosperity was to keep labor in its place and business free of all control and responsibility except that of making profits and then more profits, amassing property, creating the tools of production without any concept of their responsibilities to society or their country.

That bubble burst.

Then the Democrats under President Roosevelt had to rebuild the economy.

The people had to be fed, clothed, housed, returned to useful work. Banks, railroads, insurance companies, factories, merchants, farmers, processors had to be bailed out of the Republican quagmire of irresponsibility, corruption, and extravagant wastage of our natural resources.

That all took money, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] suggests.

No one—not even the Republican Party whips—can deny that under Roosevelt the Democrats brought about present-day conditions; that without any loss of liberty, without any loss of political freedom or economic freedom—nay, Mr. Speaker, with positive gains of freedom, of equality, of justice, of a more abundant life—we have reached the highest employment, the highest national income, the highest national production, in all history. The only flaw is that under a Republican assault on the administration program controls were removed too soon, and prices and wages are completely out of balance.

I do not believe that anything this Republican majority can do will spoil that prosperity in the next 16 months; but I do not believe that the way to remedy the disparity between prices and incomes is to prohibit workers from making effective demands. The way to guard against subversion is by making our democracy work; and we help make it work by making workers as secure and as prosperous as the employers are.

NAME CALLING WILL NOT HIDE VICIOUSNESS OF BILL

My colleague has repeatedly coupled "left wing" and "New Deal" in his speech in the effort to smear all progressives who have the best interests of labor, agriculture, free and honest business, and of the American people at heart.

This is an old and time-worn trick. It may work for a while, but no amount of name calling can hide the vicious nature of this bill, which has one purpose only—to destroy the rights of organized labor, and with it the rights of all labor.

Nor is there anything new in this technique.

AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT 150 YEARS OLD

The American labor movement is just 150 years old.

The first labor union came into being not long after the adoption of the Constitution; and the Federal Society of Journeymen Cordwainers won their first strike.

Big business—small by our modern-day standards but respectable enough in the bustling days of the new Republic—immediately sought means to break the unions. They found it when they found a court which did not raise an eyebrow over the association of the manufacturers, but indicted the unionists for criminal conspiracy, found them guilty, and fined them; and then the strikers were blacklisted.

After years of struggle criminal conspiracy charges were outlawed; but ingenious industrialists found many another trick to keep labor from organizing, or, if they did dare to organize, to jail them, fine them, blacklist them, or even have them beaten up, shot, evicted.

STRUGGLE FOR UNIONIZATION CONTINUES

Notwithstanding threats, abuse, misrepresentation, fear, privation, law by injunction, even sudden death, the struggle for unionization continued. Panics and depressions destroyed unions when guns and blackjacks could not. Introduction of pitifully underpaid and overworked child and female labor threw back union organization many years.

Liberal leaders, both from the ranks of labor and from among the intellectuals and the politicians, were discredited and driven from their own communities and from public life for no other reason than that they earnestly sought to bring living wages and decent living conditions to their fellow workers. Your party, Mr. Speaker, has led in that kind of reprisal for many years.

KNIGHTS OF LABOR EMERGE FROM STRUGGLE

Even when local unions were formed, or national craft organizations brought into being, industrialists managed to keep them divided so that there could be no national solidarity among labor organizations, although Nation-wide federations were proposed often enough.

Finally, in 1869, the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor was organized by Uriah S. Stephens, and became Nation-wide in scope and influence. Under the leadership of Terence V. Powderly, the Knights of Labor was a power which profoundly influenced the politics and the economics of the Nation from 1879 to 1893. Although originally a secret order, the Knights of Labor at its height comprised 702,000 members and was organized along lines comparable to contemporary industrial unions—the horizontal pattern of unionization, although craft unions were included among its constituents, just as the CIO today includes some crafts among its member unions.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR FORMED

However, the power of the crafts in the Knights of Labor became ascendant over the broader concepts held by Powderly, and out of the conflict of aims and directions the American Federation of Labor emerged with a new direction for organized workers.

By 1893 the Knights of Labor had virtually departed from the scene, and the alliance between farm, labor, and some white-collar groups held together by Powderly's dream of a full life fell apart.

Led by the sagacious Samuel Gompers, the American Federation of Labor became a sound and solid national organization in the vertical pattern of craft unionization, modeled closely on the British Trades-Union Congress. The AFL was actually organized in 1886, after 5 years of preparatory work, and rose rapidly to power and influence and solidity.

PROGRESS SLOW AND PAINFUL

The road to progress has been slow and painful.

I myself, in the span of my own lifetime, can remember when all unionists were reviled as anarchists and Socialists, or both, just as now it is in style to call every unionist, every progressive, every liberal, a Communist or fellow traveler.

Nevertheless, progress has been real.

Many present-day institutions which even Republicans accept as a fundamental part of the American scene are the product—and in many instances the recent product—of labor organizations' activities. To name only a few: Free public education, universal manhood suffrage, the homestead laws, the 8-hour day, the income tax, workmen's compensation, safety installations on railroads, industrial safety appliances, social security, postal savings, and many other noble concepts which we now take as a matter of course originated with discussions in labor organizations.

With these reforms labor won real and solid benefits of its own. From the days of Woodrow Wilson on, progress has been rapid. The Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawing labor injunctions, the statutory guaranty of the right to organize and bargain collectively, retirement systems, wage-and-hour laws, the right to picket, the right of laboring men and their families to be secure in their own homes against assault and violence, have followed and accompanied social benefits.

THIS BILL WOULD SUCK OUT THE SUBSTANCE OF RIGHTS

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would suck out the substance of those hard-won rights, and leave but the bare bones, stripped of their meat and sinew.

This bill is hypocritical in the extreme.

If you were honest, you would gather together in this omnibus bill all the other rights and benefits for which good American blood has been shed—for which good American bodies have suffered jail and beatings and death—and strip away free schools, the vote, the 8-hour day, the 10-hour day, too, for that matter, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Wages and Hours Act—for what was left after the Gwynne bill went through.

You would say, frankly and openly, that you wanted to turn the clock back 150 years.

You have taken an almost equally brutal course with this bill, which would leave the unions as not much more than social clubs where the workers could gather and curse the bosses and their representatives. You have talked about communism and the left wing—this is the way to breed subversion.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS HELP ALL LABOR

Members of unions do not enjoy alone the benefits of labor organization. Not only the 18,000,000 workers joined together in the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Railway Brotherhoods, and many independent and unaffiliated unions, but all the 58,000,000 American workers share in the progress brought about by organized labor.

Many of you remember the bloody struggle to bring about, first the 10-hour day, then the 8-hour day. You remember the bitter fights against safety appliances in railroads—and every big businessman riding in a pullman car can thank organized labor for making that ride safe and comfortable—and against prohibiting sweatshop slavery for children and women. Millions who have never paid a dime to a union share in the benefits brought about by labor organization.

Is that the reason you wish to destroy the unions?

LEAVE WELL ENOUGH ALONE

If you gentlemen were fair, if you were not drunk with brief power, you would leave well enough alone.

If you will not examine the misdeeds of business, at least you would not wreak your vengeance on the American workers.

Today we have not less than 58,000,000 people at work—perhaps as many as 59,000,000. That is the greatest number of employed workers in peacetime in all history. With only minor exceptions, we have industrial peace throughout the Nation. Labor and management are learning to work out their own problems over the conference table, guided and advised by the Federal Conciliation Service.

Yet, like the Whigs and Federalists of 150 years ago, you would strip labor of all organizational rights, while ignoring the collusive organizations of industry and business, many times bearing such deceptive names as institutes and bureaus and other innocent-sounding titles behind which industries are organized far more authoritatively than any union can ever organize. These industrial organizations, however they are styled—whether institutes, trade associations, bureaus, chambers, committees, or what have you—are effective and tightly controlled. They know what they want and they go after it. Not their conscience, or the public interest, but what they can get away with, is the limit of their actions. They do not hesitate to spread poisoned propaganda to the public in the effort to justify their refusal to grant a decent living wage and security to their employees. Why do you propose no restrictions on them?

INSUFFICIENT TIME TO STUDY BILL

Even if I had my full youthful health and vigor, I could not come before you today, Mr. Speaker, claiming to have studied all the vicious implications of this bill.

I could obtain a copy of the bill, with its 66 pages, and of the report, containing 116 pages, only yesterday morning. I do not believe the printed hearings are even now available. Yet had I read all of yesterday, and last night, and this morning, foregoing all other duties, I could not have claimed to have read and studied them sufficiently to know all the hidden meanings and injustices contained in this infamous measure. Its backers must have spent years preparing it secretly and minutely to strip organized labor of all meaning.

I shall not attempt any detailed discussion of the bill, for those who follow me in general debate, and particularly those six who signed the minority report, will do that expertly.

And when all the facts are in, and the full meaning of this omnibus antilabor bill is made clear, I am confident that the American people, to whom fair play and equal justice is the essence of the democratic way of life, will be shocked and dismayed, and will repudiate the bill and all its supporters.

STORM OF DISAPPROVAL ALREADY GATHERING

That storm of disapproval already is gathering. At this point I am inserting in my remarks an editorial entitled "Monkey Wrench and Banana Oil" from an independent Chicago newspaper with more than a half-million circulation, the Chicago Times—a newspaper with a reputation for letting the chips hit anybody in range—which compares the tactics of the Republican Party on this omnibus bill with the disruption tactics of the Communist Party:

MONKEY WRENCH AND BANANA OIL

When the Republicans were campaigning for votes last fall, they told one and all that they were the sole possessors of a magic oil which would make the Nation's industrial machine run smoothly. It is beginning to look now as though the lubrication they had in mind was banana oil.

Instead of passing legislation which will take the squeaks and slow-downs out of our industrial machinery, the Republican bosses are all set to toss a monkey wrench in the works and jam it up, but good.

The monkey wrench is labeled "Politics."

The Republican leadership plans to shove through Congress a drastic labor bill. This bill will include moderate legislation that President Truman has asked for. It also will include out-and-out antiunion legislation that is supported only by the far right and is opposed by sincere, serious experts on labor problems.

The Republican leadership cannot honestly expect President Truman to approve the "all-or-nothing" measure. The GOP leadership cannot expect to be able to pass the measure over his veto. That's part of the diabolical, political plan.

The Republicans would say if labor conditions went from bad to worse: 'We tried to pass a labor bill, but the President vetoed it. So now we have industrial chaos."

If the Republicans were sincerely trying to improve industrial conditions, they would pass a series of labor bills, each of which would be designed to correct defects in our present system. If the President should veto one or more, those that he approved at least would remain to serve their purpose. Mr. Truman, for example, would approve a bill forbidding jurisdictional strikes. But he could not be expected to go along with the right-wing measure to abolish the National Labor Relations Board.

On Washington correspondent explains the Republican position this way: "The Republican leaders decided to risk their entire labor policy in one omnibus bill."

That's misleading. The GOP risks nothing. In fact, the omnibus bill doesn't represent any one policy—it represents a mad jumble of every labor panacea proposed.

The real risk in the course the GOP leadership is pursuing is to the Nation's own welfare. The all-or-nothing policy is out of harmony with the American spirit of fair compromise. It threatens to sabatoge industrial peace in the hope of making President Truman look bad in the upcoming Presidential election year. The GOP would then say: "Only a Republican President can bring labor peace."

Last fall they said: "Only a Republican Congress can legislate intelligently on the labor front."

If Republican leaders continue on the course, which alarms many veteran reporters of events in Washington, they will be no better morally than the Communists whose strategy also calls for industrial chaos in order to bring about political revolution.

DR. NOURSE WARNS OF FUTURE DANGER

And here, Mr. Speaker, is part of an article which reports on the statements attributed to Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Economic Counsel, the body which we charged with the task of studying and reporting on economic conditions, and of recommending appropriate actions when we passed the full-employment bill at the recent Cabinet meeting. Bear in mind that Dr. Nourse is no radical, no demagog, no alarmist. His appointment brought universal approbation.

DR. NOURSE'S WARNING

1. Prices have increased about 70 percent on all commodities since last July 1. Foodstuffs have gone up about 80 percent, raw materials about 55 percent on an average.

2. In some fields, wholesalers and retailers are pricing themselves out of the market. The demand for certain goods—clothing, women's apparel, and shoes—has dropped to the danger point. Even in lines recently scarce, such as radios, refrigerators, and higher-priced automobiles, Nourse reported, demand is going way down.

3. While prices have increased, consumers' wages have dropped. This disturbed Nourse greatly. Secretary of the Interior Krug and Secretary of Commerce Harriman backed him up regarding this.

The figures used by Nourse for his conclusions show that wages dropped about $5,500,000,000 between the first quarter of 1945 and the last quarter of 1946.

However, while wages dropped in 1945, profits soared. During 1945 net corporate profits were $9,000,000,000. In 1946, with wages dropping, profits climbed to $12,000,000,000. However, that was only part of the story. During the last quarter of 1946 profits were mounting at the rate of $14,900,000,000 for the year, and during the first quarter of this year they increased at an even higher rate.

During this same period wages were tumbling from a 1945 high of $111,000,000,000 to $106,000,000,000 in 1946—and still going down in 1947. That was why Mr. Truman made his statement the day after the Cabinet meeting that if prices don't come down, wages must go up.

ARE WE "STUMBLING TO DISASTER?"

I insert also an editorial from the Progressive entitled "Stumbling to Disaster." This newspaper is owned and published by a Republican. I hope that all Republicans will take special note of the editorial. Let me say in introducing it that, even though it comes from the most recent issue, some of the figures on price increases already are obsolete. Both corporation profits and consumer prices are far higher than those used in this editorial.

STUMBLING TO DISASTER

Strikes and threats of strikes dominated so much of the front-page news during the past week that there was little or no room for basic, official facts piling up about the causes of renewed labor restiveness.

The facts are simply told and easily digested:

Fact No. 1: Corporation profits have soared 34 percent in a single year and are now at the highest peak in the war or peacetime history of the United States. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)

Fact No. 2: Prices for consumers during that same year have soared 19 percent. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)

Fact No. 3: Wages for labor advanced only 14 percent during the same year—and in some fields much less or not at all. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

Fact No. 4: Savings of American individuals during the same year have dropped to the lowest level since 1941 and to half the amount saved in 1945. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission.)

The whole story is right there. American labor, at the peak of its productivity, finds more and more of the wealth it creates going out into profits. Meanwhile, its own cost of staying alive is shooting skyward. At the same time it is being cut off from its financial and psychological anchor—security in the form of savings.

Let's retrace a bit. Department of Commerce figures for 1946, now assembled for the first time, show an all-time high in profits of $12,000,000,000, after taxes have been paid. Thus far in 1947 profits are piling up even faster, at the rate of $15,000,000,000 a year after taxes.

Now let's have a look at the official figures on the prices the average consumer pays. In the 9 months since OPA controls have been abolished, food and farm products skyrocketed 48 percent on the wholesale level, while other commodities jumped 44 percent.

Translated on the retail level, where the average consumer must buy, the figures show that meat bounced up 46.8 percent in those 9 months. Butter and other fats and oils went up 59.3 percent, dairy products 24 percent, and clothing 20 percent.

Labor is striking or threatening to strike, because profits have gone up 34 percent, prices 19 percent, and wages only 14 percent. It's as simple as that, especially if you defrost these cold figures and try to see them as they leave their impact on the daily living of the average American family.

It must be clear to every thoughtful American that we will be stumbling our way into a major disaster if the present trends are continued. Fortunately there is some hope that the more far-sighted leaders of business and industry are beginning to spot the booby traps along the course on which they are embarked. The Ford Motor Co. has announced a cut in prices. The Chrysler Corp. followed suit with an announcement last week that it is going to reduce the cost on Plymouths.

Perhaps even more significant were the statements of two outstanding businessmen, one a manufacturer, the other a merchant. Said Don G. Mitchell, president of the Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.: "Too large a segment of industry is still willing to make as much as you can while you can, a policy that can lead only to disaster."

Jack Straus, president of R. H. Macy & Co., New York, bought full-page advertising space to warn consumers against buying indiscriminately, to plead for lower prices, and to advocate a slash in profits. "We are all going to have to reduce our profit margins," he said. Profits, "in many industries, including our own, were abnormally high in 1946, based on consumer sales."

The head of the world's largest department store put his finger on the most urgent need in the American economy today—and incidentally on the cause of labor-management conflict—when he said that improved efficiency must be translated into lower prices rather than into higher profits if we are to have continuing prosperity. High production must be the basis for high wages. Our economy can be supported only by high production and high wages.

Mr. Straus is dead right, of course, and yet every official figure shows we are now pursuing the reverse course.

BILL DENIES ORGANIZATIONAL RIGHTS TO 3,500,000 WORKERS

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that this bill undertakes to repeal or nullify or emasculate the National Labor Relations Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and union protection under the Clayton Act—this bill undertakes to prohibit unionization of three and a half million workers, and to deprive them of their constitutional rights, of their implicit right of association, of their right to seek security and a more abundant way of life.

I am referring to the provisions in this bill that woul deny to supervisory employees peaceful machinery for settling their problems with their employer.

It seems to me that a more comprehensive study should be made of the terms and conditions of employment of supervisory employees to determine whether or not they are justified in their demands that the full protection and benefits of the National Labor Relations Act applies to them. For example, how many of us know how many cases have been presented to the National Labor Relations Board by foremen who have been discriminated against by their employer? Does the Labor Committee have full knowledge of such pertinent information before considering this legislation?

We are all aware that foremen are organizing into unions for their own mutual aid and protection. We are also aware that employers are vigorously protesting lawful protection of supervisory employees' rights on the grounds that foremen are management, and as such cannot have a dual allegiance. It seems to me that this matter has been given very thorough and serious study, not only by the National Labor Relations Board, but by the Supreme Court of the United States. Just recently our highest tribunal decided that supervisory employees are definitely entitled to the benefits and protection of law. Can we, therefore, cast aside their rights? I believe that if I were employed in a supervisory capacity by any employer who dealt unfairly with me that I, too, would seek the protection from the Congress of the United States that is offered to all workers. After all, foremen are workers too. And, can we therefore deprive a large segment of our working population of the same rights that we offer to the rest?

FOREMEN SHOULD BE ALLOWED UNIONS

I say that foremen should be permitted to have their own organization

for their own mutual aid and protection. That they are seeking such protection through organization cannot be denied; for in the past several years thousands of them have banded together in an effort to establish equitable conditions of employment for themselves.

The history of labor in our country has established a clear and concise record of supervisory employees participating in union activities in many of our great industries. For example, building trades, typographical, maritime, and our great railroad industry have always recognized the right of supervisors to have their own union and bargain collectively. Why then should we deny to others the same privilege and right that we have recognized and granted for the past 50 years to the supervisors in the industries I just mentioned?

CONGRESS INTENDED TO PRESERVE THIS RIGHT

There has been much debate on the question of whether or not Congress intended to include supervisory employees in the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act providing for employee-rights. It seems to me that the father of the act, Senator ROBERT WAGNER, in his debate on the floor of the Senate last year set forth clearly his intentions in offering to foremen the same benefits and protection offered to other workers, when he said—and I quote:

Mr. President, I understand that the question with which we are dealing is now pending in court. I believe that the subject about which we are asked to legislate is the very subject over which we fought several years ago. The issue then was, shall the workers have the right to organize and bargain collectively? Foremen are also workers. What we are now being asked to say to the foremen is, "No; you may not organize. If your employer does not want you to have a union, you may not organize." As I have said, we fought over that issue some years ago when the so-called Wagner Act was first before the Congress. Supervisors are not a part of management; but it is now proposed to say to them, "You may not be protected under the so-called Wagner Act because you are foremen. You are not ordinary workers. You may not have anything to say about your wages. You have no right to bargain collectively." We fought out that very issue back in 1933, and we thought it was settled. The employer said to the employee, "No; you may not belong to a union." We were compelled to enact legislation so as to permit the workers to organize.

Continuing, Senator WAGNER said:

Senators may do as they please, but if they vote for the amendment they will say to many foremen and supervisors, "No; you have no legal protection. You have no right to bargain collectively. You have no right to carry on collective bargaining with your employer with reference to what your wages, hours or anything else shall be." Senators, if we do that I say that we are returning to the old days.

I am particularly opposed to the provisions of this bill that will deny to supervisory employees lawful protection in their efforts to secure wages and terms and conditions of employment that are fair. I feel that we will err in passing upon this matter of such importance to 3,500,000 workers at this time, and therefore recommend that a more comprehensive study be made of this particular problem, so that we can act with justification based upon facts.

REPUBLICANS HAVE VOTES TO ADOPT RULE AND PASS BILL

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that you have the votes in the House necessary to adopt this rule and to force through this drastic and ill-considered bill, even to the extent of being able to defeat every amendment designed to mitigate its harsh and unwarranted provisions.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied that if the Republican membership were free to act according to conscience and not bound by the action of your party caucus and the whip of the powerful and short-sighted interests behind this bill, many would reject this extremely harsh and unfortunate bill which soon will be stuffed down the throats of the Members of this House.

I feel sure that when the votes are cast there will not be a single Republican vote against this rule, and that the Republican vote for the bill will be very nearly unanimous. Of course, they will be joined by some gentlemen from this side who are unfriendly to labor, who have no organized labor in their districts, and who will be swayed by the high-pressure and dishonest campaign carried on for many, many years against organized labor, and whipped up to a new and degrading fever in recent months.

SPIRIT OF LABOR CANNOT BE THUS BROKEN

But notwithstanding that you will, by passing this bill, wreak your long-nourished vengeance against the American workingman and his family, and thus express your contempt for the democratic processes on which the American way of life is soundly founded, I now prophesy that you will not break the spirit of American labor.

To the contrary, I predict that by this senseless action you will give American labor new inspiration to renew the age-long fight for justice and equality and freedom; to work together in harmonious cooperation to preserve their self-respect; and to expand their membership and their influence as the unorganized majority of workers begin to realize more fully their lack of protection against unjust and vengeful attacks on their economic and political rights.

Mr. Speaker, they will be fighting for their very existence. They will be fighting to prevent their being forced back into medieval serfdom, into the slavery of working 10 and 12 hours a day for a pittance of a dollar a day; into the horrors of the sweatshop, where women worked long hours for 75 cents a day, and children of tender age worked by their sides for 25 cents a day.

All workers, organized and unorganized, will be forced to the realization that you are legislating in the interest of those who have, against those who have not.

DESTROYING FARM PROSPERITY

You are destroying the farmers' markets for their high-priced foodstuffs. When the crash comes—and if this bill becomes law the crash will come as surely as night follows day, and winter follows summer and the moon follows the sun—the leaders of rich and arrogant farm organizations will not be able to deliver the farm vote to you.

Farmers are shrewd and understanding. They, too, can read their magazines and newspapers—and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They will remember then that it was under a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress that they were rescued from the Republican-made Hoover depression; they will remember that it was the "despised New Deal" which brought to them the highest prices in history, and the highest spread between what they can sell their products for, and what they have to pay out. They will remember that it was the Democratic administrations under Wilson and Roosevelt which pulled them out of despair and hopelessness, and enacted beneficial laws to enable them to save their soil, to save on interest, to save their homes and their means of making a living. They will come to realize—as labor already realizes—that selfish forces of black reaction lie behind this bill, inspired only by greed and profit.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that those on the Republican side have neither eyes to see nor ears to hear nor hearts to understand what has taken place in the minds of the American people; but remember, when election time comes again, it will be your funeral, not mine. I feel that this legislation, aiming to cripple labor and destroy business, will not be enacted because the American people will not stand for it and will not approve of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could you not answer one question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because I am opposed to the consideration of this legislation. I think that any person who believes in collective bargaining must acknowledge the fact that there cannot be any collective bargaining without some sort of equality on both sides. The only people who do not sincerely believe in collective bargaining, both in business and outside of business, are those who would establish some form of Fascist control of labor in these United States. I believe the average businessman, the person who has at heart the welfare of the country and believes in the advancement of its economy, absolutely adheres to the proposition that you cannot have industrial relationship conducive to the welfare of the Nation without collective bargaining. A study of the history of collective bargaining and how it came about demonstrates conclusively that only as equality for labor is established can collective bargaining become a reality. The history of labor is a story of struggle by the American worker to achieve equality through unionization and that whatever equality he has been able to obtain in his relationship with

industry has been obtained only after years of struggle, struggle of the most excruciating kind. Labor has been subjected to the worst kind of exploitation. The only way the workers could protect themselves in some measure against it was to organize and form unions. That is, unions free from company control. In the beginning it was craft unions. Then, to achieve more effective unity, industrial unionization was attempted and carried out by the CIO.

Now, what does this legislation do? This legislation wipes out whatever strength organized labor acquired to bring about equality in bargaining. Any honest analysis of the bill will demonstrate that to be correct. It wipes out completely any semblance of equality on the part of labor in bargaining with industry. It destroys completely the bargaining power of organized labor to sit down at the table with the employers and seek redress against exploitation. You cannot bargain unless you have power. Labor cannot have power except through unionization. Union activities such as have been laid down in the Wagner Act, protected by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, put on the statutes, for the sole purpose of granting to American workers who are organized, equality in bargaining—all that is being wiped out by this legislation. Distort the truth as much as you can but you cannot get away from that.

What is your justification for this legislation? Oh, you say you are going to give certain rights, a new bill of rights to the American worker. What are you giving him? What are those rights? You are shearing him of his strength, strength which exists only because of unionization, unity on the part of the workers protecting him against yellow-dog contracts, company unions, low wages, long hours, and indecent working conditions. You are taking that protection away from him and thus you leave him completely at the mercy of the big monopolies of this country. So you are giving him the right to do what? To become once again a wage slave. You are giving him the right to be free, freeing him from unionization, freeing him from his hard-earned protection, freeing him from his union, his only defense against exploitation. You are making him free to be exploited. You are making him free to be forced to work for lower wages. You are making him free to be forced to work long hours. You are making him free and impotent to defend himself against any attempt by industry to subject him to the same working conditions that existed in these United States 75 years ago. You are giving him the freedom to become enslaved to a system that has been repudiated in the past not only by Democrats but also by outstanding progressive-minded Republicans. You are giving him freedom to be subjected to the injunction, to the yellow-dog contract, to company unions, to the vilest form of exploitation. In the name of freedom and a new bill of rights you destroy his rights, his unions, his strength, and his real freedom. You may pass this legislation, but you will not fool American wage earners. They know that their union and their rights that you now seek to destroy have been and are their best guarantee and bill of rights for freedom and economic security.

The whole philosophy of industrial relationship based on equality of bargaining is destroyed by this legislation. You say that you are going to do this to get rid of the Communists in the unions, to get rid of the racketeers. Let us see Under the guise of fighting communism you are with this legislation advancing fascism on American labor. That is just what you are doing, and again, you cannot get away from it.

Now about this talk of racketeering, let us see who are the real racketeers. When we consider the spiraling in prices, the spiraling of the cost of living which has increased 50 percent since last June, we find that the real racketeers are the gentlemen who asked for free enterprise in order to raise prices. By free enterprise they meant freedom to charge whatever prices they pleased and to pay whatever wages they wanted to pay. That is the kind of free enterprise which was urged by these gentlemen upon the United States in the last election; and these same people who used the cry of free enterprise and who are now taking out of the pockets of the American consumers millions and millions of dollars are behind this legislation. They are the real racketeers. They made billions and billions of dollars in wartime. Now these are the men who are destroying the purchasing power of the American people and seek to destroy the rights of American workers. They are the real racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will yield him two additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for four additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not greatly surprised that the gentleman from New York is opposed to this bill, but I will be greatly surprised if the great majority of my good friends on that side of the aisle oppose it, inasmuch as President Truman himself said that something must be done; that we must have some labor bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I opposed the President's proposal at the time he came here during the railroad strike. But that is neither here nor there. Let us judge this legislation by just what it is.

As I was saying, these big monopolies that have been taking millions and millions of dollars out of the pockets of the American consumers are the ones who want this legislation. They are the ones who today make it impossible for labor to bargain. They are the ones who are today adamant in their refusal to negotiate agreements on wages and hours and refuse to give the American worker a wage with which he can keep up with the increasing cost of living. They want this legislation and they support it from A to Z in order to continue to deprive Americans of their share of the peace.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois who asked about gentlemen on this side a while ago, that the gentleman from Illinois cannot point out a single opponent of this bill among the big trusts that have been profiteering and racketeering—wholesale racketeering, that is what it amounts to—the worst kind of racketeering, increasing the cost of living at the expense of the American consumers.

Did anyone of them ever come out against this kind of legislation? No. They have paid out millions of dollars to put in advertisments supporting it. They have issued tons of literature for it. They have their radio commentators, columnists, and the press busily engaged smearing labor. All of them have been drumming the war drums against the men and women of America whose only crime has been to try to obtain for themselves and their families a decent standard of living.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman as an expert on what constitutes racketeering.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is a much better expert on that than I am.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman qualifies eminently as an expert on that subject.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman knows what a racketeer is, and in his own district, too.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My district is just as good, if not better, than the gentleman's district and I am mighty proud of my district. My district is a district of homes, schools, churches, and workers whose people gave their sons for freedom but do not go around bragging about it. You cannot meet the issues and you drag out a red herring.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I will identify the red herring, too.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. The gentleman cannot identify anything. I, however, have identified the real racketeers and it is obvious that the gentleman is very sensitive over it. I repeat, you are drawing a red herring in order to escape from the real consequences that this bill imposes on the working people of this country. You are parroting the same tactics that are employed by the National Association of Manufacturers.

I would like to know how much collaboration the authors of this legislation have received from the attorneys of the National Association of Manufacturers and the so-called experts employed by that organization, all enemies not only of labor but as a result of their practices, their racketeering practices, real enemies of the economy of these United States.

This legislation is a part of a pattern. It is part of the pattern of boom, bust, and war, and in the face of that condition which you have been creating your only answer is Fascist labor legislation. Send to the Library for the Fascist syndicate

laws enacted by Mussolini after he came into power; compare those laws with what you are enacting here, and the similarity is striking, the similarity is such that it is sufficient to frighten anyone in America who believes in American democracy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that with this legislation we are marching, as Philip Murray correctly stated, toward fascism. You cannot have a free America without free labor unions; you cannot have free labor unions when you deprive the American labor unions of their fundamental rights. You cannot have free labor unions when you deprive the American labor unions of their power to bargain collectively. You cannot have free labor unions when you destroy the strength of free labor unions to obtain equality in bargaining. That is what you are doing with this legislation. You think you are going to get votes by it, you may think you will sweep an election by it, but I tell you that the day is not far off in these United States when the American people will recognize the pattern of boom, bust, and war that you are trying to put over on them under the guise of fighting so-called communism, and so-called racketeers. You are putting over fascism in these United States and again you cannct get away from that no matter how gross the distortion, no matter how big the lie.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a moment ago that I was not surprised that my good friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is opposed to this rule. As I stated previously, this rule is an open one. It provides that the majority Members of this body, together with the minority, can pass such labor legislation as they desire. I bring to the gentleman's attention that on January 6, in the President's message to Congress in regard to labor, he mentions certain labor-management problems, and I quote:

> Certain labor-management problems need attention at once and certain others, by reason of their complexity, need exhaustive investigation and study.
>
> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.
>
> In the light of these considerations, I propose to you and urge your cooperation in effecting the following four-point program to reduce industrial strife:
>
> Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.
>
> First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.
>
> A second unjustifiable practice is the secondary boycott, when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A third practice that should be corrected is the use of economic force, by either labor or management, to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts.

That is the President of the United States saying we need some labor legislation. The gentleman from New York obviously will vote against this rule. He does not even want to consider any labor legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The President in his message also stated, and I quote:

> We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules and his associates for bringing this proposal before the House under an open rule. I know that some people said before that rule was granted that it was proposed to bring the measure before the House with a closed rule that would prohibit amendment. However, is this not the situation? Under the rule presently before us and which will shortly be adopted, amendments are in order so long as they are germane. It is in order for the House, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, to take such action as it deems proper in respect to this bill. The House can act as it sees fit on any of these provisions. So the issue that will come on the vote on the rule simply is, Shall we proceed to the consideration of legislation having to do with labor-management relations—legislation, I may say, overwhelmingly demanded by a majority of the people of this country and, as the gentleman from Illinois has just pointed out, even suggested, in part at least, by the President of the United States?

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, but the gentleman forgot to say that the President asked for a commission, representatives of both Houses and the public, to make a long, extensive research and study, which has not been given by this Congress up to now. Even this bill before us has been the subject only of a very inadequate study.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand the Labor Committee, for at least 6 weeks, from early morning until late at night, has been holding hearings, and that they brought before them leaders of organized labor, and that the hearings were very extensive.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the present consideration of this bill, and I think I can answer the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, in this way: As a member of the Committee on Labor, I can definitely state that we have not adequately studied this problem of labor-management relations. Certainly, hearings were held, but this bill was being written—and I will tell you in a minute by whom—while these hearings were held; and, in fact, it was begun before the hearings were started. The chairman of our committee—and I have great respect for him and high regard—stated publicly during the course of these hearings that the bill was being prepared, and explained at that time, in the early stages of the hearings, just what the bill would contain. President Truman's suggestion that a committee should be appointed to fully study the problem is an excellent one and should be followed.

Mr. Speaker, some monopolistic corporations are trying to get the American people to believe that labor has become a monopoly, and therefore is threatening the country. They are really trying, and trying desperately, to disguise what the Senate Small Business Committee calls the alarming growth of monopolies in business.

In the auto industry, the great symbol of American enterprise, of 1,200 companies that have been in business, only 12 remain. Of these 12, 3—Ford, Chrysler, and GM—do 90 percent of the business. These three control the policies of the entire industry.

The Secretary of Commerce said in June of 1946:

> Since VJ-day there has been a sharp increase in corporate mergers and acquisition of small firms by larger ones.

Who coined this slogan "labor monopolies"? It was coined by John W. Scoville, formerly with the Chrysler Corp., now with the Committee for Constitutional Government. This committee, financed by Pew, du Pont, and other NAM leaders, brags that the slogan was adopted as part of a careful plan against unions:

> Our first step was to coin a slogan, as we had coined "court packing," "purge," "one-man rule," each of which swept across the country and led to victory over public menaces.

The committee's new slogan is "labor monopolies," which was projected into the title selected for John Scoville's book. Copies of the book, Labor Monopolies, were sent to all Members of Congress with an offer for 100 free copies to distribute to their constituents. It was mailed to public officials in every State.

The CCG propaganda uses the big lie to cover the fact that free competitive enterprise is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. Small business is being squeezed out. Profits are higher than ever before, and going up—wages are going down. Prices continue to rise. Rent control is being killed. The Amer-

ican worker's standard of living is seriously threatened.

This is a threat to our American way of life. Our unions stand as the strongest bulwark for economic and political democracy because, without strong unions, our economy will collapse, through further drops in wages and purchasing power. After World War I, the same lopsided picture took shape. The unions were weakened, and we went into a severe depression.

The present drive against labor does not represent the wishes or thinking of many Members of Congress, including certain members of the House Labor Committee.

The new House labor bill was not written with the help of the Democratic members of the committee. In fact, they were not consulted and no full committee meetings were held to discuss it. The bill was actually written with the help of several industry representatives and some lawyers from the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who reports a $24,000 annual salary as a lobbyist.

Ingles represents Allis-Chalmers Co., Fruehauf Trailer Co., J. I. Case Co., the Falk Corp., and Inland Steel Co. These are not the only antiunion companies that are helping out the Labor Committee. Patrioteer Theodore R. Iserman put aside his rich Chrysler law practice for two full weeks to help out the House committee.

Another volunteer in the antilabor cause is Jerry Morgan, whose law offices in Washington serve a variety of big corporations.

This group of high-priced lawyers quietly worked up the most vicious bill yet produced. The Democratic members were ignored. For 2 weeks no committee meeting was called.

Then the threatened telephone strike was announced. The distinguished chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], called the reporters. He said, in effect, a majority of the committee had approved a bill to stop the telephone strike. He added that if the strike were called off the bill would not be pushed.

The Hartley bill to break the telephone strike is based on Mr. HARTLEY's desire "to protect the public health, safety, and interest," but the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] and his Republican colleagues voted to wipe out the only Federal agency dealing with safety—the Bureau of Labor Standards. They fought every health bill, and most of them even fought the school-lunch program. To show how far this thinking can go, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] cited a strike of magazine bindery workers which could be stopped by the same bill because the strike affected communications, which are, of course, vital to public safety.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue involved in the vote on this rule, and that is simply whether or not the Members favor considering legislation to deal with labor problems. The record is clear as to why we have this problem on our doorstep yet. It is because the bill which the Congress passed last year was vetoed and the problem was not met.

Behind the action that the Congress took last year you had a record of the President of the United States calling for legislation back in the fall of 1945. The President called a labor-management conference here in Washington. The Members of the House were told, "Do not press for legislation until this voluntary conference has had an opportunity to show what it can work out."

The President came before the Congress with a special message on the 3d of December in 1945 and told us that the objectives of the conference had not been reached, and he asked the Congress to pass legislation. He made three specific recommendations. That matter was considered by the committees of the two Houses. We had not taken action at Christmas time. The President went before the country on the radio on the 3d of January 1946 and said to the people of the country, "You want action. While the Members of Congress are home on their vacation, tell them what you want is some action on this, and, if they do not like my recommendations, to write their own bill." The Congress proceeded to write its bill and we passed it, and then the President did not like that, and vetoed the bill.

Someone talks about free labor. The President came here in one of those crises which arose because we do not have any machinery to meet that kind of a situation and asked for the drafting of labor in the railway strike. Is that freedom for labor?

These crises came back to face us and to plague the country as they are now in the telephone strike, because Congress has not met the problem, or, if we did meet it, then the President was not ready to go along with us.

This is our opportunity today to consider comprehensive legislation under an open rule that will permit any germane amendment.

Of course, this rule should be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 47, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Arnold	Boggs, La.
Albert	Auchincloss	Bolton
Allen, Calif.	Bakewell	Bonner
Allen, Ill.	Banta	Boykin
Allen, La.	Barden	Bradley, Calif.
Almond	Barrett	Bradley, Mich.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bates, Mass.	Bramblett
Anderson, Calif.	Beall	Brehm
Andresen, August H.	Beckworth	Brooks
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Brown, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Ohio
Angell	Bennett, Mo.	Bryson
Arends	Bishop	Buck
	Blackney	Buffett
	Boggs, Del.	Bulwinkle
Burke	Harness, Ind.	Norman
Burleson	Harris	Norrell
Busbey	Harrison	O'Hara
Butler	Hartley	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	Owens
Camp	Hébert	Pace
Canfield	Hendricks	Passman
Cannon	Herter	Patterson
Carson	Heselton	Peden
Case, N. J.	Hess	Peterson
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Phillips, Calif.
Chadwick	Hinshaw	Phillips, Tenn.
Chapman	Hobbs	Pickett
Chelf	Hoeven	Ploeser
Chenoweth	Hoffman	Potts
Chiperfield	Holmes	Preston
Church	Hope	Price, Fla.
Clason	Horan	Priest
Clements	Howell	Ramey
Clevenger	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin
Coffin	Jarman	Redden
Cole, Kans.	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rees
Cooper	Jensen	Reeves
Corbett	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Cotton	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Riehlman
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Cravens	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Crow	Jones, Ohio	Robertson
Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Robsion
Curtis	Jonkman	Rockwell
Dague	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
D'Alesandro	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ga.	Kearns	Rohrbough
Davis, Tenn.	Keating	Ross
Deane	Keefe	Russell
Devitt	Kerr	Sadlak
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Dingell	Kilburn	Sanborn
Dirksen	Kilday	Sarbacher
Dolliver	Knutson	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Kunkel	Schwabe, Mo.
Dondero	Landis	Schwabe, Okla.
Dorn	Lanham	Scott. Hugh D., Jr.
Doughton	Larcade	Scrivner
Drewry	Latham	Seely-Brown
Durham	Lea	Shafer
Elliott	LeCompte	Sheppard
Ellis	LeFevre	Sikes
Ellsworth	Lemke	Simpson, Ill.
Elsaesser	Lewis	Smathers
Elston	Lodge	Smith, Kans.
Engel, Mich.	Love	Smith, Ohio
Engle, Calif.	Lucas	Smith, Wis.
Evins	Lyle	Springer
Fellows	McConnell	Stefan
Fenton	McCowen	Stevenson
Fernandez	McDonough	Stigler
Fisher	McDowell	Stratton
Flannagan	McGarvey	Sundstrom
Fletcher	McGregor	Taber
Folger	McMillan, S. C.	Taylor
Foote	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Forand	MacKinnon	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	Macy	Thomas, Tex.
Gamble	Mahon	Thomason
Gary	Maloney	Tibbott
Gathings	Manasco	Towe
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Trimble
Gearhart	Mason	Twyman
Gillette	Mathews	Van Zandt
Gillie	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Goff	Meade, Md.	Vursell
Gore	Meyer	Wadsworth
Gossett	Michener	Walter
Graham	Miller, Conn.	Weichel
Granger	Miller, Md.	West
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Wheeler
Gregory	Mills	Whitten
Griffiths	Mitchell	Whittington
Gross	Monroney	Wigglesworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morris	Williams
Gwynne, Iowa	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Hagen	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Hale	Muhlenberg	Winstead
Hall, Leonard W.	Murdock	Wolcott
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Hand	Murray, Wis.	Youngblood
Hardy	Nixon	Zimmerman
Harless, Ariz.	Nodar	
	Norblad	

NAYS—47

Blatnik	Fulton	Kelley
Buchanan	Gordon	Kennedy
Carroll	Gorski	King
Celler	Havenner	Kirwan
Crosser	Hedrick	Klein
Delaney	Heffernan	Lane
Donohue	Holifield	Lesinski
Douglas	Huber	McCormack
Eberharter	Jackson, Wash.	Madden
Feighan	Karsten, Mo.	Mansfield, Mont.
Fogarty	Kee	

Marcantonio	O'Toole	Rabin
Miller, Calif.	Pfeifer	Sabath
Morgan	Philbin	Sadowski
Norton	Powell	Somers
O'Brien	Price, Ill.	Welch

NOT VOTING—66

Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Rayburn
Battle	Hall,	Rayfiel
Bender	Edwin Arthur	Rizley
Bland	Hart	Rooney
Bloom	Hull	Scoblick
Brophy	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Buckley	Jennings	Short
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Maine
Clippinger	Judd	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kefauver	Snyder
Combs	Keogh	Spence
Cooley	Lusk	Stanley
Coudert	Lynch	Stockman
Crawford	McMahon	Talle
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	Tollefson
Dawson, Utah	Merrow	Vail
Eaton	Mundt	Vorys
Fallon	Patman	Wood
Fuller	Plumley	Woodruff
Gerlach	Poage	Worley
Gifford	Poulson	
Goodwin	Rains	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. McMahon for, with Mr. Bloom against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Worley.

Mr. Crawford with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Short with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Clark.

Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. GORSKI, and Mr. GORDON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MUNITIONS CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 195)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a proposal for legislation to authorize supervision of the exportation of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and related commodities, and the importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to provide for the registration, under certain conditions, of manufacturers, exporters, importers, and certain dealers in munitions of war; and to provide for obtaining more adequate information concerning the international traffic in arms. The principal purpose of this proposal is to supersede the present provisions of law in section 12 of the Neutrality Act of November 4, 1939. For the reasons outlined below it is believed that the Congress will agree that this section of the present law is particularly ineffective in dealing with current problems and that the Congress will wish to take prompt action to enact a new law along the lines proposed herein.

Section 12 of the Neutrality Act provides for: the establishment of a National Munitions Control Board; the administration of the provisions of that section by the Secretary of State; the registration of those engaged in the business of manufacturing, importing, or exporting arms, ammunition, and implements of war; the conditions under which export and import licenses may be issued; the reports which the National Munitions Control Board shall make to the Congress; and the determination by the President of what articles shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Reports of the activities carried on by the Department of State pursuant to section 12 for the years 1941 to 1946, inclusive, have been submitted to assist the Congress in its consideration of the legislation now suggested. Operations prior to 1941 are contained in the first to sixth Annual Reports of the National Munitions Control Board.

The proposed legislation contemplates continuing certain of the essential aspects of section 12 of the Neutrality Act, particularly those pertaining to the administrative framework of the controls now exercised. However, it is different in its objective and it proposes a more flexible and efficient administration.

The present system of supervising this country's international traffic and trade in arms and munitions of war was conceived during a period of neutrality and with the view to remaining out of war. To achieve this end the successive Neutrality Acts of 1935, 1937, and 1939 were founded on the principle of impartiality toward all who would secure munitions from us regardless of their motives. As long as section 12 of the Neutrality Act is in effect that requirement of impartiality is still the law and the Secretary of State must treat aggressor and aggrieved, peacemaker and troublemaker equally by granting every application for a license for the exportation of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war unless such action would be in violation of a treaty. Such a provision of law is no longer consistent with this country's commitments and requirements. We have committed ourselves to international cooperation through the United Nations. If this participation is to be fully effective this Government must have control over traffic in weapons which will permit us to act in accordance with our position in the United Nations and will be adaptable to changes in the international situation. Therefore, there must be new legal provisions enabling the exercise of discretion in the granting or rejecting of applications for export or import licenses for arms, ammunition, and implements of war and related items.

Weapons and implements of war are material weights in the balances of peace or war and we should not be legally bound to be indiscriminate in how they are placed in the scales. If war should ever again become imminent, it would be intolerable to find ourselves in our present position of being bound by our own legislation to give aid and support to any power which might later attack us. The proposed legislation is designed to permit in normal times of peace control over traffic in arms or other articles used to supply, directly or indirectly, a foreign military establishment, and in times of international crisis, to permit control over any article the export of which would affect the security interests of the United States.

The exercise of discretion necessarily requires a revision of the administration of the controls presently in operation. The suggested legislation provides for the exercise of discretion in the types of licenses which may be used, and in determining the activities which may be subject to registration. The new proposal differs from section 12 inasmuch as it permits the issuance of various types of licenses designed to take into account under what circumstances and in what quantities the export of the articles covered by the proposed bill should be subject to control. The purpose of this procedure is to permit freedom of trade in items of a purely commercial nature.

With regard to the registration requirements it should be noted that under the present law anyone engaged in manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the articles defined as arms, ammunition or implements of war must register with the Secretary of State, whether the item handled by that person is a battleship or merely a .38-caliber pistol. Under the new proposal the President upon recommendation of the National Munitions Control Board may determine when the manufacture, exportation, or importation of any designated arms, ammunition, and implements of war shall require registration. This will mean that consideration may be given to the relative military significance of the item handled.

Another important change provides for obtaining fuller information which will be made available to the Congress in the reports of the National Munitions Control Board. With a number of agencies of this Government actively concerned with the disposal of arms and related items, the proposed legislation will allow for the amalgamation of all such information into one comprehensive report.

In addition to the foregoing, the proposed legislation differs from section 12 of the Neutrality Act by providing export controls over two additional categories; namely, (1) articles especially designed for or customarily used only in the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war and (2) articles exported for use, directly or indirectly, by a foreign military establishment.

With regard to item (1) it is certainly unsound to endeavor to regulate traffic in arms and ammunition and permit a free flow of the special machinery and tools used in the production of those arms and ammunition. In the absence

of such a provision those countries from whom munitions are withheld would soon seek and obtain the equipment with which to supply themselves.

In the interest of world peace articles supplying a foreign military establishment cannot be left free from Government supervision so far as exports are concerned. Prior to the last war there were no provisions for controlling articles supplying foreign military establishments. This condition must not be allowed to recur. The proposed legislation is consistent with the international trade policies I outlined a short time ago at Waco, Tex. It is designed to protect the security interests and to carry out the foreign policy of the United States.

There is one other aspect of the suggested legislation which warrants comment. At present there is no provision for supervising the activities of those persons who do not manufacture, import, or export arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but who, as free agents, buy or sell these items for export, or who obtain commissions or fees on contracts for manufacture or exportation of such items. These brokers assume none of the responsibilities of this important traffic, yet they promote it, often irresponsibly, and need only concern themselves with the profits to be found in the trade. It is scarcely fair to those who have the responsibility of carrying on what experience has shown to be a legitimate business, that such people should not be subject to regulation.

The international traffic in munitions and related items is a matter of major concern to us and to the other nations of the world. By such legislation as is now proposed for consideration by the Congress, the Government would be given powers essential for the safeguarding of its security interests in this international trade.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 1947.*

[Enclosure: Report to the President from the National Munitions Control Board transmitting proposed bill.]

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commisison the following Members of the House: Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; Mr. BAKEWELL, of Missouri, and Mr. THOMAS, of Texas.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] will be recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the rule today, some rather unkind and unfair references have been made to the manner in which this bill has been drafted. This bill was written by the House Committee on Education and Labor. Those of us on the majority side accept full responsibility for what is in this bill. It was our responsibility in the first place and I think we have fulfilled that responsibility.

This committee, as everyone present knows, made the most exhaustive study and held the most exhausive hearings on this most complicated matter that have ever been held by any Committee on Labor in the history of the Congress of the United States. After the bill was prepared it was presented to the entire committee. It was read line by line and section by section, and no member of the committee was denied the right to amend it in any way he saw fit.

I would also like to make one brief response to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] echoing the statement of the president of the CIO and his reference to fascism. As far as I am personally concerned, I am getting sick and tired of hearing those who are not Communists called Fascists. It is too bad that today, if you do not happen to follow the party line, if you do not happen to be a Communist, you have to sit and listen to the charge that if you are not a Communist you must be a Fascist, per se.

We are ready to defend this bill. I am going to, briefly, in a general way, recite what is in the bill. Following me, members of the committee will present in detail all features of the bill.

First, this bill outlaws the closed shop and monopolistic industry-wide bargaining. Now, I know there are those who are not quite pleased with the ban on industry-wide bargaining. I recognize that there undoubtedly will be some dislocations as a result of that particular feature, but I want to ask the membership of this House if we are going to be more concerned about some dislocations in one branch of industry than we are with meeting Mr. John L. Lewis face to face on the 1st of July, and whether we do not want to save this Nation from having its entire economy prostrated as a result of the domination of one man over the entire coal industry or any other industry.

Do we want to promote the tragic situation that this Nation faced last November and December? Or are we going to have the courage to meet the issue and try to settle it as best we can?

I may say to the membership of this House that no one claims this bill is perfect in every particular, and I may also add that I hardly believe there is another Member of the House who likes the bill in all its particulars. This bill is an unusual bill, may I say, in that it is most controversial in whole, and it is controversial in lesser or greater degree in all its parts; but may I suggest that any attempt to open this bill up when it is read under the 5-minute rule or to emasculate it will do more harm than good.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. HARTLEY. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. PACE. It would be helpful if the gentleman would point out the particular section of this bill which provides for the closed shop. I have had some difficulty in reconciling the different provisions.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is section 8 (a) 3. Other members of the committee will explain the provisions of the bill in detail; I am merely attempting to cover the bill in a general way.

This bill also exempts supervisors from the compulsory features of the National Labor Relations Act. In other words, this bill does not bar them from organizing but they cannot obtain the benefits of the act. It was quite apparent to us from the evidence we received in the committee that there was no such thing as an independent foremen's union; they were either identified with or controlled by the employee organizations composed of employees they were supposed to supervise.

This bill also imposes on both parties to labor disputes the duty of bargaining, and likewise it provides that in bargaining arrangements there must be a secret ballot by the employees on their employers' last offer of the settlement of a dispute. Why is this important? We find today, for example, there are over 900 strike notices on file in the United State Department of Labor. Under the terms of the Smith-Connally Act there has been built up a definite policy that whenever there is a collective consultation or conference to be held the members of the union automatically arm their leaders with a strike vote. This bill provides that that strike vote shall be taken after the members of the union know what the employers' best offer is and, therefore, be in a better position to decide whether or not they are satisfied and whether or not they wish to go out on strike.

This bill also provides for the removal of the present National Labor Relations Board and the substitution of a new board with different functions than those now possessed by the present Board. Every one of us who has studied the administration of the National Labor Relations Act knows that not only has it failed in many particulars because of its inherent weakness as a law, but it has failed in larger degree by the improper administration by the members of the Board and their subordinates. The National Labor Relations Board has been

investigator, prosecutor, jury, and judge all rolled into one. Under the pending bill we make it a quasi-judicial board which will pass on investigations and prosecutions that have been made by a separate administrator who is provided for in the bill. We further make it in order that these decisions shall be made on a preponderance of the evidence rather than on the fictitious evidence that has been permitted in times past by examiners of the Board.

This bill also protects the existence of labor organizations which are not affiliated with one of the national federations. It prohibits certification by the Board of labor organizations having Communist or subversive officers. If anyone doubts the need of that in the bill all you have to do is to read the testimony taken by our subcommittee in connection with the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee and you will understand that section of the bill is most in order.

This bill also outlaws the picketing of a place of business where the proprietor is not involved in a dispute with his employes. Mr. Chairman, why is that provision in order? Our committee has received and taken evidence all over the United States showing that in attempts to organize, yes, even a small grocery store, where perhaps every member employed in that grocery store were members of the same family, or in cases where only one or two employees were employed, picket lines were placed in front of the establishment even though there was no wage dispute involved at all.

We had a notable case of that in Oakland, Calif., where a paint manufacturer, a father and son corporation, employing only three persons, was approached by an organizer to organize the men in his establishment. He agreed to permit them to be organized and after they failed the organizer came to him and in spite of the fact that not one signed up demanded that the proprietor sign a closed-shop contract. This he declined to do. As a result a picket line was placed in front of his place of business. Now, this was a place of business employing only three persons. The picket line in this instance was not successful. What happened? The members of the paint-makers organization joined forces with the teamsters local and the teamsters refused to pick up or deliver any products of the paint maker. As a result he was forced to close his doors.

This bill also provides for unlawful concerted activities and it gives those persons injured thereby the right to sue civilly any person respcnsible therefor.

Why is that provision important in this bill? Let me cite cases of damages that have occurred by the hundreds, cases in California in particular, for instance, the case where milk by the thousands of gallons had to be poured down sewers or fed to hogs or destroyed because those teamsters called it "hot milk" and refused to handle it. In one instance their embargo, their refusal to handle this so-called hot milk, went to the ridiculous extreme of refusal to handle the milk because it came from cows that had been fed feed that had been delivered to the farm by a nonunion truck.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Was it not delivered by the farmer's own truck?

Mr. HARTLEY. It was delivered by the farmer's own truck. I am glad the gentleman referred to that.

We had a case where a lady who ran a turkey farm and was supporting an invalid husband, raised a certain number of turkeys every year. When it came time for them to be fattened and sent to the market she would call in her neighbors and for a nominal sum they would pluck the turkeys. They went to market but there could not be handled. Why? Because they had not been plucked by a union turkey plucker. Do you know how they finally met the situation? Finally they were permitted to be handled when a union turkey stamper stamped the birds one at a time and got something like 30 cents apiece for doing it. In the meantime this lady lost some $3,000 that year in her efforts to provide an income for herself and her family.

This bill provides that where such a condition exists a person who suffers damages may recover in the courts.

This bill also creates a new and independent conciliation agency. It removes the exemption of labor organizations from the antitrust laws when such organizations, acting either alone or in collusion with employers, engage in unlawful restraints of trade. It guarantees to employees and employers, and their respective representatives, the full exercise of the right of free speech. It provides a means of stopping strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the public health, safety, or interest, and in that respect it provides that when the President finds that the public health or safety is threatened, that he shall authorize the Attorney General to seek an injunction in the courts, and if the courts so find that the public health or safety is imperiled, that the injunction shall be issued. Thereupon there follows a period of mediation if any agreement is reached, and if no settlement has been obtained that there shall be a following period of arbitration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

This bill also outlaws mass picketing and other forms of violence designed to prevent individuals from entering or leaving a place of business, and if you need any good reason for voting for that provision of the bill, all you have to do is to read the testimony of the Allis-Chalmers strike, of the mass picketing there, where there was bloodshed and violence. Also the mass picketing out in Hollywood, which has gone on intermittently for a period of over 2 years over a jurisdictional strike, where once again heads have been bashed in, bones broken, and all that sort of thing; and all you have to do to see what takes place is to see the press pictures of the demonstrations in the present telephone strike. Now, I would like to ask anyone of you here present, how you would like to attempt to go to work through a mass picket line such as I have exhibited by picture here in my hand. This provision barring mass picketing by the use of force and violence in the conduct of a strike is based on this premise: We do not want to interfere with the legitimate right to strike, but the committee holds that there is an equally fundamental right, and that is that any person has the right to go to work if he wants to work, and that he have that right free from any molestation on the part of anyone, be it a union or anyone else.

It makes labor organizations equally responsible with employers for contract violations and provides for suit by either against the other in the United States district courts.

It outlaws sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, illegal boycotts, collusive strikes by employees of competing employers, as well as sit-down strikes, featherbedding, and other concerted interferences conducted by remaining on employer's premises. I want to say just a word about jurisdiction strikes. I heard the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle a little while ago refer to the high cost of living and the high cost of building. Now I want to give you a little reason why it is so hard to build a home today and why these costs are so high, and I want to call your attention to what is going on right now in my own State of New Jersey.

Up in New Jersey right at the present time there is between $45,000,000 and $50,000,000 worth of public housing at a total standstill not because of any question of hours and wages but simply because the carpenters say, "We want to carry the lumber from the trucks to the job," and the laborers say, "No, we want to carry it." As a result, nobody works, and that $45,000,000 to $50,000,000 worth of heavy construction is held up.

Are we acting against the interest of these individual carpenters and these individual laborers in providing an end to jurisdictional strikes? I say no, and I will tell you why I say no. I have had letters by the hundreds from carpenters and from laborers in the State of New Jersey who have said they want to go back to work. Both carpenters and laborers are satisfied to get back to work. But why is it they cannot? It is because Mr. Hutcheson, the head of the carpenters, and Mr. Moreschi, the head of the laborers here in Washington, have refused to get together and settle this jurisdictional dispute. They could do it overnight if they had the will to.

Mr. Green appeared before our committee and he pleaded as I have heard no one else plead. He said, "Do not interfere with the house of labor." Let me say to you that the house of labor is sick and is refusing to take any medicine itself. We believe that this House has to give it some medicine that will cure it of its own ills and restore the right to go back to work, that the rank and file of the labor movement really want.

It is not only heavy construction that is being held up in New Jersey today, it is the Federal Government's own building program to provide homes for returning veterans that is being held up be-

cause those projects, too, are at a standstill as the result of these jurisdictional strikes.

I want to point out something else. Representatives of three segments of the lumber industry appeared before our committee, the fir, the redwood, and another branch, and they pointed out that as a result of work stoppages, not concerning wages or hours but concerning jurisdictional strikes, closed-shop issues, and things of that kind, the production of sufficient lumber to build 210,000 6-room homes was lost. That is the reason for the high cost of building. It is not the high cost of building, it is the high cost of strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

This provision of the bill is also going to give us an opportunity to stop Mr. J. C. Petrillo from keeping American school children from going on the air. It is going to stop him from firing out of his union a man like Dr. Maddy, who was head of the Interlochen School, in Michigan, and who put on programs and trained youngsters throughout this Nation at their camp every year. It is going to meet face to face those high-handed dictatorial methods.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Idlewild Airport, a $90,000,000 project in New York, has been stopped from completion for a year because the telephone workers and the electrical workers are in a jurisdictional fight to determine which one shall do about 24 hours' worth of work in pulling a cable 1 mile.

Mr. HARTLEY. Exactly, and the instance the gentleman cites can be repeated ad infinitum all over this Nation.

In the year 1215, at Runnymede, King John delivered the Magna Carta, surrendering to the British barons sovereign power. In 1790, the Constitution of the United States gave to the common people of our country their Bill of Rights.

In 1935, the New Deal brought forth the National Labor Relations Act, rightly called another Magna Carta, and by it surrendered to the labor barons sovereign powers over the working man and woman of the United States. This year, this Congress gives to these working men and women their bill of rights.

And whom do we hear complaining of our purpose? The man at work? His family? His friends? No. We hear the labor barons, gathered in this city today more than 250 strong to fight this bill, the worker's bill of rights, with every weapon at their command.

Now let us see what is in this bill of rights. Let us see if it oppresses the workingman, or if it liberates him and gives him a voice, free of fear, in the affairs of a union that has over him the power that the National Labor Relations Act gives to his exclusive bargaining agent. This bill guarantees to him:

First. The right to join with the fellow workers to select a collective-bargaining agent of their own choosing, that is to say, one that is not forced upon them—sections 7 (a), 8 (a) (1), 8 (a) (3), 8 (b) (1), (9) (c) (2), 9 (f) (2), 9 (f) (4), 9 (f) (5).

Second. It gives him: The right to get a job without joining any union—sections 8 (a) (3), 8 (d) (4).

Third. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job—sections 8 (d) (4), 9 (g).

Fourth. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union—section 8 (b) (2).

Fifth. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own, and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union, without dictation by national and international officers and representatives, and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers—section 9 (f) (1).

Sixth. The right to keep on working and getting his pay without sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer—section 12 (a) (3) (a).

Seventh. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him—section 2 (11).

Eighth. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or the union officers without suffering any penalty or discrimination—sections 8 (a) (4), 8 (c) (5).

Ninth. The right to vote by secret ballot without fear in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for—section 8 (c) (8).

Tenth. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers—section 8 (c) (8).

Eleventh. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses—section 8 (c) (10), 303.

Twelfth. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want—section 8 (c) (3).

Thirteenth. The right to receive his pay in his pay envelope, without the employer and the union spending it for him, checking it off for union dues or for other purposes—section 8 (a) (2) (C).

Fourteenth. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for, first, not paying dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the union; third, violating the union's contract; fourth, being a Communist or fellow traveler; fifth, being convicted of a felony; sixth, engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union—section 8 (c) (6).

Fifteenth. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like—section 8 (a) (1), 8 (b) (1), 12 (a) (1).

Sixteenth. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer—section 9 (a).

Seventeenth. The right without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes—section 8 (c) (5).

Eighteenth. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested—section 12 (a) (1).

Nineteenth. The right of a union free of Communist domination and control, and one that is devoted to honest trade unionism and not class warfare and turmoil—section 9 (f) (6).

Twentieth. Every right to strike for any legitimate object that he has had under our laws since labor has had the right to strike.

Twenty-first. And, finally, the right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights—section 10.

Besides all these rights, the bill preserves every essential right that the Labor Act in its present form guarantees to working people.

Now, is this oppressive? Is it punitive? Is it unfair? It is oppressive, if you wish to call it that, only to those union leaders who wish to exploit and degrade the people they represent, who wish to deprive them of a voice in matters that vitally concern them, to deprive them of free and fair elections within the union, and to control their political as well as their economic lives. Public opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of the union members themselves approve reforms that we propose.

We are trying to make this labor bill a two-way proposition, we are trying to write equity into the law, to make the relationship between labor and management equitable, to place them on an equal basis. We are trying in this bill to reverse the trend that has been going on for some time, that is, to build up such terrible prejudices between management and labor. We are trying to stop this philosophy that the only way you can build up labor is to tear down management. We are trying to follow the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln on this particular subject when he said:

> Property is the fruit of labor. It is desirable. It is a positive good in the world. That some may be rich shows that others may become rich and, hence, is just encouragement for industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but rather let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus assuring that his own will be safe from violence when built.

That is the philosophy that permeates this bill.

In conclusion, may I say that there was a time when we increased wages and we reduced prices. Why were we able to do that? Because when we increased wages, we increased the productivity of

the average workman. But, later on, the philosophy changed, and it became the philosophy of "get as much as you can for doing as little as you can."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has a constituent who, in my opinion, has given us a new philosophy which everyone of us, whether we be in the labor movement, in management, or in the Halls of Congress, might well follow. I would like to leave it with you in closing. The philosophy which his constituent expresses is this: "To get more for the dollar you spend, give more for the dollar you earn." If we would all do that, I think the whole country would be better off, and we would be on our way toward real progress.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 24 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after a careful study of H. R. 3020, it is my firm conviction that if the Congress should pass this bill it would take us back to the Dark Ages with respect to labor-management relations. Perhaps that is what it is meant to do—to take us back to the Dark Ages—back to the days of Republican normalcy. I can think of no better way to create the greatest degree of industrial strife this Nation has ever known than to enact this bill into law.

During the 170 years of this Nation's history, we have been made over from a nation of farmers and country dwellers into a nation three-fourths of whose people live in cities and work in industry. During the course of that 170 years, there have been many far-reaching, even fantastic, developments in industry. The employer of yesteryears who worked side by side with his hired man and served as a friendly counselor to his worker and his family is all but nonexistent today as far as the great mass of workers is concerned. The vast majority of workers today are machine tenders who do not know what the boss man or the chairman of the board of directors looks like.

During the 170 years we have come to recognize certain developments in industry as the labor movement. There have been troublesome times for both management and labor, but by and large it has been a struggle for recognition on the part of the wage earner and his family. This is pointed up in a 1943 report by the chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on industrial and labor conditions entitled "The American Story of Industrial and Labor Relations." The chairman of that committee was IRVING M. IVES, now the junior Senator from the State of New York. On page 101 of that report there appears this paragraph:

> When the labor movement was growing rapidly at the end of the nineteenth century, many employers tried to prevent unions from being organized in their plants.

Then the report relates how some employers forced their workers to sign yellow-dog contracts, which, as you know, were agreements not to join or support a union while they worked for those employers. It describes another method used by some employers to fight the unions of that period, by blacklisting, which consisted simply of circulating among other employers the names of union members or those who were suspected of being union members. This particular scheme worked to the detriment of the unions because there were more workers than there were jobs, and it was risky to be affiliated with a labor union.

That was toward the close of the nineteenth century. Now during the present century our economy has grown by leaps and bounds, our industrial development has outstripped the dreams of the wildest visionary, until today our industrial know-how is unsurpassed the world over. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, our know-how in labor-management relations has not kept pace with our technological development.

Because our economy has expanded so rapidly and because practices, customs, and methods have changed so drastically in our huge industrial machine in such a short time, serious and often ugly labor-management problems have confronted us; some of those problems we have solved effectively in fairness to both management and labor; unfortunately, some of the problems still remain. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there are remaining problems to be settled is no reason for going back to the Dark Ages or back to the days of Republican normalcy. And that is what I think this bill would do. I want to read an interesting sentence from a document which is probably familiar to a large part of this body. I refer to a little opus entitled "Textbook, Republican National Committee, 1940." On page 28 of that literary effort, under the title of Labor Relations, this is the leading paragraph:

> The Republican Party has always protected the American worker.

Now as I read an item in section 8 of House bill 3020, it would virtually nullify the check-off system under which employers automatically deduct union dues from employees' pay. This, gentlemen, is defined as an unfair practice on the part of the employers. And I suppose that is done in all faith with respect to the statement in the 1940 textbook:

> The Republican Party has always protected the American worker.

Now as I read another item in section 8 of the bill, it would outlaw employer contributions to any funds over which a union had any control at all, including those jointly administered by the union and the employer. Such a contribution by the employer would be an unfair labor practice. If, however, an employer should want to establish a fund over which the union would have no control, he could do so. With respect to negotiations dealing with a contract, however, another section of this bill would bar the union from demanding a welfare fund. In other words, the employer could dole it out as a charity if he agreed with the Republican slogan that the Republican Party has always been a friend of the worker.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from another interesting little document entitled "A Program for a Dynamic America—a Statement of Republican Principles." This document is a report of the Republican program committee submitted to the Republican National Committee on February 16, 1940, and I quote from page 42 of that document:

> A free labor movement is important to the maintenance of representative self-government. Labor unions, like farmers' cooperatives and other agencies of organized self-help, are among the drill grounds of democracy.

Now, I am sure that we all agree that that is beautiful. It is what is known as fine writing. But to continue:

> Their processes, when they are kept democratic, give to workers who participate in them valuable training for their wider role as citizens in community, State, and Nation. Every inroad that Government makes upon a free labor movement involves a loss to democracy.

That was from page 42 of a report from the Republican program committee in February 1940. Now, here is something from a Republican-inspired work of April 10, 1947, known as House bill 3020. As I read section 9 in connection with section 12, which outlaws monopolistic strikes, Mr. Chairman, section 9 would, among other things, operate as an outright ban on industry-wide bargaining. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my Republican colleagues if that is what the 1940 report of the Republican program committee meant by the statement that every inroad that Government makes upon a free labor movement involves a loss to democracy; or, I might ask, in the same vein, do their proposed definitions of illegal boycotts or sympathetic strikes fit the 1940 statement of the program committee?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read from another literary effort of the Republicans. This is taken from the Republican Party platform of 1944. The first sentence under the subdivision labor reads as follows:

> The Republican Party is the historical champion of free labor.

That was in 1944. Today, the Republican Party is sponsoring a bill which would limit labor's activities to those which have not been defined by the Republicans as unfair practices, a bill which would require labor unions to make annual reports of their finances but which would make no such requirement of manufacturers' associations.

Reading further in the Republican platform of 1944, Mr. Chairman, I have found this:

> We pledge an end to political trickery in the administration of labor laws and the handling of labor disputes, and equal benefits on the basis of equality to all labor in the administration of labor controls and laws, regardless of political affiliation.

Is that what the Republicans mean when in this bill they would provide for amendments to the Clayton Act of 1914, the effect of which would be to subject to antitrust prosecution any combination or conspiracy in restraint of commerce. As you know, it was the purpose of the Clayton Act of 1914 to bar application of the Sherman antitrust law to labor unions. Now this bill would take us back to 1914. Perhaps in future labor legislation the Republican Party, with all of its fine promises to labor, will try to take us back to the yellow-dog contract,

to the good old days of blacklisting—to the Dark Ages—back to the days of Republican normalcy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to offend my Republican friends, but I think that it would be pertinent here in my recital of the traditional attitude of the Republican Party toward the labor movement to ask their indulgence for a question. It is a question of their own making and so perhaps they will not mind if I put it to them. It is simply: Have you had enough? But, Mr. Chairman, I must hurry on with another point or two.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read from another piece of Republican literature. This is a document issued by the Republican National Committee and entitled "The Republican Administration—Its Tasks and Responsibilities." Although it is undated, I assume that it was issued along about 1931 because of this concluding statement in its foreword:

> There are no 10 years of American history marked by such magnificent progress, both social and economic, as has been witnessed since 1921. The same courage, the same sense of responsibility, the same solicitude for the welfare of our people, have been shown by each succeeding administration.

Then on pages 28 and 29 there are these two paragraphs under the title of "Labor":

> Aid to labor has been furnished in a great number of directions. Wages have been very generally maintained in the face of the business depression, through agreements between industrial leaders and the President; the maximum number of employees in industry have been given work on part-time basis. Through the medium of the Federal Employment Service and its cooperating offices, 1,408,131 individuals have obtained employment since January 1, 1930. Wage earners were further protected by an executive order largely curtailing the immigration of foreign workers, which in 5 months resulted in a denial of 96,883 immigration visas, and reduced nonquota visas from Canada and Mexico from 60,000 to less than 5,000. By action of the Department of Labor, about 20,000 aliens illegally within the United States have been deported. Noteworthy, too, a requirement was made that contractors for public buildings pay the prevailing local wage scale where such buildings were erected.
>
> The Federal appropriation of $1,000,000 for the rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry was continued for another 3 years.

That was the Republican labor record, according to their own statement during that 10 years of magnificent progress. If their determination to pass this bill is an indication of their labor record for the future, we apparently may expect more Republican activity with regard to the worker in the present Congress than there was in the 10-year period of Republican administration in the twenties. But, unfortunately, judging by the attitude of the Republicans thus far in the Eightieth Congress, the added interest in labor matters is not going to redound to the benefit of the American wage earner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a very excellent statement. There have been a lot of rumors around about numerous secret meetings by representatives of outside groups, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and certain other representatives, down here, conferring with members of the committee in connection with the drafting of this bill. I think those rumors should either be confirmed or dissipated in the interest of the Members of Congress because, if that is so, it is the most vicious lobby I have seen in my 19 years as a Member of Congress. The gentleman is the ranking Democratic member of the committee. Has he any information about representatives of certain interests in this country being down here and helping draft this bill or imposing their personalities in connection with the drafting of this distinctively antilabor bill?

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I think in view of the insinuation that has been made, as chairman of the committee I should be permitted to answer.

Mr. LESINSKI. I will let the gentleman answer.

Mr. HARTLEY. I say that as far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, there have been no more visits to the committee by representatives of industry and farm groups than there have been by representatives of labor groups. And, I will add that the chairman is having difficulty in getting certain leaders of the labor movement to visit with the committee and only yesterday had to serve a subpena upon Mr. Petrillo to meet with us.

Mr. LESINSKI. I will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. The minority had no hand in shaping or writing this bill. This bill was presented to us on Thursday morning, and we met Thursday afternoon, and we also sat Friday afternoon until the reading of the bill was completed and amendments made, and we only met Saturday for the purpose of passing the bill, and we had Saturday night to file our minority report. That is all I can answer on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been a lot of rumors going around, and it is only fair that they should either be repudiated or confirmed. There have been a lot of rumors around. Has the gentleman any knowledge of that?

Mr. LESINSKI. I realize that there have been rumors. I do not have any knowledge. I have not attended any meetings. We were not called in and I do not know what happened until the bill came before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Hoffman, you are going to have time on your side. The time is equally divided, and I must give time to my men. Your chairman will allot you time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, you can ask that on your side.

To return to more recent times, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a bit more from the Republican platform of 1944:

> The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. * * * All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor.

I thoroughly agree with that statement, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I am violently opposed to title III of this bill which would take the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor. Of course, Mr. President, the statement which I read to the effect that all labor activities must be placed under the direct authority of the Department of Labor, was made in 1944. This is 1947 and the Republicans have had enough of their promises. They are in the saddle now and they have had enough of fair labor practices. They mean to legislate away the standards we have built up and, though I hope this Congress will come to its senses before it passes such vicious legislation, if it does pass, I predict that the labor strife of the last year will look like a Sunday school picnic in comparison with the labor strife that will be engendered by this thoughtless, discriminatory bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I heard aright, the last statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] was to the effect that if we passed labor legislation we would have more strikes. Some labor leaders have been threatening the Congress with a Nation-wide strike for some time. If it takes a labor bill and strikes to settle the issue as to whether the national welfare or the special privileges granted to minority groups comes first, which is the question which has been bothering the country for the last 10 years, the sooner we get the strikes, if they are inevitable and must come, and have them over with, the better; at least, that is my opinion. If a tooth must be filled or pulled, if I must be operated upon, I have always followed the practice of getting it over with instead of thinking and talking about it.

The gentleman complains about the way the bill was written. He may be correct in his statement as to when he first saw the present bill, but for the last 8 years, for 8 long years, while the gentleman's party had absolute control of every branch of the Government, many of the provisions of this legislation were pending before the labor committee, of which the gentleman was a member, and the committee buried it. I know about that. I introduced it. I was on the committee. It comes with rather bad grace for the gentleman to complain now.

As for the Republican Party, its platform, and its broken promises, I suggest the gentleman read the platform on which President Roosevelt was first elected. There was a good platform so far as promises were concerned. But if there was any promise in that platform

that the gentleman's party did not break the first year it was in power, I would like to know what it was.

Why were labor unions given special protection? Why have we labor unions today? We have labor unions because, when mass production industry came to this country with its automatic machines and its miles of assembly lines, the man who worked in a factory became automatically almost a part of the machinery. He lost his individuality. He came close to being an ox in a yoke. The corporations grew to be all-powerful, and the individual worker was unable to cope with management.

So the Congress of the United States in 1934, ever mindful of its duty, ever sympathetic to those you might term the weak, the underprivileged, the unprotected, enacted the Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner Act. The Congress made that law unequal, unfair, and lopsided. It imposed liabilities, responsibilities, and penalties upon employers. It granted special privileges to labor unions and labor leaders without imposing any responsibility, without imposing any penalties upon them. The Congress did that deliberately because the laboring man, the workers in the factories, were unable to bargain on an equal basis with industry. So we made the law, as I said, lopsided, unjust, and unfair had the parties been on equal footing, but the parties did not have equal bargaining power. It was something like the teeter board we used to play on when we were children. The little kid, the lightweight, got the long end of the board, the big kid the short end, so it would go up and down, so the teeter board would work. So we gave the workingman the big end of the deal. The short end to the employer. But times and conditions have changed and the unions are now strong and powerful—the employer—especially the one who gives a few jobs, is weak. So the teeter board—the law—must be shifted to give equal leverage to each.

Unfortunately, as so often happens when a law is unfair, the unions prospered unduly under that law. They took in millions of new members. They collected millions upon millions of dollars. Just a little while ago, two years ago, at a convention in New Jersey, the teamsters, Dan Tobin's union, boasted that it had $4,000,000 in cash, that it had $5,000,000 in bonds. It also authorized its executive board, or rather, its president, Dan Tobin, to spend any part of the $4,000,000 in cash to defeat Congressmen. It forgot the labor field and the employee and dropped over into politics. And some unions and the PAC did their dirtiest to intimidate and coerce Congress and individual Members of Congress.

As so often happens when you have millions of dollars all hung up in plain sight ready to be spent, and you have a loosely knit organization, the profiteers are waiting, in this instance the racketeers and the gangsters who had been in the prohibition game—recall?—making millions of dollars, slipped over into the unions. Was it the fault of the average union man? Oh, no. He was busy working. When his job was over in the daytime, he went home to be with his family, perhaps to work in the garden, perhaps to visit with his wife and children, perhaps to go on a little outing with them. Perhaps to study to make himself a better worker—a better citizen. He was not looking after union politics. But the gangster and the union politician and the racketeer, they were all johnny-on-the-spot. They infiltrated into the union organizations. Throughout this country extortion and racketeering under their guidance grew up until today there is not a community in the country that is not affected by the unlawful activities of those men; there is not an individual. The farmer? The farmer today cannot haul his produce to market without paying, if you want to use the polite term, a tax to the union to use as it wants to. He pays if he uses the public highway.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]—from Detroit, if I may suggest—does not get a single pound of food that does not have the teamsters' tax on it. He complains of the high cost of living and the taxes and all. Oh, the teamsters' union taxes him. The President talks about the high cost of living. He says nothing about the exorbitant sums collected by union racketeers which are reflected in the prices the worker and all others must pay.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is in the contracting business. He cannot buy a foot of lumber; he cannot buy a keg of nails; he cannot buy a single brick to carry on his business, without paying a tax to the teamsters' union and to a half dozen other unions which have a part in production of each item.

I wonder how he likes it. Why complain about the high cost of living? Why complain about the Republican Party when for 14 years his party has had absolute control, has encouraged rather than frowned upon those conditions which all now admit are outrageous?

In Detroit there are small corner grocery stores, the papa-and-mama stores, as they call them, where papa and mama are running the store and doing all the labor themselves, trying to carry on and make a livelihood and a few additional dollars so they can educate and clothe their children and perchance give them a little stake when they want to build a home of their own. Around comes Mr. Hoffa, of Detroit, head of that union which permits him to practice extortion, and he says: "Papa and mama, even though you are employers, even though you never have hired a man, you are employees even though no one hires you, no one pays you, and you must come across to Hoffa's teamsters' union." Under the law only employees can be members of a union. But the teamsters' union and other unions say to papa and mama, "Join up, pay up, or else."

You cannot do business in Detroit and a hundred cities today unless you meet the demands of some union. Talk about the need of labor legislation throughout this country? I say, those unions, not the unions that the Wagner law anticipated, but the unions that the gangsters and racketeers and extortionists have given labor—the kind of unions controlled by these men who are levying a tax upon the farmer, upon the businessman, and upon the little man who wants to run a store, they must be made to know that extortion is a crime, the United States Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding. All throughout the country, store after store had to pay the teamsters' union in order to get goods from the warehouses. And the clerks had to join.

And the union man? What of him? Time and again the union man has been fired from the union because he did not go along with the men who were in control of his union. There are cases in the books, decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, decisions by the courts, where the courts have had to come to the rescue of the man that this law, the National Labor Relations Act, was designed to protect, where they had to come to his rescue to protect him from the union itself when he ventured to express an opinion and some crook in union office made it hot for the real worker. I say nothing of the N. L. R. A. which denied, as did that act, the employer the right to free speech. I am talking now about the union man who was denied free speech and a job—who could not go to his job because of the closed shop situation, and in many other instances where the union boss wanted to impose his will and coerce the union members who did not agree with him. Some man in the union spoke up. Immediately he was fired and it took a decision of the United States Court of Appeals to get his job back for him. To restore to the union member his right of free speech.

Talk about this bill being an anti-labor bill? Why, this bill is a bill to protect the union man himself. It is the workingman's Bill of Rights. For the first time since labor legislation has been written, you have here a bill which in its title—in its title expresses concern for the public, for the non-union employee, for the employee who is a union man, for the union, and the only one who is condemned in this bill is the racketeer, the extortionist, the man who is hiding behind the cloak of unionism, masquerading as a union official, but who is, after all, nothing but a crook carrying on a crook's business and living upon legitimate business, oppressing the poor, oppressing those who must work, and doing it by assuming the title, the role of masquerading as a union official.

Those men were crooks—they are crooks—they always will be crooks, because their business is crooked, and if they were deacons in a church they would still be crooked. This bill is designed to get them to give to the real workers—to the union man the protection he needs—to give to the public the protection to which it is entitled.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is always very amusing to listen to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I am sure that we have all, for the twenty-sixth time, enjoyed his remarks

on the same subject. However, as far as I was able to interpret the gentleman's remarks, he really did not give us much information on the bill. However, perhaps that may come later. We should probably hear from him again—often and long.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3020 and in support of the minority report. I know the members of the committee will discuss the over-all features of the bill. Therefore, I will confine my remarks to just a few parts of the bill, particularly the part which has to do with the Conciliation Service. Changing the name of the Conciliation Service—a Service that has held the respect of labor and management during its 34 years of service—seems to me just another one of the "sleight of hand" performances you have been indulging in throughout the entire consideration of this bill. My information is that changing the name of the Service will not improve the method of handling labor disputes. In fact, it will have the opposite effect because, as I have said, the people of the country have knowledge and respect for the 34-year-old Conciliation Service. It has not been perfect, but by the same token neither has Congress, nor has any other service which must depend upon human behavior but when its long record of useful service is compared with its very few mistakes, the scales tip very decidedly in favor of its useful service. We know that in the final analysis conciliation rests upon voluntary cooperation. The only thing apparently new in creating the Office of Conciliation is that it separates the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. Is that what you want to do, and, if so, why? It seems to me a completely stupid thing to do. Everybody knows that under our system of government, the people, the Congress, and the President look to the Secretary of Labor as the cabinet officer in charge of labor relations problems to maintain industrial peace. If you divest the Secretary of Labor of the conciliation function, how can he properly exercise his duty to maintain industrial peace? It is just an impossible situation.

This is not a labor bill. It should be called an anti-Democratic bill. It is a monstrosity—the objective of which is plain. The destruction of labor unions in America.

Of course, I realize how difficult it must be for the Labor Committee to bring in a fair and reasonable bill for consideration. Unfortunately, there are few members on the committee who have had much experience in dealing with labor problems and the new members probably do not realize the great service rendered by labor during the war years, when not only our own country but our allies looked to labor to save the world by supplying the implements of war. There were differences of opinion and strikes, to be sure, but no fair-minded human being will deny that upon the backs of labor rested a very great responsibility and it came through, with flying colors supplying the Army and Navy with the implements necessary to win our glorious victory. Too many people forget the great service labor rendered, and, unfortunately, remember only the strikes, many of which were justified. They forget too that industry got "its pound of flesh" and if you do not believe this, I will just refer you to the industry reports of the past several years. Industry took no chances with their "cost plus" and the "plus" was plenty.

Just now it is the fashion to condemn labor and by this bill you are attempting to destroy labor but you cannot do it. And, I predict that if you vote for this bill, conceived in hate and hysteria, you will regret that vote and if you have any further political ambition, it will die with this Congress.

And now I shall attempt to explain title 2 of this bill as I see it.

Title II of the proposed bill would wipe out the existing Conciliation Service and create an independent agency separate and apart from the Department of Labor. All of the functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service as provided for under the Enabling Act of 1913 establishing the Department of Labor, are transferred to the new Office of Conciliation. The new Office of Conciliation would have no new or additional powers to those now being exercised by the United States Conciliation Service. As a matter of fact, it fails to make provision for some of the preventive conciliation procedures now being used by the Conciliation Service and it fails to make provision for a Labor-Management Advisory Committee, which is now providing such able assistance and guidance to the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Conciliation Service. Since the Office of Conciliation has no new provisions under H. R. 3020 there certainly is no reason for engaging in the "sleight of hand" of changing the name of the agency. We certainly will have no better agency for handling labor disputes just by changing its name. As a matter of fact, we will undoubtedly have a worse agency because the people of the country have come to respect the name and reputation of the Conciliation Service as built up in its 34 years of experience.

As we all know, conciliation rests upon voluntarism. Both labor and management must accept the facilities of the Conciliation Service if its work is to succeed. If the suggestions and proposals made by the Conciliation Service are to be given due weight and consideration, they must come from an agency which commands the respect of the parties to the dispute as well as the respect and confidence of the public. The Conciliation Service now commands that respect and confidence. A new agency, no matter how good its intention, cannot build up that respect and confidence overnight. It certainly cannot have that respect and confidence during this critical period of reconversion from a war economy to a peace economy. Lacking that confidence, it cannot have the same degree of success in settling disputes as the present Conciliation Service now has.

Before voting on this bill I think it is important that we examine what it seeks to achieve. On its face it would create a new Office of Conciliation with no new powers from those now being exercised by the Conciliation Service. The only thing new about the proposal is that it would separate the Office of Conciliation from the Department of Labor. If there were any sound reasons for the separation, I for one would support it. But let us look at the reasons submitted by the majority in support of this proposal. Page 45 of the report states:

> Sections 201 and 202 create an Office of Conciliation, an independent agency, and transfer to it functions of the United States Conciliation Service, and define the duties of the Office of Conciliation.

That is all that the majority report has to say in support of the establishment of a new independent agency, wiping out the long-established Conciliation Service. The reasoning behind this proposal is not difficult to analyze. There just is not any reasoning. If there is, it is a deep, dark secret which the majority apparently is afraid to have included in its report. The fact is that there is no good, legitimate reason for establishing an independent Conciliation Service. The fact is that we now have a strong Conciliation Service with 34 years of experience. We should not wipe out that vast store of experience by an irrational, unreasoning vote.

There is only one result to be achieved by establishing an independent Conciliation Service. That result is a duplication of functions. We all know that under our system of government, the people, the Congress, and the President look to the Secretary of Labor as the Cabinet officer in charge of labor-relations problems to maintain industrial peace. If we divest the Secretary of Labor of his conciliation function he cannot properly exercise his duty to maintain industrial peace. As President Truman stated in his veto message on the Case bill last year:

> This creates a new five-man Federal Mediation Board. All mediation and conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service are transferred to the Board. The Board, although technically within the Department of Labor, would not be under the control of the Secretary of Labor.
>
> I consider the establishment of this new agency to be inconsistent with the principles of good administration. As I have previously stated it is my opinion that Government today demands reorganization along the lines which the Congress has set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945, i. e., the organization of Government activity into the fewest number of Government agencies consistent with efficiency. Control of purely administrative matters should be grouped as much as possible under members of the Cabinet, who are in turn responsible to the President.
>
> The proposed Federal Mediation Board will have no quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions. It would be purely an administrative agency. Surely functions of this kind should be concentrated in the Department of Labor.
>
> Since 1913 there has been within the Department of Labor and responsible to the Secretary of Labor a United States Conciliation Service formed with the very purpose of encouraging the settlement of labor disputes through mediation, conciliation, and other good offices. The record of that Service has been outstanding. During the period of 1 year, from May 1945 through April 1946, it settled under existing law 19,930 labor disputes. Included in this total were 3,152 strikes, almost 10 each day. The Conciliation Service has formed one of the principal divisions of the Department of Labor.

The bill proposed to transfer that Service and its functions to the newly formed Federal Mediation Board. To me this is the equivalent of creating a separate and duplicate Department of Labor, depriving the Secretary of Labor of many of his principal responsibilities, and placing the conciliation and mediation functions in an independent body.

In the eyes of Congress and of the public the President and the Secretary of Labor would remain responsible for the exercise of mediation and conciliation functions in labor disputes, while, in fact, those functions would be conducted by another body not fully responsible to either.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I said in a message to Congress: "Meanwhile, plans for strengthening the Department of Labor, and bringing under it functions belonging to it, are going forward." The establishment of the proposed Federal Mediation Board is a backward step.

Everything that the President said with respect to a Mediation Board applies with equal strength to an independent Office of Conciliation. The hearings before our committee preceding the majority report have proven that our great President exercised sound judgment when he vetoed the Case bill, for many of the people who a year ago clamored for an independent agency for the mediation of labor disputes have since changed their minds. The provision of H. R. 3020 calling for an independent agency is certainly not based upon any evidence presented at the hearings before this committee. On the contrary, if time were taken by the majority to read the hearings, they would find that representatives of organized management and labor have opposed the separation of the conciliation facilities from the Department of Labor. The roster of leading representatives of management and labor who favored the continuation of the present Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor is indeed impressive. The National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Association of Machinists, and the National Federation of Telephone Workers all testified before this committee that they favored the retention of the present Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor, and the Committee for Economic Development, which favored a new Conciliation Service, did recommend that it be kept within the Department of Labor for housekeeping purposes.

In November 1945 the President's National Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations unanimously recommended that the Conciliation Service be continued within the Department of Labor. This conference, composed of leaders of industry and labor in the United States, the real experts in the field of labor relations, the people who work with the problem on a day-to-day basis, saw no reason for establishing an independent Conciliation Service. This conference was composed of representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, the AFL, the CIO, the railway brotherhoods, and the United Mine Workers. Although these people did not agree on many things, they did agree upon one very important fact. They unanimously agreed that the Conciliation Service should be reorganized and strengthened and that it should remain within the Department of Labor.

As recently as December 1946, the Thirteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation of representatives of State labor commissions went on record as saying "that the Federal Government continue to discharge its responsibility for mediation and conciliation of disputes through the Conciliation Service within the United States Department of Labor." That is the recommendation of State labor commissioners who work with the problems of labor relations on the community level or at the grassroots level, if you will. They know how industrial disputes can best be handled. They felt that the Conciliation Service was doing a good job and should be left within the Department of Labor.

The recommendation for reorganization of the Conciliation Service made by the President's National Labor-Management Conference was accepted seriously by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and his Director of Conciliation, Edgar L. Warren. As one of the most important steps taken in that reorganization process, a Labor-Management Advisory Committee was set up to meet regularly with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of Conciliation to make recommendations on procedures to be employed by the Conciliation Service for the better performance of its job of settling disputes. This Advisory Committee is made up of people nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL, and CIO. The work of this Committee is by no means perfunctory. It meets with the Secretary and the Director on a regular monthly basis. Its recommendations are taken seriously and not a single major reorganizational step has been taken unless it was either upon the recommendation of or with the approval of the Advisory Committee. That reorganization program has proved effective and the Service is now operating smoothly. In the past year it settled more than 13,000 labor disputes. In more than 90 percent of the cases in which the Conciliation Service was called in before a strike occurred, the Service succeeded in closing those cases without a strike occurring. Gentlemen, when you bat .900 in this tough field of labor disputes you really belong in the big leagues. I do not know of any manager who, when he had a team batting .900, would decide, because of some whim, to put in his second team. He knows as well as I do that the fans would have his neck in no time and I fear that our fans, the public would have our necks if we vote to put in a second team when we now have a team that is batting over .900.

What is even worse is that under this proposal we do not even know what kind of a second team we would have, because H. R. 3020 fails to provide for a transfer of the present Conciliation Service personnel to the new agency. Thus in one fell stroke we would wipe out the entire experience built up over 34 years of the present Conciliation Service. That section of the bill which fails to transfer the present personnel to the new agency is so drastic and irresponsible in its nature that I would like to discuss that in greater detail later in my speech. At this time I want to continue for a few minutes on the steps taken by the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Conciliation Service for strengthening the Conciliation Service pursuant to the unanimous recommendation of the President's Labor-Management Conference. I will not discuss those steps in detail as many of you already know them and representatives of labor and management know them and are pleased with them and the public generally has received them with acclaim. Some of the steps taken pursuant to the recommendation of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee are:

First. Establishment of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee from nominees recommended by the AFL, CIO, NAM, and chamber of commerce.

Second. Establishment of regional advisory committees on the same basis.

Third. Decentralization of the field organization.

Fourth. Reorganization of the Arbitration Division.

Fifth. Reorganization of the Technical Division.

Sixth. Establishment of a Program Division for training of new officers and keeping the staff up to date on current labor-relations problems and developing improved mediation techniques.

Seventh. Appointment of special conciliators to supplement the activities of regular conciliators in key disputes.

Eighth. Commencement of a program through the Philadelphia Assembly and Utility Conference for cooperation with local groups for settlement of labor disputes on the local and industry levels.

Ninth. Establishment of procedures for tripartite mediation.

Tenth. Fact finding.

I believe, as do my colleagues in the minority, that the record of the Conciliation Service has been a remarkable one. If you remember that this record was made during the most difficult period in our history, during a period when we reconverted our vast war machine to a peacetime machine, that record is the more remarkable. It would seem the sheerest kind of folly for us to cast aside this experienced, well-trained organization and replace it with an inexperienced, untried agency. Our reconversion process is not complete. We still have a long way to go. Prices are still on the uprise. Until prices are brought down, we will have considerable industrial unrest. We cannot afford to have green men handling the industrial problems that we will face during the next year.

The majority gives exactly the same reason for failing to transfer the personnel of the present Conciliation Service to the new agency as it does for setting up the new independent agency. No reason whatsoever. This failure to use the vast store of experience built up by the Conciliation Service since its establishment in 1913 is the height of recklessness and irresponsibility. As the minority report points out, of the top 31 members of the staff in the highest grades of the Service, there is a total

of 362 years of service in the Federal Government, 269 of which were in the Department of Labor. When the public is demanding that we provide for a strong Conciliation Service, the majority recklessly proposes that we wipe out this vast reservoir of experience.

If the majority believes that there is an overabundance of trained conciliators available, they are sadly mistaken. If they believe that they can find 400 Republicans who are trained conciliators, they are sadly mistaken. I have no doubt but that they can find 400 Republicans who want jobs, but I do know that they cannot find 400 men with the background and experience necessary to settle the difficult problems involved in current labor disputes, and I do know that the conciliators now on the staff of the Service who have come from all walks of life have a background of industrial-relations experience that cannot be duplicated by inexperienced, untried men. I know as do a good many of my colleagues in this House that a strong Conciliation Service as demanded by the people cannot be created just by passing a law here, but that it can be built only upon a foundation of experienced and highly qualified personnel.

This proposal of the majority to wipe out the present Conciliation Service is not only a form of reckless folly, but is an example of the worst kind of partisanship. This proposal of the majority is not founded upon one iota of testimony before the committee. Aside from this proposal which the majority submitted to us at the last minute on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, there has not been a single bill introduced into this House or the Senate relating to methods for conciliating disputes which does not contain a provision for the transfer of the present Conciliation Service personnel to the proposed new agency. Every single bill introduced into either House of this Congress recognized that a proposed new agency would have absolutely no chance of success unless it were to be built upon the foundation of the experienced personnel of the present Conciliation Service. The majority proposal under H. R. 3020 is not based upon any of the bills considered during the hearings. It is not based upon any of the testimony presented at the hearings. It is a proposal that the majority just pulled out of a hat for pure partisan reasons. It is about time that the Republicans in their newly won power began to realize that the people of this country do not like partisan trickery. The people of this country want industrial peace. They want economic prosperity. The people want an impartial Conciliation Service. They demand a nonpartisan Conciliation Service. They now have that kind of a Service.

The Republican majority apparently wants to create a Republican Conciliation Service. Labor disputes cannot be settled by a Republican Conciliation Service or a Democratic Conciliation Service. They can be settled only by a nonpartisan impartial Conciliation Service. That is the kind of Service they now have. It should not be tampered with.

When I say that the Conciliation Service should not be tampered with, I know that I speak for my distinguished colleagues of the minority. When I say that we favor constructive proposals to strengthen and extend the facilities of the Conciliation Service, we of the minority believe that there are some constructive steps that can still be taken to extend those facilities. President Truman in his state of the Union message pointed the way to the kind of extended facilities that were required when he said:

Point No. 2 is the extension of the facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining. One of our difficulties in avoiding labor strife arises from a lack of order in the collective bargaining process. The parties often do not have a clear understanding of their responsibility for settling disputes through their own negotiations. We constantly see instances where labor or management resorts to economic force without exhausting the possibilities for agreement through the bargaining process. Neither the parties nor the Government have a definite yardstick for determining when and how Government assistance should be invoked. There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

We of the minority support this program of our great President and we have indicated that we would support a bill containing the constructive proposals set forth in the State of the Union message. The majority, however, were in too great a hurry to pass a law to even meet with the minority for the purpose of considering the views of the minority. Instead they just presented us with a bill and, in effect, said "take it or leave it." In their newly won power the Republicans seem to have forgotten that we have a two-party system and that the people of this country expect those two parties to work jointly in framing legislation for the good of all the people. The people of this country do not like "take it or leave it" offers from anybody and they will not like it when such offers are made by the Republican majority. We still believe that there are constructive steps that can and should be taken, and they are the steps set forth in the President's State of the Union message.

Before voting on this proposal to divorce the present Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor and to set up a new Conciliation Service independent of that Department, I believe the Members of this body should consider for a few minutes a brief history of the Department of Labor and the Republican platform of 1944 as it relates to the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor was created by the Enabling Act of 1913. It was adopted by a Republican Congress. It was signed by President Taft, the father of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as his last official act. I believe the Republican Party and President Taft deserve great credit for giving birth to the Department of Labor. But this certainly does not give them the right to tear it down and destroy it.

The Republican platform for 1944 states:

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. Labor bureaus, agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide, in Washington and throughout the country, and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor. (Report, Factual Campaign Information issued by Senate Library, September 30, 1946.)

This proposal to set up an independent agency is clearly inconsistent with the Republican platform proposal that "all governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor." If the Republican majority thinks it can get away with talking out of one side of its mouth during election campaigns and out of the other side of its mouth in this Congress, they are wrong. The people of this country are watching them and they expect them to fulfill their campaign pledges. A vote for this bill is a vote against the 1944 Republican platform.

I would like to comment very briefly on sections 203 and 204 of the proposed bill relating to strikes imperiling public health and safety. I will not dwell upon it at any great length as I understand that others of my distinguished colleagues will discuss it in greater detail. As the minority report states, sections 203 and 204 create a hodgepodge machinery for handling public utilities disputes. It creates a procedure for compulsory arbitration without establishing any standards under which the decisions are to be made. All it calls for is an opinion as to how the case should be settled, without requiring any statement of the facts upon which the opinion is based. Depending upon the whim of the special Board set up under the act, the entire resources of the public utilities companies can be given away to the employees or all the rights of the employees can be taken away from them depending upon how overdeveloped or underdeveloped a sense of equity that Board may have. It places in the hands of inexperienced people the disposition of the cases most directly affecting the national welfare.

The handling of these important public utilities disputes is typical of Republican "pass-the-buck" procedure. Such cases would be handled by the President, the Attorney General, the district courts, the Office of Conciliation, the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, the circuit court of appeals, and special boards appointed by the chief justice of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Everybody seems to get "into the act" except Jimmy Durante. As the minority report points out, it will be impossible to fix responsibility for mishandling of one of these critical labor disputes. Which one of the numerous people handling it at each step of the way is responsible will be the real $64 question. If the Republicans prefer that the responsibility not be fixed, if

they prefer this irresponsible hodgepodge approach, if they prefer this state of confusion they will quickly find that the public will not let them get away with it. The public will not be confused. It will place the responsibility right back where it belongs, on those Members of Congress who vote to adopt this "pass-the-buck" procedure.

If we were to sum up in one sentence the effect of title II of H. R. 3020, I think we could say that it wipes out in one fell swoop the vast store of experience built up by the Conciliation Service in the 34 years since it was created in 1913. This bill proposes to get labor disputes settled merely by changing the name of the agency doing the job and by bringing in inexperienced, untried people to handle problems requiring years of practical experience. This bill would create dual responsibility for handling industrial labor relations problems between the new Office of Conciliation and the Secretary of Labor. It would create a new unnecessary agency at a time when the public is seeking sound economy and consolidation of agencies dealing with related problems.

As the second part of the title, the bill creates a complicated "super-duper" machinery designed to handle public utilities cases. It provides the kind of machinery which was condemned by the Labor-Management Advisory Committee, when it said on December 16, 1946:

Members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee believe that a system of free collective bargaining can work. We believe that any form of compulsory arbitration or super machinery for disposition of labor disputes may frustrate rather than foster industrial peace. With collective bargaining freed from all wartime controls, we believe that American industry and American labor can and will assume their individual and joint responsibilities for the production of the goods and services so necessary to a prosperous peacetime America.

This new machinery instead of curtailing Government interference would provide for Government interference by numerous branches of the Government. If the Republican Party thinks they were given a mandate to pass antilabor laws they are wrong. They did receive a mandate for less governmental interference in our domestic affairs. This bill instead of giving us less Government interference would provide for more Government interference than we have ever had before in our history. This bill will give us Government interference by untried, inexperienced hands. This bill would deprive the Government and the people of the vast store of experience built up in the Conciliation Service, which is well prepared and ably equipped to handle labor disputes. A vote for this bill is a vote for more strikes. A vote for this bill is a vote for industrial chaos. I urge that this bill be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from New Jersey one additional minute.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. As many of us know, the gentlewoman from New Jersey served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House for many years. I have often wondered if she cared to explain to me and the other Members of the House why she resigned from the Committee on Labor this year and this session?

Mrs. NORTON. Frankly, in one sense, I regret that the gentleman has asked me the question because I have never knowingly hurt a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle. I have a very great respect and affection for the Members I have served with, but I regret to say I have no respect for the present chairman of the Labor Committee. And I could not serve with a chairman for whom I hold no respect. My reason for that is that during the 10 years I was chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, who is now the chairman of the Labor Committee, and who comes here before you and talks about labor as if he knew something about it, attended exactly six meetings in 10 years. That was my reason for leaving the Committee on Labor.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use my own words in response to the remarks just made, that I think more properly might have been withheld, but I am going to read a letter addressed to me as late as April 1940, after I had been a Member of this House for 12 years:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1940.*

To All City Central Bodies and Local Labor Unions in the Tenth Congressional District of New Jersey:

I am sending this letter in behalf of Congressman FRED A. HARTLEY, who, by his votes and general attitude, has proven himself to be an outstanding friend of labor.

He is one of the high ranking members of the Labor Committee of the United States House of Representatives and he is ever alert in that committee and elsewhere in the interest of labor.

Every one of the votes he cast while a Member of Congress has supported the views of the American Federation of Labor. I urge that the membership of every local union be advised of this fine attitude of Congressman HARTLEY and that they in turn request the members of their family, their neighbors, and their friends in his district to support him in the coming primary and the November election.

Let us prove to all that we are truly grateful to Congressman HARTLEY for the fine service he has rendered us by returning him to Congress by an overwhelming vote.

Fraternally yours.

And it is signed: "William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, since it is appropriate to read from the Republican Party platform of 1944, I want to quote the last paragraph of that platform:

American well-being is indivisible. Any national program which injures the national economy inevitably injures the wage-earner. The American labor movement and the Republican Party, while continuously striving for the betterment of labor's status, rejects the communistic and the New Deal concept that a single group can benefit while the general economy suffers.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect to solve all labor-management problems by legislation but we can stop the Red labor leaders and stop labor racketeering. Our main objective should be to enact a labor law which would encourage settlement of disputes between labor and management and minimize strikes and lockouts.

We must protect the public from union leaders who have misused their power. We must give labor the right to strike and give the rank and file of labor the right to take a greater part in their problems.

No one should condone jurisdictional disputes, wildcat strikes, secondary boycotts, mass picketing, and violence and destruction of property.

Secondary boycotts have cost the Nation a loss of millions of dollars in foodstuffs. A lettuce strike in California caused a loss of 2,000 cars of lettuce. Twenty thousand gallons of hot milk were dumped one morning in front of the city hall of Los Angeles. One million dollars were lost in an asparagus strike. Farmers in California were forced to dump 76 carloads of lemons because they could not get them unloaded and delivered to the markets. By reason of the labor leaders high-handed methods, used on Dock Street, Philadelphia, $125,000 worth of perishable fruits and vegetables have rotted because dealers were prevented from either moving or selling them since January 6 of this year. A returning veteran who went into business for himself testified that he was not permitted to use his own truck even though he employed a union driver. These union leaders on Dock Street gave one of the merchants 15 minutes to get off the street. This merchant had worked on this street for 57 years. The union demands that an employer may be permitted on the firm's premises on Saturday morning provided permission to do so is obtained from the union in advance. The union also demands that where a partnership of two persons exists, but who employ no salesmen, one member of that partnership must be a member of this union. Therefore, in the event of a strike one partner would be forced to picket the other.

This industrial unrest proves that our present labor laws are thoroughly inadequate of attaining industrial peace. And we intend to do something about it in terms of what is best for all of the people.

But in finding the solution for labor abuses we should not abolish labor unions. The right to strike, industry-wide bargaining, the union shop and the check-off are union fundamentals.

If you outlaw industry-wide bargaining you will create industrial strife in such industries as steel, automobile, clothing, longshoremen, coal, rubber, and newspaper unions. If the employers and employees want to bargain on an industry-wide or area basis, I see no objection. You are not going to stop strikes but you

will create thousands of strikes. I have not heard a sound argument yet to abolish industry-wide bargaining. If you outlaw industry-wide bargaining strong unions will have an excellent chance of picking the smaller employers one by one. As a result of the abolition of industry-wide bargaining we will return to cut-throat competition, scab coal mines and sweatshops. We certainly do not want the Government to take over all of the functions of labor and management.

If we have to regulate and regiment the employees and employers we might as well repeal the National Labor Relations Act and save the taxpayers the money of administering it. The workers and management would have more freedom without these regulations.

I would also like to discuss briefly three other proposals in this bill. The first is the definition of "employee." There is some doubt as to whether an employee has a right to strike for legitimate reasons under the present definition.

The second is the welfare funds under section 8 (a) (2) (C). This section of the bill would invalidate thousands of our existing health-benefit agreements. These welfare funds should be left to collective bargaining. I see no reason why we should even try to protect the employer on this subject because the employer certainly has a right to reject such a proposal.

The third point is the automatic check-off. Especially where a union shop exists, the employer should have the right of deciding whether or not he wants to give the automatic check-off. The automatic check-off in many cases is very convenient to the employer. I have talked to hundreds of businessmen in the past year and not a single one has asked me to outlaw the check-off. It should be left to collective bargaining.

As a member of the House Labor Committee for 9 years I did not have the opportunity to present industry-wide bargaining and the welfare fund to the full committee. I hope to present these amendments to the House Thursday.

I would like to read two typical letters which will demonstrate what the rank and file think. One comes from Osage, W. Va., and it reads:

HONORABLE SIR: I am a coal miner of West Virginia and speak for myself and information I gather from other miners.

There is a very, very few men want to strike and 90 percent of the miners in this district are in favor of some kind of legislation that will give them a voice about if they want to strike or not. They also think that there should be a law compelling union organizations to pay every man a certain amount for each day he is out on strike, say about one-fourth his daily wages earned in the mines, and no increase in union dues to be imposed. A cut to one-half of all union officials' salaries during the time of strike. Such a law would stop this strike business. The wage earner at present pays the bill for a strike. Let the union officials help pay the bill and also pay the striker enough to partly keep him out of debt and half enough to eat. We do not want to lose our union, but we do feel we should have a voice in it if we want to accept an offer made or not. The most of us know that the longer a strike lasts, the more certain officials get out of the union treasury, say our scale committee—they get approximately $30 a day when negotiating a contract. Sure, I, too, would try to prolong a strike as much or long as safe to do so.

There is not anything we can do about the question locally, so why not you and your fellow Representatives and Congressmen get busy; put us little fellows where we can have a say in a way that it will count, and not be compelled to listen to a few dictators.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

P. S.—A secret vote would show you at least 90 percent of the men are in favor of a no-strike law.

This letter from the rank and file which is typical. I have one more:

I want to commend your opposition to restrictions on the closed-shop contracts and industry-wide bargaining.

I see no reason why men enjoying the benefits now by a union should not be required to become members of the same. The same principle requires me to pay a school tax when I do not have children.

Industry-wide bargaining has benefitted the whole country by placing the manufacturers on an equal basis where the greed of a few will not be a detriment to those being fair with their employees. Although too often the smaller competitor is dominated by the larger corporations, the advantages to the country greatly outweigh the disadvantages that sometimes occur.

My point is this: We have taken care of practically every labor abuse I can think of, but outlawing industry-wide bargaining will not stop strikes, it will not cure any abuses. It will cause more chaos; it will tear up the whole steel industry, the automobile industry, the rubber industry, the clothing industry, the longshoremen, and the amalgamated clothing workers. When you have destroyed that system of collective bargaining, then you have hit the fundamentals of labor. I think industry-wide bargaining should be put back in the bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I believe the gentleman has made some mighty fine statements, but does he not believe that under our bill, in connection with the Steel Trust, for instance, the unions could bargain with the entire group at any time? Is there any question about that?

Mr. LANDIS. There is some question. The point is that the antitrust laws take care of the corporations through prices, but they do not take care of the corporations through wages. The employees should have the same benefits under the act as the employers in regard to wages.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Labor Committee for many years. I have associated with many Members of the House as they have come and gone. I have served under many chairmen. Without picking any argument with anyone, and without even implying that the chairman needs any word of defense, I simply pay this tribute to him as being something to which he is justly entitled. The chairman of this committee has worked hard. He has performed his duty as chairman. He has presided over the deliberations of the committee with fairness, justice, and dignity. At all times was he careful to preserve the rights of any minority member or any majority member, whether he thought the issue being discussed was important or not. I have not only great respect for him, but have a high regard for his friendship.

I feel that the committee has given very careful consideration to this bill. It is one of the most difficult pieces of legislation I have ever had the experience of trying to take part in writing. It is easy for any of us to say, "Well, something should be done." All of us know that. There is not a person within the sound of my voice but that knows something should be done. We certainly cannot long continue in the direction in which we are now traveling and preserve our American economy and our American way of life.

Some are going to try to say here, I expect, since that implication has been made, that all the Democrats are opposed to this bill. I say to you now that I am operating under no mandate from the Democratic Party that is inconsistent with the principles involved in this bill. And I do not propose to recognize any synthetic mandate from anyone else. If any party on earth has ever stood for a democratic form of government, a democratic way of settling differences, and a democratic way of presiding over organizations, it has been the Democratic Party, and I refuse to stand here and let some disgruntled Democrat heap all the credit on the Republicans, and I also refuse to stand here and let the Republicans claim the credit.

There is some much-needed legislation in this bill. We conducted long and tedious hearings. We called the labor leaders in before the committee, and they were given ample time to present their views. I regret to state that very few of them took an attitude of trying to help the committee, even though they themselves knew full well the dangers that were surrounding not only our economy but our American way of life, as well as our national safety itself.

I was astounded when Mr. Bittner, Van Bittner, I believe it is, appeared representing Mr. Murray, of the CIO, when he finally came out with the statement that he thought it would be a good thing for the Congress of the United States to go to sleep for 10 years and not meet. A rather ambitious person, I would say. Does he want to run the affairs of this country? Upon what meat does such a little Caesar feed?

The committee felt that even though it was an unpleasant duty it must go ahead and do something about these sympathy strikes and jurisdictional strikes, murder, and highjacking. If you will read the reports of the hearings on this bill, it will make your blood run cold to think of the things that have been carried on throughout the country. Then to take the attitude that because somebody claims to be a union member, we should refrain from taking any steps whatever. I love my church. I support my church. I wish I could do more for

it, but I do not want my church to get as far afield from its proper sphere of activity as the labor unions have gone from theirs. They have reached a point where, in many instances, they have sought to control and dictate to each individual member what he should write to his Congressman. That sounds strange, but here is a letter—here is the order that goes out to the members of a local, and it says:

In order that this program be a success, each one of you must—

In capital letters—

write letters to your representatives in the House and Senate immediately.

Skipping a paragraph or two, it says:

It is recommended that you give your letters to your steward or bring them to the union office and have your name checked off our list as one who has complied. We will gladly pay postage and mail these letters directly from the union office.

Then the next paragraph reads:

It is also recommended that those members who do not follow through with the above program be called in before the executive board of the local union No. 90 to explain why they did not comply with the above recommendations.

You will save time by writing a short letter that takes only a few minutes, rather than make an appearance before the executive board to explain why you did not do so.

And you tell me that the average union member should not be protected from that? And you tell me that this bill is not loaded down with protective clauses and paragraphs for the everyday, average workingman who is seeking a little freedom? I do not know if you can complain so much of the heads of many of these unions. They are like the average man. The average man is unworthy of too much unrestricted power. And they have enjoyed it until they have now reached the point that they regard it as an inherent right. So they have been pushing the members around. I fear they forget the fact that this Congress, in response to what it regarded as a very necessary thing to do, threw safeguards around labor and labor unions because the power of the dollar had gotten to be too great, and it was taking advantage of the laboring man who produced. So the Congress in its wisdom attempted to set the scales aright, and now it has reached the point that the scales are tipped in another direction. The American people will not live under such tipped scales in favor of anybody very long. That is why the overwhelming majority of this House is in favor of remedying the situation and that is why this bill came out of the committee with an overwhelming majority.

I will never let my partisanship for any party step in front of me when I see such dangers as are at present hovering around the national security of this Nation without raising my voice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There was some intimation that improper influences were brought to bear on members of the committee in the writing of this bill. Does the gentleman care to comment about that?

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. Oh, I do not know anything about that kind of business. I am not scared of anybody talking me out of my head. Why should I refuse to talk to labor organizers? I had two of them in my office this morning. Fine gentlemen. I enjoyed talking with them. If somebody from Hoshkosh who ran a store wanted to come in and talk to me, I think I would be a mental coward if I were afraid to discuss it with them. I am not suspicious enough because I see a man talking to somebody else to say "something is rotten in Denmark." I think that is placing the level of intelligence at a very poor level in this House. I do not ascribe any such thing to the Members of this House or the committee. I think the members of this committee are honest and conscientious men. They did the best job they could. Those who disagree with me, I respect them. I respect their views and I expect them to respect my conscientious convictions in the same way. That is how America has grown great. That is why the freedom of this Nation is such a priceless gem that we are not willing to give it up without a fight.

In the handling of our legislative matters we have let our production become involved. We have let it reach such a low point that it has slowed down and we know it has slowed down, yet we cry about the cost of living. We will never get the cost of living down until production is going full force. Every time you add one of these tributes that are forced from men, whether it be from the closed shop or not, every time you add one of those fees, up goes the cost of living, and the very people who are being ground into the dust by the increased cost of living are those who are crying for these safeguards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to say a word about the so-called closed-shop issue in this bill—and that is about the only issue in this bill that could be classified as a major one and a major point of difference in the committee. The difference, may I say in passing, is not confined to either side, Democrat or Republican. I think an amendment will be presented on the floor, and, personally, I hope there will be a tendency to discourage the adding of a whole lot of amendments because the bill deals with a very delicate situation. It touches almost every angle of American economy, industry, and some branches of society. So when that issue comes up I am sure it will be generally debated.

Personally, I am a little inclined to go along with that great liberal, Justice Brandeis. Justice Brandeis was a very wise man and was looking far ahead when he was writing his statement on the closed shop. I believe everybody will recognize and admit that Justice Brandeis was what is termed a "truly great conscientious liberal."

Here is what Justice Brandeis said on the subject of the closed shop:

It is an essential condition of the advance of trade-unionism that the unions shall renounce violence, restriction of output, and the closed shop. * * * The American people should not, and will not, accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employee.

I think there is no other man or body of men whose intelligence or whose character will stand in absolute power, and I should no more think of giving absolute power to unions than I should of giving to capital monopoly power.

And again he wrote:

The closed shop seems to me opposed to our ideas of liberty, as presenting a monopoly of labor which might become as objectionable a monopoly as that of capital. (The Brandeis Guide to the Modern World, pp. 139 and 140.)

Mr. Chairman, that is the very issue that will come up in this bill. There are many people who are conscientiously in favor and who are conscientiously opposed. This House is well on the way to writing some much-needed corrective legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 3020 will not provide the solution necessary to an equitable settlement of present industrial-labor differences with justice and fairness. I yield to no one in my desire for amity between employers and employees. I have always deplored strikes, for the time and money lost through strikes can never be regained. Deplorable as they are, the right to strike is recognized by all democratic governments. There are no strikes in Stalin's Russia. There were no strikes in Germany under Hitler, nor in Italy under Mussolini. The right to strike is inalienable under democracy.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 58,000,000 workers in this country. With the exception of a few, they are God-fearing, law-abiding, and home-loving Americans. This bill will have the effect of an indictment of these workers.

During the Revolutionary War, when the American Colonies were fighting for their independence, British imperialists and tories were demanding the extermination of what they termed the "rebels." Edmund Burke, a great statesman and orator of that day, made a speech in the British Parliament urging conciliation, in which he said:

I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures.

Burke made that statement concerning less than 4,000,000 people in the American Colonies; how much more true are his words when you multiply this number to 58,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Smith-Connally antilabor bill, which was passed over the veto of President Roosevelt, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, a patriotic, conservative labor leader, appeared before committees of the Congress and warned that the Smith-Connally antilabor bill would foment labor troubles and cause untold strikes. He was supported by other labor leaders. The history of that uncalled-for legislation has proven that they were absolutely right. Mr. Green now expresses a similar fear concerning H. R. 3020. He was right before and he is undoubtedly right now.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I include as a part of my remarks a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to H. R. 3020. This statement is complete and comprehensive.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The statement of policy is explicit in authorizing Federal Government's intervention into the process of collective bargaining. The Government for the first time in our history is to be given authority, not only to intervene when free and voluntary collective bargaining fails, but also to inject itself into procedures precedent to negotiations and to regulate the conduct of employees in their relation to each other and in their relationship with management. One of the stated purposes is to give the employees themselves a direct voice in the bargaining arrangements with their employers. Thus the Government would assert a policy of opposition to the very process whereby democratically chosen representatives of employees are authorized by such employees to negotiate and contract on their behalf. In other words, the purpose of the bill is to undermine and disrupt the process of collective bargaining itself. In this the bill reaches at the very foundations of voluntary representation which is a part and parcel of the free-enterprise system.

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF NLRA

REGULATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Section 2 provides for detailed regulation of the steps taken in the collective-bargaining process. This includes a legal requirement of five separate conferences between the employer and his employees or their representatives, within a 30-day period following the initial conference. Apart from the absurdity of prescribing by law how the parties should arrange the course of their negotiation and what consecutive steps they should take, it is untenable that what the bill purports to be collective bargaining would extend to a procedure which is not collective bargaining at all. As described in the bill, the procedure is not confined to duly chosen representatives of the employees, but may extend to the dealings between the employer and the employees themselves.

STRIKE VOTE

The workers are not expected to notify the employer or the employer to notify the workers about the impending strike or lockout. Instead the notice is to be sent to the Administrator of the NLRA. It is significant that if a threatened strike is involved, the Administrator must promptly notify the employer. Notice of a lock-out by the employer, however, is not to be conveyed to the employees. The statement of the employer's position in the dispute must be sent by registered mail to the representative. Since the representative is defined to include any individual, this means a requirement for an employer to mail his views by registered mail to every employee. A Government supervised vote is then to be taken in each disputed case. A requirement is also included for the consent by the employer regarding the procedure to be followed in the conduct of the strike vote. The employer is thus directly injected in the procedure whereby the employees make their decision. The ballot itself is prescribed by law. It mentions only the employer's last offer and makes no reference to the position taken by the union. The employees are thus precluded from the free exercise of the right which Congress cannot constitutionally deny them to freely pass upon the policies and decisions made by their own chosen representatives.

NEGOTIATIONS DRASTICALLY LIMITED

The bill specifically limits the collective bargaining procedure to stated items to be negotiated. Thousands of agreements which today provide for direct contribution by the workers through their union to greater efficiency, improved production and other forms of labor-management cooperation will no longer be an authorized subject for negotiations. A multitude of other existing agreements would have agreed provisions essential to the maintenance of industrial peace expunged as the result of this provision.

SUPERVISORS

This term is defined in order to exclude from collective bargaining employees classed as supervisors. The definition is so broad as to exclude a major proportion of wage earners from the collective bargaining process. For example, almost any employee in an establishment may be said to be given by the employer information that is confidential and is not available to the public, the competitors or the employees generally. Yet any employee who gains access to such information is termed as a "supervisor."

FEATHERBEDDING

The adoption of the proposed language would make it legally impossible for labor to reach an agreement with an employer requiring proper manning of the job necessary to meet minimum requirements of safety and health of the employees. This section is so loosely and viciously drawn as to extend far beyond the relationship between labor and management and would, if strictly applied, make the payment of any taxes imposed by Congress a featherbedding practice.

MULTIPLICITY OF AGENCIES

The bill creates a Labor-Management Relations Board and an Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act. The Administrator is given the duty to prosecute complaints of unfair labor practices before the Board. At the same time, the Administrator is also given the quasijudicial function of investigating representation petitions. He is also to act as the agent of the Board, before which he appears as a prosecutor, in making application to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board. This new structure is, by its terms, bound to lead to confusion so vast that no employer and no union would be able to proceed with the normal conduct of employer-employee relations without a constant danger of being in violation of some requirement of the law.

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

Section 7 (b) gives each member of a labor organization the right to be free from unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands of such labor organizations. It also requires to have the affairs of the organization conducted in a manner that is fair to its members. None of these terms is defined and no one is given the responsibility to interpret their meaning. What is unreasonable or discriminatory? What constitutes fair manner of conduct? The bill is silent on these questions and gives no indication by whom or in what manner they should be answered.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES OF EMPLOYERS

The bill dilutes the present requirements of the NLRA and in addition outlaws the check-off of dues. Today over 5,500,000 workers, or more than 40 percent of all employees under agreement, are covered by check-off provisions voluntarily agreed to by employers. No one before either the Senate or the House has criticized the operation of the existing check-off agreements.

WELFARE FUNDS

The bill outlaws employer contributions to any health, welfare, or benefit fund, whether or not such a fund is administered by the union alone or "in conjunction with any other person." Even if a union has an indirect control in such a fund and the employer is a party to it, no employer contributions toward such a fund can legally be made.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES OF LABOR

The bill includes the provisions making it unlawful for unions to seek to compel anyone to become or remain a member of a labor organization. This provision, for many years sought by the NAM, is aimed directly against union organization. The bill would regulate initiation fees or dues and prohibit any payment of a tax required as a condition of employment. If narrowly applied, the provision of section 8 (c) (2) would make the collection of any union dues unlawful. Furthermore, the bill would grant the right to any member to resign from the organization at any time making the maintenance of a stable union membership an undesirable objective, if not an impossibility.

BENEFIT PLANS

The bill prohibits the maintenance by the union of a compulsory insurance or benefit plan. Yet there is nothing in the bill to prevent the employer from imposing compulsory group insurance or other benefit plan upon his employees.

EXPULSION OR SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS

Detailed specifications are given forbidding unions to expel or suspend any member on other than the specified ground. A union is permitted to expel a member upon conviction of a felony. Legally it could neither suspend nor expel any member upon conviction of grand larceny, treason, or other unlawful acts other than felonious act.

UNION SECURITY

The bill outlaws the union shop in four ways. One is section 8 (c) (7) which requires the acceptance to membership of any one, regardless of qualifications. Another is a provision in section 8 (d) (4) which requires a period of not less than 30 days, but otherwise unlimited, during which the employee is free not to join the labor organization. In addition section 9 of the bill eliminates the present requirement of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically authorizing the union shop. Finally, section 9 (g) prohibits a union shop agreement reached as a result of a strike or a threat of a strike. This section also requires that any agreement providing for a union shop must be followed by an application to the administrator for a secret vote of employees and also for a hearing by the administrator. The validity of a union shop agreement is limited to 2 years, after which time the complex machinery, including the Government supervised ballot, must be invoked again.

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

Section 9 of the proposed bill drastically modifies the established procedure for the settlement of cases concerning representation. The changes that have been made are not supported by evidence presented to the congressional committees in the course of their hearings on proposed labor legislation.

Instead of having an investigation made whenever a question concerning representation arises, as provided in the Wagner Act, the investigation is to be made only on written application by a labor representative representing at least 30 percent of the employees in the unit. In contrast to this, an employer may ask for an investigation and an election by merely alleging that any individual has presented to him a claim that he represents a majority of the employees. It is clear that no matter what the purpose of the provisions of this section of the bill, it attempts to settle by detailed legislation problems which can only be properly resolved as they arise in each case by the National Labor Relations Board itself.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Section 9 (f) makes ineligible for an election employees of two or more competing employers unless the union represents less than 100 employees of each employer or unless the employers' plants are less than 50 miles apart. In industry after industry, these provisions will serve to eliminate trade associations as collective bargaining agents for employers in a related field, thus wiping out orderly collective bargaining built up over a period of years in large areas of peaceful labor-management relations. By stating a complex stand of eligibility for certification, the bill throws wide open the door to a mass of litigation and administrative decision as to what constitutes the proper basis for certification. By the time all the questions are answered as to who competes and who doesn't; how many employees are regularly employed; and how far apart is one plant from another, the time for orderly designation of representatives will have long since passed and the industrial unrest become widespread.

THE ELECTION BALLOT

Under the present procedure of the National Labor Relations Board, the form of the ballot is determined as the result of an investigation of the Board, which decides whether any claim for representation is substantial or valid. The bill requires that space be provided on the ballot for any choice of representative whether or not such a representative has anything to do with the existing labor-management relations. It will not be surprising if this procedure results in write-in votes designating a popular movie star as the representative or some person unable or unfit to perform the function of effective labor representation.

THE USE OF THE INJUNCTION

After the complex and extended administrative procedures of the Board proposed by the bill have been carried out the complaints of unfair labor practices are made subject to court enforcement. However, the decisions of the Board are limited in a number of ways, including the provision which would give a company union the same status as a bona fide labor organization independent of employer influence or domination. The bill makes discrimination against employees for union activity extremely difficult to prevent by forbidding the Board from ordering the reinstatement of any individual as an employee "unless the weight of the evidence shows that such individual was not suspended or discharged for cause." In all court enforcement the use of the injunction is made applicable in labor disputes by amending the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Thus the amended Wagner Act is turned into a happy hunting ground for union-breaking employer relying on unbridled rule of labor by the injunction.

UNLAWFUL CONCERTED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the provision of unfair labor practices in which employees and labor organizations are prohibited to engage, section 12 contains an additional list of unlawful activities directed against unions. Section 12 thus makes the amended Wagner Act heavily balanced against labor in favor of the employer. Even more dangerous is the fact that in section 12 Congress would bring activities subject to State and local laws within the sphere of Federal jurisdiction and Federal regulation. The use of force or violence is traditionally subject to local law enforcement. Section 12 makes such acts Federal offenses. The scope and manner of picketing is regulated by State and local laws. Section 12 would make picketing subject to Federal control. In addition, section 12 outlaws various forms of strikes. It also makes labor organizations liable for suits by employers and subject to the court injunction. The provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are made applicable to any situation covered by the section. This not only reinstates the use of the injunction in labor disputes but also permits the employer to impose a yellow-dog contract upon his employees. This is accomplished in this way. Any employee or labor organization found to have engaged in an unfair labor practice is deprived of the right of self-organization, the right to form or join a union, the right of collective bargaining, and all other rights conferred upon them by the National Labor Relations Act as amended. [Sec. 8 (b) and (c) and sec. 12 (d).] In addition, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is repealed in its entirety with respect to any action or proceeding in a Federal court involving any activity which section 12 defines as unlawful. [Sec. 12 (c).] As the result, if a worker participates in "picketing an employer's place of business in numbers," he is not only deprived of the right of union membership, but also may be required by the employer, as a condition of employment, to sign an individual contract not to join a labor organization.

It is important to note that, under the bill, when a union engages in an unfair labor practice, it promptly loses the right to its very existence, its existence becoming illegal for 1 year. Of course, no employer found guilty of an unfair labor practice is required to go out of business for 1 year. The employer must merely cease and desist from continuing such an unfair labor practice and take such affirmative action as may be necessary to comply with the law.

Enforcement of one right through the denial of another right is bad law. It is self-defeating. If all sinners were excommunicated from the church, sin would not be curbed but would become more widespread. The Wagner Act never contained any punitive provisions. The cease-and-desist orders, on which its enforcement is based, follow the tested and equitable procedure of the Federal Trade Commission Act designed to forbid unfair trade practices. Under that procedure, anyone found engaging in what the law holds to be an unfair practice, must stop the practice. But no one is sent to jail as a criminal or deprived of his civil rights.

Deprivation of the workers of their basic right of self-organization and collective bargaining will not further industrial peace. On the contrary, it will breed unrest. The proposed enactment is fraught with grave consequences to our society. Instead of removing the causes of industrial unrest, the authors of the bill attempt to outlaw its results. They deliberately close their eyes to the causes of industrial disputes. They ignore the contribution made by the free and voluntary self-organization of workers to a free society. They blindly trample upon the legitimate and lawful aspirations of American wage earners and seek to destroy the peaceful and constructive relationships and institutions which workers and employers have built up over a period of years. They would outlaw an effective peaceful picket line maintained by workers in seeking a legitimate economic objective. By doing so, they would drive workers from the economic picket lines to political picket lines, in search of a remedy against unfair and discriminatory laws. Today, after the national exertion of a world-wide war, when its attainment of economic stability at home is far from assured, when peace in the world surrounding it is not yet secure, our country can least afford the disruptive consequences which will inevitably flow from the adoption of laws imposing such far-reaching restrictions upon collective bargaining and upon organized labor.

TITLE II. CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

This title, if enacted into law, would create a legislative monstrosity and result in a vast confusion of administrative responsibilities of conflicting agencies.

Having already created, in title I, a Labor Management Relations Board, an independent agency of the Government, and an office of Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act (also "an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government"), the authors of the bill establish in title II an Office of Conciliation, again "as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government," headed by a Director of Conciliation. But that is only the beginning. This title also authorized the President to make an independent finding that a labor dispute threatens to curtail commerce or services essential to public health, safety or interest. It then vests the Attorney General with the responsibility to petition a Federal district court for the injunction, and subsequently move for the court discharge of the injunction. At this stage the Administrator of the NLRA comes in to conduct a Government-supervised ballot. Next the Secretary of Labor steps in. Upon notification by the Secretary of Labor, the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia must act. It is the duty of the Chief Justice to then convene a Special Advisory Settlement Board and to assume the chairmanship of that board. The special board renders an opinion in 30 days and 15 days later the Administrator of the NLRA comes back again to conduct another Government-supervised ballot among the employees, to find out how they feel about the special board's opinion. How the employer is to express his feeling about the special board's opinion is not stated. If one or both parties refuse to accept the special board's opinion, the dispute is back exactly where it started. To accomplish this result, the services of nine distinct and separate agencies of the Federal Government are utilized. And this is before we get to title III, where the United States Department of Labor is required to maintain a register and a file of financial reports of unions.

Overlapping jurisdiction and conflicting and unrelated responsibilities of this multiplicity of Government agencies and bureaus is bound to result in a confusion so profound that a special arbitrator would seem to be called for to resolve jurisdictional disputes among the independently acting agents of the Government. The procedures call for thousands of Federal agents, repeatedly conducting secret ballots, investigating and rendering reports. It requires mountains of administrative paper work incidental to Government record-keeping, reports, tabulations, and litigation in the courts. It necessitates huge outlays of public funds to sustain the workings of a teeming bureaucracy called upon to penetrate into every nook and cranny of business firms and of labor organizations.

Chairman FRED A. HARTLEY, of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in publishing the contents of the bill on April 10, said that the bill was "our response to the mandate that the people of the people of the United States gave us last November." We will not venture a guess to what group of people Congressman HARTLEY refers to as "the people of the people." We are sure, however, that he is misreading and misstating the

people's vote of last November. The November vote was a protest against a far-reaching Government bureaucracy and excessive Federal controls extended into peacetime. Then, as now, the people were fed up with governmental intervention into their private decisions and Government control of their private activities and transactions. It was a clear and ringing mandate against the very kind of legislative enactment Mr. HARTLEY has prepared for the consideration of Congress.

The proposed bill goes far beyond any known precedent in any field in peacetime Federal intervention. It extends Federal control to the very heart of the collective bargaining. It allows Federal authority to cut across the binding fiber of the private contract. It thrusts Federal Government jurisdiction into the area now reserved to the State and local jurisdiction. It writes a detailed script for collective-bargaining negotiations whereby labor and management reach agreement by Government mandate and not of their own accord, and places heavy penalties on those who would depart an iota from the Government-prescribed script. It regiments the actions of the workers and employers. It subjects free and voluntary organizations to all-embracing governmental control. It does all of these things, and more, and yet it is offered for the adoption by the Congress in the name of free enterprise.

Sections 201 and 202 remove the United States Conciliation Service from the United States Department of Labor where it has effectively functioned for many years and sets it up as an independent agency. It would forbid any employee of the Service to act as an arbitrator. The entire proposal militates against sound judgment, is diametrically opposed to the recommendations of the President's Labor-Management Conference and is supported by nothing but a scattered expression of a small minority of employers.

Sections 203 and 204 prescribe a special complex procedure to be followed in disputes found by the President to affect commerce in public utilities or services essential to public health, safety, or interest. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is repealed with respect to all such cases, permitting the widest reliance on the court injunction against unions. The proposed plan is directed entirely against labor and is completely one-sided. It provides for a compulsory submission of such disputes to a fact-finding special board, headed by the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. It again requires a secret ballot of employees on the acceptability of the employer's last offer, without regard to the union proposal. By setting up a court of last resort, it promotes protracted disputes and would serve to thwart the possibility of a direct settlement. The plan would contribute nothing to the maintenance of industrial peace and would subject labor organizations and collective bargaining to oppressive Government regulation and control.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include as part thereof a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to H. R. 3020, pursuant to consent heretofore granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I feel just a little bit queer having the gentleman from North Carolina, a Democrat, make my speech for me, a Republican.

I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that this is a nonpartisan problem; it is an American issue. What will make for a strong, virile, free, and solvent America? I regretted when I came to the Eightieth Congress and found I could no longer serve under the gentleman from North Carolina who was chairman of the Committee on Education of which I was a member. But I have become associated with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], and I have found him fair at all times. I have really enjoyed participating in the committee of which he is chairman and the work it has done. We worked sometimes until midnight. You get a real thrill by being privileged to play on his team. I have often thought that if all the people in New Jersey were like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] I would like to go to New Jersey and meet more of them.

In considering the question before us today it seems to me that in general there are two approaches to it. How are we going to determine what are fair wages? Are we going to have governmental determination of wages, hours, and working conditions? Are we going to restore and maintain the traditional American wage system where economic laws rather than governmental edicts determine how much a man can get for what he has to offer the public, namely, his services, his labor?

It seems that in the past few years we have been going down the line toward governmental determination in this country. When we talk about liberalism and conservatism and antedated ways of doing things, to me we are harking back to the old European system of government saying what a man can do and what he cannot do.

We have had perhaps 150 witnesses appear before our committee. There were over 2,000,000 words of testimony. More than one-third of our witnesses were labor leaders. To a man almost all these labor leaders were of the opinion that the solution to our troubles would be greater union security and when we would ask them for their recommendation as to how to solve some of the abuses that have crept up, invariably they would recommend greater union security. If they did not have the closed shop they wanted that. If they did not have the check-off they would want that—always something to make the unions more powerful.

The question is whether that is the way the American people want to go on in the matter of settling what are fair wages, hours, and working conditions, and determining those matters, or whether we want to let economic rules govern and fix our wages and working conditions. Which method will make for a sustained rising standard for our working people? Which method will keep our people free? Of all union members, about 77 percent belong to what we call compulsory membership unions; about 30 percent of the 77 percent belong to the closed shop; about 27 percent to the union shop; about 20 percent to maintenance membership, and I think a small percentage in other forms.

This bill attempts to put a ban on the closed shop, and right there let me say that does not mean the unions will be completely crippled. In the Railway Labor Act the closed union shop and compulsory membership therein is specifically banned, yet since that time the railway brotherhood memberships have doubled and trebled.

Mr. Chairman, we are interested in individual freedom. We know that during the war and since there have been veterans who have come back. There were defense workers during the war who could not get a job unless they would first pay tribute to a union. We want to protect the individual's right to work without having to pay tribute for the privilege to work.

A lot of union leaders in this country have as a goal the universal closed shop, but we are fearful of what that would lead to in this country. Mr. Van Bitner, vice president of the CIO, when he was testifying before our committee, said that the OPA was as dead as a dodo bird. Now, I questioned that.

After all, if we go on making our determination of wages and hours and working conditions not by economic laws or by economic forces but by governmental determination, and if we let powerful unions set prices on wages, hours, and working conditions, we are going to find one of these days that by having a huge powerful labor monopoly, or the Government determining, if you please, wages, we are also going to have the Government determining commodity prices. There is a very close, definite relationship between wages, hours, and working conditions, and commodity prices, because 80 to 90 percent of most commodities is labor after all. So, if we go down the line we have been going with excessive unionism, union determination of wages, we are going to have the OPA back with all of its viciousness.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman conceive of a closed shop in which the member of a union retains his economic freedom?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Well, of course, there have been closed shops for years and years and in many cases there were no abuses; in many cases the employer acquiesced willingly. But, it enables the union to have a stranglehold. It furthers the labor monopoly.

There are two powerful weapons that enable unions now to control or to fix prices and wages and working conditions and do it on a national scale. One is the closed shop and the other is industry-wide bargaining. They are the two eye teeth in this bill. They are the two things that we must take care of in this bill, or else it will be a milk-toast affair.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I think what the gentleman from New York was asking, without saying it specifically, is this: Would

it be possible for a workman working under such conditions to achieve his best effort, or would he be limited in his effort by a specific order? Could he be paid for what he does as compared with what the other man does? I think that is what the gentleman meant by "economic freedom."

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I will cover that in a moment. I think, personally, that perhaps industry-wide bargaining is the most important thing; overshadowing in importance all other things. In this bill we put a ban on industry-wide bargaining.

Industry-wide bargaining is undesirable for the following reasons: It places the public at the mercy of the labor monopoly. It impairs employer-employee relationships. It tends to result in political determination of conditions of employment and, lastly, wages cannot be set in relation to efficiency of producers. Individual effort is not given proper reward. Initiative and technological progress are stifled.

When you have union-wide, nation-wide, or industry-wide bargaining, whatever term you wish to call it, you destroy the keystone of our free economy, you destroy competition to a large degree. Talk about prices! The President of the United States says that we must lower prices or else raise wages. Why, with industry-wide bargaining it makes us have higher prices, because you in effect subsidize marginal producers, and in doing so allow too much profit to efficient producers; you do not have individual employers bargaining with their employees. You destroy competition, and competition, we have learned from experience in our country and in other lands, is the best regulator of prices the world has ever known. It keeps prices not too high and not too low, and when we stray very far afield and get away from competition and the fundamental economic rule, and substitute governmental rule, we get into plenty of trouble. Then, such a thing as a fair price or fair wage is only an accident.

So, I speak a good word for this bill. We must support the ban on industry-wide bargaining in this bill or we will go down the line toward a corporate state, statism, governmental determination of wages, hours, and working conditions, as well as commodity prices. Only by placing our reliance on fundamental economic laws rather than political forces can Americans remain free and solvent.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed today at the number of experts we have on management and labor relations, so may I say before I start that I do not hold myself out as an expert but I do have some ideas about this piece of legislation perhaps a little bit different than those proposed.

In the first place I am a strong advocate of the President's proposal that we set up a commission to study this question, and not only the problem as it is represented by symptoms but by causes, because some of them are very fundamental. I do not think we have done that in this bill or that any Congress has gone far enough. I disagree with my distinguished chairman in that respect. He feels that he has done a good job, that he has gone far enough, but I do not.

It is significant that those who have been shouting the loudest against bureaucracy in Government and the expenditure of taxpayers' money should now be the loudest advocates of the establishment of an immense bureaucracy in Washington to govern and police the working people of America and which would require sums of money far in excess of the combined annual expenditures of the Conciliation Service and the National Labor Relations Board. It would be well for the taxpayers to take a little note of what is going on in Washington among our Republican friends.

The American public is being and has been propagandized on this subject of labor regulation for the obvious purpose of compelling this Congress to write in haste, without proper or adequate study, a bill to govern the activities of labor unions and, incidentally, adversely affect the unorganized groups. As has been said frequently, this kind of legislation would destroy labor organizations by destroying the right under the Constitution to band together in organizations for security and preservation. It is at the wage-earning men and women of America that this propaganda and legislation is directed. It is they and only they who are being persecuted.

There is little I can say that would change by one iota the purpose of the leadership in this House. What concerns me most is that legislation designed to correct certain evils should be written with such inadequate preparation, investigation, and study. This Congress has completely ignored the warning of the President in his State of the Union message that—

> We must not under stress of emotion endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

Who is there to say that this proposed legislation does not run counter to the warning of the President? It will do just what he said—lead to results not anticipated or desired. The President also goes on to say:

> On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor legislation but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society.

Here lies the nub of labor unrest and labor disputes—insecurity. What has this Congress or any committee of this Congress done to study and discover the underlying causes of labor unrest? Exactly nothing. Instead time has been devoted to the tackling of symptoms, not causes. Would that Congress could cease being a medicine man and become a physician.

House Joint Resolution 83 has been lying in the House Labor Committee since January 23 of this year. This resolution called for six Members of the Senate, six Members of the House, and eight members to be appointed from the public by the President of the United States. This Commission was to make a complete and thorough study of the underlying causes of labor unrest and the report was to be in the hands of the President on or before June 1, 1947. It seems clear to me that had this resolution been acted on the material before the Congress by June 1 would have been the proper material to inform the Congress on labor-management-relation problems. How different this would have been from the program that has been carried out. As an illustration, the Committee on Economic Development, which is composed of some of the outstanding businessmen of the country, took 8 months for a study on how to m ke collective bargaining more effective. The Committee on Education and Labor attempted to cover the whole field of labor-management relations in a quarter of the time required by this business group to study only one phase of the subject.

Whatever else might be said about the great array of witnesses who appeared before the committee, it cannot be said that these witnesses bore complete, or accurate testimony on the basic problems affecting labor-management relations. Are we to legislate upon this kind of information? I hope not. I do not believe the American public would accept it. I do not believe the workers of this country would accept it. This legislation, if enacted, and even as it is proposed, will create bitterness in the hearts of the working people, for they will feel, and justly so, that their rights are being denied them.

We are all deeply concerned these days about the activities of the Communist Party, and yet in this type of legislation we cultivate and fertilize the soil for the sowing and reaping of communism. I was interested in reading recently an article in the March issue of Atlantic Monthly entitled "Can Labor Defeat the Communists?" by Meriyn Pitzele, who is labor editor of Business Week. The last two paragraphs are significant, and I quote them because they make my point much better than I myself could:

> If the growing tide of Communist power in the labor movement is to be turned and if it is not to become renascent, the public has two great responsibilities. It must first see that the unions are not broken by hasty, ill-considered, or dubiously motivated legislation passed in a mood of hysteria engendered by strikes. Breaking established union institutions would drive the American labor movement underground and deliver it lock, stock, and barrel to the Communist Party. Only the Communists have the competence for running conspiratorial organizations in America today, and when the labor movement did come up again from underground, it would be brought up by them as a full-fledged revolutionary vanguard prepared to fight for state power.
>
> Finally, most important of all, there exists the public obligation, which no citizen can escape, to prevent another depression. With their present resources, give the Communists national unemployment on anything like the scale of the early thirties and they will use it to seize more than part of the labor movement. Nothing that could happen in this country or in the world would better serve their power drive or the interests of their masters in Moscow.

So, in our activities we are perfectly oblivious to the needs of vast millions of working people in our country. We permitted the cost of living to rise, we destroyed what few regulations we had, and permitted shortages to occur in the basic necessities of life—all with the idea that business itself would take care of production and prices. Then we proceeded to take from the hands of the working people the instrumentalities which they have for their own improvement. And, then, we wonder why strange "isms" will creep into the minds of these people. The living standards of every American family are threatened by this bill. Not only organized, but unorganized, workers will be driven to lower standards of living. Hunger and insecurity will come into their homes. All of our workers, industrial workers, clerks, white-collar workers, salesmen, will be hurt by the enactment of this legislation. Strangely enough there was very little testimony before our committee with relation to the average wage today, the cost of living today, the inevitable depression which is coming, although these are basic considerations in the problem.

This bill, H. R. 3020, was written around certain premises. For instance, someone said at sometime that the rank and file members of labor unions are coerced and compelled to follow leaders which they do not like, that undemocratic practices are followed in the affairs of labor unions. How was this determined? Who is capable of saying these these accusations are true or false? Certainly, no investigation was made of these charges, and they are only two of many. Can it be assumed that over 14,000,000 working people of America join labor unions because they are coerced or threatened? Those who say that, they have no understanding of the impending motives which cause people to band together in labor organizations. There may be instances of coercion having taken place, but such a great number of people must have been willing to unionize voluntarily. Why have these charges not been investigated? Why do we close our eyes to a complete examination of them? That is one of the mystifying things, and the only conclusion one can draw is that we do not want to know the truth, that we want to believe what appeals to us most. I know from personal experience that many of these charges are not true. I know how eager working people are to have the opportunity to join labor organizations. I know that threats or violence or intimidation cannot keep them away from organization meetings.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say for the benefit of the Members of the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is in the coal-mining business in private life, and he has had a great deal more experience with the hiring of labor than the average Member of this House. Therefore, I think the words he is giving us come from the standpoint of an employer who has had experience in the hiring of many people.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I wish everyone could have the opportunity to read the minority report, and the majority report along with it. I believe the reader would be convinced that there is much confusion in the minds of those who support H. R. 3020. I believe the reader will find that the minority report clearly points out the danger of this drastic amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, of the host of unfair labor practices by employees, of the destruction of union security, of the amendments to the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, and others, and shows beyond a doubt that the ultimate objective of the bill is to weaken labor unions in their collective-bargaining procedures. I believe the reader will readily see that this bill is entirely in opposition to the wisdom of the President's proposal.

It should be borne in mind here that all management is not interested in this kind of legislation. We have been hearing from a most articulate and vociferous group in management, but I am not convinced that this group speaks for management as a whole. I think management would find this legislation a nuisance. If the managers think they have trouble now, just let them try to operate under this proposed legislation. They will be coming down here to Congress and crying to high heaven for relief. If the legislators who are the proponents of this measure imagine for 1 minute that it is going to bring peace between labor and management, they are in for a sudden and serious awakening. The American workingman is a long-suffering individual, as past history will prove, but he will subject himself to chains only so long. The day will always come when he will rise up and smite his enemies. The supporters of H. R. 3020 must overlook the fact that anything that circumscribes the liberties of the workingman and his right to improve his working conditions and security is violently resented, because it is not only he but his family who is affected. It is the threatened impoverishment of his children, the deprivation of proper food and clothing and education, which creates bitterness in him. So we had better weigh well the consequences of any kind of legislation that affects the intimate life of our working people.

In any legislation we should attempt to raise the standard of living, not drive it down. All society is benefited by such a positive approach rather than a negative one. We should not forget that there are between 55 and 60 million working people in this country who have families. They are the great bulk of our population. The imposition of this kind of legislation by a few is contrary to the concepts of a free people. Again I say that what we need at this time are enlightened physicians, not medicine men.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak a word of praise concerning our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. He has worked day and night and has been preeminently fair. It has been a pleasure to serve under him.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in any bill submitted to this House for vote, the American workingman is to be protected from the unfair labor practices of labor organizations, by provisions which, in effect, constitute a bill of rights for workers. Some refer to these provisions as union democracy. They are definite steps forward in the emancipation of the individual worker. They are distinct gains for the worker. In view of that fact, is it not strange that the labor leaders who appeared before the committee suggested none of these provisions? Probably the most noteworthy feature of the hearings was the almost uniform opposition of the labor leaders to any changes in the present labor laws. They urged us to let well enough alone. If the past and present conditions were good, if labor peace exists, then their argument would be sound, and would be most persuasive. But you know the facts prove otherwise.

The words of the testimony piled up story after story of violence, intimidation, and extortion, community paralysis, conspiracies to stop the necessities of life—food, fuel, transportation, and communications—conspiracies to restrict production, and to control prices; denial of rights to employ, or be employed; denial of free speech; invasion and suppression of democratic processes by the Federal agencies, in collusion with union tyranny; denial of home rule to workers; communistic infiltration and un-Americanism.

The labor leaders brush aside these examples of union coercion, violence, and communistic domination by saying they are but isolated cases. Mr. Chairman, we were able to obtain only a sampling in such a short period of time, but the record clearly discloses a distinct pattern, extending from Connecticut to California, and from Wisconsin to Alabama.

The record of the testimony, the public-opinion polls, and the mail from people throughout the length and breadth of the land, demand correction of these conditions. They cry out for the adoption of fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another; for the protection of the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations and employers; and for the recognition that the public interest is paramount in labor disputes affecting commerce, which endanger the health, safety, or welfare of all our citizens.

The bill before you today seeks to accomplish these purposes. Yet we find these same labor leaders who refused to cooperate in any way during the hearings, who stated that no changes were needed, who were contemptuous of Members of Congress attempting to find a proper solution of these problems, now launching a propaganda campaign to smear the bill and those who participated in its preparation. The familiar slogans of "antilabor," "reactionary,"

"Fascists," and so forth, are hurled forth in every direction.

Actually, how unfair to the individual laboring man is this bill? Page after page speaks of the rights of the employee, of the workingman; and sets up provisions to safeguard them. Would the labor leaders wish to eliminate them? Would they wish to do away with the provisions to safeguard the public interest in certain types of strikes?

The bill continues the right of the workingman to organize and bargain collectively. Not one word—and this should be emphasized, Mr. Chairman, not one word—calls for lower wages, or poorer working conditions. It recognizes his right to select his own bargaining representative by secret ballot, free from any coercion from an employer or a labor organization. It sets up procedures for collective bargaining, instead of following the hit-or-miss methods of the past, which only led to friction and misunderstanding between employer and employee over the question as to whether or not collective bargaining had actually taken place. Methods are prescribed to insure that the workingman will be informed of the issues of a dispute, the areas of agreement and disagreement, the latest offer of the employer, and then the opportunity by secret ballot to decide for himself, whether he wishes to accept the latest offer of the employer or to strike.

Under the designation of unfair labor practices, an employer cannot interfere with an employee in the formation or administration of a labor union, nor can the employer refuse to bargain collectively with the representative selected by the employee, nor can the employer discharge an employee because he filed charges or testified under this bill, nor can an employer deduct money from an employee's own pay check for union dues, fees, or assessments without written permission of the employee, who has the right to withdraw this permission at any time on 30 days' written notice.

Are these provisions antilabor?

And here are the new provisions, defining the unfair labor practices on the part of a labor organization: Unions cannot interfere or coerce individuals in their right to organize or bargain collectively, nor can they compel them to become or remain a member of any labor organization. They cannot normally charge initiation fees greater than $25 per member, nor charge dues that are not uniform for the same class of members, nor sell work permits, nor deny any member the right to resign from a union at any time. A labor organization cannot deny a secret ballot on any question involving fees, dues, assessments, fines, striking, or union policy; nor fail to hold elections of officers at least every 4 years; nor expel or suspend any member without an opportunity to be heard, or on any ground other than, first, nonpayment of dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; third, participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement of his union; fourth, being a member of or promoting the Communist Party; fifth, conviction of a felony; sixth, scandalous conduct, tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute.

A labor union cannot fine or discriminate against any member because he criticized the organization or its officers, or because he failed to contribute, support, or vote for some candidate for civil or labor organization office; nor can a labor organization employ or direct any person to spy upon any member, or intimidate his family, or injure the person or property of a member or his family.

Are these bill-of-rights provisions antilabor?

This bill seeks to protect the freedom of the individual worker. It attempts to emancipate him from abuses of power by either a labor organization or an employer. Again, let it be stressed—not one word calls for lower wages or poorer working conditions.

Does the individual worker know that?

Has he been informed of all the provisions in this bill?

Does he consider the entire bill antilabor?

Why not let the individual worker decide for himself?

He and the public should be the real judges in the last analysis.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the National Labor Relations Act which was enacted 12 years ago, has been known as labor's bill of rights. It was intended to encourage collective bargaining between employer and employee. It gave employees freedom to join unions without employer interference. When the practice of collective bargaining is universally accepted in good faith by the American employer and employee, we will enjoy industrial peace.

I am opposed to H. R. 3020, known as the Hartley bill, because it practically nullifies the Wagner Act. It also complicates and weakens the collective-bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining between employer and employee is democracy in action.

In 1935 when the Wagner Act was passed, less than 4,000,000 wage earners were unionized. Today there are approximately 15,000,000 in both affiliated and independent unions. Since 1935, wages, working conditions, and living conditions have greatly improved, not only for the 15,000,000 union members, but also for approximately 30,000,000 other American wage earners.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the Wagner Act has been that it protected the employee if he desired to join a union. Previous to the Wagner Act, most individual wage earners were unable to bargain on an equal plane with their employers. Most employers asserted their economic power by destroying the wage earners' attempt to pool their numerical strength. It was then impossible to establish that equality of position between the parties in which true liberty of contract begins. You cannot have collective bargaining until employees are free to act without fear of employer retaliation.

The Wagner Act was designed to protect and to encourage the institution of collective bargaining as marriage laws are designed to protect and encourage the institution of the family. But happy labor relations are no more guaranteed by the one than happy domestic relations are by the other. In the field of labor relations, the human element is very important. Attitudes, mutual forebearance, and consideration, are no less important than in family relations.

We are emerging from the economic aftereffect of the greatest war in all history.

Since VJ-day, the take-home pay of the industrial worker has decreased over 30 percent. The wartime 48-hour week was reduced to 40 hours. The cost of living in industrial areas has sky-rocketed 35 percent since the shooting war stopped. The major portion of this unreasonable increase in the cost of food, clothing, and so forth, took place since price control was ruined last June with the power of the Republican leadership leading the execution.

A great number of employers who testified at hearings on this bill, admitted that reduced take-home pay and the increased cost of living since VJ-day contributed greatly to labor unrest and strikes during the last year and a half.

Last June the Republicans in Congress killed price control and the cost of living has skyrocketed. This impossible economic situation is the cause of our industrial unrest. Congress should try and solve the high cost of living problem instead of trying to saddle the so-called Hartley bill on the backs of the American wage earners. The Hartley bill will promote industrial confusion and chaos and postpone reconversion beyond measure.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee on Education and Labor held hearings for a period of 5 weeks. The vast majority of the witnesses who testified before the committee were bitterly antilabor and a great number were employers who had experienced labor difficulties and strikes. On questions propounded by some of the minority members, it was revealed that practically all the employer witnesses had made no effort to comply with the collective-bargaining provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Press releases were given almost daily during these hearings by the chairman and some of the Republican members in order to build up a case against union labor in the minds of the American public. In a number of instances, witnesses testifying in behalf of union labor were heckled, interrupted, and silenced so they were unable to present their views in a coherent fashion. On the other hand, witnesses who were offering testimony in criticism and opposition to the Wagner Act or union labor, were listened to in courteous silence by the majority members of the committee. If they failed to make a point, there was always a helpful Republican Congressman ready, alert, and willing to explain his meaning more clearly.

After the public hearings closed, the committee members of the majority party held secret sessions and proceeded to write H. R. 3020, known as the Hartley

bill. The majority of the minority members were excluded from these meetings. For over 2 weeks the iron curtain was drawn against most of the minority members, and, finally the gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman HARTLEY, called an executive meeting of the committee for 1 p. m. on last Thursday, April 10, to vote on this bill. The minority members received a copy of this bill a few hours before the committee meeting. The Member from Indiana, now addressing the House, moved that the executive committee meeting be postponed until 10 a. m. the following Monday to give the minority members an opportunity to study this 68-page document of labor legislation. I asked that we be given time to acquaint ourselves with the complicated mechanism of this highly involved bill. My motion did not prevail.

Since becoming a Member of this House, I have served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. During that service, former Chairman Burch, of the Post Office Committee, did not at any time call together the majority members formally or informally to the exclusion of the minority members. During the last session, I served on the Naval Affairs Committee. At no time did the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman CARL VINSON, call the majority members of the committee formally or informally to the exclusion of the minority members. In composing this legislation, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, with the cooperation of the majority members, succeeded in practically eliminating the two-party system as far as the legislative operations of this committee are concerned. I am confident that when the membership of this House, after listening to the debate in the Committee of the Whole and making a thorough study of the complex, highly involved legalistic structure and the restrictive provisions which will, if enacted, deny the wage earner of America adequate collective-bargaining protection, the now apparent solid Republican endorsement of this bill will be greatly shattered.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The Supreme Court has often pointed out that collective bargaining under the present act, means "negotiating in good faith." Yet nowhere in the definition of collective bargaining in this act is there any reference to good faith. The parties are required to hold at least five conferences during a 30-day period to discuss the issues in the dispute. But the 30-day period does not begin to run until the first conference has been held. It vaguely requires that this conference must be held within a reasonable time after receipt of proposal by one party. This would avail an obstinate employer numerous delaying tactics to the detriment of the wage earner. The only course of the wage earner in the face of such tactics would be the filing of an unfair labor practice before the board. After a long period necessary for a hearing and appeal, the employer might be ordered to bargain collectively. During this period, the wage earner would be denied the use of his only weapon, his constitutional right to strike.

If the parties could not reach an agreement during the so-called 30-day period, the employees would still be prevented from engaging in a strike to enforce their demands because of further procedural requirements which by their nature would bring further delay. Thus the employer would be given a reasonable time to inform the employees of the issues and his last offer of settlement. And again, after the employees are so informed, the administrator is given a reasonable time to provide for the required secret ballot. Even if the administrator desires to expedite the balloting, the present practice of the majority party of denying sufficient funds to labor agencies in the executive branch of the Government, would undoubtedly make it impossible to employ sufficient personnel to hold such elections promptly.

The provision requiring the union and the employer to make separate summations of the issues and their positions on the issues to the employees is another delaying maneuver. The method of presenting the issue would resolve itself into a confusing propaganda campaign. Each side would attempt for position in a more favorable light.

From the above, one can plainly see that this legislation is a clever maneuver to destroy collective bargaining and deny the wage earner his only weapon to better his working conditions and income, to wit: the right to strike.

CHECK-OFF

This bill makes it an unfair-labor practice for employers to make deductions from employees' compensation for union dues, known as the check-off.

This system, whereby pay-roll deductions are made for payment to union organizations of certain authorized funds, is well established in the American industrial pattern and widespread in its application.

In the manufacturing industries alone, nearly 5,000,000 workers, approximately 50 percent of all workers in this industry, had their union dues checked off in 1946. Both in effect and in theory, the subject of the check-off is a legitimate subject of contract and meets with the approval of the great majority of manufacturers.

THE CLOSED SHOP AND UNION SECURITY

This bill makes it an unfair-labor practice for an employer to require membership in a union as a condition of employment.

The effect of this section outlaws the closed-shop provisions in existing contracts covering millions of workers and would result in nullifying many of these contracts in their entirety. The result would be chaos and confusion of industrial relations in vast and vital sectors of our economy. Union security agreements have a recognized function in industrial relations. Such agreements prevent nonunion workers from sharing in the benefits resulting from union activities without also sharing in the obligations. They are a manifestation of the democratic principle of majority rule and the sharing of the obligations by a minority in return for benefits received. They prevent the weakening of labor organizations by discrimination against union members, and eliminate the lowering of standards caused by competition with nonunion workers, and thereby promote higher efficiency and productivity. They give to labor organizations a sense of security from attack by rivals and thereby facilitate good relations with management. They also enable union leaders to devote more attention to administration of collective agreements and less to defending themselves against raiding.

If this bill were designed, among other things, to outlaw the closed shop, closed union arrangement only, and to permit union security arrangements that were not based on the closed union practice, it has gone far beyond what was needed to achieve that purpose. This, in effect, means that the union is shorn of its power to discipline its own members for good cause.

DENIAL OF INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

In outlawing industry-wide bargaining, this bill disregards the fact that employers compete with one another, both as to the price and quality of their product and for labor. It is unthinkable, for example, that the large steel manufacturers, all of whom compete for labor in the Indiana Calumet area, can pay a different wage scale. Yet, this provision would necessarily mean that the wage levels of entire industries would be forced down to the lowest level which any substantial group of employees were inclined to, or could, accept.

Under this subsection of the bill a union that has been designated as a collective-bargaining representative would be ineligible to be certified as the representative of the employees of any competing employer, unless the employees involved are less than 100 in number and the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. A provision more inconsistent with the policy of the bill set out in section 1, to minimize industrial strife and to encourage peaceful settlement of labor disputes, could scarcely be imagined.

The impairment of industry-wide bargaining that might well follow from the enactment of this bill would upset existing collective-bargaining pratices which have proved successful in many industries and made important contributions to industrial peace.

Employers as much as employees have benefited from this practice and have testified in favor of its continuance. Such widely varied employer groups as the men's clothing industry, the full-fashioned hosiery, ship building, and the maritime industries have testified to the efficacy of industry-wide bargaining as a means of promoting stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has shown also that industry-wide bargaining has made a valuable contribution to the promotion and maintenance of fair standards in wages, hours, and working conditions, to the benefit not only of the living standards of the wage earners of this country but also the prosperity of the employers in the industry. The stabilization of wage rates through industry-wide bargaining has helped to discourage unfair competition with respect to wage rates and has

enabled the great majority of fair-minded employers to operate at the American level of fair play and decency.

Although the sponsors of this proposal undoubtedly did not intend it, one of the significant effects of any weakening of industry-wide bargaining would be to seriously impair the bargaining power of many employers. Unions would be aided in a policy of picking off employers one by one. Employers who sought to protect themselves against such tactics by organizing and bargaining as a unit would be hurt by a limitation on industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, unscrupulous labor racketeers or radical elements would be free to follow a policy of divide and conquer. That is the reason why small employers, particularly, look to industry-wide bargaining as their only hope of gaining some approximation of equality with large and powerful unions.

CONCLUSION

I would heartily endorse any practical legislation that would aid in eliminating industrial disputes. Had the Congress followed President Truman's recommendation in his State of the Union message, we would be well on our way toward common-sense and stable legislation for industrial peace. The President recommended that the Congress create a temporary joint commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relation, composed of 12 Members of Congress chosen by Congress and 8 members representing the public, management, and labor. He suggested that this commission investigate and make recommendations on certain changes, such as:

First. Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest;

Second. Methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process; and

Third. The underlying cause of management-labor disputes.

The consuming public of America well remembers President Truman's request a year ago that Congress continue price control and keep down the cost of living. Had the above recommendations of our President been followed, the cost of living would have been controlled and increased wage demands and industrial disputes would not be haunting the American people today. The responsibility for the rejection of the above request of President Truman can be laid at the door of the Republican leadership in Congress. In its place the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is now presenting to the American people this legislative monstrosity known as H. R. 3020, the Hartley labor bill.

I am fearful that if this bill is enacted into law in its present form, industrial democracy in America will be shattered. Living wages, good working conditions, and future security for the American home is the greatest bulwark we have against fascism and communism.

Since VJ-day we have been struggling with peacetime reconversion and gradually overcoming the natural aftermath of the greatest war in our history. I hope the Congress will not impede our fight to return to peacetime prosperity by enacting this legislation and discouraging over 50,000,000 wage earners of the Nation.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] who has just addressed the Committee, criticized this bill because it would, said he, in effect nullify the Wagner Act. I, for one, wish it did. If this bill could simply read, "The Wagner Act of 1934 is hereby repealed, period," this would be a great law and a great day in American jurisprudence.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I was quite concerned early in the afternoon when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in good faith asked a question, not for or against this bill, but which impugned, to a great extent, the honor of Congress. The question was not answered. I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] to yield and he refused to yield. I also asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and he did not yield. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked the question or made the statement that there had been a rumor that someone has lobbied, not before the committee, not in testimony, not in the open, but as if it had reached hotel rooms, as has been reported in some of the newspapers.

What I as a Member of Congress would like to know is whether any Congressman has met on this bill with groups in hotel rooms. If so, their names should be given out; if not, such implications and innuendos should not be made.

With all the testimony that has been heard on this bill in the open light of day in the committee room in the presence of members of both sides, I wish to ask a member of the committee what I was going to ask both the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Massachusetts, but they refused to yield to me.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for asking the question as to how the bill was drawn and where. It has also been recorded that this is the first time in something like 14 years that a major bill of this kind has actually been drawn in the Congress and in the Congressmen's own rooms. I suppose it may be an occasion for wonder. I believe I worked with the committee nearly every night after the hearings. As you know, the hearings ran for 7 weeks. When we had finished examining witnesses during the day about the only time the Members had to work was at night, and various Members were working continuously, sometimes until 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning in their own rooms.

I know of no occasion when any Member met with others in hotel rooms in connection with the drawing of this bill.

There are seven or eight lawyers on the majority side of the committee and they worked long hours and late on these provisions.

We did have the advice and counsel of Jerry Morgan, who was the counsel of the committee for 15 years. He worked very diligently on the bill; but we had the benefit of his knowledge and advice as the Democrats themselves had for 15 years prior to this year. We have had, of course, a tremendous number of proposed bills offered to us in the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a very high regard for Jerry Morgan, and I know him in connection with the legislative service, but is he still connected with the legislative service of the Congress?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand he is not, that he is now outside of Government service. Now, with no reflection on Mr. Morgan, the gentleman has given a piece of evidence which shows that a very able man, but a man with outside connections, assisted in the drafting of the bill. There is no impugning of motives, for he is a very fine gentleman and I have a very high regard for him, but I understand Mr. Morgan is no longer connected with the legislative counsel of the House.

I proceed no further because under no condition would I personally draw any inferences of his sincerity or that of those associated with him, but I understand he is no longer connected with the House organization.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for not drawing any inferences. I hope those who have any inferences to draw will specify the names and places where they say conferences took place outside the corridors of this Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The thing that really is important is the substance of this bill and not who helped prepare the bill. Is not that true?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It makes no real difference where you get the benefit of certain information; you can take it and use it or not as you see fit. There is not a Member of this Congress, including the leadership on the Democratic side, that does not receive suggestions and advice from all sorts of people.

As far as I am concerned, and as far as any decent Member of Congress is concerned, I expect to legislate as I see fit, taking all of the information I can receive from any and all sources, using my own judgment and my own conscience and what little intelligence God gives me to write the kind of legislation I believe will be proper for the Congress to pass upon.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman for referring to the fact that the real test is whether or not we know a good idea when we see one.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that a man by the name of Van Bittner, now connected with the CIO, testified

before your committee that he wrote the famous Wagner Act?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I am glad the gentleman mentions that. We almost had a fist fight between Van Bittner and Green as to which one wrote the Wagner bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What difference does it make who wrote it if Congress finds it is a good law and passes it?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I do not think there should be any difference at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the general observation made by the outstanding brain of the Republican Party in the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope he will very carefully check what he just said and put some very sharp limitations upon it, because it is important whom one works with at times. Certainly if there were a power lobby operating up there and they were sitting in in connection with the drafting of a bill, I know the gentleman would not stand for that. The gentleman has opened up a lot of questions. His statement is general, and I suggest to my friend that he very carefully edit what he said because he stated in his general remarks that anything can go. Well, everything cannot go under certain conditions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from New York for the distinct benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I stand upon this statement, that after all the thing that counts in connection with legislation is the legislation itself. Why I have even known of good ideas, legislatively speaking, coming from the Democratic side of the aisle in this House. I have supported such legislative ideas, not because of the source from which they came but, rather, because they stood on their own feet and my own judgment, my own conscience, my own intellect told me they were good suggestions. Perhaps the gentleman may find good suggestions in many different sources in this life of ours. Even Tommy Corcoran and our friend Cohen, the famous writers of the "must" legislation of the New Deal days, brought bills up here that the gentlemen of this House accepted without question at all, some of the great legislation for which some Members I see on the floor have received great credit. That came from individuals who were in no way connected with the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry I put my friend on the defensive so much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not have me on the defensive, but, rather, he is in the position where he will have the opportunity to explain some of the discrepancies of the past.

I would like to conclude by saying to the gentleman from New York that the testimony given before the Rules Committee indicated very clearly that this bill was the legislative work of the members of this committee. While it is true that most of the work on this bill was done by the Republican members of the committee, that is nothing new or nothing unusual. The Republicans have been doing most of the work for a long while in this Congress. The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action. That is exactly what this committee has done, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacKINNON. I would like to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DINGELL. Where?

Mr. GWINN of New York. In room 547, Old House Office Building.

Mr. MacKINNON. Who asked that question?

Mr. DINGELL. I did.

Mr. MacKINNON. I thought so. I may say this, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that immediately after the conclusion of our hearings and before a word was put on paper, and without any outside lobbying or interference, we voted as to how we stood on every single controversial proposition in this bill.

This legislation in its present form, while it is not in conformance with the wishes or desires of any single member of the committee, conforms exactly to what the committee members on the Republican side voted for, plus the final amendments that were made when the bill went to the full committee. In the earlier actions I understand that Democratic Members who were friendly to the idea of legislation were contacted, and I personally discussed some of the issues with some of them. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just simply inquiring. The gentleman mentioned Jerry Morgan's name. The Republican members met by themselves, did they?

Mr. MacKINNON. That is right, and consulted with the friendly Democrats.

Mr. GWINN of New York. With further reference to the gentleman from Indiana, who is a member of the committee, and his complaint about not having more time to work on this bill. He was like Mr. Green and Mr. Bittner and Mr. Murray, who testified that positively not a dot nor the crossing of a "t" should be changed on their bill, and that was the attitude for more than 2 days of the gentleman from Indiana who voted against every provision. We naturally assumed that if we went on for days, his attitude towards this bill would be the same. I trust we have not missed anything.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from New York is incorrect when he states that I voted against every provision. I voted "present" a number of times.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am glad to be corrected.

Now, the reason this bill has to be changed, if we are going to have any legislation at all to improve our labor relations, is illustrated by the provision that exempts supervisors. You know, the original bill was enacted to protect labor from bosses—from so-called powerful combinations of employers. Nobody ever dreamed that the rank-and-file leadership would get around and finally press the supervisors—the foremen in the plants—to make them join a union. After a while they saw it worked so well that they said, "He is our boss now, but we will take him in and then we will boss him." By the same token, after a while, they can take in the vice presidents of the company and say, "Let us boss the whole outfit." They could do it because they have such tremendous votes. They could take in or exclude anybody in their bargaining unit that they wanted to take in. So this law simply excludes supervisors. They cannot belong to a rank-and-file union organization; they are supposed to represent management; they are supposed to direct and to discipline and to be loyal to the management's point of view.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the bill provide any kind of union for foremen or supervisors?

Mr. GWINN of New York. It does not. It simply excludes them. Supervisors or foremen may organize as they did before the Wagner Act, but they have no standing under this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But it does absolutely prohibit affiliation with a rank and file union.

Mr. GWINN of New York. It does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask if a gentleman by the name of Theodore Eiserman ever sat in with the majority Members and aided in the drafting of the bill?

Mr. GWINN of New York. Theodore Eiserman, as you know, was what we thought one of our best witnesses. He introduced not only a fine statement on the law, but introduced his own book, and on occasion I conferred with him in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. One other reason why this bill must be amended is that men who violate the law have been exempted from the processes of the law under the Wagner Act. One of the most evil things that has been rolling up under

this bill for the last 14 years is utter lawlessness and violence, because men who commit violence cannot be prosecuted successfully under the Wagner Act supported by the LaGuardia Act. Listen to this language which has been set aside by this new bill. It is an astonishing statement when you set it alongside the lawlessness for which there has been no remedy. This is section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act:

No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

The interpretation of these acts by the Board and the courts has been that respectable robbery could be committed without liability. The new Hartley Act now before us for passage changes that and makes all men subject to the law and subject to damages for unlawful, concerted, monopolistic acts to destroy property and to injure persons.

This is one more step back to the restoration of freedom, one more rededication of Government to its primary function of protecting individual freedom in America. The sum total of many individual freemen is the fundamental source of a good society. The formation of groups to exercise compulsion and intimidation over individual men ends in strife and violence which has multiplied threefold since the Wagner Act.

The American workman who was once free has been cajoled, coerced, intimidated, and on many occasions beaten up for the alleged good of the group he was forced to join. His whole economic life has been subject to the complete domination and control of unregulated monopolists. To get a job he has had to pay them. He has been forced to join these groups against his will because he feared them. At other times when he has desired to join a group he trusted he has been forced to join one he has mistrusted. He has been compelled to pay assessments for causes and candidates for public office which he opposed. He has been shut up in meetings and fined or expelled for expressing his own mind about right and wrong on public issues. He has been denied the right to arrange the terms of his own employment. He has frequently, against his will, been called out on strikes and violence which have resulted in wage losses representing years of his savings. He has been ruled by Communists and other subversive influences because he has had no right to vote. In short his mind, his soul, and his very life have been subject to a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

The committee report finds the employer's plight has been equally bad and dangerous. He has played an unhappy enforced part in rising prices and reduced production and resulting scarcity under a new form of monopoly called laboristic monopoly. He has been required to employ or reinstate individuals who have assaulted him and his employees and want only to destroy his property. When he has tried to discharge Communists and trouble makers he has been prevented from doing so by a board which called this union bating. He has had to stand by helpless while employees desiring to enter his plant legally to work have been obstructed by violence, mass picketing, and general rowdyism. He has been unable to speak against irresponsible slander, abuse, and vilification against him.

His business often has been brought to a standstill by jurisdictional fights and disputes for which he himself had no responsibility or possibility of settling. And finally, he has been compelled by the laws of the greatest democratic country in the world to be a part of a rising tide of industrial warfare three times greater than ever before witnessed, in this land of 165 years of liberty, because of the Wagner Act.

The public has suffered most of all.

By default in our legislative branch of Government, Americans have been separated into contending factions because they have ignored and set aside established constitutional law. The administrative and judicial departments of our Government have with equal shame participated.

This is the sordid story unfolded before the committee in its hearings.

RESUMPTION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

The bill is a restatement of the inalienable rights of the individual and a rededication of Government to its primary function of protecting those rights of individuals. It has been drafted on the principle that when individual rights are protected and free men are truly free in their life, work, and pursuit of happiness, as our Constitution provides, the whole of society achieves its greatest good.

The bill rejects the contention that organized groups may assert and force an individual to give up his basic rights for any alleged higher right of a group. The committee finds such so-called group rights lead to the exploitation of individuals as well as of the public generally.

Now there hangs over the Nation a silent, sullen resignation of millions of men and women who have paid hundreds of millions of dollars each year to organized forces of compulsion that they do not trust but fear to resist or offend.

This bill holds that no individual can be compelled by another individual to pay tribute for the privilege of starting to work, or monthly dues for the privilege of continuing to work, or fines wherein a mere individual man assumes to be master over another. It stops the growth of strife and even violence that results from compulsion or assumption of power of one man over another. This bill is designed to break up the organization of monopolistic-group control over the individual's freedom to contract for the exchange of his own goods and services. It should protect the rights of the willing buyer and seller in a free market. It should stop the exercise of power of any group over the individual to the point where the group controls the number who can work, the amount of production, and fixes monopolistic prices in its organized effort to exploit the public generally for the special benefit of the group itself. It should stop the growth of the group in its compulsory unionism as it stopped monopoly group power of industry 50 years ago. It recognizes and deals with the dangerous expansion of unionism into a kind of labor cartel, a complete monopoly.

The whole of society is even now deprived of coal, telephones, steel, motors, food, and houses, and compelled to bow to its labor masters as the members of the union themselves have been compelled to do. For example, they have maintained the costs of building houses at such high prices—costs of building houses being nearly 100 percent labor, past or present—and thereby so reduced production that more than one-half of the people are unable to build houses at all. More than one-half of the families of this Nation receive less than $6 a day. Obviously, they cannot pay lumbermakers, carpenters, bricklayers, masons, painters, plumbers, and others an average of $20 a day and more. Neither can they get the services of young men, veterans, nonunion men, free men, to exchange their services on equal terms with them. Such men, when they volunteer or respond to the pressing need, are called scabs, enemies of the organized group and by violence and threat of violence, prevented from entering this field of work by goons that have become the law of the land in whole states.

So the committee finds once more as our country has found before, that freedom alone can cure the evil effects that beset us. Individuals under freedom are so much more honest and productive than groups of individuals organized deliberately to defeat freedom, reduce production, and raise prices.

Finally, this bill rises in protest not only against industrial strangulation but against the expansion of political groups—the twin brothers of industrial groupism. Power, starting with industrial power, grows from one group into still larger groups, step by step, until they are finally united in the governing group. Smaller collectivist groups become one collectivist group, one party power which subjugates at last all other groups. The American people in greater numbers have united, undoubtedly greater than those who united for the first struggle of freedom and constitutional government, greater than those united in the Civil War and in the war against monopolistic control by industrial combines, 50 years ago. We shall win this battle again for freedom because the people are united and determined to win.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

HOW THE BILL IS LOADED AGAINST LABOR

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the bill is hypocritical and one-sided.

The bill is sponsored by those who profess to abhor Federal regulation, yet it is the most involved and complicated regulatory code which has ever been imposed in the history of industrial relations.

The bill is sponsored by believers in States' rights, yet it federalizes the most minute details of labor's functioning.

The bill takes the heart out of the existing five unfair labor practices of employers and leaves standing mere words.

It imposes upon unions 13 unfair labor practices and a host of unlawful concerted activities.

The theme of the bill is regulate labor but hands off the employer.

Every portion of the bill reveals a shocking one-sidedness.

Section 2 (11) (vi) (b) of title I gives the union 5 days to inform the employees of the issues in a dispute. Subsection (vi) (d) gives the employer a "reasonable time" to inform the employees of the issues in a dispute.

The bill in section 2 (11) (b) (vi) (e) provides for a secret ballot before employees may strike. Strangely enough, no provision is made for a secret ballot among stockholders to determine under what circumstances management may change its labor relations policy or fix wages.

The bill proposes that a secret ballot be taken for the employees' approval of the employer's last offer of settlement.

No provision is made for a ballot among stockholders to determine whether the union's last offer of settlement is satisfactory.

Sections 2 (14), 2 (15), 2 (16), 2 (17) of title I of the bill contain definitions of alleged illegal concerted activities by labor organizations. These include boycotts and so-called monopolistic strikes. Yet no attempt is made in the bill to impose comparable punishments upon employers who jointly agree on wage terms or other labor policies through employer associations.

Section 7 (b) of title I of the bill insists that members of labor organizations be free of unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands but no suggestion is made that stockholders in corporations be free of similar demands on the part of corporate management.

Sections 8 (b) and 8 (c) of title I of the bill contain elaborate provisions regulating the internal affairs of labor organizations. No comparable provisions are present there or anywhere else in the bill regulating the internal affairs of corporations.

Section 9 (f) (1) of title I of the bill prohibits a representative from acting as a representative of the employees of competing employers—yet nothing in the bill prevents competing employers from establishing a common labor relations policy.

The same section of the bill prohibits an international union from approving or guiding the labor relations of affiliated locals. There is not a word in the bill to condemn the frequent control over labor relations policies of member companies by employer associations.

Employer associations have written the blackest pages in our antilabor history. Under this bill they may continue to destroy unions. Unions are forced to remain helpless in the face of this attack.

A further instance of the gross bias of this legislation is section 9 (f) (2) of title I which authorizes the Board to exclude from bargaining any group whatsoever within a proposed bargaining unit if those individuals indicate a desire to be excluded from bargaining.

However, under section 9 (f) (3) the fact that employees desire to bargain and have organized for bargaining is expressly declared to be an invalid ground for grouping them in a bargaining unit.

Under section 9 (f) (7) of title I the bill prohibits more than one election within a 12-month period if the purpose of the election is to select a bargaining agent.

However, if the purpose of the election is to repudiate or decertify a bargaining agent the Board under section 9 (c) (2) is required to hold an election as often as a petition is presented.

Under section 10 (c) of title I the Board is authorized to deprive a union of its rights under the act for a year. This is equivalent in the case of a union to forcing a union to go out of business for a year.

In the case of an individual employee who violates the act, it means that the employee may be blacklisted in an entire industry for a year, since he has no rights under the act. No comparable sanctions are provided against employers who violate the act. They continue to be, as today, merely subject to cease-and-desist orders.

Likewise under section 10 (c) of title I, a special evidentiary test must be met before the Board may order the reinstatement of a discharged union member. No such procedural tenderness is shown for unions against which the Board may issue orders under the new bill.

Section 12 of title I of the bill contains a long list of so-called unlawful concerted activities by employees and unions.

The bill makes possible ex parte injunctions without hearings. Violations also mandatorily deprive unions and individuals of their rights under the act.

This means that an employer may discharge an employee who violates the act with immunity. That employee may be subject to a loss of rights for a year and be blacklisted throughout an entire industry. If a union engages in these practices, not only may it be enjoined but it may lose its right to exist for a year.

The ex parte injunction is not made available against employers. They still receive a hearing, and if the Board ultimately finds that they have violated the act, they are subject only to a cease-and-desist order.

In the sections of the bill dealing with strikes imperiling public health and safety—title II, section 203—injunctions are imposed upon unions who engage in a strike or threat of strike. This means that an employer may cut wages and nevertheless be certain that the employees will work on his terms.

No provision in the bill imposes any restraint whatsoever upon the employer.

Section 204 of title II provides for the taking of a secret ballot among employees to determine after the injunction has been outstanding 30 days whether, first, they desire to accept their employer's last offer; and, second, they desire to change their bargaining representative.

No provision is made in the bill to conduct a ballot among the stockholders to determine whether they will accept the union's last offer and whether they desire a new set of officers to embody their acceptance in a contract with the union.

Section 203 (d) of title II provides after a further delaying process for a second ballot upon the two questions indicated above.

No provision is made for comparable ballots to be taken among employer representatives.

Under title III, section 301, all of the unlawful concerted activities described in section 12 of title I of the bill—such as picketing an employer's business in large groups or picketing his home under any circumstances, engaging in sympathy strikes or a strike for recognition—are made the subject of antitrust laws, although they manifestly have nothing to do with restraints on trade.

The enormous growth of monopoly which is primarily responsible for current labor unrest is left completely untouched.

In addition, these practices are the subject of—

(a) Injunctions, ex parte, and without a hearing;

(b) Treble damages;

(c) Criminal prosecution;

(d) Unions engaging in them lose their rights under the act. In contrast to these savage penalties, an employer is subject only to a remedial order and not to punishment. He must cease and desist from the conduct which the bill prohibits.

These are only a few of the many jokers in a bill, which must mark some sort of record in one-sidedness.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, the lifeblood of a democracy is the freedom of its labor. When we have broken up the unions and dispersed the workingmen, it will be too late to ask what has become of our national vigor. History teaches us that suppression of the labor unions is the first sure step toward total dictatorship and national decay.

This Nation has not chosen that road. Twelve years ago, when Europe was already on the way to ruin, we gave new statutory recognition to the rights which American labor had won. In the National Labor Relations Act we declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and to protect employees in the right to organize and bargain collectively. We also recognized the right to strike, without which there could be no bargaining. This law was democratic in the truest sense, for collective bargaining gives employees a voice in fixing the

conditions under which they work. It came, in time, to be called labor's Magna Carta.

The bill before the House—I refer to the committee bill, H. R. 3020—effectively repeals that Magna Carta. It weakens Federal protection against employer interference; it outlaws strikes; it penalizes unions; it meddles in their internal affairs; it subjects them to nuisance regulation; and it renders collective bargaining a mockery.

It also tosses out the National Labor Relations Board, which has done a good job under the most trying conditions, substitutes a dual bureaucratic system, multiplies delay, and assures unlimited court litigation.

It does all these things in the name of protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives. But I have studied the declaration of policy contained in this bill; it carefully avoids the term "collective bargaining"; indeed, the bill repeals all reference to that term in the preamble to the existing law. Collective bargaining has been the touchstone for reconciling right with might—for enabling workers to meet with something approaching equality the economic power of great employers. Is it our purpose to revive the "yellow-dog contract"? To re-create the situation in which employees, powerless to meet their employer on terms of economic equality, are also powerless to associate collectively for dealing with him? Is it our purpose to recall conditions of fear and insecurity, in which the worker joins a union at the risk of discharge, and starts a union at the risk of blacklisting?

I have read this bill and I have read the decisions of the present Board and of the courts touching on collective bargaining, and I say to the Committee that this bill destroys collective bargaining.

The courts have said that the obligation to bargain collectively shall be discharged by good faith efforts to reach agreement. This is the very heart of the Wagner Act, to the end that industrial disputes shall have the best chance to be settled reasonably, democratically, peacefully. Every provision in the existing law is devised to advance that purpose.

What does the committee bill do about collective bargaining? First, it defines collective bargaining. For good faith bargaining, it substitutes a time table, and a mechanical routine. It says the parties shall discuss any proposal at least five times within 30 days.

That is all they have to do. The obligation to bargain in good faith is abolished.

Although the submission of counter-proposals is one of the surest evidences of good faith, the bill expressly states that this is not a requirement. This bill is satisfied if a proposal is discussed. Another indication of good faith is a willingness, within reason, to negotiate all elements of the dispute between the parties—all the issues bearing upon the employer-employee relationship. But no, this bill creates five limited categories, and provides that nothing else need even be discussed. As I read the section—at page 9—it is possible that parties to wage discussions may even refuse to discuss such universally used criteria as cost of living and wage-price relationships. Whatever may be its ultimate legal significance, I believe that this bill encourages such a refusal.

Another indication of good faith in bargaining, and one of which employers and unions often avail themselves, is the willingness to consider changes in existing agreements. They need not yield, but often, by discussion, mutual advantage may be found, understanding achieved, crises on both sides of the table averted. This bill makes clear that this shall not be required—it provokes the parties to an adamant position—encourages them to stand pat—to demand their pound of flesh.

Two specific matters which have been the subject of much collective bargaining in the past, and which have become parts of numerous collective agreements, are simply outlawed by the bill. Thus—section 8 (a) (2) (C), page 20—it becomes an unfair labor practice to grant a check off—unless it be voluntary and revocable at will—or to grant a welfare fund. Manifestly labor organizations which achieve these concessions through bargaining are not necessarily corrupted thereby.

What is the sense or the justice of requiring parties who have achieved these arrangements in good faith to alter them to their mutual inconvenience simply because of the irritation engendered by the coal strike?

Even what is left of collective bargaining under this bill is so hedged about, encumbered, and restricted by delay and red tape, and by regulations and litigation as to destroy any practical benefits either to employers or employees.

Let us consider some more definitions. "Employer" in the existing law is defined to include "any person acting in the interest of an employer." The bill—section 2 (2)—would substitute "any person acting as an agent of an employer." If these two expressions mean the same thing there is no reason for the change. The danger in the substitution is that it may result in endless litigation to test whether superintendents, foremen, supervisors, and the like whom the courts have held as "employers" under present law, qualify as "agents" under the language of the bill. Twelve years of judicial interpretation are thus set at naught.

"Employer," for the first time, excludes charitable and educational organizations. While the number of workers thus deprived of any participation in the terms of their employment may not be large, it seems ironical that organizations devoted to the social welfare should be exempted from bargaining with their own often underpaid employees.

In its zeal to exclude supervisors from employee status and protection, the bill—section 2 (12)—goes much too far. The definition not only excludes all foremen and higher supervisory employees; not only debars supervisors in the printing and maritime industries where they have traditionally bargained for decades, but removes from the protection of the act thousands of white-collar employees, pay-roll clerks, inspectors, watchmen, lead men, timekeepers, and typists. The definition of "supervisors" is so inclusive that an employer is able to make almost any worker a "supervisor" and thus exclude him from the status of an "employee." Such excluded workers will not only be powerless to bargain, they will also be without protection against discharge for union membership. If they desire to organize against the employer's will their only weapons will be to resort to the strike, the very result which the Wagner Act was intended to avert.

Section 8 (5) of the present law requires employers to bargain collectively with the representatives of their employees. The committee bill—section 8 (a) (5), page 21—imposes this obligation only with relation to currently recognized, or certified representatives.

Since it is within the power of an employer, at any time, to cease currently recognizing a union, this provision actually limits the obligation to bargain to situations in which the union has been certified by the Board. In so doing, it excuses employers from their present obligation to bargain with unions whose majority status is known and unquestioned.

If the Board were in the position to settle representation questions promptly, this requirement might not work undue hardship. But the provision must be read in connection with other provisions of the bill, which will not only delay the final certification of a representative, but leave its status, once established, subject to challenge at all times.

For example, under present law a Board certification cannot be appealed directly to a court. The employer may test the certification by refusing to bargain. If the Board issues a bargaining order, he may then obtain court review of the certification by appealing the Board's order.

The committee bill—section 10 (f), page 39—changes this rule. It makes certifications directly reviewable in court at the instance of any person aggrieved.

This provision of the bill, alone, is calculated to render collective bargaining a practical impossibility in the presence of any determined opposition, whether by a rival union, a minority group, or an employer. Here is why: The Board normally accords a certification validity immune from challenge for about a year. A year is also the average length of time necessary to complete court review of a certification. Thus the election upon which the certification was originally based will be pretty stale evidence of majority by the time the certification is sustained in court. And nothing in the bill will prevent an employer thereafter from refusing to bargain collectively, appealing from the Board's order, and testing the identical issues—of appropriate unit and majority—again.

This endlessly delays the beginning of collective bargaining and leaves unions with little incentive for submitting representation questions to the Board. It also encourages obstructive and dilatory objections by rival unions seeking delay.

Even after the certificate has been secured, and has been honored or sustained by a court this bill enables further frustration of bargaining.

Under present law, as I have said, a certification is presumed to be valid for a reasonable period of time—normally a year. This bill—section 9 (c) (2), p. 28—permits employees aggregating 30 percent in number of a unit they claim is appropriate, at any time to file application to decertify a certified representative; or to disestablish a recognized (but uncertified) representative. The Board is required to investigate and act upon such an application like any other—section 9 (d), page 29.

This provision plays havoc with stability of relationships. It means that a rival or dissident group can disrupt bargaining relationships which are on the very verge of fruition, for under existing law an employer is required to refrain from contracting with representatives whose status is challenged in a proceeding of which the Board has taken cognizance. It means that majority rule shall be effective only so long as more than 70 percent of the employees adhere to their choice. It means that a minority can force a situation in which a contract with the employer will be left without anyone to administer its grievance and arbitration provisions on the employee side. It means that a minority of only a fractional part of an appropriate unit, by claiming that that part is appropriate, can throw into confusion the representative status of the larger group.

Section 9 (f) (7)—page 33—throws sharply into focus the remarkable bias of this bill against collective bargaining. That section prohibits an election in any unit or subdivision thereof in which a valid election has been held within the preceding 12 months. A sole exception is made in the case of an application to decertify a union, which I have just discussed. Consider the result—the greatest confusion and uncertainty if the employees have selected a bargaining representative, but absolute finality for 12 months if they have not.

I turn next to the infringements which this bill makes upon the rights of employers and employees to determine the boundaries of the appropriate bargaining unit best suited to their needs. Section 9 (f) (1)—page 30—makes provision against so-called industry-wide bargaining. It states that no representative may be designated or act for employees of two or more competing employers unless their plants are less than 50 miles apart or their employees regularly aggregate less than 100. It also forbids affiliated or federated unions from bargaining or acting in concert if such activities are directly or indirectly subject to common control or approval.

This provision will break up satisfactory collective relationships which have been in existence for years. Several million workers have been bargaining with several thousand employers' associations under highly stabilized contractual arrangements. I think all must agree that this bill would again make peaceable, law-abiding employees and employers suffer because of the coal strike in which they had no part.

In addition, this provision would create thousands of new cases for the already overburdened Board since parties will not be able to continue their satisfactory arrangements and must seek new certifications upon the basis of bargaining units to be determined afresh. Raiding unions will profit from the confusion, but the parties themselves will reap nothing but chaos.

Further restrictions on employee grouping are found in section 9 (f) (2)—page 31 of the bill—which requires that upon application by "any interested person or persons" provision shall be made for a separate ballot "for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group" and that such group shall be excluded from the unit unless a majority votes for the union to be certified. This provision again takes away from the Board the power to acquiesce in the bargaining arrangements to which the parties may have accommodated themselves throughout years of bargaining. Any splinter group, however small, must be separated if an "interested person" desires it, and if the group is "distinguishable." Employers of large industrial plants will be faced with the necessity of bargaining with numerous though numerically inconsequential groups, and management's problems of maintaining any semblance of order or uniformity of conditions will multiply. Unions, of course, whether craft or industrial in form, will be weakened by the right of any splinter group to separate at will, and the total effectiveness of collective bargaining will necessarily be impaired.

Finally, the bill—section 9 (f) (6)—provides that no labor organization may be certified if one or more of its national, international, or local officers is or can reasonably be regarded as a Communist. In the absence of any criminal statute making it illegal to be a Communist, and in the absence of any precise tests as to what shall constitute reasonable grounds for belief (and by whom), this provision seems better calculated to evoke slander, recriminations, and confusion, than to approach a solution of the Communist problem.

In another section—8 (d) (3), page 26—the bill revives the right of an employer—long outlawed under existing law—to get him a company union for the purpose of bucking legitimate self-organization.

The bill states that it shall not be an unfair labor practice for an employer to form or maintain a committee of employees and to discuss with it matters of mutual interest, including grievances, wages, hours of employment, and other working conditions unless the Board has certified or the employer has recognized a representative.

Consistently since the inception of the present law both the Board and the courts have found this kind of arrangement to be an illegal interference with the rights of employees to bargain through representatives of their own choosing—to be in violation of the prohibition against dominating labor organizations.

Even under the present bill—section 2 (5), page 5—such an employer-sponsored committee is defined as a labor organization, since employees participate in it, and since it exists for the purpose of dealing with the employer concerning wages and other conditions of employment.

The proposal is an outright repeal of one of the most important provisions of existing law. It permits an employer to erect a self-inspired bulwark between himself and legitimate self-organization of his employees. Its enactment would be a blow to labor's rights and would inevitably increase labor disputes.

I turn to the provisions of the bill dealing with union security—section 8 (d) (4), page 26. Under existing law an employer may make an agreement embodying union-security provisions with any bona fide majority union.

The bill outlaws the closed shop altogether, and permits modified forms of maintenance of membership and union-shop provisions only under specified conditions—section 9 (g), page 33. First, the union must be certified by the Board; then, it must appear that the employer agreed to the union-security provisions without strike or threat of strike; then a second election must be held at which a majority of all in the unit must vote in favor of the provision. If they so vote, the provision may be agreed to, but for not longer than 2 years or the duration of the agreement, whichever is shorter. And finally no discharges may be made under the agreement except for nonpayment of dues.

This seems an elaborate, expensive, and dishonest method of dealing with the problem. For one thing it means that those unions and employers which have enjoyed union-security relations without challenge for years must submit themselves to two elections at Government expense in order to continue these arrangements. Further, if we are to allow unions to compel discharge for no reason other than nonpayment of dues, it would seem cheaper, more consistent, and more candid to permit the mandatory check-off, which is made an unfair labor practice elsewhere in the bill, and to cut out union-security altogather. Why pretend we are letting the unions have maintenance of membership and union shop? Unions are accustomed to determining for themselves the conditions of membership. The National War Labor Board recognized this. Its standard maintenance of membership clause allowed the union to insist upon "membership in good standing" as a condition of employment. This bill pretends to allow a requirement of membership but really allows only a requirement that dues be paid. Why do not they say what they mean?

Section 8 (c) of the bill, page 22, sets up 10 unfair labor practices by unions. A few of these seem harmless, but if you read all 10 you know that the bill wants us to go into the business of running the unions from Washington. We regulate dues and contributions, police the disciplining of members, prescribe for what offenses they may be expelled without a hearing, and lay down the accounting obligations of the union toward its members. This bill establishes the makings of a labor front. The American people will never accept its provisions.

In my remaining time I shall comment on the most vindictive aspects of this bill—those which outlaw strikes and penalize employees and unions.

First, any striker loses his employee status as soon as he has been permanently replaced—section 2 (3), page 4—and an employer may thus promptly rid himself of all strikers, regardless of the cause of the strike or who provoked it, by permanently replacing them.

Second, employees may be found guilty of unfair labor practices—section 8 (b), page 21—such as "intimidation," refusal to bargain, and participation in economic strikes for objectives not expressly authorized by the bill. Workers will have to be pretty good lawyers—for the authorized objectives of bargaining in this bill are new and ambiguous and have not been judicially construed.

The penalty for engaging in one of these new employee-unfair-labor practices is loss of rights under the act which means, of course, loss of job.

I have already mentioned the catalog of unfair-labor practices by unions. Any union found to have committed one would lose the rights, if any may be found, which still belong to unions under this bill.

But these are mild provisions. Section 12, page 47, creates a long list of unlawful concerted activities and provides most drastic penalties. Not only is the use of force and violence prohibited, but also three different kinds of picketing; nine specified kinds of strikes are outlawed, the sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, illegal boycott, sit-down strike, featherbedding strike, strike for recognition, strike to compel violation of law, and lastly, I quote:

> Any strike * * * to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act.

In other words, the greater the employer's provocation, the more certain is a strike to be illegal, for if the employer engages in really serious unfair labor practices, a strike in protest becomes one to remedy practices for which administrative remedies exist.

Actually, under this bill no strike is legal unless, after exhaustion of collective bargaining and after the employer has been given a reasonable time to argue directly to the employees the virtues of his last offer, and after a Government-conducted poll, a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit vote to reject that offer and to strike.

And by that time, even if the employees want to stick with their union and do go on strike, they may immediately be replaced. If that happens, they are no longer employees. To the extent they try to bargain thereafter, their strike has become illegal, since it seeks recognition.

These provisions encourage employers to undercut and toss out unions, encourage employers to provoke employees, so that a single misstep will cost them their economic freedom. They constitute an intolerable regimentation of American labor.

If an employer succeeds in provoking a violation of section 12 by employees or a union in a sheer struggle to survive, they not only lose their rights under the act, but become liable for treble damages under the Sherman antitrust laws and lose the immunity accorded by the Norris-LaGuardia Act against ex parte injunctions.

This means that any strike may be enjoined by court order without a hearing.

Most of the real abuses which the bill proposes to penalize are already violations of State law, to which violators are subject. On the other hand, employer violations of labor's rights can be reached only through the procedures of the Wagner Act. What is the fairness in now subjecting workers to dual prosecution?

An employer who violates the Wagner Act is afforded a full hearing. If a Board order is issued, he may appeal it through the courts. Then and only then must he cease and desist, and take remedial action if so ordered. This may take years.

Under this one-sided bill, an employee who falls afoul of section 12 loses his job, may be immediately enjoined without a hearing, may be blacklisted for a year, and is subject to treble damages.

Will such discrimination stand the test of conscience? I think not.

The strikes and stoppages which have provoked this bitter bill are symptoms of our country's growth, of its adaptation to world-shaking dislocations. These problems are not to be solved by shutting our eyes to the fact that 15,000,000 of our people are organized in unions, or to the reasons for which they joined, nor by provoking class struggle. What is needed is cool heads and calm study. No honor will accrue to this House if we approve the vindictive crucifixion of American labor, offer our working people second-class citizenship, subvert their hard-won social and economic gains—the fruit of a century of struggle, require honorable employers to withdraw freely negotiated benefits or destroy stable and satisfactory relationships, or provoke less honorable employers to union busting and labor baiting.

I trust that the membership will reject this bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I have written a speech on this proposed legislation and have obtained permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My remarks are directed to the men and women who comprise the rank and file of labor and I intend to see that my speech reaches them. Therefore, I see no reason for taking up the time of the Members of this committee listening to my remarks which are primarily intended for someone else. Any Member who is interested in my remarks may read them in the RECORD. However, there is no compulsion to read them as there would be to listen to them if I spoke further at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point in the RECORD an amendment which I shall propose at the appropriate time so that the Members may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it before it comes up for consideration. This amendment proposes to relieve the people of the fear of national paralysis due to labor strife and in this way to enable us to deal constructively with labor free of the pressure of this legitimate public fear.

Page 57, line 10, to page 58, line 21, strike out the text of section 203 and substitute the following:

"SEC. 203. Whenever the President finds after investigation and proclaims that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in, the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in an industry essential to the public health or security, of sufficient magnitude to imperil or imminently threaten to imperil the public health or security, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to preserve and protect the public health or security, the President is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto, and by order to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or facility, the subject of such labor dispute, and to use and to operate such plant, mine, or facility in the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of the United States and while operated in its interests, shall be operated only to the minimum extent which seems to the President necessary to protect the public health or security of the United States, or of any material part of the territory or population thereof; and (2) the wages and other terms of employment in the plant, mine, or facility so taken, during the period of Government possession and operation shall be as prescribed by the President pursuant to the applicable provisions of law, and to the findings of a panel or commission specially designated or appointed for the purpose by the President, which wages and other terms of employment shall be not less than those prevailing for similar work in the area of such plant, mine, or facility by private business; and (3) such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or facility, that the possession and operation thereof by the United States, or in its interests, is no longer necessary to insure the minimum operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the public health or security; and (4) the President may by order confer authority upon any Government department or officer to take possession of, to operate, or to exercise any other of the powers herein granted to the President with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility; and (5) fair and just compensation shall be paid to the employer for the period of such possession and operation by the United States, or in its interests, as follows:

"(A) The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid as rental for the use of such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of or operated by the United States, or in its interests, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder.

"(B) If the employer is unwilling to accept as a fair and just compensation for the use of the property taken hereunder by the United States and as full and complete compensation therefor, the amount so determined by the President, the employer shall be paid 50 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any District Court of

the United States in the manner provided by sections 24 (20) and 145 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 41 and 250) for an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid shall be equal to the total sum which the employer considers to be fair and just compensation for the use of the property so taken by the United States."

If the foregoing amendment is adopted I shall offer the following additional amendments to the next section of the bill:

Page 58, line 22, strike out all following: "(a)" up to the word "it" in line 25 and insert the following:

"Whenever the President has issued an order under section 203 by virtue of a labor dispute which imperils, or imminently threatens to imperil, the public health or security."

Page 62, line 2, after the word "order", strike out the next four words up to the word "issued" in line 3.

Page 62, lines 4 to 8 inclusive, strike out subsection (f) of section 204.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an amendment which he expects to offer to the pending bill.)

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a bill of rights for the American workman and the American people. That, Mr. Chairman, is the simplest description of this measure now under consideration.

H. R. 3020 restores to Americans, workmen and employers alike, the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. It ends super-government by labor czars. It ends immunity from law for labor bosses. It ends the power of a labor dictator, by a nod of his head, to strangle the economy of our Nation of 130,000,000 people. It ends the authority of a labor racketeer to deny a workman the right to earn a living for himself and his family. And it does these things, Mr. Chairman, without sacrifice of a single legitimate union activity. This bill is antiabuse, not antilabor. It is a bill which, at last, puts the interest of John Q. Public above the interest of John L. Lewis. It is a bill which is for the American workman and against the dictators who have so effectively enslaved him.

I happen to be the only industrialist on the majority side of the Committee on Education and Labor. I have always regarded myself as a conservative. In each of my three elections, I have campaigned on that basis. Yet in the formulation of this bill in committee, I have found myself repeatedly on the liberal side. I would not support this bill, as I do, did I believe it to be contrary to labor's best interests, or damaging to the legitimate labor union movement.

It was abuses by a few selfish corporations which made necessary, in the public interest, the corrective measures of a few decades ago applicable alike to good and bad corporations. It is abuses by a few reckless drivers which make necessary, in the public interest, the speed laws applicable alike to careless and careful drivers. It is abuses by criminal elements which make necessary, in the public interest, laws regulating use of firearms applicable alike to peaceful and dangerous citizens. It is abuses in labor unions which make necessary, in the public interest, the law we are now considering and which is applicable alike to well run and badly run labor unions.

It will be my purpose, in the remainder of this address, to cite some of these principal labor union abuses and point out the manner by which this bill will protect the American public and the American workingman against such abuses.

A certain labor leader has been president of a monopolistic union for a couple of decades. Under the terms of the union's laws—and note that they are commonly termed laws although they have been enacted by no legislative body yet do exercise absolute control over the economic life of union members—this man can never be ousted as president for the simple reason that anyone advocating his ouster can be thrown out of the union on the charge of advocating a dual union. This union controls some 95 percent of the output of a commodity essential to the Nation's production and health. At a spoken word from this president, the 400,000 members of his union lay down their tools and cease work. They do not resume work until he has spoken again. And until he has spoken again, tens of millions of American workmen are prevented from working. He achieves his power through industry-wide bargaining. This man is John L. Lewis and his union is the United Mine Workers of America.

The bill before you strips John L. Lewis of his dictatorial powers. It prohibits industry-wide bargaining by restricting bargaining, with a minor exception, to the single-employer level. It prohibits any strike until a majority of all the workmen affected have had opportunity by secret ballot to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their employer's last offer.

A certain man had devoted his life to the education of children in a particular field. He achieved phenomenal success. But, in doing so, he incurred the displeasure of the czaristic president of a certain union. Without proper trial and at the mere whim of the union president, this man was deprived of his union card. Thereafter, no children under his direction could perform over the radio nor could he lead them in any theater. He was even denied use of certain school buildings. His name is Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, the founder of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan. The union is, of course, the musicians' union whose president is James Caesar Petrillo. The musicians' union is a closed shop.

The bill before you abolishes the closed shop. No longer will James Caesar Petrillo, under this bill, have power to deny Dr. Maddy his right to lead his orchestras of young people in radio or theater or school performances.

A certain jobber and commission merchant had worked in the business of distributing produce since he was 7 years old. A racketeering union had demanded that he join their union and that his firm sign the most iniquitous contract of which the Committee on Education and Labor heard in some 2,000,000 words of testimony. He and his firm refused. Thereupon, he was told by the boss of the union that he had 15 minutes to leave the area in which his business was located. If he failed to get out and stay out, the union boss informed him that he, a partner in the business, would be beaten up. This man is Herman J. Chassen, a jobber and commission merchant in the Dock Street Market of Philadelphia. The union is local 929 of the teamsters' union, A. F. of L. The union racketeer who told Mr. Chassen to leave the area of his place of business or else be beaten up is Turk Daniels, the president of the union.

Under H. R. 3020, Mr. Chassen could not only apply to the court for injunctive protection to his person, the Norris-LaGuardia Act notwithstanding, but he could also sue the teamsters' union for the damages the union's unlawful activity had caused him.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees the right of free speech to all Americans. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board, over a period of 7 years, denied that right to an American who happened to be an employer. If the union representing, or seeking to represent his employees published barefaced lies with regard to the employer and if the employer even attempted to answer those lies, his answer would be an unfair labor practice as per the 7-year interpretations of the National Labor Relations Board.

The bill before you abolishes the National Labor Relations Board. The Committee on Education and Labor in writing this bill did not feel that a Government board which denied to Americans a right guaranteed by the Constitution is entitled to continued existence.

A certain canning factory in California maintained harmonious relations with its employees. No disputes existed. Both AFL and CIO moved in and demanded that the employer sign a closed-shop contract requiring that all employees take membership in their particular union. AFL contended that, if the employer refused an AFL contract, the AFL teamsters union would transport neither the company's incoming raw material nor the company's outgoing finished product. CIO, on the other hand, informed the company that unless all employees joined CIO, the factory would receive no supply of tin cans because CIO controlled the factory in which the cans were produced.

H. R. 3020 outlaws the secondary boycott. Under its terms, employers and employees can no longer be caught in the middle between rival and grasping labor unions.

In California, a small firm manufactured paint with the assistance of three employees. A union agent appeared demanding that the employer sign a closed-shop contract forcing these three employees to join the union or be fired. These employees were satisfied with their wages and conditions of employment, did not wish to join the union, and the employer on their behalf refused to execute the contract. Thereupon, the plant

was picketed and all teamsters in the vicinity were forbidden to haul raw materials or finished products. Faced with no alternative, the employer then signed the contract and each employee paid $75 initiation fee. Three weeks later, the Oakland general strike was called. Despite the fact that the contract contained a no-strike clause, these three employees were ordered out on strike. They lost their pay while the strike continued but there was no relaxation in the requirement that they continue to pay their union dues.

The bill before you requires that there be a dispute between employer and employee before picketing can ruin the business and force employees to pay tribute to racketeers.

It is obvious that conciliators and mediators, to perform most effectively in a dispute between employees and employers, must be unbiased. Yet, under existing law, the United States Conciliation Service is a function of the Department of Labor, which Department, under the organic statute by which it was established, is bound to be biased in favor of labor. The Secretary of Labor, in his testimony before the committee, denied bias on the part of the Conciliation Service. He denied this bias despite the fact that bias is required of the Secretary of Labor, who, in turn, is the boss of the Conciliation Service.

The Committee on Education and Labor believes that conciliation and mediation can be most effective without bias—hence the independent Conciliation Service established under this bill.

In New York City, a butter, egg, and cheese business was founded in 1898 with four employees. Over the years, the number of employees grew to 82, who, through profit-sharing and enlightened treatment, are well paid, loyal, and happy. Their rates of pay and working conditions are substantially superior to the union scale which prevails in the city. Hence, these employees were nonreceptive to joining the union. The union; however, demanded tribute. Failing to get it, boycott was applied to the trucks, the piers, the warehouses, even the customers with which the firm does business. Farmers who customarily sold their produce to this firm were fearful for their lives and property were they to attempt to drive their trucks to the firm's place of business. The firm has been compelled to meet the situation by driving its own trucks 20 or 30 miles from the city for clandestine meetings with the farmers' trucks on remote country roads. And this, Mr. Chairman, is in America.

H. R. 3020 reestablishes for American workmen and American business the right, peacefully, to earn their livelihoods without first squaring matters with union gangsters.

Another produce merchant—this time in Philadelphia—suffered a complete cessation of his business because of his refusal to sign a contract with a hoodlum-dominated union, which, under the terms of the contract, would have required him to obtain permission from the union before he could even visit his place of business on Saturday.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, substitutes protection guaranteed by law for protection guaranteed by thugs at a price.

The abuses I have recited are not typical of labor unions in America. Neither are blackmail, extortion, intimidation, and physical violence typical of the American citizen. But, because there are criminals who practice blackmail, extortion, intimidation, and physical violence, we have laws to protect the public against such practices. H. R. 3020 is to protect American workmen and the American people against the abuses which have developed in a small segment of the labor-union movement.

The bill deserves the support of every right-thinking American.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House has prepared a bill, H. R. 3020, which it offers as a means of assuring industrial peace. The majority pleads for the adoption of this bill on the ground that it will strengthen democracy and the free-enterprise system. It asserts that this bill was written as the majority's "response to the mandate that the people of the United States gave us last November."

This, the so-called Labor-Management Relations Act, is not a product of a democratic process. The full committee did not have the opportunity to participate in its preparation. It was written in secrecy, behind closed doors. The proposals which it contains were not subjected to a test of public hearings. The minority members of the committee received copies of the bill on April 10 and were told to have the minority report available by April 12. No room was afforded for committee deliberation, interchange of views, or debate. The bill was jammed through the committee by the strong-arm tactics repugnant to the very process of democracy.

The provisions of the bill are in direct contravention to the expression of the will of the people recorded in the last election and is an abject refusal by the majority party in power to live up to the party commitments and pledges and to the campaign promises so glibly made only 6 months ago.

The proposed measure is fraudulent in its stated objective, in its declared intent, and in the language of its specific provisions. What this bill does is, not to reduce the far-reaching Government intervention which the people called for last year but to increase that intervention sevenfold and to make private actions of businessmen, as well as of the workers, subject to drastic regimentation and control. It clothes Federal agents with almost unlimited authority, arms them with the force of drastic penalties, and gives them legal authority to invade the most intimate phases of the day-to-day relations of the employer and his employees. At a stroke of a pen, it destroys the age-long relationships painfully built up by labor and management through private contract. It writes a step-by-step itinerary which both management and labor must strictly follow at the risk of being adjudged criminals if caught in a single misstep from the rigid and narrow plank which the bill would compel them to walk.

Despite the fact that the multiple and extremely intricate provisions of the bill are far more drastic than any measure of Federal regulation ever proposed within the framework of our constitutional government, they have been written without study and without adequate consideration. The main features of the bill are not supported by evidence brought out in the hearings held by the committee. They are founded on neither fact nor even an important contention of any major responsible witness representative of the point of view of the management, the public, or of labor. Secretly concocted, the bill has been rushed before this House under limited rules with the clear intent of jamming it through with tactics reminiscent of the blitz. This most far-reaching legislative proposal, whose effect will be felt by every enterprise and every citizen of the United States, has received far less committee consideration than was given to the British loan, and will be subject to much more limited debate than any number of proposals secondary to the formation of the public policy of the United States.

The outstanding feature of this bill is the fact that it cannot be honestly claimed to be legislation which would contribute to the maintenance of industrial peace. On the contrary, its enactment is bound to set off a chain reaction of industrial unrest that is likely to shake our economy to its very foundations and jeopardize the survival of our free institutions.

Industrial unrest since the end of the war was not the result of a break-down in collective bargaining. It was not due to any shortcoming of the Wagner Act. It was not the result of any concerted or restrictive practices of labor unions. It was real and genuine unrest caused by a very real force: the squeeze between constantly rising prices and declining wage income. Every wage earner and every housewife knows what it means to be caught in this merciless vise. They know, and the Members of this House know, that the root of the trouble has been inflation. Yet H. R. 3020 refuses to go to the source of trouble. It does not deal with causes of our industrial strife. It chooses to ignore them and to hide behind a phony camouflage and a false indictment of the men and women who have suffered most from the relentless robbery of unbridled inflation.

H. R. 3020 outlaws voluntary self-organization and free collective bargaining. It turns unions into puppets of the state. I say to you that depriving workers of their right of self-organization and collective bargaining will not further industrial peace. No, on the contrary, it will breed industrial unrest. It will leave no room for the adjustment of real grievances, for the correction of real abuses in the condition of the work-

er. It answers the worker's legitimate complaint with the injunction. His plea for the correction of a true injustice, it answers with a contempt citation. For the workers it offers nothing but punishment and compulsion.

What will this royalist suppression of the workers' economic rights produce? A sense of hatred and a spirit of revolt. It will drive patriotic and law-abiding peace-loving citizens to political protest. It will make them fall an easy prey to the Communists and other subversive forces. These enemies of democracy will, in turn, seize upon this long-awaited opportunity to undermine our democratic institutions, to foster class hatred and political unrest. Yes, at the time when our free institutions stand on trial before the whole world, the adoption of this oppressive bill would make a mockery of the ideals of freedom which have become a symbol to many nations of America's purpose, her stature, and her strength. Like a smothering black cloud, this bill would snuff out the torch of liberty that has guided America in her onward and upward march of industrial progress, never matched by any nation in the history of mankind.

This bill has been offered in this Congress by the Republican majority of this House and in the name of the Republican Party. But I submit that there is real and reasonable doubt about the true origin and authorship of this proposal. It was devised and drafted in shameful secrecy which ill becomes elected public representatives responsible to the people. "Who wrote H. R. 3020?" is a pertinent and legitimate question which the people can rightly ask of its sponsors. Were the attorneys and lobbyists of giant and powerful corporate aggregates admitted behind the closed doors of the committee chambers just by accident when the bill was drawn? Was the expensive and lurid antilabor propaganda with which the Halls of Congress have been strewn in the last few days just a coincidence?

There is more than a clue in the fact that the program of labor legislation drafted by the National Association of Manufacturers last December and published in full-page advertisements in the New York Times and scores of other papers on January 8 of this year, is embodied in its entirety in the proposed bill. There is more than a hint of the bill's real origin in the fact that several sections of this NAM program are written into the bill word for word. Study this bill; examine it carefully, and you will be driven to the inevitable conclusion about its true authorship. Listen to its language and observe the open and the hidden points of its thrusts. And you will be compelled to conclude: Yes, the voice is the voice of the Republican majority, but the hand is the hand of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The employers who are giving support to these proposals are a small but powerful minority of American employers. The great majority of representative employers are not in sympathy with this drastic bill. Most employer witnesses appearing before our committee not only failed to support the key provisions of the proposal, but termed the excessive Government regulation and drastic repression of collective bargaining as dangerous and objectionable. There is a small minority of short-sighted employer spokesmen who yearn to duplicate the union-breaking tactics of their predecessors after the First World War. At that time a number of employer organizations, led by the National Association of Manufacturers, conducted a vicious anti-union campaign which resulted in a widespread union destruction and a 25-percent membership loss by labor unions within 2 years.

The sponsors of the bill contend that they are legislating industrial peace. But I defy you to find anything in its provisions that bears directly on the recent record of industrial disputes. Let us examine that record.

The winning of the war brought on the cancellation of war contracts and the reconversion of war industries. The length of the workweek was cut back, overtime was reduced, and millions of workers were down-graded into jobs of less skill and lower pay. All this meant that the individual worker's take-home pay was drastically reduced. Remember that it was the worker's take-home pay out of which came the money to feed, house, and clothe the family. As a result, workers sought increases in basic wage rates. These wage increases to offset the workers' rising living costs were vigorously resisted by employers.

Thus we had two forces working in opposite directions. The result was inevitable. Early in 1946 this country went through several months of widespread work stoppages. However, beginning with May 1946, to date work-stoppages have declined steadily. In recent months, time lost through strikes accounted for less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total working time.

In reviewing this record since VJ-day, it is significant that only a few strikes have been responsible for a relatively large proportion of the total time lost from all strikes. For example, during the 1-year period following VJ-day, three strikes accounted for 46 percent, and seven strikes accounted for 61 percent of the idleness caused by strikes.

These figures give perspective to the postwar strikes. But they do not show what caused them. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has made a special study of the 29 strikes involving 10,000 or more workers which began during 1946. Of these 29 strikes the major issue in 21, accounting for over 95 percent of the total idleness, was the question of wages. In three more the major issue was a combination of wages and union security. These figures give some indication of the causes for the 1946 strikes. During the past 9 months, work stoppages have been getting fewer and the record of industrial relations has been, on the whole, quite satisfactory. Only two major disputes have occurred—in coal and the telephone industries. Nothing in the provisions of H. R. 3020 would help settle these disputes. In the 12 months prior to that, 9 out of every 10 workers who engaged in a work stoppage, did so solely to protect their income against the inroads of inflation. That basic problem can be solved only by the assurance of economic stability, and not by a modification of the Wagner Act or regimentation of unions.

It would be very fine if we could eliminate all work stoppages due to labor-management disputes. But we must remember that the only countries that have succeeded in abolishing strikes are the countries that have succeeded in abolishing freedom. Strikes and the freedom of each individual worker to reject the terms and conditions of his employment, whether singly or in concert with others, is an integral part of our democratic society. A country which compels workers to perform their task through the exercise of force or threat of punishment, cannot be called a free country. No matter how thick the disguise, it accepts involuntary servitude.

H. R. 3020 repeals the Wagner Act and instead of the National Labor Relations Board, creates a Labor-Management Relations Board and an office of the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act. The Administrator prosecutes unfair labor practices before the Board. He also acts as the agent of the Board, before which he appears as the prosecutor, in making applications to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board. Aside from this, the Administrator is also given the quasi-judicial function of investigating representation petitions. This arrangement makes the procedure complicated and confused. Under it no employer and no union would escape the constant danger of running afoul of some requirement of the law.

The bill is claimed to "equalize" the Wagner Act. Actually it relieves the employer from any serious responsibility or obligation, while subjecting unions to a constant threat of their complete elimination. A worker or a union, found to engage in an unfair labor practice, is deprived of the right of collective bargaining. The right of forming a union is then withdrawn and the union is put out of existence for at least a year. No such penalty is, of course, placed upon the employer.

The present National Labor Relations Act does not merit any drastic amendment. Actually, the Wagner Act has been extremely successful in reducing the number and impact of strikes involving union recognition. In 1937, for example, there were 2331 strikes whose major issue was union recognition or discrimination. This constituted 50 percent of that year's total strikes. Contrast this with the figure for 1945 when there were only 601 strikes in this category, comprising only 13.2 percent of the total. The record is even better for the first year following VJ-day. The Department of Labor statistics show that union recognition was an issue in only 23 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers during that time. This represents only 5.3 percent of the total strikes, and only

4.1 percent of the total man-days idle caused by these strikes.

Another group of proposals in the bill constitutes an attempt to impose the arbitrary restrictions on the free process of collective bargaining. I am referring specifically to the anti-closed shop amendments and the proposal to ban industry-wide bargaining.

In my opinion these two proposals are the most pernicious of the entire lot. We have come a long way in the handling of labor disputes in this country, and the biggest step that we have taken is the recognition that collective bargaining and not individual bargaining is the most practical and equitable method of settling disputes between employers and employees. It is now commonly accepted that collective bargaining is the cornerstone of the relations between unions and management. It represents the means whereby a free and voluntary agreement is reached concerning terms and conditions of employment.

Since we are all agreed that the best agreement is a voluntary agreement, it is sound logic that employers and employees should, together, settle their mutual problems. Whenever these two together are able to reach a mutual understanding, they should be permitted to do so without any outside interference. There should be no Government agency dictating or prescribing the provisions or the limits of this agreement. Only if that agreement violates the constitutional rights of individuals or is directly harmful to the public welfare should Government interfere. Certainly Government should not interfere to declare that unions and management cannot enter into industry-wide agreement, or that they are prohibited from agreeing on a closed or union shop. So long as these two practices have benefited the parties directly involved who have voluntarily adopted them, there is no need for Government action of any kind.

The facts are that both industry-wide bargaining and the closed shop have been instrumental in achieving a very high degree of stability in many industries. Industry-wide bargaining has been practiced in many industries for as long as 50 or more years. In the pressed and blown glassware industries, no major strikes have occurred since the signing of a master agreement between the union and an employers' association in 1888. Among industries in which industry-wide or association-wide bargaining has become prevalent are: Men's and women's clothing, shipbuilding, pottery, trucking, construction, paper and pulp, shipping, and a number of others.

Industry and regional bargaining has been successful in achieving its basic objective, greater standardization of wages and employment conditions. This has meant greater stability for the industry, generally higher wages, and at the same time fewer bankruptcies and a higher proportion of the firms returning a fair profit. This conclusion is supported by the findings of a special study recently completed by the industrial relations section of Princeton University. This comprehensive research survey concludes:

> Under national or regional bargaining, wage decisions are likely to be more sensible and far-sighted, taking into consideration the economic interests of the industry as a whole, than is the case where the wage pattern for the industry is established by a wage leader or by local bargaining with the union playing one firm against another. Experience (e. g., west coast pulp and paper in 1940) indicates that the union's wage demands may be more modest when they apply uniformly and simultaneously to all plants in a multiple-employer unit."[1]

Through the free collective-bargaining process, unions and employers mutually determine the form of their collective agreement and fit it to the most effective way of solving the problems both confront. In many cases over the past 50 years, the scope of these agreements has been enlarged in response to the growth of large-scale enterprises and the increasing interdependence of related business enterprises. Statutory limitation of labor agreements to a single locality is a direct attack upon the process of free collective bargaining. Any such attempt to confine collective bargaining to a specific area will turn back the clock of industrial progress.

The closed shop is another issue on which there has been a great deal of misunderstanding. The anti-closed-shop amendments of H. R. 3020 in reality would destroy all types of union security, including maintenance of membership and union shop arrangements. Proponents of this restrictive legislation, whether by design or accident, have obscured the fact that their proposal would strike at approximately 74 percent of all the workers covered by collective-bargaining agreements. According to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1945, 45 percent of all workers under agreement are employed under closed or union shop contracts, while an additional 29 percent are covered by maintenance-of-membership clauses.

The closed or union shop is necessary for constructive union-management relations. By "constructive union-management relations" is meant relations which have gone beyond the cat-and-dog or hair-pulling stage of collective bargaining. This means the development of a mutually cooperative effort to reduce labor costs, stabilize output at a high level, and improve quality. Only in this way does collective bargaining serve its real purpose of bringing benefits to our economy through higher wages, progressively lower prices, and a fair return on investment.

This type of constructive union-management relations has been worked out in many specific labor-management situations. It is only possible where the union is strong, independent, and disciplined, and is secure in the knowledge that the employer has unequivocally accepted the principle of collective bargaining. These conditions reflect a degree of union security which is only possible under a closed or union shop.

The proposed bill contains a wide range of other restrictive, prohibitive and punitive provisions. Many of them are repetitious, overlapping and almost unbelievable in their confusion and complexity. It amends the Clayton Anti-Trust Act of 1914, turning back the clock 33 years. It repeals the basic Norris-LaGuardia Act, making workers in specific situations subject to the "yellow-dog contract" and reviving the war on unions through the injunction. It revamps the Conciliation Service. And, above everything else, it creates a completely monstrous procedure whereby nine distinct agencies of the government intervene as independent agents in a labor dispute affecting public welfare. After a ride on this incredible government merry-go-round, the dispute is left just where it started.

This is dangerous, ill-conceived and ill-considered legislation. It must not be allowed to become law. Its aim is to destroy organized labor and to lead the nation down a dark and murky path of dubious political regimentation both of unions and of industrial management.

Let Congress prove itself in this test of its statesmanship. Let it initiate a careful and judicious study of labor-management relations, through a joint committee, proposed by the President in his message to this Congress last January. Let the Congress then, upon full, public and open study, formulate reasonable and effective proposals, dealing with the causes as well as the results of industrial unrest. That is the path of sanity, statesmanship and of lasting service to the people of America.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

THE REPUBLICAN SCAB LABOR BILL H. R. 3020 AND UNION SECURITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the deep sympathy and love of the Republican Party for the working people of America is evidenced by the bill which they have brought to the floor today. I want the people of the United States to know that this bill, H. R. 3020, is a Republican bill. It was reported out by a unanimous vote of the Republican members of the Labor and Education Committee. A majority of the Democratic members voted against reporting of such a bill. The velvet covering of last November's campaign promises has been torn away. The steel claw is now in evidence for everyone to see, and that steel claw is at the throat of the working people of the United States. This omnibus labor bill, or I should say "antilabor" bill, if it should become the law of the land, will take away from the workers of America both organized and unorganized, the ability to protect themselves against predatory corporations and vicious employers, whose main interest is profits and not the welfare of the average workingman. As the debate proceeds on this bill, section by section,

[1] Wages Under National and Regional Collective Bargaining. By Richard A. Lester and Edward A. Robie. Industrial relations section, Princeton University, 1946, p. 93.

you will see exposed the real purpose of the Republican Party in its professed love for labor. You will see that H. R. 3020, the Republican scab labor bill, will unfold in all its ugliness. The measure under consideration is so comprehensive in its attack on basic rights of labor that it is impossible for any speaker to cover the bill in its entirety. I will, therefore, direct my remarks specifically to the subject of union security.

The people of America, workers, farmers, and businessmen, are tired of industrial strife. They are deeply aware of the fact that the future of this Nation and the self-interest of every citizen is not served by unions and employers slugging out their differences in economic warfare. They want stability in industrial relations. They expect us as their legislative representatives to promote that stability.

The majority of the Committee on Education and Labor proposes to promote industrial stability by H. R. 3020. That number deserves to live in the history of this Chamber as representing one of the most cynical, vindictive, and ill-begotten legislative monstrosities that it has ever produced. Instead of promoting stability in industrial relations, it stimulates friction. Instead of encouraging responsibility in union organizations and a disposition on the part of employers to bargain collectively in good faith, it is well calculated to break the national unity which won us a war, and separate us into a society of warring classes. H. R. 3020 is the kind of bill that Karl Marx might well have written for inclusion in an appendix to Das Kapital as an illustration of the type of legislation which would intensify the warfare between economic groups and classes and thereby accelerate his anticipated collapse of the free enterprise and the capitalistic system and the triumph of the one-class proletarian socialistic state.

It would take me more time than has been allotted to describe the mischief in the provisions of this bill. I shall confine myself to only one aspect—its effect on union security.

Union security is a good term in the minds of all excepting those relatively few but sometimes powerful employers who belong to the stone age of industrial relations and feel that justice, truth, and the good life will only be served by destroying every union in the country. Nothing stimulates aggression like fear; nothing promotes peace like security. That is true of private individuals, employers, nations, and even unions. One of the classic illustrations of that proposition in the labor field is the molders' union in the A. F. of L. which between 1850 and 1890 engaged in a tragic and bitter contest with the stove manufacturers, primarily over the closed-shop issue. When an agreement was finally arbitrated and the manufacturers in good faith reversed their position and accepted unionism, the union lost interest in its closed-shop demand.

The lesson is plain: The closed shop or maintenance-of-membership shop are means by which workers seek to protect their organizations from the attacks of the stone-age employers. They are not ends in themselves. They are shields against employer aggression and intimidation. Labor history shows that when employers seek to destroy unions, the demand for union security becomes more insistent; when employers in particular industries accept unionization, the closed union or maintenance-of-membership shop is a piece of useless armor to which no one pays any attention. It is obvious, therefore, that the sense of security which comes from collective-agreement provisions of that character is a definite contribution to industrial peace.

For the benefit of those who may be confused by these terms, permit me to define them briefly. A closed shop, generally, is one in which an employer may hire only union members who must remain in good membership standing, in default of which they will be discharged; a union shop is one in which nonunion employees may be hired, but they must join the union within a definite period of time; in a maintenance-of-membership shop no worker is obliged to join a union, but if he does he must remain in good standing for the life of the collective agreement.

Under existing law all of these types of shops are legal excepting in some few States in which hysterical legislatures, reckless of constitutional consequences, have banned the closed shop. Section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, in a proviso added to the provision making it an unfair labor practice for an employer, by discrimination, to encourage or discourage membership in a union, specifically permits employers to enter into collective agreements for a closed shop with a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit. That act, then, does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they are declared illegal. It merely leaves it up to the parties to agree, if they so desire, upon that degree of union security which they deem appropriate.

Before pointing out the effect of H. R. 3020 on the status quo, I wish to make this observation. I do not wish to be understood as an unqualified defender of closed shops or more moderate types of union security. There is evidence that undemocratic practices have crept into some unions, and their union-security status has been abused. We should legislate to correct those abuses, not destroy union security. However the majority of the committee may feel, I do not favor amputation of an arm as a cure for an infected finger.

The committee was informed by the Secretary of Labor that as of last April of the 77 percent of all employees in unions working under some form of union security, 30 percent were under closed-shop contracts, 15 percent under union-shop contracts, 29 percent under maintenance-of-membership contracts, and 3 percent under preferential-hiring contracts—another form of union security provision.

Now let us examine the contribution of the majority of the committee to industrial discord and warfare.

First, in section 8 (a) (3) of the bill—page 21 of the print—it drops the proviso from the National Labor Relations Act which permitted employers to enter into closed-shop agreements without fear of being accused of an unfair labor practice. Then, in section 8 (d) (4)—pages 26 and 27 of the print—it proceeds to state what shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice. That provision permits employers to enter into agreements with certified unions for a union shop or a maintenance-of-membership shop. It does not permit employers or unions to enter into a closed shop. In consequence, if the bill should pass, the employers who have 30 percent of all union workers under existing contracts providing for a closed shop, can immediately be charged with unfair labor practices because, in the language of 8 (a) (3), by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment they are encouraging membership in a labor organization. Many of these contracts have a year or more to run. They were the product of honest bargaining. The workers have fought hard and long for their union security, and have sacrificed wage increases and other benefits for them. I fear that I have no words to characterize the committee proposal. That it is an arrant disregard of the solemn obligation of contract and fair dealing is obvious—but it is equally plain that in addition to depriving many employers of an institution that for many years has afforded them relative industrial peace and stability, it will outrage the sense of justice of workers who presently are protected by closed-shop contracts. The committee wants to outlaw agreements affecting millions of workers which were legal when made and were intended to bind the parties for some period in the future. The legislative methods it suggests that this Congress approve are reprehensible. I do not even want to discuss the legality of those methods under the Constitution.

I have already indicated that section 8 (d) (4) permits union and maintenance of membership shops. But let us examine the obstacles placed in the path of agreement on these types of union security which make a sham of the legislative permission.

In the first place, the union shop and maintenance of membership shop contract can only be entered into by an employer if the provisions are not in conflict with State law. Thus, the committee turns back to the discredited thinking underlying the Articles of Confederation and closes its eyes to what every informed adult knows—that the industrial strength of this Nation flows over State lines, and that when local diversity of control constitutes a burden on that interstate flow and effort, it must give way to central control. Why else did the founders confer upon us the power to regulate commerce among the several States? H. R. 3020 would permit an employer in one city to enter into a contract, but prohibit the same employer

from entering into a similar contract across the river in another State where it may be forbidden. Can the committee be jesting with us? I can think of no better way to drive employers and unions to distraction.

But even where State law permits union and maintenance of membership shop contracts they may be negotiated only where it appears, under oath, that the employer's agreement "was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof." I cannot say what that really means, specifically. What is a threat between a union and an employer? It is not unusual in collective-bargaining meetings for each side to forecast the most horrible events for the other side—but that is part of the custom and folkways of collective bargaining. The consequences of the provision are certain. No such union-security provisions will be negotiated; they will come into effect only when the employer on his own initiation, and where he already believes that it will serve his interest, suggests a union-security clause. Thus, the quoted provision, in effect, will take union security out of the field of collective bargaining. If you have any doubt that my statement is correct, I suggest that you take a look at section 2 (11) on page 9 which describes the scope of "collective bargaining." The language starting on line 14 makes it clear that the closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership and preferential shop are not one of the subjects which the parties are obliged to bargain collectively about, although the present Wagner Act requires it.

Another condition in section 8 (4) is that the procedure set out in section 9 (g) be complied with before a union-security clause becomes effective.

Section 9 (g) says that a union desiring a union shop or maintenance of membership shall state under oath to the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act that the agreement for the union-security provision signed by the employer was not obtained by strike or threat. The Administrator then informs the employer of the union's application. If the employer does not object to the union-security provision—that is, if he stands by the bargain he has made—a secret ballot of the employees is held to determine whether they really and truly desire the provisions negotiated for them by their own representatives. If the employer does make objections—that is, if he turns on his bargain—a hearing is held before the Labor-Management Relations Board. If the Board finds that the matter affects commerce, it directs the Administrator to take a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit as to whether they desire the agreement carried out.

We then come to one of the most preposterous provisions in the bill. In the ballot last mentioned, a majority of all of the employees in the bargaining unit must vote in favor of carrying out the provision, if it is to be regarded as outside the scope of the unfair-labor-practice section.

Members of the House, I direct your attention to that extraordinary provision on line 3 of page 35 in the bill before you. I do not know who drafted it, but whoever he is, he has no understanding or faith in one of the basic tenets of a democratic society. Such a society is built on majority rule. In our local, municipal, State, and Federal elections we accept the rule of the majority of qualified individuals who have cast their ballots. Those who stay at home are not counted on either side of an issue. In our fraternal and other private organizations, in our corporate directors' and stockholders' meetings, in our Supreme Court, in our congressional committees, and, indeed, in this very Chamber, and voting on this very bill, so long as a quorum is present, the rule of the majority of votes cast is the rule of the organization or institution. But section 9 (g) would require an affirmative majority of all of the employees in the unit to legitimatize a union-shop agreement. Those who stay at home are, therefore, to be counted as voting against the agreement. A premium is placed on employer intimidation. The employees will know that anyone who shows up to vote risks the displeasure of an employer who prefers an open shop, although he may have agreed, for strategic reasons, to union-security provisions.

Nor does the majority of the committee stop with these administratively unworkable and undemocratic provisions. It goes further and makes it an unfair labor practice for an employee or a representative of an employee to call, authorize, engage in, or assist in any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, the object of which is to compel inclusion in a collective-bargaining agreement of provisions for any type union security whatsoever. This is done by section 8 (b) (3) of the proposed bill.

It is manifest that the end result of all of these provisions is to take from employees any reasonable means, by concerted action, to protect their union from antiunion employers and from the incursion of other competing unions. The bill drafters have done a job the objective of which cannot be mistaken by any Member of Congress. It is to give lip service to the proposition that good and strong unions of workers are necessary to our industrial democracy, but to legislate every possible obstruction and hindrance to their normal development and self-protection. In this respect the bill is hypocritical on its face.

This bill does not, as the Republican majority claims it has the voters' mandate to do, promote the usages of democracy in industrial relations; rather it undermines the institutons of democracy and makes a mockery of the legitimate aspirations of millions of American citizens as loyal and patriotic as any Member of Congress. It would deny to workers and their organizations those procedures and practices that are our democratic heritage and tradition. Unless H. R. 3020 is a grisly stupid joke—which I would prefer to consider it—or an irresponsible political trick, I regard it as one of the most impudent and reckless proposals ever put before Congress.

I say again, I shall not defend all of the abuses by unions of the various types of union-security arrangements. Unions, if they are to have power, must be responsible and democratic in their procedures and activities. We should legislate to promote democracy in unions. But we should not legislate, as is here proposed, to strike down the union-security provisions which contribute to industrial peace. Union-security provisions free unions from those two fears which more than anything else drive them to aggressive and sometimes antisocial conduct: One is fear of antiunion activity by the employer; the other is invasion and competition by another union. Union security enables unions to enforce that discipline among its members, the absence of which accounts for the unauthorized and quickie strikes which have plagued our industrial production in recent years. Union security enables a union to turn its attention from industrial warfare and to devote its attention to the constructive rather than the destructive aspects of labor relations.

The proponents of this bill seem to proceed on the theory that unions, as such, are evil and wicked things, and have no powers for good. The example of many good unions and the testimony of good employers and disinterested experts to the contrary, makes no impression upon them. Even then, however, they do not have the political courage and straightforwardness to legislate unions out of existence in a direct and manly fashion. They indulge in the shameful subterfuges and construct the elaborate booby traps that constitute the substance of this bill.

We are in a dramatic period of history. Part of the world is Communist. Great Britain is no longer a free-enterprise nation in our sense of the term. Our system is competing in the world market of ideas and things with the other great systems. We should be made sober by our historic responsibility—the responsibility of making strong and stable, for the future, all of our institutions, including our industrial relations. The one thing of which we may be absolutely certain in this world, is change. The world and its events are moving on and forward, for better or for ill. We must master the future by anticipating it and adapting ourselves to its requirements. The most generous thing I can say of H. R. 3020, is that it discloses that its framers do not look for their instruction at the condition of affairs in the world today and, apparently, are incapable of looking into the future. They have offered us a blueprint for a Neanderthal period in industrial relations. They think of the world as static, and would have the law of the jungle applied to labor relations with this qualification—all of the stones and clubs are to be put into the hands of those employers who remain unthinking enemies of unions. I should be false to my oath and my duty if I did not denounce this bill. I shall feel a deep sense of shame if this House approves it.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Will not the gentleman in his remarks also call to the attention of the House the fact that there was at least one gentleman on the other side of the aisle who denied that we were entitled to all the credit for this bill and claimed some credit for himself?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that. My remarks were very explicit. I said the majority of the Democratic members voted against the reporting of such a bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman prefers a condition to prevail that we saw right in that company within the last year, where the employees of General Electric and Westinghouse went out on strike for so long a period and for so little increase in their wages after all their striking, that it will take them a period of 9 years' steady employment to regain what they lost as a result of the strike. Does the gentleman wish that condition to prevail?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I do not wish that to continue. I say I would prefer the occasion of collective bargaining such as the one this week between General Motors and its workers. However, I am aware of the fact, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is also aware of the fact that the General Motors profit figure for this last year, with their strike, due to the fact that they got a refund of some forty-odd million dollars in taxes, enabled them to take care of the strike which they had and still show a good profit on their ledgers.

So it has been all through the course of history, the workingman has always paid; he has paid for the privilege of getting a little high standard of living in society. It is not a profitable thing for a man to strike. No man likes to strike; these people do not like to strike, but they do not like to be held down either and denied the right to a decent standard of living while the profits of great corporations multiply as they have in the last year and while the prices of things the workers make go higher and higher and the purchasing power of the individual worker goes lower and lower. We cannot depend upon the benevolence of the great corporations. That has been shown time and time again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next after the regular business of the day and the previous orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. HARTLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a chart.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. RAMEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter sent by Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers' Union.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post of last Saturday.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the foreign labor supply bill (H. R. 2102) may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POULSON, for 4 days, on account of the death of a close friend and associate, Lee Galloway, of Los Angeles.

To Mr. STANLEY (at the request of Mr. ALMOND), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. WORLEY (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 day, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they built a dam to back up the waters and then dug two canals to control the flow for the uses of industry, and in this manner a town was born and its name was Lawrence.

Looking backward, we realize how important was this river—called the Merrimack, after the Indian word meaning "swift waters"—in the birth and development of our city.

Most communities come into being by accident. A man finds a clearing in the wilderness and builds a cabin. He is joined by other families, and a settlement begins. Some enterprising person starts a store to service these people. Goods are brought in to stock the store. The products of the labor of the few families are exchanged for the goods. Each helps the other and so the community grows as its products and needs and services expand. That, in brief form, is the story of most places where people live together in sizable groups.

Lawrence, however, was an exception to this rule. It is the only "made-to-order" city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the early days, before the palefaces came, this general area was a sylvan paradise. Bodwell's Falls, now the Lawrence dam, and the shores of the Spicket were favorite resorts for the Indians, especially in the fishing season. Some old writers claim that this was the ancient seat of the Agawam Tribe and it was here that the Princess of the House of Pennacook came to reside.

But, as solitary and adventurous white men began to push the frontier up the Merrimack, the Indians withdrew to New Hampshire. A little more than a 100 years ago, if you stood on the top of Tower Hill, you would see rolling meadows and patches of forest in the valley of the river. And, if you strained your eyes, you might count the presence of 20 families by the plumes of smoke coming from the chimneys of the few scattered homesteads.

In 1793, there were settlements at Methuen and Andover, and there was a rough bridge across the river in this "in-between" country, to provide communications from one to the other. In 1801, a part of the bridge fell in ruins while a drove of cattle were passing over it, and 66 animals perished in the water below. It was repaired, in primitive fashion, and stood until 1807, when a great freshet and run of ice swept most of it away.

There was no Lawrence. There was merely the problem of a bridge, so that the few people in Andover and Methuen might reach one another.

But in 1825, a notable event took place. General Lafayette, of Revolutionary fame, was making a triumphal journey from Boston to Concord, N. H., and he had to cross the bridge. And the good farmers, from miles around, crossed the rolling hills and meadows and came down to the river. General Lafayette traveled in an open carriage and was escorted by several companies of infantry and cavalry and the people gave him a great cheer as he crossed the bridge. On that day scarcely a one gave much thought to the river.

The years passed, and the only sound one heard, apart from the ring of a woodsman's ax, or the lowing of the herd, was the music of the rapids at Bodwell's Falls.

Up to 1845 little change had taken place in more than a century. There was the solitary farmer, the river raftsman, and the fisherman who, with one drag of his net, pulled in a week's supply of food. That was all, except for the restless river flowing to the sea.

There was one man, however, blessed with the vision from which all great enterprise began. As he walked along the banks of the Merrimack he saw and was fascinated by, the unused power of the river. He was a man who never mislaid, or wasted, or destroyed anything that could become of any future use or value. Here, before his eyes, was the greatest physical power within the then-known reach of man, and its possibilities challenged his competitive spirit.

Somewhere, somehow, this potential power could be controlled to turn the wheels of industry in the service of man. And as he studied and thought over this problem, he came to the conclusion that there must be a more considerable fall between Lowell and tidewater in the Merrimack River, than was generally believed.

With a single assistant, and with no other instruments than a straightedge and a spirit level, he measured the fall of the various rapids and got a clearer picture of the mighty source of power and wealth, hidden within these few and unobtrusive rapids.

About 2 miles above the present location, at the head of Peters Falls, a dam could have been constructed at a smaller expenditure of money than where the present dam now stands. This would sacrifice a few feet of fall. So, at that time, a choice of location was by no means certain in this man's mind. On one thing, though, he was determined. He would find in one of the two localities, a great manufacturing center.

Without taking anyone into his confidence, he began to purchase, strip by strip, parcels of land on both sides of the river, until he held in his own right, the whole of Peters Falls.

Having gone as far as he could venture alone in so great an undertaking, he now opened up the whole matter to his nephew, J. G. Abbott, John Nesmith and Samuel Lawrence, all residents of Lowell, explaining what he had done and what he proposed to do.

Impressed by his sound business record and the glowing terms in which he described the possibilities of the project these men, together with Daniel Saunders, Jr., Thomas Hopkinson and Jonathan Tyler of Lowell, and Nathaniel Stevens of Andover, formed the Merrimack Water Power Association.

Some members of the Association, urged the purchase, as quietly as possible, of all lands in the immediate vicinity and as cheaply as possible.

The father of the enterprise opposed this procedure. He advised, instead, that the Association should announce its intentions of building, in one of the two locations to be decided upon, a new manufacturing city. Furthermore, he believed that the landowners should be offered a joint benefit, by taking bonds from the owners for the conveyance of their lands within a given time and at prices much higher than the value of these lands.

He was given authority to proceed along this line. Patiently he set about the task of contacting present and absent owners. The wise ones laughed and called the whole thing foolish, but who were they to refuse the fancy prices offered for mere farmland? In spite of those discouraging remarks, and the slow tedious job of convincing timid owners who had never made a conveyance of land in their lifetime that there was nothing to fear, this man stuck to his task.

The name of this man was Daniel Saunders, and he was a sturdy example of Yankee enterprise.

As the project developed, it was proposed to call the new town "Saunders" in tribute to the man whose vision and zeal brought it to life. To this, Mr. Saunders objected, stating that, as there was no town in Massachusetts called Merrimack, and as the new community was located on the river of that name, the settlement should be called "Merrimack" in honor of the river which inspired its development. And so it was, up to the time of its incorporation.

When the act of incorporation was asked of the General Court of Massachusetts, it was decided to call the town Lawrence after the Lawrence family, members of which were leaders among the up-and-coming textile manufacturers of that period.

Abbott Lawrence was principal stockholder of the group of capitalists who became interested in the building of the new textile center. At one time, he represented the United States as Minister to England.

Some will wonder why Mr. Saunders, who, more than any other one man, can take credit for this beginning, should have declined the honor of having his town named after him. His thoughts, however, were in another direction. Should the enterprise succeed, there would be satisfaction enough for him in seeing a thriving city rise from this countryside, giving employment to thousands; profits on capital invested, to others; and producing the clothing needed all over the earth.

On the 20th of March 1845 the Legislature of Massachusetts granted to the original association and their successors, the charter of the Essex Company, authorizing the construction of a dam across the Merrimack River. On the 16th of April, the stock of $1,000,000 having been taken up, the company was organized and the work began. An accurate survey was made, plans executed for a dam, canal, mill sites, streets, lots and public squares in the town, and on the 19th of September the first stone was laid in the company's dam. Within two years, the work was completed. At the time, it was one of the outstanding engineering accomplishments in the country. It is of granite, 1,629 feet in length, 35 feet thick at the base and twelve and a half at the top, backed by gravel to within a few feet of the surface. The granite blocks from which the dam is built, were hammered on the bed and laid in hydraulic cement. The overflow of water is 900 feet wide and the fall is 26 feet. In some places, the dam is as high as 40⅓ feet. The cost was only $250,000.

The north canal is somewhat over a mile long, 100 feet wide at the upper, and 60 feet wide at the lower end, and is 12 feet deep. It is 400 feet distant from the river and runs parallel with it. The river affords an average of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second, but sometimes it reaches 60,000. In the old days, a power thus obtained was estimated at 150 mill power. A mill power takes 30 cubic feet of water a second, with a head and fall of 25 feet. This produces a force calculated to give 60 to 70 horsepower. When the Atlantic Mills Corp. purchased the site for their factory, the price agreed upon for a mill power was $14,000, of which $9,000 was paid in cash, the balance of $5,000 remaining perpetually at 4 percent interest, payable annually in silver or its equivalent. The Atlantic Co. bought 20 mill powers, and the other corporations in proportion to their needs.

A second canal, on the south side of the river, was built in 1870. This detour of the river water to furnish power, is nearly a mile in length.

On the many occasions when the Lawrence pioneer, Daniel Saunders, reined up old Snow Ball, the white horse he rode, to the tumbling rapids, he dreamed of the possibility of harnessing that wasting power to the machinery of workshops and mills. His dreams came true in a manner exceeding his expectations. The town developed almost overnight. Acres of red-brick factory buildings crowded the banks of the river, gathering raw material from the wide world and scattering finished products far and near. Immigrants came from all parts of the earth to man the looms and the spinning machines.

How much the mills depended upon the water power furnished by the Merrimack may be gleaned from statistics published in 1880.

The motive power of the Washington Mills, producing 280,000 yards of goods a week, consists of 7 water wheels of 1,025 horsepower and two engines of 1,000 horsepower.

The Atlantic Mills, producing 23,000,000 yards of cloth annually, are powered by one steam engine of 500 horsepower, and four turbine water wheels.

The Pacific Mills, being the most extensive works of its kind in the world at that period, produced and printed a total of 65,000,000 yards of dress goods annually. This was sufficient to put a bandage three-quarters of a yard wide, once and a half around the world. This plant used 50 steam boilers of 3,000 horsepower, 37 steam engines of 1,200 horsepower, and 11 turbine water wheels of 2,000 horsepower.

The Pemberton Mills, producing over 6,000,000 yards a year, used steam double engines of 300 horsepower and 3 water wheels, each of 200 horsepower.

The Everett Mills, with an annual production of 8,000,000 yards of goods, de-

pended for its power on three turbine water wheels.

The Arlington Mills, turning out over 5,000,000 yards of goods a year, was supplied by one Corliss engine of 300 horsepower and three Swaine water wheels of 200 horsepower.

Lawrence was indeed a "corporate town," built by waterpower. The operatives in the mills lived in corporation boarding houses run by the mills. Indeed, the whole material welfare of the mills and the workers depended upon the Essex Co. The land and the power were all vested in this corporation. H. A. Wadsworth, in his History of Lawrence, Mass., states:

With the acceptance of the city charter (1853) came new duties, new responsibilities, and the clear-cut outlines of individualism faded away, with here and there an exception, and men became merely the mass.

The city was to grow until, during World War I, close to 100,000 people worked and lived within its small area of 6.75 miles. New and larger mills were built, including that of the American Woolen Co., a quarter of a mile long, the largest of its type in the world. In time, the mills began to rely more and more upon coal and steam to develop electricity which was used to power the machines, and the water-power of the river, never fully utilized, was now neglected. After the turn of the century, there was a concerted movement, carried as far as committee hearings before Congress, to have the mouth of the Merrimack dredged, so that barges might bring seaborne coal up the river to the mills. In view of the opposition presented by competing interests and the unfavorable report handed in by the Army engineers, this proposal was defeated. But the mills continued to use coal and oil brought in by rail.

If Daniel Saunders could return to life and stand again on the bank of the river which he loved, he would be dismayed by the changes which have come. True the city of Lawrence filters the water to make it fit for drinking as it comes through faucets into thousands of homes. The Merrimack serves the needs of the fire department, and its water is used for incidental functions in many offices and in every store and factory. But, by and large, to all the communities along its course, this river which gave birth to a great industry, has become just a sewer.

Daniel Saunders would miss the miracle of its power, once used and then largely forgotten before its full potentialities were realized.

This year Lawrence is celebrating the fact that 100 years ago it was incorporated as a town. It is a time, not only to review and rejoice over the things of the past, but to make progressive plans for the future. At the very moment when other regions are reaping the benefits flowing from the public development of cheap and abundant hydroelectric power, we look at our Merrimack and wonder why it is being neglected. For this river is not only the second largest in the six States, it is the source which originally powered New England to industrial greatness. But now it hurries wastefully to the sea.

In this centennial year the people of Lawrence recall the stories of our city's birth and growth.

They are reminded of the river which gave it being.

We do not intend to dwell on the industrial accomplishments of the past. Daniel Saunders was not a man to do so, and neither are we who live in 1947.

At this moment we are closer than ever before to the vision and will of the pioneers who founded Lawrence. Like the prodigal son, our generation has come back home. With a clearer understanding of first causes and fundamentals, we know that our one sure, unfailing resource is the dormant power of the Merrimack River. Inspired by recollections of the original enterprise and challenged by the present opportunity, we are determined to follow through on our predestined courses.

Only through greater use of the river's power potential, can the people of the Merrimack Valley realize their objectives of better production, better wages, and better living conditions. On this one hundredth anniversary, we in Lawrence are pointedly reminded that our future depends upon the unlimited development of the Merrimack River.

And so we are setting our sights on the establishment of a Merrimack Valley Authority to fully utilize this power for the common welfare.

That is Lawrence's goal as it goes forward into the second century of its life.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

545. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Taunton River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 15, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

546. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 9, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of and a review of reports on the Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana and Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 28, 1938, and August 11, 1939, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 6, 1939, and August 2, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

547. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers, with a view to modifying the plans for flood walls and works for the protection of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and a preliminary examination and survey of Mill Creek Valley, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 28, 1937, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

548. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on House Administration.

549. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a landing craft for use by the Girl Scout mariner troop at Pacific Grove, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

550. A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

551. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $30,000 for the legislative branch, United States Senate (H. Doc. No. 199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 181. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill H. R. 3020, relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 334. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 385. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 407. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall; with amendments (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler; with amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Russell F. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of Fred Pittelli; with amendments (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 1067. A bill for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Paul Goodman; with amendments (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; with amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 3041. A bill to incorporate the American War Dads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3042. A bill to license persons operating motor vehicles upon highways and to make uniform the law relating thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3044. A bill to establish the Territory of Guam, to provide for the civil government thereof, and to confer United States citizenship upon certain of the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3045. A bill to place the office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction, supervision, and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3046. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS (by request):

H. R. 3047. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, paragraph (t) of section 602, to provide lump-sum payment of national service life insurance claims which matured prior to August 1, 1946, in any case where the beneficiary, now receiving monthly payments, so elects; and to afford to the beneficiary an election of the optional modes of settlement of claims maturing on or after August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3048. A bill to amend Public Law 704 to extend terminal leave benefits to next of kin of those who died prior to separation from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3049. A bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. R. 3050. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide a more equitable method of paying for the transportation of mail and for subsidizing essential aircraft operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3051. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 485a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3052. A bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3054. A bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3055. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3056. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3057. A bill providing for the transfer of a part of Fort Douglas, Utah, to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and conveyance of part to the State of Utah and public agencies of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3058. A bill to provide for the establishment of a reservoir on Bear River, Utah, for the maintenance of water levels in the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3059. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place or places in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover new means of treating, curing, and preventing diseases of the heart and arteries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3060. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 45 days; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the period from Thanksgiving to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the recent speeches on foreign policy, delivered by Henry A. Wallace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York.

H. Res. 183. Resolution to provide for a Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to migratory wild fowl; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution of the House of Assembly, State of New Jersey, calling upon New Jersey's representatives in the National Congress and the legislatures of the sister States and all good citizens to restore the American Republic and the 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3063. A bill for the relief of Emma Dumas, Anna M. Daigle, Glen Lemaster, John Luke, Nettie Mallinger, C. A. Seavey, Sandra

Sinkola, and Charles Young, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 3064. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Thomas Lucas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of Miguel A. Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3067. A bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3068. A bill for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Hong Fort Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

328. By Mr. BRAMBLETT: Petition of Eloise Stoltenberg and others, relative to proposed legislation prohibiting liquor advertising in interstate commerce and via radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

329. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Miss Amy M. Henry and others, for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

330. By Mr. JONES of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Ella K. Lowry and 90 other mothers, Christian citizens, and members of a Sunday-school class, of Troy, Ohio, urging the passage of S. 265, which bans liquor advertisements in newspapers, periodicals, news reels, by radio, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

331. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the citizens of Knox County, Ohio, urging passage of S. 265, the Capper bill, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prevent the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Lake County Townsend Club, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

333. Also, petition of members of Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the One Hundred and Seventy-first Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to adopt H. R. 724, providing for the conveyance of the Bureau of Animal Industry quarantine station at Clifton, N. J., to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in the face of life's mysteries and its vast imponderables, give us faith to believe that Thou makest all things to work together for good to them that love Thee. Strengthen our conviction that Thy hand is upon us, to lead us and to use us in working out Thy purposes in the world. Even though we may not see the distant scene, let us be willing to take one step at a time and trust Thee for the rest. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorun..

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hoey	O'Daniel
Ball	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hawkes	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Murray	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security may hold a meeting this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent for that purpose is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be absent for the rest of the week on important public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may meet this afternoon to hear a number of witnesses on the antimonopoly bill; and in that connection, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL LANDING CRAFT TO GIRL SCOUT MARINER TROOP, PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Girl Scout Mariner troop at Pacific Grove, Calif., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a personnel landing craft for the use of that organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

SALE OF LIQUOR TO CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the sale of liquor to Indians outside Indian country (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

ORGANIC ACT OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

JOURNAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAII LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Acting Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1945 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a memorial signed by sundry members of the Civil Rights Congress, New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1884, to prohibit certain un-American activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 100 citizens of Horton, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolution of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a fair-employment-practices act

"Whereas the Declaration of Independence states: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness'; and

"Whereas the preamble of the Constitution of the United States declares that the people ordained and established the Constitution in order to establish justice; and

"Whereas during the World War II neither our draft boards nor enemy bullets selected our citizens because of race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already established a fair-employment-practices act to outlaw discrimination in employment: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to adopt an effective permanent fair-employment-practices act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 1, 1947.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 8, 1947."

PRICES OF MILK

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a memorial unanimously adopted by both houses of the Vermont Legislature, addressed to the Vermont delegation in the Congress, protesting the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in reducing the price of milk at this time.

I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by representatives of 14 milk producers' cooperative associations in New England, setting forth the conditions which led to the adoption of the memorial I have just presented.

There being no objection, the memorial and letter were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, United States Secretary of Agriculture, has ordered that the price of class I milk for May and June 1947, payable to producers in the 201–210-mile zone from Boston shall be reduced 44 cents per hundredweight below April prices, and has ordered similar reductions in prices to be paid to producers shipping milk into New York City and other federally administered milk markets in New England; and

Whereas, by these orders, estimated returns to producers in said 201–210-mile zone will not be over $3.68 per hundredweight during the month of May and $3.50 per hundredweight during the month of June, being sharp declines from returns during these same months in 1946, of $4.06 and $4.17, respectively, while at the same time the index of Vermont farm costs has risen a minimum of 14 percent over the costs of the comparable periods; and being also sharp declines from prices received during the past few months; and

Whereas the Vermont Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service, the College of Agriculture, University of Vermont, and United States Department of Agriculture cooperating, has published its statement that, based upon existing prices of grain and feed, and other present costs, the costs of producing one hundredweight of milk in said 201–210-mile zone is $4.86, using as labor costs a less figure than many dairy farmers pay for labor, being a production cost 33 percent higher than estimated May sales returns per hundredweight and 39 percent higher than estimated June sales returns per hundredweight; and

Whereas such a deliberate action with respect to governmental pricing can only result in disaster to the Vermont dairy farmer, and clearly indicates that the Department of Agriculture has failed to understand, or give any consideration to, the producer needs and production conditions prevailing in this State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we formally protest this action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture for the reasons above stated, and as punitive and unrealistic governmental action that can only result in irreparable damage to the economy of the State of Vermont by breaking down the efficiency of its basic industry, that of dairy farming; and that we respectfully request that the Secretary of Agriculture review and revise his order of April 9, 1947, by giving consideration to the actual conditions in Vermont to the end that class I milk-producer payments in New England federally administered markets and in the New York City market be held at least at April prices; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Vermont delegation in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this joint resolution be treated as a memorial to the Members of the Vermont congressional delegation that they take affirmative action to advise the Secretary of Agriculture of the needs of the Vermont dairy industry as expressed herein.

Approved APRIL 12, 1947.

ERNEST W. GIBSON,
Governor.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 4, 1947.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, *Secretary,*
United States Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On March 12, 1947, the undersigned cooperative associations representing more than two-thirds of all producers supplying milk in the Greater Boston, Mass., marketing area, submitted to you two petitions relating to suspension of certain provisions of the class I price schedule contained in Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 4.

The first of these petitions related to the month of April 1947 on which affirmative action has already been taken. The second petition requested a similar suspension of the formula pricing provisions of order No. 4 for the months of May and June 1947, so as to hold the class I price to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight. We wish to again call to your attention the latter petition, to submit additional information which has since become available, and to request affirmative action on such petition.

The above-mentioned petition conforms to the proposal with respect to class I price which was submitted jointly by the producers' cooperative associations at a recent hearing in the Boston market on March 14-26, 1947, and supported by lengthy evidence in that hearing. The proposal submitted by the cooperative associations called for elimination of the present butter-powder formula as a basis of establishing the class I price, and for the substitution of a definitely named seasonal schedule of prices to run from now through the next short season. The price schedule proposed provides for maintaining the class I price to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight, an advance to $5.21 in July and to $5.65 in October to carry through the next short season.

The class I price in the Boston market has already been reduced by 44 cents in February and another 44 cents in March, and no further reduction is warranted for April, May, and June in the face of the sharp advance which has occurred in feed prices and continued high levels of production costs. The blended price to producers in March is now estimated by the market administrator at $4.23 per hundredweight for 3.7 percent milk in the 200-mile zone. For March last year the blended price including the subsidy amounted to $4.31. The price to Boston producers in March will be lower than a year ago, and for April, May, and June, the relation will continue to become less favorable compared to last year. In the meantime, feed prices have advanced about 21 percent; farm labor 19 percent; and farm machinery and supplies at least 25 percent above the level of a year ago.

The market administrator for the Boston market regularly compiles and publishes a figure showing the average price of dairy ration per hundredweight based on quotations of eight large feed distributors supplying dairy farmers in the Boston milkshed. These figures are official in character and are the best measure available of the sharp increase in cost of dairy ration which has occurred in the last 6 weeks. A table showing such prices was introduced as a part of Government Exhibit No. 3 at the recent hearing in Boston. The figures below are taken from that exhibit.

Average prices of dairy ration, per hundredweight

March 1946	$3.419
February 1947	3.640
Week beginning:	
Mar. 3, 1947	3.759
Mar. 10	3.965
Mar. 17	4.140

The above figures indicate that by March 17 the average price of dairy ration had advanced to a level 14 percent above February 1947 and 21 percent above the level of March last year.

The price of mixed feed is dependent on the prices of feedstuffs used in preparing such mixtures. During March prices of these ingredients have risen to new high levels and it is probable that not all of the increase in prices of ingredients has yet been reflected in prices of ready-mixed rations. The following table shows average prices of certain feedstuffs as reported in the USDA Weekly Feed Market Review (bagged, per ton, in carlots, sight-draft basis) at Boston, Mass.

	1947		
	January	February	March 25
Wheat bran	$45.70	$48.50	$73.50
Wheat middlings	46.70	51.60	75.50
Linseed meal	90.45	87.45	95.00
Soybean meal	79.00	70.75	91.00
White hominy	54.40	56.25	76.50
Cottonseed meal	83.55	73.50	90.00

Farm wage rates have continued their steady advance. On January 1 in Vermont the reported rates of farm wages per month with board were 19 percent higher than a year ago. Prices of all farm machinery and supplies have increased substantially and are due to remain at much higher levels than in former years.

The national index of prices paid by farmers used in computing the parity prices for Boston milk has advanced every month except one since July 1945. Figures for the last 6 months are: October 218; November 224; December 225; January 227; February 234; and March 243. This is an increase of 7 points in February and 9 points more in March. This steady upward trend causes a similar upward trend in milk parity prices. In view of the continued increase in cost of things that farmers buy, and the additional fact that last year's milk prices failed to encourage production of an adequate supply of milk for Boston, it is a poor time at present to further lower the class I price.

In our petition of March 12, we attempted to make a rough estimate of the seasonal level of blended prices that would result in the event that the class I price were held to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight. Based on a class I price of $4.77 in June, a class II price of $3, and a class I use of 45 percent, the blended price in June would run around $3.77 per hundredweight. This compares with a blended price of $3.62 plus 55 cents subsidy, or a total return of $4.17 for June last year. This means that even if the present class I price were held to the end of June, returns to producers in June will be lower than a year ago by 40 cents per hundredweight in the face of higher costs of feed, of farm labor, and farm machinery and supplies. A June blended price of $3.77 is to be compared with a price of $5.53 which prevailed last November. The reduction is $1.76 and the November price is 47 percent higher than June. The differential is ample to encourage production of relatively more fall milk. We believe that any greater reduction in returns to producers for May and June in the face of continued high levels of production costs would lead to the liquidation of dairy herds and discourage production for the next short season.

On the demand side, consumer income and industrial earnings have remained at a high level in New England, and demand for fluid milk is still close to the all-time high record of last June. The number of wage earners employed in manufacturing establishments in Massachusetts in February 1947 was 16 percent larger than a year ago, average weekly earnings were up 13 percent, and total pay rolls up 32 percent. The number of wage earners in representative establishments in Massachusetts for all classes of employment combined in February 1947 was 12 percent higher than a year ago, and total wages paid showed an increase of 27 percent. These figures are based on statistics compiled and issued by the division of statistics, Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries.

For the above reasons, we believe that there is no basis either in production or demand conditions to warrant a further reduction in the class I price in the Boston market for May and June 1947.

This petition is submitted jointly by the following producers' cooperative associations.

Very truly yours,

Bellows Falls Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Bethel Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Cabot Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Co., Inc. Connecticut Valley Dairy, Inc.; Grand Isle County Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Granite City Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Maine Dairymen's Association; Manchester Dairy System, Inc.; New England Dairies, Inc.; New England Milk Producers' Association; Northern Farms Cooperative, Inc.; St. Albans Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Shelburne Cooperative Creamery Co.; United Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Chester W. Smith, C. W. Swonger, George H. Thompson, chairman, for the committee.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 14 of the Iowa Legislature, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of the State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER known as S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, which bill is now in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, is the chairman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa hereby urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to us their influence and support in behalf of S. 265 to the end that the general welfare of the people, and especially the youth of Iowa and of the United States, be safeguarded and protected.

Furthermore, that a copy of said resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Iowa and the United States Representatives from Iowa, to the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., Senator from Maine, and to the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the recognition of the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a plan calling for the unification of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the said plan in one form does not make adequate specific provision for the recognition of the United States Marine Corps as a distinct unit of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Marine Corps has established itself over a period of more than a century as one of the greatest fighting organizations in the world and should be continued in its traditional status; and

Whereas the security of the United States requires the continuation of a unit versed through experience and training in the art of amphibious warfare; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has, since its organization in 1775, distinguished itself as the greatest and best versed amphibious force in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate favorable action toward specifically establishing the United States Marine Corps and making adequate provision for its continuation in any plan for unification of the armed forces of the United States.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of

Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, dealing with tax regulations in connection with community property and other matters.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of the United States, as construed and administered by the Internal Revenue Bureau, permits married residents of eight States to split their income for income-tax purposes because of the existence of the community property concept in such States; and

Whereas married residents in all other States are not so permitted to split their income; and

Whereas the use of this legal fiction or rule of law, known as the community-property law, results in discrimination against the married residents of Iowa and all other similar non-community-property States, and requires such residents to bear an unjust proportion of the Federal tax burden; and

Whereas in connection with the adoption of the Revenue Act of 1947, the Congress of the United States is now considering various proposals to eliminate this unjust and unfair discrimination; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this general assembly and of the people of Iowa that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be amended so as to permit a husband and wife residing in non-community-property States, including Iowa, to split their income for income-tax purposes upon the same basis as is employed in community-property States, irrespective of the sources of the income: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring): That the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa respectfully represents to the Congress of the United States that it is the opinion of the people of Iowa, as well as the opinion of this assembly, that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be revised and amended so as to permit a husband and wife, residents of Iowa or of any of the other non-community-property States, to split their income, and thereby eliminate the unfair and unjust discrimination now existing in favor of the married residents of States having the community-property concept;

That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to exert their efforts to secure such a revision of the Internal Revenue Code;

That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to so revise the Internal Revenue Code of the United States;

That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. Walter Hall, 8 Oak Street, Salem, N. J., a letter, dated April 11, 1947, the body of which reads as follows:

We are sending petitions signed by 395 voters who ask your support for Capper bill (S. 265).

Please present these petitions to the Senate and have them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to present the petition for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

To Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946, as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 245. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 338. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act, approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; with amendments (Rept. No. 102).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1114. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1115. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Vincent Bad Wound; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1116. A bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1117. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. McKELLAR introduced Senate bill 1118, to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 45 days; to the Committee on Civil Service.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy.

I now read into the RECORD today an excerpt from the RECORD as it appeared in the House of Monday last. I want the Senators who are present to hear it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DAVID LILIENTHAL TO HIRE DAUGHTER

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lilienthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lilienthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In this connection, the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

"His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to endorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism. The fight against the endorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several 'front' organizations."

I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

Mr. Cox. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Cox. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God himself can explain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

In the next place I want to read an article by a distinguished writer in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. I want to read it because it is of such ability and importance.

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Yesterday's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 3351) reports a significant and penetrating indication of how the world

wags among our lawmakers on Capitol Hill in this atomic age. Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, of Chicago, Republican, and a Regular Army overseas veteran of World War I got the nod from Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and spoke as follows:

"Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lilienthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lilienthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"In this connection the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

" 'His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to indorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism.

" 'The fight against the indorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several front organizations.'

"I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

"After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

"Mr. Cox (Democrat, of Georgia). Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

"Mr. COX. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God Himself can explain."

The blast in the House, it may be noted, came the week after the Senate, following bitter and savage wrangling, had confirmed Lilienthal's nomination by a vote of 50 to 31. There will be more of these uproars. They will increase in violence as our relations with Moscow worsen.

The net result, damaging of course to the morale of the Nation, is that the confidence of Americans in the one man to whom is entrusted the greatest war secret in the history of the world will be sapped.

Truman, of course, pulled one of the biggest boners when he sent the name of Lilienthal to the Senate. Lilienthal wounded himself and the men who had battled with him for TVA and everything that TVA stood for, when he permitted his name to be considered.

Six months hence, it's an even money shot that Lilienthal will have quit his post or stubbornly, and, to the detriment of national security, will be defending himself against Communist charges even more violent than those already in the record.

And the most devastating, from the standpoint of the Nation, will be the charges that never get into print or never are heard over the air waves.

The national caliber of the Senators who voted against Lilienthal on the grounds that when it came to protecting the atom secret he did not have the confidence of a Nation behind him, was impressive. Party lines were kicked out the window.

Voting against Lilienthal were such Democrats as Byrd, of Virginia, and the veteran McCarran, of Nevada, lining up with Ohio's Republican Bricker, Governor Dewey's running mate in '44, and Ohio's other Presidential aspirant, Taft.

They simply didn't want Lilienthal because they figured the Nation—unjustly perhaps—was worried when it came to the atom bomb secret and had sent out the call, "Put only Americans on guard tonight."

These would have taken, gladly, a military hero—a MacArthur, Nimitz, King, Eisenhower, Bradley; or Marine Corps heroes Vandergrift or Holcomb or Spaatz of the Air Corps, or such civilians as former Senator Bob La Follette, Barney Baruch or New York's Bob Moses—but they didn't want anybody who had even been scented, however innocently, with the aroma of Moscow.

And, writes one acute and observant citizen, after watching the atom bomb hysteria on Capitol Hill:

"Truman is playing a smart game to win in 1948 but a losing game for America, which has few champions. His advisers are of two sorts: the Politburo showing him how to use world politics to win in 1948; professional military experts who lack political, historical and social knowledge or sense.

"The latter do not realize that the American war machine, actual and potential, can only destroy. It can't build. And capitalist America cannot win a war of destruction. The Pentagon crowd are dumb enough, like their German prototypes, to suppose the world's best machine can dictate a world to our liking."

I also read two editorials from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of April 14 and 15, 1947:

WHILE MR. LILIENTHAL ESCHEWS ANY CONNECTION WITH POLITICS, POLITICAL PLUMS SHOW STRANGE AFFINITY FOR HIM

Mr. Lilienthal's bid for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission resulted, naturally, in his qualifications coming under much greater public scrutiny than those of his colleagues.

We were greatly interested, therefore, in the views of the editor of a well-known Iowa newspaper as to the member of the Commission from that State, Mr. William W. Waymack, especially since he was nominated by the President, if not at the suggestion of Mr. Lilienthal, then at least with his consent.

Mr. Waymack has an extended record on a variety of public boards and civic agencies, as listed in Who's Who, but what interested us was the emphasis which this editor from Iowa placed on his pro-Russian bent of mind.

This, our informant asserts, is plainly shown by an almost continuous flow of editorials and articles in the Des Moines Register and Tribune favorable to Russia or in justification of one or another of the Russian attitudes or positions. Mr. Waymack has for many years occupied a powerful position in the editorial councils of the Des Moines newspaper and, presumably, its affiliated publications, one of which is Look. That magazine, some readers will recall, sponsored and of course financed the well-advertised safari of Elliott Roosevelt to the Kremlin, a journey which was productive of a considerable controversy as to the extent to which Elliott had belittled the foreign policies of his own country.

We would not be misunderstood. We do not assert, nor did our informant charge, that Mr. Waymack, as Chairman Lilienthal's colleague, is a Communist or that his essential loyalty to his own country is questioned. What our informant believed, and what will occur to most of us, is that the Commissioner has that soft viewpoint toward Russia and almost necessarily toward communism that was objected to by many Senators in Mr. Lilienthal and is regarded by many of us as a threat to national security when found in men in high places.

In this connection it will also be noted that the selection of Mr. Waymack as a nominee to the Commission marked another of those astute political moves by which Mr. Lilienthal has won to a position of international prominence. (We have asserted repeatedly that with the single exception of the late Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Lilienthal is the greatest politician of our age.)

Mr. Waymack, as noted, is an outstanding Iowan. So, too, by a strange coincidence, is Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, formerly Governor of Iowa and chairman of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee before which the Lilienthal hearings were held. We do not suggest that Senator HICKENLOOPER got his chairmanship as a result of Mr. Waymack's aspirations to the AEC, but it is a definite probability that Mr. Waymack got his nomination on the ground that Senator HICKENLOOPER would almost certainly be friendly to Lilienthal because of his previous association with Waymack back in Iowa.

Nor did Mr. Waymack have to rely on pure friendship or the fact he and the Senator are from the same State. Senator HICKENLOOPER would naturally have been predisposed toward Mr. Waymack, not primarily as the candidate of Mr. Lilienthal but of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, which is a monopolistic newspaper combination in position to be remarkably helpful to any political candidate, including one running for the Senate.

The chain of mutual aid could be outlined, therefore, thus:

If Lilienthal placed Waymack on this important board, Waymack was in position to insure a warm reception from HICKENLOOPER, who in turn could expect to command the cordial support of the Des Moines papers. It's quite a pretty piece of political planning, although, as Mr. Lilienthal says, he will have nothing to do with politics.

These are things that can't be proved. They would be dismissed by Mr. Lilienthal as pure speculation. Nonetheless, the story is there in the pattern of human and political relationships for anyone to read who cares to.

ASSOCIATED PRESS ON SUNDAY OFFERED TYPICAL EXAMPLE OF PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES OF ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES

On Sunday the Knoxville Journal published a piece of TVA propaganda which provides a typical example of the way in which the agency, with the cooperation of not only the Associated Press but other national press associations, does a continuous selling job on the American people.

The story started out with a recital of observations on TVA operation by the General Accounting Office which were, in themselves, legitimate, though the same press association had carried a straight news story on the GAO report one day last week.

Reading down a few paragraphs, however, it became clear that the design of the piece was twofold, first, to emphasize what the TVA cult believed to be favorable in the report and, second, to hand out some propaganda against several recommendations of the GAO which the same cult believes would reduce TVA's independence of Congress.

In order to accomplish this result, Associated Press editors permitted their writer to introduce that ubiquitous character known as "a Senate friend of TVA—who asked that his name not be used—" and from the moment he entered the story the old propaganda blowgun really got a working out. This technique, in a press service so notoriously insistent upon "seeing the body" before permitting a factual story to be carried on its wires, occurs to anyone who analyzes it as being most remarkable. What it really shows is the efficiency with which the TVA "liberals" and those employed by the AP and other press associations work in selling any program of mutual interest. The Associated

Press would definitely, and properly, decline to carry a story reporting the death of this "Senate friend" unless an authorized authority, such as the police, could be quoted, yet its editors have no hesitancy in feeding through the machines propaganda that might easily contribute to national consequences much more serious, in the eyes of some of us at least, than the death of old "Senate friend."

So much for the technique of propaganda, this example of which is worth the study of anybody interested in this sort of thing. There was one opinion expressed by the "Senate friend" that is good enough, from a standpoint of being 14-carat fallacy, which certainly deserves comment here and preservation in anybody's album of remarkable viewpoints.

The General Accounting Office's report included the recommendation that follows:

That TVA be required to pay 2½ percent interest on the entire Government investment in its power activities.

This would mean an interest charge of ten millions per year on the Authority's allocation for power from the total investment since its establishment. The news story under discussion forecast a total repayment by June 30 of thirty millions since 1933.

What was the attitude of "Senate friend" toward the recommendation that TVA pay interest on its investment? This is one for the book. He is quoted in the second person as follows:

"The Senator commented that the Government—under such arrangement—would be paying interest to itself since TVA is entirely Government-owned and operated."

We submit that no man with little enough understanding to make a statement like that has any right to a seat in the Senate, much less to be quoted anonymously by a great news service such as the Associated Press.

"The Government would be paying interest to itself," he says.

And where does the Government get this money? We didn't know our Government, or any other Government for that matter, had any money. Of course, it can get money, but by only one method—that is taxing the people. When "Senate friend," therefore, or any other advocate of socializing the country talks about the Government's money, you simply have to know that he's talking about the tax money in the taxpayer's pocket.

In the present instance, "Senate friend" is simply ignoring the fact that while TVA is paying no interest to the Government, the Government in turn is paying interest on the more than $700,000,000 borrowed from the people and invested in TVA.

One of the troubles with the country right now is the fact that so many people, including old "Senate friend" subscribe to the fallacy that so long as the Government is spending money nothing really costs anything. This is a favorite New Deal theory, heavily sold by Roosevelt and his associates, that it makes no difference what the Government owes because we simply owe ourselves. It is because so many legislators share "Senate friend's" belief that the President had the nerve to propose a budget of $37,000,000,000, and it is also because of this belief that Americans are paying the highest peacetime taxes in history.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two radio broadcasts on the subject of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal by Fulton Lewis—one April 3 and the other April 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the radio broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULTON LEWIS' RADIO BROADCAST, THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1947

The Senate late this afternoon voted down the first open attempt to block the nomination of Mr. David E. Lilienthal by a vote of 52 to 38. It was a motion by Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, to send the Lilienthal nomination back to committee for further consideration, and presumably it was a test of present Senate strength.

Eighteen Republicans voted with 34 Democrats to support Mr. Lilienthal, while 7 Democrats and 31 Republicans voted against him. If the present balance of votes remains intact, it means that the Lilienthal nomination wil be approved by the Senate when the final show-down comes, possibly some time next week.

In the meantime, however, I promised you last night that beginning this evening I would try to present to you some facts about Mr. Lilienthal's career with the Tennessee Valley Authority so that you might have something more than the idle generalities that are current as a basis for making up your own mind on the subject of his desirability for this job; and having so promised, we'll go through with it, in spite of the Senate action this afternoon. And, I might add, because of the nature of this report tonight, it will not be interrupted for any middle announcement.

In the course of this discussion of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination there have been many charges hurled against him and many defenses presented on his side. As I observed to you last night, he has been charged with being a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, on the one hand, and he has been championed as a great and able administrator who has done a wonderful job of running the Tennessee Valley Authority, on the other hand, and, frankly, there has been an abysmal lack of proof or substantiation in support of either declaration.

Mr. Lilienthal has been nominated by President Truman as head of the Atomic Energy Control Commission, a job in which he will hold tremendous power over the future welfare and the future economics and the future safety of the United States. The whole atomic-energy question will be in the hands of that Commission—the military, the commercial, the production, the policy to be followed. That Commission will have complete control, and because of the tremendous future implications, these discussions in Congress over Mr. Lilienthal have taken place. It becomes a matter of real importance what sort of a person he is; what are his philosophies of government, and economics, and society, and politics. It is not merely a matter of his alleged ability as Administrator of the TVA; it also is a matter of how he thinks and what he thinks. Is he a part of the reactionary clique which believes that labor should be exploited like slaves for the enrichment of a few? Is he a middle-of-the-road, normal American, who believes in the profit motive and free enterprise and the American way of doing business as we have always known it as a nation? Or, is he a member of the clique on the left, which believes in Government ownership and paternalism, and the socialization of industry—the group that is opposed to private enterprise and disapproves of the profit of the profit system which we have always had, and would like to change that?

Those are three different points of view, and it's a matter of interest, certainly, just where Mr. Lilienthal stands, as between those points of view, when it comes to his qualifications and his desirability, as the chairman of this Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy, which may revolutionize the world of tomorrow, or may destroy the world of tomorrow. It's a matter of importance just what his philosophies are, along those lines.

As to whether Mr. Lilienthal really did or did not do a great job, as head of the TVA, we can leave that to some other discussion. There is a wide division of opinion on the subject, in the public mind. Mr. Lilienthal was given the job of running a Government hydroelectric power project in Tennessee, which was to produce electricity for the public at a cheaper rate than the private concerns which had been producing that electricity, and it is on that score that the claim is made that he did a great job. There have been reductions in the electric power rates in the area served by TVA, that is true. Whether the savings in those electricity bills is enough to justify the $733,000,000 worth of appropriations and advances which Mr. Lilienthal has gotten from the Federal Treasury, with a total of $22,000,000 paid back into the Treasury by TVA as the Government's return, is a question that hardly can be settled in this broadcast here tonight, and I'm not going to try. That is a net investment of about $711,000,000, and page 1006 of the President's Budget for the present year requests an appropriation of another $27,000,000 to finance the TVA for the coming year.

There are side activities of the TVA however, in which I think you may be interested, and about which I want to report to you tonight. Sentor WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has mentioned some of these activities, and on the strength of what he said, I have done some further investigations; and inasmuch as they are activities about which I'm sure that you the public are totally unaware, they seem to be worth attention.

And everything I tell you from here on—except where I specifically state otherwise—is taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the President's own budget message to Congress, or official reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, or the official reports of the TVA itself.

In 1934, the records show, Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the Tennessee Valley Authority board, Mr. Arthur E. Morgan and Mr. Harcourt Morgan, undertook to set up a cooperative known as the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, with a charter under the laws of the State of Tennessee.

President Truman states in his budget message—and it is also stated in others of these documents—that the three individuals acted as private citizens in setting up this organization, although the corporation was listed as belonging to the United States Government. It was financed by a grant of $300,000 in Government relief funds, provided by the old FERA, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration under Mr. Harry Hopkins, $1,000 of which was for capital stock all of which was owned by the Federal Government, and the other $299,000 being listed as capital surplus.

Despite the fact that it was owned by the United States Government, however, the charter provided that Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans were to have control over it. In fact, the charter went so far as to state that the board of directors shall exercise all of the powers of the corporation, and shall reappoint themselves or their successors, as directors.

This corporation still is in existence, and President Truman made it the subject of a special mention in his annual budget message to Congress on page 997. In fact, he asked for an appropriation of $2,500 for the coming fiscal year to pay the administrative expenses of it.

The $300,000 of original capital now has dwindled to $186,000 according to the Budget figures.

The charter shows, and it is set forth elsewhere in these documents, that the purpose of the TVAC, thus established by Mr. Lilienthal, was to promote the organization of cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area; and the charter gives the TVAC the authority to engage in any and every conceivable form of business or business enterprise, and to do business not only in the Tennessee Valley area, or in the United States, but in any other countries of the world.

Senator WILLIAMS told the Senate that TVA itself is sponsoring some 175 cooperatives in that area, and it is a matter of record in various places that the TVAC—this Government-owned cooperative started by Mr. Lilienthal—actually organized at least nine of them, and perhaps many more. These nine are the only ones of which there is any particular record.

The record also shows that when the Comptroller General of the United States attempted to make an audit of the books of the TVAC, he received a letter from the TVAC refusing to permit him to do so. I quote the letter:

"Because of the fact that these funds were granted by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to the State of Tennessee, and by the State of Tennessee to the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, and because no money has been put into the organization directly by the United States, we feel that this organization is not subject to the usual regulations affecting Government departments."

According to Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, the records show that Mr. Lilienthal and the Morgans actually initiated the request by the State of Tennessee for the $300,000 of relief money for the purpose of setting up this cooperative and of course the cooperative is a Government-owned corporation, with a budget item requested in appropriation bills, the Treasury Department admitting that it holds the complete stock in this TVAC.

On page 997 of the President annual budget message to Congress, delivered in January, is the following sentence—and remember, this is the President of the United States speaking:

"No act of Congress, or Executive order, or Federal statute specifically authorized the creation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc."

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a report last May 1, made the same identical statement in the same words.

Now, to sum up what we have thus far:

We have Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans, as private citizens, setting up this Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives financed with $300,000 of Government relief funds, to sponsor the formation of other cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area, wherein 175 have sprung up which are directly sponsored by the TVA itself or the TVAC; the control of that corporation, although the Government owns it and although Congress is being asked to appropriate money to pay its expenses of operation, is entirely and completely in the control of Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans, or those other private individuals to whom, under the charter, they have assigned their powers of control. The Comptroller General is told that he cannot go into the books of the cooperative, although the Government owns it; and both the President of the United States and the Comptroller General say that there is no act of Congress, no statute, and no Executive order that ever specifically authorized the setting up of this Government-owned but privately controlled cooperative.

Now, that is about all we have time for tonight. We'll pick up again tomorrow night, with some information on some of these cooperatives which have been organized under the tender sponsorship of Mr. Lilienthal and his TVA and his TVAC. Of course, the simple fact is that the promoting of cooperatives is not in the slightest objectionable in itself. It all depends on what these cooperatives are, that they have been set up, whether they are good or bad ones; if they're good, that is fine, if they're not, that's something else.

It all depends on how they are operating in competition with private enterprise; what the TVA, under Mr. Lilienthal, was doing with them, in their competition with private enterprise. And these little details, we'll get into tomorrow evening.

FULTON LEWIS' RADIO BROADCAST, FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1947

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I want to pick up where I left off last night, in reporting to you some of the activities and policies of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, in his operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority—the famous TVA.

As I told you last night, in my introduction to these reports, there has been bitter controversy in the Senate, in debate on Mr. Lilienthal's nomination as head of the Atomic Energy Control Commission, as to just what he stands for, and just what his political and social philosophies are. On the one hand he has been called a Communist; on the other, he is acclaimed as having done a great job as TVA Administrator—and no one seems to have produced any supporting evidence on either side of the picture. Therefore, it seems helpful to get a little factual information, and that's the reason for this broadcast.

As I pointed out to you before, the average individual seems to have a conception of TVA as a Government power project designed to give cheaper electricity to the people of the TVA area. Whether it actually has succeeded in doing that is a very controversial question, but what the public does not seem to know is that there are a great many other activities which the TVA and Mr. Lilienthal personally conducted along with the TVA power project which throw some light on the mental and philosophical approach of this very controversial gentleman.

Last night I reported to you on the subject of an organization which Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the TVA organized with Government money. To recapitulate briefly, this was what we found:

In January 1934, Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the TVA Board set up a cooperative corporation under the laws of the State of Tennessee, called the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives—the avowed purpose of which was to promote the organization of various localized cooperatives throughout the Tennessee Valley area. It was a sort of master cooperative which could do business in any line of business or industry anywhere in the United States or any country in the world, and which could finance, by gifts or loans, these local cooperatives, after they were organized.

The President of the United States and the Comptroller General and the Attorney General and the legal adviser for the TVA itself are on the record as stating that there is no act of Congress, statute, or Executive order authorizing the setting up of this Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives.

The record shows that the cooperative is 100-percent owned by the United States Government, $300,000 of Federal relief money having been given to it in 1934 to finance it. Despite the fact that it is wholly owned by the United States Government, the charter provided that it was to be permanently controlled by Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans as individuals—they being instructed to reappoint themselves to the board of directors, or to reappoint such substitutes as they might see fit.

The record shows that in spite of the fact that the TVAC was wholly owned by the United States Government, it refused to permit its books to be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States until Congressional legislation was enacted, requiring that such audits be made. The present audit, contained in President Truman's budget message to Congress for this year, shows that the $300,000 of original funds now has dwindled to $186,000, and the President's budget requests an appropriation from the Treasury of $2,500 for operating expenses for the coming year.

Now, in addition to this super cooperative, the annual reports of the TVA and other records show that the TVA itself, as such, has also been active in the promotion of cooperatives. In fact, I might read you a line or two from the last annual report of the TVA:

"In the interests of carrying out the broad objectives or resource development, the TVA, through a small staff, has encouraged the activities of cooperating associations. Cooperatives are an important factor in attaining, at a minimum of cost, the application of soil minerals and readjusted farming methods, in order that the broad objectives of land and water conservation may be attained."

As a matter of fact, the Comptroller General's reports show that TVA actually gave to this TVAC—this super cooperative, some $58,000 in just two years—in addition to the original three hundred thousand which that outfit got from relief money. Also, they provided personnel to help operate the TVAC. The record also shows that this Tennessee Valley Authority had so-called farm extension workers all through the areas of the Tennessee Valley watershed, helping in the cooperative movement.

So, to boil it down to a simple proposition, aside from the electricity producing function of TVA, it was busily engaged under Mr. Lilienthal in the promotion of Cooperatives—not only directly, but also through the super-cooperative, the TVAC, which Mr. Lilienthal and his two companions had set up.

The fact is that this same report by the TVA itself boasts that many of the cooperative groups which it spawned, have incorporated as cooperatives, and "have expanded into other activities as needed." It then goes on to say that as of last year, an incomplete survey showed that TVA has relationships with some 175 of these organizations.

Now, in and of itself, the promoting and sponsoring of 175 or more cooperatives in a given area is not in the silghtest objectionable; in fact, it may be a very commendable accomplishment. There is nothing wrong with cooperatives, as such, as I've called to your attention over this microphone before. The question is, what sort of cooperatives they were—whether they were good ones or bad ones—whether they have an unfair advantage over the private enterprise that exists in that particular area and is paying the taxes which provide the appropriations by Congress, to keep Mr. Lilienthal's TVA in operation. This year, TVA is requesting an appropriation of 27 million dollars.

Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, told the Senate a week ago that he had personally investigated four of them, picked at random, without the slightest advance knowledge of any details about any of the four. He told the Senate that he found that in three cases of the four, the incorporators were not backward farmers in the Tennessee Valley area, but actually were employees of the TVA drawing regular salaries from the TVA.

But go back to the TVA's own annual report for this year. By way of giving an example of what has been done in this field of organizing cooperatives, the report has the subtitle, "Example in Virginia," and it explains that the name of this organization is the Southwest Virginia Cooperative, which is a federation of local county cooperatives.

The report says that the cooperative handled certain quantities of fertilizer, and that at the close of the first year, it is "laying plans to extend its activities to the handling of feed and is considering other possible activities for the benefit of its members."

Now, in the course of trying to get to the grass roots of Mr. Lilienthal's cooperatives, and what sort of cooperatives they are and how they function, I wanted to trace down a few individual cases, and inasmuch as this is the example that the TVA itself offers as its prize exhibit, I thought the fairest and simplest thing to do was to look into this one. Therefore I called the head of the Southwest Virginia Cooperative, the headquarters of which are at Lebanon, Va.—his name is Bryce Connally—and I interviewed him. I have a verbatim record of that interview; so we'll let him tell the story.

He said that he is a sort of wholesale cooperative; he has 11 members, each of them a local county cooperative in southwest Virginia, and they are the sole stockholders, each having put in $1,000 capital.

He said that he buys fertilizer from the TVA and from other sources, and he sells it to the 11 local cooperatives which are his members, and they, in turn, sell it to the farmers.

He said that his cooperative made a little money last year—that the difference between what he paid for the fertilizer and the amount he received for it from the local distributors, less, of course, his expenses of operation—amounted to about $7,800. Please remember that figure—$7,800.

Now, Mr. Connally revealed that in addition to that regular business as a sort of wholesaler of fertilizer, his cooperative also receives free fertilizer from the TVA, which it passes along to the local member cooperatives, which they in turn pass along to the farmers. Mr. Connally's organization gets 50 cents for each ton of fertilizer so handled, and the local distributing cooperatives get an additional dollar. The farmer gets the fertilizer for $1.50, plus shipping costs from TVA's fertilizer plant, which stands the farmer a total of approximately $5 to $6 a ton. The same grade of fertilizer, commercially, costs the farmer $54 a ton, delivered.

I asked Mr. Connally how much of this free fertilizer he has handled from TVA as compared with the fertilizer he has bought from TVA and he said that his cooperative has handled about 2,200 tons of this TVA fertilizer for which they have paid the commercial price, and they have received and distributed something in excess of 3,400 tons of the free fertilizer.

The records introduced in the Senate show that last year the TVA gave away more than $2,000,000 worth of this particular fertilizer to farmers throughout the TVA area through these cooperatives on the grounds of tests and experimentations. The particular fertilizer in question has been in standard production and use by American farmers since 1907.

Getting back to the $7,800 which Mr. Connally's cooperative had on hand at the end of last year's operation—I asked him whether any corporation income tax had been paid on that. His reply was that no income tax has been paid; that his organization has made an application for exemption from corporation income tax on the basis that they are a cooperative.

The United States Treasury states that the corporation income tax on $7,800 profits for a given year would be approximately $1,600.

Mr. Connally said that various private enterprise distributors of fertilizer were doing business in the same area, in which his cooperative has been functioning, and was kind enough to give me the names of some of them. I talked, among other people, to a Mr. Duncan, of Chillhowie, Va., who is in charge of the Vance Supply Co. fertilizer plant there. He said that in times of competition it would be entirely impossible to compete with the operations of this southwestern cooperative with their free fertilizer, and that his company last year, a rather large company that has been long in business, instead of paying no income tax, made a profit of about $45,000, of which it paid $26,000 in taxes to the Government.

That, of course, is the story of just one of these 175 cooperatives which Mr. Lilienthal's operation has sponsored, but it is the story of the one he selected as the sample in his annual report, and it's the story as told by the head of that cooperative himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the bill to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to restore the atomic energy proposal to the War Department of the Government, I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1118) to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy, introduced by Mr. McKELLAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed to transfer to the War Department at the earliest possible date all property heretofore transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission and all other property of the Atomic Energy Commission, including all books, records, documents, papers, and all written or printed matter of every kind, nature, and description in the files of such Commission.

SEC. 3. The War Department shall administer the property transferred to it pursuant to this act and, for such purposes, shall have all the powers and duties with respect to the development and production of military weapons utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy, and with respect to the maintenance of secrecy concerning the details of such weapons and the materials and processes utilized in the development and production thereof, which it had prior to the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date concerning plans for the use and control of such materials and processes developed in connection with the production of military weapons utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy as may be used for civilian purposes.

SEC. 5. Any person who shall disclose or cause the disclosure, or who shall conspire with any person to disclose or cause the disclosure, directly or indirectly, of any information of any kind which has not prior to the date of enactment of this act been made available to the public concerning the production of fissionable materials or any detail of any military weapon utilizing fissionable materials or atomic energy or of the development, manufacture, or production of any such military weapon, to any person not entitled to receive such information, shall be guilty of a capital offense and upon conviction thereof shall be sentenced to death by hanging.

SEC. 6. The unexpended balances of any funds heretofore made available to the Atomic Energy Commission are hereby transferred to and shall be available to the War Department in carrying out its functions under this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such purposes.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FISCAL MATTERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE ON LABOR LEGISLATION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator KILGORE regarding proposed labor legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRAST BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM—ARTICLE FROM LABOR'S MONTHLY SURVEY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article presenting the way of life in a democracy as contrasted with the way of life of communism, from the March-April issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARE OF THE BLIND IN PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by O. E. Day, chief, State Council for the Blind, Department of Welfare of Pennsylvania, and a statement by Miss S. M. R. O'Hara, dealing with the care of the blind in Pennsylvania, which appear in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON'S AUTHORSHIP OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Julian P. Boyd, librarian of Princeton University, relating to the discovery of a fragment of Jefferson's text of the Declaration of Independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. VANDENBERG'S ROLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "Mr. VANDENBERG'S Role," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RED OAK (IOWA) EXPRESS

[Mr. WILSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom Depends on Paper," from the Red Oak (Iowa) Express, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator from Illinois proceeds, let the Chair state the parliamentary situation. The pending question is a series of 12 amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON],

which, by order of the Senate, will be considered en bloc. Therefore the pending question is the block of amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, having seen first hand the destruction wrought by World War I, having visited England, France, Belgium, and Germany immediately before and after the conclusion of World War II, and having carefully examined several of the concentration camps, having had first-hand reports and visual evidence of the destruction in other parts of the world caused by World War II, I am fully conscious of the great need for assistance to unfortunate peoples throughout the world.

None of the nations, according to authentic report, suffered more in physical and mental anguish than did the little country of Greece, and my sympathies go out to the people of Greece in this, their great hour of need.

I am not unlike the vast majority of the American people in this regard. Historically, throughout more than a century and a half of our progress, we have proved to be the most generous, charitable, and kind-hearted people on the face of the earth. No greater demonstration of this generosity has come to my personal attention than our conduct at the close of World War I.

We had just conquered the German armies in the field, and immediately the American people contributed millions of dollars' worth of food and clothing, and even shipped boatloads of live cattle into the heart of Germany to sustain and support the bodies of the undernourished children of the soldiers of the army we had just brought to its knees. At the same time, the American people raised millions of dollars and sent clothing and food to the distressed and starving children of Armenia who had been the tragic victims of the vicious atrocities of another enemy in that war—Turkey.

We are presently sending food and supplies to the heart of the nations we have recently conquered in World War II. To this noble purpose, I fully subscribe. The fact is that there are more people hungry, starving, suffering without clothing and homes; there is more hate, suspicion, and fear throughout the world at this very hour than at any other period in the history of mankind. The heart of America goes out to these distressed people of the earth. But the cold fact also is that the full production of our fields and factories, if it were devoted in its entirety, could not reach them all nor materially eliminate their pain and suffering.

The proposition presently before the Congress of the United States is in part the supplying of necessities of life and the essentials of life to help rehabilitate the ancient, historic, and heroic people of Greece. To that endeavor, I fully subscribe. But that is not all, nor in my judgment is it even the larger part, of the program to which we are asked to give our complete approval. We are asked to send not only food and supplies, but arms and military and civilian missions to build up the armed strength of both Greece and Turkey, and to do this as the sole responsibility of the United States of America. This is truly a new course in the history of America's foreign endeavor. It is being sold to the American people as a new emotional crisis, and I know of no other policy that is capable of more mischief than for us, the greatest free country in the world, to undertake this program alone.

I realize full well that when I oppose this gigantic, initial, and individual undertaking on the part of the United States, I lay myself open, and will be subjected to, the same criticism that I received when I objected to the pouring out of American arms to the Soviet Union during the war, without having some definite evidence of their intent and desire to subscribe to some of the ideals of free people. I realize I will be subject to the same criticism that I was subjected to when I objected to the pouring out of American relief supplies under the so-called UNRRA, without some assurance that the American people were not dissipating their wealth, food, and sustenance, to be used to further the cause of communism throughout the world. I realize I will be subjected to the criticism of those who will charge that my action now is an evidence of my unwillingness to oppose communism.

Mr. President, I oppose communism with all my heart. I recognize the right of the Russian people to follow communism, if they so desire, within their own territorial limitations. I object to their imposing it on other people, or expanding their philosophy in our own country. I objected to its expansion with our help by allowing their agents to distribute our relief to advance their cause throughout the world. I objected to the infiltration of Communist left-wing alien-minded individuals into the departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Government of the United States, prior to and during the recent war. I objected when the rule was changed, at the outbreak of this war, whereby men with former Communist affiliations were allowed to become commissioned officers in the Army of the United States. I was criticized for my objections then. I continue to oppose communism with all my heart.

Realizing, however, that the few men in charge of our National Government and its foreign policy were actually appeasing and aiding communism at home and abroad, throughout the war and afterward, I was desperately anxious to find some means of arriving at a peace based upon justice as a reward for the terrific suffering and sacrifice of the American people. I am one who voted with all good faith for the establishment of the United Nations organization. I believed that, even if in its formative stages it was to be no more than the meeting ground to organize the conscience of the world, it might serve that purpose. Wanting to face the facts, I was doubtful as to the possibility of ever bringing the Communists of the world into any general decent understanding, but I felt that this was the organization through which we might ferret out, expose, and demonstrate their obstinate determination never to cooperate, and thereby mobilize through that institution those nations who would band together to advance the cause of peace and the rights of minorities for the liberty-loving people of the world.

I sincerely believe that it was a grave mistake for the leaders of our Nation, being in possession of all the facts, to delay bringing this matter to the attention of the United Nations, and then to use that delay as an excuse for taking this desperately bold step as an emergency measure in a crisis that may lead either to war or to the ultimate bankruptcy of our country. Mr. President, I believe that the steps proposed may provide the spark that will lead us into the war which the proponents wish to prevent. With all my heart I want peace based upon justice. I know of no authentic veteran who does not want peace based upon justice.

I objected during the recent war to the constant misleading statements made to the American people that we were then pouring out our resources, finances, and substance to support democratic governments, when, in fact, many of the governments we assisted had no element of democracy in their being. I object now to calling Greece a democratic country, when everyone knows that Greece is ruled by a corrupt royal regime. I object to having the American people told now that we are supporting a democratic country when we support Turkey, which actually is a tyrannical dictatorship, one which enriched itself by trade and other alliances with our enemies until the very last hour of the recent war.

I firmly believe that the step now proposed is only the first step, and that it will start a chain reaction that will drag us into constant conflicts around the globe.

During the recent war we sent our guns, planes, and military equipment to Russia to the tune of $11,000,000,000, and to Yugoslavia. Even the Greek guerrillas, whom we propose to stop today, are in large part armed with American weapons. We propose now to send other American weapons to compete with American weapons already there. We propose to send American weapons into Turkey to be used with weapons which Turkey produced and designed for Germany, against which we fought during the war, with no assurance based upon Turkey's history that she is a dependable ally for the future. I object to calling these grants of American weapons and money loans, for they will in no sense be considered as loans and will never be repaid.

We are already being told that the next step is to furnish $600,000,000 to Korea. We will send American weapons, supplies, and personnel into Austria; then will come Italy, China, France, and Britain again. We will take over the policing of the Adriatic, the Aegean, the Black, and the Mediterranean Seas. Where that will lead America in expenditure and draining of American resources and funds no man can tell. To pretend that we are not picking up the defense of the life line and the age-old British Empire's frontiers to maintain for all future time does not change the fact that that is exactly what we are proposing to do. I object to having the American people take over the British program of suppression around the world.

To say that the United Nations can, by a vote, ask us to withdraw the aid we now propose to give is a pious hope, for so long as the members of the United Nations know that it is our established general policy to supply arms, money, and military missions throughout the world to nations who cry for help, they will not shoot Santa Claus, and they will never ask us to withdraw. Nor will the people of Greece and Turkey ask us to withdraw until they decide to take a course of their own; and then, having weakened ourselves, we may find it necessary to send other American missions and arms to meet the American arms which it is now proposed to distribute throughout the world.

Different persons arrive at somewhat the same conclusions for different reasons. There will be and are some who oppose the proposed program for reasons with which I totally disagree. I want no truck with, or part of, communism; but I do not believe that we can stop it with American dollars abroad when we know it has infiltrated even into the armed services of our own country, and into the bureaus, departments, and agencies of our American Government. American dollars will not stop such insidious infiltration or the expansion of communism abroad. In this initial step it is proposed to send dollars and supplement them with military missions. When the presence of our military missions is challenged, then we must either retreat or supplement them with troops. How many combat fronts American will be called upon to defend across the face of the earth as a result of this action, no one can now predict. We may have countless Pearl Harbors and subsequent tragic experiences around the world like the ones at Bataan and Corregidor.

I am ready and willing to vote to send supplies, surplus food, and clothing, and any reasonable amount of financial help to any people who will strive to guarantee the independence of individual nations who recognize and defend human rights and personal freedoms, but I do not believe in draining the resources of the American Nation and her people to maintain dictatorial tyrannies, socialistic governments, or monarchies which oppress their people and do not guarantee to join us in advancing the freedoms we wish so much to defend.

To supply arms and military missions, to create power blocks of various dictatorial governments around the world, denies the historic ideals that have guided our destiny thus far and still are the hope of the human race.

I still believe that the conscience of mankind could be mobilized through the mechanism set up in the United Nations. At least, we would then know which countries are willing to join us now in all-out participation to achieve and maintain the high ideals we so tenaciously support.

It has been said and will continue to be said that any vote on this measure except a vote "yea" will weaken the hand of the President of the United States. I remind the Senate that the same argument was used when another President of the United States, by secret agreements, was giving the Soviet Government nine-tenths of the Balkans, the Kurile Islands, Dairen, Port Arthur, and even agreed to give them $20,000,000,000 worth of reparations from Germany. That same argument was used when another President was agreeing with the Soviet Government to the division of little Poland, and at the same time failing to protest Russia's expansion by complete subjugation of the Baltic States.

When the Congress of the United States, after full discussions, has by vote adopted a national policy, I shall support my country's policy and program, but my understanding of true representative government is that men should vote their convictions based upon the yardstick of what is good for their country. We have already supplied billions of dollars' worth of American arms and they are scattered at this hour throughout the world. We have already burdened the future of America and her people with a debt of over $258,000,000,000. Now, if we, in addition, start this global spending and meddling, we will not be able to reduce the cost of our Government; we will not be able to save on military and naval expenditures, for we simply cannot shake our fist at people all over the world and not be prepared to back it up. Once we commit the American people to a program of spending America's millions and billions all over the world, it will be doubly hard to deny any demand for ever-increased appropriations at home.

Any pretense of substantially reducing the taxes of our American people will prove to be a delusion, for while we may effect a reduction of taxes this year, the necessities of tomorrow caused by this action will quickly wipe out any reduction presently made.

Mr. President, I firmly believe we should start a genuine fight against the expansion of communism by an immediate relentless search for, and elimination of, the Communist element embedded within our own Government, its departments, agencies, and bureaus.

I believe we should, through the facilities of the United Nations organization, establish definitely which of the countries of the earth will participate in a joint undertaking to stop the cruel expansion of communism elsewhere.

I repeat, I believe that the policy of undertaking this gigantic program alone may do for us what the policing of the world did for the British Empire. It may very easily ultimately lead us to war on countless fronts and ultimately lead us to bankruptcy and the international bread line. Not even the most ardent advocate of the proposed program can guarantee that this will not be the ultimate end.

I believe firmly that the hope of those who love liberty, the freedom of worship, and representative government depends upon our maintaining a strong and solvent America. I believe that it is the duty of elected representatives of the people to cast their vote solely for those things which they believe will contribute to the future strength and solvency of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I noted in the press this morning that there has been a renewal of the proposal to loan a billion dollars to Russia. What would be the Senator's attitude toward such a loan? Would he oppose it, together with the other loans which have been suggested? I do not want to ask him whether he would favor loaning to both sides of a controversy, but that is what it seemed to me to amount to.

Mr. BROOKS. To answer the Senator's question, I do not know how authentic the report is. When we were appeasing Russia, when we were giving her everything she wanted during and after the war, there was a good deal of talk about advancing her a loan of $1,000,000,000. I may be wrong, but I think it was finally admitted by the State Department that we had advanced it, but it was held in abeyance. To me it would seem stupid and silly to loan another billion dollars to Russia, when we are starting out now to prevent Russia from expanding communism. But that is what we did before. We built her up. We helped to make Russia the colossus of Europe. There was a time when we had an air power which was greater than any air power in the world, when we had a Navy which was greater than that of the combined naval powers of the world, and we had the fastest, hardest-striking army in the world. That was the time to have prevented the expansion of Russia and to have refused her the right to annex the Baltic States and to dominate and control the Balkans. Now with our Army and our Navy demobilized, we must start from scratch; we must begin where we started before. We are saying we will not send troops; that is not contemplated now. Troops were not contemplated when we started lend-lease shipments, as the Senators knows. The same words were used then.

I cannot say where this program will lead unless Russia backs away; and if she backs away she will advance at some other point. If we start this program with Greece and with Turkey we will have to extend greater help to Austria, to Italy, to France, to Great Britain, and to Korea and China. I do not think the resources of America can stop communism as such, and I do not think we can raise an army sufficiently large to stop it as such if Russia decides to move. If our men were there they might be in the position they were in at Bataan and Corregidor; they could not retreat; they would be cut off from their own country and we could not reach them.

That is what I visualize in this program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with his position in this matter. But it seems to me that the Senate is entitled to a statement from the Sate Department that no loan is now contemplated to the Soviet Union. If we are making loans in opposition to her, then certainly we should not be making loans in her behalf. I

think it is incumbent upon the State Department to inform us immediately if such a loan is contemplated or that no such loan will be made. I should like to challenge the Senators on the floor who are sponsoring this proposal to give us an answer, unless the Senator from Illinois can answer it.

Mr. BROOKS. I cannot give the Senator an answer to the specific suggestion, but I can give him an answer to another problem of like nature. I think it depends on who in the State Department decides to do these things. In the State Department, I do not think the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. In this instance they are asking for money for the purpose of stopping communism. The President yesterday sent Congress a message asking it to amend the Neutrality Act so as to prevent the shipment of machine tools; and yet less than 6 weeks ago the State Department was before the Committee on Appropriations asking it to change a provision which was put into the deficiency bill last year prohibiting the use of money for the shipment of lend-lease suppplies beyond January 1 of this year. They told us there were approximately, as I recall, $30,000,000 worth of supplies which still ought to be shipped, and they wanted us to change the rule or law so as to permit them to send lend-lease supplies over there. I asked them what countries they had in mind. They named about 8 or 10. Finally, I asked, "Is that all?" They said, "No; Russia." The question was asked, "How much of this $30,000,000?"—if that is the correct figure; I think it is approximately correct—"will go to Russia?" Then we learned that $25,000,000 of it was to go to Russia, but they forgot to name Russia until the very last.

The committee said, "No; we will not do it." They argued; and they said, "You have got to do it." "What is it for?" we asked. Then we learned that included among the items was one of the finest refineries for high-octane gasoline in the world—more modern than anything we have in the United States. Less than 6 weeks ago the State Department was before the Appropriations Committee saying that we had committed ourselves. We said to them, "What about Russia's committing herself to give us an accounting for lend-lease?"

Mr. President, at this moment the time seems to be very opportune for such an accounting; at this moment Russia appears to be willing to talk to us about the $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease we gave her. But what about the 95 ships we gave? There seems to be no indication that Russia wants to talk about that.

Yet, we were supposed to send Russia $25,000,000 worth of goods—not merely machine tools, although some machine tools were to be included, but, in addition, and the largest items, the finest, most modern refinery for high-octane gasoline in the world. We said, "We will hold the matter in abeyance and see what we shall do."

But now comes word from the President, who must have had the advice of the State Department, requesting that machine tools be withheld, although the same State Department has been asking us to send Russia machine tools and the finest, most modern high-octane gasoline refinery. So I am not surprised that the State Department should ask us to lend a billion dollars to Russia while we are undertaking to stop Russia in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further, let me say that during the war between Japan and China, before we went to war with Japan, before Pearl Harbor, of course we were shipping aviation gasoline and scrap iron, scrap copper, and various other scrap materials to Japan, and at the same time we were sending funds out of our Treasury to China. In other words, we were building up both sides, so that they would have a real fight.

I wonder if that same policy is being pursued at the present time; and I wonder how Senators who say that the President has committed us to such a foreign policy and that we must go along because he has already committed us, can explain their ability to go along with that kind of policy. Has the President committed the Senate to that kind of a policy of helping both sides and playing both sides against the middle? Does it not occur to the Senator from Illinois that at this time, before this bill is enacted, we should require an accounting to clarify the whole position and reach an understanding of this apparently traditional policy of playing both sides against each other and helping both sides?

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the Senator that I think one of the most tragic aspects of the entire war was that the American soldiers at Bataan and the ones who ultimately went to capture the islands in the Pacific found that the very shells which were breaking upon them and destroying them had been produced from scrap iron sent to Japan from the United States, and the very planes the Japanese used to strafe them were driven by gasoline which we furnished to the country which finally attacked us.

I have tried to make that clear in what I have said. Undoubtedly, some place along the line we shall send another mission and other arms to go forth and meet the arms we shall manufacture in the United States and shall distribute all over the world. I do not see how we can ultimately miss running into them somewhere, if this course is followed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wonder if there is any obligation upon the Congress or the Senate simply because the President or some of the leaders say we are committed and that we should go along with that kind of a program, if in our judgment we do not think so.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, I think we have no obligation, as such. I do think the situation is regrettable, and I know that the Senator from South Dakota must feel as I do. I hate ever to be put in the position of denying the President of the United States; but in a matter so vital as this, I do not represent the President of the United States; I represent the people who sent me here. They sent me here believing, at least, that I would do what I told them I would do; and that is one thing I have done and shall continue to do. When I leave here, some one else can take my place on the basis of the statements he makes as to what he will do. But I think we should stand up for the things we told the people of our States we would do when we came here.

If the President can lead us off on a tangent, then in my judgment we have "missed the boat."

I wish to state my position clearly: When the President discusses this question fully, and when we finally conclude what program the country should adopt, I shall support that program with everything I have, including my life. In the meantime, I think I should state my convictions and vote my convictions.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. For the benefit of some of the newer Members of the Senate, will the Senator be kind enough to explain what he considers to be the obligation of the Senate in the case of a national policy of this kind, concerning which, as I understand, we are to advise and approve.

Mr. BROOKS. I have just stated what I think the Senate's obligation is; namely, that each individual Senator has an obligation to support his conscience and his own convictions when a matter of this kind is presented to us, especially a matter which some of us at least have a deep conviction that it is going to lead us right down the road to war all over the world or to bankruptcy or to the bread lines. In such a case, how can we do otherwise than vote our own minds and our own hearts? That is what I think our obligation should be.

I repeat that I regret that we have been put into this position; but it is not fair for someone to belabor a Senator by saying that he is weakening the hand of the President of the United States. It may be that momentarily we are weakening the hand of the President of the United States, but we are strengthening representative government; and we may have to fight for it harder than we ever have fought before in our lives, if a program of this kind goes into effect.

Mr. MALONE. What is the law, or what does the Constitution provide—that we have equal responsibility or that we are supposed to follow a lead?

Mr. BROOKS. The pending matter is simply a bill providing for a loan. Of course, the word "loan" is not a good one to use in this case. If only a loan were wanted, it could be made through the International Bank, for the International Bank is in existence, and it would be a good agency to handle such a transaction.

Let me digress for a moment to refer to the International Bank. Russia does not belong to the bank; so we would not be slapping her in the face by letting such a loan or grant be handled by the International Bank. As I recall, we contribute 37 percent of the funds of the bank, and the other countries who are members of the bank contribute 63 percent of its funds. As I have said, Russia is not a member of the bank. I think that by May 1 there will be $800,000,000 subscribed to the bank, and the largest part of it will be the United States' contribution. So if we wish to avoid shaking our fist by sending military missions, that would be a good place to have this loan handled. Then the people who want to have such a loan made could urge that it be made by that bank; and if the loan were made by the bank, the contribution made by the United States in that connection would be larger than the contribution made by any other nation. I think that would be the proper place to handle this matter, if it is desired to make loans, although the pending proposal is not for loans, but simply for out-and-out grants.

However, I would even vote for a grant if the provision for military missions were omitted and we were not called upon to go forth shaking our fist all over the world.

I honestly believe that if we start this program we may be challenged, and then we shall either have to retreat or fight; and then we shall have to adopt universal military training, which we have been talking about for a long time, and we shall again have conscription and regulation. There will be no other choice, once we are challenged. No Senator would vote against adopting such a course if the American flag and American soldiers were challenged by another country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Has the Senator been advised as to where the great over-all plan for occupation, or spheres of influence, or whatever it is, upon which we are about to embark, may lead us?

Mr. BROOKS. I have been advised only through the answers to the questions which were submitted to the State Department by Senators, and I gather that the Department says that after the action now contemplated we will act in each case according to the circumstances of the particular situation. If we start this chain, we create the circumstance, we establish the policy. When any nation says, "We are going Communist if you don't come," that is a call to arms for us again, because we have established the policy, and where that will lead I do not know. We cannot go beyond that. If the State Department says, "We take each one according to circumstance," all I know is that, so far as the countries I have named are concerned, we are going to be getting calls for help, and we will go to their aid all over the world again, but with military missions.

Mr. MALONE. What would be the alternative? Suppose the Senate rejected this proposal; what, in the Senator's judgment, would be the long-range alternative?

Mr. BROOKS. The next alternative is to find out what we can do with the United Nations. We can send supplies, we can send food, we can aid these people, we can make them a reconstruction loan through the International Bank. The United States and Great Britain contributed 51 percent to the capital of that bank. Russia is no part of it. We can channel money through that agency, and lend the countries money for reconstruction, if we keep out of the military aspect of it.

Mr. MALONE. Are we shipping any kind of goods or any form of aid to Russia at this time?

Mr. BROOKS. As to that I am not sure. I stated that we were asked to do so, in the Committee on Appropriations, and some money is going into Russia through UNRRA. I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations answer as to that, if he will. He was presiding at the time. Some few weeks ago we were asked to authorize the shipment of a great plant for the refining of high-octane gasoline, and other supplies. I understand that within the last 10 days there has been a repeated call to have that go through. Is that true, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true. Without agreeing or disagreeing with the premise the Senator from Illinois has made in the presentation of his case, I feel quite strongly that one thing we cannot do in this world is carry water on both shoulders at the same time. I feel that that is the fundamental weakness of our position and of the position of the State Department today. What the able Senator from Illinois has indicated is true, that there has been almost continual pressure on the Committee on Appropriations, since the first of the year, to release for shipment to Russia lend-lease supplies totaling in excess of $25,000,000. That pressure has consisted of individuals high in the State Department coming before the committee and testifying, and of letters and calls and personal contacts from officials high in the State Department, all of them putting pressure on the Committee on Appropriations to release supplies to Russia at this time. The last, as the Senator from Illinois has indicated, was in the nature of a communication which came from across the seas, or from that direction.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Can the Senator from New Hampshire enlighten us further as to the type of this assistance. Was it anything in the nature of munitions of war, that could be used in fighting this country?

Mr. BRIDGES. The principal item, I think, was oil-refining equipment for the refining of high-octane gasoline. As I understand, high-octane gasoline is used for planes, particularly fighting planes; and this, again, made the Committee on Appropriations suspicious, and has made us very firm, to date, in our refusal to take action in any way which would release these lend-lease goods to Russia.

Let me point out to the Senator that I supported lend-lease. I think it performed a real service during the war. But when I supported it, I was under the impression that it would end with the cessation of hostilities, with the termination of the war. But in spite of that it was continued. It necessitated last year action by the Congress of the United States, originating in the Committee on Appropriations, to prohibit further lend-lease supplies going across after December 31, 1946. Mind you, that was about a year and a half after the war was over, and the sending of supplies was still continuing. So we had to pass that legislation at that time, to prohibit it after December 31, 1946.

In spite of the war being over, in spite of the intent of lend-lease being ended, in spite of Congress taking affirmative action prohibiting further sending of lend-lease after December 31 of last year, the State Department still insisted, and is still insisting, on sending millions of dollars worth of lend-lease supplies to Russia, and is at the moment, so far as I know, demanding that that be done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to address a question to the Senator from New Hampshire, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Where is this refinery for high-octane gas and where are the materials which the State Department seeks to have sent to Russia?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are still in this country, and still in the hands of the contractor, or the person with whom the contract was made, according to my understanding.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that it is most revealing and most shocking that the State Department of this Government would seek at this time to have sent to Russia materials for the manufacture of airplane gasoline, when the very purpose expressed in the pending and proposed legislation is to stop the spread of communism into the lower countries of Europe, which means to stop Russia. It is utterly irreconcilable that any department of this Government should appear before one committee of the Senate and ask that materials be sent into Russia for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline with which to operate their planes, and then appear before another committee of the Senate and ask that steps be taken and money be advanced to prevent the spread of communism by Russia. It is not understandable.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am amazed, in listening to this discussion, to hear the reference that is made, first, to the $11,000,000,000 lend-lease which was given by this country to Russia to make her allegedly a mighty military power, and now to have Members of this body surprised that the State Department is still requesting that $25,000,000 of supplies, at the tail end of the lend-lease program,

be made available to Russia. How many Members of the Senate know that since VJ-day $233,000,000 have been made available to Russia under the lend-lease program? It came to my attention a few weeks ago that shipments aggregating millions of dollars were still going to Russia under a program which was represented as being a war aid. I directed a letter to the Administrator of the Lend-Lease Administration a few weeks ago—I regret I do not have the letter with me; it is in my office at this time—in reply to which I was notified that $233,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods had been shipped to Russia since VJ-day.

What I want to know, and I ask my good friend from Illinois the question, is why the State Department does not give us sufficient information so that Senators, as representatives of the people, may be in position to determine accurately whether the President and the State Department are intent upon building Russia into a still greater military power. Now, almost 2 years after VJ-day, do we in fact intend, in line with other representations which are being made, to determine, through the United Nations or in some other way, whether Russia is going to collaborate with the United States and other peace-loving nations to restore peace and maintain peace, or are we going to make a mockery out of the objectives for which millions of young Americans fought in World War II?

Can the Senator advise us on that point and tell us what information is available which will enable us to determine which way our foreign policy is being directed at this particular time?

Mr. BROOKS. I would say to the Senator that the only information I have is that which has come to me through the answers submitted by the Department of State to the questions propounded by Senators, plus other statements made by the Department. But I pointed out the inconsistency of the State Department asking us now to appropriate money for a loan, so-called, and to send military missions to stop the expansion of communism on the border of Russia, and asking the Committee on Appropriations, as they did a short time ago, to permit the shipment to Russia of $25,000,000 worth of supplies and lend-lease goods, represented in part by a high-octane-gas plant which would help them destroy, faster than we could furnish the supplies, the things which were built up in the other country. I think there has been a very great inconsistency, and I think the greatest inconsistency is what we are proposing to do now. We are starting out again to furnish American arms to meet American arms already there, and we shall probably face them again, in due course of time, all over the world.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I gladly yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This discussion has reached a point of revelation that ought to be made known to all the people of the country. From the statements which have been made to the Senate on the pending issue it appears that, on the one hand, the Government has been sending millions of dollars into Russia to equip her and at the same time has been seeking permission, through a committee of the Senate, to send other equipment, while, on the other hand, it is proposing to embark on a course designed, as it is said, to stop the spread of communism by sending money and military personnel to other nations.

Reference was made a few minutes ago to supplies going into Russia under lend-lease. I wonder if the able Senator from Illinois will permit me to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as to the aid which has gone into Russia since the end of the war through UNRRA.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that UNRRA shipments, of which as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia knows, we furnish about 72 percent, are still continuing. The supplies are being bought in this country at this time, even though UNRRA, in theory, has expired. We still have in process of accumulation and in the process of shipment to two of the states or countries of the Soviet Empire, namely, White Russia and the Ukraine, many tens of millions of dollars worth of American supplies, which are going through UNRRA to those two divisions of the Soviet Empire, and also to some of the Russian satellite countries. The State Department says that that is done in accordance with an international commitment; but I may point out that if it were desired to stop carrying water on both shoulders and be consistent, we always have the control, through export licenses, of whether or not goods can be shipped from this country. We have the power and the right to control the shipment of goods to both divisions of the Russian Empire, and to Russian satellite countries such as Yugoslavia, that is at the present time so violently hostile to the United States.

Mr. BROOKS. Furthermore, reference to the answers submitted by the Department of State to questions shows that that was one of the questions which was asked. Question 71 was this:

Question. How much money has the American Government contributed through various sources to the Government of Yugoslavia in the past 3 years?

The answer is rather unusual. I might say in many respects it is a very typical State Department answer:

Answer. Yugoslavia has received $32,000,000 of lend-lease aid since July 1942—

As I understand, what we are worried about is the march of communism from Yugoslavia into Greece. That is the movement we want to stop.

Yugoslavia has received $32,000,000 of lend-lease aid since July 1942, of which $39,000 has been received since September 1945.

Note these words:

Data for the period of the last 3 years are not readily available. The United States share of UNRRA's contribution to the Yugoslavia relief program was $312,000,000.

We have already poured $312,000,000 through UNRRA. I objected at the time, to having their own Communist agents administering our millions of dollars. Now we have got to send missions and money to stop the Communists, because they are going into Greece; but we gave them $312,000,000 in relief. We gave them $32,000,000 of lend-lease since July 1942, but data for the period of the last 3 years are not readily available.

The $312,000,000 is exclusive of freight.

Based on 72 percent of the total contribution, all of which was furnished in the past 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reference to distribution under UNRRA, during the month of April, it so happened that on yesterday I received an answer to a letter which I wrote to UNRRA, asking for the distribution at this time. I have the schedule here, as of April 1, and I should like to read it. Possibly it might clear up some of the questions as to what we are planning to do during the month of April by way of UNRRA shipments. I may say that 80 percent of our shipments, even today, are going to Russia and to Russian-controlled countries. The shipments are being loaded in New York now. That was verified yesterday by UNRRA.

To Austria, which is Russian-controlled, we are shipping $4,083,810, during the current month. To Bylo-Russia, which is merely a Russian province, there has been allocated $607,000; to Czechoslovakia, $5,281,550. Poland is scheduled to get $14,437,800. The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic is getting $1,880,500. Yugoslavia is given $21,027,600. Those shipments are in the process of being loaded at this particular time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question, if the Senator from Illinois will yield for a moment. What type of equipment is Russia buying at this time, through what we call lend-lease or the extension loans that they have now obtained from the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. A large part of what they are buying, as I said, is oil refining equipment; and then there is other equipment of a varied nature. I do not have the figures. I have them in the Appropriations Committee, but I do not have them on the floor of the Senate so as to give the details. But the equipment is miscellaneous.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee remember the number of trucks we have sent to Russia?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean during the whole period?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; during the whole period.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the number of trucks sent was about 111,000.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will look up the figures, I think he will find that the number is far greater than that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure it is.

Mr. WHERRY. It is more nearly 300,000 vehicles.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the number stated by the Senator from New Hampshire is the number sent to Russia since we thought lend-lease was terminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion, Mr. President, that it is necessary that we know the type of equipment that is going into Russia. I am informed that Russia is one of the countries which has been the recipient of a great number of box cars and of other railroad equipment. It seems to me from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has pointed out and from the observations made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, that we should find out of what the equipment sent to Russia consists; and whether or not Russia is paying for it? Is Russia paying cash for it? Are we to be paid for it in the end? Are we continuing the policy of sending Russia equipment which is vital to her in order to pursue an expansionist policy, on the one hand, and on the other hand, are we proposing to stop Russia's expansionist policy through furnishing aid to Greece and Turkey? I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he can answer that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not have the figures with me. I can secure them, and shall do so.

The Senator from Nebraska is correct in saying that more than 300,000 vehicles were furnished to Russia. When I gave the smaller figure I was referring to the period after the war ended.

Mr. President, the point I want to make is that I am personally sympathetic to stopping the spread of communism over the world, and I feel that the area of Turkey and Greece is a strategic area. But to me it is almost inconceivable that the same administration which asks Congress loyally to support the proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey at the same time is furnishing aid to Russia and Russian satellite countries. To me, such a procedure is the height of inconsistency. I simply cannot understand it. It represents the weakness of our whole policy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Nebraska in his question spoke of supplies being sent into Russia and Russian-dominated countries at this time by our own country under lend-lease. The Senator spoke of boxcars and of trucks and other vehicles being sent to Russia. Let me say to the able Senator that millions upon millions of dollars worth of equipment has been sent into those countries under UNRRA. I think I am correct in saying that most Senators believed when they voted the appropriation for UNRRA that they were voting to provide food and clothing and shelter for needy and distressed people. But let me say to the Senator that UNRRA not only has sent food and clothing, but thousands of railroad cars, coal cars, boxcars, and other equipment which is needed in this country. Within the last 2 months I myself saw in the yards at Newark, N. J., new locomotives awaiting shipment abroad, with "UNRRA" written on them. So when I see such materials being channeled to countries whose expansionist program we now say we want to stop, I say most earnestly that it is the most distorted administration of the purposes for which UNRRA was set up that can be imagined. The abuses under UNRRA are terrible to think of.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois have any information as to how many occupied countries have been cleaned out of heavy industrial materials, such as industrial plants which, in the case of countries now controlled by Russia have been moved to Russia? I refer to countries such as Germany and Manchuria, to which a good portion of the repair parts and equipment were sent by this country in the first place. Does the Senator know whether most of the heavy equipment in those occupied countries has been removed to Russia?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know, and I do not think anyone knows. We cannot know what goes on behind the iron curtain. We helped the Russians advance into the space which they now occupy. We permitted them to move into Berlin by waiting so they could move in there first. Wherever Russian armies moved in they took out heavy equipment and machinery. So the only supposition that can be drawn from that is that wherever they are they have appropriated unto their own use materials which were useful to them, regardless of whether we in the first place sent the materials to the people of the occupied countries in all good conscience as relief or for their assistance. Russia takes such material to her own use.

What I am now saying is that the same department of our Government which has followed the inconsistent program of furnishing material which was then taken by Russia for her own use, wants to determine how the aid now proposed to be furnished shall be handled. It is proposed that we shall trust them, until some day we will find ourselves again in the middle of a stream. We cannot change horses in the middle of that stream, and will again find ourselves engaged in a war. We cannot direct events except to fight wherever we can obtain a foothold at such a time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that is generally conceded, and do not newspaper reports indicate—at least all the reports to which I have had access indicate—that the movement of heavy industries to Russia is on? Is it not conceded that such industries have been removed from Germany and the other areas occupied by Russia; that heavy machinery has been taken out of Korea and Manchuria, and other areas occupied by Russia and moved into Russia? Is not that common knowledge?

Mr. BROOKS. It is my understanding that it is common knowledge.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am rising at the moment only to keep the record straight in respect to one or two matters which have drifted into the debate. I am not rising in any aspect to challenge the able address made by the Senator from Illinois, whose courage and candor in this matter I totally respect. Some references, however, were made both by the able Senator from Colorado and by some of the questions since intervening, which evidently refer back to the statement I made regarding the fact that Congress does not find itself totally a free agent in making a decision of the character which here impends after the President of the United States has made a recommendation. I want to revert to that phase of the matter because I want to be very sure no one misunderstands either me or the situation which Senators confront, whether they like it or not.

I have never for an instant challenged the fact that every Senator has a complete right and duty to face the facts in this situation precisely as the able Senator from Illinois has faced them from his point of view. I have no challenge to the exercise of that right whatsoever—so long as it is exercised in this country, I might add. I am not interested in itinerant saboteurs. What I submitted to the Senate, Mr. President, and I am sure that Senators upon reflection will remember it, was that among the factors which we cannot escape considering is the price of noncompliance with the Presidential recommendation. That is the extent to which I have injected this argument into the debate.

We must weigh the price of noncompliance against the price of compliance as one of the factors in making up our independent minds. I am not, I repeat, challenging for an instant the right and the duty of every Senator to make his decision pursuant to his own conscience and judgment in the face of the facts as he weighs them. The only thing I submit is that among the facts which must be weighed is the price of noncompliance with the general purpose to which the President of the United States has addressed himself.

The President of the United States has undertaken to say that this Republic of ours stands in this world against the overthrow of independent government either by sabotage from within or assault from without. He has expressed a great fundamental principle to which American idealism has been attached since the days of the Declaration of Independence.

When I addressed the Senate upon this subject, I was totally frank with the Senate in respect to it, and I laid perfectly candidly upon the line the fact that this is a fundamental disagreement between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, involved, not only at this point in Greece and Turkey, but involved in every aspect of our interna-

tional relations. It is involved in every decision which has to be made in the United Nations. It is involved in every decision which General MacArthur has to make in distant Japan. It is involved in every decision which has to be made in the occupied zones in Germany. Fundamentally, as I stated when I presented this case in the first instance, we confront a deadlock between the viewpoints of the Soviet Union and those of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not until I have finished this statement, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

In dealing with the Soviet problem, I assert that it has been our experience for the past year and a half that the hope for peaceful agreement rests and depends largely upon whether we can make it plain to the governing authorities in Moscow that there is a deadline of ideals beyond which we will not retreat.

I agree that this is a guessing contest for everyone. It is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that there is a chance for the Soviet Union and the United States of America to find a basis upon which they can live and let live in the world, and in that fashion avoid the conflict which neither nation wants any part of—and, least of all, the Senator who now speaks.

I know of no way that we can hope successfully to approach even the perimeter of that sort of an agreement, except as we make it perfectly plain that the United States says what it means and means what it says, and that no policy of appeasement of any aggressive government on the face of this earth is a part of our program. I have submitted to the Senate that when the President of the United States takes a courageous, constructive, dedicated position in respect to that objective, among the factors which Senators must weigh when they vote upon this bill is what the price of noncompliance is, what the price is of notifying the Politbureau in Moscow that this Government is divided at home and that all they have to do is wait for us to fall apart.

That is not a conclusive factor. I go back to the point where I started. I say that the Senator from Illinois and all like him confront the duty of doing precisely what he has done in presenting his own honest views. I have never even intimated that Senators should subordinate their viewpoint to that of the Executive. But I say again that, whether we like it or not, we cannot escape the fact that in making up our minds as to what our duty is, the cost of noncompliance with this particular kind of a Presidential recommendation is one of the things which we cannot escape.

If the Senator from Nevada wishes to interrupt me on that point, I am very glad to yield to him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to give us some idea of what he considers the price to be?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid I do not understand the Senator's question. If he will make it a little plainer I shall try to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to do so. The Senator says that we must consider the price of noncompliance. What is the price?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Every Senator will have to weigh that decision for himself. I am not the keeper of the conscience of any Senator except myself.

Mr. MALONE. May we have the benefit of the Senator's advice?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In his original presentation of this subject, the Senator from Michigan stated as frankly as he knew how to state, that in his opinion—and I dislike to repeat this because it may seem that I am attempting to force Presidential duress upon Senators; but the Senator asked me what I thought. I believe that if the Congress should fail to uphold the hand of the President of the United States in respect to this general challenge—omitting details upon which, obviously, we have a right to be consulted—there would never be another opportunity for us pacifically to impress the next aggressor with any degree of success.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What is the Senator's opinion as to the alternative?

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the alternative to which the Senator refers?

Mr. MALONE. What is the alternative if everything happens which the Senator outlines—if we do not go along with this loan, and admit that we are divided at home, which we are?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In my opinion we shall have sacrificed the moral and spiritual leadership of the world; and from that point on, since we should have encouraged aggressors to believe that they could proceed with immunity, regardless of us, the Senator will have to draw upon his own imagination as to what would happen.

I have previously tried to express the thought that no one has any remote right to discuss this subject dogmatically. No man has a right to say, "I know the answer." No Senator knows the answer. The President of the United States does not know the answer. This is one of those situations, in these restless, impatient times, in which the only choice we have in connection with this problem and many others is the choice of a calculated risk.

We never have an opportunity to do as free agents precisely as we would like to do; and the Senator, like all other Senators, will have to take his own calculated risks, subject to the factors involved.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does this calculated risk involve war with Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to discuss the question of war with Russia, even though it be involved in the calculations of some of those who survey this plan. I do not think it is necessary to talk about war with Russia, provided we can proceed with a united country to impress the Soviet Government with the fact that we propose to be absolutely, scrupulously fair to them, that we are prepared to guarantee their legitimate borders for the next 40 years against any aggression, and if we make it completely and scrupulously plain that we do not have one single aggressive motive against Russia. I am unable to believe if we can make our own position clear and immutable it is necessary to talk about war.

I may be wrong, and I repeat that no man dares to be dogmatic upon this subject, but in my view this bill looks in the direction of peace instead of in the direction of war. Otherwise, I could not support it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Will the distinguished Senator from Michigan give us his opinion, for the benefit of some of us, as to whether we in effect are laying the gauntlet down to Russia, and whether if she picks it up we are in war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has three "ifs" in that question.

Mr. MALONE. I will take all of them out. Are we in war if Russia decides we are wrong in fixing her boundaries?

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are in war at any time Russia decides she wishes to go to war. In my opinion, the last thing on earth that Russia wishes to do is to go to war, precisely as the last thing on earth we wish to do is to go to war.

Mr. MALONE. Are we in war if Russia takes up the challenge?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That depends entirely on what the Senator means by taking up the challenge.

Mr. MALONE. Suppose she does not stop in Greece, but keeps on coming. Are we in war if we permit this action to be taken?

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are not in war unless and until the Soviet Government decides to go to war. On that subject I have no prophecy to offer, except that I am totally of the opinion that war is unnecessary, that it is futile, provided we can lay down specifications which are clear and sure for both nations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. If Russia, however, continues to come, shall we back up or go to war once we are there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The trouble with the Senator's questions is that his terms require definition.

Mr. MALONE. I shall define them if the Senator will tell me what he does not understand with reference to them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator means, if Russia starts to blow us up are we in war? the answer is "Yes."

Mr. MALONE. I do not mean that. But if we give Greece $400,000,000, a few soldiers, and material, if Russia continues to come across Greece, what is the next move? Are we in war in order to stop her? Is that part of my question plain?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, when we go to Greece we have gone on a mission which is designed for the purpose of making Greece itself self-sufficient in maintaining lawful peace.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. There is no Russian offensive as such against Greece. It is a communistic infiltration—and all of this is a matter of argument—from surrounding satellite

countries. The question of who is to blame for what happened on the Greek border is one of the things which the United Nations itself will shortly decide. In my opinion, when that decision is made, unless the Soviets intervene with a veto, there will be established a border commission of the United Nations—and nothing in our plan would interfere with it at all—which will largely take over the responsibility of what happens on the border.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that with $400,000,000 and a few soldiers Greece can stop Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly not, if Russia wants to invade Greece.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that my original question is still pertinent. What shall we do if Russia continues her travel through Europe which she has already started?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MALONE. Shall we back down in Greece?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question, because questions of that magnitude and that awful impact will have to be answered as the situation requires when the time comes. I might as easily ask the Senator, What shall we do if we allow Greece to collapse, if we allow Turkey to collapse, and if a chain reaction sets in which produces a Communist-dominated world from the Dardanelles to the China Sea and westward to the Atlantic Ocean, and we find ourselves substantially encircled a few years hence by a communistic world? I might ask the Senator, What shall we do under those circumstances? I should not expect the Senator to answer the question, because no man can answer it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I think that should be considered. Did the President say that our move into Greece is to stop Russia or the Russian people? Is that what he meant?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think he said it was to stop Russia. As to what he meant, he will have to say for himself.

Mr. MALONE. What did he say?

Mr. VANDENBERG. He clearly indicated that the purpose was to stop aggression and to defend the right of independent self-government in those two key places of the world.

Mr. MALONE. Then, does not that answer the question; that if Russia keeps coming we are in war?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nevada will have to answer his own question, I repeat, just as every other Senator will have to answer the question for himself as to what will happen if we allow self-government to fail in Greece, if we allow independent government to fall in Turkey, whatever its character may be, and if we allow this chain reaction to set in, which can easily consume three-fourths of the world.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but I do not want to spend all afternoon on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like earnestly to make this reply to the Senator, that there are certainly very few facts in the report submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations on the very things which some of us would like to know. I too want to preface my remarks, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has, with the statement that I am open-minded on this subject. Certainly some of the questions being asked today should be asked of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am about to come to them, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will yield. Does the State Department have a foreign policy for every foreign country?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know what the Senator's question means.

Mr. WHERRY. I can indicate what it means. In the United States News for February 7 Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, is quoted by the editor of that publication as stating that the State Department has a foreign policy for all foreign countries; that the policies are top secrets of the State Department and are known only to a few Army officers. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, ought to know if the Secretary of State has such a policy and blueprint and program. If he does, I should like to ask a second question: Can the Senator give us the facts as to how far the State Department wants to go? It is proposed that we start with Greece and Turkey. Are we to go from there to Korea, and from there back to Italy and then to France and then to Great Britain and then perhaps to Germany, and finally wind up in China? I think the Senator from Nevada asked a question which should be answered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure he did.

Mr. WHERRY. What is this foreign policy? Does the Senator from Michigan know it? If he does know it, why should not the Senate know it, if the Senate votes to provide this initial loan?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should consider the question submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska totally incapable of being answered. This world is in a state of restless flux; we cannot tell what the headlines on the front page will be day after tomorrow. If the State Department was smart enough to be able to have in its library a chart to cover its policy for the next year with respect to every country on the earth, it would be a State Department entitled to a higher opinion than I have of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield briefly. I should like to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be brief.

Does the State Department have the same policy in China that it has in continental Europe, relative to stopping communism? Is it a consistent policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, we could go off on 50 of these detours if we wished to do so. The Senator from Nebraska knows perfectly well that I have stated publicly that I have been highly critical of the State Department's policy heretofore in China, because it has looked toward the creation of a coalition with Communists, and in my opinion no Communist ever entered a coalition for any purpose except to destroy it. Therefore, in that aspect, I have not been in step with some phases of the China policy during the last year or two. Nevertheless, one of the greatest and ablest men of this Nation, gifted not only with a military sense but with a high sense of statesmanship, has spent a year—one of the best years of his life—in China, trying to work out a policy for this Nation; and so far as I am concerned, I have been quite willing that he should have the opportunity to see whether it could be done.

Again, I say no man can be dogmatic as to what are the answers to these questions in these difficult times. As to China, the answer apparently is that General Marshall's errand did not succeed.

So far as I am concerned, I should think that the fulfillment of our great hopes in China rests upon the success with which Chiang Kai-shek can enlarge and liberalize his own national government, within which he has been able to assemble every political party in China except the armed Communists; and I should feel that in the case of China, as in the case of all other foreign nations, despite the characteristics of the Chinese Government—characteristics which we do not like, and which we would greatly prefer to change—our great hope in China, I say very frankly to the able Senator from Nebraska, would be for success for the generalissimo in enlarging and liberalizing his own Nationalist Government as against the armed Communists.

What the policy of the State Department is I am unable to testify. There is a considerable amount of misunderstanding about the so-called bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I have tried to make that plain on several occasions. It is very narrowly channeled within very specific things; namely, the minor peace treaties in Europe and the activities of the United Nations.

I have never been consulted about the Chinese policy or the pan-American policy or many other policies, and I am not in a position to be an expert witness for the Senator from Nebraska. My information probably is a little more intimate than that of other Senators; but speaking generally, the facts are as I have indicated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the interest of accuracy, and to do credit to General Marshall, it is true, is it not, that when he returned from China, before he later went back to China, he appeared before

the Foreign Relations Committee and made a full disclosure of what he had been doing and what he hoped to do?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I trust that the distinguished Senator from Michigan will not become impatient with me or with some other Senators who are asking questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope I did not indicate any impatience.

Mr. WHERRY. I really feel that in the last hour I have learned more about these matters than I have learned at any other time during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nebraska is welcome to any information I have.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, and we are seeking information. I hope the Senator will take these questions in that light—namely, that those of us who are asking questions are not in any way attempting to disrupt the program. On the other hand, I think we have an entire right to have the full light of every fact that is available.

Personally, I could not understand the policy in China. I do not understand it today. I certainly think it has been an inconsistent policy, and I should like to know more about it.

I cannot understand the policy in South America. Here we are going to stop communism abroad, and yet under Mr. Braden we went into Argentina and used the Embassy as the seat of communism in an election in which we intervened. I cannot understand that policy, and I think we have a right to know what the policy is going to be; and I think we also have a right to know the amount of money which will be used for the purpose of the pending bill. Certainly, if it is going to run into billions of dollars, a time will come when it will not be a question of whether we want to take the moral and spiritual leadership; for if the United States becomes bankrupt and insolvent there will be no chance for America to give the kind of leadership that is now contemplated.

There is nothing in the report to indicate what we might be led into if the eventualities which have been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nevada should come to pass.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the first part of the Senator's last interruption I can cordially welcome. So far as I am concerned, I have gone to extreme lengths in endeavoring to provide the Senate with information, as the questionnaire which is on the desks of Senators clearly shows. I hope I have demonstrated no impatience in undertaking to answer factual questions.

So far as the Senator's later expressed view is concerned, I can only say that, again, that is a matter of opinion, and the Senator is entitled to his opinion.

But when he complains that the report of the committee does not draw a blueprint which answers every question which can arise day after tomorrow in this distraught earth, when no man knows for 20 minutes at a time what is going to happen, the Senator from Nebraska is asking something totally unreasonable, from my point of view.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has the Senator finished?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Finished what?

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator from Michigan finished his reply to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. One never finishes replying to the Senator from Nebraska. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan probably will.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Nebraska desires to make further inquiries at this time, I ask the Senator from Michigan to yield to me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the distinguished Senator whether he thinks that what prompted the able Senator from Nebraska to ask his questions was perhaps a dilemma in which some Senators may find themselves as to whether we should regard the President's recommendation as indicating a general policy, or whether we should regard it in the light of what the State Department might regard as an incident or event somewhat localized in character. Does the Senator think there might be some justification for the belief that the President made it clear that he was speaking about a policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think that is a fair question. I think the President's message defined what is being done in terms of a doctrine, a little more definitely than I interpret the situation, as I undertook to make plain when I presented the plan from the Foreign Relations Committee. To me it is a plan; it is a part of a pattern, and as such is to be distinguished from a policy. I would not want to disguise any phase of this matter, because of all the things I believe in one of the most important is that the country should be candidly dealt with in a question of this nature. I agree to that completely. The American people are not children; they do not wish to be fooled; they want the facts and the truth.

As I tried to say when I presented the matter more formally a few days ago, it would be silly to attempt to ignore the implications which are involved in this plan and pattern. To what extent and in what direction it ultimately expresses itself, the Senator from Florida can guess as well as I can. I only submit that in making that sort of a guess we must parallel it with a guess as to what may happen if we do not do what the President recommends.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In furtherance of the policy indicated by the President, which possibly the Senator from Nebraska and others of us have in mind, in the first place is the fact that the President appeared personally before a joint sessison of the Congress, rather than requesting aid in the way of an ordinary routine message; in the second place, the President started right off:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The next line of the President's message is:

> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

Then at a later place in the President's message, on page 4 as it is printed, the President said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

From those words I think anyone would undoubtedly be justified in assuming that the Congress was asked to pass on a momentous matter, that we were asked by the President to approve a policy rather than a condition, for the reasons stated by the President in his message.

If it is a policy, it is a fair inquiry as to what is the implication of the policy, what is its significance? If it is merely an incident, if it is only a particular situation, then we can more adequately estimate what it will cost, and it is a matter of limited implication and significance.

Of course, none of us can control what is said in the press, but when we find men like Walter Lippman, and other eminent columnists, discussing this as a "policy," and when we find it in the press of the country, in the comments of the country, compared by responsible people with the Monroe Doctrine, then would not the Senator think in all fairness that there was some justification for the feeling that we are here about to make a momentous decision, and that it is one of the utmost gravity to the Nation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator that there is justification for the deepest searching of souls I have known of in the 19 years I have been a Member of this body, because unquestionably we here assume a position of fidelity in respect to our ideals to a degree which heretofore has never been so plainly stated.

What we stand for may be a matter of argument, but I am unable to believe that we do not all stand for the righteousness of independent liberties to which the President fundamentally addressed himself. I am very sure the Senator from Florida does.

What that involves for day after tomorrow, I can only repeat, depends upon day after tomorrow. I sometimes wonder if the Great Architect of the Universe Himself knows what is going to happen day after tomorrow. Certainly no Senator upon this floor does.

I cannot answer questions based upon hypotheses which are put together out of the utterly ruthless factors which are at large in this world upon the one hand, and the utterly desperate factors of famine and want and subjugation which are involved on the other.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to interject, if the Senator will allow me, that

what he has said is characteristic of his approach all the way through this matter, and I wish to commend him for it, and also to commend the President. The President did not quibble, he did not weasel, he did not try to evade. He laid the matter squarely before the Congress in a joint session, and the first sentence he used referred to the gravity of the situation. But by the same token candor bids me say that in my opinion the State Department has not been equally candid in its presentation of the matter. I feel that it is only fair that we understand that we are making here a decision which may be a matter of policy, or, to use the interesting figure of the able Senator from Michigan, a part of a pattern, I believe, rather than using the word "policy."

If I may drop to a detail——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves that point, I should like to say a word.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What the Senator says is substantially true. I decline to gloss over any phase or factor of the problem with which we are confronted. When I presented the matter I said that there must be no soft illusions about what we do. I must constantly add that there are no soft illusions as to what happens to us when we confront the Soviet Union, in one controversy after another, utterly unable to make any progress in behalf of fundamental rights and human freedoms.

If one is looking for the larger implications, consideration with me is whether or not it is possible to make real progress by a program of absolute candor in dealing with Moscow, candor not only in assuring Russia that we do not have an iota of conquest against her in our souls, candor, on the other hand, that we do have in our souls a lot of iron in respect to our ideals. I am unable to believe, I repeat, that that is not the most hopeful aproach to a pacific settlement instead of an approach which would notify the Politburo in Moscow that the Congress of the United States has divided with the President of the United States, that the people have divided behind them, and all in the world that Communist aggression has to do is to wait for us to collapse.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think, again, the Senator has been just as fair and just as candid as an honest mind, well informed, could be.

Is it not also fair to infer, from what the Senator has said, that the provocation for this policy, or pattern, is the existing situation of the Soviet Union and this country, vis-à-vis; that this is not a relief bill for Greece, but relief for Greece is an incident which could be handled in several different ways; that the real significance of this pattern, this policy, we are asked to approve, is the belief of the President, and the belief of the State Department, and the belief of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that what is proposed is the right position for us to take vis-à-vis our relations in the world today with the Soviet Union?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says this is not a relief bill for Greece, in fact.

Mr. PEPPER. I mean that relief is not the major element.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly. In order to assess the justification for the Senator's statement, we shall have to define the word "relief."

Mr. PEPPER. I mean economic relief, if the Senator will allow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. Unfortunately, as the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate unanimously believes, economic relief for Greece by itself is futile and useless. It is simply a transient bounty, which will go down the drain the way the other bounties have gone, for the last 2 years, except as Greece can be assured of a lawful peace within which to develop her own institutions. So it seems to me that the word "relief" which the Senator used, in its larger sense, in the first instance, is the sense in which the word applies, and on that basis I think it is a relief measure.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in inferring that the sense in which the Senator is now using the term "relief" would also be large enough to include the word "security"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think so. The Senator from Michigan would not want to retreat a sixteenth of an inch from the feeling which he deeply has, that the security of the United States is involved in the creation of a world in which Communist aggression has stopped, on a pacific basis, if there is any human way to achieve that objective; and that is the effort in which the Senator from Michigan thinks he is engaged.

Mr. PEPPER. So, the Senator is honest and sincere in his belief, as was the President in his presentation, that this measure is necessary on the part of the United States, vis-à-vis its relationships with Russia as a world power, and vis-à-vis the spread and contagion of communism in the west.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, I think so.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, if the Senator will let me drop down to a lesser detail, I do not recall that a statement has ever been made, either on the floor or in the committee, as to what was the amount of the British aid to the Turkish armed forces before that aid was withdrawn. Does the Senator happen to have that information?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not have it available at the moment.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield further, it was my understanding that what precipitated primarily our proffer of aid for the armed forces of Greece was the withdrawal of such aid by the British Nation; and I wondered how the amount that the British had been contributing compared with the amount that we propose to contribute in the next 15 months?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not have those figures at the moment.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he enters upon another branch of the subject?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There has been much speculation in this debate, and there have been many implications drawn as to what may or may not happen as a result of this contemplated program. In view of the fact that the debate has been proceeding on that premise, would the Senator care to make an observation with respect to the implication the leaders of Russia might make, in the event the pending bill providing for the Greek loan and the Turkish loan should be defeated by the Senate, so far as communism being advanced into the Balkan countries is concerned?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I made a statement on that subject before the Senator came in, but I am very glad to answer it again, and categorically. It is the fundamental point I had in mind when I said that while Senators are perfectly free agents to vote as they please on this issue, one of the factors they must consider is the price of noncompliance with the President's recommendation. Whether one likes it or not, he cannot escape the fact that that is one of the things that must be put in the balances when conscience weighs its decision.

The Senator from Illinois is asking me what is the price of noncompliance, and I say to him, as I said before, that it seems to me, in view of the basic psychology which is constantly involved in relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union, in view of that controversial psychology, and in view of the record of the past 6 years, if divisive refusal to unify the Presidential and congressional voices should become apparent, it would be a straight notice to the Soviet Union in accordance with their old policy of waiting for us to surrender, either through our impatience or through our anxiety to do business at any price. In my opinion, the chance of ever getting another pacific agreement with Moscow would have disappeared for keeps.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator a further question? Does he agree with me that the refusal of the Senate to grant the Greco-Turkish loan would be almost tantamount to an invitation to Russia to spread the communistic doctrine in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the answer is obviously yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, after that, let me say——

Mr. VANDENBERG. But before the Senator takes his next step, I remind him that when I presented this matter in the first instance, I dealt directly with that matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I was not present at the time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I then asked a few questions. For instance, if you were a citizen of Athens and were on the rim of Communist invasion and subjugation; if under such circumstances your only hope was that held out by the message of the President of the United States, and if you heard that Congress had declined to join forces on any basis with the President of the United States, in his purpose, what would you do, as a citizen of Athens, except resign yourself to the inevitable?

What would you do if you were a citizen of Ankara, and had been paying a majority of your taxes for the purpose of maintaining an army of defense along your country's border line in connection with a war of nerves which had all but exhausted not only your nerves but your resources, and the President of the United States had said, "Something must be done to protect the integrity of this Turkish people"—what would you think if you were a citizen of Ankara under those circumstances, and the word came that the Congress of the United States had declined to proceed in the direction indicated by the President, namely, that the integrity of Turkey must be defended? What would you do except resign yourself to the inevitable?

And what would you do if you were a member of the Politburo in Moscow, if you got the word? What would you do? The question answers itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I totally agree with the Senator. It seems to me that what he has said in the last few moments touches the vital problem with which the Senate should concern itself. Favorable and prompt action on the pending bill is vital to the safety and security of our country. It is vital to the citizens of Greece and Turkey, as the Senator has so well expressed it. But, following that up, if the Senate does not uphold the hands of the President of the United States, I undertake to say that it will be an invitation to Russia to spread the doctrine of communism through the Balkan countries. What is then to be done? The able Senator from Nevada has been talking about war, saying this is a road to war with Russia. What are we then to do, after we shall have denied the President's request for a loan, so far as our own defenses are concerned? In my humble opinion we must retire into our own economic and political shell and begin preparing for a World War III some time in the future.

I understand and appreciate the risk we take in traveling on either road, but I am unable to believe, as the able Senator from Nevada indicated, that this is the road to war. I definitely think, if there is going to be any peace at all in this world, that what the President has requested the Senate of the United States to do is the primary road away from war. I am as sure as that I am standing here on the floor of the Senate that once communism spreads its ungodly influence throughout Europe and Asia and finally reaches the shores of South America, and we are totally encircled by it, some day soon we will wake up with another war in progress, and we will have a difficult time defending ourselves against the rest of the world under those circumstances.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. WILSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before I yield further I desire to make an additional comment in view of the observation made by the able Senator from Illinois. I spoke about the reaction of the citizen of Athens and about the reaction of the citizen of Ankara. I am not primarily interested in those reactions because of my interest in Athens or in Ankara. I am interested in them because it seems to me that if they are what they inevitably must be in the event of the failure of this program, immediately Communist aggression, subjugation, and conquest have been extended to two key points in the world's geography and the chain reaction is almost as surely as anything in this word to extend from the Dardanelles to the China Sea, and, I repeat, westward to the Atlantic. I am interested in what the citizen of Athens and the citizen of Ankara think because of the effect of their thinking upon the security of my own United States. I think everything we do should stem from an understanding of our own intelligent self-interest.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment. The Senator was asked as to what he thought the price of noncompliance would be if we failed to vote this loan. The Senator will recollect that, within perhaps 48 hours after the President made this recommendation, I commented to him to the effect that I did not know about the outcome of our efforts at Lake Success to bring about effective control of atomic energy, but I felt certain in my bones that if we did not go forward and uphold the President's hand in this situation, we would find that we would positively make no progress in those negotiations, which I for one look on as the basis of keeping the peace. I say to the Senator that if we were to retreat and defeat this loan we would see an immediate closing of those negotiations, which may be closed without success, and which may result in an atomic war. But we have at least got a chance of fair success if we tell Russia that we intend to uphold the President's hand, as the Senator has pointed out that we must.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Connecticut made that observation. A few moments ago I indicated, I think in response to the able Senator from Florida, that while we are here dealing specifically with only one segment of a problem, and that is all that is involved at this particular point, nevertheless there is a general pattern due to the fact that we find ourselves in this same type of collision and controversy in almost every forum on earth wherever the Soviet Union and the United States of America confront each other.

In giving some examples at that time I neglected to refer to the problem of atomic energy. I am grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for reminding me of it, because that is the overriding exhibit of all, which clearly demonstrates that we must go to everlasting lengths not only in preserving our own atomic secret but in endeavoring to find a common denominator on this earth whereby not only the United States but also the Soviet Union can join in outlawing the use of fissionable material for destructive purposes. That is just one more of those dire necessities which challenge us not to meet the Soviet Union tomorrow afternoon with defiance, but to meet it in firm friendliness, making them understand, on the one hand that we do not pose one single conquest against them and that we have every purpose to help defend their legitimate rights and boundaries, and have offered a 40-year contract to do it, but making them understand, on the other hand, that the price of an agreement in this world in which communism and free enterprise can live and let live is an acknowledgment of the fact that the United States of America stands for some human rights and fundamental principles which are too priceless to be surrendered. Except as that consciousness can be driven into the Moscow mind we cannot hope for the agreement for which I am pleading.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to ask a question in order to clarify the situation in my own mind. I find on page 3 of the bill, subsection (3), this language:

> by detailing a limited number of members of the military service of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only.

The total appropriation for Greece is $300,000,000, is it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; $150,000,000 of it for military supplies.

Mr. WILSON. Does the Senator feel that that is a limited amount?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That it is what?

Mr. WILSON. That one-half of the total amount which is to be devoted to military supplies represents a limited amount of such supplies?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; because the fundamental need in Greece, according to every testimony we received, is the creation of lawful peace within which Greece can rehabilitate herself, and there is reasonable hope that if lawful peace is established in Greece, Greece can rebuild herself with the resources which she now possesses, and those which are to be made available to her not only here, but in a subsequent relief bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I know that what the Senator told me is the hope and the ambition of many, but can the Senator tell me where in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee we can find anything to substantiate his opinion?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, we are right back to the same thing we discussed for an hour earlier in the day, if I may say so with deference to the Senator. No man can be dogmatic on this subject. I may be as wrong as I can be——

Mr. WILSON. Oh, no——

Mr. VANDENBERG. But this is a world in flux. There is no blueprint for it after tomorrow.

My hope may not be justified, but in my opinion it is justified. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry I nettled the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I was simply asking for information. I think the people would like to have the information.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So would I.

Mr. WILSON. Why did not the Senator, then, instead of making a speech in answer to my question, say he did not know? I am asking for information. I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee ought to say either "Yes" or "No." I asked only for one thing. God knows, I want to do right.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. WILSON. I am afraid to repeat it, because the distinguished Senator from Michigan did not understand it to begin with. I wanted him to tell me where in the report of the committee I can find the things to justify the statements he has made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All I can say to my able friend from Iowa is that I think he will find throughout the committee report the answer to his question, insofar as an answer is possible. What I tried to say previously to the Senator was that I did not think there was any answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A moment ago the Senator said that it was impossible to form a coalition government with the Communist Party in any nation. My question is this: The United Nations is in effect a coalition government. We cannot take the Communists into a coalition government because, as the Senator said, if we take them into it they will try to destroy it. The only reason they would come in would be to sabotage and destroy it. Is that a basis for lack of confidence in the United Nations, because the Soviet Union is part of a world coalition government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, I do not think think there is a lack of confidence in the United Nations today. On the contrary, I should say that during the past 3 weeks the response which has come to the President's program has indicated a greater degree of confidence in the United Nations than I had ever supposed existed. In fact, I have found the United Nations embraced and glorified upon many occasions during the past 3 weeks by those who heretofore have had no use whatever for it. So I cannot accept the Senator's premise that there is a lack of confidence in the United Nations.

I shall try to answer the remainder of the Senator's question, which I think is a fair question. Frankly, the United Nations is not a government. It was not intended to be a government. It totally lacks the characteristics of a government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is it, then?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is an association of nations for a given set of purposes, those purposes being to sustain and further international peace and security, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. In the operation of the United Nations one of the functional difficulties which is constantly developing question marks in the popular mind, to which the Senator refers, is the Soviet use of the veto. So, in a degree, the thing to which I referred applies even to our relationships in the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why was there so much talk about surrendering sovereignty to the United Nations if the United Nations is not a government, and if it has none of the qualifications or qualities of a government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There was no surrender of sovereignty except on a voluntary basis. I do not think there is any surrender of sovereignty in the United Nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I had understood—and I think the President so stated—that the proposed aid to Greece was for the purpose of helping a free people. Does the Senator suggest for one moment that the Greeks are a free people?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The present Government of Greece, according to approximately 600 American observers, was chosen in an absolutely free election. To that extent I should say that it has credentials of popular support exceeding those of some other governments we might mention. Whether that election was preceded by terrorism on one side or the other which affected the result and caused certain factions from voting, I am unable to say. But certainly the monarchy is not a democracy in any such sense as we use the word, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That was the point I was about to suggest. Greece is a monarchy. In no particular is it a republic or a democracy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct. Greece is a monarchy. It is a self-chosen monarchy, at least on the record, and according to substantial testimony supporting the procedure which produced it. The fact remains that Greece is still an independent nation; and it is the independence of Greece, rather than the democracy of Greece, which is the sine qua non in this situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator has made a very good case for the obligation of this country to use its influence, and if necessary, its power, to preserve the independence and protect the security of Turkey and Greece. I assume the Senator would extend that principle to other nations and other peoples as well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I would extend it completely to Soviet peoples.

Mr. PEPPER. And to other peoples as well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if he does not think it is an arguable question, about which there may be an honest difference of opinion, as to whether the method which is here proposed is the most desirable method for the United States to employ in the execution of such a policy and in the discharge of such an obligation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have discovered that it is an arguable thesis.

Mr. PEPPER. The thing which I should like to have the Senator acknowledge is the fact that there may be some justification for difference of opinion on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator and say categorically "Yes." I repeat that no man has a right to be dogmatic on this subject.

Mr. PEPPER. That is characteristic of the fair attitude of the able Senator from Michigan.

There are two categories of action which might justify the concern of a great many people. One involves the question as to what we should do at an international conference, for example, where the question of the control of the Dardanelles is at issue, what we should do as a friend of Turkey if pressure were to be exerted against the security and independence of Turkey and we were called upon to express an opinion or take a position as a nation upon that question.

In quite another category is the question of what we should do, as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, if Turkey were attacked by Russia or any other nation. We might be called upon to go to the aid of other nations. It seems to me that the second category involves entirely different tactics. In this case it is proposed that we start in the first instance by sending a military mission to Turkey and contributing $100,000,000 in the next 15 months for the equipment, training, and maintenance of the Turkish Army in Turkey.

My point is this: Cannot the Senator see that Senators might conscientiously feel that we might well exhaust everything that could be done in the first category before resorting to a precedent which many consider dangerous, namely, for the first time sending a military mission to Turkey and putting up $100,000,000 in 15 months, without knowing whether or not we shall have to put up more hereafter, to equip, train, and maintain a Turkish army in Turkey?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I recognize the difference in the categories to which the Senator refers. All I can do is to repeat what I said when I presented the report in the first instance. I think there is a crying, fundamental need for Washington and Moscow to confront each other with all the cards face-up on the table with respect to all the various points of divergence and controversy. Where I differ with the Senator is that I think the procedure to which we here commit ourselves, far from interfering with that sort of a show-down, infinitely encourages the kind of a result which ought to come from it if the result is to be of any advantage, because otherwise I fear the Politburo in Moscow would misunderstand, as it has so often in the past, the extent to which we tenaciously adhere to some of our ideals and some of our designs. I think one of the prerequisites to a successful contact of the sort I am discussing is an understanding in Moscow that the days when we signed on dotted lines at war conferences have gone. I am not saying that we should not have done so, though God knows that when a man signs on the dotted line in a war conference it involves the possible loss of millions of American lives, nevertheless we signed on dotted lines at con-

ferences. But until it is perfectly clear that we are no longer signing on dotted lines my point is that I think even our friends in Moscow could not misunderstand the necessity which would be involved in the agreement for which I pray.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, have we not been hearing it said for at least a year that we had already adopted, through the State Department and with the able assistance of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, a get-tough policy with Russia; that we were standing up at international conferences; that we actually stood up, as it were, on the matter of the Dardanelles; that we had given notice to Russia that we would not acquiesce in her pressing for exclusive control of these countries, or even for control of the Black Sea powers and the Dardanelles; and have we not been sending battleships, or at least cruisers and destroyers, there which may be there now? And did we not send the carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* there and let the planes meet in the sky during the time of the Greek election; and have not all those manifestations been made by us as a nation in the exercise of our own sovereignty to indicate that we were standing up for principles? Can we not in the United Nations, can we not in our international councils, and can we not as a nation in the discharge of our own obligations stand up for principle and for the security of these countries without resorting to the precedent of sending a military mission, which we have never done before, to Turkey, to train, equip, and maintain an army in Turkey, 4,000 miles from the United States of America?

That is the serious question with which many of us are troubled. Can we not accomplish it in some other way, without adopting this dangerous precedent which from now on will give the Soviet Union practical justification to do the same thing in any nation in the world, including South America, if she should choose to do so?

One last question to add to that. Suppose, Mr. President, that a little while ago, when Peron, the President of Argentina, was shouting against Yankee imperialism and contending against the United States in Argentina's domestic election, he had indicated that he was receiving Russian assistance; suppose Russia had sent a military mission over there and said, "We will send you some military equipment and will show you how to use it and we will provide $100,000,000 for the next 15 months to maintain an Argentine Army to protect you in your fear against Yankee imperialism." What would we have said about that? If we do this, how can we say that Russia will be doing anything more wrong than we are doing if she does the same thing in some other nation of the world?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; that is the end.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Wait a minute. I have the encyclopedia to answer first.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know of a Webster's unabridged dictionary that would be more capable of responding to the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The fundamental difference between the able Senator from Florida and myself in this particular situation in which we find ourselves is a very simple one. The Government of Greece has said to us, "Except as we can have your aid, not only your economic aid but your aid to strengthen our resources in the defense of lawful peace, except as we can have these things promptly, immediately, there is little or no hope for us to maintain our independence."

In my opinion, which evidently differs from that of the Senator from Florida, the downfall of Greece under existing circumstances would expand the satellite movement of communism to a point where it would outflank Turkey and inevitably produce the same result in Turkey; and having been produced in Turkey, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, it would be an almost irresistible chain reaction across areas of the earth which would finally bring us into an exposure and a hazard which we had far better confront in its incipience at this point than to wait for its accumulation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the Senator finishes——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not like to filibuster this bill, Mr. President. I rose about 2 hours ago to keep the record straight with respect to one or two things that had been said by previous speakers. My sincere feeling is that whatever the Senate intends to do about this matter, we ought to be about the business of doing it, because if our answer is "yes," the sooner the world knows that the answer is "yes," the less hazardous it will be for us. If our answer is "no," whatever chance Greece has to live to recoup in other directions will be the greater the sooner she has that answer. So I should like to proceed, if possible, with some progress on the bill itself this afternoon, and I am wondering whether as a reward for this rather prolonged catechism I could get a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the pending amendment in 10 minutes. I make that request, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall be glad to help the Senator all I can to reach an early disposition of the pending measure. I think we ought to dispose of it at the earliest possible time. But when the Senator says—quite good naturedly, of course, and I do not think he really meant it—that the time consumed in answering the questions which have been propounded is in the nature of a filibuster——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not say there was a filibuster.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Michigan said he did not want a filibuster.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator said he did not want a filibuster, and therefore he did not want to answer any more questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator will not take any of my sins unto himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not complaining. I simply want to observe that when there are so many questions the Senate has not finished its job yet. Until all the questions are resolved and until everyone is satisfied, I think the discussion should proceed. We speak of free speech in this body, and certainly we should go ahead with the discussion of this measure until all Members of the Senate have finished the debate and until all questions are answered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado does not complain of any efforts I have made to limit considerations; does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no; except the Senator from Michigan just asked unanimous consent that the Senate vote within ten minutes on the pending amendments. I thought he made that proposal jokingly, but then he followed it with what I thought was a serious request.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado would not blame me for trying; would he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but I was going to suggest to the Senator from Michigan that I myself would like to make a unanimous request that the Senate vote on this question at 5 o'clock on Monday.

However, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] who had to leave the floor of the Senate a few moments ago, asked me whether I would object to a unanimous-consent proposal to have the Senate vote this afternoon; and I agreed to it. Until the Senator from North Dakota is present, I would not wish even so much as to suggest the unanimous-consent agreement which I had in mind; namely, to have the Senate vote at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon on the bill and on all amendments pertaining thereto.

But for the reasons I have already stated, I must object to the unanimous-consent request that has been made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not desire to live up to the observation made by the Senator from Michigan; namely, that the Senator from Nebraska is never finished. I am not on my feet for that purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator from Nebraska understood me.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not mean he is never terminated; I meant he is never plowed under.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the theory that I am never plowed under, and without attempting to keep the Senator from Michigan on his feet much longer, I should like to ask several questions, if he will answer them.

First, what military equipment does the Senator from Michigan believe we can learn, from the report or elsewhere,

will be shipped to Greece for the purpose of reestablishing the peace that is needed there, and also what military equipment will go to Turkey? As I understand, $300,000,000 of the $400,000,000 will be set aside for both Greece and Turkey for military purposes. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so, that is approximately correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know whether any tanks are to be shipped to those countries or whether any heavy artillery is to be shipped to them. In short, what will be required to reestablish the peace which we are told we are going to have in Greece?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to wait for a few moments. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan know from the record and the report the answers to the questions I have asked?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the first thing I wish to say, in answering, is in respect to naval equipment, because I distinctly remember the answer in that respect. The answer is that the naval equipment will largely consist of mine sweepers, for the purpose of clearing harbors.

So far as the military phase is concerned, the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has a keener mind on that phase of the matter than I have, probably could give the Senator from Nebraska a better answer than I could; and, accordingly, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, insofar as Greece is concerned, I think I am correct in stating that it is not planned to send any weapons larger than infantry mortars. I do not think it is planned to send any tanks. Most of the military supply will be signal equipment, such as walkie-talkie sets and other forms of radio. Such equipment is the most difficult kind to learn to handle, and consequently most of the instruction which will be given will be in the operation of such signal and communications sets.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that I read the speech he made, even though I did not have an opportunity to hear it. I also read the colloquy in which he engaged with the Senator from Illinois, which is a restatement of the matter. But what would happen if the emergency required more than that? Does the pending measure contain any limitation which would prevent our sending heavier equipment to Greece?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator refer to the type of equipment?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Does the bill provide any limitation as to the kind of military equipment which would be shipped to Greece or Turkey?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think there is any limitation as to the character of the equipment.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct. So we may assume that the first $150,000,000 for Greece or the first $150,000,000 for Turkey might be used to provide any equipment that was required to establish peace. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Up to that amount of money.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; up to that amount of money, or up to equipment of that much value.

Mr. LODGE. But I imagine that most of the money which is to be provided under the bill will be largely accounted for by the equipment which it is planned to send. For instance, in the case of Turkey it is planned to send equipment to rebuild the ports and the roads and the railroads and other communications, and I imagine that work will take a great deal of the funds to be allocated under this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I should like to ask the Senator what equipment is to be sent to Turkey.

Mr. LODGE. As I have just said, it is planned to send there equipment to rebuild the ports, docks, roads, and communications facilities, such as telephones and telegraph, and some surplus weapons, such as antiaircraft guns, and perhaps some obsolete airplanes. The list is not entirely firm yet.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me where I can get a break-down of the equipment which is to be sent, and where such a break-down is to be found in the report?

Mr. LODGE. That matter has not been broken down any more definitely in the report than I have stated to the Senator just now, because the list is not yet absolutely firm. It is subject to change in the future.

I am merely telling the distinguished Senator what the present intention is. Of course, the War Department or the Navy Department would have the right and, in fact, the duty to change the items on the list if circumstances made it seem advisable to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator; that is exactly my interpretation of the matter. In other words, there is no limitation as to what equipment may be sent into either country. That is the point on which I am seeking information.

Mr. LODGE. There is a distinct limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; there is the $150,000,000 limitation on the first installment.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is the limitation; and I think we can assume that only weapons which are surplus or obsolete will be sent there. I do not assume that our Army or Navy will send any equipment which is scarce or in short supply in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the questions which has been bothering me ever since I have been trying to make up my mind about this initial loan.

Mr. President, not only do I substantiate the words of the Senator from Iowa, who rose to his feet this afternoon and said, "I want to do what is right in this matter, but certainly the report is devoid of facts," but I wish to say that we cannot learn the facts from the report which is before us. What the military implications are, I do not know.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan has made a very fine speech, in his inimitable style, relative to what the price will be if we do not intervene. But I wish to state that when we boil it down, all we have is a guess as to what will be the price if we go the other way. We are entitled to know what that price will be.

Mr. LODGE. I am trying to ascertain what the able Senator has in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. In the first place, I begin with the point that the mission proposed is a military mission, and that it is proposed that we send there, not only equipment, but also provision for the training of soldiers. While the theoretical purpose is the establishment of peace in Greece, yet there is no limitation as to how far we might go in establishing peace in either Greece or Turkey.

Mr. LODGE. Nevertheless, there is a money limitation. I wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska, because I think he is asking a very interesting and valuable line of questions, that the bill does provide a money limit as to the amount of equipment and kind of equipment that can be sent. Of course, we might wish to go beyond that; but if we do, we shall have to have further information before we make an additional authorization. I do not see what the significance is as between sending 50 rifles on the one hand or 1 light tank on the other. I do not see what the importance of that is.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Massachusetts like me to make an observation or state a premise?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I would.

Mr. WHERRY. Because I should like to understand the viewpoint of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has been over there, and I myself have been there, and we have seen the situation fairly well, I think. Let me tell the Senator what my apprehension is. We are told, first, that what is contemplated is a relief loan, in the sense that it will provide security for Greece. The details were explained. It was said it was a sort of WPA, so far as relief was concerned, that we are to have an agricultural program, to plant trees, and all that sort of thing. I can understand that. But when we boil it down, out of the $400,000,000, $300,000,000 is set aside for military purposes. When we get to the point of making up our minds as to what the price might be, what the Senator from Nevada suggested this afternoon may happen, that is, that we go in there to establish peace, and come to the place where we cannot stop, or, if we stop, then we are lost. I should like to have the Senator tell me whether there is any limit in the bill to what is contained in the title or the whereases, or is it the beginning of a military operation in Greece and Turkey which might lead us into war, and if it is, I should like to ask the Senator what the impact will be then?

Mr. LODGE. Let me reply to the Senator, first of all, by saying that I quite agree with him that what is proposed is not another WPA, and those who depicted it as being another WPA were not being frank. It is not that kind of a proposition at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Such a characterization does not include the presentation I made of the bill, because if anyone ever was frank in saying to the Sen-

ate that it was not a suggestion for a WPA it was I when I presented the bill.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has been completely honorable and frank about it from the beginning.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to imply that the distinguished Senator from Michigan would state that it was a WPA bill. I did not have him in mind. But it has been mentioned as a great, glorified WPA project in Greece. I agree that it is not that at all.

Mr. LODGE. It is not that at all. I have been searching my mind for some weeks to find an adjective that would describe it. It contains some relief features, some economic features, some political features, some more or less military features. If I wanted to put it in one word, I would say it was a strategic proposition.

Mr. WHERRY. Strategic from a military point of view?

Mr. LODGE. From a diplomatic point of view. We cannot divide those things up into watertight compartments, any more than we can take a knife and cut a pail of water in two. The diplomatic, the financial, the political, all merge in together, and if they do not, we have not something which has any vigor to it. My belief is that a step of this kind is a step toward peace and away from war. That is my belief.

In answer to the Senator's principal question, I cannot read the future any better than can anyone else. Of course, we wish we could gaze into the crystal ball and know exactly what will be confronting us here a year from now, but we cannot do it. But with what vision God gives me, I can say that I think this is a sound step to take.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further, if he would care to make one more observation?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the equipment we send, and the military aid we give, should involve an open conflict, then what would the result be?

Mr. LODGE. There is nothing we are sending, either to Greece or to Turkey—and this is my own opinion—and there is nothing we can send either to Greece or Turkey, which will put them in such a position that they can undertake offensive international combat action on a large and effective scale, because the population just is not there. I cannot conceive of anything we could do which would put either of those two countries in a position to take a military offensive. The most we could do—and we are getting very far afield in this discussion, but we are trying to examine all the approaches—the most we could do would be to put those countries in a position to resist aggression. I do not see how we could ever put them on such a footing that they could undertake an attack.

Mr. WHERRY. How will we be involved if we put them on a footing to resist aggression, or oppression—"Communist aggression" is the President's phrase, I think—with no limit in the bill except——

Mr. LODGE. Except dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. Except an initial limit on the amount of dollars, and we can easily increase that if we need to, because the President says if the necessity arises he will come to Congress for more authority. I am seeking information, which I cannot get from the report. The facts are not in the report. But I ask the Senator, as a military expert, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if we do not stop the aggression, will we in any way be caught in the entanglement of an open war with Russia? If we are, what will be the implications then?

Mr. LODGE. It is not my belief that the proposal will lead in that direction. I should certainly be very much opposed to that. That is not the type of question the answer to which one can find in a report. The question is a very searching and important one, but it is also such a transcendental question one cannot find the answer to it in a report. I certainly cannot see anything in the proposal before us that is going to put us into an aggressive or offensive posture.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. By the way, I appreciate being called a military expert, but I am not that at all. I am merely another humble worker in the vineyard.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the service the distinguished Senator rendered in the World War, and I was greatly pleased to meet him over there and talk with him when he was in the service. I value his judgment.

Mr. LODGE. And I am pleased to meet the Senator from Nebraska here, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but I hesitate to ask him because now he is apparently worn out by the questions already asked him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Hardly that, but I did not think it was necessary for me to walk sentry post in this dialogue.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan the significance of the time element. I have heard it said many times by the distinguished Senator that we have to have this done by March 31, and here it is the middle of April. By the time we get through with it and get it to the House probably another month will have passed. I have tried to expedite this matter. I think the Senator will agree with me that we want to bring this bill to a vote. But I should like to ask what the Senator meant when he said he would like to have the bill passed now, at the most favorable time. What is the significance of the time element in the passing of the bill?

Before the Senator answers, if he does not mind, permit me to make an observation. I have been a Member of the Senate for 4½ years, the Senator has been a Member for nearly 20, four or five times as long. Certainly since I have been in the Senate there has been one emergency after another. The cry has been, "We have to do this, and we have to do it now. We cannot wait 5 minutes. We have to pass it."

I want to uphold the hands of the President. If it is a question of doing that, and if that is the only significance there is to the request for speed, I should like to know it. Otherwise, I should like to know what the time element means. Personally, I think the question before us is so large, and that the implications that might involve us are so great, that we should have plenty of time for consideration. There should be sufficient debate to enable the people of the country to know what we are going into if we vote this initial $400,000,000.

I say that, not as being prejudiced in any way; I am still open-minded. I am still searching for light on the question. That is why I am asking the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the question?

Mr. WHERRY. What is the significance of the time limit, why do we have to act now? I think the Senator's words were that we should have the bill taken up in the Senate at the most favorable time. What is the emergency?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator is just as well advised on that subject as I am, because he has listened to all the presentations, and he has read the report.

On the 31st of March the Greek Government ceased to enjoy the support which it had previously received from the British Empire, under a relationship which was inherited by the British Empire as its share of postwar liquidation in that area. The Government of Greece requested assistance as of March 31. The President of the United States presented the matter on March 12. A month has gone by. During that month, so far as any experience of mine is concerned, the Committee on Foreign Relations has gone to greater length to try to produce information for Senators than ever before in connection with any bill that was ever submitted. I do not need to tell the Senator that, now that the situation is laid before the country and the world, the longer uncertainty exists respecting the answer the greater becomes the complication. That follows just as that two and two make four. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will yield, he has said that the purpose of this loan or gift, whatever it may be, is to stop aggression. May I ask what "aggression" is? It seems to me it means soldiers.

Mr. LODGE. There is such a thing as subversive war. There is the open and declared war, involving the use of soldiers, and then there is subversive war, which is the ideological struggle, which can be carried on so successfully that the Nation that wins it puts its opponent in a position where it could not wage armed warfare even if it wanted to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. That is merely my personal view.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, for the purpose of obtaining his opinion, I should like to read two paragraphs from Kiplinger Washington Agency letter of Saturday, April 12. I should be very happy to have

the Senator comment on the following announcement:

Greece and Turkey, a little slow in Congress, but still sure.

Then Korea, six hundred millions—on the heels of Greece and Turkey.

Then will break the real story of United States intentions on world aid.

The real story is this:

Moscow Big Four meeting has already flopped—simply cannot agree on German reparations. Russia does not want treaty with Germany now.

Russia figures on collapse of Britain, France, Italy, Germany, on economic and political crack-up of all these nations—most of Europe.

Russia figures that the United States will also crack up economically, and will be forced to withdraw aid from Europe, leaving Russia free.

Time, within 2 years—as the Russians see it.

So our State Department is working feverishly on a big-scale plan for an economic-diplomatic offensive going right up to Russia's borders, even to Hungary and Rumania. They are close to famine, only United States can help. The plan is to send food and supplies and go in and supervise distribution. Thus, face Russians at their front door with food, relief, diplomacy.

This means a huge sum of money for economic relief of the world, including Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, China, and others. Object is to prevent them from cracking up—keep Russia from moving in.

Amount, ten to fifteen billions, preliminary estimate, next 2 years. Get it out of the Treasury, although officials are working on methods of covering up the appearance of deficit to make the aid seem sweeter.

Why hasn't this been announced? Becaues State Department, as usual, is afraid of public opinion. And because the President is undecided on whether to let it trickle out at retail, as on Greece, Turkey, Korea, or to let the public have it at wholesale, in one piece, a big gulp. At present he seems to think Congress might swallow it better piecemeal. Nevertheless, the facts are as we report them, and will be coming along.

That is signed by Mr. Kiplinger. I should like to have an expression of the Senator's opinion on that outlook.

Mr. LODGE. That is a rather long statement, and I do not know whether it is accurate or not. I am not privy to the secret councils where our foreign policy is decided, but I can comment just the way any other Senator can comment, and to say, first of all, that I hope the leaders in this body will be privy to these decisions, that they will be consulted, and that we shall not be put on the horns of the dilemma where all we can do is choose between the lesser of different evils, after having been left out—the lesser of two evils, or possibly it might be the lesser of three or four evils. I do not think we should be put in that position. I hope we are not going to be taken by surprise. I hope we are going to be smart. I hope we are going to be intelligent. I hope we are going to be strong—and I hope we are going to anticipate some of these things. I hope we are not going to throw good money after bad. I hope we are not going to throw money down a rat hole, and I hope that when we spend so much, that we will try to get something permanent and something basic in the way of progress and in the way of improvement.

I do not call that imperialism. I think the talk about the United States being aggressive with its relief is complete nonsense. One is not aggressive with something that is good; he is aggressive with something that is destructive. If we can, by the so-called aggressiveness of which Kiplinger speaks, bring back Europe and give her people some chance, some hope, and a few of the decent things of life, so that they can once again be self-supporting, I would not call that imperialism. I should call that Christianity—and I do not apologize for it at all. If we can make that kind of expenditure and get those people back on their feet so that they can furnish a market for our goods, and so that some day they may be able to pay it back, I do not think that is a bad type of expenditure.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is information available, or has it been made available to any Senator, so far as the Senator knows, as to what plans the State Department has?

Mr. LODGE. I have heard nothing official about far-reaching plans in the future. I read an article in the newspapers somewhat similar to what the Senator from Nevada just read to me. In Europe, for instance, we have gone ahead and restored the old crazy quilt of little independent squabbling nations; we have rebuilt the old firetrap, the old tenement house that has caught fire twice already since 1914. It stands to reason that there is no hope at all for Europe, unless we get some kind of integration. It stands to reason we cannot afford to let Europe, as a matter of humanitarianism or as a matter of realistic self-interest, go to the dogs, and so it is simply a question of whether we are going to bail them out with a lot of expensive last-minute rescue parties, or whether we are going to try to use our good offices to develop some kind of integration over there that will make some sense, and that will make possible the lifting of the political and military pressures that oppress them at this time. Then, and only then, will it be possible for them to achieve some degree of rehabilitation of their economic life.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. We have had two wars, and the Senator and I have each served in one; so it is nothing new to us. We probably would go again if it became necessary. It is my considered opinion that, since we have backed into two World Wars in the last generation, with little, if any, factual information, if we are now confronting a situation which might again lead to war, the American people should be given the facts so they will know the direction in which we are traveling. I have been listening here for 2 or 3 days to speeches. I believe one could look up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1939 and change the names and the dates and the places, and as applying to the present situation, substitute the speeches then made, to the effect that there shall never be anything done other than loaning a little money.

I made only one promise to my people. That was that until I understood a bill pending before the Senate and until sufficient information was furnished to the public so they could understand it, I would either not vote on it or vote against it. I have not yet made up my mind on the pending bill, and I shall not make it up until I have to, unless such information becomes available.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to comment on one phase of the figures submitted by the able Senator from Nevada. We are constantly hearing the statement made that "if we go into the Greco-Turkish program, the next thing we know we will have to go into Korea." I think it ought to be made perfectly plain that there is an unescapable obligation in Korea which is totally unrelated to the question we are here discussing, and which we shall confront regardless of what we do in Greece and Turkey, because we are occupying the southern half of Korea and are responsible to the Allies, not only for the occupation but for the development of an internal situation in Korea which will permit us to retire and get out.

We have precisely the same responsibility in southern Korea that we have in the American zone of occupation in Germany, and I should like to make it very plain that, yes, there will have to be a Korean program, as there has to be a program in the American zone of occupation in Germany. But in neither instance is there any connection with the general program to which the Senator refers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. My question is not directed so much to the details, because I myself am convinced, after listening to the debate, that we cannot and will never know all the details surrounding this proposition. I can say for myself that I intend to vote for the bill. There have been addressed to me, and I know to other Members of this body, by persons outside this body, questions on certain fundamental matters which have been asked and answered again and again, but I heard the Senator's speech made the other day, which was directed more to the military side, and if it is possible I should like to obtain his views upon what I think are some of the fundamental questions involved in this issue.

First, respecting the reason why we should take this action now in a way which seems inconsistent with our commitments in the United Nations. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts that this proposal fundamentally and essentially is a matter of self-interest, a matter of the security of this country based upon the idea that any war between any of the great nations would ultimately involve this Nation?

Mr. LODGE. I think this matter clearly involves the security of the United States. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask if, in the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, any policy could lead more directly and surely to war in which we would be involved than a continued aggression by

one of the members of the United Nations—a continued policy of aggression?

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator restate the question?

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator if he knows of any course of action which would more surely lead to war and more surely involve this country in war than continued, active aggression toward and coercion of other countries by one of the members of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. The only thing that could lead us to it more quickly than that would be for us to give in to the aggression of other nations the minute it started. I think that would be a sure way to cause trouble.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, another important question which has been asked all of us, and it has been voiced again and again, is concerning the method which is now being proposed. I can say frankly that if I could believe that the aggression could be stopped by action of the United Nations I do not see how we could vote for the pending proposal. I wish to ask the Senator if upon the basis of the evidence we have had during the last 2 years respecting Russia's attitude toward us he believes that the continued aggression and coercion can be stopped now by the action of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my personal view—and I am not an expert at all—is that the United Nations was not set up to deal with situations of this character, and that it would be taxing that organization unfairly, getting it off to a very bad start, if we sought to impose upon it functions which are clearly beyond its present power to discharge. I want to build up the United Nations and I want to make it do the things it can do just as fast as it can do them, but I do not want to swamp it, and I do not believe that this is a situation which can be dealt with by the United Nations at the present time. But I am hopeful that the action contemplated here will have some effect in lifting these military pressures and making some modicum of the good life possible for the people of the world.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question. The fear has been expressed here again and again that by adopting this measure we shall pursue a new course which some believe is without the United Nations, and I say again that it is my opinion and belief that we cannot achieve peace by any continued unilateral action but only through organization for collective security. I wish to ask the Senator if in his opinion this act of ours, which we could construe to be in the spirit of the purposes of the United Nations, could have the effect of bringing other members of the United Nations, and particularly Russia, to a more active and consistent participation in the United Nations itself, with good will and in good faith.

Mr. LODGE. I should hope that that would be the case. I do not consider that this bill, as it has been amended by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, consitutes unilateral action. I think his amendment shows the deference which we have towards the United Nations, and it would be my hope, as the Senator from Kentucky says, that this action would lead eventually to more active participation in the United Nations by other nations.

Mr. COOPER. As I gather, then, it is the Senator's feeling that the entire spirit of this movement is eventually to bring about a more active participation in good will and with good faith by the members of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. I think if the Senator had heard the discussion in the Foreign Relations Commitee he would not have had any doubt at all of the strong desire of everyone to keep faith with the United Nations and the belief which I think animated everyone that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan accomplished that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to announce to the Members of the Senate that there will be a night session tonight, and, replying to the request of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that if the bill is not disposed of by tomorrow at 5 o'clock we will have a night session Thursday night. So Senators should take cognizance of that announcement and be prepared to be in session tomorrow night in the event the bill has not been passed before that time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I find myself unable, in good conscience, to vote for the Greek-Turkish program proposed by the President before the Joint Session of the Congress on March 12, 1947. Respect for the able and distinguished persons who are urging support of the President's proposal leads me to state the reasons that have brought me to this conclusion:

These reasons are:

First. The United Nations should be given an opportunity to function.

Second. The plan is primarily military, rather than humanitarian.

Third. Good-will of nations and peoples cannot be bought.

Fourth. Our first duty is to make democracy work at home.

Since much of the ground has been covered already in this debate, I shall try to be as brief as possible.

My first reason is that the United Nations should be given an opportunity to function.

We should work through the United Nations in solving our international problems. Only in the event the United Nations declines or fails to act should we act alone.

There is abundant evidence to indicate that a majority of our people, in approaching this problem, believe, first, that the impact of the airplane, atomic energy, and other modern inventions upon our way of life cannot be ignored; and, second, that Russian aggression must be stopped. I agree fully. I also believe that the solution which upon mature thought will appeal to our people as wise and logical, is first to use the agency of the United Nations. It has been set up to deal with just such problems as this. The United States, in becoming a signatory to the contract, agreed to rely upon it in just such cases as this. In section 1 of article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. Austin reports progress toward establishing the police force or "peace force", as he calls it. Such help as it needs by way of military force should be forthcoming from its constituent members.

Some of the strongest advocates of the President's program have admitted publicly that it is unfortunate that the President did not even so much as notify the United Nations before appealing to Congress to deal with this problem. From my point of view, this failure is a fatal error, which is not corrected by an amendment, thought of afterward by the proponents of the plan, providing that if the United Nations ask us to cease and desist, we shall do so. The sound course is to start all over again, bring the matter to the attention of the United Nations, and then to have the courage, the patience, and the faith to believe that our hopes and aspirations in creating the United Nations have not been in vain.

The other day a veteran of 4 years with the 34th Infantry Division and considerable combat experience, wrote me:

> We fought for an ideal in World War II, and if the leaders of this country cannot keep peace after this last war they will not be able to do it after another. In short, we would be continually fighting because the so-called leaders of our country cannot settle a problem any other way.

I hope that this bill will not be pushed to a hasty passage. I cannot escape the feeling that before this momentous question is decided by the Congress a real opportunity should be given the American people to express themselves, and particularly should we hear more generally from the young men and young women of America, to whom the decision means so much.

My second reason is that the plan is primarily military rather than humanitarian.

The President's plan, in its bare essentials, is based upon the use of such military force as may be required to stop Russian aggression. In my judgment the so-called Greek loan is mere window dressing, mere camouflage. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] says that this plan involves strategy. Mr. President, when we talk in terms of strategy, in my book we talk in terms of military strategy. The essential crux of the plan is military support of Turkey, with the grand strategy of stopping the Russians at the Dardanelles. This involves an extension of our military frontier to the Dardanelles, to be held by American blood if necessary. This momentous decision should not be presented to the American people or decided by them under the guise of a loan to Greece and Turkey.

The President's plan to be successful cannot stop at the Dardanelles, but must be extended around the whole circumference of the Soviet Union, into Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Balkan States, Iran, Iraq, India, China, and Korea. If we dam the Soviet in one place and do not give it any attention at others, what do we gain?

As has been suggested today, the plan is being presented to us piecemeal. Are we to be asked later to "stop communism" in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries pervaded by it? If not, why not? The plan cannot be successful without the use and backing of strong military force. Twice in our generation our country has been involved in war. In each case the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals; the first time to make the world safe for democracy; the second time to realize the "four freedoms." In neither case have they seen these ideals accomplished. We lost men. We exhausted irreplaceable natural resources. We created conditions which have caused dissension and doubt on the part of many of our people concerning the very foundations of our Government and our way of life. The investment, which according to the President we have made in world freedom and world peace, has not yet begun to yield returns. We have drunk the cup of war to the bitter dregs, and we want no more of it.

It is said that "Russia is not ready for war." Perhaps she is not; probably she is not ready now. But we are asked to make commitments on Russia's doorstep that may prove very embarrassing to us in a few years when Russia is ready and perchance we are not. Are our young men to go out to fight another Crimean War? If they do, will they or will they not have the help of the British, already enmeshed in socialism? Let us turn back and think carefully before we go in too far.

The President's program is a venture in power politics. The American people are being asked to supply the venture capital now, and the manpower later, when and as required. There is abundant evidence that the plan has not been carefully thought out. It is the quarterback technique already familiar to our people. It would seem from the answers submitted by the Department of State to questions that the President will call the signals without knowing, when one play is made, what the next is to be. Instead of a carefully thought out course in which each move is anticipated and planned in advance, we have a hit-or-miss affair, hastily contrived, with the British holding a stop watch, and threatening to pull the stopper if we do not act by a date they themselves have set.

My third reason is that good will of nations and peoples cannot be bought.

We have tried again and again in the past to buy good will and support of foreign nations, but each time it has proved to be a blunder. Has the President forgotten our experience? Has he forgotten that whenever we have practiced this system it has made for us something less than friends?

When Russia was a brother in arms we supplied $50,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease to other nations. Russia was given $11,300,000,000 during the war, and $232,000,000 after VJ-day. We have sent six separate notes to Russia asking for a discussion about repayment. After being prodded six times, Russia has finally indicated a willingness to discuss the matter. We supplied her satellite nations as follows: Poland, over $16,000,000; Yugoslavia, $32,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $619,000. Can we count them as our friends?

How about China, to whom we sent $1,500,000,000 during the war and $747,000,000 since VJ-day? Or France, who owes us $430,000,000 for goods shipped since the war's end? Have these gifts served their purpose and gained the desired results?

When we agreed to pay over 70 percent of the expenses of the UNRRA, some of us thought that we would not be called upon for these extras. This expense added to the aid given by private agencies comes to over $3,000,000,000.

It seems that even our worst enemies would acknowledge we have done our share, but the above is not all, because through the Export-Import Bank we supplied other billions in credit authorization to 20 nations in Europe, 20 countries of Latin America, and 8 Asiatic nations. No nation in recorded history has ever been so liberal with money and goods. And for our generosity, how have we been repaid? Is Uncle Sam held in either affectionate regard or grateful respect?

Turkey not only prospered from the war, but became a rich country, richer than ever in its history, but now Turkey, falling in line, asks us for $100,000,000.

Our experience has not been unique. Britain and France for many years played the role of Santa Claus, trying to buy and keep the friendship of these very countries. Each is now ready to acknowledge her lack of success. Can we afford to give European nations the impression that we are ready and willing to put up further and unlimited sums "to stop communism"? I am convinced that we do not have enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole world, and that if we attempt to do so we shall only succeed in reducing ourselves to the level of those that we are trying to help.

My fourth reason is our first duty is to make democracy work at home.

The most important thing before America now is to make democracy work at home, restore industrial peace, stamp out communism—within our own borders and in our own Government—balance our budget, reduce taxes, and put our economy on a sound basis. We are strong today only in comparison with the weakness of the rest of the world. The greatest contribution the United States can make to the world is to rebuild her own strength so that she can remain, as she is today, the bulwark of free government. We have more pressing measures at home than on the Dardanelles. Let us look the economic facts squarely in the face. In view of our swollen indebtedness and with the war boom over, is it within our ability to implement the Truman doctrine? According to the current number of World Report, April 15, 1947, if the President's present program is carried to the logical end, $21,000,000,000 would be committed in loans and grants in the next 3 years. These estimates are said to be on the basis of what actually will be disbursed each year.

There is already evidence that our economy is beginning to show the effect of strain. The President has noted the widespread complaint in regard to high prices. He has failed to tell the American people that one of the principal reasons for these high prices is the fact that goods and commodities have been purchased in this country in such large quantities by the Government and sent abroad. The Truman doctrine involves not only the money Congress is asked to appropriate now; it involves the prices on everything we eat, and wear, and use in our daily living for years to come. The Truman doctrine offers no prospect of tax reduction. Will we be serving the cause of humanity if, in an attempt to extend free institutions throughout the world, we jeopardize our own?

For these reasons, I support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I shall vote against Senate bill 938 on final passage.

To summarize, my reasons are fourfold:

First, the United Nations should be given an opportunity to function first.

Second, the plan presented by the President is primarily military rather than humanitarian;

Third, the good-will of nations and peoples cannot be bought, as has been abundantly shown by our own experience; and

Fourth, it is our first duty to make democracy work at home.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, did you ever feel impelled to say something about a big subject only to find that words to do justice to the real importance and significance of the subject just would not come? I feel like that now, Mr. President, as I venture my estimate of the situation involved in the administration's request to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey.

It is my intention, Mr. President, to support the bill before the Senate, but in doing so I want it known that there is little joy in my heart, no stars in my eyes, and few illusions in my head. I shall support, without apology or excuse, the President's program, not because I think it even approximates an answer to the problems, both foreign and domestic, which beset us, for this I plainly do not believe, but because the program was presented in such a way to the world that I cannot reject it, and because the program, from my point of view, possesses a measure of potential merit through which the United Nations may possibly become the instrument for effective force and leadership that its designers, and the faith of countless millions of human beings everywhere, intended it to be.

In his magnificent treatment of the problem the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred to the President's proposal as being a plan. He will not think me disrespectful when I refer to it as being at this time nothing more than a directive, an instrument which charges that a plan is to be drawn to achieve the mission set forth in the directive. A part of the plan, but possibly only a small part of the plan to be, is the requested emergency money, material, and manpower to be used and deployed in Greece and Turkey. This premise I believe to be sound, and if it is it ought to be emphasized, dramatized,

and spelled out to every American because of what the directive intends to fully accomplish and do.

The President laid down the directive in the speech he delivered to the Congress on March 12, 1947, a day and a speech I shall never forget. The President, who is primarily held responsible for the conduct of foreign relations said in part:

> It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. We must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. Our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes. I ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries. I recommend that authority be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel. If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before Congress. On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

Small wonder, then, Mr. President, that I see in this directive little to cause anyone to shout enthusiastically. All I can clearly see, however necessary, imperative or inevitable, is trouble and sacrifice and turmoil ahead.

The directive has a purpose and a beginning, beautiful and praiseworthy and to be desired, but it has no tangible shape or form or pattern or end. Only a plan can have these things, and there is no plan.

I talk like this, Mr. President, because I want to help our Nation to know what it is being asked to undertake. I want people to know that some of us resent the administration's urging us to move so fast into an unknown and uncharted and uncertain field. I want people to appreciate that it is one thing to write a directive, and quite another thing to carry it out. I want people to understand that they, and not their Government, are going to reap the benefits or the sorrows which result from the action being taken now. I want people to be conscious of the costs and sacrifices and burdens demanded by the program. Only by having these factors uppermost in our national awareness, can we hope, to my mind, for any appreciable degree of long-range success.

The so-called Truman policy frightens me, Mr. President, and for good cause. I cannot fully understand it, and I know of no Senator who fully understands it. We are told that the recommended assistance to Greece and Turkey will not set a precedent. Yet the President set forth very plainly that he would not hesitate to come before the Congress again if he needed additional funds or authority for the broad purposes set forth in his March 12 message to the joint session. I think every thinking American can foresee coming situations abroad which will demand, though they may not get, American money, material, and men. If we do not begin to think now about these possibilities, even probabilities, we shall be as totally unprepared for them as we were when the President let the Congress in on the Greek-Turkey secret for the first time, one short month ago.

While the President's speech included a directive, the substance and purpose of which we can understand and appreciate, it included one statement which I hold to be wholly, but not necessarily meaningly, misleading, and one which was calculated to minimize resistance and opposition. The President stated that the war having cost $341,000,000,000, he was asking the Congress for only one-tenth of 1 percent, or $400,000,000, as an investment for peace. Perhaps some others were as shocked and aroused as I was by the implications of this careless phrase. It implied (a) that we are only concerned with Greece and Turkey, (b) that we shall not be concerned with them beyond June of 1948, and (c) that the cost of war ended with VJ-day.

I trust that not a single American citizen will place any reliance or confidence in that statement. I hope every American is conscious of present-day facts; and if he is not, I trust that he will soon become thoroughly familiar with them.

In recent speeches the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have laid before this body and the country the commitments we have made overseas since VJ-day.

In the 2-year period from the war's end until June 30 of this year, the United States will have spent more than $16,000,000,000. Two-thirds of that fantastic peacetime sum of money has been loaned, and one-third of it has been given away. All of it has been employed to make peace certain. I know of no other reason for using abroad money and material which we could so usefully employ at home.

We very properly worry about high prices and inflation, but we are adding to these national ills by aiding those in distress across the seas. Yes; long before we ever were confronted with the Greek-Turkey crisis, we had been making a mighty investment for peace.

We hope to have much of the money advanced repaid to us, but history does not give us much encouragement in that respect.

Compared to what the United States has already spent and invested in peace, the requested $400,000,000 does not loom very large.

But we must remember that it is in addition to the more than $16,000,000,000 we already have invested overseas, and we must not forget that there are other peacemaking contributions in the offing.

House Joint Resolution 153 would authorize $350,000,000 to assist in completing the great task of providing relief from the ravages of war to the people of the liberated countries. Still another measure, Senate Joint Resolution 77, would provide for membership in the International Refugee Organization at a cost of $75,000,000. Add the $400,000,000 to the $350,000,000 to the $75,000,000, and we have $825,000,000 which the Congress has not yet agreed to subscribe.

If it is right to assume that these measures will pass, where do we go from the date of passage? Which foreign nations and which international problems must be taken care of next? Is there a line which is forming on the right? Or is there reason to believe that once having taken care of Greece and Turkey and a few other odds and ends we shall have no further call on our resources from abroad?

Mr. President, we have not the remotest idea of what lies ahead. We can only assume that we shall be confronted with one further request after another. I wonder whether each future request will be presented to the Congress as a "Crisis"? Can we have any assurance that it will not? I do not think we can. The President said that on the Greece-Turkey problem the executive and legislative branches must work together. I wonder what he meant? The Senate did not know anything about the problem until the President addressed the joint session of Congress. The Senator from Michigan said he knew nothing of the matter until the President called him to the White House on February 27th. The only problem before us is whether we shall vote the 400 million dollars. Unless we want to repudiate the prestige and honor of America, we must go along. I think that from the beginning we have had no other course to take.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator mean to say that he will vote for the pending measure simply because it has been put up to him on a crisis basis and on the basis that we have no other recourse? If that is the case, then if that procedure works this time, it will work at any time, and anything can be presented to the Senator as a crisis; and if that is the way to get everyone in line, it is evidently an excellent technique and will work all the time, because does not the Senator agree that from now on the crises will be more real and more urgent, after we once enter upon this undertaking?

Mr. CAIN. I can only say to the Senator from Idaho that in the remaining few minutes of these remarks I shall attempt to explain my position more thoroughly with respect to this crisis and the crises which lie ahead.

The President declared to the world by press and radio what he was going to do at the very instant when he was outlining the problem to the Congress. Russia, for example, knew as much about what the President had in mind as we did. Is this the course the President intends to follow in future cases? Let us fervently and vehemently hope not. Perhaps there are others like myself who will go along this time because we think worse trouble would result if we made America look foolish and divided in the eyes of the world by refusing the President's request. But that does not mean that we would go along next time, and the time after that. I do not think we would. But we might if the executive and the legislative begin now to map out and diagram

our international future. Problems of real magnitude do not spring up over night. They can be seen as they come up over the horizon, and they must be anticipated. If the President wants to work with Congress as the Congress wants to work with him, I think he had better begin to confer with the Congress long before another foreign loan or gift is requested.

Up to date Mr. President, there has been no bipartisan foreign policy except insofar as support of the United Nations and some peace treaties are concerned.

The Republicans know very little of what is going on in the State Department and in the office of the Executive.

For my part, I think that from now on we had better be given an opportunity to assist in fashioning a consistent foreign policy.

Despite the fact that the Presidential request before us will probably be granted, I feel that we have not been given a fair or intelligent chance to properly evaluate the scores of factors involved.

At the outset of these remarks I suggested that I would vote for the bill because it might help to breathe real life and effective force into the United Nations. Perhaps the wish is father to the thought.

I have the conviction that the United States, regardless of our strength and greatness, cannot long pursue the Truman directive without assuming obligations beyond our capacity to bear.

We cannot buy freedom for others, nor liquidate communism abroad with mere dollars; even though we had a million times more than we have. If we are going to make the attempt by ourselves we shall help others a little, but only temporarily, and then we shall as a Nation, be insolvent with no place to turn. That would be the great American tragedy. Our greatest hope for the future lies through the United Nations. What it cannot do today—as, for example it cannot help Greece and Turkey—it must be prepared to do tomorrow, if any of us are to benefit from our tomorrows.

If we recognize that our immediate obligation is to Greece and Turkey, but that our fundamental and continuing obligation is to the United Nations, we shall do everything within our power in coming months to make of the United Nations an organization which is capable and prepared to assume a score of Greek-Turkish problems. We must hurry, Mr. President, in trying to make this objective come true. We have no time to lose if we are to save civilization.

The Vandenberg amendment encourages the United Nations to assume our Greek-Turkey obligations at the earliest moment. The stage is set for a rebirth of action and positive conduct within the United Nations. I hope those nations recognize how impossible the world situation will become if they long permit the two great powers of the earth to struggle for supremacy and power and influence. If we go on as we are going now, I do not believe that war is just around the corner, but I know that war between the Soviet Union and ourselves can only be forestalled until the day when one nation thinks it is prepared to conquer the other. If I am right, and no man was ever more sincere in his assumption, I foresee that the United Nations will struggle with renewed effort and inspiration to become a fully workable organization before it is too late.

With possibly a few exceptions, I have probably seen more men die, in more gruesome fashion, and more civilians, of every age, sex, and walk of life, suffer in indescribable fashion, and more property and spiritual values destroyed, than all other Senators. There is nothing to cheer or dream about in this knowledge, but out of experience has come the knowledge that war is an answer to nothing. Anybody who thinks at all must understand this to be true. Those who want to see the truth realized must have renewed faith and confidence in the United Nations. The nations included must reconcile their prevailing difference, even if this means that the majority nations must use drastic means to force the minority nations to observe the common good. To be truly effective, the United Nations must create and develop an international police force with sufficient authority and means to defeat any aggressor nation, and to discipline any arrogant or errant member nation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask the Senator from Washington, how is the United Nations to grow and thrive if we start the same process that scuttled the League of Nations, the great nations bypassing the United Nations, and taking unilateral action? It will throw it into disrepute, destroy the confidence of the people in it everywhere, and it will wither and die.

Mr. CAIN. In this instance there happens to be a difference of opinion between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington, rightly or wrongly, has the conviction that in helping Greece and Turkey, through the recommendation which has been made by the executive branch of our Government, we may give to the United Nations an opportunity, and time in which to become prepared, to do the very things I have tried to suggest in the last few minutes. I do not think there would be the faintest possible chance of the United Nations being effective in handling the problem which confronts us this afternoon.

All of us know that an international police force is intended. It is not necessary for me to say, or explain why, no international military body is presently in prospect. Should this force some day be established, I think that the nations of this world could then move in the direction of total disarmament. The senior Senator from Maryland has submitted a resolution which directs the President to call a disarmament conference. I am conclusively and completely in support of this resolution, but I very much doubt that any conference would serve a practical purpose at this time. Power politics continues to run the world, and there will be no change for the better until an international police force makes the maintenance of separate national armies unnecessary and futile.

In a recent splendid contribution the senior Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that in any foreign campaign it was not possible to separate things political from things military. How true this is, and how tragically often we neglected to observe the truth of that fact in the recent war. Perhaps we shall do a better job of combining things which supplement each other in the future.

In recognizing that we cannot dissociate things military from things political it seems equally clear that America cannot separate its domestic and international problems and obligations. The success of our participation abroad will be determined almost entirely by what we do and accomplish at home. If our people have no sympathy or understanding for what is being attempted abroad, we shall certainly fail over the long pull, but there are other ways in which we can fail in the attainment of every international objective.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the Senator familiar with the result of the last Gallup poll?

Mr. CAIN. In what respect, may I inquire?

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with the move about to be undertaken. Does the Senator know what it indicated as to how the people of America feel toward this proposal? Did the Senator see the Gallup poll last Sunday?

Mr. CAIN. I might make three points in replying to the Senator. First, I have not seen the poll; second, I shall make it my business to look at it; and third, each Senator speaks on the basis of his conviction after considering the facts as they appear to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. That has nothing to do with the reaction of the people to the problem before us. On March 28 the Gallup poll showed 56 percent of the people against what is proposed. That is, the question was asked, "Do you think this should be turned over to the United Nations?" The words "turned over" were used. Fifty-six percent said "Yes." Last Sunday 63 percent said "Yes" to the same question. The people do not like this plan of handling the situation.

Mr. CAIN. That is very interesting. I take it, from the Senator's position, we should automatically cast our individual votes on the basis of what the Gallup poll says a selected group of people in America think should be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly not. I was not arguing that at all. The Senator asked what the reaction of the people was, and I was merely trying to inform him; that is all. Certainly we should use our own discretion.

Mr. CAIN. I have considerable respect obviously for what the Gallup poll said a number of people in America were thinking, and I would think about that as best I could, and study the problem in the largest sense that I could, and speak with feeling, as my own conscience dictated.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I say to the Senator there have been times when I voted against the Gallup poll. This time, it just happens that I am in accord with it.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator from Washington will yield, I understand he is willing to support this bill and support an appropriation of $400,000,000 for the purpose of implementing the Truman doctrine, but he is unwilling to go further?

Mr. CAIN. I would say to the Senator from Missouri that that is not completely my position. In the first place, I shall support it on what to me are reasonable grounds.

Mr. KEM. I suppose the Senator will give us the benefit of those reasons during the course of his address?

Mr. CAIN. I shall, indeed. Primarily, my reason for supporting it is that I think the instrumentality to which all nations should turn in times of strife and trouble and turmoil, the United Nations, is not presently prepared to do the job. I should like to think that this sort of crisis would result in such a situation, recognized by everybody, as would redound ultimately to the advantage and development of the United Nations. We are going to be given an opportunity, I think, replying to the Senator from Missouri, to make the United Nations work. It cannot do so today in this instance.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator think it would be appropriate to seek an opinion from the United Nations as to whether it is capable, or should like an opportunity to deal with the situation?

Mr. CAIN. I may be wrong, but on the basis of such information as I have at my disposal, the United Nations, above all others, are conscious of the fact that they are not presently qualified to do the job. I believe that to be so.

Mr. KEM. The Senator believes that to be a fact, but has he had any official indication from the United Nations of that fact? Is it not true that Mr. Lie himself has scarcely veiled his displeasure at the action of the United States in proceeding in this matter without consultation or even notice?

Mr. CAIN. That, I do not know.

Mr. KEM. Returning to my first question to the Senator from Washington, as I understand, the Senator is willing to vote for the $400,000,000 appropriation, but he expressed some doubt whether our economy could stand the strain of implementing the entire doctrine as proposed by the President. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator think it wise to make a start on a plan which is hastily contrived, which has not been fully thought out, which, as the Senator himself says, is contrary to what he would like to see done with respect to the United Nations?

Mr. CAIN. Having a real hope that coming out of this present problem of Greece and Turkey there will be a rejuvenated and very positive United Nations, which can undertake such obligations in the future, I think it is very much worth while taking a chance with $400,000,000, which, as is known in this body, represents a ratio of 1 to 40 of the moneys we have invested overseas since VJ-day.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel, in view of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to which we are signatory, particularly in view of the section 1, paragraph 24, of the Charter, that we have the option of deciding for ourselves whether the United Nations should handle this matter or not? Is it not true that we have already committed ourselves in advance to reliance on the United Nations and to entrusting them with the handling of a matter of this kind?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from Missouri, that I think it very unfortunate that a complete understanding between the United States and the United Nations was not properly arrived at prior to the time of the declaration of need and the request which was made of us on March 12.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has in effect said he considered it a fatal error on the part of the President not to have given such notice. Does the Senator not believe that it would likewise be a fatal error on our part to proceed with the President's plan, which has been launched under such inauspicious circumstances?

Mr. CAIN. If I understand the Senator correctly, I take it that my answer obviously must be "No." The Senator thinks there is more virtue in opposing the proposal, because of the way in which the program was presented, than in supporting it. I take the other side of the question.

Mr. KEM. In the first place, I think that we are under solemn covenant to entrust such matters to the United Nations. In the second place, I think if we expect the United Nations to develop into anything more than a debating society we must show our faith and trust at this time above all other times.

Mr. CAIN. We only differ, I may say most respectfully to the Senator from Missouri, in the way in which we are going to achieve exactly the same objective. I think it must be done, under the circumstances, in this way. The Senator upholds the other side, for which I have considerable respect.

I have but a few additional comments to make, and with the permission of the Senate I should like to repeat the last sentence.

If our people have no sympathy or understanding for what is being attempted abroad we shall certainly fail over the long pull, but there are other ways in which we can fail in the attainment of every international objective. Our present heavy international commitments, which are certain to become heavier, are geared to our domestic economy. If anything happens to retard our industrial production or to lessen our national income, failure abroad will become not only certain but absolute.

We can best help nations beyond the seas by doing a much better job at home than we have done for a long time. If we did not have a single foreign commitment, the need for doing a better job domestically would continue to stare us in the face.

The Eightieth Congress came into being to rid this Government of unnecessary waste and extravagance; to begin to whittle away on a national debt which could result in national insolvency; to provide tax relief in order that men would be encouraged to venture capital again; to work out a relationship between management and labor which would insure continuing production. None of these objectives has been accomplished. Until they are accomplished, there is cause for every citizen to be suspicious of any stability in his future.

America cannot be foolish or shortsighted or wasteful or divided at home and have any remote chance of carrying the rest of the world around on its shoulders.

Mr. Henry Wallace opposes the intended assistance for Greece and Turkey. He considers it ruthless imperialism. That I think him wrong goes without saying, but more important to me is the thought that it matters little what he says, for he is generally held to be utterly and completely irresponsible. It was Wallace who shrugged and laughed off the serious work stoppages and industrial strife which followed his tragic, mischief-making statement of some months ago that wages and prices had no relationship.

What America needs is the application of some thoughtful, ruthless economic realism. We shall not pay our debts, carry our foreign and domestic financial burdens, and have peace either at home or abroad unless our industrial machine is fully and continually employed. Freedom for this world is geared to the assumption that America will work as it has never worked before.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me to ask him another question, I should like to ask why our practice of stark economic realism should be postponed until tomorrow, rather than be undertaken today? In other words, why should we not look the economic facts of life in the face today and try to read whether our economy will stand the strain of the Truman doctrine, whether there is in it any prospect of tax reduction, whether there is in it any prospect of industrial peace, whether there is in it any satisfactory price level for years to come in this country?

Mr. CAIN. That mission has been too long delayed. The Senator from Missouri and I thoroughly agree on that.

Mr. KEM. May I suggest to the Senator from Washington for whom I have profound respect, that there could be no better time for the members of his party and mine to commence the fight for economic realism than on the vote on the pending measure?

Mr. CAIN. I think there are so many aspects to the Senator's point of view that I cannot answer them in one statement. To my mind, if we want to continue to live, we must become much more economically realistic at home than we have been for a long time, irrespective of any pending loan or grant or gift to Greece and Turkey. Secondly, it is a

matter of degree. I think we should take a chance on $400,000,000 which, if its spending results in providing a means qualified to do the job we are now undertaking to do, will then be a tremendous investment in the name of freedom.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator has the same view of this proposal as I do; that we are taking a chance.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. Under those circumstances, since it is the taking of a chance, would it not be better to take a chance of letting the money lie in our own Treasury?

Mr. CAIN. All factors considered, from my point of view, I can say to the Senator from Missouri, I think not, sir.

I repeat, what America needs is the application of some ruthless economic realism. We shall not pay our debts, carry our foreign and domestic burdens and have peace either at home or abroad unless our industrial machine is fully and continually employed. Freedom for this world is geared to the assumption that America will work as it has never worked before.

In my considered opinion the President was guilty the other day of uttering a statement which can do as much harm in the future as the statements of Henry Wallace have done in the past. The President said that if high prices did not come down it was cause sufficient for wages to go up.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator mean to say that that is not a fact?

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to conclude this paragraph, by the end of which I shall be delighted to answer his question, if I shall not already have done so?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. The President said that if high prices did not come down it was cause sufficient for wages to go up. This is economic heresy of a suicidal kind. We all know that prices must come down. All of us are looking for ways through which prices can be reduced. But none of us have any right to indicate that the evil of high prices can be cured by the equally great evil of adding to the cost of production. If we worry about inflation now, and every individual does, we know, if we know anything at all, that to take the easy way out by encouraging national wage increases is to speed the day of economic disaster for America and the world.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator believe that higher prices for goods, commodities and services are implicit in the Truman doctrine?

Mr. CAIN. I so stated in the earlier paragraphs of my statement.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. In which I called the attention of America to the fact that one of the reasons for prevailing high prices is the shipments we are making abroad. But there are other elements of the price structure which we hope will help to bring prices down, and in that field I know the Senator and I are in perfect agreement.

Mr. President, along about 1874 or 1875 Mr. Disraeli, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, said "There is nothing around us but ruin and despair. There is no hope." Many a thinking person is inclined to believe that his statements are applicable today. I deny it, not because the ingredients for approaching disaster are not present, for they are, but because I think we have within our own spiritual, mental and physical resources the power to attain peace and opportunity for America and the United Nations.

I look to another one who had been Prime Minister of Great Britain for words and a philosophy to guide my thinking in perilous days like the present. When things were going rather well in the war in 1942 some friend said to Mr. Churchill, "It looks like the end." "No," Mr. Churchill said, "It is not the end, it is not even the beginning of the end. But perhaps," he said, "it is the end of the beginning."

That is what I think about our great problems in the year of 1947. Like many an American I dream and hope and pray that we are working for the end of our beginning toward a happier day for all mankind.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It was said on the floor of this Chamber a few days ago that the United Nations is the last blessed hope for "peace on earth and good will toward men." I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees with that sentiment?

Mr. CAIN. If there is hope—and I think there is—it certainly will lie in an organization which is either the United Nations as presently constituted, or a better organization which will take its place. That is where the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington are thoroughly in agreement. But I conceive that if we endeavor to load upon them today an undertaking which they cannot accomplish, we shall have lost ever so much more ground than we should have gained. A chance—it is a fantastic chance we are taking whatever decision the Senate reaches.

Mr. KEM. The Senator will recall that it has been frequently said that the League of Nations was destroyed on the floor of the Senate. Is the Senator willing to be one of those who strike a mortal blow at the United Nations?

Mr. CAIN. In my conscious mind that is the very last thing to which I think any Senator in this Chamber would want to be a party. But I do not conceive that, in supporting the administration's request, we are either (1) bypassing, or (2) destroying the future effectiveness of the United Nations. Certainly I would not want to be a party to an undertaking of that character because I think the saving of civilization is the prize we all seek.

Mr. KEM. One more question if, the Senator please. Before the Senator votes on this matter would he not be interested in an official statement or declaration on the part of the responsible officials or the Security Council of the United Nations as to what they believe would be the effect of our action upon the future of the United Nations.

Mr. CAIN. Like every other Senator of the present number of 95 I want as much information as one can possibly receive before any vote is cast.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks which are provoked perhaps by the able and interesting discussion by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] of the very vital point which has been raised by the thought-provoking speeches by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that those who oppose this measure use as a most forceful argument the fact that it will bypass the United Nations. I am bound to admit that that is a very potent argument. It is one which I should like to examine briefly from another angle.

In the report of the committee in connection with this bill there is the following language:

> During the course of its hearings the committee has carefully explored the relationship between the President's proposals and the role of the United Nations.

I believe that the President made a mistake in the manner in which this problem was handled so far as our relationship with the United Nations is concerned, and so far as the position of the United Nations in this problem is concerned. However, if it was a mistake, it has been made, and it seems to me that it has been ably remedied by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Reading further from the report:

> It has become increasingly clear that by taking the action suggested by the President, the United States will be fulfilling a basic objective of the United Nations Charter—to create conditions of political and economic stability which will preserve the freedom and independence of its members and thus safeguard their sovereign equality.

With that statement I am in hearty accord. I feel that all of us who sincerely and earnestly believe in the United Nations should likewise be in accord with it, because it seems to me that that is exactly what our obligation is. If we believe what we believe sincerely and earnestly, and intend to stand by it, that is exactly what this measure proposes to do.

I read further from the report:

> The United Nations was not created to supersede friendly relations between states through assistance from one state to another to carry out the purposes set forth in the Charter.

That statement means to me that when one nation can, by its individual assistance, help another nation which is a member of the United Nations, in a way which basically affects the independence, sovereignty, and status of that nation as a free and independent nation, particularly when the United Nations is unable to do so, we ought not to feel that we are doing violence to our obligation under the United Nations Charter or destroying the effectiveness of the United Nations.

Reading further from the report of the committee:

The Greek Government has requested the assistance of both the United States and the United Nations. At the request of the Greek Government, the Security Council of the United Nations is already dealing with important aspects of the Greek problem. A commission of investigation of the Security Council is concluding an investigation of the disturbed conditions along the northern Greek border.

As we all know, another commission of the United Nations is looking into the question of economic conditions in Greece. In other words, the United Nations was appealed to by Greece, and the United Nations went forward and did the things which it was able to do under the United Nations Charter, with the facilities it then had. As this report bears out—which has not been successfully denied on the floor of the Senate—the United Nations has no relief agency as such. It has no military force as such, and it has no money as such, to do the things which Greece has asked us to do. Therefore it seems to me that rather than being at variance with the United Nations in the proposed policy, we seem to be working hand-in-hand with it, the United Nations doing on its part what it has the authority and the facilities to do, and we on our part, as a liberty-loving, freedom-preserving people, doing what we have the power and facilities to do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is there any prohibition in the set-up of the United Nations which would keep us from furnishing the United Nations with such money as it needs to do the job?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think not, Mr. President; but I would object strenuously to that course. We have already attempted to deal with relief to foreign nations through a united organization. UNRRA was such an organization. We found that our money and our goods were being used, and others were getting the credit. Instead of our goods and money being used in the manner which seemed to Americans the most effective, desirable, and useful, they were being used in other ways. It seems to me that if we are to put American money into this undertaking we should operate it in the American way. If there is any objection, it is perfectly possible, under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, for the Greek people to tell us that they do not want us in their country, and for the Assembly of the United Nations, or even a majority of the Security Council, to tell us to get out. How could we be fairer than that?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator does not presume to compare the United Nations organization with UNRRA, does he?

Mr. BALDWIN. I certainly do not; but in effect our effort to put this money into the United Nations organization, which has no agency of its own to handle it, would simply require another organization to be established. Then we would be pouring our money into a project and having someone else administer it. We have seen in the past that a combined effort of that kind has not been as effective and useful in the cause of peace and in the cause of the prevention of starvation and the restoration of economic stability as we would like to have it.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not true that all the United Nations now lacks is money with which to do business? Is it not organized to handle international questions?

Mr. BALDWIN. I most earnestly hope that as a result of our action, if we pass the pending bill—and I fervently hope that it will be passed—and as a result of our gesture to the United Nations and the rest of the world, indicating our willingness to enter into any united effort, the other nations which are members of the United Nations will say, "The people of the United States have displayed splendid leadership. Let us get together with them and go forward and do this job." Then we shall begin to build the kind of an organization in the United Nations which can handle a problem of this kind. We shall then give it the power, prestige, and authority which it now lacks to do the job.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator expect any other nation except the United States actually to put up any money for such an organization?

Mr. BALDWIN. None has offered to do so.

Mr. MALONE. No other nation is known to have any money, unless we have previously loaned it to them. Therefore it does not seem very complicated to me to place the money in the organization and pull the trigger.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it altogether inappropriate to suggest that what has just been said by the able Senator from Connecticut is a little like one saying in Lincoln's time—and it must be remembered that I am a Confederate descendant, but I am proud, as an American, that all America saved the Union—"The Union is not quite ready to be saved yet; but if it breaks up, after it is all over we will try to form another, which will be a good union"?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not know that I thoroughly grasp the Senator's analogy.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator appears to take the position that we cannot use the United Nations now for relief, or to protect the security of nations which are threatened with aggression, but that if we proceed unilaterally, outside the United Nations, and without regard to it, and save those nations individually, perhaps at some later time we can build up the United Nations to a position of such strength that it will be able to do what I assume we all agree it should be able to do at the present time. That leads to the question, Would it not be better for us now to do our utmost to act through the United Nations organization, and if it is deficient in power or authority, or, as the Senator has implied, in money, try to supply that deficiency and use the United Nations as the instrument through which to accomplish our objectives, rather than further to weaken it by admitting its impotency and acting unilaterally, even to achieve a good objective?

Mr. BALDWIN. In answer to that inquiry, let me say that if we had a year, 2 years, or 3 years in which to act, it would be well worth while to consider that particular suggestion. But we have not that much time; the time is short; the time is running out. If aid is to be given to Greece it must be given soon. That seems to me one of the chief reasons why we must proceed through this measure rather than through the United Nations, where we would be met with endless problems as to how the money should be administered, how the whole question should be handled, how best to preserve peace, and where to get the military force and the supplies to accomplish the purpose. Then, in the last analysis, what about the veto power when the matter reached the Security Council? What would be done about that? While all these questions were being considered and worked out, time would run on, the crisis would have passed, and Greece would have collapsed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other inquiry?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if the latest reports in the press do not indicate that the Greek Army, without any of our money and without our equipment and a military mission being there at all, is progressing against the insurgents in the mountains, and does it not seem that the Greek Army is doing fairly well in protecting Greece, which has 7,000,000 inhabitants, against 13,000 insurgents who happen to be in the mountains. Is not the real need in Greece at the present time the need for economic aid? Does not the Senator believe that the Senate and the House could get together in a matter of hours on a program of economic aid for Greece, and then try to preserve the security of Greece either from internal aggression or outside aggression through the instrumentality of the United Nations organization?

Mr. BALDWIN. I answer the Senator's question by saying that there seems to be in the Senate substantial support for this measure. I do not know whether that had anything to do with inspiring the Greek Army to put up a really energetic defense or to preserve order in Greece. I do not understand, Mr. President, that all of the money is to be expended at once in an effort to help organize the army, to help suppress rebellions. That is the kind of thing we want, and that is what can be done under this bill, and that is what it proposes to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just one other inquiry, if the Senator will yield. Is it not also a fact that the United Nations organization has taken jurisdiction of the so-called border aggression of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and has sent a mission to investigate it, which is now preparing its report, and that the matter is to come up on the agenda of the United Nations? Is it not also possible that they may have done

some good in bringing about a better situation?

Mr. BALDWIN. It is possible. It may very well be that when we receive the report and have all the information available we may want to change our policy. That is perfectly possible. It may be that then the Greeks will want us to leave. They could ask us to do so, under this bill. It may be that the United Nations Assembly or the Security Council would want to have us leave after they receive this report, and then we could do so under the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that we have a very simple and sound program.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Would it not be possible to obtain some sort of a preliminary report before we vote on this measure?

Mr. BALDWIN. That I do not know. If the United Nations wanted to bestir itself in that matter, it ought to be perfectly possible.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator mentioned emergency. We have talked about emergencies for the last week. In the Senator's judgment, are we starting on another 14-year cycle of emergencies, concerning which we are not able to wait for proper information upon which to base a vote?

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with the able Senator from Nevada that it is high time we found some other word in place of the word "emergency." We Americans have heard it over and over again and have heard it enough. I use the word "urgency." I would say that there is the probability of a crisis. It seems to me that our basic interests are involved. It has been more than a month since the President first proposed action, and we certainly have not, in the length of the debate and in the length of time which has elapsed, been treating it as much of an emergency.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that we have gained very little additional information from the State Department during the month of delay. Until we get some report from the Commission which has been over there on the ground, a preliminary report, any kind of direction from someone as to our part in a great international plan for establishing spheres of influence, if that is what it is, where do we go from there? The senior Senator from Michigan said that a move into Greece had no connection with the contemplated move into Korea. It seems to me that if we go into Greece for the reason the President says we are going there, then for the same reason we will go into Korea. I see no other reason to go there. They take care of themselves until someone else moves in. Can the Senator give us an idea of what the reason might be for this continuous emergency?

Mr. BALDWIN. With regard to the question of how much we know about it, as I understand the bill and the proposal a mission will be created on which there will be military representatives and naval representatives, and I have proposed an amendment which the Senate probably will consider, that there be representation from the Congress on this particular mission, so that we shall have our own representatives there who can give information directly to us, and in that way we shall probably know more than we could know from any Commission of the United Nations. Furthermore, we shall have the advantage of the knowledge and experience of the United Nations Commission. So there is every opportunity for more complete knowledge than we now have. I share with the Senator from Nevada the regret that our knowledge is not more complete and detailed than it is. As on many other occasions in life, we have to act on the best knowledge available.

Mr. MALONE. We have a Commission on the ground. I understand they are on their way back to make their report. We also have two distinguished Members of this body on the ground at this time. I understand that they will return on Monday. Would it be too much to ask that we wait until our own Senators return and ask them a few questions about what they found over there? By the use of the telephone it would not be impossible to communicate with the United Nations Committee and ask them if they could throw a little light on this debate as to whether or not they think America should act independently or through the United Nations. We have no information on that score.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would say in answer, that the probabilities are that this question will not be decided before next Monday, and if there is any knowledge or information which the Members of this body who have been to those countries and who are now on their way home can provide, there is every probability that the decision will not be made before they can be here to provide it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. I have referred to the Gallup poll. The poll which was published last Sunday was made on the basis of the same question as the poll published on March 28. The question was, "Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations organization?"

On March 28, 56 percent answered "Yes." Last Sunday, 63 percent said "Yes"—that it should be turned over to the United Nations.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan a question, and then I shall be happy to yield.

I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan whether his amendments carry out the philosophy and wish of the people, as expressed in those polls. Do the Senator's amendments turn this proposition over to the United Nations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho knows the answer to that question, I am sure. I would say that the amendment turns over jurisdiction to the United Nations at any time that it wishes to assert jurisdiction.

What the Gallup poll intended to ask, I do not know. Although I have always found the Gallup poll interesting and encouraging when it agreed with my point of view, I have not formed the habit of considering the Gallup poll to be in the same classification as either the Constitution or the Bible. This is not a pure democracy under which we live, where Gallup polls are the controlling consideration. I quite agree that insofar as they reflect public opinion accurately—and frequently they apparently do—they are of very great interest to a representative body of this character; but if the Senator from Idaho will permit me to say so, I would hardly be able to rest my opinion in respect to a problem of this fundamental importance upon a Gallup poll.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this instance, particularly, the Gallup poll might well be guilty of lacking adequate information on the part of those polled. We find that Senators who rise on the floor of the Senate have been in contact with all the documents and all the debates thus far and have been in personal contact with the President's message, and yet we find them saying that they are not sufficiently informed to be able intelligently to decide what they should do.

How we could expect to sample indiscriminately the sentiment of the American people, as Dr. Gallup does, and be fortunate enough to contact persons who are better informed than Members of the Senate are in respect to the question concerning which they are asked for an answer, it is hard to conceive. I think it is quite obvious that a poll of this particular character is not so impressive as some of the other Gallup polls are.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator for his extended answer. I appreciate it sincerely.

My only reason for bringing up the point was that the editors of the Gallup poll—Mr. Gallup himself, I assume, or at least editors writing under his name—say that their poll would appear to bear out the position of the Senator from Michigan and to support his amendments.

That is why I wish to ask him whether his amendments would turn over this undertaking to the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I have not answered that question, I wish to be very sure that I do, because it is a perfectly fair question. In my opinion, the amendment which has been adopted gives the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations a—shall we call it—residuary jurisdiction to recall this plan whenever it has the votes to do so and has such a disposition. Therefore, since the first instance, in my opinion, it would be impossible for the United Nations to take jurisdiction, I think we have gone as far to give it jurisdiction as, from my point of view, is possible, as a result of the amendment to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was in no way trying to embarrass the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not embarrassing me in the slightest.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to point out that Mr. Gallup went a little off base in trying to read into his poll things that the poll itself did not show. That is my sole aim.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's quarrel is with Dr. Gallup, then, and not with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan means to say that 1 week after this loan is granted, if the Security Council of the United Nations or the Assembly of the United Nations by majority vote, if I remember correctly, wished to take jurisdiction, it could take jurisdiction and could take this matter out of the hands of the United States of America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me read the amendment, because it is a perfectly clear justification for the Senator's statement:

> The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances.

The second circumstance is:

> If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Even "undesirable," Mr. President. I think the answer to the Senator's question is emphatically, unequivocally, and without reservation, "Yes."

Furthermore, I should like to add, because I feel it so keenly myself, that I do not think anyone in this Chamber would accuse me of any lack of fidelity to the United Nations. I have given my life to it.

In my opinion, in all the story of the United Nations there has never been an act of voluntary allegiance equal to the unanimous adoption by the Senate of the United States of a declaration that we will yield to the judgment of the Security Council, regardless of anyone's veto. I should like to see a parallel to that act of faith on the part of anyone else on earth.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the point I was about to discuss next, as a result of a preliminary question or two. I was about to discuss the very thing the Senator from Michigan has mentioned, namely, the yielding upon the part of this country to the veto power set up in the United Nations organization.

Anyone who is aware of what has been going on knows definitely, as a result of the using of the veto power by a certain nation now a member of the United Nations, that this matter never could have been handled by the United Nations in the beginning, and, in my judgment, the only way the United Nations could have had any jurisdiction whatsoever was by having us do exactly what has been done through the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

In my judgment, the United Nations would never have taken jurisdiction of this matter in the beginning, had we depended solely upon that organization to do it, because the veto power would have been used. In other words, under this amendment, we are almost forcing the United Nations to take jurisdiction—not unanimously, as is suggested under the Charter of the United Nations organization, but by only a majority of those in the Assembly or in the Security Council. We are hereby yielding some of our precious sovereignty to show our good faith in working toward peace.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that there has never been, in the interest of something that is fundamentally right, in the interest of looking forward to something that is peaceful in this world, in the interest of a suffering humanity, a greater piece of generosity upon the part of any nation, in any great, fundamental world upheaval such as the one we are experiencing at the present time.

The only reason that we do it, Mr. President, the only reason why an amendment of this kind is offered and adopted, whereby the United States of America in a way gives up its jurisdiction and its right to handle a unilateral proposition of this kind, is because we want to demonstrate to the people of America and to the people of the world that we are moving in the utmost good faith toward bringing about an everlasting peace—the kind of peace that mankind has been crying for for so long.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today we have listened to what I consider to be one of the most spirited and searching debates I have heard on the floor of the Senate for some time.

I am sure we all appreciate the gravity of the situation which confronts us. I wish to say at the outset that I am not opposing the pending bill. It is my desire to support the President's proposal, and to support the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations who presented the pending bill in the Senate.

However, there are certain considerations which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate which may affect the final form the bill should take. I have a few amendments which I wish to present, and I shall develop these matters during the course of my discussion.

The legislation we are considering here is no ordinary bill to provide funds for relief, economic assistance, and military aid to Greece and Turkey alone. This is a bill intended, as the President of the United States said, in addressing the Congress on March 12, 1947, "to implement the foreign policy and the national security of this country."

The bill provides:

> That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of the United States, furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—
>
> (1) By rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;
>
> (2) By detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;
>
> (3) By detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph; and
>
> (4) By providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for, by manufacture or otherwise, and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries.

The President has stated clearly the intention behind this bill. He declared:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. * * * We shall not realize our objectives unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. * * * I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. * * * The disappearance of Greece as an independent state would have a profound effect upon those countries in Europe whose peoples are struggling against great difficulties to maintain their freedoms and their independence while they repair the damages of war. * * * Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in the fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the west as well as to the east. We must take immediate and resolute action.

Mr. President, the import of the proposed legislation is easy to understand. We are assuming the obligation of defending democracy and opposing communistic imperialism in the world. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] concisely stated the purpose of the bill when he said it is intended to "put a stop to further communistic imperialism."

Mr. President, I am sure that we all wholeheartedly share the feeling expressed by the Senator from Georgia and other Senators during this debate, that we must not fail to oppose communistic imperialism with all the vigor and resources we possess. Nevertheless, in this resolve we must not fail to recognize that there is a widespread feeling in the country that this is not solely an American problem. It is a problem of all democracies. It is one, from a financial standpoint, that we cannot shoulder alone.

In accepting the challenge of communistic imperialism, however rich we may be, we are engaging in an international undertaking which may lead us into far greater financial commitments than the ones involved in the present proposal.

The able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is recognized as an authority on the fiscal problems of the Nation, has asked that a financial survey of the situation be made so that we might know just what our total obligations will amount to, and so enable us to determine whether we can safely undertake the financing of such a program. Although our assumption of world leadership is important and commendable, the

manner in which we assume and discharge our responsibilities is equally vital.

In a recent article published by an investment research organization in New York City, known as Value-Line Investment Survey, I find the following statement, which I quote:

> We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world, and such extensive undertakings would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing, they would prove to be self-defeating.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that in Greece we are not dealing at the present time with a democratic government. What we do under this proposal in Greece, therefore, will be scrutinized throughout the world, and in the years to come we will be held accountable for any mistakes we may make. The present government in Greece was originally imposed on the people there by the British Army. The present government is by no means a genuine democratic government. Nevertheless, it is the government that we will, under the present plan, be called upon to sustain until such time as the people of that country may be able to express their wishes in a genuinely free election, if they ever may be permitted to do so.

Frederick R. Coudert, New York lawyer and authority on international law, in the New York Times of April 6 says that the move we are considering is not a move merely to prevent the infiltration of communism into democratic countries. If that were the only thing involved, we would not have this measure before us today.

"All sane men," says Mr. Coudert, "would recoil from any such religious wars as afflicted Europe in the sixteenth century." Mr. Coudert then asks, "Why has there been this misunderstanding and camouflage regarding our dominant and real reason?" He then goes on to point out that perhaps it was because of the bad odor of the balance-of-power policy that the effort was made to place the move on the ground that it was being used to prevent the expansion of communism.

Mr. Coudert thinks what we are really trying to do by the steps we are taking is the application of the balance of power methods to Russia. We are proposing by this measure, he points out, to hem Russia in on the Black Sea and prevent her passing through the Dardanelles to become a Mediterranean and Atlantic power, and threaten our security and safety. It was to prevent Russia from becoming a Mediterranean and Atlantic power back in 1878 that the British mobilized their fleet to stop Russia from overwhelming Turkey and gaining access to the sea.

Now, Mr. President, the representatives of the Soviet Government understand perfectly well what this program is all about. Russia has been struggling for centuries to get through the Dardanelles. The British are stepping out of the way and turning over to the United States the responsibility of holding the Russians in check. Of course, the British are more anxious to stop Russia coming through the Dardanelles than we are. They are seeking to consolidate their interests in the Near East and in Africa, and if Russia were to get through the Dardanelles at this time the British would be seriously threatened.

Naturally, the United States will have to assume the blame, as well as the credit, for having blocked Russia from becoming a Mediterranean and Atlantic power. But, in this connection, it might be well to consider what some experts seem to think about the situation. It is thought by many that later on the British and the Russians will get together. Their interests will be more complementary than ours, and it would not be unnatural for England and Russia in the years to come to enter into closer relations.

I do not offer these matters as conclusive reasons for rejecting this proposal. But I do think these considerations should give us pause; we should not act precipitately; we should certainly know the facts and pursue the inquiry suggested by the able Senator from Virginia before final action is taken.

The able chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee invited all members of the Senate who had questions or amendments to offer to come before the committee. Accordingly, I appeared with other Senators and presented some amendments. These amendments were considered by the full committee. Two of my amendments were adopted in part by the committee, and I believe the others were embodied in the committee report accompanying the bill S. 938. Mr. President, I wish to express my high appreciation for the manner in which the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and members of his committee have handled this legislation which was suddenly thrust upon them for quick action. They felt impelled to abbreviate the hearings, but their frank and statesmanlike action in setting forth in the report the full implications of the bill is commendable. In their report they have set forth with great clarity the obligations to be taken on by the executive branch of the Government in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, in its report, among other matters, points out that—

> The committee is strongly of the opinion that the fullest success will not be achieved unless competent persons are sent to Greece to insure the development of controls at key points and to supervise their application. The United States Government must be assured that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in matters such as the following: Fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, a strict husbanding and control of the foreign-exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These measures are necessary to enable Greece to achieve stability.

Furthermore, Mr. President, while the report specifically declares that the United States is rendering this aid to Greece of necessity "to meet a short-term crisis," it further says, "the proposals made by the President do not preclude longer-range action by United Nations agencies on behalf of Greece. On the contrary, they set the stage for such action." In the bill itself the declaration is made that this legislation is necessary because—

> The United Nations is not now in a position to furnish to Greece and Turkey the financial and economic assistance which is immediately required.

In this declaration I read the intent on the part of the United States that the United Nations should assume this as its obligation as soon as possible. I further read in another provision of the bill the same intent, where it says:

> The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein * * * if (he is) officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto), or that the General Assembly finds, that action or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undersirable.

These sections of the bill have been widely acclaimed as declarations proving that we are not bypassing the United Nations but that we are accepting only an emergency responsibility to bridge the short-term crisis now confronting Greece.

I am in accord with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in his desire to make it clear that we are not bypassing the United Nations. However, I do not believe his amendment goes far enough. I therefore intend to propose an amendment further clarifying this matter so as to make it absolutely clear that it is the understanding of this Government that the assistance we are rendering is wholly an emergency matter, it being the understanding of this Government that the rendering of such assistance is the continuing responsibility of the United Nations. I intend to offer such an amendment because I feel that we must in clear and unmistakable language set forth that this is an emergency matter, and that the continuing responsibility for assistance to Greece and Turkey by common consent is one of the very fundamental purposes involved in the establishment of the United Nations organization.

Another amendment to the bill seems to be absolutely necessary. I refer to my amendment proposing that the Congress of the United States establish a Joint Congressional Committee, composed of three members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, which shall, not less than twice a year, during the period this act is in effect, visit the countries receiving assistance under it, and shall make full reports to the Congress and to the American people as to the administration of this act, current problems, and the conditions in the countries visited, so that the interests of the United States may

be fully understood and protected. The purpose and need of this amendment is obvious, and I will not take up any time in discussing it. It speaks for itself.

Mr. President, this legislation, calling for intervention in the affairs of Greece and Turkey in the form of economic and military assistance, presents one of the gravest questions our country has ever been called upon to face. It is a question with so many implications and ramifications that few of our citizens not familiar with foreign affairs can fully comprehend its ultimate significance.

The people of the country generally have not a full understanding of the underlying facts and circumstances. Already it appears to have created widespread confusion and conflicting opinions in the minds of the people. Daily we see in the press evidences of this confusion and misunderstanding. Columnists, editors, private citizens, and groups of citizens throughout the country are giving their views in constantly increasing volume. One cannot pick up a newspaper without observing these conflicting views.

Having only recently concluded the most terrifying and destructive war in our history, our people have been looking forward with hope and encouragement to a period of genuine peace; a period in which they might have an opportunity to recover from the tragic dislocations of the war and readjust their lives to peaceful pursuits.

In the midst of these preoccupations, they have been profoundly disturbed and confused by this sudden and unexpected proposal. Judging from my mail, which I believe is no different than the mail of other Senators, I find it has produced two conflicting reactions. One section of my correspondents express enthusiastic approval of the proposed policy. They take the view that our Government must have an immediate show-down with Russia; that the constant expansion of Russia's dominions and spheres of influence and the infiltration of communism into other countries requires the prompt and unequivocal approval of this policy. It is argued by some that inasmuch as we have the secret of the atomic bomb, and the greatest military and economic resources in the world, we can fight Russia now and settle, once and for all, these problems that are causing so much fear and uncertainty in the world. They feel convinced that we will be correct in taking a stand in Greece and Turkey to challenge the threat of Soviet imperialism and the onward march of communism which they assert threatens to engulf the world and eventually destroy our own way of life in America.

Of course, if this judgment regarding Soviet aggression is correct, and it cannot otherwise be checked, the proposal is entitled to the wholehearted and patriotic backing of the American people.

But, Mr. President, a large number of our people, perhaps a majority, as indicated by the Gallup polls and the correspondence we are receiving, are expressing grave fear and alarm lest the course proposed may inevitably lead us into national bankruptcy or into a war which may be more deadly and destructive than the one from which we just emerged. These individuals express the opinion that because of the dangerous implications involved in the proposed policy, it should not be assumed as the individual responsibility of our country. It is felt by these persons that this is a responsibility exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is easy to understand the reaction of this large section of our people.

Hardly a family in America escaped the ravages of the late war. Even in the most remote sections of our country few families failed to mourn the loss of sons or relatives. They have been closely touched by the horrors of World War II, the most dreadful and destructive war that has ever afflicted the earth. They do not easily react to the rhetorical appeals and stirring argument of those who feel that America is rich and powerful and should undertake the burden of making democracy safe for the whole world. They feel sincerely that this is a program for all the democratic nations working through the United Nations. If the United Nations cannot shoulder the task, they want this proven beyond any reasonable dispute.

Mr. President, it is true that we all feel thoroughly disillusioned and disappointed with the delaying tactics and maneuverings of the Soviet diplomats at the peace conferences. The press dispatches which we have been reading, and must rely on, have convinced us that Russia is not cooperating in a genuine endeavor to bring an early peace to the world. No one can condone their efforts to delay, confuse, and prevent the prompt consideration and settlement of the many difficult problems that have grown out of the war.

But, Mr. President, when we talk of military assistance to Greece and Turkey, for the purpose of preventing the infiltration of communism into the outer world or for the purpose of hemming in Russia so as to prevent her expansion and passage through the Dardanelles to participate with other big nations in the economic exploitation of the Near East, I can readily understand how large sections of our people may feel that in following such a course we are undertaking something which may lead us into far greater commitments than we are proposing to make in Greece and Turkey.

Senators on both sides of this body during the present debate have taken the floor and pointed out that this Greece-Turkey program will lead us inevitably into further and even more stupendous commitments. The able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], a few days ago said:

> Obviously, we will not be confined to this single request from Greece and Turkey but will have to underwrite all European and Asiatic countries, and I doubt if the United States is either able or willing to engage in that sort of a program. I fear that our attempt to enter the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey inevitably means another war.

Following the Senator from South Dakota, the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], expressed views along the same lines. Among other things, he said:

> It seems to me that in our study and discussion of this proposed loan—or shall I say grant or gift—to Greece and Turkey, we should consider it not as an isolated plan but as a tile in a large mosaic. If the United States proceeds to take the step requested, it should not do so with blinders on. The Nation should act only after a careful look around the barrel. * * * The searchlight of truth should be turned on in full force for the benefit of the American people.

The able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], speaking on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, said:

> This situation is different. We are embarking on a long, new adventure. We have set out to achieve peace actively, rather than enjoy it passively and precariously. We must shed on this long, new adventure every ray of light which can be gathered from every source. Those rays of light must be directed onto the dim, difficult path which lies ahead.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] also expressed serious concern over what he calls "this new adventure." Let me quote him:

> At this time the Members of the Congress and perhaps the people of the country have been caught by surprise.

Yet, Mr. President, on this matter of need of abrupt and speedy action, the able columnist, Walter Lippmann, writing in the Washington Post of March 4, 1947, said:

> There is no apparent reason for forcing so abrupt a decision before March 31 except that this date happens to mark the end of the British fiscal year. The British Government, though it must cut drastically its foreign expenditures, has not suddenly run out of funds as of March 31. The fixing of that most inconvenient time limit is an accident of the procedure on the budget. * * * The immediate need, therefore, is for a stopgap arrangement with the British Government which covers the immediate emergency in Great Britain and in Greece, and will permit us to examine here, and with the British Government, the great issues which are at stake. It is not in anyone's interest that they should be dealt with in an atmosphere of panic.

It has been pointed out here before that an over-all program has been presented to the United States calling for aid and development of foreign countries which will aggregate many billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money. Now, we are asked to underwrite this new and perhaps even more costly program. However laudable such a program may be, it could, in the end, bankrupt us. As a Wall Street research organization recently pointed out, it is not so much the danger of communism which should alarm us, as it is the danger of the deterioration of capitalism itself. This is the conclusion of the Value-Line Investment Survey which I mentioned earlier in my remarks. Let me quote this very interesting study of the proposal a little further:

> America investors are deeply concerned over taxation. Taxation far more than communistic infiltration is threatening our way of life.

* * * * *

THE SHIFT OF BRITISH POWER

The number one fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustments is that the British are shifting their Empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa.

* * * * *

There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization.

* * * * *

The big danger to the British scheme is that the Russians may inject themselves into the Near East and north Africa before the British are able to carry their plans for Africa and the Near East to fruition.

It is here that the next American move becomes decisive. If the United States takes up the position in Greece that the British Army is evacuating, the burden of defending the British sphere in Africa and the Near East in its formative period falls upon the United States. Not only is Britain's African empire then protected, but Britain is in a strategic position later on to shift her alliance toward a Russia exasperated by American obstruction. Once Britain's African and Near East eastern empires are established she would have stock in trade—Arabian oil that could be shared with Russia, and foreign markets in the Balkans and in Asia that might advantageously be shared with the Russian cartels on some basis mutually satisfactory to the two socialist governments. The exclusion of American goods from European and Asiatic markets would naturally be required, since England's production competes in export with America's.

The British shift out of the Far East and eastern Europe into Africa and the Near East, and her political reorientation from the American orbit to the Russian will not come to pass in a day. Britain has still to use up her American loan. She can import only from America, because only America is rich enough to export at this time. But in the long run Britain's interests will dovetail with Russia's more closely than our own and her political alinement with Russia is therefore probable. To think thus may shock the sentiments of many good people. But in the game of power politics, which for four centuries has found England waging wars against Spain, France, Russia, and Germany with complete impartiality, there are no scruples but only interests.

* * * * *

At the same time, the Russian Government is desirous of expanding its sphere of influence to contiguous territories for three reasons: (1) For defense through buffer states; (2) for space in which to build up complementary trading areas; (3) for outlets to the sea.

How, then, will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm water outlet?

* * * * *

To Russia the American decision to take over Greece must be a particularly bitter pill to swallow, because not only is it a threat to Russia's security as well as her expansion, but it comes right after the Russians gave their approval to America's claim for control of the militarily strategic Pacific islands. The Russians must think that we Americans want the whole world, including their back door.

The upshot cannot be favorable for the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look to Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

* * * * *

The essential quality of capitalism is this: That it is an economy governed by a free market in which prices, demand, and supply are at liberty to reach an equilibrium without government intervention. Under pure socialism, prices and supplies are determined by the government and the demand is regulated by rationing.

The free economy is clearly the more efficient except during periods of deep maladjustment.

* * * * *

In every instance where the people themselves have had a chance to choose between an economy that has a degree of free determination and an economy of complete government regimentation, the people have always shown a strong preference for the free economy. Since this has been so wherever the two systems came into conflict, it may be concluded that sooner or later the Russian people will themselves insist upon a greater degree of freedom in their country.

To this the foe of Russia replies that there can be no freedom of choice in that country. That is true today. That is not true of tomorrow. Today the Russians must tighten their belts to produce capital enough to build up their income. Once they have forced through their industrialization—a process which the Russians are attempting to complete in a generation though other nations have required centuries—they will be ready to live.

* * * * *

The Russian people have a sincere admiration for America and American achievement, as attested by the dispatches of many responsible men who have visited Russia. Why, then, is it necessary to prove to them at the point of a gun that our way of life is superior to their own? Especially so when pointing the gun requires that we weaken our own way of life?

It is necessary to be practical. There must be some lines within which the contest for men's loyalties can be fought out by force of example. We are not yet such a perfect race that we can eliminate power politics altogether. But in the practical application of power politics, the first rule is not to bite off more than can be chewed. The natural, the practical sphere, in which to prove the superiority of capitalism and individualism is North and South America and the islands of the Caribbean and Pacific. These happen also to be the territories that the United States has traditionally defended. The area is large enough to be economically self-sustaining. Yet one imagines that if any responsible government authority advocated intervention in South America political and economic affairs, he would be denounced as an imperialist by the very same people who shout isolationist at anyone who is reluctant to see America control the government of Greece.

There is not such a vast gulf between the Russians and ourselves that we could not live together in peace in our own parts of the world. It is implicit in the Russian program to relax the present regimentation of the individual's life. When that happens the difference between us will be no greater than that between us and the socialist state of Great Britain.

The contest of capitalism versus communism will then get down to a question of which works better. That could be settled without warfare. It would seem to be the part of wisdom for America to strengthen capitalism by removing as many as possible of the controls that make it unworkable, such as tariffs, cartels, subsidized prices, labor monopolies, and income taxes that prevent constructive enterprise. Nobody is going to stop the expansion of communism by sticking a $250,000,000 thorn into the side of Russia. Communism will be stopped by something that works better.

I was greatly impressed today, Mr. President, at a luncheon in honor of a distinguished visitor from England, a Member of Parliament. In discussing the situation in Europe he pointed out that the proper way to stop communism is not by the establishment of Maginot Lines but by making democracy work better in democratic countries.

I continue quoting from the Value-Line, Investment Survey:

They can learn, but they will not be taught at the point of a foreign gun. Nor will they learn to admire the capitalist economy unless we capitalists see to it that it works. We have more to do in North and South America than on the flanks of the Dardanelles.

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Communist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to "contain" Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

The views expressed by the able Senators whom I have quoted are in accord with the thoughts I have been attempting to express here. I feel that before we act on this matter we must enlighten the whole people on the subject. They must back us up or we will have failed.

Many private citizens and leaders in American public life have discussed this subject during the last few days expressing with varying degrees similar views. I have had many letters from citizens of my State who appear to be considerably alarmed as a result of this proposal.

In one letter from a prominent businessman in Missoula, Mont., I find the following:

I have conversed with a number of people on the subject and the unanimous feeling is that any assistance rendered should be with extreme caution. There are varied feelings as to what might happen, such as inviting another war, encouraging more poverty-stricken nations with high hopes of our being a Santa Claus to them also. The feeling is that we should be more than ever thinking about making ourselves strong, keeping out of other people's business, and that if help in any form is rendered it should be with the thought in mind to help them become able to help themselves.

Another letter from a businessman in Great Falls, Mont., states as follows:

The illness of Greece is critical and severe but in my opinion can be treated and brought to recovery without the drastic military steps this country is contemplating. Each year thousands of people in rural Greece are

dying from exposure because their villages have been destroyed and no shelter has yet been provided. Please accept this from one who knows—I was there and saw it. This almost hopeless condition is driving the people to what we term "communism," but be assured that the Greek peop'e themselves are anything but Communists—they are individualists as all their actions of life show but are being driven by desperation to their own destruction by communistic influences. The so-called Red army in Greece is made up mostly of youngsters who were selected when Greece was invaded by the Germans and whose education has been nothing else but a series of economic and political slogans. They don't know any better. The present government has through terrorism, as I have seen it enacted by the country police, not helped any to alleviate the desperation above mentioned, nor has it taken out of the rebel army the immature youngsters. On the other hand, they have driven them further away from the present government. Without making this too long, be assured, Senator, that if the Greek people were given reasonable shelter by rebuilding their villages, a little assistance in agriculture, a chance to have an education, and freedom from oppression, and allowed to select a representative government without coercion, Greece would be safe and no American soldiers would be required.

I have numerous letters along the same lines warning that this matter should be very carefully studied before we take the course proposed.

Mr. President, these are not ill-considered arbitrary expressions from unthinking people. The citizens of this country will patriotically accept any plan shown to be essential to the preservation of our American way of life. They hesitate, however, when they are called upon to support a course which may possibly lead us into a dangerous position. No one here can justifiably cast aspersions on citizens for frankly expressing their judgment on this momentous question. We must not forget that any course we pursue must have the backing of the people, and it will be wise at the outset to take the people into our confidence and try to adopt a program here which can be shown to be sound and that will not involve us in dangerous consequences.

The situation calls for speed but not for reckless speed. If the course proposed in this legislation is the only sound course we could pursue, then it must be made clear to the American people and we may rest assured it will be accepted. That has not been done so far, because 90 percent of my correspondents express opposition to it in its present form. No longer can we depend on a select few to determine the destiny of our country. The people of this Nation are well aware of the fact that in the past serious diplomatic mistakes have been made which have been costly to us. We must not now attempt to hurry this matter through the Congress without adequate amendments and safeguards. Otherwise, we may later find that we have adopted a policy by our hasty action which may be under suspicion and distrust in the country.

Mr. President, in my opinion, when this proposal was first announced, the people of our country were not in possession of sufficient information of the conditions to have a proper understanding of its effect and meaning. I believe that the hearings subsequently held were inadequate to fully develop the justification for this program and the ultimate costs we would assume in carrying it out. Very little consideration was given to the conditions prevailing in Turkey and Greece which prompted the program.

I am satisfied, and I think we all here recognize, that the fundamental purpose of this bill is to advance the democratic cause in those two countries and strengthen the democratic position of this Nation in international affairs. If this purpose can be shown to be well-conceived and thoroughly demonstrated to the American people, I am sure that most of the present confusion and misunderstanding concerning the measure would disappear. I say this, of course, with the assumption that it must be shown to be a practical program—that it is feasible and that it will not be so costly as to threaten our national solvency.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not unalterably opposed to this program, but I do feel that it requires more study and that some amendments are necessary. I should like to have seen more extensive hearings in order that all the facts and all the conditions of the program could be completely understood by the people of this country. I want the public to know exactly what we are doing in order that we may have undivided support in any course we take.

Under our democratic system any foreign policy must rest upon public approval for support. The public must be fully and completely informed on all commitments, policies, and actions. To withhold any information would be unwise and dangerous. The American people all understand that ever since the ending of the war, the Soviet Government has pursued a course of arbitrary opposition—a course of delay and obstruction to the early establishment of a just peace and settlement of the problems arising out of the war. It is generally felt that we must find some way of letting the Soviet Government know that the American people are firmly united in opposition to the imposition of her ideologies or her arbitrary will on other nations of the world. The program which we are providing in the legislation now being considered may be the only effective course for our country to pursue. I feel, however, that it has not yet been demonstrated.

It is therefore important that all its provisions and implications be made clear. I want the country to know the full extent of the burdens we are assuming and the full consequences which may result in the adoption of this policy. Only if we do this, can we have the undivided support of the American people back of it.

I do not wish to be understood as reflecting in any way on the efforts of the distinguished members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the very able chairman of that committee who by reason of his recognized ability has the confidence of every Member of the Senate. I think the able and conscientious chairman of the committee has already made invaluable contributions to our country and to the world in connection with our peace efforts. I wish to assure him of my support to the fullest degree in the heavy burdens which he has assumed and is carrying out on behalf of our country.

In offering the amendments which I have presented to the Senate, my sole purpose has been to aid in making it clear that by our action here we are not bypassing the United Nations organization. I want to support the President and cooperate with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this matter, because I fully appreciate the need of national unity in the face of the dangerous conditions which confront us.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the able acting majority leader. Of course, I would not make any motion without first having some understanding about it. But I feel very strongly that when we have night sessions and when everyone is acting in good faith in an effort to expedite the business of the Senate, it is only fair that Senators have some time for dinner, and that no Senator be asked to stand on the floor and speak to empty seats, while many other Senators are in the dining room getting their dinner.

I wonder what the acting majority leader would think about frankly taking a dinner recess until 7 o'clock, and then returning here. If we remain in session 3 or 4 hours after that, it would seem to me that that time, in addition to the 6 hours we would already have devoted to the session today, would make a total of 10 or 11 hours of work, which would be a fairly good working day.

I would not wish to ask the Senator to make such a decision without reflection and consultation with his colleagues; and I assume that no Senator would take advantage of the situation by attempting to break a quorum of the Senate and thereby prevent debate this evening.

But I wonder whether it would be possible for us to have a short time for dinner, and then resume our deliberations a little later in the evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not quite understand all the Senator's proposal. I should like very much to have the Senate continue to follow the announced plan, and proceed until 7:30 or 8 o'clock, at least, and then, perhaps, determine what Senators wish to do thereafter.

I am quite satisfied to have the Senator from Florida yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I was only making an informal suggestion; I would not under any circumstances make a motion to that effect without having first an understanding about the matter. I am simply saying that the Senate has been in session for 6 hours, lacking 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And presumably the Senate will be in session this evening until 10 or 11 o'clock. I think the Senator from Colorado expects to address the Senate, and possibly I myself will do so, and thereafter perhaps other Senators will address the Senate. That will mean that we shall have put in a rather full working day.

If the Senator from Colorado begins to speak at this time, many Senators are downstairs having their dinner, and it is a little unfair to call them away from their meal for a quorum, thus interrupting their dinner, and then have them return to the dining room. At the same time I do not wish in any sense of the word to break a quorum and make the evening's efforts futile.

So I am wondering whether the Senator thinks we should proceed without a quorum call and without at the same time having any Senator speak to only a handful of Senators during the normal dinner hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Florida. I should like to suggest to him that yesterday announcement was made that this evening the Senate would have a night session and would continue in session without interruption. Accordingly, I appeal to the distinguished Senator's sense of fairness to let us proceed.

I, myself, think the absence of a quorum should be suggested so as to get Senators into the Chamber, let the session continue until the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Florida have concluded, and then take a recess until tomorrow.

We are up against the same condition we always face in connection with night sessions. We have been attempting to bring this legislative proposal to a conclusion, and I have tried my very best——

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Nebraska has been very cooperative.

Mr. WHERRY. I have made my best efforts to have the Senate hold night sessions and to have a full attendance at them. I definitely announced on yesterday, Tuesday, that it was planned to have a session today, Wednesday, and also a session tonight, Wednesday night, to try to facilitate progress on the pending measure and to conclude action on it.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator from Florida would not make such a motion as he indicated he had in mind. Let us proceed without interruption until the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Florida have concluded their remarks. Possibly by that time some arrangement can be worked out in regard to a vote on this measure, either at the end of the week or the first of next week, in a way that might be acceptable to all of us who understand the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as well as to the able Senator from Florida, that night sessions, according to my experience, are wholly inadequate and very seldom prove to be of any benefit. Let me say to the Senator that night sessions are washouts, as a rule, and they interfere greatly with the plans of many Senators. There is a very small attendance at night sessions. Of course, there are many persons in the galleries, if Senators wish to convince them.

But I think it is not fair to the Senator from Florida to ask him to speak at a time when many Senators are eating their dinner or, later on, going to the theater. It is not fair to the Senator from Colorado, either.

I think we would save time by abandoning the plan for night sessions, and by meeting tomorrow and devoting all day tomorrow to the subject now before us. At that time there will be nothing for Senators to do but speak on the pending business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Nebraska to understand that I was not about to make a motion or take any other action in regard to the matter. I was merely making a suggestion.

I somewhat disagree with my able friend, the Senator from Texas, about the efficacy of night sessions. As a general rule, it seems to me we have a better attendance in the Senate at evening sessions than we do at sessions during the day.

But I feel the same way about having the Senate take time for both lunch and dinner, as I have heretofore stated on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that to have a Senator address the Senate at a time when, as the Senator from Texas has so graciously said, other Senators are out of the Senate Chamber, taking their meals, reflects upon the Senate to those who come here to observe, and also is rather a discourtesy and perhaps a disadvantage and an embarrassment to the Senators who have to speak. Probably we should not here this evening attempt to make new rules.

I desire to suggest to the leadership of the Senate that I think from time to time we should have evening sessions, but when we run up to 6 o'clock, let us recess until 7, so Senators may go downstairs and have their dinners, and then let us return and have a quorum call and 2 or 3 hours of debate in the evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I should like briefly to reply to the observation of the distinguished Senator from Florida. There seems to be argument both ways as to whether or not the Senate should run straight through, when it is to have a night session, without a recess for dinner, or whether we should recess for an hour or two and return at 7 o'clock. We have tried both ways this session, and I submit to the distinguished Senator from Florida that one of the best sessions we had this year was the night when we ran straight through. The distinguished Senator from Florida himself will recall the debate we had on the portal-to-portal bill, in which the Senator took a conspicuous part.

I myself feel that if we are to have night sessions we should run straight through and adjourn earlier. I also agree that it is difficult, when the Senate meets each day, to hold night sessions and secure a full attendance. We have had a pretty stiff session today, sitting for 6 hours, and have had a spirited debate on the pending question. I should like to comply with the Senator's request. I will say that if we are to have night sessions in the future, we will again consider recessing for 2 hours at dinnertime and return after dinner.

Inasmuch as it was announced that tonight we would sit straight through until we got ready to adjourn, we will proceed without a recess, and at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Ferguson	Martin	Vandenberg
Flanders	Millikin	Watkins
Green	Moore	Wherry
Gurney	Morse	Williams
Hawkes	Murray	Wilson
Hayden	Myers	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate during the remainder of today's session and all day tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to discuss at this time another of my amendments. At the end of the bill I propose to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the Government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to abolish within 90 days all hereditary offices and titles under such government; (b) to hold within 90 days free and democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive officer of such government and the membership of its legislative body and to grant prior to such elections universal suffrage for all persons over the age of 21; (c) to afford to all political parties full opportunity to participate and engage in election activities prior to the holding of such elections; and (d) to grant immediate amnesty to all political opponents of the persons or parties in control of the government requesting such assistance.

The amendment is directed at one of the evils which is apparent in connection with the undertaking upon which we are urged to enter, namely, that one

of the governments we are supporting, the Government of Greece, is not a government worthy of our support. It is a government which does not hold the viewpoint which we cherish. It is not a democracy. It is a military-Fascist government. My amendment is directed toward correcting that evil before we put up our money and place our stamp of approval upon the proposal which is pending in the Senate bill. I most earnestly hope that Senators will give serious consideration to the amendment.

In his message to the Congress the President stated:

> No government is perfect.

In a further significant admission the President stated:

> The Greek Government has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done, or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

I call the Senate's attention to three words in this rather remarkable and frank statement by the President. He said that the Greek Government has made mistakes. He further said "The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done, or will do." Evidently the President fully anticipates that the Greek Government in the future is not going to be much better than the Greek Government has been in the past. So we are giving them a blank check. We are not necessarily requiring them to adhere to any of the principles which we hold so sacred, but are simply saying, "We do not like you, we do not like what you have done, we do not like your record, we know that you have not done the right thing in the past, and we know that you will not do the right thing in the future." The President adds the words, "or will do." It seems to me that the Congress of the United States cannot go along with the President in that kind of a proposal.

I heard on the floor of the Senate today questions raised as to what the alternative would be if we rejected this program, and what the alternative would be if we accepted it. From the conclusions which I heard stated on the floor the situation is pretty bad in either event. If we accept the program we face bankruptcy; if we do not some Senators say we are offering the green light to the expansionist program of Soviet Russia.

It seems to me that there ought to be another alternative, and I think there is another alternative. I think we might proceed with a humanitarian program for Greece and still stand on our feet and demand that certain conditions in Greece and in Turkey be fully met before those countries can receive our assistance, and, what is more, before they may have our stamp of approval upon what they are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has stated correctly that upon the floor this afternoon during the debate on this issue it has been stated that we face certain alternatives. The statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan that he is basing his judgment on what the price will be if we do not accept the proposal. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] asked the question: What will the price be if we accept the proposal? The distinguished Senator from Colorado in years gone by has been a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and has had considerable experience with and a deep knowledge of world problems. I have profound respect for his judgment. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator the same question the Senator from Nevada asked the Senator from Michigan. What is the price going to be if we accept the proposal and send military aid to the countries involved, and then become involved in difficulty with Russia? Are we then in war, and if we are in war, what is the price going to be? Does the Senator care to express an opinion on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I should be glad to give the Senator my opinion for what it may be worth. In my opinion, we face the grave danger of getting into a war with Russia. If we escape from a war with Russia it will only be because Russia feels that she is not strong enough to fight us at this time, and she will be preparing for the day when she may be stronger and when perhaps we may be weaker, when war may come. In other words, if she is not able to set the time now she will set it at her own pleasure and at her own convenience for a later date.

As I see it, we are heading for a military clash with Russia, and there is no escape from such a clash. If Russia is strong enough I do not see how she can permit the alliance between Turkey and the United States of America which is proposed in this proposal. The proposal is for a military alliance. We are moving the uniform and we are moving the flag into Turkey. Russia cannot accept such a condition. The uniform and the flag are being moved into Turkey. If Senators will read between the lines in the President's message and listen to the debate on the floor of the Senate they will know that the flag and the uniform are going into Turkey to stop Russia. That is the objective; that is the purpose involved. Russia must know that as well as we know it.

As I stated the other evening, Russia knows that if no outside help is given to Turkey, even though she is a fairly strong nation, she will be of no danger to the Soviet Union. But when a great military power such as the United States moves into Turkey with a military alliance and attempts to use Turkey and proposes to use Turkey as a springboard to fly at the throat of Russia, certainly Russia must take note of it.

Mr. President, I have not gazed into a crystal ball, and I am not a prophet, so I do not know what Russia will do, but I feel certain that if Russia feels sufficiently strong she will resist this sort of thing with every ounce of her strength. What is proposed to be done appeals to me to be a military aggression, just as we would consider it a military aggression if Russia should move into Cuba or into one of our Latin-American neighbors. I am sure there would be great consternation and great anger and that the United States would feel terribly displeased if, for instance, Russia should move into Cuba. I am told that there are far more Communists in Cuba than there are in Turkey. So we must go back to the Golden Rule, which was laid down by the greatest Teacher man has ever had, and do unto others as we would have others do unto us. We must put ourselves in Russia's place. We must admit that this program is a threat to Russia.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Inasmuch as this has been said on the floor of the Senate before today, I am not giving away any military secrets when I mention it. If I correctly remember, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated that our aid to Turkey would consist of improving her harbors, docks, highway system, and communications system. It seems to me that we are getting ready to unload troops and start a campaign against someone. The purpose is not to strengthen Turkey. It is to establish a landing place for us. If I were a Russian, I would certainly be worried.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The whole proposal is to use Turkey for a springboard. That can be the only objective. Turkey is remarkably well situated on the map for such a purpose. She is well adapted to that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] propounded an inquiry to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to what limitation, if any, there was in paragraph (3) on page 3, with reference to the military appropriation. As I recall the answer, it was to the effect that there was no limitation on the $150,000,000 as to what the military equipment should be. The Senator has handled a great deal of legislation. Except for the amount of money involved, does he feel that there is any limitation as to what the money can be spent for so far as military equipment is concerned?

I should like to ask a further question. Is there any limitation in the bill on the number of troops that might finally be sent into Greece and Turkey?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I find no limitations, except as to the amount of money. The President and the Senator from Michigan have very frankly stated that more money may be required. The President has stated that he will ask Congress for more money if more is needed. When we undertake a military maneuver we cannot stop to place limitations on costs. This is only the first installment. No man knows what will follow. The President was frank enough to tell us that he would come back and talk to the Congress if he needed more money.

I have repeatedly heard Senators say today, and before today, in the cloakrooms and on the floor of the Senate, that they intended to vote for the bill because they did not want to let the President down. Suppose we get our flag over there, and establish our troops over there, and the war clouds begin to roll closer and the threat becomes greater. What can we do? We shall have to go on. Congress will be helpless. Congress cannot do anything about it.

During the last war we voted appropriation after appropriation. We never batted an eye. We voted whatever was asked for. We never turned down any requests. We never restricted those in authority to the extent of a single dollar on any occasion. We never questioned the amount of money asked for. We could not. American youth was in uniform. American youth was facing gunfire. It was no time for us to be quibbling over appropriations. We shall be facing exactly the same situation in this case. There is no limitation as to the amount of expenditure, the nature of the expenditure, or anything else with respect to this adventure.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Would the distinguished Senator from Colorado feel as much morally bound to vote for a declaration of war against Russia in the event she should resent our move into Greece and pick up the gauntlet which the President has thrown down as he now feels bound to vote for the bill before us?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado does not intend to vote for the bill. However, if this program is carried to the point where we are to get into war, the Senator may be very certain that the Senator from Colorado will not hesitate to do everything in his power to place this Nation in a position where it can win the war. After we once get into war there is no turning back. We must give everything we have. The Senator from Colorado certainly would do that if we were to get into war. But I do not like to play with fire. I do not like to take unnecessary risks.

I can show the Senator on the map an exact parallel to the present situation which occurred in the last World War. We sent troops to the Philippine Islands. General MacArthur was in charge of them. We sent more troops than we had supply lines to take care of in case of trouble. The Philippine Islands were directly in the path of the Japanese on their way to the oil fields, the rubber fields, and the tin mines of the East Indies. Those troops were placed in a fine strategic position—directly in the path which the enemy wanted to travel. We could not have found a better location, and today we cannot find a better location than Turkey. We placed our troops directly in the path of the enemy. We had no way of supplying them with arms, munitions, and other supplies. What happened to them is history. The same thing will happen here, as I see it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps I should frame the question differently. On the basis of the Senator's experience in the Senate, if the Congress of the United States should pass the pending bill and we should enter upon this adventure, would we not then be morally bound to go to war with Russia if Russia should oppose us and attack the few men we have over there? Would we not be morally bound to go to war, just as we were in the First World War?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Whenever the uniform is attacked, of course, we are in war. There is no escape from it.

Mr. MALONE. We could not withdraw.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. There could be no backing up. That would be humanly impossible. Before the last World War, when we were edging closer and closer, it was said that one cannot take a single step down Niagara Falls and then back up. The same principle applies here. We cannot take one step down Niagara Falls and back up if things do not look the way we want them to look. We had better be thinking about the steps we propose to take before we take any of them. So, in this case, we ought to figure this thing out on a careful basis before we take any risks which might involve us in a war with Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Then, it is the Senator's opinion, I take it, that now is the time to spend a couple of weeks thinking this thing over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Now is the time to think it over. This is our responsibility. This is the only opportunity the Senator and I and other Senators will have to think it over before taking action. This is our day. After this day passes we shall be in the lap of the gods, and whatever they hand out we shall have to accept.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the Senator hear the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] today? The suggestion he made was that perhaps it would be a good idea for us to request a report from the United Nations as to whether they are equipped to handle this question or whether they want to try to handle it. Would it not be a good idea for us to ask them and to wait until we receive a report from them before we jump in with both feet, or, to use a better expression, as the Senator has said, before we "take one step down Niagara Falls"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I think it would be only good judgment. It would be consistent with the things we have attempted, with the hopes we have for the United Nations, to have word from them in a positive sort of way. Of course, we are doing it through the Vandenberg amendment in a negative sort of way. They can stop us. It seems to me it is not quite satisfactory. We should go beyond that. We should have a positive statement from them that they want us to go ahead. In other words, I think we should be asked by the United Nations to do this job, instead of telling them, "If you want to stop us, you may stop us." They probably know that already. I hope they will stop us. I think there is some hope that they may stop us—not because of the Vandenberg amendment, but because of their own authority which was given to them when the charter was subscribed. I think they have that authority without the Vandenberg amendment, and I hope they exercise it. I have some small hope that they will.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Colorado has stated that he will vote against the bill and has painted a very gloomy picture, in answer to a question, pointing out all the bad things that can happen by taking this step. It is equally fair, is it not, I ask the Senator, for those of us who will vote for the bill to feel that war is less imminent and can be postponed for a longer time, if it has to come, by taking this step than by refusing to take it and being swept over Niagara Falls? What the Senator has said is equally true, perhaps more true, of the picture if we view it from the other side of the question. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I feel very certain, however, so long as I stay away from Niagara Falls, that I shall not be swept over it. What the Senator says, of course, is true, that we should weigh going in as against staying out. We must do that. What I am suggesting is that we weigh both possibilities against a middle-of-the-road course.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator might very well add one more feature—going in as against staying out, after the President of the United States has taken the initiative in asking us to go in. What would be the moral effect, the psychological effect, and the physical effect of staying out after that has been done?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My answer to the question and my recommendation in connection with that kind of a proposal are that we go in with certain reservations; that we lay down conditions upon which we will go in. One of those conditions I am trying to discuss tonight. That is that we require the Government of Greece to be a democratic government selected by the people in a democratic election. I think that is one of the important conditions which we should lay down, so far as going into Greece is concerned. Turkey is a different problem, I must admit. I want to discuss tonight the situation which we are facing in the case of Greece. I think that if the Congress of the United States should prescribe conditions and make them acceptable, we would be rendering most constructive assistance to the President of the United States, to the State Department, and to the people of the United States. I feel that that is one of our great opportunities to do something constructive, to work out of this dilemma, to escape from a position between the devil and the deep sea, which is where we are at this time. Either way we go we shall be in trouble.

I feel that to be true, but I believe that there is an opportunity between those two horns of the dilemma to work out a constructive program. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, we all have the greatest sympathy for the heroic people of Greece. We want to do something, and we have done something in connection with the liberation of Greece. During the debate this afternoon, reference was frequently made to the fact that if we made available $250,000,000 we would forthwith make relief available which would preserve the autonomy and the confidence of the great Greek people. I am disturbed, because I read recently in the New York Times—and I assume it to be an authentic account—with a Washington date line, under date of March 20, the following statement:

> The United States has contributed approximately $435,000,000 to Greece since that country was liberated, it was learned today. Of the $354,000,000 Greece received through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the United States contributed approximateiy 72 percent, or $254,000,000. The remaining $181,000,000 was authorized as follows:
>
> Lend-lease, $81,500,000; surplus-property credits, $45,000,000; Export-Import Bank loan, $25,000,000; Maritime Commission assistance for the purchase of Liberty ships, $30,000,000.
>
> This $435,000,000 in a period from November 1944 until March of this year was in addition to many millions of dollars provided by Britain and other friends of Greece.

I am wondering how we can justify it. The only way that I could accept it as being truthful and accurate would be to prove that providing an additional $250,000,000 at this time would accomplish what $435,000,000 has already failed to accomplish in providing essential relief for the people of Greece.

I am reminded that Paul Porter, who headed President Truman's economic mission to Greece, recently made a report to a liberal left-wing organization which met approximately a month ago in the Capital City. Porter, who is an astute New Dealer, in thorough sympathy with the New Deal program—his connection with OPA will be remembered—was sent to Greece to make an investigation as head of an economic mission. Of course we know he could not be influenced in the slightest degree by political considerations, because I presume he believes in the bipartisan foreign policy advocated by the President of the United States. Porter, in addressing this group—and I quote from a dispatch which appeared in the Washington Star—had this to say:

> Since its liberation from the Nazis, Greece has merely managed to survive. Greece's economic and physical resources are in much the same condition as when the Nazis were expelled.

There we have the statement of Paul Porter, who recently returned from the economic mission to Greece which he headed, that after the United Nations has made available $435,000,000 in the space of approximately a year and a half, for the relief of the people of Greece, their economic plight is about the same as it was when that heroic country was under the domination of the Nazis.

Now we are given assurances that $250,000,000 will solve all the problems facing the people of Greece at this time.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado whether we should place any credence in such assurance? The State Department may have other information and data available. I assume it has, or that the President has, but certainly there is little to justify the explicit confidence of the Members of the Senate in the assurance that another $250,000,000 will do what $453,000,000 has failed to accomplish in the past.

Can the Senator from Colorado give us any additional information on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator's conclusions are inescapable. The $250,000,000 which it is proposed to send to Greece under the provisions of this bill will be only a drop in the bucket; it will only last a little while, if it is utilized in the same way that the money previously sent to Greece was utilized and if it is poured down the same rat hole. Britain herself made a considerable contribution to Greece, during the time when our money went there and during the time when UNRRA relief went there. UNRRA aid was given to the Government of Greece, to be distributed to the people of Greece. But the Government of Greece sold the UNRRA relief supplies, goods and food, and put 85 percent of the proceeds of the sale of those supplies into the treasury of the Government of Greece. That is what happened. I was given that information by one who handled UNRRA officially in Greece.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am greatly disturbed by what the Senator from Colorado has just said; namely, that he does not believe that $250,000,000 is all the money that the Senate of the United States will be asked to provide for the relief of Greece. Certainly if additional funds will be required from our country, should we not have full information at this time, so that we can act intelligently, rather than merely take snap judgment? It will not be in the interest of the security of our country and, as is alleged, in the interest of avoiding war, for us to go along with the pending bill merely because the State Department and the President have proposed this step.

So far as I am concerned, I should prefer to take some action through the United Nations, so as to force the hand of Russia at this time, rather than to go through the back door into the Balkans or force a showdown a year hence or 2 or 3 or 5 years from now. I think that revelations which have been made during the past few months, tending to show that Uncle Sam and the American people were sold down the river by secret agreements which were made by representatives of our country in dealing with Russia, and in which Britain, our ally, participated, indicate that the time has come for all the cards to be placed face up upon the table, so that the American people and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States may take action predicated upon what the entire program is, rather than to adopt a piecemeal program involving our taking only one step at this time, but inevitably to be followed by other steps which we are reluctant to take.

I hesitate to believe that we are not getting all the information and are not being told the entire truth when it is said that $250,000,000 is all that will be required to implement this program of relief for Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not think the President told us that. I think he told us very plainly that he would be back for more money if he needed it. I think he put us on our guard and gave us the bad news when he delivered his message to us on March 12. If we go ahead with this kind of proposition blindly and without giving that phase of it the consideration it deserves, of course the fault is ours, and the people of the United States will have every right to hold us responsible for it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Colorado this question: If what is proposed is to be the policy—and it is declared by the President to be the policy—should not and would not it have to be applied alike in all parts of the world where comparable situations exist?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my understanding of a policy; namely, that it should be applied alike everywhere. In other words, if this is to be the policy, the situation in Greece is not simply a lone incident to be treated without regard to other similar situations. Of course, Greece, as we see it portrayed on the map, is only one small point; and the Greek population of 7,000,000 is not large. The Greek situation is only one small feature of the entire world program which we are facing. I feel that what the Senator has said is correct; and that the Senator is correct in his conclusion that if we are laying down a policy, that policy applies to everyone, everywhere, and is the foreign policy of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It has been asked on the floor of the Senate what would be said by the Politburo if we do not accede to the President's request. What does the able Senator from Colorado think would be the effect if we stand up for this policy in Greece, and then later, if some other situation arose in some other part of the world, did not stand up for the same policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, it will be a singular situation if we are going to have one policy for Greece and Turkey simply because Greece and Turkey stand in the so-called path of Russia, between Russia and the oil fields of the

Middle East, and if we are to have another policy for the rest of the world. If we are to have a policy, it must be applied consistently throughout the world, if it is based on the high principles which the President so eloquently enunciated in his message of March 12.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If we begin to implement that policy in Greece, but do not continue it in place after place all over the world, then whenever we quit, if the Senator's warning to us is valid, the Politburo will be able to say, "Well, they started off with a policy, but they have quit carrying it out."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course; and then our weakness would be shown up. Unless we are able to carry a policy through to a conclusion—right down the road, and all the way down the road—we should not adopt the policy in the first place. That is as plain as anything can be.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, if we reach the conclusion that we cannot follow this policy indefinitely, and cannot finance the world forever, what is likely to happen to us is, is it not, that we shall arm Turkey and we shall arm Greece and we shall arm other countries abroad with modern weapons, and then one day we shall find, just as Great Britain has found now, that we have come to the end and cannot go further; and then we shall have to pull out. If Russia then moves in, she will find there armed countries ready to be turned against us. Would not that be the situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The situation could not be different from what the Senator has stated.

Mr. President, let me say that it is quite clear from Mr. Truman's apologetic statement that the present government in Greece is not the kind of government that the American people would approve if they had the full facts before them. First of all, of course, there is the notorious, venal, and corrupt monarchy which the Greek people have struggled against for a hundred years. It is important, I believe, to go back into the history of Greece and remember that early in the 19th century the Greeks fought a war of independence against the Turks. Following that war, the Greeks attempted to establish a republican form of government, but the great powers then governing the world decided that the Greek people must have a monarchy. After considerable maneuvering, the monarchy was established. Not a Greek family, not a family from the Balkans, but in actual fact a German-Bavarian family were made the rulers of Greece. This family, never popular, has had a turbulent history. King Otto was driven from the throne in 1862. The unhappy George I was assassinated in 1913. King Constantine abdicated in 1917; and after his recall in 1920 he was forced to abdicate again in 1922, in favor of George II. The late King George II was driven into exile in 1924. On October 10, 1935, a dictatorship of extreme Royalists, and aided by the Royalist Military League of high Army and Navy officers, was established. Under that dictatorship, a Greek plebiscite was held, and King George II was returned to the throne from exile. Less than 1 year later—on August 4, 1936— this on-again, gone-again ruler, in violation of his oath to preserve a constitutional form of government, authorized the notorious and hated Metaxas dictatorship. Ruthless suppression of civil liberties throughout Greece followed. Greece was attacked in 1940 by Italy. By heroic military action she repelled the invaders. Subsequently, in 1941, Germany joined the Italian-Greco war. The Greek army was defeated, and Greece surrendered unconditionally in August of 1941. King George and his government fled to Cairo, and then to London. Various officials associated with the Metaxas dictatorship were guilty of treasonable collaboration with the enemy, helping to hasten the defeat of Greece, while other officials of the Metaxas government went into exile with King George II. Slowly the resistance forces formed in Greece, and they relentlessly counter-attacked the Germans. King George II, from his place of safety in London, began to prick up his ears.

On March 15, 1943, King George and his government-in-exile returned to Cairo. The various representatives of political parties and groups active in Greece against the Nazis sent delegates to call on the King, and, without exception, all of those parties and resistance leaders urged the King to issue a statement that he would not return to Greece "before people have given their decision on the form of the regime."

It is interesting, Mr. President, that the cabinet concurred with the popular demand, and so expressed themselves to the King, but King George II rejected this proposal, as well as the suggestion by the British for a national unity government. The resistance representatives of the patriots fighting in Greece against the Nazi occupation were placed under house arrest, were kept incommunicado, and later were sent back to Greece under extremely humiliating circumstances. We can go into great detail, Mr. President, as to how the British landed in Greece, how they violated their agreements with the resistance forces, and how the British General Scobie proceeded to conduct civil war in Greece against the resistance forces which had made matters so uncomfortable for the Nazis. We can show in detail how Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden personally flew to Greece and intervened in the internal situation. We can show how the Royalist forces were not disarmed, while every effort was made to destroy the liberal groups that had conducted underground warfare against the Nazis. We can go into the whole history of 2 years of British blundering.

Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a part of a chapter in Leland Stowe's very timely book entitled "While Time Remains." I shall not delay the Senate in quoting from the book. I regret that every Member of the Senate has not read While Time Remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WAS THE GREEK "MOUNTAIN BRIGADE," AND WHO SPONSORED IT?

In April 1944—while Germans still occupied Greece—"mutiny" broke out in the Greek Army and naval forces in Egypt. These were Greeks who had fled their country to fight on beside the Allies. The EAM resistance leaders had smuggled delegates out of Greece and sent them to Cairo. These resistance delegates came to ask that they—like the French resistance delegates to the French National Committee in North Africa—should be represented in the British-dominated Greek Government-in-exile. The Greek patriots who were resisting and dying at home felt they should have some representation in their government. In Cairo the EAM delegates were received with harsh words—and locked up; finally they were shipped ignominiously home to Greece. But the British and American correspondents in Cairo were severely muzzled by censorship. They could not report any of this, nor explain what followed, until long afterward.

What followed was officially described by British officials as a Greek "mutiny." As a protest against the high-handed ousting of EAM delegates, thousands of Greek soldiers and sailors refused to obey orders. They felt that the greatest resistance movement in Greece had every right to be represented in the exile government. Fighting broke out. Many were killed. Thousands of patriotic Greeks were jailed—and Allied correspondents were not permitted to tell the world how and why this incredible thing had happened. Eighteen months later, in the late autumn of 1945, some 1,500 anti-Fascist Greeks, victims of this "mutiny," were still imprisoned in British concentration camps in remote Eritrea. They had been guilty of demanding a Greek government of national unity. At least until July 1945, it was charged that they had never been granted the right to see a representative of the International Red Cross.

It was immediately after this ruthless suppression of Greek soldiers and sailors in Egypt—when British guns first shot down Greeks—that the Churchill government proceeded to organize the Greek Mountain Brigade All Greeks in Egypt were carefully screened. Greek Republicans of all nuances from moderate conservatives to leftists, officers or men, were barred from the new brigade. It was built up as a strictly Royalist and anti-Republican fighting force. Was it a coincidence that the Churchill government was a frank champion of King George of Greece? A Greek officer, a lifelong Republican, whom I knew well in Albania in 1940, told me in Athens: In Cairo I saw the whole thing. They jailed or banned all Republican officers from the Mountain Brigade." Allied correspondents saw this, too, but they were not allowed to inform the British and American people. If the Greeks had "mutinied" in Egypt, then the Mountain Brigade was a Churchill-approved (or invented) Royalist plot.

So the British whipped the monarchist MB into fighting trim. The Mountain Brigade fought in Italy for about 1 month, long enough to help capture Rimini. Then, soon after Athens was liberated in mid-October 1944, the British brought in the Mountain Brigade. The Athenians cheered these men wildly because they were the only Greeks who had fought the Germans as a

regular army unit. But the EAM-ELAS leaders knew that the Mountain Brigade was ardently Royalist. And when General Scobie demanded that ELAS, the patriots' half-armed forces, should give up their arms, these Greeks naturally said: "Disarm the Royalist Mountain Brigade, too—or, no, thank you."

It was this dispute over disarming the British-created royalist brigade which precipitated the government crisis, which in turn produced the civil war. In Athens I checked over this, step by step, with Greeks and correspondents—and Allied officers—who were on the spot at the time. Premier Papandreou finally agreed that both ELAS and the Mountain Brigade would be disarmed. Then Papandreou retracted. He gave an EAM member, then in the government, a letter from General Scobie. The letter said that Prime Minister Churchill would not permit the royalist brigade to be disbanded, along with ELAS. The American Ambassador in Athens confirmed to me that this rejection came either from London or from General Scobie. This decision provoked the resignation of the EAM ministers. That brought on a huge EAM street demonstration on Sunday, December 3. The police fired into the unarmed, peaceful paraders. The civil war began. I asked a strongly anti-Communist Greek doctor why Churchill forbade disbanding the brigade.

"Well, who created the Mountain Brigade?" asked the doctor.

A brigade officer made this frank remark to a friend: "We were brought here for one purpose—to suppress the Left. Our men have been promised jobs in the new police force which is going to be formed."

While I was in Athens, Mountain Brigade men were being incorporated wholesale into the new Greek Army, called the national guard; or into the police. So were the pro-monarchist EDES followers who had cooperated with the Germans through most of the occupation. But to get the picture straight:

HOW DID THE GREEK CIVIL WAR START? WAS THERE A RED PLOT?

In Parliament Prime Minister Churchill gave this explanation: "From the depredations and ravages of ELAS there developed * * * a well-organized plot by which ELAS should march down to Athens and seize it by armed force and establish a reign of terror."

In his January 18 (1945) speech Mr. Churchill quoted a report from the British ambassador to Greece. Ambassador Leeper charged that a small, well-armed Communist Party had been practicing a "reign of terror" all over Greece, and added: "Nobody can estimate the number of people killed or arrested before the revolt in Athens actually began." This statement implied that left-wing guerrillas had been pillaging and killing in Athens, and throughout most of Greece, for weeks before the police began shooting on December 3.

In Athens I investigated with great care what had happened between the capital's liberation on October 12–14 and December 3. For those first two October days ELAS forces held Athens alone, until the British arrived. Naturally, they were wildly elated—and, of course, they went after Quislings and traitors. Some were killed, and in the furore of those first 2 days of liberation some innocent citizens possibly became victims of passions long pent up. But as soon as the British came, General Scobie requested ELAS to withdraw their forces from Athens—and ELAS withdrew. That, indeed, was a strange procedure for "well-organized plotters" who, in Churchill's version, later planned to march on Athens and "establish a reign of terror." On October 14 ELAS vastly outnumbered the British and held Athens in their power. Why, then, did they obediently withdraw?

In Athens I met many old colleagues. We had worked together in many parts of Europe. These British and American correspondents I knew by long observation. They were journalists of great integrity and reliability. I asked them, as I asked Greek friends of the Italian war period, if looting and killing occurred on any important scale before December 3. Since British troops arrived, they told me, there had been nothing remotely resembling a "reign of terror" in Athens. The terror had started only with the civil war—and then it was war, with ruthless fighting on both sides. Frank Gervasi of Collier's and M. W. Fodor of the Chicago Sun had journeyed from Athens all the way north to Salonika and back without encountering any "massacres" or hint of ELAS "depredations." In Salonika the British commander, Major General Hollworthy, told them there had not been a single reprisal execution by ELAS since that city was liberated on November 7. Although I sought evidence on every side, Ambassador Leeper's statement about vast killings "before the revolt in Athens actually began" simply could not be substantiated. Along with other correspondents I had to conclude either that Sir Reginald had been a victim of highly emotional rumors, or that he had become involved somehow in a deliberate falsification.

Once the civil war started, many upper-class Athenians talked wildly about acts of "Communist terror." Certain ELAS extremists had run amok, they said, and committed all sorts of crimes. But when you tried to get specific dates, you could almost never place serious disorder before December 3. And American officers and officials, on the whole, confirmed this important distinction. Mike Fodor, as foreign correspondent, had known Greece for more than 20 years. No one who has ever met Fodor can question his honesty. He summed up the pre-civil war situation to me in these words: "In 25 years I've seen almost every revolution in Europe. This, right here, was the quietest, calmest, and most civilized revolution I've ever seen—until the shooting began by the police and the British intervened."

BUT HOW DID THE SHOOTING IN ATHENS BEGIN?

During the week before December 1, the Papandreou government was stalemated on how to get ELAS and the Mountain Brigade disarmed and disbanded. When the British command, or Government, insisted that their hand-picked brigade of Royalists must have special treatment over the resistance patriots (who had opposed the Germans at far greater cost), the six EAM ministers quit the government. Yet when Winston Churchill told the world about the Greek civil war he made no pretense of reporting all the facts. He never so much as mentioned his government's stand in support of the Royalist Mountain Brigade—nor so much as mentioned the existence of the brigade.

On December 2, EAM leaders asked for governmental permission to stage a protest demonstration—and gave their word that it would be unarmed. Papandreou granted permission for the parade on December 3, next morning. Out of 1,250,000 Greeks in the greater Athens area, probably 80 percent or more were EAM supporters; mostly workers and the poor. That afternoon they got word that the demonstration was permitted. Most of them had never possessed telephones or radios. They went to bed early, so as to get up at 4 or 5 o'clock and start marching to Constitution Square in the heart of Athens. But Papandreou had a long parley with General Scobie that night, and shortly before midnight the premier canceled permission for the parade—when the people could not possibly be notified. Papandreou also decided to declare martial law. From British sources I was told that General Scobie told Papandreou it was time to "get tough" with EAM.

On Sunday morning tens of thousands of Athenian workers and their wives and children marched toward and into Constitution Square. The police had machine guns on the roofs—something no correspondent had seen before ther. The EAM supporters carried placards. Some of the slogans read: "Why, America, have you abandoned us?" "America, we are tired, and we don't want civil war." "Bring the traitors to trial." "We want a real national unity government." The square was jammed with people, but correspondents close beside the police lines said there was no disorder. Then, suddenly, some of the police began firing into the tight-packed throng. In a short time 25 were dead, including a boy, aged 6. Scores more reddened the pavement from their wounds. Now it was not merely martial law, but civil war.

Later on I had a long conversation with British Ambassador Leeper. He talked so readily that I had little opportunity to ask questions. At the end of some 40 minutes, I was keenly aware of the fact that the British Ambassador had scarcely looked me straight in the eye twice throughout his prolonged monolog. This is a fact which I am compelled to report. There was a further fact. In years of rather frequent encounters with ambassadors of many nations, I had never left a consultation with such an unpleasant impression as I took away this time. I regret to have to say this, but I believe it is too important to be glossed over.

This happened, oddly enough, without so much as asking an embarrassing question. Perhaps this was because the official Churchill-Leeper version of the tragedy in Greece had won only one ardent supporter among some 20 British and American correspondents who were making their own investigation of facts in Athens. The Churchill-Leeper version badly needed support in the world press, yet about 90 percent of Anglo-American correspondents on the spot rejected large sections of it in toto. As a more recent arrival, I was probably thought to merit an extensive official review of the situation. In the course of this review, Ambassador Leeper said: "The police did not shoot first. Grenades were thrown first by the ELAS. The Communists put their women and children in the front row, as they always do, to hide their armed men. They had their guns behind and were shooting."

This statement was so completely contrary to everything I had previously heard that I maintained a poker face to hide my amazement—and did not question it. But I went back and talked again to about a dozen correspondents who—unlike the British Ambassador—had been eyewitnesses. Again I asked if there had been any shooting by the EAM demonstrators.

"None whatever. Only the police shot."

That was the unanimous verdict. "We never saw any EAM people with weapons in their hands," they said. "If any of the EAM were shooting, how was it that not a policeman was wounded?" The British correspondents were particularly incensed over their Ambassador's statement. One of them said: "There were never any women and children out in front to hide men with weapons. That's a lot of ——."

I am absolutely convinced that he was right.

In fact, the absurdity of Ambassador Leeper's accusation was demonstrated by the news photographs which Dimitri Kessel of Life risked his own life in taking that morning of death and disgrace. These pictures show Greek workers—men, women, and children—being mowed down by police fire, without a weapon in their hands. Was it merely as a precaution that Papandreou was

persuaded, the night before, to declare martial law? By the record of what happened, the Athens police should have been placed under martial law.

The massacre by the police prompted the EAM-ELAS supporters to attack police stations all over the city. British troops were ordered to uphold the forces of "law and order." And within 24 hours the British and their Greek royalist bands were in serious danger from ELAS forces, which outnumbered them greatly and were backed by the overwhelming mass of the Athenian population. That was when 100 United States Army transport planes were called upon to intervene in the civil war. American pilots flew in British and Indian troops as reinforcements. All of Athens, that lovely and shining metropolis beneath the brow of the incomparable Acropolis, became a battlefield. For 33 days the common people fought against lend-lease tanks and RAF dive bombers. They were bombed and machine gunned in their pitiful shacks and hovels in Ghizi and Kaisariani. They were "terrorists" and "Communists," the "liberators" said. The strongest of EAM and ELAS leaders were Communists, and so were a small minority of their extremely large following. But who were the terrorists? Who had started the terror? Let history answer—let time bring its own retribution.

But in these first days, even with all the organized military units on their side and even with the best and heaviest weapons, the British and the Greek royalists were pushed backward and backward. So it happened, just 2 days after the fighting started, that General Scobie accepted other allies—the Quislings and Lavals of Greece. By Scobie's order, or by his permission, the traitor "Security Battalions" were released, rearmed, and thrown against the ELAS forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a United Press report under the date line New York, April 10, quoting from Winston Churchill with respect to the civil war in Greece. Churchill makes an admission in his statement, and I am sure that nothing will be found inconsistent between what Churchill said and what Leland Stowe stated.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNIE SAVED GREECE FROM REDS, HE SAYS

NEW YORK, April 10.—Winston Churchill said today in an article in the New York Times that if he had not given the order to fire on the Communist guerrilla bands in Greece on December 6, 1944, the Communists would have taken over Greece. The defeat of the Communist coup d'etat was necessary, he said, to insure free elections in Greece.

Churchill wrote that "not only has the Communist peril been recognized as the gravest that now overhangs the world, but a series of measures of a resolute character has been taken to resist further encroachments and expansion by the Russian Soviet state in Europe and Asia."

CITES FULTON SPEECH

Churchill pointed out that this policy backs up the statements that he made in his controversial speech in Fulton, Mo., on March 5, 1946, when he warned against Russian expansion and asked for close Anglo-American cooperation.

"On Greek affairs in 1944–45 I seemed to find myself out of step. But today it seems I was pursuing the exact policy which, little more than 2 years later, the United States has adopted with strong conviction."

"All the talk of denunciation of British imperialism in Greece was sheer nonsense," Churchill said. "We had no special interest to serve, except the cause of freedom; and many others are involved in that.

"WE SEEK NOTHING

"We sought and seek nothing from Greece but to give her a fair chance of revival and thus do our duty to which we had pledged ourselves by long sentiment and alliance."

Churchill further stated that "the ambitious of this mighty Communist empire and oligarchy go far beyond the dreams of czarist days. The domination of the whole of the Balkan Peninsula by Communist rule under Soviet guidance, and the conquest and probably incorporation of Turkey are the two immediate objects of Russian desire." According to Churchill, President Truman's declaration of March 12, 1947, involves the decision of the United States to take a leading part, so far as it is necessary to world peace, in the eastern Mediterranean, or what is commonly called the Middle East.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Leland Stowe is a reporter in whom the American people have every right to have great confidence. He tells an unbelievable story of the beginning of the civil war in Greece, how the people had petitioned for the right to assemble, and were given permission. Late the night preceding the morning when they were to assemble, the order was changed, and they were not to be permitted to meet. But they did not get the word, so they came early in the morning, and the British machine guns were turned on them. The Royalist guard turned their guns on them and mowed them down in cold blood when they appeared for a peaceable assembly. It was one of the cruelest things that has ever happened in history. Even children were murdered. It was one of those happenings in history that make one's blood boil.

Mr. President, the substance of the recent history of Greece is nothing but another chapter in the history of broken promises by an arrogant and corrupt monarchy, which for 100 years has exploited seven and a half million people for its own personal aggrandizement. Now King George II is dead and he has been succeeded by his brother, Prince Paul. From all available information, it is quite useless to attempt to hide from the fact that Prince Paul is more hated than any other member of the Greek royal family.

During the Metaxas dictatorship, Prince Paul was titular head of the Greek Fascist youth organization, the EOM. This organization carried out the customary training and monkeyshines of the Hitler youth group. They had the customary Nazi uniforms, salutes, paraphernalia, and creeds. Its creed, to which Greek children had to subscribe, read like this:

We believe in one divinely inspired and God-sent leader and savior and guide of the nation, creator of its present and future history, father of the Greek youth and outstanding fighter, John Metaxas.

Does not that sound like something that happened under Adolf Hitler? It does to me. That, of course, was in the days when Metaxas was the dictator of Greece.

This hated Greek monarchy is the pattern which the British have employed in India, the Near and Middle East, and in the Malay Peninsula to obtain agents for their policies of exploitation. This pattern of imperialism has nothing in common with the tradition, heritage, or concepts of democracy enjoyed by the American people.

Mr. President, I believe that as far as possible the Senate should wipe its hands of the lackeys who have been scattered throughout the world by the clever, empire-conscious British Government. There is no reason why we should pour out the money of American taxpayers to sustain and continue the basic mistakes of British foreign policy in Greece during the past 2 years. The American people, Mr. President, are anxious to give millions for clothing and food for the hungry, but they are not willing to expend one cent to maintain a corrupt and venal monarchy any place in this world. The Members of the Senate ought to bear this in mind when they vote on my amendment.

My amendment provides not only for the abolition of hereditary offices and titles, but it provides for free democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive of such government and the membership of its legislative body.

For a people famous throughout the world for their love of liberty, who by their heroic deeds have inspired poets for centuries, the Greek people deserve a chance at democratic government once more. It is absurd, ridiculous, and stupid to pretend that the present Greek Government in any way represents the democratic choice of the majority of the people of Greece. It is pure, unadulterated sophistry to contend that the Greek Government has the support of 85 percent of the people, when in truth it has merely the support of 85 percent of those political parties with seats in the present Greek Parliament.

Roughly, half of all the Greek political parties did not participate in the election held a year ago. Not only did they not participate but a large proportion of those who did did not vote for candidates now sitting in the Parliament. Supposedly, more than a million people voted in those elections; yet the fact is that this constitutes roughly 15 to 16 percent of the population of Greece, and of this percentage many did not vote for the present Government. In other words, 85 percent of the present Parliament members support the present Government, but this 85 percent represents less than 15 percent of the people who live in Greece.

The so-called elections recently held in Greece were in no sense free or democratic. It is necessary, if one is to make a judgment on those elections, to remember that just previous to the elections civil war had raged in Greece; that the country was occupied by British troops; that neither the press nor the radio was free; that election campaigning was not allowed in any genuine sense. It is necessary to understand that the government had control of the existing food supplies. It is most relevant to remember that the Royalist groups were armed while their opponents were not armed. It is essential to understand that the political leadership of the existing political parties did not participate nor have the

opportunity to participate freely and actively in those elections. The most clever apologist in our State Department cannot produce the facts to sustain the contention that free and democratic elections were held. It may well be, Mr. President, that under the eyes of allied observers, large numbers of docile, terror-ridden peoples were herded to the polls. It is impossible, as all of us know, for outside observers unfamiliar with the history and background of the situation, with no understanding of the confusion resulting from the absence of trusted leaders, to render an accurate judgment.

If those elections, Mr. President, were fair and democratic, why would any one object to the provisions that free and democratic elections should now be held within 90 days after the request for aid has been made?

I should like to ask at this point to have inserted in the RECORD a report by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, April 1, 1947. I shall not detain the Senate by reading Mr. Krock's report, except just one part of it:

This correspondent today read a report of this character:

"I feel," this trained observer wrote, "that, while the motives of the President's program to combat communism are the very best, he is repeating the same mistake which lost us Poland and other areas now behind the iron curtain and conceivably might even lose us South America. This mistake is in endorsing the worst elements of reaction in Greece and ignoring the center and and the non-Communist left."

He continued:

"All responsible and reasonable disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present Government, and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty."

And that is what my amendment provides for.

"Whether or not the last elections were fair, it is still a fact that a substantial section of Greek public opinion feels they were not. In any new election the Left stands no chance of winning, which makes denial of the electoral test by the Government even stupider."

I ask permission to insert all of Mr. Krock's statement in the RECORD.

There be no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREEK GOVERNMENT IS A DIFFICULT CLIENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Although the administration has stressed that part of its newly announced foreign policy which provides aid for the Greek people, and played down the aid to Turkey, which is much more strategic from a military standpoint, the attention of critics of the current government in Athens has not been diverted by this tactic.

These critics share the general admiration of the western world for the gallant Greek resistance to the Axis, and the widespread sympathy for the economic and social plight of the Hellenes. But this has not removed the objection of some to extending the proposed aid while the Greeks are governed as at present, or distracted others from insisting that the projected Turkish intervention shall be weighed more realistically than officially it has been. Senator Austin, for example, in his explanation of the new policy to the United Nations, discussed the Turkish program very briefly indeed.

* * * * *

A REPORT FROM GREECE

The provision that any government representative of a majority may request withdrawal of the plan in Greece and Turkey is especially designed to meet the point that the government in Athens is neither truly representative nor democratic. The President passed this over lightly in his address to Congress. But nearly every day a report comes to Washington from reliable sources, sometimes brought in person, which suggests that Mr. Truman made an understatement when he said the Greek Government is not perfect. This correspondent today read a report of this character.

"I feel," this trained observer wrote, "that, while the motives of the President's program to combat communism are the very best, he is repeating the same mistake which lost us Poland and other areas now behind the iron curtain and conceivably might even lose us South America. This mistake is in endorsing the worst elements of reaction in Greece and ignoring the center and the non-Communist left."

He continued:

"All responsible and reasonably disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing, and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present Government, and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty.

"Whether or not the last elections were fair, it is still a fact that a substantial section of Greek public opinion feels they were not. In any new election the Left stands no chance of winning, which makes denial of the electoral test by the Government even stupider.

"The announcement that the United States is going to bail out Greece has served to impede many good things Paul Porter (the President's special Ambassador) wanted the Athens government to accomplish on the home front. It was also the signal for a new campaign of repression by the Ministry of the Interior, which is neither better nor worse than the Soviet NKVD or the Yugoslav OZNA (secret police)."

ARRESTS BY NIGHT

This observer, who would not be quoted in this space had he not impressively established his reliability, disinterestedness, and capacity to report objectively, further asserted that the Ministry, in its renewed campaign of repression, is following the secret-police technique made familiar for years in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Spain, Japan, and Soviet Russia. Arrests of citizens were made between midnight and 5 o'clock a. m., and within 24 hours those seized were deported to a lonely island without a public trial.

"In one 3-day period," he added, "after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professional—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the Government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation. And the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the Government."

This observer concluded with the statement that, as much as he detests Communists, he would go to the mountains if he were a citizen of Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the present government really, genuinely believes it is representative of the people, it has nothing to fear. That is just as Mr. Krock has reported. If it is a free and democratic government, it will not object to free and democratic elections. Only the enemies of democracy are afraid of the voice of the people. The American people do not want to pour out hundreds of millions of dollars to sustain governments which essentially are royalist, antidemocratic in their heart, and who are not supported by the people. The American people still believe that the power to govern is derived from the consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senators who have favorably reported this legislation exactly how many political prisoners are held today in concentration camps by the present Greek Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that probably there are not very many prisoners held at one time in Greece, because political prisoners are not fed, and so it is impossible to keep very many on hand for a very long time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator thinks they do not last long?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish we had exact information on the conditions under which the prisoners suffer, so we could present it to the Senate and to Congress while this bill is being considered.

I should also like to know how many Greek political prisoners are held by the British in Egypt and other areas under British control. My information leads me to the belief that the number of such prisoners runs well over 20,000.

It is reported from Athens by the correspondent of the Overseas News Agency that within 24 hours after the President's speech on Greece, the Government announced that it had arrested, sentenced, and deported to island prisons nearly 600 leftists. That was when they got news of the President's speech. That is what happened in the city of Athens.

Mr. President, if this present government is free and democratic, why are thousands upon thousands of Greeks in political concentration camps? Free and democratic elections cannot be held if political tyranny of this kind continues. If free speech and free press exist in Greece, why are such measures necessary? The obvious answer, of course, Mr. President, is that democratic procedure and democratic liberties do not exist in Greece. The excuse is given that several thousand Communists in the mountains are attempting to overthrow the Government. If those people now fighting in the mountains did not have the support of the Greek populace, would not the present Greek Army be able to disperse such a woeful handful of men? And if the men and women now fighting in the

mountains have the support of large parts of the Greek people, is not this by itself prima facie evidence that the present Greek Government does not represent the rank and file of the Greek people? Remember, Mr. President, the average Greek worker is paid 7,000 drachmas a day, but he needs a minimum of 10,000 drachmas a day just to buy for his family 2,500 calories of food which, as everyone knows, is roughly 500 calories above the starvation limit. Can a government which enforces a regressive taxation system, which makes no effort to stop disastrous inflation, ever entertain the support of the majority of its people? It must be obvious to everyone that for such a government, military dictatorship is necessary if it is to remain in power.

I should like permission to insert in the RECORD a remarkable article by Raymond Daniell, which appeared in the New York Times magazine, April 6, 1947. I have marked parts of it which I shall ask to have printed. I wish that I had time to read the whole article to the Senate, but I shall read a few short excerpts. Mr. Daniell is a very conservative and reputable correspondent. I am sure everyone will agree that he is not given to exaggeration, nor is he given to propaganda in the articles he writes. He is an accurate reporter. He is a reporter upon whom the readers may absolutely depend. He simply states the facts without bias, and without attempting to distort or to make it appear that one side is in a better position than the other.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. He has shown by his usual logical presentation that the Government of Greece probably does not actually represent the people of Greece, or at least represents less than a majority of the people. Is it not a logical conclusion further that Greece as a matter of fact is simply a pawn in this game, regardless of what her government is? If our policy, as the President has laid it down, conflicts with the Russian policy, then whatever government Greece should have, we would do what is now proposed to be done, and probably would follow that policy into other countries regardless of what kind of governments they had. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Unfortunately, I am afraid that is the situation. I am afraid we are giving no concern whatever to the kind of government we propose to help. I heard the statement made on the floor of the Senate today, "Oh, well, Greece is an independent government," and therefore we should help her. When we can no longer support the kind of government that exists in Greece, it is proposed to fall back on the statement, "Theirs is an independent government, and therefore we must support that country."

I cannot go along with that kind of a proposal. I do not think the American people want to go along with such a proposal. I do not think the American people can effectively fight communism by doing such a thing. If we are going to fight communism we must have something better than communism with which to fight it, not something which is far worse than communism. As between communism and the kind of government now existing in Greece, communism is a bright and shining star. There is a much better form of government than communism, and it is a democracy. Even some of the democracies which are not exactly pure democracies are much better, in my opinion, than communism. In my opinion, communism is pretty well down the scale in forms of government. But I do not think that communism is quite as far down the scale as is the kind of government the Greek people are afflicted with at the present time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a further logical conclusion, then, that almost throughout the ages—and we are following in the footsteps of those who have gone before—whenever for any reason one country wants to go into another country for interests of its own, it finds reasons for doing so? Then, as a matter of fact, does not our talk about the kind of governments we are going to support, the four freedoms, and all, fall a little flat?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; of course it falls flat. That is the difficulty, and that is why I cannot go along with Senators who say on the floor of the Senate "We have two choices." I say, let us make a third choice. Let us lay down some conditions. Let us insist that the situation so far as the Greek Government is concerned, be clarified and purified and improved so that it meets the standards—not the highest standards, but acceptable standards on the part of the people of the United States. Before we do anything else that is what we should do. A strange thing in connection with this matter is that if we would do such a thing there would not be civil war in Greece. There is civil war in Greece because of the depression, there is civil war in Greece because of the inefficiency and the inability of her tyrannical fascist government to do the job that a government is supposed to do. So what we should do in Greece, unless we want to pour money down a rat hole, is to do first things first, and the first thing to do there is to straighten out the Greek Government.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, as a matter of fact, for whatever reason we want to go into Greece now, whether it is to protect our fuel supply in Turkey or whether it is to protect the Mediterranean and keep Russia from obtaining full possession of the Dardanelles—and it is suspected in rather high quarters that that may have something to do with the program—for whatever reason then, we would take occasion to find an excuse to go into Greece regardless of what kind of a government they had. Is that not a rather logical conclusion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am compelled to reach that conclusion. So long as the President's new policy of interfering in civil wars—and he has laid it down in so many words, and it is the new policy—continues to be American policy, whatever kind of government we find in the country involved is not of importance to the policy; that does not make any difference. The President says that hereafter it is to be the policy of the United States to take sides in any civil war or strife we find any place on earth. That is a new policy for the United States. As a matter of fact, no nation has ever had such a policy. We complained bitterly during the War Between the States when England was more or less taking one side in the struggle, and she had to pay heavy damages when the war was over for the position she took.

The President, in his message before the joint session of Congress, said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"By armed minorities"—that is a civil war. That sounds very fine. The policy is to support "free peoples." But we decide who are the "free peoples." We decide whether the "free peoples" are the Greek Royalist Government or the poor peasants and workers in Greece fighting for a chance to live and a chance to feed their families and take care of their families and escape from the terrible miseries which surround them. It is proposed that we go into Greece and decide who are the "free peoples" of Greece. Of course, that is what nations always do when they intervene in civil wars. They pick out the people they are going to help and try to cast the robe of purity around them. That is what we are doing in this case.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If we went into Greece, would we not actually suppress the very thing we would like to see exist in Greece, if our talk means anything?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. We are going in to shoot down the very people for whom the American people naturally would have a great sympathy, and I am not referring to the Communists. As Arthur Krock has pointed out, it is the middle class. It is not the Communists on this end of the line or the Royalists on the other end, but it is the great ordinary common people—those who are in between. They are the ones who would be shot down.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, the debate brought out today, I think, very clearly that the crisis, if there is one, was precipitated by the withdrawal of English support from Greece. Then if we rush in and take up the mantle which England has cast off, are we not simply

picking up England's fight without taking the time to form a clear policy of our own?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and we are making a great mistake, because the English people are very clever at colonization; they are very clever at working with other people. They have made that a career. They have an excellent brand of diplomacy. Our diplomacy is far less efficient than British diplomacy. Yet where England has failed dismally and is getting out because she has failed, we are going to take over, and we have had no experience in that sort of thing. Usually the British go into another country to help it; they make it pay its own way. But we do not do that. We go in with great grants out of our Treasury and try to make the program succeed with grants from our Treasury. The British do not do that. I feel very certain that we are only heading for serious trouble when we attempt to do something that the British have failed to do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without discussing the merits of this program, whether it is the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do—and that is a question which could be debated—are we not going in to stop the Russians from taking over the Dardanelles, the Mediterranean, and the oil fields in Turkey? Is not that the logical conclusion? Without debating whether we should do it or not, should not the truth be told to the American people?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, if that threat actually exists. I have not seen any evidence that Russia wants to take over the oil fields or take over Greece, or even Turkey. What Russia has asked for is the right to fortify the Dardanelles. If one looks at the map and considers the position of Turkey, he will see what a magnificent springboard it offers for any nation which wishes to attack Russia. When we look at the Black Sea, we must remember that it has 2,000 miles of shore line. Russia desires to defend herself. She wishes to build bases around her country. The area around the Black Sea is the only point on the compass where Russia is vulnerable. One can very readily see why she would rather place fortifications on the Dardanelles than fortify the entire shore line of the Black Sea. The Black Sea reaches up into the bowels of Russia. It is the right road to travel if we want to attack Russia. Of course Russia knows that, so Russia wants to protect herself by building fortifications on the Dardanelles. Is not that sensible?

The Senator has made some reference to my service on the Committee on Military Affairs. I recall that more than a year ago the War Department—as it should have done—figured out the defense of America. It planned bases beginning at the Philippines, on the one side, and extending into the Arctic Circle in a northerly direction. The other leg of the horseshoe was in the Azores. That is what the War Department said was needed to protect America. Those were the bases which it claimed were needed; and I think we needed them. I am sorry that the plan was not put into operation and the necessary bases established, because I think they represent the very minimum in our defenses, and that we should have them.

But when we make such military plans as that, how can we say that Russia should not make similar plans to protect herself? I think it is entirely reasonable that Russia should be given the right to have fortifications and protection on the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is free to everyone to use. But, of course, in time of war it is a pathway into the interior of Russia. I do not think Russia is blind to that fact. I know she is not. I know that if she could place fortifications on the Dardanelles they would cost perhaps 1 percent of the cost of the fortifications she would have to have on the entire coast line of the Black Sea. She knows that, and so do we.

We are going into Greece and Turkey with our flag and our uniforms, to keep Russia away from the Dardanelles. As nearly as I can determine, that is the only object. Our whole purpose and objective is to keep Russia out of the Dardanelles with her fortifications.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It was brought out on the floor of the Senate today rather clearly that England has always been able to stop Russia from entering the Dardanelles area. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. England has followed that policy for a hundred years. She has kept Russia out of the Mediterranean. She has kept Russia from having a warm-water port.

Mr. MALONE. She stopped Russia with her fleet on at least one occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator well knows, Britain has been the mistress of the seas for many years, and she has been able to keep Russia at bay. She has been able to keep her out of the Mediterranean. But that day is gone. Britain is no longer mistress of the seas. We are taking over her job. She can no longer keep Russia out of the Mediterranean. It is not possible for her to do so, so we step in and assume that job. Why we should assume it, God only knows. I do not.

Mr. MALONE. After witnessing two world wars, being in one officially and in the other unofficially, and now having this responsibility, I have long since come to the conclusion that any vote I cast on the floor of the Senate will be on one basis alone, and that is whether it fits the policy of protecting the United States.

My next question to the Senator from Colorado is this: What study has been made, if the Senator knows of any, to determine whether it would be in the interest of the United States to prevent Russia from entering the Dardanelles?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot see that our intervention in that area would be in the interest of the United States. I hold the opposite opinion. I do not think it has anything to do with our defenses. I believe that our defenses lie entirely outside that area.

As I stated a moment ago, our War Department has figured out the defenses of the United States in a great horseshoe, beginning at the Azores and ending in the Philippines, with air bases all along the way. I think that is the way to defend America. I think that was a fine plan. It was designed by our highest military strategists.

I have never heard of any necessity for us to build air bases in Turkey—at least until the 28th of February, when this new plan came out. So far as I know, such a plan was never previously proposed. The War Department was a little reluctant to propose the horseshoe defense plan which I have described, because it was feared that the American people might not accept it. But now we have gone far beyond that point. We are going into the Mediterranean and attempting to build air bases far removed from us, bases which we cannot supply, bases in which we are likely to be caught if there is any trouble, just as we were caught with our bases in the Philippines. We shall probably reap the same results which we reaped at Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. How much closer would the Russian armed forces be to the United States of America than they are at this moment if they were allowed to come through the Dardanelles?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They would not be any nearer to the United States. They are very close to us now over the North Pole. That is the place where this Nation is vulnerable to Russia, through Alaska and through the Arctic Circle. Russia is a very close neighbor of the United States in that area. She is many thousands of miles away from us by way of Turkey. That is a long distance away, halfway around the world. But across the Arctic Circle Russia is a very close neighbor of the United States, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. MALONE. The next observation on which I should like to have the Senator's opinion is this: Supposing we agree with Russia on a situation in which we would both be admitted to the Dardanelles, including England; supposing we are all friendly and at peace, what would be the effect of such an agreement upon the peace of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is an agreement which should be worked out. That is an agreement which is more or less on the way. It is an agreement that should be worked out in the United Nations organization. The United Nations was created to immunize fever spots. That is one of the world's fever spots, and I am certain that it can be dealt with around the conference table in a peaceable way, which is the way we envisioned it when we created the United Nations.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator feel that our hostile move—I must conclude that that is what it is—in connection with the announcement by the President of the United States that we are there to stop Russia's form of government at the borders of Greece would promote such an agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I think that our threat in Turkey and in Greece is primarily the cause of the disagreement we have been having in the United Nations and which we have recently witnessed in Moscow. I do not see how we can expect other than that. I do not know how we can expect to reach an agreement around the conference table when we have a program such as the one outlined in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator, consistently with the answer he has just made, think this has made the solution of the German problem any less difficult?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It has made the solution of the German problem absolutely impossible—not only the German problem, but all the other problems and controversies that stand between the two great powers, Russia and the United States. Conditions can only drag on from bad to worse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course I have to disagree with my able friend upon that point. I think I would rather follow, under the circumstances, the opinion of our great Secretary of State, George Marshall. I have no knowledge as to Marshall's position with respect to this measure, but I think it is pretty safe to assume that he did not go to Russia without some knowledge of the problem we are now discussing, and it was undoubtedly his judgment, after having been closely allied with the Russians during the great war and having a world of experience in dealing with all types and kinds of people, that a move of this kind would strengthen, rather than weaken, his hand in the conferences at Moscow. That is my position; and I cannot help but think that it is George Marshall's position also, or he would not have gone to Russia under the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator is correct in his statement that Secretary of State Marshall knew about this. As a matter of fact, I think he is the author of the plan. I think it is the Marshall plan.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be. I do not know that it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume it is.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly think he is at least favorable to the plan, or he would not be where he is at this moment. The only point I am making is that a man who has occupied the world position which George Marshall has occupied during the last few years has undoubtedly weighed this proposition carefully and reached a very definite conclusion as to what effect, if any, it might have upon the conference now proceeding in Moscow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no doubt of that. However, the Senator well knows that many well-laid plans backfire and do not work out the way it was hoped they would.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that. I do not assert that George Marshall has all the wisdom in the world. He has no monopoly of it. The able Senator from Colorado may be correct in his conclusions. Time will tell. We have to take one or the other horn of the dilemma which is presented. I submit that either road we take is a dangerous one. It is merely a question of judgment as to which way we should go to try to bring about a peaceful solution of the world's affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course it has been a very difficult road. Russia has adopted an obstinate and, I think, stupid policy of negation for many months, and certainly her policies and her position in world affairs have been enough to try a saint. I think we must admit that. It is not an easy problem to work out. I do not see how we can expect to work it out by launching in Turkey a military threat to Russia. I do not see how we can expect to reach an amicable agreement with Russia when we have that kind of a proposal in the making.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield for one more observation along that line, I will say that I have never considered the situation so serious from the standpoint of a military threat as many other Members of the Senate have considered it in this debate. We have created more furor and fuss in this country regarding the question of war with Russia than has been created in any other place on the globe. I have never read a statement by anyone in authority in Russia that indicates what has been indicated on the floor of the Senate—that we are leading this country to war. I have never seen a statement come out of Russia that indicated that the policy which we are pursuing in advocating the Greek-Turkish loan was a policy of war against Russia. There may be some statements along that line. I have followed the newspapers daily and I have seen some critical statements coming from the Russian press and from some of the leaders in the political life of that nation, but I have never seen anyone go so far as those who are opposed to this loan have constantly gone on the floor of the Senate, and in some instances by gentlemen who are not Members of the Senate of the United States. We are not proposing to do any more—in fact, we are proposing to do less, as I see it—than the British have been doing ever since the war in both Turkey and Greece. I have never seen any protests upon the part of the Russian people with respect to what Great Britain has been doing in Greece with her thousands upon thousands of soldiers there, loaning money to Greece, and selling her military equipment, and being all the time back of Turkey both during the war and since the war.

If I understand the situation correctly, when Great Britain moves out of Turkey and Greece we will take over under much less favorable circumstances, from the standpoint of a military venture, than Great Britain has experience ever since VE-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course Britain went into Greece during the war and is getting out of Greece now that the war is over.

The Senator complains about alarmist statements which were made upon the floor of the Senate. I should like to read to him what a distinguished American had to say on March 12 in the House of Representatives when the Senator was present. The President of the United States thought the situation was so serious that he came before Congress personally and delivered a message under the most solemn of conditions. This is his first sentence:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.
>
> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

Then the President continued his address. I have never seen a more solemn occasion than that one. The President further said:

> I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time.

The President did not deceive us any; I am not calling the President an alarmist, but I do not think any statement which has been made on the floor of the Senate could be more alarming than the President's statement on March 12. Certainly a very serious situation exists.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I agree with him that the situation is serious. A moment ago I said that either horn of the dilemma which we take will lead us down a dangerous road. There can be no doubt of that, in view of the conditions which now exist throughout the world.

The President did come to the Congress with that message, and it is a serious one, but I am satisfied that the President sincerely and honestly believes that this is the only step which will keep the peace. In my humble judgment, that is his position, and it is the position of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And it is the position of the Senator from Colorado, likewise, that whatever he is doing has those same objectives. I have no quarrel with the Senator over his objectives, and I have no doubt at all that the President is absolutely sincere in what he is doing, and that he believes it is for the best interests of the United States that we take the action he has suggested. I have no quarrel with that. Of course, it is only natural that he should take that position.

I am not charging bad faith on the part of the President, nor am I charging bad faith on the part of Senators who do not agree with my position. I want the Senator to understand my position. I believe that we face two horns of a dilemma, as he has mentioned, and that either one of them is bad enough. So I am trying to find a middle course which will be devoid of the dangers attaching to the two horns of the dilemma which we are facing. My intentions and my objections and my motives are just as good as those of any other person who is attempting to deal with this problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, no one can question the sincerity and integrity of the able Senator from Colorado. No one has ever done so since I have been

a Member of the Senate. I have frequently disagreed with the Senator, but no one has ever questioned his sincerity of purpose in relation to any of the great and important matters which frequently come before the Senate of the United States; and I am always glad to listen to the views the able Senator expresses from time to time, even though I may disagree with him.

Let me ask the able Senator this question: Does he believe that the policy upon which we are embarking is an imperialistic policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not exactly call it an imperialistic policy, because I am not too well informed as to what our motives are with respect to the petroleum deposits in the Middle East. I will say that it has some of the earmarks of imperialism. We have discovered the greatest petroleum deposits in all the world, and we know that the State Department and the private oil companies—the Standard Oil companies—have been working for years to settle the difficulties between other nations so that the American private oil companies can have ownership of that oil. I call that imperialism, and I think that oil will be extracted from the earth and those resources will be exploited for profit. I do not know whether the State Department or the United States Government has laid down any policies of reimbursement to the poor, miserable natives who have lived such lives of hardship in that area. I do not know whether they are to be reimbursed for the removal of that great natural resource, but I fear that they will not be taken care of.

If it is our purpose to go into the Middle East and extract that very valuable deposit of petroleum, then I say we are getting very close to a policy of imperialism, as I understand the term.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield, and then I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I agree with the purport of the Senator's amendment which he is going to submit in due course, as I understand. I do not think it is pending at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it is not.

Mr. LUCAS. But it deals with the oil situation. I shall support that amendment because, so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to leave the slightest impression that the Government is making this loan to Greece and Turkey in order to protect the private oil interests that now are in the Middle East—not at all. I shall support the amendment which the Senator from Colorado is going to offer along that line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the amendment is a good one, even though it may not be necessary; but in order to make the position of the Senate of the United States clear and certain, I shall support that amendment.

I support the Greek-Turkish loan solely on the theory that in my judgment it is in the interest of the safety and security of the United States. I am trying now to look far down the mountainside into the future, and not just consider the situation momentarily, as we are discussing it now.

I may be wrong; I do not say I am infallible; but I certainly hope I am right.

In the great issues that come before the Senate of the United States, I do the best I can, as every other Senator, I am certain, does. I pray that God Almighty will give us some light to enable us to see aright in regard to the issue before us, solely in the interest of free men and women everywhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is entitled to his opinion, and I think he is searching for the right road in that connection. I certainly hope he finds it; I hope he is correct, because as I contemplate what is likely to happen in the Senate a few days from now, it seems to me that the Senator from Illinois will have his way in this matter. So I am tremendously interested in having him be right. I reluctantly disagree with him at the present time; I see these things somewhat differently from the way he sees them. But I have no quarrel at all with his objectives or his purposes or his hopes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am somewhat confused in regard to one statement contained in the address which the President made before the joint session of Congress. I mention this in line with the discussion between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I read the following statement from the President's address to the joint session of Congress:

> The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.

I think it is well known and freely admitted that the governments of both countries which we intend to enter are totalitarian. From what totalitarian government are we to protect these countries? I address the question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado or to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as Greece is concerned, they have a tyrannical dictatorship, and it is a totalitarian government. The Government of Turkey is, I think, a much more democratic government than is that of Greece, although it, too, is a Fascist form of government. Very few of the rights which are so precious to our people who believe in democracy are enjoyed by the people of Turkey. But I think the Government of Greece is much lower in the scale of government than is the Government of Turkey. Of course, the present Government of Turkey is a great improvement over the Government of Turkey prior to World War I. But it lacks a great deal of being a government which the United States of America, with its ideals of democracy and right living, can approve.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Apparently we are supporting the governments of both these nations, and could it be that the inference is that we are protecting them from the totalitarian Government of Russia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is presumed that that is the reason for our military manueuver, to protect Greece from infiltration, and Turkey from outside pressure or coercion.

Mr. MALONE. From the Russian Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the Russian Government.

Now, Mr. President, to proceed with Mr. Daniell's splendid article in the New York Times, I wish to read two short paragraphs. He says:

> It will take more than the injection of dollars to put things right, as the British have learned to their sorrow.

He is talking about Greece.

> Nor will the cure be effected speedily.

Later in this splendid article he says:

> General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them—

This refers to the reaction on the part of the Greeks—

> General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them as a just reward for the long struggle against their latest invaders, the Italians and Germans. The more cynically minded smile and say that if the United States is terrified of Russia, she, no doubt, is willing to pay her frontier guards lavishly.

There is something for us to consider. That is what the Greeks are saying, that if we are terrified of Russia, we should be able to pay her frontier guards, such as Greece and Turkey, lavishly.

Mr. Daniell continues:

> For the concept of America here is based on Hollywood movies largely and consists of a picture of a land where everybody owns a sleek, shiny car, a lavish home and generally makes a million dollars before he dies.
>
> Among the extreme right, American intervention in the domestic troubles of Greece has encouraged extravagant talk of an imminent war with Russia.

The Senator from Illinois said he had not heard of any talk of war except on the floor of the Senate.

> On the March day, when the nation celebrated its liberation from the Turks in 1821, Royalist groups sang songs in which there was a warning to Stalin that "Truman and the atom bomb will make dust out of you."

That should make a very gruesome kind of a song, I should think.

Mr. President, there is one other paragraph I wish to read, because it shows how this relief is handled in a country like Greece. They have had a tremendous amount of relief, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] pointed out a few moments ago. Mr. Daniell proceeds:

> Another factor which may help is that, without security, rich Greeks who formerly kept their capital abroad may bring it home and submit to taxation. Peasants and retailers likewise have been hoarding gold sovereigns in fear of foreign invasion and

the necessity for flight. With the release of this money and the flow of goods and services, the desire to work, which is not very strong right now, may return. It must, if Greece is to recover and stand on her own feet when her present troubles are over.

In other words, the thing that is going to save Greece is what is going to save the rest of the world, that is, a little sweat and a little hard work.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert the marked portions of this splendid article in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It will take more than the injection of dollars to put things right, as the British have learned to their sorrow. Nor will the cure be effected speedily.

* * * * *

The next thing that strikes one is the vast quantities of cheap American motion picture and adventure magazines which drape and obscure the news kiosks, which, in the center of the city, average about three to the block. The shops are full of luxury goods, such as have not been seen in London since the war began, and all imported since liberation with borrowed funds, to be sold at inflated prices to the well-to-do.

The reason for this anomaly in a land of hunger, violence, and terror is not hard to find. A large part of 80,000,000 pounds sterling which Britain lent to Greece has been used to import expensive articles like radios, wrist watches, and cosmetics, instead of wheat, fats, clothing, and shoes, so desperately needed in the country outside the capital. The same thing will happen to American dollars unless we devise some more effective method of controlling their expenditure than the British have done. The British on the scene, who will soon turn over their function to their American successors, are the first to admit this and to warn against repetition of their methods, which consisted largely of serving in an advisory capacity.

The truth is there is no effective control of imports and the Government has been unable to resist the pressure of business interests for importation of articles which bring high prices and handsome profits, such as new American automobiles, British bicycles, and pure silk. There is no rationing of food and price controls are a joke. There is no confidence in the currency and all rents and large contracts provide for payment in gold, which the Government has to import to sell, with results that have been ruinous for its foreign exchange. Legally, the exchange is fixed at 5,000 drachmas to the dollar, but the black-market price ranges from 6,000 to 7,000.

Prime Minister Maximos gets a salary of 1,000,000 drachmas monthly. * * *

Twenty months ago clothing, textiles, and shoes worth $13,000,000 began arriving at Piraeus. Most of the 6,000-ton shipment remains unopened in the warehouses. Months of effort to have it released and distributed were fruitless, and only in the last days of March did it begin to trickle out at the rate of 500,000,000 drachmas' worth a day through retail shops which collected 3 percent from the Government for disposing of it.

The British proposed that it be released at one-third of cost to poorly paid civil servants, of which there are some 80,000, but they encountered only excuses for delay, whereas the real reason is that if it were put on the market it would force down prices of privately owned stocks in the shops.

* * * * *

For Greece's trouble is not only economic. It is hard to say which is the gravest trouble or which must be brought to a halt before the other is cured. To this correspondent, it seems that there can be no sound economy here until the bitter feuds which divide the people of the same family can be reconciled and conciliated, but members of this Government seem inclined to other methods and are now planning extensive military operations against the leftist bands in the north.

Officially, the Government has declared war on all bands, whether of left or right, but in practice it seems somewhat less than impartial. For instance, recently when a rightist leader slew some Communists he was extolled by Government spokesmen as a hero, but when he in turn was slain by Communists, General Zervas, Minister of Public Order, said:

"We will answer terrorism with terrorism ten times as strong, disaster with disaster ten times as strong, and slaughter ten times greater. And this is not anti-Christian, because God has taught us how to behave to anti-Christian Communists, who have sold their souls to the devil."

The Government points with pride to the statement that it represents 85 percent of the legal loyal parties, to the amnesty it offered the rebels who would give up arms and surrender, and it claims to believe wholeheartedly in democracy. But those who question this are not all Communists. Themistokles Sophoulis, former prime minister, who refused to join the coalition, declared to this correspondent that the Government is "stifling civil liberties." The 87-year-old leader asserted that thousands of Greeks have been exiled to islands without trial on mere police denunciation, and said that the civil service was being purged of political opponents of the regime and coercion was being used in the Army against reading anything but approved party newspapers.

Sophoulis also ridiculed the Government's claim to represent 85 percent of the people, pointing out that, while it was true that it represented that much of Parliament, it was probably representative of less than half the people. Besides the Communists, who may represent 15 percent of the 7,000,000 population, he said his own party represented 20 percent, and half a dozen smaller parties represented together about as much more.

In his view Greek public opinion has undergone a radical change toward conciliation since the election was held. He advocated an early election.

General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them as a just reward for the long struggle against their latest invaders—the Italians and Germans. The more cynically minded smile and say that if the United States is terrified of Russia, she no doubt is willing to pay her frontier guards lavishly. For the concept of America here is based on Hollywood movies largely and consists of a picture of a land where everybody owns a sleek, shiny car, a lavish home, and generally makes a million dollars before he dies.

Among the extreme right, American intervention in the domestic troubles of Greece has encouraged extravagant talk of an imminent war with Russia, and on the March day when the nation celebrated its liberation from the Turks in 1821, Royalist groups sang songs in which there was a warning to Stalin that "Truman and the atom bomb will make dust out of you."

* * * * *

Another factor which may help is that, with security, rich Greeks who formerly kept their capital abroad may bring it home and submit to taxation. Peasants and retailers likewise have been hoarding gold sovereigns in fear of foreign invasion and the necessity for flight. With the release of this money and the flow of goods and services, the desire to work, which is not very strong right now, may return. It must if Greece is to recover and stand on her own feet when her present troubles are over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since the liberation of Greece, more than $850,000,000 worth of goods, including UNRRA supplies, have been sent into the country; yet, by common consent, Greece's economy is acknowledged to be worse off today than before. That was the point which the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] brought out a few moments ago, that UNRRA relief, help from the United States and from Great Britain, has amounted to $850,000,000 since the war, yet Greece is in worse condition than she was before. So why should we expect that the $250,000,000 now planned to be spent under the bill would perform any great miracle? It simply will not do it.

Now it is proposed that several hundred millions of additional dollars be placed at the disposal of a Greek government which has proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, its basic incompetence either to deal with the economic or the political situation. What happened to the eight hundred and fifty millions is certain to be the fate of the additional three hundred millions. In fact, Mr. President, the current expenditures of the Greek Government for its armed forces are running at an annual rate of, roughly, $240,000,000. They will use up all the money in 1 year with the Army.

If we are to foot the bill for the military tyranny of the present Greek Government, what portion of the funds we are to provide will actually go into reconstruction? Of course, the answer is: Not one thin dime. And if the present Greek Government is never able to establish real order, never able to attain genuine support of the Greek people, how will our funds be used effectively for reconstruction of the Greek economy?

The Associated Press carried a dispatch on April 7 stating that the Greek Parliament appropriated $40,000 as a dowry for Princess Catherine, the sister of King Paul, who is to be married very shortly to a British officer. Here is a nation, many of whose people are starving to death, a nation which is asking for help from the United States Treasury, and yet their Parliament, according to the Associated Press dispatch of April 7, appropriates $40,000 for a dowry for a princess. Of course, she will have an expensive wedding, and the United States Treasury will have to stand all the expenses of it.

Obviously, until a genuine political democracy is established in Greece, it will be impossible to restore the economy of Greece. That seems to me to be as plain as anything on this earth. The mere military conquest of this people, the mere saddling on this people of a mercenary army, can never create conditions of political stability. A mercenary army is what this bill provides for.

If Senators do not believe that, I want them to read carefully paragraph 3 on page 3 of the bill. It provides for a mercenary army, and the army is to be paid for by the Greek and Turkish Governments.

The mere military conquest of this people, the mere saddling on this people of a mercenary army devoted to an outworn and hated monarchy, can never create those conditions of political sta-

bility under which the economy itself can be improved. We must face the blunt fact, Mr. President, that the economy of Greece can only be restored when a genuinely democratic government, supported by the vast majority of the Greek people, is established. Otherwise, the funds which we have now been asked to appropriate will be wasted, will be thrown away, in precisely the same manner in which the eight hundred and fifty millions of the past 2 years have been. Remember that despite the eight hundred and fifty millions, the economic situation in Greece is worse, worse, worse, not better, and if we now commit ourselves to a half billion or a billion a year to subjugate the Greek people with bayonets to a government which they hate, we will never be able to restore the Greek economy.

Mr. President, the primary requirement for defeating communism in Greece is the establishment of a democracy—a genuine political democracy—in Greece. Whether or not the Senate is determined to have a genuinely democratic Greece is the issue. Let us be clear. Everything depends upon the establishment of a political democracy in Greece. If we do not base our foreign policy on a political democracy, we are engaging in imperialism, either our own or someone's imperialism, and in the maintenance of a corrupt monarchy. In using the American taxpayers' money to foster an unwanted military tyranny, it would be, by the most conservative standards, a colossally stupid piece of international effrontery. Furthermore, it would be a complete waste of the American taxpayers' money. America could gain nothing but hatred by such a policy. It would profit no one; it would cultivate and breed communism; it would prove that the peoples throughout the democratic world cannot look to America for encouragement.

I shall ask now that I be not interrupted until I conclude. I have a few more pages, and I will go ahead as fast as I can, because the hour is growing late.

If our aim is to stop the spread of communism and the expansion of Soviet Russia's influence over Greece and Turkey, I do not see how we can achieve it through this bill. It is obvious that we cannot stop Russia or communism by increasing the strength of the Greek and Turkish Armies

Communism is an idea and not a tangible object. You cannot fight ideas with guns. The only way to fight them is with better ideas.

The conditions which breed and spread communistic ideas should be our concern. Whatever money we invest in such an enterprise should go to fight hunger and disease, and, in Greece especially, to repair the terrible destruction of her cities and farms which has been her legacy from this war.

We certainly cannot spread the ideals of democracy throughout Greece by giving arms to a Greek Government which does not practice these ideals.

The events of the past few years in Greece should teach us a few lessons. Germany and Italy tried to suppress the Greek people and failed. The Italians, with 300,000 soldiers, scattered over the country, and the Germans, with 50,000, could not subjugate them. When the Italians surrendered in 1943, the Germans increased their own garrisons, bringing them up to the strength of almost 15 divisions. Still, the guerrilla movement grew stronger every day.

Then, the Germans tried using quisling troops, but the result was stronger and stronger guerrilla units, and the creation of a deep-rooted division of the Greek people—separating them into camps of resistance fighters and collaborators. This was the beginning of the civil war which is going on today.

What happened after the liberation of Greece? The British Government brought in troops to establish order and found itself embroiled in a civil war. Ten thousand Greeks lost their lives, and approximately 500 British soldiers were killed. The British realized that the resistance movement was strong and came to a compromise. The Varkiza agreement was drawn up between the resistance forces and the government in power at that time. This agreement, indirectly backed by the British, guaranteed full political amnesty to the resistance fighters if they were to lay down their arms, and in February of 1945, the guerrilla fighters surrendered their guns to the Royalist Government. Immediately, in every city, town, and village, there sprang up government-sanctioned terriorist organizations, composed of Royalists and former collaborators, and a campaign was launched to plunder and terrorize all those who had in any way participated in the underground movement against the enemy. This terrorism grew more and more violent until it reached its peak in the summer and fall of 1945.

In the midst of this, the elections were announced, along with the plebescite which returned the king. Of course, we sent observers to these elections. Their reports declared that the voting had been orderly and that the elections resulted in a fairly clear expression of the will of the Greek people.

What these reports neglected to mention was the terrorist campaigns before the elections, which were most effective. These reports did not explain that no Greek would dare to vote against the wishes of the local terrorist organization. They did not mention that his life would not have been worth two cents the next day, or that his family's safety would have been sacrificed if he dared to vote against the groups in power.

Our observers witnessed only the outward peaceful conduct at the polls. They did not detect the seething turmoil beneath the surface. They did not see that many candidates were prevented from visiting their districts, that they had no chance to present their platform to their constituents.

Let us examine this present Greek Government closely before we act. Under this regime, people are arrested, imprisoned, and detained indefinitely without trial. Men, women, and children have been deported to dry, barren islands without trial or right of appeal. There is no freedom of speech in many areas. Freedom of movement has been limited by the activities of the terrorist bands of the left and the right. The Greek Army which we propose to aid with equipment and military advisers has been cleared of the greatest part of its democratic elements, and is now staffed by more than a thousand officers who were members of the security battalions, those formations which were created by the Nazis during the war and which the Allies have repeatedly labeled as traitorous.

Let us look at the record of its Minister of Public Security, the man to whom the guerrillas would have to surrender if they accepted the proffered amnesty in which our State Department seems to place so much faith. The man who holds this office is Gen. Napoleon Zervas. His position, in Greece, is identical with the position of J. Edgar Hoover in this country. He is at the head of the police department of Greece.

During the war, this general, with British money and arms, created a guerrilla force which at its height was composed of 8,000 well-paid and well-equipped men. This force, from 1943 till the time of the German withdrawal from Greece in 1944, did very little to disturb the enemy.

For example, Mr. President, the Minister of Security, Mr. Napoleon Zervas, is reliably reported to have collaborated with the Germans during their occupation of Greece. I had a visit from an American officer, a second lieutenant from the Office of Strategic Services, who served 8 months behind German lines and who was in Greece 9 months after the liberation of Greece. This officer testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations while this bill was pending. This lieutenant, an American citizen, showed me a German document which had come into his hands which indicated that Zervas had collaborated with the Germans. This man who now takes in Greece a place comparable to that held in this country by J. Edgar Hoover, was a collaborator.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that the people of America do not believe that the Greek people have had a fair deal—that they have had genuine free and democratic elections.

It is worth noting that the statement that 1,500 officers now serving in the Greek Army, who served in the notorious security battalions which maintained order in Greece for the Germans during the Nazi occupation, has not been challenged. We are going in to back up that kind of crew in Greece with money from our Treasury.

It is a fair thing for the Senate of the United States to face this fact: Why are 1,500 Nazi collaborators today officers of the Greek Army? Could a genuinely democratic government tolerate such a situation? We shot them in Germany. We hung them in Germany, as we should hang them in Greece when we go in there.

I believe that the Senate, if it does nothing else, should indicate its faith and belief in democracy. We would not vote $400,000,000 to maintain the Fascist Dictator Franco. We would not vote $400,000,000 to assist the Nazi Peron government in the Argentine. We are opposed

to tyranny everywhere. We should demand that a free and fair election be held in Greece. That is what my amendment provides. As an essential feature of Greek elections, it is vital to establish full opportunity for all political parties to participate and engage in election activities. It is essential also to grant immediate amnesty to all persons who have fought the present government.

Mr. President, I have in my hand this German report which fell into the hands of the Allies. It is a military situation report from the Twenty-second German Mountain Army Corps, which speaks of the "lawful attitude" of General Zervas toward the German Army. It mentions no sabotage on the part of Zervas' guerrillas against the German invaders, while it shows that Zervas devoted his energies to fighting his rival Greek guerrillas, the men who were waging an effective underground battle against the Germans. Now we are going to help Zervas destroy the men who are on our side.

I ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts from this German report in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following are some extracts from a German Army document in connection with the collaborationist activities of the present Greek Minister of Public Security, Gen. Napoleon Zervas. During the period under consideration Zervas was chief of the guerrilla groups known as EDDES, or as the document refers to them "Nationalist bands." The references to "Communist bands" means the ELAS, or Leftist guerrillas.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS XXII (MOUNTAIN) ARMY BUREAU IC—No. 8813/44, CONFIDENTIAL—SEAT C L OCTOBER 8, 1944

1. REPORT ON SITUATION ON JULY 8, 1944

1. Political situation: The fact that Zervas after a temporary recurrence of activity has again returned to his lawful attitude toward the German troops was received with satisfaction by nationalist circles.

2. Situation of the bands:

(a) Nationalist bands (Zervas' bands):

At the beginning of July he (Zervas) abandoned his lawful attitude, which he had kept until now, and under pressure from the British, he attacked various posts, camps, and convoys on the road from Jannena to Igumenitsa and Arta, also on the road Philipias-Louros-Preveza. After a few days, however, he stopped the fighting and since then has kept a neutral position and does not follow any more the orders of the Allies to start again his attacks against the German troops.

(b) Greek Communist bands (ELAS bands):

The bands of the ELAS developed continuous lively activity in the southern district occupied by the corps especially on the road of Arts-Agrinion and on the railway line of Agrinion-Messolongi there took place surprise attacks and repeatedly attacks by mines and mine-laying which in part caused us considerable losses.

3. Defense situation:

* * * * *

(b) Enemy activities and sabotage:

Mine explosions, blow-ups, and general sabotage activities against our mail routes continued in the southern sector with the same frequency as before, and became more frequent in the northern sector, where during last month attacks were extremely rare. In Zervas' territory no sabotage took place.

5. Conclusions on the situation: The important factor to the above would be if the Allies would be able to force Zervas to give up his until now lawful attitude and thus use his troops again for attacks against the German forces. We must also expect continuous activities from the Greek Communist bands in the entire sector of this corps, if these forces are not stopped with frequent mopping-up operations (translator's note: Meaning on the part of the German Army), or if they are not distracted by attacks on the part of Zervas' forces.

For General Headquarters, the Intelligence Officer (signed the draft):

BURKER.

JUNE 8, 1944.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few days ago the newspapers carried reports of the murder of 32 political prisoners being held in the prison of the city of Gythion in Southern Peloponesos by Royalist terrorists. The Government declared martial law in that section and General Zervas rushed to the spot personally to take care of the situation. Three weeks elapsed and not one of the murderers had been arrested. Instead, General Zervas used the forces under him to fight the Leftist guerriallas of the region.

Does our State Department really expect the guerrillas to hand over their guns to General Zervas? Do we hope to spread American democracy and ideals through such a man?

Remember, Senators, that when the British first intervened in Greece to "establish order" they were greeted with wild cheers. Today, as they are preparing to leave, the Greek people show no signs of sorrow over their departure. From all the reports coming out of Greece we can see that there is little but hatred in the hearts of all classes of Greeks for the British.

Mr. President, 2 years from now I do not want the same thing to be said about America.

I do not want to see us intervening in the internal affairs of another country, with the avowed intention of bringing democracy to its people, and achieving nothing but hatred in the hearts of those we intended to help. That is why I say that we must be very careful to select the right way to achieve our ends. We cannot go into Greece with half-baked plans about what can be done and no clear-cut idea of how it can be done.

Anything we do must be carefully weighed, not only insofar as it concerns our future relations with Greece, but as to how it will appear in the eyes of the rest of the world.

How will we appear to the people of the world who look up to us for our democratic institutions and our traditional championing of the oppressed and weak, if we use our money and arms to fortify an antipopular Government with such an undemocratic history?

The loss of prestige which would result from a failure of our program to bring democracy to Greece would be incalculable. We have announced to the rest of the world that we want to strengthen democracy in Greece—to establish peace and enable the Greek people to start repairing and healing the wounds which they suffered in their heroic resistance against the Germans and Italians;

We must succeed in this objective; we dare not fail; but we cannot succeed if we attempt to work through the present Greek Government.

However, I do believe we can achieve our declared ends by seeing to it that before we give any money a government is formed which represents all shades of political opinion in Greece, with a man at its head who has the confidence of the Greek people. There are several men in Greece today who have that confidence and more than enough leaders of all parties to form such a government.

With the formation of this coalition government, it would be possible to bring the civil war to an end without firing a single shot. Until we bring the civil war to an end there can be no restoration, no rehabilitation of Greece, and no real relief to the Greek people.

I think it is clear from the reports coming out of Greece today that the guerrillas would be more than willing to lay down their guns if there were any hope that they could do so without being thrown into prison. After all, these men have been fighting for over 6 years. They are sick of it. They were sick of it in 1945 when they laid down their guns. If there were a government in Greece which could be trusted not to indulge in reprisals against them and their families, there is small question that they would once again be willing to surrender their arms.

If the aid which we propose to send to Greece were conditioned upon the creation of a broad, coalition government which would honestly offer complete amnesty to the guerrilla fighters, we could bring peace and democracy to Greece, and the stature which we would gain in the eyes of the rest of the world would be even greater than what we would lose, if we were to take the wrong course, and fail.

Senators, the answer rests in our hands. We can offer to Greece the only gift which she really wants—peace, and a start on the road to the democracy which she has fought so hard to gain.

We do not have to indoctrinate the Greek people in the ways of democracy. They know and prize them as highly as we do. But they have been prevented through foreign interference from ever holding their democratic institutions once they had gained them. Now we can show the Greek people and the people of the world that we believe in our democratic principles and institutions and that we will actually help others to attain them.

It has been said many times that the democracies were weak because they did not believe in their own principles strongly enough to support and strengthen them wherever they existed.

We have now proposed to give evidence of our faith in democracy's ability to withstand the dynamic force of communism and all other totalitarian principles.

Let us then be even overly careful in seeing that no Fascist-like elements are allowed to benefit from our aid.

We are on trial before the world.

There is no way to measure the extent of our loss if we fail. Nor is there any way to measure the strength we will gain if we succeed.

Senators, we have a glorious opportunity in this bill to aid Greece. Let us take full and courageous advantage of it. Let us offer our aid to the Greek people and see to it that there is a truly democratic government in power to administer the aid. But on no condition should we send arms to the present undemocratic government and strengthen those elements which, by their Fascist-like tactics, have done more to spread communism in Greece than a thousand Russian agents could have ever accomplished.

Mr. President, many governments may come knocking on our doors during the years ahead. Are we going to submit to blackmail from every military dictatorship throughout the world on the grounds that if we do not fork over our cash, they will go communistic? Let us set up now, let us establish now, the requirement of political democracy as a basic condition for assistance from the American taxpayers' pocket. My amendment should be adopted. It would accomplish this purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that the Senator quoted generally his sources of information from New York newspapers. I do not believe he once quoted from a Washington newspaper. Has the Senator ever seen any article in any Washington newspaper giving the truth respecting the situation in Greece, that is, any dispatches of any kind from the scene over there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been very much disappointed, I will say frankly to the Senator, at the attitude taken by the Washington press concerning this great controversial question, which has so many phases and which is of so much interest to the people of the United States and to the people of the city of Washington. I have been grievously disappointed by the way they have handled this question. They have gone all-out to put over the pending measure as quickly as possible, without giving any consideration whatsoever to the points which have been raised in the debate and which have been made available to us largely from the press of New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. I found that to be the case When I was preparing my material, I had to go to newspapers outside the city of Washington. The newspapers of Washington did not give both sides of the case. They are all-out for the Greek-aid proposal. In my opinion, the way the question has been treated by the Washington press is a sad abuse of the privilege of a free press.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly they have not been fair to their readers.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Florida if he expects to make an extended address this evening.

Mr. PEPPER. I had expected to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me so that I may propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that the time has finally arrived when the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure can look forward to a reasonable prospect of obtaining a vote not only on the amendments but on final passage of the bill. At least, the opportunity should be provided to arrange a definite time to vote on the amendments and on the bill itself. Let me say to the Senate, and also to the distinguished occupant of the chair, that I have received suggestions from both the proponents and the opponents of the bill as to a suitable time to vote upon the amendments and upon final passage of the bill; and with the idea in mind that at least we can make the suggestion and obtain the consensus of opinion of Senators, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request which I ask to have read, after which I shall ask that it be adopted if it is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the proposed order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Monday, April 21, 1947, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and upon the final passage of the bill itself.

Ordered, further, That on said day of Monday, April 21, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and said hour of 5 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that it will be necessary for the Senator from Nebraska to ask unanimous consent that the necessity for a quorum call be waived.

Mr. WHERRY. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the main request?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel that the pending measure is very important. It is a well-known fact that public opinion is turning in favor of the opponents of the measure, and more particularly in favor of having the United Nations handle the problem.

I have also pointed out that the press apparently refuses to print one word of the statement made by those of us who are in favor of turning the problem over to the United Nations. I do not know what the people of the Nation are basing their opinions upon, unless it is what they hear over the radio, which makes them take the attitude that this problem should be turned over to the United Nations. Perhaps those who come into the galleries and listen go out and tell others, but that is a slow process.

I should like to take all the time possible. I may point out that the House committee has not concluded its hearings, so the House is not prepared to take up the question, and we are not actually losing time by discussing it.

I dislike to agree to the unanimous-consent request, but if the date were made Tuesday, April 22, instead of Monday, April 21, I would agree to it. I can see no hope of delaying a final vote beyond Tuesday. I am hopeful that by that time the American people will express themselves fully, and that we shall then be ready for a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for agreeing to the date of Tuesday, April 22. I have no hard and fast date in mind. I simply wish to bring the suggestion to the attention of the Senate.

I modify my unanimous-consent request and ask that the date be made Tuesday, April 22.

Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho if he has any objection to making the hour 2, 3, or 4 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not object to the hour of 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Perhaps if I were to speak at length I could persuade him to agree to the hour of 3 o'clock. However, I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request so as to make the date Tuesday, April 22, and that the hour be 4 o'clock, the time to be divided as already suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The order as modified is as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, April 22, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and upon the final passage of the bill itself.

Ordered, further, That on said day of Tuesday, April 22, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and said hour of 4 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is now 8:30 o'clock. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would like to make some extended remarks. We have worked pretty hard today, and I feel that in justice to him and to the Senate we should take a recess until tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent, if the Senate is to take a recess at this time, that the distinguished Senator from Florida be recognized and have the floor tomorrow at noon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be a night session tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. It is my present opinion that there will not be a night session tomorrow. That will depend, however, on what the majority leader decides. However, my opinion is that there will be no night session tomorrow night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be recognized and have the floor upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Jesus, we rejoice that Thou hast entered into Thy rest. No more art Thou a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief; Thou art lifted above the scoff and the scowl of those who persecuted Thee into resplendent glory. O awaken us to a full realization of the blessedness of our inheritance, walking humbly with God and patiently among men. We pray Thee to mold Thy creatures with an unmovable faith and trust in Thy unsearchable riches. O lead us out of that twilight of understanding in which our judgment misleads our best emotions and reliance upon self is a broken reed. Deliver us from all disabling tests and give us the support which drives out fear and failure and makes us free and firm for the blessed interests of our beloved country.

Vouchsafe Thy blessing, Heavenly Father, upon these Thy servants; give them strength and wisdom for this day. Because Thou hast given us this splendid land, because Thou hast allowed us to live in this wonderful day, O lead us to work unsparingly for the unity and rights of men. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning my old friend George Reedy, veteran news commentator and news analyst on Station WOL, the Mutual Network, said this:

> Everybody wants to get in on the act, and Attorney General Tom C. Clark is no exception. He has joined that popular and rapidly growing group of people who "don't like Henry Wallace," and he isn't pulling any punches.
>
> Without mentioning the ex-corn shucker and boomerang thrower by name, Clark has managed to call Wallace a liar and a man with no appreciation of the American way of life. But he warned against hasty action, and said—and I quote:
>
> "The cheap, blundering assault now being made by some upon the bipartisan foreign policy of our Nation must not be allowed to provoke action on our part which would be utterly out of keeping with democratic principles."
>
> So much has been said, and so well said, about Mr. Wallace that I have not mentioned him on this program. But there is a Biblical quotation which I feel is very apt. It is: "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a prayer offered by the Reverend Dr. Thorning and in the other an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Gen. Eugene Reybold on the occasion of Army Week observance at the University of Delaware.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill he introduced today on the subject of Federal aid to education.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in one, on rural electrification, excerpts from a letter; in the second a report from the production and marketing administration of Searcy County, Ark.; and in the third a report from the production and marketing administration of Washington County, Ark.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very interesting poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities and in the other an address by Eddie Rickenbacker, one of America's greatest heroes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

HENRY A. WALLACE'S ATTACK ON MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in one of his recent subversive speeches in England, Henry A. Wallace sneeringly referred to my State as "the enlightened State of Mississippi."

Henry did not know it, but that is about the nearest he has come to telling the truth since he has been in England.

It was the enlightened State of Mississippi that rendered one of the greatest services the American people have ever enjoyed when it led the fight in the Democratic convention that prevented Henry A. Wallace from being nominated for Vice President in 1944 instead of Harry S. Truman.

By that one act, the representatives of the enlightened State of Mississippi prevented Henry A. Wallace from becoming President of the United States, and saved this country the humiliation and the disgrace, to say nothing of the disaster, that his becoming President of the United States would have meant to the American people.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that the House would be making a great mistake to pass this bill in its present form.

I do not think that there are any of us who do not recognize that the 12 years since the passage of the Wagner Act have been marked by turbulence and unrest.

We have seen the growth of powerful unions who have been exempted from judicial and legislative restraint in their relations with their members, with business, and with the Government. They have in their irresponsibility been guilty

of excesses that have caused this country great discomfort and concern. Certainly all of us recognize that legislation that will channel the great powers of these unions along lines that will take cognizance of the stake of the public in their activities is needed and should be passed by this House.

But merely because we feel that there are wrongs to be righted, we should not agree to any legislation that is put before us, no matter how high-sounding its language, and how superficially fair it may at first seem, without careful examination.

The bill contains clauses which do much toward guaranteeing each individual union member a square deal from his union. It makes an effort to end feather-bedding, racketeering, and arbitrary combinations of unions which conspire to set prices and conditions which benefit themselves alone. All of these clauses are good, but let us recognize that these clauses are merely window-dressing to secure support from those Members who feel that this Congress has an obligation to correct existing evils. The actual fact is—and I say this with restraint—this bill would in its present form strike down in one devastating blow the union shop, industry-wide bargaining, and so strangle collective bargaining with restraints and limitations as to make it ineffectual. This grave error that the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor have made is that in seeking to destroy what is bad, they are also destroying what is good. There is no need to—there is great need not to—smash the American labor movement to rid ourselves of "feather-bedding," racketeering, and similar evils. Let us look briefly at some of the clauses of this bill.

The majority of this committee in their report have stated, "Important among the provisions of the bill are those that reassure the workers freedom in their organizing and bargaining activities." This concern with the rights of the workers is praiseworthy, but were the majority of the Labor Committee concerned with the rights of the workingman when they outlawed the closed shop and permitted the union shop on only one condition—on condition that the employers give their consent? Is this an example of the bill's concern with the freedom of the workers to organize and bargain? Were the majority of the Labor Committee concerned with the rights of the workingman when they wrote in this bill clauses to outlaw welfare funds, and pension plans, to invalidate in fact two-thirds of the existing welfare plans that are administered jointly by employers and employees? Is it their concern with the rights of the workingman that caused them to do this?

Was it their concern with the rights of the workingman that caused them to outlaw sympathy strikes? Under section 2, if a small number of workers in a plant strike because of any condition, or for any reason, it is forbidden that any of the other workers in the same plant should come to their assistance and strike with them. Is that because of their great concern with the rights of the workingman?

Does section 9 (f) attempt to forbid industry-wide bargaining because it wants to break down as they say "the great labor monopolies," or is it because they recognize that organized plants cannot compete economically with those that are unorganized, and that the latter can, by the sweat of labor, drive out of competition the factories that pay a decent wage, and whose employees work under decent conditions. In order to complete the job, this bill in section 2 (14) (C) will outlaw wholesale any type of boycott, so that the unions cannot protect themselves and their employers against the competition of sweatshops.

Is this bill really concerned with the freedom of the workingman to organize and bargain? Under the provision of section 12, together with other sections of the bill, if an employer is guilty of an unfair labor practice by the terms of this bill he would be entitled to a full hearing, findings by the National Labor Relations Board and even by the courts before the findings become legally compelling. Even then the employer is subject only to remedial order and not to punishment. At most he must merely cease and desist and restore the situation to what it was or should have been before he acted. But let us see what happens to the employee. After the bill has outlawed nearly every conceivable type of strike, such as a strike to remedy unfair labor practices, this bill provides that employees who violate certain of these provisions would expose themselves to certain penalties, ex parte injunctions without a hearing, treble damages and loss of his job. Does that honestly show a great concern for the freedom of the workingman to organize and bargain freely?

The manifest unfairness of these sections are not isolated. There are others throughout the entire bill.

This bill does not assure the worker freedom and the men who wrote this bill must have known that it does not. It destroys with high-sounding words the power of labor unions to bargain equally with the employers. It will if passed in its present form bring not peace but labor war—a war bitter and dangerous. This bill in its present form plays into the hands of the radicals in our unions, who preach the doctrine of the class struggle. If this bill is passed, this Congress will have fired the opening shot. Where it will lead us no one can say. Have no illusions that you are voting for labor peace and for the protection of the workingman. You will be voting for industrial warfare—you will be voting for a bill which seeks to strangle by legal restraints the American labor movement. I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, having sat with him on the committee. I notice in the report the gentleman filed along with the minority report, particularly this statement:

> There are several simple truths which must guide us in our approach to the labor-management problem. The closed shop, the union shop, industry-wide bargaining, free and unrestricted collective bargaining without unfair advantage on either side.

And then on the next page you say:

> If unions are to retain the closed shop and the right to bargain collectively on an industry-wide basis and if, as I feel, the anti-trust laws should not be resurrected to harass unions with criminal and severe civil penalties, some method must be worked out to deal with strikes which cripple the Nation's industrial power.

So that you meet the situation just as you talked about it in committee, except that you would propose going directly to the Supreme Court and obtaining an injunction. That is what I myself fought against in the committee—an injunction, that would strike employees alone, without taking some means against the employer. What is your answer to that?

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe that this country should certainly be in a position to combat a strike that affects the health and safety of the people. Therefore, I feel that the President must have the power to step in and stop those strikes. I am not in the position of opposing everything in this bill, but there are certain things in the bill that are wrong. I do not see how the President is going to have the power to stop strikes that will affect the health and safety of the people under the procedure listed in section 203. I think he must have that power.

I agree with you that any bill providing for an injunction should carefully consider the position of the striking union and make sure that their rights are protected. I think that in those cases Federal seizure until the dispute is settled would perhaps equalize the burden in the fairest possible manner.

Mr. OWENS. Will not the gentleman admit that we have a third word in there? It is "interest." Could we not better use the word "welfare" instead of "interest," because the word "welfare" occurs in the Constitution? It is just as broad as the word "interest" and more practical.

Mr. KENNEDY. The proposal embraces two separate things, health and safety. Because the remedy is drastic these two, in my opinion, are sufficient. I believe we should apply this remedy when the strike affects health or safety, but not the welfare and interest, which may mean anything. I would not interfere in an automobile strike, because while perhaps that affects national interest, it does not affect health and safety.

Mr. OWENS. Does not the gentleman agree that "welfare" is the stronger and in line with the President's idea?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. Both "welfare" and "interest" are too indefinite. They could cover anything. I would not have the law apply except in cases where the strike affected health and safety.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for reporting the pending bill and for its passage through the House, this omnibus labor bill, a most unusual procedure, rests definitely upon the shoulders of the Republican Party.

I agreed with the chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], when he said yesterday that "undoubtedly this bill is one of the most far-reaching" that could be presented to us and also when he said "it was one of the most important bills any Member of this House would be asked to vote upon." It certainly is far reaching, and any labor legislation is important. This bill is decidedly so, especially when, as in this bill, we are considering a new national policy of government in the matter of relationship between management and labor, and also relationships between management and labor with the Government and with the people in general. There is no question but that it is a bill of sweeping nature.

Many ideas are thrown into this bill. There are some good provisions in the bill which I would welcome an opportunity of supporting if contained in a bill by themselves and were not confused by the injection of a lot of ideas which have no place in the practical world where we are dealing with millions of human beings. These ideas, many of them, are poorly conceived and hastily thrown into the bill which we are now considering, a bill, which should it ever become law, would operate upon millions of human beings and try to determine the relationship between two of the great economic groups in this country—management on the one side and labor on the other.

The few good provisions are many times offset by the unwise, unwarranted, and impractical ideas that have been hastily conceived and, in my opinion, injected into this bill in desperation, by a desperate leadership desiring to produce quick results, and which situation invariably produces very harmful results. That is what has happened in connection with this bill. This bill, in my opinion, and I am talking in my capacity as a Member of this House, is simply another evidence of the confused and uncertain, in fact, growing into desperate leadership, of my friends on the majority side.

The first example we had this year was the matter of the wartime excise taxes, the effort of a confused, desperate leadership. After the last election, as we all remember, certain Republican leaders made what we now know and what they know was a rash promise, and to those to whom it was made it constitutes a broken promise, namely, that the wartime excise taxes would be repealed as soon as possible after this Congress convened.

Before we convened, President Truman, as a further evidence of his superb leadership, which has caught the confidence of the people of the country, issued an Executive order declaring a cessation of hostilities. Insofar as wartime taxes are concerned, that meant they would automatically expire on June 30. He recommended their extension for the next fiscal year, a period of 1 year which the next fiscal year constitutes, with an estimated revenue to the Treasury of $1,200,000,000 coming from those wartime excise taxes. Immediately some of my friends on the majority side, including certain Republican leaders, before conferring, declared they would not wait until the June 30 date, but would repeal these taxes before that time.

Mr. Chairman, that is the record. There was a definite promise made, but overnight our friends, the Republican leadership, changed their minds. They needed this money to carry out another hasty, unwise promise made in reference to a 20-percent income-tax cut across the board, a windfall for those fortunate enough to earn large incomes. Accordingly, a bill was reported out extending not for the next fiscal year but permanently the wartime excise taxes. As a result of the hasty, confused, and uncertain action of the leadership there is a broken promise. I wonder how those engaged in various businesses that these excise taxes fall upon will feel because of this political exhibition?

Another promise was a $6,000,000,000 reduction in President Truman's budget. A resolution to that effect was passed by the House. In the Senate the reduction was $4,500,000,000. President Truman, before he sent his budget recommendations up to the Congress, had reduced the budget requests of the various department and agencies by about $7,000,000,000—from about $44,000,000,000 to $36,500,000,000. Despite that fact our Republican friends promised the country to cut his budget $6,000,000,000. The House passed such a resolution. The Senate provided a $4,500,000,000 cut.

Where is the resolution now? That is one of the mysteries of this Congress. Where is this resolution which is in conference? There has only been one meeting of the full committee to which the Democrats on the conference committee were invited. If I make an incorrect statement I pause for correction. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, my distinguished friend [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. I know there has been only one meeting of the conferees. There may have been many other conferences, but there was no serious effort made to reach an agreement in this one meeting. If there was I never caught on to it. It is all in the dark. I have asked at different times about it but I have received no satisfactory reply. I have been here 36 years. There is disagreement between the House and the Senate. Conferees have been appointed on this important matter. There has been a great delay and I am puzzled. If some one can give me some information about that conference and what is going to be done it will help me a lot.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am sure it would help us all. There is only one simple question involved, and that is the difference between the $6,000,000,000 cut by the Republican majority in the House and the $4,500,000,000 cut by the same majority in the other body. Certainly, unless they were confused, or that they are afraid of what they had done, they ought to get together and settle that question very quickly.

We all know that two appropriation bills have already passed this House totalling about $15,000,000,000. Now, if they are going to make any cut of $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000, or whatever amount they agree upon—and they never will apparently, because this resolution will just die—but if there is going to be any cut in that minimum of $4,500,000,000 up to $6,000,000,000, it will have to be made in some of those bills such as the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, one of the biggest bills, about $13,000,000,000, plus. Yet, there they have only cut $124,000,000 in real money. Then we heard the furore as a result of that cut in connection with the customs service. They had to cut down the United States Secret Service 140 employees, with counterfeiting on the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. They cut down the Bureau of Internal Revenue which will manifest itself on April 1, and that is where our Government gets most of its money. For every 1⅓ cents paid for wages and expenses by the Bureau of Internal Revenue there is $100 in taxes brought in. For every 1⅔ cents paid for wages by the customs service, there is $1 brought in in duties to the Government. There is the kind of false economy that the $124,000,000 has brought about. Now, there are eight or nine more supply bills. I am wondering, when they come in with the Army, the Navy, the Agricultural, and the Veterans' Administration bills, how they are going to get the four and one-half to six billion out of those bills, and I am watching with expectancy, in particular, the agricultural appropriation bill, to see if they will cut down soil erosion, cut down rural electrification, cut down the dams and projects. I am waiting with expectancy to hear what some of my friends will say who voted for the $6,000,000,000 cut in the House. The answer today is that the $6,000,000,000 cut is forgotten. One of my good friends on the other side said, "We will get around to it next year" and he said, "it will be six, seven, or eight billion dollars." Well, the promise was made this year that they would cut $6,000,000,000 and the Senate four and one-half billion for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1947, but if they cut only $500,000,000 and that will do substantial violence to the efficient services to be rendered by the Federal Government.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. With pleasure.

Mr. VURSELL. I am always interested in the views of the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. A question now.

Mr. VURSELL. I am going to ask a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not mean to limit the gentleman. I respect my friend very much.

Mr. VURSELL. I wonder if the gentleman believes that those who think the budget can be cut by $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000, and if they miss it a little, that they might be excused, in view of the fact——

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean by "miss it a little"? Will the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VURSELL. I will tell the gentleman in a minute—in view of the fact that the President within the past 6 months twice has said we would have a deficit of over $2,000,000,000 this year, and the other night he said we would have a surplus of $2,000,000,000, so apparently if the President, with all of his advisers, would miss by $6,000,000,000, the Congress might be excused if it is not quite correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean by "missing $6,000,000,000 by a little"? Will the gentleman inform me for the benefit of myself and the RECORD?

Mr. VURSELL. Well, it is a little compared with what the President has missed on his guess of the budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but how much would the gentleman say was "miss a little"?

Mr. VURSELL. A billion and a half, with the present thinking of the members of the New Deal Party who have run this Government into debt to the tune of $260,000,000,000, by that standard, would be a little.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman say you are going to cut $4,500,000,000?

Mr. VURSELL. I think we will cut more than $4,500,000,000 if you folks will give us any cooperation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, now, "if you folks will give us any cooperation." Why, that is one thing about the Democratic Party, when we are in the minority we are a constructive party. We do not blindly oppose. The last time we were in the minority was when Mr. Hoover was here, and we supported him then whenever he brought in any constructive policy.

Mr. VURSELL. When Mr. Hoover was here——

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman here when he was here?

Mr. VURSELL. No; but I was in this country when the depression broke, and for the first time the Democratic National Committee set up a fund of $1,500,000 for a propaganda machine, to destroy the Hoover administration rather than to follow a policy of cooperation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a wild statement when he starts talking about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman talks about that, the Republican National Committee have representatives doing the same thing. I have no objection to it. It is a practical matter. I did not see anything wrong about it. It is perfectly all right, it is part of the game. We are engaged in politics, and the Republican National Committee is justified in engaging in it and so is the Democratic National Committee. I do not whine and I do not cry when our Republican friends do it. It comes with poor grace for a Republican to cry when the Democratic National Committee at some time or another engaged in practices and policies which were for the best interests of the party and at the same time for the best interests of the country.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts missed the point of the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois meant that the $1,500,000 spent by the Democratic National Committee was very puny compared to what the Republicans spent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten the $750,000 that John L. Lewis gave the New Deal campaign.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but John L. Lewis is with you now.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; if the gentlemen will give me one more minute.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the Chairman for the additional time. May I say that if any labor leader who has been a Republican all his life, fighting Republican battles, continues to do so after this bill which we are considering today, then they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

On the question of confused leadership, we come to this bill which is distinctly antilabor and antimanagement, because, instead of bringing about understanding between management and labor, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] so well said should be done, it is the road to industrial discord.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this labor bill we are now considering is an important one, from many different points of view. I want to speak in behalf of freedom for the returned soldier.

As one who was with American soldiers at the crossing of the Vesle, when they were before the bloody hills of Verdun, and in the deadly Argonne Forest in 1918; again as one who was with them on the Omaha Beach; at the breakthrough at St. Lo, then on to the Siegfried line into that hell hole of the Hurtgen Forest, and with them in front of the Runstedt drive in the Bulge; from there across the Rhine to within 90 miles of Vienna—I have seen two generations of Americans dying for their country. For what? I'll tell you for what. Freedom.

These two generations, after seeing Europe, know what freedom is. It is not something they read in textbooks or hear some professor expound in college. They know what freedom means from seeing the lack of it in Europe.

What has this got to do with this bill? Just this—these returned soldiers, when they were on the battlefields of the world, thought of their old home town with all the imagination of children. Every one of them thought of what he was going to do when he got home—dreamed of running his own business.

You gentlemen in the last Congress appropriated millions of dollars so he could make that dream come true, but did it come true? No; it did not for a lot of them, because they could not get products delivered because they did not belong to a union. They could not take their truck and buy a load of potatoes and deliver it to the navy yard in Philadelphia because they did not belong; they could not deliver the milk from their own cows in their own truck to New Caanan, Conn. Why? Because they did not belong to a union in an adjoining State. They could not mix and sell their own paint in California because their three employees did not belong; they could not move into their own house in Missouri because there was a jurisdictional strike on as to who would connect up the sewer pipe; they could not sell lighting equipment in Illinois without paying a union for the privilege of putting a union tag on the product so their own employees could assemble it for sale. In Utah they had to take 10 cents a dozen less for their eggs because they were not put in a package with a union label.

Is this the sort of freedom they dreamed of from their fox holes? Can they join the carpenters, bricklayers, stonemasons, and other skilled trades? No; because they are not taking any more apprentices in those trades and we in Congress appropriate millions of dollars for housing for these ex-soldiers and they cannot get them because there is a shortage of skilled workmen and they themselves cannot learn the trade because of a closed shop.

What do they want along with millions of other Americans? Freedom from going to a hiring hall for a job. By hard work with a little capital they want to start their own business—and to know that no one is coming around the next morning and say, "Sign up or else." Freedom is such a simple word, but it means so much. All over these 48 States they came back dreaming of their glorious country. Are they not entitled to freedom—an ex-serviceman, as such, is not entitled to a lot of privileges but certainly he is entitled to a square deal and he is not getting it in the labor field.

When I am saying these things I am not asking you to give money for the ex-serviceman from a paternalistic government. I am only asking for something that is not guaranteed by the Constitution but given to him by his Creator—the right to work where and when he pleases—just plain freedom.

Oh, yes; I know that the labor czars of international unions will come before us with a halo of patriotism hanging around

their heads and in an arrogant manner say with a deep professor voice "The frontiers are gone—individual freedom was for the pioneers. You cannot have individual freedom in a modern society."

But that ex-soldier from the fox holes of Europe or the jungles of the Pacific dreamed a dream as the pioneers did of yesterday—what he could do as an individual when he got home.

But now it seems somewhere along the line of individual effort he has got to dig in again for freedom—the cause of freedom always entails work and labor. Somebody has got to speak the truth. Some of us have got to stand for individual freedom. The issue for a million ex-servicemen is freedom in our time.

Freedom to turn the key in his own shop door—go home to his family and know that during the night no one is going to throw a brick through his window—that on the morrow his few employees will be there to work—that there will not be any picket line marching up and down asking all to boycott his place—give the individual his freedom and there will still be a frontier.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill for a number of reasons. In my opinion, this bill will bring about the correction of many abuses which exist. Likewise, I believe it will make for individual freedom of the workingman.

That many abuses have existed, and do still exist, has been made clear in several speeches already given in this debate. For about 7 weeks hearings were held by the Education and Labor Committee, at which testimony was given by labor leaders, by management, by representatives of small business, and by civilians in many business activities. Some of the information was indeed startling. Gangsters and racketeers played their full part in many places. It is not necessary to give examples of the situations and occurrences. Scores of instances will be found in the printed report of the hearings. Read some of these in the report of the hearings, and you will be surprised that such things could go on in this free Republic under our Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

This bill is intended to protect the workingman himself as well as the employer and the general public. This bill not only protects the union man himself, but it is in reality the workingman's bill of rights. The only person who is condemned in this bill is the racketeer and those who have been guilty of wrongdoing. The right of the workingman to organize and to bargain collectively is preserved. In fact, his right to select his own bargaining representative by a secret ballot free from force from any person or any organization is guaranteed. He is further guaranteed the right to decide whether he wishes to accept the latest offer of his employer or to strike, and he can decide it without fear of any danger to himself or family and according to his own judgment.

If this bill should become a law, the rights of freemen under our Constitution will be restored to each and every workingman. He cannot hereafter be suspended or expelled from his union by any arbitrary action. He can no longer be coerced into doing many things that he does not want to do. The time of intimidation of the workingman by unscrupulous leaders will be ended by the enactment of this bill into a law. The many good labor leaders who have been doing right, and there are many of them, have no fear from the provisions of this bill. The local unions to which members belong because they want to belong will have no cause to dislike this bill if enacted into a law.

It is the considered opinion of the Education and Labor Committee that this bill will be a law only a very few months until the great majority of labor leaders and laboring men will themselves come to see its justice, its fairness, and will come to appreciate the real freedom that has been restored to them. All will soon delight in the overthrow of tyranny and be glad that the Eightieth Congress had the courage to enact the workingman's bill of rights.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, a number of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor have expressed tribute to the chairman of that committee for the manner in which he conducted the hearings which extended over a period of some 6 weeks, and during which time about 138 witnesses were heard. I should like to join with the others in paying that deserved tribute to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. I have never attended a committee where the chairman conducted the hearings with such dignity, decorum, and such high sense of fairness as that displayed by the gentleman from New Jersey in presiding over this committee. I am glad to join with others, and I think this represents the views of most of the members, both the minority and the majority on the committee, in paying my tribute which the gentleman deserves, especially in view of the fact that some have seen fit to criticize him.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a provision which is unique in the history of labor legislation in this country. It puts the public welfare ahead of the special interests of either management or labor. For the first time in history, it is definitely stated as a principle of public policy that in industrial relations the public has an interest that is paramount. Here is what the bill, in its preamble, says:

> Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and, above all, recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

That, I say, is something new, Mr. Chairman. It is important. You can search the Wagner Act with a magnifying glass and you will not find the words "public interest" mentioned one time. And, whether it is admitted or not, I strongly suspect that a major portion of the opposition to the Hartley bill which we are now considering stems from fears of possible implications that declaration of public policy may contain.

Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with this bill that it is so loosely labeled as being "antilabor"? Since when has it become a form of fascism to protect individual freedom and restrict the activities of organized monopoly in this country? Instead of dragging out the old stereotyped "antilabor" and "Fascist" bugaboos, why do they not meet the issues contained in this bill? Do they deny that evils exist that should be corrected? Let us be realistic and honest about this thing.

Let us get down to cases. During the past year approximately 119,000,000 man-days of time were lost to production in this country, something unparalleled in the history of this or any other country of the world. It was said by the mayor of New York City not long ago that under existing conditions that city could be put on starvation in 10 or 12 days. During 1946 for 100 days the Territory of Alaska was practically isolated because of combined strikes in the shipping industry on the west coast. These conditions are far more serious than those who are now talking about this being antilabor would have you believe. Let us be realistic about it and let us get down to cases. Let us take a man who has been much talked about, John L. Lewis. He is a man who is pretty well known to the people. They have had a lot to do with him during this war and in recent months. They know something about the stranglehold he has over the American people and over the life of this Nation. They have not forgotten the strikes he pulled during the darkest hours of the war.

How many Members of this House feel that John L. Lewis should not be disturbed in the exercise of his present unbridled and ruthless power over the economic life of the American people? How many of you who are here now desire to take a stand in favor of leaving him unmolested and untouched as head of the holding companies that control the labor unions that make up the United Mine Workers of America? Mr. Chairman, I pause for someone to respond.

Mr. Chairman, what do we propose to do to curb that power to which I have referred? Just what can be done that will be effective?

We can outlaw illegal boycotting, jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, mass picketing, "featherbedding," involuntary check-off, and the closed shop, howsoever desirable those objectives may be, and yet not fragment the monopolistic power of John L. Lewis—and I use him as an example to illustrate the point I am making, but there are others. He would still be supreme and practically untouched. He would still control the lives and destinies of 400,000 men. He would still be able to use the individual mine-worker unions as mere pawns in his hands and use local union officers as mere messenger boys for his gigantic empire. He could still bring the Nation to its knees, staggering and groaning from the economic

pains he has the power to inflict on the American people. He could still force Government intervention and pull his strings from an expensive suite in the Carlton Hotel. He could still flex his muscles and demonstrate his power as evidence of his qualities of monopolistic leadership while he is campaigning for president of the American Federation of Labor.

So what can be done and yet not impair the basic rights of the laboring people of this country? The answer is really very simple. It is indeed so simple that it is oftentimes overlooked. And it is really the only effective answer. That answer can be found on page 31 of the Hartley bill, supported by other provisions. There industry-wide bargaining is prohibited. It is provided that the certified representatives of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representatives of employees of any competing employer.

The only exception is in cases where there are less than 100 employees in competing plants and they are not more than 50 miles from each other.

The argument that the adoption of that provision will destroy unions and return workers to the status of sweatshop is simply too ridiculous to answer. That its adoption will lay waste the monopolistic empire of John L. Lewis I admit. That it will return life and vitality to the local unions I admit. That it will play havoc with the present monopoly some few men are able to maintain over human labor I admit. That it will protect the public interest against the actions of power-drunk labor bosses I admit. But what is wrong about those effects, those reforms? Are they not desirable? Let us come to grips with the real problem this Nation faces. Do we or do we not want to curb the power of John L. Lewis and his kind over the economic life of the Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I should like to pursue this subject of industry-wide bargaining a little further. It is of the highest importance and should be emphasized. This industry-wide bargaining practice has grown to such proportions in this country that the Committee on Education and Labor regards it as a most serious threat to the freedom of our economy. It tends to dehydrate and destroy the very autonomy of local unions. This results from the fact that more and more of their affairs are being handled by the directing heads of international unions, sitting behind mahogany desks a thousand miles from where the real issues exist. The local man-to-man human touch, so essential to peaceful industrial relations, is lost in the humdrum of big-time maneuvering.

The practice has the effect of concentrating tremendous power in the hands of a few men—more power than good men should want and more power than bad men should have.

It tends naturally toward more Government intervention in industrial relations. The fact that the practice embraces entire industries means that a work stoppage has a serious and immediate impact upon the Nation's economy. Government intervention follows in a frantic effort to protect the general welfare, as has been demonstrated in the coal industry and in many others during recent years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is discussing an important question with complete intellectual honesty and ought to be heard. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for giving him additional time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am also grateful to the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, in industry-wide bargaining the practice is to fix uniform wage levels, and these are usually fixed according to what the more favorably situated and efficiently operated plant can afford to pay. The result is that the less fortunate and marginal plants are often forced into the orbit of an industry-wide pattern and are forced out of business because of being unable to meet the competition. The Committee on Education and Labor had many instances presented which you can verify if you will take the time to read the hearings.

I have used the coal-mining industry as an illustration. If industry-wide bargaining is outlawed, as I hope it will be, if a dozen or even a hundred individual mines are closed down by strikes—there will still be 3,000 operating—the economic effect over the Nation will not be noticeable. The result would be that a shut-down of the entire industry would be a virtual impossibility and there is the only real protection that the American people can have against the monopolistic situation that now results in bringing the whole Nation to its knees, and which is affecting the whole Nation from coast to coast.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On this industry-wide bargaining let us assume that the Firestone Rubber Co. pays 50 cents an hour for a tire builder in Los Angeles and 75 cents an hour in Akron for a tire builder. Then would the Firestone Rubber Co. give to the public the benefit of that saving of wages, or would the Firestone tire sell nationally at a set price?

Mr. FISHER. I am unable to advise the gentleman about the policy of any company, but I will say to the gentleman that in each individual locality, whether it be in Akron or whether it be in California, in each plant there is a local union, there is a local management, so let them go to the bargaining table and discuss their problems. Why should it be settled by an international union sitting a thousand miles away which is not familiar with local conditions and local freight rates or many local elements that enter into the composite picture of what they should pay or can afford to pay. The cost of production varies in different areas.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I further state that, if such a law is passed, a law should be passed making management give to the localities the benefit of that saving in wages in the place of enforcing a Nation-wide price on the article which similar article is manufactured in both places?

Mr. FISHER. That is a commendable objective for the gentleman to work on if he feels there is need for legislation on that subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it is not in the bill.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman can very easily pursue that. It is not a subject of labor legislation. Surely the gentleman is not in favor of national monopolistic control through industry-wide bargaining, I assume?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will answer the gentleman, and I say that I am not in favor of monopolistic setting up prices throughout the United States, either.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman did not answer my question. Is he opposed to national monopoly over human labor as is now exercised in some instances through industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not consider it national monopoly.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I just wanted to ask this question at this particular point. Is it not true that the bill provides for complete company-wide bargaining?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Then that would cover this instance.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The gentleman is correct, but I trust the bill will be amended so that noncompeting situations will be covered.

Now let me give you a few examples of what I mean. I speak of the evils of industry-wide bargaining. This Nation is witnessing at this moment a Nation-wide telephone strike that has been in progress for 10 days. It is a typical industry-wide, Nation-wide shut-down. Two of the demands of the unions are industry-wide bargaining in the future and the union or closed shop. The company insists on regional bargaining by the various companies that have contracts with the various individual unions. Why should not that be done? In that way each union will have a responsibility and a meaning. Its affairs and the wages and working conditions will be worked out on the ground and not in the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C. And, more important, the public interest and welfare will not be subjected periodically to these Nation-wide shut-downs resulting from Nation-wide strikes.

Then there is the well-known case of the United Steelworkers Union. In October 1945, the Steelworkers Union announced a Nation-wide demand of 25 cents an hour wage increase, to be imposed on every company with which the international had a contract and many of them had no connection whatever with steel.

All the local unions were forbidden to close a contract with any manufacturer for less than this standard demand of 25

cents an hour. After this demand was made, a strike vote petition was filed with the National Labor Relations Board, and this occurred before any semblance of collective bargaining was undertaken. In many instances strike vote demands were filed by the International Union without even the prior knowledge of the local union and before the 25 cents an hour wage increase demand had even been served on many employers in whose plants a strike vote election was demanded.

You may say: "Oh that proves nothing. After all the locals did not have to vote to strike." Let us see about that. Pursuant to the strike notice, the NLRB at Cincinnati, for example, conducted a strike vote election on November 28, 1945, for 23 companies in that area with which steelworkers claimed bargaining rights. The employees of three companies voted not to strike. In the face of that fact, even the majority of employees in the three plants who voted not to strike were not heeded. The district director of the steelworkers union immediately announced that those employees would be expected to strike when notification of the strike date was issued by the international union, headed by Phil Murray.

Subsequently, all the local unions from coast to coast were notified by Mr. Murray to strike beginning on January 21, 1946, and on that day the international threw a picket line around the plants of the three companies where the no-strike vote was made, and forced them to join the Nation-wide shut-down.

Mr. Chairman, we had many instances presented to the committee where in connection with that steel strike last year, local unions in small plants, covered by the steelworkers union, were forced to strike against their will. Those were cases where no local labor dispute whatever existed, and where any differences could have been resolved in 5 minutes, were they permitted to do so. But no, they were forced to pay homage to the big moguls in the CIO, a form of absentee bossism, and the result was that the individual workers and the whole Nation suffered.

Perhaps there is time for another case in point. Up near New Canaan, Conn., there is a small dairy known as the Norman Dairy, Inc., of which Abraham Norman is the treasurer and a stockholder. The business has developed over a period of 30 years in the Norman family, and in 1945 it had a value of about $65,000 and had 10 employees. They were then doing both retail and wholesale business in New Canaan and Stamford and surrounding communities. They were even purchasing milk from other dairies in surrounding territories for pasteurization and retail purposes.

There had never been labor trouble on that farm. But things began to happen in May 1945 when the dairy was notified by one William Kennedy, the business agent of local 338, teamsters' union, that the dairy hands had joined his union and that a contract had to be signed. The union was located at Mount Vernon, N. Y., and operated out of New York State.

Mr. Norman was told to sign the contract or else face a strike. Mr. Norman, in his testimony, stated:

> We tried to point out that the adjoining towns, namely, Norwalk and other towns in which we served milk, were under the jurisdiction of a Connecticut labor union, wherein the wage scale was different, that is, lower than the wage scale prescribed in this contract, and that we could not stay in business with that type of competition.

But the Normans were told to sign, and if they could not compete they could go out of business.

Kennedy insisted they were operating on uniform contracts and no alteration in the terms of the contract would be tolerated by the union.

Having no other choice, the contract was signed without a single change. It was to expire in October 1946. But during November certain milk dealers in New York City and certain parts of New Jersey, known as the Metropolitan Milk Dealers Association, and the teamsters union, negotiated a new contract to take effect in January 1946. The Norman dairy was not a member of that association, and was not eligible to be a member. The new contract included provisions for a 5-day week of 40 hours. The Normans were told by the union the new contract had to be signed before the expiration of the one previously signed. Objection was made to the terms of the new contract. First the current contract did not expire for 10 months; that while the wage scale of the present contract was higher than that prevailing in neighboring towns in Connecticut with whom the Normans had to compete, the new contract called for additional increase of 20 percent, placing the Norman dairy at a decided disadvantage as against others in the industry in Connecticut; the new contract was based on an anticipated increase of 2 cents per quart in New York City, which was actually granted by OPA, but not for Connecticut.

Then came the pay-off. On January 25, 1946, Mr. Kennedy notified the Normans to sign the new contract or the men would strike. There was no 30-day strike notice, as required by law. The next morning, the men did not show up for work, though there was never a strike vote taken.

The family dairy operated a few days with two war veterans helping. But when the strike began from two to three hundred imported pickets from New York State were brought in to intimidate the customers and suppliers. They paraded along the farm road in front of the dairy. The dairy truck drivers were followed, pulled from cabs, threatened and on two occasions tires were stabbed.

On the second day of the strike the drivers attempting to bring in the supply of milk were followed and stopped. One of the drivers, a son of one of the dairy operators and a war hero, alive by the grace of God and a parachute, was set upon by 10 of the goons and thugs, his milk was destroyed, he was beat into insensibility and left lying on the roadside.

The dairy was then shut down for 4 months, resulting in the loss of customers accumulated over a period of 30 years, and an effort is still being made by that small dairy to overcome the terrific losses that were involved there.

Is there any Member of this House who upholds that sort of business? Is there anyone to uphold that conduct as being a proper labor activity? The Normans were not only victims of vicious criminal assaults and intimidation, but were forced to accede to terms of a contract of an industry-wide pattern, manipulated by a union some distance away. And because they could not meet those industry wide terms, they were put out of business and lost thousands of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, Congress passed the antitrust laws to prevent corporations and industrial groups from becoming too powerful. The same reasons prompted the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Federal Communications Commission, the Utility Holding Company Act, and scores of others—all designed to prevent combinations and price-fixing against the public interest, and to keep open the channels of competition where private industry is involved. And yet today that same sort of monopoly has been built up in the labor-union movement. The big international unions have become holding companies for the thousands of smaller unions, and each union in most instances is forced to obey the dictates of the directing heads. That is plain monopoly over human labor, and when abused and misused, as it so frequently is by Nation-wide and industry-wide strikes, the public suffers and the local unions suffer and the individual workers suffer.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not antilabor. It is antilabor monopoly. It contains a bill of rights protecting the workingmen who are members of unions. It prohibits conduct by unions or individuals that is obviously not in the legitimate interest of labor and is contrary to sound public policy. It is not punitive legislation. It is positive legislation.

This measure was drafted by the committee, but it was written in the hearts and minds of the American people. Read the polls of the past year, taken of public opinion. Talk to the man on the street, in the filling station, on the farm. This bill is the composite voice of the American people. And let us not be swayed for a moment by the antilabor attitude of the reactionaries who are opposed to this sort of needed and long overdue progress. This is a prolabor bill, and it should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in voting H. R. 3020 out of committee, 5 of the 15 Republican members who voted did so with formal reservations. Ten members voted unqualifiedly. Of the five of us who voted with reservations, some at least did so with the thought of proposing amendments in the House. At the proper time, I as

well as perhaps others intend to offer certain amendments.

Every one of the 15 Republican members and most of the Democratic members labored ardously for more than 6 weeks, 6 days a week, and many times into the night trying to arrive at the truth with regard to the real rights of labor and management. Many experts and scholars testified. Many had divergent views. Labor leaders for the most part thundered against any legislative disturbance of the status quo, even though the American scene today is replete with examples of goon-squad banditry and the many crimes committed in the name of the Wagner Act against the rank-and-file workers and against the honest employer. Some representatives of management, while offering lip service to the right of the workingman, sought to limit or cripple his legitimate rights—rights that are derived from those inalienable rights of every American—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the right to life that includes the right to sustain life with a decent wage for himself and his family; the right to liberty that includes the liberty to organize and to work, not as a slave or menial dependent on the benevolence of his employer, but as a dignified human being; the pursuit of happiness that includes the right effectively to obtain decent and healthful working conditions and to procure by one's labors sufficient beyond mere subsistence, education for one's children, and at least the modest measures of those pleasant things that make this world bearable.

Gentlemen, I wish to pay highest tribute to the chairman of our committee. He broadened the scope of our hearings. He gave every member wide opportunity to question all of the 137 witnesses at length in order to develop every reasonable line of inquiry. He has listened with tolerance to opposing views though some of us differed on certain important questions. I know that it is his determined purpose to protect the rank-and-file workers and to bring peace to labor relations.

In my humble opinion we should seek on this floor to determine the charter for the average American worker and his union. We should correlate it with the rights of management and we should recognize that the rights of neither should infringe upon the rights of the public at large. That charter is largely written in H. R. 3020.

Our objective in the committee was a bill of rights for the worker and his union and for the average American businessman and his free enterprise, and the protection of the public against injury to our economy caused by an abuse of the right to strike.

H. R. 3020 goes a long way toward accomplishing these objectives. It can be improved by not permitting wages to be the subject of as keen competition between employers as is a mere commodity. The worker's bargaining power through his union should more nearly approximate the bargaining power of, particularly, corporate employers that can combine in various ways to obtain a market advantage.

The bill does excellent work in eliminating the irresponsible acts of union officers. It contains strong measures to harness the unbridled strength of some unions that would trample roughshod on our economy. It looks into the scene of the union hall and observes the rank-and-file worker who up to now has been mute and unable to express himself; who has been led out on strike when he did not want to go on strike; when he has been brushed aside by goon-squad tactics; where his rights were not regarded on the matter of the union's financial transactions; where he has been domineered, in many cases by party line and even Communist officers. The bill centers its attention upon this rank-and-file worker. It gives him a bill of rights within his own union. It gives him freedom of speech without danger of reprisal from opposing factions within his own union. For example, I can recall a case as was related to me of a worker in a Milwaukee plant who sought to express his opinion at a union meeting in opposition to the leaders, and immediately thereafter he was advised by union goons that if he did not keep his mouth shut, his little girl might not come home alive the next day.

The bill gives real suffrage to the rank-and-file worker on important issues, in the choice of his officers or on the decision to strike. It insures to him the secret ballot so that he might not be shouted down in his efforts to express his own will. It forces the union officers to furnish complete financial statements to members so that they will have a real knowledge of how their dues are spent.

Section 9–F, subsection 6, provides that no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its officers is a member of the Communist Party or a party liner. Section 8–C, subsection 6, gives the union the right to expel Communists and party liners. This is extremely important because in times past, Communists and their fellow travelers made a specialty of studying trade unionism and the technique of the union hall. They became experts in the knowledge of trade-union matters so much so that many good American workers have been willing to place their fate in the hands of party-line officers only to find that they became the dupes of Communist tactics. One high-ranking officer of the United Electrical Workers in testifying before our committee brazenly stated to the committee that his was the most democratic union in the country because they accepted all shades of political belief. He openly stated that they accepted Communists on the same basis as people holding any legitimate different political belief. We know that it is the purpose of the Communist Party to use the labor union as a tool to bring about the spread of their antihuman doctrine.

One example of Communist tactics that came to the attention of our committee and concerning which a report is intended to be made subsequently in Congress by a subcommittee of the Labor Committee, is the example testified to by Mr. Louis Budenz, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker. Budenz testified that the Communist Party Political Committee in New York decided in the year 1940 that a strike should be called in the Allis-Chalmers Co., of Milwaukee, because they were one of the few firms making steel turbines for United States destroyers and that by pulling the strike in that plant they could bring about a following of the party line at that time of opposing aid to Britain. That was before Hitler attacked Russia. Budenz testified as to traveling to Milwaukee and meeting in secret with Mr. Eugene Dennis, present secretary of the Communist Party and with Mr. Harold Christoffel, the Communist Party member and president of the Allis-Chalmers local, at which secret meeting it was decided to strike the plant pursuant to the decision in New York of the Communist Party. Shortly thereafter the strike was called. It was later determined by the Milwaukee courts that over 2,000 of the strike ballots were fraudulently stuffed into the boxes. That the Communist Party, as agents of a foreign government, should be able to cause a strike in an American plant is horrifying. We have got to keep communism out of the American labor unions. This bill does that.

The Republican Party does not believe in the dictatorship of big business, neither does it believe in the dictatorship of the workers. One of its prime concerns is the welfare of the average American family. The average American wants industrial peace and freedom—fair play for the worker and fair play for the businessman. In the economic tension that will exist between our country and Russia this Congress faces a real challenge. The issue lies deeper than party lines. We must get our industrial house in order. This bill does largely that. The economic system of Russia is based on the Communist idea of state domination, no unions, no right to strike. It is based in large part on slave labor. The individual there counts for little. We in America prize human individual liberty even above the state. We believe that property rights are natural to man. The best protection of those property rights and of that liberty is in the balancing of the rights of our workers and the rights of our businessmen so that the great majority of our citizens will enjoy that private property and that human liberty. We should not delay in passing the bill that will maintain the rights of the worker and protect the rights of the businessman. We cannot delay. Time is too short. We must demonstrate to the world that we recognize Christian justice to all American citizens.

In the contention that has developed between the United States and the country of Russia we must see to it that we preserve those things which we hold sacred—that is, freedom, property rights, and all those things that are natural to man. In the economic contention and competition that we will undergo with Russia we know that that country does not believe in those things; that their

economy is based on slave labor; that their economy is based on the state over the individual. Ours is just the reverse. Ours is based on Christian concepts where the rights of the individual are superior to the rights of the state, and by protecting that right we will save our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, strikes against the public interest should be settled at once and not delayed by willful opposition of either the unions or the industries. The disputes should be arbitrated quickly and fairly, so the public will not suffer. Our country stands for reason and is opposed to the rule of force. Both the employers and employees must have the right for peaceful discussion of their disputes, but the solution of their problems should not be delayed at the cost of the innocent and suffering public.

Under our American system of government, all parties in a controversy are equal in law. Recently we have had many controversies between labor and management in which the parties were not equal and the public—the third party—was not even considered.

We must preserve the rights and laws to protect labor from the hardship and sweatshop conditions of many employers in the past, but at the same time we must have equal protection for management and the public so as to give justice and equality to all three classes.

We all remember well in the early thirties, when the awful depression came, labor suffered more than any other class when long bread lines were formed in all the large cities of this country. Congress passed many laws to help all classes, especially the wage earner, who must continue to have good wages in order to live decently and maintain high production for the consuming public.

The innocent and suffering public is demanding an end to so many uncalled-for and unjustified strikes wherein the public is the chief sufferer. Repeated work stoppages have not only injured the public, but have inflicted severe hardship upon the rank and file of the working men and women in many instances.

The public has a right to demand that the excessive abuses by some labor leaders shall be curbed, and that arbitrary disregard of labor rights by management, when it occurs, should also be corrected.

The people are expecting us to meet the labor-management issue courageously in order to curb abuses the public has suffered from time to time.

Many believe that the increased popularity of President Truman is due largely to his firm hand in the coal strike and his having filed court proceedings against John L. Lewis.

We all know that some measure must be adopted to protect the public from such a labor leader as John L. Lewis, as peaceful collective bargaining is almost impossible with him.

I am informed that some 200 labor bills have been introduced at this session of Congress. What stronger evidence do we need to show that the public is intensely interested in correcting the abuses brought on by continued disputes between labor and management? The Committee on Education and Labor has given a long and patient hearing to all the bills referred to that committee and finally, by a large majority, agreed on the bill we have now under consideration. This bill may not be perfect, but under the broad rule under which it is being considered, amendments are in order and the bill can be perfected if it is unfair to labor or management, and amendments should be adopted, when we begin reading the bill, to correct such injustices, because I do not believe that anyone in this chamber, certainly not a majority, desires to be unfair to labor or management but is certainly determined that we must have some law with teeth in it to protect the public and curb the unjustifiable strikes so that we may have full production, which is the chief weapon against inflation.

Government officials take the position that to be an employee of the Government is a privilege, not a right, and the Government is free to decide who shall work for it. Private industry takes the position that it has as much right as the Government in hiring its employees and that if the Government is free to decide who shall work for it, private enterprise should have the same privilege.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

H. R. 3020—THE GOP ANTILABOR BILL

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3020, the Republican antilabor bill.

This bill, which the committee has recommended for approval, purports to prescribe "fair and equitable rules of conduct" for labor and for management, "to protect individual workers," and "to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes." To accomplish these objectives it writes off the statute books the National Labor Relations Act, and abolishes the National Labor Relations Board. To accomplish these objectives it discards the findings, which, based on long and careful study of the facts of the relation between employers and employees led Congress overwhelmingly to adopt the policies embodied in that act.

The provisions of the National Labor Relations Act rest upon the indisputable fact that workers individually have no power to bargain with their employers over wages, hours, and working conditions. Long before that act was passed, Chief Justice Taft said that—

> Labor unions were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to resist abitrary and unfair treatment.

Under these circumstances employers were able to play off the needs of one worker as against another, to offer to the worker most in need of a job the lowest wages he would be willing to accept and to require all the other workers to accept that lowest standard or lose their jobs. This competition between workers for jobs led to a constantly declining standard of real wages as compared to the value of goods and service which, with the aid of an advancing technology, labor was able to produce. This the Nation recognized in the bitter years of 1929–32, and in 1935 Congress declared in the National Labor Relations Act that the inequality of bargaining power between individual workers and employers "tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners."

The National Labor Relations Act was passed because employees, seeking to maintain their advantageous bargaining position in relation to their workers, and seeking constantly to widen the margin between wages and prices so as to increase profits, fought with all their might to prevent workers from joining together so as to deal on a basis of equality with their employers. That act was passed because Congress and the country recognized that it was bad for the public interest, bad for workers, bad for consumers, and bad for industry as well, to permit employers to utilize their tremendous economic power to frustrate the self-organization of workers, to continue to play off the individual weaknesses of one against another, to enforce competition among workers, as though labor were a commodity of commerce, like bricks or stones, to which the harsh principles of competition should be applied.

Long before the need for a National Labor Relations Act became apparent, Congress in the Clayton Act recognized that labor was not an article of commerce and that to enforce competition among workers would lead not to human and material welfare, but to degradation, depression, misery, and ultimately to class warfare. Remember that the National Labor Relations Act seeks only to prevent employers from utilizing their economic power to force workers to compete one with another, for jobs, for wages and for other terms of employment. And remember, when you consider the provisions of this committee bill which would deprive workers of their rights under that law, that under this bill employers would once again be free to hire thugs and gunmen and spies, as the La Follette committee's investigation shows they did before the National Labor Relations Act was passed, to discharge workers who join a union, to blacklist and send to economic destruction workers whose only offense would be that they sought to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment by their employer. Remember, that under this committee bill, employer dictatorship over workers is reestablished in industry.

Is this a "fair and equitable rule of conduct"? Does this "protect individual workers"? Is this in "the public interest"?

But this bill goes much farther. It prohibits (sec. 9 (f) (1); p. 30) any representative who has been selected by

the employees of one employer, from representing, with minor exceptions, the employees of another employer although the employers are all engaged in the same industry and the employees are all engaged in the same trade, craft or occupation. The bill would thus legislate competition among workers with a vengeance.

Labor, this bill in effect proclaims, is a commodity of commerce, and must be treated as such. Labor, this bill proclaims, must not be permitted to combine to deal effectively with employers to obtain a fair share of the products of industry. Labor must not be permitted to attempt to raise substandard wages paid by some employers in an industry, which in turn depress the wages of all.

Long ago, Chief Justice Taft, speaking of the necessity for combination among workers to protect their interests and the interests of society as a whole, said:

> To render this combination at all effective, employees must make their combination extend beyond one shop. It is helpful to have as many as may be in the same trade united because in the competition between employers they are bound to be affected by the standard of wages of their trade. Therefore, they may use all lawful propaganda to enlarge their membership and especially among those whose labor at lower wages will injure their whole guild.

The markets for the products of industry today are Nation-wide. The standards of wages set by employers in one section of the country have great bearing upon the prices which those employers can charge for their goods. If those wages be substantially lower than the wages paid by competing employers in other sections of the country, these employers will not long be able to keep their wages high and continue to compete in the same markets. The organized workers would thus be required to conform to the standards of the lowest paid, unorganized workers, and this bill would prohibit them from seeking redress. Conduct which the Supreme Court, as well as the Congress, thought was lawful 50 years ago by this bill would be made unlawful. Is this a fair and equitable rule of conduct? Which individual workers are benefited by it? Does anyone believe that the public interest is served by a constantly descending spiral in the wages and living standard of workers which this bill would set in motion? Does anyone seriously contend that the advantages of competition as an economic policy lie in trading upon the weakness of wage earners who must work in order to eat and pay rent and doctor bills for themselves and their wives and children? If not, this bill must be defeated.

But even where this bill does not, by its very terms, deprive workers of the decent protection accorded them under the National Labor Relations Act in the exercise of rights which they must possess in order to protect the living standards of themselves and their families; even where it does not, by its very terms, sanction the use by employers of physical and economic weapons of coercion to defeat the natural desire of workers to compete on an equal footing with employers; the bill opens wide the door for employers to intimidate their employees and make them forego the very limited and almost futile right to bargain collectively which is reserved to them under this bill.

In section 8 (d) (1) the bill provides that it shall not be an unfair labor practice in effect for an employer to tell employees that they should not join a union, provided only such a statement does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal. Under this section of the bill it would now be lawful, for example, for an employer to offer a bribe to employees to induce them to refrain from joining a union or to resign their union membership. It would be lawful for an employer, who has discharged the leaders of a union because of his hostility to it, to tell employees to resign from the union, just as long as he lets the discharges stand as an object lesson to the others and does not, in express terms, threaten them with the same fate.

This bill ignores completely the undoubted fact which the Federal circuit courts of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States have repeatedly recognized that employees who are dependent for their bread and butter on the job which it is within their employer's power to give or withhold are sensitive and responsible even to subtle suggestions of the employer's desires, and that employers need do no more than hint to assure that employees will obey them. Is a rule of conduct which is based upon disregard of this elementary fact fair and equitable? Does it protect the rights of individual workers?

Moreover, by section 8 (d) (3) of this bill, employers are once again to be authorized by law to create company unions, in the guise of employee representation committees, to thwart real self-organization by workers in their own interest. When the Congress which passed the National Labor Relations Act studied this problem, it concluded that "the active entry of some employers into a vigorous competitive race for the organization of workers is not conducive to peace in industry." Have we heard any evidence which would warrant a contrary conclusion today?

The House committee that considered the National Labor Relations Act thought it clear that "it is of the essence that the right of employees to self-organization and to join or assist labor organizations should not be reduced to a mockery by the imposition of employer-controlled organizations, particularly where such organizations are limited to the employees of a particular employer, and have no potential economic strength." This bill is predicated on the opposite premise. Is the permission granted to employers to saddle employee representation plans upon employees in lieu of labor organizations of their own choosing a fair and equitable standard of conduct? Does the destruction of the right to self-organization which this bill accomplishes protect the rights of individual workers?

This bill in section 12 (c) abolishes the right of employees to strike in protest against unfair labor practices committed by their employer. It would permit an employer to discriminate against union members by cutting their wages, assigning them to unaccustomed and ill-suited tasks and even bluntly to discharge their leaders, and yet preclude the employees from striking in protest against such discriminatory treatment. This is done on the specious theory that "an administrative remedy is available" to the employees. But the remedy available even under the National Labor Relations Act against employer discrimination of this character often takes many, many months, and sometimes years, to obtain. This is so even when the National Labor Relations Board is not hamstrung, as the Board created by this bill would be, by having its investigative and enforcement facilities divorced from it, and being deprived of the aid of attorneys in analyzing the record of hearings before its examiners and thus expediting decisions. Under the proposed bill the administrative remedy would be a delusion rather than a reality.

What the bill would accomplish is readily apparent by one example. Suppose an employer desired to evade his obligation to bargain with the representatives of the union freely chosen by his employees. He could, by committing unfair labor practices, and discriminating against union members in a hundred ways, so good and irritate them that they would be compelled to strike to save their self-respect. Make no mistake, American workmen are neither serfs nor clods. If sufficiently irked they will strike regardless of the prohibitions of this bill. In that event they lose their rights under the act and the employer may with impunity discharge their leaders and so intimidate the remaining employees that they will forego representation by the union. Is this fair and equitable? Is this likely to promote industrial peace or industrial strife?

This bill is 66 pages long. In the time available it is impossible to discuss each of the provisions of the bill and to test them against the standards which are avowed in its title, and against the standards of sound public policy which Congress embodied in the National Labor Relations Act, to protect against deprivation by employers the exercise by workers of what Chief Justice Hughes termed their "fundamental right" to organize and bargain collectively. From what has already been said, however, it is apparent that the fundamental premises underlying this bill are the self-organization and collective bargaining by workers is inimical to the public interest, that it is for Congress to limit, not to protect that practice, and that employers are to be authorized to utilize their economic power to punish employees who dare to act together to secure redress of their grievances.

These premises could not help but produce a bill such as this which deprives workers of rights which have been theirs for 150 years, which turns back the clock on the economic and social progress achieved by the last generation, which seeks again to pit individual workers against giant corporations. These premises, because they ignore the facts of industrial life, cannot possibly lead

to fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management. They cannot afford meaningful protection to individual workers, for that protection basically must be found in the right to associate and act in concert with their fellows. They cannot lead to protection of the paramount public interest, for that interest lies not in depressing, but in raising, the standard of living of wage earners in the Nation. The premises upon which this bill is founded, and the principles which it embodies, serve none of these interests. They serve rather only the interests of those employers who seek to exercise dictatorial power over their employees, who seek to trade on the weaknesses of unorganized workers, who would profit temporarily by a decreasing standard of living for workers. But that way lies national calamity, not prosperity. For these short-sighted employers would by this means deprive labor of purchasing power and would head the Nation, and themselves, straight for another depression.

If we would do more than pay lip service to the principles of liberty embedded in the Constitution, if we would truly seek to make those fair and equitable democratic principles effective in the industrial world, we would support the National Labor Relations Act, not destroy it; we would provide ample funds for its effective administration, not deplete its staff; we would reaffirm the right of employees to collective bargaining and demand that employers refrain from trampling on that right. On these premises a sound and fair and equitable structure of labor-management relations can be built; they can be built on no other.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, section 304 of H. R. 3020 deals with restrictions on political contributions. It amends section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 to make it unlawful for a corporation or labor organization not only to make a "contribution" but also an "expenditure" in connection with any election at which Presidential or Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for. Contributions or expenditures made "in connection with any primary election or political convention held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices" are likewise made unlawful and punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or a fine or imprisonment of officers of the corporation or labor organization who consent to any unlawful contribution or expenditure. The present suggested amendment would make permanent, in broadened form, the restrictions on political contributions by labor organizations imposed by the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, soon to expire.

There are a number of reasons why I am opposed to this provision of the bill:

First. The prohibition against political activities of unions has no relevancy in a bill purporting to adjust labor-management relations and to minimize industrial strife. The task of investigating contributions and expenditures in Federal election campaigns constitutes a complex and entirely separate field of legislative activity and has been so recognized by the Congress in the passage of Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and the Hatch Political Activities Act approved August 2, 1939. To inject issues concerning political activities into a bill of the kind now under consideration would harm not help the cause of stabilized labor-management relations.

Second. If such prohibitions are to be imposed upon the political activities of labor organizations, the same prohibitions should be imposed upon employer associations such as the National Association of Manufacturers or the Chamber of Commerce. Similarly, unincorporated organizations should be included within the scope of such prohibitions. If the bill seeks to bring about equality of treatment to management and the associations which represent it in dealing with labor and labor organizations, certainly it would seem inconsistent with the purpose of the bill to restrict only the political activities of labor organizations.

Third. The evil which the prohibition seeks to correct is in fact nonexistent. The widespread activity of the Political Action Committee of the CIO in the elections of 1943 and 1944 was the signal for a furious campaign against it in the press and in Congress. Demands were made upon Congress for an investigation on the ground that the Corrupt Practices Act as amended by the Smith-Connally Act was being violated. In the midst of this furor the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944 was convened for the purpose of hearing testimony by the chairman of the Political Action Committee. A majority of the special committee found no violation of the Corrupt Practices Act on the part of the Political Action Committee and the Attorney General discovered no violation of the Criminal Provisions Act after investigations initiated at the request of several Members of Congress—Senate Report No. 101, page 23, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

Fourth. Even if the evil which is attacked in the bill did exist, the method of prohibitions and sanctions is unsound and unworkable. The special committee established by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, after long and careful consideration of the subject and after hearing much testimony, came to the following conclusion:

> The committee as a result of its investigations unanimously came to the conclusion that prohibitions and sanctions had failed to prevent pernicious political activity in Federal elections. They concluded that free and prompt publicity as to campaign contributions and expenses would be more likely to achieve the desired result. Therefore its recommendations as set forth above stress the reduction of prohibitions and the increase of publicity. (S. Rept. 101, p. 83, 79th Cong., 1st sess.)

Fifth. Assuming, however, that the evil did exist and that a prohibition against contributions was a sound method of combatting the abuse, the extension of the prohibition beyond contributions to expenditures is an unwarranted limitation on the rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly. In considering a recommendation for an amendment to section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act to prohibit not only contributions but also expenditures, a majority of the Senate's special committee on campaign expenditures rejected the recommendation for the following reasons:

> The extension of the prohibition to include expenditures would tend to limit the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. The investigations which the committee has made brought out the fact that many organizations claiming to be educational are claimed by others to be purely political. The line of demarkation is difficult if not impossible to draw since it depends to a considerable extent upon human motives. An expenditure made in connection with an election may well be for the publication of pamphlets or newspaper articles or speeches justifying the point of view of the organization paying for it. An editorial in a newspaper states its position. The reproduction of that editorial in the form of a pamphlet or a speech based on that pamphlet may state the position of the organization paying for it. Free discussion of political questions should be encouraged, not prohibited. (S. Rept. 101, p. 83.)

Sixth. The effort to restrain labor organizations from using their funds for the support of political parties in England proved to be unworkable. The effect of the decision of the House of Lords in *Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants* v. *Osborne* (1910 A. C. 87) was to restrain a trade-union from using its funds for political activites. Such funds had been used to support the new Labor Party that had counted so heavily in the general election of 1906, but the Trade-Unions Act of 1913 corrected this limitation imposed upon trade-union activities, and funds could thereafter be devoted to the furtherance of political objectives if they had received authority for that purpose from the members of the union. Even the restrictive Trade Disputes and Trade-Unions Act of 1937 following the overthrow of the Labor Government did not prohibit unions from using funds for political purposes. At most it required an assent from each trade union member as a condition precedent to the legality of a levy upon him for funds for legal purposes. Passage of section 304 of the present bill would mean that we would have taken a more restrictive position against labor organizations in this respect that even the most restrictive piece of British legislation.

Seventh. There is no justification for treating labor organizations on the same basis with corporations for this purpose. The $5,000 limitation by the Hatch Act upon individual contributions to political committees has been ineffective as against corporations because its officers, directors, and members of families having controlling interests in these corporations can afford to make large contributions distributed to a large number of State, local, and independent committees. Thus we find that 31 members of the du Pont family contributed $109,832.83 to various political organizations for political

purposes. Five members of the McCormick family contributed $28,000; six Mellon family members contributed $59,500 and nine Pew family members made a total contribution of $96,995.76. See appendix 8, Tabulation of Contributions by Prominent Family Groups, Senate Report No. 101, pages 140–151. Neither wage earners who have associated themselves into a labor organization nor members of their families are in a position to make such contributions for political purposes. The necessary interest of the wage earner in the vital questions of taxation, housing, rent, and price control, full employment, minimum wages, health, education, the elimination of discrimination in employment, and other legislative matters which affect him and his family and in fact the entire community can be expressed effectively only in combination with his fellow wage earners acting through their unions. They alone have the resources and facilities to support measures and condidates which will act in labor's interest so often synonomous with the interests of the community as a whole. Restrictions upon political activity by limiting political contributions of trade-unions creates rather than eliminates a social evil. It should not be injected into the consideration of a bill to adjust labor-management relations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago it was highly amusing to me to see the majority leader of this House endeavor to toss into the lap of the Democratic Party, John L. Lewis. The American people have not forgotten, even though the Republicans would like them to, that John L. Lewis in the last two national elections supported the Republican candidate for President and the Republican platform. He was very much sought after by that party and was high in the party councils. He was also the principal radio drawing card. There are many members on the Republican side of the House today whom the great John L. supported. You have found out now that Mr. Lewis is not only an abrasive, but also very adhesive. My Republican friends, he is your bride, to have and to hold until death does you part.

Now as to the bill itself: It is our legal duty to engage in moderation. Yet, there is no moderation in this bill because it was written sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and page by page by the National Association of Manufacturers. It is but a reprint of all of the propaganda and antilabor ideas with which that organization has flooded the Congress. The bill has one primary intent and that is to put the American working man back to the standard of servility that existed in employment 50 or 60 years ago.

You talk of labor on the floor of this House as though labor was composed of villians, thieves, and cutthroats. Who is this labor that you talk about? Sixty-eight million American men and women—your neighbors, your friends, the people who live next door to you, the man who lives upstairs, the people who pay 80 percent of the taxes of the United States, the people who supplied 75 percent of the armed forces in time of war, the people who have built this great country and who have contributed their time and money and their blood in every important moment of its existence, the people who today merely ask to be treated as Americans and seek a continuation of the guaranties of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.

The Republican side of the aisle has been saying for years that they are opposed to communism and to class consciousness or class struggle. Mr. Chairman, I warn you today: Pass this legislation and you will create a spirit of class consciousness the like of which this country has never seen. You will create a definite cleavage between employer and employee that will make the labor incidents of the last few years appear weak and puny. Further, you will drive hundreds of thousands of decent American workingmen into the Communist Party because they will feel that their rights have been taken away from them by their own elected Representatives in Congress. They will feel that they have no place to turn to, and will embrace the false political philosophy of communism which will give them a temporary ray of hope. I warn you gentlemen that the Communist Party is the only group in this country that is in a position to receive the disgruntled worker. By passing this legislation you may possibly bring about a national strike of every line of industry in protest against your actions. Your legislation would be more successful than the Daily Worker or all of the communistic street-corner speakers in our land. You will bring about a condition of industrial chaos that will take many years of difficult effort to untangle. Mr. Chairman, remember—moderation.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

UNION DEMOCRACY VERSUS DICTATORIAL CONTROL

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains important proposals to bring that democracy to all unions that is now provided by the best unions. These provisions, 10 in number, have well been termed "the bill of rights"; they protect both the union member and the public.

BILL OF RIGHTS

In substance, these guarantee:

First. The right to free speech within their union and the right to conduct their organization in conformance with the free will of a majority of the members.

Second. Protection against unreasonable fees and dues.

Third. Protection against being compelled to join in collateral financial schemes.

Fourth. Protection in their right to resign.

Fifth. Political freedom.

Sixth. A fair hearing on disciplinary action limited to reasonable grounds.

Seventh. Protection to the unorganized workers in their right to work when the union denies their membership on some ground not applicable to other members.

Eighth. A secret ballot, frequent election of officers, and reasonable notice of meetings on strikes and other important union matters.

Ninth. Protection from spying and intimidation in their personal and family affairs.

Tenth. Full disclosure to members of the financial affairs of both locals and internationals.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

At the inception of our deliberations it became apparent that the first problem we had to decide was whether we were going to permit undemocratic practices to continue in those labor unions that we gave special privileges in the Wagner Act. In our committee hearings we noted that unions using the Wagner Act as their avenue to power had come to the point where they now literally control the very means of livelihood of millions of workers. It is unthinkable that organizations with such great power to control the economic welfare of millions of their fellow men should continue to exist under protection of Federal law without minimum guaranties being made to protect their members against the growing abuse of such power. Instances where they have abused this power are to numerous to mention.

DEMOCRATS ADMIT NEED FOR LABOR LEGISLATION

As is well stated in the minority report at page 95:

> No one can deny that labor unions have engaged in some activities that are so clearly unjustifiable that this Congress can and should legislate against them immediately.

That was in the minority report, not the majority report. I submit to this House that some of the "activities that are so clearly unjustifiable" as to warrant legislation are some of the undemocratic practices in the administration of unions that are within the common knowledge of all of us.

PUBLIC INTEREST

In fact, labor unions today stand at the very threshold of a man's right to a livelihood. As such they are clothed with a public interest and the right and duty of Congress to legislate with respect to them cannot be denied. They are more than social clubs. And those who oppose this bill, by telling you how important these unions are to millions of workers and to our economy, answer their own argument that Congress should not or cannot legislate with respect to them since they prove the tremendous public interest that is involved.

The minority report at page 76 claims that these features providing democratic guaranties in union affairs are without parallel when compared to any other form of voluntary association. If this statement were true, which it is not, I submit that the power of labor organizations over their fellow men is without parallel when compared to any other form of voluntary association. And while most men join labor unions voluntarily, still there are many to whom the act of association is not voluntary and both groups are entitled to protection against undemocratic practices.

The minority report also states that such regulatory measures are not an appropriate subject for Federal legislation and that we are attempting the impossible. But you and I know it is not impossible. That it is possible and would interfere with present undemocratic practices is the reason these provisions are opposed.

EMPLOYERS COULD NOT INTERFERE WITH UNIONS

The minority report also claims that this would be the opening wedge for employers to gain control of union affairs, but this argument falls of its own weight because of section 8 (a) (1) and (2) of the act which make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to interfere with the administration of any labor organization.

QUESTION INVOLVED

The question in this bill is whether you are in favor of laws which place it in the power of a few men to strangle the national economy or whether you favor sanity in labor relations.

Clearly this country ought not to be exposed to another wave of paralyzing strikes. No one wants to be unjust to labor, organized or unorganized, but no one ought to want to continue unrestricted power in the union labor bosses after the demonstrations we have had, in the last few years, as to how they use it.

LABOR OLIGARCHY

Do we at the present time have a labor oligarchy of union bosses? Let us turn to the minority report for our answer.

The minority report claims that these provisions providing for democracy in unions will place—

labor organizations under the constant threat of struggle for existence.

See page 77 of the minority report.

That is a very serious indictment that the minority makes of labor unions. That statement when carefully examined means that it would be a threat to the very existence of labor unions if they were required to live under democratic principles. I am sure that these principles which will guarantee democratic rights to each individual member of a labor union will make labor unions grow strongly and on a solid foundation and will foster rather than threaten their growth. Out of these provisions will come, I am sure, new strength to unions solidly grounded in the free activity of their members free from outside dictation of any sort. Then again on page 87 of the minority report, we find a bold statement supporting the continuation of union control by the top bosses. The statement reads:

Many local comittees are untrained or dominated by elements much more radical than those in the international organizations.

In other words, the argument made by the minority report is that the public must be protected from the rank and file, and that the labor-union bosses are the ones to protect the Nation from the radicalism of the rank and file of their membership. I do not hold to that philosophy. I hold to the philosophy that the best protection this Nation can have is the guaranty of thorough democratic processes to each individual member in all labor organizations. The rank-and-file member is the one to be protected and to have the argument made to this Congress that the country needs protection from the rank and file of labor shows clearly who is opposing this bill and who the opposition is protecting. I have full confidence that the rank-and-file members of American labor do have the intelligence, judgment, courage, and sense of civic responsibility to administer their own affairs in a sound, constructive, and American way.

In the minds of those who oppose this bill, any bill would be a drastic bill which really curbs the power of the labor bosses by modifying their great advantages under existing legislation.

GROWING LABOR ABUSES

There are those of you who mention the threat of fascism. I hold no brief for either communism or fascism, but several facts are plain. Labor abuses have been growing under the protection of the Wagner Act—the sit-down strike, the racketeers with their murder, arson, extortion, and highjacking, the Petrillo taxes, the jurisdictional strikes, the secondary boycott of farmers' produce, mass picketing, strikes in public utilities and hospitals, and now a seemingly never-ending wave of national strikes against the national interest. Every day that Congress delays the enactment of curative laws we have an increase in the severity of the abuses to be remedied. This means that every new bill is necessarily a more severe bill because the abuses have become more severe.

I plead with those of you who oppose fascism, if you also oppose communism, to join with us who want reasonable labor legislation to now stop these abuses which both of us admit exist, and put a stop to both fascism and communism.

We can do this by guaranteeing democracy in unions and putting our faith in the American worker.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am especially concerned with sections 203–205 of the pending bill dealing with strikes imperiling the public health and safety. In my judgment the provisions contained in these sections are not adequate to deal with the menace of strikes in public utilities, including transportation, communication, and the production and distribution of food and fuel. At best, the bill provides for temporary restraint and delay, whereas it is my fixed conviction that in this type of strike there must be not merely regulation and delay, but a prohibition of them.

The Nation-wide telephone strike, now in its second week, is merely the latest of a long series of events which establish to my mind the absolute necessity for prohibiting strikes of such character. It is not by the grace of the leaders of this strike that even emergency calls are going through, but rather by the loyalty and devotion to duty of a small number of supervisors and other persons who are maintaining at least the bare essential communications by working double shifts; while others have been called from their posts without the faintest regard for the needs of the public, and without regard for the sometimes fatal consequences of the lack of telephone service.

In fairness to the strikers, it should be said that it is probable that the great majority are perfectly willing to work, and to continue the negotiation of such grievances as they have, but they are subjected to pressure of a strike-minded group of leaders who have gotten out of control of the rank and file of the workers who made them, and who pay them.

As an illustration of this, let me call to your attention the Associated Press story appearing yesterday that telephone workers in stricken Woodward, Okla., were resigning from their union, rather than obey instructions not to return to their posts following the disastrous tornado there.

With half the town in ruins, the union wired to the workers, as follows:

Do not permit members to report to work. If they do so, pull them off the job. Responsibility for situation there rests with company for rejecting union's proposal before strike and during strike. Company took position week ago could handle all emergencies. Let them handle them. By working you cancel efforts of many pickets. This is not time to weaken.

The operators replied:

Girls refuse to stop. Will work as long as needed. Have you seen this place? Several members injured and homeless. Services not required at first-aid stations. Can help more by doing what we are trained for. Would be ashamed of a union which would put up pickets in a disaster like this. Criticism by the entire town would be shameful.

I hold no brief for the management of the Bell Telephone System. The workers may have some just cause for complaint, although it is a generally accepted fact that telephone employees earn normally good wages and enjoy working conditions and benefits far superior to the average worker. I am not immediately concerned with the merits of the present dispute and whether the weight of justice lies on the side of management or union. There is a third interest which we must consider; an interest which, in these circumstances, becomes paramount, and that is the interest of the public. The worker can accomplish nothing by continuing to irritate and damage the people at large. Whatever the final results of this strike, the Bell Telephone Co. will survive it. If new and costly benefits are given the telephone employees, the cost will, of course, be paid not by the telephone company but by every user of a telephone. There is room for doubt, however, if unions will survive many more strikes of a character which threaten grave injury to the public.

Nothing can be gained by this termination of essential service which could not be gained by negotiations properly regulated with benefits made retroactive.

In considering present labor difficulties we must remember that there is a vast difference between a strike which is limited in character and whose effects are largely confined to the employer and employee, and a strike which has a drastic effect on the health and safety of the people generally. The prob-

lems are entirely different, and the method of dealing with them should likewise be entirely different.

For example, a strike in a hat factory affects the man or company who owns the factory and his employees. The factory may be bankrupt, its employees may go hungry. This is a serious matter and obviously requires the best machinery we can create for its peaceful adjustment, but the public can get along without hats. Thus, while such a strike is of concern, it does not give rise to national emergency. I would regulate as best we can the relations involved, but I would not for a moment attempt to prohibit, or unduly restrict, the free rights of labor to strike in that hat factory. A strike in the telephone company, however, or in the coal mines, or oil fields supplying necessary fuel to the homes and factories of America, or in railroads or electric light companies, or in general in any field which seriously affects the production and distribution of fuel or food or other elements vital to the continuance of life itself, should not be talked about, or mildly regulated, but should be prohibited entirely.

Our civilization is very complex. A century and a half ago the family was largely sufficient unto itself and could get along somehow no matter what its neighbors were up to. Candles lighted houses and wood from the adjacent fields heated them, and food was home grown and home preserved and the essentials of life were at hand. Today we are wholly dependent for our warmth and shelter and our food and our lives on electric light and power companies, and coal and fuel oil and transportation. The interruption of these can destroy us.

It is absolute necessity, therefore, that drives me to the conclusion that we cannot tolerate strikes in such utilities and the alternative must be found. The alternative, in my judgment, is compulsory arbitration in which workers, with their eyes open to exactly what they are facing, voluntarily give up the right to strike if they want to work in utilities at all, and obtain in lieu of that right certain very definite benefits such as tenure of position, health, and sickness benefits, insurance benefits, and in general a security which they would perhaps not obtain in another type of employment.

The recent strike in the coal mines, the clever and contemptuous so-called memorial period which John L. Lewis has just flagrantly engineered; a public utility strike which not so long ago completely paralyzed the great city of Pittsburgh; the transportation strike in Philadelphia and Washington; the tugboat strike in New York, and many other examples have hung as a constant threat over the health and lives of our citizens. These things are persuasive beyond any mere theories that if we are to survive in our present complex civilization, we must control utility strikes of the character I have described.

It was more than a year ago that I introduced the original resolution to study means to prevent strikes in public utilities and I am more than ever convinced of its necessity.

The proper and equitable solution of labor difficulties generally, and the prohibiting of strikes in public utilities can be accomplished without violating the fundamental rights of labor to organize, to form strong unions for the constant improvement of working conditions, and as a last resort to strike. These rights I shall always support. But, like all other rights, they are subject to modification, and the modification that I propose is essential for the protection of the physical safety and even the lives of our people.

This bill is deficient in its treatment of this very important and special phase of the problem. We still have it before us, and I must keep insisting that we deal with it adequately.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, the current problem of industrial relations is our most critical domestic issue. A solution to this crisis must be immediately found if our country is to remain strong and if we expect to continue and improve the standard of living of our people.

From the beginning of our Nation there have been many domestic disputes and misunderstandings between individuals and between organizations. Our Government has heretofore provided laws and courts to adjudicate these grievances.

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. Individuals and organizations must not be permitted to take the law into their own hands. We must have respect for law. It is for this reason that we have government. When those who disregard the laws of government and attempt to settle their own controversies by force or by coercion government ceases to exist and anarchy and chaos result.

Today we are faced with critical industrial disputes between management and labor. Not only are management and labor suffering as a result of these disputes, but the public is paying the penalty.

The critical state of industrial disputes must not continue. We, the legislators of our Government, must have the courage to enact just laws for industrial relations that will guarantee an equality of rights for management and labor and the public. The constitutional rights and the general welfare of all the people must be recognized and protected by these laws.

It is true that the rights of labor must be safeguarded, but as our Government must check monopolies in business so must monopolies be checked in labor.

It is also true that workers must have the right to strike, but the right to strike is not the right to cause the baby's milk to spoil or to imperil the health and safety of the public.

The legislation before us attempts to regulate industrial relations between labor and management and to provide for the general welfare of all the people.

The present bill is not perfect. I do not agree with all its provisions, but, taken as a whole, I believe the bill is a substantial beginning to the solution of our critical problem of industrial strife. I shall vote for this legislation with the sincere hope that its enactment will result in industrial peace.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been called a bill of rights for labor. That is correct but only partially true. This is a bill of rights and lefts under the belt for labor, not only under the belt but in the back, in good old foreign fascist style. This bill without changing one word could just as easily have been introduced in the Reichstag in the days of Nazism at its worst. I do not mean by that, Mr. Chairman, that you are Adolf Hitler. There is absolutely no difference between this and the labor union policy of Hitlerism in Germany, word for word. The tragic thing about it is that we, the representatives of the people, meaning the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, did not write this bill. Not only did we not write it but we did not even see it, and right now not one-half of the Members, both Republican and Democrat, of this Congress have read the bill. This bill was written on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, written by over a score of corporation lawyers, paid not by the Government of the United States, not by even small business, but paid by big business, monopoly business.

You say that this bill is to protect the public. What do you mean by that? Who is the public? Is the public the 15,000,000 organized workers of America with their families totalling 60,000,000 people? Is the public small business? No! By this bill you define the public henceforth as the monopolies of America. The public interest for you is monopoly interest.

It is inconceivable that we can turn back the pages of history in this progressive hour as far as this bill does. This bill scraps the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was signed by President Hoover, then President of the United States. This bill turns back the pages of history to the 1700's in England when it was a criminal conspiracy for workers to attempt to strike. You are not just conservative or reactionary, you have a Dark Ages concept.

One speaker raised the question of this being a Christian Nation and therefore this bill should go forward and be passed in the name of Christianity. I want to speak, therefore, on that basis: Christian concepts. Prices are spiraling upward today and wages are being maintained at the levels they were a year ago.

The average worker in America makes today for his family less money than you spend on your automobile, less money than you spend on food as Congressmen. Under this bill even these meager wages are going to be driven further down because labor will not have the power to maintain present wage levels. Do you believe it is a Christian concept, therefore, to take away bread and butter from the mouths of people made in the image of God? Do you believe it is a Christian concept not to give them enough money to afford decent shelter for them and their children? Do you believe it is a Christian

concept to destroy the American abundant life?

If the words of the Master could be heard in this Chamber today, they would be, "When I was hungry, you fed me, and when I was naked, you clothed me, and inasmuch as you have done it unto one of these", the least unto the millions of workers of America, "you have done it unto me." It is a sacrilege to say that this bill is based upon Christian concepts. This bill is undemocratic and un-Christian. This bill is a direct return to chattel slavery of the working people of America. I do not even think it is possible that this bill will ever become law, but if it does pass in the House and pass in the Senate and the veto of our President is overridden, do not think for a moment that the working people of America, who are the public, who are the majority, are going to take this kind of un-American fascism, un-Christian legislation lying down. They are not going to do it. They are going to meet you in 1948 at the polls and they are going to beat you wherever you rise and try to run for public office.

The people are the public, they are the majority, and the NAM cannot save you in that hour of free elections. This is the time for you men and women not to vote as rubber stamps. This legislation is being thrust down your throats with a rubber stamp, and on it is printed, not "Republican," not "USA," but "NAM." It is time for you to spit up the gag. Stand up like men and vote against this bill in order that the people of America may go forward, so that our Nation will not perish from the earth; so that it will be a Nation of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The bill, H. R. 3020, which a majority of the Labor Committee railroaded to the floor without even the courtesy of consultation with the minority members of the committee, is the worst conceived piece of legislation ever to come before this House. Its 66 pages of text breathe only one spirit; Hatred for American workers. Its provisions, if conceivably they could ever become law or be thought of as constitutional, would repeal the thirteenth amendment against involuntary servitude and make of American working men and women chattels bound to accept the unrestrained and capricious dictates of their employers.

It is profoundly discouraging to think that supposedly responsible representatives of the people should, even in their most irresponsible moments, have given countenance to proposals so alien to our entire tradition. This bill would set us upon the path which Germany and Italy have already traveled. In attempting to settle our industrial and labor problems by the use of force applied by the Government rather than by the processes of collective bargaining, tolerance, and reason, it would have us adopt the methods of the labor front and the police state. Apparently, many have not yet learned the clear lesson of the last 25 years: That you cannot strike down the free trade union movement without at the same time inevitably destroying free enterprise and the right of industry to manage its affairs.

In countless ways this measure is designed to wreck collective bargaining, even where it is operating most successfully. By this bill the obligation to bargain collectively is diluted to a mechanistic formula contemplating five meetings within a month and nothing else. Even at those five meetings the parties are forbidden to discuss many matters of mutual interest. Unions are broken up into the smallest possible units so that employers, if they are willing to bargain at all, will bargain with so many different groups of their employees that they will have little time for the conduct of their business affairs. The company union is not only to become legal; it is to be affirmatively encouraged as a part of Federal policy, restoring the hypocrisy of the years from 1933 to 1937 when employers, while actually dealing with themselves, pretended to be dealing with their employees. This bill would, with only insignificant exceptions, make all strikes illegal. Yet no one has yet devised a method by which collective bargaining can be effective if employees are deprived of their sole weapon against employer injustice or shortsightedness.

The sponsors of this bill talk of equalizing the responsibilities of management and labor. Their conception of equalizing is to remove any possibility that employers can be found guilty of unfair labor practices and to saddle labor with such restrictions as inevitably will cause the complete destruction of the labor movement. Do the sponsors of this bill seriously suppose American workers would take all of this lying down? Is it not clear that, if this bill became law, the majority would invite a wave of labor troubles which would make the strikes of the past year and a half look like 15-minute rest periods? But with this important difference—this time the strikes would be directed against this legislation and not against private employers. By in effect putting workers outside the pale of our democratic society, the majority would arouse class feelings of which our country has been happily free; free precisely because all our citizens, whether employers or workers, have had the equal protection of the laws and the same rights within our society. There is a hollow mockery in the statement of the proponents of this measure that they are "merely correcting some New Deal mistakes." With trivial exceptions they would repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act, signed by that earnest New Dealer, Herbert Hoover, thereby at a stroke reinviting the Federal courts again to indulge those abuses which called forth that necessary and bipartisan measure. With trivial exceptions the Clayton Act of 1914 is repealed; the sponsors of this bill would deny the declaration of the Clayton Act that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity," and make of workingmen only an item in manufacturing costs. Any combination of workers to raise their wages would, under this pernicious bill, make them liable to treble damages under the Sherman Act. The older Members of the House will recall the outraged cries which greeted the Supreme Court's decisions in the Bedford Cut Stone and Duplex against Deering cases, where the Court held that actions of workers to protect themselves against unfair goods were violations of the Sherman Anti-trust Act. This bill goes further than did those cases; under those cases the Supreme Court said that the primary objective of the strike must violate the Sherman Act; under these bills it is enough if an object of the strike is to fix industry-wide wage rates.

Under this measure if workers attempt to strike at a sweat-shop competitor whose wage rates threaten their own, they are engaged in a criminal conspiracy. That was the law in England in the late 1700's. For over a century the doctrine of criminal conspiracy has been dead in this country. Now the sponsors of this measure would revive that doctrine. It is the rankest misrepresentation to say that this bill merely corrects abuses or straightens out the New Deal, it adopts out of a century and a half of history all the worst legislation, all the worst court decisions, and all the worst proposed legislation. Those decisions and those proposals have for decades been denounced by Republicans and Democrats alike. Even if the purpose of this bill—to give corporate management whatever it wants and to harass and destroy the labor movement—were frankly stated it would be a bad bill. For vast segments of industry in this country have achieved stable collective bargaining relationships with their employees, which are assets quite as tangible as the plants and machinery they own. This bill, by fragmentizing unions, by forbidding industry-wide relationships, by outlawing the closed shop, the check-off, and many other devices which have proved useful in obtaining industrial stability, would produce such chaos and would be so provocative of strikes that no employer, however benevolent and well-intentioned, could longer peacefully settle his labor problems. This bill is a gold brick thrown at the heads of employers, unions, workers, and the public.

This measure is proposed at a time when, despite all the agitation about unfair New Deal legislation American industry is operating at profit levels without precedent in the history of our country. If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, each member of this House should support the measures so ably sponsored by President Roosevelt which have succeeded in increasing the purchasing power of American workers, commensurate with our increased productive capacities. Everyone recognizes that our present problem lies in prices which are too high and profits which are too swollen. Instead of dealing with that problem, however, the sponsors of this measure say now let us give labor a good kick in the teeth so that prices may stay up, wages decline, and profits rise still further. This is Alice-in-Wonderland economics.

Those who support this measure shout a single refrain: "What about big strikes?" There is an answer to big strikes; indeed, there are two answers. One is the Russian answer of destroying all businesses and making labor an implement of the state. It has the merit that it works, but only through a police state and the denial of industrial and political liberty. The other is the Nazi

and Fascist answer of destroying trade unions and forbidding strikes. For awhile that worked, too, until it threw the world into a convulsion from which it will not soon recover. And that, too, depended upon a police state and the denial of political, religious, and civil liberty. Free enterprise and free labor are luxuries; luxuries which I believe our country powerful and wealthy enough to afford. But luxuries have their price; to enjoy them we must be prepared to pay something in the way of occasional and temporary inconveniences in the form of strikes. Despite the difficult postwar transition period, with the epidemic of strikes through which we have come, no one has been permanently injured. Profits are at all-time highs; finished goods are being produced at a rate hitherto undreamed of; unemployment is low; we are the most favored Nation in the world. Now this bill proposes, because of the slight inconveniences which many of us suffered during some of those strikes, to reverse our political history; to substitute for a free and voluntary labor, conscious of its rights and able to protect them, the approach of the slave master and the slave state.

This is one cake which you cannot both have and eat. Either we must live with the concept that we are equal citizens in a democracy, working together for a national purpose, or, turning our backs, stand committed to the proposition that employers are to be the uncontrolled leaders of our enterprises and that workers shall not dare assert their rights. We have only these choices, and the choice is crucial; either to follow the road of voluntary accommodation through collective bargaining in good faith, or the eventual substitution of the police state and the withering away of civil and political liberty.

Confronted with a national emergency, labor undertook during the war to give a no-strike pledge. That pledge was, with only the most trivial exceptions, lived up to. Free labor, proud of its rights and status, produced during the war a flood of military supplies which was the wonder of our military chiefs and resulted in the destruction of the slave-labor systems of two continents. Labor's loyalty to our institutions in time of national need was not accident or happenstance but reflected the sense of participation in our life which generations of free institutions have given our people. No better system of labor relations has been devised anywhere in the civilized world. Do not be misled by the statements of the proponents of this measure who would have you believe that under this legislation labor could continue free; I only ask that each Member of the House read the bill and the minority report which we have prepared before making his judgment concerning its incredible implications.

I have not time to analyze page by page and section by section this legislative absurdity. It is an exaggeration to say that the sponsors of this measure, in a spirit of vindictiveness best illustrated by the procedure which they have adopted to conceal its provisions from disinterested scrutiny, have proposed that we give up the American way of life. There has not been time for the country to become aware of what is now proposed, and this too is deliberate, designed to prevent consideration of the measure by the American people. Once its implications are known there will be, I am confident, a roar of protest from Americans in all walks of life who are not likely to allow cherished institutions to be thus violated. I repeat: Read the bill, read the minority report, and join those of us who would retain American freedom rather than barter that freedom away for an alien autocracy.

ANALYSIS OF HARTLEY BILL

For those who have been saying "it cannot happen here," and for those who have been fooling themselves with the idea that the Members of Congress would never dare to go as far as their speeches on labor would indicate, the answer is now available in black and white. Congressman HARTLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education, has put his suggestions down in black and white. Anyone who has any doubts as to what this man has in store for the working people of America, or who has any doubts that he really means business, should take some time off to do nothing more than read this bill.

The Hartley bill is 66 pages long. It would not be an adequate description of this bill to say that it destroys the rights and protections given labor under all of the legislation of the past 50 years. This bill does at least that; but it also does much more. This bill deliberately and carefully takes the very laws intended for protection of working men and women and turns those laws around and aims them at destroying unions. It does not merely turn the clock back 50 or 60 years by removing protections against antilabor injunctions or by removing protections against unfair labor practices of employers; it deliberately creates new kinds of restrictions, new kinds of injunctions that did not even exist 50 years ago.

It deliberately says not only that employers are to be free to attack unions in all of the ways that employers attacked unions 50 years ago; it goes further and sets up Government agencies with power to put the Government squarely in support of the employer and makes the Government a means of regimenting, crippling, and hog-tying the entire labor movement.

In very blunt terms it is quite fair and accurate to say that this law has been carefully designed to permit crippling if not total destruction of the labor movement and, at the same time, to guarantee that if the labor movement survives at all it is to survive solely as a labor front; controlled, operated, and regulated by Government in the interest of employers.

It is not possible in a short space even to outline the details of all of the 66 pages contained in the bill. It may give a slight indication of what the Hartley bill is like to point out that for all practical purposes it eliminates 2 of the 5 employer unfair labor practices now in the law and creates 13 unfair labor practices for unions and employees, in addition to a 2-page list of certain additional unlawful concerted activities which are subjected to court injunctions apart from general provisions for antistrike injunctions in so-called public utilities and general provisions subjecting unions to Antitrust Act prosecutions, to harassing lawsuits, to requirements of filing and reports, and restrictions on political activities.

So that there may be no doubt, however, as to the accuracy of the general description given above, we will set forth briefly a few of the major items contained in this bill.

I. DESTRUCTION OF NATIONAL UNIONS

No union may represent the employees of more than one employer. National unions which thus now deal with all of the major employers in their industry would be compelled to break themselves up. While this bill would permit the various separate unions, each representing a separate employer, to be affiliated with a common national organization, the Hartley bill would even prohibit the local to have any national affiliation if the activities of the local were subject to any control or approval by the national, and would prohibit any strike in which any two locals were cooperating or consulting on common policy.

II. DESTRUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNIONS

As part of this same attempt to disrupt and break up the functioning of labor unions, this bill has a series of additional disruptive provisions. The Hartley bill requires that, whenever anyone asks for it, there must be a separate ballot "for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group." Thus, it aims at breaking up collective bargaining into as small and scattered groups and units as possible so that the union and the collective-bargaining process may be carved up into meaningless segments.

III. DESTRUCTION OF UNION SECURITY

It outlaws the closed shop. It pretends to preserve the union shop and maintenance of membership, but it ties these clauses up into so many knots and tangles that for all practical purposes any form of union security is marked for destruction.

IV. PREVENTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The four corners of the world have been reached to discover ingenious excuses for preventing collective bargaining wherever possible.

We have pointed out above how a series of provisions would break collective bargaining up into separate unions for each employer and separate units for each craft, each plant, each group of professional employees, each department, and even each distinguishable group.

We have pointed out above the series of walls and traps set up to prevent any collective bargaining, let alone agreement, on union security.

It goes further in other directions to attempt to prevent or upset collective bargaining. Here are some examples from the Hartley bill:

If a union does not receive a majority vote on the first ballot on representation, even where several unions are involved, there is to be no run-off. No union will be certified in such a case unless within 60 days it can prove to the

Board that it represents over 50 percent of the workers—in which case it can have a run-off election.

If a union loses an election, no further election can be held for a year; but if the union wins, then a group of discontented employees can come to the Board at any time to get an election to "decertify" the union.

Even if a union wins all elections it may not be certified if any one of its national officers or any one of its local officers is a member of the Communist Party or can be said to have promoted or supported the policies, teachings, and doctrines of that party.

The subjects on which collective bargaining may take place are sharply limited to five specified subjects which do not include welfare, insurance, union security, and many other items.

The employer is given a multitude of excuses for refusing to bargain at all even with the certified union since one of the penalties for the long list of so-called unlawful concerted activities is that there is a loss of rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

V. DESTRUCTION OF RIGHT TO STRIKE AND PICKET

This bill contains provisions outlawing strikes of all kinds except after an extensive "cooling off" period.

This bill sets aside the Norris-LaGuardia Act to permit the Attorney General of the United States to secure a strike-breaking injunction against certain national strikes. Under the Hartley bill it could last forever. While the strike is thus being broken by injunction, this bill provides for ballots to be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, going over the head of the collective-bargaining representative, to ask the workers to accept the employer's offer; the Hartley bill even provides means for setting aside the collective-bargaining representative completely in any settlement.

The Hartley bill has collected into one document a list of all the different kinds of strikes that anyone has ever suggested for prohibition. Among the "unlawful concerted activities" outlawed by the Hartley bill are the sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, boycott, any strike to enforce featherbedding. The Hartley bill would make a strike for recognition unlawful if the employer is not required under the law to recognize the union; in the same section the Hartley bill would make a strike for recognition unlawful if the employer is required under the law to recognize the union. The Hartley bill would even make it unlawful for a union to strike to prevent an employer from engaging in an unfair labor practice.

The Hartley bill has a long series of definitions of the various strikes listed above. By virtue of these various definitions it is illegal to strike against scab goods; it is illegal to strike if there has been cooperation and agreement with another local union representing employees of competing employers; it is illegal to strike for larger safety crews or against speed-up; it is illegal to strike for any item—such as welfare funds, insurance, union security, and so forth—which is not specifically part of what Mr. Hartley says is a legitimate subject of collective bargaining. The Hartley bill would also make it a subject for Federal injunction if in the court's opinion picketing is not conducted "in a manner reasonably required to give notice" of the labor dispute, or if there is picketing of any home, or if the court declares that there has been physical obstruction of the free access to an employer's premises. In all of these instances injunctions are to be permitted without hearing or notice and without any limitation by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

In addition, this bill creates a new unfair labor practice consisting of a union's refusal to bargain. If this contemplates merely requiring a union to negotiate in good faith with an employer it would obviously not be needed since that is the very purpose of a union's existence. What it does involve is the placing of the power in the hands of the Board to issue a cease and desist order against a strike on the basis of the Board's determination that it did not feel that the union had yielded sufficiently in negotiations.

VI. THE GOVERNMENT TAKES OVER THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Hartley bill contains a series of attempted regulations of the detailed operation of unions themselves. The Hartley bill places virtually no limit on this process and puts the Government in the business of directing and running labor unions.

The Hartley bill, for example, has a blanket provision stating that the affairs of the organization must be conducted in a manner that is fair. The bill then proceeds to make it an unfair labor practice for a union to fail to comply with this requirement. Thus any complaint as to the fairness of a union's operation can become the subject of investigation and order by the Board.

It should be remembered that this is just a catch-all provision picking up anything and everything that may have been omitted in a series of nine other unfair labor practices directed to the internal operation of unions. Among the other things on which the Board is given specific power to regulate the operation of the union are the following:

First. The Board can determine what are reasonable dues, fees, and so forth.

Second. Unions may not set up insurance or benefit plans in which all members must participate.

Third. Unions may not discipline any disrupter who attacks or undermines the organization and not expel or suspend any member for any reason other than those dictated by the proposed bill.

Fourth. Unions may not enforce a union security contract with respect to any member expelled for any reason other than nonpayment of dues.

Fifth. A number of other restrictions and internal regulations on balloting, term of office, strike decisions, financial records and reports.

VII. STRIKEBREAKING BY INJUNCTION REVIVED AND STRENGTHENED

In several different sections this bill carves and slices the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act until nothing is left. This means that where the anti-injunction law does not apply injunctions may be issued even against peaceful strikes and picketing and without any notice or open court testimony.

This bill permits such injunctions at the request of employers against picketing and strikes of certain types as indicated above.

This bill permits such injunctions in other cases at the request of the Attorney General. The Hartley bill permits the Attorney General to secure such an injunction whenever the President finds a threat to "interstate or foreign commerce in transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to the public health, safety, or interest."

Under the Hartley bill the National Labor Relations Board is to take such a ballot at the end of 30 days and at the same time, completely disregarding the collective-bargaining representative, the employees are to vote as to who shall accept the employer's terms for them.

If the employees reject the employer's offer, the injunction continues but the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and two others will spend the next month or two examining the case and rendering an opinion.

The employer is free to accept or reject this opinion. As to the union, however, if it rejects then once more the NLRB is to take a vote of the employees both as to acceptance and as to who is to represent them. Whether the opinion is accepted or rejected the injunction is to continue until the Attorney General moves to discharge it.

The minimum time for all of this is 3 months and it will be remembered that under other sections of the bills the threat of strikes must have been preceded by a cooling-off period lasting under the Hartley bill as long as the agency enforcing the act wishes.

VIII. OTHER PROVISIONS

We have given above a few of the major highlights. These aspects of the bill reflect such complete irresponsibility, such complete willingness to tear the laws into pieces and to wreck collective bargaining and the labor movement that it seems pointless to go into the many other aspects of the bill.

The following list of a few of the other items in this bill may give an idea of the willingness of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] to omit nothing:

THE HARTLEY BILL

First. Expressly permits employer to establish and maintain company union.

Second. Abolishes NLRB and sets up new Administrator and Labor-Management Relations Board.

Third. Excludes supervisors, including straw bosses, pushers, gang leaders, clerical, and others, from collective-bargaining rights.

Fourth. Denies strikers rights under act if they receive unemployment compensation.

Fifth. Sets a 6 months' statute of limitations on the filing of charges and a 6 months' statute of limitations on the issuance of a complaint.

Sixth. Replaces the Conciliation Service by a new Office of Conciliation.

Seventh. Subjects union treasurers to harassment through lawsuits throughout the country and makes union responsible even for unauthorized acts of individuals.

Eighth. Subjects union to prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act even for legitimate union activity.

Ninth. Outlaws any expenditure by a union even for education and public discussion of political matters.

It should be remembered that this list for each of these bills is in addition to all of the aspects of the bills mentioned in the earlier sections of this memorandum.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to discuss the subject of the change in membership of the National Labor Relations Board, but before I get into that subject I should like to reply briefly to the gentleman from New York, who attended 8 of the 55 sessions we had and then only for a short time, so that he did not have an opportunity to listen to the volume of evidence which we heard from all over the Nation concerning the things which were happening to the general public. So in quoting from the Bible, he can go back to those words in the Bible that refer to those who labored in the vineyard a whole day and not for just a slight portion of the day.

One interesting matter in the hearings before the committee was the remark of the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board that he would be pleased when the time came where he would no longer have a position because of the fact that the employers had recognized that they should bargain collectively. I think that was a mighty fine statement, and he seemed to say it sincerely, at least as sincerely as a man could who was trying to talk himself out of his position. However, in order to judge whether or not he would ever so lose his job, let us analyze the facts.

When the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935 its purpose was to diminish the causes of labor disputes that affect interstate commerce. It also was passed for the purpose of equalizing the employee with the employer because he could not bargain with a corporate body or other such association when he had no association. Unfortunately, it had the effect that any unilateral act would have, because it gave power to the employee to pursue his remedy against the employer. Leaders gradually took that power from the employees and asked for additional power so that they could save the liberties of the employees, and what happened? They gradually took more power and more power, until they have been crushing the liberties they would save beneath their heels rather than saving them.

I say this from experience. I have represented both employers and employees. I have represented members of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and laboring men of other nions many times. I had to fight to preserve the rights of employees against their own union. I had to fight to keep them from being discharged. I not only had to fight, but I beat them many times when they discharged men without hearings, hundreds at a time, and obtained reinstatement in their jobs and hundreds of thousands of dollars of back pay for them. So I know whereof I speak.

Coming now to the question of what happened with respect to the act, in the 6 years which preceded the passage of the act, according to the majority report, there were approximately 750 labor disputes a year, involving about 300,000 employees. In the 6 years after the passage of the act there was an average of 2,500 disputes a year involving over a million workers. In the 6 years which followed that the strikes jumped to 3,500 a year, involving over 1,500,000 workers.

In 1945 it jumped to 38,000,000 mandays lost, and in 1946 to 119,000,000 mandays lost, not including the loss to all the other people who were not directly involved in the disputes. Therefore, we needed an amendment. In making the amendment, we did not want one which would repeal the act, as the gentleman from New York said yesterday who is on the same side of the aisle as I. If he were just going to repeal it, I do not know why he would have to have some lawyer sitting beside him, as he said, to help him just to draw an act to repeal it. We do not want to repeal it. We, the majority, want to give workers the act. We want to safeguard the rights of employees and of the general public. That is what has been done, especially in the bill of rights which has been given to the employees.

One of the main features to which objection originally was made was that the Wagner Act provided that the Board would be the investigatory body, the prosecuting body, the examining body, and finally, the judge and jury. Obviously, that had to be changed, but it was not changed during all these years until we provided in this bill for the first time that those powers are divided. We have created an administrator, and this administrator is a separate body of the Government who will investigate the cases, and when charges of unfair labor practices are filed with him, if he finds they are just and fair charges, he will issue a complaint and file it before the Board and prosecute it before the Board to a final conclusion; then go before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for an order affirming and enforcing the order of the Board and the issuance of a proper cease-and-desist order. The Board, on the other hand, would thereby be limited to being a judicial or quasi-judicial body to listen to the evidence and pass upon the evidence presented to it by the administrator.

Here is another important change. Previously, the Board merely made its decisions as to whether or not it would dismiss the complaint or allow the complaint on the basis of the testimony. Now, it must decide it on the basis of the weight of the testimony; that is, upon the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, as is done in other cases. When a case goes to the upper court, that court, because it could not review the facts if there was any evidence, even slightly more than a scintilla of evidence, would have to affirm, can now, under the present bill, review it on the question of whether or not the decision and order of the Board is against the manifest weight of the evidence, or whether or not the evidence is substantial. That is a very material change in the matter of procedure.

It also changes the procedure as to the introduction of evidence before the Board. It must now be conducted according to the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Board cannot exclude the rules of evidence as was heretofore done.

You can see in these major changes how we have attempted to help. It is not going to cost one penny more. In fact, it is going to cost less, because previously the court had to provide for every one of these things now being done through an administrator, and the Board is a separate body that functions as a court. That is the reason we need a new board, because when you have a unilateral board that is only thinking of helping the employee against the employer, they cannot think along the same lines as a board which is now required to act bilaterally in passing upon complaints of both management and labor. That is the reason for the creation of an entirely new board.

I think, on the whole, those changes alone would have made the act necessary without the bill of rights which has been given to the employees.

I submit to you that this bill should be passed in its present form.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am aware of the gentleman's interest in labor and the fact that he, as a lawyer, has frequently represented labor and labor unions. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can assure the membership of this House, after the great study he has given to this bill, that the rights of the workingmen are protected by this bill and, in fact, will be enhanced by the passage of this bill.

Mr. OWENS. I do not believe there is any question about the fact that the rights of the workingmen will be enhanced. I do not mean that every provision in the bill is just as it should be. If there are any amendments, they should be considered. I certainly would suggest some, and I suggest some changes should be made in conference, but on the whole, the bill is splendid.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I would like to have the gentleman clear up in a few words the matter of requiring the employer to agree for the organization of a union in a union shop.

Mr. OWENS. I will be glad to do that. Previously, in the matter of the closed shop, the union was supposed to furnish the employees. The bad feature of that was that during the war the

unions would not attempt to furnish the men. In a union shop, under the bill, an employer has a right to employ his own employees, but within 30 days thereafter, if he is required, through the regular procedure——

Mr. ROBSION. Can it be justified? Must it be upon agreement with the employer?

Mr. OWENS. There may be an argument as to whether it can be justified, but when the employer has agreed he would like to have a union shop, and more than half of the men say they would like to have a union shop, I believe the others can give way to the wishes of the employer and the other employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the pending legislation. It is, in my opinion, long overdue. I do not say that this is a perfect bill. I reserve the right to support constructive and clarifying amendments. I am sorry that we have conditions in this country which make it necessary to enact legislation which goes as far as does this bill. Under the circumstances, however, I do not see that we can do less and effectively meet the difficulties between labor and industry which confront the country today. The history of organized labor in this country during the past 15 years is a tragic record of bad leadership. There have been some sound constructive labor leaders, men of vision and statesmanship. In the main, however, labor leadership in recent years has gotten into the hands of men who are nungry for power and who were thoroughly unscrupulous as to the ways in which they secured and exercised that power. In some of our largest and most important unions the leadership has fallen into the hands of outright Communists or those who are controlled by Communists. In the case of other unions, labor racketeers have taken control. Under existing legislation as administered by New Deal agencies, it has been impossible for the splendid, honest, patriotic, American citizen who represents 95 percent of our labor-union membership to exercise any control over labor policies. They have had nothing to say concerning them.

In many cases they have not dared to raise their voices for fear of reprisal and persecution. They have been the tools and pawns of a leadership more interested in perpetuating its own power than in the welfare of the workers of this country.

Now, as never before, we need unity and cooperation in this country. We are facing some of the greatest problems which ever confronted any Nation. We can meet those problems successfully only if we have the strength which comes from unity and cooperation. Yet during the past few years it has been demonstrated time and again that the chief activity of labor leadership in this country has been stirring up strife and dissension. These labor leaders have tried to make their followers believe that the interests of labor and capital were antagonistic. The fact is that at least 95 percent of the time the interests of labor and capital are identical and what helps one, helps the other. It is only when there is cooperation between the two that we can realize the great opportunities that lie before us as a Nation.

One illustration of the sad lack of leadership in labor is that in all the consideration and discussion which has gone on in Congress over the admitted need of revised labor legislation, there has not been the slightest cooperation on the part of labor leaders. Their sincere cooperation could have made this a much better bill than it is, and they could have rendered no greater service to the laboring people of this country than by cooperating in finding a remedy to the many abuses which exist. Instead of cooperation, labor has chosen to take the position that nothing was wrong as far as labor was concerned; that all of the fault was with industry and the public.

Thus it has become necessary that we enact this somewhat drastic legislation. It must be made drastic because that is the only kind of language that our present type of labor leaders seem to understand. It must be made drastic to protect the rank and file of the laboring people of this country against the excesses of their leaders. Because of the general recognition of this situation on the part of the public and Congress, this legislation is going to pass the House by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, defects and unfair and often destructive practices obtain under existing labor laws.

The passage of remedial labor legislation to prevent industrial strikes, and above all to prevent strikes affecting the public, is long overdue.

The opposition of organized labor, or at least of the spokesmen of organized labor, is short-sighted. They run true to form. They oppose any legislation.

The statement of Mr. Van Bittner, as carried in the public press, in behalf of the CIO before the committee is rather typical of the opposition of selfish and designing labor leaders. His statement was an insult to the committee, the Congress, and to the country. It was utterly fallacious and without any foundation whatsoever. The substance of his position was that Congress was incapable of legislation respecting labor. He took the absurd, ridiculous view that it was entirely in order for Congress to pass the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the National Labor Relation Act. It was entirely all right for Congress to pass legislation to provide and protect collective bargaining. He asserted the contradictory position that while it was all right for Congress to pass legislation to promote organized labor, it was all wrong for Congress to even consider passing remedial legislation. His view, while typical of designing labor leaders, is untenable and unthinkable.

Nor have I any sympathy with the view of statesmen who would soft-pedal spokesmen for organized labor, who have always urged that no legislation should be considered because the public mind was aroused and insisted that calm deliberations should obtain in the consideration of labor legislation. It takes an attack to declare war. What patriotic or thoughtful or sensible citizen would advocate delay in national defense because patriotic citizens were aroused? For three long months during the present sessions, and for at least eight previous years, Congress has given consideration to the evils in existing labor legislation. If ever there was deliberation, amounting to repeated delays, that has characterized the consideration of any legislation, it has certainly been with respect to labor legislation.

I commend the committee for reporting the bill. Among others, I would like to see an amendment that would definitely ban the union shop. I would like to strengthen the provisions preventing strikes against the public interest.

I would welcome a perfecting amendment to the industry-wide bargaining provisions of the bill.

It is time for labor to clean house. It is time for the workers to be free and for freedom of speech among workers to obtain. It is time for the public safety and public interest to be safeguarded.

When organized labor was asking Congress for labor legislation, we didn't hear so much about involuntary servitude. There is confusion in much of the talk to the effect that legislation to curb strikes and to prevent racketeering is involuntary servitude. The contention is absurd.

There are in society no absolute rights. The right to free speech does not license the right to libel. The right to bear arms does not license and approve killing and murder. The public right is always paramount to private right. The talk about involuntary servitude is not only confusing but utterly unsound. Taxation, eminent domain, conscription, all put public rights above private rights. The right to quit work is not absolute. It is not synonomous with the right to conspire with others to paralyze or break down an essential public service.

The right not to work is by no means synonomous with the agreement of union employees to cut off a city's lights and power, as was done at Pittsburgh some time ago. The right to quit work is not the right to conspire with others to shut off food supplies. It is not the right to halt transportation, as was done in the railroad strike in the spring of 1946. The right to quit work is not synonomous with the right to deprive a city of police protection as was attempted in Boston 28 years ago.

Freedom from involuntary servitude is precious. It must be protected. It must be safeguarded. Such protection and such safeguarding cannot be accorded by using the words as a cloak for abuse or as a cloak for the actual destruction of freedom. I am sympathetic

with organized labor. I believe in the general right to strike, but it is justice in requiring men not to strike when to strike would deprive thousands of others of the right to work. The public interest is paramount. I oppose discrimination, mass picketing, the closed shop, the union shop, and industry-wide bargaining.

Legislation should be fair to employers and to employees, but above all, it should be fair to the public. I oppose any strike at any time against the great public interest. If the United States could win the greatest war in human history, the United States is able to provide for remedial legislation without paralyzing and crippling the public interest that would promote the welfare of employers and employees, and at the same time protect the public.

Unfortunately both management and labor leaders are often selfish. They put their immediate interests first. Often the industrialist asserts that totalitarianism will result unless Congress curbs labor and prevents strikes. William Green and Philip Murray cry out just as loudly that if Congress undertakes to regulate labor or curb its unfair practices or amend existing legislation, communism will obtain. Management and labor are each therefore capitalizing upon the current concern about totalitarianism and communism in the effort to persuade public opinion. As I indicated, however, labor offers no remedy. The House proposes to do something about the matter. Labor insists upon collective bargaining but when collective bargaining breaks down or is perverted by force, the public suffers. Confusion, nonproduction, strife, and unemployment, whether caused by management or by labor, is fertile ground for totalitarianism and communism.

I believe that there is a middle ground. Such ground has been found in solving the problems of taxation, of agriculture, of preparedness, and of national safety, and I believe that there is a middle ground that is embraced in the pending bill that will contribute to the solution of the problems between management and labor.

We live in an atomic age. Free enterprise must work. Assaults are being made upon the system. If the world is to survive, war must be eliminated. If free enterprise is to survive in America, strikes must be eliminated.

We did not prevent strikes during the war, nor have we prevented or controlled strikes since the war.

There exists a lopsided set of restrictions which permit unions to carry on activities that would be criminal if carried on by management. Under existing law, strikes obtain although they violate contracts. Labor should be made accountable for the violation of its contracts. There must be no monopoly either by management or labor. Jurisdictional strikes should be prohibited. Secondary boycotts should be eliminated. Sympathy strikes should be abolished. The rights of the consumer must be safeguarded. The public must be protected. The labor problem must be solved. The pending bill should be promptly enacted.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

FINANCIAL REPORTS BY LABOR UNIONS NOT REQUIRED BY OTHER NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority has characterized this bill, H. R. 3020, as labor's bill of rights. The Republicans claim to have written the bill and assume full responsibility for its success or failure. Of course that is a reasonable position for them to take.

There are undoubtedly bad practices of labor unions and individual members of unions that need correction, but in order to correct abuses it should not be necessary to burn down the whole house. It seems to me that is what this legislation intends to do. Therefore, if this bill is made law, instead of it being labor's bill of rights labor will be handed a crown of thorns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to confine my remarks to section 303 (a). This section is just another example of the type of purposeless, meaningless, ill-advised legislation which the majority is attempting to push through this House. This legislation can result in nothing more than imposing upon the labor unions of this country and on the Department of Labor needlessly burdensome requirements serving no salutary purpose.

This section of the bill would require every labor organization whose members are employed in industry affecting commerce to file annual sworn reports with the Secretary of Labor, showing the name and address of the organization, its receipts and disbursements, the names of its principal officers, and the compensation and allowance or reimbursement for expenses paid to each, the names and addresses of all employers with which it maintains collective-bargaining relations, a copy of its constitution and bylaws and the conditions governing administration and expulsion from membership and such other information regarding its organization and activities as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe by regulation.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this section of the bill which is basically noxious to labor unions, but at the same time it should not be the purpose of this Congress to enact vindictive legislation which serves no useful purpose to anyone.

In the main, this section of the bill requires the labor unions to furnish information to the Department of Labor which it already furnishes to its membership and to the Treasury Department. Available statistics show that of 25 international union organizations of the American Federation of Labor, 22 provide for regular reports of finances either directly to the local unions or to the conventions, and three provide for regular publications of financial reports. Of the 35 CIO international unions, 31 provide for regular financial audits by a certified public accountant, 30 publish financial reports available to anyone, and 5 provide for financial reports to local unions or its members.

Now, let us see what, if anything, this section of the bill accomplishes. First, it would require the Department of Labor, whose budget has already been cut by this House by 44 percent, to establish an organization to prescribe forms, to issue and promulgate regulations for carrying out the purposes of this section, and to compile data. It would require additional personnel to handle, and additional space to store, these documents. These additional responsibilities cannot be performed by the Department of Labor without additional funds.

Aside from gathering dust in the vaults of the Department of Labor, the use to which these documents will be put is not clarified in the bill. Under the express provisions of the bill the Secretary of Labor is prohibited from making these reports public.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of this House that under section 1117 of the Revenue Act of 1943 all tax-exempt organizations, including labor organizations, are required to file financial returns with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. To a great extent the information which would be furnished in the reports required under this bill would be duplicatory of the information contained in the returns filed with the Treasury Department under the Revenue Act.

So that here we have a provision in the bill which requires the preparation of reports by the labor organizations, the submission of these reports to the Department of Labor, the expenditure of substantial sums of Federal funds, so that these reports may be filed in the Federal Archives.

Now, aside from the requirement in this provision of the bill for the filing of financial statements by the Labor Department, this provision goes considerably further. It singles out from all the nonprofit organizations in this country, the labor organization, and it says, "You must file with the Department a statement of the policies or practices which you follow in admitting individuals to and expelling individuals from membership in your organization." Is this same requirement imposed on the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Association of Railroads, or any other employer organization? Mr. Chairman, I submit that this imposition is foisted upon the labor organizations alone in this bill.

This is a fundamental inequity, it is repugnant to all our basic democratic principles, it is government by regulation at its worst, it is anachronism which emerges out of the pages of darker days in our labor history, it is unjustifiable, it is purposeless, and I urge this House to repudiate it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on the effect this atavistic antilabor bill would have in my district. The authors of this bill have failed completely to take any constructive action. They have deliberately avoided any consideration of the

real problem in industrial relations, although the measure is entitled "The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947."

The people in my city of San Francisco are by no means unfamiliar with the relationship between workers and their employers, with which this bill assumes to deal. I may say that we have acquired some degree of maturity in this respect in the city by the Golden Gate. In these days we do not have very many labor-management crises, such as we once had. We do not pretend to have solved all of the fundamental problems, but men are bound to learn something through experience. In San Francisco we have over 200 labor unions, strong and militant. We have dozens of employer unions, equally strong and militant. They have met each other often—and argued out their differences. And now, it seems to me, they pretty much have each other's measure. As a result, we get some degree of intelligent appraisal from each side on any given problem of industrial relations. We have achieved, at least, what may be called industrial balance.

I do not pretend to know exactly what will happen if this crazy-quilt measure is enacted, in the form recommended by the committee, but I am sure that this import balance will be destroyed. I make this statement as one who is not a neophyte in the field of labor-management relations. I do not pretend to have discovered any legislative panacea for all of the irritating problems which occur in this field, but I am convinced that our intensive experience in San Francisco has shown that a practical industrial balance can be achieved under our present laws, with far less drastic alterations than are contemplated in this bill.

It cannot be said that any union is as powerful as our greatest corporations. Therefore, we cannot hope to achieve national industrial balance if we permit our great industries to operate on a Nation-wide basis, indeed on a world-wide basis, and at the same time decrease the size and scope of our labor unions. To restrict the geographical area of bargaining between the management and employees of a corporation which does business in every State in this Nation merely reduces the strength of the union, while it leaves the corporation with all of its great power and more.

San Francisco is a seaport city, and the balance between the workers and the employers on the docks and the ships sets a pattern for the rest of the community. The maritime workers there have won the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining through long years of industrial struggle. No one will deny that working conditions and standards of living are infinitely better now than in the days when ship captains used to fire the whole crew in a port so that a "runner" could scout the waterfront bars for a new crew, collect a cut from each man, and share it with the skipper. The seaman had to buy his way into a job aboard ship before the closed shop was established. The memories of that graft and double dealing are strong today, kept so by mouth to mouth repetition of cruel stories dating back to the time when shanghaiing was an established institution.

I do not believe that the shipowners of San Francisco want to return to those barbarous days of old. And I doubt whether the shipowners in any American port where they do not now have the closed shop and the hiring hall like the frequent bloody conflicts which are the result of the infamous hiring pay-off system.

In San Francisco our water front is the core of our economic life. If you take away the hiring halls by abolishing the so-called closed shop you will disturb our entire population. If you take away industry-wide bargaining you will put one group of men against another in the same kind of work, and incite bitter rivalry between companies engaged in the same kind of business.

Is it the theory of the proponents of this measure that the only way to promote private enterprise in America is to encourage cut-rate competition in wages? If so, they are negating the great modern doctrine that labor is not a commodity or an article of commerce, and are pointing their course backward toward the age of slavery.

In San Francisco our building trades are stable, and have been since they won their independence in the days when labor was in demand after the great earthquake and fire, 41 years ago this month. These unions have the closed shop. Many other unions there have the closed shop, and many employers in those stabilized industries have said that this is a satisfactory way to assign journeymen to their jobs. In industries were skills are not standardized the collective-bargaining agreements do not contain closed shop or hiring-hall provisions.

The stability of the great metal trades industries in our shipyards and naval establishments, which are vitally necessary for our national defense, would likewise be upset by abolition of the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining. Our Government recognized the truth of these statements during the late war, and no one can dispute the fact the closed shop and collective bargaining in vast regions of the country were paramount factors in the success of our armed forces and the unprecedented volume of American production which determined the outcome of the war in every part of the world.

All of this epochal system of equity in industrial relations, which has been created with such painstaking effort and patriotic thought in the crucial era preceding and during the war, would be torn to pieces by this destructive legislation, and the American people would be thrust back into the old barbaric struggles which many of us had hoped were but ugly memories of a never-to-be-repeated past.

I do not contend that we have national balance in industrial relations today. But we must discover the root causes of industrial disharmony, and not be deceived by superficial charges that labor has too much power or management too great control.

One of the root causes is that both management and labor have failed to consider the major adjustments that each has to make to conform to the alterations demanded by industrial change. We have reached a stage in this country's industrial and economic life where a return to the past, as envisioned in this bill, is unthinkable. America must go forward if she is to fulfill her destiny as a world leader.

The real problem is a human problem. It is not entirely one of science and engineering or of systems like the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining. The fundamental problem is in human relations.

We are inclined to boast about our industrial superiority. But how many of our industrial engineers can measure the human equation like they can the productivity equation? Most of them have failed to recognize that the human being's relation to his fellow man is a factor of major importance in the productivity equation.

Nowhere in this bill is there an effort to help management and labor work out a better cooperative spirit, which would be a service to all the people. There is no effort to set up, for example, a Nation-wide system of union-employer cooperative councils, which have proved so successful where they have been used, in which the worker could get the feel of contributing his thoughts to industry, as well as his brawn. There is no direction here to a Federal agency to explore the whole field of human relations in industry so that the Government of the people can do on a large scale what a few private individuals are trying to do with private funds. There is no indication in this bill that its framers want to bring labor and management together to study how industrial workers, isolated from a feeling of participation in industry, may gain that feeling of affiliation so essential to the community spirit in all of us. The family farmer or small businessman has the feeling of social usefulness, but the production line worker is isolated from the type of community living and production which was the basis of this great Nation's growth.

Elton Mayo, of Harvard University, who is conducting a study of the problems of human relations in industry, recently said:

> The group has an impulse to self-preservation as strong as, or stronger than, that of the individual; and many strikes are actually symptomatic of the attempt of a group to hold together, however the so-called causes are stated. Economics, psychology physiology, all ignore the fact that complex group association is the distinguishing character of the human being.

Men must work together. They cannot work together if by law we separate the workers and allow other elements in the community to grow stronger. Men work effectively in teams. With team achievement, workers get more satisfaction than in individual achievement. And the employers get more profits. Therefore, a system by which industrialists would create teams of workers, through conference with the workers themselves, might bring about an adjustment in our highly mechanized society which would result in real achievement and industrial peace.

This is the kind of labor-management action I would like to see provided here. On the contrary, the pending bill is re-

strictive, punitive, reactionary, and bitterly antilabor.

I would be even more deeply concerned about this measure, Mr. Chairman, if I believed there were any real likelihood that it would be enacted into law in its present form. But it is obvious, from published reports emanating from the other body, that it cannot be passed by the Congress without radical changes, and I am hopeful that it will never appear among the Nation's statutes.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the leaders of the majority party in this House do not expect final approval of many of the provisions which they have incorporated in this bill. In my opinion, it is a deliberate legislative hoax, designed to enable the majority Members of this body to report to the radical antilabor interests which helped to elect them that they at least tried to carry out the repressive policies of those radical groups. Then, when the measure finally goes to the White House in its altered form, they will seek to propitiate the men and women of labor with the crocodile plea: "Well, it was not so bad, after all."

By its espousal of this retrogressive legislation the party of Abraham Lincoln has repudiated the basic principles of its founder. The present-day leaders of the Republican Party are apparently committed to the doctrine that human labor shall be exploited for financial profit without the protections which true disciples of Lincoln have gradually written into law since the great emancipator abolished slavery in this country. Such a doctrine cannot endure in modern America.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in the declaration of policy this act provides means for protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives in their relations to one another, and above all it recognizes under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

I think that no person who is a loyal citizen has any quarrel with this declaration of policy. It has occurred to me that too often in the past much of our legislation with respect to both industry and labor has failed to take into account the paramount interest of the general public.

In the light of recent and current industrial strife, each of us has been forced to recognize the need for proper legislation which would protect for each citizen his inherent constitutional rights. That corrective legislation is needed is axiomatic, but such legislation must be so carefully drawn that it will promote equity and we must not permit ourselves to become prejudiced by apparent abuses on the part of certain unscrupulous and powerful individuals who have abused existing legislation and infringed upon the rights of the general public, the workers, and the employers alike. Every citizen needs and is entitled to equity, and just protection under the laws of our Nation.

Many of the provisions contained in H. R. 3020 are directed at much needed correction, but I am fearful that some of them have not been properly thought through and that their consequences may be reflected in the transfer of special privilege from one group to another. This should be avoided. It is not clear to me that all the provisions of this act are in keeping with the declared objectives set forth in the declaration of policy.

There are several phases of this bill to which I wish to refer in a general way. Many of its provisions are designed to protect individual members of labor organizations from exploitation by their own leadership. I think it has been evident in the past that decisions reached by powerful organization officials, far from the scene of industrial strife, have been made arbitrarily without proper consideration to the wishes and welfare of the workers involved.

This bill would guarantee to the workers a more democratic conduct of their own organization and would reserve to them many of the prerogatives which have been usurped by unscrupulous leaders.

In our debate, it has been said that the two major provisions of this bill are those affecting the so-called closed shop and those relating to industry-wide bargaining.

It is inappropriate for me to discuss those provisions of this bill with respect to the closed-shop issue which I believe are improper. The reason is that the legislature of my State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, at a special session earlier this year, has made the existence of the closed shop illegal in my State.

There is much that can be said on both sides of the question with respect to industry-wide bargaining. In this practice there are possibilities of abuse perhaps as serious as industrial monopolies. We have sought to deal with those in antitrust legislation. On the other hand, industry-wide bargaining is frequently helpful both to the workers and the employers. Numerous illustrations of this can be cited, and there are times, I believe, in which it can be demonstrated that bargaining on a purely local level is not in the best interest of the general welfare. I think this problem needs much more careful thought than has been given to it. I do not think the answer is found merely by making this practice illegal.

In view of the many considerations which commend this legislation to me, and the many which likewise impel me to oppose it, it is my judgment that this bill should be recommitted and sent back to the committee for further study in order that it may be put into a final form which would assure equal justice and the protection of the rights of all our people.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this bill. It is a comprehensive piece of legislation widely affecting the employer and employee relations in our country. It defines many rights and many duties of both employer and employee as between themselves. It also recognizes that the general public has rights to be protected against unwarranted injuries that labor-management conflicts may impose.

This bill is designed to curb or prevent many evils. I call attention to a very important fact. Every restrictive provision in this measure is aimed at a well-known evil established by our experience of the last 20 years. There is no injustice to any class when we restrain unwarranted injuries to others by any of its members.

It is a trite thing to recognize the importance of labor in the affairs of this Nation. Our wage earners are more than 50,000,000. They are the largest group in every section of our country.

I think I would not be mistaken if I said that, looking down the long course of the years, that which is best for this great body of workers is best for our country. Then, with even greater emphasis and with greater assurance, I could say that which in the long course of the years is best for this country is best for the humblest man in this Republic.

The wage earner may be a union-labor man today, but in his lifetime and that of his children and grandchildren he is a citizen of this Republic. In a land of freedom, open avenues to opportunity, equality, and just government by law, he can find a reward beyond that which any class government can ever give.

A democratic government is concerned with the welfare of its humblest citizens. A true democracy is at war with class government at any level.

This bill proposes restrictions on certain activities of labor unions. The explanation is not that the members of labor unions as a whole are different from the rest of the population. The fact is they are like the rest of us.

Congress has been generous to labor. It still wants to be; but the privileges Congress granted have been abused to the injury of the American people. When labor unions are so organized and permit themselves to be so manipulated that they produce a Lewis and a Petrillo, they give those dictators more power than any white man in this country ought to have.

When a Lewis can tell the people of this country whether or not they can have fuel to heat their homes or run their factories, and when a Petrillo can decide what music the American people can hear and at what price to his union, it is time for Congress to awaken to the fact that it owes a duty to act for the protection of the American people.

The committee report on this bill states facts which constitutes a severe arraignment of the evils suffered by our Nation due to management-labor conflicts of the last 20 years. We are well aware that the victims of these conditions have not been confined to employers and employees. Practically every citizen in the Nation has been materially affected by the evil conditions that have thus brought distress to the country.

This legislation is directed to the purpose of relieving the country of much of the industrial strife to which it has been subjected.

In the main, this bill is far more than a measure to ameliorate controversies between employers and employees. It is true that the industrial strife that has inflicted the Nation originates out of the employer-employee relation. This industrial strife is a growing evil. It reached its zenith in the last year when there was a direct loss of 116,000,000 man-days of employment; when the number of strikes reached an all-time high of 4,985.

These figures fail enormously to reflect adequately the full loss imposed upon the Nation by the indirect reduction of employment, the curtailment of production, and the denial of much-needed products to the cousumers of the country. The loss to our Nation in the reconversion period and the inflationary factors released, imposed immeasurable hardships.

Who were the victims of this infliction upon the country? Primarily the victims were the great masses of the public who were not parties to the controversies. These thousands of conflicts had millions of innocent victims. Today, a primary concern of the Congress is to afford protection to the public, to these victims of the industrial strife.

In many cases we have seen heartless injustices imposed upon the public, with apparently little corncern by the immediate parties to the conflct, as to how much suffering they might inflict upon the public.

A strike is a crude method of settling disputes. To strike means to hit the other fellow. Strikes and lock-outs are coercive conflicts where, like war, might prevails rather than right. They are justified only by the failure to provide any better protection for the worker.

Long ago we attempted by the establishment of courts to provide the public against the grosser offenses of the criminal. We outlawed the duel. Some decades ago strong employer groups so organized themselves that they could crush their competitors and combine to prey on the consumers of the country by the control of production and prices. That was a form of economic compulsion that the law attempted to remove from the consumers of the country. Antitrust legislation became necessary to protect the public against that type of racketeering.

We now face the duty of going further and placing restrictions against another form of economic compulsion too frequently exercised in the employer-employee relation.

Great numbers of citizens have been deterred from exercising their normal rights through fear of physical violence and injury to persons and property. Innumerable men in public life, at every level, have catered, yielded, compromised, and surrendered public rights for their own political peace or advancement.

This situation has yielded itself to the class favoritism and class Government in the administration and enforcement of the law and in its interpretation by the courts.

In recent years an irresponsible type of leadership has imposed itself on labor organizations to their misfortune. With the catering, favoritism, compromising, and yielding of governmental authorities, there has grown up an arrogant quality of leadership that has been demoralizing both to the public life of the country and to the union membership. It was unfortunate that so often labor was unable to clean its own house when, under mercenary leadership, as happened in some unions, an arrogancy was exhibited that has been highly detrimental to labor's cause.

Notwithstanding the Nation-wide dissatisfaction with such leadership, the organizations under them seemed unable to throw off their yokes. The arrogant character of this leadership is manifested in the growing extent to which unconscionable demands are made on employers without offering any services in return for what is demanded.

I am pleased to see that this bill very properly includes inhibitions against "featherbedding." The success of labor must be in getting paid for what it does, and not in pay for what it does not do.

No comprehensive legislation to restrict this industrial strife could properly leave out an inhibition against this kind of racketeering. Demands of this character are rapidly spreading—demands for the payment of money and other financial concessions where no services are performed or offered in return, and which demands are made without any contract, legal or moral right. These demands have the moral quality of racketeering and extortion.

It is unlikely that any bill dealing with so many subjects and as lengthy as the one before us should entirely satisfy the viewpoint of any one Member of Congress. Fundamentally, I think this is a useful bill. It attempts to meet some great evils of our time. It combats evils of monumental proportions. I have no inclination to vote against it, because it might not in every respect suit my exact viewpoint.

The broad explanation of this situation is not that the members of the labor unions as a whole are different from the rest of the population. The fact is they are fundamentally the same. The average union man is just an average citizen of our country and is in no sense an outlaw. This legislation is not good if ultimately it is not for his benefit. The laboring people of the country are fundamentally like the rest of us, with the same ambitions and hopes in life a large part of the members of labor organizations are today hoping for legislation that will place labor-union activities on a higher and more patriotic basis.

A sound conception of American citizenship will concede that the humblest American citizen should be more deeply concerned in a government of equality, fairness, and justice, rather than any possible advantage that may come to him by a system of class government which would give him temporary advantages at the expense of the rest of the country. Every right-thinking American must be more interested in what kind of government he is going to build for himself, his children, and grandchildren than he is in the hope that through class government he can gain some advantage to himself at the disadvantage of the rest of the country. Democracy, if it has any legitimate meaning, is a negation, a denial of the thought that any one group, however numerous, can best profit under a system of class government.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I previously made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of directing a question to the proponent of this bill, specifically the chairman of the committee, and the person whose name the bill carries.

This bill has been hailed by its proponents as a new bill of rights for the working people of this country. In view of the Republican claims in the last election with respect to discrimination in employment and its pledges for the enactment of fair employment practice controls, I now inquire of the chairman if he will accept an amendment incorporating the principles of fair employment practices to be added to the so-called bill of rights that the gentleman proclaims his bill to be.

Mr. HARTLEY. I will say to the gentleman that as far as that issue is concerned, I am opposed to injecting that argument into this bill. I will say to the gentleman, if he wants a hearing on that bill, he can have it before my committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Why not accept the amendment? FEPC is germane to the subject with which the bill deals.

EFFECT OF H. R. 3020 ON THE NORRIS-LAGUARDIA ACT

One of the worst features of a great many bad features in this 66-page invitation to industrial chaos which we are considering is the insidious manner in which labor's enemies would gut the Norris-LaGuardia Act under the guise of prescribing fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management and of protecting the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations. This proposal would protect the rights of individual workers to such an extent that the drafters found it necessary to nullify the Norris-LaGuardia Act in five different sections. Five different times they found it necessary to withdraw the protection of that act so wisely raised against the forces which would settle industrial relations problems by the law of injunction.

Let us examine the statute and determine the purposes for which this legislation would remove the Norris-LaGuardia restraints upon the equity jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Under this bill, the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act would not be applicable in the following situations: First, in actions to prevent unfair labor practices; second, in actions involving any activities declared to be unlawful concerted activities; third, in any action by

the Attorney General to enjoin strikes imperiling public health and safety; fourth, in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws; and, fifth, in actions and proceedings involving violations of agreements between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees.

Now, let us reexamine each one of these situations in which the majority deems it expedient to deny the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

First. Section 10 (h) provides that in actions to prevent unfair labor practices the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The proponents of this provision will say that this is no change from the present National Labor Relations Act. The answer is only true in part. This provision is contained in the present NLRA, but it has been given much wider scope by saddling labor with a number of new unfair labor practices which are subject to this provision.

Second. Section 12 (c) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not have any application in any action or proceeding in a court of the United States involving any activity defined in this section as unlawful. Section 12 defines a number of activities which are termed "unlawful concerted activities." Those activities include the use of force or violence in a labor dispute; engaging in a sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, illegal boycott, sit-down strike, or strike to force an employer to accede to featherbedding practices; or to strike for a number of objectives considered to be improper.

A quick examination of these provisions leaves an individual having a trusting nature with the impression that most of these suggestions are rather sound. Section 12 contains a provision to outlaw illegal boycotts. The definition of illegal boycott in this bill is so broad in scope that it will outlaw many activities which have been recognized as justifiable for many years. For example, suppose that employer A operates an air line; employer B also operate an air line. A decides to cut the wages of his mechanics and the mechanics go out on a strike. Under the definition of "illegal boycott" in this bill the mechanics employed by B could be ordered by him to service the planes owned by A and any refusal on their part to act as strikebreakers would make them liable to the following actions: a Federal court injunction to forbid this "illegal boycott," suit for damages by company A, loss of status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act, and criminal penalties and triple damages under the antitrust laws. Truly a bill to protect the rights of individual workers. All the rights they will have left will be a right to pay fines and a right to go to jail.

Third. Section 203 (b) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not be applicable in any case in which the Attorney General has been directed to petition a district court for an injunction to stop a strike threatening to imperil the public health, safety, or interest. The rights of the citizens of this country deserve to be protected from this overwhelming power in the hands of the Attorney General by more specific language than "public health, safety, or interest." Any strike has some effect on the public interest. If it were not so, the strike would be of little value.

Fourth. Section 301 (c) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not be applicable in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws. It has been pointed out many times that the antitrust laws were not designed for the regulation of labor unions and their provisions do not easily lend themselves to that purpose. The evidence of failure in this field prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be sufficient warning that such laws do not create industrial peace. By this provision the majority indicate their willingness and even desire to return to the days when the strike-breaking injunction was available to every private employer who desired to go to court and claim a violation of the antitrust laws.

Fifth. Section 302 (e) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall have no application in actions and proceedings involving violations of agreements between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees. The proponents of this legislation are not satisfied to open up the Federal courts to innumerable suits for breach of contract, they must also provide that an alert employer can secure an injunction even before the breach occurs.

Net income [1] of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946 [2]

[In thousands of dollars]

Industrial groups	Number of companies	Net income after taxes		Percent change	Percent return	
		1945	1946		1945	1946
Baking	23	$29,093	$60,872	+109.2	10.2	21.8
Dairy products	16	38,989	65,454	+67.9	12.0	18.9
Meat packing	17	34,825	70,461	+102.3	5.4	10.8
Cotton goods	46	28,760	102,896	+257.8	7.8	27.1
Silk and rayon	13	14,280	42,419	+197.1	9.5	24.5
Woolen goods	7	11,986	30,328	+153.0	10.3	25.2
Clothing and apparel	31	14,909	35,430	+137.6	9.8	23.3
Shoes, leather products	21	17,262	26,757	+55.0	8.2	12.7
Tires, rubber products	27	66,152	136,759	+106.7	10.7	20.6
Iron and steel	51	183,531	273,336	+48.9	5.1	7.5
Agricultural implements	12	54,671	45,520	−16.7	7.1	5.7
Nonferrous metals	26	110,710	136,685	+23.5	5.8	7.1
Total manufacturing	1,511	2,997,938	4,091,355	+36.5	9.3	12.1

[1] Net income is shown as reported—after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, but before dividends. Net worth includes book value of outstanding preferred and common stock and surplus account at beginning of each year.
[2] National City Bank Newsletter, March 1947.

	June 14, 1946	July 15, 1946	Nov. 15, 1946	Feb. 15, 1947
Consumer price index	133.3	141.2	152.2	152.8
Foods (retail) (years 1935-39=100)	145.6	165.7	187.7	182.3

Percentage increase, June 15, 1946, to Feb. 14, 1947:
Consumer price index ..... percent.. 14.6
Foods ..... do.... 25.2

Profits (in billions) [1]

	All corporations
First quarter 1946	$9.1
Second quarter 1946	11.4
Third quarter 1946	13.6
Fourth quarter 1946	14.9
Year 1946	12.0
Average 1942-45	9.5
Average 1936-39	3.9

[1] Department of Commerce.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this so-called labor bill is one of the rankest pieces of labor legislation ever foisted upon the average American working man and woman.

One of the expressions we have heard repeated over and over again in recent years is to the effect that people all over the world look to the United States of America to see what kind of leadership we will afford to a world which is crying for a helping hand.

During the years of the war we heard the declaration that we were civilization's sole hope. We lived up to every expectation and in effect answered every prayer.

After the war we answered the pleas of starving millions with food, money, and clothing. We demonstrated our sincere interest in the promotion of peace and freedom for all peoples.

We believe sincerely now that little people everywhere look to this land as the outstanding example of democracy in action—and if people looked to us for inspiration and leadership in other years—their eyes are turned this way today.

If our conduct was instrumental in inspiring the people of other lands—in the conduct of war and the working for peace—then just as emphatically is it certain that our conduct in the field of economics and social justice will set the pattern to be followed by those whom we influence in other areas of the world.

What this Congress does today to the working men and women of this Republic, will demonstrate in the clearest of all possible manners the attitude of this Congress toward those who toil to produce the industrial wealth of the Nation.

The measure which this Congress has for consideration—the measure which is labeled "labor legislation"—is a step backward. It is a deliberate attempt to blot out the social progress which has been achieved by the average American during the past 50 years.

I know it is natural for the proponents of any measure to label a proposition with fancy title and surround it with high-sounding phrases, but there is a limit beyond which common decency cannot be stretched.

In hypocritical fashion this bill is tagged as one to relieve the American worker from a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

This is the label that is attached to the measure which is the first step back along the road to a decadent social era when men and women who worked in mills and factories were looked upon as no more than chattels and serfs and were subjected to abuse and ridicule while industrialists grew fat and sleek on the profits created by the men and women who toiled in their sweatshops.

This is a bill to relieve the American worker from the despots who brought them organization and made it possible for them to speak out against the foul and vicious conduct of management in the days before trade-unions became a fact on the American industrial scene.

This is a bill to free the American worker from the tyrants who did away with the dawn-to-dark slave factories, the company stores, the run-down hovels where mill workers were forced to live, the slave wages which provided no more than enough to keep bread on the tables, and condemned children to work at the looms and machines at 10 and 12 years of age.

Oh, what hypocrisy!

It was trade-unions that made the American worker free in fact rather than in fancy. It was the labor union which freed the American worker from the tyranny of the antilabor injunction which made it impossible for that worker to speak out against inhuman working conditions, to band together for the betterment of his own and his family's economic lot in life, to hope to live as a decent member of society, to own his own home, to educate his children, and look forward to an old age free of the constant fear of poverty and hunger.

This the labor union did for the American working man and woman, and you can chant your fancy phrases from now till doomsday, but there is no one better aware of what labor unions have accomplished for our society than the American workingman himself.

He knows what his lot was before the advent of trade-unions and he has a pretty good idea what it will be again if measures like this succeed in finding their way onto the statute books of the Nation.

Labor has but one weapon in its constant fight for a decent share of the fruits of its toil—it is the strike. The right to strike is fundamental and is guaranteed to the American worker by the Constitution which this Congress is sworn to uphold. Yet, with tongue in cheek you would restore in one fell swoop the most evil chapter in the story of industrial relations by placing the hated antilabor injunction in the hands of industrialists who will not hesitate to use it to pin back the ears of any man who will dare to speak out against injustice in a factory or shop.

You say these men and women should not strike—they should bargain and bargain and bargain interminably—all the while prices climb and climb and the struggle for food and clothing becomes more and more desperate.

The men who now propose this measure promised a few months ago that they could reduce prices and promote prosperity if they could rid the country of price controls.

As hated as those controls were they at least guaranteed that the average American family would get enough to eat.

The controls were removed and the law of supply and demand commenced its functioning, but although months have passed it is still all demand and no supply.

I shudder to think of the men and women in my district who work in the mills for 90 cents an hour—some 83 cents an hour—and have to provide a home and clothes and food and medical care for a family with four or six children.

Everyone recognizes the serious condition which prevails, but does this Congress address itself to an attempt to restore prices to a sane level? No, quite the contrary. It solemnly and coldbloodedly tells the American worker, "You shall not make any attempt to increase your wages." It tells the American worker—whom it now professes to free from tyranny and despotism—that he, he alone, is responsible for the plight in which he finds himself. He is responsible for high prices and little food, but never a word is said about the fattest profit picture in the history of the country.

Some of our papers direct their vicious criticism against this oppressed American worker because he has struggled to get a few more cents with which to make an effort to make ends meet. But never a line do they write in criticism of the selfish greed of the profit seekers whose goal is all the traffic will bear.

The proponents of this bill profess to believe that big unions are detrimental to our industrial life, and through this measure they have set out to break the unions except—more pious language—for neighborhood groups.

The effect will not be to restore industrial order, but to produce chaos. The bill professes to abolish the closed shop and put an end to industry-wide bargaining. Actually, what it endeavors to do is break labor unions now in existence into small segments which can be taken on piecemeal and destroyed. The proposal is but the forerunner of a wave of so-called company unions and the "yellow dog" contract given the blessings of the Congress of the United States.

But while this move goes forward with vigor and determination, not a sound is heard in criticism of the constant growth of monopoly in this country—much of that growth fostered by the millions which this Government pumped into the industrial machinery during the war years. Big business alone is in a position to take advantage of the gigantic construction program, the research and development that went into the industrial set-up to produce the badly needed material of war.

This Government provided all sorts of aid and incentive to industry during the war and provided tax refunds and other aids after the war.

Yet, this Congress smilingly overlooks the growth of monopoly in business but violently objects to the growth of labor unions—growth which has been made possible solely by the desire of the men and women in the shops to be represented at the bargaining table by effective and intelligent agents.

Just a few days ago this House labored over an appropriation bill which was to provide the funds for the operation of the Department of Labor. A great many pages were filled with words of economy. The Labor Department was to be curtailed in its operations—and running through all those pages is the same theme—the Labor Department was under attack because it was prolabor. What a commentary on the great American love of democracy. A Cabinet post is to be reduced to impotency—all because its people have the intestinal fortitude to speak out occasionally in behalf of the rank and file American.

Now the Department of Labor is to be smashed at again. One of its chief functions is to be made an independent agency. Why, there can be but one answer; as presently set up the National Labor Relations Board is prolabor. Why is there a curse on being prolabor? What is wrong about raising a voice in behalf of Americans? Do not these men and women pull their share of the load? Have they not a right to expect that some branch of this Federal system will seek to protect their interests?

Then, what is to be the attitude of the new independent agency proposed? You say it is not to be antilabor, it is to be fair and impartial. I deny that. How can you say fair and impartial when you arm it, as you do here, with all the machinery for antilabor injunctions, union-busting mandates, company-union guarantees, and the rest of the provisos of this legislation? I say it is to be antilabor and for that reason alone is it proposed.

This is not legislation for the common good—this is punishment because labor unions have grown so powerful. American workers now have a voice in the functioning of our industrial machinery and some industrialists resent this. They are determined that, at whatever the cost, these men and women must be returned to the position of humble and suppliant employees, glad to work for whatever pittance is awarded them.

This Congress, if it passes this measure, is lending its weight to that plan. This Congress is notifying the people of other lands—the people who look this way for leadership and inspiration—that democracy is a great thing on paper, but it does not work out here in fact.

All Americans have a right to share in the great possibilities of this great Nation. This legislation denies the mem-

bers of labor unions a right to participate and drives them to the rear where they are expected to be seen and not heard.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The minority has 23 minutes remaining; the majority, 31.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this proposed labor bill now before the Congress, because I believe it will tend toward taking us back into the Dark Ages.

By the Dark Ages, I refer to that time and period previous to the enactment of the Wagner Labor Act and what happened for about 50 years prior to the time it was recorded on the statute books.

We should all feel grateful, and ever remember former Senator LaFollette, who headed the special investigating committee, which brought to light the many discriminations against the American working classes, and helped to a great degree enact some favorable legislation in their behalf.

The first major strike in this country took place at Pittsburgh, in the steel Ruhr, back in the year 1892. Many of us here will remember that Carnegie paid a man by the name of Frick a million dollars to break the strike, while he took a trip abroad. Pinkerton detectives were called in and, together with the police, soldiers, and traitors, many workers were shot from river boats, with Gatling guns camouflaged in hayracks. Frick was shot in the neck by Alexander Berkman and, while recuperating in the hospital, had many days and fretful hours to dwell over the suffering and grief that he had brought to countless workmen and their families. He had the opportunity to recall that his parents had been of the working class—and that he, himself, had been reared in a company house, at a rental of about $4 a month. No doubt he recalled the hardships that he and they had endured on sweatshop wages and lack of fit working conditions. He became very remorseful and bitter. When Carnegie sent him a wire as he was leaving the hospital, asking him to come to his office, he wrote as the return message, "I'll see you in hell; we're both going there."

The steelworkers' union was broken, together with the hearts of workers, throughout the country. As the candle of Carnegie's life grew dim, he, too, became remorseful, because he built great libraries in various cities throughout the country. It did not mean a great deal to the men in the mills, because with working 12 hours, and hours spent in getting to and from their job, they had little time to spend in reading books. It was Carnegie's desire to go out of this world poor and without money.

Then we had the railroad strike at Chicago in 1893. Railroad workers were shot down in the streets by Federal troops. The men who participated in the strike were black-listed all over the country and they never knew why or how they obtained their addresses. As they went into other cities to seek employment, naturally they were asked for references or place of previous employment. The letters came back, with the emblem of a broken car wheel on the railroad letter heads, which served as a tip off that they were not to be hired.

In 1902 along came the miners' strike in the anthracite coal region, in which 149,000 persons participated, myself included. The strike lasted from April until October. True, we experienced the untold hardships of eating only corn meal mush; being evicted from company houses and forced to live in tents—large families of 8 and 10 children, together with their parents, but a great deal was accomplished toward better working conditions. We were given the right and privilege to work 8 hours a day and got out from under slavery. The first major strike was won. Previous to that time, representatives of the commissaries or company stores would search homes 3 or 4 days before pay day, in an endeavor to find some article or merchandise that had not been purchased through them. If found, the father and other mine workers in the family were certain to receive their discharge. That was during the period so often referred to as rugged individualism or free enterprise. Do you, fellow colleagues, believe that the boys or girls of today would want to go back to that kind of living?

I remember the strike of 1904, at Pueblo, Colo. No American should ever forget that one. The miners and their families were evicted from company homes—the tents in which they found refuge were burned by troops under the command of Major General Bell. The men were arrested and transported to the plains of Kansas, while their wives and children were left behind without food or shelter. They traveled back through the villages—tired and hungry; and if they got onto the railroad property were arrested for trespassing. That is the era, perhaps, to which some will refer as the "good old days," and to which they are so eager to have us go back.

At the time of the Pueblo strike a young fellow by the name of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was graduated from Brown University. His father, who owned the Pueblo Coal & Fuel Co., asked him to go out there and make a personal report back to him on existing conditions. When he returned he advised his father not to sell the mines—but to give it away and get the blood off his hands. To that fine son—a real American in every sense of the word—and to the everlasting credit of his esteemed father, he took his advice and in the following years became the world's greatest philanthropist; leaving a great fortune alone to cancer research.

Then along came 1937—just 10 short years ago. Here on the floor of Congress our attention was called to the Memorial Day massacre. At the steel plant in Chicago 19 men laid down their lives and scores were injured by police because they dared to form a picket line. At that time Congress amended the Wagner Labor Act, demanding that American labor be given the rights and protection provided by the Constitution of the United States.

In 1939 legislation came before the Congress, known as the Federal mine inspection bill. All that bill called for was that in the event of an explosion in a mine the Federal investigators would be moved in with a rescue car. After they donned their helmets and gas masks and removed the bodies, they were to make a report on what they had seen with their own eyes and to ascertain what caused the explosion. Heretofore, when explosions occurred they were not allowed to make a report on what they had seen or to make a report on what caused it. The company or mine operator would move in 50 to 100 workmen, repair the fan and the mine and then notify the State inspectors to come on in.

Yet this body of Congressmen, supposedly the greatest law-making body in the world, would not pass this proposed legislation to save and protect human beings. I voted for the bill, and before the ink was dry on the recording of my vote I had two calls from two heads of the largest steel corporations in the district which I represent, asking what kind of a Representative or Congressman I was. They asked, "Do you realize you do not have a miner in your district?" I told them I did not care whether I had a miner in my district or not—I wanted to know why a hundred men were killed, and that I was trying to stop them from killing miners by the hundreds. They apparently were not concerned with the loss of life, they were simply concerned with the cost of repairing the mines. Usually the State inspector made a sugar-coated report, that he could not find anything to cause the explosion, and the widows and children would have no evidence to take the mine owners or operators into court.

In the year 1941, a very moderate form of a mine inspection bill was passed by the Congress. However, had the 1939 proposed bill been enacted, it would have saved many lives and disruptions in the mining industry and throughout the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, we seem to be drifting back into those so-called good old days. It has been my privilege, and I indeed consider it a privilege, to have participated in five strikes in my lifetime—three major ones. I have had no regrets—and am grateful for the opportunity that I had, in some small degree, to make some contribution to labor and the progress that it has been able to make through the last several decades. Their working conditions have been made safer, sanitary, and more endurable. These are privileges that the older members of my family—my fellow workmen and neighbors strove for and dreamed of. The suffering and deprivations of many years were worth the sacrifice.

If I had that part of my life to live over again, I would do the same thing and if the right was taken away from me to join a union, if I preferred to do so—I would be just as happy to have my life taken away. I plead with my colleagues here, do not take the right of joining a union away from any man or woman—nor do not take away the right to a closed shop. If any of you have ever worked in a steel plant, factory, or mine, you can realize the situation, I am sure.

Under the old way, for every couple of hundred men employed, there was at

least one stool pigeon. The La Follette committee proved that pretty well in its report. It was their job to work among the men and make a report every morning. They would lie about the workmen and their families. Thousands of men, during the lean years, lost their jobs because the stool pigeon probably went to sleep and had nothing to report—so in the morning an innocent man was his victim. Is that what you want to go back to? If you do, then you are taking the first step backward. You talk about war; you talk about battles that we have gotten into, including Pearl Harbor. You talk about men who have laid down their lives for their country. Men get down in the well and talk about the soldier and why he is fighting for this and that. Have we representatives from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars for this bill? Has the committee or Members of the House received telegrams from any of them expressing their approval of this bill? Of course you have not. I do not think you have anything from the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars or any other veteran organization. It is not right to come down into this well and talk about the soldiers who died on this or that battle front. Why bring them into it? They knew what they laid down their lives for. Eighty percent of our soldiers were the sons of laborers and farmers. Do you want to take their rights away? No; I do not believe you do.

If the Congress is sincere in wanting to pass a good labor bill, now is the time. But you will not accomplish this by asking men questions over the table. You will have to send Congressmen themselves into the mines, factories, steel plants, oil fields, automobile industry, and railroad yards. After they spend 4 or 5 months down in the bowels of the earth and sweatshops, living in miners' cabins and company houses, eating their food, instead of at Fan and Bill's famous steak house, I feel confident that at the end of that time a good, honest, and fair labor bill would be drawn up, and the country would and could be assured of no more strikes.

If the Members of Congress would do this, they would have done something worth while for the Nation and we would not have to worry so much about the peace treaties with other nations. We would have established in this country a true democracy—a real spirit of love for the rest of the world and mankind.

If ever this country needed to work, it is now, in order to retire our debt, reduce taxes, and retain our rightful place in world trade.

The President is doing his best and has asked that wages and prices be stabilized. Industry and utilities should make a determined and honest effort to put on the scales of justice the same weight of willingness and cooperation for industrial peace as does labor. If they do so, then, and only then, will we have a balanced prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable FRED HARTLEY, JR., for the fine work that he has done as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. He has been tireless in his efforts, and he has been efficient in molding legislation that will make history in this Congress.

I am somewhat puzzled as I sit here and listen to the debate, especially by some members of the minority. But before I mention that particular phase of it I would like to pay personal tribute to each and every member of the Committee on Education and Labor and to tell them that it has been a personal pleasure to work with them.

However, I understand that all of us here in Congress are good Americans, and I cannot understand for the life of me why certain insinuations are made that this Eightieth Congress would do anything that would deal a bad or serious blow to the American people. Whom do we serve as Congressmen? We serve our district, yes; we serve labor, yes; we serve industry, yes; we serve all phases of American life. Not only that, but we are held responsible for our actions here to the Nation, because the deeds we do here are recorded, and they react in only one way, and that must be for the good of all the people. How can anyone say that this Congress is antilabor or that this committee is antilabor? I do not think that this Congress or the Committee on Education and Labor has ever acted in an antilabor fashion. We do not do business that way. This Congress will go down in history, I am confident, as a doing Congress, a Congress that will meet its obligations and come up to the point where action is needed. And they will give action. The Committee on Labor in its hearings heard all sides of the story; labor, big business and little business, and they have weighed the evidence; they have formulated legislation, and now they are proceeding to enact laws that will be for the best interest of all the people.

Yes, labor came before this committee, and industry came before this committee. Some members of industry would say, "You must throw out all the present labor laws, there is no need for such laws. The workingman deserves no consideration for his actions." Then we would have labor leaders come before us and say, "Do not touch any of the existing laws. We need them. We do not want you to bother with them." We even had one labor leader say that it would be better if Congress would convene only once every 10 years. Certainly it is a blessing that Congress is convening this year.

We were elected to Congress to do the job that we are now doing. We were not elected to Congress to do what we are told to do. I do not believe there is any Congressman here, and I mean this, who has come to the Halls of this Congress pledged to do a job for any individual or any group of individuals. Once he comes through the portals of these doors here he must vote to the dictates of his own conscience, and then he must answer for that vote to his constituents, and then it must be the way that it would be good for all the people of this country.

Last week a very prominent judge back in Erie, Pa., told me this story. He said, "Congressmen remind me of the little lad who was sent to the grocery store and then forgot what he was sent for." He said, "I am glad to see that you do not conform to that type." I wrote back and said, "That goes for the Eightieth Congress, not an individual. This Congress knows what it has been sent down here to do and we expect to do it."

Yes; this Eightieth Congress realizes many things. It realizes the perils of labor and it realizes the perils of industry. I say that this Eightieth Congress feels sincerely and knows keenly that the greatest souls in America work under those dirty shirts that dig the coal in the mines, under those greasy shirts that labor in the mills. Those souls have the heart of America at stake. We are not trying to legislate any legislation here that would hurt anyone. No; this Congress is going to pass legislation here that is fair to everybody.

This bill acts in the best interests of the people of these United States. When I say that the men of America, the workingmen of America, want a functionable bill, I mean just what I say. You know what they want most? It is pay days. They want the pay day to come around regularly, and they want more take-home pay.

Another thing they would like to have is the privilege of doing in the years to come what they have not in the past and that is to know the boss again. They have not known the boss for 10 years. The boss would like to go out in the plant and know his men again. He would like to be able to go through the plant and say, "Hello, Tom, good morning, Sam." They should work together in this great country of ours, not be fighting one another all the time but rather working together.

Yes; this bill, H. R. 3020, reaches out to the men in America who want freedom. They want to be recognized as individuals again. They do not want to be part of a chain that is driving them all the time to concepts they do not agree to. Let us reestablish the American rights of the workingman so that he can go ahead and proceed as he would like to in his life. Yes, he wants a constitution to work under. He wants to work under the greatest Constitution of all times, but not a constitution for industry, not one written for the purpose of industrial procedures and gains, nor one written only by labor, that is going to hold him down to adhering to the things that labor demands. He wants to be a man in his own right, under his own name. He does not want to be known as a number in America, he wants to be a citizen and work under the greatest Constitution that any nation in this entire world has ever known, and that is the Constitution of these United States of America. H. R. 3020 gives that right to the workingmen of these United States.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, as a new Member I have listened with a great deal of interest to these debates, and, as all of you know, none of us have had the time to properly study this 68-page bill. There are four or five volumes of hearings which record the testimony of the witnesses. There is not a man here outside the committee members themselves who has had an opportunity to read that testimony and analyze it. Nor have we had an opportunity to analyze the majority report to compare it with the views of the minority.

I do not know how anyone can vote intelligently on this bill. Of course, we can give vent to our prejudices and our emotions, but to really decide this important issue in the light of reason, I do not think we have sufficient time to give it full and proper consideration.

One or two remarks have been made before this House by a member of the committee on the majority side which I think reveal the crux of the whole situation.

He stated that the teeth in this bill is the closed shop, and, secondly, the provision for industry-wide bargaining. He complained that labor has too much power. Therefore we must take away from labor that power.

As I understand the preamble of this bill, its purpose is to promote industrial peace. I say to you, pay attention to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who has spoken from experience and who knows what it is to work in the mines and steel mills and who speaks as a man who knows something about labor. I wonder how many of you men here really know anything about the problems and conditions under which working people work and live. You see, when he spoke of Colorado he was speaking of the Ludlow massacre. We in Colorado know about that. We know about company unions, and we know the things that people do when company unions exist. We know the fight that men and women of labor have made and the fight that has been going on to raise their living standards and their fight for those things in life that give them human dignity.

Gentlemen, when you preach that this is a bill of rights you do not really mean that. You cannot mean it if you know anything about labor problems. As a matter of fact, let me tell you what this bill does. This bill will not promote industrial peace. It is a declaration of war, and do not forget it. If this bill become law you will have more industrial strife than you have ever had in the history of this Nation.

I read in the RECORD the other day where William Green of the American Federation of Labor testified that there is bitterness in the hearts of working men and women as a result of the intemperate attitude of Members of this body concerning workers' problems. When you pass this sort of legislation, you are going to run into trouble.

I think it well to remind you that in this legislation you are dealing with the faith, the hopes, the aspirations, and the welfare of human beings. The labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce. Reason, logic, and human dignity demand that the labor of human beings cannot be placed in the same category as a lifeless, cold piece of merchandise or a machine. In your bill you not only, in a measure, restrict the full enjoyment of the political democracy of millions upon millions of people in this Nation, but you completely destroy and deny to them every hope of economic democracy which they have just begun to share as a result of the progressive and forward-looking legislation fathered and sponsored by that great humanitarian, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Moreover, by your legislation you are setting up and establishing rules for industrial warfare. These rules are weighted heavily against the working men and women of this Nation. This legislation will divide the workers from each other and divide the unions which unite them. As a result of this division and this legislative denial for workers to exert their full economic strength there can be no just and equitable collective bargaining. It follows then that the real purpose of this legislation is to divide the forces of labor, separating them unit by unit in order that they may be eventually conquered. You follow the age-old principle of divide and conquer.

This division is accomplished in many ways. One of the ways is to grind the bargaining representatives into small, completely segregated and isolated units.

The essence of this method is found in section 9 (f) (1) appearing at page 30 of the bill. By and large under this section a representative may bargain only on behalf of the employees of a single employer. He may not bargain with a group of employers on behalf of the employees of the members of the employer group; he may not represent employees on an industry-wide or market-wide scale or on a regional or local scale. He may appear only on behalf of the employees of a single employer. There is but one very unimportant exception to this which allows common representation where the employees represented are not more than 100 in number and where the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. Employers may, of course, continue to band together. And the committee majority, tongue in cheek, would tell you that equality of bargaining power is promoted by this bill. How can they say that when local No. 43 of some union, denied the advice, support, and resources of its international union, will be faced at the bargaining table by an association representing most of the employers in an industry, with vast reserves of economic power. The kind of bargaining envisioned by this provision shocks the Anglo-American sense of fair play. It sets David against Goliath and denies David the stones and slingshot which are his only means of defense.

There are a few reasons which have been advanced from time to time for the elimination of industry-wide bargaining, but whatever may be said for them independently, they cannot be made to support the drastic action proposed here. Not only does this provision prohibit industry-wide bargaining; it outlaws all common representation. It prohibits any sort of coordination, liaison, or assistance between local and local or between local and regional or local and national office. Coordination between even the smallest of locals is deemed monopolistic by this Act. If, indeed, the purpose of the provision is to avoid strikes, its method is to destroy collective action. This is its theme—no unions, no strikes.

There is the bona fide belief among some that the local is less anxious to strike than the international organization and that strikes may be prevented if the bargaining is localized. But experience shows that this is not the case. Market-wide and regional bargaining has made for stability of labor relations. Our conciliators have often found that after the locals have failed in their negotiations, representatives of the international unions have then been called to assist with great success. The reason for this is perhaps because many of the locals are untrained or some of them may be dominated by radical elements, anxious to make trouble. Actually we are past the day when collective bargaining will yield to the tactics of a David Harum horse trade; it requires the technical assistance which can be supplied by only the large organizations.

It is a fact that market-wide collective bargaining has proven successful in many industries and represents the natural trend in bargaining development. Both employers and employees have benefited from this development and have already testified to this effect. Such widely varied groups as the pottery and glassware industries, the needlework trade, shipbuilding, and the maritime industries, men's clothing and full-fashioned hosiery have agreed on the record that industry-wide bargaining is an effective means of securing stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has also shown the many other decided advantages to the practice which is now sought to be outlawed. Management has by this means been provided with predictables in labor costs. Labor is secured from reckless and arbitrary wage slashes made without regard to its effect on the industry and on the Nation. Fair standards in wages, hours, and working conditions have been promoted and maintained for the benefit not only of the wage earners but also of the employers. Stabilization of wage rates has discouraged unfair competition in wage policies and has strengthened the economy.

It must be recognized, by those who care to look, that the trend toward market-wide bargaining is a wholesome, normal development in the evolution of labor relations. The short-pants era of table banging and horse trading is largely historical. The developing era is one of intelligent appraisal of the economic problems by both sides, requiring the wider use of technical assistants, economists, engineers, lawyers, and sociologists. A broader area for collective bargaining is for that reason required. Only on that level can the experts be employed, and only on that level can they obtain the required bird's-eye view of the total

situation with its long-term implications. Turning back to the tense days at the end of the last century cannot obliterate this trend. It can result only in worse tensions which threaten to obliterate our society.

The growth of the giant corporations with their concentrations of control and ownership, interlocked through banking connections, compelled the labor market to develop strong labor unions to restore, at least partially, the equilibrium necessary to the well-being of this country. This was the purpose of the Wagner Act. To destroy that act, to destroy these unions, to restore the old rules protecting the businessman from the risks of the game, and to assure him of all of the scores is what this new Labor Relations Act proposes. It seeks to regain the lost businessman's paradise of the early part of this century. Have we forgotten that that paradise, like all things established on a basic inconsistency, was bound to crash and did crash in 1929 and 1932. Are we still fooled by the traditional doctrine that the worker must be disorganized if business is to be safe? The majority of the committee sponsoring this bill honestly believe that this doctrine is sound. It is for that reason they have declared war. If they prevail we shall all lose and it may be too late in the game to recover our losses.

If you are looking to the 1948 campaign, if you think you have a mandate from the people to do this thing, I say to you, you are mistaken. I am one of the few Democrats who was able to oust a Republican encumbent who had sat here for two terms. I spoke to the people of my locality as I speak to you today. There was no mandate to destroy the gains that labor had made through the past 10 or 12 years. I think you are making not only a serious mistake politically—perhaps that is unimportant—but I say to you, you are breaking the back of labor. You are taking away from the working men and women of this Nation the gains they have made for 50 or 60 years.

I urge upon the Members of this House to view this bill in the light of reason, to put aside all prejudice and to give it that mature deliberation which its importance demands. I sincerely trust that an amendment will be offered striking from this bill the vicious provisions which prohibit industry-wide bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the work of the committee which reported H. R. 3020 and the exhaustive study they have made of problems which affect labor-management relations. I recognize there should be some legislation correcting certain ills which exist in our present labor laws. Jurisdictional strikes, many secondary boycotts, certain racketeering carried on under the guise of union activity, should be regulated and corrected and the general public, whose interest all recognize as paramount, should be fully protected.

I am more than willing to support a labor bill which makes certain corrections in our labor-management set-up and which protects the general public. One of my chief objections to the proposed legislation is its provision to outlaw or eliminate industry-wide bargaining. What little time I have, I shall devote to that subject.

During this debate I have heard the various ills of labor-management recited—such as secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, racketeering in various forms—but none of these ills which have been recited flow from industry-wide bargaining itself. Therefore, in seeking to prevent and eliminate such ills and to protect the general public from the same, the solution is not the outlawing of industry-wide bargaining.

In the debate on this bill, I have heard it stated that the people of the country, by their vote last November, expect some action to be taken by this House to correct inequities in the industrial field. I take no exception to that statement. I believe the people of the country do expect and have a right to expect certain corrective labor legislation, but I do not believe the people of this country expect this House to outlaw industry-wide bargaining. To my knowledge, no candidate announced as a part of his corrective program the outlawing of industry-wide bargaining.

In my judgment, the law should not contain any provision favorable or unfavorable to industry-wide bargaining; this is a matter of negotiation between the particular industry and the labor employed in that industry. I believe I am well within the facts when I state that to eliminate industry-wide bargaining would largely throw the coal industry into chaos. Anyone who is familiar with the history of the coal industry knows that at one time negotiations were based at the union level, later at the district level, and finally we had industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide bargaining has brought stability to that industry. It has not resulted in monopolistic practices.

Our free-enterprise system in this country cannot thrive in a rigid system of control. The nature of certain businesses require elasticity. If we put rigidity into our labor laws, it will result in dislocations. We have heard during this debate that of course there would be dislocations—that is to be expected but it is necessary for the common good. We have some 600,000 coal miners in the United States, representing probably some six or seven thousand operations. The coal industry is important to our national welfare, it should not be laid on the altar and sacrificed by reason of some contingent happening or occurrence. What will be the result in the coal fields in this Nation if we eliminate industry-wide bargaining? We might as well face the facts at this time and accept the responsibility. With the elimination of industry-wide bargaining and under the provision of this proposed legislation, each union would have to bargain directly with the coal operator in a particular mine. The coal business is highly competitive. John Jones, who operates a mine, is not going to enter a contract with the union and agree to pay them a certain amount as a mule skinner or for loading a ton of coal, until he knows what his competitor, who has an operation in the same county or an adjoining county, is going to pay. Consequently, there will be no contracts closed. The coal will not flow from the mines. What then is the remedy?

There are certain other industries in which industry-wide bargaining lends itself to our free enterprise system. I sincerely urge the Members of this House to make an intelligent study of this provision, think it through and see what the inevitable result would be in many of our industries. Factories in one section of the country will negotiate wage scales which will eliminate competition in other sections of the country. In writing our labor legislation, let us write it in a manner which will strengthen our free enterprise system.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, for the short period of only 3 months I have had the honor of sharing the responsibilities of this body, but up to this time I have refrained from addressing the House. This was largely because the matters theretofore before us were ones upon which I felt that I had no special personal knowledge, beyond that more fully available to many of my colleagues.

Today it is different; we have before us legislation of great import on a subject about which I believe I do know something. All of my life I have practiced law, and in an industrial community; and I have observed at closest range the changing picture of labor-management relations, bringing us where we are now. I am glad therefore to have some voice in advancing this much needed legislation; and I am grateful to the chairman of the Labor Committee for leave to use a little of his time to discuss one special aspect of this bill.

But, first may I say, without any suggestion of mere conventional courtesy, that the draftsmanship of this bill is of itself a matter for congratulation to that committee. When we consider the broad field of their investigation, the complications which have log-jammed over the years, and the unavoidable novelty of some of the remedies recommended, and then realize, as we must, that these have been effectively and logically marshaled into a single piece of legislation, with a complete continuity of thought, with a notable absence of circumlocutions, and the legalistic style which mars so much legislative draftsmanship; and finally with a general clarity of statement which scarcely ever falters. I feel this is really a magnum opus of legislation, which is a credit to its draftsmen, our colleagues of the committee.

I have praised the form of the bill; I could praise most of the substance. This is, I think, a job we were sent here to

do; and a job generally well done. I am not in entire agreement with the committee; there are several particulars in which the bill differs greatly from my own individual ideas. I have already told my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation of one of these issues, and why I feel as I do. I shall not pursue the matter further now, because I want to devote these few minutes to another aspect, to me the most hopeful and significant of the whole bill.

This is the proposal to do away entirely, and I hope forever, with that extraordinary body, the National Labor Relations Board. If the bill did only that, it would be a grand piece of legislation. Doing that, it might vary far more from my other ideas than it does, and it would still recommend itself to me.

I observed the original complexion of that Board and have watched it function. If I am mistaken in my belief that it is the most un-American tribunal ever foisted by law on the people of this country, the mistake does not grow out of any misappraisal of the Board, but must rather reflect my ignorance of some past malign era of our history which has escaped my reading. At any rate, I am glad I did not have to live and practice law under any judicial or quasi-judicial administration of public affairs which might have been worse than this.

I know there has been a change, first in the personnel and more recently in the philosophy of decision, of this ill-omened body. But so far as I am concerned, nothing can wipe out the blot of the early and vitally important first years. Probably none of us are impressed with either the significance or the sincerity of deathbed repentances of this sort. A tribunal which suddenly begins to talk plain commonsense only after the people have finally roared their wrath does not deserve our sympathy, consideration, or respect.

But we came here to bury Caesar, not to praise or even unduly blame him. This Board was no doubt itself a victim of the circumstances of its conception. I suppose the Council of Ten in Venice were well-intending gentlemen, too, trying to accomplish what they conceived to be a wise purpose; but that did not help the unfortunates whose names were dropped into the lion's mouth, and who found themselves marching over the Bridge of Sighs, after a farce of a trial and a preordained conviction. That is what has happened to American employers, caught in the toils of this body—this extraordinary body and their extraordinary coterie of so-called special examiners. Thank God their day is apparently about done.

And there is a lesson in all this, Mr. Chairman, not merely for these men who betrayed and distorted truth itself in their excited preoccupation with ideological, if not political, objectives; and not merely for the political philosophies which bred and nurtured this monstrosity, but for us of the majority as well. And this truth is that in our democracy there is and must be a line beyond which neither partisanship or the enthusiasms of the doctrinaire can be permitted to go without endangering not merely the schemers' own plans but the essential integrity of government. And this line should and must not merely protect our courts, but our quasi-judicial and policy-making bodies as well. If they cannot be first of all completely American in their fairness and impartiality, they should not exist at all. And in that spirit we should all welcome the new Labor-Management Relations Board. The pitfalls of their problem are written plainly in the records of their predecessor. But to avoid them all they have only to be fair.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 3020 because it is a bill that enslaves labor. The 35,000 members of organized labor in my congressional district want no part of the so-called new Republican bill of rights for labor. In my opinion this bill puts labor back to the days of the secret meetings held by the old Knights of Labor of 1879. Since that time labor has had a hard and difficult climb. Many of us from industrial regions remember the bloody struggle for shorter hours and a liveable wage. We also remember the cruelty exercised by the large corporations in the way of bloodshed by so-called yellow-dog company police. We remember the company unions, court injunctions, yellow-dog contracts, evictions from homes, bread lines, and soup kitchens.

In this bill, we feel that it is the beginning of the march back to the "good old Republican days." Yes, gentlemen of the majority side, you may pass this bill and return the organized worker to industrial slavery, but he will rise again and demand his freedom by using the ballot box in 1948.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, shortly after I arrived in Washington as a freshman Congressman and witnessed the dozens of antilabor bills dropped in the hopper, I began to suspect that there were plans afoot to destroy the American labor movement. Later I read the vicious antilabor propaganda which was circulated by irresponsible sections of the press and noted the lynch-labor attitude of some of my colleagues. Now, after reading this bill, H. R. 3020, I know that my fears were far from groundless.

The Hartley bill is not aimed to correct abuses in the field of labor relations but is designed to cripple and destroy the organizations of the working men and women of America. I am shocked that such an irresponsible, unjust, and unfair proposal should be reported out by supposedly responsible Members of Congress.

It is impossible to discuss this bill on its merits, because it has no merits. It is a patchwork pieced together from all the antilabor recommendations made by the National Association of Manufacturers and the various other powerful trade associations who look upon labor unions as threats to their enormous profits. The result indicates complete irresponsibility, a lack of understanding of the nature of collective bargaining and labor relations, and a callous disregard for the rights of wage earners and the living standards of the American people.

I have said, and I repeat, that this bill contains every antilabor proposal which has been made by the National Association of Manufacturers. This fact will become obvious to every Member of this body who troubles to compare the recent NAM recommendations with the contents of this bill.

Early in this session I received a leather-bound booklet from the National Association of Manufacturers with my name lettered in gold on the cover. I believe that my colleagues were similarly favored. This booklet, entitled "Now Let's Build America," contained the legislative recommendations of the Fifty-first Annual Congress of American Industry held last December under NAM sponsorship. It may, therefore, be looked upon as a statement of the official position of the NAM regarding labor legislation and other matters.

I should like at this time to point out the close parallel between the NAM proposals and the provisions of the legislation now under consideration by this body.

The very first recommendation of the NAM was the amendment of the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. These were the NAM's suggestions:

First. Limitation of collective bargaining to the subjects of wages, hours, and working conditions;

Second. Outlawing of jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, strikes against the Government, and strikes to force recognition of an uncertified union;

Third. Outlawing of any strike until a secret ballot has been taken on the latest offer of the employer;

Fourth. Requirement of approval of a strike by a secret ballot and a majority of all employees in the plant or bargaining unit; and

Fifth. Banning of mass picketing.

The Hartley bill covers all of these items in the NAM recommendation. It limits the subject matter for collective bargaining and hence for strikes to a narrow field, and excludes such subjects as welfare funds, vacation funds, union hiring halls, union security provisions, apprenticeship qualifications, assignment of work, and many other matters which have in the past been dealt with through collective bargaining and which are of vital interest to the worker. Jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and secondary boycotts, are declared illegal by the bill. The NAM conditions whereby a strike may take place are written into the bill when it provides that before a strike can take place it must be authorized by a majority of all men in the plan—not a majority of the union—by a secret ballot wherein they decide between the employer's last offer and the strike. Picketing becomes a meaningless gesture under restrictions written into the Hartley bill. The effect of these provisions alone is virtual destruction of the Wagner Act.

Another NAM proposal is to outlaw industry-wide bargaining. Here, again, the Hartley bill parallels the NAM

recommendation. It not only limits collective bargaining to employees of a single employer, but it contains provisions which would permit the breakup of a union in one plant into separate bargaining units. Thus national unions would be broken up into hundreds of local groups, and formulation of uniform wage policies through the Nation would be rendered impossible.

The objectives of this proposal are clear: by breaking labor unions up into tiny segments it will be possible for the industrial giants to launch an offensive and destroy the organizations of the workers piece by piece. End result will be sweatshop conditions in many plants which will result in unfair competition between progressive employers and their sweatshop competitors.

Such a proposal shows a lack of understanding of the national character of American industry, which makes localization of collective bargaining impossible. It represents an attempt to completely destroy labor unions and is unfair to most employers. It will result in labor unrest and industrial strife.

A third major NAM recommendation reads as follows:

> The monopolistic * * * control over the available supply of labor must be eliminated by outlawing the closed shop and every other form of compulsory union membership.

Once again we find that the Hartley bill follows the NAM recommendation. It contains provisions to outlaw the closed-shop contracts which today cover millions of workers. In addition, it virtually destroys all other forms of union-shop and union-security contracts. Such provisions completely ignore the fact that union-security contracts have a recognized function in modern industrial relations and that such contracts are based upon the principle of majority rule and equal sharing of responsibilities for benefits received.

Union-security contracts make for industrial peace, greater efficiency in production, and fulfillment of contract responsibilities. As Mr. William Green recently stated:

> No union can be expected to fulfill a contract if only part of the employees in a plant are members of the union and subject to its discipline. * * * Those who are in the benefits of the union should share in its responsibility.

To abolish or discourage union-security contracts is to pave the way to greater industrial strife, cause conflict between union and nonunion men, and permit unscrupulous employers to use stool pigeons, spies, and antiunionists to destroy labor unions.

The bill denies to nearly 5,000,000 supervisory employees the benefits of collective bargaining—another NAM suggestion. In fact, the hundred and one antilabor provisions of this bill simply represent a codification of the NAM antilabor, pro-big-business program. Its purpose is to render the American workingman helpless in order that he may be exploited and plundered by the selfish interests who are today making the largest profits in American history. Not content with corporate profits after taxes of $12,000,000,000 in 1946, the enemies of labor want to take from the worker his only defense—his union—and thus destroy his standard of living between the inflated cost of living and a depression of wage levels.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record here as wholly and completely opposed to this bill. In my opinion, it is totally lacking in merit. It contains nothing constructive. Its only objective is to cripple, to harass, to punish, and to destroy labor unions. Its result would be to curtail production, create industrial strife, and lower the living standards of the American people.

It is intended to repeal the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and to eliminate those provisions of the Clayton Act which were meant to restrict its application to labor unions. It invokes injunctions as a strike-breaking technique. It subjects labor to the ancient common-law doctrine of conspiracy—thus turning the clock backward for centuries. Only those who seek to destroy labor unions can honestly support this proposed legislation. Only the NAM can rejoice if this bill becomes law.

This bill cannot give America the industrial peace which we all desire. The road to industrial peace is to be found in a Government policy which will eliminate the causes of industrial conflict. The root cause of labor unrest and industrial strife is found in the high cost of living, the decrease in labor's real wages, the lack of economic security. Only a domestic program based on a high-wage policy, the lowering of the cost of living, the expansion of social-security coverage, and full production and full employment with rising living standards can give America industrial peace.

As I studied the Hartley bill, I could not help but remember the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> All that serves labor, serves the Nation. All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between the two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet hate labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor, and to fleece the one is to rob the other.

Surely it is high time for the Congress to discard its lynch-labor attitude, and with mature judgment, and in the spirit of Lincoln, reject this irresponsible proposal aimed at the destruction of the entire American labor movement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a vote for the bill, H. R. 3020, now under consideration will not bring peace in the labor-management field. It will, however, bring enslavement to the working men and women of America. For that reason I am opposed to the bill and will vote against it.

All of us are agreed, I am sure, that existing labor laws could and should be amended to remedy certain evils that experience shows have developed.

Unfortunately, however, our Republican friends are not satisfied with removing these evils. Yielding to the pressure of the National Association of Manufacturers, they are going all out to restore the employer to the type of throne he occupied in the dark days of the yellow-dog contracts, the days of injunctions without hearing, the days when the American workingman was a pawn of his employer.

It is the same old story repeating itself. Under the pretense that this legislation is in the interest of the employee, and of the public, the proponents of the bill are using it as a vehicle to forge shackles for the worker.

The enactment would not only break down Nation-wide unions but it would break up plant-wide unions into individual units within the plant. It would render these labor units impotent and thus subject the individual worker to the whims of the employer. It would compel him to accept unfair working conditions and wages or to get out. He could not, as an individual, force the correction of the bad conditions under which he may be forced to work.

H. R. 3020 is a vicious bill and should be defeated.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is a voluminous document consisting of 68 pages and as it has taken me several hours to go through it during the limited time at my disposal it would be impossible to go over the provisions of the bill as I should like to. My reaction to the bill is that it is a great waste of effort. A bill accomplishing the same objectives could have been written on one page with these words, A bill to kill labor.

Oh, yes; I have seen the so-called bill of rights which is supposed to be given to labor. Labor's rights under this bill are so insignificant I wonder why the committee even bothered to mention the subject. As I say, the time at my disposal is so limited I cannot go over the bill as I should like to but I would like to point out one of the most singular paragraphs of the majority report which appears on page 4 and reads:

> In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor were lost as a result of strikes. And this total was trebled in 1946, when there were 116,000,000 man-days lost and the number of strikes hit a new high of 4,985. The resulting loss in national wealth is staggering.

The report does not remind Members of Congress that more than three-quarters of all those lost man-days were due to the refusal of employers to grant, without a strike, wage increase of 18½ cents recommended either by Government fact-finding boards or the President himself, and finally granted by employers after the strikes. Yet these are the facts.

Some Members may say, "Yes; but to grant these wage increases price increases were needed." In the steel industry a $5 per ton increase was granted the industry after the wage settlement and it was estimated that this was nearly twice as large per ton as the wage increase. In the fall of 1946 the OPA reexamined these price increases and found that the steel industry, by curtailing the production of low-end price items, had

actually averaged a $9 per ton increase or more than four times the amount of the wage increase. The profits of the steel industry show this very clearly. For example, United States Steel which secured profits of $25,900,000 in the last 6 months of 1945, secured $64,600,000 in the last 6 months of 1946. Other leading steel companies showed even larger increases.

Profits during the year 1946 were approximately $12,000,000,000 after taxes compared to $3,900,000,000 average for 1936–39. These profits reached a rate of $15,000,000,000 annually in the last quarter of 1946 and for the first quarter of 1947 at the rate of $17,000,000,000, or nearly four and one-half times the 1936–39 average. Remember that these profits were made on top of an 18½-cent wage increase in many industries, and that this wage increase even at the time it was granted did not restore take-home pay to 1945 levels.

I mention these things because they are so completely omitted from the majority report or the considerations of the proponents of this legislation. I think the record shows that these gentlemen who profess such a lively interest in the public welfare are completely neglectful of the average man and woman in the United States today. The majority report is full of self-serving statements about the interest of its authors in protecting the rights of individual workers, "in their relations with labor organizations." I believe it is amply demonstrated that the authors of this legislation are far more concerned about protecting the most profitable corporations in America against the demands and needs of individual workers, organized or unorganized.

As for me, I am outraged by the objectives of the authors of this bill. And I am alarmed as to the economic effects which it is bound to have, not only in the long run where its effects cannot fail to be disastrous, but in the near future.

Like many of my colleagues, I am a frequent reader of the United States News. In this week's issue that weekly says:

> It is getting near to the time when the country will have to learn the economic facts of life, when it will discover that every boom has its end.

The article goes on to say that we can expect declining prices, declining profits, and that unemployment will shoot up. This same forecast may be found in almost any leading business or financial journal. Many of these journals are cautioning employers for their own good to make moderate wage increases and/or at least a token price reduction. Apparently, these journals fear the rise of public indignation over these unprecedented profits, as well they might.

Like many of the rest of you, I hear from my constituents with considerable regularity. More and more of them are writing to tell me what inflation is doing to them. And more and more of them blame this inflation upon the premature destruction of price control. Some of them admit to me that they were for the removal of price controls and voted their convictions at the last election, but now regret doing so and have learned a lesson. They tell me about the cost of food, and what high prices are doing to their budgets and their savings. When I go home and talk to my constituents who are wage earners, I find that many of them are cashing their bonds—not in order to supply themselves with consumer durable goods, like refrigerators and washing machines, but to pay the doctor and the dentist and even some of them to buy groceries. Yet the United States News tells us that there are still a few weeks or a few months before the end of the boom. Government figures show that the cost of living since June of last year has increased by 20 percent as of March 1947. This is about two-fifths of the total increase since 1939, in the space of about 9 months. The price of the food budget has increased much more rapidly in these 9 months. A dollar spent in March of this year would not buy more food, if as much, as the housewife could buy last June for 72 cents.

It now takes $72.52 a week to support a family of four at minimum standards of health and decency—which is below what we like to call the American standard of living—according to the Heller budget. Government statistics show—United States Bureau of Labor Statistics—that the average weekly wage of production workers in industry early this year was only $45.83 per week. Let me underscore the word average, because I want to remind you that half of these workers and their families were living somehow on less than this average.

I recite what may seem to some of you these dry statistical facts because I want you to realize that these are the conditions upon which it is proposed to superimpose this legislation.

I say to you, that if the American people experience a depression like that of 1929, they will know where to look when they place the responsibility. Granted that this legislation is being undertaken at the demand of a small group of greedy men who are not satisfied with their outrageous profits and are willing to smash the labor movement in order to increase both their profits and their control over industry. Nevertheless, it is we who are today called upon to say whether this grab is successful and whether by our votes we shall make it so. If we make a mistake on this issue, the American people will hold us responsible.

This is an enormous responsibility because it means that whereas in 1929 it was possible for Congress to say that it did not know and could not foresee the effect of its economic policies during the 1920's, we have no such excuse. It should be as clear as daylight to us, and it will be to the American people, that we have greased the skids on the slide carrying the American economy into another depression. We gave the car a dangerous push last summer and were deceived by the fact that the car still seemed to be going up.

Today Congress must decide whether we are going to attempt a major repair job on the roller coaster of the business cycle or whether we are going to give the car a push down the last and steepest incline we have helped to build.

The authors of this bill are clearly not interested in pushing the American economy steadily uphill to higher living standards. They are bent upon establishing monopoly control over the roller coaster and taking the American people for a dangerous ride.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill will mark the last rights of labor. For example, it provides for a cooling-off period, which I think is 30 days. If anybody needs a cooling-off period, to my mind the proponents of this bill need the cooling-off period. Its authors acted in heat and much turbulence. Somebody in the cloak room said that the bill, as far as labor is concerned, is not tough; it is just "Molo-tough." I believe it was written with a jaundiced eye against labor and by a pen dipped in the ink of hatred of labor. It destroys the closed shop, so if the bill is passed the entire Nation will be checkerboarded with closed shops, union shops, nonunion shops and company shops, with concomitant inequities of wages, hours, and conditions of employment. It would prevent industry-wide bargaining for employees. It would not prevent industry-wide bargaining for management. It would thus fragmentize labor into small units and enable management to divide and conquer. It is rather anomalous that the bill exempts from its scope industries covered by the Railroad Labor Act; that is, it exempts and permits industry-wide bargaining in case of the railroads, air lines, interstate trucks and busses. Well, if industry-wide bargaining is good for those industries, why is it not good for coal and steel and rubber and other industries? It would reinstate the obnoxious labor injunction and revive the so-called yellow dog contracts. I am old enough to remember, and many of you here are old enough to remember the tragedy of the Danbury Hatters case, involving the so-called ex parte injunction. We would bring back the days of the Danbury Hatters. In those days the judges, without hearing, issued injunctions based upon affidavits of stooges and stool pigeons and agents provocateur. The abuses in the granting of these injunctions so aroused the Nation that we in 1932 passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act which outlawed the granting of ex parte injunctions against labor. This bill would reinstate those ex parte injunctions against labor and would turn the clock back and return us to the robber baron days and the days of the industrial buccaneers.

It will enable management to make its profits primarily out of back-breaking hours and reduced wages.

It treats the human rights of laboring men and women as if they were inanimate objects.

It makes labor subject to antitrust laws with criminal penalties and treble damages.

It so hedges strikes as to destroy the right to strike and the right of threat to strike, which have helped raise wages so that today our citizenry has the highest purchasing power in the world.

It does not go to the root of the evil nor attempt to remove the cause of that evil which arises out of the high cost of living and through economic maladjustment. These create industrial strife. Strikes are the result and not the cause of industrial unrest.

It revives company unions where management can sit on both sides of the table.

It usurps the police powers of the States and tends to increase Federal bureaucracy.

The proponents of the bill have the mistaken notion that a bill of this drastic character can prevent strikes. No law can prevent a strike. Witness the fact that we have coal strikes despite prohibition against strikes in the Smith-Connally Act. The transport workers went on strike in England though such strike was in violation of an English statute.

It discourages collective bargaining and encourages individual bargaining.

In union there is strength. Labor will now lack that strength because collective security is gone. In division there is weakness. Labor will now be rendered divided, weak, and ineffective.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, this bill eliminates industry-wide bargaining. It does so to break up a labor monopoly. I hope that either by an amendment to this bill, by new law, or by the enforcement of existing law we break up all monopolies, be they monopolies of labor or management.

In my opinion there is very little difference between a cartel controlling the manufacture of a product and the labor union controlling the supply of workers who manufacture this product. Monopolistic power of either type is contrary to the best interests of our country.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House have noted with considerable interest the name-calling attacks which have been made on this bill. As I have sat here in the 2 days of debate I have been jotting down some of the things that have been said. I should like to summarize them at this time, so that we can find out what the real issues of this debate are.

It has been termed the "scab labor bill," the "kill union bill," the "death warrant for labor," "a vicious monstrosity," "the bill which will bring back the sweatshop and the yellow-dog contract," a bill which, on the one hand, is a "long step forward on the road to fascism" and on the other hand, "a bill which would drive the union-labor movement into communism." It is "a bill which was rushed through without sufficient time." It is "a bill which was written in smoke-filled rooms by corporation lawyers and not by the Members of Congress who should have written the legislation."

It was even suggested that some of the newer Members of the House might not remember the great contribution that was made by labor during the war years. On that particular point I should like to make this remark: I think the newer Members of this House on both sides of the aisle know the great contribution that was made by labor during the war years, the contribution made by the 14,000,000 workers who are members of unions, the contribution of 35,000,000 workers who are unorganized and not members of unions, the contribution made by the millions of farmers, the professional people, and the businessmen, and the contribution as well of the 15,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces, men and women who had been members of unions and not members of unions; who had come from positions in management and from the ranks of labor. It was a great contribution that was made by all the people of America, and we recognize that.

That is typical of the kind of attack that has been made on this bill today. I think it is fundamental as we close this debate that we get down to the issues that are really involved. Let us remember that the issue in this debate and the issue that we are going to decide when we vote on this bill is not an issue of management against labor; it is not an issue of the public against labor; it is not an issue of the Republican Party against labor, as has been suggested, and I would go so far as to say that the issue is not that of the Republicans against the Democrats, because on both sides of this aisle we are going to have, I believe, substantial support for the provisions of this measure.

The issue on this particular legislation, I submit to you, is that this Congress must recognize that it is time to enact a labor bill which is not class legislation, but which is in the best interests of all the people of America.

So, what have we done? We have submitted for your approval a bill which recognizes the rights of the public and the consumer, the rights and responsibilities of employers, the rights of union leaders, and the responsibility of union leaders both to the public and to the workers they represent. What is most important is that this bill recognizes and protects the fundamental rights of the 60,000,000 people in America who work for a living and in whose interest every piece of legislation which passes this House must be written.

Why was this bill introduced? The suggestion has been made that it was introduced because a few greedy monopolists in the National Association of Manufacturers and chambers of commerce decided that they wanted more money and, therefore, ordered a bill which would allow them to wring the last dollar out of the laboring men of this country.

But what are the facts? When this Congress convened in January of this year it looked back on a record of labor-management strife about which the people of this country had declared something must be done. We know that in the year after VJ-day we had lost $6,000,000,000 in the standard of living in America, due to industrial strife. We had seen unprecedented force and violence in labor disputes throughout the country. We had seen ab[illegible] by labor leaders, abuses which many good labor leaders decried and about which they said something should be done. We had seen, as well, in the labor-management field how a few persons, irresponsible leaders of labor, could paralyze the entire country by ordering a strike by the stroke of a pen. That was the situation with which we were confronted when this session opened. That is why the Labor Committee has had these extensive hearings. That is why the committee has brought before you a bill which is all-inclusive, which goes to the root of the evils which have arisen and which recognizes and protects the interests of all the people in America.

Now, the suggestion has been made that some of those who oppose this bill are in favor of some legislation. They realize that there are some evils to be corrected but they do not like the way we have attempted to correct them. They think we have covered too many subjects in this bill. I imagine that those Members who have stated this position are in accord with the statements made by the President in his address to the Congress on January 3. He recommended that certain steps should be taken.

I think we should analyze those recommendations.

First of all, he recommended that machinery should be set up providing for peaceful settlement of jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts arising out of jurisdictional disputes, and disputes over the interpretation of contracts. He recommended a study of all other labor-management problems without action at this time. I wish to point out that if this Congress were to limit its action to carrying out the President's recommendations, we would be acting only on disputes which caused less than 5 percent of the days lost in strikes in the United States during the past 2 years. The people of America demand and are entitled to more action than that. It is the responsibility of this Congress to pass a bill which will give the American people the protection they need from industrial strife.

It has been said that we have drawn a bill which recognizes and protects the rights of the public, but that in doing so we are destroying the rights of labor and turning back the clock of labor reform 100 years. I think it is well for us to bear in mind who are making those charges. Are the workers of this country, the members of the unions, objecting to this bill? Or are the objections coming only from a few entrenched leaders of union labor who fear that their unrestrained power over the workers of America will be curtailed?

In that connection let us analyze the provisions of the bill, having in mind the interest of American workers. Do they object to the fact that the bill gives the right to speak freely in their union meetings? Do they object to the fact that the bill gives them the right to vote freely in democratic elections for their officers and to organize and bargain collectively? Do they object to the fact that the bill protects their right to strike over fundamental issues involving wages, hours, and working conditions? Do they

object to the fact that this bill provides that where two union leaders are fighting between themselves as to who will get the union dues from workers on a particular job, such a dispute shall not be the basis for a strike depriving innocent workers of their jobs who have no interest in the dispute? Do they object to the fact that we have attempted to control violence, mass picketing and other abuses which all good union leaders have decried?

On the contrary the workers of America have a great stake in the passage of this bill. It has been said that the public suffers from strikes; it has been said that management suffers from strikes; but we must remember that the man who suffers most, the man who has the greatest stake in industrial peace, is not the public, not management, but it is the man who has to go out on strike.

I submit to this House that the man who goes out on strike and who serves to lose most by going out should make the determination as to whether he should go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute additional.

Mr. NIXON. So we have provided that that decision to strike will be made, not in the sumptuous quarters of a labor baron in the Carlton Hotel; not in some smoke-filled room, as the gentlemen have seen fit to describe it, where labor leaders get together and, by the stroke of a pen, decide the fate of millions of workers, but by a secret ballot by a majority of all employees in the plant affected.

In the year 1215 King John at Runnymede granted sovereign power to the barons of England. Centuries later a bill of rights was granted to the individual citizens of England, protecting them against the irresponsible power of their rulers. In 1935 the New Deal Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act which granted unrestrained sovereign power over the workers of America to the barons of union labor. Now, I submit it is the responsibility and the opportunity of this Congress to grant to American workers their bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, one-half minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to announce to the House that a very few minutes ago, at Texas City, Tex., on the Gulf coast, a French nitrate ship exploded and it, in turn, exploded a high-octane tanker, and as a result of those two explosions a big chemical plant blew up. Between 200 and 700 are known to be dead now. I am further advised that the Red Cross has declare a national emergency, and they are flying nurses and doctors from all over the country to the scene of that horrible disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on general debate has expired.

Before the Clerk reads, the Chair wishes to state that section 101, which begins on page 3 and extends over to page 51, will be read and considered as one section and open to amendment after reading.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

(b) Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and, above all, recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to encourage the peaceful settlement of labor disputes affecting commerce by giving the employees themselves a direct voice in the bargaining arrangements with their employers, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago when this House was considering the annual appropriation bill for the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency I cautioned the Republican majority to stop, look, and listen before they proceeded to emasculate the Labor Department by using a meat ax on the appropriations requested for the proper functioning of that vital agency. But the majority's antilabor steam roller was well oiled, just as it is today. It saw fit, practically to a man, to deny adequate funds for the proper functioning of the Government bureaus which have the responsibility for minimizing and reducing labor disputes, and for furnishing data on labor conditions throughout our country.

Immediately after that, the majority brought to this floor from committee a tax bill which would grant less relief to the wage and salary earners in the lower income brackets than to individuals in the wealthier categories, at a time when common sense dictates we should first be concerned with reducing our huge national debt created as the result of the war.

Now our Republican friends must accept the dubious honor of bringing before us this unfair labor bill, this piece of legislative chicanery which seeks to deny working men and women the basic rights of organization and collective action; a bill which is deliberately designed to lay low organized labor and decent living standards and to turn the economic clock far back.

These three pieces of legislation, together with the fact that the cost of living today has terribly advanced due to abandonment of price ceilings at the most crucial moment in the reconversion period, are depressing the living standards of 60,000,000 of our people who earn their bread by the sweat of their brows.

Cannot we who hate communism realize that a bill shackling labor such as H. R. 3020 gives the Communists ammunition for the guns they aim at the destruction of our country? Cannot we realize that the Communists are the enemies of labor and the working class and have as their objective not the well-being of labor but the hopeless exaggeration of class conflicts and the undermining of our American economy? Cannot we see how they will exploit this nefarious antilabor bill for their revolutionary purposes?

James Burnham points out in his article entitled "The Goal of Soviet Policy" published in the current issue of American Mercury that—

Within the United States, the Communists arouse and exploit every divisive possibility. Labor against capital, big business against little business, CIO against AFL, farmers against businessmen, Negroes against whites, Christians against Jews, Protestants against Catholics, landlords against tenants, foreign-born against native-born, South against North, unemployed against employed—wherever there is a potential rift in the national life, the Communist tactic is to deepen and tear that rift.

Mark my words: This bill will create the deepest rift we have ever had in our national life. You will create a field day for the Red Fascists.

If there were no other reason, I would vote against the pending bill because it is aimed directly at the present strike of 340,000 telephone workers, 99⁹⁄₁₀ percent of whom are fine, decent American citizens. You will not find many "Commies" among them. Why should they be denied the right to protest the impossible rise in the cost of living due to the greed of big business or the right to seek a decent living wage from companies which, while bloated with profits, have been notorious for the low salaries paid their employees? As one Member of Congress who is thoroughly in sympathy with them in their fight for a fair increase in pay and better conditions I feel that I would be letting them down if I were to vote for this negative and punitive legislation, drafted, if you please, by a Republican majority and some highly paid corporation lawyers who were so kind as to assist, right here in the Capital, without charge, our friends on the other side of the aisle. What a job these obliging big business lawyers have done for the Chrysler Corp. and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, is it good sense to aid and advocate liberty for other peoples of the world and at the same time subject

labor here in our own country to oppressive and arbitrary restraints? If we as a nation are to survive, if our American system of government is to continue to function, labor must be free. Sure, labor has many faults. But are we going to roast a pig by burning down the house?

The pending hastily prepared and too hastily considered bill, containing 66 pages, would not only destroy the rights and protections given to labor during the past 50 years but would deliberately take the very laws intended for protection of working men and women and turn those laws around and aim them at destroying organized labor. It would not only remove protections against antilabor injunctions and unfair labor practices of employers, it would deliberately create new kinds of restrictions, new kinds of injunctions that were unheard of a half century ago. It would reintroduce over a wide area penalties and judicial procedures which have been banned by the Congress for many, many years.

Since the development of the labor injunction in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there has long been widespread opposition to its sweeping use in labor disputes. It is generally regarded as having broken the back of the Pullman strike in 1894, and with crippling unjustly the legitimate activities of labor unions in many cases since. After widespread objection to the misuse and abuse of judicial power in the labor injunction, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed and signed by President Hoover in 1932. Section 12 (c) of this bill would in effect virtually repeal that act.

Although seemingly limited to certain types of cases, the so-called unlawful concerted activities, the effect of labor injunctions would go far beyond these situations, and hamstring many other activities. Ordinarily, a temporary injunction is obtained by one party going to court and showing that there is reasonable ground to believe that illegal activities are in process or may be pending, and that these activities would cause him great harm. In this temporary restraining order, a time is set for a full hearing of both sides, a possibility which is largely illusory, since in most labor injunctions, the matter cannot be carried through to such a final determination. In other words, in practice, the temporary injunction, issued when only one side has been heard, decides the issue by throwing the weight of the Government on one side of a complicated economic dispute, without giving the other side a chance to be heard. This was clearly recognized when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted. But this bill would turn the clock back of 1932 when that law became effective.

This bill would turn the clock back to and beyond the early 1920's when in a single strike, more than 300 injunctions were issued, in some cases of such sweeping character that persons in no way connected with the union were affected with severe restrictions on their freedom to speak as they chose.

This bill would turn the clock beyond 1914. In that year Congress passed the Clayton Act, which recognized that the Sherman Antitrust Act had been passed to restrict monopolistic business practices and was not a suitable instrument in dealing with other types of organizations. The Sherman Antitrust Act provided a penalty of triple damages, a type of penalty designed for, and when enforced, particularly appropriate for monopolistic practices of business. Although this device was intended to curb such practices, I know of no instance where the application of this penalty to a business concern has caused its failure. The imposition of this penalty against union activity has, however, killed unions affected, such as the Danbury hatters local.

With reason, the late Samuel Gompers termed the Clayton Act labor's "magna carta upon which the working people will rear their constitution of industrial freedom." With reason, the American Federation of Labor after 1908 began consistently to support those who would confine the Sherman antitrust law to its proper sphere of activity. With reason, the American Federation of Labor has supported those who would give the workingman a right to be heard, by curbing the injunction, which in practice usually denies him that right.

Instead, labor organizations have joined with fair-minded employers to urge the expansion of mediation services which do afford all parties such an opportunity.

This bill would do harm, however, to the Conciliation Service by divorcing it from the Department of Labor, in spite of the fact that the Secretary of Labor would continue to be primarily responsible for handling labor disputes, and in spite of the recent Reorganization Act, which Congress approved to continue and extend his powers along this line.

Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply disturbed by the short-sighted tactics of this Congress in dealing with problems of labor. This bill would subject each local to the possibility of constant and minute surveillance with respect to its financial statements, the reasonableness of all assessments or dues, the adequacy of freedom of expression, and the fairness of the conduct of the local's affairs. These terms are not defined, but, nevertheless, infraction of these general objectives might carry severe penalties. I know the House would not accept such close supervision of business practices, methods, and policies, and I think we should be fair and not subject labor to a gestapo-like scrutiny.

There appears to be a very evident determination on the part of this Congress to increase the discontent of American workers by denying them in a wholesale fashion the rights under the National Labor Relations and Fair Labor Standards Acts which they have struggled so hard to achieve. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that if the standard of living of the American worker were generally known abroad, and the freedom in conjunction with his fellow workers which he now enjoys were also known, much of the lure which totalitarian doctrines might have would tend to disappear. And I believe just as firmly that the policy embarked on in this Congress of wrecking labor rights would dim that light of freedom and opportunity which we in America should continue to show the world.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill, as I said a moment ago, we do away with national industry bargaining. That is, we do away with it on one side of the table and not on the other side of the table. Nobody has ever tried to stop management from organizing into boards of trade or chambers of commerce; nobody has tried to stop anybody who is a manufacturer from joining the National Association of Manufacturers, which is designed to protect management's collective judgment and interest. There are 2,300 chambers of commerce in this country and about 2,000 interstate trade associations. The National Association of Manufacturers speak for about 50 trade associations covering about 70,000 corporations.

With this bill, on the one hand we deny the right of the unions to bargain collectively over the national area, but we do not do that for management, on the other hand. They can band together as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. can band together with its subsidiaries and indicate to labor what it wishes, but labor cannot indicate to management on an industry-wide basis what it wants and desires.

This bill, in short, would forbid the existence of national unions and would break every one of our national union organizations like the international unions of the AFL and the CIO into a series of small, weak, local organizations. There is something rather hypocritical about this.

When the unions first started to organize in major industries they were only able to organize one plant at a time. When they bargained with the employer for a single plant the answer was given that these demands could not be met for the single plant alone because they were matters of general policy affecting the entire corporation or the entire industry. So the unions organized the entire corporations. Then in industry after industry the reply was given: "Why make us the guinea pig? Why should we be asked to pay more than our competitors? Why is not this demand made on our competitors as well as on us?" And as recently as 1945 and 1946 this was the complaint, for example, of General Motors Corp. when it was the only automobile manufacturer involved in a strike. So the unions organized the competitors of General Motors Corp. Now the cry is "Go back to the separate employers and take them one at a time." In that way you fragmentize these national unions and render them impotent and useless and so weak as almost to cause them to fold up.

What will happen when we have these weak unions scattered throughout the country? There will now be competition to lower wages among the competing units of a given industry. There will be competition to make conditions of employment more burdensome. There will be competition to increase the hours of employment. That is the very reverse of the policy that has been enun-

ciated in this chamber for the last two or three decades.

I do not want to go back to that kind of condition. Unless we have strong unions then the laboring man and the laboring woman will come on evil days. This bill, to the extent that it weakens these unions, will make conditions of the laboring man and the laboring woman in this country most insufferable, and I therefore ask that this bill be defeated for that reason, and for many other reasons. Our economic structure rests on high production and lower prices achieved through competition. But we do not mean and could never mean that there should be competition as to who is to establish the worst working conditions.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Has not the gentleman noticed, by reference to section 9, which relates to utilities, that where there is competition it is possible for the unions, all of them, to deal Nation-wide with such industries, or in the case of steel companies, to which the gentleman referred——

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield further. I yielded for a question.

Mr. OWENS. I thought the gentleman yielded for a question.

Mr. CELLER. I want no limitation on industry-wide labor bargaining. If it is good for one, it is good for all. The exceptions in this bill have so many loopholes as to be valueless.

Millions of workers now work in closed shops. Destruction of the closed shop principle would create nothing but havoc. We would have some people working in closed shops and some in open shops. That would mean chaos.

The closed shop is nothing more nor less than a medium to protect the security of the worker in labor unions. It can only exist by agreement between labor and management. The closed shop is the result of the justified fear of labor after a long history of bitter experience that taught labor the employer would try to undermine, corrupt, and dissolve union organization by open shops, company unions, and the use of stooges and spies. The closed shop has been highly successful in many industries—the construction industry, A. F. of L.; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; the International Ladies' Garment Workers.

Break the closed shop and you return clothing and garment industries to former sweat-shop conditions. Outlawing the closed shop would open the door to racketeers and Communists in the absence of disciplinary power accorded the unions by closed-shop arrangements.

The closed shop does not prevent the right of any individual to work. Union labor fought unceasingly—when nonunion labor was completely complacent—to outlaw the evil of the employer blacklist, yellow-dog contracts, and ex parte labor injunction which were violations of the right to work. There is no reason at all, morally or in common decency, why labor and management should not be allowed to enter into the closed-shop agreement which says that those who seek jobs in the plant must joint the union in order to qualify. The closed shop presently cannot be had save by the vote and will of the majority of workers. They have a right to join together to refuse to be associated with an individual whom they consider a free rider. Similarly, the employer has the right to exclude the applicant who wants to remain nonunion or antiunion and who refuses to conform with the terms of employment and who would disrupt plant management and production. The nonunion man could still work. There are many nonunion shops.

Furthermore, the union has created great benefits, including increased wages, better working conditions. The worker, therefore, should be compelled to pay dues to the union that brought about those benefits. There should be no free riders. A closed shop does not mean a closed union which bars new members. This is rank deception. The doors of the trade-unions are always open to new members.

To get a better understanding of labor conditions today we must consider the entire labor picture, beginning with the war. We must also consider the postwar psychosis of all our people. After any war there is a release of tempers, bad manners, and uncertainties. Workers came out of the war tired from the long workweek and from the suspense. First, there were the lowered living standard conditions because overtime pay and the higher wages were ended. Second, many lost their jobs when war plants closed, and they were afraid that they would not be reemployed. Many segments of management felt that the time was ripe to destroy the effectiveness of labor unions, and the general American give and take, because of frayed nerves, was missing. Things got out of hand and there were strikes. Grievances accumulated. Both labor and management during the war were able to run to boards with their grievances. Decisions were made and there was no need for collective bargaining. Management and labor are compelled now to relearn the need for free collective bargaining. They are relearning, and work stoppages this year were far less than last year. They are the lowest since VJ-day. Free collective bargaining can work. Any form of compulsory arbitration or supermachinery for the disposition of labor disputes will frustrate rather than increase industrial peace.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, stated recently:

> In 1946 the CIO Steelworkers Union cooled off for 14 weeks. The CIO auto workers cooled off for a similar period. CIO electrical workers cooled off for over 2 months. The cooling off didn't work. In each case our CIO unions accepted the Government's compromise proposals, but were forced into a long strike to make management accept those compromises. Will mere cooling off prevent strikes? I know it will not.

Antilabor legislation calls for the employees to observe a waiting period before striking. This might be analogous to requiring employers to observe a waiting period before closing down their plants. But neither the National Labor Relations Act nor any general law so obligates employers—and on this last point reference to the Railway Act is not apropos, because there the waiting period imposed on workers is matched by the obligation of the public utility not to stop the running of the trains.

In all this discussion on labor, what is forgotten is that labor is not an inanimate mass. We are concerned here with human beings, individuals entitled to a living wage for themselves and their dear ones. They do not want strikes. Strikes hurt them as much, if not more, than management. Like the rest of us, they want peace. There is too much at stake for them. Strikes mean months of idleness, and, in many cases, want. The workingman must depend on his salary; he has no security beyond that, and no absolute guaranty of the continuance of his salary. The average annual industrial wage throughout the country is a little over $40 per week, and it is a constant struggle to maintain and achieve decent working conditions and fair living standards and a more than subsistence wage. Instead, a picture is painted for the public of a huge overwhelming labor giant grasping for power. Members of the working class are Americans, seeking a better way of life, with a fair degree of comfort, with the means of education for their children, and security in old age and protection for the American home. Consider, then, carefully, the harsh legislation that is being proposed in the light of the accomplishments and aims of our unions.

It is well to remind labor baiters and some fire-eating antilabor commentators and editors, as well as the proponents of this bill, who want laws forbidding strikes, that both the London transport strikes and the United States coal strike were forbidden—the first by British law, the second by the Smith-Connally Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

SEC. 101. The National Labor Relations Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by providing means for protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives in their relations one with the other, and for preventing the commission by either of unfair labor practices.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, labor organizations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any instrumentality thereof, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization, or any corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation organized

and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

"(3) The term 'employee' shall include any employee and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual who has been discharged by his employer where such discharge constitutes an unfair labor practice under section 8 (a) and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, and shall also include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of a labor dispute (unless such individual has been replaced by a regular replacement, or has obtained other regular and substantially equivalent employment, or is receiving unemployment compensation from any State), but shall not include any individual employed as a supervisor, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual engaged in agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code) or any individual employed by any person other than an employer as herein defined, or any individual having the status of an independent contractor. For the purposes of this paragraph, a 'regular replacement' means an individual who replaces an individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of a labor dispute, if the duration of his employment is not to be determined with reference to the existence or duration of such labor dispute.

"(4) The term 'representative' includes any individual or labor organization.

"(5) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"(6) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"(7) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(8) The term 'unfair labor practice' means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

"(9) The term 'Labor-Management Relations Board' means the Labor-Management Relations Board created by section 3 of this act.

"(10) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act provided for in section 4.

"(11) The terms 'bargain collectively' and 'collective bargaining' as applied to any disputes between an employer and his employees or their representative, means compliance with the following minimum requirements:

"(A) If an agreement is in effect between the parties providing a procedure for adjusting or settling such disputes, following such procedure.

"(B) If no such agreement is in effect, complying with the following procedure:

"(i) receipt of any proposal or counterproposal of the other party;

"(ii) discussion of such proposal and any counterproposal at a conference with the other party held at a time mutually agreeable to the parties or, in the absence of such an agreement, within a reasonable time after such receipt;

"(iii) continued discussion of the matters in dispute at not less than four separate additional conferences with the other party held within the 30-day period following the initial conference, unless agreement is sooner reached;

"(iv) if agreement is reached, putting such agreement in writing;

"(v) if agreement is not reached by the end of such 30-day period, complying with the requirements of clause (vi) before authorizing, conducting, or participating in any lock-out or strike in connection with such dispute;

"(vi) the following requirements shall be applicable as a condition of authorizing, conducting, or participating in, any lock-out or strike in connection with the dispute:

"(a) The collective-bargaining representative shall notify the Administrator of its desire to have a strike vote conducted in connection with the dispute;

"(b) Within 5 days thereafter, such representative shall inform the employees in writing of the issues in the dispute and the representative's position thereon. Copies of such statement shall be sent by registered mail to the employer and to the Administrator;

"(c) The Administrator shall promptly notify the employer of the representative's request for the strike vote;

"(d) The employer shall have a reasonable time, fixed by the Administrator, to inform the employees of the issues and his position thereon, and of his last offer of settlement. Copies of such statement shall be sent by registered mail to the representative and to the Administrator;

"(e) Within a reasonable time thereafter, the Administrator shall, after due notice to the parties, provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question whether such employees desire to reject the employer's last offer of settlement, and to strike;

"(f) The ballot shall be conducted in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the parties, or, in the absence of such agreement, conducted and supervised by or under the direction of the Administrator;

"(g) The ballot shall read: 'Shall the employer's last offer of settlement of the current dispute be rejected, and a strike be called?'

"(h) A lock-out or strike may not be authorized or conducted unless in such secret ballot a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned vote to reject the employer's last offer of settlement, and to strike.

Such terms shall not be construed as requiring that either party reach an agreement with the other, accept any proposal or counterproposal either in whole or in part, submit counterproposals, discuss modification of an agreement during its terms except pursuant to the express provisions thereof, or discuss any subject matter other than the following: (i) Procedures and practices relating to wage rates, hours of employment, and work requirements; (ii) procedures and practices relating to discharge, suspension, lay-off, recall, seniority, and discipline, or to promotion, demotion, transfer and assignment within the bargaining unit; (iii) conditions, procedures, and practices governing safety, sanitation, and protection of health at the place of employment; (iv) vacations and leaves of absence; and (v) administrative and procedural provisions relating to the foregoing subjects.

"(12) The term 'supervisor' means any individual—

"(A) who has authority, in the interest of the employer—

"(i) to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, demote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline any individuals employed by the employer, or to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend any such action; or

"(ii) to determine, or make effective recommendations with respect to, the amount of wages earned by any individuals employed by the employer, or to apply, or to make effective recommendations with respect to the application of, the factors upon the basis of which the wages of any individuals employed by the employer are determined, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the exercise of independent judgment;

"(B) who is employed in labor relations, personnel, employment, police, or time-study matters or in connection with claims matters of employees against employers, or who is employed to act in other respects for the employer in dealing with other individuals employed by the employer, or who is employed to secure and furnish to the employer information to be used by the employer in connection with any of the foregoing; or

"(C) who is given by the employer information that is of a confidential nature, and that is not available to the public, to competitors, or to employees generally, for use in the interest of the employer.

"(13) The term 'sympathy strike' means a strike against an employer, or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, which is called or conducted not by reason of any dispute between the employer and the employees on strike or participating in such concerted interference, but rather by reason of either (A) a dispute involving another employer or other employees of the same employer, or (B) disagreement with some governmental policy.

"(14) The term 'illegal boycott' means a concerted refusal, or threat of a concerted refusal, by individuals in the course of their employment—

"(A) to render services, where an object of the refusal or threat is to force a person to do business or to cease doing business with another person; or

"(B) to render services, where an object of the refusal or threat is to force a person to deal with or to cease dealing with a labor organization as the representative of individuals other than themselves; or

"(C) to use, install, handle, transport, or otherwise deal with particular articles, materials, or commodities by reason of the origin or proposed destination thereof, or by reason of the character of a prior or proposed future handling thereof, or by reason of the policies or practices of any person (not their employer) having any direct or indirect relationship thereto.

"(15) The term 'jurisdictional strike' means a strike against an employer, or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to require that particular work be assigned to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class.

"(16) The term 'monopolistic strike' means a strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations which results from any conspiracy, collusion, or concerted plan of acting between employees of competing employers or between representatives of such employees, where the employees of such competing employers do not have a common bar-

gaining representative certified under section 9.

"(17) The term 'featherbedding practice' means a practice which has as its purpose or effect requiring an employer—

"(A) to employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(B) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of employing, or on account of failure to employ, any person or persons, in connection with the conduct of the business of an employer, in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(C) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed; or

"(D) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services, in connection with the conduct of a business, which are not to be performed; or

"(E) to pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, buying, renting, operating, using, or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, or maintenance of the same, if such restriction is for the purpose of preventing or limiting the use of such article, machine, equipment, or materials.

"LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a board to be known as the 'Labor-Management Relations Board' in this act called the 'Board'), which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members shall be members of the same political party, and all of the members shall be appointed with reference to their fitness to perform the functions imposed upon them by this act in a fair and impartial manner. Of the members first appointed after the date of the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 3 years, and one for a term of 5 years, from such date, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The Board shall annually designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board may appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, an executive secretary, and a secretary to each member, and may appoint such other officers and employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress. The Board may not appoint or employ any attorneys except (1) such legal assistants as each member may require, (2) employees to maintain an index and digest of its decisions, and (3) trial examiners to conduct hearings. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board or the Administrator to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation or for statistical work.

"(e) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

"SEC. 4. There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government an office of Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act (in this act called the 'Administrator'). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with reference to his fitness to perform the functions imposed upon him by this act in a fair and impartial manner, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. He shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Administrator may establish or utilize such regional, State, local, or other agencies as may from time to time be needed. The Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may from time to time find necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties, except that the heads of the regional offices and the chief legal officer in each of such offices shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Attorneys appointed under this subsection may, in the discretion of the Administrator, appear for and represent the Administrator in any case in court. In case of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator, or in case of the absence of the Administrator, the President shall designate the officer or employee of the Administrator who shall serve as Administrator during such vacancy or absence. Expenses of the Administrator, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the Administrator or employees of the Administrator under his orders while away from his or their official station, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Administrator or by any employee he designates for that purpose. It shall be the duty of the Administrator, as hereinafter provided, to investigate charges of unfair labor practices, to issue complaints if he has reasonable cause to believe such charges are true, to prosecute such complaints before the Board, to make application to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board, to investigate representation petitions and conduct elections under section 9, and to exercise such other functions as are conferred on him by this act. The Administrator shall be made a party to all proceedings before the Board under section 10, and shall present such testimony therein and request the Board to take such action with respect thereto as in his opinion will carry out the policies of this act.

"LOCATION OF PRINCIPAL OFFICES OF BOARD AND OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 5. The principal offices of the Board and of the Administrator, respectively, shall be in the District of Columbia, but they may exercise any or all of their respective powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by any trial examiner or examiners, conduct hearings in any part of the United States. The conducting of any such hearing by a member shall not disqualify such member from subsequently participating in a decision of the Board in the same case.

"REGULATIONS AUTHORITY

"SEC. 6. The Board and the Administrator, respectively, shall have authority from time to time, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, to make, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out their respective functions under this act.

"RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 7. (a) Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist any labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities (not constituting unfair labor practices under section 8 (b), unlawful concerted activities under section 12, or violations of collective-bargaining agreements) for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

"(b) Members of any labor organization shall have the right to be free from unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands of such organization, to freely express their views either within or without the organization on any subject matter without being subjected to disciplinary action by the organization, and to have the affairs of the organization conducted in a manner that is fair to its members and in conformity with the free will of a majority of the members.

"UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 (a).

"(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization (A) by preventing such organization from determining independently or out of the employer's presence its own policies or planning independently or out of the employer's presence its own objects and courses of action; or (B) by giving, or offering to give, any reward, favor, or other thing of value to any person in a position of trust in such organization for the purpose of perverting his judgment or corrupting his conduct in respect to such organization; or (C) by assisting any labor organization (i) through deducting from the wages of any employee dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions payable by the employee to a labor organization, or collecting or assisting in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions, unless such action has been voluntarily authorized in writing by such employee and such authorization is revocable by the employee at any time upon 30 days' written notice to the employer, or (ii) through making payments of any kind to such organization directly or indirectly, or to any fund or trust established by such organization, or to any fund or trust in respect of the management of which, or the disbursements from which, such organization can, either alone or in conjunction with any other person, exercise any control, directly or indirectly;

"(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by any employee or any individual seeking employment as an employee;

"(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act;

"(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees currently recognized by the employer or certified as such under section 9.

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employee, or for a representative or any officer thereof, or for any individual acting for or under the direction of a representative, or for or under the direction of any officer thereof—

"(1) by intimidating practices, to interfere with the exercise by employees of rights guaranteed in section 7 (a) or to compel or seek to compel any individual to become or remain a member of any labor organization;

"(2) in the case of a representative acting and currently recognized by the employer, or certified under section 9, as the representative of employees, to refuse to bargain collectively with the employer;

"(3) to call, authorize, engage in, or assist any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to compel the employer to accede to the inclusion in a collective-bargaining agreement of any provision which under section 2 (ii) is not included as a proper subject matter of collective bargaining.

"(c) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or any officer thereof, or for any individual acting for or under the direction of a labor organization or for or under the direction of any officer thereof—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce individuals in the exercise of rights guaranteed in section 7 (b);

"(2) to impose initiation fees in amounts in excess of $25 per member unless the Board shall find that initiation fees greater than that amount are reasonable under the circumstances; or to impose any dues, or general or special assessments that are not uniform upon the same class of members, or are in excess of such reasonable amounts as the members thereof, whom such organization represents or seeks to represent as a representative under section 9, by a majority of those voting, after due notice to the membership, shall authorize; or to impose any tax or exaction on any person for any work permit or other arrangement whereby the person paying such tax or exaction would receive in return therefor the ostensible right to work or to conduct his business free from interference from such organization;

"(3) to compel any member to agree to contribute to, or participate in, any insurance or other benefit plan;

"(4) to deny to any member the right to resign from the organization at any time;

"(5) to fine or discriminate against any member, or subject him to any discipline or penalty, on account of his having criticized, complained of, or made charges or instituted proceedings against, the organization or any of its officers, or on account of his having supported or failed to support any candidate for civil office or for any office in the labor organization, or on account of his having supported or failed to support any proposition submitted to the labor organization, or to citizens generally, for a vote.

"(6) to expel or suspend any member without affording him an opportunity to be heard, or on any ground other than (A) nonpayment of dues; (B) disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; (C) participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement to which the labor organization was a party; (D) being a member of the Communist Party, or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force; (E) conviction of a felony; or (F) engaging in scandalous conduct tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute or in other conduct subjecting it to civil damages or criminal penalties;

"(7) to take any action or make any arrangements that would have the effect of requiring an employer to deny employment to, or terminate the employment of, any individual (A) to whom membership in such organization was not available on the same terms and conditions as those applicable to other members, or (B) to whom membership in such organization was denied on some ground other than failure to tender the initiation fees and dues uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership therein;

"(8) to deny a secret ballot and an open count of ballots cast, on any question involving fees, dues, assessments, fines, striking, the nomination and election of officers of local labor organizations, or the expulsion of any member; or to fail to hold elections of its officers and elective personnel at least once every 4 years; or to direct or call a strike, unless at least a majority of those voting on the question have, after the membership has received due notice of proposed balloting thereon, authorized such strike;

"(9) to employ, engage, or direct any person to spy upon any member respecting his exercise or enjoyment of any lawful right, or to intimidate his family, or injure the person or property of such member or his family;

"(10) to fail to keep adequate record of its financial transactions or to fail to present annually to each member, whom it represents or seeks to represent as a representative under section 9, within 60 days after the end of its fiscal year a detailed written financial report thereof in the form of a balance sheet and an operating statement.

"(d) The following shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act:

"(1) Expressing any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, if it does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal.

"(2) Permitting employees to confer with the employer during working hours without loss of time or pay.

"(3) Forming or maintaining by an employer of a committee of employees and discussing with it matters of mutual interest, including grievances, wages, hours of employment, and other working conditions, if the Board has not certified or the employer has not recognized a representative as their representative under section 9.

"(4) Agreeing to, and after the procedure specified in section 9 (g) has been complied with (but not before), making effective and carrying out, provisions of a collective-bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization that is certified under section 9 as the representative of the employees in any bargaining unit of the employer (if such provisions are not in conflict with the law of any State in which the agreement is to be carried out), whereby the employer obligates himself in either of the following respects:

"(A) Not to retain in his employ in such unit any employee who, being a member of such organization 30 days from the date such provisions become effective, or becoming a member thereafter, fails to maintain his membership therein;

"(B) Not to retain in his employ in such unit any employee who fails to become a member of such organization within not less than 30 days after his employment, or within not less than 30 days after the date such provisions become effective, whichever last occurs, or who, having become a member within such period, fails to maintain his membership therein;

except that no such provision may have the effect of denying employment or continued employment to any individual who on or before the time required tenders to the organization the initiation fees and dues regularly imposed as a condition of membership therein and to whom, in spite of such tender, membership therein was denied, or of denying employment or continued employment to an individual who has been suspended or expelled from the organization on some ground other than nonpayment of regular dues.

"REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purpose of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining: *Provided*, That any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to, and settle grievances with, their employer without the intervention of the bargaining representative if the settlement is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement then in effect.

"(b) The Board shall upon application under, and subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, determine in each case whether, in order to insure to employees full freedom to exercise their rights under section 7 (a), the unit appropriate for that purpose shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivisions thereof.

"(c) Whenever written application is made to the Administrator under oath—

"(1) by a representative representing at least 30 percent of the employees in a unit claimed by such representative to be appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b), requesting an election to determine whether the employees in such unit do or do not desire to designate such representative as their representative for collective bargaining; or

"(2) by employees, or some person acting for employees, who constitute at least 30 percent of the employees in a unit claimed by them to be appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b), requesting an election to determine whether a representative that has been certified or is currently recognized by the employer as the bargaining representative is no longer a representative under subsection (a) of this section; or

"(3) by an employer alleging that any representative has presented to him a claim that such representative represents a majority of the employees in a specified unit for the purposes of collective bargaining;

the Administrator shall investigate such application, and if he has reasonable cause to believe that the facts stated therein are true and that a question of representation affecting commerce exists, he shall transmit such application, together with all documents pertaining thereto, to the Board.

"(d) The Board thereupon shall give due notice to interested persons of the filing of such application and set the matter for hearing within a reasonable time. Any interested person may intervene under regulations prescribed by the Board. If upon the evidence adduced at the hearing the Board finds that a question of representation affecting commerce exists and that the action requested in the application is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes specified in subsection (b), it shall by order determine the unit appropriate for the purposes so specified (subject, however, to the limitations of subsection (f)), shall direct the Administrator to provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the unit so determined, and shall certify the results thereof.

"(e) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following a hearing pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, and there is a petition for the en-

forcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such hearing shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under subsections (e) or (f) of section 10, and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing, modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.

"(f) The Board shall exercise its powers under subsections (b) and (d) subject to the following limitations:

"(1) A representative that has been designated or acts as the representative of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representative of employees of any competing employer, unless the employees of such employers whom the representative seeks to represent are regularly less than 100 in number and the plants or other facilities of such employers at which the representative acts and seeks to act as such are less than 50 miles apart, but nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any representatives from being affiliated or associated, directly or through a federation, association, or parent organization, with representatives of employees of competing employers, if the collective bargaining, concerted activities, or terms of collective bargains or arrangements of such representatives are not subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval.

"(2) Upon application of any interested person or persons, the Board shall direct the Administrator to provide for a separate ballot for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group within a proposed bargaining unit, and shall exclude from the bargaining unit any such group if less than a majority of the employees in it who cast ballots shall have voted for the representative that the Board shall certify for such unit.

"(3) In determining whether a unit is appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b) the extent to which the employees have organized shall not be controlling.

"(4) In determining whether a question of representation affecting commerce exists, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply regardless of the identity of the person or persons filing the application or the kind of relief sought; and in no case shall the Administrator or the Board deny to employees the right to designate or select a representative by reason of an order of the Board with respect to such representative or its predecessor that would not have issued in similar circumstances with respect to a labor organization, national or international in scope, or affiliated with such an organization.

"(5) In all elections held to select representatives for collective bargaining, employees shall be given the choice on the ballot of voting for a representative (including one not appearing on the ballot) or for no representative; and where an election does not result in a majority vote for any representative, there shall be no run-off unless within 60 days following such election a representative receiving votes in such election furnishes the Board satisfactory evidence that it represents more than 50 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit in question, in which event the run-off shall be between such representative and no representative.

"(6) No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its national or international officers, or one or more of the officers of the organization designated on the ballot taken under subsection (d), is a member of the Communist Party or by reason of active and consistent promotion or support of the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party can reasonably be regarded as being a member of or affiliated with such party, or believes in, or is a member of or supports any organization that believe in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

"(7) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision thereof, within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held, except upon an application filed by employees under subsection (c) (2) of this section.

"(8) If, pursuant to any election under this section, a bargaining representative is chosen for any unit and a collective-bargaining contract covering such unit is then in effect, certification of the new representative shall not be effective unless and until such new representative becomes a party to such contract and agrees to be bound in all respects by its terms for the remainder of the contract period.

"(g) A labor organization which has made an agreement with an employer containing provisions described in section 8 (d) (4) shall be required, as a condition to being entitled to have such provision carried out by the employer, to make application to the Administrator for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether the employees in such unit desire to have such provision carried out. The application shall be under oath and must state that the employer's agreement to such provision was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof. The Administrator shall forthwith give notice to the employer of the filing of such application, and if within such reasonable time thereafter as may be prescribed by regulations of the Board the employer has not made objection to such application, the Administrator shall provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether they desire to have such provision carried out. If within the time so prescribed the employer does make objection to the application and if in the opinion of the Administrator the matter is one concerning commerce, he shall transmit the application, together with all documents pertaining thereto, to the Board, the Board shall thereupon give due notice to interested persons of the filing of such application and set the matter for hearing within a reasonable time. Any interested person may intervene under regulations prescribed by the Board. If upon the evidence adduced at the hearing the Board finds that the facts stated in the application are true and that the matter is one affecting commerce, it shall direct the Administrator to provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether they desire such provision of the agreement with the employer carried out. Such provision may be carried out by the employer only if upon the secret ballot taken under this subsection a majority of all of the employees in the bargaining unit have voted in favor thereof. An election under this subsection shall be effective to authorize the carrying out of provisions described in section 8 (d) (4) only for a period which does not extend beyond the date of the termination of the agreement in which such provisions are included, beyond 2 years from the date on which such agreement was entered into, whichever first occurs.

"(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of hearings by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations and rules of decision of the Board.

"PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to adjudicate complaints of unfair labor practices affecting commerce filed by the Administrator. Such power of the Board shall be exclusive.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Administrator shall forthwith give notice to the party complained of, shall investigate such charge, and if he has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true, he shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating such charge, except that the Administrator shall not have power to issue a complaint stating a charge of any unfair labor practice that occurred more than 6 months prior to the date on which such charge was filed with the Administrator, or stating a charge of any unfair labor practice that was filed with the Administrator more than 6 months prior to such issuance. The person complained of shall have 20 days within which to answer and serve such answer on the Administrator, unless such period is extended by the Administrator. The Administrator shall file the complaint and any answer thereto with the Board. Upon application of the Administrator or any person charged in the complaint, the Board shall set the case for hearing before the Board or a member thereof, or before a designated trial examiner or examiners, at a place which the Board shall fix, not less than 15 days after the making of such application. Any such complaint or answer may, with the approval of the Board, or with the approval of the members, examiner, or examiners conducting the hearing, be amended at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to appear in person or otherwise give evidence at the place and time fixed by the Board. In the discretion of the Board, or the member, examiner, or examiners conducting the hearing, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to give evidence. Any such proceeding shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 723–B, 723–C).

"(c) The evidence before the Board, member, examiner, or examiners shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. Thereafter upon application of any party, the Board upon notice may, in its discretion, receive further evidence or hear argument. If upon the weight of the evidence the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action requested in the complaint (which in the case of unfair labor practices under section 8 (a) may include reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, and in the case of unfair labor practices under section 8 (b) or 8 (c) may include deprivation of rights under this act for a period not exceeding 1 year) as will effectuate the policies of this act. Such order may further require such person to make reports from time to time to the Administrator showing the extent to which he has complied with the order. If upon the weight of the evidence the Board shall not be of the opinion in the case of any person named in the complaint that such person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint as to such person. No order of the Board shall require or forbid any action by an employer with respect to any labor organization that in similar circumstances would not be required or forbidden with respect to a labor organization national or international in scope, or affiliated with such an organization. No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee,

or the payment to him of any back pay, unless the weight of the evidence shows that such individual was not suspended or discharged for cause. In case the evidence is presented before a member of the Board, or before an examiner or examiners thereof, such member, or such examiner or examiners, as the case may be, shall issue and cause to be served on the parties to the proceeding a proposed report, together with a recommended order, which shall be filed with the Board, and if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service thereof upon such parties, or within such further period as the Board may authorize, such recommended order shall become the order of the Board and become effective as therein prescribed.

"(d) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Board may, upon application of any party, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(e) If any person against whom an order of the Board shall issue fails to comply therewith within such reasonable period as the Board shall specify, or thereafter shall violate such order, the Administrator shall petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia), or if all the circuit courts of appeals to which the application may be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair labor practice in question occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board. No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, or its examiner or examiners, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board as to the facts shall be conclusive unless it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court either (1) that the findings of fact are against the manifest weight of the evidence, or (2) that the findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners and to be made a part of the transcript. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which shall be conclusive unless it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court either (1) that such findings of fact are against the manifest weight of the evidence, or (2) that such findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence, and the Board shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board (including an order or certification under section 9) granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought, may obtain a review of such order or certification in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside or, in the case of a certification, that the certification be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Administrator, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleadings and evidence upon which the order or certification complained of was entered and the findings and order on certification of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Administrator under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioner such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board, or affirming or setting aside the certification; and the findings of the Board as to the facts shall have the same weight as in the case of an application by the Administrator.

"(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order or certification.

"(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101-115).

"(i) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously and, if possible, within 10 days after they have been docketed.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of any proceeding before the Board, or before a member, examiner, or examiners thereof, or for the purpose of any investigation by the Administrator under section 9—

"(1) The Board, or any member thereof, or any trial examiner shall, upon application of the Administrator or any party to such proceedings, forthwith issue to the Administrator or to such party as the case may be, in the name of the Board, subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application. Within 5 days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Board or its duly authorized agent or agents to revoke, and the Board, or such agent or agents, shall revoke such subpena if in its, his, or their opinion, as the case may be, the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in its, his, or their opinion, as the case may be, such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. The Administrator or any member of the Board or any examiner or examiners designated by the Board for such purposes may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the person to whom such a subpena was issued by the Board, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person so guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey an order requiring him to appear before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, or before the Administrator if the subpena so directs, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty of forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(4) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers provided for in this act may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegrapi or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Administrator or before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(5) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(6) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Administra-

tor, upon his request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"UNLAWFUL CONCERTED ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 12. (a) The following activities, when affecting commerce, shall be unlawful concerted activities:

"(1) By the use of force or violence or threats thereof, preventing or attempting to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of, or from accepting or refusing employment by, any employer; or by the use of force, violence, physical obstruction, or threats thereof, preventing or attempting to prevent any individual from freely going from any place and entering upon an employer's premises, or from freely leaving an employer's premises and going to any other place; or picketing an employer's place of business in numbers or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required to give notice of the existence of a labor dispute at such place of business; or picketing or besetting the home of any individual in connection with any labor dispute.

"(2) Picketing an employer's premises for the purpose of leading persons to believe that there exists a labor dispute involving such employer, in any case in which the employees are not involved in a labor dispute with their employer.

"(3) Calling, authorizing, engaging in, or assisting—

"(A) any sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, or illegal boycott, or any sit-down strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations conducted by remaining on the employer's premises;

"(B) any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to compel an employer to accede to featherbedding practices;

"(C) any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is (i) to compel any employer to recognize for collective bargaining a representative not certified under section 9 as the representatives of the employees, or (ii) to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act, or (iii) to compel an employer to violate any law or any regulation, order, or direction issued pursuant to any law.

"(b) Any person injured in his business, person, or property by an unlawful concerted activity affecting commerce may sue the person or persons responsible therefor in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without regard to the amount in controversy, and may recover the damages sustained by him as a result of such unlawful concerted activity, together with the costs of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

"(c) No provision of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', shall have any application in any action or proceeding in a court of the United States involving any activity defined in this section as unlawful.

"(d) A person who is found to have engaged in any activity herein defined as an unlawful concerted activity shall be subject to deprivation of rights under this act to the same extent as a person found to have engaged in an unfair labor practice under section 8 (b) or 8 (c).

"(e) Except as specifically provided in this section, nothing in this act shall be construed to diminish the right of employees to strike or to engage in other lawful concerted activities. No provision of this act, and no order of any court issued hereunder, shall be construed to require any individual to perform labor or service without his consent.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'National Labor Relations Act'."

Mr. BARDEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that section 101 contains over 47 pages, beginning on page 3, line 1, and ending on page 51, line 12, I ask unanimous consent that that section be considered as read and that it be printed in the RECORD and that we proceed with the consideration of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 21, after the letter "a", insert "current."

Page 5, line 18, strike out the word "or" and insert "of."

Page 10, line 2, strike out the words "procedures and practices relating to."

Page 11, line 14, after the word "who", insert "by the nature of his duties."

Page 15, line 23, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$12,000."

Page 17, line 7, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$12,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 19, line 18, after the comma, insert "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude an employer from making and carrying out an agreement with a labor organization as authorized in section 8 (d) (4)."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I objected to this committee amendment in committee, and I am carrying my objection to the floor for the reason that I do not believe it has any place in section 7 of the act. The latter part of the amendment states:

Provided, That nothing herein shall preclude an employer from making and carrying out an agreement with a labor organization as authorized in section 8 (d) (4).

This language belongs immediately after section 8 (a) (3) and not in section 7, and at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to place that after section 8 (a) (3).

With respect to the remaining words, "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities," I call the attention of the chairman to the fact that section 7 provides:

(a) Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist any labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities (not constituting unfair labor practices under section 8 (b), unlawful concerted activities under section 12, or violations of collective-bargaining agreements) for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

I submit that when you are giving the employees the right to bargain collectively by virtue of section 7, and encouraging them to do so, to place the words at the end thereof "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all such activities," is redundant because the words are unnecessary, inasmuch as they have the right to so refrain, but it indicates a desire on the part of Congress to discourage them, asking them to refrain from so doing. I therefore oppose this committee amendment and ask that it be voted down.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARTLEY. As I understand the gentleman's contention, he thinks it would be in better form to have it in section 8?

Mr. OWENS. Section 8 (a) (3). If this can be done in conference, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has been my purpose to offer an amendment to the committee amendment beginning on line 18 by striking out the proviso beginning in line 20. Now I understand that something has been said here about that committee amendment belonging in section 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the Committee at this time is whether or not this particular committee amendment shall be agreed to. The gentleman from Illinois has opposed the amendment. The gentleman may offer an amendment to the committee amendment if he desires to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to offer several amendments. They all seek the same purpose, I may say to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether or not the committee amendment shall be agreed to. The committee amendment may be amended by the gentleman if he desires, otherwise the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 19, strike out beginning with the colon in line 20 down through "(4)" in line 22.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first written, it contained a provision for the open shop. Since that time there has been written into the bill a provision for the union shop, and out through the country has gone the impression that the committee bill bans the closed shop.

That is a play upon words. There is little, if any, practical difference between a union shop and a closed shop. In a closed shop the men, when they go to work, must be members of the union. This bill provides that if the employer and the majority of the employees agree, the shop then becomes a union shop, which means that everyone who is employed in that shop must not later than 30 days from the time he becomes an

employee or within 30 days from the adoption of the union shop become a member of the union and continue therein as such so long as he works in that shop.

There is nothing to be gained by attempting to deceive the people, because sooner or later this play upon words, "union shop and closed shop," will be disclosed for just what it is. The committee, as I said in the first instance, provided for an open shop. There were in the original draft of the bill these words:

And shall also have the right—

That is, the employee shall have the right—

to refrain from any and all such activity.

Which meant simply that a man should have the right to join or not to join, to be bound by or not to be bound by, union rules. If this Congress wants to forsake the American principle that the man who must live by toil, who must work if he would eat, have clothing, a home, and be able to provide for his family—if this Congress wants to turn its back upon that principle and say that no man shall work when the employer and a bare majority of the employees say that he cannot work unless he conforms to their rules and restrictions—it has the power to do so. But my contention is, if we are going to write a labor bill for the benefit of the man who works, then we should amend this section and subsequent sections and provide that any and every man should have the opportunity to work at, when, and where he can find a job.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all that the gentleman from Michigan is attempting to do is to take out the proviso and leave the words in the bill that I mentioned would cause the Congress to be encouraging employees not to become members of the labor unions and, in fact, take away the union shop.

I am asking now for the sake of these employees whom we are trying to help and not hurt that we vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, after which time I will withdraw my motion and let it be taken care of in conference.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the argument of the gentleman from Michigan, it is that he seeks to strike from the bill the provisions that would permit union-shop agreements under the circumstances outlined in the bill, and also, if I understood him correctly, what he is trying to get at is to provide for the outlawing of the union shop as well as the outlawing of the closed shop.

Mr. OWENS. That is exactly what he is trying to get at.

Mr. HALLECK. I want my position known as far as that provision is concerned. I think it should be understood by everybody that the union shop stems from a contract made between employer and employee. If I understand the committee provision, it simply is that the matter is to be left to free agreement between the two bodies. The employer is protected against coercion and what we might call blackjacking, which might force him to sign such an agreement. On the employees' side there is a provision for a vote. If a majority votes for such union-shop agreement, and the employer agrees to it, freely and voluntarily, then the union-shop contract may go into effect. Otherwise, it may not go into effect.

Mr. OWENS. That is exactly correct. In other words, it is the same as under the previous act, where there was a proviso that permitted the employer to deal. In this particular case, if the employer desires a union shop, and so expresses it to the committee, and the labor organization makes an affidavit to the Administrator stating that the employer wants a union shop, and that no coercion has been exercised to secure it, the Administrator provides for a secret election, at which, if a majority of the employees vote for a union shop, thereby they have a union shop, subject to certain restrictions whereby the union cannot vote a man out of the union or refuse to take his dues, and so forth.

Mr. HALLECK. Does not the bill recommended by the committee also contain a provision granting to the States authority to deal with this whole problem if they so desire?

Mr. OWENS. Absolutely. The States can deal with the problem. It does not affect in any way the many States that have already acted upon it and others that probably will act upon it. Therefore, I say the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. A question was raised as to my position. I want the committee to understand that I stand with the committee on that provision.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most vital provisions of the entire bill. This is the provision that deals with union security. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] you will have no union security in this Nation. I, for one, believe that in our complex industrial society we should permit and encourage voluntary union security, in order that the American worker may fairly combat the large concentration of economic power that exists on the other side. That is the issue and the only issue in this particular amendment.

I call upon you all to join together and vote down this proposal to abolish union security.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of several provisions contained in this bill which deals with the so-called union-shop provision. Other amendments are expected to be offered as various sections are reached, provided this one is adopted, which pertain to this subject of whether we should or should not provide for the union shop in this bill. So the question is presented here, and it might as well be decided now, this being an important provision pertaining to that subject. It is just a question of whether or not this Congress wants to adopt the policy now of giving legislative recognition to the so-called union shop as a matter of public policy in this country.

The way the bill is now written it is permissible for the employees, if at least 51 percent of them in a plant or company vote for the union shop, to make it binding on those who do not vote for it.

Personally, I feel that it is a form of involuntary servitude; that it is unfair for, say, 51 percent of the employees in a plant to control the other 49 percent who perhaps are opposed to that sort of thing; yet, if as many as 51 percent of the members of the bargaining unit in a plant vote in favor of the closed shop—and that is the effect of it if the union-shop provision once goes into effect—the other 49 percent have no option; they have to pay the dues and do as they are told to do, or they are not allowed to work.

I think the right to work is one of the most sacred rights a man has. It is the right to exist. It is by work that men live. It is one of the most fundamental things we have to deal with. The right to life implies the right to work. I think it is a fundamentally wrong American public policy for this Congress to put its approval upon that sort of thing and say to 49 percent of the workers in a plant that because they happen to be outvoted by a few men they have got to accede to their desires and their wishes, join a union, pay dues, pay initiation fees, or get out and go try to find another job if they can find one. In an industry-wide union shop, they lose their right to work in that industry or industries. That is exactly the situation with which we are faced. If you want that kind of thing you should vote against this amendment. If you are opposed to that sort of thing you should vote for this amendment. We are face to face with that issue right now. In a completely unionized society, failure to join a union or expulsion from a union, would mean the absolute loss of the right to work.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that can intervene without any action on the part of the employer.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes. The employees have the right through an election to determine whether or not there will be an open shop or whether the union-shop provisions shall be contained in the contract.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that requires only 51 percent, no more.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; just a majority.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is not the provision of this bill "a majority of all the employees" as against the requirement under the present law of "a majority of those voting"?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is confused in his reference to the present law. It is a majority vote of the bargaining unit.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of all those voting.

Mr. FISHER. A majority of those in the bargaining unit must agree to it.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. If the union should get out of hand as the gentleman supposes might be possible, would it not be within the province of the employer to correct that when the next contract came up for signing in not recognizing the union shop or insisting that there not be a union shop?

Mr. FISHER. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that that question was discussed considerably. The employer can object. I doubt if it would be an effective objection, because the union could insist upon other conditions in the contract which they would never agree to until he came around on the union-shop issue. I think it would open the thing wide for demands to be made and to be maintained and to be insisted upon with the same effect that you have now. In my judgment, that would be the effect of it.

I feel that, if the majority of those working in a plant want the union-shop provision, if they think it is a good thing, if it is a good thing for the majority of the members, then they can sell it to the others. If they can make the benefits of union membership sufficiently attractive, the employees will join voluntarily.

Under the Railway Labor Act now, by act of the Congress of the United States, the closed shop and the union shop are prohibited, and the check-off is prohibited, and they get along very well. There has not been any of the disaster that has been depicted here. Most all of the railroad employees are union men. They become sold on its merits and voluntarily join. The railway unions are among the best and strongest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When a shop once becomes a union shop by agreement between the employer and the employees, is it not from then on in effect a closed shop? That is, when one is employed in that place of business he knows right then and there that from the date of his employment he must become a member of that union or else he cannot work in that shop.

Mr. FISHER. That is exactly right. The union shop and the closed shop are Siamese twins. In either case a man cannot work unless he belongs to the union, whether he wants to belong or not. I think any employee should have the right to join if he desires, but my objection is to compulsion where the right to work is involved. The right to work should come first.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The fact is he will from the day of employment be paying tribute to someone or else he does not work in the shop?

Mr. FISHER. He must continue membership in good standing in the union or he may be dismissed from the union for proper reasons and then, of course, he cannot work in the plant any longer, or in that industry any longer if it is covered by an industry-wide contract.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is in the bill to prohibit the employees in a shop from forcing the employer to agree to a union shop?

Mr. FISHER. I think that would be the effect of it. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not also true that his membership in that union shop is limited to the duration of the contract, which under no conditions shall exceed 2 years?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. HARTLEY. In other words, if they wanted a nonunion shop after that they could vote by a majority and do away with it?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to ask the gentleman if a majority of any group and the employer agree to a thing, where do we get our authority to say that the majority shall not rule, that they shall not make the kind of contract they want to make?

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman wants a majority of the people working in that plant, the 51 percent, to control the lives and destinies and the question of whether they do or do not belong to a union forced upon the other 49 percent, then his argument is a sound one; but the fact that 51 percent of the members of the committee voted for this bill does not necessarily mean that the other 49 percent have to vote for it or be expelled from the Congress for their failure to do so.

Mr. BREHM. We live in a country of majority rule. Fifty-one percent can elect a President that some of us think should not be elected, but we have to put up with it.

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman feels it is sound policy for 51 percent in a plant to force the other 49 percent to be members of a labor union in order to make a living for themselves and their families, then he is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House want to punish unions they will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The Committee on Education and Labor had no notion of punishing labor unions. It does not want to punish labor unions. It only wants to improve the conditions of union membership. That is why it included the wording that appears in the bill before you.

There are millions of workmen in this country today who are working under union-shop conditions. I dare say they are the majority of all employees in this country working under union contract.

Let me outline again just what a union shop is. A man applies for work with a particular employer. He knows that a union shop is in effect in that plant. He knows that if the employer accepts him he will be compelled to join the union within 30 days. If he does not want to join the union he will not apply for work with that particular employer. The employer takes him. Within 30 days the man joins the union. What is his obligation from then on? He only has two obligations: No. 1, to pay the initiation fee, which is regulated under this bill, and No. 2, to pay his dues. He is protected from any oppressive tactics on the part of union officials. He undergoes no risk. He undertakes merely the obligation to help support the union which in turn represents him in dealing with his employer.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is agreed to we upset countless contracts in this country under which millions of men are working on union terms satisfactory to the men and satisfactory to the employer.

I urge upon the House the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman think that to pass this amendment, with these thousands of contracts and millions of workers now operating under a union-shop contract, would be apt to lead to greater industrial unrest in this country than would accrue by reason of the passage of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. In my opinion the enactment of this amendment would lead to complete chaos in labor relations.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not true also that under the terms of this bill we raise the requirements from the present status of unions where 5 to 10 percent of the membership control the situation to more than 50 percent under the terms of this bill and, furthermore, that this vote must be taken by secret ballot?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it not also be fair to say that by the provisions of the bill the employer is made a free agent in determining whether or not he shall sign such a contract or shall not sign it?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What happens to the closed-shop contracts already in existence? Are they required to go through the secret ballot?

Mr. BUCK. The closed shop under this law is abolished, and the closed-shop contracts, after the lapse of a certain amount of time, become inoperative. Then, if the members desire union-shop conditions, they will use the ballot as provided under this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is also fair to say, is it not, that after a man becomes a member of the union, if he should thereafter fail to pay his dues to the union, that he loses his job?

Mr. BUCK. That is correct, but when the employee takes his job with that company he knows that fact in advance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman just made a statement that I want to be very positive about. The bill now before us, if enacted into law in its present form, will outlaw, after the date stated in the bill, every closed-shop contract in the United States; is that correct?

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, having outlawed the contract, the employer and a majority of the employees, 51 percent plus, may proceed to negotiate a union contract.

Mr. BUCK. For a union shop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the employer and the employees having agreed on that contract, an employee may then have 30 days in which to make up his mind as to whether or not he will go along with the 51 percent plus.

Mr. BUCK. That is right. If he does not go along then he can no longer remain an employee of the company.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or work in that plant where a contract was created under the law.

Mr. BUCK. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the situation?

Mr. BUCK. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, to understand the gentleman, then, the Hoffman amendment would do exactly what?

Mr. BUCK. The Hoffman amendment would outlaw the provision for a union shop. It would destroy union security and deny the union any assured membership support in any plant even where the employees want it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And generally upset the provisions of the entire bill, you might say.

Mr. BUCK. I feel that way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The question has been raised as to the position of the employer in this union-shop arrangement. I direct the attention of the Committee to page 34 of the bill, where they will find, beginning in line 20, these words:

> The application—

And that is referring to the application for such a union-shop contract—

> shall be under oath and must state the employer's agreement to such provision was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof.

Of course, the application is filed with the Administrator.

It is provided further, beginning with line 7, page 35:

> If within the time so prescribed the employer does make objection to the application—

And so forth.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. This amendment, if adopted, would say that if every employee unanimously voted for the union shop and the employer wanted the union shop, still they could not have it; and I do not mean just exactly 51 percent, but unanimously.

Mr. BUCK. It would be illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

In the State of Wisconsin we have in our statutes what is known as the voluntary union shop. It is quite similar to the provision written into this committee bill. As other gentlemen have stated, it is not a proposition concerning which the employees may strike or collectively bargain. Under the committee bill, it is permitted only where the employer and the employees—that is, 51 percent of them—want it. I think those who want to outlaw even that evidence the fact that they are essentially against the idea of a union, or at least they want to cripple it to the point where it must be ineffective.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that with the provision on page 34 it does not make any difference whether you have this amendment or any similar amendment, because in fact you destroy the union shop by prohibiting a strike in favor of it?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. You permit it where it is voluntary.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, but how many employers are going to agree to a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think there are a great many of them that want union shops.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did many of the employer witnesses before our committee show any evidence that they desired a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think probably the majority of them did not, but some took the other position.

Mr. KENNEDY. This amendment is really unimportant because you are not going to have many union shops anyway.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think we are going to have a number of them, because I think the enlightened employer sees the value of a union.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman really feel that if you are going to have a union shop, and you should have, you should strike out that section on page 34 that forbids the right to strike to get a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Personally I am in favor of permitting the employees to bargain for a union shop.

Mr. KENNEDY. And to strike if they want to?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman comes from a State where they have statutes providing for a voluntary closed shop.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes, a voluntary union shop.

Mr. MACKINNON. Will the gentleman enlighten the House as to what the experience under that has been, whether there has been any substantial disruption of the legitimate labor-union activity?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As far as I know there has been none whatsoever in regard to Wisconsin. You have a similar provision in this bill. As I stated a moment ago, those that would want to outlaw even the union shop are those that are essentially against the idea of a union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that the troubles of not only Allis-Chalmers in the gentleman's own district but the J. I. Case people grew out of the fact that they have refused to sign a union-shop contract?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The trouble with the Allis-Chalmers situation was that the local there was dominated by Communist officers. That was the chief over-all proposition in the dispute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has not the company refused to sign a union-shop contract?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It has refused to deal with that particular group on almost anything because they were Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does not the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. What is the question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think they have refused, among other reasons, for the reason that that contract calls for a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As I understand, the reason for refusing to negotiate with that group of officers is that they were Communists and Communist dominated.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The fact is that if this amendment is voted down and they do write into this bill a recognition of the union-shop philosophy and authorize it where a majority of the people working in a plant vote for it, and it is agreed to by the employer, under that condition as many as 49 percent of the people working in that plant may be required and forced to pay union dues and belong to the union in order to work there; otherwise they must leave that plant. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is correct, if the employer agrees to it. In my opinion, the situation there is that when a majority of the workers in that plant want a union and the employer wants it, every person in that employ should belong to that union.

I also understand that the provisions of the bill, as the gentleman well knows, also prohibit every type of racketeering that has existed heretofore and very definitely it regulates the activities of the unions so that 49 percent, to which the gentleman refers, would in nowise be punished in any respect. They are merely required to pay reasonable dues which are required for the unions.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. Its adoption will in nowise punish the workingmen as has been alleged. It may not be so good for some labor leaders and politicians, but there is nothing wrong about it so far as those who really earn their living by toil are concerned, and I think it is they that deserve primary consideration.

I want to say a word in reply to the argument that is so often made that a majority of the employees in a plant have the right to impose their will upon the minority, forcing them to pay tribute for the right to work, and so forth, because they receive certain benefits which would not otherwise accrue to them. If this is a correct principle now, then the whole Constitution rests on an entirely false basis. One of the underlying concepts of that charter is protection of the rights of minorities. The idea that a majority knows what is best for a minority and can impose its will upon them is a purely authoritarian concept. The important point to be noted here is that it is the political regime controlling our Government that is forcing the minority in a plant to become subservient to the majority. It should not be overlooked that it is Federal law that empowers the majority to exercise control over the minority. Therein lies the fundamental wrong. Nothing can justify that.

Furthermore, the analogy which is sought to be drawn between an arrangement such as that provided under the Wagner Act which empowers a majority to force its will upon a minority on the one hand and majority rule in matters politic on the other is a wholly false analogy. The Constitution postulates the protection of minorities by majority rule, not the plundering of them.

Indeed, it is difficult to find in any stage in the development of trades unionism the absence of strong political interest.

We are primarily dealing not with any fundamental differences that exist between employers and employees—basically this is essentially a political problem.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. It has been pointed out repeatedly that this kind of an arrangement may be voluntarily arrived at through a majority of the members of the employees in a plant agreeing with management. Does not the gentleman believe that this issue should not be settled on that basis, but should be approached on the basis of sound public policy as to whether the Congress of the United States wants to adopt a measure which would approve of a situation which would force union membership before a man is allowed to work in any particular place?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think the gentleman is quite correct. In other words, I think we ought to go back to the Constitution of the United States. All this amendment does is reassert the provisions in the Constitution which guarantee to every man the liberty to work where he pleases, at what work he can get that suits him best, for such wages as he can bargain for voluntarily with his employer without having to pay tribute to anyone or belong to any organization. That is my view of this amendment. Ninety-nine percent of the Members of the House know that is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman just made a very truthful statement, that is, if this amendment is not adopted, under the bill as it is now written, a man who goes to work in a union shop will have to pay tribute or else be out of his job. That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And is that not what your party has been opposing and speaking against for years?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You are right that it is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It has been stated by men who are opposed to this amendment that the provision in the bill does not impose involuntary servitude upon the minority. Of course it does.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to my beloved colleague.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I see the difficulty about majority rule, if you get a majority of the workmen in a plant who agree with the management of the plant that they want a union, why should they not have it? Many of the men of the minority of the employees, whether it be 49 percent or 30 percent or 15 percent, would get the benefit of that contract made between the majority of their fellow workmen and the management. It seems to me that it is not unreasonable that they should go along and contribute dues like the others.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, papa knows best? Is not that your proposition?

Let me emphasize that it is not the workingman that will be punished by the adoption of this amendment. What earthly right have we legislators to empower by law a majority of employees in a plant to force a minority to pay tribute to anybody for the right to work or to belong to any organization?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. You gentlemen are sincere. You lack hypocrisy. You are telling the Members of the Congress and the country what you want, although I am opposed to both of these amendments. Nevertheless, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will execute labor, while the committee amendment will merely give it a general anesthetic, but the result is the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that the political element which has intruded itself into employer-employee relationships has done more to create ill will and strife between those two groups than all other factors combined. Making political capital out of industrial capital is one of the oldest industries in the world. A study of the evolution of the trades-union movement in the different countries shows that politics has always been one of its prominent features.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not true that the gentleman in appearing before the committee, and now on the floor, is against any labor relations bill at all?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I urged in testimony before your committee the repeal of the Wagner and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. I did this purely in the interests of the workingmen themselves. My testimony will show that I took the position that the Wagner Act is not labor's Magna

Carta but its death warrant, that it is carrying them into slavery just as was done under Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany, and precisely by the same procedures.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman, in all frankness, opposed to collective bargaining?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is not opposed to collective bargaining if it is purely voluntary; if it is not imposed by force, that is, law. Bargaining imposed by law just is not bargaining. It is simply a species of paternalism or dictatorship.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman feel that in thousands of instances throughout this country it is necessary for the workingmen to be organized in a union in order to deal on a fair basis with its employer?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not opposed to unions. What I am opposed to is political meddling in the field of employer-employee relationships through trade-unions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition tc the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the speech of the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who just left the floor, in behalf of the Hoffman amendment. May I urge him to make a careful reading, if he has not already done so, of that very able opinion delivered by former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and former President of the United States, William Howard Taft, bearing on this identical question. It could not be said that Chief Justice Taft was ever accused of being one-sided in his support of labor. He said in that able opinion in a case that went up from Pennsylvania that under the Constitution of the United States the working people had the right to organize. He also said that it was necessary that the workers of this country have that right and exercise it because the individual worker could not protect himself against the organized brains and capital of this country. To meet the aggregate of capital and brains, it was necessary for the workers to organize their brains and brawn.

Our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], states that he is opposed to the closed shop or the union shop. Under the closed shop, the union in effect hires and fires the workers in a plant. Management merely advises the union of the number of workers required and the character of work they are to do and the union sends these men to the employer. No one can work in a closed shop unless he belongs to the union and the dues are collected by management and turned over to the union.

A union shop is somewhat different to a closed shop. Management selects and employs the workers and under proper conditions can discharge them. Under this bill, the workers in any shop, factory, mine, or plant can have a union shop provided 30 percent of the workers in any particular shop or plant petition to the Administrator under this act to establish a union shop and then if 51 percent of the workers in that plant, shop, or factory vote for the union shop and the employer agrees with the majority of his workers to have a union shop, then a union shop is established and the 51 percent of the workers, by their votes, elect a bargaining agent or representative. Of course, they can select such union as they desire and thereupon they can enter into a collective-bargaining agreement as to wages, working hours, working conditions, and other matters pertaining to their employment.

Labor organizations of this country, as well as management and business, have objected to the Government interfering in the affairs of the workers and management in matters pertaining to their wages, hours, working conditions, and so forth. This bill is most democratic. It puts it up to the workers and management as to whether or not they will have a union shop, a bargaining agent and collective bargaining. In the formation of the union, the workers who oppose it can vote against it. All of these elections are conducted under the proper supervision of the Government and the balloting is secret and must be free from coercion or fraud.

No act ever passed by Congres protects the rights of individual workers and the legitimate rights of the unions as well as the workers as this measure does. No union can expell its members except for just cause set forth in this bill. Some of our colleagues here today have denounced as racketeering the collection of union dues from the minority members who are opposed to the union shop and collective bargaining. No doubt, there have been abuses in the collection and disbursement of union dues. The purpose of this bill is to cure any such abuses.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any man on the floor of this House that brains and brawn have greatly increased the wages of the workers, shortened the hours of service and bettered their working conditions? If 51 percent of those employed in the shop, mill or mine, agree on the establishment of the union and select a bargaining agent and enter into a bargaining contract, it will benefit not only the 51 percent but also equally the 49 percent. Why should the 20 percent, the 30 percent, or the 49 percent of those in the minority not contribute their share of the necessary expenses of the union as well as the 51 percent or more? If the union is established in this way and benefits come to the workers all alike, is it not only fair that the beneficiaries, whether the majority or the minority, contribute their equal share in securing these benefits?

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not that analogous to a bond issue for the building of school houses or raising the pay of school teachers? It carries by a majority vote, yet those who vote against the issue must contribute their share of the public cost of the benefit.

Mr. ROBSION. My friend from Tennessee is certainly correct, but in the case of the increase of pay for teachers, I cannot see how it would be equitable for the teachers who benefit by their teachers' organizations in securing increased salaries and other benefits who fail to contribute to their teachers' associations or their national association through whose efforts the increase was brought about. In the Bar Association of lawyers or other legitimate groups, lodges, and so forth, certain benefits accrue to the members. Each member is expected and does contribute his part. I really believe each person, who is able to do so, should carry his part.

This bill will take the so-called racketeers out of labor unions and labor contracts. It will not be the Government running the labor unions—it will be the workers and employers themselves carrying on the business of management and labor. Our friend from Michigan, by his amendment, hopes to take away the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I agree with Chief Justice Taft that labor has the right, under the Constitution of the United States, to organize for the benefit of themselves and their families. They not only have the right, in my opinion, but it is necessary for them to do so. I have always favored honest, sincere, collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of the disputes arising between management and labor.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEEN MILLION DAYS LOST IN 1946

The Government records show that for the 6 years preceding the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933—NRA—the United States had an average of 753 strikes per year involving an average of 297,000 workers; during the next 6 years there were an average of 2,541 strikes per year involving an average of 1,181,000 workers a year, and during the next 5 years, that is 1939 through 1944, there was an average of 3,514 strikes a year involving an average of 1,508,000 workers. These strikes during those 12 years or 13 years represented the loss of tens of millions of man-days of work, but the number of strikes and man-days lost increased rapidly year by year. In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor was lost as a result of strikes—still on the increase. In 1946, according to the Government records, there were 4,985 strikes and there were 119,000,000 man-days lost. It is said that the average pay of workers involved in these strikes was approximately $10. That means that the workers alone involved lost $1,119,000,000 in wages in 1946.

Beginning with the NRA and on down to and including 1946, we see an increase in the number of strikes of 800 percent and the number of workers involved and the number of man-days lost greatly exceeded 800 percent in 1946 over 1933. This appalling loss of man-days does not take into account the tens of millions of man-days lost as a result of indirect effect of strikes. I recall last year during the coal strike that perhaps 85 percent of the trainmen in my section were laid off and 27 daily trains in the State of

Kentucky were taken out of the service during that strike by reason of the strike. Many factories were closed in Kentucky and literally thousands were closed throughout the Nation. This was only one of the many big strikes that have taken place in the last 10 or 15 years. The losses to the workers and their families were tremendous and the loss to agriculture, industry, and commerce was even greater. It is quite evident that under our present laws the relationship between management and labor is not what it should be. Some plan must be worked out to improve the relationship between management and labor not only in the interest of management and labor but in the interest of the American people as a whole. Labor, management, and the American people as a whole all have a stake in this very, very important problem. The American people are demanding action and relief from these conditions.

Labor has rights that should be and must be respected and protected. This same thing goes as to management, business, and the American people as a whole.

The Committee on Education and Labor of the House has worked diligently for many weeks—yes, for several months—trying to find a way to protect the rights of all three of these groups and find a way to bring about better relationship between management and labor. They have heard the testimony of a multitude of witnesses in favor of and in opposition to legislation on this matter, and out of it all they have submitted to the House the bill that is now before us. The committee is made up of Republicans and Democrats. Eighteen Republicans and Democrats favorably reported this bill. Four of the members of that committee expressed themselves as being opposed, and it is now up to the House and Senate to review the work of the committees of the House and Senate, in an effort to pass a law that will be just and fair to labor and management and also protect the just rights of the 140,000,000 Americans. While much has been said over the radio and in the press urging persons to write or wire their Congressmen and Senators, I thought that we would receive a flood of letters, telegrams, and wires, but strange to say that, although this bill has been under consideration for some days in the House, I have only received three letters and telegrams urging me to support the bill and one letter and one telegram expressing opposition to the bill. During the further consideration of the bill I expect to be present all of the time and do what I can to help make it a better bill. I recognize it is very important to labor, management, and the American people. There are some things in the bill that do not meet my approval but, of course, after we have finished the bill it will then go to the Senate, and, as there may be some differences in the provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill, it will then go to conference and the conferees of the House and Senate will consider both bills and try to arrive at a just and fair compromise and report their findings to their respective bodies, and when it comes up in the House and Senate and these two Houses approve the conference report, that, then, will be the final bill, and I hope that when it does come up for final approval that the bill will be improved and that we then can say that the House and Senate, through long and earnest effort, have presented the very best bill possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the committee will offer a committee amendment on page 50, an amendment which should be considered in connection with the question now under discussion. That is a section which proposes to recognize State action on the question of the closed shop. It is a very important section. It is a very important section particularly in those States which have taken action upon this question, either by legislation or by constitutional amendment. I call attention to it because just this week the attorneys general of several States have been in session at Lincoln, Nebr., to consider what steps they may need to take in order to protect the validity of State enactments on the subject in view of the congressional power over interstate commerce.

Section 13 on page 50, which is a committee amendment, reads as follows:

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any State law or constitutional provision which restricts the right of an employer to make agreements with labor organizations requiring as a condition of employment membership in such labor organization, and all such agreements, insofar as they purport to impose such requirements contrary to the provisions of the law or constitution of any State, are hereby divested of their character as a subject of regulation by Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to the extent that such agreements shall, in addition to being subject to any applicable preventive provisions of this act, be subject to the operation and effect of such State laws and constitutional provisions as well.

It seems to me it is important to remember that will be offered as a committee amendment because it strengthens the provisions of the bill so far as bans on the closed shop are concerned in the States which have taken action. I think now there are about 12 States that have taken formal action and another dozen have that kind of action under consideration. Those who want to support the committee position can well vote, it seems to me, to support the committee in the provisions heretofore discussed and against the amendment now pending and in favor of the committee amendment which will be offered as section 13 of the amended Wagner Act.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the gentleman refers to the fact that there were 12 States, now 13 with Texas, that have voted on this proposition, which is an indication of the overwhelming public opinion in this country in that direction. In that connection I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the last Gallup poll on this subject 66 percent of the American people are shown as favoring the open shop, 18 percent favor the union shop, 8 percent favor the closed shop, and 8 percent have no opinion on the subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is representative of the general opinion. My State first enacted a legislative bill and then the voters in a general election confirmed that by an amendment to the State constitution, known as the right-to-work amendment. Under this trend the gentleman mentions that will be done in many other States of the country. The committee amendment will support such action where it is taken.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I have read section 13. May I ask the gentleman if it would not suffice if in the second line, after the word "provision," a period were inserted and strike out the rest of the section?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if you put a period there, it would be pretty broad because it would deal with subjects other than the right of the employer to make closed-shop agreements. You might nullify much of the bill, because you would establish State rights to deal with all phases of industrial relations in spite of any provisions whatsoever in the act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In considering the Gallup poll referred to by the gentleman from Texas, is it not the understanding of the gentleman that that poll was on the question of what a particular person preferred, a closed or union shop, the question not being: Did the person prefer to have the Congress of the United States ban legally one or the other, the closed shop or union shop?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman probably has answered the question in his question. I do not remember the exact phrasing of the Gallup poll question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last nine words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment which I do not propose to discuss in detail. I am very much constrained to express deep regret that we have been unable to find a way to face the very serious problem of labor and management, and capital, because there are now three groups involved. There used to be just capital and labor, now management has become a vital factor. I am particularly sorry that we cannot go at so vital a problem as is involved in H. R. 3020 basically rather than doing little more than treat symptoms. Granted that the companies must have relief, granted that the country must be able to go forward in production. How can capital put its money into enlargement of its industry unless it knows that it is not going to be held up by strikes and labor problems? Lead time is of basic importance to production and

it is rooted in the need to know that there will be no stoppages at any point. How are you going to handle the production of automobiles or anything else unless there can be assurance of continuous action on the part of both management and labor?

I want to see us get back to a few basic things, to be a truly united country. The greatest thing we had to give the world beginning on VJ-day was our much-vaunted genius for production. The world needed everything, everything, but we just have not got into high gear. Yes, one reads that production is high, but try and buy something that you want; just try it. If we had started our production lines of peacetime commodities promptly and kept them moving there could not have been such high prices. One of the best known of the leaders of labor joined with industrialists and Government men in stating that production is the great need in avoiding inflation and a consequent depression.

I have watched with a sad heart the results of our policies toward our workers. We seem to have taken away from a man the dignity of his own labor, the joy of his work, the urge to do a better job each day. This loss of satisfaction in work well done is one of the most distressing things that have happened to us as a people.

I regret that I must feel as I do that this bill reflects too strongly the results of the strikes that are doing so much to destroy our usefulness as a nation in a world that looks to us for help and inspiration. I cannot agree with some of its provisions. I shall do what I can to change those features that seem to me most objectionable. I shall hope that if I and those in agreement with me are not successful, conference with the other body may eliminate the worst of them. But I wish we might deal with fundamental causes and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I speak as a woman, not just as a Congresswoman. I would like to have known what are the living conditions of the workman? What does his wife have to contend with? How much of the difficulties of living is due to too little money? How much of it is due in a measure at least to the human element in the men and women themselves, and how much of it is really due to an ill-adjusted economy? Surely we must take into consideration the human element.

There is no way to avoid the hard fact that there is a real need for some disciplinary legislation, unfortunately. Once again the responsibility falls upon those of us who are Republicans. But we do not forget that it was the Republicans who disciplined capital when capital got all out of hand. Surely we cannot refuse to take a similar responsibility at this point in relation to another group. I should be happier if I could be very certain that we will remember that all the fault is never on one side. Disciplines must be set up to curb the present trends, but these should be established with justice and restraint and a sense of the common needs of all concerned. And I insist, Mr. Chairman, that we should discipline ourselves as well.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. I believe it presents the issue whether or not we are going to maintain our fundamental American freedoms, which have already been frittered away to a great extent or whether we shall have a new birth of freedom for the individual. This amendment simply gives a laborer the right to refrain from joining a union. Why should an American citizen not enjoy that right?

It is true that with this right the nonunion member may enjoy benefits which have been secured by organized labor without having contributed to this result. Strictly spreaking and all other things being equal this seems unfair to those who are organized.

However, it seems to me that the other considerations outweigh this inequality. The union shop proposed in this bill differs from the closed shop only in that the former requires that the employer must voluntarily ask for the union shop, then 50 percent of the actual employees must vote for it and upon the happening of these two events it becomes a closed shop to every employee 30 days after he begins work there. From that time on he becomes the subject of union officials and must assume at least moral cooperation and responsibility for all the conduct of union leadership.

Now the principal criticism of unions today is not directed at unionism itself but to the irresponsible and corrupt management and leadership into which many unions have drifted. It requires but little reading of the hearings on this bill to cause one to shudder at the tyranny and depredation committed by such union officers and leaders. A member of such unions must assume partial responsibility for such conduct.

I have, I dare say, thousands of labor constituents in my district who cannot conscientiously become members of certain unions because they cannot and dare not accept joint responsibility for the conduct of leaders of such type. They should not be compelled by the union-shop provision in this bill to accept that stigma but have the right to refrain from joining any union whose leaders engage in disreputable practices.

It is, of course, true that all legislation is the result of compromise. But to compromise on this principle is as I said at the outset a further frittering away of a fundamental American freedom. It is further an admission that the union shop is not something that can be sold on its merits but must be riveted on the wrists and ankles of a substantial part of our citizenry for the ease and certain tribute for such aforesaid labor leaders. Therefore I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 11 words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in the debate up to this point. I think the members of the committee who have spoken have very well explained the bill. The knowledge of the bill and of its provisions they have displayed conclusively demonstrates the fine, thorough work they have done in its preparation. I want to commend the members of the committee for the excellent work they have done on the bill, and that commendation also applies to members of the committee on the other side of the aisle who worked with the members of the committee on this side of the aisle in bringing this bill to the floor for consideration. I make that comment because it is worthy of note that the bill was reported for action by a vote of 18 to 4.

There is no question but that the issue here presented is one of great importance. It is one about which the people of the country have debated. It has been the subject of countless polls. It has been the subject of much controversy among many honest, conscientious citizens, and certainly among honest and conscientious Members of Congress, Members striving to find the right answer.

I am glad that in the consideration of this particular proposition we have had real argument rather than epithets. I have listened to much of the debate on this bill, and I regret that on occasion we have had name-calling rather than argument, which is certainly a poor substitute for reasoned judgment.

Some reference was made to party position. I have not understood that at any time in a party announcement my party declared itself specifically for the abolition by legislative action of the union shop or the closed shop. Our position for the enactment of fair and reasonable legislation dealing with labor-management relations has been known for a long time. On that we stand and on that we are proceeding here today.

I commend the committee particularly for the provisions they have worked out in respect of this particularly troublesome problem. As I understand the bill, the closed shop, and there is a manifest difference between the closed shop and the union shop, is outlawed by the terms of the bill, but as to the union shop, this is what we are doing: First of all, it ought to be understood by everybody that whether it is a union shop or a closed shop the arrangement stems from a contract entered into by the employer with the employees. It is not ordered by Government, it is not put into effect by Government. I am one of those who have felt that Government had no right or authority to order a closed shop or a union shop into effect where the parties did not want to agree to it.

I understand that frequently employers who are against the union shop will say that they are not free agents in arriving at the contract. My view about that is that an employer has some responsibilities that he ought to be ready to meet. If by legislation we throw around him the mantle of protection to the end that whatever contract he enters into in this regard he may enter into voluntarily and without coercion, then certainly that leaves him a free agent to do what he thinks ought to be done.

On the question of giving the employees the right of free action, it is likewise provided in the bill before us that a secret ballot must be had by the employees and that a majority must vote for a union-shop agreement before it can be put into effect. I know many employers prefer a union shop. They find nothing wrong with it. They operate under it. They

take it by choice. They say if they are going to have a union they want everybody to belong to the union.

There is the right of the freedom of employment or the seeking of employment left to every man. I believe that if this provision is written into the law some of the troublesome things we have seen and which have distressed us all in connection with labor disputes on this very problem will be done away with. In any event, why not give it a try? Why not see how it will work? If it should happen in the future that this is a satisfactory and adequate provision and arrangement, then we have gone far enough. If the course of experience demonstrates it is not sufficient, then there will be time in the future to do whatever else might need to be done.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is making a constructive defense of the principle of the union shop. However, I think the gentleman should be aware of the fact that under the operations of this bill the union shop is for all practical purposes destroyed so that in defending the provisions of this bill the gentleman is negating what he said in his very able defense of the principle of the union shop.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman I do not agree with his interpretation of the bill. Of course, if his interpretation is correct, then his argument is a complete answer to those who seek to strike out the provisions of the bill as the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan undertakes to do.

As I say, I do not agree with his contention as to the effect of the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that the rights of the people on the employer's side are adequately protected and that the rights of the people on the employee's side are adequately protected. If through free agreement one of these arrangements is worked out, I think the objective that probably would be sought by all will be achieved.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to the reference he made to the poll that was taken on this bill. I cannot in my wildest stretch of imagination see how any polling institution, the Gallup poll or any other, could intelligently go out among the American people and take a poll on this 68-page complicated piece of legislation. Yesterday afternoon I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] a question as to whether or not Theodore Eiserman, a Wall Street lawyer, one of the attorneys for the Chrysler Corp., sat in with the Republican majority in the drafting of this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] answered, as is set out in today's RECORD:

> Theodore Eiserman, as you know, was what we thought one of our best witnesses. He introduced not only a fine statement on the law but introduced his own book, and on occasions I conferred with him in my office.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Another point to which I wish to call attention is the absolute sincerity and lack of hypocrisy on the part of the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, when he stated that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be completely wiped out. As I see it, if either of these amendments is adopted—and I am against both of them—the same effect will take place and the Wagner Act will be nullified. But let us take our friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, at his word, and that will bring us back beyond 1935, if we wipe out the Wagner Act. Of course, then we go into the depression that was caused by the Republican malfeasance and misfeasance in office during the twenties, when we had over 14,000,000 men idle during the period from '29 to '33. So let us eliminate those 4 years from Dr. SMITH'S survey.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not right now.

Then we go back beyond 1929. Then we are in the period that the majority side are trying to revert us to by the passage of this bill. We are in that grand old period from 1921 to 1929 when we had that so-called perfect economic condition referred to by our Republican friends. The Republicans are trying to bring us back to those days through this bill. I can tell you something that was going on in my own district, the Calumet industrial region of Indiana, during the 1920 period. Men were working in the mills 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, sometimes 14 hours a day, and on every second Sunday they worked 24 hours—a double shift on every second Sunday. If this piece of legislation is enacted into law as it is written, we will revert to those days, in those good old Republican times, when we had three Republican Presidents serve beautifully under our former great Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] for being open and aboveboard and sincere in their contentions for the Hoffman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 22, line 1, strike out the word "thereof" and insert "of a representative."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 22, line 17, strike out "2 (ii)" and insert in lieu thereof "2 (11)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 24, line 19, after the word "force", insert "or other illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 25, line 15, after the word "strike", insert "or make any request to the Administrator under section 2 (11) for a strike ballot."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 25, line 19, after the word "strike", insert the word "action."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 26, line 8, after "(d)" strike out the word "The" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 30, line 21, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 33, line 21, strike out the word "believe" and insert "believes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 33, line 22, after the word "force", insert "or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 43, line 9, strike out the word "on" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 45, line 16, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 47, strike out all of lines 18 to 22, inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 50, after line 14, add the following:
>
> "SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any State law or constitutional provision which restricts the right of an employer to make agreements with labor organizations requiring as a condition

of employment membership in such labor organization, and all such agreements, insofar as they purport to impose such requirements contrary to the provisions of the law or constitution of any State, are hereby divested of their character as a subject of regulation by Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to the extent that such agreements shall, in addition to being subject to any applicable preventive provisions of this act, be subject to the operation and effect of such State laws and constitutional provisions as well."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 50, line 16, after the word "provision" strike out the balance of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill—and in many respects it is a most excellent bill, and I shall vote for it no matter what you do to it—and if I am one of the conferees who goes over to confer with the Members of the other body, I hope, ability permitting, that I will do at least as much as—I would like to hope more than—any one of the conferees from the House to carry out the will of the House.

I had thought that there was something in the thought that you should have something to trade when you went bargaining. I believe sincerely and wholeheartedly, and I am satisfied that a majority of the Republican members of the committee who wrote this bill believed, and some of them still do, that it was no more than right and fair and decent, if I may use such a word, to write into the bill a declaration that if a man, an American citizen, a returned veteran, wanted to refrain from joining in union activities he might have that privilege. Unless this amendment is adopted, he will be, in many instances, denied employment unless he joins. If the Members of the House will read the report or read the hearings held by the Committee on Labor, or if they will read the hearings of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures on racketeering, they will discover that racketeering and extortion are practiced widely and are very successfully practiced—all carried on under the guise that it is a union activity well established. Hence it was that I offered the amendment, but the House in its wisdom has voted it down. Of course, I am forced to abide for the time being by that decision.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Has the gentleman, who is a member of the Expenditures Committee, found any shortage of silverware?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman's constituents are personally interested in that and can understand his earnest desire to get whatever his constituents want.

I wish the Members of the House would take this bill and turn to page 50 and read section 13. I read it several times. I can understand why I cannot understand it but I cannot understand why seven eminent and distinguished lawyers of this body on the Republican side whom I asked late yesterday and today to explain it do not understand what it means unless the purpose is to permit the States to legalize the closed shop while at the same time saying nothing about or giving authority to the States to permit the open shop. I wish a member of the committee would tell me what that section means. If they will I will be glad to withdraw my amendment. I do not know what it means and I wonder if you gentlemen know what it means. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] to tell me what it means. I know the purpose or at least I think I do. I know the statement was made in committee that the States were to be given the right to legislate on the subject. The purpose is to permit States to legislate if they want to on the closed or security union shop or open shop issue. But this section does not do that. What does that section mean?

Mr. BARDEN. I am not exactly going to try to take on the job of making the gentleman understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that. I plead in confession and avoidance when I rose a moment ago, but if the gentleman will make some other Members of the House understand it, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that we had a pretty thorough discussion of this in the committee at the time it was adopted overwhelmingly by the committee. I am not so sure but what the gentleman voted for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would probably follow the gentleman's advice.

Mr. BARDEN. I hope you will in this instance and withdraw your amendment. All of this amendment was taken from the Case bill. There did happen to be a slight change in the wording of it, however.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPE). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

May I say to the gentleman that there are certain technical requirements that must be met when you are dealing with a matter such as this for it does have some bearing upon the power vested in Congress. It is dealing with a very technical question of regulating commerce between the several States, and in view of the fact that many of the States have passed laws dealing with the closed shop, why, then, the committee felt, and I am sure the whole House will feel, that the States should be recognized and their laws should certainly be given full power and effect as far as a State is concerned.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does it not in effect mean this, and is it not designed to have this effect, that insofar as this House or the Congress may, it concedes the right of the several States to pass legislation or laws such as have been passed by certain States.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I stated in my opening statement that I understood what the committee was trying to get at, which was to give permission to the States to legislate on interstate commerce insofar as it affected these contracts. But what I want to know is whether this section does it. If you say so, I will have to go along with you.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I say so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. Then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I might call attention to the fact that the Seventy-ninth Congress about a year or two ago passed a law which did this same type of thing in regard to the insurance laws. You may remember that we divested the insurance business of its interstate character to a certain extent, and that earlier the Congress had enacted the Webb-Kenyon law to permit the States to handle the liquor traffic in the days of prohibition, and this does exactly the same thing.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right, as I recall it. The amendment is in the best possible form the committee and its attorneys could prepare it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 51, line 5, strike out "13" and insert "14."

Page 51, line 11, strike out "14" and insert "15."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS:

Page 21, at the end of line 6, insert the following: "except to the extent permitted by the provisions of section 14."

Page 51, after the committee amendment ending in line 3, insert a new section reading as follows:

"TRUST FUNDS

"SEC. 14. It shall not be an unfair labor practice under section 8 (a) (2) (C) (ii) for an employer to make payments to a trust fund established by a representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents), provided (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on re-

tirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; and (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, such agreement to contain a provision that in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund, the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement; and (C) such payments meet the requirements for deduction by the employer under section 23 (a) or section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code."

Renumber the two following sections.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, some of us have had no chance to have amendments considered in the full committee, and I think the members of the committee will bear me out in this. I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The section on page 21 that has to do with the welfare fund outlaws all of the pension, health, hospital, and other benefits of labor organizations. I do not believe the Congress intends to outlaw those benefits. This amendment is practically the same amendment that was offered to the Case bill last year to take care o these health, accident, sickness, and death benefits that the welfare funds comprise. I wish and hope that the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, what will be the result?

Mr. LANDIS. Those funds and benefits will all be wiped out. There are about 15 international unions affected, and it affects over 600,000 workers in America who have put money into these funds.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If they are continued they will just do what they were intended to do from the beginning, just be beneficial to everybody interested?

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Why is it, then, that the committee did not consider this when they were preparing the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. I was to offer no amendment in the committee; I was to offer amendments on the floor of the House. This is the only opportunity I have to put the amendment in the bill.

Mr. MASON. But in the testimony before the committee in the hearings this must have been stressed. Why was it not considered then and adopted as part of the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. The committee did not see fit to take everything.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman refers to it as an amendment to the Case bill of last year. Does not the gentleman mean that this is the so-called Byrd amendment, which was added to the bill in another body?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was in the bill as it was approved and went to the White House?

Mr. LANDIS. This is what was known as the Byrd amendment to the Case bill last year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was the amendment offered in committee?

Mr. LANDIS. No; it was not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman's amendment permit the employer and employee on a voluntary basis to set aside the trust fund for hospitalization and retirement?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. That is all it does?

Mr. LANDIS. It protects all funds and benefits.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. It will continue those trust funds that have already been created and have been in operation for years?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right; there is no question about that. You cannot wipe those out.

Mr. ROBSION. The House last year adopted it in the Byrd amendment?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes, they adopted it.

Mr. ROBSION. When they finally passed the bill the House accepted it?

Mr. LANDIS. It passed the House and Senate last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. If the bill passes in the present form, all those funds would be wiped out?

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. What would happen to the existing funds if we failed to adopt this amendment?

Mr. LANDIS. They are all outlawed. I do not know what would happen to the funds they have in their possession, but it would outlaw all funds.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman point out just where that is in the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. On page 21, line 6, (ii).

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I think he inadvertently and certainly without intent has left the wrong impression with the House when he says that there was no opportunity to offer this amendment in committee. May I say that in the conference, when we wrote the original drafts—and there were several drafts of the bill—the gentleman had that opportunity. I recall no instance where he was denied the right in committee to present this amendment. It was my understanding that the gentleman attempted to present his proposal after we had agreed that no additional amendments would be offered. I understood the gentleman reserved the right to bring it up on the floor.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. The Republicans in the committee made an agreement that we were not to offer any controversial amendments to this bill in the full committee and you gave us the privilege of amending the bill on the floor of the House. I am surprised.

Mr. HARTLEY. May I say that the last statement that the gentleman from Indiana made is correct. When the majority members of the committee had decided on what we wanted to present to the full committee, it was the idea then that amendments that were controversial would not be offered in the committee. The chairman certainly did not reserve the right to prevent any Member from offering any amendment on the floor of the House. However, I do not believe we have had enough opportunity to know what this amendment will really do. I am told it might result in a tax being passed on to the consumers of coal, for example, or that the workers in the automobile industry might decide that they want to tax every car, let us say $50 or $100, for some welfare, insurance, or trust fund, which would be passed on to the consumers.

A colleague asks me if this is a John L. Lewis amendment. I am not certain the gentleman from Indiana offers it in that respect, but it might be so termed.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. You will agree that it passed both the House and Senate last year?

Mr. HARTLEY. I understand as the gentleman from South Dakota has said that it was tacked on to the Case bill in the other body and finally did pass the House.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It seems to me a very serious matter. If we passed the substance of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana in a previous session of Congress, and if it was accepted by the House and signed by the President, and so forth, and if certain labor organizations have been operating under it and they have large funds of money which

have already been paid in, what then is the duty of the gentleman as chairman of the committee and the duty of this House? We ought to do something about it. Why not pass this amendment now, and if it is not right and proper or if it is unsound, it will be taken out in conference. But if we pass it up now, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. HARTLEY. It is up to the House as to what it wants to do, but as chairman of the committee, I feel it my duty to try and protect this bill as it was reported out of the committee, and, therefore, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask if the committee considered what the status of existing trust funds would be if the provision reported by the committee should be adopted and enacted into law? Was there any consideration of what would happen to existing funds that have been set up?

Mr. HARTLEY. To be very frank, I would say to the gentleman I do not recall that issue having been thoroughly discussed in the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. The committee, not having dealt with this matter in drawing up the bill, those charged with the handling, preservation, and distribution of these funds which are now in existence will continue to be so charged. It would in no way affect the set-up which they now have. The committee considered it and overwhelmingly voted to try to some extent to put safeguards on something that had begun to grow in this country, in which we saw great danger. In the hearing before the committee it was brought out that it was a dangerous threat, and the committee in its wisdom very wisely put a provision into the bill and it was reported out by the committee. If I might offer this observation, I sincerely hope the House will not interfere with that section of the bill, because if you do I think you are digging deeper into it than you would think, on the surface.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much concerned by the language in line 21. I know of a great many insurance plans, retirement plans of all kinds, in my part of the country. Some unions have representatives on the committees that administer them. Others are solely controlled by the employers and paid for by the employers. In other cases the employee pays half, and in some cases the employee pays all. There has been no criticism of this group hospitalization plan that I am aware of. Some of our oldest unions, for instance the typographical union, have similar funds. I understand they operate a home at the present time with 500 men retired from their profession. The funds are contributed by members of that union. Certainly, in an effort to prevent what some people fear is an abuse, we do not want to work a hardship on those old, established national or international unions that have administered these funds successfully and properly over a long number of years.

I would like to see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] go into the bill, and at least let it go to conference, so that it can be discussed further. To say that they can go on and run their institution as they have in the past is not the answer. They cannot do that because their income is shut off if this becomes law.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not a fact that the present provisions in the bill will permit these trust funds now in effect to continue, where the contributions are made voluntarily?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a question of the effect of the word "voluntary." You have approved the closed-shop plan, for example. It can be said that it is compulsion to contribute to the fund.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. These trust funds relate to widows and children of workers, do they not?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Some of them do. Some of them are for retirement homes for aged workers.

Mr. ROBSION. I think it would even reach the burial funds and those things that are in operation in nearly all factories and shops.

I agree with the gentleman that perhaps the committee has not given the consideration that it should have given to this matter. It ought to go into the bill and go to conference where it can be considered.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I am urging, that we put it in the bill and send it to conference. If the members of the committee can have more time to look into it I am sure that as they do they will agree as they did to the amendment to the Case bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which never received any consideration by the committee. It was only seen by me as a member of the committee about 10 minutes ago. I understand it was not seen by the chairman until today.

This amendment looks innocuous but it can involve taxes of hundreds of millions of dollars upon the consumers of this country. It has never been my feeling that it was the job of conferees to write legislation. It has seemed to me that the place to write legislation, in the case of bills under consideration in this body, is in the House of Representatives, and I am not impressed by the argument that we should put this amendment in the bill and let the conferees see whether it is all right or not.

This committee has worked some 3 months preparing this legislation. Here is an amendment that strikes to the heart of what this bill tries to do and imposes a limitless tax upon the consumers of the country. We are asked to adopt it on 10- or 15-minute notice without the counsel of the committee or anyone else having had opportunity to study its ramifications.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. It appears to me that it is a sort of shield and suit of armor, where the man says, "Now if I can get something like this on this bill then I have got me a prophylactic that will take care of me when the next election comes along.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I am a bit puzzled by this amendment, with all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana. In view of the fact that in section 8 (a) 2 we have a provision that states that the employer shall be guilty of an unfair labor practice by assisting any labor organization through deducting from the wages of any employee dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions payable by the employee to a labor organization, or collecting or assisting in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions, unless such action has been voluntarily authorized in writing by such employee and such authorization is revocable by the employee at any time upon 30 days' written notice to the employer. This means that, if the employee authorizes it, the employer can do it. That being the case, we have the provision where the employer can collect these assessments from the employee, but over on page 23 we have a provision whereby a labor organization cannot compel any member to agree to contribute or participate in any insurance or any benefit plan.

Is it not clear that the gentleman from Indiana is asking us to do something we have already done in the bill?

Mr. BUCK. The thing is too much for me, and I do not like to vote on something I do not understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee may want to hold the bill just as it is, but it does occur to me that this question deserves a little deliberation. If you do not want to refer this to the conference and think the bill should be written here in the House, then let us at least know what we are doing in this matter.

The original section 8 of the Wagner Act carries a provision in defining unfair labor practices which makes it an unfair labor practice for a contribution to be made by the employer to an employees' fund. The background of that was an attempt to prevent company domination of unions, and thus it had a sound historical basis. Actually, because of the fact that the welfare funds, or funds of that sort, have been more or less in favor of labor, few attempts have actually been

made, if any, to have such contributions declared an unfair labor practice.

During the deliberations on labor legislation last year, however, the question rose in very acute form because of the so-called welfare fund which was being asked as part of the settlement in the coal strike. Growing out of the general debate on that proposition which occurred through the press and throughout the country generally, when the labor legislation was taken up in the other body, there was an amendment offered by Senator BYRD which was incorporated in the bill. It was in the bill as finally approved by the House and as it went to the President.

The language which the gentleman from Indiana seeks to offer here would place in this bill somewhat comparable provisions. It would not make for an unfair labor practice if a company made a contribution to a welfare fund, provided that welfare fund were guarded by certain restrictions, such as that it should be a trust fund for the benefit of the employees or the members of their families or used for sickness insurance or accident insurance, and that it should be subject to joint control by employer and employees and by an annual audit to insure its protection as a trust fund.

Let me read you the language of the bill, and I read from pages 20 and 21. I shall skip certain portions of the language which do not relate to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana refers particularly to section 8, paragraph (a) subsection (2) (C) (ii). I will read only the pertinent language as it follows on down through those references:

> It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer (2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization (C) by assisting any labor organization (ii) through making payments of any kind to such organization directly or indirectly, or to any fund or trust established by such organization, or to any fund or trust in respect of the management of which, or the disbursements from which, such organization can, either alone or in conjunction with any other person, exercise any control, directly or indirectly.

Now, that is a rather strict prohibition to carry in a bill against any contribution by a company to any welfare fund, no matter how it may be administered. The gentleman is within his rights very properly in calling to the attention of the House the opportunity to put in some safeguarding language which would make it possible for a contribution to be made by an employer to a welfare fund under certain conditions. Those conditions are set forth in his amendment and follow the language of the so-called Byrd amendment which I have described.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Would it be proper to use the identical Byrd amendment with which we are acquainted rather than to give us an amendment which, as the gentleman says, is along the line of the Byrd amendment, which I have never yet seen to this very minute as a member of the committee?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The difficulty is that the first part of the Byrd amendment was drawn in a pattern to fit in the other bill. The first part of this is drawn in a pattern to fit in these various references to which I have already referred. So far as the substance of the amendment is concerned, it is very close to the so-called Byrd amendment, it is essentially the same.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is a very capable parliamentarian and we look to him in that direction. The gentleman knows what happened last time. The other body put this language in the bill. Would it not be a good thing to let that happen this time in the other body after that body has had time to read this?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That depends on how the gentleman feels as to whether we should accept the responsibility here or pass it over to the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the proof of the pudding is the argument at the present time on this one little amendment, and I doubt that there is a Member on the floor who really understands the amendment any more than we were expected in the minority to read a bill of 66 pages in 2 days and on the third day file a minority report.

There has not been enough study given to all this legislation, and I repeat what I said before, that this bill is nothing but a monstrosity, and I further say this, that it is a death knell to labor, and all you can say is "requiescat in pace" to labor.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall use only one minute. This amendment is a rather complicated and a long one that the committee never did have a chance to see. I heard it read here for the first time a few minutes ago, and I had no information that it was going to be offered, and I do not think the committee has had an opportunity to study it. It seems to me that a matter of such grave and far-reaching importance as this is is one that should not be acted upon hastily here. It seems to me the procedure should be as was done before when this matter came up and it was passed to the Senate, and there the Byrd amendment undertook to take care of the situation to which it referred, and if it needs attention something like the same procedure should be followed at this time. I say that especially due to the fact that the committee never had an opportunity to go into it and give any study to it.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. This was mentioned in the committee in regard to the section relating to the benefits of the union and their funds. Of course, the amendment was not read, but if any one will read the section on page 21 and then read the amendment, he will see that it is important, and if any Member in the House will give me a reason or give a good argument for voting against the amendment, I am willing to take his word for it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I would really like to have an answer from the gentleman from Indiana, and that is whether or not, where we have made provision in here that the employee by voluntarily agreeing that the money can be paid to the labor organization, that does not take care of it? The labor organization can then turn it over to a trust fund or any fund that they want to. All we have done here is to say that the employer cannot turn that money over to a trust fund, but there is nothing to stop the labor organization from doing it once the money is placed in their hands.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Let me point out that this thing of welfare funds is getting pretty well out of hand. Under the Krug-Lewis agreement, which was agreed upon last spring, a tax of 5 cents a ton was placed upon all the coal in the bituminous mines, which amounts to about $30,000,000 a year. That is a tax directly on the consumers of this country. Mr. Lewis has already given notice that he is going to double that demand when he comes up for another contract, and make it 10 cents a ton, not a contribution from the employer, if you please, but rather a tax upon the consumers of this country. Coal is already selling for $3.75 at the pit of the mine, and it is something that can very easily get out of hand. There is even talk now that some of the unions will follow this lead that has been undertaken in some instances. They may put a cent or two tax on each loaf of bread, and they may put a cent or two on each bottle of milk. There is no end where it will lead unless it is stopped or that there will be regulation if it is permitted at all. Therefore, I say hasty action in adopting that amendment would be entirely out of order at this time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then the committee did, in considering the language in the bill in section 8 (2) (c), intend to prohibit the very thing that is being done under the Krug-Lewis contract?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is right. It was an attempt to prevent the very thing that caused the disastrous coal strike last summer.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That was considered, and that is the purpose of it.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the bill was read in its entirety. It must be remembered that the end is not one resulting from funds created by employee contributions. The evil lies in the tax that,

without the consent of Congress, is levied upon products such as coal. It is a direct tax on the consumers. Other forms of welfare funds may be desirable, but here we are dealing with the question of a direct tax on the American people.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I am curious to know from the author of this amendment why he did not present it to his own committee while they were considering the bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Any amendment I had to offer was supposed to be offered on the floor of the House. That was the understanding. I had no objection to offering the amendment to the full committee.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, the only argument against this constructive amendment comes from the Republican members of the committee who say that they cannot quite grasp the intent or understand the far reaching extent of the amendment. These very gentlemen, however, brought in a bill containing 66 pages, and the membership of the House did not receive much more time to study the entire bill nor the report, consisting of 114 pages, than was given to the minority members of the committee itself.

The gentleman from Indiana has stated, as I understand, that he was granted the privilege by the committee of offering the amendment on the floor of the House. Of course, it is very magnanimous and extremely liberal on the part of the majority of the committee to permit a member of the committee, a gentleman who at all times has shown great interest in the cause of labor and proper legislation, to offer the amendment.

No good or valid reason has been given thus far by anyone who has spoken in opposition to the amendment. I think the amendment is in the right direction. Of course, there may be some gentlemen who may be under the impression that it might strengthen the bill. I myself believe it is so grossly unfair to the interest of labor and lopsided to the interest of management that it could not be improved by the adoption of any amendment in the Committee of the Whole.

Further, I feel that the gentleman from Michigan does not need to be alarmed when he says that notwithstanding what the House may do or what we may do to the bill, he as a member of the conference committee will stand by the action of the House. I assure him this House will not, and could not even if it tried to, do anything to amend the bill, because it is so vicious, it is so bad, that it matters not how some of the enemies of organized labor may try, they could not make it any worse than it is.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a splendid amendment, in the interest of justice, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Does not the gentleman feel it is quite clear here that the committee did consider this very proposition, and that it is against the amendment not because it does not understand it but because it is against it on its merits? They want to prohibit the paying out to the miners of that 5 cents per ton for their trust fund.

Mr. SABATH. I believe the gentleman's observation is correct. It is not because that the committee does not understand it but that the committee understands it too well. Under the proposed amendment the employers may agree with the employees to add a few cents on each automobile, or a cent or two on a radio or any other device or product, on which tremendous profits are made by the manufacturers. They oppose this amendment notwithstanding that they are willing that the public pay 5 cents or 10 cents more for a quart of milk, 20 or 40 cents more for a pound of cheese, or 20 or 50 cents more a pound on any kind of meat. But the moment an effort is made to pass legislation or an amendment proposed to legislation that would enable an employee to derive a little benefit or security, it meets with their opposition. I hope these observations may help to bring about the adoption of this worthy amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Let me say to the gentleman that I am for the amendment, too.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. There is nothing in the amendment that relates to the 5-cent tax in the Lewis-Krug agreement. As I understand, this amendment does not apply to that at all.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his interpretation of the proposed amendment. I believe that he views the amendment as I do and that he will vote for it. I repeat, I believe that the amendment is in the right direction and should be adopted.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

"I TOLD YOU SO"

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my position in the pending legislation by the words "I told you so." On June 19, 1935, our good friend Billy Connery, who has gone to his reward, had charge of the legislation, the Wagner Act—page 9688. I reiterate my remarks given at that time; and if we had heeded then, we would not need this legislation today. My statements then were as follows:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I might preface my remarks first by stating that before I came to Congress I had been a manufacturer all of my business life, and I have employed labor and do now employ labor. During the time of my sojourn in business I never suffered a labor strike. Probably I am not the best employer of labor, and for that reason I do not believe that I am the worst. My only object in considering this bill is to try to do more for labor. I am just as much interested in seeing that labor has its just due as any man in the House. I feel no business concern can succeed today—nor could it succeed formerly within the last 25 years or more—if labor and capital did not work hand in hand. We can say, as laborers or as manufacturers, we ought to believe in the Golden Rule, and all the laws that we might pass will never take the place of that law of Him who rules supreme above.

I cannot conform to all of the things suggested in this bill because of the fact that I believe as the bill is drawn today it will cause us to see more strikes in the next 2 or 3 years than we have ever seen in the history of this country, and Members of Congress know that in the past 2 years we have had more strikes than we have ever had in the history of the country.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not intend to yield to anyone until I have finished my statement, and then, if I have time, I shall yield principally to those who are labor-union men or who represent the labor unions in the House.

If an employee must be left free to join a union, so should he be left free not to join a union. There are rights of the employees and there are rights of the employers, and all of those rights must be considered if we are going to pass legislation that will eliminate strikes and make conditions in the country better for the employer and for the employee; because, as I said before, labor and capital are inseparable. They must work together. The majority of businessmen are honest and are striving to do the thing that is best for labor and for their business, and if the politicians make such laws that radicals and intimidators are permitted under laws, to close industry, forment strikes, then greater harm than good will be done, men will be put out of jobs instead of employed, industry will be closed rather than operated.

I am not a lawyer. I cannot, therefore, speak of the quality of this act with legal authority, but I have read and listened to authoritative argument to which the committee of this House has paid little attention. They convince me that the measure before us is in deadly conflict with the decision of the Supreme Court in the poultry case and the long line of cases that led up to that declaration. If I am not a student of common law, I, at least, have some common sense. I understand the difference between the power of Congress to regulate intercourse between the States, which we call the commerce power, and the prohibition against any attempt by Congress to regulate production within the States. I know that the power to regulate commerce extends to the persons engaged in that commerce and the instrumentalities of that commerce, like interstate railroads, telephones, and ships. I know the difference between regulating the relations between employer and employee in carrying on interstate communication on a railroad or a telephone company, or a ship, and undertaking to regulate the employment relations of the parties who are engaged in building engines or making telephones or putting a ship together. I can see that one is a regulation of commerce and the other is a regulation of production.

I know, the Supreme Court, in the poultry case, said in very clear language that—

"Persons employed in slaughtering and selling in local trade are not employed in interstate commerce. Their hours and wages have no direct relation to interstate commerce."

I know that means that Congress cannot regulate the hours or wages or working conditions of a man engaged in plucking poultry or making shoes or manufacturing furniture, even though, after the job is finished, in each case the goods might be shipped in

interstate commerce. For the same reason, it is just as clear to me that a dispute between employer and employee about plucking poultry or making the shoes, or the furniture, is a dispute not in commerce but in production, and you cannot make it a part of commerce by saying it is or declaring that it affects commerce by using a lot of words to that effect, when, as a matter of fact, as the Supreme Court has so plainly said, as of other acts, the relations of employer and employee engaged in manufacture or local service may remotely and indirectly affect it.

I know that it is equally true that for years, whenever there was a local strike that shut down a plant, in whole or part, that any attempt to bring an injunction against the strikers, because they were restraining production and therefore restraining commerce, was denied by the Federal courts, and it was the unions who raised this issue. And I know that the Supreme Court sustained their view and, in the poultry case, the Court recites these very cases and says that—"This principle frequently has been applied in litigation growing out of labor disputes."

Of course, if all the miners in the United States quit work together in order to deprive the Nation of fuel, their purpose being to stop all its commerce, we would have a very different situation. We would have just such a one as confronted Woodrow Wilson, in 1919, when the same president of the United Mine Workers threatened the country with a general strike, just as they do today, unless we enact the Guffey bill. Then President Wilson, addressing this Congress, October 27, 1919, said: "This strike is not only unjustified; it is unlawful."

And to protect the people of the United States he proceeded to stop it. There was a different conception of the public interest in the White House then.

I speak of this to call the attention of the House to the difference between any kind of a combination whose purpose is to tie up or obstruct the commerce of the United States and the attempt to make every petty dispute between an employer and an employee in local production the ground for a complaint to a Federal Board. Surely no Member of this House who has regard for the oath which he took to support the Constitution can fail to have a doubt as to the validity of this legislation. If he does have such a doubt, then he ought to resolve it before he acts, for I distinctly repudiate such statements as are made by Mr. William Green that Congress ought to act and then let the Supreme Court determine the constitutionality of our acts. We are agents with limited powers, and the Court gives every reasonable presumption to the constitutionality of what we do, because it believes that we have settled our own doubts and not passed them up to the Court.

I read the other day the statement of our congressional obligation by one of the greatest American judges in his work on constitutional law, and I venture to call it to the attention of this House, because too many of us have forgotten its nature.

"Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution; they are chosen to do what it permits, and nothing more, and they take solemn oath to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions, they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate the promise they have confirmed by an oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether it does not violate the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly, and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt, would be held a criminal. Indeed, it is because the legislature has applied the judgment of its members to the question of its authority to pass the proposed law, and has only passed it after being satisfied of the authority, that the judiciary waive their own doubts and give it their support." (Thomas M. Cooley, Principles of Constitutional Law.)

Let me give you a test for this bill. Suppose there was a labor dispute in the Schechter Poultry Corp., the company which appealed the case in which the Supreme Court just decided. Suppose a complaint is made to the Labor Board you propose to establish charging that this man Schechter committed an unfair labor practice by attempting to interfere with the self-organization of his employees or refused to bargain with their representatives. Would that be a case for this Board? Here, of course, Mr. Green—or Mr. Connery—would say "Yes." Why? Because it would be a "labor dispute," under paragraph 9 of section 2 of this bill, and under paragraph 7 of the same section, it would affect commerce, because it might be "tending to lead to a labor dispute pertaining to or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce." Would the proposed Labor Board take jurisdiction? Of course it would; but if it did, it would plainly be dealing with an employment relation which the Supreme Court says is local. But, although it is local in every circumstance, this bill is drawn so as to drag it by definition into commerce. Are the gentlemen of this House fooled into believing that by calling a thing "commerce" they can make it so? I do not have to be a lawyer to know better than that.

Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Connery] that this legislation has been sent down here by the administration—and when anything is sent here by the administration we are supposed to be gullible enough to accept it as it is forwarded to us without amendment—I think it is an imposition upon the membership of Congress, and I want to read at this juncture where Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, threatened a general strike. This is in New York, under date of May 23:

"NEW YORK, May 23.—Labor stands ready to tie up the Nation's industry by throwing down its tools in a general strike if Congress fails to grant its basic demands, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, warned today.

"CROWD ROARS APPROVAL

"The crowd roared its approval as the labor leader threatened:

"'If Congress fails us, labor has its economic strength. If it comes to the point, we can mobilize our complete strength and refuse to work until we get our rights.'

"And when the applause had thundered away, he added grimly:

"'That is no idle threat. I mean just what I say.'

"In addition, he told the audience, labor must be ready to mobilize its political strength to defeat unfriendly Congressmen when they run for reelection."

I want to say to Mr. Green and I want to say to anybody in this land of ours, whenever I cannot use that God-given right of mine to think, I do not want to be in the House of Representatives. I would not be here, and if Mr. Green or anybody else thinks he is going to domineer me when it comes to using my best judgment in trying to legislate, then God forbid that I be a Member of Congress. This is intimidation of the worst sort, and that is what radical labor men resort to, to coercion and force to meet their own selfish ends, whether it is the best thing to do for the greatest number or not. I personally must try to make laws for all and for their best interest, not for any particular minority when it does injury to a greater number.

Now, when you examine this bill you can see that is precisely what is proposed to be done, for we propose to create a permanent labor board to entertain complaint with respect to what are called "unfair labor practices." These are five in number, and they can be committed only by an employer. The same things may be done by an employee, but they are not unlawful. Now, what are these things? They are to restrain or coerce employees in self-organization or forming, joining, or assisting labor organizations, or bargaining collectively through representatives of their own choosing. A little later we will see that this is precisely what the bill will not permit, but for the moment let us see what the labor practices are. I have said that they are interference, restraint, or coercion with the above rights by an employer, or domination or interference by him or the contribution of financial support to any labor organization. Of course, under the rules established by the Board an employer may be permitted to allow employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of pay, but it is very interesting to observe that he is not to be permitted to allow the employees to confer among themselves without loss of pay. Yet how can they prepare to confer with him if they may not confer among themselves? Of course, the purpose of that is to permit only one kind of a labor organization to function.

The remaining unfair labor practices are to discriminate in employment so as to discourage or encourage membership in any labor organization or to discriminate against an employee because he files charges under this bill or to refuse to bargain with the representatives of employees. The employer may make an agreement with a majority of his employees to make it a condition of employment that the employee shall join the majority organization. That, of course, means the establishment of the closed shop.

Now, what do these terms mean? What is interference? Is it discussing with employees the merits or demerits of any particular organization? Is it refusal to deal with a Communist organization? Because Communist organizations, under the definition of this bill by paragraph 5, section 2, have exactly the same standing as any reputble labor organization. So long as part of its purpose is to deal with an employer respecting working conditions, he is just as much obliged to deal with its representatives as any other kind of organization and thus encourage the very type of organization that is constantly denounced on the floor of this House. Moreover, it does not make any difference what the reputation of any organization that seeks to deal with the employer is. It may not keep its contracts, it may have bad leadership, but it will be an unfair practice not to recognize its representatives and deal with them. If the employer discusses these things with his employees, is he interfering with them? Is he discriminating in employment when he refuses to hire men of bad reputation, or is he dominating and interfering with the formation of a labor organization if he undertakes to discuss the number of apprentices that ought to be permitted, or any one of the numerous questions that arise in the normal relations of employer and employee by means of which they live in peace and amity?

Walter Lippmann severely criticized this measure, because he said that in a field where clear definition was most important this sloppy measure presented vague and indefinite definitions of unlawful conduct that would constantly multiply disputes and litigation. In other words, it encourages by its bad draftmanship exactly what it claims to minimize.

That is what they call a penal statute. The courts have again and again said that if

such statutes are ambiguous and do not clearly tell us in advance what we can do and what we cannot do, they are bad laws. In this field they make worse policy because they breed discord and bitterness and afford to the man who is looking for it the chance to make unfounded complaints. What this bill will do is to create a gigantic police court, for employers may be summoned from every part of the United States on any kind of a petty dispute, and if the Board constituted is no more impartial than the one which we have witnessed in action or the one over which the sponsor of this bill presided, it will breed strikes as fast as a fish lays eggs.

Perhaps the worst feature of this bill which carries the intrinsic evidence of this unfairness is the declaration that only the employer shall be prohibited from intimidation, coercion, and restraint. The President of the United States, when he settled the automobile dispute, March 25, 1934, made a notable declaration. He said:

"The Government makes clear that it favors no particular union or particular form of employee organization or representation. The Government's only duty is to secure absolute and uninfluenced freedom of choice, without coercion, restraint, or intimidation from any source."

The President was not talking about his opinion. He was talking about what was the Government's duty. Now, by giving his approval to the measure before us he has abandoned his conception of public duty and substituted for it his endorsement of tolerated coercion by one class of citizens, while condemning the same kind of coercion by another class of citizens. I know of no greater injustice than to say that it shall be unlawful for one group of our people to do that which other groups are permitted to do. It is a distinct encouragement to lawlessness. In this case it is not secret, occasional, or sporadic lawlessness.

It is notorious, customary coercion which accompanies every kind of a labor dispute of any proportions with which we are familiar. Every member of this House knows it as well as I do. I have no use for boycotts or blacklists or intimidation by employer or by employees, corporations, or by labor unions. The corporation and labor union which hires thugs or tolerates or condones violence ought to keep the lock step of fellow convicts. I know it will be said that labor unions condemn lawless acts, but I have yet to hear of any labor organization that has ever suspended or expelled any member for engaging in such conduct of which it was the beneficiary. Yet this House, in the face of the declaration made by the President of the United States as to what the duty of government is, is asked to write into this bill a prohibition of coercion against employers on the ground that they alone interfere with self-organization or the selection of representatives. Every one within the sound of my voice knows that closed-shop unionism is determined to have no representatives except those of its own selection. It has not accepted the outcome of any election that went against it under elections supervised by the Labor Board, no matter how great the majority. Mr. Green has said, in an interview with the American Magazine for May, that he never will accept the results of such an election, save temporarily, and under compulsion.

I have always thought that the most elementary right of an American is that of selecting and pursuing the employment of his choice. In that right he is to be free from molestation or intimidation by anyone. This House is asked to write in the law the proposition that he shall be free only from employers and that the equally notorious coercion of labor organizations shall be ignored. How long do you think that kind of arbitrary classification will stand in a court? You also propose to give to this Labor Board, with only the guidance of your vague definitions, the power to determine what constitutes these unfair labor practices. You give that Board a jurisdiction and an authority greater than is possessed by any of our courts. Without rules of evidence it is to make findings of facts and they are to bind the court which reviews them. It is to have the power to have its orders enforced by the courts, and how? By injunctions. The American Federation of Labor has fought in Congress for years to destroy what it called government by injunction. Now it is asking for it and asking you to govern the employment relations of the United States by injunction. But this time it is the conduct of employers, not their own, that is to be subjected to injunction.

All that I have said about the unconstitutionality of this bill is emphasized by what the Committee on Labor has done with it. Since it passed the Senate, they have rewritten their report and brought in 21 amendments for the purpose of trying to save it from the condemnation of the courts, but no trick of theirs can save it from its fundamental defect, and that is the attempt by the Federal Government to take control of and regulate the relation of employer and employee entirely within the States, and while engaged in acts of manufacture, construction, mining, and service. They still think that a dispute in a factory, a restaurant, a barber shop, or a pants-pressing establishment might lead to a dispute that might lead to a strike that might threaten our commerce. The more I have read this bill the more I am inclined to think that the gentlemen would pass a bad bill and have it overthrown in order that they may find a new reason for criticizing the Court which will be compelled to condemn this flagrant violation of constitutional authority.

But are the gentlemen gaining new rights for labor? On the contrary, I think they are inflicting new wrongs upon the worker, for, if this bill is enacted, his right of self-organization and association will not be enlarged—it will be contracted. First of all, the Labor Board, not himself, will determine the unit of employment which is to select representatives. Unless he is a part of the majority in that unit he will not be represented by an agent of his own selection. As an individual, whether he is in a big or little unit of employment, he cannot make his own contract and sell his own labor if a majority of his fellow employees want to sell it collectively. This is not enlarging the right of self-organization or association. This bill gives fellow employees the right to coerce and intimidate their fellows in the exercise of every one of these rights. It destroys individual bargaining, takes away the right to determine their own unit of employment, and, unless you are part of a majority, the worker will have to let someone whom he did not select sell his labor for him. I predict with confidence that, if this measure is enacted, it will have a short life but an unhappy one, for it will breed strife and bitterness, as it is neither practical nor effective to protect the rights it pretends to safeguard. On the contrary, it is defective, biased class legislation and deserves from this House the condemnation it will receive from the courts.

I cannot conclude my comments on this measure more appropriately than by quoting the characterization which it received from the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who, pointing to the lopsided, arbitrary, and unjust provision approving coercion by one group and tolerating it when committed by another, said:

"As I see this particular section, it looks to me like an effort to force every man in America to join a certain kind of union, whether or not he wishes to join that union; and the coercion and intimidation features are not to be inserted in this section because a certain union desires a free hand to take the workers from the groups in which they now belong into groups into which they may not wish to go.

"That is the naked fact back of the opposition to this amendment. It is an amendment to force all working people into a particular union, and every Senator on this floor knows that to be the truth." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1935, p. 7671.)

The Wagner Act will work in the interest of only a small minority of workers represented by professional labor leaders, will promote industrial strife, will bring about an epidemic of labor disputes, will drive employers and employees apart, and will substantially impede recovery.

It will in practice tend to make a closed shop of every plant and to make every employee carry a union card if he is to earn a living.

It penalizes employers for so-called unfair practices but will leave the agents and organizers of labor unions, or the labor unions themselves completely free to use violence, intimidation, and other coercive methods which they may seek to employ.

Every employer is compelled to report in detail every dollar of money received and how every dollar is expended, so why not compel labor unions to give a strict accounting of the money that they receive, and above all, how same is spent? [Applause.]

On page 9718, I offered an amendment to the bill with comment by me and Chairman Connery, which I insert:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 4, line 16, insert, after the word 'states', the following:

" 'To make effective the policy declared by the President of the United States the Government makes clear that it favors no particular union or particular form of employee organization or representation. The Government's only duty is to secure absolute and uninfluenced freedom of choice without coercion, restraint, or intimidation from any source' "

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to state to the membership of the House, that if this amendment is adopted it will only make effective the President's declared policy which he has advocated and I hope the membership of the House will see fit to adopt this proposal of the President. If you adopt it, you are then advocating the principles which he has enunciated with respect to justice to labor and to capital and the free will to join any organization. If you do not adopt it, then you turn down his expressed request insofar as handling the affairs of capital and labor, in my judgment, is concerned.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I will simply say in answer to the statement of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, this bill as it is now drawn up and as it has been reported to the House by the Committee on Labor, is the bill which the President approves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; certainly.

Mr. RICH. Is it going to be the practice that any amendments that are presented here are not going to be permitted to be considered by the membership of the House because of the fact that this is a cut-and-dried or dyed-in-the-wool bill and we must accept it as is?

Mr. CONNERY. I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania that we have no idea whatever of saying that an amendment offered by any Member here should not have consideration, but the gentleman in his address mentioned the President and I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill, as reported by the Committee on Labor to the House is in the form in which the President would like to see it passed. This is all I said.

The gentleman is entitled to his view of the matter, but I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

On page 9721, I offered an amendment which was voted down. If it had been adopted we would not need this legislation today and our labor relations in the meantime would have been more pleasant:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 6, line 9, at the end of the last paragraph, insert the following:

" 'The term "labor organization" shall not include any organization defined in the preceding paragraph unless said organization files with the National Labor Relations Board its acceptance of the following conditions of operation:

" '(a) That all elections and votes on strikes shall be by secret ballot.

" '(b) That a reliable accounting system will be maintained, and will be audited at least annually, with reports promptly and duly made to a meeting of the members, and a copy filed with the National Labor Relations Board.

" '(c) That its membership books, or rolls, will not be closed to new members, and all applicants will be admitted to membership, except for good cause shown relating to the individual applicant.

" '(d) That all of its objects and purposes are lawful.

" '(e) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike for an illegal purpose.

" '(f) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike in violation of any collective-bargaining agreement, or in opposition to any arbitration award rendered pursuant to an agreement to submit to arbitration.

" '(g) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike to further any issue which the employer offers to submit to arbitration pursuant to section 12 hereof.

" '(h) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike, except as a last resort after making all reasonable efforts to settle the issues by direct negotiation and governmental mediation.

" '(i) That it will agree to submit all jurisdictional disputes to arbitration pursuant to section 12 hereof, and will not engage in any jurisdictional strike, in cases where other organizations, parties to such dispute, likewise agree to submit to arbitration.

" '(j) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike designed or calculated to coerce government or any agency thereof either directly or by inflicting hardship upon the community, against any action on the part of the State or Federal Government, or any of the agencies or political subdivisions thereof.

" '(k) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike except in furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in which the strikers are engaged.

" '(l) That it will not coerce, or attempt to coerce, any worker to join any particular labor organization.' "

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section of the bill. It introduces the subject of strikes, and the bill is dealing with the subject of what are labor organizations.

Mr. LESINSKI. It looks like a bankers' bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the amendment itself does its own speaking and it is not necessary for any Member of Congress to make any comment on it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARNOLD). The Chair is inclined to think that the amendment is not subject to the point of order. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

"I told you so."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] complains about having had no opportunity in the committee to present his amendment. I sat with the Republican members of the committee, and I thought everything from sunrise to sunset was in order. If I remember correctly, we agreed to report this bill out and reserved the right to offer amendments on the floor. I also understood that this amendment was proposed to the Republican members of the committee and that the committee—that is, the Republican members—were not in favor of it, and the gentleman reserved the right to offer it here.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. You certainly are misinformed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That will not be the first time. But that is my understanding of it anyway, that everybody over there when the Republicans met together, not in secret sessions, but only when Republicans were present, had a full opportunity to offer any amendment he wanted to. I know that was the case with me and I reserved the right to offer an amendment and I am certain the gentleman aired his views on this several times.

As to the amendment, here is what it does, and do not make any mistake about it. If this amendment goes through, it opens wide the door for every union to demand that every employer contribute to a health, or welfare, or some other funds.

If you want to put through an amendment, and I do not know where the leadership is on this amendment which enables, for instance, Reuther, to say that the motor industry shall give to the UAW–CIO $5 on every car that is manufactured, or $1, or whatever the sum may be, on each unit, you will open the door; and, as one gentleman said, there will be a tax of 1 cent on every bottle of milk, a cent on every loaf of bread, some charge on every pair of shoes, on every hat.

Shall there be imposed on articles that are manufactured a tax for the benefit of the members of the union to be paid by the consumers?

What is the sense of the President talking about the high cost of living if we are going to turn over to the union or any other group outside the Congress the authority to levy and collect taxes? That is just what we are doing if we adopt this amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment for this reason. When we seek to prohibit such things as have been in existence for years and have been practiced in certain industries, such as pension funds and certain proper welfare funds, I think we are doing a real injustice to large bodies of workers who have been dependent upon this type of thing in times of unusual stress. There are such funds as burial funds, for example. I think this is one of the many things in this bill that should be attended to. I think we should include a provision that where the employer permits it and where the employees want it, they should be permitted to set up these funds. And the check upon the undue cost is the fact that the employer is not going to agree to everything, but it will be what they can agree to voluntarily. Why should we try to stop it? We would be doing a sociological wrong. I think it is the proper thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, this complex and intricate bill is very puzzling to me. I think it is perplexing to most of the Members except perhaps those who have been on the committee and who have struggled with its preparation. I understand that it has been written and rewritten so that we may consider it the boiled down, concentrated judgment of the majority party on the Committee on Education and Labor, which has presented the measure. This is an able committee of 25 members, 15 of whom are Republicans, or of the majority party, and I assume that all members of the committee have given very careful study to its provisions.

When our great authority, the distinguished English author, James Bryce, wrote his monumental treatise on American Government entitled "The American Commonwealth," this outstanding scholar praised and criticized our Government in many respects. I distinctly remember that he criticized Congress because of our committee system of legislation, which seemed to him to divide the work of law making up among too many almost independent compartments, giving each too much authority and power to shape vital measures on which the very future of the country depended, or would depend. It may be that the present Congress, under the Reorganization Act, has improved the situation by reducing the number of committees and giving each more authority than former committees had. I think it is safe to say that through the close party organization which exists and the firm control of the majority party upon the legislative committees and upon the Rules Committee, as well as upon the legislative program of the House generally, we may properly assume that the majority party—including every member of it—has his share in the measures that we pass. This share seems to me to be greater than that of other Members not on the committee, for we who are not on the committee have so little time to give each of these intricate provisions full and careful thought.

This bill is an omnibus bill. It has some good features in it, I believe, but it has some questionable features. I do not know that the legislation could be brought before us otherwise, but I am going to be distressed to have to vote yes or no on this measure unless it is considerably amended. The gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] has offered an amendment to section 14 on page 51, which would permit labor unions to have trust funds for the sole and exclusive benefit of employees. As I see it, that is a good amendment. Of course, I would not favor the building up of a great fund over which a labor czar might have exclusive control to divert it to some other than a beneficial use for the members who had contributed to it.

Of course, I believe in social security in general. I believe in various kinds of modern insurance. I think that industrial insurance, health insurance, accident insurance, and all such kinds of insurance are a great social economic function which permits large groups and numbers of human beings to mitigate the inevitable hazards of life by dividing the risks. Without discussing whether such social insurance should be public or private, I believe that American citizens, under right modern law, are thereby able to obey the Biblical injunction: "Bear ye one another's burdens." I am saying nothing about whether such insurance should be voluntary or involuntary, whether it should be private or public in its control, for these are points that may be in controversy, but in our modern industrial society it seems to me fair that the cost of the inevitable risk to life and limb and health ought to be borne by the consuming public and the cost of such insurance or security should be one of the costs reflected in the price to those who demand the service or the product. With some such thought, I approve of benefit funds for such organizations and other groups. If properly safeguarded and not subject to a wrongful use, I would not write the law banning them or outlawing such contributions and funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANDIS) there were—ayes 107, noes 126.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LANDIS and Mr. HARTLEY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY:

Page 24, strike out, in line 9, the word "or."

Page 24, strike out, in line 10, the words "other than" and insert in place thereof the word "including", so as to read:

"(6) to expel or suspend any member without affording him an opportunity to be heard, on any ground, including (A) nonpayment of dues; (B) disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; (C) participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement to which the labor organization was a party; (D) being a member of the Communist Party, or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods; (E) conviction of a felony; or (F) engaging in scandalous conduct tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute or in other conduct subjecting it to civil damages or criminal penalties."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS: Page 31, strike out lines 7 to 23, inclusive, and renumber the remaining paragraphs in the subsections accordingly.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, this is the most vicious part of the bill, and is the most important amendment that will be presented to the House, and that is the amendment to leave industry-wide bargaining in the bill. We see eye to eye on many of the reforms that would help balance labor legislation. It should be easy to find a common ground for a measure that will end secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, wildcat strikes, mass picketing, elimination of Communists and subversive individuals from labor unions, and make possible the settling of strikes in industries essential to the health and safety of our citizens.

My main objective is to eliminate strikes and to create better labor-management relations; not outlaw unions. This is a tough labor bill, very much tougher than the Case bill of last year. Why not be consistent in this bill? You control industry-wide bargaining among industries in America, but you are not consistent, because the railroads do not come under the act; that is, you leave industry-wide bargaining free among the railroads but you will control the coal, the steel, the amalgamated clothing workers, the longshoremen, the rubber, pottery, and many other industries in America. If industry-wide bargaining is good enough for the railroad workers, then it is good enough for the steel workers and the automobile workers and the other workers of America. If it is good enough for management it is good enough for labor. Under the antitrust laws they have taken care of the corporations through the administration of prices but not in wages, and if you let the corporations and big business of America bargain industry-wide, then why not let the employees bargain industry-wide?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman knows that there is a price-control system set up by the Government on railroad rates.

Mr. LANDIS. We are not talking about prices. We are talking about wages and bargaining.

Mr. PLOESER. All right, but wages and prices have a very definite relationship. Would the gentleman therefore advocate that the Government set up a bureau to control all prices and wages?

Mr. LANDIS. No. I want to get rid of bureaus.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not true that in committee when that was urged the gentleman from Indiana said the railroads should be left out?

Mr. LANDIS. Sure the railroads should be left out and so should the other industries be left to bargain industry-wide. If the employer and the employees want to bargain industry-wide, I think they should have the right to do so.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. If you destroy industry-wide bargaining you destroy labor unions, because you will have made them so weak they will not be able to function.

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that.

Mr. KELLEY. There will be no bargaining at all; there cannot be.

Mr. LANDIS. You hit right at the fundamentals of the labor unions. If you are against unions, of course, you are against industry-wide bargaining, but if you are trying to get rid of labor abuses, then do not try to create chaos in the steel industry, automobile industry, the rubber industry, and all the rest of them. Let us not tear up the unions and create chaos all over America. I am for taking care of every labor abuse in America, the secondary boycott, the wildcat strike, all abuses, and all racketeering, but why tear up industry-wide bargaining? Why hit at the fundamentals of the labor unions of America?

Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the consistency of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. Just a few moments ago when I asked the House to write into this bill following the declaration that a man had a right to join a union and to participate in union activities the further statement that a man had a right not to join, oh, no, we could not have that, and the gentleman insisted it would be detrimental to the union.

Now he comes along and praises the Railway Act. That is a fine act. As a matter of fact, the Railway Act has written into it in express words the open shop. It says that a man shall not be discriminated against because of nonmembership in a union. How is that for consistency?

When a few moments ago I was endeavoring to have written into the bill, at the end of subdivision (a), section 7, which declares that "employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join or assist any labor organization and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining and other mutual aid or protection," the simple declaration that they should also "have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities," the argument was made that I was attempting to destroy the unions and that such declaration

was unnecessary and would serve no useful purpose.

The opponents of that provision and, in particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], were vigorous in their opposition, but now the gentleman from Indiana, as just stated, praises the Railway Act and, if you will read it, you will find the following provision there in subdivision 5 of section 152 of title 45 of the United States Code:

> No carrier, its officers, or agents shall require any person seeking employment to sign any contract or agreement promising to join or not to join a labor organization; and if any such contract has been enforced prior to the effective date of this chapter, then such carrier shall notify the employees by an appropriate order that such contract has been discarded and is no longer binding on them in any way.

There is another statute which contains a similar provision. Take a look at the so-called Norris-LaGuardia Act, title 29, chapter 6, section 123 of the United States Code.

There you will find a provision that "every undertaking or promise hereinafter made, whether written or verbal, express or implied, constituting or contained in any contract or agreement of hiring or employment between any individual, firm, company, association or corporation, and any employee or prospective employee of the same, whereby (a) either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises not to join, become or remain a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization," is declared to be contrary to public policy and not enforceable in any court of the United States and shall not afford any basis for the granting of legal or equitable relief by any such court.

What is he talking about now? He is talking about industry-wide bargaining. You take industry-wide bargaining—and remember that industry is regulated by the laws against trusts and monopolies and labor never has been—and General Motors or any other industry which has subsidiaries all over the country can bargain with the union on an industry-wide basis and impose on the employers in the smaller towns the same conditions and the same wages they have in the large cities.

With automatic machinery costing sometimes more than a hundred thousand dollars for one installation, with almost mile-long assembly lines, Detroit or Pittsburgh or any of these places can produce much more cheaply than can the industries in your city or my city. Yet the purpose of this industry-wide bargaining is to impose the same wages, the same working conditions, the same hours upon the people in the small places that obtain in the larger centers.

It means the lessening of industry throughout the smaller communities. It means the wiping out of a small businessman engaged in industry. It means bringing everything to the city and forcing the workers to go to the cities where they live in coops such as we put chickens or other domestic animals in. Where the children are forced to play in the streets.

If that is the kind of America you want to build up, we have the power to do it, but if you want to protect small industry and if you want to protect the worker who prefers to have his job out in the country where he can have a garden and his wife can have a flower bed and his children go to school and have a yard to play in, if you believe in that kind of America, then do not let these unions force industry-wide bargaining upon us and deprive the fellow in the small town of his job. Let them bargain on a company-wide basis as the bill provides.

This law as it is written permits company-wide bargaining. All you need to do is go along as the committee voted and not permit industry-wide bargaining which fastens the bad results and the competition of a monopoly upon all the small industries and upon the employers in the smaller cities.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are here dealing with a subject that is extremely difficult. Every expert who appeared before our committee and every witness had a different idea on this subject of industry-wide bargaining. We all, of course, fear the possibility of a labor leader declaring a strike throughout an entire industry. The bill seeks to deal with that situation in various ways. It provides at the end that in the case of an emergency the President can ask the Attorney General to procure an injunction. It also democratizes unions so that strikes may not be so readily called.

But this proposition of outlawing industry-wide bargaining is mighty serious. I want to point out one grave, and I think vital, defect in the way the bill is drawn. It prohibits employees or their representatives from bargaining where more than one competing employer is concerned. It limits it to a company level so far as the employees are concerned, but it does not limit the employer in the matter of getting together and entering into a contract, one with the other.

On wages the bill is silent. As I understand it, that is not against the antitrust laws. The antitrust laws forbid the fixing of prices. They do not forbid the fixing of wages. That is apparent because of the fact that we have had industry-wide contracts on wages for years and nothing has ever been said about it. But now we are striking down the employees, but are not dealing with the employers. We are not forbidding them from getting together where company A and company B and company C might enter into an agreement in an industry and say, "All right, boys, this year we will knock off your union in company A. Next year we will take care of company B, and the third year company C." The employers can do that under the language of this bill.

So therefore the provision pertaining to industry-wide bargaining whereby we do not permit employees to go beyond one company, I think is vital, and must be remedied. Otherwise, we will then really be putting into the hands of the employers in competing industries the power to strike down unions one after the other.

I have a substitute amendment, if this amendment is not agreed to, which is quite similar, but I favor the general proposition that something has to be done about industry-wide bargaining as far as the provisions of the present bill are concerned.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would not the answer be to amend the antitrust laws to take care of the industries or corporations, rather than to go ahead and perpetuate another evil?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes. I think the antitrust laws should be dealt with in a great many ways, because the reports are that there are many mergers among the large companies. We are getting larger and larger cartels. But if we are going to forbid the employees from bargaining beyond the company level, and permit the companies to agree one with the other, we are really putting it into the hands of the employers to do away with unions. Do not forget this: When we put it on the company basis, and take away industry-wide bargaining, we are then making wages the subject of keen competition among competing employers. As an example, the amalgamated clothing workers in New York will return to the sweatshop pay if we permit this to go through in this fashion. It is a fatal defect.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. I think the gentleman has an excellent proposal along this line and I wish he would explain to the House.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As I understand it, it will be out of order. It cannot be offered as a substitute amendment. It will have to be offered as a separate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a very serious situation which we are discussing. You have heard me speak before about the fact that the other body sometimes expresses itself. We have heard prominent Members of that body express themselves with respect to this very situation. In view of that fact, it behooves us to move slowly. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] and I, and several others, sitting together and discussing this matter, drew an amendment about which the gentleman spoke a moment ago, which we feel will take care of it when it is presented to the conference. It is an amendment which will permit the various unions to reach out and bargain with companies which are united, for the purpose of fixing wages. As the bill stands at present, unions are able to bargain with all of the utilities because they are not competing. For instance, they are able to bargain with the Steel Trust, because in holding companies there is no competition. But where a group of employers, through an association, had merged and decided that they are going to oppose certain wage rates or the fixing of certain wage scales,

I believe it can easily be arranged in conference by this amendment to take care of that situation. I believe it would be a mistake at this time to vote for the pending amendment and thereby vote against the committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this has merit, why should we postpone the period to adjust it? Is that not what we are here for today? If this is the right kind of amendment, why should we not adopt the Landis amendment?

Mr. OWENS. Striking out that entire paragraph would not be proper, because it would give too much leeway. Just because we want to cure a cut is no reason why we should cut off the entire arm.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How are you going to get it into conference if it is not in the bill?

Mr. OWENS. That provision is in the bill, and, therefore, it would be comparatively simple to amend it.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. If we abolish industry-wide bargaining, how do we comply with the Republican platform pledge which reads:

> The Republican Party has always protected the American worker. We shall maintain labor's right of free organization and collective bargaining.

Mr. OWENS. I can answer that, for when it comes to a situation where we know that because of industry-wide bargaining one man at the head of one union can say the word and close down the industry of an entire nation at a time when our Nation could be attacked by an enemy, which is very likely at any time, we would be in a sorry state. It is up to us to be mighty careful to prevent that. By not voting for this amendment but by changing it in conference to remove any slight error that might arise I think would be the best step to take.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Why would it not be well to read to the Members the amendment the gentleman proposes, what the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. OWENS. I see no objection to that. I believe the difference could be taken care of in conference. The amendment reads:

> Page 31, line 23, add the following:
> "*Provided, however,* in every instance in which such competing employers may lawfully engage in any concerted activities among themselves in the formulation of a common or agreed policy for collective bargaining with their respective employees or any of them whereby such competing employers are subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval, the representatives of such employees as may be affected by such concerted employer activities may likewise formulate a common or agreed collective-bargaining policy that is coextensive in every legal effect with the policy of such competing employers.

I believe that takes care of it equitably for both the employees and the employers. It could also be reached by forbidding concerted action by competing employers to fix wage rates.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. If the Landis amendment is voted down, will we not have an opportunity to vote on this in the House rather than wait until the bill gets into conference?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I believe that would be the proper step to take, and it would be excellent if the Committee on Education and Labor, in conference, can agree to adopt the amendment as a committee amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], and in line with the thought expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Let us see what we do with this particular provision. As we know, many of the necessities of life are manufactured by corporations and are distributed on a Nation-wide basis. Let us take any of the famous-brand names, whether it be in food, clothing, or whatnot; the article, whether it be a Firestone tire or a Stetson hat, is priced nationally; in other words, that organization has the privilege of pricing in thousands of stores throughout the United States the same article at the same price. They manufacture and distribute these articles in many different plants throughout the United States.

Let us take the General Electric Co., for instance. They have 96 different factories. This provision of the bill would force upon General Electric and upon their employees the necessity of having 96 different bargaining contracts unless the plant has less than 100 employees, as I understand it. If I am not right I should like to be corrected. I ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. And less than 50 miles apart.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it would be on a regional basis.

Mr. BREHM. If the gentleman will yield, that is not correct; a company would be permitted to bargain all over the country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is not true.

Mr. BREHM. That absolutely is true according to our legal counsel.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to make the statement that under this bill General Electric would have to have 90-odd contracts?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me ask the question: If General Electric had 96 plants would they have to have 96 different bargaining contracts?

Mr. HARTLEY. The gentleman is entirely in error in his understanding of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. HARTLEY. Under this bill we ban industry-wide bargaining, but we do not bar company-wide bargaining; so General Electric could bargain for the employees in all its plants in one contract.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me pursue the question further and ask the meaning of the provision with reference to the 50-mile area and the 100 or less employees in a plant. What would that have to do with it?

Mr. HARTLEY. That would not interfere with it in any way.

On page 31, line 7, the language is as follows:

> (1) A representative that has been designated or acts as the representative of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representative of employees of any competing employer, unless the employees of such employers whom the representative seeks to represent are regularly less than 100 in number and the plants or other facilities of such employers at which the representative acts and seeks to act as such are less than 50 miles apart, but nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any representative from being affiliated or associated, directly or through a federation, association, or parent organization, with representatives of competing employers, if the collective bargaining, concerted activities, or terms of collective bargains or arrangements of such representatives are not subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I understand it, then, if the General Electric through its board of directors would say: "We will not pay over 75 cents an hour as a maximum for a certain job throughout all of their plants" there would not be any necessity in a local area for bargaining on that?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The provision simply brings bargaining down to the employer level, not the plant level. Having regard to the General Electric, with whatever number of plants it may have, each of those plants could bargain with the unit of that plant, the representative unit, if that were the arrangement agreed upon. The employees of General Electric being in one over-all union or being made up of the locals in the different plant unions could bargain with the management of General Electric for contracts covering all of the plants.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On what basis could they secure that right of bargaining on consent of General Electric?

Mr. HALLECK. It is left to agreement. There is no prohibition in the law as far as General Electric is concerned or the employees of General Electric.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the situation as it exists today.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. The situation of the 100 employees within a 50-mile radius is designed to take care of, oh, say, little foundries in a community employing less than 100 men, fabricating plants and things of that kind, where a general over-all bargaining operation is

the desirable thing. That sort of situation does not give rise to the monopolistic practices that are sought to be reached by this provision of the bill. So I think very rightly the committee exempted employers having less than 100 employees and within a 50-mile radius.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] brought up one of the basic factors behind this particular provision when he mentioned the city of Pittsburgh and spoke of the economic competition between the large cities, mentioning Pittsburgh specifically, and small communities, and mentioned that competition in respect to this particular provision on the ban on industry-wide bargaining. That brings me to my feet because while we have five Congressmen from Allegheny County, there are two of us on the floor of this Congress who have the majority of their districts in Pittsburgh, that great industrial area. I represent the southern industrial area of Pittsburgh consisting of shipbuilding, mines, mills, factories, and I am glad to say such industrial areas have Republican Representatives as well as Democratic Representatives.

The position I would like to bring out is this: If we people in the cities are put into competition with people in small communities and in farm areas where those people can work part time in factories, and then get part of their food and their living from the soil, we are going to be in a bad competitive bargaining position. We have the highest wages in the world in our Pittsburgh industrial area, and we pay the highest prices for food because we have to buy it in city stores. The food has to be shipped in, and we pay freight costs on top of production costs. Because we live in the city we pay the highest taxes of any type community in the whole Nation, and in addition we have this competitive disadvantage because we have to buy all of our food at the city stores. We cannot raise any of it, yet they tax our real estate high, they tax our income high, and Pittsburgh does pay as high an income tax as any city in the country.

Now, if you look at it on that particular basis, I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] brought it up. I had not intended to speak, but let me tell you this: I am here to protect the city of Pittsburgh. If it is really on that basis as the gentleman from Michigan states, I am in there fighting, and I think some of the people from the cities better wake up. I do not want to put the city against the country, but if that is the basis that this provision was drawn on, I think it is a very unfortunate basis.

May I say, however, that I do think there are logical reasons outside of competition between urban and rural areas, which can be cited on both sides of this question. The logical reason which impresses me is this, that once your industries have grown up beyond an agricultural economy, until you have industries that distribute Nation-wide and produce Nation-wide, and when you have groups of employers and associations acting together, it is only natural that on the other side there should develop joint action, group action, through collective bargaining. We have had that development here in this country. I, too, think it has become lopsided and that certain things have to be corrected.

But let me warn you, industry is the heart of this country. We cannot afford, without looking into it closer, to go too deeply into probing the heart, because you may stop the whole thing in these trying times. If we are going to correct abuses, let us correct the abuses. Let us not change the entire structure, because in changing it you may have a transition such that ends you up in a controlled economy. I think there is too much Government control now, and I am against this prohibition of free agreements by labor and management arrived at by collective bargaining between the parties, because this is a further Government control of contracts, and I hope the Republicans will support me on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can understand and appreciate the gentleman's position and I respect his views. My point was this, that while you in the cities are compelled to pay more for the food and the clothing and the things you use, would you deprive the small employer who is out in the country and who can get, as you stated, competitive workers for a less wage, because they do live in the country and raise a part of their food—would you deprive him of his business by forcing him to pay a wage on a product where he cannot meet the city price in competition?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; he can meet the city price.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How?

Mr. FULTON. Because we had that argument proved out in the southern and northern coal operators' fight. We have been up against that in Pittsburgh all along, where the southern operators wanted to pay the miners less. They were able to deal with local employees because the employees were not apprised of their rights of collective bargaining and they did not have the representation that was as experienced as they had in the northern fields. We paid a higher wage rate in the northern fields, and then it was always a fight. First there was the fight between the mine operators and the unions, and then the unions would join up with the mine operators in the North and fight the southern operators to get their wages higher. That is the way it has been all along. There is no doubt that both the northern and southern coal mines are operated successfully under better working conditions than previously but it has been a long, uphill climb.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the discussion between the majority leader and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. The simple matter is that bargaining has been surrounded by so much prohibition that you would not have any collective bargaining. You would break it down, you would destroy it. Let us not kid ourselves about that.

The gentleman from Pittsburgh [Mr. FULTON] raised the point about the coal industry, as to the difference between the coal operators in the South and the coal operators in the North—I will say the operators in southern West Virginia and those in Pennsylvania. I know something about what happened in years gone by when they did not have industry-wide bargaining in the coal industry. The gentleman said the southern operators wanted to pay a lower wage. Well, they did. They did for years, until the industry-wide bargaining brought about a level that they both paid. So it helped the coal industry all over the country. So when you talk about industry-wide bargaining and try to surround it with all the prohibitions that this bill is trying to do, you might just as well quit kidding the people of the country, because you are destroying collective bargaining, you are destroying all bargaining, and you are destroying the unions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The explanation that was given me was not wholly satisfactory to me, although it was partially. At the bottom of page 31, in subsection 2 appear these words:

> Upon application of any interested person or persons, the Board shall direct the Administrator to provide for a separate ballot for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession or other distinguishable group within a proposed bargaining unit.

As I understand that, any interested party would be either a party on the part of management, a party on the part of the union, or an individual in a union. So it seems to me that certainly that would be a case where a ballot would be required on a much narrower basis than on an industry-wide basis. In other words, it seems to me this is breaking it down to individual plants. If that be the case, if the bill is as I interpret it on that point, it seems to me you are going back into the days of the sweatshop conditions in the clothing business in New York, when competing manufacturers had no obligation at all in the way of a minimum-wage law, when each one would compete with the other in the pricing of their articles in the market, and the only place that they could cut after they passed a certain point in materials and efficiency was in the wages of the individual worker. We know what resulted from that cutthroat bargaining back and forth. The whole industry went into chaos. In view of the latter part of this section on pages 31 and 32 it seems to me you are returning to that status of bargaining.

Mr. KELLEY. That is inevitable.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Whether it is a plant, a profession, a trade, or a calling, you break it down to the very lowest minimum industrial or manufacturing group. If my understanding is wrong,

I should like to have an explanation from the chairman on that.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I think the gentleman's understanding is in error there, because the language the gentleman just read refers to a case where you find a craft union working with an industrial union. It is an endeavor there to protect the right of the craft union to bargain by itself and protect its own identity and not be gobbled up and lost sight of in the larger industrial union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, in addition to crafts, it has many others—department, plant, trade, calling, and profession. I admit that is true in regard to the craft, but I think it goes further than that.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. In the case of the amalgamated clothing workers, where there is more than one employer, and there is more than one employer, they have to have a number of 100 or less employees before they can bargain in this 50-mile limit. There is no question about it, it will disrupt the whole amalgamated clothing workers' industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That was my interpretation. In other words, plants like Hart, Schaffner & Marx and Kuppenheimer and other national firms whose plants have from 500 to 5,000 workers in different cities could not bargain together.

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

In outlawing industry-wide bargaining this bill disregards the fact that employers compete with one another, both as to the price and quality of their product and for labor. It is unthinkable, for example, that the large automobile manufacturers, all of whom compete for labor in any market, can pay a different wage scale. Yet, this provision would necessarily mean that the wage levels of entire industries would be forced down to the lowest level which any substantial group of employees were inclined to, or could, accept.

Under this subsection of the bill, a union that has been designated as collective-bargaining representative would be ineligible to be certified as the representative of the employees of any competing employer, unless the employees involved are less than 100 in number and the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. A provision more inconsistent with the policy of the bill set out in section 1, to minimize industrial strife and to encourage peaceful settlement of labor disputes, could scarcely be imagined.

The impairment of industry-wide bargaining that might well follow from the enactment of this bill would upset existing collective-bargaining practices which have proved successful in many industries and made important contributions to industrial peace.

Employers as much as employees have benefited from this practice and have testified in favor of its continuance. Such widely varied employer groups as the men's clothing industry, the full-fashioned hosiery, shipbuilding, and the maritime industries have testified to the efficacy of industry-wide bargaining as a means of promoting stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has shown also that industry-wide bargaining has made a valuable contribution to the promotion and maintenance of fair standards in wages, hours and working conditions, to the benefit not only of the living standards of the wage-earners of this country but also the prosperity of the employers in the industry. The stabilization of wage rates through industry-wide bargaining has helped to discourage unfair competition with respect to wage rates and has enabled the great majority of fair-minded employers to operate at the American level of fair play and decency.

Although the sponsors of this proposal undoubtedly did not intend it, one of the significant effects of any weakening of industry-wide bargaining would be to seriously impair the bargaining power of many employers. Unions would be aided in a policy of picking off employers one by one. Employers who sought to protect themselves against such tactics by organizing and bargaining as a unit would be hurt by a limitation on industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, unscrupulous labor racketeers or radical elements would be free to follow a policy of divide and conquer. That is the reason why small employers, particularly, look to industry-wide bargaining as their only hope of gaining some approximation of equality with large and powerful unions.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, if the people back home like the telephone strike and if you want John L. Lewis to continue to apply and tighten his noose around the country's neck and if you want James C. Petrillo to continue to dictate to every musician and every theater and every radio station in America and if you want the thugs in the teamsters' union to continue to control the small stores from coast to coast, then vote in favor of the Landis amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Are there not other provisions in this bill which go far toward taking care of those admitted abuses in the existing law without destroying industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. BUCK. They do help, but the prohibition against industry-wide bargaining, in my opinion, is the heart of the bill.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I would like to tell the gentleman that the major part of my district lies in the great industrial city of Pittsburgh and for the protection of the more than 150,000 breadwinners whom I represent, I am going to vote against the amendment and in favor of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is probably the most important provision in this bill which they are attempting to destroy. Make no mistake about it. If you eliminate this provision in the bill, you eliminate the principal bulwark that is provided here against a monopoly about which we have had complaints in the different fields that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] just referred to.

In the committee hearings we had many instances of how this thing works. It has practically destroyed industry-wide bargaining in its true meaning in this country. No longer do they sit down across the table at a plant or in the areas where the conditions exist and undertake to iron out their differences and agree upon the terms of the contract. No; it is handled now by absentee bosses who operate a thousand miles away writing out the pattern for a gigantic industry-wide situation.

Consider the United Steelworkers, for example. Phil Murray controls about 1,000,000 workers. Only a portion of them are actually in the steel industry. They are in many allied industries and many independent competing companies. Yet, when the strike order was sent out last January a year ago, all of these companies had to go out on strike. The employees in every one of the companies had to go out.

We had many instances brought to the attention of the committee where the employees did not want to strike. In some cases they even voted against going out on strike, but they were instructed that they could not settle and could not make a contract until they were given the word and the pattern from headquarters.

The result has been that collective bargaining is a mockery, as you can see. In the steel case, it was referred to as collective bludgeoning, and that is not an inapt description of it by any means. Therefore, strikes imposed upon the employees in many industries who did not want to strike. Why? Because they were ordered from headquarters of the international unions.

It is hard to believe what is going on, and it is not going on in isolated cases either. We had an instance brought to the attention of the committee where the companies of some of these concerns covered by the steel workers' union contract received a notice from the Labor Department of a strike notice because of a dispute in the plant and they then called in the officers of the local union and asked them about it because they had never heard about it. The local officers said, "We never heard about it either and perhaps you had better call the international office to find out what the trouble is."

Now, that happened in many, many cases. That is one of the byproducts of your industry-wide bargaining as it has grown up in this country. If you want to operate it that way then you should vote for this amendment. If you want to break it down and let bargaining be on the company level or on the plant

level, then vote against this amendment. There is no way of escaping the issue. It is purely a question of monopoly—a matter of control over tremendous industries that vitally affect the welfare of the entire Nation.

I recall very well a few months ago when there was a great clamor that went over this Nation about curtailing the monopolistic powers of John L. Lewis, who was able to pull a string down in the Carlton Hotel and with one fell swoop call out 400,000 miners and cause this Nation to get down on its knees. I think most of you remember that. Now, do you want to let him do that again? There is only one provision in this bill that will break down that concentration of power, and that is to prohibit industry-wide bargaining. Break down that monopolistic control over all of these men at one time. The coal industry is owned by hundreds and hundreds of different concerns, entirely independent of other concerns. It is an industry that is broken up into different groups and different ownerships. Each one has a local union. Let those local unions bargain with the local plants and you will break down this monopoly. You will restore collective bargaining as a real thing. You will perform a real service to the workers and to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, just for the purpose of clarifying a statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], wh'ch was completely in error, I wish to say that this bill, as presently drafted, permits employer-wide bargaining regardless of the size of the corporation. That goes for Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and it goes for the telephone company, and it goes for the United States Steel Corp., and it goes for any employer, regardless of size. However, it is not compulsory upon the employees. If the employees in any separate craft, plant, or otherwise wish to vote to have a different representative, then the provision that the gentleman referred to in section 9 (f) (2) is the provision that gives them that right. It does nothing more.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. In other words, all the employees of Chrysler, Ford, or General Motors, or the employees of any manufacturer of any automobile can bargain on that plant basis, but they cannot bargain over-all for the entire automotive industry?

Mr. MACKINNON. They can bargain at one sitting for the entire Ford industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As the gentleman explains it, is it not true that if any person in that bargaining unit, as outlined in section 2, requests individual bargaining on the basis of a certain plant, it would impose upon that plant the necessity for that single bargaining?

Mr. MACKINNON. No; if they petition for it this provision merely says there shall be a separate ballot of the employees of that particular unit to determine, by majority vote, who they want to represent them. It is a purely democratic procedure.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not a fact that in the bill as it now stands the only prohibition upon even industry-wide bargaining of a union is that it makes them eligible to be certified as the bargaining representative of the company? Aside from that, they have full right to go ahead and bargain industry-wide?

Mr. MACKINNON. That is correct in my opinion.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. Why allow General Electric and United Electric employers to bargain on wages and not the employees of those outfits?

Mr. MACKINNON. It does allow them.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman means United Electric and General Electric together?

Mr. MACKINNON. No; not together.

Mr. LANDIS. It depends upon what the employer does. You have different clothing employers bargaining separately. You do not bunch them together.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is correct but I am merely explaining the workings of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANDIS) there were—ayes 71, noes 161.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the States of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3020) the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Sault St. Marie Evening News of Friday, April 11.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence published in the Long Beach Press Telegram, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Shore Breeze, Shore High School, Euclid, Ohio, telling of the exploits of William Crowell, who won the American Legion essay contest here in Washington, and also to include the essay that he wrote on the subject "Americanism Or."

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News of April 16, 1947.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Pan-American Week.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include with those remarks a table and a statement.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include another newspaper item.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five separate instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and was given permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain information regarding the enforcement of cases by OPA. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75. In view of the importance of this matter I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CLASON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently made by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which I consider to be a very courageous statement and one of a most constructive nature in the forming of a

sound public opinion in America at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 3042, referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States House of Representatives. A preliminary hearing on this measure has been scheduled for next week. I hope the committee will ultimately report it favorably to the House for consideration.

The purpose of H. R. 3042 is to reduce the accident toll on the Nation's highways by establishing and enforcing uniform regulations for the issuance of drivers' licenses, and requiring financial responsibility on the part of drivers, and thus to insure, so far as possible, that those operating motor vehicles are reasonably fit, competent, and able to do so. Few subjects would seem of greater importance than the safety of life and limb. Yet, the slaughter on the highways of this country is annually greater than American losses in the First World War and shows steady increase. Too many Americans apparently accept traffic accidents as inevitable. They do not see or possibly comprehend the tremendous daily toll of killed and injured and the vast property losses resulting from a sum total of many millions of individual acts of thoughtlessness and indifference. It is true, but difficult to believe, that while we have had the automobile for about 50 years, numerous States still permit anyone, regardless of his physical or mental fitness, to operate with abandon a killing machine capable of traveling up to 100 miles per hour and weighing thousands of pounds. Some of the States which do have license requirements for drivers nevertheless issue licenses cheerfully to lunatics, habitual drunkards, and narcotic addicts. Many drivers are more dangerous than a maniac with a meat ax. In my own State you can get a driver's license renewed for 25 cents and without a test of any kind. In many other States and numerous cities, the drivers' license is a revenue and not a safety measure.

Statistics gathered by various authoritative sources show that since the end of the war and the resumption of heavy motor travel, the death rate from automobile operation is again decidedly on the increase. This deadly killer now ranks tenth in the list of causes of death in this country, and no less a person than the President himself has publicly predicted that on the basis of known figures the automobile accident toll this year in this country will reach 30,000 fatalities. This does not even take into account the great loss and suffering from personal injuries not fatal, or the tremendous property damage resulting from motor accidents, or the inevitable business and financial losses accruing therefrom, or the delays and hazards created in travel and interstate traffic. A study of these accidents will demonstrate that many arise from the presence on highways of persons who are unfit or incompetent to drive an automobile.

Congress is properly giving much attention to prevention of accidents in the air. Yet, the proportion of air accidents is infinitesimal compared to auto accidents.

It is hardly arguable that something must be done to correct a situation which goes to the very heart of the well-being of the public and of business. Some States, of course, have adopted stringent measures for the regulation of motorcar operation and the careful examination of those who seek to drive. Others, unfortunately, have little real effective legislation on the subject and there is a general lack of uniformity in laws presently existing. A number of States do not even require an examination of a person's fitness or ability to operate a motor vehicle. Under present conditions, with heavy traffic between States and highway travel greater than ever before, and with more worn and unsafe automobiles on the road than ever before, the problem is no longer one of purely local concern. Intercourse between the States on the many highways of the country is now so great and so commonplace that States acting individually can no longer effectively cope with the situation confronting us.

The bill I propose represents the first step in securing effective Federal regulation as the only means whereby safety on the highways can now be promoted. The bill sets forth various regulations and restrictions for the issuance of operators' and chauffeurs' licenses, provides for an actual test of a person's ability to drive an automobile, provides conditions under which a license may be suspended, canceled, or revoked, and provides for an office of Commissioner to administer the law and keep the necessary records. The modest fees which the bill requires to be paid are not onerous but will assist materially in defraying the cost of administration. No one dislikes to see additional Government bureaus any more than I do. But Government has its obligations to the people. The time is here when we should have bureaus to help the citizen protect his life and property instead of taking it away from him. We have too many of the latter kind and not enough of the former.

My bill incorporates many provisions recommended in the model code approved by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety and thus reflects expert consideration as to what is necessary for effective examination and control of those who operate motor vehicles.

The objection will doubtless be raised, as it has in the past, that highway safety is a matter of purely local concern, that States' rights must not be interfered with and that such a bill is not within the constitutional power of Congress to enact. I submit that States' rights are of little interest or value to a citizen who is lying crushed in the gutter, his brains mixed with blood and crankcase oil, the victim of a preventable motorcar accident. I want to do nothing which would take away from the States any power or responsibility they might have in the matter but I do wish to emphasize that the Federal Government has its responsibility, too, a responsibility that has been wholly neglected to the sorrow of countless dead and maimed. The Federal Government is annually contributing hundreds of millions of dollars to be supplemented by State funds for street and highway construction. Advocates of States' rights welcome this Federal aid with open palms. But, what shall it profit our people to have super-highways devoid of safety? You or a loved one may be killed just as dead on a United States highway in a State with drivers' license laws as on a road in a State which has no laws, but your risk is greater where such laws do not exist.

I believe that the power conferred by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce affords a sound basis of constitutionality for my bill. The present climate of judicial opinion has broadened appreciably the concept of the commerce clause from earlier and more narrow views. The Supreme Court has ruled that interstate commerce embraces any sort of activity, commerce or traffic, which concerns more States than one and which substantially and economically affects interstate commerce. The Court has frequently upheld the regulation of purely intrastate activities which have had such an affect or which are so commingled with interstate activities that the one could not be regulated without the other. Even if an activity be local and not regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, the Court has said, be reached by Congress if it exerts a substantial and economic effect on interstate activities. Within the scope of the commerce power the use of the highways is subject to the imposition of legislative conditions having the character of police regulations, and regulations of this sort are based on the public interest. The operation of motor vehicles can no longer be separated into 48 distinct territorial compartments which function in isolation from each other. It is common knowledge that today there is a continuous and indivisible stream of vehicular traffic and intercourse betwen the States, and it cannot be determined where local operation ends and interstate operation begins. The Supreme Court has declared that the power to regulate under the commerce clause is to legislate concerning matters which, reaching across State lines, affect the people of more States than one. I submit that the operation of motor vehicles on our highways comes within this category.

For those who may be interested in this legal aspect of the matter I will include in the RECORD a brief I have prepared, listing the pertinent judicial decisions to substantiate my position.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I understand the gentleman's bill will be in the nature of a uniform Federal traffic code.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. I do not see why it could not be worked out. We have a uniform Negotiable Instruments Act. Prior to coming to Congress I was on the bench for a long while. Sometimes those who wanted to reform others were at the same time the greatest traffic violators. At one time I had on the bench with me a great minister from Kansas, the man who wrote the book In His Steps, Rev. Charles M. Sheldon. After the unfortunates were heard they reached the traffic cases, and found those that were self-righteous violating the traffic laws. He said, "I can see that the punishment of traffic offenders is much more difficult, because while in police court matters you have the publicans, in traffic court you have the Pharisees." This came from perhaps the world's greatest clergyman, who sat on the bench with me that day.

I believe the figures which no doubt will later be included in the gentleman's address show that even during the latest war more people were injured in traffic accidents, even though they could not drive so much, than were injured in the war itself. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Probably so.

Mr. RAMEY. In the First World War it was many times over.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio is a former judge, who while sitting on the bench handled many traffic cases. He is very well qualified, I think, to express helpful opinions on the subject. I am grateful for his contribution.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I take pleasure in congratulating my colleague from the State of Missouri on his timely presentation. I am glad to see that he has taken the initiative on this legislation. I hope the committee considers it favorably, and I will be pleased to support the bill if and when it comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to also commend the gentleman for his efforts in calling the attention of the Nation to this very serious problem.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

It is a very serious problem and one that merits the attention and consideration of the Congress of the United States.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BILL TO REGULATE OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

A bill which seeks to regulate the operation of motor vehicles by individuals must be sustained, if at all, under the power granted Congress by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. Other possibilities may be dismissed with brief mention. It is settled that the Congress has no general police power—*Speert* v. *Morgenthau* (App. D. C. 1940), 116 F. (2d) 301. Nor does the general welfare clause of the Constitution—article I, section 8, clause 1—empower Congress to legislate generally for the public benefit, but merely empowers Congress to tax and appropriate the moneys so raised for the purpose of paying the Nation's debts and providing for the Nation's welfare—*U. S.* v. *Butler* ((1936) 297 U. S. 1). Thus the clause is not an independent grant of power but a limitation on the power to tax—*John A. Gebelein, Inc.* v. *Milbourne* ((D. Md. 1935), 12 F. Supp. 105). While the taxing power may be the basis for regulatory measures which have the quality of police provisions, nevertheless, the bill at least on its face must be for revenue purposes and the Supreme Court in some instances has frowned on enactments which used the taxing power merely as a means of imposing police regulations. See Cushman, Social and Economic Control Through Federal Taxation, 1934, Eighteenth Minnesota Law Revised, page 759; Essert, What Is Meant by Police Power? Twelfth Nebraska Law Bulletin, page 208; Willis on Constitutional Law, 1936, 721–722. In respect to regulation of motor vehicle operation, the object of the taxing power would be difficult to define and, moreover, the measure would patently have as its object police regulations rather than the raising of revenue.

With regard to the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, article I, section 8, clause 3, the climate of judicial opinion has broadened the concept of the power from earlier and more narrow views to that originally envisioned by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* ((1824) 9 Wheat. 1): that it covers any commerce "which concerns more States than one"—*Zehring* v. *Brown Materials, Ltd.* ((S. D. Cal. 1943) 48 F. Supp. 740); *Wickard* v. *Filburn* ((1942) 317 U. S. 111); *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533). Chief Justice Marshall also declared:

> The genius and character of the whole government seems to be, that its action is to be applied to all the external concerns of the Nation, and to those internal concerns which affect the States generally; but not to those which are completely within a particular State, which do not affect other States, and with which it is not necessary to interfere, for the purpose of executing some of the general powers of the Government. The completely internal commerce of a State, then, may be considered as reserved for the State itself. (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, supra.)

It is now recognized that the commerce clause must be fitted to the practical essence of modern life and that the dividing line between interstate and intrastate commerce is not immovable but must often be redrawn to conform to the changed conditions of the times—*U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n, supra; Chicago Board of Trade* v. *Olson* ((1923) 262 U. S. 1, 35); *Pensacola Telegraph Co.* v. *Western Union Telegraph Co.* ((1877) 96 U. S. 1, 9). The expansion of our national economy has "inevitably been reflected in the extension of Federal authority over economic enterprise and its absorption of authority previously possessed by the States"—*A. B. Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling* ((1942) 316 U. S. 517). In this respect the congressional approach has been "strikingly empiric"—*A. B. Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling, supra.* From the practical standpoint, there can be no hard and fast rule, no rigid formula or dependable touchstone as to what is or is not interstate commerce. In construing the commerce clause, the Supreme Court acts in a gradual process of inclusion and exclusion: The criterion is necessarily one of degree—*Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1938) 303 U. S. 453); *Wickard* v. *Filburn, supra.* There is no controlling force to past nomenclature for formulae. "The precise boundary has never yet been, and doubtless never can be, delineated by a single abstract definition"—*U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n, supra.*

The approach laid down by the Supreme Court today is whether the activity in question substantially and economically "affect" interstate commerce. If activities through intrastate have such an effect, they may be regulated—*Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1938) 303 U. S. 45); *Wickard* v. *Filburn* ((1942) 317 U. S. 111); *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533).

> The commerce power is not confined to its exercise to the regulation of commerce among the States. It extends to those activities intrastate which so affect interstate commerce, or the exertion of the power of Congress over it, as to make regulation of them appropriate means to the attainment of a legitimate end, the effective execution of the granted power to regulate interstate commerce. (*U. S.* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.* (1942), 315 U. S. 110; see *Smolowe* v. *Delendo Corp.* (C. C. A. 2d, 1943), 136 F. (2d) 231.)

Moreover, it is no longer necessary to find that intrastate activities have a "direct" effect on interstate commerce. Even if the activity be local and though it may not be regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, be reached by Congress, if it exerts a substantial and economic effect on interstate commerce, and this irrespective of whether such effect is that what might at some earlier time have been defined as "direct" or "indirect"—*Wickard* v. *Filburn*, supra. Where intrastate activities are so commingled with or related to those of an interstate character, that all must be regulated if interstate commerce is to be controlled effectively, then Congress has the power so to do—*U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100); *Currin* v. *Wallace* ((1939) 306 U. S. 1). Nor does the tenth amendment prevent Congress from resort to all means appropriate to the permitted end—*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra. If Congress says in a statutory declaration that a particular activity affects interstate commerce, then the courts in passing on the validity of the statute have only the function of determining whether that activity is within reach of the Federal power—*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra. And such validity is determined by what is regulated, not by what the regulation affects—*Enterprise Box Co.* v. *Fleming* ((C. C. A. 5th, 1942) 125 F. 2d 897).

The use of the highways is subject to the imposition of legislative conditions within the scope of the commerce power, and regulation of this nature is based on the public interest—*Transamerican Freight Lines, Inc.* v. *U. S.* ((D. Del. 1943) 51 F. Supp. 405). In light of the principles just stated, and adapting the language of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533), it is arguable that the operation of motor vehicles "is not separated into 48 distinct territorial compartments which function in isolation from each other." Rather there is "a continuous and indivisible stream of intercourse among the States" and it cannot be said with any exactness where local operation ends and interstate operation begins. It is a matter of common knowledge that with the improvement and expansion of the national highway system and the coming of the present-day automobile, rendering all points easily accessible to the traveling public, the operation of motor vehicles is no longer confined solely to local use. There is a vast stream of traffic between the States at all times, and much of this traffic partakes of or relates to matters of business and trade. Chief Justice Marshall said that commerce was "traffic"—Gibbons against Ogden, supra—and anything which interferes with or obstructs this traffic can be regulated.

Certainly, a State law which in some fashion unreasonably prevented the inflow of such traffic would be regarded as interfering with interstate commerce. Compare *Edwards* v. *California* ((1941) 314 U. S. 160). Similarly, accidents, with resulting delays, hazards, personal injury, and property losses, affect such traffic and materially affect the flow and economic aspects of interstate commerce. If these matters are to be regulated, then driving, even of a purely local nature, must also be regulated in order for congressional control to be effective. Within the principles stated by the Supreme Court, a good argument can be made that regulation of this sort is within the power granted by the commerce clause, as presently construed. Under modern conditions, it can be said that motor-vehicle operation is a matter which reaches across State lines, affecting the people of more States than one.—See United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association, supra.

It is no objection to the congressional assertion of power to regulate interstate commerce that its exercise is attended by the same incidents which attend the exercise of a State's police power—*U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100). Congress can control interstate commerce to the extent of forbidding and punishing certain acts therein which spread harm to the people of other States from the State of origin. In so doing it is merely exerting the police power, for the benefit of the public, within the field of interstate commerce—*Kentucky Whip & Collar Co.* v. *Illinois Central R. Co.* ((1937) 299 U. S. 334); *Currin* v. *Wallace* ((1939) 306 U. S. 1).

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 15, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

552. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $564,000 and a proposed provision for reappropriation of an unobligated balance of $1,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

553. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation involving a decrease of $33,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

554. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of various equipment to city of Memphis, Tenn., town of Newfield, N. J., and Thompson Products Auto Album and Aviation Museum, Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

556. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redeeming their geographic scope; to the Committee on Public Lands.

557. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate pertaining to the administrative expense authorization of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 203); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

558. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the withdrawal of a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,640,000 for the Federal Loan Agency (H. Doc. No. 204); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

559. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the period July 1, 1945, to March 14, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend 42 United States Code 253 (b) (the Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3074. A bill to fix the rate of tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employers and employees for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3075. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3076. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3077. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3078. A bill to permit certain employment by the United States to be included as employment under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3079. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3080. A bill to improve housing conditions in the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3081. A bill to promote the national security by establishing a uniform ratio of officer and enlisted strength for all the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3082. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the family of the late Patrick Rose, in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of fellow fishermen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3083. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3085. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory

thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3086. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 102, 103; 33 U. S. C. 158, 159), providing for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States, to extend the provisions thereof to the Mississippi River below the Huey P. Long Bridge at New Orleans, La., to certain other rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and to the entire Gulf intracoastal waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the prevention of collisions on western rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 184. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) (a) (16) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal legislation concerning income-tax discrimination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3088. A bill for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3090. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Ridenhour, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3091. A bill for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada Svejkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3093. A bill for the relief of Ernest Bernhard Jaffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3094. A bill for the relief of the Silver Fleet Motor Express, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3095. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Estes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

335. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Passaic, N. J., memorializing Congress to withhold passage of the proposed legislation to change the basis of industrial relations, to call a meeting of management, labor, and the public for the purpose of deciding in what areas self-disciplinary measures can be applied, and to rededicate its purposes to the welfare and prosperity of all citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

336. By Mr. CLASON: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

337. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt an effective permanent Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

338. By Mr. MILLER of California: Senate Joint Resolution 14 adopted by California State Legislature, relative to appropriations affecting the United States customs service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

339. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Slovak Catholic Sokol Assembly 124, of Racine, Wis., asking for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

340. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition by the Senate and House, Missouri Legislature, concerning legislation permitting the division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Transport and Quartermasters Department Servicemen of Spanish War, McKinley Fleet, No. 1, of San Francisco, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the endorsement of S. 340 and H. R. 886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

342. Also, petition of members of St. Cloud Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

343. Also, petition of the chairman, Board of Temperance, Southwest Missouri Methodist Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

344. Also, petition of the Daytona Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in whom is our trust, Thou alone dost know the end from the beginning, and we, Thy children, must needs walk by faith. We are anxious about the consequences of what we do. May that concern restrain us in our private lives as it does in our public duty. In our troubled minds there is confusion and honest perplexity. But we know there is no confusion with Thee. Wilt Thou guide us, that we may do what is right; and if we suffer for it, we shall be blessed.

This we ask in Christ's name, who was crucified, having done nothing amiss. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 17, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; and

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.).

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations may sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the time of the recess last evening the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] had the floor, and under the unanimous-consent agreement he retains it this morning.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Louis L. Brown to be postmaster at Fort Valley, Ga., which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 151 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year

ended June 30, 1946, and to the date of its liquidation, March 14, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the Congress did return the public employment service to the respective States as of November 16, 1946, and provided for payment of all operation expenses by the Federal Government only through June 30, 1948; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated funds to meet the full cost of operating the public employment services since January of 1942; and

"Whereas the Federal unemployment compensation tax collected on pay rolls of employers has greatly exceeded the entire cost of the operation of the public employment service and unemployment compensation programs; and

"Whereas the States were required under the Wagner-Peyser Act to appropriate a portion of the expense for the operation of the public employment service from its general fund up to and prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Congress be, and it hereby is, memorialized to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Georgia."

A memorial of the American Chamber of Commerce in Paris, France, remonstrating against the ratification in the present form of the 1946 Franco-American Double Taxation Convention; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from Fred Kirchner, secretary of McKinley Fleet, No. 1, Transport and Quartermasters' Departments, Service Men of the Spanish War, San Francisco, Calif., transmitting a memorandum of that organization, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 340) to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of delegates of the Townsend Clubs of the Fifth Congressional District, and members of the Daytona Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning Federal income-tax returns

"Whereas several States now have community-property laws by virtue of which certain citizens of such States receive Federal income-tax advantages over the citizens, similarly situated, of other States, including the State of Colorado, which do not have community-property laws; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado that the citizens of each State should be permitted to file Federal income-tax returns on the same basis, whether such State is a community-property State or not; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Colorado is advised that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposed legislation which is designed to eliminate Federal income-tax discrimination between the citizens of community-property States and the citizens of non-community-property States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to approve said proposed legislation or so much thereof as is necessary to eliminate the Federal income-tax discrimination between the citizens of community-property States and the citizens of non-community-property States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the enactment of legislation relating to the use of surplus military lands for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on April 15, 1947, p. 3377, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by approximately 70 citizens of Winchester, Oskaloosa, and Valley Falls, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 354. A bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission; with an amendment (Rept. No. 103).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 993. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 104).

THAD E. RAGSDALE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 94, and I request its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 94), submitted by Mr. MURRAY on March 18, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thad E. Ragsdale, the sum of $1,046.67, for reporting and transcribing certain hearings held by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

CHANGE OF NAME OF COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 99, and I request its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99), submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, on March 27, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) (e) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "Committee on Civil Service" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Post Office and Civil Service."

Such change in identification of this committee shall be effective January 1, 1948.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Illinois. A resolution has just been agreed to changing the name of the Committee on Civil Service to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BROOKS. No. The name is changed from "Committee on Civil Service" to "Committee on Post Office and Civil Service." This is in compliance with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the resolution does not change the name of the committee from that specified in the Reorganization Act.

Mr. BROOKS. It fully complies with the Reorganization Act.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1119. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. Hash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1120, to repeal certain obsolete laws, and to amend certain laws by striking out obsolete parts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1121. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Glacier County, Mont.; and

S. 1122. A bill authorizing the sale under supervision of land of Richard Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1123. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the death of James W. Taylor 3d; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1124 (by request). A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1125 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and prevent monopolistic labor practices, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

REPEAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE LAWS

Mr WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the first of a series of bills to amend certain obsolete laws and to amend certain laws by striking out obsolete parts. I request that this bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee and that a statement which I have prepared on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1120) to repeal certain obsolete laws, and to amend certain laws by striking out obsolete parts, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement submitted by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON BILL

The compilation of obsolete laws and sections which I am seeking to repeal was prepared at my direction by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

In introducing this measure, I serve notice that it is my intention to introduce similar measures in the coming period. My initial bill is aimed at 53 laws, which are obsolete and should be repealed in whole or in part. Subsequent bills will seek to repeal as many or more obsolete laws in one swoop. It will be ideal if we can possibly repeal at the rate of a law a day or two laws or more a day as the case may be, for as long as this Congress is in session.

NATURE OF REPEALED LAWS

Following my remarks is printed a statement on these initial 53 laws, with comment in each case on the law's status and indicating what has superseded the law—for example, in one or two cases, a constitutional amendment.

Thus, one of these laws relates to the National Prohibition Act which has been made obsolete by the twenty-first amendment. Some of the legislation deals with the Government of the Philippine Islands, and this is now obsolete for obvious reasons.

My over-all purpose is, of course, to begin to clear our statute books of the vast amount of legal cobwebs which delay efficient legal work.

APPEAL FOR COOPERATION

Toward this objective, I invite the cooperation of all of my colleagues in the Senate and House and all of the executive agencies in locating other statutory deadwood and in cleaning it out.

I feel sure that I can count on the able support of the American legal profession and, in particular, of the American Bar Association in this endeavor, based upon previous reports to me and warm assurances of eager assistance.

NEED FOR HOUSE CLEANING

Repealing obsolete laws is no mere negative activity; it is constructive in that it reveals the core of current law free from the surrounding mass of outdated statute.

Too long have we been so intent on passing laws that we completely lost sight of obsolete statutes which have grown in number to staggering proportions. I believe it should be the continuing responsibility of our executive agencies to winnow out outdated statutes within their jurisdiction and report them to Congress for repeal.

I have always felt very strongly that the particular function of the Committee on the Judiciary is not merely to grind out new laws which are necessary. It should also be the function of the Judiciary Committee to initiate a thorough legislative housecleaning. This I propose we do, beginning now.

This attempt to house clean our statute books is not the first such attempt, but I, for one, propose to follow it through to the limit of my ability.

LACK OF LAWS' COORDINATION

The average practicing lawyer today must devote an extraordinary amount of time and energy in search of the law. The Federal Statute Law is lodged within the pages of 59 heavily bound volumes and a sixtieth volume is ready for binding.

These volumes, the Statutes at Large, are today the basic Federal statutes available to the public. They have continued in substantially the same form down to the present time and contain in chronological order all public acts, resolutions, private acts, and treaties. Publication of those books did not begin until 1845.

A formidable barrier to the successful solution of law problems is presented by Federal law, as administered, to the extent that the task of finding the correct statute to fit a point in a case is very difficult. Each succeeding session of Congress adds confusing numbers of statutes and increases the burden.

NEED FOR CODIFICATION

Actually the remedy for this disorganized and burdensome state of Federal law lies in an enacted codification. Statutes must be assembled and codified so that order, coordination, and logical sequence will result where there is now only disjointed bulk and obscurity.

The dean of law at one college last year rightly asked whether a nation could call itself truly civilized when its law could not be located, much less stated by experts.

The Congress has taken no action to enact a general codification of the Federal laws since 1874. By the act of June 20, 1874, the Revised Statutes of the United States were authorized to be published and the first edition was officially published on February 22, 1875. Section 8 of the act stated that the revision was to be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained. By act of March 2, 1877, a new edition of the Revised Statutes was authorized but not enacted, and this edition was published on February 18, 1878. This, the Revised Statutes are the only complete enacted codification of the Federal law in existence.

SEPARATE CODIFICATIONS

Separate fields of the law have been codified. The Criminal Code was established by act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1088). That codification was an important step in the administration of Federal criminal law. Many additional laws have been enacted however, and the time has come when revision of the Criminal Code should be considered.

The Judicial Code was authorized by the act of March 3, 1911. That codification established order and practicable working connections, and the statute law affecting Federal courts and the judiciary.

The Internal Revenue Code was enacted by act of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat.). This was done because confusion had reached a critical stage and codification was imperative in the best interest of the public and for the practice of tax law. Even the experts were at a loss to apply the law to tax problems. Since the Internal Revenue Code was published, however, complete revision of the taxing structure has taken place. Supplements and additions to the code tend to confuse and obstruct the search for the true law. A new revised code is the only adequate remedy.

The Nationality Act of October 14, 1940, codified the Federal laws concerning citizenship, immigration, and naturalization. That is a valuable work affecting the present and future status of thousands of persons who already have or who intend to become American citizens.

UNITED STATES CODE

The United States Code, a codification of the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, was authorized by act of Congress June 30, 1926. The compilation of this code was a tremendous task—ably accomplished. It has served a noteworthy purpose and has been invaluable to the lawyer in his search for the Federal law.

By the terms of the act, however, as found in section 2 (a), the matter set forth in this code is only prima facie the laws of the United States. It still remains for the lawyer to prove the statute upon which he rests his case, should there be a failure of judicial notice or objection to the admission of matter set forth in the code. That points out one of the shortcomings of the United States Code as it is now constituted. The remedy again is a complete codification and recognition of all Federal statutes as the law of the land as of a date certain to be designated in the creating act.

FUTURE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ACTION

It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary some time before the end of the year will be able to make some conclusive recommendation to the Senate respecting the complete codification and legislative recognition of all Federal Statutes. I might at this point recall to the Senate that the Judiciary Committee has already initiated steps to revise the annotations on the United States Constitution since January 1, 1938.

I have commented largely on the technical elements involved in this problem. The problem is, however, infinitely larger because it involves the basic idea that the law should be made simpler and more understandable not only to the lawyers but to the average citizen. So, it makes good sense to clear up the legal rubbish which clutters up our statute books.

A LIST OF OBSOLETE LAWS WHICH SHOULD BE REPEALED

In act of February 6, 1931 (46 Stat. 1065, ch. 111), strike out the third paragraph under the heading "Legislative-Senate," concerning salaries of Senators appointed or elected to fill vacancies. Superseded by 49 Stat. 22–23.

In act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1022, ch. 648), strike out paragraphs 3–7 on page 1022, concerning salaries of Senators appointed or elected to fill vacancies. Superseded by 49 Stat. 22–23.

Repeal section 2 of an act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1489, ch. 404), concerning vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry, etc. Superseded by act of July 6, 1943 (57 Stat. 374–380).

Repeal sections 2 to 8 of act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482–1485, ch. 397), concerning promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy. Superseded by act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944–953).

Repeal last proviso under heading "Bureau of Industrial Alcohol" in act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1224, ch. 277), relating to removal of distilled spirits to warehouses for bottling in bond. Superseded by 49 Stat. 1834, chapter 725, section 1.

Repeal section 10 of act of February 20, 1931 (46 Stat. 1199, ch. 246, sec. 10), relating to protest concerning assessment by aggrieved property owner in the District of Columbia. Superseded by 52 Stat. 1198, 1200, chapter 702, sections 1 and 3.

Repeal act of February 17, 1931 (46 Stat. 1164–1165, ch. 206), providing a shorter week for postal employees. Superseded by 49 Stat. 650, chapter 535.

Repeal an act of January 15, 1931 (46 Stat. 1036, ch. 29), amending "An act to amend the National Prohibition Act." Made obsolete by the twenty-first amendment, etc.

Repeal section 8 of act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 948, ch. 847), making certain laws applicable to the navigable waters of the Virgin Islands. Superseded by act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1808, ch. 699, sec. 4; U. S. Code 48: 1405c. (Repeals U. S. Code 48:1399)).

Repeal act of June 28, 1930 (46 Stat. 829, ch. 712), to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army. Superseded by act of February 12, 1936 (49 Stat. 1137, ch. 63).

Repeal act of June 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 825, ch. 650), establishing additional salary grades for mechanics, etc., in the motor-vehicle service. Superseded by act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 446, sec. 13 (d, e)).

Repeal the second paragraph of section 518 in the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 738, ch. 497), which exempts United States Customs Court judges from a portion of Revised Statute 1790. Obsolete because Revised Statute 1790 is repealed by 49 Stat. 864, chapter 689, section 1.

In act of June 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 567, ch. 463), strike out the second and third paragraphs on page 567, concerning discharge of minors in the Navy and Marine Corps. Superseded by act of August 18, 1941 (ch. 364); the 1930 provision is in United States Code 34:202 and the 1941 provision in United States Code Supplement 34: 181 and 34: 692.

Repeal act of June 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 553–554, ch. 454), increasing the salaries of certain postmasters of the first class. Superseded by act of July 16, 1945 (59 Stat. 437, ch. 274, sec. 8 (a)).

Repeal section 1 of act of June 5, 1930 (46 Stat. 496, ch. 398), relating to the World War adjusted-compensation payments. Superseded by act of August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 729, ch. 621, sec. 2).

Repeal section 4 of act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391, ch. 340), relating to the consolidated prison industries working-capital fund. Superseded by act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211, ch. 736, sec. 4.)

Repeal section 4 of an act of April 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 155–156, ch. 132), prescribing trademark registration fees. Superseded by act of July 5, 1946 (ch. 540, sec. 31).

Repeal sections 1–2 of an act of December 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 50, ch. 7), continuing the powers of the Federal Radio Commission. Superseded by act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1102, ch. 652, secs. 602, 603).

Repeal act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 545–556, ch. 416), which provided for the government of the Philippine Islands. (Now obsolete.) Repeals United States Code 2: 45; part of United States Code 39: 328; United States Code 48:1001–1003, 1010, 1016, 1041–1054, 1071–1075, 1078, 1091–1092, 1094, 1111–1125, 1171–1172, 1191, 1221–1223, 1225.

In act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1143–1144, ch. 147), repeal paragraph headed "Internal-Revenue Taxes, Philippine Islands." Obsolete.

Repeal act of March 23, 1912 (37 Stat. 77 ch. 65), to amend "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands." Obsolete by 39 Stat. 546, section 2.

Repeal act of February 15, 1911 (36 Stat. 910, ch. 81), providing for quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly, etc. Obsolete by 39 Stat. 518, 552.

Repeal joint resolution of April 9, 1910 (36 Stat. 877, No. 19), fixing the terms of court in the Philippine Islands. Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48:1076.)

Repeal act of June 14, 1910 (36 Stat. 467, ch. 291), providing for quadrennial election of members of the Philippine legislature, etc. Obsolete by 39 Stat. 548, 552.

Repeal Philippine Tariff Act of August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 130–178, ch. 8), to raise revenue for the Philippine Islands. Obsolete.

In the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1084, ch. 320, sec. 34), repeal so much of section 34 as reads "and the courts of first instance of the Philippine Islands." Obsolete. (Repeals portion of U. S. Code 17: 34.)

Repeal act of February 27, 1909 (35 Stat. 659, ch. 227), amending "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands." Obsolete by 39 Stat. 550–551.

In act of May 22, 1908 (35 Stat. 183, ch. 186), repeal so much as reads "and the salary of each of the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands shall be the same as that of the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico." Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48: 1093.)

Repeal act of May 11, 1908 (35 Stat. 125, ch. 164), increasing the membership in the Philippine Commission. Obsolete.

Repeal act of April 29, 1908 (35 Stat. 70, ch. 152), concerning shipping to and from the Philippine Islands. Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 46: 127; 48: 1014–1017.)

Repeal act of June 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 453–454, ch. 3521), to amend an act of March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands." Now obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48: 1152, 1153.)

Repeal act of February 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 24–26, ch. 509), to amend the act entitled "An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands." Obsolete by 36 Stat. 130, sec. 2; 36 Stat. 137, sec. 8; 36 Stat. 173, sec. 13.

Repeal Philippine Tariff Revision Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 928–977, ch. 1408), to revise and amend laws of the Philippine Islands. Now obsolete. (Not in U. S. Code.)

Repeal act of February 6, 1905 (33 Stat. 689–698, ch. 453), amending certain laws relating to the Philippine Islands. Now obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 2: 45; 48: 1013, 1077, 1153, 1192–1194, 1201–1202.)

Repeal act of March 2, 1903 (32 Stat. 952–955, ch. 980), relating to establishment of standard of value and coinage system of the Philippine Islands. Now obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48: 1142–1145, 1147–1151, 1153–1155.)

Repeal act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 691–712, ch. 1369, secs. 1–86), temporarily providing for administration of the affairs of the government of the Philippine Islands. Largely superseded by 39 Stat. 545–556; rest of law now obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 2:45; U. S. Code 48:1009, 1011, 1018, 1071, 1092, 1141, 1144, 1146–1148, 1150, 1156, 1173, 1194–1200, 1223–1226.)

Repeal act of March 22, 1902 (32 Stat. 88, ch. 273), concerning acknowledgement of deeds, etc., in the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico. Partly superseded by 39 Stat. 968, section 54, and rest of act obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48:1019.)

Repeal act of March 8, 1902 (32 Stat. 54–55, ch. 140), temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, etc. Now obsolete. (See Public Law 371, 79th Cong., etc.) (Repeals U. S. Code 19: 152a, 152b, 577; 48: 1009.)

In the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874, ch. 29), repeal the second paragraph, relating to the Philippine Islands. Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 8:175.)

In act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 231, ch. 30), strike out "several courts of first instance in the Philippine Islands, and the", "to the Philippine Islands, and", and "of the Philippine Islands and" in section 2 of title XIII. Repeals part of U. S. Code 18:39, 574; 50:39.

In the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 425, ch. 106), strike out of section 18 "the several courts of first instance in the Philippine Islands and" and "to the Philippine Islands and." Obsolete. (Repeals portion of U. S. Code 50 App., 18.)

Repeal act of January 26, 1918 (40 Stat. 432–433, ch. 11), to authorize the calling into the service of the United States the militia and other locally created armed forces in the Philippine Islands. Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 32: 84.)

Repeal act of July 21, 1921 (42 Stat. 145–146, ch. 51), relating to bonded indebtedness of the Philippine government. Obsolete. (Repeals portion of U. S. Code 48: 1151 and 1191.)

Repeal act of May 31, 1922 (42 Stat. 598–599, ch. 203), relating to Philippine government. Obsolete. (Repeals part of U. S. Code 48: 1191.)

In act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 940, ch. 229), repeal section 7, concerning certiorari from United States Supreme Court to Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands. Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 28: 349.)

In the Revenue Act of February 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 52, ch. 27, sec. 261), strike out the words "and the Philippine Islands," "or the Philippine," and "or the Philippine Islands, respectively." Obsolete. (Repeals U. S. Code 48:1054.)

In act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997, ch. 904), strike out paragraph 5, reading: "To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, $10,500 per year, and to each of the associate justices thereof the sum of $10,000 a year," (Repeals U. S. Code 48:1075.)

In act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1348, ch. 364), strike out of section 2 "reports of the acts of the Philippine Legislature, referred to in paragraph 127 of such act of May 29, 1928, and the." (In effect repeals part of U. S. Code 48:1054.)

Repeal section 2 of the Legislative Pay Act of June 20, 1929 (46 Stat. 38, ch. 33), concerning clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners. Superseded by act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 831–832, ch. 617, sec. 1).

In act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21, ch. 28), strike out the second and fourth provisos in section 3, relating to veterans' preference, etc. Superseded by act of June 27, 1944 (ch. 287).

In the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act of February 26, 1907, as amended by section 4 of the Legislative Appropriation Act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1301), strike out of section 4 the following: "the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President of the United States, and" and "and the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico and Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum each." Covered by Legislative Reorganization Act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, section 601 (a), which fixed compensation of Members etc. Repeals all of U. S. Code 2: 31 and part of U. S. Code 3: 44.)

Repeal joint resolution of February 7, 1902 (32 Stat. 735, No. 5), increasing membership of the Joint Committee of Congress upon the Library. Superseded by section 223 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Repeal Revised Statutes 82, concerning powers and membership of the Joint Committee on the Library. Superseded by 29 Stat. 544, paragraph 9 (U. S. Code 2: 136), and section 223 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (Repeals U. S. Code 132a.)

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 593) to provide for the adjustment of repayment contract, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

DISASTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the people of my State of Texas have just suffered one of the most tragic disasters in the history of our State and our Nation. A series of explosions and fires covering a wide area in and around Texas City has claimed the lives of several hundred citizens, terribly injured hundreds more, and wrecked property valued at many million dollars.

Our dead and injured are being cared for as best can be by the Red Cross and other State and National agencies and our citizens. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the injured and to the loved ones of those who perished. The full extent of the loss of life, injury, and damage will not be known for many days.

Mr. President, I realize that this series of explosions could have been accidental, and I do not want to charge or insinuate that anybody could have been so mean or debased as to have planned and executed this disaster. But in view of the high tension on international affairs and because of the rather large number of fires, explosions, railroad wrecks, and other disastrous occurrences in this Nation lately, all so nearly resembling disastrous occurrences which preceded our entry into the last war and which were due largely to communistic underground activity, I believe it is the duty of this Senate to conduct a full and complete investigation into this Texas City disaster and to start the investigation immediately.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution which will provide for such an investigation and ask that it be received, referred to the appropriate committee, and acted on promptly.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 104) was received, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the disaster at Texas City, Tex., resulting from a series of explosions caused by a fire aboard the French Lines freighter *Grandcamp* in Galveston Bay, on April 16, 1947, with a view to ascertaining the causes of the disaster, particularly whether there is responsibility on the part of persons connected with the communistic underground, any steps necessary to prevent the occurrence of similar disasters in the future, and the extent to which facilities of the Federal Government are needed in extending relief to sufferers in such disaster and in rebuilding destroyed property. The committee shall report its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the press is filled with accounts of one of the greatest holocausts ever visited upon the United States, the disaster which has struck Texas City and its environs. Latest reports disclose that more than 400 dead have already been counted. Estimates of the total number of deaths run from 650 to perhaps 1,000 or 1,200.

Texas City is located on the mainland, just across the bay from Galveston. For many years it has been developing industrially. Its future was apparently assured.

Mr. President, according to press reports, this terrible disaster originated on a French cargo ship loaded with nitrates, moored at a dock near the Monsanto chemical plant. Either a fire or an explosion on the ship ignited the Monsanto plant. In turn a chain of explosions were set off. The reports indicate that the plant, the harbor facilities, and a great portion of the city have been completely wiped out.

Mr. President, when the news first came to me, I took the matter up with Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, commanding general of the Fourth Army at San Antonio, with the regional director of the War Assets Administration, Gen. Caspon R. Rucker, at Dallas, and with the Chief of Engineers of the War Department. General Wainwright has informed me that he and his staff officers are on the scene personally directing relief; that blood plasma, blankets, cots, and gas masks have been rushed by motor van and plane; that nurses and a medical field company have also been dispatched by air.

General Rucker, the regional War Assets Administrator, has informed me that he has made available any equipment or supplies within the region, some having already been dispatched.

The Navy and the Coast Guard have also extended active aid. The Red Cross responded immediately, and has already sent some of its best and most efficient representatives.

The Office of the Chief of Engineers reports its men and equipment are already on the scene fighting the fires and giving assistance.

It is said that from all parts of the State, relief workers and citizens who desire to aid in the saving of life and the rehabilitation of the stricken, have flocked to Texas City.

Of course, Mr. President, the people of Texas are grieved beyond measure at this terrible calamity. I know the people of the entire United States have been touched and their hearts have been moved by the awful catastrophe.

Mr. President, we are grateful to the agencies of the Government for their immediate response in furnishing physicians, nurses, medical supplies, and fire-fighting equipment. The people of Texas are grateful to all the citizens of the United States for their generous expressions of sorrow and sympathy. The anguished cry of the unfortunate people of Texas City has been heeded.

Mr. President, I have made this statement to the Senate so that it may know of our deep sense of gratitude.

RETURN OF CERTAIN OLD TREATIES TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, under the law and practice, whenever the President of the United States sends treaties to the Senate they remain on the calendar of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations from one Congress to another. As a result, when the committee organized for the Eightieth Congress, I found innumerable old treaties carried currently on the calendar of the committee, some of them going back to as far as 1923. For instance, on the current calendar of the committee one treaty is still in the hands of a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah; the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Glenn; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Robinson; and the Senator from Montana, Mr. Walsh.

I find another treaty, Mr. President, which is still currently carried on the calendar and is in the hands of a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Duffy; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Van Nuys; and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Cutting.

It occurred to me that it would be a good idea to clean up the calendar, and, in accordance with instructions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I addressed a communication to the Department of State, suggesting that it recommend some course of action to bring the calendar down to date. As a result, we received a Presidential message last week, recommending the return to the President of all treaties submitted prior to 1941.

I find that a resolution of the Senate is necessary to instruct the Secretary of the Senate to return these ancient treaties to the President, and therefore, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution for this purpose. Without interfering with the pending business, I request its present consideration. The resolution covers 19 treaties which were submitted prior to 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the resolution was received, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and is hereby, directed to return to the President of the United States, in accordance with his request, the following treaties:

Agreement between the United States of America and Costa Rica regarding an interoceanic canal across Costa Rican territory, signed at Washington February 1, 1923 (Executive B, 67th Cong., 4th sess.).

International convention for the suppression of the circulation of and the traffic in obscene publications, signed at Geneva September 12, 1923 (Executive M, 68th Cong., 2d sess.).

Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warware, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925 (Executive G, 69th Cong., 1st sess.).

Convention and protocol between the United States of America and Canada for the preservation and improvement of the Niagara Falls, signed at Ottawa January 2, 1929 (Executive U, 70th Cong., 2d sess.).

Protocol of revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (World Court), signed at Geneva September 14, 1929; protocol of signature of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva December 16, 1920; and protocol of accession of the United States of America to the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva September 14, 1929 (Executive A, 71st Cong., 3d sess.).

Treaty between the United States of America and Canada for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway,

signed at Washington July 18, 1932 (Executive C, 72d Cong., 2d sess.).

Berne convention of September 9, 1886, for the protection of literary and artistic works, revised at Berlin, November 13, 1908, and at Rome, June 2, 1928 (Executive E, 73d Cong., 2d sess.).

International convention for the suppression of the traffic in women of full age, opened for signature at Geneva October 11, 1933 (Executive H, 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Argentina with reference to sanitary regulations concerning plant and animal products, signed at Washington May 24, 1935 (Executive O, 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

International convention relating to economic statistics and a protocol thereto, signed at Geneva December 14, 1928 (Executive S, 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama for the regulation of radio communications in the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone, signed at Washington March 2, 1936 (Executive C, 74th Cong., 2d sess.).

International convention for the unification of certain rules to govern the liability of vessels when collisions occur between them, and a protocol thereto, signed at Brussels September 23, 1910 (Executive K, 75th Cong., 1st sess.).

Draft convention (No. 56) concerning sickness insurance for seamen, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-first session, held at Geneva October 6–24, 1936 (Executive Y, 75th Cong., 1st sess.).

Draft convention (No. 61) concerning the reduction of hours of work in the textile industry, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-third session, held at Geneva June 3–23, 1937 (Executive J, 75th Cong., 3d sess.).

Draft convention (No. 63) concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session, held at Geneva June 2–22, 1938 (Executive L, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

International sanitary convention, signed at Paris October 31, 1938 (Executive J, 76th Cong., 3d sess.).

Convention for the establishment of an inter-American bank, signed on behalf of the United States of America May 10, 1940 (Executive K, 76th Cong., 3d sess.).

Convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland providing for the exemption of taxation on property or transactions connected with defense, signed at Washington October 17, 1941 (Executive H, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Supplementary protocol concerning whaling signed at London October 5, 1945 (Executive J, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations may sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate. I may add that this will be the final public hearing of the Labor and Federal Security Subcommittee. We expect to start marking up the bill on Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business may meet between 3 and 4:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask to be excused from attendance upon the Senate beginning on Monday, April 21, for a period not exceeding 10 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday and Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

COAL-MINING SAFEGUARDS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by him.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The atomic age may be just around the corner, but today coal mining is the backbone of the Nation's industrial might.

Coal is needed to keep the furnaces going in the huge industries of my own State of West Virginia, as well as those in virtually every other industrial area in the Nation.

Despite the importance of coal, however, it has been only during the past few years that many people have recognized that coal is used for many things besides heating furnaces; and it has been only during the past few years that any large segment of the Nation's population has come to fully realize that coal mining is a highly dangerous occupation.

It is true that tragic mine disasters, claiming the lives of a great many miners, have aroused the Nation.

But, in the past, the day-to-day accidents—claiming far more lives than the individual disasters—have gone almost unheeded in the eyes of the general public even in my own State where more than 100,000 men are employed in the mines.

In recent years the Federal Government has recognized its responsibility in regard to promoting safety in the coal-mining industry.

One of the important measures passed during 1941—my first year in the United States Senate—was a bill known as the Federal Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act.

Prior to 1941 the coal mining laws of the various States were of a widely divergent character, and as a result our national mine accident rate was very high.

A series of mine disasters just prior to 1941 aroused public opinion over mine safety laws. It became apparent to many people that there was a great need for uniform standards and regulations governing safety and health in the coal mines.

Public opinion demanded action. Congress responded—at last—by passing a law authorizing the Bureau of Mines to inspect coal mines in the various States.

This law gave the Bureau of Mines the authority to inspect mines and make recommendations—but it did not give the Bureau any power to carry out its recommendations.

Despite this draw-back, a very serious one in my opinion, the Bureau's work has been effective. Official records definitely prove that point.

Let's examine a recent report from the Department of the Interior on this subject:

"The administration of the present act by the Bureau of Mines began in December 1941, coincidental with our entrance into World War II. The increased demand for coal after the start of hostilities together with adverse operating factors would naturally tend to increase mine-accident rates during 1942.

"However, contrary to the record during World War I, accident rates began to decrease in 1943 after the Federal inspection program got well under way."

That trend has continued.

Originally, 107 coal-mine inspectors were employed. Congress appropriated funds for the employment of 25 additional inspectors during the fiscal year of 1945. 25 more were employed in 1946, and 23 more in 1947, making a total for that year of 180 inspectors.

Incidentally, the increase in the 1947 appropriation was secured only after a bitter fight on the floor of the Senate—even though the records proved the value of the inspection service.

I believe it is significant that each increase in the inspection force has brought a decrease in the mine accident rates.

For example, the fatality rate was 2.30 per million tons of coal produced in 1942, but in 1946 it was down to 1.64 per million tons of coal.

The 1946 figure, incidentally, is the lowest accident rate since the Bureau of Mines was organized in 1910.

During the period from December 1, 1941, to June 1, 1946, the Bureau made some 9,200 coal mine inspections, and approximately 25 percent of the recommendations of the inspectors were voluntarily complied with.

Last summer the Federal Government took over the operation of the coal mines. The Secretary of the Interior took possession of the mines under authority of Executive Order 9728 of May 21, 1946; and on May 29, 1946, the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Coal Mines Administrator, and the United Mine Workers of America signed an agreement which included a Federal mines safety code for the bituminous and lignite coal mines of the United States.

This code contained provisions far broader than those contained in the Federal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act of 1941. Under this code the workers themselves participate with management in the administration and enforcement of health and safety regulations. Unless a new agreement is reached, this safety code will go out of existence when the Federal Government turns back the mines to their owners.

It should be pointed out that for the last 5 months of 1946, with mandatory compliance under the code, the fatality rate was lower than during the same period for 1945, even though the 1945 period was considered one of the best in history. This does not prove, to my way of thinking, that the Federal Government should continue to operate the mines, but it definitely does prove that we should strengthen our mine safety laws so that, when the mines are returned to their owners, the miners at least can have the same protection as that afforded during Federal operation of the mines.

For the past two sessions of Congress I have been fighting to secure enactment of a bill to require compliance with safety regulations in the coal mines.

I have asked repeatedly: Why make recommendations if we are not going to enforce them?

My bill, S. 100, now pending before Congress, gives the Bureau of Mines real authority to enforce its recommendations. Penalties are provided for anyone who willfully violates the safety regulations prescribed by the Bureau.

Another section of the bill affords all interested persons an opportunity to submit orally or in writing data, views, and arguments with respect to proposed new regulations or amendments to old regulations.

The bill reads as follows:

"Be it enacted etc., That the first section of the act entitled 'An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes,' approved May 7, 1941, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) For the purpose of obtaining such information as may be necessary or appropriate for prescribing regulations pursuant to section 13 and for the administration and enforcement of such regulations.'

"SEC. 2. Such act of May 7, 1941, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to prescribe reasonable regulations establishing standards and requirements necessary and appropriate for the prevention or amelioration of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in coal mines the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce. Such regulations may provide, among other things, that the operations of any such mine shall be suspended in whole or in part upon the order of a coal-mine inspector if he finds in such mine an unsafe or unhealthy condition which is specified in such regulations as a ground for such suspension.

"'(b) At least 30 days prior to the issuance of any regulation under this section or any amendment to such a regulation, notice of the proposed regulation or amendment shall be published in the Federal Register and shall include either the terms or a statement of the substance of the proposed regulation or amendment. Not less than 15 days after the publication of such notice, interested persons shall be afforded an opportunity to submit, orally or in writing, data, views, and arguments with respect to such proposed regulation or amendment. All relevant matter so presented shall be given consideration, and such regulation or amendment shall, before issuance, be revised to the extent which the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, deems necessary and appropriate in the light of such matter.

"'(c) Whoever violates the provisions of any regulation prescribed pursuant to this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"'(d) Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute, or will constitute, a violation of any regulation prescribed pursuant to this section, the Secretary may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such regulation, and upon a showing that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order may be granted without bond.'"

I believe this measure will go a long way toward strengthening our mine-safety program, and I hope that it will receive favorable action during this session of Congress.

I believe the records of the past prove beyond all reasonable doubt that we need more, not less, mine-safety inspection work.

As to the costs, let's examine the figures:

For the fiscal year 1947, the Congress appropriated $1,457,000 for administering the Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act. In my opinion, that is a small sum for such highly important work.

This sum enabled the Bureau of Mines to inspect only coal mines employing 25 men or more on an average of twice a year.

Certainly the coal mines should be inspected more frequently by the Federal inspectors.

To carry out the provisions of my bill, it is estimated that the Bureau would need approximately 230 additional inspectors and other additional personnel.

According to best estimates, the Department of Interior would need an additional appropriation of $2,970,000 to take care of additional personnel, traveling, and other expenses.

The Department of Interior believes that with the additional inspectors all coal mines may be inspected three times a year. This would insure additional inspection service for all mines.

Coal mining is our most hazardous industry.

Certainly, the Congress has a moral as well as legislative responsibility to do everything possible to cut down the tragic fatality rate.

No one can say definitely that expansion of the Bureau of Mines—with authority to enforce its regulations—would immediately bring about this much needed reform in the coal industry. But, in view of the records of the past, there is every reason to believe that it would be very helpful.

After studying this measure, the Department of the Interior declared that it "would afford strong support to the work of the Bureau of Mines in promoting health and safety in coal mines"—"provided that Congress will see fit to appropriate the necessary funds for its administration."

Make no mistake. Passage of this measure alone will do little to promote health and safety in the coal mines. The necessary funds must be appropriated to carry out the program.

Without these funds, passage of this or any other mine safety measure would be little more than an empty gesture to the men who toil in the mines.

It is time that Congress measured up to its responsibility to the coal miners by enacting mine safety legislation that will give the Bureau of Mines full authority to enforce its recommendations, and thus assure a greater mine safety program.

THE UNIVERSE WE LIVE IN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while returning from the Middle West last night on the train my attention was drawn to an editorial in one of Chicago's newspapers entitled "Look for Big News." It recalled to my mind some ideas which had their genesis a number of years ago after reading a statement by the English philosopher James Hopwood Jeans. Jeans said that if the British Isles were entirely covered, their full length and breadth, with a layer of the finest sand one foot deep, and one should then pick up one grain of that sand, the single grain would represent this little globe of ours, compared to the known universe. The philosopher Jeans was talking as of that time with the then knowledge of astronomy and telescopes. But, Mr. President, some years ago, we were told of a new telescope which was being built. The war years intervened and its construction was halted. This summer, however, that telescope is to be erected on Mount Palomar, in California, and it is stated that it will extend man's conception of the known universe 800 percent. So, now, in order to form an idea of how small this little earth of ours is, the layer of sand on the British Isles should be made 8 feet deep, and then one grain of it would represent the earth as compared with the known universe.

The reason I take the time of the Senate to make these few remarks is that frequently we find ourselves so close to a tree that we cannot see the other trees, we cannot see the forest; and likewise our frequently petty problems on the floor of the Senate interfere with our thinking, with the perspective and with the judgment that is necessary if we are to live successfully on this little grain of sand. On this grain of sand, Mr. President, there are some two billion human beings; we are among them, and we are trying to bring about order for all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following these remarks the short editorial to which I referred, entitled "Look for Big News," which calls our attention to the fact that as the human mind will now grasp a little more of the meaning of infinite space and the significance of the outside instead of the little inside, perhaps we will have more light on how to solve some of our inside problems.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK FOR BIG NEWS

The biggest story of 1947 may well be the installation of the giant 200-inch telescope on Mount Palomar, in California. Delayed 4 years by the war, the job is nearly done. It started in 1928.

Science is again on the march after a virtual 5-year lay-off for warmaking. We are too likely to assume that we know a great deal more now than we knew before World War II. That is an illusion based upon the use for war purposes of basic knowledge accumulated before the war.

Men of science were too busy from 1939 to VJ-day converting proved theory into practical engineering. They did not have time to add much to our stock of facts about the universe we live in. Although we have made atomic piles and bombs since 1942, we actually know very little more about atomic structure and energy than we knew in 1939, when Fermi, Strassman, Hahn, and Meitner confirmed in the laboratory what the mathematical physicists had deduced before.

When the Mount Palomar telescope goes into action, we will undoubtedly reap sensational gains in fundamental knowledge. At one stroke man will see two times farther into his outer world than he has ever been able to grope before. We may find out whether this is really an exploding or a dying universe, as some evidence seems to show. We may even find whether there are any boundaries to the systems of stars with which we are familiar.

In view of the problems confronting us on our own troubled little ball, it may seem of slight importance whether we know more in the latter part of 1947 of a sphere of space eight times as great as any we have ever sounded before. The temptation to say "So what?" is, indeed, great, especially as there

is possibly a chance that none of us will be here long to enjoy a bigger universe.

It may be in order to recall that the unlocking of atomic energy was due in part to curiosity and research into the composition of the sun and the reason why it shines.

More than once the greatest new story of a year has been hinted first in the reports of such institutions as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution. That may repeat this year.

PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY IN PITTSBURGH AREA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, during the past few weeks the plan of free enterprise in America versus governmentally controlled projects has been discussed at considerable length. It is within the knowledge of a number of Senators, if not all of them, that certain concerns in Pittsburgh, Pa., have under way a project designed to produce gas, Diesel oil, and gasoline from coal. The project involves a cost of probably more than $120,000,000, all of which will be furnished by private enterprise without a single grant, loan, or subsidy from public authority.

In view of the circumstances, I felt it might be of interest to the Senate if certain insertions were made in the body of the RECORD. For example, in the operation of this process, 20,000 tons of coal a day will be required, and there will be produced gas to the extent of 90,000,000,000 feet per annum, which is more than both the Little Inch and Big Inch can transport from the Southwest. Furthermore, taxes aggregating several million dollars per annum will become available for the local, State, and Federal governments.

Without going further into details, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Pittsburgh Press, by the business editor, W. L. Russell, and also, following that, an editorial from the Oil City Derrick, which is the pioneer journal of the oil industry, commenting on this gigantic industry.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

A vast industrial miracle is coming to Pittsburgh.

It will be the conversion of enormous deposits of western Pennsylvania coal into gas, gasoline, Diesel and fuel oil, and industrial alcohols.

The Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. announced today that immediate construction of a $300,000 experimental plant at Library is expected to be followed by the erection of a giant gasification and liquefication plant costing $120,000,000.

The gigantic project will be undertaken by the pooled resources of Pittsburgh Consolidation, world's largest coal producer, and Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, biggest oil company in the world.

Operating experience of the demonstration plant at Library is expected to follow that of similar developments in other industries.

* * * * *

The commercial installation will be located within 25 miles south of the Golden Triangle in the heart of vast untapped coal reserves. * * *

Operating commercially, the startling scientific development will—

Revolutionize the soft-coal industry.

Assure coal a continued high place in the business sun.

Alleviate Pittsburgh's gas shortage.

Insure full success of the smoke-control program.

Build up the area as an oil center.

Attract many new industries here.

Contribute more than $40,000,000 a year to western Pennsylvania prosperity.

Increase employment and pay rolls throughout the district.

It is further estimated that the operating plant will—

Consume 6,000,000 tons of coal a year, or around 20,000 tons a day.

Yield 96,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas a year. Production would be at the rate of 400,000,000 cubic feet a day during four winter months, and 200,000,000 cubic feet a day in the other 8 months of the year.

Produce 114,000,000 gallons of gasoline a year.

Turn out 14,000,000 gallons of Diesel and fuel oil annually.

And market 8,000,000 gallons of alcohols a year. This is the product needed in the new modern world of industrial chemistry to make synthetic rubber, resins for plastics, and a myriad of other postwar products.

The output will be flexible so that most of the production in winter could go into gas for the entire district, both domestic and industrial.

During summer the bulk of the output would be gasoline.

This would avert any such gas shortages as have handicapped Pittsburgh in recent winters because existing gas distribution lines here would be used.

The plant's gas production would be equal to that carried by the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines combined.

* * * * *

In launching the radical venture for the coal industry, Pittsburgh Consolidation is shaking off a 157-year lethargy in improvements of coal marketing.

* * * * *

For more than 150 years coal in this country has been sold in chunks, transported in open-top vehicles and burned at its destination.

* * * * *

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick]

GIGANTIC INDUSTRY

Oilmen in all fields will be interested in the mammoth project now being launched by Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. This plans the production of gas, high-octane gasoline, Diesel, and other fuel oils and commercial alcohols from mine-run coal by a synthetic process of gasification and liquefaction.

This process is still in the development stage. However, enough progress has been made to warrant the organization of a $120,000,000 enterprise which will be located in Washington county. This means taking the 100,000-acre coal reserve of Pittsburgh Consolidation and converting the carbon and hydrogen into various products, using the raw material owned by the coal company and applying to its treatment the various processes developed by the big oil company. The coal company is exploring the same field through another cooperative venture with Hydrocarbon Research, Inc., at Trenton, N. J.

This means eventually 6,000 more jobs. West Virginia and eastern Ohio may be considered as possible sites for future plants. Output of the plant now under consideration would match the capacity of the Big and Little Inch lines in high-heating gas and at the same time open a large new source of gasoline, Diesel, and other fuel oils. It is claimed the conversion process would produce 400,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day during the winter months. This would do much to relieve the situation which faced us some weeks ago. It would also produce 14,000 barrels of gasoline per day.

If the enterprise is successful it will do much for Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal, which says it cannot mine its untapped reserve of upward of 700,000,000 tons of coal and show a profit against the coal of neighboring areas, even considering river freight costs. It estimates its reserves will insure at least 30 years' operation for two major gasification plants, with cleaning and screening costs eliminated.

Just now we have no idea how this development will affect the Pennsylvania oil industry. We still have the best lubricating crude in the world, but in spite of the fact that there is still a lot of oil in the sands, production has been declining. Let us hope that some of these days someone will come along with a process which will make possible the recovery of this great reserve which is now useless.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on April 15 before the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association at Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL BEFORE ROTARY CLUB OF DETROIT, MICH.

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Blind Staggers in Washington" delivered by him before the Rotary Club of Detroit, Mich., on April 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator IVES at the one hundred and sixty-first dinner of the Economic Club of New York on April 16, 1947, in New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD a Jefferson Day address delivered by Senator HOLLAND at Richmond, Va., April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. BARUCH'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Bernard M. Baruch before the South Carolina Legislature on the unveiling of his portrait at the State Capitol, Columbia, S. C., on April 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM AMERICA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Summons to Intervention," relating to the proposal to extend aid to Greece and Turkey, published in the March 29, 1947, issue of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

DON'T DELAY: SPEED GREEK AID BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Delay: Speed Greek Aid Bill," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AFFECTING LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Chamber's Formula," referring to a statement of principes affecting labor-management relations, published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—ARTICLE BY PAUL JONES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to Congress, written by Paul Jones and published in his column Candid Shots in the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LOYALTY ORDER—LETTER PUBLISHED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to the executive loyalty order, written to the editor of the New York Times by four members of the faculty of the Harvard School of Law, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, 36 days ago the President of the United States submitted to the American Congress a momentous proposal. The President presented the proposal with characteristic courage and forthrightness. There was neither evasion nor equivocation in his utterance. The first sentence he employed was:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The second sentence was:

> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

It has now become apparent that the decision to be made by this Congress will be one of the truly momentous decisions made by any Congress in American history.

Mr. President, the human mind would be dull indeed if it did not learn by study and if it did not profit by reflection; and the parliamentary system of government in the world would be sterile if it did not gain in wisdom by consultation and by counsel. Democracy would not deserve the great repute which it has in history if the people themselves did not afford a constant, illimitable storehouse not only of confidence but of information for their representatives and for their Government.

Therefore I think I am justified in saying that we have profited by the period which has elapsed since the President's recommendation to the Congress. The Congress has had an opportunity to debate the question. The people have had an opportunity to consider it. It has had the regard and the earnest concern of the press, and indeed, Mr. President, of the pulpit. It is now apparent that any division of opinion in the Congress or in the country which exists today is not about objectives; it is not about aims; it is not about ideals. It can only be about the methods by which high American aspirations can best be achieved. It is to method that I address myself today.

The address of the President was on the 12th of March. There elapsed between the 12th of March and the 21st of March a period when there was a degree of shock in the Congress and the country respecting these proposals. Everyone wanted to support our able and patriotic President and wise leader. Everyone wanted to do his or her patriotic duty. Everyone wanted to support policies the objectives of which were as defined by the President in his message to the Congress. But there were those who immediately began to ask the question as to what would be the effect upon the United Nations organization of seeking to reach those aims in the manner suggested, and there were those who were very earnestly and deeply concerned over the question as to what the effect would be upon the United Nations organization if the proposals were carried out by the method suggested.

The American people have had a great conversion in the last generation. At one time they may have acquiesced in the United States withdrawing from world affairs and, like Pilate, washing its hands of its international responsibilities and obligations. But, Mr. President, the American people no longer embrace such a philosophy of false interest or of folly. Today we have repented and have been baptized into a new conversion of collaboration with the other nations and peoples of the world to keep the supreme hope of mankind, peace on earth, and to encourage the highest Christian aspiration, good will among men. So the American people believe that there is no hope of future peace, there is no way to prevent future war, except by the kind of international working together of nations and peoples which is possible alone through the United Nations organization.

The American people knew that this was not a world government. They knew that sovereignty of nations had not been given away or destroyed. They knew that this was a toddling infant, if a potential giant. They knew that it would take time to build this device to the majesty and might to which they prayerfully looked forward. But they believed in their hearts that we had made a real beginning, that something of substance and form had been accomplished, that something tangible had been built—built not only in institutional concept, but actually with reality and material substance here upon American shores.

We have a charter to which we had committed our sacred national obligation and honor. It has been subscribed to by 51 nations. But more than that, this good land of ours, this soil sacred to freedom, this America, has been made the permanent seat of the United Nations organization, in recognition by other nations that if this organization were to succeed, America must bear the brunt of it, must carry the principal load, must be able to sustain its great weight; in recognition by the other nations of the world that if the United Nations failed it would be America's failure, and that if the United Nations succeeded it would be America who would be the Atlas able to carry this colossal universe upon his strong shoulders.

So, Mr. President, it was only natural that, when this proposal was made, which seemed, in the language of the day, to bypass the United Nations, the American people were deeply concerned. That concern was not limited to persons outside the Congress. There were in this body Senators who had participated in the building of this edifice. There were

those who had labored long in its establishment. There were those who had been the representatives of the Senate in its construction and formulation and had honorably written their names indelibly into the sentiments of those all over the world who love peace. They were concerned if events are permitted to speak their sentiments.

Mr. President, what do we find? On the 21st of March the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who had carried as great a load and deserved as great a credit as any man for the Charter of the United Nations, hope of world peace, aided by his distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] who had labored so grandly with him in all this great endeavor, introduced upon the Senate floor a proposed amendment to the bill introduced pursuant to the President's recommendations to the Congress. That Vandenberg-Connally amendment, Mr. President, was for the purpose of making it clear that we were not bypassing the United Nations organization by its recitals added to the bill as a preamble. It was for the purpose of making it clear that we recognize our obligation to that organization, that we intend and determine to support it now and in the future. That was a very creditable effort on the part of these able and eminent Senators. But, Mr. President, it was an act that was ex post facto. It was not before the bill was introduced; it was afterward. It was the first conscious, clear effort on the part of the Senate or on the part of the leadership of the measure to allay the disquieting fears which were agitating the hearts and minds of the people of this country that the United Nations was being weakened by what we were proposing to do.

That, as I said, Mr. President, was on March 21. On March 25, the senior Senator from Florida and the able senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] offered an amendment in the Senate which endeavored to provide that the relief to be given and the protection that should hereafter be accorded to the security of Greece and Turkey should be accomplished through the United Nations organization.

On the 26th of March, Mr. President, in words that must have been intentionally meaningful, we find the press attributing to the Secretary General of the United Nations organization the following words, which I quote from the Washington Post of March 27:

Lie—

Referring to the Secretary General of the United Nations organization—

told the Council that UN will succeed only if all countries "resort to the UN even when the most vital national interests are at stake."

That, Mr. President, as I said, was on the 26th of March. On the 28th of March the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] offered a series of amendments, the general effect of which was to exclude from what we should do in aid for Greece military missions and military aid, and to exclude from what we should seek to accomplish any aid for Turkey of the character proposed in the pending bill. There were other amendments identifying our procedure in connection with the truly democratic forces of the countries which we might assist.

Then, Mr. President, on the 28th of March, 16 days after the proposal of the President to the Congress, in spite of the fact that the Security Council was in constant session, our representative in that body, our former distinguished colleague, Mr. Austin, for the first time officially gave notice to the United Nations organization of what we proposed to do in this matter.

Then, Mr. President, there were other amendments offered on the Senate floor, some by the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and there were statements given to the press, even by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which it was set forth that at least a tactical error had been committed by our unilateral approach to economic aid for Greece and to an effort to accord military security to Greece and to Turkey.

Then, on April 1, came the statement of the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in which he squarely proposed that this matter be brought within the jurisdiction of the United Nations organization and that any issue involved be squarely fought out in that body.

Finally, Mr. President, on April 3 the Committee on Foreign Relations went further in recognition of the disquiet which was in the minds and hearts of the people of this country that we were bypassing the United Nations organization, and reported an amendment by which the United Nations organization was given what has been called a veto power over actions which the United States shall take in giving to Turkey and Greece the aid which had been requested by the President.

There we have recognition not only on the part of Members of the Senate, but also on the part of the Committee on Foreign Relations itself, that there is some justification for the disturbance in the minds of those who feel that there may be some basis, at least, for the charge that we, who have been the principal founder and supporter of the United Nations organization, have now turned our backs upon it and regard it as either impotent or incapable of averting the crisis which we propose unilaterally to meet in that remote part of the world. So, Mr. President, it must give some corroboration to the belief of some of us, at least, that we erred in the method by which we attempted to give aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just said that the amendment referred to was a recognition of the fact that we had erred in the method we chose of granting aid to Turkey and Greece. May I suggest to the Senator that the method has not been changed at all. The method remains the same. The only thing the amendment did, or does, was to make it crystal clear that the method adopted and proposed was not and is not in any way a bypassing of the United Nations organization, and that the committee was as anxious and as much concerned to make the United Nations effective where it could be effective and whenever it could be effective as was the Senator from Florida or anyone else. But the method has not been changed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if my friend will allow, I will have to take issue upon that question. The bill first introduced did not allow, as a legal matter, the United Nations any authority whatever with reference to the program which might be undertaken under the bill by the Government of the United States. If the Vandenberg-Connally amendment had not been agreed to, no matter how many resolutions the Security Council might adopt, no matter how many votes the Assembly might take, the program in Greece and Turkey as authorized by the bill originally introduced could go straight ahead without any compulsion on the President to interrupt it in any way whatsoever pursuant to any action by the United Nations.

Not only that, Mr. President, but that amendment provides that we shall cease the aid that we propose to give if a government representing a majority of the people in either one of those countries requests us to cease it. That, too, imposes a legal obligation upon the President—one which would not have been imposed had not that amendment been proposed and adopted.

But now the matter is not left to the discretion of the President. The Congress proposes to write into the law the imperative duty, legally conferred by the Congress upon the President, that if the Security Council by a majority vote or if the Assembly by a majority vote requests that we discontinue what we shall be doing under this measure in Greece or Turkey, the President, under his constitutional oath to discharge the law of the land and to observe it, must discontinue and desist from what we would otherwise be doing.

Mr. President, I think I am on sound legal grounds, therefore, when I say that my able friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] overlooks the fact that by that amendment we are reposing in the United Nations the legal authority to stop what we, a single, sovereign Nation, are about to do in Greece and Turkey under this measure, I submit to my friend that that is the correct interpretation of the committee amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say that I think the present discussion has no point whatever; I really am sorry I interrupted the Senator, because we are perfectly agreed on the purposes of the amendment and its desirability.

However, I still insist that the method has not been changed. The amendment recognizes the fact, in short, that when the United Nations organization is able and ready to carry on in the emergency which is presently existent, we shall gladly surrender and give that power to the United Nations, when and if ever that time comes to pass. But the amendment recognizes that that time has not yet come, that the United Nations is not now in position to take over that obligation, and the method originally proposed continues in effect until the United Na-

tions is able to assume the obligation and states that it wishes to do so.

I have said that the argument is without point, because I know that the Senator wants, and I know that I want, and I know that our committee and all Members of Congress and the people of the Nation want to have the United Nations organizations assume that responsibility as soon as it is able to do so. As soon as the United Nations organization can carry that responsibility and that obligation, we shall be most happy to surrender it and deliver it over to the United Nations organization.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my able friend, but let me say that he will have to recognize, I think, able lawyer that he is, that the difference is that we would have decided, had not this committee amendment been proposed and adopted, when the United Nations was able to take over the obligation or when we should desist from what we now propose to do. But after the amendment has been adopted, then it is the United Nations which will decide when it is in a position to take action adequate to meet the objectives which we seek to serve, and the United Nations will decide when it is desirable for us to stop. That decision, under the committee amendment, will be made by the United Nations, not by us.

So what has been done, and consciously done, here is that we have given a clear indication that we are acting subject to the veto of the United Nations, if we did not start to act through it in the first place. We submit ourselves to its jurisdiction, and if it did not start us on this course, at least it can stop us whenever it chooses to do so. I think that is a fair interpretation of what has been done by the able committee in an earnest effort to meet the criticism which has been made in Congress and in the country, not to speak of in areas abroad, with respect to our violating our obligations to act through the United Nations in collective efforts to keep the peace of the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who has made the decision as to whether the United Nations is capable of handling this affair? Has anyone referred this matter to the United Nations? Has anyone asked the United Nations whether it is capable of handling it or whether it wishes to handle it? Have we had any opinion from the United Nations, other than a gentle and probably as forceful a reminder as Mr. Lie thought advisable? Has there been any other official word?

Mr. PEPPER. That is obviously the point to which I am coming, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his usual prescience. Obviously, I shall proceed to the argument that if the Senate has now recognized that it is proper that the United States submit to the jurisdiction of the United Nations in this matter, would it not be still better for us to go a step further and give such temporary relief as we can immediately give, and then see whether we can discharge our entire duty to our United Nations obligation and proceed in the first place, in respect to the security aspects of the matter, at least, through the United Nations? Obviously I shall address myself to that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, after listening to the questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], I am prompted to ask a question of the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Florida is a man of ability and high intellectual capabilities——

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for the compliment. I wish I might deserve it as generously as he has given it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me ask the Senator whether it is not a question of plain, common sense, in the mind of the Senator from Florida and in the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts that the United Nations is not now capable of handling this relief situation immediately and promptly, as it must be handled? Is it not a question of plain, common sense in the mind of each one of us?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me say that I know the sincere and earnest spirit in which the able Senator, whose ability, integrity, and patriotism cannot be excelled, has asked the question. It is a little further along in the argument which I propose to make; but I digress here to discuss, for example, what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and I propose, namely, that the President be authorized to make available $75,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds, which he might employ in such aid, and that the President also be authorized, acting through the United Nations, to contact other nations—I should suggest that he do so through the Secretary General—to ask if they would join us in meeting the immediate relief problem, stating that obviously we feel that others should assist us, though in view of the emergency we are willing to do more than our part, but we wish to know whether others will give us some help, and whether they will do so at once.

If the President had such authority, he could do one of two things: In the first place, he could authorize the Secretary General to begin to use our funds immediately through the UNRRA personnel which today is in Greece, which is familiar with the problem and is trained and experienced. In short, I think our money could get there in that way as quickly as any funds could be sent there. In that way, at least, our $75,000,000 would, in a matter of days, if not in a matter of hours, be available to relieve distress in Greece, through the amendment which the Senator from Idaho and I propose.

However, if no other country joined us in making such contributions, or if other countries did not have time to observe their own legal requirements in that connection, we would not be spending any more money, if we provided it in that way, than we shall be spending if we provide it in the way that is now proposed.

I would go further, although what I shall now say is not spelled out in our amendment, and I would say that if, before this matter were legalized through the Security Council or the Assembly, we were to put up all the money through the Secretary General, then I think it would be proper for the Secretary General to appoint an American commission to supervise the expenditure of the money; and I would emphasize that, even in that case, the commission would be an American commission, appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations, and we would actually be acting through the United Nations organization; and our personnel, while being American and patriotic to America, would at the same time be a part of the United Nations organization.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to speak for a moment further before yielding to him, then I shall yield.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida ventures to suggest that that is one practical way by which we might give immediate relief through the United Nations up to $75,000,000. If the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to enlarge that figure I can assure him that the Senator from Idaho and I will not object. But I think we can give him practical assurance that in that way prompt and immediate help will go through the United Nations organization itself.

As to the permanent, long-range help, I think that can be met in two ways through the United Nations organization.

First, I am cognizant of the recommendation of the Food and Agricultural Organization Committee, which went out there as an instrumentality of the United Nations and investigated the entire situation in Greece, and came back and made a very solemn and serious recommendation, which has been published since we have been debating this matter in the Senate. That commission recommended that the only temporary aid that should be given by England and the United States should be some food and some necessary imports, and the suggestion and the connotation of the report is that the amount is not large in number, and it is emergent in character. But they recommend, the Senator will recall, that for long-term permanent rehabilitation of the Greek economy, the assistance should be furnished through the World Bank.

I am not saying that they were right or wrong, but I am saying that when there is an official commission, several members of which were Americans, and the chairman of which, I believe, was an official or professor of one of our great universities, I believe the University of Utah, and they study the situation on the spot and make recommendations, some credit should be attached to that committee's recommendation about meeting the long-term needs of the Greek economy. And they did not recommend that the United States provide all the long-term rehabilitation money, they recommended that the World Bank should do it.

So far as I know, no one has come before the Committee on Foreign Relations from the World Bank and said that the World Bank could not do it, or denied that the World Bank has the money. I suggest that the American Government has great influence with the World Bank, because its president is an American citizen, we are its largest stockholder, and it is located here in the United States.

There is another way by which, as a long-term matter, the United Nations organization could give aid to the Greek economy. In the Security Council or in the Assembly I think we could work out additional long-term funds which might be advanced by the member nations, if we did not in the last analysis choose to use the World Bank as the source from which the funds should come.

Mr. President, I have already seemed to be unappreciative of my able friend from New Jersey by not yielding when he has been on his feet seeking recognition, and I now yield to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to recall to the Senator that when this issue first arose, I think I was as urgent as the Senator was that we must not bypass the United Nations. He will recall that he spoke to me about the matter. The Senator did me the honor to ask if I would join in an amendment or substitute he proposed.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I told the Senator then that I could not join with him because I was not prepared to oppose the President, but was prepared and intended in every way possible to implement—and let me distinguish the word "implement" from "oppose"—the President's program. I have followed through with that. I was glad to see that Mr. Austin, the representative of the United States on the United Nations Security Council, followed up the President's message with a very clear statement of the whole purpose of our Government. He made it clear that what the President proposed was a temporary move by the United States because of the exigencies of the situation. He made it clear that the United States would move out just as soon as the United Nations was prepared to pick up the matter. He made it clear we were doing everything we could with the United Nations.

In addition to that, if I may say so to the distinguished Senator, I regret that he could not attend all the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, because what became absolutely clear was that from the time of the original set-up of the United Nations organization the United States has tried to act through the United Nations in every way possible. In Paris, Mr. Byrnes and his associates, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], tried to work out all these treaties, and at every step Russia did prevent the effective functioning of either our delegation at Paris or the United Nations in their operations and did prevent the use of the Security Council in the only way it could be effective on the Greek border by opposing the organization of its armed forces. We came to the point where we had to say, "We cannot perfect the United Nations unless you stop these obstructionist tactics."

The whole purpose of the proposal before us is to say to Russia, in the kindliest way, "We cannot tolerate your resisting and vetoing the development of the United Nations organization." As I tried to say in my remarks a few days ago, the whole point is whether we can simply say to Russia, "We are determined to go forward perfecting the United Nations organization, and we do not expect you to be putting these vetoes and blocks in the way any longer. We propose to maintain the status quo until you sit down with us and settle these matters with the United Nations. Since the United Nations organization was first set up you have been unwilling to do that."

That is the spirit of what Senator Austin has said, the spirit of the Vandenberg amendment and the action of our committee. The President has set forth, a forthright American doctrine, that we are going to do everything we can to make the United Nations effective at this time, and to urge Russia to stop blocking it. By the statement of former Senator Austin and the amendments proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations we are implementing the President's program and clarifying its spirit and purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator, undoubtedly unintentionally, would leave with the casual listener the impression that we have striven, in respect to the particular matter now under consideration, to act through the United Nations, and I am sure the Senator does not mean to suggest that. We have never brought up the question of aid to Greece through the United Nations and had it turned down by members of the United Nations organization. I am sure the Senator does not mean to suggest that.

Mr. SMITH. Greece itself applied for help to the United Nations and could not get it.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator brought that up. Greece did apply, not for economic help, but applied for help against alleged aggression across the northern border of Greece by people or by organizations or governments in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. But instead of the United Nations turning down Greece's appeal and making it necessary for little Greece to go somewhere else saying, "The United Nations has failed; you must now help us," the United Nations took jurisdiction, the United Nations appointed a commission, the commission went to Greece and investigated on the spot. The commission is now preparing its report, and the action on the part of the President, and the proposal on the part of the Congress, is ahead of any receipt of the report from the commission of the United Nations organization. In short, instead of acting through the United Nations, while the United Nations was engaged in acting, we intervene and propose to act unilaterally. Can the Senator call that help through the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that Mr. Austin opened his address to the Security Council by calling attention to the very commission of the Security Council on the border, and the whole purpose of his address was to explain the President's action in backing up the Security Council, and asking the commission to come back and report as promptly as possible in order that the Security Council could carry out its function. It cannot meet its obligation because Russia will not allow it to organize and do it. That is why we have to put our men in there, until Russia lets the United Nations organize; then we will withdraw any military help we are giving.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator from New Jersey was giving expression to what the substance of the matter is rather than meaning accurately to indicate what the bill provides, by saying we are sending our men in there. We are not actually sending men in there, except the military mission, but we are paying for the Greek Army, we are equipping the Greek Army, we are training the Greek Army. The Senator was, therefore, perhaps inadvertently correct when he said they are our men. That, in substance, is what we are doing.

Mr. President, I said at first that this Greek border matter had been put by the complaint of Greece into the jurisdiction of the United Nations, in conformity with the Charter, and I said the United Nations had attempted to act, and there had been no veto by anybody in the United Nations of anything pertaining to this action on the part of the United Nations in regard to this particular alleged aggression across the Greek border. What is the ordinary course, when a case is in court upon the claim of a complainant and the court has the matter in its jurisdiction? If, while the jury is out, one should go out and kill the fellow whom the jury by its verdict might later hang, would anyone think that was helping the court by accelerating its decision?

Mr. President, we did not take an obligation to do what we wanted to do; we took an obligation, in becoming a member of the UN, to act collectively with other nations in trying to keep peace in the world, in resisting aggression on this earth, and in trying to find a peaceful and honorable adjustment of situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. At that point I should like to say that I agree with everything the Senator says. The action we are taking today is doing that very thing.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; in our way.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Regardless of what has been said, what does the word "personnel" mean, if it does not mean soldiers?

Mr. PEPPER. It does, in one case, intentionally mean soldiers, because we are

going to send a military mission to both countries, and while we have been told by testimony that there would not be but about 30 or 40, there is no limitation in the bill to 30 or 40. The President can send as many as he chooses to send, according to the language of the bill which might be covered within the amount of money available. Of course, the other personnel is expected to be civilian in character.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is nothing in the bill that says it might not be two divisions, is there?

Mr. PEPPER. There is nothing in the bill that limits the number of military personnel or the character of the military personnel that we shall send. Now, I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that I am not saying that this is a design on our part to send our own combat soldiers into Greece or Turkey to act in a combat capacity in either of those countries. I am not charging that, Mr. President. I do reiterate what I just said that it does authorize military personnel to be sent. It is intended that they shall be sent as a military mission. The bill does not limit the number of military personnel that may be sent, nor define the character of the duties of the military personnel that may be sent, so far as I recall.

Mr. President, I venture to assert that there is this possibility, if they are going to teach those armies how to use our modern equipment, I do not see how they are going to sit in a safe, air-conditioned office in Athens and effectively do it. I do not see how they can take the sergeants and the corporals, who are going to use that equipment in combat in the mountains, behind some thick wall where they cannot get shot, and carefully instruct them in the use of that equipment. I venture to predict the possibility, at least, that some day some of our uniformed men are going to be at some field headquarters, and some of them are going to get shot, or get hurt, either by accident or by act of the enemy, and that there is nothing in this bill that excludes the possibility that American military personnel may leave their sacred blood, by the command of their Government and the authority of their Congress, upon this already torn and rent land.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to take issue with the last statement, because the bill provides for a "military mission." That term has been defined time and time again. It is the purpose not to send exceeding 40 men. What can they do in the way of fighting? They do not intend to go to fight. They intend to go to help the Greeks take care of themselves, until the Security Council can say there is no further need.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Horatio stood very well at the bridge, though he did not have 39 other men to stand with him. The Spartans stood very well at Thermopylae. There was not a large army at Thermopylae, but I think they left a very good report in history.

Mr. SMITH. I doubt that Horatio could have done much against modern tanks, in the way of resistance.

Mr. PEPPER. I assure the Senator that had Horatio lived in our day he would have employed the best weapons obtainable.

Mr. President, I should like to go back to the point at which I deviated a little bit ago. I was first saying that the Congress itself, at least the Senate, has tried to the best of its ability, so far, to correct the original errors which I feel the executive branch of the Government committed by not going through the UN in the first place. Senators were trying to quiet the rising storm of disapproval from the country that we were bypassing the United Nations by the amendments which were not only offered on this floor but by the amendments recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations itself, and already adopted into this bill by the Senate.

Mr. President, I have here a Washington Post story of April 6 entitled "Diplomats See Greek Aid Hurting UN." This is dated Lake Success, N. Y., April 5, United Press:

> A magazine poll indicated tonight that 82 percent of the world's diplomats believe the American handling of the Greco-Turkish problem hurt United Nations prestige.

It goes on:

> The magazine's representatives counted 83 diplomats from 38 countries.

Let us remember the words of "Bobby" Burns—

> O wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!

Mr. President, this is how 83 diplomats from 38 countries, according to this poll, saw what we were proposing to do in relation to the United Nations organization. I continue with this poll:

> Sixty-eight regretted, as a matter of principle, that the United States did not come before the United Nations with the Greek and Turkish problems, the magazine reported. * * * Thus while 82 percent condemned the United States for bypassing United Nations, nearly half (41) approved the American initiative. Twenty-two predicted war.

These are not men of no experience or little knowledge, Mr. President; these are experienced world diplomats here from their several countries, at the United Nations.

Twenty-two predicted war for the spring of '48, or even for the summer of '47, unless there is a decisive change in big-power policy and a complete agreement at least on the unlimited international control and inspection of atomic energy.

Mr. President, I have referred to what the diplomats say. I want to go now a good long way away from Lake Success, N. Y., out to a little city called Huron, in South Dakota. I have in my hand a paper published in Huron, S. Dak., dated April 6, 1947, the name of which is the Huronite and the Daily Plainsman. Before I determine to use this newspaper I went to the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the present chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. I wanted to be sure that this was not a publication whose patriotism or integrity could be questioned by anybody. I thought it was pertinent to know what an honest, patriotic newspaper in Huron, S. Dak., might be thinking on this matter, and especially what the people of that neighborhood might be thinking. I was assured, as I said, of the patriotism and the thorough repute and capacity of the proprietors of this newspaper. Substantially, the whole issue is devoted to the problem of foreign policy, which we are now debating in the Senate. The heading of the front page article is: "Let us work through the United Nations in solving international problems."

The first subheading is: "Only if the United Nations fails should we act alone."

The next subheading is: "Let us not pit one nationalism against another nationalism."

The third subheading is: "But let us have world-wide atomic control immediately."

Then it gives the result of a poll conducted among its people.

The first paragraph is as follows:

> 1. It is geographically, politically, and economically impossible to be an isolationist nation at this time. (Unanimous concurrence.)

That is unanimous concurrence of the people polled.

> 2. Because in a democracy foreign policy rests upon public approval and support, the public must be fully and concurrently informed on all commitments, policies and actions. It should be brought up to date at this time. Where consistent with security, advance information must be given. The withholding of information in the past has been unwise. (Unanimous concurrence.)
>
> 3. To implement our foreign policy we must have a strong and successful democracy at home. (Unanimous concurrence.)
>
> 4. The imposition of any political ideology upon a people without true consent of the majority presents a menace to world peace. (Unanimous concurrence.)
>
> 5. We favor the immediate and effective world-wide control of atomic energy. (Unanimous concurrence.)
>
> 6. (a) America's first approach to the solution of world problems should be through the United Nations. (b) Only upon failure of the United Nations to act should the United States act unilaterally. (There was only one dissenting vote.)

I believe the Huronite and the Daily Plainsman is speaking the sentiments of the American people. I believe that is the way the people of this Nation feel today. I think they are harkening their Government back to its obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, I have some evidence of that in the latest Gallup poll. This poll was published in the April 13 issue of the Washington Post. The question was:

> Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations organization?

The following are the answers, Mr. President. On March 28 those answering "Yes" were 56 percent. On the date of the poll, April 13, the percentage answering "Yes" was 63 percent.

On March 28, 25 percent answered "No." On April 13, 23 percent answered "No."

On March 28 those having no opinion were 19 percent. On April 13, those

having no opinion were 14 percent. Is that not rather interesting, Mr. President? The more the debate, the more the discussion, the more the consideration, the more the reflection, the more people who were first undecided become decided; more had an opinion. The more the debate and consideration and reflection, the greater the number of our people who say "yes," that we should turn the matter over to the United Nations organization. That is what the Senator from Virginia said as well in his resolution. And there are fewer who say "no," that it should not be turned over to the United Nations organization.

Mr. President, if this question were submitted to a referendum of the American people: "Shall we go ahead with this proposal unilaterally, even with the committee amendments giving the United Nations the power to stop us after we start, or shall we back up right now while there is still time, and if need be, let Greece have some emergency money directly, and then submit the matter to the United Nations?" I will venture that nearly two-thirds of the American people will say, "Yes, the latter is the better way to do it." That is what we are advocating here. We advocate, and the sum total of these amendments mean in substance, that we shall, if we give any aid to Greece, let it be temporary economic aid exclusively, and if we are to give long-term aid, let us try it through the UN, and if we are going to dedicate ourselves to the protection of the security of Greece and Turkey, at least let us try it to the utmost through the UN. Let us not resort to unilateral action until unmistakably before God and man the United Nations has failed and there is no hope on earth save through what we do alone. Is that not sound doctrine? It that not sound foreign policy? Is that not good principle? Is there any lack of idealism in that? Is there any swerving away from duty in that proposal? I do not think so. I think we will rue the day if we ever make a contrary decision.

When this proposal was made we thought it had to be done immediately, for three reasons. The first was that the Greek economy was about to collapse.

The President made this recommendation to us on March 12, and this is now April 17. I have not seen anything in the press nor has anything, to my knowledge, been reported to the Congress by the Executive that the situation has gotten materially worse in that period of time. No doubt it has gradually dragged on to a greater impasse than was first perceptible, but that is not the fault of the United States Government but the fault of the Greek Government in not adopting legislation and rules and regulations in that country that will protect their own economy. If they would make the rich pay some taxes, as we do here, that would help a great deal. I wonder if the people are aware of the fact that there is no income tax in Greece.

Mr. President, I love the Greek people, and I hope I can say that without immodesty because I have for a long time tried to indicate in some tangible way my affection and regard for them. I was the author of the resolution which the Senate unanimously adopted which said that it was the sentiment of the Senate that the Dodecanese Islands, which are Greek in character and had been held by Italy, and northern Epirus should, by the Council of Foreign Ministers, be given to Greece. The Dodecanese Islands were awarded to Greece by the succeeding Foreign Ministers Conference. Well, I was not responsible for it. I do not claim that the Senate was responsible for it. But I do claim that the Senate adopted that resolution, and the RECORD speaks for itself as to who was the author of it.

I have had many honors conferred upon me by the Government of Greece and by the Greek people when I was there in 1945, and subsequent to that time, for which I am profoundly grateful. I have an honorary degree from the University of Athens. I have been given the freedom of the city of Athens. There is a street named for me in the city of Athens, and a square in the Island of Patmos is named for me, and I am deeply touched by these moving deeds.

An emissary from the Foreign Office came to my room in 1945 in Athens and presented me with a beautiful ribbon characteristically colorful which signified that I was a member of the Order of Phoenix. I was especially honored by being made a commander of the Order of Phoenix. I speak with deep apology for having said those things lest they be misunderstood, but I thought I might fairly say that I do not place any Senator's affection or admiration for the Greek people ahead of my own. I am not standing here trying to keep us from helping the Greek people. If $100,000,000 is not enough, I am ready to vote for $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 or whatever sum may be necessary.

Mr. President, I cannot too strongly emphasize that it is not a question of aid to Greece. I am protesting a policy which will commit America for the first time, because the Greeks need help, to sending military aid to a foreign army and using American taxpayers' money to maintain and support foreign armies upon foreign soil. In my opinion, that comes dangerously near to going violently outside the democratic traditions of our country. That is what I warn against. I am saying that since we took an obligation to act collectively in meeting the challenges of aggression in the world, we are under a duty to try to act through the United Nations organization. I shall later try to emphasize that I believe that the United Nations can act and will act adequately if America will only take the lead in holding up its hand and making it possible for it to act.

If Senators did not come to the Senate, these bare seats could not legislate. If judges did not go to the courts and decide cases the courts would become sterile marble edifices. If leaders did not lead and soldiers did not fight, an army would not exist. What can the United Nations do if all of its members forsake it? What can it do if the strongest member forsakes it without a trial and says that it is incapable of acting in this crisis? For 16 days after the President's proposal there was not even official notification to the United Nations of what we proposed unilaterally to do. Is it fair to call that a failure on the part of the United Nations when it has not had an opportunity to act? I do not think we have any right to hurl the criticism of impotency at the United Nations organization. I do not think we have a right to disillusion every hope on earth that that organization can and will function to keep world peace, before it has failed after a fair opportunity to succeed.

As I said, when this proposal was made, we were told that we must act immediately because the economy of Greece was about to collapse. It is now 36 days since the President made his recommendation, and the economy has not yet collapsed, so far as I know.

In the second place, we were told that we must act immediately, that we could not wait for the United Nations Commission to report; we could not wait for the United Nations to act; we could not even consult other countries lest the Greek Army collapse and the insurgents take over the country. Not only have we not conferred with the United Nations, but we have not consulted with any other countries or asked them to help us, unless one could say that the notice which the British gave us that they were getting out of Greece was a consultation. Many persons have been anxious for a long time to see the British get out of Greece, as a part of a general policy of everyone getting out of everyone else's country. That is what I have always advocated. I think that is what Senators believe in. I wonder if we could not have a simple resolution for everyone to get out of everyone else's country, and make no exceptions. That is a simple, understandable rule, it seems to me. Let everyone get out of everyone else's country with armed forces. I will support such a policy to the limit of my ability as a Senator and a citizen.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator speaks of armed forces. I assume he would ask Dimitrov to get out of Bulgaria. The Senator would send him back home, too, would he not?

Mr. PEPPER. It seems to me that everywhere in the world where the armed nationals of one country are in the land of another people they ought to go home, especially if their presence has any military significance. I make no exception. Let the penalty fall wherever it may. I am not trying to protect anyone in any aggression upon any other people anywhere in the world.

As I say, the British gave us notice that they were going to withdraw their economic and military aid from Greece, and were going to get out of Greece on March 31. I understand that we requested them not to get out so soon, until we could equip the Greek Army with our weapons and train Greek forces in their use through our military mission, and until we could provide for the maintenance of the Greek Army so that it

would be an effective instrument of the state to protect the solidarity of Greece. We did not want the British Army to get out. Whether we should have taken the position of encouraging another country to keep its soldiers in the land of another country which was an ally during the war, because of an internal disturbance in that country, I submit is a matter which might be argued by conscientious men.

We have just read a moving article in Life magazine by one of the great and honored names of the world, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill. Mr. Churchill claims great credit for having ordered General Scobie, the British general in command of the British armed forces in Greece, in the early hours of a certain morning, to go out and hurl back the armed Greek forces which, as he said, were marching upon Athens itself, and endeavoring to take over the government of that country. A great many Greeks were shot down in Athens and its environs by the British forces under the order of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. British soldiers were also killed.

Mr. Churchill thought he was doing democracy a service. I have no doubt that he was conscientious in what he did. He is one of the great men of all times. I honor what he did in World War II in saving democracy on the earth. Had it not been for Winston Churchill, when Britain stood alone against the Nazi hordes, not only Britain, but Europe, and perhaps America, might have been unable to stand up and preserve, in good time, their independence and freedom. So men will honor the name of Winston Churchill for that as long as glorious pages of history shall be written.

But, Mr. President, Mr. Churchill is mortal. He eats and sleeps, even if he does not drink like ordinary mortals. But Mr. Churchill has the ordinary emotions, and, I might add, even the predispositions, if not the prejudices—to which the humble and feeble are heir, because to err is human. Mr. Churchill thought he was saving democracy in Greece, that he was discharging a British duty, when he ordered British troops to shoot down Greeks engaged in a civil war in Greece.

I respectfully submit that honest men may differ on that question. We had the War Between the States in the United States, through four tragic years of American history. My grandfathers wore the gray, and I have a Southern lineage since my family has been in this country, for more than 200 years. Does anybody suppose that today I, a descendant of two Confederate soldiers, relish the fact that certain foreign powers in the War Between the States thought seriously of intervening on behalf of the South. When the Southern forces were at Bull Run, some might have felt that it was their duty to preserve the kind of government they wanted in the United States, and to bring British warships up the Chesapeake Bay to help the Government save Washington and reverse the results of the Battle of Bull Run, causing the running to be in the other direction. Would southerners thank God for the British having saved them from the Yankees? I suppose we wanted recognition at that time and appealed for it, but are we not all very happy that we did not get it?

It will be remembered that the Russians also had a little part in that affair. When the British for one reason or another were pretty sympathetic to our Southern brethren, the Russians sent a fleet over to New York Harbor, or thereabouts, and let it be known that if the British intervened on behalf of the South in the War Between the States, or the Civil War, as it is sometimes called, they would have something to say on the side of the Union. Are we not all glad that that never happened either?

I wonder if a nation has a right to have a war of its own. It is a tragic thing. I think all wars should be stopped. Again, men may honorably differ about the best method by which to stop wars. The American Secretary of State is one of the greatest men that has ever adorned that office. He spent a year in China. With his great knowledge, and with the year of on-the-spot understanding, what did he come back and tell his countrymen? He said, "Let us get our troops out of China. Let us not take part in their civil war. Let us try to urge both sides to get together. The Chiang Kai-shek government is a reactionary, corrupt regime, and the Communists in the north are equally objectionable. They are extremists on one side and the Chiang Kai-shek group are extremists on the other. Let it be our policy to try to get the forward-looking, patriotic, liberal leaders of China together and let them take over the government of China."

Is it not to be supposed that history will approve what General Marshall recommended? How much better that counsel to his country than if he had said, "Let us now take over and support, equip, maintain, and train, under an American military mission, the government forces of Chiang Kai-shek." I venture to say, Mr. President, that no jury would find today that the government of Chiang Kai-shek in China is as corrupt, as fascistically inclined, and murderous in practice as the government of the monarchist forces of Greece which we are asked to support by this measure and into whose hands we are asked to entrust an army of 125,000 men, with modern military equipment in the use of which their soldiery shall be trained by an American military mission.

Why is it that in Greece we go exactly contrary in policy to what General Marshall recommended with reference to China? I have no doubt that the first thing that impressed General Marshall was that the situation was similar to that which we have in Florida sometimes. In certain parts of Florida there are what we call sinkholes. People sometimes get mired in them, and there does not seem to be any bottom to them. Sometimes a cow will get into one of those bogs, and it is glorious oblivion for her, because she will never get out.

General Marshall, I suspect, saw that China was a bog, and if we ever got into it we would never get out. Mr. LaGuardia, who testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations, said, with reference to the Balkans, that if we ever got in there we would never get out. No one has ever got out successfully. After trying it for centuries singularly enough the British are getting out with an admission of failure. Only we have the temerity to rush into a place which the British are getting out of because they say it is impossible to remain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator's reference to General Marshall's experience in China brings this question to my mind: Is not General Marshall supporting the program which is before the Senate today, with reference to Greece?

Mr. PEPPER. He is presumed to be supporting it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As Secretary of State he completely advocates this program. General Marshall either sees a different situation in Greece which warrants this action on the part of our Government, or perhaps the situation is entirely different from the circumstances that led him to make his statement with reference to China.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct in presuming that General Marshall gives this matter his wholehearted support. I will say, however, that I have heard in the rumors and gossip of the Capitol that when this matter was proposed to the leaders of Congress in the presence of General Marshall, it was said by one who was present, when asked what General Marshall said, "He did not say much; he was pretty cagey."

I am not saying, however, and I have no reason to infer, that General Marshall did not give his support to this program. I doubt that he initiated it. But I will ask the question, Why, then, did General Marshall make certain recommendations to us with reference to China, and why does the State Department recommend that we stay out of the civil war which is going on in Paraguay and the contest which is in progress in Argentina, and yet recommend that we go into the bog of the Balkans?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has spoken of General Marshall as the greatest statesman we have had in the State Department for some time and has called attention to what he believes to be the great wisdom of General Marshall in recommending certain things with reference to China. Yet we are bound, I think, to assume that General Marshall is thoroughly supporting the proposed aid to Greece which the Senate is now considering. The Department of State, of which General Marshall is the head, has been represented through many witnesses before the committee who have made statements supporting the measure. General Marshall has not been available for testimony, but I think we can assume nothing else than that he is vigorously supporting it and has brought his great statesmanship and his great background of information to bear upon it and that he approves and advocates it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is entitled to that inference. I will say that one difference may be that the general spent a year in China and, so far as I know, he spent only a few weeks in Greece. It may be that if he had spent a year in

Greece or in the Balkans studying the situation, as he did in China, he might have had a different opinion about it. But the Senator is perfectly justified in his inference that the general is supporting this present proposal.

I repeat Mr. President, we were told that there was an emergency and that we had to give economic aid immediately. Yet we have been here 36 days and Greece has not yet collapsed. In the second place, we were told that we had to support the Greek Army; otherwise the insurgents were about to take over the country; that they were led by Communists, and the effect would be to place what they call a totalitarian regime in power in that strategic area in Greece. But the latest press reports indicate that the Greek Army is doing all right against the insurgents. I read a dispatch the other day which stated that the Greek Army had 2,500 of the insurgents surrounded in the mountains. I heard a radio report or saw a dispatch a day or two ago which indicated they were moving to the offensive against the guerrillas. I have not heard anything more about the deterioration of the military situation on the part of the government or the army.

How many insurgents are there? We are told that there are 13,000. What is the population of Greece? It is 7,000,000. Are we to believe that 13,000 guerrillas are not only expected to defeat the Greek Army, but to defeat the Greek people? Is the situation so dangerous that we must immediately send an American military mission there and immediately recruit, train, equip, and maintain a Greek army of 125,000, without giving the commission sent there by the United Nations even an opportunity to report, or the United Nations organization an opportunity to consider its findings or come to any conclusion or make any recommendation of its own?

So, Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the emergency in Greece justifies the concern that many had which was the basis of this proposal that we have to give aid immediately without giving any consideration whatever to acting through the United Nations organization.

With reference to Turkey, Mr. President, no one has ever suggested that there was any probability or possibility of the Communists taking over Turkey. As a matter of fact, they have only recently reached the point where they permit Democrats to vote. Anyone who has ever heard of Ataturk and his party and his government, which is now carried on by his chosen successor, President Inonu, knows that there is not any likelihood of communism getting a foothold in Turkey.

Neither the President, the Acting Secretary of State, nor the willing witnesses, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, nor Mr. Porter, who has just returned from Greece, suggests that there is any threat of communism taking over the Government of Turkey. No. They say that the question there is that the Russians have asked that they might share with the Black Sea powers in the control of the Dardanelles.

They do not say the Russians have issued an ultimatum. They do not say the Russians have threatened to move troops. They do not say the Russians have threatened to bomb or to move their naval forces against the Dardanelles or against Turkey. They simply say the Turkish economy is being taxed in order to maintain the present Turkish Army of approximately a million men against the possibility that Russia might at some time attack in order to obtain control of the Dardanelles, and they say that if we do not let Turkey have the money to maintain her army at that strength, either she will have to reduce the size of her army or she will have inflation.

Mr. President, I wonder what the American housewife thinks about keeping down inflation in Turkey, while at the same time permitting it to exist in the United States. Yesterday a representative of the British Parliament appeared in the Capitol at a luncheon and told Senators that the British Government was giving several hundred million pounds in subsidies to the British people in order to keep down the price of foodstuffs. There the British Government was keeping down the price of food for the ordinary people of Britain. Here we have already said we cannot afford to spend money to keep down the price of food in America, that we cannot give a subsidy to the dairymen or to the other producers of agricultural commodities, including food. We have said that we wish to economize. However, now the situation seems to be that if one happens to be located in a strategic area of the world and if one is likely to have some inflation in connection with maintaining a large army, why, yes, the United States Government can afford that kind of subsidy. That is what we are now asked to provide. It is said that Turkey has $250,000,000 in gold reserves outside her borders, I believe, and is getting along all right, but that if we do not help her maintain her army, she will begin to have inflation rather soon, and her economy will begin to suffer.

So, Mr. President, although the United States cannot afford to protect her own people against high prices, although the United States has felt that its money is so limited that it has been necessary to curtail the school-lunch program, although we are called extravagant if we ask for $100,000,000 to try to find the cause of and cure for cancer, which will kill one out of eight of us here in this edifice, and although we are told that we cannot be so profligate as to spend $100,000,000 to find the cause and cure of heart disease, that will kill one out of every three of us, still we are asked to give $100,000,000 in the next 15 months to maintain the Turkish Army and to keep the Turkish economy from suffering from inflation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yesterday I read an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, published in the New York Times. Mr. Baldwin, as we all know, is an authority on military matters. The article strongly supported the Truman policy of intervention in Greece and Turkey, but one paragraph of the article contained the statement that the crisis in Turkey, so far as threats from Russia are concerned, has greatly diminished in the past year; that a year ago, according to the article, Russia had many military men on the borders of Turkey, but that those forces have been greatly reduced, and are at a very low level at the present time.

I assume that a writer of the reputation of Hanson W. Baldwin would not make a statement which did not have a basis in fact. So I wonder whether there is such a crisis as we have been told.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot see any justification for the belief that there is such a crisis as the one which has been called to our attention in this matter. As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, I have not seen anything in the newspapers about such a crisis, and we have not been told by the State Department of anything new in connection with this matter for weeks, if not for months.

We have stated before that Russia has been trying to get a new arrangement regarding control of the Dardanelles. But, Mr. President, as the Senator from Colorado so well pointed out yesterday, Russia has been trying to do that for over 200 years. Peter the Great, not Joe Stalin, started that. I do not suppose our reaction is so slow that we are just waking up to one of the threats that old Peter made over two centuries ago. Mr. President, we all know that for over two centuries the Russians have been trying to get a warm-water port, and for that length of time the western European powers have been fighting just as diligently, and more successfully, to keep Russia from doing so. We know that in 1854 the Russians, following a war with Turkey, by the terms of the peace treaty subsequent to that war, won the Dardanelles, and Constantinople, as well. But then what happened? The British and French—not to aid Turkey, because they did not come into the picture until the war was lost by Turkey, but because they did not want Russia to have that strategic waterway—sent the British and French fleets into the Black Sea, where they sank the Russian fleet, and then made the Russians agree to a new treaty which took away from Russia her fruits of victory—the Dardanelles and Constantinople.

Let me also say that the Russians not only have a strategic interest in that waterway and in the city which lies close by it, but they also have a sentimental attachment to what used to be called Constantinople, and now is called Istanbul. We must remember that the religion of Russia is an offshoot of the Greek Orthodox religion, which was the religion of the Byzantine Empire, which centered in Constantinople. We may remember the story of the Russian ruler who was a prince of what was then called the Moscow Kingdom. He decided that the Russians needed a new religion, and he sent a commission abroad to decide what religion his country should adopt. That commission went far and wide; it examined sacred edifices; it interviewed princes of the church and people generally. Finally the commission reached the old center of the Byzantine Empire,

Constantinople, and went to one of the most magnificent cathedrals which stands on earth today, St. Sophia. Anyone who has had the exhilarating experience of walking into that inspiring edifice, built from A. D. 532 to A. D. 562, and so grand in its architecture that today it would be an adornment to any part of the world, can imagine the thrill they received when they walked into that great building, which was the beautiful enshrinement of the sacred, throbbing heart of the Greek Orthodox Church. Thereafter they returned to their prince and recommended that their nation adopt the Byzantine religion, the Greek Orthodox Church. That was done, and they have ever since maintained it in principle. In fact, Moscow calls itself the second Rome. She has felt that she was the heir to the leadership and primacy of the Greek Orthodox world, since Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks.

So, Mr. President, Istanbul has a sentimental significance but the Dardanelles has a strategic value to Russia which it possesses to no other major power.

It is well known to everyone, but I will ask Senators just to look at the map on the wall of the Senate, which shows the position of Turkey in relation to the Black Sea, and also to Rumania and Bulgaria.

It is well known that the territory of Turkey extends across the straits into Europe, but what is not so well known is the fact that Bulgaria, which is already alleged to be in the Russian sphere, is adjacent to this territory of Turkey, as the situation is today, and those who talk about Russia gaining a new influence and getting a new access to the Dardenelles, and an opportunity to overthrow Turkey, evidently overlook the fact that it is charged that they are already dominant, at least in sentiment and sympathy, in Bulgaria, which lies immediately adjacent to the Turkish territory to an extent approximately the same as Greece lies adjacent to Turkish territory today.

It is said that if we let Russia have any part in the defense of the Dardanelles, it will mean she is going to overrun the Middle East. Even the President said in his message that if Turkey is disturbed or overrun, it may mean disorder in the whole Middle East.

Evidently what these persons fail to take into consideration is the fact that today Russia borders on Iran to a large extent. The Russians do not have to go through Turkey to get to the Middle East. The Russian territory already is adjacent to Iran on one side and the other of the Caspian Sea.

So what is to keep Russia from going right down to the Middle East tomorrow, with her admittedly dominant army, if she wants to go? Yet people tell us that we have to keep them from having any share in the defense of the Dardanelles, in order to keep them out of the Middle East.

They were down in Iran. They occupied the northern half of Iran during the war with their troops. If they wanted to go to the Middle East, why did they not stay while they were there? Why did they not go farther? Who got them out? It was the United Nations. When they remained in Iran in violation of their treaty, the President did not come here and say, "We got out of Iran. The British got out of Iran. We agreed at the Teheran conference that we would all respect the territorial sovereignty of Iran. The Russians are violating their treaty. They are staying there. Now we have to send some British and American troops over there to get them out."

The President did not come to Congress and say, "The Iranian Army is weak, the government is weak." And it was at that time; it was in a state of turmoil. There were all sorts of pulls and stresses and strains in the country politically. The President did not come here and say, "That country is torn politically. It is enfeebled economically." And it is. They are so poor in the great capital city of what we used to call Persia, now called Iran, that as Senators who have been there know—and there are many on this floor who have been there—the drinking water which the people of Teheran use flows down an open ditch beside the street. People go out and wash their clothes in it, or walk in it, or do whatever else they will, and that is part of the water supply of the people of a great city. What justification there would have been for the President to come here and say, "You don't realize the squalor of some of those people. You don't realize their economic distress. You don't realize their political conflicts. We have to send a military mission there. We have to send them money, and let them recruit and train and equip with our weapons an army to push the Rusisans out of there." The President did no such thing. Iran hailed the Russians to the bar of international justice. Iran appealed to the United Nations.

Did the United States say, "Listen. Don't bring this thing to the United Nations, because, in the first place, it might require some money, and the United Nations has no money. In the second place, it might require some troops, and the United Nations has no troops, because Russia will not agree to setting up the United Nations police force. We would not want to be embarrassed by making a decision and then not be able to carry it out. Let us not bring that up."

No; on the contrary, every pressure was brought on our Secretary of State to deter him from going ahead and giving full support to the Iranian people. Even while Russia was putting pressure, all kinds of pressure, according to the press, upon the Iranians to withdraw their appeal to the United Nations, we said to them, "Don't withdraw. Stay here, and let's fight it out. If they are in your country wrongly, the world should know it, and if this organization is ever going to amount to anything, it has to stand up when it faces crises. We are not going to run from this crisis because this happens to be the army of the greatest land power on earth."

I heard a man, whom Senators would recognize if I should give his name, say the other day that the Russian army could occupy all Europe in 8 days if it wanted to. Yet we did not run because this happened to be the army of the greatest land power on earth away off out there in Iran. We stood up in the United Nations, and what happened? The pressure of world opinion, the prestige of the United Nations, and the dogged righteous determination of Britain and America, and other nations which stood with them, exercised such compulsion that the Soviet Union moved their troops out of Iran. What a victory for this "feeble" organization, which now its own fathers are repudiating, its own godfathers denying.

I refer now to an incident involving Syria and Lebanon, right to the west of Iran. The French, as Senators recall, had had a mandate over that area under the League of Nations, and the people were restive because the French seemed to treat them, not like citizens of a mandated power, but as if they were part of the French Empire. For years and years those people struggled to be emancipated from their new masters. Finally came the days of the war, and a promise was made by the De Gaulle government that these people would be emancipated from French rule. The time came for their emancipation, and the French did not get out. These people protested to the French, and they agitated for the removal of the French troops and for the French to carry out their pledged word to give them their freedom, as they had promised they would. That did not avail, and eventually they agitated so much that the French decided they would get tough with them. I hate to repeat what happened but I was in Lebanon and talked to the President of Lebanon and his family, and had dinner with them one evening, and the President's wife, beside whom I sat, told me how the French took her husband out of the family bed and carried him off into captivity, kept him 8 days incommunicado, and would not even let him go to the next room to tell his 10-year-old daughter good-by. The daughter and the mother for 8 days thought their father and husband had been shot because he was advocating the freedom and independence of the fine people and brave citizenry in Lebanon.

Over in Syria, in the city of Damascus, all one has to do is to stand there and look, as I did in 1945, at the Parliament Building, shot up by the French because Syria demanded freedom. I was told the story, not by some stranger, but by the man who was the speaker of the assembly, who was sitting in that building and got out just minutes before the French started shooting. They turned their 75's right on the Parliament doors, and there were the gaping holes, there was the burned interior, and on the opposite side of the street were the headquarters of the French general, and in the next house the headquarters of the French army. One standing in the street could not see a single evidence that they were shooting in self-defense. They started a violent conflict, and about 1,500 people were killed in the Damascus fighting.

Finally conditions got so bad, and sentiment in the country seethed so dangerously that the British moved in in an effort to stop the fighting. They moved the French around to a compound where they could not carry on war any longer,

and they quieted down the population by parading up and down the streets with their tanks and with their machine guns and with their soldiers. The British stayed there then, to keep peace between the French and the Syrians. When I got there the Syrians wanted to get both of them out. They said that, in no unmistakable terms, to our Minister and to me. And what did the Syrians do? Did they call on us for military aid to run them out? Did they call on somebody else to finance a new army so they could push them out? No. They were law-abiding citizens of the world. They went to the United Nations and protested, and I say to the credit of the British and the French that they set a magnificent example in acceding to the plea of these people. They got their troops out of Syria and Lebanon.

Now, what do we have? In the course of less than 2 years' history with the UN we have gotten Russian troops out of Iran, British and French troops out of Syria, and British and French troops out of Lebanon. Is not that a very good record for UN during that period of time?

And when have we had any great failure? "Oh," my able friend says, "there have been some vetoes in the United Nations organization." I do not recall, however, that those vetoes related to the matter of any country getting its troops out of another country's territory. They have generally been on procedural matters; they have been on conflicts of policy; they have been on the issues they are debating up there.

Mr. President, a part of the price we have to pay for democracy is delay, exasperation, irritation, annoyance, endless argument. I may be guity of one of the offenses myself; perhaps sometimes some of the rest of us are. But, Mr. President, that is the character of democracy. That is a part of the price that must be paid for it. If there is an organization in which somebody just gives an order and nobody dares to argue about it, what is it? It is totalitarianism. See how it worked out, even in the armed forces of the nations of the world. We had over here a democracy. I do not always say that there is too much democracy in the army. We get more now than we have had in the past, and I know all of us are rejoicing. We have tried to do what we could to bring it about. But, after all, the President of the United States, whoever he is, has never ignored his advisers and commanded them to do what he individually thought was the thing to do. President Roosevelt was Commander in Chief during the major part of this war. I believe he would not have any nobler witnesses to testify to the truly democratic spirit in which he discharged that office of Commander in Chief than the generals and the admirals who worked with him, whom he had the right to command all during that war. But Hitler—why, even Goering could not stand up against him. I know Senators have heard the instance and the story of how, just when Goering and the air force thought they had worked out the jet-type fighter plane that would probably be able to stop the mass bombings that were leveling German cities and halting their production, Hitler just capriciously and arbitrarily changed this plan and started putting bombs on some of their planes. In other words, he tried to convert the air force to a bombing air force, which was strategically inappropriate for Germany's situation; but nobody dared to stand up against him.

I remember reading that President Roosevelt at one time was dedicating a school at Hyde Park. What he said struck me. He told those people who had gotten this little school, "You had to wait a long time for this school. A totalitarian government would one day have just issued the order and you would have had the school up here in about 3 weeks, whereas under democracy you had to agitate for it and argue for it and save for it and vote for it; but now you have finally got your school. But my! how rich are the rewards of democracy, even if some time we are delayed a little bit in getting what we want!"

So I am saying that in the UN it takes time to get a policy adopted; sometimes it does, here in the Senate. That does not mean that so far the Senate has seen the wisdom even of abolishing the power to filibuster. We have adjudicated for a century and a half that it were better to hear everybody as long as he wanted to be heard, than to cut anybody out of the right to speak, as long as he wanted to speak. So if we have had a little delay in the UN, if we have some in the future, does that mean that we are going to break it all up? Are impatient Senators going to come around and say, "I am a new Senator. I went there and stayed 30 days for them to dispose of the Lilienthal matter, and they were still debating it at the end of that time; I am not going to be a party to that; I am going to go out and do what I want to do." What brand does a man like that place upon himself, when he refuses to become a part of, even if vexatious and sometimes annoying, the democratic way of settling things and disputes? Let us not too soon repudiate the only democratic organization of world character there is today. In this case we would repudiate it without asking it to attempt to solve the problems with which we are now wrestling.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question. He has referred to the use of the veto power in the United Nations. I should like to ask him, when the question before the United Nations is a matter of aggression by one of the members, whether the aggressor member may exercise the veto.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator brought up that question. It falls into two categories; one, what the UN may do in attempting a peaceful settlement of a dispute; and, second, what the UN may do in attempting by force to resist aggression, as the case has been put by the able Senator from Missouri.

In the first case, let it be applied to this particular situation—and this was recognized in the Foreign Relations Committee hearing, and it is in the report, it was brought out during the testimony of Mayor LaGuardia in the first case, if Greece and Turkey were to charge before the UN that Russia was an aggressor, directly or indirectly, against them, or so far as I know, if we were to charge it, or if Britain were to charge it, so that the record stood before the UN that there was a dispute between Russia on the one side and Turkey and Greece on the other side, in that case, by the specific language of chapter VI of the United Nations Charter, Russia could not even vote in respect to the UN making a recommendation for a peaceful settlement of the dispute, let alone veto a recommendation for a peaceful settlement.

Let us be clear about that. I do not know whether a recommendation for a peaceful settlement would be observed or not, but it has not been tried, it has not failed any nation that was requested by the Security Council, to which under the Charter we have given the primary responsibility for making world peace, I say a nation that flouted the recommendation of that organization would stand accused as a criminal, as a wrongdoer, as a law violator before the nations of the world.

Mr. President, we have not sought action by the Security Council in an effort peacefully to settle this dispute between Greece and her neighbors, or Turkey and her neighbors.

The question is asked, "What can there be in the nature of a peaceful solution of this dispute?" That brings us to the point where I think we ought to find a basis for the reconciliation of this dispute which today is tearing the UN open, is tearing the world open, and opening an abyss in which the whole race of man will be lost in an engulfing third world war if we cannot find some way to reconcile the dispute. I think one of the bases of such reconcilement is to come to a practical and sensible discussion of such issues as this one over the Dardanelles.

I realize what will be said about anyone who dares to suggest that the Russians have any rights at all, in view of the very bad reputation they have in the world today, in view of the many stupid things they have done, in view of the many instances when they have apparently exhibited an utter lack of regard for the sentiments or the convictions or the institutions of other people. I realize that, to put it in the vernacular, they are in bad so much today with the nations of the world, fanned, as that feeling is, by the breeze of propaganda, into a flame, that anyone who dares to stand up and say, "Well, frankly, I think there is much merit in what the Russians are asking about the Dardanelles," will be condemned. In the next issue of a certain magazine such an individual will be called a Russophile, or by some loose-tongued and mentally debilitated people, will be called a Communist or something like that, and charged with everything next to being a traitor, and I guess they would charge that if they thought they dared to. But I want to say that some time or another the major powers have got to sit down around the council table and take into account the area of each, the power of each, the position of each, the history of each, the fears and the concerns and

the interests of each, and try to find—within the principles of law and justice and due respect for other people—a basis upon which they can agree to work together in peace, instead of fighting one another in war.

Some Senators may say, "Well, they will not do that." I will tell the Senate what I think the critical error was in our approach to the Soviet Union ever since the end of the war. I think we started out with the assumption that we were going to tell the Russians what they had to do in the areas around about them. Well, we may have been right. I realize the sense of shock that our people received many times when the Soviet Government has followed policies which it has followed in many instances in the past. But take this matter of the Dardanelles, for example. It is right over there practically in their front yard. They are one of the major powers on the Black Sea, as are Turkey and Rumania and Bulgaria. That is the only outlet to warm water which they have, short of the Pacific Ocean.

They feel that it is so close to their homeland—and it must be but a few hundred miles away—that they at least ought to be one of the major powers that will have the control of this area and be responsible for its protection, its use or disuse by military or naval personnel and equipment. And they say, "Now look here; you do not need to be so self-righteous about this thing." Turkey is not controlling the Dardanelles at the present time. Oh, Turkey has the fortifications there, but it is governed by the Montreux Convention, which is a convention of powers. We are not a member of it, but Britain and France and the European powers are members of it, and they have presumed to lay down the law concerning the control of the Dardanelles. I suspect the Russians have resented that because they feel it is meddling in an area that is proximate to their territory and with respect to interests that are vital to their security and defense. It must be remembered that other people want to be secure as well as we want to be secure here in our own country.

Then the Russians may say, "Why do you talk to us about the Dardanelles? The British and the French promised us the Dardanelles in World War I if we would go to war on their side while the Turks were fighting with the Germans, and we would already have had the Dardanelles if we had not had a revolution in Russia and had to draw out of the war although Sir Bernard Pares says that we Russians by our sacrifices saved Paris twice after we had suffered two and a half million killed and two and a half million wounded in the war." But by reason of the fact that the Russians got out of the war before the war ended, and the fact that they were governed by a government which was a people's government which wanted to be friendly with everybody, which did not want to have anything to do with empire, although it may be strange to hear me say that about Lenin, they gave up area after area which they had had in the past. They never did ask for the Dardanelles then. Not only that, but Lenin gave up the oil rights which Russia had in northern Iran although the British did not give up the rights they had in southern Iran at the same time. But they were like the French revolutionaries of their day. With the French revolutionaries it was "Liberté, égalité, fraternité," and the Russians then said, "We do not want to be an empire. Take it back." They did not claim the Dardanelles, and so the Dardanelles stayed in the hands of Turkey. But for a long time even Turkey was not allowed to arm her own straits. The western powers said "No, we want to control the straits."

Finally Ataturk took advantage of the strife which existed in Europe and developed a strong army and a strong government in Turkey, and sent the now President of Turkey, President Inonu, then his prime minister, I believe, or foreign minister, to one of the conferences—it might have been at Lacarno—and secured an agreement on the part of the powers respecting the Dardanelles. Mind you, Turkey, through which the straits run, got permission of the powers to arm her own straits, but subject to the rules and regulations and restraints of the Montreux Convention.

Russia, which has knowledge of all this background and all this history, and the contempt, if I may say so, which at various times the powers have shown for the sovereignty of Turkey, now hears us say, "No, you, Russia, who have all this border on the Black Sea to which the Dardanelles is the outlet, and you, Rumania, who have a considerable area on the Black Sea, and you, Bulgaria, who have a considerable area, and you, Turkey, who have roughly half of the area of the Black Sea—you four are not going to be permitted to determine what the government of these straits shall be. We, the western powers, say you cannot have that determination." Well, who is "We"? We, the United States, are not a party to the Montreux Convention. But now we march right up there with the other powers and take our stand with them and say, "We are taking exactly the same position in this matter."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator permit me to finish this statement, and then I shall be glad to yield. We are taking the same position, so far as I know, that the British take at this time and have taken for a considerable period of time in the past. I am not saying we may not have the right to do so. I know we have a duty to stand up for the rights of some nations. I say today, as I have said on the Senate floor before, that if, without any fair opportunity to negotiate this matter, the Russians were to become angry and send an army down to the straits and try to take the straits, I will help the United States in every way I can to participate in repelling them, by force, if necessary. But as I said the other day, the attitude which we should take on the subject is an entirely different question. What I think we should do in the United Nations to try to find a solution for the problem is another thing.

I do not think this violates any confidence, because I think the attitude of Turkey is well known. When I was in Istanboul in 1945 I spent an evening with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Turkey. About the middle of the evening I asked a question about the Dardanelles. I asked if there was some way in which the question could be resolved. They stated, in substance, that they were willing to try to find a solution for it. However, they felt that there were two principles upon which they should insist. One was the sovereignty of their territory and the other was the security of their country. I was very much encouraged when I heard that. I thought that within those two principles we might be able, if we did our part, to find a basis for pacifying the Russians and at the same time not being unfair to the Turks, while protecting our own legitimate interests.

I still think that there can be a solution of this problem. As I have stated, I have not heard lately of anything that changes the situation from what it has been for the past two or three years. The question was discussed at Potsdam, to see if some basis of adjustment could not be found. The necessity of revising the Montreux Convention was admitted. The British and American representatives have already admitted that. They have already proposed that the Black Sea powers have the right to send their merchant ships and armed ships through the Dardanelles at any time they desire to do so, and that no other power shall have that right. That is a considerable concession. It may be that that could be the eventual basis of the adjustment of the dispute. But it is also barely possible that the Russians may say, "We resent the United States alone telling us what the conditions are upon which we who occupy this area may defend it. The United States is not a party to the Montreux Convention. The United States is 4,000 miles away."

We say, "The trouble is that some of those who as Black Sea powers would thus have control are Communists." It is said that of the four powers, Russia, Turkey, Rumania, and Bulgaria, the latter two are under the dominion of Russia, and it would be three against one, and that therefore we must take the side of the one. The Russians naturally say, "How can you Americans consistently take that position? You have a whole hemisphere which you preempted from Europe, and from which you are determined to keep European colonization. Your hemisphere extends for thousands of miles. How can you go before the United Nations and say that you want the Carolines and the Marianas, 6,000 miles to the west of your homeland? How can you go to Greenland, Iceland, the Azores, and Portugal and ask for bases, thinking that they are essential to your security, and then say that we are the aggressors because we want to be one power, or the major power, in the defense of a waterway which is comparable, in respect to us, to your Gulf of Mexico with respect to you. Our Volga is something like your Mississippi."

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I apologize to him for making him wait so long.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, he complains that we might be too aggressive at the present time in pushing the issue with respect to the Dardanelles. He spoke about what happened after the First World War. After that war we were not aggressive enough. We took no position. We remained in the United States, and we had to send our boys into a greater World War. This time, as I see it, we are trying to correct that mistake. The First World War started in the Balkans. The Second World War was fomented in the Balkans. It seems to me that we have a responsibility as the strongest power in the world today to take an aggressive position in an effort to try to stop another world war, even if it is 4,000 miles from our homeland, even if it is fairly near the boundaries of the second most powerful nation in the world.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has stated a perfectly fair and perfectly penetrating question. My answer, to give a short answer, is this: Mr. Justice Holmes, whose memory adorns the great State of Massachusetts, once said that everything from the Twelve Tables down to the present was a matter of degree. If the Senator were disposed to make political capital of an argument, he could say, for example, that I either favor aggression or approve isolation; and if I were to adopt the same tactic, I could say to him that he favors our intervention in every part of the world. As a matter of fact, neither conclusion is justified. But surely, if it is a matter of degree, there must be some point so near to the vital interests of other peoples that, when they try to protect those vital interests related to their security, we cannot reasonably charge them, necessarily, with bad faith or with aggressive desires.

Take our case in the Carolines and the Marianas. I once had luncheon with the Prime Minister of New Zealand. In order to obtain his reaction I asked him, "What do you people on the other side of the world think about our desire to have the Marianas and the Carolines?" He replied, "We are waiting to see what the decision is." I am confident that they are probably agreeable to our unilateral and exclusive possession of those islands. That is what we have asked for before the United Nations, and that is what we have obtained, or will obtain, from the United Nations.

An enemy of the United States might say, "The United States is not trying to defend the Western Hemisphere. The United States started by defending the United States. Then it decided to take in the Western Hemisphere. Now it has practically taken over the Pacific Ocean and is trying to reach out into the Atlantic. Where is the United States going to stop?" Could not propagandists from another country charge us with aggression? Yet we do not consider that we are aggressive. Suppose New Zealand and Australia were unfriendly to us. Suppose they were Slavs or some other kind of people. Would they not be able to say to us, "You are reaching far out into the Atlantic. Why do you not let the United Nations protect the Carolines and Marianas?"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I not correct when I say that New Zealand has objected to what the Senator has said the United States was trying to do, and has appealed to the United Nations? So the question is still unsettled, and is to be left to the United Nations for decision.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to have the Senator remind me of that fact. It rather indicates that there has been a continuity of policy in that country. Of course this question will be decided by the United Nations. It is not like the question of the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is not a part of an enemy country, so it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the United Nations, whereas the Carolines and the Marianas are, in a more legal way, subject to disposition by the United Nations. Yet can we say that America is being hailed before the United Nations? A propagandist might say that America is being hailed before the United Nations because she has stretched her long, strong arm 6,000 miles into the Pacific.

What shall we say when we go before the United Nations? We are going to explain the strategic situation. We are going to say that American boys gave their lives in order that the American flag might fly over that area, and that we want to be secure against future attack. But can we entirely ignore the feelings of other peoples with respect to questions which are of particular interest to them? Why can we not go before the United Nations with the whole Dardanelles situation? I believe I would extend that principle to many other strategic areas. Let me be frank with my able friend. I would far rather see the United States Government go before the United Nations and set a good example by saying, "These islands 6,000 miles away were bought with American blood. They are important to American security; but we realize that it is better to have peace on earth and understanding among nations, and cooperation to keep the peace, than it is for us alone to try to obtain bases far enough away to make us secure against any weapons of the dangerous and uncertain future."

I say that morally, politically, and physically America would have been better off if someone's counsel had not prevailed. I understand it was not that of the State Department. That is the report. I have read in the newspapers that the State Department always felt, working through the United Nations as they were, that we would be subject to criticism if we asked for the exclusive—mind you, exclusive—occupation and use of those islands away out there, thousands of miles across the Pacific. The Russians have voted for our having the Mariannas and the Carolines. If they ask that some islands go to them, what are we going to say?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said, quoting Justice Holmes, that everything is a question of degree. I naturally agree with that statement. Would it have been the exercise of a better degree of decision on the part of the United States after the war to have been somewhat more aggressive than less aggressive and consequently possibly have to send our boys abroad again and possibly expend ourselves and our security in another war? We are now trying to help Greece and to aid Turkey so that they may remain nations, so that they may keep their identity and be able to present questions affecting them to the United Nations in the future and have the United Nations decide them when it is capable of deciding them, while their identities remain, and thus make the United Nations useful to us and to Russia and make it possible for us to be less aggressive in the future than we may have to be at present. Is that a fair question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; it is a perfectly fair question. The Senator from Massachusetts always asks a fair and honest question. My answer to the able Senator is this: In the councils of nations we should stand up for the independence and security of Turkey and Greece and all other nations. That is the first thing. In the United Nations we should try to help the economies of Turkey and Greece and all other nations. If the United Nations feels, after fair trial, after all we could do in the United Nations, that we cannot achieve our objectives, then we have no alternative. But in this particular case, while the United Nations has jurisdiction of the dispute on the Greek border, while the United Nations apparently, by what we did last year and what several nations proposed last year, is agreeable to setting up an international relief fund, while the United Nations has not been asked to solve this problem or to try to reconcile this dispute, and while the United Nations has not failed to prevent or to throw out Russian aggression, I say to the Senator that our wrong lies in our first effort being to send a military mission to Turkey, to begin to pay for the equipment and the maintenance of the Turkish Army to the extent of $100,000,000 in the next 15 months, and to send a military mission to Greece and equip, train, and maintain a Greek Army of 125,000 at the expense of 150,000,000 American people in the next 15 months. I say, Mr. President, to my able friend that that is going too far on America's part. It commits us to a course from which we will never, in my opinion, be able to recover our lost prestige or the prestige of the United Nations, and it makes America stand before the nations and peoples of the world in a light which I believe is not in accordance with our best democratic traditions of the past.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will concede that much of what the Senator has said would be correct if he had started from the proper premise, but it seems to me that he starts from a false premise when he says that the United Nations is capable of handling this immediate problem at the moment. What we want to do is to make the United Nations capable and strong; and common sense tells us, as was discussed a little earlier today, that the United Nations is incapable of handling this immediate problem. So we are handling it ourselves in order to give the United Nations time to get on its feet and carry out what the Senator wants to have done.

Mr. PEPPER. I know that that is exactly the policy that has been given in justification of this proposal. I say to the able Senator from Massachusetts that the time to make the United Nations strong is not in the indefinite tomorrow; it is now. If Russian aggression threatens Turkey, the time to make an issue is now, in the United Nations. I say that if the United Nations is weak, now is the time to make it strong. If America were to put its full majesty, might, and power at the disposal of the United Nations, with other nations, would it not begin to take on more strength?

That goes to the question which my friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], asked me a few moments ago. What about a case in which we cannot settle a dispute peacefully and it has got to be settled by force?

Before I leave the first point, however, with reference to peaceful conciliation, I will say that I spoke about an error which I thought we made in trying to work out an understanding with the Russians. I think another grave mistake we made directly after the war was in indicating to Russia that we would not help them financially with their own problems. Russia suffered terribly during the war. Millions of persons were killed. In the last two wars they have lost in killed 15 times as many as we and the British have lost. That is the figure which I have seen. In addition to that, Stalin told me they had 25,000,000 homeless in Russia after the Hitler hordes receded, their economy has been broken and torn asunder, and they have suffered terribly. They wanted help from us to rebuild their economy, to rehabilitate the devastated country, to get themselves back on the high road to a decent standard of living for a people that has never had a decent standard of living. The Russian people have never been decently housed, adequately fed, or properly clothed, not in a thousand years of Russian history. They, too, have had their stirring of aspiration within the hearts of people. They have adopted some radical things in order to get ahead. We may not like them or approve them. I certainly do not like or approve communism as a philosophy. But it is their country, and they have chosen that dynamic experiment to try to better themselves.

I believe that back in the very early days, if we had taken a little different position, if we had worried along with them a little more, the situation would be more satisfactory.

It has been repeatedly stated by Senators that Russia never applied for an American loan. I do not know whether she did or not. I know that Joseph Stalin, sitting in the Kremlin, in the presence of our Acting Ambassador, told me that Russia had applied for a loan of $6,000,000,000, and that for 6 months had not received an answer to the application. I know that the Acting Ambassador did not repudiate it. I know that when we got to Moscow with the Colmer committee, the Ambassador and we, in the embassy, before going to see Mikoyan, whose office corresponds to that of our Secretary of Commerce, discussed the Russian application for a loan, and it was common knowledge that Russia had applied for a loan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me finish this statement, please.

It may be that Russia did not file a formal application. In international diplomacy one seldom does things the way in which a schoolboy would do them. But later Russia made another application for approximately a billion dollars to the Export-Import Bank, and that application got lost in a pigeonhole for a few months.

Is it to be supposed that the Russians think that we are disposed to give them the same treatment that we have given our other ally, Great Britain? Russia would be as good a customer as American business could have if we could work out decent, reasonable, and proper commercial relations between the two countries. Russia is a great market. It wants the things that we can manufacture.

Now we are complaining because the Russians do not engage in multilateral trade. Mr. President, the Russians cannot engage in multilateral trade, because they do not have international exchange. The only kind of trade they can engage in is bilateral trade—with Sweden, Hungary, Rumania, and other areas with which they enter into such bargains or agreements.

I do not defend or countenance or approve of a great many of the things the Russians have done; but I will say that at Frankfort, General Eisenhower, who has been dealing with the Russians since the war, said to me, "Senator, the key to friendly relations between ourselves and the Russians is the one word 'confidence.' If you get the confidence of the Russians, you can work with them." He then said, "I have their confidence, and I do work with them, and I can work with them."

He told me of instance after instance—in the presence of General Bedell Smith, then his chief of staff, and now our Ambassador to Moscow—when he did work with them and when there were what appeared to be misunderstandings which would have justified the most bitter denunciation of the Russian conduct, but which, when understood against the background of Russian character and Russian capacity to get things done and Russian equipment, were thoroughly understandable actions on the part of the Russians. Let me give just one illustration of that. He said there was a train which ran through the Russian zone, in going from one part of the American zone to another part of the American zone. The Russians would stop the American trains there every few days. He got tired of that, and it was interfering with distribution, so he went to the marshal in command of the Russian forces at that point and complained about the stopping of that train. The marshal readily agreed that it would not happen any more. In about 10 days the train started through that area again, and the Russians stopped it again. General Eisenhower said he got red in the face and felt like going to the Russian marshal and telling him what he thought about him. However, he did protest about the breach of the agreement. Later he found that the Russian system of communications and red tape was such that the man who stopped the train never had heard of the conference between Eisenhower and Zhukov. The man who stopped the train was not just a scoundrel or a lair or a criminal or trying to be nasty, but he had never heard of the conference between General Eisenhower and Marshal Zhukov. General Eisenhower said, "I find if you want to get them to do anything, allow about 20 days for it."

Mr. President, we who live in the United States, with governmental bureaucracy, can understand that, because many people in our States cannot understand why it takes the Federal Government so long to do the things it does. Yet we know that the Federal Government does not intend to break its obligation or its word to the citizens, and sometimes there are explanations for such matters.

All I am saying is that the Russians are a peculiar people; they have a peculiar psychology; they have had a past so different from ours that we cannot ignore it and properly appraise them. I am afraid that, somehow or other, unintentionally a long time ago, we gave the Russians the impression that we are their enemy and that we do not understand their point of view and that we are trying to bottle them up in the Black Sea and in their country and not let them reach the oil of the Middle East or the warm waters of the Mediterranean or of the Pacific. Mr. President, no one in the United States intends that. My gracious, if anyone were to tell me that the Secretary of State or Mr. Truman or this Congress intends any such thing as that, I would say it was a false accusation. They do not intend it. They are conscientiously trying to work together. But they see things through our eyes, just as the Russians see things through their eyes.

I could give almost innumerable instances of things they do. I shall mention just one, which I have spoken of many times as an example of how they will act differently from other groups of people. They let Mrs. BOLTON and her colleague enter Russia in an American plane, and they treated them fine; but when they got nearly out of Russia the Russians opened their baggage in such

a way that they got angry about it. The Russians let the Colmer committee fly in General Eisenhower's plane into Moscow, but they would not let them take it to Tehran. When I went to Russia on a Russian plane, going from Berlin to Moscow—because I was not using a Government plane—they did not charge me anything for the trip from Berlin to Moscow, but they did charge me the regular commercial rate from Moscow to Tehran. I think all of us shall have to admit that the Russians have their own ways of doing things—ways that are very different from our ways of doing things. But there, again, I still believe there can be found a basis of reconciliation and understanding, and I think we have to try to find it, because surely we would rather worry and worry and worry than to accept the inevitability of war or to begin a policy which accepts the inevitability of war, as I believe the policy now under discussion does.

At long last let me state that the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] was asking me, "What can we do if we take this matter to the United Nations, and then the Russians veto it, and a peaceful recommendation does not avail?" That would either be the issue upon which the United Nations would become stronger and would endure, or else it would be the rock upon which it would be destroyed. My answer to that question is the answer which Senator Austin, now our representative to the United Nations, gave a little while ago. He said that under articles 1 and 51 of the United Nations Charter, if the time ever comes when a nation commits aggression upon another nation and then the nation which is charged with aggression vetoes any effective action by force to resist that aggression, there is, nevertheless, a duty under the Charter upon all the other members of the United Nations to act collectively to resist that aggression.

So I say to the Senator from Missouri that, as applied to this case, if the Russians are about to attack the Dardanelles, the proper procedure is for Turkey to take that matter to the United Nations; and if there is justification for the assumption that such threat or action is about to take place, it will be the duty of the United Nations to take action by notifying the Russians that it would be contrary to the Charter for Russia to take such aggressive action, and that in case the Russians did take such aggressive action, the United Nations would have to set in motion the machinery of the United Nations which is contemplated for use in resisting and preventing such aggression. Then it would be the duty of the United States to step to the front and say to the other nations, "I am ready and willing to discharge my obligation."

After all, Mr. President, we are talking about sending $100,000,000 to Turkey, to be used to build up and train the Turkish Army in the next 15 months. Do we think that little amount of money would keep Russia from attacking Turkey if she wanted to attack her? If Russia does attack Turkey, do not we have to go to Turkey's defense anyhow? Does not the United Nations have to resist that aggression anyhow?

So it is obvious that by following the course which we are now urged to follow, all we do is give some provocation, by going in there before the threat occurs, before the attack is made, before it is even imminent; going in there in the face of the Russian people and the world, and saying, "We are not going to wait for the United Nations, we are not going to wait for a condemnation, we are not going to wait for a failure of an effort to achieve a peaceful settlement, but we are now going in to take over the Turkish Army and support it. We do not have to do that, do we, in order to stand by our Charter obligation, in order to be a great democracy? Do we have to do that? As I said here a few days ago, cannot Senators see what we do when we do that? First, we break a precedent. America has never done it before. It is a rather serious thing for America to start a precedent of this import. President Truman started his address by speaking of the gravity of the situation.

Suppose Russia should hale us to the United Nations. Suppose Russia should say, "All right. This is just the same as if you sent your own troops over. What you do by another you do by yourself." Suppose it should precipitate a crisis. Then can we say, "Well, we did everything we could to avoid it. We went before the United Nations, we told Turkey to take them to the bar of the United Nations organization. We had the matter aired on the agenda. We gave them notice that, if they struck, we would resist with our brethren of the United Nations organization. Now they have ruthlessly attacked this little nation. What else can we do except accept the issue of mortal combat?" Would we not be in a much stronger position morally if we did that than if we did what is proposed, which might precipitate us into armed conflict?

I say, first, it establishes a precedent. We have not been sending military missions out of the Western Hemisphere. A proposal is pending today in the Committee on Armed Services to authorize the sending of a military mission anywhere. Such legislation has been proposed since last year, and it has not been favorably recommended as yet, so far as I know, from the Armed Services Committee of our own Senate. Evidently we have not been ready to establish a precedent of that kind. We have not been arming the armies of foreign powers. Now it is proposed that we do both.

Moreover, we go outside the United Nations organization. Now let us see what else it does. In the first place, it justifies any other nation, for example, Russia, doing the same thing in any other part of the world. Yesterday, in a colloquy with the able Senator from Michigan, I said when Peron was shouting about Yankee imperialism, about our trying to intervene in his country—what if Russia had sent him word saying, "If you would like to have us do so, and you think you would feel safer, we will send you a lot of our good tanks and a lot of our good airplanes and a lot of good machine guns and mortars and ammunition. We will also send you over some of our good Red army advisers, who fought on the western front and hurled back the mightiest military force the world at that time had ever seen."

Suppose the headlines of the newspapers had said, "Russia considering in the Politburo sending a military mission and lending $100,000,000 for the next 15 months to Argentina to equip and to train and to maintain the Argentine Army." What would we say about that?

Can we do it in one part of the world, and deny others the right to do it in any other part of the world?

Oh, it is said, we would not stand for it; if they did it, we would go to war. Well, perhaps we would. But the Russians may not understand what is proposed here, either. I do not know what they will do. I know they are not ready to fight. I know the people of that country do not want to fight, any more than the people of this country want to fight. I hope and pray that all of us will keep our heads and will prayerfully try to settle these disputes, that none of us will precipitate any action which would lead the world into another and unspeakably horrible war.

I desire to emphasize one other thing. At the present time we hear talk about Russian aggression. I am told, and I believe it is a fact, that with all that has been said about Russian aggression, today Russian territory is smaller than it was at the beginning of World War I. They have aggressed on some of the countries. A little bit of Finland they have taken. The Baltic states they have reacquired. I wish those states could have retained their independence, but it is a little different when a power attempts to get back again the territory it once had within its area. All I am saying is that many people who read the papers think Russia has taken half of the world since the end of the war, when as a matter of fact the total area inside of the homeland is less today than it was at the beginning of World War I.

We hear people say, "Look at the country she has overrun." They say she is in Poland. She got the eastern areas from Poland at the Potsdam Conference. Her being in Poland was agreed to by President Truman. I am not saying he agreed to political interference with the Polish people's government, but the fact that today Russia has the eastern half of Poland, east of the Curzon line, was agreed to by the President of the United States and by Winston Churchill, as Prime Minister of Great Britain. I am saying also that the Curzon line was drawn under the League of Nations by a commission, back in the days when the Versailles Conference was sitting.

It would not be accurate to say that Russian occupation of the eastern half of Poland is altogether an aggression, when that area was stated by the Curzon commission to be more Russian than Polish, and when their acquisition of that territory was agreed to by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States at the Potsdam Conference.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have not heard all the Senator's speech today, but I heard his first speech, and have read it several

times, and the question I am about to ask is prompted by his statement regarding aggression.

As I understand, the purpose of the pending bill is primarily to protest against or to stop the aggression of Russia. I should like to ask the Senator if he considers that there has been any aggression by Russia since the conclusion of World War II.

Mr. PEPPER. To answer the question in the larger sense, yes. There is no doubt that Russia has used pressure in certain areas about her homeland in order that she might, according to her own judgment, first be secure, and, in the second place, in order that, in her own judgment, she might have friendly governments in power in those countries. There is no doubt that Russia and some of those countries have exercised pressure.

Mr. COOPER. I have appreciated the tremendous support the Senator has given in his speeches to the United Nations. However, considering the spirit and the purpose of the United Nations, I should like to ask the Senator if he believes that the action of Russia in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Finland has been in accordance with those purposes and principles.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator will have to take into account that when the United Nations came into being Russia had already reacquired or reincorporated into her territory Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, the three Baltic countries. So far as I recall, she had also acquired part of the Karelian Isthmus in Finland. I do not know that in any instance the United Nations went back and asked any country to disgorge any territory it had previously acquired. But there is no doubt that Russia employed force, probably military, physical, and political, upon those people to get them back into the Soviet Union, where they were before the Germans, at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, took them over. While there may be something to be said in justification of it, as I said a while ago, it is not the kind of thing we do, and I wish they had not done it. There is no doubt whatever that those people would probably have preferred to maintain their independent existence. But if the United States had had a war with Mexico, and Mexico had taken away Texas, which we have had as long as Russia had the Baltic states, and then 25 years later we won a war and took it back, even over its protest, I dare say that nations would feel somewhat differently about it than if it had been a territory which we had never had before in our past. But I will say to the Senator I am not trying to whitewash Russia. She has been guilty of a great many things that were not only provocative but certainly contrary to the spirit of the United Nations organization; there can be no doubt about that. The question is, What is the best method of finding a basis of agreement? That is the issue.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that. I should like to go just a little further, though, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Senator consider Russia's action in respect to other countries, not occupied by it during the war, and not acquired by it during the war—for example, Poland and Hungary, and now, as charged, against Greece, and as it has been charged by our Government in reference to various other nations—to be aggressive?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator, I think, will have to distinguish between one group of countries and another. In Poland, so far as I know, the aggression has not been military because I was told by the Polish Ambassador here the other day, when I called him and asked him, that there were very few Russian troops in Poland; there were only some small detachments that were there to guard the Russian communication lines into Germany, and that those were the only Russian troops that were in Poland. I have no doubt that the Russian Government has exercised considerable political influence in Poland in the establishment of the Polish state, so it must have been noticed the other day that Micolajyck, who is the head of the party that opposes the Polish Government, which is supposed to be pro-Russian, thoroughly opposed the position that General Marshall took in respect to a change in the Polish border, and supported the position taken by Russia in respect to the Polish border being retained as it is today. There is the leader of the opposition, who has been bitterly anti-Russian and bitterly antigovernment, taking that position upon that crucial matter.

The Senator will, of course, recall that Hungary is an occupied enemy country, that the peace has not yet been made, that Hungary sent her troops along with Hitler's troops into Russia and attacked Russia without Russia giving any justification that I know of for doing so, and the Senator will recall that Rumania did the same thing, and that Austria did the same thing, and that, therefore, if the Russians are in there today as occupying forces, they occupy an enemy country whose forces went into Russia and killed Russian soldiers and Russian citizens, and plundered Russian property, and that their occupation of those areas is not dissimilar from our occupation of a part of Germany, or our occupation, under General MacArthur, of Japan.

Mr. COOPER. I think there is a distinction, though. I know the Senator will agree that in Hungary a non-Communist government was placed in power.

Mr. PEPPER. It was elected.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The Small Holders Party; that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It has been so stated, despite the fact that coercion and influence have been exerted by Russia. I should like to know if those are the facts.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have heard stories to the effect that the Communists in Hungary, with the aid of the Russians, have been putting pressure upon the Small Holders Party which won the election there. If that be true, it is unjustifiable, it is subject to criticism and condemnation. I do not know whether it could be brought before the UN, before the peace treaties are ratified, but I will say two things to the able Senator from Kentucky. The first is that the Russians were in occupation in Hungary when the Small Holders Party won the election; that Voroshilov was the Russian marshal there in command of the Russian forces, and that he did not intervene in that election. I suppose if he had, he could probably have prevented the Small Holders Party from winning the election, and instead, he could have aided the Communist Party, which had candidates in the election, to win the election. So the Russians let the Small Holders Party win the election. If, at the present time, they are pressing the Hungarian Government, they ought not to be doing it. But the Senator will have to remember that the Russian Army today occupies that country, and he must remember that we occupy Japan, and General MacArthur is certainly not putting any Communist or any Fascist in power. He is putting in people he thinks represent America's point of view.

We shall be able to complain, in my opinion, much more when we ratify the Hungarian treaty and then call on the Russians to get out 90 days after the treaties are ratified, as they are obligated to do; and when Hungary then becomes an independent country again, to call on them to let Hungary alone. But I doubt very seriously if the Communists are winning any elections in the American zone in Germany, or in General MacArthur's Japan, which he is now occupying as the head of our forces. So, as I was about to say a while ago, when I hear all this talk about aggression, I remember from my ancestors hearing the story of Federal troops putting the Negroes in power in the South after the Civil War and disfranchising the white people who lived there. So, this is not the first time in American history that a conquering country installed the kind of government it wanted; but after the War Between the States was over, after reconstruction days had passed, and after Florida and Alabama—Alabama is where I was born and reared, and where, as I was told, these things had occurred—after we had been readmitted into the Union, then there were no Federal troops there with Federal bayonets, and they were not putting one class of people in power and disfranchising other kinds of people. Some seem to assume that no nation in all history has ever tried to do anything with respect to a conquered people that was not exactly in accord with the idea of perfect democracy that all of us hope to see among the nations and peoples of the world.

Let us ratify the treaties with Hungary and Rumania. They are before the Senate, and we will have to pass on them. Let Britain also ratify the treaties with Hungary and Rumania, and then when 90 days have elapsed, let us call on the Russians to get their troops out of Hungary and Rumania, and if they do not do it, let us do the same as we did when they would not get Russian troops out of Iran, in violation of the treaty; let us haul them before the United Nations, and see if we cannot get them out in accordance with their obligations.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I merely want to get back to this one point: Does the Senator

believe then that there is basis for the position that this policy is founded upon the aggression of the Russian Government?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the Senator I do not believe it is such aggression as justifies the United States today in doing what is proposed by the pending bill. I do not think the United States is justified because Russia, in the conquered countries of Hungary and Rumania, which went into Russia and killed Russian soldiers and citizens and robbed the Russians of their property, has not set up perfect democracies, or because it is interfering with the Small Holders Party. Russia could install any kind of government it wanted for that matter, while it is occupying those countries and while there is no treaty of peace. Every conquering country in history has reserved the right to do the same thing, and I had a whole lot rather the United States would not be in the position of being the defender of our enemies and an aggressor ourselves, in the opinion of some, on behalf of our former enemies against our former friend. It was the Hungarians and Rumanians that helped kill America's sons. I stood at the Ploesti oil fields and saw there the devastation of those great oil wells and the machinery around about, and I had people come and tell me of the number of American boys that died bombing them. I rode one day along the highway, and back on the hillside was a cluster of white crosses. They marked the graves of American boys who never would come back from Rumania.

The same statement may be made with respect to other countries. I am not going to become so sensitive all of a sudden as to take up the cause of every former enemy and to say that Russia is the greatest enemy we ever had. Russia has not yet killed any American boys that I know of in any war upon this country, now or in any other time in our history. To read what certain newspapers say and what certain commentators say one would think that there had never been an enemy of ours who was as dangerous, as devastating, and as deadly as Russia. There are some who say, "Let us today build up Germany again against Russia." My God, how many American boys in one generation have the Germans killed? Yet today I hesitate to think of the number of people who will take the side of the Germans, who are criminals convicted by the nations of the world, if the Russians happen to be on the other side.

Mr. President, we have got to reappraise this situation. We have got to remember who were our enemies in the war and who were our friends. There are Senators on this floor whose sons are home today who would not be here if it had not been for the number of Germans that the Russians killed. I am not denying that we did our own great and glorious part in it, but it is merely simple arithmetic that the Russians killed more Germans than we did. It is simple arithmetic that the Russians engaged more Germans than we did, and while Mr. Churchill talks gloriously and grandly about Britain standing alone for a year, Russia stood alone for 3 years against the host and might of the German forces, from June 1941 until June 1944.

Is all that going to be forgotten merely because their manners are bad, because they do a lot of stupid things, because they have in many instances committed aggressions amounting to less than war? Are we going to say that we will break a precedent as old as America and we will thrust our fist in their Black Sea face? Are we going to reach through the Straits and say, "No, you cannot come out. You shall not pass because you are committing an aggression against Turkey," which in the last war gave aid to the Germans, and fought with them in the First World War. Because Russia asks something from Turkey, another country not much less totalitarian than Russia, although they may have made some progress in the last few years toward democracy, shall we claim that our interference is a matter of self-defense?

A little while ago when Roosevelt said the frontier of America was the Rhine, there were many people who condemned him. He may have been right or wrong, or he may never have said it. But I cannot for the life of me, as I said to the able Senator from Massachusetts, believe that today the situation threatens the security of America in such a way that we have got to send a military mission to Turkey and spend $100,000,000 in the next 15 months trying to maintain, equip, and modernize the Turkish Army.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I can say to the Senator from Florida that I agree with him wholly on the point that I think if there is to be any peace it must be through collective action in the United Nations. But without discussing who has been our friend and who has been our enemy in the past, is it not true that the problem is now as to whether or not the United Nations will function? I will ask the Senator if it is not true that the achievement of peace must require the good will of its members, particularly the five powers, and, more particularly, Russia and the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to know if it is the Senator's opinion that Russia has used the same good faith in the United Nations, in the Security Council, and in the effort to develop its purposes and interests, as has the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. No; certainly not. I think anyone would be foolish to make such a contention. I certainly have never said so and never will say so. But I say that that is not a justification for breaking up the UN and embarking upon a private war with Russia, declared or undeclared.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask the Senator if there is not the possibility that any nation—in this instance Russia—might use the United Nations as a sanctuary for delaying action while it pursued an aggressive course?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I said in the first place that democracy has as one of its faults and one of its costs, delay. Wherever there is democracy, there is going to be delay. Wherever there is the privilege of speech and discussion, there will be those who use it to delay the enactment of legislation or to delay the decision of the issue. But I will say that, in spite of the fact that here on the Senate floor we have had many instances where there were filibusters and where there were calculated delays to prevent the enactment of legislation as early as some desired, we have always, or in most instances, eventually gotten over the hurdle and eventually carried on in the democratic way. Our society has not collapsed. While some of us favor the abolition of the filibuster power, while some do not think it is democratic, yet the Senate so far has not been willing to abolish the filibuster. Although a Senator can theoretically, and a few can effectively delay the Senate from ever voting on anything under the present rules, yet we have not seen a dead Senate here. That power has never been so exercised that, after we get over all the annoyance and the vexation and the delay and the retarding of the legislation, we did not eventually go on to the performance of our functions otherwise.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me answer the other part of the question. I will say yes, the Russians can delay, as can any other country, action in the UN. But the answer to that is that is one of the prices we pay for democracy.

The second answer I make is that, if while they are arguing against action themselves, they act, then there will be another situation. If they ever think we are stupid enough to permit the use of technicalities and listen to them veto and listen to them argue while they take over a country, they are greatly mistaken. I do not think there is any one in the United States who is so stupid, and the Senator from Florida, I can assure the Senate, will never be the defender of any nation which takes such a course. But I do think, Mr. President, that at least where action has not been taken, where aggression has not been committed of the kind that we are repelling or purporting to repel, and where we have never even brought it up in the UN, and where the Russians have not delayed consideration of a problem, that it is premature to convict them of delay or that they are using that as an excuse to do this kind of aggression.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator consider there is any force or strength in the position that this statement of our principles might have the effect of bringing Russia into a closer cooperation in the United Nations and thereby strengthen the United Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the Senator asking that question. I think just the contrary. Although I reluctantly comment on things of international consideration, I will say that I do not think that this proposal has aided the solution of the German problem which is at present under consideration in Moscow. I will tell you why I say that. If this is going to be a power struggle between us and Russia, the Russians are going to

move every peg, gain every strategic position, occupy every strategic advantage they can possibly get control of or access to. They are not going to agree to the German problem being put at peace until peace is established between Russia and America. The first peace today to be settled is the peace between the Soviet Union and the United States. If that peace is settled, if accord is established between those two powers, the other differences will fade like the mist before the bright morning sun. But let that peace be unsettled, permit the war to continue—call it ideological, or political, or any other kind of a war—let that continue and nothing is going to be settled. If we settle it, it will be unsettled directly or indirectly, in some way or other.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the able Senator believe that our diplomatic forces have done everything possible within the power of a democracy to try to make an honest and sincere agreement with Russia upon practically every important question which has arisen between us?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; they certainly have conscientiously, honestly, diligently, and patiently tried. It is regrettable that they have failed. I am not placing the fault with our people because we have failed so far; but I say that the peace of the world is so dear that it justifies us in continuing in the best way we can, holding our temper, straining our patience, exerting our efforts at good will, and doing everything we can save committing an act which might be construed by Russia and other nations as military action on our part. So far, thank God, we have confined the Russian-American differences to talk. We have not shot at each other. We have not hit at each other. So far as I know, we have not issued an ultimatum to each other. So far the differences have been kept in the realm of talk—and propaganda, I regret to say, each against the other.

But what frightens me is that we are doing something that is more serious than talk. In the first place, we started by sending carriers to the eastern Mediterranean. We sent the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, loaded with planes, to give a demonstration over Greece. Every few days we read in the newspapers that we have sent cruisers, destroyers, or something like that. But today, for the first time since this proposal has been made, we are asked to send a military mission to a country adjoining Russia's borders, and we are asked to equip and partially to maintain a Turkish Army which is said to be there for purposes of defense against Russia.

What I am afraid of is that we are adding to the tenseness of the situation which exists today. I think it is tragic, if we are to do something of this character, that we do not do it with other nations, so that we cannot be accused of doing it unilaterally.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree that there is a tenseness in the Middle East as the result of what we are doing, but I ask the able Senator, in all sincerity, if he thinks that the United States is responsible for the tenseness which exists in Greece and Turkey at this very moment.

Mr. PEPPER. No; we are not responsible for it; and Russia is not exclusively responsible for it, although in my opinion she is partially responsible. The reason why I say she is not exclusively responsible is that I do not support the thesis that everywhere there is a Communist he was sent there by the Russians, and is directed and probably paid by the Russians. I know that I shall be pilloried and condemned by a great many persons for making that statement. I actually believe that some persons are Communists because they want to be Communists, and they would be Communists even if Russia were to disappear tomorrow. I think some of them are in Greece. I also believe that the majority of the so-called bandits in Greece today are no more Communists than the Senator from Illinois or other Members of this body. As I told the Senate the other day, I shrank when the Secretary of War went so far as to say, more or less casually, "bandits, or whatever you call them," in speaking about the 13,000 so-called guerrillas in Greece today who are armed. I believe that an honest inquiry would indicate that many of those people are no more Communists than we are. I believe that they dislike the royalist government. They think it is reactionary. Some of their relatives may have been killed by that government. They feel that it is alien to their traditions, as the royal family is alien to Greece. We all know that the Greek royal family has not a drop of Greek blood in its veins. It is German. The wife of the present King is a granddaughter of Kaiser Wilhelm. I am merely saying that some of those people are fighting their government simply because they do not like it, and that the Russians are not solely responsible for that condition. While it may be said that Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria have been giving some aid, after all, I do not know that we could convict Russia for that. Russia may be in the background somewhere, or the spiritual source of such aid; but so far as I know, she has never been charged with responsibility for it, unless she is chargeable with everything those three countries do. I must remind Senators that those people generally are Slavs. The Russians are Slavs. The Russians have been the defenders and protectors of the Slavs. So at least there is justification for the Slavs in Yugoslavia—and the people of Yugoslavia are not all Slavs, although many of them are—feeling that Russia is their great champion.

Again I say that some nations may honestly be the friends of Russia without being coerced into such friendship. I believe that Czechoslovakia has deliberately chosen to identify herself with Russia. That is what President Benes personally told me. He realized that that was best for them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that there are some persons in this country who see Communist behind every tree. I have never been particularly alarmed by such persons. Undoubtedly there are some Communists in this country who are in the employ of the Russian Government. I do not know that to be a fact; but, as the Senator has said, many persons are Communists because they want to be Communists.

I desire now to recur to the argument which the Senator was making with respect to the patience, good will, and humanitarian effort that this country should put into a program with Russia in order to bring about peace. In my opinion, that is exactly what we have been doing. I, for one, have stood on the floor of the Senate in times past and stated openly and solemnly that I thought that certain individuals had gone too far in their criticism and condemnation of the Russian Government and her people, because we did not understand them, and they did not understand us. I have stated that I was certain that sooner or later the two ideologies could live side by side in a peaceful world; and I still think so. I shall not give up hope, because when we give up hope of Russia and the United States living together in this world, we give up hope for all humanity and civilization.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I desire to make with respect to the able Senator's argument is this: He is making a good argument from his viewpoint, as he always does, but it seems to me that sooner or later the time must run out when we can continue to listen to the veto of Mr. Gromyko and accept what seems to me to be a rather arbitrary and stubborn policy on the part of our Russian friends. It may be because we do not understand them; it may be because of their viewpoint that they cannot see any other way and cannot see the light as clearly as we think they should. I am still willing, as I said a moment ago, to continue to exhibit all the patience necessary in order to reach some kind of an amicable agreement with them so that we can have peace in the world; but some day, sometime, we have got to make a choice, it seems to me. Whether this is the time I am not certain.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the Senator asking the question, and it gives me an opportunity to say a few things which I wanted to say.

A writer for one of the great newspapers, a man for whom I have respect, made a comment the other day upon my first speech on this subject in the Senate. He spoke graciously about what I said, but stated that I took only one side of the case; that I took only the pro-Russian argument and did not take into consideration the opposition. Perhaps I am unconsciously guilty of that offense. I did not intend to be. I did not need to say anything against Russia. That is in every newspaper and on many lips. It is seldom that we hear anything that might suggest Russia's point of view.

Take the question of the Dardanelles. I am merely saying, as Burns said, that we should try to "see ourselves as others see us." Let us try to imagine how we would feel if the Straits of Florida, the

mouth of the Gulf of Mexico, were involved.

In the first place, as the able Senator has stated, there is a tension between this Nation and the Soviet Union. We all hopefully and prayerfully desire to diminish and resolve the conflict and dispute. We all know that, if we work together, we can give the world the longest peace and the highest level of living it has ever enjoyed. If we fight each other, we shall destroy mankind. We all know that. Anyone who loves his fellow man does not want to see him blown to pieces by an atom bomb or killed by radio activity or slain by one of these germ bombs which are in process of being made, or in some other way wiped off the face of the earth. We all, to the very best of our ability, want to find a way to keep peace between this great new axis that exists today, one end dominating the Western Hemisphere and the other end dominating the Eastern Hemisphere. We do not want to see them in mortal combat across the oceans of the world.

This bill carries us further than we have ever gone before. It makes us commit the United States to the first military act. Sending a military mission to Turkey, financing the Turkish Army, and equipping it is dangerously near to military action on the Russian border. It is dangerous especially when it is a precedent in all our history.

In the second place, under the treaties now in the process of consideration, Russian troops in Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria are obligated to withdraw within 90 days after the treaties are ratified. Suppose we ratify the treaties in the next 30 days? The British system is such that Britain can ratify a treaty in 10 hours. That country does not have debate as we have here in the Senate. I learn from the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that the British have already ratified the treaties. Are there any other countries besides the United States, Britain, and Russia who have to ratify the treaties before such ratification makes it obligatory upon the Soviet to get their troops out of the country?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator addressing the Chair?

Mr. PEPPER. Only in his individual capacity as a Senator. I am not asking the Senator to commit any breach of the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is partially correct and partially in error. The occupying troops have to be withdrawn from each of those countries within 90 days, except that the Russians are permitted to continue to maintain whatever troops are necessary, in their judgment, to protect what they call their line of communications to Austria. Therefore it is necessary to have an Austrian treaty concluded before the thing which the Senator is discussing can be concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Then it comes to this: That when those treaties are ratified—and they have already been ratified by Great Britain—it will be the duty of the Russians to remove all their troops from Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria except such as they may find necessary to guard their lines of communication into Austria, until the Austrian treaty is agreed to and ratified. I believe that is a fair statement of the situation.

I realize that that allows a technical possibility that the Russians might keep more troops there than they might fairly require to guard their line of communication to Austria. In the first place, I think all of us want to expedite the Austrian treaty. I know our people have done all they could in that connection. But until we settle the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union, we shall probably not settle any of these treaties, because if we are struggling for advantage, Russia will hold on to her part of Germany and Austria, because they are both strategic in the control of Europe and in the placing of her forces in Europe.

Let us suppose we ratify the treaties with Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, and suppose the Russians keep more troops there than are reasonably and fairly required to maintain and protect her lines of communication to Austria. I have already said that the Polish Ambassador told me that they were keeping only a small number of troops in Poland to guard their lines to Germany, which I would regard as an analogous situation. He said there were only small detachments to guard communication lines into Germany.

But suppose they violate the treaty and keep more troops than are necessary: Can we not accuse them of violating the treaty? Can we not take the matter to the United Nations and say that the treaty has been violated and they are committing acts of aggression upon what will then be independent countries? If the treaties are ratified, those countries become independent countries again. Will it not be similar to the case of Iran, when they had their troops there in violation of a treaty, and did we not get Russia to remove them?

It appears to me that the situation is on the eve of getting better in the central European area, right at a time when we commit what they may call an act of provocation, in the first place; or, in the second place, they may say "If you are going to finance the Turkish Army, or the major part of it, it means, in substance, keeping troops in Turkey in violation of your obligations under the Charter, although it is covered up indirectly, and therefore we will keep our troops in these other countries in violation of our treaty."

In other words, Mr. President, one wrong does not justify another. I know that when we start to put our money into a foreign army it comes very near to sending our own troops there.

Under the present Monroe Doctrine our principal commitment is against outside or European aggression. Suppose Russia were to send money to Mexico to maintain the Mexican Army: Would we not claim that that was in violation of the Monroe Doctrine? Would we not say it was an act of aggression in the Western Hemisphere? I am saying now, as I said to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a while ago, our record is good in the United Nations. Does the situation justify our spoiling that record? Merely because the Russians have been doing some things which they should not do, are we now justified in doing similar things ourselves, instead of going to the United Nations and saying, "Let us stop the wrongdoer while there is only one." It seems to me that is the fundamental issue, Mr. President.

I started to say that I want to stop Russian aggression wherever it exists, and I want to stop communism wherever it exists, when we can. But that does not mean that we are going to intervene in every country where there is communism, I do not suppose; and certainly we are not going to back a reactionary corrupt government, a broken-down monarchy that is alien to the people it rules, and was put in under the guns of a foreign army—well, I will not say that, Mr. President; I will not say the British put them in, but I will say they were elected while the British Army was there, and it is never a good thing for an election to occur while a foreign army is in a country. Believe me, if this measure is enacted, and if we arm and train and maintain that army in Greece and another one in Turkey, it will be a political football in every election they have, and they will charge us with taking sides in every political contest they have; they will say we are backing one crowd or the other. We must remember that the Greek Army that we are asked to support is expected to shoot down, if they do not surrender—if they still keep on their present course—the Greek people who are called the insurrectionists. Therefore, we shall be giving the Greek Government the power to shoot anyone in their country. You know, in some of the Balkan countries the government forces do not mind shooting their people. We are giving the Greek Government the power to shoot their opposition. A contrary course would mean that we were going to run the Greek Government and supervise everything that Government does and determine whom they will shoot, and that we are going to determine who is good and who is bad, and are going to administer not only their civilian but also their military bodies.

Mr. President, is the situation so bad that we have to get into that position now? Is the situation with which the United Nations is already dealing so grievious that we are going to go that far? Once we go in, mind you, we shall be just like Britain; we shall have a bear by the tail. Once we get there, we shall be stuck there. Senators talk about having us do this now, and later take it up with the United Nations. Well, Mr. President, when will things get better? Can we be sure when that will be? Do we expect Russia simply to disappear? Are we going to wait until we whip Russia, and then start a United Nations? If we do, I doubt that there will be enough of us left to join a United Nations.

Mr. President, we must take one thing into consideration: The Russians are a tough people. I think Napoleon Bonaparte and Adolf Hitler would be the best witnesses to that. They are the only

two who ever tried to get tough with Russia, really; and their testimony would not be very favorable to a proposal to start on such a course.

Some people say "Let us lick them"—as if licking them would be as simple and as easy as licking someone before breakfast. I am reminded of a story the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has told us. He spoke of a politician in Texas who, in the Civil War days, stirred up a great feeling against the Yankees, and in favor of secession. He said, "Why, we can whip those Yankees with cornstalks." But after the war was over, when that man was running for Congress, one day he was speaking before a big Fourth of July crowd, and a man in the crowd said, "Say, ain't you the fellow who said we could whip the Yankees with cornstalks?" At that, he was a little nonplussed, but then he said, "Yes, my friend; but durn them, those Yankees don't fight with cornstalks." And, Mr. President, the Russians do not fight with cornstalks, either. They do not frighten easily. Do Senators think we can scare the Russians with $100,000,000 which we might put into the Turkish Army—an army which they could swallow in a few weeks? What does this mean, unless we are going to back it up, except a provocative gesture?

Mr. President, when I was a small boy I learned a very important lesson. I was a country boy who came in from the country, with some other country boys, to attend a Baptist association meeting. When the noon hour came in the local school, the little town boys passed by the church where we country boys were standing gaping at the town's wonders. There was a little fellow with the crowd of town boys who started saying some impolite things to us. The country boys pushed me to the front, to speak for them, and I started to reply. In a moment we were scowling at each other and almost spoiling for a fight, like a couple of bantam roosters. Then that town boy stepped back and said, "I dare you to just touch me." Mr. President, I made one of the biggest mistakes of my life when I just reached out and touched him, for he almost knocked my head off. I then and there made up my mind that if ever I was going to have a fight with a fellow, I would not begin it by just reaching out and touching him, and then having him knock my head off. All that the pending proposal does is just to touch the Russians; because I do not suppose it makes much difference to Russia whose army defeated Hitler, whether the Turks have $100,000,000 from us, or more or less. If the Russians want to invade Turkey, I do not suppose this $100,000,000 will keep them out. What it will do will be to give the Russians the provocation and the justification that will cause many of them to believe that the United States has forsaken democracy and the council table, and is going to get tough with them in their front yard.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that this is not only a dangerous policy but an unnecessary policy for us to follow.

What else can we do? I wish someone could answer that question somewhere in the world. But I think there are a few things that we can do to help. First, we can amend this bill so as to make it provide for the sending of whatever economic aid we wish to Greece, either individually or collectively through the United Nations, and we can send that aid to Greece and help the Greeks all we can in that way. Then we can refer the security aspects of this measure to the Security Council of the United Nations, where they should be referred, and we can go to the United Nations and tell them that we are ready to do our share, and more, to protect the security of Turkey and of Greece and of every other country in the world, and that if Russia vetoes the action of the Security Council of the United Nations organization, while committing aggression, we are ready to put up force against them—that we are willing to do what Lincoln did, to call for volunteers to save the Union. That is the first thing I would suggest.

The second thing I would suggest is that in respect to the oil in the Middle East, we observe the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which says that nations shall have equality of access to the raw materials of the world. Japan and Germany fought wars because they said they were "have not" nations, and that other nations had gobbled up the major part of the world's critical resources. In consultation through the United Nations, I would work out with Britain and Russia a policy to provide some kind of decent compliance with that principle of the Atlantic Charter, so that the Russians could get some of the oil from the Middle East, just as the rest of us do. The Russians need oil to run their industrial machine. As the situation is today, Russia has a slight oil concession in northern Iran, which she finally got by means of the utmost exertion of her pressure. The British have one in the large oil fields in southern Iran. The British, the French, the Dutch, and the Americans—of course, I really mean private oil corporations of those nations—hold concessions in the large producing oil wells in Iraq; and Iraq is only a few miles away from the Russian border. Yet, no Russian has any interest in the oil fields of Iraq or in the oil concessions in southern Iran.

In Saudi Arabia, which has the greatest oil reserves in the world, outside of those in the United States, and perhaps the greatest potential oil reserves in the world, today two American oil corporations, the Texas Co. and the Standard Oil Co. of California, have the largest oil concessions in the world, nearly equal to those which all the oil companies in the United States, put together, have in the United States. There are two other Standard Oil companies; one of them is the Socony and the other is the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; and they are trying to get in on that arrangement. The Saudi Arabian princes were over here, and they wined them and dined them.

I have had the honor to visit His Majesty, the King of Saudi Arabia, Ibn Saud, who is one of the most colorful and interesting monarchs and personalities of all the world. There is a great deal to be said for those people, and I certainly want to see my country help them in every way we possibly can to raise the standard of living of their own people, with the great resources with which nature has endowed them. But none of that oil is accessible to the Russians.

In the second place, I would try to find some way of letting a major nation like Russia, which is related to the Middle East as we are to Mexico, have some share or some way to share, through some international organization, in those oil fields, so that they would not be able to say that we have shut them out of an area accessible to their own country, as if we saw foreign countries get all the foreign oil concessions in Mexico, and saw us kept out altogether.

I would do the same thing in respect to other strategic materials, in a way to keep the world from having war because some nation claims it has been denied access to some essential resources of the world.

In the third place, I would propose to internationalize the Straits. I would propose to put their protection under the Security Council of the United Nations. I do not know whether that would satisfy Russia or not. I believe it should be done through the United Nations.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, we have offered the possibility to Russia of a treaty which would give her free access to and use of the Dardanelles. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. We have proposed that the Montreux Convention be revised so that the Black Sea Powers, including Russia, may have access, with their merchant vessels or their armed vessels, through the Straits in time of peace or in time of war. That is my understanding of what we have recommended.

Mr. BALDWIN. Am I correctly informed that the Russians do not want to accept that proposal, but would accept it if they were permitted to install some fortifications which they themselves would control?

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that has been their counterproposal, that the Montreux Convention be revised so that those privileges would exist; in the first place, that the four Black Sea Powers should have responsibility for the control of the Straits, and that the Russians should have authority perhaps to establish bases on the Straits themselves, to be under their control.

Mr. BALDWIN. What further could the Security Council of the United Nations do than we have already suggested be done with reference to the internationalization of the Straits, if the Senator desires to call it that?

Mr. PEPPER. To answer the Senator's question, I would say that, in the first place, the decision should be rendered in the United Nations, not outside the United Nations, as is now being proposed. The Montreux treaty should be put under the United Nations, and the

United Nations should work out the matter of how the Straits should be controlled.

In the second place, so far as I know the proposal we have made does not demilitarize the Straits of Turkish defenses. So that the Russians might be able to say, "You give this right to go and come, but suppose the Turks, who are going to keep the defenses here, and man them, do not want us to do that. What assurance have we that we will be able to get through in pursuance of this treaty?" So they say, I understand, "If you are going to give us this right, then let us help assure it by setting up a base of our own, not exclusively, but along with the Turks here in the Dardanelles."

My suggestion was, the Senator will recall, that we disarm the Straits, demilitarize them, and put them under the Security Council. As I said, I do not know whether Russia would accept such a proposal, but so far as I know, it has never been proposed.

Mr. BALDWIN. Has Russia, to the Senator's knowledge, put this question up to the United Nations in any way?

Mr. PEPPER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator think that if they wanted United Nations action in this matter, it would be up to them to initiate it in the United Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. Possibly so. Nor have we put it up to the United Nations, so far as I know.

There is one other consideration which I think we will have to take into account. As I said, in the first instance, suppose the United Nations proposed to internationalize the Panama Canal. What would we say? Could an American statesman agree to that without being put out of office probably? Suppose someone propose to internationalize the English Channel, or, to put it better, the Straits of Gibraltar, today guarded by the British fortress on the mainland of Gibraltar. Suppose someone should say, "Let us internationalize the Straits of Malta," where the British fortress stands like a great sentinel across that neck of the Mediterranean. What would the British say? Suppose someone suggested that we disarm Cyprus, where the British today have a base. What would the British say?

The Russians might say, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, when we propose to internationalize the Dardanelles, "I will tell you what we should do"—as they said a few days ago about disarming. Suppose they said, "Very well, let us internationalize the Panama Canal, and demilitarize it. Let us internationalize the Straits of Gibraltar, and demilitarize them. Let us internationalize and demilitarize the Straits of Malta." Then would be the time for our face to turn red, would it not? What could we say? Can the British indefinitely, can the United States indefinitely insist upon one rule for a strategic waterway in one part of the world important to us, and another rule respecting a strategic waterway in another part of the world belonging to someone else?

We believe in the principle of equality under law. We believe in the principle of nondiscrimination. One reason why I say we can do more than we are doing is that I do not yet feel we have fairly and candidly, with the recognition of their point of view, laid down a proposal about the strategic waterways of the world which applies alike to them all, and deals with those dear to us as it deals with those dear to somebody else in some other part of the world.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator feel it is just as much up to the Russians, if not more up to the Russians, to raise this question in the United Nations as to the internationalization of the Dardanelles, than for us to do it? Yet they have not done it. The Senator is talking about using the United Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator may be correct, except, again, I say the Russians may feel that, so long as the United States is going to dominate exclusively the Panama Canal and Great Britain is going to dominate exclusively the Straits of Gibraltar and Singapore, we should not tell the Black Sea powers who of them and how they are going to control the Dardanelles, which are immediately in their territorial front yard. I am saying that we are subject to the accusation of unfairness and hypocrisy when we assume to carry on the old policy, based upon the old position of the western powers vis-à-vis Russia. I wonder if we are not ignoring some of the facts of history, and one of those facts is that Russia has emerged as a strong power, the second to us, that Britain has fallen in strength in comparison with Russia and us, and that today we are probably the strongest power in the world, but that the western powers of Europe no longer have the force to keep Russia out of an area strategic in character, and proximate to her home lands. If we are to lay down rules of morality, must there not be a single standard for all parts of the world?

Mr. BALDWIN. If the Senator will yield further, it seems to me that our difficulty with Russia lies in the fact that up to now we seem to have made all the concessions and they seem to have made none. Yet I think the will of this country is to do the best we possibly can to get along in the world with the Russians.

We have heard a great deal about Americans feeling that they must understand the Russians. It seems to me that perhaps now the shoe is on the other foot, and that probably it would be advisable if the Russians or the Russian Government should try a little bit to understand us. Certainly our gestures for the last 5 years have been all of an extremely friendly and an extremely generous nature, and I think the American people are beginning to inquire how long have we got to pursue that policy against a policy of no concessions whatever.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator conscientiously feels that we have been altogether generous when we are dealing with somebody else's area. Would the Senator say, "See how generous Russia has been with Britain"?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will let me finish this statement, then I will yield. Suppose somebody were to say, "See how generous Russia has been with Great Britain—she has let her have Singapore, and she has let her have the Strait of Gibraltar. See how generous Russia has been with the United States, in letting us have the Panama Canal."

Mr. BALDWIN. That would be a very generous gesture, since we built it with our money, after others had failed.

Mr. PEPPER. What I was saying is this: Are we being altogether generous when we prescribe conditions that are to govern the administration of that part of the world, when they are not having anything whatever to say on what happens in the British and the American sphere of the world?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not want to take issue with the Senator this afternoon, but his very strong statements against our country, saying we are hypocritical, and we are not generous, are tempting very much to invoke replies. I should like to have the Senator explain one single instance when his country, and mine, has failed to be generous with every other country in the world.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wants to take that attitude toward it, in the course of my remarks here, when I said that we are subject to the accusation of being hypocritical, when we said that strategic waterways in one part of the world have to be dealt with in one way, without admitting the same principle for another, I am sorry I gave the Senator any such impression. I think I used as the synonym of "hypocritical," "unfair." I first said that it is unfair, and perhaps hypocritical, to claim that we can tell them how to govern the Dardanelles, when they cannot tell us how to govern the rest of the strategic areas of the world. If the word "hypocritical" has given any offense to the Senate, I will gladly withdraw it, because I am discussing to the best of my ability what is the sound basis of policy by which we can deal fairly with them and expect them to deal fairly with us and keep the world peace. That is all we are talking about.

Mr. HATCH. I want to say, in behalf of our country, that we have not laid down conditions to Russia about the government of the Dardanelles.

Mr. PEPPER. We are sending the money over there to the Turkish Army today because the Russians have made certain demands upon the Turkish Government.

Mr. HATCH. We have said to Russia with our consent and approval she should have free access which she has today. The Senator has argued that Russia ought to have the right to build military bases on the Dardanelles.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I have not said that; I beg the Senator's pardon. I said the Russians took that position. I was answering the Senator from Connecticut. I said my proposal was that they should be internationalized and demilitarized, if the Senator will reflect. I said the Russians, in counterreply to our suggestion, have said that they wanted to assure that ingress and egress that we proposed to allow, by building a base there themselves. I have never suggested that, I want the Senator to understand.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator's argument was critical of us, because he said we had refused to let Russia build her military bases on the Dardanelles. I listened to the Senator, and I am quite sure I am not mistaken.

Mr. PEPPER. We have opposed it; yes, that is correct. We have not acceded. I will put it this way: We have not acceded to their counterproposal that they do that; so I suppose we opposed it.

Mr. HATCH. I suppose the Senator thinks we should accede to that position.

Mr. PEPPER. I should think there is a good bit to be said for it. Yes; I say there is a good bit to be said for it. The Russians have got as much right in there as we have to be in Panama, to be perfectly frank with the Senator. Now, if we are to get down to the morality of these issues, I do not think we can wrap the cloak of holiness around ourselves and protect our strategic interests and say, "God ordained it," without saying that these other people have got something on their side, when they make the same demands. That is what I mean to say.

Mr. HATCH. I resent the words that the Senator uses when he says that our country is wrapping the cloak of holiness about herself. We have not done that. We never have done it. If the Senator would be consistent, and if he wants the Dardanelles opened to Russia and to be secure for her free access both ways, let Russia come to the Security Council of the United Nations; let them put the whole problem before the United Nations organization, and not attempt to bypass it, to use an expression that has been used so much. Let Russia come with that problem and every other problem, and I will say to the Senator that his country and mine will deal fairly and justly, just as we offer to do in this identical proposal, in the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. We will even, on most occasions, give up our right of veto. And if the Senator will say that Russia will be as fair and will be as generous and as just as we are, and not wrap any cloak of holiness about herself, but if they will come and lay their problem before the United Nations and let it be settled there, fairly and justly, and not let the veto power be used even on matters of procedure, the entire discussion will be ended, the world can be at peace, and there can be complete disarmament.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much for what he has said. Undoubtedly what the Russians should do about every dispute is to go to the United Nations organization, but I have not seen the British running to the UN about Singapore. I have not seen the British running to the UN about Gibraltar, and I have not heard of our running there about the Panama Canal either. I do not know of any compulsion upon the Russians that does not morally apply to the rest of us, I will say to my able friend, if he wants to be fair about principles. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator thinks that in his statement he has in any sense justified the attitude of the Soviet Union, by comparing our attitude in the case of the Panama Canal with the attitude of Russia—if he gets any solace or comfort from that, and if he thinks that is good argument and good logic, I shall not further interrupt him nor take his time.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator, and I know he would like me to feel properly chastened, now that he has given me his rebuke and given me a lecture on patriotism, from the primacy of his position. I know that he must feel much better, and, since I think as much of him as I do, and since I understand how strongly he feels the sentiments he has expressed, as I do, I am going to say we are both very happy, because I understand the background out of which the Senator said that, and he feels much better for having said it, and now we may go ahead with the discussion of the principles by which each of us hopes to keep the peace of the world, and each of us loves America, to which alone we only owe any allegiance on earth.

Mr. HATCH. May I join the Senator in the hope and the wish that the discussion may continue on the real principles involved.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. President, I started out by suggesting what I thought we should do about this proposal. I was talking about some way to reconcile the differences between Russia and the United States. I secondly said that I thought we should work out in some way the oil conflict in the Middle East. Then I said, third, I thought we should try in some way or other to resolve the conflict over this age-old strategic waterway, and my learned friend from New Mexico, with his knowledge of classical lore, might say that the Trojan War did not arise because Menelaus and Agamemnon went from Athens to Troy, and that it was not fought because of the fair Helen. As a matter of fact, some say it arose because of an argument over the Dardanelles. So that dispute goes back a long way into antiquity; and sometime or another it has got to be settled; it has got to be resolved.

I am only saying that a matter can not always be settled without taking into account the point of view of the other fellow who happens to be affected, and who will question the other's conduct if he does not believe he has applied the same principle to him and to everyone else in the world.

The fourth suggestion I make is that we try to bring about international economic collaboration. Let us try to help all these backward economic areas to come under the United Nations organization at least as to planning. I do not think the United States has enough money individually to back one group or another, or by gift or loan to make every nation in the world prosperous, or to prevent its economic collapse. I know what we agreed to in the United Nations Charter was that we would work together to help bring about the international economic improvement of the world and the peoples therein. I think that is what we ought to do and I want to be perfectly frank about the matter. I do not think America can confine the economic aid just to those whose political systems we like. I do not think we can.

When a man opens a store for business, if he is a Democrat he does not simply sell to Democrats or if he is a Republican he simply does not sell to Republicans. If a Communist comes in to his store and has money with which to buy, I am sure the storekeeper will sell to him. I presume that is the practice everywhere. If a Fascist should come into the store and in a modest and quiet way ask for a piece of tobacco and the storekeeper handed it to him and the buyer handed him his money, I assume he could turn around and walk out without having any argument or fight about the matter.

I think today the pattern of the world economy is so related that we have to help all these countries, and we have made a mistake so far, in my opinion, by permitting the ideological conflict between us and the Soviet Union to prevent us from finding some basis upon which we two can economically collaborate in building up the level of living of the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, is there not enough for all of us? Out there in India and China, in the Middle East, in the backward areas of other lands of the world, if we go in and work together and build dams and build roads and build air lanes and set up an economy that will be strong and vital and virile, it will mean business for American businessmen. It will mean more jobs for the American workmen. It is for us to try to find some way to settle this ideological conflict or at least to keep it within the bounds of restraint today existing between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Mr. President, responsible Senators have said that this plan is primarily aimed at stopping communism. If it would stop communism, I would vote for it 40 different times. But, Mr. President, I know that with as many billions of dollars as we have already spent, another $400,000,000 is not going to stop communism.

I have in my hand a table which shows how communism is scattered around over the world. If we are going to tackle the job of rooting communism out of every country in the world or keeping it from gaining control in any countries of the world, we had better secure the help of other nations if we are to have sufficient resources to accomplish that task. The table I speak of was published in the March 16, 1947, issue of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the following appears at the head of the table:

HOW THE COMMUNISTS ESTIMATE THEIR STRENGTH

At a recent Communist conference in London, a chart showing the advance of Communists was displayed, giving the Communists' own estimate of their strength. The total world membership claimed was 18,592,300. According to the chart, all parties in this list base themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. This is the listing that appears on the chart.

Then appears the listing of Communist members by countries throughout the world.

Argentina, 30,000; Brazil, 130,000; Canada, 23,000; Chile, 50,000; Colombia, 10,000; Costa Rica, 20,000; Cuba, 152,000; Ecuador, 2,500; Haiti, 500; Mexico, 25,000; Nicaragua, 500; Panama, 500; Paraguay, 8,000; Peru, 35,000; Puerto Rico, 1,200; United States, 74,000; Uruguay, 15,000; Santo Domingo, 2,000; Venezuela, 20,000.

All those countries are in the Western Hemisphere. Then the figures are given for the countries in Asia. In China there are 2,000,000.

Then it gives the other countries of Asia, and of Australasia and of Europe and Africa.

In Czechoslovakia there are 1,000,000. They are in control of the Government of Czechoslovakia. Are we going over there and arm the opposition so the Communists can be turned out and some party friendly to us put into power? If we could simply do that and quit, perhaps well and good. But once we get into the politics of another country, we will never get out until our fingers are so burned that we will give it up in disgust.

Mr. President, I realize that we all want to prevent the contagion of communism. We want to hold it in check and throw it back. But, Mr. President, I venture to say that the $7,000,000,000 we have already committed ourselves to in the last year or two for use in foreign countries will be but a pittance compared to the billions upon billions we will have to use in the future if we are going into every country and put up enough money to finance an army to keep the Communists from taking over, and if we are going to send a military mission there, and if we are going to put up enough money, by gift or by loan, to help that country keep the Communist Party out of power. France is at the very verge of having communism take over that country. Are we going to send an army to France or are we going to send an army to China or to some other country of the world to stop that?

Mr. President, the only way to stop communism is first of all to do what we agreed to do in the Charter, work together economically to keep a virile democracy in these countries where the Communists threaten to take over. I cannot believe that in any part of the earth people want to give up a decent democracy for communism. I believe that if we stay out of their politics and keep military forces, directly or indirectly, out of people's countries, we can help democracy to survive, and through the United Nations organization we can protect the democratic peoples of the world against being trampled upon by the few totalitarian regimes of the earth.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I respect what others have done and what they have said about this plan as the best method of achieving our objective. I agree wholeheartedly with the objective, but, Mr. President, with all the strength of my heart I protest against America, upon any excuse, beginning to send military missions to foreign countries. I am against furnishing armies to foreign lands. I am against America, the builder of the UN, now joining with others who turn their backs upon it.

I protest against America being placed in the position of being accused of dealing in power politics, and being more interested in strategic bases and strategic areas than in anything else. I believe from the bottom of my heart that in the long run we shall be better off, democracy in the world will be more secure, and every nation on earth will be happier, freer, and more independent if we let this crisis be the occasion when America will take the lead in saving the union of nations—our United Nations, which is the only hope of peace on earth—as Lincoln saved the Union in his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from an article on page 83 of Time magazine for March 24, 1947. The article deals with the subject of oil in the Middle East.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL, THE BLUE CHIP GAME

In the subterranean world of petroleum, it is the international oilmen who play the blue-chip game. The players must back their gambling spirit with refineries, tankers, filling stations—and millions in hard cash. In this blue-chip game, the jackpot is the Middle East, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the string of tiny sheikdoms in the rolling sand dunes around the Persian Gulf—Bahrein, Kuwait, and Qatar (pronounced "gutter").

Under these scorching deserts lies an ocean of oil, the fabulous wealth of the Arabian Nights. The ocean contains a minimum of 26,000,000,000 barrels (1¼ times the proved reserves of the United States), a maximum of 150,000,000,000 barrels. How much is this worth? In cash, enough to make a hundred Rockefellers; as a military asset, as nations count, it is beyond price.

This jackpot has not lacked for players. The Nazis tried to sweep the tables in World War II by Rommel's drive into Egypt. The Russians placed a tentative bet only a year ago, lost out with their fiasco in Azerbaijan, Iran. Now Russia has raised the ante by threatening Greece and Turkey. Last week, President Truman dealt in the United States—in a diplomatic way—by asking for a $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, accompanied by military advisers and weapons (see National Affairs). The loud talk was all of Greece and Turkey, but the whispers behind the talk were of the ocean of oil to the south.

NEW DECK

As the United States prepared to make its historic move, a potent group of United States oil companies also came to a historic decision. With the tacit approval of the United States and British Governments, the companies concluded a series of deals—biggest ever made in the blue-chip game—to develop and put to full use this ocean of oil.

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), world's biggest oil company, was the natural leader of the group; as Standard's internationally minded president, Eugene Holman, was the one who had a big hand in drafting the breath-taking plans. Jersey Standard and its partners were going to spend upward of $300,000,000 in the stormy Middle East to bring out the oil.

EXHIBIT A

HOW THE COMMUNISTS ESTIMATE THEIR STRENGTH

At a recent Communist conference in London, a chart showing the advance of communism was displayed, giving the Communists' own estimate of their strength. The total world membership claimed was 18,592,300. According to the chart, "All parties in this list base themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." This is the listing that appeared on the chart:

Country	Party	Members	M. P.'s
AMERICA			
Argentina	Communist	30,000	
Brazil	do	130,000	17
Canada	Lab.-Progressives.	23,000	
Chile	Communist	50,000	20
Colombia	Dem. Socialist.	10,000	2
Costa Rica	Vanguardia Pop.	20,000	6
Cuba	Popular Soc	152,000	12
Ecuador	Communist	2,500	
Haiti	Popular Soc	500	1
Martinique	Communist		2
Mexico	do	25,000	
Nicaragua	Partido Socialista.	500	
Panama	Partido del Pueblo.	500	
Paraguay	Communist	8,000	
Peru	do	35,000	5
Puerto Rico	do	1,200	
United States	do	74,000	
Uruguay	do	15,000	5
Santo Domingo	Pop. Socialist.	2,000	
Venezuela	Communist	20,000	2
ASIA			
Burma	do	4,000	
Ceylon	do		
China	do	2,000,000	
Cyprus	Akel	4,000	
India	Communist	53,700	
Indonesia	do		
Japan	do	6,000	5
Korea	do	50,000	
Lebanon	do	15,000	
Malaya	do	10,000	
Palestine	do	1,400	
Philippines	do		
Siam	do		
Syria	do	8,000	
AUSTRALASIA			
Australia	do	25,000	1
New Zealand	do	2,000	
EUROPE			
U. S. S. R	do	6,000,000	
Albania	do		
Austria	do	150,000	4
Belgium	do	100,000	23
Britain	do	43,000	2
Bulgaria	Workers' Party.	450,000	278
Czechoslovakia	Communist	1,000,000	115
Denmark	do	60,000	18
Finland	do	28,000	41
France	do	1,200,000	
Germany (Soviet)	Soc. Unity	1,576,300	
Germany (western).	Communist	350,000	
Greece	do	400,000	
Hungary	do	650,000	70
Iceland	United Socialist.	1,000	10
Ireland (northern).	Communist	500	
Italy	do	2,200,000	108
Luxemburg	do	5,000	
Netherlands	do	50,000	15
Norway	do	33,000	11
Poland	Workers' Party.	600,000	
Portugal	Communist		
Rumania	do	500,000	68
Slovakia	do	250,000	
Spain	do		
Sweden	do	46,000	
Switzerland	Parti du Travail.	21,000	1
AFRICA			
Algeria	Communist		
Eritrea	do	200	
Morocco	do		
South Africa	do		
Tunisia	do		

Mr. HAWKES obtained the floor.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in speaking to Senate bill 938 which provides that the United States shall render assistance to Greece and Turkey it is my firm conviction that in the settlement of this question it might well be that we are entering an international no man's land from which we may find it impossible to retrace our steps.

I wish I could follow the President on this Greek expedition, but it seems to me it is more important to follow one's conscience and think first of what is best for our people in the over-all, long-time position. The President, I am informed, has had more than 6 months in which to consider these problems with his intimate advisers, while we and the people have had only 30 days.

The President, like each of the rest of us, is only a human being, and there are more than 140,000,000 people in the United States whose future welfare and destiny are to be affected by the course we choose to follow outside our own borders under the provisions of this bill.

Nothing in my whole experience in American life has ever surprised me more than to see the representatives of the people of the United States ready to commit them on a new policy, which could easily make us the policeman of the world so long as the police funds last, without the people having the facts and less than 30 days in which to understand the implications of this adventure.

I do not believe in appeasement, but I believe that we should not start any program until we have reasonable ground to insure its successful completion.

The Greek-Turkish adventure, I believe, is understood by the vast majority of Americans to be an effort to do two things: First, to halt the spread of communism; and second, to render aid to a valiant little country which held the Italians and Germans in check for several of the most important weeks in history during the early part of World War II.

I have given President Truman's proposal as much careful consideration as I have ever given to any subject that has come into my life, and I have found contained in it potentialities which I do not believe have been adequately explained to either the people of this country or their representatives in Congress.

These potentialities, which I believe are unknown or not understood by the people of this country, I attempted to enumerate in the form of questions in a speech before the Economic Club of Chicago in that city on April 7, 1947. I asked the audience these questions:

First. Can we successfully carry through with the thing proposed and the things which may happen if we start this new world program?

Second. Are you, as a private citizen, willing to pay your full share of the taxes which will be required of you if we become involved in a worldwide program against totalitarianism and socialism?

Third. Are you willing to do your full part physically and to contribute the members of your family to war, if war results from the act proposed?

Fourth. Can the people of the United States correct the evils which have been and are growing upon them through being forced to breathe the diseased air of the world which is befouled by communism, socialism, and totalitarianism, all of which survive only under the iron hand of dictatorship?

Fifth. How far has communism gone in the various countries which are now presumed to be our friends; and if we extend this aid to Greece and Turkey, how can we refuse extending it to China, Korea, France, Italy, and various other countries who either are now or later may find themselves in the same situation as that of Greece and Turkey?

In addition to the point around which these questions turn, the Greek-Turkish program has other implications.

In my opinion it will circumvent the United Nations and we shall have undermined that great organization and its possibility for worldwide service, and peace will be tremendously reduced—even destroyed. In my opinion, this last potentiality—the circumvention of the United Nations—is the most serious.

I am told that 49 out of the 55 nations in the United Nations are anxious for peace. I do not know. If that be so, I would not permit one nation, which dominates five satellite nations, to destroy the objective of the 49 nations.

There never was a better opportunity for a show-down than right now, particularly if it be true that 49 nations will stand together as a unit for peace. If it be that we are to proceed, and I believe we shall, in making the loan to Greece and Turkey, then I ask in all fairness why this country should not find out from the 49 nations, who have been consistently voting with us in the United Nations, whether they approve the course we are going to take before we embark upon it. That seems to me to be merely good common sense.

I desire to go back to some remarks I made in this Chamber on July 25, 1945, just before I cast my vote in favor of the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations:

> I have more faith in an informed people wanting to keep the peace than I have in the political leaders of the people wishing to keep the peace. It is my prediction that if we give the people full information as to where their leaders are taking them we will have done more to avoid future wars than we can by any other method. Let us hope that God may look upon this Charter with all of its possibilities for good or ill and guide us in such a way that some day billions of people may look back upon this turn in the tide of affairs and say that our Charter action, taken here now, started the world to answer the call of Him who said, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

Mr. President, if I were to vote "yea" for President Truman's proposal, I would repudiate every single word I have just quoted above; and I believe that the President in making this proposal, without first assaying the feeling of the member nations of the United Nations, has with equal force repudiated the membership responsibilities of the United States in the United Nations.

It seems incredible to me that the United States, after having spent so much time in helping to organize the United Nations, should now choose to play a lone hand in the international arena, rather than to ascertain whether it is possible for the United Nations to be reorganized in such a way that one nation, with power of veto and an insatiable desire for expansion, is not allowed to block the peace of the world.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that 49 great nations banded together for peace would let any one nation or any system which they devised breach the peace of the world again, when there is sufficient power available to stop or prevent such a breach.

After all, the world may be described as the biggest business organization in existence. The United States is the most successful and powerful subsidiary of the world. Other than in this international field, if 49 great organizations could not get along with 6, or primarily 1 with 5 satellites, the 49 would find a way to keep the 1 and 5 from destroying the great objectives of the 49 organizations.

I realize this is a drastic step to mention, but the world has been seeking peace since the beginning of time, and it has failed woefully up to now. Perhaps the progress of the world lies in the fact that there may be 49 nations who may be willing to unite in a determination to have peace, regardless of the resistance from a small minority composed of a great world power surrounded by 5 satellite nations.

If we do not find a way to determine the possibilities of ruling the world for

peace by a combination of this vast number of national powers then we shall continue as we are going, dissipating our national substance to a point where we are weakened to such an extent that we have lost our power of action and then a bewildered, confused people will be the prey of any "ism."

We cannot solve this great problem by hacking around here and there, but we may solve it if we establish a program that is big enough and direct enough and sufficiently understood to receive the support of forty-nine fifty-fifths of the United Nations.

The people are looking to be led soundly and safely. They do not want communism in the United States. They would like to see communism replaced by individual freedom and liberty throughout the world.

The United States, by an overwhelming majority vote of its representatives, backed the program of the United Nations which banded together all the important nations to do the things which are vital and necessary to the maintenance of individual liberty and freedom and peace throughout the world.

I believe that the great majority of our people in the United States are opposed to isolation or excessive nationalism without regard to the rest of the world, and that is the reason they were in favor of our performing our full part, or even a little more, in an effort to make the United Nations work.

Like a vast number of our American citizens, I have been deeply distressed over the course taken by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, but I have not been surprised.

When Mr. Wallace was nominated as Secretary of Commerce, I recognized that his views were too far to the left and too much opposed to the underlying principles on which our way of life was built, to justify my casting a vote for his confirmation. However, the fact that Mr. Wallace is opposed to this loan is not in itself a good and sufficient reason for me to vote for it.

This question is so much bigger than Mr. Wallace or any other individual in the United States that it behooves every representative of the people to recognize fully his responsibility for his act before we take the step, rather than after we have taken it. No Representative should for one moment act because of popular clamor from certain quarters, which is based upon a partial knowledge of the facts or upon erroneous assumptions and information.

There are a number of people in the United States, among them some Members of the Senate, who are against this measure for reasons diametrically opposed to those which actuate my disapproval of it. No one who knows me and what I have stood for in private life, as well as in public office, could ever surmise that I am or could be in favor of communism, with its defiance of the Almighty and its subjugation of the individual.

We cannot continue to pay the bills of the world without committing national suicide. Undoubtedly, it will always be necessary to have a world fund to help weak nations from time to time, either by loan or, in some cases, by outright gift.

If I had time to do so—and at a later date I intend to—I would put before the Senate and the Congress a plan which I believe would take the world off the back of any nation, and would put the world where it belongs, namely, in the hands of a combination of nations. The plan I have in mind involves an export tax on all exports of all nations, the proceeds of which tax would go into a common fund and be regulated on a sliding-scale basis, so that when the fund reached the amount of $10,000,000,000, let us say, if it were considered that $10,000,000,000 were sufficient for the purpose of handling loans and gifts which would have to be made to weak nations, then the tax on all exports the world over would be reduced percentagewise, and would automatically work up and down to maintain this world fund in an amount deemed necessary. But some such system is the only way by which we shall ever get the world off the back of the United States, without our making gifts and loans without any collateral or security.

It is time for all Americans to wake up and have their idealism tinctured with a little realism, unless we wish this greatest human development in the history of the world to pass into history as a failure because we did not understand the human family.

I can remember Germany when she was strong. I can remember France when she was fairly strong. I can remember Italy long before Mussolini. But most important of all, I can remember Great Britain. Remembering Germany before the first war, would one ever dream that a great and powerful nation such as she could fall from the position of one of the greatest powers on earth to the position of misery and disintegration in which she now finds herself?

I ask all in this Chamber if they ever expected that Great Britain would today find herself in a position where the great individual freedoms of the people have been substantially destroyed, and her Government is taking steps one by one to nationalize and socialize the nation?

That is not hearsay, Mr. President. It has been stated in this very building, in the lunchroom, before Senator after Senator, by Englishmen who today are serving in the House of Commons. It is appalling to hear the admissions made of what confronts the British Empire compared with what we have known it to be.

Think of Great Britain admitting that she is unable to carry out the things in Greece and the Middle East which are vital to the preservation of her Empire,

Think of Great Britain admitting that we, the United States of America, are the leader of the world, and must wield the baton leading the orchestra, and also pay the piper. I am not reflecting upon the British people, because I have a wholesome respect for those who would preserve individual liberty and protect private property rights, but I do want all our American people to look before they leap, and to try, at least, to understand some of the possibilities and consequences of the proposed steps.

There never was a time in the history of the world when there was more confusion, misunderstanding, bitterness, hatred, and misery than exists throughout the world today. As I think of all the nations in the world, and bring to mind what I have learned, from travel and experience, regarding human desires, impluses, and selfish aspirations, and realize that the United States of America seems to be the only country in the world which has the combination of material substance and genuine individual freedom left, I wonder if we must not pause and think carefully, before we take steps which may snuff out the last brilliant lamp of liberty in the world.

It is so easy to seek to do good things without first analyzing whether we have the strength and power to carry through in our efforts to accomplish the objective. We must have more than the will to do and we must be certain that the will to do will continue to exist as we meet obstacles which try our souls and strain the Nation's financial structure.

No man ever intentionally took a direct plunge into great difficulties from which he finds it imposisble to extricate himself. The first step may be a very simple one, and the first step may be the cause of the second step, and those two steps lead to other steps from which there is no retracing. America was built by foresight and not by hindsight. There never was a time when it was more important for the people of this Nation to weigh the results that may come from each step we take beyond our own borders into the unknown international picture than the present moment.

It seems incredible to me that any citizen of the United States, understanding the facilities of the human family, and the selfish desires and aspirations of mankind throughout the world, should not appreciate now that we cannot go where we will to go and do what we alone will to do, without incurring the enmity and the bitterness of those nations and people who feel that their internal conditions are such that they also are entitled to receive from us the same consideration we give to others.

I feel that this new international program transcends all our domestic problems in importance. It involves difference of opinion between great groups of people in our own country, and that difference of opinion can, through the turn of events abroad, be fanned into hatred and division within our own borders.

I should like to mark that statement. There is a great difference of opinion, and that difference of opinion in some quarters could very easily be fanned to the point where we would be a divided people instead of the united people that won World War I and World War II.

At the start of World War II, we were not doing so well in production for war until Russia became the ally of Great Britain and ourselves. We won both World Wars because we were a united people. Any serious, honest, American citizen has a right to his opinion on this subject of preliminary aid to Greece and Turkey. If it were simply aid in food, clothing, materials, and machinery, the wisdom of doing it might be an easy matter to determine. But the announced objective is not only to help with food and clothing and other necessities of life, but

to strengthen those two countries in opposing an ideology which is contrary to the political and economic philosophies of our American system of free men. It is possible to cover up real facts for only a short period of time, and then the truth must come out.

In Europe and Asia, Russia emerged from World War II as the strongest of the victorious Allies, and in the Western Hemisphere, the United States, by God's grace, emerged from the war, her resources somewhat depleted by wartime demands, but her land intact and unscarred. Between these nations lie many smaller nations who paid a great price. Their areas were devastated. Their economy was distorted, in some cases to the point from which there can be no recovery. It is to the peoples of these ravaged nations that our action is most important. Our task fundamentally must be to prove that in a system of American representative democracy lies the hope for the preservation of individual liberty. If we spread ourselves so thin across the face of the globe that our resources are depleted, our finances exhausted, our standard of living reduced—then we are not good salesmen for the cause of representative democracy.

One of the ablest men in this country wrote me a letter over 5 years ago in which he said, "I make this prediction. Before we are through with this war and the after effects of it, unless we proceed carefully with the important powers of the earth, we will find that we have been generous to a fault, with no ulterior motives, and yet we are likely to be the most hated nation in the world."

When I asked him why, he replied, "You cannot start a program of vast benefaction and then discontinue it because you were forced to, through lack of funds, without incurring the ill will of those to whom you have been a benefactor."

I remember the rest of the letter which I have not quoted. The writer asked me to keep the letter for 10 years, and he said, "If you live that long, I want you to look at the letter then and see whether I understand the people of the European nations." In the letter he made another prediction, that in his opinion the British people would later have more hatred for us than would the Germans, who were our prime enemies at the time.

Senators may think these things are meaningless, but I see these predictions beginning to come true today. And think of what will happen if we go ahead with a great program of $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey, $540,000,000 in Korea, and $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 in China, and begin to carry that policy out all over the world and then find we are like Mark Twain's man "who tried to do too much and did it."

I have been in every country in South America. Is there a man sitting in this Chamber who does not know that four out of every five people in the South American countries are held in subjection by the strong hand of dictatorship? So let us ask ourselves over and over again the question, How far has communism gone in the world, and what is the best way to stop it, whether to use bullets and bayonets, or to set a great example and put our own house in order, and then do the things that are necessary to release the shackles from people throughout the world.

I mention this to show that if we give Greece and Turkey $400,000,000 as an entrance fee—that is all it is, an entrance fee into a great show—and accept the responsibilities that go with that loan under the conditions proposed, we will be called upon by nations throughout the whole world for help, and if we fail to give like help to other nations similarly afflicted, we will have created an enemy in nearly every case where we refuse.

Such friction and ill will certainly will not contribute to the working of the United Nations. I care not who tells me it will; I care not who tells me that this move is not circumventing the United Nations. I have had much experience in various parts of the world with people and organizations, and I have seen organization after organization destroyed. Why? How much money has the United Nations got? Where is it going to get the funds which will be required? Why should anybody go to the United Nations when Uncle Sam makes it so easy to get $400,000,000 here, $540,000,000 there, and another billion, without even waiting to analyze the situation and with no suggestion of any kind of security, collateral, or anything else? Why, I would not waste my time, if I were free, out in the world, to go through a befuddled mess such as the proposed action would make of the United Nations; and have to wait for 45 boards of directors' meetings, when I could get the promise of someone in the executive department or the State Department of the United States of America that I could have what I wanted without going through all that procedure.

During the open hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I asked our distinguished Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, certain questions, and I am going to read now from the record of those hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Senator HAWKES wants to ask a question.

Senator HAWKES. Mr. Chairman, some of the points have been covered in the questions recently asked, but I do want to ask the Secretary, Mr. Acheson, if we are contemplating doing anything that we did not contemplate the United Nations would do to keep peace, provided the United Nations was organized to the point where it could effectively do the thing that you are talking about?

Secretary ACHESON. No; we are not. If the United Nations was organized and had funds, and had taken the necessary preliminary steps to be able to do the things which we are called upon to do, there is nothing that we are doing which would be contrary to what they could do.

In my opinion, the words "called upon to do" were improper words; the correct words would have been "asked to do."

Senator HAWKES. Now, may I ask you, how do we know that? There are 55 nations in the United Nations, and I am told—I think we all want to be very frank, because the lives and the future of everybody in this country are involved in what we are doing. It is a tremendous step. I am not at all sure but what it is the right step. I am looking for information. But there are 49 nations in the United Nations, I am told, that go along on nearly every vote that has been taken with the United States, and there are 6 that seem to be on the opposite side. The veto power has kept the United Nations from getting organized to the point where it could do a job of peace in the world such as we had hoped it would be able to do at an early date.

Now, I am just wondering whether there isn't some common sense in knowing before we take a step whether 49 nations are in agreement with what we are going to do, and, therefore, we will have the right to expect their support after we have taken the step, rather than to assume that because they have voted with us here and there, and 6 have voted the other way, that they will come along after we take the step.

Secretary ACHESON. Well, Senator, I think I must have misunderstood your first question. I understood you to ask me whether there is anything in what we are now proposing to do which the United Nations might not have been able to do.

I did not say that, Mr. President. What I said was as clear as anything could be.

Senator HAWKES. I did not say that. I said, is there anything in the step we are going to take that the United Nations as a peace-making body of the world would not take if they were organized to take the step? I am not asking whether they would have the power to do it. I am asking whether in your opinion the thing we are going to attempt to do is something that the United Nations itself would do if it were organized and had the military and financing power to do it.

Secretary ACHESON. I did misunderstand you. The answer to that is that we cannot possibly tell. I agree with you. If this involved the use of United Nations forces, those forces could not be used without the unanimous consent of the permanent members of the Security Council. While we intend to use no forces whatever of our own, we could not, of course, be sure that we would get the unanimous agreement of all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Senator HAWKES. I think you can be pretty sure you would not get unanimous agreement of all the Security Council.

I am going further than that, Mr. Secretary, and I am very sincere in what I am asking. I am asking whether you do not think that this is such a great step, and has so many implications to it, that we should do what you and I as prudent men would do in business. If there are 55 concerns involved and we felt we had the support of 49 and the opposition had 6, would not you and I go and find out whether we could do it as an organization or not? Would we not find out whether those 49 believed that the step we alone were taking was right and did not circumvent the United Nations and the objective of it?

Secretary ACHESON. If I understand this question, I think I must answer it "No."

In other words, the Acting Secretary said he would not try to find out whether the other nations which were members of this great organization believed that what we were proposing to do was right or wrong.

I do not think that is a desirable step to take.

Listen to this, Senators—

As I said this morning in answer to a question, I think it is most important that we should not, by attributing to the United

Nations jurisdictions and powers and functions which it is either not designed to exercise or is not ready to exercise, inhibit ourselves and other states from performing very basic duties which are necessary to maintain the underlying structure upon which the United Nations is based.

Now, when the Greeks come to us and ask us for economic help for the reasons that they do, there not only is nothing in the Charter to prohibit our granting that aid, but every basic consideration is in favor of our granting it, and not weakening our will to help one of the members of the United Nations, a historic friend of the United States and a very gallant people, by the sort of inquiry that you have in mind. No well-disposed nation is going to object to what we are doing. We are helping a very sorely pressed country.

Mr. President, I should like to inject at this point that there is no one in the United States who has a greater feeling of friendship and even of obligation to the Greek people than I have. I shall show later how the Greek people held the great German and Italian armies engaged while the Allies were getting their breath. But this flag-waving business does not mean too much.

Senator HAWKES. Just the same, may I interrupt there? You say no well-intentioned or disposed nation is going to object to it. Who is going to determine what is a well-disposed nation?

Secretary ACHESON. Nobody is going to determine it.

So that means that we will not know.

Senator HAWKES. Do you not think we ought to try to find out whether this forty-nine fifty-fifths is in favor of the step we are going to take, and get some idea as to whether they are in favor of it or whether, on the other hand, we will wake up after we have partially taken the step and find that we have lost friends who did not approve of what we are going to do?

Secretary ACHESON. No; I do not think we will lose friends. I think when it is quite clear that the thing you are doing is right, the thing to do is to go ahead and do it as quickly as possible.

Senator HAWKES. You are vitally interested, I know from my knowledge of you, in making the United Nations a great success in bringing about world peace. There is no question about that, is there?

Secretary ACHESON. That is correct.

Senator HAWKES. Now, what I am thinking about is, can we be accused of circumventing that thing and defeating the purposes we worked on so long by not having gotten any expressed opinion of any kind from any of the 49 states that have apparently gone along with us for the last year?

Secretary ACHESON. I do not think so, Senator.

Senator HAWKES. On what do you base that opinion?

Secretary ACHESON. Well, I base it, as I have been trying to state, on the basic proposition that the greatest error, I think, that we can make is to attribute to the United Nations powers and functions which it does not have or is not prepared to exercise.

Note that statement, Senators. I am trying to find out whether the United Nations, if it had the money and the power to do this thing, had the right to do it, and whether it was contemplated they would do it, and the Acting Secretary says he thinks we are making a great mistake in attributing these powers to that organization.

The United Nations is not designed and cannot at the present moment shoulder all the burdens of the world.

This is Acting Secretary Acheson speaking.

It has a well-defined field in which it is operating, and operating successfully. Perhaps that field may be extended, but it is not extended now.

There are duties between states which have not been canceled by the United Nations organization. Therefore, when a state comes to us—a friendly state, a very gallant state, a state which is struggling to maintain its own constitutional system and its own democratic institutions of human freedoms—and says, "We are in a simply desperate economic situation; an armed minority with foreign support is trying to overthrow this government; we need financial help; will you give it to us?" I do not think you do a service to the United Nations to say, "Well, we have to go around and talk with a great many people first to see whether anybody objects to our saving your existence." I think we know we ought to save it.

Senator HAWKES. May I break in there?

I am not objecting to the help—the loan of $400,000,000. That is nothing but an entrance fee into a show if this thing goes on. I am not objecting to that at all. I am inquiring into the implications of doing the other things. You understand, I have listened to your explanation. It has been very clear and very frank. I have listened to it very carefully, and the particular thing I am concerned about is, are we alone, when we have partners in a great peace movement, in embarking upon a campaign which may not have the approval of a very substantial majority of the nations of the world? And can we go through with that campaign on to the end and accomplish the objective—because Greece and Turkey are not the only countries in trouble in the world, and they are not the only ones that are going to be in trouble? Can we go through to the end objective in that thing, or will we find after we have gotten involved in a situation, and possibly put several billion dollars into it, that we have got to say we undertook too much?

Secretary ACHESON. I do not think so.

Senator HAWKES. I shall not take any more time. Apparently your answer to me is that you do not think the United States has any obligation to find out whether its course is approved by the 49 nations or any substantial part of this 49 who have voted consistently with us to do the things which would accomplish the very thing we are talking about now; namely, orderly government in the interest of free people.

Secretary ACHESON. Not where we are asked to help a member of the United Nations to preserve its very existence.

Senator HAWKES. But there are other members of the United Nations who are fighting for their very existence today.

Secretary ACHESON. If their problems are placed before us, then they have to be considered by us. They may be very different problems.

Senator HAWKES. You cannot answer the question of whether we are big enough and strong enough to carry through on all these implications?

Secretary ACHESON. If I knew what the implications were, I would do my best, but as I have tried to say here, I do not think that what we are proposing this morning is taking on vast financial burdens.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, that is the very thing I am saying, and that is the thing I am going to talk about, and it is the thing Senators are going to have to look at the rest of their lives. If we do not know anything about what the implications are, and the Acting Secretary of State, who is handling this matter, admits that he does not know—that he would talk about them if he knew what they were—if we are going to take a high dive into unknown international waters, plunge in without taking any soundings and without knowing where we are going, then all I can say is we are breaching faith with the American people.

I continue to read:

Senator HAWKES. Of course, if you embark on a campaign, you have China, you have Korea, you have France, you have Italy, you have any number of nations that are going to be confronted with these very serious problems of making government work. Are we to be the only nation in the world that tries to force that thing and spend our substance and funds in trying to enforce that situation so that those different governments can do the same thing that we are trying to do in helping the Greek Government, and possibly the Turkish Government, too?

Secretary ACHESON. Well, all of those situations will be different. Each one of them is quite different from the one you have before you. If you ask, "Are we the only source of capital?" of course, we are not the only source of capital; but there are very few others.

Senator HAWKES. Where are any others?

Secretary ACHESON. To a small extent Canada, Switzerland, Holland.

Senator HAWKES. Where are any others? They are mighty small.

Secretary ACHESON. They are very small, but they are potential sources for investment.

Mr. President, if what the Acting Secretary of State said means anything other than that he does not know how far this step will take us, or what it will lead to, then it will be because the English language means something different than it means to me.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to summarize my thinking with respect to this grave question before the Senate.

I should like to interpolate that a short time ago I went to Chicago and there I talked for 3½ hours intimately with 100 of the best citizens of Chicago—not all big businessmen, but the best citizens of the city. Not one of them understood any of the implications. Every one of them said, "Certainly I am in favor of lending some money, because I want to stop communism." Who does not want to stop communism? This afternoon the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] stated that if he were satisfied that this measure would stop communism he would vote for it without reservation. Is that not correct?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. Who does not want to stop communism?

After I had finished explaining what little I knew about this subject, those 100 men in Chicago said, "You have told us enough." There was not a man in the room who did not say, "We ought not to do it at this time."

Last night I went to Richmond and talked to 400 people. At least 200 of them remained behind. Most of them were not what we call big men in business. They were small businessmen, the salt of the earth in America. Nearly every one of them said, "We are glad you came down here to show us this thing in the light in which you have placed it."

Some of them said, "We do not know positively whether we agree with you, but all we thought of up to date was, 'Is the United States going to stop commu-

nism?'" That seems a simple question if we take it as a side issue. But it is a great question, because no one has yet defined Communism. There are millions of people who are weaving around in a spirit of unrest. I say again, let us get our own house in order and let us set an example to the world to show that representative democracy does work. We have much to think about in the next 2 or 3 weeks, as to whether our representative democracy can again prove it will successfully work, so that we can point with pride to what we have done and get the lesson over to the human family throughout the world.

Human instincts are the same all over the world. Human beings want something that is better. I never saw one who did not, whether he was in Russia or anywhere else. They want something that is better; and if we can show them something that is better, we shall not need to worry too much about using any other means.

This proposed legislation, if passed—as it probably will be—will launch the American people into a new international role which, in my opinion, few of them know anything about because they have not had the full facts, indeed, I might say, scarcely any of the facts. That is my experience throughout the country. The people have had scarcely any of the facts. Those who have had some of the facts have had little time to consider the implications of the proposed role of Uncle Sam as the international banker and policeman of the world, without security or collateral, and possibly without any partners. No bank would last under those conditions, and no nation can survive under them.

If this is an illustration of the way representative democracy works, then I can understand why it has fallen in many quarters of the world, and the people are again being harnessed to be driven by new masters.

What right have the people's representatives, after selling them upon the value and importance of the United Nations as an agency to solve the problems necessary if peace is to exist, to turn around and embark upon a new policy under the guise of another emergency, of which we have had hundreds, and without giving the people time even to understand the thing, much less time to reach sound judgment and let their representatives know what they want them to do.

Right here, I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for the work he has done in connection with the United Nations and for his efforts in behalf of peace.

I wrote him a letter a few months ago in which I recorded my pleasure and satisfaction because of the firm stand he had taken in the foreign conferences.

We are all human, and make mistakes as we go along, but the important thing for any of us to do is this: When we believe we have made a mistake and are doing something that is inimical to the welfare of the people, we should be willing to change our course and correct the mistake before we have gone too far.

So far as I am concerned, if God will give me the power to stand by a conviction, I shall never vote again on any subject before I understand it, simply because I am told by the best men in the Senate that there is an emergency. We were told that the whole world would fall apart on March 31 unless we took the proposed action. It is now April 17, and the world has not yet fallen apart.

What is representative democracy? I thought representative democracy meant that the people choose representatives to represent the people, not to represent what the representatives alone think is good for the people.

If we get our own house in order and prove that representative democracy has the power to inform its people and the duty to carry out their crystallized opinions and convictions, then we shall have done more to eradicate communism from the world than bullets and bayonets and bombs can ever do.

I am aware that force may be necessary to keep the peace, but force must be used intelligently and it must be available in sufficient quantity to win the battle of peace and not lose it. Unless the United Nations is so reorganized that it has the power, based upon the cooperation of the great majority of the nations of the earth who are willing to keep the peace, then we had better buckle on our armor and prepare to protect ourselves against aggression and attack until ultimately, under God, we and the world see the wisdom of peace versus war.

It is the people who fight wars, pay the bills, and make sacrifices of life and limb. They have a right to full information and a right to express themselves—and no emergency I can think of short of an aggressive attack upon us can justify the representatives of the people in proceeding with such haste as we are now proceeding.

Representatives may create wars—they do not fight them, except in rare cases. Sound judgment instead of the folly of haste can help to avoid wars, but sound judgment cannot be exercised without full possession of the facts, without political integrity and sagacity, and without time to analyze and reflect.

My mail and communications on this subject of the Greek-Turkish loan have completely reversed themselves in the past 2 weeks. Why? In my opinion because the people are just beginning to understand that this is more than offering aid to Greece and Turkey to keep them from the misery of starvation.

Mr. President, do not the people have a right to enough time to understand this subject and crystallize their opinion upon it before we act and bind them in a way from which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to extricate themselves?

If we have to proceed to establish peace under the plan of individual liberty and freedom without Russia and her satellites after the exhaustive efforts we have made to secure her cooperation—then let us proceed without Russia.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is a Senator in the Chamber who would say, if we found no way to get Russia to cooperate with us, that because an instrument called the United Nations Charter was drawn in a certain way, containing the veto power, this great effort to establish peace must fail because we do not take the necessary steps to change the instrument.

Let us be as certain as possible that the other 49 nations, who we are told have shown an interest in producing world peace, are in agreement with us and want the kind of peace which we believe is necessary for the world—peace which contains the most important ingredients in human life—individual freedom with the acceptance of individual responsibility.

Mr. President, under the circumstances as they are put to me in this bill, and without full knowledge of how far the administration intends to go in loans and military aid throughout the world, I have no choice except to vote against the passage of this bill, even though I am in favor of rendering aid, without military implications, to gallant little Greece.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I had expected at this time to proceed to a discussion of the pending bill, but the hour is growing late, and I understand that many Senators desire a recess. I should like to have unanimous consent, if that be proper, to proceed tomorrow after the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request of the Senator is granted.

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I report an original bill, and I submit a report (No. 105) thereon, together with the individual views of Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that the bill be read twice and placed on the calendar, under rule XIV, paragraph 4.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and prevent monopolistic labor practices, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. The bill is reported by a vote of 11 to 2. It entirely rewrites the Wagner Act and makes other important changes in the labor law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say in regard to the labor bill what I said at the close of the meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think it is due the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the other members of the committee. I think the chairman, particularly, is to be commended for the manner in which not only the public hearings but the meetings in executive session were conducted. All Members of the Senate, when they read the bill, should remember the great differences that existed among and between us at the beginning of the hearings, and then note how in a great many respects we have come together in agreement by what I think were reasonable and conscionable compromises. I think the Members of the Senate will agree with me that the bill represents a fine example of committee work in which men devoted to the

public welfare did their best to resolve their differences on a basis of fair compromise. Reasonable men, desiring to accomplish but one end—to help promote the public interest without destroying the legitimate rights of either industry or labor—have worked together in the Senate committee reporting this bill and after weeks of cooperative effort they have brought forth a bill which, in my judgment is a constructive bill. If it should be passed by the Senate and by the entire Congress it would be a great constructive contribution to industrial peace in this country. I think that in its present form it is a bill which the President would not be justified in vetoing. He is a fair-minded man and I do not think he would want to veto it. Therefore, I hope that when the Members of the Senate come to study this bill they also will come to develop the spirit and the understanding which I think has come to motivate every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which has voted out this bill.

I want also to commend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] who certainly has had views on labor legislation somewhat at variance with those of some of the rest of us, and who still holds those views, but I think he made a great many constructive contributions in the executive sessions of the committee, thereby making it possible for the committee to report a bill as fine as this bill.

I particularly wish to commend the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] who introduced legislation on the floor of the Senate, much of which will be found in this bill. He deserves a great deal of credit for the contributions he made to various sections of the bill. In fact, an examination of the final bill will show that the provisions in the titles of the bill dealing with mediation and emergencies were for the most part taken from the Ives bill previously introduced in the Senate. Likewise, the provisions on breach of contract, as well as many other proposals in the final bill, were taken by the committee directly from legislation introduced by the Senator from New York.

I am very happy that on March 10, in a speech which I am sure my colleagues at the time thought was too long, I laid the foundation for my proposals for amendments to the Wagner Act. At that time I offered S. 858, containing the specific proposals which I recommended in that speech insofar as the Wagner Act was concerned. I am very pleased that in the bill which we are reporting today practically all of the provisions of S. 858 are contained in it plus some refinements of S. 858 which I have developed on the issues since my speech on March 10, 1947. In fact the bill which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is now presenting as the committee bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is for the most part a combination of the Ives-Morse bills previously introduced as separate bills.

It is not often, Mr. President, that I feel motivated to hand out complimentary flowers, so to speak, but I am so deeply moved with regard to the fine spirit which characterized all of the deliberations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, including every member of that committee, without exception, that I think this statement of commendation for the work of the committee should be made at this time when the committee bill in its final committee form is being presented to the Senate by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I want to particularly commend the chairman of the committee through whose leadership we were able to reach the fair, reasonable, and conscionable compromises which produced the final bill.

In closing let me say that if the Senate wants to pass constructive labor legislation that the President acting in good faith can sign, it will pass this bill without adding to it any of the drastic provisions which we defeated in committee. It is a bill which represents a great step forward in sound labor legislation. It protects the legitimate interests of workers, employers, and the public. It has teeth in it but is not punitive. It meets a public need and a public demand for a check upon unfair labor practices without destroying basic rights of free labor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to leave a wrong impression regarding the bill. I think it is a good bill, and I shall support everything in it; but approximately four additional provisions which were in the bill as originally presented to the committee and which I think should be adopted were stricken out by a vote of 7 to 6. I do not want to give the impression that I do not think those four things should be added to the bill.

I must say that I appreciate greatly the statement made by the Senator from Oregon. I think he has approached the matter from a most cooperative standpoint. I do not think any bill in the preparation of which I have ever participated has been considered in more detail and more thoroughly studied than has this particular bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the just tribute which has been paid by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the manner in which he has conducted the hearings and deliberations on the labor bill, leading to the preparation of the measure which he has just reported to the Senate. I think as good a job has been done on that measure as has ever been done by the chairman of any Senate committee, and I think the result attained is on the whole a good one. There are many parts of the bill as reported for which I voted in the committee, and with which I am in accord, and for which I shall vote on the floor of the Senate.

However, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I, who were the two members of the committee to cast dissenting votes in connection with the report on the bill, felt about some of the provisions of the bill just the opposite of the way the Senator from Ohio felt about some matters which are not now covered in the bill. He felt that some further provisions should be included in the bill. We felt that the bill included some things which should not have been included in it.

Accordingly on the floor of the Senate we shall vote for some of the things contained in the bill, I am sure, but we shall vote against some of the provisions of the bill, and perhaps we shall vote for some provisions which may be offered in the form of amendments, and which are not now contained in the bill.

But I wish to give hearty tribute and commendation to the chairman of the committee and to all other members of the committee for the very fine spirit of cooperation in which this bill was finally put together.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 18, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 17 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

POSTMASTER

Louis L. Brown to be postmaster at Fort Valley, in the State of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

May there be a few moments of devotional silence in memory of our country's sorrow.

Our Father in Heaven, we bow our souls in humility, asking forgiveness of our sins. Teach us the importance of our duty in the life of our people, never shielding ourselves from its call. We walk with tears in the path of our Nation's sorrow. Our land travails and groans with pain because of the unmeasured affliction which has come to our Southland. O God of mercy, help them, bleeding and dying, to breast the gloom. O give comfort to all who suffer; stoop to their need and share their load. May our whole country respond to the call of all humane agencies whose arms are open and common to all men; in every way may we help to bind up the brokenhearted, relieve the distressed, and do our whole duty with unflagging purpose. Wherever there falls a shadow on the human heart, may rest be found through Him who hath loved us.

"Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away.
* * * * *
Heaven's morning breaks, and earth's vain shadows flee;
In life, in death, O Lord, abide with me."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE DISASTER IN TEXAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost sacrilegious after the words of our beloved Chaplain to add anything.

Perhaps our Heavenly Father, by design, ordains that we undergo great calamities that we may not forget our obligations of brotherhood to the stricken. Certain it is that such an event as the Texas City disaster brings us closer to one another. We share the tears of those who grieve and the pain of those who suffer.

Now we pause in the heat of a sometimes bitter—yes, sometimes too bitter—debate to say to our colleagues from Texas, "We mourn with you and want you to know that you and the stricken families of your fine State are in our affectionate thoughts and prayers in this hour of tragedy."

Particularly do we extend this message of sympathy to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], a distinguished and beloved veteran of this body, who himself is now undergoing a serious illness, from which we all wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago I received unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an address by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker. I find, however, that, according to the calculation of the Printing Office, it will cost $159.75 to print. This means, of course, including everything, but as a matter of actual value it costs only the paper on which it is printed and the ink with which it is printed; but notwithstanding the estimate, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts.

A LESSON FROM THE DISASTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the terrible calamity that has shocked the entire world which occurred in the small community of Texas City has brought to mind something I have been thinking about for many months.

Consider the panic and the terrific loss of life that would occur in Washington with hundreds of thousands of people trying to get out of this city in case of any pending disaster. We have only one road to the west, one to the south, and one to the east. The only railroad to the south is dependent upon one lone bridge. These roads are jammed every Sunday afternoon with motorists coming home after a day's outing.

Imagine what would happen if hundreds of thousands of panic-stricken people were trying to get out of Washington to escape some terrific pending disaster. Hundreds of people met death at Texas City because of the poison gas escaping from the explosions that occurred there. Similar explosions could very well occur in the vicinity of Washington, and poison gas might well kill hundreds of thousands of people in the District before they could even think of getting away in their automobiles.

Atomic-bomb scientists have told us that the explosion of one atomic bomb would kill every living thing within a radius of 10 miles. That is something to think about when we realize there are no roads out of the city of Washington that would accommodate any great number of motorists who wanted to get out of Washington at the same time to escape pending disaster.

Why do we have to centralize all our Government agencies in Washington? Why not locate the Department of the Interior in the State of Colorado or some other Western State? Why not locate the Department of Agriculture with its thousands of employees in the State of Wisconsin or Minnesota? There are thousands of employees in the War Department located in one building—the Pentagon. What would happen if all those in the Pentagon Building wanted to get away at the same time? Why not locate the War Department at Camp McCoy at Sparta in my own district in Wisconsin, where we have the finest accommodations for 60,000 people? The same argument might be made for all the large departments and the thousands of employees connected with those departments who are now living here, and who for safety sake should be centered in the safe recesses of the West and Middle West.

Why bring hundreds of thousands—yes, millions—of people to this city who could not get out if we ever had to escape some holocaust like that of Texas City?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

AVIATION IN OVERSEAS SHIP OPERATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 3079, which I introduced yesterday, seeks to end a grave inequity in the field of international transportation. It seeks to benefit American ship lines and air lines in their competition with foreign air-line and ship-line operators.

If enacted, this bill will permit American steamship lines to appear before the Civil Aeronautics Board on an equal footing with all other applicants to obtain certificates to use aviation in their overseas operations. This will put these lines more nearly on an equality with foreign lines which have already been accorded this right by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This bill does not give the steamships any monopoly of air or other transportation. It does not automatically give them the right to fly. It simply accords them the same status as any other applicant, whoever that may be, when applying to the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the right to use aviation in their operations overseas.

Ever since I became chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have sought to obtain some measure of justice for American shipping lines in this vital national issue.

The whole subject is now to be brought to the attention of Congress at hearings beginning April 22 before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, at which I hope that this bill will be considered. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman WOLVERTON, of that committee, for bringing this major national issue up for public attention, and for congressional action that should result in the establishment of a sound national policy that will be in the public interest.

American steamship lines believe that they can make a definite contribution to our whole pattern of international transportation. They seek only the right to prove this contention.

Deprived of an air arm, the merchant marine faces fully equipped foreign steamship and air-line combinations with one hand tied behind its back. Ten billion dollars of our national income and three and one-half million steady American jobs depend upon our foreign trade. The competition is fierce and our American merchant marine requires every facility in order to maintain and develop American industry's foreign trade. Overseas air lines, operating in complete independence, are at a handicap.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, in referring to steamship lines in overseas trade, said:

> They will be possessed of powerful competitive weapons that will enable them to crush independent air lines.

But foreign steamship-air-line combinations already have these weapons and are using them effectively. It is the epitome of national foolishness not to put an American team of equal strength in the field.

UNITED STATES AID FOR DISASTER VICTIMS OF TEXAS CITY, TEX., AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one Member who has had the experience of a disaster in his home town I want to suggest that the Congress should let the suffering people of Texas City and the cyclone victims of Oklahoma know that the Federal Government is ready to assist them in any way it can.

On the 5th of April 1936, there swept down on my home town, Tupelo, Miss., a cyclone that injured a thousand people, killed something like 200, and swept away 600 homes in less than 3 minutes. I have never witnessed such devastation in all my life.

The Red Cross, the people of the entire country, and the Congress of the United States came to our assistance, just as they were going to the assistance at that time of the flood sufferers along the Ohio River.

If those people in Texas and Oklahoma need assistance, I for one am ready to go the entire way, just as I would if it were in Mississippi, New York, Michigan, Iowa, Alabama, or any other State. It is a question of humanity; and I want the world to know that so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak the sentiments of the entire Congress, when I say that we are willing to do our part in extending Federal aid to these unfortunate people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a distinguished citizen of Iowa, the commander of the American Legion, department of Iowa.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on displaced persons.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Bender	Gifford	Norton
Bland	Granger	Pace
Boggs, Del.	Hart	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Hays	Short
Cannon	Hill	Simpson, Pa.
Clements	Hull	Smith, Va.
Cox	Jones, N. C.	Teague
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Tibbott
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	West
Dingell	Kirwan	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	McDowell	Wolcott
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Wood
Fletcher	Morrison	Worley
Fuller	Murray, Tenn.	
Gerlach	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. HALLECK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 490

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Communication 490, previously referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 26, 1947, be re-referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from H. J. Porter, president, Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of April 14, 1947.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Governor Kerr, of Oklahoma, at Saxton, Mo., on April 12.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Sunday Tulsa World of April 11, 1947.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of labor.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial apearing in the Republican Journal, and in the other an article on General Spaatz.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include excerpts from the Railway Labor Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 26, strike out line 25, everything on page 27, and all on page 28, down to and including line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No employer shall directly or indirectly require any person seeking employment to sign or to be bound by any contract or agreement promising to join or not to join a labor organization."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered so that the RECORD may be absolutely clear, so that in 1948, when the campaign is on, the people will know how those who may be seeking reelection voted on this fundamental proposition, the proposition of the unrestricted right of Americans to work. Are we now to limit that right by legislation or by the rules or regulations of a labor union? Labor laws presumably are written for the protection of the man who works, and incidentally in the public interest. We have come now in the consideration of this bill to a place where there is a provision which it is said organized labor insists must be in the bill or there will be political retaliation, to a provision which we have been told during the last 10 days employers want written in the bill—the section which

legalizes the union shop, which forces a man to join a union in order to hold a job. I can well understand the attitude of a national labor leader who wants to control in a monopolistic way all employees, to have them under his control, his dominion, to be to them a dictator. I can understand the attitude of the employer in a great industry who has hundreds of thousands of men working for him and who wants to bargain with the labor leaders. The first will be in a position to sell, the second in a position to buy human labor. The individual employee is ground in between those two men when they get together and is at the mercy of those two men who have control over his future.

I have heard a great deal from labor leaders and from politicians seeking votes about the fairness and the workability of the Railway Labor Act. Let me read you what that says on this subject. Here it is:

No carrier, its officers, or agents shall require any person seeking employment to sign any contract or agreement promising to join or not to join a labor organization.

If that provision written into that law was good, if it has worked out so well, and these advocates over here who speak against this amendment which I have proposed hold that up as a model, why should it not be in the basic labor legislation? Why do they refuse to incorporate that provision into this act.

Again, we have heard about the Norris-LaGuardia Act, what a wonderful benefit that was to the men who work. What does that provide? Let me read it to you:

Any undertaking or promise, such as is described in this section, or any other undertaking or promise in conflict with the public policy declared in section 102 of this title, is hereby declared to be contrary to the public policy of the United States, shall not be enforceable in any court of the United States and shall not afford any basis for the granting of legal or equitable relief by any such court, including specifically the following—

Here it is:

Every undertaking or promise hereafter made, whether written or oral, express or implied, constituting or contained in any contract or agreement of hiring or employment between any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation * * * whereby either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises not to join, become, or remain a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization, is unenforceable.

Mr. Chairman, previous Congresses on two occasions have written into the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Railway Labor Act the provision that no man should be required to join, become, or remain a member of a union. Is this Congress, the first Republican Congress in 14 years, going to deny to the employees who will be seeking and holding jobs between now and 1948 the right to work, the unrestricted right to work? I have offered this amendment so when that campaign rolls around your constituents will know how you voted on it. You tell them.

On every poll which has been taken more than 73 percent have indicated their desire for the open shop. Why, pray tell me, is the Congress now refusing to give to the factory worker what the Congress gave to the railway men? Why deny to the veteran the freedom he brought to the people of other lands?

That you may see the injustice in refusing to accept this amendment, I am reading from the two acts.

From the Railway Act, title 45 of the United States Code, section 152, subdivision 5, comes the following:

No carrier, its officers, or agents shall require any person seeking employment to sign any contract or agreement promising to join or not to join a labor organization; and if any such contract has been enforced prior to the effective date of this chapter, then such carrier shall notify the employees by an appropriate order that such contract has been discarded and is no longer binding on them in any way.

From the Norris-LaGuardia Act, title 29 of the United States Code, chapter 6, section 103, comes the following:

SEC. 103. Any undertaking or promise, such as is described in this section, or any other undertaking or promise in conflict with the public policy declared in section 102 of this title, is hereby declared to be contrary to the public policy of the United States, shall not be enforceable in any court of the United States and shall not afford any basis for the granting of legal or equitable relief by any such court, including specifically the following:

Every undertaking or promise hereafter made, whether written or oral, express or implied, constituting or contained in any contract or agreement of hiring or employment between any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, and any employee or prospective employee of the same, whereby

(a) Either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises not to join, become, or remain a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization—

And so forth.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I know how strongly the gentleman from Michigan feels on this issue, and hence I do not intend to take up too much of the time of the Committee in answering him, but I would remind the Members that this issue was thoroughly and extensively debated on yesterday, and a similar amendment was decisively defeated. This is the issue concerning the modified union shop in the bill. I am certain that the Members are familiar with the provisions of the bill which this amendment would strike out. Therefore, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 3020, is a measure which has for its objective better relationship between management and labor in our industrial world.

It is not an antilabor bill. It is a bill designed to correct the abuses which have grown up in organized labor under the Wagner Act. I do not share the pessimistic views expressed by some Members of the House who profess to be the friends of labor that this bill will result in dire calamity to our economic system if it becomes a law. If those who voice such predictions are no more accurate than those who sponsored the Wagner Act when it came before Congress 12 years ago, in prophesying that it was the panacea for all the evils existing between capital and labor, then the claims made against this bill should be entirely disregarded.

A reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 12 years ago is pertinent to the consideration of this bill. In urging passage of the Wagner bill then, it was claimed, and I quote from page 9683 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 9, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session:

The general results of this measure—

Meaning the Wagner Act—

will promote economic peace and security.

What this bill means to do will be to stop strikes.

Did it stop strikes or bring about economic peace and security? The very opposite has been its effect. Its unfair and one-sided provisions have resulted in the worst wave of strikes, chaos and confusion in industry and business ever witnessed by this Nation. The result of that act has brought economic disaster to the country. As evidence of this statement, I refer to the report on this bill and the record of this Government which shows that last year the country witnessed 4,985 strikes, resulting in 116,000,000 man-days lost. This is not progress. It is class warfare and no one in this country has benefited by that shameful record or received any satisfaction out of it except the Communists. They have given notice that they propose to destroy us through class warfare.

The American Government is founded on the principle of fairness, equity, and justice among its people. These cardinal principles have been emasculated and destroyed by that unwise and one-sided labor legislation. It has nearly destroyed both management and labor. The rank and file of American labor has suffered at the hands of their own union leadership. I am not opposed to unions nor collective bargaining if conducted and maintained under the American principle of fair dealing. One thing is certain, America cannot go forward or progress under the present conditions of strikes and fear of strikes. Our whole economic structure and way of life is placed in jeopardy and the welfare of the Nation endangered.

The telephone strike, now in progress, is but an example of the chaos and confusion which can be brought about under present labor laws. The vast majority of the rank and file of union labor, I believe, is dissatisfied with present conditions. Freedom has become a farce in America. The dignity of the individual working man and woman no longer exists. Two things have vanished in the industrial life of the Nation. First, a spirit of cooperation and good will between employer and employee, and second, the pride of accomplishment. The result has been disastrous. The present attitude seems to be, How much can I

get for how little I can do? No one has ever devised a substitute for honest work nor has anyone been able to improve on simple arithmetic.

President Truman's statement that prices must come down or wages go up is fallacious and unsound. Production of goods at reasonable prices is the remedy. Strikes and slow-downs bring about scarcity of consumer goods and the needs of our people for more goods result in higher prices for everything.

As evidence of conditions existing in our industrial life, I shall read a letter received yesterday from a union man, a member of the CIO in Michigan. Mark his words:

APRIL 13, 1947.

I am a member of local —, CIO union, and feel as though I have no freedom.

When working this is what I have to contend with: "Don't work so hard; take a walk; management won't thank you for it; take it easy."

Now this all ruins production and in doing so ruins free enterprise, competition, profits, and America.

Bills to curb unions will save America and all it stands for. Don't let the unions scare you from doing what is right.

Our late President stated, when he signed the Wagner bill, that it would remove the chief cause of wasteful economic strife and that it would prevent practices which destroyed the independence of labor; and that it sought freedom of choice and action for every worker within its scope. It has had the very opposite effect, as evidenced by the progressively increasing number of strikes.

Even the author or sponsor of the bill which we now seek to amend or modify claimed that it would stabilize and improve business by laying the foundation for amity and fair dealing among our people. He has lived to see the destructive effects resulting from that unfair legislation.

This bill may not be perfect. It may not cure all the ills which have resulted from the ill-conceived and unwise legislation enacted by the New Deal, but no reasonable man can read the commonsense provisions of this bill without coming to the conclusion that it seeks to reestablish the sound principle of justice that should at all times prevail among all classes of our citizens. It is a step in the right direction.

Steady employment at good wages; protection of the savings of our people; expansion of business and industry and strengthening the free-enterprise system of America are some of the objects and hopes of this bill. Confidence between the employer and employee must be restored if we are to go forward to a better day. The American people are demanding that present conditions be corrected and they said so in no uncertain terms at the ballot box on the 5th day of last November.

My support of this measure is to carry out the wishes of a vast majority of the people whom I represent on this floor.

I shall support this bill in the belief that it will benefit the working people and that it will contribute to the general welfare of our country.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 31, line 23, add: "; *Provided, also,* That no such competing employers may engage in any concerted activities, collective bargaining, or arrangement in the formulation of labor policy for collective bargaining whereby any such competing employer is subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval of any other competing employer except in the instance mentioned above where the plants and facilities are less than 50 miles apart and the employees of such plants are regularly less than 100 in number."

On page 49, after line 13, insert:

"(4) Any conspiracy, collusion, or common arrangements between competing employers to fix or agree to terms or proposed terms of employment of their employees, or to subject such terms or proposed terms of employment to common control or approval, not permitted as to their employees, or as to the representatives of their employees, with respect to the collective bargaining, concerted activities, or terms of collective bargains or arrangements of such employees."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the House in its wisdom on yesterday afternoon decided not to permit industry-wide bargaining when it voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] to strike out this restriction in the bill which forbids industry-wide bargaining. That being the situation and the bill standing as it is, it now provides without the amendments which I am offering that representatives of employees are forbidden to get together and formulate a wage policy where more than one competing employer or where two competing employers are involved. In other words, it prevents industry-wide bargaining so far as employees are concerned or their representatives.

My amendments level off the situation and equalize it as regards employers making that restriction applicable to both employees and their representatives and employers. This amendment forbids employers from getting together and agreeing on a wage policy with regard to their industry whereby they are controlled, directly or indirectly, by the other. I think in all fairness it must be adopted. As I understand it, the committee will accept the amendments. This being the situation, I do not think there should be any great trouble in equalizing the situation as far as industry-wide bargaining is concerned. You know, all of us, particularly the newer Republicans, are interested in seeing to it that large concentrations of wealth do not control our economy. It is necessary to insert this amendment to equalize the bargaining powers of both employers and employees. As I said, it forbids the employers from getting together and entering into wage contracts, one with the other, so that they might perhaps overwhelm their respective unions. The antitrust laws do not cover the situation, and I believe we have to cover it in this bill as far as wage contracts are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. All you want to do is to balance the situation and put the employers and employees in the same category?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes. That is the whole purpose of this bill, to equalize the situation between employers and employees. The Wagner Act was a Magna Carta, in one sense, for the employees, but it was a one-way street. This whole bill seeks to equalize the situation.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. I note you have offered two amendments. I understood the one that was offered on page 31. Will the gentleman explain the amendment as offered at page 49?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will be glad to do so. The one offered with regard to page 31 forbids employers from entering into a common wage contract. The amendment offered on page 49 is merely a sanction for that prohibition. It makes it an unfair labor practice. It is necessary to follow it out with a sanction. One follows the other as a corollary.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. As I understand, the chairman has accepted this as a committee amendment. I am familiar with both of the amendments which the gentleman has offered. One is simply to put the same restrictions upon employers that it puts upon employees. The other one is making it an unfair practice for the employer to violate the first amendment. I will say to the gentleman I have discussed with all of the Democratic members of the committee and they are in accord with the gentleman's views. I think it is an improvement of the bill and, as I understand it, the chairman of the committee accepts it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I am opposed to industry-wide bargaining on the part of labor organizations; I am also opposed to it on the part of competing employers.

My opposition to industry-wide bargaining is based on a fundamental conclusion which has developed painfully and slowly over a period of years. I now know that absolute good and absolute bad exist in very few cases in this modern complex world. There are some good reasons for and against industry-wide bargaining. I recognize the fact that tangible benefits have occurred because of its existence. But I see the disadvantages, and the net result leads me to the decision that the dangers outweigh the gains.

The arguments for it are mainly those of a monopolist. Elimination of competition because of its economic waste and business casualties seems like a good reason for a monopoly to exist. I was a monopolist in my beliefs during my college life and early business days. In the field of public utilities, I still believe

in regulated monopolies for certain reasons. But as for business generally, I am opposed to it. The development of big combinations of capital and then the growth of big labor combinations, with big centralized Government power to regulate both of them, has caused me to become doubtful of my earlier position. As I watch a few men sit down and decide the destiny of millions of people, I realize there is something dangerous in that pattern. Something wholesome has gone out of American life. An individual counts for very little; he has become just a cog in a mighty machine. It is changing the whole concept of our American Republic with its protection for minorities and the individual citizen. It is closely akin to statism. It resembles the pattern of the early days of the Mussolini regime in Italy, which finally ended up with labor and business both under Government. It is a long step forward toward a government-controlled society.

We cannot go all the way back to a nation of very small businesses and small labor organizations, but, in having company bargaining instead of industry-wide bargaining, we are eliminating some of the dangers.

I hope you will see this as I do, and as apparently you did see it yesterday when you voted to ban industry-wide bargaining on the part of labor organizations, and vote today for this amendment to ban it for employers also.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the committee accepts these amendments.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] is meaningless. It does not by any means restore the industry-wide bargaining which has been so essential to stabilization of industrial relations, the protection of American workers against substandard wages.

It does not prohibit the ganging up on the part of monopoly industry against any labor organization or any group of workers in any particular plant. The gentlemen in control of monopoly industry and monopoly finance do not have to sit down formally to fix a wage policy, they do not have to enter into a written agreement among themselves; the understanding is fixed by community of their interests. Therefore, what you are prohibiting here is something they do not have to do in order to accomplish what they have been doing and what they will do, namely, to act in concert against labor's just demands.

It is significant that the very gentlemen who have been insisting on the prohibition of industry-wide bargaining by labor now support this amendment. Without doubt the fact remains that they realize that this amendment does not in any manner restore industry-wide bargaining, and further, that it gives no protection to labor against the ganging up on the part of the trusts.

The gentleman from Wisconsin in proposing this amendment states that it will sort of equalize the situation. He proposes it on a basis of equality. It is the same kind of equality that Anatole France defined with respect to the law. He said: "The law in all of its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, beg on the streets, and steal their bread from the shop windows." That is the kind of equality this amendment as well as this bill gives to labor.

While I do not oppose the amendment I simply state that it does not fool those of us who are today still supporting the right of American men and women who work for a living to bargain collectively.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have read and reread this bill. I have listened recently to all of the debate, and I have carefully read both the majority and minority reports.

In the debate the bill has been characterized by the opposition as being Fascist, and also as a bill that will drive the workers to communism. Extravagant and irresponsible statements of this kind have not, in my view, contributed to understanding of what the bill does or what it contains.

Although the opposition, in its minority report, agrees that something has got to be done to improve labor-management relations in the United States and to correct labor abuses—yes; even though the President of the United States has recommended to the Congress that something be done—I regret to say that the opposition has made no effort whatsoever to improve this bill by amendment. They have made no effort to do even what their President has recommended.

All of the efforts in this direction have come from the Republican side of the aisle.

I am one of those in this House who believes that the bill goes too far, and I have supported all of the efforts that have been made to improve it. I regret that the House did not see fit to adopt the various amendments offered. If they had been adopted, the decision of Members like myself as to how to vote on final passage would not have been so hard.

After much thought, I have made my decision. I am going to vote for the bill, not because I desire to see it become law in its present form but because I, like the overwhelming majority of the people of our country, believe that something has got to be done, and the best way to do something is to get started in the right direction. There are some things in this bill that I do not like. As I have said, I have supported efforts to change them. There are, likewise, many things in the bill that are good.

Passage by the House is only the first of a long series of steps in the legislative process. We know that the temper of the other body is more moderate than that which seems to prevail here.

I am confident that this bill will be substantially modified by the other body, and that when it has gone through conference it will come back to this House in a form making it more acceptable to many of us here.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote "aye" on final passage.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. I wonder if the gentleman who has just preceded the gentleman now about to address the House has any idea what House Joint Resolution 83 means, which has been lying before the Labor Committee since January 23. When he makes the statement that the minority members of the committee have not done anything he ought to inform himself as to what really exists instead of making wild statements on the floor of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I know that opposition to this bill will avail naught and what I have to say may fall on unwilling and deaf ears, but there is an old Hindu saying that if you rub a bar of steel long enough you can convert it into a needle. That process of instilling a feeling of fairness to labor in this bill's sponsor would take a long time, but nonetheless we who oppose this bill must perforce speak our minds earnestly and sincerely. If we keep up our fight and in common parlance we continue to "rub in" the need for justice and equity to labor.

We passed a bill similar to this not so many moons ago, the so-called Case bill, but all your work was for naught. It received a well-earned veto by the President, and I can assure the Members of the House that this bill will likewise earn the veto, and justifiably so, of the President, despite the fact that the bill may be slightly modified in the other Chamber. So all our efforts here will have been for naught.

There is a tendency to believe that everything that comes out of the Committee on Labor and Education is sacrosanct and we cannot alter or change its findings. I notice, however, that the Committee of the Whole is willing to plug one little hole in this leaky ship, but it is too late. Even adoption of the pending amendment would avail you naught. There is another old saying that we never repair a leaky ship after it sets sail. We have set sail with this bill and any kind of an amendment of this sort, even though it may be slightly beneficial, is not going to do so very much good. The ship is full of many holes.

I call your attention to the fact that this bill gives all the advantages to management and all the disadvantages to labor. Management does not need any aid from you or anybody else. It can take care of itself. It advanced beyond the dreams of avarice even with our present labor laws. Let us see what the present levels of earnings of corporations are in this country.

The profit reports for the first quarter of 1947 will show a rate of earning after taxes that is well above 1946, itself a record year. It is almost double the profits earned in 1929, once considered the peak of prosperity, and 50 to 66 percent above earnings during the war years. At the present rate the 1947 profits will top those of 1946 by the staggering sum of $3,000,000,000, and this in face of the fact that we have the Wagner Act,

the Wages and Hours Act and all of the other labor bills against which those on the other side and some on this side inveigh.

Let us take the picture of the income of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. For the 3 months ending with March those profits amounted, after taxes, to $48,000,000. For the 12 months ending March 31 the net income amounted to $193,500,000, which compares with the figure for 1946 of $177,000,000, an increase this year of over $15,000,000. This company and thousands upon thousands as well entrenched are to be the real beneficiaries of this bill. What of the laboring man who has to meet the staggering prices that have resulted from the fact that you took off controls? He cannot show such staggering profits. His dollar cannot stretch far enough to enable him, whom you really hurt in this bill, to buy the very necessities of life, food, raiment, and medicines and the necessary services to make life comfortable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact that the President in his message on the state of the Union said that we needed to enact some labor legislation, and referred specifically to jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, and so forth, I would like to inquire whether or not the gentleman in his statement that this bill, if passed, would be vetoed by the President, speaks officially for the President or as a result of any direct information?

Mr. CELLER. I do not speak officially. But I can put two and two together, and I have a fair degree of intelligence. I know that the President is one who places human rights above property rights. He has an earnest desire to help the laboring man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I am not a crystal gazer, I cannot read tea leaves or the palm of the hand, but I do know, judging from facts and factors within the knowledge of all of us, that the President will never accept this bill because it is so unpalatable to the entire Nation.

I would be inclined to accept a labor bill doing away with jurisdictional strikes, doing away with secondary boycotts, doing away with sympathy strikes, and many on this side of the aisle would likewise accept such a labor bill, and so might the President, but the President is not going to accept a bill that is as tragically sweeping as this bill. It is hoped, however, that labor will purge itself and voluntarily do away with jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. But the pending bill makes it utterly impossible to have anything in the nature of collective bargaining. What does this bill do with reference to collective bargaining? Read the purposes of the bill on page 3, I think it is, and you will see they do away with the words "collective bargaining." They do not appear in the purposes of the bill.

But the National Labor Relations Act provides as follows in section 1:

> The denial by employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining leads to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest.

You do away with that language by this bill, and therefore, perforce, anybody reading this pending bill will rightfully come to the conclusion that you not only do not put an imprimatur of approval on collective bargaining but intend to abolish collective bargaining. When you read the balance of the bill you can readily see that what you want to do is to do away with collective bargaining and have individual bargaining. What chance has the individual against corporations whose profits this year have been $3,000,000,000 above that of last year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be compelled to vote against H. R. 3020, entitled "Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947." On the surface, this measure presents some attractive features, but when one goes into it exhaustively one finds them belying the underlying facts.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act and other so-called labor laws are the principal cause of most, if not nearly all, of the industrial strife that prevails. The way to cure this trouble is not by amending those laws but repealing them. The real cause of strikes and the evils that go with them is the intrusion of the political forces controlling the Government into the field of employer-employee relations. Unless and until the political element is taken out of this field, there can be no such thing as genuine industrial peace.

The measure before us puts more politics into employer-employee relations. It provides for another independent bureau in the executive branch of the Government headed by an Administrator appointed for life and removable only at the will of the President, who is vested with wide and sweeping dictatorial powers over both management and labor. This labor-management relations czar will be given absolute power to determine what questions can be considered before they reach the Labor-Management Relations Board, which Board under the bill replaces the National Labor Relations Board. It is provided that he shall be a party to all unfair-practices proceedings and "shall present such testimony therein and request the Board to take such action with respect thereto as in his opinion would carry out the policies of this act."

This man will be empowered to arbitrarily determine which proceedings shall be instituted, how they shall be conducted, and what evidence shall be introduced, and there is no appeal from his decision in such matters. An appeal to the courts can be had from the decisions of the Board but not those of the Administrator. Think of the serious implications that will be involved by vesting the Administrator with the extraordinary power of representing both complainant and countercomplainant in a controversy between them. Since politics would in practically all cases be dominant, imagine what abuses and injustices would be forthcoming out of this arrangement.

Whoever is appointed Administrator, by the very nature of things will be compelled to use his office to the limit to corral votes for the next and succeeding Presidential elections, just as is incumbent upon the National Labor Relations Board now to do. The administration of the act will be largely in the hands of the employer-employee relations czar. It seems unbelievable that a monstrous agency such as this should be set up in the wake of last November's election.

The bill does take away from labor leaders much of the power they now hold. That is fine. But what does the bill do with the power it takes away from the labor leaders? Does it give it back to the employers and employees to whom it legitimately belongs and from whom it was originally taken by the politicians through the Wagner and other acts and given over to union leaders? No; it vests the power it takes from the labor leaders in the politicians controlling the Government who will use it primarily for their own aggrandizement. And here it should be noted that the course which this act pursues is precisely the same that was followed by Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy. This procedure was basic in their program of regimentation.

What this bill provides is more politically managed labor relations and less union-official management of such relations. Both are part of the same process and both lead to regimentation and slavery. What the Nation really wants is neither of these. It wants a situation where employers and employees are free from both union-official and political control and solve their own problems. Of course, such an arrangement would result in some wrongs, but they would be puny indeed compared with the terrible wrongs that will inevitably be visited upon employees and everybody else if we continue on the road that the pending bill now takes us.

A lot is being said publicly about this bill outlawing the closed shop. The fact is, however, that it specifically legalizes the union shop, and, generally speaking, there is little difference between the two. The closed shop can hire only union members, whereas a union shop can hire persons who do not belong to the union but who are compelled to join within 30 days after receiving employment. It is provided that if not less than 51 percent of the employees in a plant vote for a union shop and the employer voluntarily agrees thereto, then a union shop is formed. Here lies one of the most vicious evils of the entire measure. To vest an employer and a majority of the employees of a plant with power to force their will upon a minority of the workers and compel them to pay tribute for the right to work is nothing short of involuntary

servitude. The Constitution forbids this and guarantees to every man the right to voluntarily join or not join a union, to work when, where, and at whatever occupation is open to him for employment, at any wage he can individually and voluntarily agree upon with an employer, without having to pay tribute to anyone.

After all, I cannot forget I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, before we proceed any further I think the Republican leadership sponsoring this bill should clear up for the benefit of the people of this Nation a very important question. It has been stated on this floor that this bill was not written by Congressmen, by Representatives, it was written by corporation lawyers. It was admitted by one of the gentlemen of the Labor Committee the day before yesterday that he did consult with a Mr. Theodore Iserman in his office. We have before us telegrams and communications which indicate that not only Mr. Iserman wrote this bill but there are others, not Congressmen, not representatives of the people, who formed this bill. We have a telegram from an outstanding Republican addressed to us, Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers Union, registered Republican, in Boston, Mass. He says that not only Theodore Iserman, a New York corporation lawyer who represents the Chrysler Corp., but also Michael Ahearn, research director for the Investors' League, and William Ingles, labor relations specialist for farm-equipment companies, wrote the most vicious aspects of this bill. I think the people of this Nation have a right to know whether this Congress is being run by the duly-elected representatives of the people or whether it is being run by corporation lawyers of monopoly business.

I have before me the copy of the opening of our hearings in the Labor Committee, and the very first witness called, who laid the foundations for this bill, was Dr. Metz, of the Brookings Institution. This book published by them, A National Labor Policy, is practically the bible of the present bill before us.

Is it possible that this Congress is being run not by the duly elected representatives of the people, but is being run by big business corporation lawyers? If so, who pays them? The people? No. Right now, the main one, Theodore Iserman is seated in the gallery watching these proceedings. Are you Republicans taking orders from him or are you taking them from the people who elected you? That is my question. Answer it if you dare. The American people have the right to know if the Republican Party has abdicated representative government.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. May I ask the gentleman if he was present in the committee while the bill was being read line by line for amendment?

Mr. POWELL. No; I was not. What has that got to do with my question and with the charge that Mr. Iserman wrote this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many days was the gentleman there when we were considering the bill?

Mr. POWELL. After the first few days, when I saw it was a rubber-stamp procedure, and we filed in like puppets and listened to whoever was there, from then on many of us on the Democratic side refused to go in longer. The times I did attend were a complete waste. Some of us did not attend one meeting outside of the first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All during the hearings that procedure was the same, was it not?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even when Van Bittner and William Green were there, the gentleman was not there?

Mr. POWELL. That is right. But do not evade the issue. I still am asking the question, Who are the men that wrote this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman like to have me answer it?

Mr. POWELL. I would.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can speak only for myself, but as far as I am concerned there was no one from any company or corporation or labor organization who aided me.

Mr. POWELL. I believe the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I rewrote the Wagner Act myself in 1939, but I did not get it adopted. I never received any help from the gentleman on that.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All through the years I have been offering bills.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman, because his amendment offered yesterday was absolutely sincere. He believes in what he offered yesterday, that this bill should wipe out all the rights of labor and not just be a subterfuge. I still ask the questions from the leadership of the Republican Party, who wrote this bill, because we of the Democratic side never saw it. Why is it that these corporation lawyers are still in our gallery directing this bill now? Who are they?

Mr. OWENS. The committee wrote the bill.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Would the gentleman from New York, who is now addressing the committee, ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] how many times he was present at the hearings? I say this without meaning any discourtesy to him, but I believe he would admit that he, himself, could not go along with the procedure that was followed during the hearings, and that is why he was not present at those hearings.

Mr. POWELL. We need not talk about that. It is not germane to my question, and I insist that my question be answered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to answer the question.

Mr. POWELL. I am sure that you can address the Committee for 5 minutes under the rules of the House and answer the question.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. The committee wrote the bill.

Mr. POWELL. The committee did not write the bill. I am a member of the committee, and I speak for 10 men who never saw it until you shoved it down our throats. The committee did not meet until 24 hours before the bill was reported out on a 2-hour notice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although it may displease some folks, I am going to take time to answer the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], which he asked his colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to put to me as to why I was not present at more hearings of the Committee on Labor and Education. Well, when I was not there I was attending the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures, which was investigating racketeering by extortionists who were sailing under union colors up in the Dock Street district of Philadelphia. We finally reported on that and filed a printed copy of the hearings.

I attended the hearings of the Committee on Education and Labor every time that there was a hearing when I was not on the other committee. I am sorry I cannot be in two places at once.

Another thing, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] made the statement, if I understood him correctly—and if I did not he can correct me now—that I wanted to wipe out all the rights of labor. That was your statement, was it not?

Mr. POWELL. All rights of labor under the present laws pertaining to the closed shop.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is, the Wagner Act?

Mr. POWELL. Yes; under the Wagner Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is absolutely mistaken. I have no doubt he believes that. You get some queer beliefs from that part of the country where he lives, and the rest of us who live out in the sticks are not responsible for those things.

Mr. POWELL. It is a part of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct and that section I am glad to say gets all the benefits of our form of government, though some people who live there, and I am not referring to either of the gentlemen from New York, seem to be dissatisfied with our way of doing things. Contrary to the gentleman's statement, my whole effort ever since I first rewrote the Wagner Act in 1939 and put it in the RECORD in parallel columns with the original act and the Smith bill, has been to strive to correct the original act. I have striven all through this debate to give to the man who actually works with his hands and his back and his muscles

and his body—to give him some protection. As against whom? As against labor politicians and the labor boss, the racketeer and extortionist, as well as against the employer.

When this bill goes through, as it will go through, and if it becomes a law as it is now written, you will find the labor leader and the employer getting together and grinding between them, as between the upper and nether millstones, the man who works.

Those gentlemen who speak or pretend to speak, may I put it that way, although I have no doubt of their sincerity of their sympathy for the poor workingman, are just selling him down the river in denying him the right to work without being required to join a union.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the distinguished contractor from the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not a fact that the way the bill is written it has broken down every union to an individual plant only and you are doing away with all unions?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no, no. That is not right. I am sorry.

Mr. LESINSKI. I am sorry—I can read English and other languages besides.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman had attended some of the hearings and understood some of the American language used and written into the bill and if he had given us some helpful suggestions instead of sitting there and voting "present" when he came out of a doze, then he would have more knowledge about this situation. Those gentlemen who were there and slept through most of the proceedings answered when the roll was called either "no" or "present" should not now here be weeping and wailing. Sometimes they were physically present but not mentally present at the hearings.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the gentleman admit—what chance did we have to offer anything when we were 4 against 18?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The same chance I had all through the years that I sat there under the distinguished leadership of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], who was then chairman of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that he was one of the very few members on the majority side of the committee who did support some motions and suggestions offered by various members of the minority on the committee when we were holding open hearings. On a number of occasions I asked witnesses who testified at the open hearings whether or not the reduced take-home pay since VJ-day and the increased cost of living since VJ-day, and especially since price control was killed, did not contribute greatly to industrial unrest. During the open hearings after returning from my district from a week end, I called the attention of the committee to steel workers and wage-earners with large families in my district who had talked to me and stated that they were paying 23 cents for a half pint of cream, 21 cents for a quart of milk, a dollar a pound for pork chops, and outrageous prices for clothing and so forth. They requested that some of the heads of families in the industrial areas of America be called by the labor committee to testify about the struggle they were having. I placed that before the committee in the form of a motion, and I wish to state in all sincerity to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that he was agreeable to that request. But I was overruled on my motion by the chairman, with this statement, "I asked to call heads of families before this committee in order that the members from the rural areas could understand what a terrific struggle the heads of families in industrial areas have in trying to live and support their children under these high prices."

And the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee, said, "I have already thought of that and I am going to do it."

I asked the chairman, "From what areas?" He said, "I have already invited some heads of families." And I again asked, "From what areas?" He said, "From up around Scranton." But the committee hearings closed and at no time did the chairman of the committee ask any heads of families to appear and testify as to the high cost of living.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. At any time during the hearings did you ever submit any of the statistical data from the United States department that has it, concerning those points?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. OWENS. If you had you would have seen that you are mistaken.

Mr. MADDEN. I brought in evidence from the workers themselves—wage earners who brought their sorry tale to me.

In connection with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated, for over 2 weeks after the open hearings closed I was available in Washington at all times to meet with the majority members of the committee and the chairman to confer on drafting this legislation, but I did not receive a call from anybody until 2 hours before they wanted to vote on the bill. I did vote "present" on several occasions, because I did not even know what material was in particular sections. And as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] said on the floor the other day, he did consult this Wall Street lawyer on a number of occasions in his office during this 2-week period when the majority members went underground and pulled the iron curtain to the exclusion of most of the minority members, they had the aid of Mr. Iserman, the Chrysler lawyer, to draft this bill, which I do not think 50 percent of the Members on this floor know what is contained in its 68 pages.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Minnesota, as he knows, and I hope he will not misunderstand me in this. I do not know what set off this endurance test we seem to be engaged in, but we have some rather important amendments before the House, and I do hope we can get back on the track and act on the amendments and proceed with the bill. I am sure the gentleman will concur in that expression.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman I agree. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Indiana, and to the House, that it is a well-known fact that you cannot write legislation with some person who is interested in writing legislation if you are sabotaged at every turn of the road by those who are not interested in writing legislation. Frankly, the gentleman from Indiana and the other members of the committee on the Democratic side who today complain about not being consulted are a part of a very small group in this House who are not interested in any major legislation on this subject. That is the reason they were not consulted, and I submit it is a good and valid reason. The Democratic members who were interested in legislation were consulted. The Nation is interested in some action to curb labor abuses and they are entitled to have this House act without further delay caused by those who are not interested in any labor legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. Not at that point. I want to be brief.

Mention was made of wages. Wages can be cut down very materially by disastrous strikes, as they have been in the last year or two. Just to bring this home to you today and to show you how it hits the worker I have here a short resolution sent me by a labor union in my district, received this morning by special delivery air mail. This is not one of those anonymous communications, this is a real one and comes not from an individual but from a special meeting of the Commercial Workers, Local 2235, Lawrence Wennell Post, Minneapolis. That is a telephone workers' union now out on strike in Minneapolis. The communication I have in my hand is a copy of a resolution they have sent to their leadership, and it reads as follows:

APRIL 14, 1947—2:20 P. M.

Whereas there is a growing feeling of skepticism and unrest as to the outcome of the strike, continuous out-of-pocket loss causing financial hardship of all of our members, whether commercial, accounting, plant, or traffic; and

Whereas there is now a stalemate in negotiations that seemingly cannot be broken in Washington: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State officers, the general board officers, and the representatives of our union on the national policy committee of the NFTW be apprised of the fact that the collective sentiment of the commercial workers demand whatever expeditious action is deemed necessary to terminate the strike.

That is where a great deal of the loss of wages has come from, strikes that the rank and file cannot control once their so-called leaders take over.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to my colleague on the Education and Labor Committee from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman and commend him for the statement he made just previous to the last statement. He is the first member of the majority on the committee who has admitted to me that during that 2-week period the majority members pulled the iron curtain down, that they had meetings drafting this legislation.

Mr. MACKINNON. Certainly the gentleman does not believe that we were doing nothing. We were writing laws to cure the labor abuses in this Nation. But what was he doing? He had the same opportunity as the other members of the committee to draft legislation himself in that period of time and to then bring it before the committee or to this House in the form of an amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make reference again to House Joint Resolution 83 which has been before the Labor Committee since January 23, and which follows the suggestions of the President in his message to the House earlier in the year. It seems that the Governor of Massachusetts, who is a very renowned and distinguished Republican, proposed the same thing to the legislature of that State. I wish to quote a few lines from his report:

In my inaugural message I informed you that I had asked nine leaders in the field of industrial relations to recommend to me such changes in our existing laws as they believed to be most helpful to narrow the area and limit the damaging effects of industrial disputes. I took this step because I am convinced that the road to progress in this field lies through labor-management understanding, rather than by government intervention.

I wish also to quote the last paragraph of that report to the legislature:

To my knowledge this is the first time in industrial history that so comprehensive a subject has been so conscientiously studied to an ultimate, unanimous agreement by representatives of every group affected. Molded by you into legislation, this Massachusetts plan can become a modern Magna Carta for labor and industry.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Governor of Massachusetts.

I mention that because this plan of the minority Members to have this resolution adopted has been a failure, and a great many Members on the majority side seem to ignore the fact that we do have something constructtive to offer. The reason we offered this resolution was because we felt that the problem is so deep that it would require a great deal of study, especially as to the causes of labor unrest and labor disputes. However, nothing has been done about it. Instead of that, we take up all of our time trying to cure symptoms and not causes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I may say in connection with Governor Bradford, of Massachusetts, that the heart of his recommendations is a strong conciliation service, which he calls labor's Magna Carta. We have a Governor of Massachusetts who is a Republican in politics recommending a strong conciliation service as labor's Magna Carta for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and a Republican Congress destroying a conciliation service for the National Government. In connection with the observation made by the gentleman from Minnesota, it is a very questionable practice having outside people with strong personal connections and financial interests sitting in with any group. In all the years I have been a member of committees, we have sat as a committee. I never remember any Democratic member sitting in and having the representative of an outside interest also present advising with us.

Mr. KELLEY. And paid by somebody else.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is all right for members to sit in and confer among themselves, but not with outside persons who have no interest in the Government sitting in to advise them. I have never sat on any committee where there was anyone represented other than a Member of the House and members of the committee staff. Certainly, on no occasion did we have anybody representing outside interests sitting in collaborating with us on policy and probably undertaking to establish a policy. That is something which is inimical to our democratic institutions and to our Government.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I am getting a little sick and tired of all these insinuations that are being carried on and the misinformation that is being handed out to the House. Let me say that at no time when the Republicans were in conference trying to prepare and draft a bill to be presented to the committee was any outsider present.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. That is a point I want to make clear. The inference that Mr. Eiserman was in our committee is not correct. He was not in our committee. He may have conversed with one member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OWENS: On page 39, line 15, after the word "employee", insert "who has been suspended or discharged."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the House for just a few minutes, because this amendment is important. It is simple, but you will miss the point unless I am able to put it across to your clearly. The committee, during the entire course of the proceedings, was watching very carefully through absolutely every line in the bill that there would be nothing done whatsoever that would harm any worker or employee in any way.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is merely a clarifying amendment. The committee is willing to accept it.

Mr. OWENS. I understand the committee is willing to accept it, but I would like to explain the situation. It is a technical error that was made. It reads this way, on page 39, line 13:

No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee, or the payment to him of any back pay, unless the weight of the evidence shows that such individual was not suspended or discharged for cause.

As that reads, it would be possible for the Board to reinstate the employee or allow the employee back pay only in the event he was suspended or discharged, whereas he is entitled to back pay in case of a strike, lockout, or any other suspension of work arising as a result of an unfair labor practice which would entitle the employee to that back pay. For that reason, after the word "employee" in line 15 I have offered the amendment, so that that particular paragraph is limited to the case of a man who has been suspended or discharged, and any one who has lost his job because of other unfair labor practices would be able to receive his back pay and be reinstated to his work, by virtue of other provisions of the bill, and particularly section 10 (c) thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: On page 34, in lines 21 to 25, inclusive, strike out the following: "and must state that the employer's agreement to such provision was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof."

During the last 2 days this House has overwhelmingly rejected the open shop being written into law. But as the bill now stands if the employees voted by a majority that they should have a union shop—not a closed shop but a union shop, they must get the approval of the employer before they can install a union shop. They cannot bargain for it. They cannot strike for it. They have to get his written approval and they must, to use the language of the bill under oath "state that the employer's agreement was not obtained directly or indirectly by means of a strike or concerted interference with the employer's operation or by any means thereof." If the employees by a majority vote approve the union shop, it seems to me that they should have the right to install a union shop and that it should not depend on the consent of the employer.

It seems to me the union shop is the employees' business. Therefore, under the amendment I have offered, the union members have a right to bargain for the union shop. I think that is the only fair way to have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the gentleman's contention that the employees themselves should have the privilege of imposing the union shop, even if the employer objects? Is that the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. The purpose of my amendment is that they should have the right to bargain for the union shop, which implies the right to strike for a union shop.

Mr. KNUTSON. They have that right now.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not the way this bill is written. It must be given voluntarily by the employer. Therefore, it would probably be seldom given. I think they ought to have the right to strike for it. As long as a majority of the employees vote for it it is their privilege, I think, to have the union shop. That is the reason for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 41, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 28, line 15, strike out the comma and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 19 and insert "their employer."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I came to Washington as conscious as any of you of the arrogance and excesses of many of the labor leaders. I came, too, with just as much determination as any one of you to try to correct its abuses and to enact a constructive management-labor relations act.

But I did not come here to and I do not intend now to have any part in weakening and eventually destroying the labor-union movement in America. H. R. 3020 does correct some of these evils but it contains also insidious and obnoxious provisions that would reduce labor unions to impotence and make them little more than social organizations. Much as I want to improve the relations between management and labor, I cannot be a party to this effort to destroy labor unionism. To pass this bill to cure our labor ills would be equivalent to cutting off one's head to cure a headache.

If you who are supporting this bill are sincere in your protestations of love for the workingman and his unions then you have had the most colossal April-fool joke of the season played upon you by the attorney for the NAM who is reported to have had a big hand in drafting the bill or by whatever influence antagonistic to labor did draw it.

One of the most insidious and misleading provisions and one that would mean the severe crippling of the labor unions is the proviso in section 9, subparagraph A. The proviso is:

Provided, That any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to, and settle grievances with, their employer without the intervention of the bargaining representative if the settlement is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement then in effect.

My amendment proposes to strike the latter portion of this provision in section 9 (a).

The present act provides that a representative designated by a majority of the employees in an appropriate bargaining unit will be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment, provided that any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer. In military terms, the attack upon this section is a flanking one. It is being made as the proviso rather than the main part, but in such a form that it actually repeals the principal section by negating the principle of collective bargaining and majority rule established by this section. To grant individual employees or minority groups of employees the right to present and settle grievances which relate to wages, hours, and conditions of employment without permitting the representative of the majority of the employees to participate in the conference and join in any adjustment is to undermine the very foundations of the act. To create rivalry, dissension, suspicion, and friction among employees, to permit employers to play off one group of employees against another, to confuse the employees would completely undermine the collective-bargaining representative and would be disastrous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Could that not be taken care of in the collective-bargaining agreement? In other words, the agency that was making the bargaining agreement would say that that could not be done, and then that group could not do that. That could be put in the collective-bargaining agreement.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course it could, but if the employer did not agree, the employees would be without a remedy.

Mr. BREHM. But what if the employer would agree to it?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot yield any further.

The foregoing consequences of requiring individual and group bargaining despite the certification of a collective-bargaining representative are not imaginary. Soon after the Wagner Act was held to be constitutional, so-called labor relations advisers sold their services to large textile corporations on the premise that through the medium of the proviso in section 9 (a), they could guarantee the destruction of a labor union. Many unions succumbed quickly because favorable settlements occurred only when the workers sought adjustment alone. The workers soon found that the union had evaporated and the employer then returned to his former practices of denying all reasonable requests. They were then forced to start all over again and establish a new union.

If you are sincere in your statements that you do not want to destroy unionism you will vote for this amendment.

If you are sincere in your belief that the union contract should be preserved, why is it that you deny employees the right even to bargain with their employer to obtain this right?

Another provision that makes it impossible for me to vote for this bill is the provision to carve out craft units from larger units of employees.

If you pass this bill as I know you will, without even the amendment offered on yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana to preserve the trust funds of certain unions and if the other body should concur in this evil bill, I thank God we have a man in the White House who has the courage to defy and conquer arrogant labor leaders but who also has the courage, I am sure, in the face of Nation-wide hysteria, to veto such an infamous bill as this.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would strike out a right which this bill gives to the in-

dividual employee to go to his employer on a personal grievance which he might have and have it settled between himself and his employer without having to go to some bargaining committee or bargaining agent. Of course, provided that the subject matter that he wished to discuss with his employer is not contrary to the terms of the collective bargaining agreement then in effect.

The effect of this amendment would be as I have said, to deny the individual employee a right which this bill gives him.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not a fact that under this provision we have gone in accord with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which hold that where employees have a grievance, for instance in connection with the recovery of a certain amount of money claimed due from an employer, they can go to him and complain about it and settle it without having a bargaining agent? We have not in this section 9 (a) of the bill said anything about wages, terms, conditions of employment, as stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], but we have specifically said it does not include the making of any settlement inconsistent with the terms of the collective-bargaining agreement then in effect, that is, at the time of the discussion and settlement.

Mr. HARTLEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] is absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 39, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this bill which we are now considering comes before us under circumstances much different than those which attended the consideration and passage of the Case bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Case bill was presented to the House for consideration as a substitute for a bill which had been reported to the House by the Labor Committee and which not one single member of that committee favored. I doubt whether a similar situation had ever before been developed in legislative procedure.

When the Republican leadership saw that the Labor Committee, which was then under the leadership of the New Deal, was not going to bring out any labor legislation it proceeded to take action to see to it that some legislation would be considered and the Case bill was prepared. This bill was not satisfactory to many of the Members, including myself, but it was a step in the right direction. The people were demanding some changes in the Wagner Act and some relief from mass picketing and from other labor troubles. It will be remembered that the President vetoed the Case bill and thereby refused to assist in the passage of any labor legislation although he was loud in his protestations that something should be done.

By reason of the failure of the New Deal to act at that time the country has seen a large number of labor disputes develop with the accompanying loss of time and wages to the workers and the loss of production which the country needs so badly.

There is no doubt that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the country generally arising out of strikes and many of the incidents connected with strikes. There is also no doubt that the American people are strongly in favor of any reasonable program that would bring peace and harmony in the industrial world. If mass picketing and jurisdictional disputes, out of which come so many of these boycotts and secondary boycotts, could be prevented the sentiment of the people on the labor question would be materially changed. I think that the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives deserves a tremendous lot of credit for the diligence it has shown in attempting to meet this labor situation, but I think in their zeal they have extended their legislative area a little farther than was necessary to relieve the situation. They have created a number of new situations which may cause a great deal of trouble. These new situations might tend to be destructive in some respects or they might be too rigid in other respects.

This was exemplified very plainly yesterday when the House was considering this measure. I think it would have been the part of wisdom if the committee had agreed to two amendments that were offered yesterday. Both of these were offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], who is a member of the committee and who is a recognized authority on labor legislation.

One of the amendments to which I refer would have placed in the bill a provision with reference to trust funds. This provision was included in the Case bill, which passed both branches of Congress. It was a provision that would have given to the employer the right to make payments to a trust fund established for the benefit of employees and their families to provide for medical and hospital care, for funeral benefits, and for other similar purposes. The bill in its present form makes it unlawful for employers to contribute to these funds. And I am not sure but that the language in the bill is so tight as to seriously jeopardize the many trust funds already set up by many industries in the Nation whereby their employees are given protection in case of sickness and death, and so forth. The vote in the House yesterday on this amendment was 117 in favor of the amendment to 126 against the amendment. I voted in favor of the amendment because I felt that the failure to include this amendment in this legislation may render a very serious hardship on many worthy organizations.

No doubt the total money held in these various trust funds all over the country will amount to a tremendous sum. If this bill that is now under consideration is passed, it will hamper the distribution of these funds and impair their solvency. We should, while we yet have time, look into this matter carefully and do what is right under all of the circumstances. The distribution of these funds has nothing whatever to do with jurisdictional strikes and with boycotts, and so forth. While I feel that the other branch of Congress will, when this bill reaches that branch, see to it that this amendment is put into the bill, still I feel that since this sort of legislation is primarily the first responsibility of the House and that we should have assumed that responsibility completely before we sent this bill to the Senate for its consideration.

The second amendment which should have been adopted yesterday is the amendment that deals with the matter of industry-wide collective bargaining. Several Members who spoke yesterday indicated that this was the very heart of the bill. I think that it is unfortunate that the committee brought into this bill the matter of industry-wide collective bargaining because it is not one of the contributors to the labor troubles against which the people are complaining. In fact, I think that industry-wide collective bargaining has contributed much to the benefit of both the employers and the employees of the country. Especially is this true in the coal industry. The coal industry was the first big industry of the land to adopt this system establishing agreements between employer and employee. In the early days when mine owners dealt directly with their own employees and with no one else, there was much discord and dissatisfaction because the agreement existing in one mine might be entirely different from that existing in another mine nearby. The result was the lack of uniformity and constant turmoil.

When the industry-wide system was adopted it meant that the work around the mines was classified and the wages were agreed upon for the various classifications in accordance with the work done by the various classes. In that way stability came to the industry and at the same time the employees were better satisfied because they were treated alike in the various mines and there was an incentive for the younger miners to improve their skill and ability to get out of the lower classes into the higher classes where the work was of a higher standard and where the wages were likewise of a higher standard. I feel sure that this bill, if passed by the House and goes to the Senate, that body will take out of it this section that refers to industry-wide bargaining. I feel sure that it would be for the best interest of industry and the employees and the country also.

While Mr. LANDIS' amendment did not receive enough votes to carry it in the House, it did receive a very substantial

vote. The debate on the Landis amendment enlightened the membership greatly and there was a strong sentiment to the effect that something should be done to relieve that situation. This sentiment was crystallized when Mr. KERSTEN's amendment which was offered today was received with great favor and was accepted by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union by a very large majority. While the Kersten amendment does not do what the Landis amendment would have done, still it relieves some of the strictures which would have been imposed by the bill had the Kersten amendment not been accepted. The action of the membership of the House today will go a long way toward bringing to the Senate the proper impression of the real sentiment of the House. I think the real sentiment of the House is not to pass punitive or destructive legislation. What the House wants to do is to pass a labor bill that will remove undesirable practices and will bring about a finer relationship between the employers and the employees of the country.

As I stated in the beginning, this legislation is not entirely satisfactory to many of the members. I think that if it is passed by the House in its present form that the Senate will remove the objectionable features of the measure to which I have referred.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 31, line 13, strike out the word "and" and insert in place thereof the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full time allotted to me because I think this is a very simple amendment.

As I read this section it seems to me it is designed to prevent the monopolistic effect of industry-wide bargaining on a national scale. I believe, however, that all of those who are concerned with the problem recognize the fact that there are a number of unions which have rendered distinguished service in their fields. Among them, for example, is the clothing workers' union of New York City.

As the provision now reads, in order for a bargaining agent to represent the employees of a competing employer two things must be conjoined, first, that the plants involved have less than 100 employees, and second, that they be within 50 miles of each other.

The amendment I have offered is designed to make it possible for bargaining agents to represent employees of competing employers in either of those two events. I happen to come from the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Bargaining has been conducted on an industry-wide basis there ever since the strike of 1902. It has been a convenience to employers and it has been distinctly beneficial to the employees. During that time there has grown up the Anthracite Conciliation Institute, which has rendered distinguished service to the community.

To compel the unions in the anthracite coal field, for example, to bargain with each company would mean that approximately 200 contracts would have to be recognized. The same thing would apply, for instance, in New York in the garment industry. My amendment would eliminate that difficulty. It would likewise, it seems to me, permit a situation to be corrected which has arisen in my industry in other sections where small employers have gotten together and put in such shop conditions which could be eliminated if the unions or the bargaining agent could represent the employees of a number of the plants; but for either of these two reasons those plants do not fit into the scheme of the bill as written.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Does not the gentleman believe that by making this change from "and" to "or" it really restores industry-wide bargaining, for instance, in areas like the Detroit section where most of the automobile companies are located within 50 miles of one another?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. It would permit it, of course, in that particular area so far as the automobile industry is located there; but it seems to me the advantages of it outweigh the disadvantages.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. Does not the gentleman believe that the adoption of his amendment would simply restore what has been the historical practice in this industry and that its general effect would be highly beneficial, particularly in the anthracite coal industry?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. That is perfectly true. I believe it would apply to such areas as Pittsburgh and other industrial cities where employees are operating and working under generally the same conditions. In other words, this would permit what is known as area bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who offered this amendment discussed the matter with me on a previous occasion and I tried to find my way clear to accept it, but, contrary to the opinion that he has expressed here, I think the amendment will do more harm than good. As a matter of fact, it would permit, as he admits, monopolistic bargaining in the automobile industry and in many other industries. It would destroy one of the main objectives of this bill which is to break down authority to call strikes which can cripple our entire economy. I hope, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania), there were—ayes 40, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL:

Page 33, line 15, after the word "is", insert "or ever has been."

Page 33, line 20, after the words "or is", insert "or ever has been."

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a correcting amendment to paragraph 6 on page 33 which provides that any person who is a Communist or belongs to certain Communist organizations shall not be an officer in a union. I am in thorough accord with the purpose of that paragraph which is to protect the future of this country against the impending danger of having Communists in control of our great American labor organizations.

As the paragraph is now written before amendment, in my humble judgment it would be wholly ineffective to carry out the purposes for which it was intended. The vast majority of the leaders in our labor organizations are good Americans. Unfortunately, here and there Communists have gotten into positions of authority and control. It is well known to every true American in this Hall today that it is a part of the Communist creed that, whenever it becomes expedient, it is perfectly proper to lie and to deny membership in the Communist Party in order that they may go on serving that organization, so that if this act be passed and the paragraph is left unamended, the only thing necessary for the Communist labor leader to do would be to announce that he was no longer a Communist and continue uninterrupted in the service of his masters in Moscow.

I am certain that every real American who is here today is concerned over the possibility of that thing happening. As I say, it is a perfecting amendment, but in my judgment it might, at some future date, save America from the tragedy that happened to France. You Members of this body have not forgotten how the Maginot Line crumbled like a piece of chalk and how an army that 3 months before had been announced by every recognized military authority in the world as the greatest army on the Continent of Europe crumbled like pie crust underneath the wheels of the juggernaut. The reason for that is well known today. The industries in France were paralyzed in the months preceding that critical hour. They could not produce the munitions of war for the armies of France because the war industries of that unfortunate nation had been infected and paralyzed by the virus of ungodly communism.

Gentlemen, let us attend to this now. Your yea or your nay on this vote may determine the history of this country a decade hence; who knows? The eyes of America are looking upon you in this moment, and it is up to you to protect those folks back there at home.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I am in favor of this portion of the bill and of the gentleman's amendment, but the thing that has been bothering me is who is to determine whether a man is a Communist or has been? Who is to determine that, and on what principle? Is the man given a hearing or who is to determine whether or not there are communistic officers in a labor union?

Mr. BELL. The gentleman is, I think, a member of the Labor Committee, is he not?

Mr. LANHAM. No.

Mr. BELL. While I am not an expert on this bill, though I read it the other night, my understanding is that if a man is shown to be a Communist he will come within the purview of this paragraph and will be taken care of according to the terms of this bill; that he will no longer have rights as an officer in a labor organization if it is shown by testimony in any court or before the board, provided by this bill, that instead of being a true American he is, in fact, an agent of a foreign country and a member of a body or organization whose sworn purpose is to destroy the rights and the liberties of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with very great reluctance that I oppose the amendment which has just been offered. I understand thoroughly the purpose of the amendment, and I want just as much as the gentleman who offered it to drive Communists out of our labor organizations, but I do not want to deprive one who has seen the light and who has made an honest reform of the right to be a member of a labor organization.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. May I ask the gentleman if in his heart he believes that any man who ever in his life has been a member of an organiaztion whose sworn purpose is to destroy the rights and liberties of the people of this country, who either knowingly or ignorantly has belonged to that sort of an organization, is fit to be a leader of a great labor organization?

Mr. HARTLEY. I recognize that it is rather difficult to believe that one who has been a member of an organiaztion that we understand has as its avowed purpose the overthrow of this Government can properly reform, but I have in mind such persons as Mr. Budenz. I may be in error in my judgment there, but I do believe that in that instance we have a man who has seen the error of his ways and who has disavowed completely his former ways.

Mr. BELL. As I see it, this is a question as to whether we prefer to preserve the right of a man who either was a knave at heart or else was too dumb to realize what he was doing to be not only a member of a labor organization but to serve as its leader, or whether we prefer to preserve the rights and liberties of Americans and to protect this country against what I humbly believe will be one of the greatest dangers to face us in the years to come. Which shall we choose? I think we will vote upon that question when we vote upon this amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. If all of those that would be aimed at by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri were in the class of the gentleman to whom the the chairman of the committee refers, of course, there could be but one answer, but I understand that the attitude of the gentleman from Missouri, and I think he is right in it, is that this amendment is striking at the members of that group on whom the spotlight was thrown by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Joe Strecker case. He raised the point that although he still believed in world revolution, although he still invested every dime of his savings in Russian bonds, although he had been a Communist and still believed in the tenets of communism, yet he had ceased to pay his dues and therefore was not a member of the Communist Party. He had his card and he kept up his dues until about the time he was ordered deported, when he ceased to pay his dues and claimed to have evaded the very pertinent provisions of the statute because of that fact. I believe cases of that kind comprise the far greater number. It is typical. It may be, and my opinion is, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] is very important and would strengthen the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Alabama that I believe this bill takes care of that when it says "believes in, or is a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force," and so on. I would say that the very facts the gentleman has presented here show that that man still believes in that type of organization. While he may not have paid the dues, he is still a supporter of it and is willing to aid it. I think the bill covers that. I do not like the idea that we shall not recognize that a human being does reform, for it is human to make mistakes and err in this world, or, after he does reform, that we shall hold him down from any future opportunities that arise in the profession he chooses, in the labor-union movement in this case.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and do so for the purpose of exchanging views with the chairman of the committee. I share his views that we should not do too much tinkering with the bill on the floor of the House. But I am wondering if this can truly be called an amendment, and if it is not in the nature of a clarification really. I think it was the purpose of the committee to put every safeguard possible around the membership of labor organizations and to save them from the troubles and grief that would come from this type of leadership.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is exactly what we want to do. I am in full sympathy with the intention of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARDEN. Let us reason out loud just a little bit. I am not so sure that with the language now contained in the bill we quite accomplish what both you and I want.

The bill says "is a member." We might very easily run into a situation where a fellow says, "Yes; I was a member last week, but I am not now." Or he could even say, "I was a member yesterday, but I will swear I am not a member now." And both you and I know that a Communist has no more regard for his oath than a frog does for a mud puddle.

Perhaps the chairman can work this out. There ought to be some way of making certain on this undetermined and indefinite element in the bill. Unless we can work it out, I wonder if the safest thing to do would not be to add the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] it being in the nature of a clarification, because I just do not believe that a man who has been a Communist could cleanse himself so quickly to the point where he would be a suitable leader or officer of a labor union. I am afraid we would be exposing the members to something that both you and I literally detest. If I am wrong, I would appreciate being shown.

I obtained the floor merely for us to reason it out a little.

Mr. HARTLEY. It is my contention that the things we are trying to do here are already covered by the language in the bill as it now stands without this amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course, the gentleman believes that this amendment does no harm. I do not mind doing harm to a Communist; that does not bother me a bit, because they do not mind doing me and my Government harm. But I am just wondering if we are really depriving a person who is justly entitled to something? I do not think a fellow who has been committed to a policy of the destruction of our Government ought to be permitted to go in and help govern the destinies of a labor organization.

Mr. HARTLEY. The point I make is that this would bar the man who has made an honest reform.

Mr. BARDEN. The thing that troubles me is: How long ago is that reform supposed to have taken place? How long must it be before that reform is regarded as honest? Can he say, "I was a Communist yesterday" or "I was one last week or last year"? I am afraid under the language of this bill that would cleanse him and I think it would take much longer than that to cleanse him.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not a fact that under the terms of this bill that judgment would be left to the employer, and then it is up to the employer to prove that the reform has not been sincere?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know whether we ought to go to that much trouble or not. It leaves it with too much uncertainty. I was in hopes that we could insert the language of the proposed amendment in the bill for the purpose of clarification.

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. It has for a number of years been common practice where Communists have been caught in positions that they had no right to be in to immediately deny the fact that they were Communists. If this paragraph is not amended, we might just as well strike it out of the bill, because it will be entirely ineffective.

Mr. HARTLEY. The argument of the gentleman has been so persuasive that the chairman of the committee is inclined to accept the amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for the Communists, but I know there are a number of young people all over the country today who are making mistakes and I want to give them the chance to repent. Members of the American Youth for Democracy, that communistic organization which I deplore, comprise many of those young people. I do not want to deprive the members of that group, who subsequently repent of their wrong, from ever earning a living in any field of proper endeavor. I think the amendment is wrong for this reason.

The bill as now worded covers two situations. If an individual is a member of the Communist Party he is out the window.

Second, if by reason of active and constant promotion or support of those policies, then, too, he is out the window, even though he is not listed as a member of that party.

That means that if one is a member of the Communist Party today, and tomorrow he says he is not, he is still out the window, because his past procedure, without any change having occurred, has been active and constant promotion or support of those policies which are communistic.

That person whom you are trying to eliminate from union leadership is taken care of by that language. What you are doing by adding this amendment is preventing a person who has made a correct adjustment of his situation and has actually given up the Communist Party and principles, such as Louis Budenz, from ever performing the functions which any other citizen not otherwise disqualified would be allowed to perform.

I think we ought to reject the amendmend for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I do not believe that any one of the three points raised by the gentleman cover the subject. We ought not take any chances. As Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, when on the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, said:

> We do have guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States freedom of speech and action, but no man is guaranteed the right to be a policeman.

So it is not a question of honest reformation. It is but the expression of positive preference for those who have never needed reformation to qualify them for positions of powerful leadership. We have enough good Americans who believe in and conform to the principles of our Constitution and laws to man our ship of state and all organizations within our Nation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman remembers Aesop's fable of the gentleman who found a cold, stiff rattlesnake and took it to bed with him to get it warm, because he was sorry for it, and when it warmed up it bit him. I think the same thing might happen here.

Mr. HOBBS. The point of the gentleman is well taken—our sympathy must not lead us into jeopardy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this section close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that include all amendments thereto? I suggest that the gentleman amend it.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many minutes will that allow those who wish to speak on this particular proposal?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees 11 Members standing seeking recognition on the section.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I inquire how many amendments are on the desk pending to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know that all of these amendments will be offered, but there are five amendments now filed at the desk.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder if the gentleman will not reconsider and allow us a little more time?

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I further modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state for the benefit of the membership that he has listed the following Members as seeking recognition on this section: Messrs. MUNDT, LODGE, DONDERO, BATES of Massachusetts, RANKIN, NORTON, CRAWFORD, LEMKE, EBERHARTER, ANGELL, CLASON, SABATH, and HARTLEY.

Each of these Members will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment pending at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that it be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT:
>
> On page 33, line 15, after the words "is a member", insert "or has within the 5 years immediately preceding the date when his case is brought up for considering."
>
> Page 33, line 20, after the words "or is", insert "has within the 5 years immediately preceding the date when his case is brought up for consideration."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment is entirely in line with the objectives of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], as well as that by the gentleman from North Carolina. I believe, however, the chairman of the Labor Committee gave us an excellent thought when he said that we should not pass legislation which permanently bars from holding these offices men who had once been Communists but had conscientiously reformed after having discovered how they had been deluded by the snares of communism. We have many cases in the records before our committee. In addition to the case of Louis Budenz, in which men who were once Communists have discovered the foreign domination exerted over the American Communist Party and who upon making this discovery have dedicated themselves to exposing and curtailing the subversive program of communism.

There are a number of cases that have come to the attention of the House Committee on Un-American Activities year after year of young men who had once been deceived by communism, who had worked with the Communists only to find to their chagrin that they were being directed by a foreign government. These young Americans then quit the Communist Party and they have been highly helpful in correcting the evils which they had unwittingly and unconsciously helped to cause.

It certainly seems to me that if a man for the 5 years immediately preceding the time his case is considered has been out of the party, working against the party, has not supported the party, or been connected with it, then there is no reason to bar him from membership in a union and holding office therein. We have on our desk at the present time, in the Committee on Un-American Activities, some correspondence from a group of members of the United Electrical Organization who were formerly Communists. These union men wrote the House Committee on Un-American Activities

that they had learned that the Communist Party is under the control of Soviet Russia and they want to come before us and testify under oath to the activities of that group. Certainly we do not want to disbar patriots like that from holding offices in labor organizations for life once they have seen the light and once they have demonstrated for 5 years or more that they are now well-informed, patriotic, and genuinely American laboring men.

Even as of today we still have in American colleges and universities young men and women who have been tricked into joining the Communist Party through affiliating with an organization which they did not clearly understand—American Youth for Democracy. Surely we should not bar for life any opportunity to hold office in a labor union on the part of these young Americans who renounce membership in American Youth for Democracy and who join the millions of other citizens who are beginning to understand communism to be the foreign fifth column which it is and who are now associating themselves with patriotic Americans working to stop communism at home and abroad.

For that reason I have offered this amendment to bar from holding offices in labor unions anyone connected with the Communist Party at any time within 5 years preceding the day the case is brought up for consideration. To attempt to punish a man for his entire lifetime for a mistake which he has publicly admitted and corrected, however, seems to be unnecessarily drastic and punitive, and I believe it would be less effective than setting up some such effective date as I propose.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I agree with what the gentleman has stated and I think he has made a very good argument but I am wondering why the gentleman selected a 5-year period?

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing sacred about 5 years. I could have stated 6, 8, 12 or 3. However, I think 5 years is a reasonable length of time in the life of an adult man for him to demonstrate that during that period he has had no sympathy or connection with communism. If he has once been deceived by communism and has seen the light and reformed and publicly renounced communism, I think he should not be subjected to a lifetime penalty.

Our experience on the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveals that frequently former Communists become very able and effective workers in the battle to expose and circumvent the plots of the Communists. I do not think we should shut the door in the face of penitents of this type. Let us by all means take steps to drive communism out of the labor unions but let us take effective and rational steps. Let us proceed with reason and let us adopt realistic reforms. It is not the vigor with which we cry out against communism but rather the value of the legislative and public-serving action that we take which will achieve the objectives which we have in mind.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to adopt some basic labor legislation to protect the public against excessive and unnecessary strikes and to safeguard the legitimate interests of both employer and employee. I shall support this legislation with or without the amendment I have proposed since the correction of management-labor relationships is long overdue in this country. It is hoped and expected that by the time this legislation has cleared both Houses of Congress it will provide a pattern of industrial relations which will help stimulate production and help safeguard American traditions of opportunity both for the individual laboring man and for employers of labor. We should perfect it as carefully as we can but we should proceed in this Congress to the correction of abuses which can no longer be ignored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to read two telegrams to the House. My telegram to William Green, asking authenticity of a letter that was read by the chairman of the Labor Committee on Tuesday, is as follows:

APRIL 15, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American
Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

The chairman of the Labor Committee, Mr. HARTLEY, read a letter on the floor of the House today from you, dated 1940, commending him for his fine labor record. In view of the fact that Mr. HARTLEY is recorded as having attended only six meetings of the Labor Committee in my 10 years as chairman, is this letter authentic, and would you send him such a letter today? I intend to use this telegram and your answer.

MARY T. NORTON,
Member of Congress.

The answer from Mr. Green came to me on yesterday, is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
House Office Building:

Record made by Congressman HARTLEY in 1940 was much different than record now being made by Congressman HARTLEY in 1947. American Federation of Labor supported Congressman HARTLEY of 1940, but is uncompromisingly opposed to Congressman HARTLEY of 1947. Because of his votes highly favorable to labor in 1940 American Federation of Labor endorsed his candidacy for reelection to Congress. This is in line with our nonpartisan political policy of supporting friends and opposing enemies regardless of political affiliation. Sponsorship of H. R. 3020, one of worst labor measures ever introduced into Congress of United States, now means Congressman HARTLEY will be classified as one of labor's chief enemies.

WM. GREEN,
President, American
Federation of Labor.

Further comment is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Bell amendment without any alternative whatsoever. In view of those things which have been occurring in conference, I think if the House is sincere about this amendment we should have a teller vote as to whether it is adopted or rejected and then let the record stand for the benefit of the conferees.

This country is now being asked to finance in almost every way conceivable opposition to the Russian philosophy and the Russian program generally. The good taxpayers and the bond buyers in my district will be asked to contribute according to their usual capacity.

I have no sympathy whatsoever with anyone who has in this day of enlightenment affiliated themselves with the Russian communistic movement when the life of this Nation is at stake. That is the reason why I am in favor of this emphatic language offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Our young university men and women who are being supported by the taxpayers in receiving their education, and who are now joining communistic movements, whether it be AYD or otherwise, have plenty of light in which to walk, and if they want to deny themselves permanently, that is, as permanent as legislation is, and that is not very permanent, from being leaders in labor organizations, well then, let them join or keep out of that kind of an organization according to their desires. We are going to find out that we shall have to come down to the philosophy which has so recently been enunciated by Mr. Baruch, who has the confidence of Democrats and Republicans, that our men and women will have to work longer and harder for some time to come in order to catch up with the ravages of war if we are to regain our heritage, if we are again to be missioners of hope and be rewarded for our efforts. He takes the position that too many people have the delusion that the world can be set right by borrowing money, and I am against labor leadership which teaches our people to soldier on the job, against labor leadership which receives its instructions from Moscow and which, at the crucial moment, can stop production in the United States, throw this country on its stomach, defeat every program that we have in the United States and the rest of the world, and I think we can follow some of the recommendations of Mr. Baruch along this general line:

It may taste bad at first to plenty of people, but here is Dr. Baruch's prescription:

FIVE AND ONE-HALF DAYS, FORTY-FOUR HOURS

"If we adopted, wholeheartedly, a 5½-day, 44-hour week, with no strikes or lay-offs, to January 1, 1949, the result would be electrifying."

That result would be that we'd produce a great deal of real wealth, which in turn would restore much of the buying power knocked out of our symbolic wealth—our money—by the scarcities and shortages which the war dealt us.

If we persist in leaning more on money than our production, Mr. Baruch predicts a vast inflation to follow the relatively mild one we now have, and a perilous shrinkage

of our present power, because "make no mistake: Our military lines are no stronger than the industry behind them."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the greatest single factor which has contributed to labor unrest today is the tremendous growth of monopolies.

A bill which addresses itself to industrial peace is meaningless unless it recognizes this fact.

Sponsors of this strikebreaking measure, H. R. 3020, repeatedly insist that it is important to put the risk back into striking; that it is important to make it difficult to strike; that it is important to make it difficult to obtain wage increases through employee self-help. Let us recognize what our real problem is.

The real problem is to put the risk back into saying "No" to legitimate demands of employees. Modern industry is so large, industrial combines have grown so powerful and arrogant, that they can readily afford to say "No" to the workers' pleas for decent living standards.

Instead of embarking upon a sinister campaign for promoting competition in wage cutting, we should direct ourselves to the crying evil of our times: The evil of monopoly. If free enterprise itself is to survive, we must promote true competition and break down the enormous industrial aggregations which threaten to destroy our entire economic life.

In the year 1909, 200 of our largest nonfinancial corporations owned one-third of our national assets. In 1929, these corporations owned 48 percent of our national assets, and today they own almost 60 percent of our national assets.

In 1880 the four largest producers in the iron and steel industry owned 25 percent of the country's rolling-mill capacity. In 1938 the four largest producers owned over 64 percent of our country's rolling-mill capacity.

Today in this country the 250 largest corporations control two-thirds of the usable manufacturing facilities of our entire economy. More than 100 of our largest corporations are controlled by a tight net of 8 groups of banking interests.

Consider the alarming implications of the fact that during the war over one-half million small businesses were forced out of economic life.

Consider what it means when as of about 5 years ago eight one-thousandths of 1 percent of the population owned one-fourth of all the corporate stock in the country and approximately six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the population owned one-half of all the corporate stock in the country.

It is these tremendous monopoly concentrations which force upon our people work stoppages and hardship because of their arrogance and power.

Consider the spectacle of the colossal A. T. & T. Co., the world's largest trust, a $7,000,000,000 corporation, pitting its enormous wealth against the puny bargaining power of its workers. Consider the reckless irresponsibility of this corporation which places its greed for profits above the welfare of the people.

H. R. 3020 strengthens the trusts in their war upon the living standards of the people. It arms them with the weapon of the injunction, the damage suits to drain union treasuries, the criminal prosecution to hound union leaders, and the blacklist to deny union members an opportunity to make a living. We cannot create industrial peace within a healthy economy by fostering trusts and crippling labor.

Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in charge of antitrust prosecutions—a man who knows about monopoly problems—recently said:

> The twin demands, "hands off business" and "curb labor," have long been the heart of the antidemocratic program of those who favor the corporate state. To say that labor unions shall be restrained while the march of monopoly is allowed to continue will result in the abandonment of industrial democracy. If industrial democracy is permitted to perish our proud heritage of political freedom cannot survive.

In order to root out a basic cause of industrial strife and of depression, I submit it would be well for the House to consider a bill providing for the elimination of monopolies and monopolistic practices and the protection of the public interest through public control over monopolies and monopolistic practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my asking for time is to secure from the committee, through its chairman, a statement as to whether or not nonprofit hospitals are covered within the term "employer" as stated on pages 3 and 4 of the bill. The reason I do this is that I am informed that under a decision of the Supreme Court it is presently held that nonprofit hospitals do not come under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. In every community, in cites and towns all over the country, we have nonprofit hospitals which are not religious hospitals, and which do charge fees and do get paid moneys. I should like to know whether or not this committee considers that such nonprofit hospitals receive the benefit of the exclusion from the terms of this bill and the word "employer" which presumably already exists.

Mr. HARTLEY. If the gentleman will yield, the institutions to which the gentleman refers are exempt under the terms of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish every Member of the House would turn to page A1715 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the so-called American Youth for Democracy, referred to a while ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

In reply to what the gentleman from New York said, many of these young men do not realize that they are joining a Communist-front organization; therefore, they have not become members of the Communist Party. They have time to get out of it before they are roped in and sworn into the Communist Party, which is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

But with or without limitation as to years, an amendment such as that offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] ought to be adopted.

I want to read to the House one more time the words of William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, who like Henry Wallace is making speeches in Europe against the United States of America. This is what he said, and he was under oath when he admitted he made this statement.

He said:

> No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads a Government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises), that Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is a statement of the head of the Communist Party in America. He has told you time and time again that they have only one flag, and that is the red flag of Russia.

This amendment is for the benefit of the honest, conscientious American laboring men against these Communists, and it ought to be adopted.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know how Mr. Foster got his passport?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I wish I did. I cannot understand why the State Department would issue a passport to such an individual.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I should like to know.

Mr. RANKIN. But I know one thing. If I had my way, both Foster's passport and Henry Wallace's passport would be revoked today.

I have been informed that Foster does not expect to return to the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the State of Michigan we have drawn this issue with the State university and the Michigan State College so that no intelligent person in those two institutions has any excuse for not knowing what the AYD is.

Mr. RANKIN. That should be done in every State in the Union.

These Communists are taking advantage of our educational institutions to poison the minds of the youth of the land.

While we are challenging the spread of communism abroad, we should drive this vicious influence from American soil by forcing every Communist off the Federal pay roll, out of our educational institutions off the radio, out of labor unions, and from every other position of trust or confidence which they can use to spread their poisonous propaganda.

I hope the Bell amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

(Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in spite of the fact that it is camouflaged with the Bill of Rights. I feel that this bill is contrary to our form of government—that it will promote un-American activities. I say this because it will give the subversive element an opportunity to further infiltrate into some labor organizations.

There is need for labor legislation, but this bill goes too far. It repeals much of the progress that organized labor has made. It brings us back to the gun-and-club—strikebreaker—age. It is this kind of legislation that makes a Wallace and his pink and commy comrades possible.

Man is inclined to follow false gods. So is Congress. We live in a world of confusion—in a world that is made with hatred and vengeance. We live in an atmosphere that is surcharged with false propaganda. I am afraid that it was in this atmosphere that the bill under consideration was written.

In preparing this bill I fear that the committee was influenced by the false propaganda heard over the air, by the evidence of a few disgruntled labor skates, and a few international racketeers and industrialists, who again made millions upon millions out of a war-mad world.

I feel that the committee should have brought in a simple bill outlawing jurisdictional and wildcat strikes, and preventing violence. Cases such as these took place in recent years in New York and Wisconsin, where the State officials failed to do their duty and preserve law and order.

Then, it should have provided for and set forth the conditions under which municipal and public service plants and industries, that directly affect the welfare of the people, would be continued in operation during a strike. Such a bill would have met with little or no opposition on the part of labor.

This bill, no more than the Smith-Connally Act, will end strikes, but it will create bitterness and hatred. We should remember that many of the veterans belong to organized labor. Of all times, this is the time to strive for unity and not disunity.

If there ever was a time for calm and sober thinking, it is now. I know that both my Democratic and Republican friends have denounced Wallace for his unseeming conduct abroad. I know that both my Democratic and Republican friends would like to have him stay where he is. However, if we pass this antilabor legislation, then he will be back to plague both parties. We will have played into his hands.

Then, we will have played the game that he and his followers—the pinks, the reds and the off-colors—wish us to play. We will have slapped organized labor in the face. Let us remember that organized labor, with its friends, constitute 48 percent of our population. That under our form of government, they have 48 percent say about the Government under which we and they live.

I know that the Nation has a headache. There are strikes and more strikes. I know that some of these strikes are justifiable—others are not. I have a suspicion that some of these strikes are agitated and caused by persons who are not interested in the American form of government. These wish to bring about chaos and confusion, and then destroy us. They prefer a dictatorship. They spurn democracy. They are not all employees—among them are employers.

I know, and you know, that there are many cases where the workers are receiving less than a living annual wage. It is easy to compare the wage they got before the war, and that they are now receiving. Such a comparison is not only unfair, but dishonest.

We hear the enemies of labor shout from the housetops, "Look at the high wages they are receiving." But these do not tell you that the dollar is worth only 40 cents in purchasing power. They do not tell you that, in many cases, the present wages paid are not more than sufficient to pay the rent on a decent place to live in, let alone fuel, clothing, and food.

They tell us that the plumber is getting $2.50 an hour, but they do not tell us that that $2.50 buys only as much as $1 would have bought in 1937. They do not tell you that many of the so-called white-collar workers are in actual want because of the depreciated salaries and wages. To these it is all right for themselves to take all that the traffic will bear. They want cost plus for industries, and cost minus for the farmer and the laborer.

I know that we have those who would go back to the Dark Ages—who prefer working slaves to working freemen. These forget that it was free labor that produced not only food, clothing, and implements of war for our own Army and Navy but for the armies and navies of half of the world. In no nation did the individual worker produce anything near that of the American farmer and laborer.

I still hope that either on this floor or in the Senate we may get a fair and just bill. I have consulted with some labor leaders of different organizations. I find that, almost without a single exception, they agree that some legislation is necessary. They agree that jurisdictional and wildcat strikes should be prohibited. They agree that they should be held responsible and be given authority to prohibit such strikes.

They agree that violence in strikes must be stopped. They are willing to assume responsibility, if given authority, to stop violence in all cases where the governor of a State or a mayor of a city fails to do his duty and uphold law and order. If they had been given that responsibility and power then the outrages perpetrated at the Allis-Chalmers plant would not have taken place, nor would the farmers have been prevented from bringing food into the city of New York a few years ago.

These leaders know that the public will no longer tolerate the disastrous effects of a strike that affects a large part or the Nation as a whole. They are willing that a law be passed that would set forth the terms and conditions under which an industry that does affect the welfare of the Nation would be continued in operation during a strike.

I feel that we cannot justify our support of this bill and square it with our conscience except on the grounds of expediency. You may ease your political conscience temporarily, but the ghost will return and haunt you.

You will not be permitted to crucify labor upon the altar of false propaganda and slander—upon the blunders and mistakes of the industrialists. Labor has furnished its full quota of fighting men and its full quota in the field of production. It performed a miracle. It supplied half the world with arms and munitions and war implements.

Oh, I have heard the remark that the wise thing to do is to vote for this bill because the Senate will improve it. My answer is that we have no right to hide behind the skirts of the Senate. This House has done that on several occasions. The responsibility is ours. It is here now. I hope that the bill will be recommitted to the committee and that it will bring in a simple bill that will be just to both labor and industry—that will do justice and protect the public.

I fear that, in a moment of emotion and excitement, we are about to pass a bill that will have far-reaching consequences. Would it not be wise if this House took a 30-day cooling-off period—a 30-day cooling-off period from emotion and false propaganda—propaganda that would have us go back to the Dark Ages in labor legislation?

Congress cannot pass a law to make a person work if he does not wish to—especially not if he has a grievance. Such an attempt is contrary to our experience and contrary to human nature. It never can be enforced except by a dictator and then only with a gun and club.

Henry Ford 2d, on January 9, 1946, in Detroit, discussing strikes before the Society of Automotive Engineers, said:

> As we look at these problems in human relations we feel that the solution must be found through a closer understanding between management and labor. If we cannot succeed by cooperation, it doesn't seem likely that we can succeed by an exercise of force.
>
> We cannot, for example, expect legislation to solve our problems. Laws which seek to force large groups of Americans to do what they believe is unfair and against their best interests are not likely to succeed. In fact, such legislation can lead to exaggeration of the very problem it is designed to solve. And when freemen give up the task of trying to get along with each other, and pass the buck to government, they surrender a substantial measure of their freedom.

In conclusion let us remember that we always enslave ourselves by enslaving others first. There are too many who ask for the protection of the Constitution when it comes to their rights but forget it when it comes to the rights of others.

May I beg you to once more observe the Constitution. There has been a growing tendency, not only on the part of the Executive, but, on the part of Congress and the Judiciary, to attempt

to hide behind the Constitution when it serves their purpose and to throw it out of the window when it does not. We have done fairly well for over 150 years under that instrument.

Let us not now in a moment of emotional hysteria, unconstitutionally crucify labor and in the end lose our own liberty. It may take a little more courage to vote your honest conviction on this bill, but in the end right will triumph. The Nation is and will recover its calmer and saner judgment.

The overwhelming majority of organized labor is just as much interested in the success of our Government as we are. Whenever the time comes when love for our country and patriotism fall so low that this kind of drastic legislation is necessary, then the Republic that you and I have cherished and love, the Republic that the world has looked to as a model of justice, will be dead. Then we will have surrendered all that is sacred and good in our form of constitutional government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am unable to vote for H. R. 3020 in its present form. I am certain that the great majority of the American people and their representatives in the Congress are anxious to enact a long-range labor-management program which will restore peaceful industrial relations between labor and management, and protect the rights of both labor and management and at the same time preserve the rights of the public and protect against the hardships and suffering resulting from Nation-wide strikes in key industries endangering the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

This bill has many provisions in it that are praiseworthy and should be enacted into law. On the other hand it has a number of provisions which would, in my judgment, foster industrial disputes rather than avoid or settle them. It is an omnibus bill and covers a multitude of labor-management issues which are highly controversial, some of which should stand on their own feet and not be sandwiched in with other less controversial issues which could receive the approval of the Congress and the President. Our country has built up an industrial system which is the admiration of the world in its effectiveness. By reason of it we were able to supply not only the armed forces of our country during the late war but to be the arsenal and warehouse for our Allies as well. Without an efficient industrial program and cooperation between labor and capital this could not have been done.

We cannot, however, close our eyes to the fact that there are defects in the system which should be cured and that means should be provided for curbing Nation-wide industrial disputes endangering the health, welfare, and safety of the Nation. Likewise jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes should be banned, labor racketeers eliminated, and violence and other similar practices should be outlawed. In doing so, however, we should not deprive labor of its rights, long recognized by our courts, to organize and bargain collectively and maintain adequate and effective unions for the preservation of their rights. A concentration of capital and power in a few hands in our great industrial empires have made it impossible for labor to secure adequate protection except through organization and collective bargaining. And there are many provisions in this omnibus bill which would seriously curtail if not destroy these well-earned rights of labor and they should be eliminated from the bill.

There is no hope that this bill will be enacted into law as it was reported by the House committee. Furthermore there is strong probability that if passed by both House and the Senate it would receive the disapproval of the President. I believe we should be forthright and approach the problem from a realistic standpoint and not attempt to penalize or chastise labor by enacting a bill containing provisions so drastic that there is no possibility of it becoming a law. If we want to make headway and enact labor legislation that will help minimize industrial disputes and restore peaceful relations between labor and management we should eliminate these drastic provisions from this bill so that we may at least have some legislation from the Eightieth Congress that will help solve our industrial problems. I hope when it comes back from the Senate it will be amended so I may support it.

I call attention to the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post of April 16 which points out the error of attempting to include in one omnibus bill so many highly controversial issues which from the practical standpoint insure the defeat of the legislation:

[From the Washington Post of April 16, 1947]

OVERDOING IT

Chairman ALLEN, of the Rules Committee, indulged in no exaggeration when he said in the opening debate on the House labor bill that "this undoubtedly is one of the most far reaching and * * * important bills that any Member of this Congress will be asked to vote on." The bill outlines a new national policy governing the relations between management and labor and the relations of both to government. To say that it is sweeping in its terms is an understatement. We can get nearer to the truth by saying that it is a vast and complex network of ideas—many of them undigested ideas—dumped into an omnibus bill without much regard for what the net effect upon our economy may be.

We think the bill contains numerous constructive provisions. For example, it would recognize unfair labor practices on the part of unions as well as employers. It is an attempt to democratize unionism, to correct such evils as mass picketing, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes that imperil the national welfare. The trouble is that in many instances it invokes crude and repressive remedies. It is not a carefully devised effort to redress the balance between industry and labor; on the contrary, it is a sharp swing of the pendulum in the direction of unreasonable restraints on organized labor. It is not surprising that the long delay in correcting the defects of the old system should produce this sort of a reaction. But this explanation of why the bill has taken the shape it has still does not make it intelligent legislation.

No doubt the bill will be vehemently assailed because it would abolish the NLRB and set up in its place a Labor-Management Relations Board. But this may prove to be one of its happier aspects. The main idea behind the proposed change is to separate the prosecuting and judging functions of the NLRB. The task of investigating alleged unfair labor practices, of preparing complaints, and carrying on all the executive work under the act would be assigned to an Administrator. The Board would become a truly quasi-judicial body for the hearing and deciding of cases taken before it. With unions and their officials certain to be hailed before the Board on charges of unfair practices, this effort to secure greater objectivity in its decisions might reasonably be welcomed by labor.

But the House Committee on Education and Labor was not content to give the Board a more judicious character or even to rewrite the Wagner Act. It has provided for a system of judicial review that might tie up most of the vital business of the Board in the courts for rehearing. The bill also sweeps on to take many labor problems out of the hands of the Board and Administrator and lodge them in the courts by restoring use of the injunction to cope with certain forms of picketing, illegal boycotts, jurisdictional strikes and so forth.

Especially unsound, in our opinion, is the provision which would authorize the President to secure an injunction to halt any strike which he believed to threaten curtailment of essential public services. We have often emphasized the necessity of providing some means of dealing with union tyrants, such as John L. Lewis, who are willing to paralyze our entire economy for the sake of gaining their ends. But in all conscience, free use of the injunction in public utility walk-outs is not the answer. Let the Government take over an industry essential to the public health, safety, and welfare, if necessary, while a dispute is being settled. But certainly the Government should not intervene by means of an injunction and then rely upon the crude machinery that would be created by the House bill to bring about a fair settlement.

Nor is this all. The bill would abolish the closed shop (although authorizing some forms of the union shop), outlaw industry-wide collective bargaining, create a new conciliation service outside of the Labor Department and set up a rather crude system for balloting among employees before strikes could be called. It is too much of an undigested lump. We doubt that many members of the committee are familiar with its details. Certainly the rank and file of House Members are not. And the great American public is almost completely ignorant of what Congress is trying to do.

This is not the way to secure sound legislation. It is not even good politics. At the very least, it seems to us, the bill should be broken down into three sections—one modifying the Wagner Act and the other two dealing with the Conciliation Service and emergency handling of utility strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do we see any chance of the country understanding what its legislative arm is doing. If the steamroller which seems to be going into action in the House disregards this widespread demand, the chief burden of legislating in this field will fall upon the Senate, where evidence of a more responsible attitude is apparent. Failure of the Senate to heed current warning signals would doubtless result in a veto, and the whole mess would be in the lap of Congress once more. The time to avert such a calamity is now while it is still possible to strip this legislation to reasonable proportions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

IF MEMBERS HAD TIME FOR REAL STUDY THEY WOULD NOT APPROVE THIS MOST INFAMOUS BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the fact that the vast majority of Members are so preoccupied with legitimate requests from their home districts, coming from manufacturers, businessmen, and others, requiring many conferences in the executive agencies, and frequent visits to those offices, that they seldom have any opportunity of really studying national problems.

Had they any time to devote to reading, to face-to-face conversations with the workers and the housewives and the little people who cannot send telegrams or make visits to Washington, I am sure they would never be constrained by the pressures from the national Republican organization to put their stamp of approval on this most infamous bill.

HOW HAS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE BEEN RESTRAINED?

Much has been said about free enterprise in the propaganda which has whipped up sentiment for this omnibus punitive measure. Industrial leaders have said that free enterprise has been interfered with. How, Mr. Chairman, how? In what way has private enterprise—I cannot bring myself to speak of free enterprise when the facts show that big business has made free enterprise only a memory—in what way has private enterprise been prevented in any way from achieving the greatest profits, the greatest surpluses, the greatest reserves, in all history?

Mr. Chairman, I really do believe in free enterprise. My whole life has been devoted to freedom—freedom of the individual, freedom of business, freedom of conscience.

THERE IS NO PLACE IN AMERICA FOR ISMS

Mr. Chairman, I am as much opposed to communism as any gentleman who has preceded me. Before most of you were born I fought communism and socialism. Therefore, nothing that I say here can be misconstrued as a defense of communism. I have said, and I repeat, that there is no place in the United States for communism. I always have been and I always shall be heart and soul for our democratic form of Government, and surely there is no room for any isms when we have democracy.

However, I have asked for recognition because I have been amazed to hear the statements of my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] and others who have spoken of his amendment, who have generally been opposed to organized labor, urging that this amendment is in the interest of the unions.

I repeat, it is, indeed, amazing, in view of their long antagonism, that they should now be so solicitous of the laboring man.

LABOR DID NOT BRING ABOUT FALL OF FRANCE

Mr. Chairman, I fear that the gentleman has left an unfortunate and erroneous impression by his remarks. I understood him to say that France fell to Nazi aggression because of lack of support of the national government by labor.

I believe that full study of the history of that unhappy country prior to its conquest by the Hitler hordes would show conclusively and indubitably that France fell because of the damnable conspiracy of the traitors, the quislings, the Nazi sympathizers among the French industrialists and politicians, and the cartelists, who had no fear of Hitler but sought the defeat of Russia. The workers of France, not the fanatic friends of Germany and the Nazi ideology, gave the only strength there was to the resistance.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BELL. Does the gentleman deny that for more than a year prior to the invasion of France by the Nazis, industry in France had been practically at a standstill? Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. BELL. I thought that was the situation—that the gentleman did not know.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, many of the military and political and business leaders of prewar France have been convicted already of collaboration and many others are in prison awaiting trial, but I have yet to hear of any labor leader or any laborer tried for treason to his country in that land. The betrayers of France were the powerful of France. It was they who were responsible for the crushing of the French Army, of the break-through of the Maginot Line—not from the front but from the rear—and of the complete collapse of French resistance when the big push came. The evidence shows that disloyal French generals had furnished the Nazis with information as to the weakest points in the Maginot Line, with maps, with full communications and defense plans, and finally with contradictory and confusing orders. The fall of France was inevitable; and the betrayal came from the highest places.

CANNOT SUPPORT AMENDMENT

I cannot, Mr. Chairman, support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]; and I find myself in full accord with the opposition expressed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe the chairman of the committee also is opposed to the amendment, because he believes in his heart that the provisions already in the bill are so drastic and far-reaching that the adoption of this amendment would imperil the passage of the bill. Of course, I do not mean that I would hope for defeat in the House; but the Members of the other body will have a much greater opportunity for study of this bill designed to destroy organized labor, and any further destructive provisions might bring about that eventuality.

Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I endorse and adopt the strong condemnation of the bill expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], who have pointed out its unfairness and the adverse effect it is bound to have on the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me point out that in spite of the tremendous increase in the cost of living, we are in a period of unprecedented industrial peace. In January of this year, the latest figures available, time lost from labor-management controversies reached a postwar low, and was less than for any month since March 1945.

Why not leave well enough alone and encourage real free enterprise?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

This body does not contain a Member who is a more stanch American than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]. I will not be charged with being reticent in exposing Communists on this floor. You have indulged me for the last 10 years on that subject. I am forced to admit, however, that we have former Communists who are now rendering yeoman service to the Government of the United States, outside of Government office. Here in Washington we have men who were former Communists who are now rendering splendid service to the protection of the United States Government.

I would like to point out that one of the instruments by which Communists seek to destroy this country is class warfare. The record of strikes in this country in 1946 is not progress. The record is nearly 5,000 of such strikes, causing a loss of 116,000,000 man-days of labor. That is not progress. That is class warfare. I am not ready to believe, and I do not believe that the rank and file of American labor caused all these strikes. Neither do I believe that all union leadership is the cause of such strikes. But I do believe that the subversive elements which we are attempting to cover by this amendment are the cause and behind a great deal of our labor unrest and stoppage of production. For that reason, we should adopt this amendment, even though it may strike in some places where we do not intend to have it strike. No greater menace faces the security and welfare of this country than the menace of communism in our midst.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that no man can resign from the Communist Party. The only way he can get out is to be expelled. They consider him a member until they expel him.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; and if he was in some other country he would not be expelled. He would be liquidated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr.

MUNDT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 40, noes 119.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BELL) there were—ayes 153, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE: Insert on page 10, line 10, after the period "6. Pension plans, group-insurance benefits, hospitalization benefits."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to minimize the interferences with collective bargaining which are implicit under the section to which this amendment applies. I regard such interferences with collective bargaining by the Government as unwarranted. These matters should be left for negotiation between labor and management.

The argument has been advanced that the innocent must suffer for the guilty. I do not subscribe to that argument. In order to punish John L. Lewis, I consider it neither necessary nor right to punish large groups of people who are in no way involved in the battle between John L. Lewis and the Government.

The argument is also advanced that welfare matters of this kind constitute in effect a tax upon the American customer. Along that line of reasoning, it might just as easily be contended that a wage rise is a tax on the American customer. Are we now going to indulge in price fixing by so limiting collective bargaining?

The omission of these matters from the right to collective bargaining will, in my opinion, result in demands by the unions for wage rises in order to compensate them for their losses in this connection. It will result also, I think, in demands for greater social security since they will be deprived of the security which would result from these benefits. This will, indeed, create additional taxes upon the American people.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Probably one of the most gratuitous pieces of legislative meddling in a bill which, I regret, is outstanding only in its contribution to industrial unrest, is that provision of H. R. 3020 which makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to assist a union by making a payment to it or to contribute to a fund of any kind controlled to any degree by a labor organization. I refer to section 8 (a) (2) (C) (ii).

I have examined this particular clause with all of the analytical powers in my possession—and—unless one concludes that honest, voluntarily chosen union organizations are completely incapable of mature management of trust moneys—an idea which is completely absurd on its face—I can find no rational basis whatever for this proposal of the bill. If an employer contributes to a union fund for the benefit of employees, no fair-minded man could question that the employer should have a say in how the money is spent. But here the employer would be forbidden to make any contribution at all—no matter how noble the purpose or useful the money to the sick, the injured, the unemployed, or the destitute in any community—as long as the union also contributed to this fund and insisted rightfully upon a proportionate voice in its management.

One of the finest contributions of management and labor toward the health of the community on a completely cooperative and private basis are numerous health benefit programs providing medical care, hospitalization and preventive treatment to union members and their dependents. Funds for these programs are established by collective-bargaining agreements covering more than 600,000 workers in 15 international unions. And that is without considering the welfare fund in the mine industry set up and managed jointly by the Government and the union. One-third of these employees are shown by a study of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to have been receiving these benefits from funds jointly administered by the union and the employer. In somewhat less than a third, unions assume the responsibilities of management. And in the remainder the administration is vested in insurance companies. All of these funds receive joint contributions from the employer and the union. Therefore, plans benefiting approximately 400,000 employees—not to mention their dependents—would be banned by this measure.

The bill does not make any nice distinctions as to the kinds of contributions—or kinds of union assistance—which would be unlawful. Legitimate charges for customary services rendered—such as payments for the union label furnished by the union—are lumped together with every kind of welfare provision. Health benefits, pensions, retirement benefits, aid to dependents, life insurance—all of these legitimate purposes relieving the State from a heavy part of the public burdens which illness and insecurity would otherwise impose. And all of these purposes would be deprived of employer contribution because of some imaginary stigma attaching to even the most indirect union control.

I have studied the report of the Committee on Education and Labor to find its comments upon the provisions of this clause. I found only these:

First, there was made the observation that employers should pay these contributions into wages and should be forbidden to pay them into welfare funds in a conspiracy with unions to mulct employees. Does the committee actually expect the Members of this House to believe that employers and unions are engaged in a conspiracy to mulct employees when they set up a jointly administered trust fund for medical-care and hospitalization payments under the strict scrutiny of our trust laws? This is a monstrous and completely unfounded charge demonstrating the woeful irresponsibility among those who support this measure. There is not one instance in the record from which any member of that committee can point to the mismanagement or misuse of medical or insurance funds jointly established and jointly administered by labor and management. Yet contribution to such funds by the employer would be prohibited.

The second comment that I found in the majority report was that the Supreme Court has indicated that employer payments to welfare funds are inconsistent with those present provisions of section 8 of the Wagner Act, which set out the duty of employers to refrain from dominating unions. Now nothing could be further from the truth. Bargaining on this type of welfare-fund system is completely within the area of appropriate collective bargaining under the present provisions of the act—and I challenge any Member of this House to show me a holding of our high Court to the contrary.

There is one more point which I wish to stress. Not only would employer contributions to these welfare funds be outlawed, but let me state here and now that under section 12 any concerted activity interfering with operations and engaged in for the purpose of obtaining such a contribution would be met by the heavy penalties and triple damages of the antitrust laws—the severest penalties which this Congress has been able to devise.

On the other hand, does the employer have to bargain with a union even about legitimate contributions to welfare funds? Not at all Under section 2 (11), he can simply sit back in his chair and refuse to discuss the matter, regardless of its merits. In other words, he can compel the union to resort to a perfectly legal strike under this bill in order to obtain the most reasonable demands. The union would be powerless to resort the negotiation; mediators would be useless; arbitration out of the question.

Now, gentlemen, what position should we realistically take in this matter? It seems to me that it is in the sound interest of free enterprise—and of preventing dependence upon the State—for this Government to assist and encourage, rather than delimit and destroy, the formulation and development, through voluntary agreements, of plans that will aid citizens during times of misfortune and distress. The alternative—presented by this bill—is just one more step toward making the worker the ward of the State and toward increasing the demand for public support when the State refuses to private industry the power and right to help itself. This alternative is totalitarianism in its purest form.

This, gentlemen, is the bill which would save our country from the costly delays and damage to production that results from labor disputes! No reasonable man can subscribe to these measures. I fervently hope that the great

American people will hear of this fraud upon the public before these measures cast an inevitable blight upon the industrial future of our land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LODGE) there were—ayes 62, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I have been devoting all my time from early morning to late at night since the labor bill was submitted to the House to consideration of that bill. The President stated the need for labor legislation in his state of the Union message to Congress. I realize that probably no labor bill could be satisfactory in all its phases to everyone. There are phases of the present bill which I am not satisfied with.

The bill does not make provision for present welfare funds of unions nor to continuing them and I feel that it should.

The bill eliminates industry-wide bargaining and I feel that that should be continued until that phase of labor-management relations is canvassed more fully. The bill, of course, does provide for company-wide bargaining. That is, the Ford or General Electric or American Telephone and Telegraph unions could bargain on a company-wide scale even though the plants of these companies are scattered throughout the country.

The country has been torn with labor-management strife since the war's end. Arrogant labor leaders such as John L. Lewis have set themselves up as super-governments contrary to the welfare of the country. The Nation is sick and all must agree that medicine is necessary to correct the condition. As doctors sometime disagree as to the amount of medicine needed, so fair-minded people can disagree in the present case as to the amount of corrective legislation which is needed.

I have attempted to weigh the merits and demerits of the bill as I see them and I have come to the conclusion that the good by far outweighs the bad.

Some of the benefits to the workingman are:

First. A worker can now unite with fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union they want, not the union that is forced upon them.

Second. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free union election.

Third. The right to continue working and receive his pay in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

Fourth. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

Fifth. The right to an accounting of union funds and their expenditure and to express his opinion on union affairs without fear of retaliation.

Sixth. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except after a hearing for, first, not paying dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the union; third, violating the union's contract; fourth, being a Communist or fellow traveler; fifth, being convicted of a felony, that is, of a serious crime; sixth, engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union.

Seventh. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested.

Consequently, I have decided to vote for the bill. I fully expect that some of the unfavorable features, as I see them, will be eliminated when the Senate bill is passed and the Senate and House bills go to a conference committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ABOLITION OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD; EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN CHANGES

SEC. 102. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "new act" means the National Labor Relations Act as amended by this title, and the term "old act" means the National Labor Relations Act prior to such amendment.

(b) The National Labor Relations Board created under section 3 of the old act is abolished, effective 30 days after the date upon which a majority of the members of the Labor-Management Relations Board created under section 3 of the new act have qualified and taken office, or 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, whichever date first occurs. Until the date upon which the abolition of the National Labor Relations Board becomes effective, the old act, except as provided in this section, shall remain in effect, except that this provision shall not prevent the Labor-Management Relations Board from organizing, employing personnel, prescribing regulations, and taking such other action as may be necessary to enable it to undertake and perform its duties under the new act from and after the date upon which the National Labor Relations Board is abolished.

(c) When the abolition of the National Labor Relations Board becomes effective, all of the records and property of such Board shall be transferred to and become the records and property of the Labor-Management Relations Board, proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board which (if initiated before the Labor-Management Relations Board under the new act) could have been maintained under the new act, and proceedings for the enforcement or review of orders of the National Labor Relations Board which (if issued by the Labor-Management Relations Board under the new act) the Labor-Management Relations Board would have had authority to issue, shall not abate by reason of such abolition, but shall, upon application of any party in interest be continued, the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act being substituted as investigator, complainant, or petitioner, as the case may be.

(d) No provision of section 8 of the new act shall be deemed to make an unfair labor practice any act which was performed prior to the date of the enactment of this act and which did not constitute an unfair labor practice under the old act; and the provisions of section 8 (a) (3) of the new act shall not make an unfair labor practice the performance within 6 months after the date of the enactment of the new act of any obligation under a collective-bargaining contract entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act if the performance of such obligation would not have constituted an unfair labor practice under section 8 (3) of the old act.

(e) No provision of section 8 (c) of the new act shall be deemed to make an unfair labor practice any act or practice which is required by the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization in question, until 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act.

(f) No provision of section 9 of the new act shall affect any certification of representatives or any determination as to the appropriate collective-bargaining unit, which was made under section 9 of the old act, until 1 year after the date of such certification, or, if a collective-bargaining contract (entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act) is in effect, until the end of the original contract period or until 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, whichever first occurs.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to 3 days of debate on H. R. 3020, the 1947 labor bill. Before the opening of the debate, I read and reread the bill and have attended several of the hearings of the committee. There is so much in this bill that is good, that it is a shame that the excellent features of the bill had to be combined with features that made the bill too objectionable. I have heard members rise and apologize for their vote for this bill and express the hope that the other body will put into the bill modifications which will make the bill acceptable to them. It is my feeling that the corrections should have been made by the committee itself and by the House. I have heard Members state that they wanted a hard, firm bill, in order to be in a better position in the Congress. I am voting against this bill and make no apologies to anyone for the position which I am taking. There will be those who will write me and express dismay because of my position. When they do this, I know full well that they have not read the 68 pages that make up this bill and will not be willing to read the RECORD and judge for themselves what action they would have taken, had they been present to listen to the debate. This is not only a bad bill for labor, but I am thoroughly convinced that it is a bad bill for business. Of course, business will not have the opportunity of seeing the actual results which would obtain were this bill actually to be put into operation in its present form. I say this because I know that the other body will modify considerably the provisions of the

bill that we are asked to vote upon. In any event, this bill will be vetoed by the President of the United States.

It would have been far better to have presented to the House of Representatives several bills embodying the good features contained in this bill such as the provisions for additional democracy within unions, the financial responsibility and rendering statements to union members and other features. Time does not permit me to go through each and every provision contained in this bill, but I am satisfied that those in management who believe this to be a proper measure, will not agree to every provision contained in this bill. We are called upon to vote upon the entire bill and are not permitted to vote for parts of it. That being the case, I am left no choice.

Stirring speeches have been made about injustices and racketeering, as well as the inroads made by communism into the labor organizations. Believe me, I should like to correct these situations and they could be corrected in a single bill and a bill which would pass the other body without question and which the President could not possibly veto. A great deal of emotionalism has been displayed on the floor today, but I am here to represent my district and the United States and not be swayed by emotionalism but by hard, cold facts. We shall have to account for our actions not as of today nor of next week, but as of a couple of years from now. I can well justify my opposition to this bill in spite of the fact that I know it will pass this body by an overwhelming vote. I prefer to take the position which I can justify, rather than one which I could never explain.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a brief analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago we had distributed on the floor a mimeographed sheet entitled "Labor's New Bill of Rights Under the Hartley Bill H. R. 3020." Now a group of us felt that that analysis did not represent just exactly our attitude. Of course, it is a difference in attitude that makes horse races. So, some 30 of us have prepared an analysis which you will find at the Doorkeeper's desk, if you are interested in it, in which we set forth what we think the bill actually does.

I might, in the time left to me, enumerate some of the things that I think the bill does and some of the things the rest of us think it does, and we also define each one of the statements in the analysis with citations to particular sections to support our thoughts on that subject:

THE HARTLEY BILL—A NEW GUARANTY OF INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

1. The employer is granted new rights and powers to destroy labor and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining. (Secs. 1, 2, 7, 8 (b), 8 (c), 8 (d), 9 (a), 9 (c) (2), 9 (c) (3), 9 (f), 10, 203.)

2. The employer is given the right to bring antitrust actions against his employees, to institute criminal prosecutions against them, to sue them for treble damages and to obtain ex parte injunctions without a hearing against them. (Secs. 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c), 301.) But the employer's violation of the law is subject merely to a cease-and-desist order issued after administrative hearing and court review. (Sec. 10 (c).)

3. The employer is granted the right to compel employees to accept a wage cut through forced labor for indefinite periods of time. (Secs. 2 (11) (B), 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 203, 204.)

4. The employer receives the right to break strikes caused by his own illegal conduct. (Secs. 2 (3), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c), 301.)

5. The employer is granted the right to obtain injunctions against strikes which have been legal for the past 50 years. (Secs. 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c).)

6. The employer retains the right to bargain through an employers' association but bargaining through national unions is outlawed. (Secs. 2 (2), 2 (16), 9 (f) (1).)

7. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to play employees against each other. (Secs. 2 (11) (B), 8 (b) (3), 9 (d), 9 (f) (2).)

8. The employer is granted the right to sit at both sides of the bargaining table by establishing company unions. (Secs. 8 (a) (2), 8 (d) (3), 9 (f) (4), 10 (c).)

9. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to refuse to bargain about such matters as health and welfare plans, apprentice-training programs and speed-up. (Secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C).)

10. The employer is given the right to break a strike for recognition even though the union represents an overwhelming majority of the employees. (Secs. 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c).)

11. The employer is given the right to outlaw and to crush any strike by hiring strikebreakers even though the strike is caused by his own misconduct. (Secs. 2 (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c).)

12. The employer is given the right to cooperate with antilabor employers in order to destroy unions. (Secs. 2 (13), 2 (14), 12 (a) (3).)

13. The employer is given the right to lock out and blacklist office clerks if they join a union. (Secs. 2 (3), 2 (12), 12 (a) (3).)

14. The employer is given the right to invoke injunctions, treble damage suits and criminal penalties against the employees in one department if they strike against a wage cut in another department. (Secs. 2 (13), 12 (a) (3), 301.)

15. The employer is given the right to instigate criminal prosecutions against individuals who exercise the right to picket. (Secs. 12 (a) (1), 12 (a) (2), 301.)

16. The employer is given the right to prevent the designation of a bargaining agent for a period of years. (Secs. 3, 9 (c) (3), 10 (f).)

17. Spies may be planted in the union ranks by the employer and the union is powerless to expel them. (Secs. 8 (d) (4), 10.)

18. The employer is given the right to grant or deny union security as he wishes; he is not required even to discuss it with the union, and he may crush a strike or a threat of strike to obtain it. (Secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 8 (d) (4), 9 (g), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301.)

19. The employer is given the right to crush any strike when a collective-bargaining contract exists, even if the strike is caused by an issue not covered by the contract. (Secs. 2 (11) (A), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301.)

20. The employer is given the power to obtain from the Government a death warrant for the union of his employees. (Secs. 8 (b), 8 (c), 9 (f), 10 (a), 10 (c), 12 (d).)

Sponsored by the following Members: JOHN LESINSKI, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, ADAM C. POWELL, JR., RAY J. MADDEN, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, JOHN F. KENNEDY, CHET HOLIFIELD, FRANCK R. HAVENNER, GEORGE P. MILLER, MARTIN GORSKI, THOMAS S. GORDON, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, FRANK M. KARSTEN, WALTER B. HUBER, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, JOHN D. DINGELL, MARY T. NORTON, JOHN A. BLATNIK, MIKE MANSFIELD, WALTER K. GRANGER, JOHN A. CARROLL, JOHN KEE, ADOLPH J. SABATH, MELVIN PRICE, DONALD L. O'TOOLE, EMANUEL CELLER, CECIL R. KING, AIME J. FORAND, HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, VITO MARCANTONIO, JOHN E. FOGARTY, THOMAS E. MORGAN, FRANK BUCHANAN.

Mr. Chairman, not only is this not labor's bill of rights, this gives the employers the right to eliminate union organization except on a very restricted basis. The whole history of our Nation, the whole raising of the standard of living of our Nation, has come through union organization. The increase in purchasing power of the mass of the people has come through their right to organize and bargain collectively. Without that purchasing power the American system of free enterprise will collapse. We have in this Nation great monopolies Nation-wide in their scope, Nation-wide in their pricing arrangement, Nation-wide in their operation. They can sit around the table and agree upon a Nation-wide policy regarding maximum wages to their employees, but you deny the employees the rights you give the employers in this bill.

American workers will not suffer these injustices and indignities in silence and inaction. I warn you today that the passage of this iniquitous bill will bring trouble, strife, and bloodshed to the industrial scene in America. You cannot enforce servitude on freemen with laws or bayonets. History will prove my prophecy.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES IN INDUSTRIES AFFECTING COMMERCE

OFFICE OF CONCILIATION

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government an Office of Conciliation, at the head of which shall be a Director of Conciliation (hereinafter called the "Director"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. Appointment of the Director shall be made without regard to political affiliations and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the Office in an efficient and impartial manner. The Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees and make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions. Conciliators may be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws, but their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Neither the Director nor any officer or employee of the Director shall act as an arbitrator in any labor dispute.

(c) The principal office of the Director shall be in the District of Columbia, but he may establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise. He may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any officer or employee of the

Director. The Director may establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local agencies, and utilize the facilities and personnel of such agencies when adequate and when available without cost.

(d) The Director shall make an annual report in writing to Congress.

(e) All mediation and conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor or the United States Conciliation Service under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 51), and all functions of the United States Conciliation Service are transferred to the Director. Such transfer shall take effect upon the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this act. Such transfer shall not affect any proceedings pending before the United States Conciliation Service or any certification, order, rule, or regulation theretofore made by it or the Secretary of Labor.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 55, line 12, strike out the comma and the remainder of the line and all of lines 13 and 14.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF CONCILIATION

SEC. 202. (a) It shall be the duty of the Director, in order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes—

(1) to encourage employers and employees in industries affecting commerce to make and maintain agreements concerning wages, hours, and working conditions, and to encourage such employers and employees to settle their differences by conferences between representatives of the parties and by other peaceful means without resort to strikes, lock-outs, or any form of coercion or violence; and

(2) to assist parties to labor disputes in industries affecting commerce to settle such disputes through conciliation.

(b) The Director may, in his discretion, proffer his services in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon his own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute. Whenever the Director does proffer his services in any such dispute, it shall be the duty of the Director promptly to put himself in communication with the parties and to use his best efforts, by conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lock-out, or other coercion. The failure or refusal of either party to agree to any procedure suggested by the Director shall not be deemed a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act.

STRIKES IMPERILING PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the President finds that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in, the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to the public health, safety, or interest, the President shall direct the Attorney General to petition, in the name of the United States, any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin acts or practices in connection with such dispute which are causing or threatening to cause the cessation or substantial curtailment of such services. If the court finds, after due hearing, that the acts or practices complained of are causing, or imminently threatening to cause, the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in such services, and are thereby imperiling, or imminently threatening to imperil, the public health, safety, or interest, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such acts or practices and to make such other orders consistent with the continued maintenance of such services as it deems appropriate. Such orders may include provisions to facilitate the voluntary settlement of the dispute. Any settlement of the dispute shall be retroactive to the date of the issuance of the injunction, or to the date of the expiration of any applicable contract, whichever of such dates last occurs.

(b) In any such case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable.

(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28 secs. 346 and 347).

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any court to require any individual to render labor or service without his consent, or to forbid any individual from quitting his employment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 57, line 10 to page 58, line 21, strike out the text of section 203 and substitute the following:

"SEC. 203. Whenever the President finds after investigation and proclaims that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in an industry essential to the public health or security, of sufficient magnitude to imperil or imminently threaten to imperil the public health or security, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to preserve and protect the public health or security, the President is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto, and by order to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or facility, the subject of such labor dispute, and to use and to operate such plant, mine, or facility in the interests of the United States; *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of the United States and while operated in its interests, shall be operated only to the minimum extent which seems to the President necessary to protect the public health or security of the United States, or of any material part of the territory or population thereof; and (2) the wages and other terms of employment in the plant, mine, or facility so taken, during the period of Government possession and operation shall be as prescribed by the President pursuant to the applicable provisions of law, and to the findings of a panel or commission specially designated or appointed for the purpose by the President, which wages and other terms of employment shall be not less than those prevailing for similar work in the area of such plant, mine, or facility by private business; and (3) such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or facility, that the possession and operation, thereof, by the United States, or in its interests, is no longer necessary to insure the minimum operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the public health or security; and (4) the President may by order confer authority upon any Government department or officer to take possession of, to operate, or to exercise any other of the powers herein granted to the President with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility; and (5) fair and just compensation shall be paid to the employer for the period of such possession and operation by the United States, or in its interests, as follows:

"(A) The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid as rental for the use of such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of or operated by the United States, or in its interests, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder.

"(B) If the employer is unwilling to accept as a fair and just compensation for the use of the property taken hereunder by the United States and as full and complete compensation therefor, the amount so determined by the President, the employer shall be paid 50 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided by sections 24 (20) and 145 of the judicial code (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 41 and 250), for an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid shall be equal to the total sum which the employer considers to be fair and just compensation for the use of the property so taken by the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed, though necessarily long in words, is brief in thought.

It proposes a substitute for the provision in the bill which says that in the event of a strike, or threat of strike, curtailing a public utility and imperiling the national health, safety, or interest, the President may direct the Attorney General to obtain an injunction, an injunction to deal with such acts or practices as are threatening this curtailment.

In short, it means that any collective activity of the employees in that particular public utility which will result in their going out on strike will be enjoined by the court. This section of the bill is careful to state that it does not make anybody work or prevent anybody from quitting, but we know as a practical matter that that kind of an injunction will make working people continue to work, if—and it is a big if—the injunction is effective.

The point of my amendment is to substitute for the injunction procedure now in the bill, which I consider involuntary servitude and ineffective in the public interest, a procedure for national seizure in any industry essential to the national health or security by which the President, in the exercise of his power in a national emergency, may seize any plant, mine, or facility of such magnitude that existing or directly threatened labor strife in it will imperil the national health or security, so that it may continue to operate. But when he seizes the property, the President is bound by five provisos. Those provisos are designed to profit from the experience which we have had in wartime seizures up to now. First, the property is not to be operated on a strikebreaking basis, but it is to be operated by the Government only to the minimum extent required for the public health or security.

Second, the employees—those who remain working—are to be paid the prevailing wages paid by private business in the area, so long as the property is in Government possession.

Third, the plant is to be restored to the ownership of the employer when normal labor relations have been restored.

Fourth, the President may exercise his powers through any Government department, or through a special officer for that purpose; and

Fifth, and this is very important, management is not just to continue to operate at its own profit or loss, as often has been the case in previous seizures of industrial property, but the Government is required to pay just compensation. It will, however, be paying compensation for use of the property in a struck or near-struck condition, and not for the use of the property in a going-concern condition, because that is the only time the Government takes it over.

This amendment sums up the basis of my whole opposition to this bill.

That is why I made it a point to speak on this section dealing with strikes imperiling public health and safety. This bill—and I say this not invidiously, for I think the bill is expertly drawn, from the point of view of the draftsmen, to button it up in order to carry out their ideas—but the policy of the bill trades on the fear of the American people—a very real fear and a very justifiable fear—that any labor group might paralyze the country's economy by a strike, whether it be in coal, steel, railroads, telephones, or tugboats.

I agree, and I think every Member of this House agrees, that the public interest is what we are here to protect—it, and it alone, is paramount to every other interest. I have therefore proposed an amendment to the bill which will enable us to serve the public interest. No public utility or essential industry should be permitted to paralyze the community at the will of the employees who work in it, or of their leaders, or of the employer.

I urge that what we should have done if we really wanted to serve the public interest was to pass a bill which would carry into effect some such scheme as I have proposed to deal with strikes imperiling the public health or security. It need not necessarily have been mine, it could have been any other; but some such bill should have been passed to first relieve the people of their perfectly understandable fear of national stoppage. Then we should have brought in bills to deal with such things as union democracy and responsibility, monopolistic boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and additional unfair labor practices. Then we would be undertaking regulation of labor-union organization and practice and reforms in collective bargaining, not driven by public fear but as statesmen. What is being attempted here is what was attempted in the portal-to-portal pay bill, and I argued against it then, too, as a matter of statesmanship. I said then, and I repeat now, because it applies equally to this bill, this is not statesmanlike legislation; it is legislation driven by fear and vindictiveness; it is legislation with a cutlass, not a scalpel. The result of knocking out industry-wide bargaining will be the pulverization of labor unions. You do not simply break down the area of the unions' activity by this bill, you pulverize them.

The absolute restriction on employees' contributions to welfare funds cripples many unions in their normal collective-bargaining activities with a long background of good precedents. The riddling of the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, permitting by this bill the widespread issuance of injunctions against employees in labor disputes, nullifies at a stroke a reform for which the rank and file of labor fought for two generations. These are aside from other objectionable features of the bill already enumerated in detail on this floor relating to the special restrictions on the union shop and other matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to know whether, if the gentleman's amendment is approved, he will vote for this bill?

Mr. JAVITS. As a famous man once said, that is an "iffy" question. I would like to keep the "if."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he may proceed for two additional minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I know what I am talking about in matters affecting labor, for I myself am the son of a workingman. My father was an operator on boys' knee pants—that means he sewed the seams on pants. When I was a boy I was told that before the days when unions in the clothing industry amounted to much, my father worked in a shop for 14 hours a day during the season. He carried his own machine on his back, supplied his own thread and his own needles and for all of this he received just about a current living wage. But the season lasted just 4 months, and for the other 8 months he had the privilege of starving to death.

I say that what you are doing in this bill in the pulverization of labor unions and in the destruction of gains made by working people for 50 years, is of a nature to bring back those sweatshop and substandard conditions. No American wants that to happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, sections 203 and 204 of this bill are designed to prevent strikes which will imperil public health and safety. The purpose of these sections is to establish machinery which will insure peaceful settlement of disputes which threaten to disrupt or curtail services essential to public health and welfare. The objective which is sought here is excellent; no one will dispute that public interest demands that strikes in essential industries should be avoided and, if possible, eliminated. Conceding the merits of the end which is sought, let us examine the means by which this end is to be attained. Let us attempt to determine whether the procedures provided in this bill are likely to achieve their purpose, and whether the use of these procedures provides the best available method by which disruption of essential services might be avoided.

This bill provides that whenever the President finds that a labor dispute threatens to interfere with public utility, transportation or communication services he shall direct the Attorney General to seek an injunction against the acts and practices complained of. After the injunction is issued it becomes the duty of the parties in dispute to spend the next 30 days in attempting to settle the dispute. If they cannot come to terms within 30 days the administrator of the National Labor Relations Act is to take a secret ballot of the employees on whether they want to accept the employer's offer of settlement and, if so, who is to represent them in the settlement negotiations. If the dispute is settled at this stage the injunction is dismissed. If no settlement is reached at this stage the Director of Conciliation is to notify the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia who shall thereupon convene a special advisory board consisting of himself and two other members representing the employer and the employees in dispute. This advisory board must investigate the facts and within 30 days issue an opinion as to proper settlement of the dispute. Within 15 days after the opinion of the special board is rendered the administrator of the National Labor Relations Act is to take another ballot of the employees as to whether they are willing to accept the terms of the opinion and, if so, who is to represent them in drawing up an agreement with the employer. If the employer also accepts the opinion he shall enter into a contract with the employees' representatives. The bill expressly provides that neither party to the dispute shall be under any duty to accept the terms of the opinion of the special board. After this procedure has been completed or the dispute is settled the injunction is to be discharged.

It is immediately apparent that after all this lengthy and involved procedure has been completed the parties may find themselves in the identical position in which they were in the very beginning; the dispute is still there, no one has been satisfied, and nothing has been accomplished. The employees have been restrained from the use of their normal means of economic strength and persuasion but their grievance has not been resolved, and all efforts to resolve such grievance have been exhausted.

These sections would apply generally to labor disputes in the transportation, public utility, and communication fields.

They would in effect, single out employees in those fields for special treatment.

For these employees, the right to strike would be seriously limited. The question may well be raised whether, in view of this, provision should not be made for special consideration to be given to the interests of such employees in any settlements proposed by officials of the Government and by the special advisory settlement boards. Precedent for such special consideration is contained in other bills introduced in this Congress.

This bill would give to the employers engaged in these fields an inordinate power over the employees with whom they deal. The threat of injunction would constantly be held over the unions. These provisions would allow the employers to refuse to bargain in good faith, and by subterfuge and clouding of the issues, place the employees in an extremely untenable position.

Will all of this lead to industrial harmony and will the public interest be served thereby? The history of the injunctive process in labor disputes provides a clear answer to this question. The unsatisfactory results of the use of injunctions in labor disputes are too well known to require elaboration here. At any rate, we must squarely face the fact that use of the injunction has never encouraged industrial peace, but to the contrary has fomented disharmony and labor unrest. This fact has been so universally recognized that most American courts had begun to refuse to issue injunctions against labor activities long before laws prohibiting such injunctions were enacted. The labor injunction is no less evil now than it was in 1914 when the Clayton Act was passed or in 1932 when the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law. If we are seeking industrial harmony it seems the height of folly to adopt a method which has proved to be productive of nothing but industrial warfare and bitterness.

The second major consideration is whether the procedures set forth in sections 203 and 204 of this bill will encourage free collective bargaining. Authorities on labor-management relations testify that harmony between management and labor is best achieved by free bargaining processes. Compulsory arbitration is the antithesis of free collective bargaining. Both management and labor are in accord in their opposition to compulsory arbitration. They are against it because they know it does not work. They are against it because it means an undesirable extension of government controls into areas of free enterprise, because it restricts the freedom of contract, and because it interjects an artificial impediment into normal labor-management relationships. Other governments have experimented with compulsory arbitration and have found it to be unworkable. Industrial harmony rests upon a foundation of good will, and you cannot achieve good will by force. Both an employer and his employees are much more willing to abide by conditions of their own making than those which are thrust upon them.

It seems obvious that the machinery provided for in this bill will not encourage free collective bargaining, but by setting up administrative processes as an alternative to collective bargaining it will destroy the incentive to free bargaining. It will encourage both management and labor to rely upon governmental processes to settle their grievances and disputes. It will magnify disputes which might otherwise be settled easily and amicably at the conference table. In many cases either or both of the parties may feel that they can get a better deal from the special board than can be worked out through normal bargaining processes. It will multiply disputes because of the break-down in normal labor-management bargaining. The result may well be less favorable labor relations in our essential service industries, and a greater threat to impairment and disruption of such services. The experiences of our war emergency labor boards may be used as an example of this. During the functioning of the National War Labor Board many trivial disputes were brought before the Board for settlement. Normal bargaining processes were abandoned. The War Labor Board developed such an enormous backlog of cases that there was no reasonable possibility of expeditious handling of disputes. Many strike notices were filed purely because of the slowness of governmental processes. In short, it is very doubtful whether this procedure will promote industrial peace.

The procedure which would be established under this bill is heavy and cumbersome. It is unnecessarily complicated. It is surrounded by legal intricacies. It states that whenever the President shall find that a labor dispute "has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in, the cessation or substantial curtailment of" essential services he shall direct the Attorney General to seek an injunction. But it establishes no criteria which the President is to apply, nor does it set forth any guides or definitions which might be followed. Thus, though the bill puts the President under a mandatory duty to take action to prevent strikes in essential services, in appropriate cases, it leaves room for wide controversy whether he should act or not act in any given case. The provisions requiring a ballot of employees as to whether they will accept the employer's last offer or the terms of the opinion of the special board appear to be based upon the assumption that the employees are always the adamant party in labor disputes. This assumption is not an accurate one, since frequently the opposite is true. Nonetheless, these provisions put the onus on the employees without regard to the possibility that the employer may actually be the adamant party. Sections 203 and 204 contain words and phrases which have very broad and general meanings. The broad scope of these words and phrases would undoubtedly add to the controversies growing out of the decision of the President to act or not to act in a particular case. It provides no guides for the courts to follow when considering applications for injunctions in these labor disputes. Although section 205 of the act provides that sections 203 and 204 shall not apply to disputes subject to the Railway Labor Act, it is difficult to know what type of transportation cases provided for in section 203 would be covered by the elaborate machinery called for under that section. If the transportation tie-up is to curtail commerce in such a way as to affect the public health or safety, it most certainly would be a form of transportation coming under the Railway Labor Act.

Further, a constitutional question arises in connection with that portion of the bill which provides for delegation of administrative functions to the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. It is an established rule of law that the legislature may not confer exclusively nonjudicial powers on courts and judges. The labor disputes which would be referred to the chief justice under this bill would not involve justiciable issues of law. They would involve wages, hours, working conditions, and the like; not legal rights and remedies. Giving the judges of our courts extrajudicial functions may seriously interfere with the exercise of their normal judicial functions. It is entirely conceivable that the time and energies of the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia might be entirely absorbed by the administrative functions which this bill would place on him, and his judicial duties would have to be set aside. This would be a most undesirable result. Thus, serious doubts as to the correctness of this delegation of administrative power may be raised both from a legal aspect and from a social aspect. No consideration appears to have been given to the experience and background of the justices of the court of appeals in the highly specialized field of industrial relations. This should be a very serious consideration.

To sum up, the machinery provided for in this bill under the guise of settling disputes would deprive labor of its basic right to strike and would reintroduce the iniquitous injunction into the field of labor relations. This machinery would provide for Government interference by numerous branches of the Government. Under sections 203 and 204 the President, the Attorney General, the district courts, the Office of Conciliation, the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, the United States Court of Appeals and special boards would all be concerned with the handling of vital labor disputes. The provisions of these sections provide for more Government interference than ever before. It does not appear that this multiplicity of Government agencies, bureaus, and boards will do much to improve labor-management relations in essential industries.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to see a labor bill of the sort of H. R. 3020 brought before the House for our consideration. I say

this because the measure has been hastily conceived and certainly is not the result of impartial consideration. It is more than a coincidence that H. R. 3020 is offered at this particular time because it is evidently the result of the telephone strike now in effect. The telephone employees are striking, not because they enjoy so doing, but because it is an absolute necessity that they receive an increase in wages in order to live. The telephone strike will be only the forerunner of similar happenings if steps are not taken to reduce the cost of living. Does anyone in this Chamber want to take away labor's only weapon, the right to strike, in an effort to protect itself? Very evidently many Members are determined to punish all labor for the mistakes of the few; very evidently the spirit of ruthless destruction of labor's gains is on the march; and very evidently it will be successful today.

The legislation now before us will not settle labor-management problems. Instead, it will lead to confusion, chaos, and strife. This legislation nullifies the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, and restores the injunctive process. This measure will insure industrial warfare, not industrial peace.

It is too bad that management, labor, and industry cannot or will not work together. It is too bad that this House considers antilabor legislation only when a strike situation is in effect. This results in an emotional feeling in passing judgment which augurs ill for our national welfare. Repressive, punitive, and vindictive labor legislation, such as this undoubtedly is, will do more to further industrial unrest and internal dissension than anything I know of.

It is too bad that this ill-considered and hastily drawn measure is before us. It is too bad that such bitter antilabor feeling is being displayed here today. It is too bad that impartial reasoning, good judgment, and common sense are so lacking as to make the passage of this bill only a continuation of the same type of ill-temper as marked the passing of the Smith-Connally Act. Mark my words: the results will be just as bad.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, while I am in general disagreement with the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, I am particularly objecting to the apparent omissions from section 201 (e) of the proposed bill. This section transfers all conciliation functions of the Department of Labor to the Office of Conciliation. No mention is made of the other assets of the United States Conciliation Service, which are personnel, equipment, and records, unexpended appropriations, and other miscellaneous appurtenances which have been accumulated in almost 35 years of operations.

To me the most important omission is the transfer of personnel. The Congress is continuously stressing the desire of greater efficiency in the various Government agencies. Not in my limited knowledge of the actions of the Congress can I recall where a creative act establishing a superagency of the Government has not absorbed the agency whose functions are to be performed by the new agency.

The United States Conciliation Service is an unusual agency and is composed of several hundred persons of exceptional ability and training, and this Service should not be considered as one only of desks, stenographers, and such similar employees which usually make up so many Government agencies doing mostly routine work.

The personnel of United States Conciliation Service is composed of men and women who are specialists in the art of assisting men of managements and men of unions in reaching a solution of their differences. This requires years of training and application, and is not something that can be acquired by reading books. It requires tact and timing, and the knowledge of when to offer suggestions and when not to offer suggestions which are to be useful in concluding negotiations. This can only come from years of experience and the knowledge of how the particular suggestions were helpful in previous conferences. Many of these commissioners of conciliation are welcomed, year after year, by the same conferees because of their knowledge of previous contract and dispute negotiations. Many times a particular commissioner of conciliation is jointly requested by the disputants to be assigned.

Many of these commissioners of conciliation have had specialized training in certain industries before joining the United States Conciliation Service. Many were employers, some were employees, others served in advisory capacities. When a dispute arises in a highly industrialized industry, an expert with knowledge of the operations of this industry, one who is familiar with its special operations and its terms and products, is immediately available. Valuable negotiating time is saved, instead of the loss of time which would result if some inexperienced commissioner of conciliation were assigned who did not have such knowledge. There is no type of dispute which cannot be immediately handled by the United States Conciliation Service by the assignment of a competent and experienced commissioner of conciliation. I ask, should such a reservoir and storehouse be discarded at a time when we are desirous of most efficient operation of our various Government agencies?

A review of the personnel of the United States Conciliation Service will show that most of its commissioners of conciliation are career men who have grown with the Service. There are several commissioners of conciliation who have more than 25 years of service in this agency alone. Should such experience be discarded? One of the regional directors was a young man when he entered this Service at the time of the creation of the Department of Labor. Surely his experience is one that could not be acquired by another, even if he read all of the many books on the subject of labor negotiation. Many, many others have had from 5 to 20 years' service. Knowledge so gained cannot be transferred to those with no experience. If the appointments by the new agency are to be on a political basis, then it will become a political football, and it will lose its power of negotiating settlements of strikes and disputes. Politics will be the controlling factor, and knowledge, experience, and ability will be relegated, and incompetence will supersede efficiency. The impartiality which is the prevailing gospel of the United States Conciliation Service will soon disappear, and employers and unions will attempt to settle their differences without the assistance of the new agency, and lacking in reaching a settlement, then economic chaos will be the final result.

You must have the confidence of the parties to any dispute if you expect to be helpful. What characteristics would you want in the commissioner of conciliation you would call in to preside in your negotiations? Certainly you would want experience, ability, knowledge, confidence, responsibility, and the assurance that the commissioner is absolutely impartial and his only place in the picture is a humanitarian desire to assist the parties in reaching a satisfactory conclusion to their differences and the avoidance of a work stoppage which is always costly to employer and employee. Surely the desire on the part of the Congress to so assist in labor unrest should in itself augur without hesitancy in the transfer of these competent employees to the new agency. Needless to say, such transfer should include the other facilities mentioned in my opening remarks.

Finally, it is commonly recognized by everyone that faithful service should be appreciated. The complex and complicated techniques of a commissioner of conciliation cannot be gleaned except by years of application and study and a sincere desire to accomplish a purpose as worthy as any in this wonderful land of ours. This recognition is as old as Christianity. St. Paul in a letter to Timothy in the year 66 A. D. said:

> It is not fit the public trusts should be lodged in the hands of any, till they are proved and found fit for the business they are entrusted with.

John C. Calhoun said in a speech in 1835:

> The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts, bestowed for the good of the country, and not for the benefit of an individual or a party.

I do not believe that there is need for a new agency, but if this Congress is to create one, I beseech that proper consideration be given my suggestion that the new Office of Conciliation contemplated by H. R. 3020 absorb all of the United States Conciliation Service and not part of it.

There is no substitute for knowledge and ability.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to section 2, subsection 11 of the bill. I can imagine no more cleverly designed nor subtly conceived method of deluding American labor than by this attempt to define "collective bargaining." The section is a mere collection of formalistic procedures that make a mockery of genuine collective bargaining.

It is perhaps one of the most vicious and misleading provisions of the entire measure.

The tragedy of our experience from 1926 through 1933 during which American industry engaged in unholy competition for the abundant labor supply and man was pitted against man in a race for the lowest possible wage only hastened the approach of the great depression of that period, increased its severity, and lengthened its duration. This period of labor-relations history was principally characterized by an absence of unions and a lack of collective bargaining. The result was individual bargaining that drove wages and working standards lower and lower.

Beginning in 1933, under the enlightened leadership of President Roosevelt, Congress enacted into law requirements that should employees desire to do so they would be protected in their right to bargain on a collective basis. This attitude of government finally found expression in 1935 in the enactment of the NLRA.

That act guarantees to labor the right collectively to present their grievances and demands to employers and protects such employees in the exercise of that right. The principle involved was by no means new. The right protected was no gift from the Congress. That right exists by the very nature of man himself. It is a natural, inalienable right that had been recognized by philosophers and the courts alike. But the exercise of that right had long been denied American labor by the vast majority of American industry. The depressed living standards prior to 1933 and the ruthless denial to American citizens of their civil liberties is one of the most sordid chapters in our history.

But, as I say, in 1933 the first sincere Government effort to protect this right made its beginning. Finally, in 1935 the collective experience of the past Government efforts, under the guidance of Senator WAGNER, finally found expression in the NLRA.

That act requires that the employer sit down and make an honest, conscientious, good-faith effort to reach agreement with his employees in settlement of points of difference. This concept of collective bargaining means the carrying on of negotiations in an open, fair effort to reach an agreement covering wages, hours, and conditions of employment. This is the very heart of the Wagner Act. It is designed to the end that industrial dispute shall have the best chance to be settled reasonably, democratically, and peacefully. Every provision in the existing law is devised to advance that purpose.

What does the committee bill do to collective bargaining? First, it attempts vainly to define collective bargaining. In place of the requirement that the parties sit down with an open mind to reach accord, it substitutes a mechanical routine that is nothing more than an invitation to disagreement. It merely provides that the parties shall discuss any proposal at least five times within 30 days. Mind you, that is merely to discuss. It is not provided that the discussions must be in an atmosphere hopeful of agreement.

The obligation to bargain in good faith is abolished.

Although the submission of proposals and counterproposals is the surest evidence of good faith, the bill expressly states that such negotiation is no longer a legal requirement. This measure is satisfied if there is mere discussion.

The bill also severely limits the scope of collective bargaining by creating but five limited subjects for meaningless discussion. It certainly will be apparent to any who will take the time to acquaint themselves with the realties of industrial operations and labor relations that a willingness to discuss any issue bearing upon the employer-employee relationship is the only guarantee of avoiding friction.

The section is detailed and cumbersome and substitutes an empty formula for bargaining as a substitute for common, ordinary, decent efforts to reach an understanding. Whatever may be the legal significance of the bill in its entirety, I say to you that the section under discussion will only encourage and foster industrial unrest. I urge you in good conscience to strike this provision from the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, when I was a candidate for office and since, I have several times stated my position on labor legislation to be in substance that I favored the passage of a constructive, curative labor bill which would further protect workingmen, their bosses, and most important of all, the innocent public from the paralyzing effects of serious and prolonged work stoppages and prevent the abuses visited on their members by dictatorial labor leaders but which would not, at the same time, be punitive or repressive in character, would not weaken or destroy the effectiveness of labor unions or those leaders who are sincerely and conscientiously representing their membership to the very best of their ability and would not create more economic disruption than it would cure. That is the kind of labor legislation which, I am convinced, the vast majority of the American public expects this Congress to pass.

No decision I have yet been called upon to make has been as difficult as this one. The measure before us certainly does not conform to my views in all respects. Probably if 435 Congressmen sat down to write a labor bill they would come up with 435 different answers.

I have supported several amendments which, in my opinion, would improve this legislation. Some have been adopted. Some have failed. I have vigorously opposed others which would strike a blow at organized labor, to which I am unwilling to subscribe. These have been defeated. In particular I have opposed the attempt to place a legal ban on the union shop where both employers and employees want it. That, in my judgment, is an unwarranted interference with collective bargaining. It is my settled conviction that the absolute ban on industry-wide bargaining which still remains in this bill is not the answer to the settlement of our labor controversies, although it should be emphasized that company-wide bargaining is still retained and that there are two other instances where this can be done: First, where the plants are within a radius of 50 miles and employ less than 100 persons; and, second, where the parties agree to operate on that basis as many, of course, did long before the passage of the Wagner Act. This particular provision was also immeasurably improved from the point of view of fairness by the amendment adopted here on the floor to impose the same restrictions against industry-wide action on employers as employees. Certainly that is only simple justice.

There are other provisions of this bill with which I emphatically disagree. I am sorry that the amendment for further study of the problem failed of passage. It is my sincere hope that in conference many of these matters will be remedied before we present a final piece of legislation to the American people.

On the other hand, there are many excellent features in this measure. I realize, too, that this committee has sat for months in hearings, taking testimony of scores of witnesses from all walks of life. I have studied their report and much of this evidence. I am fully aware that there have been serious abuses which cry out for our corrective treatment. Without any attempt to cover the field, I mention particularly the attempt to meet the problem of Nation-wide stoppages of vital production imperiling public health and safety, although, incidentally, the approach to this problem is not the precise one I would choose. I approve the ban on violence, jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts. I am against requiring a high-school band to pay a union musician to stand in the wings while they perform. I am against requiring an employer to submit to other featherbedding practices, thereby running up the cost of his product for the consuming public to pay. I favor forbidding those subversive elements who would destroy our way of life from controlling the destinies of labor unions, as I may say is the overwhelming sentiment of union members, themselves. I believe in the sanctity of contracts and that they should be binding and enforceable on both parties equally. I want to strengthen the Conciliation Service and really make it work. I want to put an end to the iniquitous practice of permitting the National Labor Relations Board in passing on labor disputes to act

as prosecutor, judge, and jury. I believe in free speech for both employer and employee, so long as the right is not abused. I believe when a plant is threatened with closure because two labor unions each claim to represent a majority of the employees, that the employer should have the right to ask for an election. I believe emphatically in declaring it to be an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce its members, to impose exorbitant initiation fees, to fine or discipline them because they criticize or differ with the officers or fail to support some political candidate, to employ someone to spy on members or intimidate his family. I believe unions should be required to keep and present to their members financial statements, as many now do. I favor the democratization of labor organizations to give the members a voice in fixing dues, making deductions from their pay envelopes, election of officers, and calling strikes.

These features will be welcomed, not only by millions of union members, but also by many farseeing labor leaders who are as anxious as we are to root out those evils which might hamper the growth and development of the labor-union movement and might tend to breed public disfavor.

Analysis convinces me that there is more, much more, in this bill to commend than to condemn. A vote "no" would sound the death knell of any labor legislation. The country requires, the public demands, relief. A favorable vote will start a labor bill on the legislative path. After the other body has acted and the conferees have met the final legislation will be back here for us to take another look. The imperative needs of this Nation, as I view them, would not justify me in a negative vote. The scales tip heavily the other way. I have decided to support this bill.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, for 2 days now, H. R. 3020, a bill to bring about greater industrial peace between employers and employees, has been before this House. There is no question but that broad and comprehensive legislation along this line should be passed. I do believe, however, that while this bill has many splendid provisions which will be beneficial to labor, business, and the general public, yet, that some of those provisions go too far.

I was in hopes when the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to amend the industry-wide bargaining provision, that the House would approve it. I supported that amendment.

I believe the bill goes entirely too far in its provisions with regard to pension, health, and welfare funds, which have been practiced for many years between employers and employees. I was in hopes the House would approve these two attempts to amend the bill as to those provisions; however, it did not.

It is my hope that the Senate in both of these instances will amend the bill, making it what I believe to be more equitable in the interest of employees and employer.

Mr. Chairman, this bill places the Members of the House in a position where if they vote against it, they are, in fact, expressing themselves as opposed to any labor-management legislation at this session. If we take this position we will fail to respond to the wishes of a great majority of the people of this Nation who know, as we Members of Congress know, that it is imperative that some of the flagrant abuses practiced in the larger industrial centers by some of the more radical types of organized labor should be curbed as quickly as possible.

I have received many letters from the honest rank and file of labor who have urged that some restrictive legislation against these abuses be passed. In fact, the majority of the rank and file of labor approve of many of the provisions of this bill because it gives to them greater democracy in their local unions, and gives them protection from intimidation and coercion that they need and want. They oppose some of its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe when this bill goes to the Senate for amendments and to the committee of the House and Senate, that the bill will most likely come back to this House in such form that it will be helpful in the future, not only to the general public and to the employers, but to the majority of the rank and file of labor. With the hope that it will be improved in the Senate, I feel that it is my duty to vote for this measure rather than to vote against it which, in fact, would be taking the position that no legislation of this kind is needed in this session.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus bill on labor-management relations. It is far reaching and controversial. It is interesting to compare the contentions of those who favor this bill and those who oppose it. For that purpose I include herewith the contentions of each group:

PROPONENTS

LABOR'S NEW BILL OF RIGHTS UNDER THE HARTLEY BILL—H. R. 3020

1. The right to join with his fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union that they want, not the union that is forced upon them. (Secs. 7 (a), 8 (a) (1), 8 (a) (3), 8 (b) (1), 9 (c) (2), 9 (f) (2), 9 (f) (4), 9 (f) (5).)

2. The right to get a job without joining any union. (Secs. 8 (a) (3), 8 (d) (4).)

3. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job. (Secs. 8 (d) (4), 9 (g).)

4. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union. (Sec. 8 (b) (2).)

5. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union without dictation by national and international officers and representatives and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers. (Sec. 9 (f) (1).)

6. The right to keep on working and getting his pay in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer. (Sec. 12 (a) (3) (A).)

7. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him. (Sec. 2 (11).)

8. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers, and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination. (Secs. 8 (a) (4), 8 (c) (5).)

9. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear, in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for. (Sec. 8 (c) (2).)

10. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers. (Sec. 8 (c) (8).)

11. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses. (Sec. 8 (c) (10), 303.)

12. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want. (Sec. 8 (c) (3).)

13. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for (1) not paying dues, (2) disclosing confidential information of the union, (3) violating the union's contract, (4) being a Communist or fellow traveler, (5) being convicted of a felony, that is, of a serious crime, (6) engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union. (Sec. 8 (c) (6).)

14. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like. (Secs. 8 (a) (1), 8 (b) (1), 12 (a) (1).)

15. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer. (Sec. 9 (a).)

16. The right, without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes. (Sec. 8 (c) (5).)

17. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested. (Sec. 12 (a) (1).)

18. The right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights. (Sec. 10.)

OPPONENTS

THE HARTLEY BILL—A NEW GUARANTY OF INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

1. The employer is granted new rights and powers to destroy labor and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining. (Secs. 1, 2, 7, 8 (b), 8 (c), 8 (d), 9 (a), 9 (c), (2), 9 (c) (3), 9 (f), 10, 203.)

2. The employer is given the right to bring antitrust actions against his employees, to institute criminal prosecutions against them, to sue them for treble damages and to obtain ex parte injunctions without a hearing against them. Sections 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c), 301. But the employer's violation of the law is subject merely to a cease and desist

order issued after administrative hearing and court review. (Sec. 10 (c).)

3. The employer is granted the right to compel employees to accept a wage cut through forced labor for indefinite periods of time. (Secs. 2 (11) (B), 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 203, 204.)

4. The employer receives the right to break strikes caused by his own illegal conduct. (Secs. 2 (3), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c), 301.).

5. The employer is granted the right to obtain injunctions against strikes which have been legal for the past 50 years. (Secs. 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c).)

6. The employer retains the right to bargain through an employers' association but bargaining through national unions is outlawed. (Secs. 2 (2), 2 (16), 9 (f) (1).)

7. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to play employees against each other. (Secs. 2 (11) (B), 8 (b) (3), 9 (d), 9 (f) (2).)

8. The employer is granted the right to sit at both sides of the bargaining table by establishing company unions. (Secs. 8 (a) (2), 8 (d) (3), 9 (f) (4), 10 (c).)

9. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to refuse to bargain about such matters as health and welfare plans, apprentice-training programs and speed-up. (Secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C).)

10. The employer is given the right to break a strike for recognition even though the union represents an overwhelming majority of the employees. (Secs. 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c).)

11. The employer is given the right to outlaw and to crush any strike by hiring strikebreakers, even though the strike is caused by his own misconduct. (Secs. 2 (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c).)

12. The employer is given the right to cooperate with antilabor employers in order to destroy unions. (Secs. 2 (13), 2 (14), 12 (a) (3).)

13. The employer is given the right to lock out and blacklist office clerks if they join a union. (Secs. 2 (3), 2 (12), 12 (a) (3).)

14. The employer is given the right to invoke injunctions, treble damage suits, and criminal penalties against the employees in one department if they strike against a wage cut in another department. (Secs. 2 (13), 12 (a) (3), 301.)

15. The employer is given the right to instigate criminal prosecutions against individuals who exercise the right to picket. (Secs. 12 (a) (1), 12 (a) (2), 301.)

16. The employer is given the right to prevent the designation of a bargaining agent for a period of years. (Secs. 3, 9 (c) (3), 10 (f).)

17. Spies may be planted in the union ranks by the employer, and the union is powerless to expel them. (Secs. 8 (d) (4), 10.)

18. The employer is given the right to grant or deny union security as he wishes; he is not required even to discuss it with the union, and he may crush a strike or a threat of strike to obtain it. (Secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 8 (d) (4), 9 (g), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301.)

19. The employer is given the right to crush any strike when a collective-bargaining contract exists, even if the strike is caused by any issue not covered by the contract. (Secs. 2 (11) (A), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301.)

20. The employer is given the power to obtain from the Government a death warrant for the union of his employees. (Secs. 8 (b), 8 (c), 9 (f), 10 (a), 10 (c), 12 (d).)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I have not only studied the provisions of H. R. 3020, the so-called omnibus labor bill which we have been considering, but I have also listened to the debates on this bill with great interest—interest because of its importance as affecting an improvement in management-employee relations and as affecting the internal and domestic security of our country—and in the accomplishment of these objectives, I am exceedingly interested. You know, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that a new Member of Congress should not speak on the floor of the House for several years. Doubtless, this is a wise policy. I want to say, however, that in departing from this policy I am doing so in order that I might say that in my humble opinion there exists today in America a great need for sound, wise, and constructive labor legislation and that I have been hoping for an opportunity to vote for legislation of this character. I shall vote for this bill—H. R. 3020—the Hartley bill—not because I think the bill embraces all of these virtues—it does not—but because it is the only labor bill we shall have an opportunity to vote for during this session of the Congress, and I feel that the people of our country are insistent that legislation to improve labor-management relations be passed by this Congress.

I am convinced that this bill contains some worth-while and desirable provisions such as, for instance, the section dealing with arbitration and mediation of labor disputes and establishing a 75-day cooling-off period during which time labor difficulties may be settled prior to the calling of a crippling strike. Further, many of the unfair labor practices enumerated in the act should be prohibited and the declared objectives of the statute, namely, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for settling employee-management disputes and the protection of individual employee rights with labor organizations, are all worth while and desired legislative objectives. Also, the measure is designed to prevent mass picketing, violence, bloodshed, and racketeering, and to protect the individual worker from extortion of undue and excessive fees and dues as a prerequisite to getting a job and securing employment.

The bill guarantees and protects employees in their rights of organizing and joining the union of their choice. In addition, the bill protects employee's right to bargain collectively through representatives of his own choice. The latter are among the fundamental rights of the laboring man which should be protected. The bill is aimed, in part, in securing these rights for the laboring man while also endeavoring to protect the public interest by outlawing practices of certain organized labor racketeers.

No one wants to do anything to interfere with the rights of the workingman. America has been made great by the efforts of the workingmen in our country. We in America believe in work and the fruits of effort and toil. Our forefathers were men who earned their living by the toil and sweat of their brow and I may say that work and effort is what has made our country great. What the American public wants is legislation to curb the autocratic power of labor dictators such as John L. Lewis, who during the war and since—at his own whim—has called crippling strikes against the Federal Government, defied the President of the United States and been found guilty of contempt of our Federal courts. The unrestrained exercise of power of this sort must be restrained.

In 1890 the Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act—the first of the so-called antitrust statutes. In 1914 Congress passed the Clayton Act, another of the antitrust statutes. Under the provisions of these acts all contracts in restraint of trade were declared illegal. The language of the statute did not say that "industrial contracts" or that "labor contracts" or combinations in restraint of trade were illegal, but that "all contracts" of this character were illegal and thus it was felt and assumed, for a quarter of a century, that labor organizations were subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws. However, during 1936 the Supreme Court held in a celebrated decision that labor unions were not subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws, and as a consequence union leaders were given the green light, so to speak, and many of the monopolistic labor practices developed. No legislation comparable to the antitrust statutes applicable to labor organizations has been passed.

President Truman has asked that the Congress consider legislation to curb certain tendencies which dictatorial labor leaders have foisted upon the people of America. It has been pointed out in the debates on this bill that certain leaders have endeavored to become greater than the Government itself and in the exercise of their power they have flouted governmental authority—they have ignored the welfare of the people of the Nation as well as the best interest of the workingman whom they have pretended to represent.

H. R. 3020 is designed, in part, to prevent the exercise of these excessive powers of unscrupulous labor racketeers. Should the provisions of this bill prove too drastic, as many predict, amendments can and should be effected.

The administration of statutes has always demonstrated the need for alteration and improvement, and changes in time will be made in this measure. It is not a perfect piece of legislation—far from it—but the bill does represent a concerted effort to improve labor-management relations; to reverse the alarming trends of widespread strikes and industrial unrest in our country and is the only bill of this character that this Congress will have for consideration.

Should both management and labor sense their high responsibilities to the

Nation, the problems of labor-management relations can be solved successfully; and the liberty for which our forefathers founded this country and for which the soldiers of our own generation have so recently fought can be regained and insured.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose the establishment of this new agency called Office of Conciliation as provided in H. R. 3020. When a business corporation wants to revitalize one of its departments, it calls in its own experts, it seeks outside advice, and after careful study it begins to place the experts' recommendations into effect. Once the department begins to operate efficiently, it is not stopped because a group of the nonexperts believe it will operate just as well if: First, a new building is built to house the department; second, the experienced employees were all discharged; third, the customers are told to buy the product without regard to quality. If anyone were brash enough to make such a suggestion, the officials of the corporation would suggest he see a psychiatrist and privately wonder how he had managed to stay on the loose for so long. This simile is not farfetched. We have today before us H. R. 3020. This bill provides for an Office of Conciliation. In addition to being as fantastic as the just-as-well advice, this proposal takes away from President Truman the honor and credit due to him for building a sound and effective Conciliation Service with the help and advice of labor and management. I was so struck by this open attempt to rob Mr. Truman of his laurels in this field, that I want to repeat them for the record.

Back in 1945, the President, who had foreseen the catacylsmic struggle between management and labor which occurred early in 1946, called together a conference of labor and management officials to discuss various problems confronting them and to try to reach some understanding of each other's positions. Mr. Truman knew, as he knows now, that the question of labor relations is a question of rights and duties of the individual, and he wanted the individuals who knew most about it to attempt to solve some of their problems. The President knew that whatever recommendations came of that conference would have to be accepted by the individuals affected, if these recommendations were to be effective. In his opening address to that conference he said:

> The men in this room direct a cross section of American industry and lead American labor of all opinions. But you will succeed only if labor and industry as a whole will willingly accept your decisions and will adopt the convictions developed out of this conference.

Out of that labor-management conference came three unanimous recommendations, and one of these dealt with conciliation. In the recommendation on conciliation we find that labor and management unanimously wanted the conciliation services of the Federal Government administered within the United States Department of Labor, and it also wanted a permanent labor-management advisory committee to the Director of the United States Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor.

Now let us look at a few more facts. The President asked his Secretary of Labor to follow faithfully this helpful direction. He so asked because he knew that in the conciliation of labor disputes the conciliator would have to be acceptable to those individuals who needed their disputes resolved. Conciliation is a friendly attempt to get two angry people back on speaking and living terms. If the two angry people do not like the friend who intervenes, conciliatory efforts can effect nothing. He knew that conciliation rests upon voluntaryism.

The Secretary of Labor did as the President directed. It is admitted by labor and management that the recommendations made have been put into effect. It is also a well-known fact that the United States Conciliation Service has increased its efficiency and effectiveness during the past year. Now, in the recent hearings before the Labor Committees of Congress, the majority of the witnesses on this question of conciliation still concurred in the recommendations of the President's conference of 1945 that conciliation remain in the Department of Labor. And so here we have what we in Congress seek in Federal Government. We have an able administrator recognize that one of his departments is not hitting on all cylinders, accept the advice of experts on the subject, put the advice into effect, and finally we see him rewarded with a smoothly operating department well on its way to being one of the best in his organization.

But now it appears that a Democratic President cannot do that to the Republicans. He cannot be nonpartisan and efficient. He has to disband this department. He has to set up a new department, the Office of Conciliation. He has to discharge all the men in his old department, men who have years of experience to help him keep down industrial disputes in this country He has to tell labor and management that he can no longer come to them for advice and help, for the bill makes no mention of this type of help in the new department. But, unfortunately, he is not the president of a free enterprise corporation. He cannot tell the drafters of this bill that they might well consult their physicians. He has to accept this attack on his administrative ability for the time being. But I want the record to show that President Truman's administration of conciliation services is impartial and efficient today. And could he administer this new Office of Conciliation with the same efficiency? Would he have the the same cooperation of management and labor? My distinguished Republican friends have seen to it that this new Office of Conciliation starts off with three strikes against it. These statesmen toss out all of the men who have had experience in mediating disputes—so the new agency starts out entirely new, without experienced personnel. They give no recognition to labor or to management for the contributions they have made to make Conciliation effective; they literally kick labor and management in the teeth and tell them to mind their own business, the Government will conciliate in its own way—a wonderful way of establishing friendship, the cornerstone of successful conciliation. And finally, they say in effect that the President has a year in which to make this new agency effective. A wonderful political weapon forged out of what is now a nonpartisan aid for the country's welfare. I want the record to show that in this field of labor relations, which the country rightly feels is our most important domestic problem, that President Truman has approached the important problem of conciliating labor disputes in a nonpartisan, efficient, and statesmanlike manner; whereas my Republican colleagues have forgotten the trust placed in them to play with this most important matter in an inefficient and partisan way.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the present Conciliation Service is performing an effective, nonpartisan, impartial job, and it should not be tampered with.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MUST WE TURN BACK THE CLOCK?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, sections 203 through 205 of the proposed bill would empower the President to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court having jurisdiction over the parties for an injunction in any labor dispute which threatens substantially to curtail interstate commerce in transportation, public utilities, or communications services essential to the public health, safety, or interest. In such cases the inhibitions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are rendered inoperative, so that the court may issue the decree.

A hasty glance at these provisions suggests that their application is limited to the transportation, public utility, or communications industry. Do not be misled. This bill if enacted would authorize the issuance of Federal injunctions in any dispute which threatened "substantial curtailment" of services provided by these industries which is deemed essential to the public interest. Certainly disputes involving fuels would be covered. Why not those involving electrical equipment, rubber tires, or copper wire? The ramifications are endless, but the point is clear. This section would permit injunctions to be issued in virtually every major industry.

The Representative from New Jersey describes this bill as one which will take labor relations out of the subject of politics. I say to you that clauses such as those under discussion could not be better calculated to inject politics into an area from which the Norris-LaGuardia Act has removed them. Who in this Chamber is so naive as to think that any major dispute could stay out of the political arena when the President has the power to enjoin any dispute which

threatens to curtail essential transportation, communications, or utility services?

Presumably the authors of this bill sincerely desire to avoid the national disaster of last winter when millions of industrial workers went out on strike, many of them for several months. What does this bill do to prevent a repetition of such a catastrophe? The bill employs the most drastic weapon in the entire arsenal of labor relations, the weapon which unions have for over 50 years regarded as management's trump card in attacking their very existence. It employs this weapon as soon as the President finds the threat, perhaps before any efforts whatever have been made to mediate. The bill contemplates 30 days of negotiations after the decree has been issued. But consider for a moment, if you will, how hopelessly unrealistic is the concept of fruitful bargaining on the one hand by employees who feel themselves handcuffed by Government decree and on the other hand by employers who know that the union has been forbidden to strike.

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit that if you wish to solidify all labor not only against all management, but against this Congress as well, if you want to insure that the entire Federal machinery of the President, the Attorney General, the district courts, the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia will be dragged into every labor dispute of consequence, you have chosen an admirable technique for accomplishing that frightful result.

Surely a more constructive approach is possible to this problem. We must make sure that all genuinely voluntary efforts are exhausted before we turn to the totalitarian technique of molding our social relations by fiat. We dare not cast aside all the progress of recent years in favor of an ill-considered patent-medicine doctrine which will set our industrial relations back 20 years.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] because I think it is fair to labor, to the employer, and, most important of all, that it protects the public from paralyzing Nation-wide strikes.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that H. R. 3020 pulverizes the unions and reduces them to impotency. I am heartily in favor of correcting the labor abuses that exist and have voted for each amendment that I thought would perfect this bill and get it in such shape that I could vote for it, but those favoring the bill have consistently voted down all liberalized amendments, and I am certain that the bill as written will return us to the days of the sweatshops.

I am quoting here the words of Hood's well-known poem, The Song of the Shirt; it is one of the most moving things of all literature:

THE SONG OF THE SHIRT

(By Thomas Hood)

With fingers weary and worn,
  With eyelids heavy and red,
A woman sat, in unwomanly rags,
  Plying her needle and thread.
Stitch, stitch, stitch,
  In poverty, hunger, and dirt;
And still with a voice of dolorous pitch,
  She sang "The Song of the Shirt."

Work, work, work,
  While the cock is crowing aloft.
And work, work, work,
  Till the stars shine through the roof.
It's O to be a slave
  Along with a barbarous Turk
Where a woman has never a soul to save,
  If this is Christian work.

Work, work, work,
  Till the brain begins to swim.
Work, work, work,
  Till the eyes are heavy and dim.
Seam, gusset, and band,
  Band, gusset, and seam,
Till over the buttons I fall asleep
  And sew them on in a dream.

O men with sisters dear,
  O men with mothers and wives,
It is not linen you are wearing out,
  But human creature's lives.
Stitch, stitch, stitch,
  In poverty, hunger, and dirt.
Sewing at once, with a double thread,
  A shroud as well as a shirt.

But why do I talk of death,
  That phantom of grisly bone?
I hearteily fear its terrible shape,
  It seems so like my own,
It seems so like my own
  Because of the fasts I keep;
O God, that bread should be so dear,
  And flesh and blood so cheap.

Work, work, work,
  My labors never flag;
And what are its wages? A bed of straw,
  A crust of bread, and rags.
That shattered roof and the naked floor,
  A table, a broken chair,
And a wall so blank my shadow I thank
  For sometimes falling there.

Work, work, work,
  From weary chime to chime;
Work, work, work,
  As a prisoner works for crime.
Band, gusset, and seam,
  Seam, gusset, and band,
Till the heart is sick and brain benumbed,
  As well as the weary hand.

Work, work, work,
  In the dull December light.
Work, work, work,
  When the weather is warm and bright.
While underneath the eaves
  The brooding swallows cling
As if to show me their sunny backs
  And twit me to the spring.

O but to breathe the breath
  Of the cowslips and primrose sweet,
With the sky above my head
  And the grass beneath my feet.
For only one short hour to feel as I used to feel,
  Before I knew the woes of want
And the walk that cost a meal.

O but for one short hour,
  A respite however brief,
No blessed leisure for love or hope,
  But only time for grief.
A little weeping would ease my heart,
  But in their briny bed
My tears must stop, for every drop
  Hinders needle and thread.

With fingers weary and worn,
  With eyelids heavy and red,
A woman sat, in unwomanly rags,
  Plying her needle and thread.
Stitch, stitch, stitch,
  In poverty, hunger, and dirt;
And still with a voice of dolorous pitch,
  Would that its tone could reach the rich,
She sang this "Song of the Shirt."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 41, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 203 enjoining acts or practices which imperil, or imminently threaten to imperil, the public health, safety, or interest, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order, for a period of 30 days following the issuance of such order, to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, and to that end to utilize conciliation and mediation assistance of the United States Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, if either party requests it. Neither party shall be under any duty, however, to accept either in whole or in part any proposal of settlement made by any conciliator or mediator.

(b) At the end of such 30-day period (unless the dispute has been settled by that time), the National Labor Relations Board shall provide for the taking of a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of (1) whether the employees of any employer desire to accept their employer's offer of settlement then current, and (2) if they do so desire, what person or persons, if any, they desire to designate as their representative to embody their acceptance in a contract with their employer. If a majority of the employees of any employer vote in favor of accepting their employer's offer, the person or persons, if any, designated by them to embody their acceptance in a contract with the employer shall be treated for all purposes as their representative for collective bargaining. The National Labor Relations Board shall utilize appropriate local governmental agencies for the supervision of the taking of secret ballots under this subsection, whenever such agencies are willing to undertake that function.

(c) If the dispute is not settled by the procedure prescribed in subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor shall notify the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, who shall thereupon convene a special advisory settlement board of three members, consisting of himself as chairman, and two other members, one of whom shall be selected by the employer or employers party to the dispute, and the other by the representatives of the employees party to the dispute. If either party fails, within 5 days after request by the chief justice of such court, to make his selection, such selection shall thereupon be made by such chief justice. The special board shall investigate all of the facts in the dispute at a place or places convenient to the parties, and within 30 days after its membership shall have been completed, shall render and make public its opinion as to the proper settlement of the dispute. The special board shall reach its conclusions and render its opinion solely on the basis of the facts of the case, and shall not be bound by any demands or offers of settlement of either party, or by the existing terms of employment, or by any opinion of any other board created under this section for any other dispute. The expenses of the special board, including compensation

of the employer and employee members, shall be divided equally between the parties to the dispute.

(d) Within 15 days after the special board has rendered its opinion, the National Labor Relations Board shall, in the same manner as is provided in subsection (b), provide for the taking of a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of (1) whether the employees of any employer are willing to accept and be bound by the terms of such opinion, and (2) if they are willing to be so bound, what person or persons, if any, they desire to represent them in making an agreement to that effect with the employer. If the employer also accepts such opinion, he shall embody the terms thereof in a contract with the representatives of his employees designated for that purpose. Neither party to the dispute shall be under any duty to accept the terms of the opinion of the special board.

(e) No provision of this section shall affect in any manner the continued effectiveness of the order of the district court issued under section 203.

(f) At the conclusion of all the proceedings hereinbefore required, or whenever an agreement is reached by the parties, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 59, line 4, strike out "United States Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor" and insert "Director of Conciliation."

Page 59, line 11, strike out "National Labor Relations Board" and insert "Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act."

Page 59, line 25, strike out "National Labor Relations Board" and insert "Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act."

Page 60, line 7, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Director of Conciliation."

Page 60, after the period on line 14, insert: "If for any reason the chief justice is unable to serve, he shall appoint another judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to act in his place and stead."

Page 61, line 11, strike out "National Labor Relations Board" and insert "Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments directed to the same point, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

First amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 58, strike out all of section 204, all on pages 59 and 60, and the first eight lines on page 61.

Second amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Strike out subsection (f), lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

Third amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 62, strike out section 205.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have about reached the end of the discussion on this bill, but before the debate closes I would like to ask someone on the majority side whether this bill bars industry-wide bargaining. We have been told throughout the debate time and again that it does bar industry-wide bargaining. I know that the bill outlaws a strike in an effort to obtain an industry-wide contract, or industry-wide bargaining through the means of a collective-bargaining contract, but as the legislative counsel who drafted the bill stated to me not more than an hour ago, the bill does not bar industry-wide bargaining; that is to say, if John L. Lewis and the coal operators want to bargain industry-wide, they may do so.

I make this statement so we may be under no misapprehension when we come to vote. As to these amendments just offered, the amendments go to the procedure by which it is sought to prevent or to end strikes in public utilities which injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare. If you have noted, the bill, up until that place where I ask that the remainder of the section be stricken, provides that the President shall, when he deems imminent danger to the public, ask the Attorney General to apply for an injunction. That is all right so far as it goes. Then the bill provides for 75 days of fact-finding, mediation, and arbitration.

Now, I ask you a practical question. What is the answer to a situation where there is a strike, where the water or the light or the food, any necessity of life, is shut off by that strike? What are you going to do for 75 days? Are you going to sit around and go without water to drink? You could get along all right without water to wash, but you have to have something to drink. There is not enough milk and whisky and other liquids in the country to keep us going for 75 days?

You say to me, "What would you do?" I would have the court issue an injunction restraining the people who are on strike from interfering with the management, or the carrying on of the industry, and I would have the management hire new employees. "Oh no," they say, "we must arbitrate, we must negotiate for 75 days." Then if they fail to reach an agreement, what happens?

Look at the last section, 205. There the Attorney General is required to come into court and ask for a dismissal of the court proceedings. When I asked some Members, "What are you going to do then?" they said, "Oh, the President can declare the danger imminent again, and he can order the Attorney General to ask for another injunction." Then you have two injunctions, one following the other, and so on; the process can go on indefinitely.

What would I do? As I stated, I would compel the utility to operate. I would say to those people who do not want to serve the public, and they know they are in the public service when they go to work in an industry of that kind, "Listen, you strike and stay out on strike overnight or for 10, 12, or 24 hours, and you folks are out of a job." Just how do you expect to operate a public utility if those who go on strike or those who are working and say they are going to quit have that privilege and yet retain the status of employees? Are you or am I or is anyone going to work for that public utility, knowing, as he does, that when the company and the employees agree, if they do agree, he is going to be fired, kicked out? I agree with the gentleman who offered this amendment just a few moments ag , the thing that comes first in this country is the public welfare. However harmful to a minority group the procedure may be, the welfare of the Nation must be protected.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would bring that section of the bill exactly to the point where it was when it was first presented as a part of the so-called quickie bill which was recently reported out of the Labor Committee. The committee after due deliberation decided that they certainly could not go into court and ask the court to grant an injunction against the employees, forcing them to work, and then do nothing whatever with respect to the employer. We prepared the sections of the bill which provide for a period of mediation, where the entire matter would be exposed to the public view and public pressure, and where the employer also would have to comply with the terms as well as the employees. The section provides for a reasonable period of mediation. I therefore ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. It is furthermore a fact that the bill provides that any wage adjustment made is retroactive to the date of the issuance of the injunction.

Mr. OWENS. That is exactly true. It provides that any wage adjustment made goes back to the period when the difficulty first arose.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In response to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill in its present state does not prevent industry-wide bargaining, is it not a fact that the amendment just offered by me, and which was adopted, prohibiting contracts among employers fixing wages, does just exactly that, and would take care of Mr. John L. Lewis in that regard?

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman is exactly right; there is no question about it.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan wants to give us an injunction with no opportunity to let the employees and employers get together. That is what we have in the coal industry today. We have the Government taking over the coal mines, with no opportunity for the operators and the miners to get together. They have had no opportunity to settle their dispute for about 10 months. This provision in the bill gives the employers and the employees a chance to get together and mediate, and then after they mediate for 30 days they have a chance to take a vote on the measure. If mediation fails and the vote fails, we put it before an arbitration board of three members for a period of 30 days and then they take another vote. This

gives some opportunity, and I would say in at least nine times out of ten gives the employers and employees a chance to get together and settle their disputes.

Of course, I expect the gentleman from Michigan wants an injunction that would last forever, but I think a 75-day injunction or a 90-day injunction is sufficient. This is similar to the Railway Labor Act. Under the Railway Labor Act there is provided a statutory injunction for the period of mediation and arbitration.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not a fact that this matter was thoroughly discussed in committee and, as a matter of fact, the provisions which the gentleman seeks to amend are synonymous with the so-called emergency bill which the committee reported out. I might add, furthermore, as chairman of the committee, I am in full accord with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I want to thank the chairman for his contribution.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not also true that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, if adopted, would bring the railway workers under this act, which I, for one, and I am sure many other Members of this Congress, do not want?

Mr. LANDIS. That is true.

LABOR'S LEGAL AND MORAL RIGHTS MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this so-called House omnibus labor bill, H. R. 3020, would change the whole range of national labor policy built up in the last 16 years, and reduce in every aspect the privileges and rights of labor. It would in effect abolish industry-wide bargaining.

It would repeal substantial sections of the Wagner Act, do away with the National Labor Relations Board, and bring unions under the penalties of the anti-trust laws.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the first effect—namely, the reduction of labor's status. What does that really mean? It means that labor's position at the bargaining table will be weakened. It means that labor will be asked or forced to accept less favorable terms from management.

Make no mistake about that, Mr. Chairman and Members of this House, this bill is aimed straight at the vital provisions of some 50,000 union contracts covering some 15,000,000 union members. These are bread-and-butter contracts which directly touch the lives of workers and their families throughout this broad land.

This proposal to weaken labor's position at the bargaining table is placed before us at the very moment when soaring prices and swollen profits threaten the Nation with an economic upheaval. This bill comes to us at a time when management itself is aghast at its own gains, when the buying power of the Nation's wage and salaried workers is lagging dangerously.

I challenge any thoughtful person to deny that the greatest domestic problem we face is this problem of reaching a sound economic balance. A just and wise balance which will keep the wheels of industry turning at high levels of employment, production, and distribution. Moreover, we must do just that unless we mean to slip back into the old vicious circle of boom and bust—with all the hardship and suffering and financial loss which that will bring.

We are asked to believe that the way to security and abundance, to peace and progress, lies along the path of reaction in punitive moves directed against all forms of labor security. To all intents and purposes the net effect of this bill is to open up an area of confusion and controversy involving some 11,000,000 workers.

Do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that about 77 percent of the workers in this country who belong to unions would have their status changed by this bill.

Now it is perfectly obvious that such proposals open wide the door to industrial strife. Union security is the very heart of these contracts. In many cases these security provisions were won after long struggles against the bitterest opposition from open-shop employers. Given this historical background and the undeniable fact that some employers still are anxious to get rid of unions, I do not see how H. R. 3020 could fail to result in industrial chaos.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all this bill provides. It also seeks to abolish industry-wide bargaining and enacts other restrictions which will limit the scope of a given union agreement within an industry. One avowed purpose of this curtailment is to weaken labor's position at the bargaining table—to tie labor's hands when its representatives sit down to bargain with the Nation's industrial giants.

The attempts today to cripple and destroy the working people's right to bargain collectively on an industry-wide basis is directly opposed to the socially progressive movement in sound labor-management relations that has been steadily advancing for the past 150 years.

In his life of William Sylvis, one of the great creative pioneers of the American labor movement, Dr. Jonathan Grossman observes that during the decade preceding the Civil War railroad mileage was nearly quadrupled to 30,000 miles.

With the phenomenal growth of transportation in the 1850's there came into being a national market, and this new national market encouraged in turn a trend toward mass production and big business. From these developments, by a natural, inevitable process, was born the national trade union, and later on, national federations of labor.

The logic of this evolution is simple enough. The business of a trade union is to protect the living standards of its members. In a market economy where competition prevails, this means that the union must be perpetually on guard against the tendency to treat labor as a commodity, that is, to pay it a price determined solely by the law of supply and demand.

In order to accomplish this objective, labor must have the sanctioned right to seek uniform wage rates, hours and working conditions through industry-wide collective bargaining because:

First. It takes wage rates—but not wage costs—out of competition, and this is a good objective, since the labor of a human being should not be completely subject to the impersonal forces of the market place. Furthermore, by protecting decent employers from cutthroat competitors, who take an unfair advantage by paying antisocial, sweatshop wages, industry-wide bargaining promotes the only kind of competition that is morally justifiable or socially desirable; namely, competition based on managerial efficiency, service, and quality standards.

Second. It encourages a more intelligent and public-spirited approach to wages than does local bargaining. Our economy has become so complex and interrelated that the level of wages is now a matter of public concern. Collective bargaining on the local level ignores the national scene and is frequently conducted by men who are at best amateur economists. The situation is different when bargaining takes place on a national or regional basis. Then the negotiators are surrounded by experts, and the contract which eventually emerges responds to the needs of the entire industry and of the whole economy. More so than the product of local bargaining, it tends to reflect an objective analysis of facts; is less the outcome of a blind test of economic strength.

Third. It promotes industrial peace and stability by facilitating changes in wage rates demanded by shifting economic conditions. Instead of hundreds, or even thousands, of individual adjustments, with all the friction and loss of time these involve, a simple agreement for each industry, or each geographical division of the industry, is all that is required.

Fourth. It will eventually weed out incompetent employers who have managed to survive up till now solely because they underpay their workers, or it will force them to improve their methods. Since subnormal wages are a cost to the community, as well as a source of other social and moral evils, the exclusion of hopelessly incompetent employers is a desirable objective.

Fifth. It will promote uniformity in job classification. While some variety in classifying jobs may be permissible, there is little excuse for the anarchic differences which are fairly common in American industry. These remain a prolific source of unrest among the workers.

Sixth. It equalizes bargaining power between small employers and big unions.

Seventh. It is the only means by which competition can be regulated without having recourse either to government control or to private agreements among employers on prices and production.

The advantages of industry-wide bargaining manifestly outweigh the pretended disadvantages. Industry-wide collective bargaining is a healthy step toward maturity in industrial relations. It is an alternative to competitive

anarchy and government regulation, and it is a logical development in a progressive trend from excessive individualism to group responsibility, and proper social controls.

Today our huge and complex industrial structure is beset by the very problems and dangers that this bill would multiply tenfold. This is obvious to every housewife who goes shopping, to every worker who takes home a pay check. It is obvious to business and industry as they face the prospect of narrower markets and declining purchasing power.

Having been called upon to end price control, we are now asked to make an end of effective bargaining between labor and management.

Mr. Chairman, collective bargaining has become an integral part of America's industrial structure. And that is as it should be, for free collective bargaining is by far the most democratic and wholesome way of bringing about needed adjustments. It is the right way for labor and management to settle their differences and share their responsibilities. That is why I say that the arithmetic of true collective bargaining is also the arithmetic of true democracy.

Right here, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on a rather curious fact. From the first beginnings of the American labor movement, the things which unions asked for—the bread-and-butter contracts which they sought—were denounced in many quarters. Then, after each gain had been won, historians and people generally looked back and agreed that labor's so-called demands were justified and necessary—because they represented the very things that gave meaning and purpose to our democracy.

This was clear enough in retrospect. It should be clear today. Would any one seriously claim that our economic stability is theatened because the Nation's wage and salaried workers are getting too large a share of the national income? On the contrary, the danger lies in another quarter.

Much is being said about the need for more democratic procedures within the ranks of organized labor. I would like to remind the authors of H. R. 3020 that the rank and file of union members are much closer to union affairs than are the electors of most cities. I would like to remind them that union members have a much more direct interest and a more direct voice in the way their unions are run than the citizens in the affairs of their city—where the latter are permitted a voice.

Democracy in unions is not perfect, but it compares very favorably with its counterpart in other kinds of civic activity. In this connection, let me cite a recent article by Joseph Shister, of Yale University, entitled "The Locus of Union Control in Collective Bargaining," the article appeared in the Quarterly Journal of Economics for August 1946. I quote:

> The ultimate control over collective bargaining in most unions does rest with the rank and file. * * * True, the full power of settlement is sometimes vested in the negotiators, but the significant point is that this power is voluntarily entrusted to the leaders by the rank and file in most instances. It is true further, that especially in national negotiations, the actual control over the bargain—in practice—rests with a small subcommittee of the negotiating group. But here again the condition has been brought about by necessary structural conditions, and was not imposed on the rank and file by leadership.

Mr. Chairman, in the President's message to Congress, on January 6, concerning labor-management problems, he stated:

> We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

In cooperation with our Chief Executive, at a time when this Nation and the world is entering a fateful hour of history, I suggest to you that our national economy and security should not be endangered by incitement towards industrial strife; industry-wide collective bargaining, and its associate objectives in protecting and preserving the legal and moral rights of the working men and women of this country, should be retained and encouraged by the Congress of these United States.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF PUBLIC UTILITY DISPUTES

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the public utility field, sections 203 and 204 of the proposed bill would create a method of handling labor disputes in this field which has never before been tried in this country or elsewhere. The procedure proposed in these sections is entirely new and without the benefit of any experience either in America or abroad. Without a clear and specific definition of what constitutes a public utility the act proposes for the Federal Government through its various instrumentalities, including the office of the President, to handle and adjust all labor disputes in this field. It is utterly unrealistic without any possibilities of success.

Public utilities in Americ are almost without exception regulated by local or State authorities. The very right of their existence and the scope of their operations and the price that they can charge for their services are almost wholly regulated by local or State governments. To give the Federal Government, as this new act proposes, jurisdiction of these operations will undoubtedly be a further extension of the definition of interstate commerce since the entire act is predicated upon the conduct of labor-management relations which affect commerce. This palpable encroachment upon State and local authority is a far cry from the announced position of the Republican Party of what this country needs is less government instead of more government.

Sections 203 and 204 of the proposed bill completely fail to take into account a long uphill struggle for good labor relations in the public utility field. In some branches of the public utility field, such as street railway systems, the employees have belonged to trade unions for almost half a century. Many of the agreements in this industry were negotiated almost 30 or 40 years ago and provided for voluntary arbitration of issues which could not otherwise be agreed to. Today a great many labor agreements in this industry contain a similar or identical provision. As a matter of fact, a great many employers and union leaders in the mass transportation industry have stated, with considerable pride, the fact that in their operations they have voluntarily, consistently agreed to arbitrate disputed differences rather than to resort to a stoppage of work.

Last December the United States Conciliation Service invited representatives of the gas, electric, street railway, and bus industries and the representatives of unions which most frequently have membership in these industries to voluntarily attend a conference in Washington for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of arriving at a plan or formula which could be used for the adjustment of disputes in these industries without the necessity of resorting to a stoppage of work. The conference was quite successful in that the parties all sent able representation and a full day's discussion brought further renewed hope that such a formula or plan might eventualiv be evolved. At the close of the conference it was generally understood that the parties would continue to have exploratory meetings, industry by industry, with a view that some plan might eventually crystallize which could serve as the basis for peaceful adjustment for all labor disputes in the public-utility field. It must be remembered that this entire program was initiated and carried out on a purely voluntary basis. Subsequent to the meeting of the above industries exploratory conferences were begun in the communications field. These conferences have not been exhausted and most assuredly will be renewed at the proper time. This is the American way of reaching a workable understanding upon a matter of great complexity and of wide ramifications. Any other way would seem undemocratic and unlikely to succe.d.

There has been a growing tendency during the past many months for public utility enterprises to agree to adjust their differences, including basic contract terms, through the instrumentality of voluntary arbitration. The Consolidated Edison Co. of New York and the union representing its employees, without compulsion from any source, agreed to voluntarily arbitrate disputed issues during their recent contract negotiations. A large up-State New York electric utility did the same thing. This was true in St. Louis and in the State of Mississippi, in Milwaukee, and elsewhere. Wartime controls have been relinquished and large segments of the public-utility field will gradually return to the historic method of settling their disputed issues through voluntary arbitration. A study or check of the voluntary arbitration cases each week in the public-utility field will confirm this statement to the satisfaction of the most skeptical student on the subject.

This proposed new act would seem to completely discourge this time-honored method of adjusting labor disputes in the public-utility field. The sections of this new act dealing with the public-utility field establishes new and novel procedures which are an invitation to the parties to discard the long-time and well-

established practices and turn to this nightmarish procedure which involves two branches of our Federal Government and might conceivably be interpreted to require the use of the third or legislative branch of our Government in the effort to settle one labor dispute.

It seems to me that no good can come from scrapping 40 or 50 years of experience and progress for the purpose of starting anew with something that no one knows whether or not will work. With the proper amount of education and understanding and with a continually fuller realization of the importance and nature of their work, it is quite conceivable that a democratic society with free collective bargaining will eventually show the way to uninterrupted operation of public utilities. Voluntary arbitration which is becoming increasingly popular with both management and employees—yes. Compulsory arbitration which both management and employees deplore and despise—no. The American way of life is as much a part of the public-utility field as it is of any of our other business enterprises.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that most Members of Congress recognize the need for eliminating the abuses and excesses that have crept into labor-management relations. These matters are closely bound up with and vitally affect the national economy and the public interest. They are complex, far-reaching, and their solution is fraught with gravest consequences, depending upon whether proposed remedies are sound and well-considered or, on the other hand, prejudicial and ill-advised.

While I appreciate the seriousness and gravity of the problems presented and the difficulties confronting the committee in connection with the formulation of this bill, I must disapprove the final form of the measure. In the first place, I believe that longer and more careful study should have been given to the many questions of greatest moment to our economy which are presented by this measure.

Equalization of the bargaining position of labor and management and not the shifting of the incidences of power from one side to the other should be a primary aim of this bill. Great damage and mischief may be done by the enactment of laws in this field which are complicated, undigested in form, and too broad in general outline. The unfortunate impression has arisen that the measure aims not so much at the elimination of abuses and excesses as it aims at the punishment, crippling, or liquidation of labor organizations. In this strange mixture of prohibitions, strait-jacket provisions, repeal of basic labor rights, little, if any, concern is directed to the possible effects upon the national economy, to the danger of even more extensive regimentation over the affairs of our people and our businessmen. It is idle to believe that the great labor classes of the Nation can be herded and regimented by the same bureaucratic techniques which we have been seeking to escape without inviting the regimentation of other groups, including business, large and small, and including the farmer as well. We have had enough regimentation. What we need now is liberation from dictatorial government.

It is appropriate, in my opinion, for the Congress to recognize and bar unfair labor practices on the part of unions as well as employers. It might be appropriate and timely to democratize labor organizations, to correct the evils of coercive picketing, jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes, secondary boycotts, and strikes that affect great public-service corporations, and thereby imperil the national interest. But there are sound constitutional ways and repressive and unconstitutional ways to achieve these results. We can, if we will, carefully redress valid grievances, check well-known abuses, and preserve the delicate but necessary balance between labor and industry without imposing unreasonable and discriminatory and punitive restraints on organized labor and the toiling masses of American working people.

This type of legislation, especially, should not be enacted in haste or at a time or in a spirit of hysteria. Retribution against the misdeeds of the few should not be visited upon the many. While the bill will undoubtedly pass this House, it will never become law in its present form, thanks to the wise safeguards of our constitutional system of checks and balances which will insure corrective changes before this or any similar measure can become law.

I am opposed in general to the use of compulsion in securing social and economic ends, because this theory is undemocratic, totalitarian, and can lead only to the break-down of democracy, the overthrow of the profit system, and ultimate dictatorship. It will engender suspicions and animosities, ill-will, and bitterness between the very groups of our American productive system which should and must zealously cooperate in hard zealous work if we are to enhance production, restore balance to our economy, achieve prosperity for industry, and provide employment for our citizens.

The use of judicial injunction to settle labor disputes provided by this measure belongs to the past age. It is a step backward in industrial relations. It will rekindle the fierce social strife that characterized the days of the infamous "yellow dog" contracts. It will break the faith of working people everywhere in the fairness and impartiality of the Federal Government as an arbiter of their differences with management.

The clauses of the bill to democratize unions are crude, unwieldy, and unworkable. The abandonment of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor discards the one great agency in the Government which possesses at once the experience, machinery, personnel, and aptitude to cope with labor troubles. The bill is so complex and contains so many disconnected, unrelated provisions that it defies clear legal analysis, and is utterly meaningless to the average American who has little, if any, comprehension of the broad sweep and serious implications of the measure.

If, instead of merging so many insoluble ideas into a bewildering fabric of inconsistency, repression, and retaliation that is bound to result in severe and sustained repercussions in time upon the whole economic system, the committee had taken sufficient time to study and consider these matters, and had reported separate bills, or even a well-coordinated bill protecting collective bargaining, equalizing labor-management bargaining rights, by amending the Wagner Act, consolidating and extending the powers of the Conciliation Service, and protecting the country against the interruption or stoppage of our great public service instrumentalities, the public would have more settled assurances that this measure was honestly and impartially directed toward labor peace rather than provocative of labor disputes, labor warfare, and ultimate regimentation of our economy.

This is a time for unifying the forces of democracy, for mobilizing all component parts of our social organism in order to tackle and solve the great problems confronting us. We can never achieve this unity and effect this mobilization so long as labor groups and laboring men believe that their Government is scuttling collective bargaining, their organizations, and their basic protective rights.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any further need to unmask the intent of the sponsors of this bill to render collective bargaining through legitimate labor organizations a mere sham, it is successfully dispelled by the provision under consideration.

Under section 8 (a) (2) and considered in conjunction with section 2 (5) and 8 (d) (3), there can be no lingering doubt that the sponsors of this measure are determined to return the labor movement and with it collective bargaining to a condition of servitude.

Consider a moment what the sections I have referred to will accomplish. Under the sections I have mentioned it will become permissible for the employer "by reward, favor, or other thing of value" to revive long outlawed company unions for the purpose of bucking legtimate efforts of employees to organize of their own choosing.

The precise and clear language of the present act prohibiting the employer from creating and maintaining company unions and the abundant Board and court precedents giving vitality to this guarantee gives way to a confusing definition that will permit numerous forms of employer domination of such organizations.

The bill states that it shall not be an unfair labor practice for an employer to form or maintain a committee of employees and to discuss with it matters of mutual interest, including grievances, wages, hours of employment, and other working conditions, unless the Board has certified, or the employer, in his magnanimity, has recognized a representative.

Since such an employer-sponsored "committee" will, under the bill, be defined as a labor organization, the proposal represents the boldest invitation to company-union activity imaginable.

Under such provisions of law, the employer will be sitting on both sides of the bargaining table. In effect, he will be talking to himself, and that is exactly what the sponsors of this measure desire.

What an empty promise to the workingman of America. What a shameful invasion of his natural right. If we in this Congress approve of such provisions, I say to you, in good conscience, we shall commit a moral wrong and shall one day pay dearly for our ill-considered action.

Is not the American worker entitled to more consideration from the Congress? Is the American worker always to expect that class legislation and special interests control the legislative body? I say to you again there is no surer way of dividing America into warring camps than to deprive the American workers of the only avenue available to protect his God-given right to a family living wage. I say to you, in all seriousness, it is on such proposals as this that the festering sore of communism will spread.

How in good conscience can we hold forth to American labor the right to organize and to bargain collectively and in the same proposal permit this right to be trampled at will? The bill, by permitting the employer openly to foster, finance, and control a bargaining committee of his employees, will turn back the clock to days that had best be forgotten. What chance will an employee have to serve his own interests in bettering his working condition, if we permit the employer to create and control his labor organization?

Oh, the proponents of the measure glibly argue that such will not happen and that such is not their intent, but these arguments only serve to emphasize their incompetence. They are unaware of the history of employer interference. How can they understand what their measure will do? I say to you, in all earnestness, these provisions are designed to destroy legitimate trade-unionism and, for the good of America, must be rejected. One of the surest ways of destroying democracy is first to destroy labor. One of the sure ways to destroy labor is to so weaken it that its unions become impotent. And the surest way to render its unions weak and servile is to turn them over to the employer. You are treating with American democracy in this measure and particularly in these provisions.

I say to you, meet your obligation in a forthright manner. Reject this opening wedge on the liberties that we hold dear.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

H. R. 3020, if it becomes law, will change the American way of life. And if it remains the law of the land, America will never be the same again.

I cannot believe that the Supreme Court would uphold such a law. The Supreme Court said in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1, 33):

> Long ago we stated * * * that a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; that he was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family; that if the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and resist arbitrary and unfair treatment; that union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer.

And in Supreme Court decision, page 338, *J. I. Case Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (321 U. S. 332):

> The very purpose of providing by statute for the collective agreement is to supersede the terms of separate agreements of employees with terms which reflect the strength and bargaining power and serve the welfare of the group.

No, Mr. Chairman; I do not believe the Supreme Court would uphold H. R. 3020.

But we must remember how long it was between the time when the Wagner Act was passed and the date when the Supreme Court declared it constitutional. It was during this period that the great strikes in the so-called Little Steel industry and many other bitter and often bloody industrial battles were waged against labor which was trying to enforce demands on employers who defied the law and the Government.

If this law were to be upon the statute books, either organized labor in this country would voluntarily agree to dissolve and leave the individual worker to bargain for himself, or the unions of this country would be forced to accept the responsibility for insurrection against the law of the land.

There is hardly a practice which has been accepted in labor-management relations for 50 years which could not be declared illegal under this law. Industrial democracy would be at an end.

These statements, I am assured, are not exaggerations.

I am sure that other Members of this body are as bewildered as I am that our colleagues who signed the majority report could associate themselves with such proposals.

I like to think, although perhaps this is not charitable either, that they do not understand what they are doing. I feel the time has come for understanding upon the part of the American people of what is about to be done to them; for an understanding by us of what it is proposed we shall do.

I find no difficulty in predicting that if this bill is passed and once the American people—whether they are members of organized labor or not—understand what we have done to them, the time will come that this will be remembered as one of the blackest days in the history of our Republic. It will be so considered because our generation and the generations to come will say that in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, stupidity triumphed.

I do not need to refer to my mail, although I hear this from my constituents every day, to discover that the American people are disturbed. They are disturbed every time they go to the grocery store; every time they read a newspaper; every time they turn on the radio; and increasingly as they hear sermons in church on Sunday. They are disturbed because they fear that something menacing and obscure is happening in this country; some seemingly deliberate fostering of dissension; some calculated creation of disunity.

For the Congress of the United States to pass such a bill as this is bound to confirm their worst fears and to reexcite their greatest anxieties.

These average people feel themselves caught up in the grip of circumstances over which they have all too little control.

I know this because I talk to them. I talk to them in my district, and I talk to them in many other parts of the country, and they write to me; these anxieties are particularly deep among the women of America. I think some of us forget that for many millions of women of America, this war was not a great adventure but a great trial. They hoped and believed that when their men came home, it would be the beginning of a new day for America. Now they are forced to the conclusion that these hopes were without reasonable foundation—at least today—at least for the time being. And there is a profound reason why they are dismayed and disturbed.

Many people learned during the war, for the first time, how great is American productive capacity. They learned that it was possible for this country alone to produce the abundance of guns and tanks and planes for ourselves and our allies to win the war and at the same time to raise the family incomes for many millions of American families.

They cannot understand why we cannot do as well or better in peacetime, and yet they know from the newspapers that the hectic boom of our postwar period is coming to an end. They fear this end is near and may be most sudden and severe.

They know that during the war 200 of our largest corporations consistently had 70 percent of all war contracts by dollar volume. They know the great majority of these corporations have earned far higher profits after the war than during the war.

They know that American industry is earning in the first quarter of 1947 nearly 4½ times the average peacetime profits for the years 1936–39. They know that their family incomes have been falling slowly but steadily since VJ-day and that their dollars have been buying less and less, so that in terms of real income they are far worse off than during the war.

Today we are legislating in haste; I predict that many of us will have ample opportunity to repent at leisure later—after 1948.

The passage of this omnibus bill will be a triumph for a suicidal antilabor, union-busting propaganda campaign that started right after VJ-day. It has gained strength and momentum with each victory it has won.

The content of this bill, and the manner in which it was assembled and presented to the House, are of a piece with the indirect and probably unconstitutional butchery of Labor Department functions and personnel in the recent Labor Department appropriations bill, H. R. 2700.

Put that bill and this bill together and they spell hell—literal industrial hell for American employers, workers, and consumers.

Both bills, to my mind, are part of a pattern and a plan, a pattern for industrial anarchy, to be followed by a step-by-step substitution of the power of the State for free collective bargaining, a plan for the rapid weakening and destruction of free trade-unions.

The Labor Department is to be weakened to the point of destruction by a 43-percent cut in its budget; unions are to be destroyed by a long list of prohibitions.

Our Nation is to be Balkan-ized, economically and politically, so far as workers are concerned, but not as far as our vast interlocking corporate employers are concerned. Labor is to be robbed of both the power to protect itself in bargaining with management and the protection of the Federal Government in minimum wages, maximum hours, and the operation of a truly national labor market. It all adds up to a program for again making labor a commodity and an article of commerce, to be purchased at the buyer's price on thousands of local, isolated labor markets.

While this bill proposes in effect to repeal the National Labor Relations Act, H. R. 2700 would wreck the Conciliation Service, thereby depriving employees and employers of that service.

H. R. 2700 would cut the Bureau of Labor Statistics budget by 60 percent, thereby shutting down the collection, frequent assembly and publication of up-to-date statistics necessary in reasonable negotiation of collective bargaining agreement. And, to make sure that workers already weakened and made defenseless by this proposed bill could not efficiently seek employment elsewhere, H. R. 2700 cuts the United States Employment Service fund by 77 percent.

Mr. Chairman, by passage of this bill, the House is attempting to pin the blame for our industrial relations troubles, for the soaring cost of living which I discussed on this floor on March 13, and for the bust that is coming, on labor, rather than on management and on Congress itself, where it belongs. This House is being stampeded into making the victim the culprit.

The principal culprit is not the American wagearner, nor the union member, nor his elected officials. The main culprits are those in management—not all employers, mind you—and the Members in Congress who forced through a phony OPA bill which could not and was not intended to hold prices.

Concurrently, a coalition of profiteers refused to agree to wage increases that would have sustained purchasing power and markets on a stable, healthy basis. Their sit-down strikes against the workers and the national interest were largely financed out of the Federal Treasury through the carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the tax act "for the relief of the greedy, not the needy," and by premature repeal of the excess-profits tax.

Such wage increases as were granted were only about half enough to do the job that had to be done if we were to convert from a war to a stable peacetime economy of full production, consumption, and employment, year in and year out. Those wage increases that were granted were more than eaten up by spiraling price increases that now frighten retailers and a growing number of employers.

Let us see what happened in 1946, the first full year after peace broke out. The facts are presented in the April 14 issue of the Progressive as obtained from the Departments of Commerce and Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission. They show—

Corporation profits up 34 percent, $12,000,000,000 after taxes, an all-time high; now running at the rate of $15,000,000,000 a year after taxes.

Prices to consumers increased 19 percent; they have risen more in 1947.

Wages increased only 14 percent, and in some fields less or not at all. Peacetime jobs, no overtime, and downgrading cut take-home pay and purchasing power.

Savings of individuals dropped to the lowest level since 1941 and to half the amount saved in 1945.

To this I would add the significant fact that installment selling is rapidly increasing consumer debt, eating into tomorrow's purchasing power and markets.

These hard facts, Mr. Chairman, and not the conduct of unions or of collective bargaining by union officials, are the cause of industrial troubles and our guilty fear of the future.

Why this ferocious attempt to break American trade unionism? Why do any American employers consent to a course of action which first starves and finally liquidates their own customers as depression and unemployment follow the collapse of the present boom?

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we may find the answer in a remarkable statement made by Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., shortly before the beginning of the costly General Motors strike, November 1945. Mr. Wilson proposed a 45–48 hour week. He argued that American workers would have to work longer hours without higher wages in order to supply the world market.

Mr. Wilson said in his October 19 press conference:

> Until the aftermath of this war is over, we ought to go back to about a 45- or 48-hour workweek. That is what the rest of the world is going to do. That is the only way that we will produce the volume of materials and goods at a sufficiently low price to satisfy the people of our country. I doubt, personally, if that is going to happen. In my own memory, I remember the 60-hour workweek, 40 or 50 years ago. When I first ran a plant, it was 50 hours. (P. 21, press conference transcript.)

Bear in mind that it was this C. E. Wilson who 6 weeks later met with the heads of leading corporations in steel, electrical goods, and meat packing to discuss their labor problems because, in his words, "we were all looking down the same gun." And bear in mind that it was General Motors who held out against the union and the Federal fact-finding board's recommendations until, in March, higher car prices were granted, just as an unjustified price increase for steel had been granted.

General Motors is against industry-wide bargaining. It is against corporation-wide bargaining. It is on record as favoring plant-by-plant bargaining, of making big unions into little plant unions. General Motors, I am sure, is in favor of this bill we have under consideration now, H. R. 3020.

Mr. Chairman, a coalition of short-run profiteers and long-run economic imperialists who look upon the world as their oyster—provided American workers can be made to behave—are about to succeed in their postwar plan to pin the blame on labor for their own outrageous exploitations of the American people's postwar need and demand for goods. I hope the President vetoes this bill. Should it be passed over his veto—and I do not believe it will be—we again will be sowing the wind for a political whirlwind in 1948, or 1950, or 1952. The longer it is in coming, the greater its force.

When the storm breaks, first in our economy and then in politics, when there is more time and inclination to trace the steps by which we—and I include the Congress—threw away our chance to make the change-over from stable all-out production for war to stable all-out production for peace, I believe the American people will finally put the blame where it belongs.

They will put it on the profiteers and the economic imperialists in industry who fought labor and brought on inflation and collapse. They will put blame on those in this Congress who, however conscientiously, voted for this bill. And they will not discriminate too carefully between those who did it with reservations and those who did it with a whoop and a holler. This is not an attempt to threaten; it is a statement of belief, of profound faith in the intelligence of the American people.

Labor was not strong enough to bargain effectively for the whole increase in hourly rates justified by markets, production costs and existing prices, rates required to maintain take-home pay and purchasing power. Labor was not strong enough to block unjustified price increases, before and after June 30, 1946, which more than canceled out such wage increases as were won.

Labor is not strong enough to prevent passage of this bill.

I am asked why labor has not proposed some so-called labor legislation to cure obvious injustices in affairs within, between, and among unions. Mr. Speaker, as I sense the temper of the majority in the House, I think I know the main reason. It is because labor feared, and with good reason, that such proposals as it might make would supply the take-off for such a vendetta against all labor as is proposed in this bill.

Yes; labor is too weak to resist and beat this bill. It will be passed by this body, which is trying to pin labor's shoulders to the mat. Labor's enemies will win this round.

The next round will be after the American people have learned what the GOP "Bill of Rights and Magna Carta" for labor actually contain.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the people of America are disturbed and they have been disturbed. They were disturbed when the coal strike came a year ago. They were disturbed when the coal strike came again last fall. They are disturbed today when we have the national telephone strike. They are disturbed, may I say in response to the gentlewoman from California, because they have thought we

delayed in passing legislation at this session to deal with such situations.

This part of the bill with which we are dealing now goes to answer the one question most generally asked by the people of the country about labor legislation. That question is this: What are you going to do when you have tried mediation, when you have tried collective bargaining, when you have tried conciliation, when you have tried voluntary arbitration, when you have tried to get the parties to a dispute together and you are confronted by a strike imperiling the national welfare? The question that this Congress is called upon to answer, if it answers any question at all in the field of labor relations, is what you are going to do with a strike affecting the public welfare, public health, or public safety when you have tried all of these devices and they have not achieved settlement.

Every effort is made in this bill to avoid interfering with the right to strike for lawful and proper objectives. The right to strike, the right to quit work in concert, is a normal accompaniment of the right to bargain collectively. But a distinction must be made, Mr. Chairman, between the right to quit work individually and the right to quit work in concert. The right of an individual to work or not to work is a natural right and a right protected by the Constitution. The right to strike, however, is not a natural right. And, if I may paraphrase, there is no right anywhere, anytime, for any group to act in concert against the public welfare, not even in the name of good intentions by a labor organization.

Without the language provided in this bill in sections 203 and 204, there will remain a question as to whether the Government can grant an injunction in a labor dispute, even where public welfare is involved. In the case of United States against Hutcheson, the Supreme Court, with Justice Frankfurter speaking the majority opinion, said:

> So long as a union acts in self-interest, * * * the licit and the illicit under section 20 are not to be distinguished by any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or the unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means.

He was referring to action under the Clayton antitrust law which would be forbidden, in his judgment, because of the declaration of policy in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In the John L. Lewis case, recently, the Court upheld by a 5-to-4 decision the right of the Government to get an injunction where the Government was the employer through having seized the industry. What would be the situation without seizure, no one knows.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. Until I have completed the main part of my statement I cannot yield; I am sorry.

When the President vetoed the bill which we presented to him from the Congress last year, in the section of his message pertaining to the proposal to modify the Norris-LaGuardia Act, he said:

> Injunctions requested by the Government itself and designed to restrain strikes against the Government in cases where refusal to work for the Government have produced a condition of national emergency are to my mind an essential element of governmental authority.

So the President in his veto message last year recognized that if there is a strike against what he called the Government itself, and the Government asked for the right of injunction, then it was something which should be granted as an essential element of sovereignty. That was the procedure he followed in the most recent coal strike. He asked for an injunction against John L. Lewis. That, however, was preceded by Government seizure, and you had the Government attorneys contending that this was a strike of Government employees, so to speak, and in that case an even stronger case of a strike against Government.

The language which the gentleman from Michigan proposes to strike from the bill would leave the bill standing with a naked right to ask injunction without any specific proposal to take the place of Government seizure upon which the injunction in the coal strike rested. With the expiration of the seizure provisions of the Smith-Connally Act, the Government today is powerless to ask for an injunction unless it is rested upon the precarious position of the 5-to-4 holding of the Court that the Government was not bound by the Norris-LaGuardia Act in the coal case.

So this portion of the bill with which we are dealing now does properly set aside the Norris-LaGuardia Act where the Government is the party asking for the right of injunction in the person of the Attorney General. But to bolster that and to say that we are not merely saying we are going to enjoin a strike in the name of Government and maintain certain services by injunction, the committee, rightly in my judgment, proposed the additional procedure contained in section 204, to give some guaranty that an effort would be made to settle the grievances involved in the dispute.

If you strike these provisions from the bill you have nothing left but a naked injunction. You create power to force the hand of labor; you do nothing to create a desire on the part of management to settle issues. In fact, you invite management to stand pat.

Mr. Chairman, what we want is industrial peace with justice. We do not want either side, management or labor, to avoid its responsibility to reach an agreement with justice. So in dealing with public-welfare strikes, if you are not going to have Government seizure, if you are not going to have some other method of trying to establish justice for the issues involved, then you should at least keep in the bill the language that is contained in section 204 as proposed by the Committee. That is why I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be voted down.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I cannot yield; I am sorry. My time is limited.

One of the three amendments the gentleman proposed should have been considered separately. I think it was a mistake, for this reason, to have agreed to consider them en bloc but, unfortunately, consent was granted before the amendments were read. The amendment to which I now refer proposes to strike out section 205.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Section 205 exempts persons subject to the Railway Labor Act from the provisions of this portion of the bill. The gentleman from Michigan in his third amendment proposed to strike out section 205. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that with section 205 remaining in the bill you do not have an answer to that final $64 question of what you will do if the National Railway Labor Act breaks down in an end dispute again.

Perhaps it is anticipated that the President will be permitted to come up again and ask us for a draft of labor, but, personally, I think we should find an answer to the $64 question which would be applicable to all labor disputes of whatever character when the regular procedures break down.

That I sought to do in the comprehensive bill, H. R. 725, which I introduced at the opening of this Congress, and more recently in H. R. 2900, which deals with this problem of public-welfare disputes alone. I recognize, of course, that the House is not going to add to the bill in any major particular at this time, but I mention this point in passing and call attention to these bills for the reference of those who may go into the matter further, or for possible consideration when this bill goes to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee of the Whole will reject the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan, which are to be voted upon en bloc.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, having under discussion title II, starting on page 54 of the bill, I want to call the attention of the Members to page 96 of the minority report reading as follows:

> Title II of the bill would wipe out the existing Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor and create an independent agency of the Federal Government to be called the Office of Conciliation, headed by a Director of Conciliation. All of the functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service as provided for under the enabling act of 1913, establishing the Department of Labor, are transferred to the new Office of Conciliation. Aside from the emergency procedures relating to public utilities, the new Office of Conciliation would have no new or additional powers. There would seem to be no reason whatsoever for going through the hocus-pocus of creating a new agency independent of the Secretary of Labor.

On the middle of the next page you will find the following:

The proposed bill is certainly not based upon any evidence presented at the hearings before this committee. There has been no public clamor for an independent agency. On the contrary, the record of the hearings shows that representatives of organized management and labor oppose the separation of the conciliation facilities from the Department of Labor. The National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Association of Machinists, and the National Federation of Telephone Workers are all on record as favoring the retention of the present Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again say this is nothing but window dressing in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, proposes to establish an independent Office of Conciliation to handle labor disputes in industries affecting commerce. The present conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor would be transferred to that Office.

The creation of an independent Conciliation Office would not, in my opinion, be as effective as the present Conciliation Service of the Labor Department. I say this because the Hartley bill makes no provision for participation by management and labor in the operation of the conciliation program. The Labor Department Conciliation Service has become increasingly effective in the last year because it has operated with the advice and counsel of an Advisory Committee of outstanding management and labor representatives.

The Labor-Management Advisory Committee for the Conciliation Service was created pursuant to the unanimous recommendation of the President's labor-management conference, held in November 1945. This was one of the outstanding accomplishments of that conference. The committee members were selected from nominations submitted by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The Advisory Committee is responsible for making recommendations to the Secretary of Labor or to the Director of the Conciliation Service with respect to the policy, procedures, organization, and development of adequate standards and qualifications for the personnel of the Conciliation Service.

The Advisory Committee is not a perfunctory group. On the contrary, for the past year it has met on an average of every 6 weeks and has actively and intelligently performed its advisory responsibilities. Material improvement has been made in the policies and operations of the Labor Department Conciliation Service during this period. Every substantial change made was upon the advice of these representatives of management and labor, or with their approval after serious consideration.

Among the substantial changes made in the present Conciliation Service in the past year are:

First. The mediation efforts of the Conciliation Service have been supplemented by the development of four major mediation techniques for special types of cases. These techniques are the use of special conciliators, tri-partite mediation, more extensive use of voluntary arbitration, and the appointment of emergency boards of inquiry.

Second. The arbitration policy has been changed so that now the parties to a dispute have a responsibility in the selection of arbitrators, and in the payment of reasonable arbitration fees, except in hardship cases. A panel list of outstanding, impartial men has been selected by Regional Labor-Management Advisory Committees from which arbitrators are designated.

Third. The field organization of the Service has been revised to provide more efficient operation and supervision of the field staff of conciliators. A policy of closer cooperation with State mediation agencies has also been adopted.

Fourth. A comprehensive program of personnel training has been established, and detailed up-to-date information on current labor law and industrial relations practices is furnished regularly to the conciliators.

Fifth. The technical staff has been decentralized to the field and the Technical Division operates with the advice and counsel of the Technical Advisory Committee, selected in the same manner as the Labor-Management Advisory Committee.

These, and other changes, have made the Labor Department Conciliation Service an improved and more efficient agency. But even more important is the fact that we have a "going concern" which is steadily improving and which has for the first time the advantage of a real spirit of cooperation from the management side.

The success or failure of the conciliation efforts of any governmental agency is determined largely by the attitude of management and labor, its customers. We are now getting a favorable attitude from both management and labor toward an existing conciliation agency with a valuable experience gained by trial and error over a period of many years.

H. R. 3020 proposes, in effect, that these advantages be cast aside for a different system of conciliation. I disagree with this proposal. Gentlemen, I am of the opinion that the conciliation efforts of the Federal Government should be concentrated in the present Conciliation Service, and that this Service should remain in the Department of Labor.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see Congress legislate in the field of labor-management relations. I am firmly convinced that we must outlaw jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, wildcat strikes, featherbedding, and labor racketeering. That is why I voted for the Hobbs and Lea bills in the last Congress. I believe unions should publish their financial reports and operate democratically; that foremen's unions should not be legalized; and that the National Labor Relations Board should be overhauled. I feel that the union shop is more in keeping with American principles than the closed shop, and I am opposed to picket-line violence and to picketing by persons not employed in the struck shop.

But I cannot support a bill which undermines the Norris-LaGuardia Act and permits the use of injunctions in labor disputes unless there are greater safeguards than this bill now provides against such use. The use of injunctions promotes industrial strife.

I cannot support a bill which outlaws industry-wide bargaining in competitive industries. In reaching this decision I am primarily mindful of the effect of such legislation on the industries in my district. If competing industries in other parts of the country were to pay lower wages, industries in my district would be placed in an unfair position in pricing their product. Labor would tend to migrate to areas where pay was high; industries would move to areas where labor was cheap. Regulation of industry-wide bargaining is necessary, but to ban it will not help industry, or labor, or the public.

I believe that a great majority of the people of the country favor most of the provisions of this bill. I wish that these noncontroversial items had been reported out in a separate bill, which, I believe, would receive the endorsement of responsible labor leaders as well as management. But there are a few sections of this omnibus bill which so impair union security that the bill can only increase labor unrest.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the effect of this be to shut off any discussion on an amendment to be added at the end of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with keen interest to this debate during these past 3 days on a measure which strikes at the very fundamentals of the American way of life. Throughout all of this discussion there has been running constantly in the back of my mind a picture of these good men and women — the working men and women—in my district in northeastern Minnesota. I have thought of the men and women of the CIO who produced iron ore from our large iron-ore producing district, the largest iron-ore producing district in the world. I followed the railroad men who shipped that ore from the mines down to the port, the city of

Duluth, the largest inland port in the world. I thought of the men in the AFL in the shipyards and in the many war plants during the period of the war. And, as I did, the picture came to my mind of the fantastic, the phenomenal job of production done by these people, producing the iron ore which gave us steel production, the very backbone of our whole war effort, which made it possible for this great Nation to build a Navy within a space of 3 years, from December 1941 to 1944. A naval building program, which is usually thought of in terms of 10, 15, and 20 years, was done in the phenomenal time of 3 years, and at the same time we were carrying on two different battlefronts on opposite sides of the world.

Thinking of these good people—these hard-working people who believe in work and do work for every cent they earn, these thrifty people, the very salt of the earth—and I cannot help but believe they are typical of the vast majority of the working men and women of this great Nation, good loyal Americans—I asked myself this question, which each and every one of you should ask yourselves: What have these people done to incur the abuse and vilification that has been heaped upon their heads in the past 3 days in this Hall of Congress? There have been smear terms of racketeering and profiteering, and what not, hurled at them. I will admit for the benefit of the people on the left side of the aisle that there are many abuses I would like to see corrected in this whole program of labor-management relations. I could go along with you on many of those, but I cannot go along on an atrocious bill of this nature, which, using these abuses as an excuse, is aimed toward driving a wedge deep into the hard-earned, fundamental rights of honest and deserving men and women of this country.

Let us turn this balance sheet over and look at the other side of the picture before we are too hasty in calling people names. Why, the biggest strike that was ever carried out in this country was done so by big business—the corporations who control the economic and political life of this country—just before Pearl Harbor, when they refused to produce goods unless they were guaranteed a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. Not only the people but our Government had to accede to their demands, and the result was that we had, I think, 16,000 brand new millionaires created in time of war. Those were the days of the highest profits after taxes in the history of this country. Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, testified late in 1945 before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that the excess charges, due to the profiteering and racketeering, cost the Treasury of the United States approximately $50,000,000,000, an amount which was equal to the cost of the entire First World War, with all of its profiteering that took place in those days. So let us look around before we say who is racketeering or who is profiteering.

This corporate chiseling which added $50,000,000,000 to the cost of the war—$50,000,000,000 which went into the pockets of the war profiteers and which must eventually be paid by the American taxpayer—is racketeering in the fullest sense of the word.

After getting by with this $50,000,000,000 steal, some of these same corporations are now allowed to save their ill-gotten gains by means of income-tax evasion. In 1945, after learning of tremendous amounts of funds being hidden by black marketeers and war profiteers, the then Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau asked Congress for extra funds to ferret out these chiselers. He was given the money and millions of dollars of fraudulently concealed funds were uncovered, and 2,037 cases were prepared for court action by the Justice Department. Because of lack of personnel the Justice Department is wholly incapable of pushing these prosecutions; only 146 indictments and arrests were made by this Department during the 1946 fiscal year. Thus the big business racketeers and profiteers who robbed the American people during the war are allowed to escape income-tax prosecution after the war.

These are the real racketeers, gentlemen, and not the few exceptional cases that are paraded as generally representative of the labor movement.

TAX REFUNDS

In addition to these unprecedented profits we have the Federal tax refunds to the extent of $3,119,000,000 in 1946. The Aluminum Co. of America alone obtained a tax refund of over $47,000,000 in 1946, and today General Motors has a tax credit of nearly $83,000,000.

The following figures demonstrate the extent of this tax-refund bonanza:

FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS

On March 3 Internal Revenue Bureau announced that Federal tax refunds totaling $3,119,000,000 were made during 1946 fiscal year. Total includes refunds to following industrial corporations:

Aluminum Co. of America	$47,168,578
American Rolling Mill Co	6,917,014
American Viscose Corp	6,245,643
Cramp Shipbuilding Co	9,775,762
Du Pont (E. I.) de Nemours & Co	6,279,434
General Electric Co	6,255,130
Shell Oil Co., Inc	9,378,790
Standard Oil Co. of California	5,894,481
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	6,767,933

Source: Moody's Industrials, semiweekly, p. 1577 (1947).

The credits for tax adjustments shown in the balance sheets for 1946 of a few corporations include the following:

Allis-Chalmers	$25,400,000
Bell & Howell	500,000
Borg Warner	294,216
Consolidated Vultee	765,105
General Electric	24,000,000
General Motors (9 months)	82,820,000
Packard Motor Car Co	5,650,000
Swift & Co	569,453
United Aircraft Products	1,822,711
Westinghouse	63,289,047

Source: Moody's Industrials, semiweekly.

Yesterday, I made the statement that the Hartley bill was nothing more than a codification of the program of the National Association of Manufacturers relating to labor legislation. To prove this assertion, I would like to present a point-by-point comparison of the legislative recommendations of the NAM approved by its board of directors on December 3, 1946, with the provisions of the Hartley bill. The similarities between the two are so glaringly obvious that there can be no doubt that the source and inspiration of this vicious antilabor bill was the National Association of Manufacturers.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. I

The union should be obligated by law to bargain in good faith.

Hartley bill: Section 8 (b) provides that—

It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employee or representative * * * (2) to refuse to bargain collectively with the employer.

Section 2 (11) provides an elaborate collective-bargaining procedure involving innumerable delays and which is certain to defeat genuine collective bargaining.

It is fraudulent to say that unions must be forced to bargain collectively for the simple reason that the one and only function of unions is to so bargain. The purpose of such provisions in the bill is to set up requirements to defeat collective bargaining or to allow such bargaining to take place only on the terms of management. Then if labor refuses to be governed by this procedure, the door is opened for the Government to interfere as a strike-breaking agency on the grounds that the union has failed to bargain in good faith.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. II

The union * * * should be obligated by law to adhere to the terms of collective bargaining agreements.

Hartley bill: Section 301 would repeal the Clayton Act regarding union liability and make them subject to treble damages under the Sherman Act. Section 302 provides that unions and their representatives shall be suable in the Federal courts, and their assets subject to confiscation.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. III

Monopolistic practices in restraint of trade * * * should be prohibited to labor unions. * * * It is * * * contrary to the public interest for a union or unions representing two or more employers to take joint wage action or engage in other monopolistic practices.

Hartley bill: Section 9 (f) (1) provides that the same union may not represent the employees of two competing firms, nor may any two locals be subject in any way "to common control or approval." Section 2 (16) provides that a strike resulting from concerted action of employees of two competing employers is a "monopolistic strike" which is forbidden by section 12 (a) (3) (A).

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. IV

The protection of law should be extended to strikers only when the majority of employees in the bargaining unit, by secret ballot under impartial supervision, have voted for a strike in preference to acceptance of the latest offer of the employer.

Hartley bill: Section 204 (b) provides that after the Attorney General has secured an injunction enjoining act of union—pursuant to section 203—

The National Labor Relations Board shall provide for the taking of a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in

the dispute on the question of (1) whether the employees of any employer desire to accept their employer's offer of settlement then current.

If the employer's offer is rejected, the same process is repeated after a special board has rendered its opinion as to settlement.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. V

No strike should have the protection of the law if it involves issues which do not relate to wages, hours, or working conditions. * * * Such issues and demands are involved in jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, strikes against the Government * * * strikes to enforce featherbedding or other work-restrictive demands or secondary boycotts.

Hartley bill: Section 2 (11) defines the subject matter for collective bargaining as:

Procedures and practices relating to wage rates, hours of employment, and work requirements; (ii) procedures and practices relating to discharge, suspension, lay-off, recall, seniority, and discipline, or to promotion, demotion, transfer, and assignment within the bargaining unit; (iii) conditions, procedures, and practces governing safety, sanitation, and protection of health * * * and (iv) vacations and leaves of absence.

Section 8 (b) (3) makes it an unfair labor practice to strike for any objectives not in this list, i. e., such issues relating to welfare funds, vacation funds, union hiring halls, union security provisions, apprenticeship qualifications, assignment of work, subcontracting of work, and so forth.

Section 12 (a) (3) (A), (B), and (C) prohibit jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, featherbedding strikes, strikes to force recognition, illegal boycotts.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. VI

Mass picketing * * * coercion * * * intimidation should be prohibited.

Hartley bill: Section 12 (a) (1) outlaws mass picketing, and the preventing or "attempting to prevent any individual from entering upon an employer's premises or picketing an employer's place of business in numbers or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required to give notice of the existence of a labor dispute."

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. VII

Employers should not be required to bargain collectively with foremen or other representatives of management.

Hartley bill: Section 2 (11) defines supervisors to include not only foremen but pushers, gang bosses, leaders, second hands, pay-roll and plant clerks, plant guards and inspectors. A carpenter having a helper would fall within the category of a supervisor. Section 2 (3) excludes all such supervisors and representatives of management from collective bargaining.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. VIII

No employee should be required to join a union or to refrain from joining a union, or to maintain or withdraw his membership in a union, as a condition for employment. Compulsory union membership * * * should be prohibited by law.

Hartley bill: Section 8 (a) (3) prohibits an employer from granting a closed shop. Sections 8 (d) (4) and 9 (g) virtually prohibit any form of union shop. Section 8 (b) (3) makes a strike for union security contract illegal.

NAM RECOMMENDATION NO. IX

The full extent of Government participation in labor disputes should be to make available competent and impartial observers. Compulsory arbitration should not be adopted.

Hartley bill: There are no provisions which actually establish compulsory bargaining. However, the procedures established by the bill—section 2 (11)—make for Government interference in the collective-bargaining process far beyond the conciliation. The provision allowing court injunctions (section 203) to be used as a strike-breaking device will result in virtual compulsory arbitration since it takes away the right to strike.

This point-by-point comparison of the provisions of the Hartley bill with the legislative recommendations proves one thing—that there has been written into this vicious antilabor Hartley bill the entire program of the National Association of Manufacturers. In fact, H. R. 3020 has even gone beyond the NAM recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. Sections 203 and 204 shall not apply to any person or dispute subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to see this bill come to a vote in its present form. Like every unbiased citizen of this country, I feel that there is a dire need for corrective labor legislation. I feel at the same time that there is no need or justification for punitive legislation. In my opinion, this bill approaches this problem in a very inconsistent manner. Section 7 of the bill frees the workingman from the control of the labor boss, and I think it does a fine thing in so doing, but the very next section strips him of his new-earned democracy and makes of it a veritable sham.

This bill approaches this problem, I take it, on the theory that if you give the workingman the right to elect his own representatives, to set up his own collective-bargaining procedure, he will set his own house in order.

The next section of the bill, however, requires the workingman to bargain only on a company level, making no similar restrictions on the employer.

In one section we throw around the shoulders of the workingman the mantle of democracy, and in the next section we place upon his brow a crown of thorns.

I think this problem should be approached in a dispassionate and American manner. I have heard much talk during the course of this debate about the city against the farm, about the industrial areas against the rural areas. I come from a district that is overwhelmingly agricultural. The farming people are tired of being the helpless victims in the fights between big business and big labor. They are tired of labor racketeering, of jurisdictional strikes, and wholesale strikes against the public interest. I do not think, however, that they want me to vote for anything that is unfair or unjust. I do not think they want me to vote for anything that goes at this problem in a manner seeking vengeance against anyone and, above all, I do not think they want me to vote for any bill which might in any manner jeopardize the economy of our country and which we cannot in good conscience defend. I think this bill will jeopardize the welfare of our country. I think it will be injurious to the employer because it opens the way to cut-throat competition between industries in the matter of both wages and prices. I cannot go along with such a measure.

We have seen this happen among small operators in the coal industry and small businesses of Oklahoma. I think we ought to approach this problem dispassionately. I think more is required than 68 more pages of legislation binding the hands of the American people. I think behind our problem of all-out production lies something much more important. I think what we need is a little more hard work, a little more mutual respect and cooperation.

I spent about 5 years in the armed forces of our country. During that time I did not hear anything about city people and country people or about laboring people and business people. With a united front and with a united America behind us, we did the biggest job in the history of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see legislation that will prevent Nation-wide strikes that are injurious to the American people. I certainly favor that feature of the bill. But, members of the committee, I believe that this country needs also to return to a sense of American unity which has not been manifest in this debate. In this will we find our real salvation. We are not "capital"; we are not "labor"; we are not "agriculture"; we are not "industry." We are a united Nation. We are Americans.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, the lady from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] told us that America would not be the same if this bill were enacted into law. I assure the lady she is correct. If this bill is enacted into law, a California farmer can haul his cabbage and milk to market without paying tribute to a city racketeer. A school orchestra can perform over the radio without first clearing matters with Mr. Petrillo. A veteran can engage in small business without first buying permission to do so from some union boss.

I assure the lady it will be a very different America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I too, have listened with keen and continuing interest to the debate upon this measure. The word "bewilderment" was brought into the

discussion by my distinguished colleague from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]. I agree with her fully and completely. The American people are bewildered and confused. They have been bewildered and confused for the past 5 years at least. They have been bewildered and confused when they went to their grocery stores to buy a bottle of milk, and found a picket line around the store because the milk came from a cow that had not eaten union-handled fodder. They have been very much bewildered about that.

I have thousands of employees of the motion-picture studios in my district who are very much bewildered. They have been out on strike, forced out on strike by a jurisdictional dispute, for months and months. I can assure you that they are very much bewildered. When a mere handful of employees of concerns such as Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and Twentieth Century-Fox can be forced out, there is ample cause for bewilderment. The American people are also bewildered when they see mass picketing, hundreds of pickets, where the law of a city or municipality or State provides for a definite number of pickets. Oh, yes. They are bewildered. There is bewilderment from one coast to the other, but the bewilderment cleared up long enough last November 5 so that there is a different division in this House today, and many of you on the Democratic side of the House who will vote for the labor bill as it has been presented are here because your constituents knew you would support the measure.

I intend to support the bill. I consider that it is a prime mandate of the people of America to produce something in the way of legislation designed to clear up this confused and desperate situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment on page 62, line 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 206. Until the transfer of functions under section 201 (e) becomes effective, the functions of the Director of Conciliation under section 204 shall be performed by the Secretary of Labor. Until the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act first appointed qualifies and takes office, his functions under section 204 shall be performed by the National Labor Relations Board.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment following section 206, which I offer at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT:

"SEC. 207. It shall be unlawful for any employee of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to participate in any strike, or to encourage anyone to strike. Any employee of the United States, or of any such agency or instrumentality, who strikes or participates in striking, or who encourages others to strike, shall be discharged from his employment, and shall forfeit all rights of reemployment, and shall forfeit his civil-service status, if any, and shall also forfeit all benefits and privileges which he may have acquired by virtue of his Government employment."

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in the beginning that this amendment is not offered in criticism of the committee. I, for one, recognize the fact that no committee of Congress, of labor, of business, or of any character or description whatsoever could write a bill that would be pleasing to everybody in every particular or to everybody in any particular. On the whole I believe the committee has done a good job. I believe this is needed legislation long delayed.

In writing this bill, however, the committee overlooked the biggest employer in the world. The Government of the United States employs more people than any other employer. Many of them now assert the right to strike. The amendment which I offer would deny such right as a matter of law. It is substantially the same as enacted into law in the State of New York to prohibit employees of the State government from striking. We have attempted to get at this thing indirectly through riders to appropriation bills. I think we should nail it down here and say positively that employees of the Government have no right to strike. In simple terms that is all this amendment does. I urge its enactment upon the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS; LIABILITY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS; MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

SEC. 301. (a) The second paragraph of section 20 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed in any proceeding, civil or criminal, under the antitrust laws to make lawful any combination, contract, or conspiracy in restraint of trade having as its purpose one or more of the objects which are defined in section 6 as not being legitimate objects of a labor organization."

(b) Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided, however*, That it shall not be within the legitimate objects of labor organizations or the officers, representatives, or members thereof, to make any contract, or to engage in any combination or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce, if one of the purposes or a necessary effect of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is to join or combine with any person to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, distribution, or competition, or impose restrictions or conditions, upon the purchase, sale, or use of any product, material, machine, or equipment, or to engage in any concerted activity declared to be unlawful under section 12 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(c) In any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws, the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not have any application.

EQUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY

SEC. 302. (a) Any action for or proceeding involving a violation of an agreement between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees may be brought by either party in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without regard to the amount in controversy, if such agreement affects commerce, or the court otherwise has jurisdiction of the cause.

(b) Any labor organization whose activities affect commerce shall be bound by the acts of its agents, and may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of the employees whom it represents in the courts of the United States. Any money judgment against a labor organization in a district court of the United States shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

(c) For the purposes of actions and proceedings by or against labor organizations in the district courts of the United States, district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of a labor organization (1) in the district in which such organization maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which its duly authorized officers or agents are engaged in representing or acting for employee members.

(d) The service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of any court of the United States upon an officer or agent of a labor organization, in his capacity as such, shall constitute service upon the labor organization.

(e) In actions and proceedings involving violations of agreements between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees, the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity and for other purposes", shall not have any application in respect of either party.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand the Clerk has completed reading section 302?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the Chairman a question, and in asking the question I want it understood that it is intended to make a part of the record that may hereafter be referred to as history of the legislation.

It is my understanding that section 302, the section dealing with equal responsibility under collective bargaining contracts in strike actions and proceedings in district courts contemplates not only the ordinary lawsuits for damages but also such other remedial proceedings, both legal and equitable, as might be appropriate in the circumstances; in other words, proceedings could, for example, be brought by the employers, the labor organizations, or interested individual employees under the Declaratory Judgments Act in order to secure declarations from the Court of legal rights under the contract.

Mr. HARTLEY. The interpretation the gentleman has just given of that section is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman and the Chairman agree that that also includes declaratory judgments in the case of jurisdictional disputes?

Mr. BARDEN. I would so understand it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to have that in the record also because declaratory judgments is a proceeding which has been adopted in the case of jurisdictional disputes.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the language is clear, but I want to make it certain.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is involved, and I refer to declaratory judgments. It is involved in the case of the motion-picture players of California and I think we can strengthen the hands of those who are trying to get that matter straightened out.

Mr. BARDEN. It will minimize lawsuits and cut down the length of these controversies. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not naive enough to believe that many votes are going to be changed by the debate on this labor bill. The bill has been criticized because it does not go far enough and, on the other hand, it has been condemned because it is too restrictive. Possibly some Members are so disgusted with the action of certain labor leaders in the past that they would vote to repeal all existing legislation beneficial to organized labor. By the same token possibly some Members are so subservient to these same organized labor leaders that they would vote for or against any labor legislation pursuant to the dictates of the labor leaders.

Mr. Chairman, these two groups are extremes. I am satisfied that a vast majority of the House wants legislation designed primarily in the public interest, limiting and regulating the power of organized labor as well as organized capital. I certainly belong to this group. This labor-management controversy is not new. There was a time when organized capital ran roughshod over labor. That was wrong and not in the public interest, and the antitrust laws and other regulatory measures were enacted by the Congress restricting such conduct. At that time the corporations were the giants and we had monopoly control. Today organized labor is the giant. Indeed its power has become so great that the nod of a labor leader alone can paralyze the industry, communication, and transportation of the country. The people must not starve, freeze, and suffer because of the lack of sufficient law to protect the public interest. The time has arrived when the people demand that the Congress stop dilly-dallying and do something about the situation.

As one Member of the House, I am ready to accept that mandate and act now.

Mr. Chairman, during debate in the last Congress I said in part:

> Surely there is some authority somewhere, somehow, in the Government that is greater and more powerful than the will of any individual, whether he be the head of a labor union or a representative of management. Time for action by the Government has long since passed. If there is no remedy for present conditions then the country might as well know it. On the other hand, if the Government in Washington still lives, the people have a right to expect that it will function in such an emergency.
>
> Technicalities do not make much difference to the people who want to work and the employer who wants to turn out products. A strike is just as effective whether authorized or unauthorized.
>
> There should be no class legislation. No group or class is greater than the Government. Those receiving the protection of the law must be responsible to the law.
>
> The greatest danger to labor is the conduct of labor itself.
>
> Whether or not collective bargaining between management and labor is effective depends on the attitude of those doing the bargaining.
>
> None of the laws protecting organized labor should be repealed in toto, but these laws should be strengthened and amended to require both capital and labor to function in the public interest and not in the selfish interest of any privileged class, be it capital or labor.
>
> Organized labor apparently does not realize that it is digging its own grave; that the organized-labor movement, nurtured by Federal legislation as it has been, is committing suicide.

Mr. Chairman, those statements are just as true today as they were a year or 2 years ago today. During the last campaign I called the attention of my constituents to these statements and promised to do my part in getting remedial legislation at once. The bill now before us is my first opportunity to fulfill those promises. During this debate we have heard much loose talk as well as much prejudiced talk. This bill is not antilabor. It attacks the problem in a comprehensive way. It is not drastic, oppressive or punitive. It does not restrict or in any manner interfere with labor's right to organize and to bargain collectively when they wish to do so. It does not restrict in any way employees' rights to engage in lawful strikes. It does not take away any rights guaranteed by the existing National Labor Relations Act. It is simply antilabor monopoly. It is antiunion abuse. It gives the worker a voice and a secret ballot free of fear in the affairs of a union.

Members of the Committee on Labor and Education call this proposal the worker's bill of rights, because the bill gives to each worker:

First. The right to join with his fellow workers to select a collective-bargaining agent of their own choosing, that is to say, one that is not forced on them.

Second. The right to get a job without joining any union.

Third. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election, the votes in which are openly counted, on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job.

Fourth. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union.

Fifth. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own, and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union, without dictation by national and international officers and representatives, and without regard to the demands of other employers.

Sixth. The right to keep on working and getting his pay without sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

Seventh. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

Eighth. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or the union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination.

Ninth. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for.

Tenth. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers.

Eleventh. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses.

Twelfth. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance, welfare, or relief that he does not want.

Thirteenth. The right to receive his pay in his pay envelope, without the employer and the union spending it for him, checking it off for union dues, or for other purposes.

Fourteenth. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for, first, not paying dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the union; third, violating the union's contract; fourth, being a Communist or fellow traveler; fifth, being convicted of a felony; sixth, engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union.

Fifteenth. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like.

Sixteenth. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer.

Seventeenth. The right without fear of reprisal to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes.

Eighteenth. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested.

Nineteenth. The right to a union free of Communist domination and control,

and one that is devoted to honest trade-unionism and not class warfare and turmoil.

Twentieth. Every right to strike for any legitimate object that he has had under our laws for the last hundred years.

Twenty-first. And, finally, the right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with those 21 points? Is one of them antilabor? Of course not—and when the rank and file of organized labor is advised, it will approve.

If all these rights are guaranteed to the individual worker, it necessarily follows that there must be some guaranty to management. This bill bans the closed shop. Under carefully drawn regulations it permits an employer and a union voluntarily to enter into an agreement requiring employees to become and remain members of the union a month or more after the employer hires them or after the agreement is signed. Such agreements are lawful, however, only if the employees by secret ballot have selected the union as their bargaining agent, and if a majority of all the employees, by a separate secret ballot, authorizes the union to enter into the agreement, and if the agreement is not prohibited by State law. An employee may be expelled from the union and thus forced to leave his job only if the expulsion is by reason of his failing to pay fees and dues imposed upon employees generally. Under this clause, employers may select their own employees. Employees have 30 days to decide whether or not to join the union. Unions may not cause the discharge of employees by discriminating against them. The agreement must be voluntary. Unions may not strike to compel employers to enter into such agreements. They are subject to loss of bargaining rights if they do so.

The mutual rights of worker and employer are safeguarded further by abolishing the old prejudiced National Labor Relations Board, by setting up a new Board, and by creating the independent office of Administrator who investigates and prosecutes, but who does not judge. In short, the present Board is prosecutor, jury, and judge. This is fundamentally wrong in any case.

This bill forbids the Board to regard as employees foremen and other representatives of management who act for employers in their dealings with employees and their unions. Management must have ir the plants, agents who are entirely loyal, just as representatives of the union and representatives of the workers must be undivided in their loyalty to the workers.

Free speech in a democracy cannot be granted to one and denied to another without placing in jeopardy the rights of both. This bill treats the employer and the employee alike in this respect.

Equal responsibility before the law is assured for both worker and employer. This bill gives the President the authority to seek injunctions against strikes that imperil the public health and safety and authorizes courts to issue injunctions in such cases, and to this extent the Norris-LaGuardia Act is clarified.

This new national labor policy is designed to assure the observance of constitutional principles in all labor-management relations.

Mr. Chairman, some labor leaders are opposed to any legislation whatever, the purpose of which is to change present practices on the part of certain organized labor groups, as well as rulings and regulations of the present Board. They threaten political action. They demand obedience by Members of Congress. They are adamant and cannot be placated. As against this group stands the great mass of the people who want action now. Political cowardice has no place here. Let us vote our convictions without fear or favor. In conclusion we must not forget that the public interest is the paramount interest, and all legislation should be drafted with that thought in mind. No, this bill does not please all segments of organized labor or all groups representing management, but on the whole it is the nearest effective compromise that has any possibility of becoming law in the immediate future. I shall support the bill and hope that it will not be sterilized on its journey to the statute books.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, section 301 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, read together with sections 2 and 12 of the proposed new National Labor Relations Act, for all practical purposes repeals the labor-protecting provisions of the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and all the other labor relations laws, statutory or judicial, laboriously built up over the past 30 years to protect the wage earners of this country. It returns the working men and women of this country to that precarious and inequitable position under the laws of the land which they occupied prior to 1914. The necessary results of the proposed legislation are so obvious that they must be intended. Thus, this fearful, backward step into the Dark Ages of labor-management relations is proposed as deliberate and considered national labor policy. This legislation is vicious, punitive, ill-considered, unnecessary, unwise, and impractical. It would, if enacted, lead to the most severe industrial strife and turmoil this country has ever seen, and would wreck our prosperity and even our democratic way of life.

We all recall with deep emotion the noble language of the Clayton Act which states that "The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce." Although section 301 of this bill does not delete this language, it renders it a painful and hollow mockery by selling labor down the river. For the proposed legislation rests on the basic assumption that labor partakes so little of the nature of human beings and so much of a commodity, as to possess not even constitutional guarantees, much less the right to fair and equitable treatment, or equal justice under the law.

The proposed legislation sweeps aside the expensively and painfully gained experience embodied in the history of labor-management relations in this country. The entire unfortunate history of attempted past application of the injunction and the antitrust laws to maintain stable labor-management relations or to police union activities is either recklessly disregarded by the sponsors of this legislation or unknown to them. The avowed purpose of this legislation is to minimize labor controversies which through strikes or work stoppages impede the operation of our economic system, and to attempt by legislation to abolish such practices as, in the opinion of the Congress, amount to abuses. This legislation proceeds on the premise that labor alone is responsible for the evils sought to be corrected. A mere look at the history of labor relations in this country clearly negatives such an assumption. The long history of abuses on the part of management, and its successful invocation of the judiciary for their perpetuation in the past, is responsible not only for the National Labor Relations Act, virtually destroyed by this legislation, but also for sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The vice of the proposed legislation is not only that it returns the working men and women of this country to the jungle period during which only by sustained courage, sacrifice, and perseverance they succeeded in alleviating the inequities of their treatment as a commodity, but that it leaves employers and management better equipped than even in those early days to keep our wage earners at such lowly estate by depriving them of the lawful means for self-protection, preservation, and advancement.

Section 301 of title III not only subjects the working people of this country and their unions again to criminal prosecution and treble-damage suits under the antitrust laws if they engage in unjustified secondary boycotts or jurisdictional strikes but practically prevents them from taking any concerted action to protect their wage rates, working conditions, and living standards. Insofar as section 301 makes it a violation of the antitrust laws for labor to combine with nonlabor groups to fix prices, restrict production, or to control markets, it is completely unnecessary, since such is the law of the land today. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the antitrust laws apply to unlawful restraints imposed on commerce by such combinations. Section 6 of the Clayton Act does not exempt a labor organization, or its members, from liability where they depart from the normal or legitimate objects of such organizations and engage in actual combinations or conspiracies in unlawful restraint of trade.

But section 301 of title III, when read together with sections 2 and 12 of the proposed new National Labor Relations Act, goes far beyond this. Those provisions would prohibit almost every type of strike, picketing, or boycott, including those conceded by all to be legitimate in purpose. Thus, for example, a strike by a union to gain recognition and better conditions for its members only would be prohibited if the union did not represent a majority of the employees, even though there were no other union in the plant. A strike against a "speed-up," or

to help fellow-employees eliminate "sweat shop" conditions in another department would likewise be prohibited. So also would boycotts of nonunion products made under sweat-shop conditions. And peaceful picketing could also be prohibited if a court thought it was done in an unreasonable manner or with an unreasonable number of pickets.

The prohibition on "picketing an employer's place of business in numbers, or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required to give notice of the existence of a labor dispute at such place of business, or picketing or besetting the home of any individual in connection with any labor dispute"—section 12 (a) (1), section 301 (b)—is a limitation as well as a prohibition of picketing which offends constitutional guarantees of free speech and free assembly. As the Supreme Court has stated—*Thomas* v. *Collins* (322 U. S. 516 (1945, Rutledge, J.)):

> It was not by accident or coincidence that the rights to freedom in speech and press were coupled in a single guarantee with the rights of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition for redress of grievances. All these, though not identical, are inseparable. They are cognate rights—and therefore are united in the first article's assurances. * * * That the State has power to regulate labor unions with a view to protecting the business interest is * * * hardly to be doubted. They cannot claim positive immunity from regulation. Such regulation, however, whether aimed at fraud or other abuses, must not trespass upon the domain set apart for free speech and free assembly. This Court has recognized that "in the circumstances of our times the dissemination of information concerning the facts of a labor dispute must be regarded as within that area of free discussion that is guaranteed by the Constitution. * * * Free discussion concerning the conditions in industry and the causes of labor disputes appears to us indispensable to the effective and intelligent use of the processes of popular government to shape the destiny of modern industrial society." * * * "Free trade in ideas" means free trade in the opportunity to persuade to action, not merely to describe facts.

The prohibition in section 12 (a) (2), which this legislation by section 301 (b) now makes a violation of the antitrust acts, also runs into constitutional invalidity. Such section renders it unlawful to picket "an employer's premises for the purpose of leading persons to believe that there exists a labor dispute involving such employer, in any case in which the employees are not involved in a labor dispute with their employer." The constitutional guaranty of freedom of discussion in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States is infringed by this prohibition in the proposed legislation forbidding resort to persuasion through picketing where the immediate employer-employee relationship does not exist. A State statute which attempted a similar prohibition was found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, which stated in its opinion that—

> A State cannot exclude workingmen from peacefully exercising the right of free communication by drawing the circle of economic competition between employers and workers so small as to contain only an employer and those directly employed by him. The interdependence of economic interest of all engaged in the same industry has become a commonplace. * * * The right of free communication cannot therefore be mutilated by denying it to workers, in a dispute with an employer, even though they are not in his employ. Communication by such employees of the facts of a dispute, deemed by them to be relevant to their interests, can no more be barred because of concern for the economic interests against which they are seeking to enlist public opinion than could the utterance protected in Thornhill's case. "Members of a union might, without special statutory authorization by a State, make known the facts of a labor dispute, for freedom of speech is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution." (*American Federation of Labor* v. *Swing et al.* (312 U. S. 287 1942).)

Section 12 (a) of the proposed legislation also prohibits and construes as unlawful concerted activities to prevent or attempt to prevent "any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of or from accepting or refusing employment by, any employer," or to prevent or attempt to prevent "any individual from freely going from any place and entering upon an employer's premises, or from freely leaving an employer's premises and going to any other place," if such actions are accompanied "by the use of force or violence or threat thereof." The use of force or violence for the direct purpose of restraining trade or commerce can be enjoined under the Clayton Act as currently constituted—see *Bittner* v. *West Virginia-Pittsburgh Coal Co.* (241 F. 716 (C. C. A. 4)); *United States* v. *Railway Employees' Department* (290 F. 906 (C. C. A. 7)).

In any event, the use of force or violence which does not have for its primary purpose the restraint of trade, is already unlawful and a criminal offense under State laws. There is no necessity therefore to make such acts violations of the antitrust acts, and in the process convert the already overburdened United States district courts into police courts, or to convert such purely local offenses into Federal offenses punishable by $5,000 fines and 1 year in jail, or both. I want to point out that there is nothing in the act which prohibits an employer from provoking his employees to the use of force or violence in labor disputes, or from hiring thugs, strikebreakers, provocators, or others to commit acts of force and violence against workmen. While mere threats by employees of force or violence are made Federal offenses by this proposed legislation, employers are free to indulge in whatever threats they may wish to make, or have made for them, in order to provoke their employees to commit the prohibited acts. This provision goes so far as to deny strikers the right of every man to self-defense. Further, the proposed bill does not distinguish between authorized and unauthorized acts of individuals as members of a labor organization. If a picket, although prohibited by the union, indulges in acts of force or violence, either initiated by him or in self-defense, or made a threat thereof, not only the picket but the whole union probably would become liable in a civil action for triple damages, plus attorney's fees. This section of the proposed bill, as written, makes acts of force and violence or threats thereof committed by one picket an unlawful, concerted act. It creates a new and strange crime—the one-man conspiracy. I call to your attention again that this section of the bill is completely silent and wholly fails to designate as unlawful the various acts on the part of employers, which in years gone by have led to innumerable instances of the use of force and violence by them. It is perfectly clear that, in result, it will stimulate the use of force and violence by according such strong protection to the passage of strikebreakers through picket lines. This is all done, according to the bill, to minimize and prohibit abuses in the field of labor relations, and to minimize labor controversies.

Section 12 (a) (3) (A) prohibits the sympathy strike, the jurisdictional strike, a new apparition called the monopolistic strike, illegal boycott, sit-down strike, and the slow-down. Under the definition of monopolistic strike if a union struck against two employers in the same industry under a plan of concerted action, the strike would be illegal. It would appear that any agreement or understanding that both striking locals would receive relief funds and assistance from their international union or follow uniform practices prescribed by such international in the bargaining proceedings, might constitute concerted action. Some unions (American Newspaper Guild and United Electrical Workers) have established minimum contract standards. The locals in their collective bargaining are required to insist upon such minimum standards. It appears clear that strikes by two locals of either of such unions, even though geographically widely separated and unrelated one to the other, would be unlawful if they both arose from insistence upon such minimum-contract standards. The prohibition against the so-called monopolistic strike even without further analysis appears to extend even further and be more all-inclusive than a prohibition against industry-wide bargaining. It is difficult to forecast in advance just exactly what may result from the prohibitions against the sympathy, sit-down, or slow-down strikes. State laws currently on the books adequately cope with the sit-down strike and Federal legislation is unnecessary. The prohibition against sympathy strikes would run into the same constitutional objections as I have previously discussed with reference to the prohibition against picketing by section 12 (a) (2). Illegal boycotts (as variously defined by section 2 (14) of the proposed legislation), are already prohibited by the Antitrust Acts, whether they be primary or secondary boycotts, where the intent is to restrain trade and commerce or to destroy the business and good will of an employer. *Milk Wagon Drivers Union, Local 753*, v. *Lake Valley Farm Products* (311 U. S. 91 (1941); *Aeolian Co.* v. *Fischer* (29 F. (2d) 560 (C. C. A. 2)).

As stated by the President in his state of the Union message, the use of the secondary boycott to further jurisdictional disputes or compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act is indefensible. However, the President went on to say "Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives.

For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blank prohibition against boycotts." The proposed legislation takes no cognizance of the legitimate labor need for secondary boycotts and unnecessarily prohibits the good with the bad.

Section 12 (a) (3) (B) prohibits all strikes or other concerted interferences with an employer's operations having for its objective the imposition of featherbedding practices. The definition of this term makes it illegal to strike in an attempt to require an employer to employ persons in excess of the number reasonably required to perform actual services. By this definition it appears that a strike against any form of stretch-out or speed-up would be illegal. For example, in a cotton mill, if the employer increases the number of looms to be tended by a weaver without any additional compensation, a strike against such a speed-up would be illegal. Furthermore, it would appear to afford any employer the absolute power to render a strike illegal even though its purpose were to enforce entirely legitimate demands for increases in wages. Thus, if a union demanded a 10-percent increase, the employer might respond that the increase would be granted but the workload would be increased proportionally. It would appear to strike under such circumstances would be illegal since, in effect, it would be an attempt to compel the employer to employ additional labor rather than to increase wages.

Section 12 (a) (3) (C) makes unlawful a strike or concerted interference with an employer's operations to compel an employer "to recognize for collective bargaining a representative not certified under section 9 as the representative of the employees." In a situation where no representative for collective bargaining has been certified, a strike by a representative of the majority of the employees for such purpose is prohibited, as well as so-called organizational strikes. This gives an employer a whip hand at the most vulnerable period in the organization of employees into a union. In such cases where the majority of the employees are members of a given union, which represents the clear majority, the employer can refuse to recognize such union and compel it to petition the National Labor Relations Board for certification, thus gaining additional time within which to further oppose and weaken such union.

Section 12 (a) (b) wipes out the jurisdictional amount of $3,000, now necessary as one of the prerequisites to jurisdiction of the United States district courts, for the purpose of entertaining an action for damages caused by unlawful concerted activities affecting commerce prohibited by the proposed legislation. The abolition of the jurisdictional amount will flood the Federal courts with petty suits and reduce them to the stature of municipal courts. The threat which this presents to other litigation venued in the Federal courts by jamming their calendars, is apparent. Such a step will result in loss and grievious inconvenience to other litigants, and break down the necessary expeditious administration of justice.

I should like to point out that section 301 of the proposed legislation amends section 6 of the Clayton Act only as to labor organizations and still retains the protective current provisions of such section as to agricultural and horticultural organizations. This only serves to heighten the differences in treatment which the proposed legislation specifically singles out for labor without affecting management, employers, or other types of organizations. This bill commits the American people to the chaotic labor relations of the nineteenth century. Working men and women constitute a dominant proportion of the American people. This bill is class legislation of the most transparent character and of explosive content. It is the type of legislation which delighted the masters of countries recently overthrown by the force of American and Allied arms. It is an abomination that I shall vote against imposing on the American people.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have vehemently opposed this bill, it is with some hesitancy that I take the floor to oppose them. However, this matter is of vital importance, and I feel that entertaining, as I do, very definite views on the subject I should not remain silent for fear of giving offense.

My views, which I will express here, are well known in my State. During the last campaign I said repeatedly on nearly every radio station in the State that the labor laws needed revision. I stated to our many friends in the labor ranks that we wanted their help in proposing amendments which would be equitable to both labor and management, but that if we did not get that help from labor we would have to do the best we could without it.

We have here a bill, the only bill on which we will have the opportunity to vote. We have no choice but to vote for this bill even though it may be, as some of my friends think it is, very strong and that it might hurt labor in some respects. When a man is sick, it may be necessary to hurt him a little in order to cure him. It is now necessary, in my humble opinion, to pass this bill though it may hurt. We have no choice other than to do that or to sit here and twiddle our thumbs. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Labor to write the bill, and I believe they have done so with courage and sincerity, even though some may not agree with their wisdom in all respects.

I stated that my views were known in my State. I said during the campaign that strikes against public utilities which endanger the very life and health of the Nation should be settled by compulsory arbitration where mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration fail. I stated that we should make labor unions just as responsible for their acts as we make management and industry responsible for theirs. I said time and again that I was opposed to jurisdictional strikes. At the time I was campaigning there occurred on the west coast a jurisdictional dispute between two labor unions. One of those labor unions set up pickets. The other labor union in turn set up pickets, presumably to picket the other pickets. Not to be outdone the employers who were holding the sack through no fault of their own, decided with sardonic humor to post their own pickets, I presume, to picket the pickets that were picketing the other pickets. In the meantime both sets of labor men lost money. The employers who were in no way at fault lost money. The public suffered. If this bill passes as it is written, that will not occur again. If this law, when enacted, does not stop that expensive foolishness, then the committee has not done a good job. I, for one, have faith in the ability and sincerity of the Labor Committee, and I, for one, shall vote for this bill.

True, I have supported some of the amendments, including that which would permit the contribution on the part of the employer of moneys for a health fund for the employees. But whether or not those amendments are adopted, I shall, as I did in the portal-to-portal bill, vote for it. If we have gone too far, we will have the aid of labor, which we are not now getting, to correct it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say here and now, so that my constituents will understand exactly where I stand on this bill, that I voted originally against the first iniquitous Wagner Labor Act, and I am happy to have this opportunity now to correct the injustices that have been created by that act and to give the people of this country a fair break.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a district in California about as varied as any in the United States in the way of industry. I come from a strictly American district—one in which we have not had any great amount of labor trouble. However, the mere fact that we have not had a large amount of labor trouble has not kept us from having many tons of milk dumped in the gutters in the last few years, because the milk was said to be hot. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the milk was hot, or the cows were hot, or the feed was hot; but I known darn well that the dairymen were hot and that the people were hot when they saw this milk poured down the gutters—the very milk that they needed for their families.

Also, the mere fact that my district has not had much labor trouble has not prevented my people from having to walk to and from their homes, to their places of business and back, because the bus drivers took it into their heads to strike on one or two occasions. These drivers were operating one of our public utilities. The only means they left for the people to get back and forth was by the use of an automobile, provided you

were a plutocrat, or by walking if you were not. The bus people had a franchise. They had the exclusive privilege of providing transportation services in the city of Long Beach. My people demand some relief from such occurrences.

Further, the fact that we are really peaceful has not kept us from being stymied by having our communications stopped by the present telephone strike.

My people, during the campaign last year, threshed out all these things rather thoroughly. They sent me here for the purpose of getting relief from some of the abuses under which they have been living. They demand relief from such practices as I have mentioned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman did not tell us why it was necessary to pour all of that milk in the gutter.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. As I remarked, it was because somebody declared something hot.

Mr. RANKIN. What does that mean?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Apparently some members of a union—I do not know exactly which ones—said that the cows ate feed which had not been hauled by a union representative, or the truck drivers hauling feed or milk were not all union men. Something of that sort. There are so many phases of the picture that I should not want to try to put my thumb on any one of them just now.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I would like to refer to another practice that takes place out in the gentleman's State that this bill will correct. I have here an article from a newspaper which says:

> For returning to work at film studios in defiance of union bylaws against crossing picket lines, 18 members of the Motion Picture Painters' Union, Local 644, have been assessed fines totaling $277,100, it was announced yesterday.
>
> Seven were fined $20,300 each; one, $15,000; and 10 were assessed $12,000.

These were for daring to go back to their jobs.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I have no doubt whatever but that the gentleman is correct. The area in which this occurred is not exactly in my district, where, as I said, we have had comparative labor peace.

Mr. Chairman, there are many details of this bill that I should have preferred to see omitted. It is not a perfect bill. I presume that it is not satisfactory in its entirety to any Member on the floor. However, it is a start in long overdue legislation aimed at the correction of abuses which have grown up during the New Deal years and which even the most sincere friends of labor know are essential if we are to have responsible government in these United States.

Some of the so-called rough spots in this bill will be smoothed considerably before it gets through conference. Undoubtedly some of the wisdom of the other legislative body will be reflected in the final product of the Congress. We, in the House, do not have all the intelligence of the Nation in our midst or at our fingertips and we welcome gladly such modifications as may be incorporated in this bill and finally agreed to by our conferees.

The fundamentals of this law are strictly in accordance with the basic principles that labor organizations are desirable and necessary, that this is to be a government of law rather than one dominated by irresponsible leaders of either capitol or labor, that the rights of the individual are not to be submerged in grants of power by the Congress, that labor cannot be compelled to work through the exercise of force or violence, that no one group or agency may be allowed to act as both judge, and jury, and that the wishes of the majority of employees must govern the status of all in establishing their relations with their employers.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill in the spirit of the remarks I have just made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, Massachusetts has either the first or second finest labor-peace record in the entire United States. Massachusetts has competed steadily for a good many months or years with New York as to which State should be first in the labor-peace movement. My home city of Lowell steadily has had the finest labor-peace record in the country. The workers are wonderfully fine and very cooperative. Lowell has never had a bad strike. Many persons who work in industries must have voted at our last State election for the Barnes bill, which was a regulatory labor bill. It passed by a very large majority.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like this bill before us. I wish it was not going to be given to us to vote on in this form. But I do think some constructive legislation is necessary. I find that many of the workers in my congressional district believe that we must pass some type of legislation that does away with abuses. I, for one, will vote and fight to repeal the bill if it does not work.

Mr. Chairman, because there have been so few strikes comparatively in Massachusetts, I think it appropriate to include in my remarks a description of our labor-peace record in Massachusetts that appeared in the Boston Herald:

KEEP OUR GOOD NAME

> Massachusetts has an excellent record, relatively, for labor peace. We are usually either in top or second place in comparative freedom from strikes, alternating with New York.
>
> In 1945, the figures of the department of labor and industries show, we had 239 strikes, involving 60,693 workers and causing 397,530 man-days of idleness. In loss of time, that was but 1 percent of the national total, whereas, on the basis of our industrial position, a record of 3 percent would be expected.
>
> Last year, with 3,139,891 man-days idle by strikes, we slipped to 2.8 percent of the national total, but we were still near the top of the list in industrial peace.
>
> We need to stay at the top. Not only in relative stability, but in a forward-looking attitude toward the labor problem, as exemplified by the Slichter management-labor report and the Barnes bill, we have achieved national leadership.
>
> This is superb advertising. Many thousands of dollars spent for a State department of commerce to promote Massachusetts development could not match the attractiveness of a good record in labor affairs. Not only industry but the best class of workers are drawn here by this.
>
> So when drivers temporarily hold up half of Greater Boston's milk distribution, when construction laborers halt important building projects (despite the pledge to President Truman), we are trifling with our good name. Not that these will add significantly to the man-day loss total at the end of the year, but both are likely to gain notice outside the State.
>
> We cannot say that strikes are never justified. But it is true beyond all doubt that the vast majority of strikes are called before all resources of conciliation and arbitration are explored. The Slichter report has indicated how much might be accomplished if labor and management work earnestly for peaceful settlement. Here is a chance to make Massachusetts stand out as a strike-free State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the very excellent and correct remarks made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] calling the attention of the House to the fine labor record that Massachusetts has enjoyed for some years. In Massachusetts both the American Federation of Labor and the CIO have excellent leadership, and the understandings between these organizations have been publicly recognized by industry, management, and the public. We have many fine labor-management studios or class clinics in Massachusetts, one at Holy Cross College, of which college I am an honorary degree member; and there are other institutions where management and labor get together and come to an understanding based upon respect. In my opinion, that is the thing that is essential in the success of any country possessing democratic institutions of government, respect for one another, respect for the views of one another no matter how wide apart they may seem to be.

I have always maintained that if I sit across the table from someone and we are in disagreement and have a problem to settle, if we do not impugn each others's motives, and we respect one another's views, somewhere along the line we are bound to get together. I think if management and labor get back more to the elements of decency, and if men get back more to the moral law, to the old ideas that the laborer is worthy of his hire and that a fair day's work is worth a fair day's pay, back to some of the fundamentals that are directly related to the moral law, many of the problems that confront us and upon which we must pass from a legislative angle would never exist.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts referred to the labor record of Massachusetts. I am sure she will agree with me that to a great extent it is due to a man we had up there as Commissioner of Labor for 11 years, the Honorable James T. Moriarty.

"Jim" Moriarty is a remarkable man. He is a man who has been a labor leader

all his life. But he is one who calls the turn as he sees it. If labor is wrong, he tells them so. If management is wrong, he tells them so. "Jim" Moriarty had the complete respect of both management and labor, as well as the general public. Eleven years ago he was appointed Commissioner of Labor in Massachusetts by a then Democratic governor. He continued in that capacity under former Governor LEVERETT SALTONSTALL for 6 years. I am sorry he is no longer Commissioner of Labor in Massachusetts. But I have heard Governor SALTONSTALL say that while "Jim" Moriarty was a Democrat in politics he did not have a head of any agency of the State government who cooperated with him more thoroughly than James T. Moriarty.

It all comes back to the question of leadership—leadership in Government, leadership in labor, and leadership in management. I was very glad to hear the gentlewoman from Massachusetts call to the attention of the House the fine labor record that Massachusetts has enjoyed. I join with her in her remarks and pay tribute to a great public official who has been mainly responsible for it and who was loyally supported by the governors under whom he served, whether they were Democratic or Republican, and who rendered great contributions toward industrial peace that has existed in Massachusetts. I refer to Hon. James T. Moriarty.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to voice my opposition to the pending Hartley antilabor bill. While it is true there has been some cause to pass certain measures to correct the abuses on the part of some sources in the labor movement, we should not forget the vast number of unionized workers who are working under union contracts. Thousands of contracts have been negotiated in good faith by labor and management and these should not be disturbed. Unfortunately, through newspaper headlines the public only hears about disputes in which the process of collective bargaining has bogged down. The present bill reminds me of the analogy that to remove a gnat which has gotten in your eye, though exceedingly irritating, does not require the removal of your head. Labor in general has been fair and just in the treatment of employers.

On page 4 of the committee's report, I notice a number of misleading and false statements; for example, the report states:

> For the last 14 years, as a result of labor laws ill-conceived and disastrously executed, the American workingman has been deprived of his dignity as an individual. He has been cajoled, coerced, intimidated, and on many occasions beaten up, in the name of the splendid aims set for in section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act. His whole economic life has been subject to the complete domination and control of unregulated monopolists.

And so forth.

The committee would have you believe that 14 million union members have been thus treated. How ridiculous! It is well known that there are thousands of contracts covering millions of members which are mutually satisfactory to labor and management. However, the committee would have you forget this by magnifying the troubles of a minority group. Punitive legislation should not wreck the unions which are noted for their constructive progress in collective bargaining covering wages and working conditions.

Time will not permit a discussion of every provision contained in H. R. 3020. I would like, however, to call to the attention of the Members of the House certain provisions of the bill which would strike at the very heart of collective bargaining.

The most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, estimates for the year 1946, indicate that of approximately 4.8 million workers covered by collective bargaining agreements, only 33 percent are covered by closed-shop agreements; 17 percent are covered by union-shop agreements, 25 percent by maintenance-of-membership clauses, 3 percent by preferential-hiring clauses, and 22 percent by none of these. Those agreements providing for a closed shop were drawn up by the representatives of management and labor and accepted by both groups in the democratic collective bargaining process. The proponents of the punitive labor legislation now being considered have overestimated the extent of closed-shop agreements now in effect in American industry and have misrepresented the nature and purpose of the closed shop. The closed shop is not invoked in all labor-management contracts but mainly in those industries and crafts where experience has shown over the past 50 years it best meets the peculiar needs and productive skills required in the craft and in the industry.

The so-called closed-shop issue is a smoke screen for an all-out attack against union security. The closed shop, of course, is that form of union security in which the owner agrees to hire only persons who are already members of the union and usually to hire such persons through the union. This operates as a condition of employment, providing that those benefiting from the activities of a union shall share in its responsibilities and costs. A union representing the majority of the workers in a plant, occupation, or factory speaks for all the workers in the group. Closed-shop agreements in collective-bargaining contracts extend the democratic principle of the responsibility of the individual for the acts of organizations representing him into the field of labor-management relations. There is nothing undemocratic in the principle of the closed shop, as members of the majority party would have you believe. As with other conditions of employment such as work hours, work uniform, shop rules, the worker accepts union membership as one of the proper responsibilities imposed by his job. If he objects to the conditions of employment, a worker in our free enterprise economy, seeks employment elsewhere.

The closed shop operates primarily in craft unions and in those craft unions in highly skilled handicraft shops where a high degree of training is required for employment. The system evolved, not because of the unions' wish to assume a dictatorial voice in the hiring of persons, but as a natural development of early systems, such as the guilds, where skilled workmen took personal pride in a high standard of workmanship and production. In these shops, the closed shop makes fuller labor-management cooperation possible, promotes efficient production, and makes for greater responsibility among workers and union leaders who are directly responsible to all the workers they represent. During the last decade there have been significantly fewer strikes proportionately in plants where union status, responsibility, and security have been guaranteed by closed-shop and union-shop agreements. In spite of this splendid record, the proponents of the pending bill seek to outlaw the closed shop and make the union shop unobtainable in many cases. The union shop, under this legislation, could only be put into effect with the consent of the employer, giving an unscrupulous employer unfair advantage over his workers and over his more fair-minded competitors.

I should like to call to your attention an international union which has a record of splendid relations with their employers and their members, and which would be wiped out of existence by the proposed measure. Section 2 (12), (B), and (C), page 11 define as a supervisor one "who is employed to act in other respects for the employer in dealing with other individuals employed by the employer, or who is employed to secure and furnish to the employer information to be used by the employer in connection with any of the foregoing; or who by the nature of his duties is given by the employer information that is of a confidential nature, and that is not available to the public, to competitors, or to employees generally, for use in the interest of the employer."

There has been no evidence submitted to the committee to suggest the necessity to exclude a large group of employees from the benefits of collective bargaining. On the other hand, the record of this international union has been such as to indicate that it is a necessary part of the labor-union movement and should be entitled to the support and aid of our Government in raising the standards of the scientists and architects and engineers engaged in the architectural and engineering professions. Before the advent of this union, these employees were the white-collar forgotten men. Until they organized, there was no method whereby they could increase their income in relationship to that of the manual worker. Being small in number and scattered throughout the country, the individual architect, engineer, or scientist had no means of presenting his needs to his employer. Only through organization has this class of employees gained recognition.

The organization to which I specifically refer is the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. This organization represents a high type of membership who do the architectural, engineering, and scientific work of our

country. They use their brains in seeking out new materials and new methods of production. By the very nature of their work, they have confidential information which is neither available to the public nor to their employer's competitors. As the result of their research and investigation, they are reducing the man-hours required in production and are constantly improving the design of the product of their employer in order to gain advantage over their competitors. They are loyal employees and use the confidential knowledge which they have for the benefit of their employers and they should not be prohibited from joining a union for the improvement of their economic status.

I have made this illustration to show definitely that while the proponents of this bill profess their belief in unions and collective bargaining they propose in fact to destroy completely an international union with a long record of excellent labor-management relations.

The free-enterprise goal of high production and high consumption can best be achieved through mass production of low-cost products, made possible by increasing our industrial efficiency. American standards of fair play and sound economics no longer countenance price competition through competitive cutting of wages. A high level of consumption is impossible unless laborers receive wages which are reasonably in line with wages of other workers and prices of consumer goods.

To correct the present maladjustment in the relationship between individual incomes and the inflated price level, the combined efforts of employers, workingmen, and consumers are needed. At the time of the highest prices and highest corporate profits in history, the majority party has introduced H. R. 3020 containing provisions which, by crippling collective-bargaining mechanisms, would handicap labor and management in their constructive efforts toward stopping the inflationary spiral. In the long run all parties, management, labor, and the public, would suffer. I cannot state too emphatically my opposition to such legislation.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly charged here that legal counsel for certain corporations had a hand in the writing of this bill. I do not know whether that is true or not.

However, there is one thing I am certain of, and that is that no member of the rubber industry would stoop to such skulduggery. The rubber industry and the United Cork, Rubber, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, to their everlasting credit, have recently reconciled their differences, and they have agreed on a work contract on an industry-wide basis. They are enjoying peaceful relations throughout the United States from Maine to California.

I know many of the local members of the rubber workers' union. I know most of the officials, and I say of those members of the local, to those who would make this charge of communism and radicalism, that those fine, Christian, patriotic American citizens could throw those charges back in the faces of their accusers.

It seems to me labor today is somewhat in the position of a tired, old, faithful work horse. He has been abused. He has been beaten. He has been overworked and he has been underfed. At the present time he may be a little balky or a little skittish, so we call in the Republican veterinarian, and instead of giving the old horse a little shot of hypodermic to cure his ills, the veterinarian advocates cutting off his head and sending the old work horse to the glue factory.

That is what you are doing to labor by enacting this drastic legislation. Everyone who is interested in labor problem will admit that some reforms are necessary, but we are going way beyond anything that has been demanded.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, for 3 days we have listened to the spirited and at times heated debate on this grave and important economic issue. Along with the foreign-policy questions, an adequate national-defense program, balancing of the budget, reduction of unnecessary expenditures of Government, a program of economy, and bringing about a reduction in taxes, this question of labor and management relations is, and rightfully so, one of the most important issues for this Congress to consider.

This is not a new issue. It was one we tried to deal with in the last Congress without reaching a conclusion and here we are again in this Congress fervently and anxiously trying to solve an issue by doing justice to the workingman, to industry, and, above all, to the public. Most everyone is of the belief and opinion that something needs to be done. This feeling has been accentuated since the ending of the war by unfortunate developments, one following another. The President of the United States, who in my opinion is doing a magnificent job, has told us more than once that something needs to be done, that jurisdictional strikes should not be tolerated, that boycotts are indefensible, that mutual responsibility is highly desirable, and that we need to strengthen our Conciliation Service. There have been many polls taken and various methods of expression from the public, all of which say that something needs to be done to correct the inequities and to bring some degree of peace out of chaos that continuously endangers our whole economic structure.

This question goes much further than merely the issue between a labor union and management. It affects our entire economic structure and unless adequate and proper adjustments are made, we are headed toward a condition I feel far worse than the darkest days of the depression. Yes, as grave and serious as exists in other countries today where they have no economy, no labor rights and no industrial production.

I am sure it is the desire of most of us to try desperately to provide the adjustments to our labor-relations program that will bring about industrial peace, happiness, and prosperity. We are all anxious, I am sure, to end strikes and bring about peaceful relationship between management and labor, without depriving either of rights to which they are justly entitled. I am one of those who believe that we should deal with these problems not on the basis of theories, but practically and realistically. It is imperative that if we are going to do a good job for the people of this country that we must give it the best and most sincere consideration of which we are capable. We can accomplish our objective only by sound and courageous action.

I have some serious doubt, Mr. Chairman, as to some of the provisions of this bill. Its general purposes, I feel, are designed to accomplish the objective sought. A great many of the provisions are desirable but in some respects, I am apprehensive as to what will be the consequences. If we are going to be successful, we must not deprive anyone or groups of those rights that are guaranteed to them in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Equal justice should be the guiding star.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I voted against the Case bill as originally passed in this House in the last Congress. I did so because of the punitive provision that would deprive an innocent man of all rights and benefits under the law if he belonged to a union that was held to be in violation of that act. Though I recognize the desirability and necessity of adjustments to the Labor Relations Act, I refused to subscribe to a bill that could penalize anyone for something for which he was not responsible.

That objectionable feature was eliminated in the Senate and in the conference and when the report came back to the House, I voted for it. I did not feel that it was wholly satisfactory just as I do not think this bill is altogether satisfactory, but it did give, as this does, to the Nation a clarification of basis and policies of labor legislation. I realize this is the first step in the processing of this legislation and it will go through many more steps before it is completed. I trust as it progresses that it will become more desirable legislation, retaining and strengthening those provisions that are needed and determining more fully the issues that are questionable.

Generally the committee has done a fairly good piece of work with this highly technical and difficult problem. This bill provides a prohibition against jurisdictional strikes, the outlawing of boycotts, defines the terms more clearly and sets up definite policies as to what are fair and unfair labor policies and practices. It establishes and proposes to strengthen the Conciliation Service, provides for mediation and arbitration, preserves the right to organize, collective bargaining, and for mutuality of contracts.

Union shops are provided for as against the closed shop. Employers and employees are permitted to discuss their mutual problems. Industry-wide bargaining, one of the clear and controversial issues is prohibited but company-wide bargaining is permitted. The right to remain a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for nonpayment of dues, disclosing confidential information of the union,

violation of union contracts, being a Communist or fellow traveler, being convicted of a felony or engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union, the right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections on matters pertaining to his union or issues involved in connection with his work are protected, the right to obtain employment without joining a union and the right to vote by secret ballot on whether his employer and a union can compel him to join in order to retain his job is clearly proposed.

I have always supported the procedure as established by the Railway Labor Act. This bill proposes to give the Government authority to intercede in strikes imperiling public health, safety, or national interest. It gives the President the authority in such controversies as the Supreme Court recently held that he had in connection with the coal strike and the arbitrary action of John L. Lewis. It does not amend the anti-injunction law in any other respect. No one can use the injunctive proceedings except the Government at the instance of the President of the United States, and only then when the public health, safety, and interest are endangered.

Furthermore, during the processing, the same procedure is invoked as we have under the Railway Labor Act to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the dispute. Mediation and conciliation are invoked and if that fails, arbitration on a voluntary basis is provided, with the chief justice of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia as chairman of the board of arbitration.

These are some of the desirable features of this proposed legislation to help clarify existing law and procedure in disputes with semijudicial determination to resolve the issues in cases of national importance, which I believe is the most practical and realistic approach to this difficult and controversial national issue.

It is on this basis, Mr. Chairman, that I expect to vote for this bill, in an effort by this first legislative step to provide a legislative formula establishing standards to bring about a fair and equitable determination of labor and management relations.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, at some point before we adjourn today I felt, as a minority member of the committee, since certain statements have been made about how the bill was written, that I, speaking for myself and I believe for the minority members of the committee, should state that there never was any intent to cast any reflections on our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], personally. The treatment he accorded the members of the committee was always gentlemanly and we have no complaints on that score whatsoever. I think possibly the treatment that was accorded the minority members in the writing of the bill was just as distasteful to the gentleman from New Jersey as it was to us, but I believe he was working under orders from the Republican steam roller to get a bill written and to get the type of bill out of the committee as was actually reported. I am certain that, had he had his own way, he would not so completely have disregarded the minority members on the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO MEMBERS

SEC. 303. (a) Within 30 days after the end of its fiscal year first occurring after the date of the enactment of this act and within 30 days after the end of each succeeding fiscal year, every labor organization whose members are employed in an industry affecting commerce shall file with the United States Department of Labor a report for such fiscal year, in such form and detail as the Secretary of Labor shall by regulations prescribe, which shall include—

(1) the name and address of the organization;

(2) its receipts and disbursements;

(3) the names of its principal officers and the compensation and allowance or reimbursement for expenses paid to each;

(4) the names and addresses of all employers with which it maintains collective-bargaining relations;

(5) a copy of its constitution and bylaws, and a statement of the policies or practices which it follows in admitting individuals to and expelling individuals from membership therein; and

(6) such other information respecting the organization and its activities as the Secretary of Labor may by regulations prescribe.

The report shall be filed under oath, and shall be accompanied by a statement under oath that it was mailed to each member of the organization at his last-known address. The report shall not be made public by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) Violations of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 65, line 22, strike out "30" and insert "60."

Page 65, line 24, strike out "30" and insert "60."

Page 66, line 1, after the word "year", insert "the principal officers."

Page 66, line 8, after the figure "(2)", insert "a detailed financial report including a balance sheet and an operating statement and showing."

Page 67, line 2, after the word "Labor.", insert "In the case of a report required under this section prior to the expiration of 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, if any of the required information is not available an answer 'no information' shall be sufficient."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESTRICTION ON POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251; Supp. V, title 50 App., sec. 1509), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 67, line 11, after the word "act", strike out "1935" and insert "1925."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I assume that my situation in reference to this legislation is very much the same as that of practically every Member of the House. I have tried to know some of the things that are in this bill. I realize and recognize as well as anyone that we must, if we can, do something to bring about industrial peace in the United States of America. It will be good for enterprise, free and otherwise; it will be good for labor and the consuming public—and we are all consumers.

I have tried to approach legislation always from the standpoint of bringing about justice, fair play, and equal opportunity for all people. I have never thought that legislation should be passed to punish anybody, any group, or any section but, let me repeat, I think it should be passed and made law to bring about justice to everyone as nearly as possible. In my opinion we should not pass legislation in heat or in response to clamor, but we should pass it after using every bit of brains and reason we have.

I quote from a message from the President of the United States—the present President of the United States. He has been getting along pretty well in bringing about industrial peace. He is the one man in 25 years who had the courage to take on John L. Lewis. Others have had an opportunity. The coal strike stopped. The President appeared before this House a few months ago when transportation throughout the length and breadth of the country was at a standstill, a condition which if continued meant famine and starvation. Pestilence in all probability would follow. That strike closed immediately. He used this language:

> We must not under the stress of emotion endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

I doubt if there is any Member in this body who does me the honor of listening to me now who does not have serious

doubts about some of the far-reaching implications of this bill. I know I do. I am going to put in the RECORD the recommendations, the reasoned recommendations of the President of the United States.

The President in his message said:

I propose to you and urge your cooperation in effecting the following four-point program to reduce industrial strife:

Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.

First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional trikes indefensible.

The National Labor Relations Act provides procedures for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.

A second unjustifiable practice is the secondary boycott, when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.

Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

A third practice that should be corrected is the use of economic force, by either labor or management, to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts.

Collective-bargaining agreements, like other contracts, should be faithfully adhered to by both parties. In the most enlightened union-management relationships, disputes over the interpretation of contract terms are settled peacefully by negotiation or arbitration. Legislation should be enacted to provide machinery whereby unsettled disputes concerning the interpretation of an existing agreement may be referred by either party to final and binding arbitration.

Point No. 2 is the extension of the facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining.

One of our difficulties in avoiding labor strife arises from a lack of order in the collective-bargaining process. The parties often do not have a clear understanding of their responsibility for settling disputes through their own negotiations. We constantly see instances where labor or management resorts to economic force without exhausting the possibilities for agreement through the bargaining process. Neither the parties nor the Government have a definite yardstick for determining when and how Government assistance should be invoked. There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

Point No. 3 is the broadening of our program of social legislation to alleviate the causes of workers' insecurity.

On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill, I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor relations but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society. In this connection, for example, the Congress should consider the extension and broadening of our social-security system, better housing, a comprehensive national health program, and provision for a fair minimum wage.

Point No. 4 is the appointment of a temporary joint commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relations.

I recommend that the Congress provide for the appointment of a temporary joint commission to undertake this broad study.

The President, the Congress, management, and labor have a continuing responsibility to cooperate in seeking and finding the solution of these problems. I, therefore, recommend that the Commission be composed as follows: 12 to be chosen by the Congress from the Members of both parties in the House and the Senate, and 8 representing the public, management, and labor, to be appointed by the President.

The Commission should be charged with investigating and making recommendations upon certain major subjects, among others:

First, the special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest. In particular, the Commission should examine into the question of how to settle or prevent such strikes without endangering our general democratic freedoms

Upon a proper solution of this problem may depend the whole industrial future of the United States. The paralyzing effects of a Nation-wide strike in such industries as transportation, coal, oil, steel, or communications can result in national disaster. We have been able to avoid such disaster in recent years only by the use of extraordinary war powers. All those powers will soon be gone. In their place there must be created an adequate system and effective machinery in these vital fields. This problem will require careful study and a bold approach, but an approach consistent with the preservation of the rights of our people. The need is pressing. The Commission should give this its earliest attention.

Second, the best methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process. This should include the responsibilities of labor and management to negotiate freely and fairly with each other, and to refrain from strikes or lock-outs until all possibilities of negotiation have been exhausted.

Third, the underlying causes of labor-management disputes.

Some of the subjects presented here for investigation involve long-range study. Others can be considered immediately by the Commission and its recommendations can be submitted to the Congress in the near future.

I recommend that this Commission make its first report, including specific legislative recommendations, not later than March 15, 1947.

If they were incorporated in a bill I believe they would help bring about understanding and industrial peace. I do not believe, and I am serious and earnest about it, that this bill will have that effect. If every man and woman in this House voted who had a serious, conscientious, earnest doubt about what a bill like this enacted into law might do I would have no doubt as to what the outcome would be.

We had better wait a minute, we had better consider these great economic issues; not, let me repeat, punish somebody we do not like, some labor leader we do not like.

You are affecting not alone the labor leader. He probably does better and can get his salary increased oftener if there is not industrial peace. I am thinking about those millions of men and women whose rights, prerogatives, and privileges you may affect by this legislation to their detriment, and maybe to your detriment and to time.

I cannot support this bill and I am not going to. I do not think it has had the sound consideration that it should have had. I am going to vote for the motion to recommit, to send this bill back for further study. That will not be adopted, of course, in the temper of this House. Then I am going to vote against the bill and wait and hope that after the Senate in more of a seasoning period passes a bill, and then after the conferees have labored, I hope and trust they will bring forth a product that I can believe is fair and just and that I can believe will bring about industrial peace.

My friend from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] a moment ago referred to pressing down a crown of thorns on somebody's brow. I do not want industry to press down a crown of thorns on the brow of labor. I do not want reckless, unthinking, and in some instances not good men to press down these thorns upon industry and all of us. I think we should study this bill a while longer. I think we should reason with it a while longer and pass a law that will be fair, one that will be just to all people, labor, capital, industry, and the millions of men and women who eat, wear, and consume, and whose interest should be the first and uppermost in our minds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as on every occasion we have listened carefully to the words of the eminent gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] the minority leader.

I had hoped that he would vote for this bill. I think that what he has said demonstrates a very definite recognition on his part that something needs to be done. I am sorry that he has arrived at the conclusion that he has just now announced. I think I can demonstrate here in a few minutes that on the basis of his statement his conclusion to vote against the bill is error.

He referred to certain requests for legislation transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States. He said that the President is doing quite well with respect to the matter of industrial relations. Well, the President's veto of the Case bill in the last Congress certainly did not constitute a contribution. It is contended by many, and I think with much force, that the real reason for such

industrial peace as we have most recently had stems from the fact that the Congress of the United States, Republicans and Democrats, have been for weeks and months engaged in holding hearings and in the drafting of legislation dealing with the whole problem of labor-management relations.

The President in his message on the State of the Union asked for several specific things that are in this bill. He characterized jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts as an abuse, and he referred to the sanctity and obligation of contracts. Yes; he said we needed a strengthening of the conciliation processes. Now, he vetoed some exceptionally good language in the Case bill having to do with jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts and mutuality of obligations on contracts.

The gentleman from Texas, with the slight exception of his reference to the present situation of President Truman, injected no politics in what he had to say, and certainly I want to avoid partisanship. But I might just inquire as to whether or not the President, too, does not know something of the temper of the people of the country who demand of the Congress that we act now, not tomorrow, or next month or next year. As we have moved to the accomplishment of the things that the people of this country demand and expect, and have the right to expect, we are constantly met with the blandishments of certain people on the other side who say to us, "Now, this is all right, but now is not the time to do it." Well, those of us who think the time has come to act just are not going to listen to that.

The gentleman from Texas said that the President took Mr. Lewis by the whiskers. Well, I have heard a lot of people complain about the injunctive process contained in this proposal. I wonder what they think about the injunctive process invoked by the executive branch of the Government in connection with the coal strike.

I want to say this for the committee that has worked on this measure, and I say it equally for the Democratic members who themselves have worked on the measure, the members of that committee who sat through weeks and weeks of testimony, day after day, listening to all persons who wanted to be heard, I commend them. Certainly do I commend them for the painstaking, careful, workmanlike job that they have done in drafting this bill and incorporating in it the provisions with some of which you may not agree, it is true, but dealing with things that have been debated back and forth across this country for months and years.

Some of my good friends of the minority side on the committee—and I have known JOHN LESINSKI and the rest of them a long time—say they were not consulted much about the writing of this bill. I just looked up the record on the vote on the rule, and all six of those estimable gentlemen voted against the rule, which just means that they were not for doing anything. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] pointed out, that sort of cooperation is not very helpful when you get down to writing the bill. The committee voted this bill out by a vote of 18 to 4. The committee wrote the bill. Do not let anyone disturb you with any red herring drawn across the trail or any smoke screen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his fine attitude, an attitude that I hope on every occasion I may be able to reciprocate.

I think it is unfortunate that in the committee hearings many of the leaders of organized labor stubbornly refused to enter into any sort of cooperative action with the committee to draft this bill, notwithstanding that the President said something needed to be done and notwithstanding that polls taken clear across the country demonstrated that the people believe something needs to be done, and we know something needs to be done. I say it is unfortunate that the leaders of organized labor were not willing and did not enter into that work and that effort, and make their contribution to the writing of legislation. But they did not do it, so the committee has written the bill as fine, able, patriotic Members of Congress and citizens of the United States and they have brought the bill here to us.

For myself, I am going to support this bill and vote for it, and I think every one should.

This is no time to discuss the details of the bill. Much time has been devoted to that. But I should like to say something to some of my friends who are possibly concerned about voting for this bill. I was here through a number of Democratic Congresses. I was here back in 1940 when we had about 150 or 160 Republicans and the rest were all Democrats. In those Congresses, those of us who were here voted for a great many of the things that are in this bill, and some of them we voted for several times. Why, the amendment to the Wagner Act, the separation of the prosecuting from the judicial functions, the right of an employer to petition for an election, the free-speech amendment—those were things that were voted on in 1940 by a Democratic House of Representatives and passed here by a vote of 2 to 1. Yes; I have often said that if those amendments had been then adopted much of the trouble we have had since then would have been avoided.

What other things have we voted for? We voted for a provision for conciliation and a cooling-off period, with a strike ballot. We voted to outlaw jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. We voted for contractual responsibility. We voted for provisions against violence, to maintain law and order. We voted for reports by labor unions to their members. We voted prohibitions against political contributions by aggregations of capital, whether on the corporate or the labor side. About everybody here voted for the Petrillo bill.

And some pretty stiff penalties were embodied in so-called Petrillo bill that are not found in this bill. But all of you who were here, even on the other side of the aisle, voted for that. The prohibition there was that an employer should not be blackjacked into hiring more people than he needed just to have them standing around.

There are two new things in this bill, generally speaking. One of them is the closed-shop and union-shop provision, and the other is the attempt to deal with industry-wide bargaining.

I think that the right-thinking people of the country, by an overwhelming majority, insist that we undertake to deal with those two propositions.

I suppose that, as the gentleman from Texas has said, there are a number of people here, and it may even be true of everyone here, that they would change some part of this bill if they were writing the bill on their own. But you know that is not the way we write legislation. It cannot be written that way. On the whole, there is no question, I think, in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle that this bill is fair; that it is an honest, sincere effort to solve the problem of bringing about some sort of equity and fairness and peace into industrial relations in our country.

Where does that bring us with respect to the conclusion of the gentleman from Texas? He said he hoped this bill would go to the Senate. Perhaps he did not say exactly that, but I understood him to say, "after it goes over there," which certainly assumes that it will. Then, the Senate will act on it.

Next, the bill will go to conference and then, he says, he will take a look at the conference report. It is true that the pasage of this bill is just the initial step in a legislative process, and that it will go through many more steps before it is finally enacted into law.

But I do not know whether anyone can predict what will happen in the other body. I do not know whether anyone can predict what will come out of the conference. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was quite confident that the President would veto the bill if we sent it down to him. Except for his original message on the state of the Union, which practically repudiated his veto of the Case bill, I do not know yet what the President wants. That is something I have not been advised about. So, as far as I am concerned, the only thing to do is to go ahead as a Member of the legislative body and write the best bill I know how. That should be the approach for all of us.

The gentleman from Texas says he is going to vote "no" on the bill. In my opinion, a "no" vote on this bill is a vote to just not have any labor legislation at all. If enough people voted "no" on this bill, there would not be any labor legislation. It would stop right here. I do not see how anyone who believes that something needs to be done can, at this stage of the proceedings, sound the

death knell of this whole legislative process and in effect and in fact say that this is the end and nothing shall be done.

I know many of the Members are going to vote for this bill, but not because they believe in every provision in it. Evidence of that is found in the fact that some amendments were offered, some by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], which had considerable support among the membership but which were not adopted. I say that demonstrates there is not complete unanimity of opinion as to every provision in the bill. But, as I said before, this is the beginning of a legislative process and at least a beginning should be made. It is long overdue.

Here and now is the time to say to the American people that, as Members of Congress, we have the courage, we have the fortitude, we have the good judgment, and the common sense to undertake the writing of legislation dealing with these very troublesome problems. No one can minimize the threat to our national welfare and security involved in our failure to respond to that demand in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman as we come to the close of 3 days of extensive debate on this labor bill, I have resolved to cast my vote for the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Education for further study. If this motion is defeated, which it appears that it will be, I shall be compelled to vote against the bill.

There are many good features in this measure. I had hoped that I could vote for a labor bill which would outlaw jurisdictional strikes and place equal responsibility of contract upon employer and employee, control industry-wide strikes, and prevent strikes against the Government. There are other features in this bill which I consider meritorious; however, there are many features in this measure which are so violent and objectionable that I find it necessary for me to vote against the measure in order to prevent the enactment of these objectionable features.

I cannot go along with this measure, because I feel that if it is enacted into law, it will give the power to the employer to destroy labor unions and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining. This measure would give the employer the right to bring antitrust actions against employees and to institute criminal prosecutions against them and to obtain ex parte injunctions without a hearing. However, the employer version of the law is subject merely to a cease-and-desist order issued after administrative hearings or a court review. Further, this bill gives the employer the right to compel employees to accept a wage cut through forced labor for an indefinite period of time. This bill also gives the employer the right to break strikes caused by his own illegal conduct. It gives the employer the right to obtain injunctions against strikes which have been legal for the last 50 years. The employers retain the right to associate together for bargaining purposes, however, it outlaws that right for labor unions. It gives the employer the right to destroy a bargaining agent and to play employees against each other. It gives the employer the right to establish company unions and destroy independent unions. It gives the employer the right to destroy the bargaining agent and to refuse to bargain on matters of health, welfare programs, apprentice-training programs, and speed-up programs.

This bill also gives the right to the employer to break a strike for recognition even though the union represents an overwhelming majority of the employees. The employer may outlaw and crush a strike by hiring strikebreakers even though the strike is caused by his own misconduct. The employer may even cooperate with antilabor employers in order to destroy unions and receive no penalty therefor. The employer may also sue for treble damages and obtain injunctions after employees in one department strike against a wage cut in another department. The employer may lock out and blacklist office clerks if they join a union. The employer may also instigate criminal proceedings against individuals who exercise the right to picket. The employer may prevent the designation of a bargaining agent for a period of years. The employer may plant spies in union ranks and the union is powerless to expel them. The employer may ignore union security and even refuse to discuss it with the union, and may, at his discretion, crush a strike or threat of a strike. In fact, the employer is given the right to crush any strike when a collective-bargaining contract exists even if the strike is caused by an issue not covered by the contract. In substance the employer is given the power of a dictator at the hands of the Government over the union.

I am fully aware that many unions and union leaders have abused the right to strike; however, this privilege of collective action is the only means by which the American working man and woman can protect themselves against sweat shops and employer subjection. The mere fact that mistakes have been made in the past is no reason for us to create laws which will bring about the utter destruction of labor unions.

I feel that this legislation will create chaos in labor-management relations and ultimately will bring about a lowering of the standard of living of the working people of this country. It is most unfortunate that the majority in this House has seen fit to lump together all the matters that are contained herein. In order to obtain the desirable features it is necessary to vote for all of these very harmful and destructive features. I find that it is like eating an apple which is half rotten in order to get the good part, and in this case I sincerely believe that the bad features are so undesirable that it makes the entire piece of legislation undesirable and objectionable. Therefore, I must vote against it. I hope that after this bill has been considered by the Senate and the conference committee that some of these undesirable parts will be removed so that it will be possible for me to cast my vote for a temporized labor bill on final enactment.

This Nation now faces strife in industry which could lead to the economic paralysis of the entire country. We have a situation wherein both employees and employers are subject to hardship, and which, moreover makes the public in general suffer its consequences. This situation is obviously contrary to our democratic ideals, and I cannot vote for a measure so extreme in one direction that it would soon aggravate and magnify the evils of industrial strife rather than correct them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to condense what I have to say into the 5 minutes allotted me.

I would not take the floor at this time had it not been for the address of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] the minoirty leader, who did not in his speech reflect the views of a large number of us Democrats, who are going to support this bill.

As far as the President of the United States is concerned, Harry Truman never had a better friend in Congress than I am, and have been for years. He suits me better than any other man who has been President since I can remember. I do not believe he will veto this bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] tells us that if we have any doubt at all we should not vote for the legislation. If you put your votes on that basis you will never vote for any legislation at all.

Now, the gentleman talks about injustices. Some of the greatest injustices that have ever been wrought have been in some of the labor legislation that has been passed in the last 10 years. You talk about the four freedoms. They passed a bill called the wage-and-hour bill that destroyed the first freedom. What is the first freedom? It is freedom to work for your daily bread without paying tribute.

I am not antagonistic to labor. I have been a laboring man myself. I am not one of these "parlor pinks" that you have here today, who never did a lick of work in their lives. I have worked in the sawmill, on the farm, and in the factory. I have toiled to pay my way through school. I worked my way through college. I know what a workingman has to do. I am telling you that, in my opinion, the best thing we can do for the honest, hard-working, conscientious, patriotic American laboring man is to pass some kind of legislation that will clear up the unfortunate

situation in which the American people find themselves today.

You heard the gentleman from California tell about his farmers having their milk dumped into the gutter. Why? Somebody, perhaps in New York, had ordered a teamsters' strike in California. Some of that trouble is creeping into the South. Do you know, the hardest-working men in America are the farmers of this Nation, especially the cotton farmers. The cotton farmer gets 1 cent an hour for his work for every cent a pound he gets for his lint cotton. He is now working for 34 cents an hour. He must work in the hot sun, toiling from sunup until sundown. He is the hardest-working man in America. I know, for I have been one of them.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] talks about letting the other body do it. Now, if you wait for the other body, that lynched my State on a roll-call vote a few months ago, there is no telling how long it will be before you get any labor legislation at all.

This legislation is not perfect; I know that; but I am sure it is more nearly perfect than anything we would get from the other end of the Capitol; and for that reason I am going along with a vast number of Democrats, men on my side of the House, who are going to vote for this bill.

For that reason I wanted to take this time to say that in my humble opinion the best thing that could happen to the American laboring man would be to pass this legislation, or some legislation of this kind, and this is all we have to vote for. If the body at the other end of the Capitol is as wise as the gentleman from Texas seems to think, then, if there are any inconsistencies in the measure, then that other body can straighten them out; but I for one am not willing, under the circumstances, to vote against any legislation at all.

I shall therefore vote against the motion to recommit and vote for the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBS: On page 68, after line 19, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 306. All provisions of this bill shall terminate on December 31, 1948, unless extended by act of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to read the amendment to the Members again. It is to add a new section:

SEC. 306. All provisions of this bill shall terminate on December 31, 1948, unless extended by act of Congress.

As suggested by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], there is no time or opportunity now to discuss the provisions of the pending bill. Suffice it to say that I think it contains a number of excellent provisions, and I am in thorough sympathy with the purpose of the framers of the bill to curb certain practices such as sympathy strikes, boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes. I believe also in the principle of mutuality of contract, although I will remark in passing that I think the provisions of the bill on that subject will not accomplish the purpose. I believe in the right of the employer to discuss freely with his employees their mutual problems without, of course, intimidation or coercion. In fact, I think such a practice would lead to a better understanding and better labor relations. There are other provisions that are good, but unfortunately there are certain features of the bill that, in my judgment, are most unwise and even dangerous.

The bill is 68 pages in length and deals with sundry subjects. It not only drastically revises the Wagner Act, but goes much further and amends the Clayton Act of 1914 passed during the administration of President Wilson, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act passed in 1932 under President Hoover. Both of these acts were passed after mature deliberation and after long experience with the evils they sought to correct had demonstrated the necessity for them. There are other provisions of the bill which more extended consideration and study will show seriously affect the right of working people to organize and maintain their unions. In that regard, the bill goes much further than simply curbing the activities of certain labor leaders or powerful labor unions. It seriously restricts unions and workers in their efforts to maintain the integrity of their organizations.

I realize that many of you entertain different views. The purpose of my amendment, therefore, is to treat the pending bill as experimental. I am willing to go along with it on that basis, notwithstanding its many provisions that I regard as unwise, even dangerous. By adopting the amendment we will, in effect, say that we will try this bill and that the Congress accepts its responsibility of continuing its study of labor legislation; that as this bill becomes effective and is put in operation, we will observe its effect with a view of amending or eliminating provisions which prove, in practice, to be unwise or unworkable.

I think the greatest danger of this bill lies in the fact that certain provisions of it will be regarded by the industrial worker as aimed at his organization which he considers the greatest safeguard of his rights as a workman. Thus, he will become the easy prey of the rabble rouser and the Communist agitator; with the result that instead of the bill producing industrial peace it will more likely greatly damage employer-employee relations, which could easily lead to chaos.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress I voted, as many of you did, for one of the most drastic strike-curbing bills ever passed by a legislative assembly in a democratic country. I did so to meet an extreme national emergency and because the bill, by its terms, was of a purely temporary nature. But you are here proposing a very drastic bill—yes, a dangerous bill in many of its provisions as a long range piece of permanent legislation. On that basis and for the reason, among others, so well stated by the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], I cannot support it. But if the House will adopt the amendment offered, it seems to me the overwhelming majority of us can support it.

In conclusion, I wish to make a brief reply to the suggestions offered by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He suggested that since the pending bill incorporates a number of provisions which the President has, in the past, expressed approval of and which the minority leader and many Democrats have on different occasions supported, that we, on this side of the aisle, should support the pending bill. I should like to suggest to the majority leader that we are given no opportunity to vote for the provisions he mentions, since they are incorporated in a single bill containing other provisions which we simply cannot support.

In short, he hands us a rotten apple and demands that we eat all of it in order to get the portion of it that is good. I, for one, cannot swallow that; and I trust you will adopt the amendment. I think it is sound and I think the support that the bill would receive with that in it would be reassurance to all of our people that the Congress means to accept its grave responsibility without partisanship, that we will work out a bill which is just and fair to employer, employee, and the public. That is the only kind of labor law that can ever work successfully in this democratic country.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, the debates this week on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House of Representatives dealt with matters as momentous as any we will be likely to consider during the present session.

I refer in the first instance to the discussion of aid to Greece and Turkey, which is taking place in the Senate. The future of United States policy in foreign affairs will be largely determined by the action to be taken on this measure. Will we as a nation be willing to carry out the Truman doctrine, as it has been called? What is the real aim of the Truman doctrine? What will be the effect of such a foreign policy, not 6 weeks from now, or 6 months from now, but 6 years from now? These are the questions that will be in the minds of many, even as the vote is taken on this crucial issue in the Senate.

No less vital to our national life in coming years will be the fate of the labor legislation passed by the House of Representatives. The action taken on this

measure will make or break our domestic economy during coming months and years. It will decide whether we are to have an honestly free economy, guaranteeing the rights of workers and the business and industrial organizations of which they are a part, or whether we are to have a lopsided system giving favored-son treatment to management, or to labor union officials, at the expense of the individual worker and the general public.

Let us look into the specific provisions of this legislation, H. R. 3020. Although it has been called the Hartley bill, its formal title is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRED HARTLEY, certainly deserves credit for the thorough hearings he conducted before the bill was completed. He deserves credit for the hard work and long hours he has put into his job as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. However, the bill itself is an amalgamation of ideas. It represents the best thinking of the committee as a whole. It deserves the bipartisan support it received by the Members of the House of Representatives.

Early in March, a witness charged that the members of this committee were not qualified to write a fair labor bill. He compared the members to 25 blacksmiths, who, he said, would be a poor crowd to deal with medical and health problems. He inferred that the only people who could write a fair labor bill would be labor organizers. He indicated that the committee members were "blacksmiths" because they were not experts in labor relations.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] said he thought the inference was clear.

The witness was not satisfied, however. He blazed back at the committee:

> The inference is that men who know nothing about a proposition shouldn't deal with it. That's not an inference. That's a statement.

This same witness was bitterly opposed to any change whatever in the National Labor Relations Act. Now, I cannot help wondering what was so different about the Labor Committee who wrote that act and the one which has worked on the present act.

Was the committee at that time composed of experts in labor relations? No. They were no more expert than are our present legislators. However, they were qualified because they were serious students of the problems of Government. They had been elected by the people to represent them. Our present legislators are serious students and they, too, have been elected by the people as their chosen Representatives. The men who wrote the National Labor Relations Act back in 1935 were qualified because they were intelligent men who were aware of what was going on around them, as are our present legislators. They were qualified because they passed a bill which answered the needs of that period back in 1935 as the majority of voters in the country understood them.

Our present legislators wrote a bill which answers the needs of the present as the majority of voters in the country now understand them.

This bill will be—and, in fact, already has been—criticized by a few extremists in management and by a few extremists who make their living under the name of labor, but who exploit, rather than protect, the laboring man. The majority of actual workers, and the sound, fair-minded businessmen have indicated their approval of the bill.

The present bill is a sincere and, on the whole, I believe, successful attempt to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce. This is the actual language of the bill itself. This is the need of the present and the period we are now entering—a time which must answer humanity's plea for high production to replace the devastating losses of war throughout the world.

In addition the bill is designed to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce. This is the language of the bill. This is the need we face today, when individual freedom is threatened all over the world.

The bill aims, also, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce which endanger the public health, safety, or welfare. This is again the language of the bill. It is the reiteration of a principle as old as the Constitution itself.

The fact that the National Labor Relations Board is to be supplanted by a new Labor-Management Relations Board is not an indictment of the men who have served as members of the Board in the past. It signifies the realization that the National Labor Relations Board was given an impossible job in the first place. As it operated, it had to act as prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner. For years I have pointed to this defect in the terms of the National Labor Relations Act. I have objected to the practice of the Board which admitted hearsay evidence.

Both of these legal monstrosities are eliminated under the present legislation.

The question today is whether or not a man may have a right, as an individual, under law, to work at the job of his choice, with the representatives of his choice carrying out the principles of his choice.

If we cannot rightfully legislate to make these guaranties a reality, we are no longer a free nation under God. We still believe in the rule of the majority. There are those among us who do not share our faith in this great principle. From them we will hear weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. But we may rest assured that in this great land we still have government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

God grant us the strength to work together in the face of those who would rob us of that government in the perilous years we are facing.

LABOR'S NEW BILL OF RIGHTS UNDER THE HARTLEY BILL, H. R. 3020

1. The right to join with his fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union that they want, not the union that is forced upon them. (Secs. 7 (a), 8 (a) (1), 8 (a) 3, 8 (b) (1), 9 (c) (2), 9 (f) (2), 9 (f) (4), 9 (f) (5).)

2. The right to get a job without joining any union. (Secs. 8 (a) (3), 8 (d) (4).)

3. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job. (Secs. 8 (d) (4), 9 (g).)

4. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union. (Sec. 8 (b) (2).)

5. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union without dictation by national and international officers and representatives and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers. (Sec. 9 (f) (1).)

6. The right to keep on working and getting his pay, in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer. (Sec. 12 (a) (3) (A).)

7. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him. (Sec. 2 (11).)

8. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers, and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination. (Secs. 8 (a) (4), 8 (c) (5).)

9. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear, in free and fair elections, on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay; what assessments the union can make him pay; what the union can spend the money for. (Sec. 8 (c) (8).)

10. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers. (Sec. 8 (c) (8).)

11. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses. (Sec. 8 (c) (10), 303.)

12. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want. (Sec. 8 (c) (3).)

13. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for (1) not paying dues, (2) disclosing confidential information of the union, (3) violating the union's contract, (4) being a Communist or fellow traveler, (5) being convicted of a felony, that is, of a serious crime, (6) engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union. (Sec. 8 (c) (6).)

14. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union doesn't like. (Secs. 8 (a) (1), 8 (b) (1), 12 (a) (1).)

15. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer. (Sec. 9 (a).)

16. The right, without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes. (Sec. 8 (c) (5).)

17. The right to go to and from work without being threatened or molested. (Sec. 12 (a) (1).)

18. The right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights. (Sec. 10.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COMBS) there were—ayes 83, noes 205.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error appearing at the end of line 9 on page 43 by substituting the word "or" for the word "of."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 178, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KELLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KELLEY moves that H. R. 3020 be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor with instruction that House Joint Resolution 83 be reported back forthwith providing for a complete and comprehensive study of all labor-management relations.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. LESINSKI. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 122, nays 291, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—122

Albert	Bishop	Buchanan
Angell	Blatnik	Buckley
Bates, Ky.	Bloom	Butler
Battle	Boggs, La.	Byrne, N. Y.
Beckworth	Brophy	Canfield
Cannon	Hendricks	Norman
Carroll	Holifield	Norton
Celler	Huber	O'Brien
Clark	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
Combs	Javits	Patman
Cooley	Jenkins, Pa.	Patterson
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson
D'Alesandro	Jones, Wash.	Pfeifer
Dawson, Ill.	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Deane	Kee	Phillips, Tenn.
Delaney	Kefauver	Powell
Dingell	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Donohue	Kennedy	Priest
Douglas	Keogh	Rabin
Durham	King	Rayburn
Eberharter	Kirwan	Rayfiel
Elsaesser	Klein	Redden
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Fenton	Lanham	Rooney
Flannagan	Lemke	Sabath
Fogarty	Lesinski	Sadowski
Folger	Lodge	Scoblick
Foote	Lusk	Sheppard
Forand	Lyle	Sikes
Fulton	Lynch	Smathers
Gordon	McCormack	Snyder
Gorski	Madden	Somers
Granger	Mansfield, Mont.	Spence
Hagen		Stigler
Hardy	Marcantonio	Thomas, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Meade, Ky.	Thomason
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Havenner	Monroney	Trimble
Hays	Morgan	Twyman
Hedrick	Morris	Walter
Heffernan	Murdock	Welch

NAYS—291

Abernethy	Crawford	Hope
Allen, Calif.	Crow	Horan
Allen, Ill.	Cunningham	Howell
Allen, La.	Curtis	Jackson, Calif.
Almond	Dague	Jarman
Andersen, H. Carl	Davis, Ga.	Jenison
	Dawson, Utah	Jenkins, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Devitt	Jennings
Andresen, August H.	D'Ewart	Jensen
	Dirksen	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Dolliver	Johnson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Y.	Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.
Arends	Dondero	Johnson, Tex.
Arnold	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Auchincloss	Doughton	Jones, N. C.
Bakewell	Drewry	Jones, Ohio
Banta	Eaton	Jonkman
Barden	Elliott	Judd
Barrett	Ellis	Kearney
Bates, Mass.	Ellsworth	Kearns
Beall	Elston	Keating
Bell	Engle, Calif.	Keefe
Bender	Evins	Kerr
Bennett, Mich.	Fallon	Kersten, Wis.
Bennett, Mo.	Fellows	Kilburn
Blackney	Fernandez	Kilday
Boggs, Del.	Fisher	Knutson
Bolton	Fletcher	Kunkel
Bonner	Gallagher	Landis
Boykin	Gamble	Larcade
Bradley, Calif.	Gary	Latham
Bradley, Mich.	Gathings	Lea
Bramblett	Gavin	LeCompte
Brehm	Gearhart	LeFevre
Brooks	Gillette	Lewis
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	Love
Brown, Ohio	Goff	Lucas
Bryson	Goodwin	McConnell
Buck	Gore	McCowen
Buffett	Gossett	McDonough
Bulwinkle	Graham	McDowell
Burke	Grant, Ala.	McGarvey
Burleson	Grant, Ind.	McGregor
Busbey	Gregory	McMahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	McMillan, S. C.
Camp	Gross	McMillen, Ill.
Carson	Gwinn, N. Y.	MacKinnon
Case, N. J.	Gwynne, Iowa	Macy
Case, S. Dak.	Hale	Mahon
Chadwick	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maloney
Chapman		Manasco
Chelf	Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth		Mason
Chiperfield	Halleck	Mathews
Church	Hand	Meade, Md.
Clason	Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Clevenger	Harris	Meyer
Clippinger	Harrison	Michener
Coffin	Hartley	Miller, Conn.
Cole, Kans.	Hébert	Miller, Md.
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Mills
Colmer	Hess	Mitchell
Cooper	Hinshaw	Morton
Corbett	Hobbs	Muhlenberg
Cotton	Hoeven	Mundt
Coudert	Hoffman	Murray, Tenn.
Courtney	Holmes	Murray, Wis.
Nixon	Robsion	Stratton
Nodar	Rockwell	Sundstrom
Norblad	Rogers, Mass.	Taber
Norrell	Rohrbough	Talle
O'Hara	Ross	Taylor
O'Konski	Russell	Teague
Owens	Sadlak	Thomas, N. J.
Passman	St. George	Tibbott
Peden	Sanborn	Towe
Phillips, Calif.	Sarbacher	Vail
Pickett	Sasscer	Van Zandt
Ploeser	Schwabe, Mo.	Vinson
Plumley	Schwabe, Okla.	Vorys
Poage	Scott, Hardie	Vursell
Potts	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wadsworth
Preston		Weichel
Price, Fla.	Scrivner	West
Rains	Seely-Brown	Wheeler
Ramey	Shafer	Whitten
Rankin	Short	Whittington
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	Williams
Rees	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Reeves	Smith, Maine	Wilson, Tex.
Rich	Smith, Ohio	Winstead
Richards	Smith, Wis.	Wolcott
Riehlman	Springer	Wolverton
Riley	Stanley	Woodruff
Rivers	Stefan	Youngblood
Rizley	Stevenson	Zimmerman
Robertson	Stockman	

NOT VOTING—19

Bland	Gerlach	Morrison
Clements	Gifford	Pace
Cox	Hill	Poulson
Cravens	Hull	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Wood
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Worley
Fuller		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clements for, with Mr. Pace against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Cox against.
Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Gifford against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hill with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Wood.

Mr. MCDONOUGH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 107, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—308

Abernethy	Bolton	Clason
Allen, Calif.	Bonner	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Boykin	Clippinger
Allen, La.	Bradley, Calif.	Coffin
Almond	Bradley, Mich.	Cole, Kans.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Cole, Mo.
	Brehm	Cole, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Brooks	Colmer
Andresen, August H	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Andrews, Ala.	Bryson	Cotton
Andrews, N. Y.	Buck	Coudert
Arends	Buffett	Courtney
Arnold	Bulwinkle	Cravens
Auchincloss	Burke	Crawford
Bakewell	Burleson	Crow
Banta	Busbey	Cunningham
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Curtis
Barrett	Camp	Dague
Bates, Mass.	Carson	Davis, Ga.
Battle	Case, N. J.	Davis, Tenn.
Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Dawson, Utah
Beckworth	Chadwick	Deane
Bell	Chapman	Devitt
Bender	Chelf	D'Ewart
Bennett, Mich.	Chenoweth	Dirksen
Bennett, Mo	Chiperfield	Dolliver
Blackney	Church	Domengeaux
Boggs, Del.	Clark	Dondero

Dorn	Jonkman	Redden
Doughton	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Drewry	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Durham	Kearns	Rees
Eaton	Keating	Reeves
Elliott	Keefe	Rich
Ellis	Kerr	Richards
Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Elston	Kilburn	Riley
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Rivers
Evins	Knutson	Rizley
Fallon	Kunkel	Robertson
Fellows	Landis	Robsion
Fernandez	Larcade	Rockwell
Fisher	Latham	Rogers, Fla.
Fletcher	Lea	Rogers, Mass.
Foote	LeCompte	Rohrbough
Fulton	LeFevre	Ross
Gallagher	Lewis	Sadlak
Gamble	Lodge	St. George
Gary	Love	Sanborn
Gathings	Lucas	Sarbacher
Gavin	Lusk	Sasscer
Gearhart	Lyle	Schwabe, Mo.
Gillette	McConnell	Schwabe, Okla.
Gillie	McCowen	Scott, Hardie
Goff	McDonough	Scott,
Goodwin	McDowell	Hugh D., Jr.
Gore	McGarvey	Scrivner
Gossett	McGregor	Seely-Brown
Graham	McMahon	Shafer
Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.	Short
Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Sikes
Gregory	MacKinnon	Simpson, Ill.
Griffiths	Macy	Simpson, Pa.
Gross	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Maloney	Smith, Maine
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Hagen	Mason	Springer
Hale	Mathews	Stanley
Hall,	Meade, Md.	Stefan
Edwin Arthur	Merrow	Stevenson
Hall,	Meyer	Stockman
Leonard W.	Michener	Stratton
Halleck	Miller, Conn.	Sundstrom
Hand	Miller, Md.	Taber
Hardy	Miller, Nebr.	Talle
Harness, Ind.	Mills	Taylor
Harris	Mitchell	Teague
Harrison	Morton	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Muhlenberg	Tibbott
Hébert	Mundt	Towe
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Trimble
Herter	Murray, Wis.	Vail
Heselton	Nixon	Van Zandt
Hess	Nodar	Vinson
Hinshaw	Norblad	Vorys
Hobbs	Norman	Vursell
Hoeven	Norrell	Wadsworth
Hoffman	O'Hara	Weichel
Holmes	O'Konski	West
Hope	Owens	Wheeler
Horan	Passman	Whitten
Howell	Patman	Whittington
Jackson, Calif.	Peden	Wigglesworth
Jarman	Peterson	Williams
Jenison	Phillips, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Jenkins, Ohio	Ploeser	Wilson, Tex.
Jennings	Plumley	Winstead
Jensen	Poage	Wolcott
Johnson, Calif.	Potts	Wolverton
Johnson, Ill.	Preston	Woodruff
Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.	Youngblood
Johnson, Tex.	Priest	Zimmerman
Jones, N. C.	Ramey	
Jones, Ohio	Rankin	

NAYS—107

Albert	Fenton	King
Angell	Flannagan	Kirwan
Bates, Ky.	Fogarty	Klein
Bishop	Folger	Lane
Blatnik	Forand	Lanham
Bloom	Gordon	Lemke
Boggs, La.	Gorski	Lesinski
Brophy	Granger	Lynch
Buchanan	Harless, Ariz.	McCormack
Buckley	Hart	Madden
Butler	Havenner	Manasco
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Mansfield,
Canfield	Hedrick	Mont.
Cannon	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Carroll	Holifield	Meade, Ky.
Celler	Huber	Miller, Calif.
Combs	Jackson, Wash.	Monroney
Cooley	Javits	Morgan
Crosser	Jenkins, Pa.	Morris
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Murdock
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Norton
Delaney	Jones, Wash.	O'Brien
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole
Donohue	Kee	Patterson
Douglas	Kefauver	Pfeifer
Eberharter	Kelley	Philbin
Elsaesser	Kennedy	Phillips, Tenn.
Engel, Mich.	Keogh	Pickett
Powell	Sabath	Spence
Price, Ill.	Sadowski	Stigler
Rabin	Scoblick	Thomas, Tex.
Rains	Sheppard	Thomason
Rayburn	Smathers	Tollefson
Rayfiel	Smith, Ohio	Twyman
Rooney	Snyder	Walter
Russell	Somers	Welch

NOT VOTING—17

Bland	Gifford	Pace
Clements	Hill	Poulson
Cox	Hull	Smith, Va.
Feighan	Kean	Wood
Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.	Worley
Gerlach	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Clements against.
Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Feighan against.
Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Hull against.
Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. SMATHERS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOMERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks of EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the legislation just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an essay and in the other to include a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. RIZLEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 93, Rept. 275), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RIZLEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 141, Rept. No. 276), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present session of Congress at such times and places, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present session of Congress the results of its studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. RIZLEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 153, Rept. No. 277), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1947, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for such purposes shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such House Resolution 318. The committee may from time to time make such preliminary reports to the House as it deems advisable; and shall, during the present Congress, report to the House the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

RELIEF FOR PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. RIZLEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 187, Rept. No. 278), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to announce the program for next week.

On Monday we expect to take up the conference report on the farm-labor-supply program, House Report 270. In addition to that I understand there are three resolutions from the Rules Committee granting subpena power to three of the regular committees of the House, namely, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on the Armed Services. We expect to take those up on Monday also.

On Tuesday there are two citations from the Committee on Un-American Activities that will be taken up first and when those are disposed of we will proceed to general debate on House Joint Resolution 153, which is the so-called foreign relief bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is expected that consideration of that measure will continue into Wednesday.

On Thursday we expect to take up the Interior Department appropriation bill, continuing that through Thursday and Friday in the hope consideration may be completed by Friday night. If it is not, we will continue on through Saturday to completion of that bill.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

APRIL 17, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of the pressure of work on other committees, I find myself unable to give to the extremely important work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the time and attention and study it deserves. Therefore, I feel that in all fairness I must submit my resignation from membership on that committee.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to fill the vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

PROPOSED TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, on Tuesday, I raised the question of whether or not the Turkish Government is in a position to lend us money. I pointed out that their financial position in respect to their national debt, to their foreign exchange holdings, to the Nazi assets and the looted Nazi gold that they now hold is considerably better than our national financial position. I also pointed out that the State Department has asked us to take from the current income of the American taxpayer and give to the Turkish Government, in order that its current income shall be adequate for its armed forces.

This whole Turkish business is a perfect example of the wretched, miserable results of the Truman abandonment of the United Nations. Of course, the fact that the destruction of the United Nations by our State Department will cost the American taxpayers ten to fifteen billions of dollars a year is of little concern to the State Department bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, I pointed out that this Greek-Turkish military bill is in effect nothing but an outright military alliance with the present dictatorial Government of Turkey. I pointed out that our State Department, in violation of our commitments to the United Nations, is deliberately undertaking unilateral action to guarantee continued exclusive Turkish armed control of the Dardanelles. We, of course, are asked to undertake this military alliance with the Turkish Government in complete violation and disregard to our pledges to the United Nations. It is a dishonorable proposal, a hypocritical proposal, a disastrous proposal, because it in the end, if applied throughout the world, will mean the bankruptcy of America. It is a proposal without rhyme or reason.

Mr. Speaker, since the House is expected by the President to vote for this bill I think that the House should consider whether or not when we vote for a military alliance with Turkey, we should inquire whether the present Turkish Government is a reliable ally. A couple of weeks ago, while on the House floor, I suggested that the present Turkish Government will always and invariably sell out to the highest bidder. The Turkish Government, in my opinion, has no intention of fighting a war or becoming involved in a war with Russia, but it does intend to make a sucker out of us, just as it made a sucker out of the British—and indeed of our Government during the last war.

Perhaps we could see, Mr. Speaker, what the future looks like if we take the trouble and the time to look at the past. In brief, let us see what the record demonstrates about the reliability of the present Turkish Government. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to study the secret documents which the State Department later released to the newspapers. In those documents, I find that on May 12, 1939, the present Turkish Government concluded an agreement with England for mutual assistance in case of aggressive war in the Mediterranean. Take note that the Turkish Government deliberately concluded an agreement for mutual assistance in case of war with the British. Now, when in June of 1940, the Italians declared war on Great Britain and France, Great Britain asked her sworn ally, Turkey, to implement its alliance. What happened? Well, everybody knows what happened. The Turkish Government refused to honor its sworn agreement. They refused to act, but they didn't stop at that point, Mr. Speaker. The very next month, in July of 1940, the Turkish Government signed a commercial agreement with Nazi Germany. Thus began the traitorous, but profitable, alliances of the Turkish Government with Nazi Germany. In 1941, the Turks and the Nazis signed a 10-year friendship act. In October 1941 the Turks signed a commercial agreement with the Nazis, which incidentally provided that tens of thousands of tons of essential chrome would be delivered to Germany. The Germans in turn would send steel and raw materials. Turkey and the Nazis signed another commercial agreement in June 1942. In September 1942, Turkey announced that it was going to send more than one-half of its chrome to the Krupp munitions plant. In return, Germany would arm Turkey. In April of 1943, another agreement was signed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our charming gentlemen at our State Department know all this. They know that the Turks broke their sworn agreement. They know that the Turks went further—they deliberately and consciously assisted to the very best of their ability the Nazis.

All of this time, Mr. Speaker, the British, the Russians, and we were attempting to get the Turkish Government to cease giving aid to Germany. As a matter of fact, at the Teheran Conference the Allies agreed that Turkey should enter the war, and President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and the President of Turkey had a conference at Cairo on December 4, 5, and 6 of 1943, to discuss the entire military and political situation. And what came of that conference, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely nothing. Exports to Germany from Turkey continued. Turkey refused to enter the war, and in February of 1944 the Anglo-Turkish military staff talks were suspended.

In May of 1944 Winston Churchill—that great and glorious advocate of the aid to Turkey today—denounced in the strongest possible language the Turkish Government. Winston Churchill, the hoary, ancient, imperialist advocate of colonial exploitation, who today is telling us that we should take from the American taxpayer and give to the Turkish Government—this same Winston Churchill violently and vigorously attacked the Turkish Government for its entire policy during the war on May 24, 1944, in the House of Commons. Winston Churchill had personal, direct experience with the present traitorous Turkish Government, but now he tells us what we should do with the American taxpayers' money. In June 1944 Anthony Eden, then Foreign Minister of the British Government, stated in the House of Commons that the British Government was profoundly discouraged by the fact that the Turkish Government allowed Germany's warships to pass through the Dardanelles, thus permitting the Germans to shift their naval strength from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean in whatever way they chose. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and I ask every Member of the House what is there in the record which persuades anyone that the present Turkish Government is reliable?

We could go back a thousand years and demonstrate the treachery of the Turks. The history of the Ottoman Empire is a history absolutely without parallel in double-dealing. We have before us the deliberate dishonorable violation of its sworn word by the Turkish Government in the past war. We know from the facts that this Government is unreliable. How in God's name can any respectable official advocate that we should form a military alliance with such a government? The mere fact that the Turks stole from us during the war; the mere fact that they still hold millions of dollars of assets and looted gold which is the rightful property of the American taxpayer; the mere fact that for a thousand years the Turks have persecuted the Christians and Jews; the mere fact that under the Vorlik law, the Turkish Government drove the Jewish people in Turkey almost out of existence—none of these things seem to have made any impression on our State Department. In their unlimited arrogance, the gentlemen of the State Department assume in their superior manner that anything they choose to do will have a rubber stamp approval from this Congress. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, everything that the State Department proposes is going to get a microscopic examination, both as to the intent and as to the facts on which their proposed policy is based. The facts, Mr. Speaker, about Turkey demonstrate that it is an unreliable, irresponsible, dishonorable government. We will be committing a crime against the American taxpayer if we vote it in behalf of this dictatorial government.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. DREWRY), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

560. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfer of various equipment to the State Historical Society of North Dakota, Bismarck, N. Dak.; the Port of New York Authority; Anderson Memorial Post, VFW, Anderson, S. C.; American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

561. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 151 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

562. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 24, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Genesee River, with respect to flood protection in the vicinity of Dansville, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 10, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 206); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

563. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 18, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of James River, Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and section 6 of the River and Harbor Act approved on August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

564. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 29, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Salinas River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

565. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

566. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

567. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

568. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics that become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after interstate shipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

569. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on American Youth for Democracy (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2237. A bill to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2238. A bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2780. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 93. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 275). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 153. Resolution to continue the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the transportation situation (Rept. No. 277). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; without amendment (Rept. No. 278). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3096. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 3097. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3098. A bill to prohibit teaching, in schools, in or by means of any language other than English, except the teaching of a foreign language; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3099. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of officers and enlisted personnel of the National Guard and Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States, the United States Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and the United States Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3100. A bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3101. A bill to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 3102. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to extend to supervisors the benefit of promotions based on faithful and meritorious service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3103. A bill to provide equitable relief to contractors supplying dairy products to the armed forces and Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3104. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation school program of elementary and secondary schools which are both tax-supported and publicly controlled, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3105. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3106. A bill to reenact and amend the organic act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3107. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3108. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 3109. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 3110. A bill providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Altoona, Pa., as the Corporal Harry R. Harr Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. Res. 185. Resolution relative to the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the activities of the Department of State relative to personnel and efficiency and economy of its operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 186. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held before said committee during the current session relative to reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary and proper legislation to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and other countries in which the foot-and-mouth disease exists; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the term of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Louis H. Deaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Westway, legal guardian for Bobbie Niles Johnson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Deiman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3115. A bill for the relief of J. A. Gray, Paul Reed, L. G. McCray, Norris Russell, and Freeman Rowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Anthony Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3118. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susan W. Roe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3119. A bill for the relief of R. R. Whitener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 3120. A bill to authorize the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to John T. Norman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3121. A bill for the relief of Austin C. Kingsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

346. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of C. J. O'Hearn, secretary-treasurer, Lodge No. 273, Switchmen's Union, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and railroad men and women of Sioux Falls, asking help to defeat H. R. 2169 and H. R. 2310, which purpose amending the present Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

347. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of citizens of Galesburg, Knox County, Ill., in support of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

348. By Mr. HART: Petition of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring), that Congress adopt H. R. 472, a bill providing for the conveyance of the Bureau of Animal Industry quarantine station at Clifton, N. J., to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

349. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6422, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on April 7, 1947, requesting appointment of a congressional committee to study the tax-revenue problem confronting San Francisco as a result of unnecessary and excess holdings of local property by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

350. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to insist that the funds requested by the Corps of Engineers be appropriated for the maintenance of the 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

351. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting appointment of a congressional committee to study the tax-revenue problem confronting San Francisco as a result of unnecessary and excess holdings of local property by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

352. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to S. 1023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

353. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Marshall County, Iowa, relative to S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

354. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

355. Also, petition of 182 residents of Lowell, Mass., asking for immediate passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we yearn for a better understanding of spiritual things, that we may know surely what Thy will is for us and for our Nation. Give to us clear vision that we may know where to stand and what to stand for—because unless we stand for something, we shall fall for anything.

Remind us, O God, that Thou hast not resigned. Harassed and troubled by the difficulties and uncertainties of the hour, we rest our minds on Thee, who dost not change. May it ever be in our minds as upon our coins that in God we trust. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 18, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE NORMAN, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, during the course of last night Hon. FRED NORMAN, Representative from the Third District of the State of Washington, quietly passed away in his sleep.

Representative NORMAN'S sudden passing leaves the State of Washington and the southwest Washington district he represented without the services of a man who was above the average in an age whose problems and potentialities also are tremendously above the average.

FRED NORMAN worked himself to death. Only yesterday he participated in the vigorous labor debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, standing up for his principles.

He was a folksy man, but no ordinary citizen. Few of his constituents knew that many a time, in order to save them and the Nation even the smallest amount of money, he rode the day coach to and from his State and the Nation's Capital. That was his way of trying to do his bit.

We of the Washington State congressional delegation are extremely distressed by Mr. NORMAN'S passing. The people have lost a valuable Representative.

We who represent the State of Washington in the Nation's Capital want to show our respect for him in the best way possible, and this would be to do some work for him.

The other Members of Congress from our State with whom I have talked are anxious to help, and until the problem of Mr. NORMAN'S successor is settled we will gladly take over the duties of Mr. NORMAN'S district.

We wish for Mr. NORMAN a happy and eternal rest. He has earned nothing less.

Were my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] present, I know he would subscribe to this sincere declaration of sorrow and respect.

Mr. President, I shall submit the customary resolution in the next few days.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, together with a summary of operations of the Fund from its establishment to June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN STATIONS BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROGRESS REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics that become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after interstate shipment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary and proper legislation to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and other countries in which the foot-and-mouth disease exists

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease now exists in livestock in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the disease has spread from the six original states involved in the vicinity of Mexico City as far west and north as the state of Zacatecas; and

"Whereas it is extremely doubtful if the Government of the Republic of Mexico can eradicate this disease from their livestock without additional assistance; and

"Whereas the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico presents a very definite threat to the prosperity of the livestock industry and the entire economic welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representative of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and from other countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; be it further

"Resolved, That we earnestly petition Congress to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol be established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals and materials carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

"Resolved, That we petition and urge the Congress of the United States to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities and assistance as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry and the United States Department of Agriculture, in order that foot-and-mouth disease be eradicated from their livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the

President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the honorable Secretary of State, the honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Kansas, with the request that they bring this matter forcibly to the attention of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body February 20, 1947.

"House concurred in senate amendments February 28, 1947.

"FRANK B. MILLER,
"Speaker of the House.
"H. W. CRAMER,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

The petition of Hideo Mori, of Brigham City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to give immigration and naturalization privileges to the Japanese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of the members of the Cocoanut Grove (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 18

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the State of Oregon by extending public assistance on the basis of individual need bears more than 50 percent of the cost in many instances especially for recipients of blind assistance and aid to dependent children because of existing Federal maximums for purposes of matching funds; and

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act contains no provision for Federal matching funds for the aid of the parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children receiving aid to dependent children; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon, in order to extend assistance to all needy persons in accordance with their needs irrespective of cause, is providing general assistance and to the extent of 85 percent of such total expenditures, there being no Federal financial participation through grants-in-aid for general assistance; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon through general assistance is expending large sums of money for medical care for persons who are receiving old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children as well as medical care for other needy persons who are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children.

"Whereas foster-family home care is provided to a large number of dependent and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent by the State of Oregon at a considerable cost from general-assistance funds; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon carries sole financial responsibility for the administration of general assistance; and

"Whereas the present limitations in the Federal matching maximums particularly with respect to aid to the blind and aid to dependent children and the lack of Federal financial participation in the assistance of all other needy persons and dependent children as well as in the administration and expenditures of general assistance place excessive demands upon general taxpayers of Oregon, and constitute an increasingly serious financial burden for the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectively petition and request that the Congress of the United States, during the present session thereof, do enact appropriate amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act providing: (1) for the elimination of Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children, and the deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, (2) for Federal financial participation in assistance to a parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children who are recipients of aid to dependent children, (3) for Federal grants-in-aid to States for general assistance to any needy person as well as for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, (4) for Federal financial participation in the costs of medical services made available to needy persons under State public assistance programs and in assistance payments to needy sick persons who reside in public or private medical institutions other than mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanitaria, (5) for Federal grants-in-aid or other appropriate provision of Federal aid to States in providing foster family home care for children in accordance with their individual needs, (6) for Federal financial participation in the administration of general assistance, including such welfare services as the States provide through the staff of the public welfare agency to help persons become self-supporting or avoid becoming dependent, and to contribute to their general welfare.

"Adopted by house March 13, 1947.
"Adopted by senate March 28, 1947."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1128. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the streams and their tributaries flowing through the Coastal Plains soil conservation district, Texas, with a view to the control of floods, retardation of run-off and waterflow, and prevention of soil erosion; and

S. 1129. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the streams and their tributaries flowing through the Matagorda County soil conservation district, Texas, with a view to the control of floods, retardation of run-off and waterflow, and prevention of soil erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 1130. A bill to create a National Cancer Research Commission in order to provide for and coordinate research in a supreme endeavor to discover the cause or causes of cancer and means for its prevention; to develop a limited number of research centers; to mobilize in the United States a number of the world's outstanding experts in scientific research in order to utilize their services; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. MURRAY and himself):

S. 1131. A bill to aid the States in establishing and maintaining scholarship and loan programs for the purpose of enabling individuals to obtain education in the eleventh year of school grade or above; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1132. A bill to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in United States in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY RATING SYSTEMS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BALDWIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the systems and methods of determining the efficiency, and providing ratings therefor, of Federal employees now in use by any executive department or agency of the Government, and with respect to any regulations pertaining to such systems or methods made by the Civil Service Commission. Such study and investigation shall be conducted for the purpose of determining the usefulness, practicability, and effectiveness of the present systems and methods, and of determining the desirability of retaining, revising, or abolishing such systems and methods or of establishing new systems and methods for determining the efficiency, and providing ratings therefor, of Federal employees.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of any study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be the alternate representative of the United States to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

LEFT-WING CONTROL OF CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD remarks I made before the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association. Among other things, I called attention to the fact that the left-wing element which had carried over from the New Deal days had misinformed the people of this country in relation to the activity of the present Congress. I specifically set up in my remarks the accomplishments of Congress.

Mr. President, after I dictated the ideas contained in my Milwaukee speech, I ran across a column by Frank R. Kent, which stated far better than I did how the left-wing elements had acquired the channels of communication. He states, among other things, that there are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before. The material contained in Mr. Kent's column is so revealing that I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—GOP CONGRESS LEADERS CHAGRINED BY MISCALCULATION ON PRESS SUPPORT

(By Frank R. Kent)

The thing that more than any other has surprised as well as chagrined Republican leaders since they took over control of Congress is the extremely bad press that has attended their efforts to formulate a program. They did expect something better, which shows that they made a basic miscalculation as to the general publicity situation.

For example, they had the not unnatural feeling that the voters, long restrained by the war, having in the last election, belatedly turned against the New Deal policies, the press (also the radio) generally would commend and support the Republican effort to go in the other direction—by correcting the lopsided labor situation; by slashing governmental expenses, reducing waste and taxes. They had every right to that expectation. When it turned out to be largely unfounded, it came with something of a shock to complacent Republicans who felt they had a "clear mandate" from the people.

So they had. They were entirely right about that. Their mistake was in totally underestimating the hold which, in 14 years of concentration, the left-wing elements, which constituted and attached themselves to the New Deal, had acquired on the channels of communication. This is one of the phenomena of the period. It is made more interesting, so far as the press is concerned, because it was obtained almost simultaneously with a campaign of denunciation. The New Deal CIO allies, for example, were enabled regularly to get extraordinary newspaper space day after day for their repetitious, verbose and wholly synthetic statements in the very newspapers which they consistently accused of suppressing the news.

TURNED OUT ALL WRONG

Apparently, the Republican idea was that when the New Dealers were repudiated at the polls, automatically their propaganda facilities would disappear and their publicity effectiveness be curtailed. But that notion turned out all wrong. There are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before. The polls were hardly closed before there was a rush toward the press, the magazines, and the radio. Some of them have become publishers, some assistants to the publishers; some are editorial writers; quite a few have become columnists and several are radio commentators. The ease with which they have penetrated into those fields can be accounted for in several ways but it is nonetheless remarkable.

The net of all this is that the left-wing spokesmen today are more articulate than before the election. When they lined up and let go at the Republicans soon after Congress convened it was something of a shock to the latter and they have been under pretty hot attack ever since. This is not to say that the Republicans have not done things for which they should be criticized. It would be amazing if they had not. It is to say that they are nothing like as black as they are being painted and that a good deal of the criticism is the same old left-wing, labor New Deal misrepresentation and propaganda, largely by the same people.

At the moment their fire is concentrated on the Republican effort to reduce appropriations. It is normal, of course, to hear the bureaucrats squeal when their estimates are cut. But the present squealing goes far beyond the ordinary. It appears not only well organized but to have a professional touch. A really violent blast has accompanied the two appropriation bills thus far acted upon by the House—the Treasury and labor security bills. A similar blast is obviously planned for every such bill as it comes up.

BASIS OF CURRENT ATTACK

The current attack is based on stories which insist that because of Republican "meat-ax surgery" various dreadful things are about to happen. We are told that the Secret Service is being undermined so as to flood the country with counterfeiters; that the Wagner Act is being scuttled through reduction in appropriations; that the Republicans are going to return the children to sweatshop conditions by denying the children's department proper funds; that the customs service is being forced to lay off men, thus throwing our ports open to smugglers; that Republican stinginess is going to permit tax evaders to go free.

Investigation proves there is scarcely a trace of truth in any of these stories. Yet they continue to be circulated. Telegrams pour in to Senators protesting the dismissal of Customs employees, but the fact, as brought out by Representative WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, that Customs asked for $6,500,000 more than it got last year; that it was given $3,165,000 more and that its appropriation provides for 400 additional employees—those facts get little, if any, attention. Neither is the fact publicized that the 8,000 revenue agents costing $30,000,000 a year, whose lopping off has been so vehemently denounced, were the not wholly occupied agents that ex-Secretary Henry Morgenthau excitedly added a couple of years ago in the 1944 agitation about tax dodgers.

These are the sort of things that induce Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee to charge that "an insidious campaign of deceit and falsehood is being conducted to the effect that we are scuttling essential public services." Apparently the Republicans, while shocked and sore, are not going to weaken. They take comfort in the obvious fact that their record will be judged after they have made it and not by what is said about it before they have had their chance.

AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE TO ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., AND JESSE P. WOLCOTT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in this week's Colliers' magazine. The article is entitled "For Distinguished Congressional Service." It tells the story behind the Colliers' 1946 awards for distinguished congressional service. On yesterday, at the White House, President Truman presented to the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Jr., a former distinguished and beloved Member of the Senate, and to the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, a Representative in Congress from the Seventh Michigan District, the Collier's 1946 awards for distinguished congressional service. Each was presented a silver plaque, and $10,000 cash gifts are to be presented to the public institutions designated by the two recipients of the awards. Senator La Follette designated the University of Wisconsin, and Representative WOLCOTT designated the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the informal remarks made by the President at the White House presentation ceremony.

There being no objection, the remarks and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT IN PRESENTING THE COLLIER'S CONGRESSIONAL AWARDS TO FORMER SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE AND REPRESENTATIVE JESSE P. WOLCOTT, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, APRIL 17, 1947

It is a very great pleasure to me, Mr. Davis, to be able to participate in this worthy enterprise. Nobody knows any more about what Congressmen and Senators go through than I do. I spent 10 of the best years of my life in office for the State of Missouri and I know what these gentlemen have to do and all the difficult times they have to go through with in order to accomplish anything.

I think this is a great thing that Collier's has inaugurated, and I am, as I say, indeed happy to be able to participate in it.

And it gives me particular pleasure to award these trophies to my good personal friend Bob La Follette, and to my good friend, JESSE WOLCOTT. I am not as well acquainted with him as I am with Bob, but that is because we did not serve in the same place. I know him by reputation and I think that Collier's has made a good selection in both cases.

[From Collier's magazine of April 26, 1947]

FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

(By James C. Derieux)

(Collier's 1946 congressional awards committee: Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, chairman; Howard E. Babcock, chairman, board of trustees, Cornell University; Walter C. Coffey, former president, University of Minnesota;

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author; Douglas S. Freeman, editor, Richmond News Leader; George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion; Clinton S. Golden, former vice president, United Steelworkers of America; Albert Goss, master, National Grange; Alan Gregg, director, Rockefeller Foundation; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, committee on economic development, and president, Studebaker Corp.; Ernest M. Hopkins, president emeritus, Dartmouth; Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, Denver Post; Eric A. Johnston, president, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc.; Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, journalist and social worker; Miss Josephine Roche, president, Rocky Mountain Fuel Co.; John Stuart, chairman, board of directors, Quaker Oats Co.; Col. Jay Taylor, former chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Tex.; Channing H. Tobias, director, Phelps-Stokes Fund; Donald B. Tresidder, president, Stanford University; Walter Wanger, president, Walter Wanger Productions, Inc.; Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor; Owen D. Young, former chairman of the board, General Electric Co.)

WASHINGTON.—The year 1946 was rough on Members of the Congress. No one could be certain just what the American people wanted or needed, but it was plain they wanted some kind of change.

And the year 1946 was not too easy on members of Collier's congressional awards committee, either. At the outset of their studies it was not plain which Senator and Representative had best served our country in that first postwar year, in the course of which propaganda for and against everything reached new highs, and the few persons in Washington who thought calmly and with some degree of balance were suspect by both extremes.

But the committee members, under the chairmanship of Chester C. Davis, stuck to their studies of legislation voting records, speeches, and advisory comments, continued their screening of the 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, and came up with Senator Robert Marion La Follette and Representative JESSE PAINE WOLCOTT as the winners; the first an independent, the second a regular Republican.

La Follette, Wisconsin's famous Young Bob, was defeated in the Republican primary last summer, and retired from the Senate at the end of the year after 21 years of diligent, effective work.

WOLCOTT, of the Seventh Michigan District, won reelection easily for his ninth time, and when the Republicans took over the House, he became chairman of the important Banking and Currency Committee.

At a White House ceremony these men received silver plaques to commemorate their distinguished congressional services in 1946, and in addition Collier's made two $10,000 gifts to public institutions chosen by the two. Senator La Follette designated the University of Wisconsin to receive one of these donations, and with it set up a graduate scholarship to study the reorganization of government, with the goal of making it more efficient and more responsive to the will of the people.

Representative WOLCOTT designated the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, at East Lansing, to receive the other $10,000 donation, and specified that the money be used to set up scholarships to assist students who, without such assistance, could not continue their studies.

The purpose of these annual awards by Collier's is to direct thoughtful attention to the fundamental role of the Congress, to point up the fact that representative lawmaking bodies are the symbol and basic essential for freedom, and to recognize publicly with appropriate honors the good work done by individual representatives.

La Follette is as notable an independent as the Senate has known since his fiery father, Wisconsin's famous Old Bob, struggled and slugged for 20 years for whatever cause seemed to him good for the common man. At times Young Bob has been the hero of the liberals, at other times conservatives have nodded approval as he went into action, and on occasions he has been a middle-of-the-road man. But always he has been free to do his stuff as he thought it should be done. Young Bob, now 52, is married and has two sons. His home is the old La Follette house outside of Madison, Wis. He has a residence in Washington, also.

He came to the Senate as a Republican in 1925, to succeed his father, whom he had served as secretary and campaign manager. The elder La Follette had died soon after making a last grim fight for his progressive principles in the Presidential race of 1924 when he ran as an independent against Calvin Coolidge, the conservative Republican, and John W. Davis, the conservative Democrat. He had deliberately overtaxed what was left of his stormy strength, despite the efforts of his son to take over speaking engagements and other campaign tasks. Young Bob was reelected three times on Republican or Progressive tickets. In 1946, he tried unsuccessfully to move back into the Republican Party and win its nomination.

But his defeat, in the opinion of Collier's congressional awards committee, subtracted nothing from the great service he rendered our country last year, when he became the key figure in efforts to modernize congressional rules and organization. The Congress had suffered in popular respect because it stumbled over its own feet as it attempted to operate in the 1940's with methods and organization developed in the 1890's.

It was the definite opinion of all those consulted by the congressional awards committee that La Follette is entitled to credit for passage of the congressional reorganization plan. "The executive branch of Government had been taking over," said a Washington news writer consulted by the committee, "and the Congress, rattled by criticism and confused by the rush of events, did not seem to realize fully where its legislation was leading. The Congressional Reorganization Act, which La Follette put through, is the first well-directed effort to enable the Congress to recapture and to exercise the powers reposed in it by our Constitution and our political system."

CHIEF FEATURES OF THE PLAN

The reorganization plan is too long to be presented in a few lines, but these are some of its features: It gives congressional committees their own fact finders so that lawmakers will not be dependent, as they have been, on interested testimony and guesswork; it sets up a compact committee structure along lines corresponding with the present activities of government; it increases the responsibility of committees to watch what is happening in Government; it brings the spending and the taxing committees into synchronized relationship; it requires that a congressional ceiling be set on appropriations, in place of the old system of adding up all the appropriations near the end of a session and only then discovering what the total was; it raises the pay of all Congressmen from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, and sets up a contributory retirement plan; it opens the doors and records of many committee deliberations heretofore held secretly.

Singularly, the Reorganization Act, generally recognized as a great service to the Nation, is directly associated with La Follette's defeat. He and others working with him last spring and early summer were convinced that the act must be driven through in 1946, if ever. Conditions were nearer right for its passage than they had been, or were again likely to be. But La Follette could not get the bill to the floor for debate until campaign time was at hand in Wisconsin. He knew he was in for a hard primary fight in that campaign. While the war had lasted he had been so busy in Washington he had not been able to spend much time in his home State, and meanwhile, groups opposed to him were assembling their strength.

What should he do? He recalled then, as he had many times before, a principle his father had told him to live by.

"The thing that counts most in life," said Old Bob to Young Bob, "is to go straight ahead to the end of the furrow."

Young Bob decided to go straight ahead to the end of the congressional reorganization furrow. The bill passed the Senate and he hurried home. But he had less than 2 weeks to catch up, and it was not enough.

Thus what may be the greatest service Young Bob La Follette has rendered his country contributed to his first political defeat—and won him a Collier's congressional award.

REGULAR BUT NOT EXTREMIST

JESSE PAINE WOLCOTT, the House winner, has been a regular Republican all of his political days, but not an extremist; not one of those "rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun" Republicans sometimes found in his native New England or his adopted Middle West. In the great OPA battles of 1946, he was shot at by both sides, a situation to which he has been accustomed since his first election to the House in 1930. He just is not an emotional political zealot who believes that all the right is on one side.

He won the admiration of Collier's congressional awards committee by his remarkable sanity in a year of poisonous political fighting. He appeared unaffected by the fiercest of propaganda bombardments, as he pushed efforts to adapt wartime controls to the changing conditions of peace. "If his counsel had prevailed last summer," an able observer told the awards committee, "the transition to a free economy might have been made more gradually and with fewer jolts. He deserves recognition for wisdom and moderation not generally appreciated at the time he was making his OPA fight."

While the war lasted, WOLCOTT supported the economic stabilization program, but when the wage line broke after the war he turned from strict price control toward greater production as the surer way to avoid inflation. Stimulation of production, while letting off controls gradually, was the heart of his domestic line in 1946. In the international field he was a powerful influence in passing the British loan agreement through the House.

Passionate advocates of OPA say he cut its throat. Equally passionate opponents of that agency say he saved it from sudden dismemberment. Some of the former sought to explain his attitude by putting out reports that he was a vastly rich man, therefore unacquainted with the difficulties of little people.

But investigation shows that WOLCOTT worked as a laborer in a chair factory in Gardner, Mass., his birthplace; that later he sent himself through high school by working as a trap drummer in a professional dance and concert orchestra—he says he was the hottest thing on drums in those days; that he almost owned one share of telephone stock when as a young man he worked by day for the Bell Telephone System and by night for the Detroit Edison Co., but that he had to cash his equity in the share before he got it paid for and since then has bought no other stock; that he is paying for a house he bought almost entirely on credit near Washington

at the rate of $66.93 a month; that his home in Port Huron, Mich., is assessed at $5,500; that he carries a $10,000 life-insurance policy, and on the day he learned he was a Collier's awards winner he had $612.13 in one bank bank account and $365.03 in another.

WOLCOTT moved from Massachusetts to Michigan when he was 19 because he thought he might do better out there. He studied law when he could, was admitted to the bar. When the First World War came he served as a sergeant and finally as a second lieutenant in a machine-gun company of the famous First Division. He saw action in the Argonne. After the war he was an assistant police judge in Port Huron, later county prosecuting attorney, and in 1930 was elected to the House, where he has been ever since. He is 54 years old, is married, has a 17-year-old son.

In recent years he has abandoned his drums, except for one appearance in the Russian Cultural Institute of Moscow. He had gone there with a congressional group in 1945, and one evening when the Russians were entertaining the visitors at the institute, WOLCOTT said to a companion that he'd like a try at the Russian drums in the orchestra. An interpreter heard the remark, reported it, and immediately WOLCOTT was escorted to the drums, where to the amazement of his colleagues he cut loose with confidence.

When the awards committee settled to the task of bestowing the honors for 1946, its first decision was that the previous year's winners, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, were not eligible for consideration. It was the unanimous opinion that no Member of the Congress should win 2 years in a row unless under the most extraordinary conditions he had changed his activities from the field in which he had won the honor to another field in which also he excelled his colleagues.

Next, the awards committee decided that generally choices should be made from the rank and file of Senate and House memberships, rather than from among party leaders whose influence springs in considerable degree from the high party posts they hold. But this decision was not unanimous, and always the Members are free to do as they think best. This same spirit of freedom carries over into the committee's voting, which pays no attention to party or ideological lines.

At the request of the awards committee each of 52 respected Washington editors, news writers, columnists and commentators suggested three Senators and three Representatives whose work in 1946 seemed to him to be notable. These confidential advisers named 20 Senators and 43 Representatives.

A LARGE LIST TO SELECT FROM

Following this poll, several hundred editors and political scientists, some in every State, were asked by the awards committee for confidential suggestions and comments. Again, each participant was asked to name three Senators and three Representatives. More than 500 replies were received, with the end result that 56 Senators and 119 Representatives were presented for consideration.

Finally the awards committee began its own voting, with 9 Senators and 14 Representatives receiving support as first or second choices on the first ballot. Twenty-one members of the committee participated in the voting. One was ill, and one out of touch. The Senators receiving support were: Aiken and Austin of Vermont, Barkley of Kentucky, Byrd of Virginia, Connally of Texas, La Follette of Wisconsin, McMahon of Connecticut, Murray of Montana, and Taft of Ohio; 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The House Members receiving votes were: Case of South Dakota, Crosser of Ohio, Dirksen of Illinois, Douglas of California, Halleck of Indiana, Hope of Kansas, Kefauver of Tennessee, Martin of Massachusetts, Rayburn of Texas, Howard Smith of Virginia, Sparkman of Alabama (now a Senator), Voorhis of California (he was defeated for reelection), Wadsworth of New York, and Wolcott of Michigan. Of these, Case, Dirksen, Halleck, Hope, Martin, Wadsworth and Wolcott are Republicans, the other 7 are Democrats.

On this first poll, La Follette and WOLCOTT were out front but did not have majorities. On the second, both had majorities of first choice votes, and on the third and final poll of the committee, both won with heavy majorities. The polls were taken several days apart to allow time for study between them.

And that's the story of Collier's congressional awards for 1946, the second year of this adventure in the interest of representative government.

JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day dinner address delivered by Senator CONNALLY before the Democratic Club of New York City, N. Y., on April 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE KIWANIS CLUB OF KENOSHA, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Service Spirit in the Atomic Age, delivered by him before the Kiwanis Club of Kenosha, Wis., on April 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him to the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding the appropriation for the Labor Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM H. KING

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. T. Odon Mathews, president of the Utah State Society, enclosing a resolution adopted by the society as a tribute to Hon. William H. King on the occasion of his return to Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH MITCHELL

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day address by Hon. Hugh Mitchell, at Wenatchee, Wash., April 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LABOR POLICY NEEDED—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRENTON EVENING TIMES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Labor Policy Needed," written by James Kerney, Jr., editor and publisher of the Trenton Times newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement entered into last night, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	Overton
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Ives	Reed
Bridges	Jenner	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capehart	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, during the closing days of this debate, which has now consumed some time of the Senate, I desire to address myself to the pending bill.

In our work here in the Congress, as representatives of the several States of our Union and all the citizens who dwell in them, we confront many problems and make many decisions which affect our Nation's course for future years, and we shape in a large measure the destiny of the American people.

Today, I say to the Senate in earnest judgment that no decision we have made during the time I have been a Member of this body will so deeply affect our people now and in the days and years ahead, as the decision we make upon the pending bill.

It is not merely a gift of money to Greece and Turkey that gives us greatest concern, however little we can afford such gifts at this time. It is the embarkation upon a policy of Government that will lead us to new obligations, new problems, and to possible distress—yes, even to endangering our existence as a nation of free people—that is the overall danger in this measure.

If we pass this bill, we will have taken upon ourselves the duty to sustain every government that calls for our help to sustain it.

I cannot, under the sense of my obligation to my own country and my own people, support such a course. I consider it to be the most mistaken and most tragic policy that men in this Government have ever devised.

This world-wide spending and military plan was first stated to the Congress on March 12, 1947, by the President. The bill before us comes from the State Department. There is its place of origin.

We are told that the real object of this bill is to stop the spread of communism from Russia to Greece and Turkey. That is a smart appeal. That appeal at once grasps the interest of our people. The insidious work of communistic thought and action in our own midst has created here an aversion to communism and a determination that it must be eradicated from our land.

No one in this country can have any doubt as to my stand upon communism. I have opposed it everywhere. I have never compromised with communism in America; I never shall. There is no higher duty upon Congress than to take every measure to drive it completely from our shores. I have time and time again spoken out upon this subject. Only recently I spoke here in Washington before a large meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon the subject of communism. I meant what I said then, and I mean now what I said at that meeting. I quote from the statement I made at that time:

> The call now comes to you as veterans of your country to work in unified effort to eradicate from our own land those philosophies that are destructive of our established way of government and of living, and to stop the work of those, whose objective is to destroy this country.
>
> Subversive activities have generally been referred to as communism, fascism, and nazism. Basically, the danger in them all is the same. The final objective of each is to seize the Government for group rule and to control all men and women in their lives and activities for the primary benefit of the group in power. That of course means destruction of freedom for the public.
>
> That communism is extant in this land of ours cannot be doubted by those who have had contact with any phase of public life. Not only is the objective of communism bad but the means of operation are subversive, hidden, and underhand.

I may say, Mr. President, that a few months ago the Communist Party in my State published a tract in which they attacked me as being their enemy. Communists seldom tell what is true in the presentation of their cause before the public, but I want to say that in that instance, when they branded me as their enemy, the enemy of communism, they were truthful indeed.

So when I take my stand upon this measure, it is not for a moment to palliate communism, but it is to act in the light of what I believe to be best for my country upon a proposed policy which can, and I believe will, injure her; which will in the end weaken her and involve her in strife and make her less strong to resist those very forces of wrong which it is said we resist.

The bill, as I stated, comes from the State Department; and when I hear the spokesmen for that Department and of the administration declaim against communism and Russia I am not much impressed with their statements, in view of the facts, and in view of their record on the subject in recent days and even at this time.

The confusion and inconsistency in the State Department, which initiated the bill, have been revealed in the course of this debate.

On Wednesday of this week it was clearly stated on the floor of the Senate, and stands uncontradicted, that during the present session of Congress representatives of the State Department appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate urging and insisting that this Government give to Russia under lend-lease—supposedly long ago terminated—equipment and supplies for the erection of a high-octane gasoline plant at a cost of $25,000,000. We are being asked to give to Russia the factory and means to make gasoline for her airplanes and thus strengthen her hand to expand her communism. Now the State Department asks that we give to two other nations millions of dollars and send military personnel for the avowed purpose of stopping that expansion.

How can such contradictory courses be reconciled or understood? What is the meaning of this confusion? What in truth is the real purpose of this measure? It seems to me we should establish a settled policy as to Russia and with regard to her actions, before we appropriate one cent more for such purposes.

Moreover, it has been brought to light here this week that since the fall of Japan we have given Russia, under lend-lease, equipment and supplies in excess of $233,000,000 to strengthen her, in addition to more than $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies given her during the time of war. Today there may be added to those sums millions of dollars which are being poured out through UNRRA, of which money we contribute more than 70 percent. That is being done today, right now.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the proposed plan of advancements to Russia. It is contained in the RECORD of the Senate, and I use the words of the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who said:

> Eighty percent of our shipments, even today, are going to Russia and to Russian-controlled countries. The shipments are being loaded in New York now. That was verified yesterday—
>
> Meaning Tuesday of this week—
>
> by UNRRA.
>
> To Austria, which is Russian controlled, we are shipping $4,083,810 during the current month of April. To Bylorussia, which is merely a Russian Province, there has been allocated $607,000; to Czechoslovakia, $5,281,550. Poland—
>
> Which we know is absolutely under the domination of Russia and votes with Russia in the United Nations—
>
> Poland is scheduled to get $14,437,800—
>
> During this month of April—
>
> The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic is getting $1,880,500. Yugoslavia—
>
> Which is under the rule of Tito, one of the leaders of communism—
>
> is given $21,027,600.

Those shipments are being made in this month of April, and, Mr. President, the State Department now comes before the Congress and says that it wants to stop communism.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For a question I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Just for a question, and a short remark. I shall not take very long.

The Senator realizes, and that is the reason he is bringing this point out, I take it, that when we turn over millions of dollars' worth of products to countries which are dominated by Russia we are putting into the hands of the Communists the power to make more and more people admit that they believe in their communistic philosophy. In other words, that is the only way that those poor people can receive any help. Does the Senator agree with me on that point?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; but there is more than that to it. It shows a confusion in our own Government that is not explainable. It shows that with one hand we are handing out millions of dollars for the support of Russia and Russian theories, while we are asked by this bill to send millions of dollars and military personnel to stop the expansion of Russian communism.

Mr. HAWKES. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make one further statement concerning an actual situation which I know about. I have received letters from three of my personal friends who are in the countries the Senator is talking about, countries which are receiving this help, and which are dominated by Russian policy. Each letter states very definitely that the coun-

tries in question can get no help from their Russian-dominated government because they have not signed the communistic pledge.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course that is so; and the very help we are giving is to strengthen communism, while we are told that the purpose of the bill is to stop communism.

Mr. HAWKES. On the one hand, we are breeding communism, and, on the other hand we are talking about spending hundreds of millions of dollars to stop it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I heartily agree with the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Can the Senator tell us under what authority payments are made to the various countries?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The sums advanced, which I last mentioned, are under authority of UNRRA, which is supposed to expire on June 30 of this year. However, I will say to the Senator that more than UNRRA is involved in attempting to supply these materials. As I stated, the State Department has come before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate at this session of the Congress and has asked that committee to recommend to the Senate an appropriation to permit the sending to Russia of a high-octane gasoline plant, at a value of $25,000,000, designed to make high-octane gasoline for the planes of Russia. How can we reconcile the action taken by the State Department, on one day insisting before the committee on sending these materials to Russia, and on the next day bringing forth this bill to stop the expansion of Russia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I heard the testimony on the point now being discussed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I ask him if he knows that the $35,000,000 for which the State Department originally asked was for administrative costs only? The State Department wanted such an authorization because under the interpretation of the Comptroller General the authority under lend-lease had terminated. The Department wanted $35,000,000 for administrative costs so that it could continue to finance the delivery, under long-term contracts, of equipment which was then in the pipe line and would still be in the pipe line long after lend-lease had terminated.

These materials are not paid for in cash. They are to be paid for under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years. The contracts cover equipment which can be used for military purposes. Such equipment is now in the pipe line, under contract. The State Department stated that with the termination of lend-lease the equipment would be lost; that we could not sell it, and that we might as well send it to Russia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand the able Senator to say that $35,000,000 would not be the total amount of money which would go to Russia?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The total amount runs into many million dollars. The equipment is not paid for in cash. The $35,000,000 was to defray administrative costs, to pay for financing the program to which we were committed with respect to Russia. The program involves millions of dollars worth of lend-lease materials now in the pipe line, and which will be delivered long after the termination of lend-lease, under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much indebted to the able Senator from Nebraska, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, for injecting into this discussion an elaboration of the point which I have presented. He shows more clearly than I have shown that the State Department is insisting on furnishing to Russia materials which could be used in waging war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make one further observation. At least some of the equipment which is being furnished would be very useful in military operations. I refer to such equipment as trucks and other heavy equipment which would be very useful if it should become necessary for Russia to go to war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator from Nebraska is in error. My understanding was that in connection with the amount of $35,000,000, Australia and other countries were paying 100 percent of the cost, and that there was an administrative cost of 2½ percent. Russia was to pay only 90 percent. The $35,000,000 was not for administrative cost. There was an additional 2½ percent for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the $35,000,000 was a cash advance, which included the administrative costs, but did not include the entire amount of money to be realized from the sale of surplus property. My understanding was that the State Department said that the $35,000,000, which was a token payment, or perhaps administrative cost, would be lost if lend-lease were cut off, and the Department asked that it be reimbursed. If lend-lease were to be continued, the materials would be supplied under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. YOUNG. There were long-term contracts; but in the case of Russia she was to pay 90 percent of the cost. The other countries were to pay 100 percent of the cost, plus 2½ percent administrative cost.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whatever the amount may be, the point still remains clear that the State Department is asking for the advance of funds for the shipment to Russia of materials to arm Russia. I think that point is particularly important when we are asked to appropriate money to stop the expansion of Russia. Under such circumstances there is only one course to take. Let us not appropriate one cent more for such a program. Let us not give away a pro-American dollar until a settled policy on this subject has been definitely established. We want no more policies like the one which we followed with respect to Japan, under which we shipped scrap iron to Japan and armed her and thus enabled her later to shoot down our own men. At that time we were in the very shadow of war.

Let us straighten out the whole situation before we move further. It seems to me that there is not much force in the appeal of the State Department, which is the source of this bill, when it says on one day, with one voice, "We want to send equipment to Russia to build plants for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline," and on another day, with another voice, says, "Give us money to stop the expansion of Russian communism."

In the course of this extended debate Senators have given their reasons for their positions. It is well that they have done so, because from those reasons we may judge, each from his own viewpoint, the soundness of the positions taken.

A principal reason advanced for this measure by some—and it has been argued strenuously upon the floor of the Senate—is that the plan must be carried through because the President has announced a policy, and that great injury would come to the country if that policy were not carried out to the letter.

We have the right and the duty to inquire into the reasons advanced for arriving at a decision. Search as I may, I cannot find any sound reason for such a position. The President came before the Congress, not with a declared policy, but with a proposal that a policy be established. He same to the Congress because under our law it is necessary that the people, through their representatives, concur in the making of any policy of government.

If the reasoning advanced by those who support this measure is to be sustained, then henceforth those who agree to that course must say that the policies of this Nation are fixed in completeness by the Chief Executive, and once announced by him, they represent a fait accompli, and nothing more can be done about it.

Under such a view the Congress need not exist. The power of national policy would be vested solely in the President. Such autocratic power was never intended to be given in this Government. Indeed, for what purpose does the Congress exist if it be not to declare the

policies of the Nation, both in the domestic and the foreign fields? We do so by the laws we enact, by the treaties we approve, and by our action upon bills such as the one before us.

To follow a course that the Chief Executive can by his ipsi dixit declare a policy and that the Congress must blindly follow it would lead to the most complete one-man domination of the Nation. It could lead us to war; and the declaration of war, expressly vested in the Congress, would be but an empty perfunctory act. It could deplete our treasury and the people could not raise their voice in protest through their representatives, or, if raising their voice, their protest would be futile.

The very fact that the President submitted this proposal to Congress is a proper recognition on his part that the plan does not become policy, in reality, until the Congress puts its approval upon it.

Congress is not a rubber-stamp; Congress must act within its own wisdom and judgment.

I want to support the President in his acts in behalf of our people. I served with the gentleman who today occupies the Presidential office. I have for him, as he knows, the highest personal regard. I shall support him so long as I believe his course is right, and I shall part company with him when, in my earnest and sincere judgment, I believe him to be wrong.

That is the course which must be taken in this case. That, in substance, is the whole heart and life of our Government. That is why we are here as the representatives of the people. We have an obligation to fulfill our part in the affairs of the Government and not to act as echoes to Executive order.

No, Mr. President, there is not any soundness in the reasoning or excuse for support of this measure to be found in the words that "though it be wrong we must approve the plan because the President has stated it or has announced it to the world."

Any such action now creates a precedent whereby the Chief Executive may, if he desires, announce his policies and then say to the representatives of the people, "This is done; this is accomplished; your judgment is not needed upon it."

I do not and will not recognize any such philosophy or concept of government in this free country.

What will be the position of Senators hereafter when the President proposes that $600,000,000 be given Korea? Will we still say the President has announced his views and the Senate must support it? We have had ample warning that $600,000,000 will be asked for Korea. What will we do when other gifts to other countries are called for? Will we blindly approve them at any cost to our country?

If we adopt such reasoning at the first consideration of this world-wide plan of giving this Nation's wealth to others we shall have set for ourselves a basis that deprives us of independent judgment upon like cases for the future.

This is not spoken in criticism of any of my colleagues; it is an appeal to them to consider the implications of what they are about to do.

Is not now, indeed, the time to abandon any reasoning which would cause us to surrender our judgment? I urge upon the Senate that this proposal be considered solely upon its merits and that we vote solely upon the wisdom of following the course outlined in the proposal.

Mr. President, we are confronted with the proposal of a gift of $400,000,000 to the Governments of Greece and Turkey and provision for the sending to those countries of American military personnel.

Let me point out in the beginning that this is not limited to a loan, but may be, and probably will be, an advancement of money which, in plain terms, is a donation. The bill provides that the President of the United States may loan or grant or otherwise give financial aid. This leaves the discretion in the President and, as I understand, already the Chief Executive has indicated his preference for a gift.

This proposal has two phases which may better be considered separately because each has different purports and effects. The first phase has to do with the gift of this immense sum; second is that which contemplates the sending of military personnel. The limitation upon such personnel is placed solely within the discretion of the President. While the bill refers to a limited number of the military, the judgment upon the limitation is given to the Chief Executive and, of course, the term "limited" can be construed in the light of any situation as it may develop.

The Congress and the people of the United States first heard of this proposal from the President in his message to a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947. It came like the sudden burst of a bomb. We had no notice of it. The purport of it was shocking. It is readily admitted that herein lies the establishment of a new policy for us. In essence it means the extension of the Monroe Doctrine by this Nation from the Western Hemisphere to all the world.

President James Monroe, many years ago, announced the doctrine that this Nation would look with disfavor upon the act of any European government attempting to interfere with any governments in the Western Hemisphere.

Several incidents have arisen under that policy in the Western Hemisphere, the most outstanding being the one involving the British Government.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the fact that the so-called Monroe Doctrine is a two-way highway. It applies not only to South America, but to Europe as well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It applies to Europe in the sense that it says, "Keep out and do not disturb the status of any established and recognized government in the Western Hemisphere." That is the essence of it.

The British incident to which I referred—and I think it is well to discuss and review these incidents to show how far the Monroe Doctrine will carry this government in action—was that the British Government threatened to seize the customs offices of Venezuela and this country opposed that step. President Theodore Roosevelt went so far as to say, after Lord Cecil, the British Foreign Secretary, had stated that the British Fleet would come and take control of the customs houses of Venezuela to collect a debt owed her, that the British Fleet would be met by the American Fleet at the mouth of the Caribbean Sea.

On another occasion the German Government threatened, as I recall, to seize some of the customs houses in one of the Central American countries, and again this country, under its Monroe Doctrine, advised Germany that the United States would enforce its policy against such interference in this hemisphere. Those are merely examples which show the nature and extent of action under the Monroe Doctrine and what it obligates this Nation to do. It obligates us to go to the extent of war. But so far the doctrine has been applied only to the neighboring countries. It has been recognized by Europe and the rest of the world as being a very fair doctrine. They have observed it, and they have known that it meant a great deal to this country. The Western Hemisphere was remote from them, and they did not desire to invade it.

Able men upon the floor of the Senate have disputed the statement that the pending measure is an extension, in effect, of the Monroe Doctrine. Let us first compare the language; let us see whether the pending bill is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine and obligates the United States to go to the aid of other established governments throughout the world. As I view it, that, in sum and substance, is the proposition. Let us see if that is not a correct view. I shall read the language of the Monroe Doctrine, which was enunciated by President Monroe in 1823:

> But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it—

He was speaking of the governments of the Western Hemisphere—

> and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a very brief statement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue for a moment until I finish my discussion of this particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am trying to bring out, Mr. President, the likeness be-

tween the original Monroe Doctrine, now more than 100 years old, applying to the Western Hemisphere, and the new doctrine now proclaimed which, in effect, extends the same principle to the rest of the world. As I have said, after reading the language and considering the actions taken under the Monroe Doctrine and then reading the President's statement with respect to the pending measure, it is inescapable, to my mind, that the presently proposed world-wide doctrine is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the rest of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from West Virginia is making such an important statement, and since I am sure he wishes to have it carried in the press and fairly reported there, let me say to him that what I wish to say will have an important bearing on what he is saying.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall yield in a moment. I hope this side of the question will be carried by the press, because I have never seen any public question of such importance so greatly ignored and given so little consideration by the press.

Mr. PEPPER. It is on that subject that I wish to speak.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a few moments I shall, indeed, be glad to yield to the Senator on that point.

Mr. President, I have read from the Monroe Doctrine with respect to any European power's interposing itself upon the government of any country in the Western Hemisphere, and I have read the portion of the Monroe Doctrine which states that such an act will be regarded as an unfriendly one toward the United States.

Now turning to the President's message before the Congress on March 12, 1947, when he presented this policy for the first time for our consideration and action, we find that he said this:

> We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.

Mr. President, the word "we" used by the President in that statement refers to the people of the United States; and "free peoples" means people anywhere in the world. "Totalitarian regimes" are such as we ourselves call totalitarian. No one doubts that Russia is totalitarian, and there are many others, so I am told. For instance, I am informed that Yugoslavia has a totalitarian government. But the President's statement means that he proposes that we undertake to secure all people against having other governments interpose themselves upon them.

I read further from the President's address to the Congress:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I quote further from the President's message:

> The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note at this point that in his message President Truman said that "the free peoples of the world look to us"—the United States—"for support in maintaining their freedoms"—in other words, that the whole world looks to us for that. The President did not say—and the point is accentuated by the absence of any statement on this point—that the free peoples of the world look to the United Nations for support in securing their freedom. All of us want to believe in that organization, and we have had hope in it. But in his message the President of the United States, the country which was most active in bringing the United Nations into being, says that the free peoples of the world look to this country alone for support in preserving their fredoms—in other words, not to the United Nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

As I have said, Mr. President, the President of the United States in his message said that the free peoples of the world look to the United States for support in preserving their freedoms—not to the United Nations, but to this country alone. I say that is an extension to all the world of the very principle of the Monroe Doctrine.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me say that by no stretch of the imagination could we call either Greece or Turkey a free people; could we?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have some doubt about their being free peoples. I have heard them called democracies. In the President's message to the joint session of Congress I heard Greece referred to as a democracy.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Greece is a monarchy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; we know Greece is a monarchy, ruled over by a King. Greece cannot be called a democracy.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Turkey is ruled by a dictator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to make a clarification of the RECORD relative to the observation I made a few moments ago to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My remarks can be placed either at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia or at the conclusion of my own remarks.

I wish to refer to the request for an appropriation of $35,000,000 which came up before the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is a fact, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota mentioned, that that appropriation came before us for the reason that the Comptroller refused to approve any more administrative costs after December 31, 1946, because lend-lease terminated at that time. What Mr. Lane asked for as Administrator of Lend-Lease was congressional authority to grant the Comptroller the right to pay the necessary administrative costs. I find that I am in error as to the amount. Instead of being $35,000,000, it was reduced to $25,000,000, and the amount for costs was $2,500,000, or 10 percent of the amount of the appropriation or the amount of the funds necessary to purchase the lend-lease equipment which was in the pipe line, so to speak.

I wish to stress that it is not the amount involved that is of such great importance, but it is the fact that in the pipe line there were nearly $35,000,000 worth of property at that time—which included such equipment as that which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been mentioning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD five pages of Mr. Lane's letter, which gives a breakdown of that equipment.

There being no objection, the portion of the letter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF ITEMS SALABLE AND NOT SALABLE IN UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, OFFICE,
FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1947.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In the course of the hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 7, 1947, Senator TYDINGS asked whether the State Department could review the material in the lend-lease pipe lines and divide it into two categories, those which could find a ready market in the United States and those which might not find a ready market. In response to this inquiry I have prepared the attached memorandum entitled "Marketability in the United States of Undelivered Lend-Lease Pipe-Line Material." I trust that this will provide the desired information.

In connection with this memorandum, it will be noted that the total amount of material in the pipe lines now is estimated at $25,479,591, as contrasted with the estimate of approximately $35,000,000 previously given to the committee. The discrepancy is explained by the fact that we have now learned that more material had been transferred to the foreign governments before December 31, 1946, than had been reported when our original estimate was made.

The clerk of the committee has called my attention to certain additional information requested in the course of the hearing on February 6, 1947. In response to this inquiry I am also enclosing herewith a copy of the statement, as of December 31, 1946, showing the general contents of the pipe lines for the various countries (see p. 8) and a copy of the twenty-first report to Congress on lend-lease operations, which contains, on page 48, the text of the pipe-line agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dated October 15, 1945 (see p. 38). The statement of the contents of the pipe lines is the same as was attached to my letter to you dated January 17, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER T. LANE,
Lend-Lease Administrator.

[Enclosures.]

[Prepared by Lend-Lease Administrator, Department of State, from data supplied by Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department]

MARKETABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES OF UNDELIVERED LEND-LEASE PIPE-LINE MATERIAL

The remaining items in the lend-lease pipe lines are divided into two main categories, namely, the material now in storage and the material not yet delivered by suppliers.

1. Material in storage (as of Feb. 1, 1947)

Country	Net tons	Value
Russian		
Oil-refinery equipment	19,919	$6,971,650
Miscellaneous (as per inventory)	1,677	838,500
British (as per inventory)	14	7,000
French North Africa (as per inventory)	58	29,000
Continental France (as per inventory)	28	14,000
West Africa (as per inventory)	16	8,000
Total	21,712	7,868,150

The material held in storage for the British, French North Africa, continental France, and West Africa consists of miscellaneous industrial equipment and parts for such equipment. Much of the equipment itself, as well as the parts, has been built to foreign specifications and would not realize any substantial return in a surplus sale. The material in storage for these countries, in any event, constitutes a very small proportion of the pipe-line material, aggregating only $58,000 in all. A complete list of this material is labeled "schedule A" and has been filed with the committee.

The miscellaneous material held for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contains a very high proportion of material made to foreign specifications and is of no value, other than scrap, in the United States. A list of this material, showing the general categories, is contained in schedule B, which has been filed with the committee. The oil-refinery equipment held for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics consists of miscellaneous component parts of oil refineries. Large portions of the refineries have already been delivered in Russia. The equipment still in storage consists of parts of machines, other parts of which have already been shipped. As a result, it is unlikely that the unshipped material has any value, other than scrap, unless it is combined with the delivered portions. Furthermore, the oil-refinery processes for which this equipment was built are of obsolete types from the point of view of the United States industry. Accordingly, it would be of little interest to United States purchasers for its original purpose.

The conclusion of those officials of the Bureau of Federal Supply (formerly the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department) who have been concerned with the procurement and shipment of the pipe-line material, is that the items now in storage would bring a very small return if they have to be disposed of as surplus.

2. Material on order as of February 1, 1947, but not delivered by suppliers

The grand total of items in this category is estimated at $17,611,441.

Five million one hundred and forty-eight thousand five hundred and sixty-three dollars' worth of this material is covered by contracts on which no definite delivery dates have been scheduled. Most of this material consists of items fairly short in supply, and cancellation of the contracts with the suppliers would probably not result in loss to the United States Government.

Material valued at $9,181,566 in the undelivered category is deemed by the Bureau of Federal Supply to be "unsalable except as scrap." This means that any of such material already completed, although undelivered by the suppliers, could not be sold as surplus with any expectation of a substantial return. Furthermore, it is to be expected that the United States Government would be required to pay heavy cancellation charges in case of cancellation of such contracts.

Three million two hundred and eighty-one thousand three hundred and twelve dollars' worth of the undelivered material is considered "usable in domestic market," which means that, if sold as surplus, approximately 75 percent of the full value could be expected to be realized.

There is attached hereto, as schedule C, a list of the undelivered material, broken down in the three categories described above:

3. Summary

	Unsalable except as scrap	Usable in domestic market	Cancelable without loss
Material not delivered	$9,181,566	$3,281,312	$5,148,563
Material in storage	7,868,150		
Total	17,049,716		

SCHEDULE C.—*Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items as of Jan. 15, 1947*

Considered usable in domestic market	$3,281,312
Unsalable except as scrap	9,181,566
Not scheduled, indefinite	5,148,563
Estimated grand total	17,611,441

Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items, Jan. 15, 1947

Program	Number active contracts	Commodity classification, undelivered	Estimated value: Disposal, domestic sale	Unsalable, except scrap	Not scheduled, indefinite	Total
Continental France	17	Spares, trucks	$84,917		$196,205	
	3	Electric sheets			306,510	
	7	Steel bars	27,000		298,332	
	1	Cranes and spares	1,579,272			
	1	Locomotives and spares		$37,781		
	1	Estrone			29,700	
	1	Magnesium wire			10,685	
	1	Copper wire			1,377	
	1	Hand saws	98,554			
	11	Machine tools		266,279	26,262	
	1	Air hose			26,880	
	3	Telegraph poles	50,000		72,450	
	7	Tractor and agricultural spares	379,077		7,500	
	3	Tractors, plows and spares	316,918			
	5	Industrial machines	7,076		182,042	
	1	Motors and parts		3,371		
	3	Air compressor parts	16,934			
	3	Tires, tubes, and flaps	5,969		8,216	
	2	Structural steel			1,285,000	
Total	72		2,565,717	307,431	2,451,159	
French North Africa	10	Tractor spare parts	$28,069		$6,982	
	18	Agricultural equipment and parts	23,111		51,870	
	1	Lumber			5,955	
	1	Sheet steel	16,000			
	1	Pillow blocks		$5,526		
	1	Circular saws	11,408			
	1	Pumps and parts		404		
	1	Fruit pulper and parts		500		
	1	Rubber hose			13,402	
	1	Engine spare parts	15,035			
	2	Electric wiring devices		8,025	1,100	
	2	Refrigerator parts		14,517		
	18	Auto spares	20,429		18,540	
	4	Electrical equipment		3,764		
	1	Garage equipment	660			
	1	Electric station and spares		1,500		
	1	Electric material and substation		26,483		
	1	Auto equipment	4,670			
	1	Mine locomotive		9,800		
	1	Gaskets		760		
	1	Sulfur dioxide			28,860	
	11	Bearings	60	7,413	200	
	3	Electrical switches	389		5,469	
	1	Chain	4,166		3,656	
	1	Dyes			2,565	
	5	Tools		7,500	15,431	
	1	Brush cutters	2,822			
Total	91		126,819	86,192	154,030	$367,041

Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items, Jan. 15, 1947—Continued

Program	Number active contracts	Commodity classification, undelivered	Estimated value			Total
			Disposal, domestic sale	Unsalable, except scrap	Not scheduled, indefinite	
China	2	Bearings	$682	$1,031		
	1	Petroleum products equipment	32			
	1	Electrical materials	14,407			
	1	Magnet wire			$6,726	
	1	Microphones	5,400			
	1	Laboratory equipment	1,112			
	2	Steam power plant		22,963	48,300	
	9	Spares-truck	7,724			
	1	Switch gears		938		
	1	Petrol equipment		1,043		
	5	Electrical equipment	15,082			
	1	Wire cloth	1,360			
	13	Tires and tubes			1,150,821	
	2	Electrical equipment	9,847	1,676		
	1	Laboratory equipment	1,818			
	3	Testing machine	23,811	9,825		
	1	Engines		224		
	1	Watt-4 motors			110,588	
	1	Turbine generator		8,810		
Total	48		65,993	61,592	1,316,435	
Netherlands	1	Tires and tubes	42,502			
Total	1		42,502			
Russia	12	Spares for cranes	4,094		74,229	
	2	Telephone equipment	24,697			
	3	Laboratory equipment	16,174			
	5	Machine tools	30,283	144,249		
	1	Electrical instruments			288	
	1	3 roll machine			1,090	
	1	Sieves	5,800			
	1	Electric motors		344		
	1	Pipe fittings		13,842		
	1	Bearings		1,056		
	1	Copper cable		8,249		
	2	Locomotives		25,641		
	11	Power equipment and spares		1,272,417	5,545	
	22	Electrical equipment		945,137		
	7	Mine hoists and controls		3,057,988		
	1	Diesel spares	29,464			
	3	Pumps and spares	6,194	14,400		
	7	Electric motors and controls		349,855		
	1	Service condenser		40,000		
	2	Boilers and spares		6,347		
	1	Locomotive storage batteries		1,776,632		
	13	Industrial equipment	3,199	299,531	31,738	
	1	Tools	33,351			
	2	Mining equipment		674,081		
Total	102		153,256	8,619,769	112,890	
Peru	2	Auto spares	491			$491
Saudi Arabia	1	Pumps and spares		515		
	6	Auto spares	2,031			
	2	Electric wiring and accessories		226	2,000	
	1	Truck and spares			47,401	
Total	10		2,031	741	49,401	52,173
West Africa	5	Locomotive parts		78,114		
	1	Motor pump		220		
	1	Rubber sheet			150	
	2	Welders		10,934		
	1	Bronze bars			1,024	
	4	Auto spares	3,900		658	
Total	14		3,900	89,268	1,832	95,000
Brazil	1	Auto spares	2,560			
	1	Battery charger	372			
	1	Industrial machinery	10,575			
Total	3		13,507			13,507
British	1	Medical X-ray		9,072		
	15	Tractor, agricultural and industrial spares	5,755	979	8,386	
Total	16		5,755	10,051	8,386	24,192
Belgium	1	Agricultural spares	25			
	2	Paper			7,551	
	2	Tires and tubes			19,358	
	1	Trucks and spares			230,444	
	5	Truck spare	31,283		46,485	
	1	Bicycle chains			17,791	
Total	15		31,308		321,829	352,937
Austria	1	Crosscut saws			62,617	
	1	Cardiograph		6,502		
	2	Truck spares	8,398			
	1	Laboratory equipment			230	
	7	Tractor, agricultural spares	37,770		16,236	
	7	Tractor and parts	19,445		653,518	
	2	Balers and spares	204,420			
Total	21		270,036	6,502	732,601	1,009,159

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the first item we find for Russia is oil-refinery equipment in the amount of $6,971,000—new equipment going through the pipe line to Russia. The letter breaks down the equipment into different categories. There are automobile tires, tractors, and a variety of items which I think would be of interest to the Senate.

I wish to say further that the amount of money involved exceeds $25,000,000 or $35,000,000, because at that time there also was brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee the matter of the disposal of goods and supplies in continental Europe by other Government agencies, such as the War Assets Administration, the State Department, and also the Army, which continued to sell and is now selling to Russia millions of dollars' worth of property on long-term security. Some of it is just as vital in a military way as the oil-refinery equipment to which the distinguished Senator has referred.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving me the opportunity to continue my remarks to this extent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks, because they clarify the point which has been made; namely, that while we are, by the measure now before the Senate, asked to take steps to stop the expansion of communism from Russia, yet at the same time we find the departments of our Government, even the same department which has brought forth the pending bill, urging the Congress to permit the sending of military supplies, even a high-octane gasoline plant, into Russia. It is inconceivable that such a thing should be done, and it is unreasonable. Certainly we should not proceed until a definite policy is established.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Yesterday in Washington Mr. Arthur H. Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, addressed the Society of Newspaper Editors. The article in the New York Times reporting Mr. Sulzberger's address contains, among other things, the following, on page 19:

> Responsibility to print unbiased, objective news is a part of the price which the public expects of the press in return for its basic guaranty of freedom, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, declared today in an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Later in the same article the following appears:

> The public, Mr. Sulzberger said in his speech, had the right to demand a fair presentation of the news.
>
> "It has a right to protection from unscrupulous advertising," he said. "It has the right to demand as accurate, full and impartial a news service as the public itself is prepared to support. It has this right because freedom of the press is one of its own fundamental freedoms which, in effect, vests with a relatively small number of its citizenry. The press and freedom suffer where a community fails to demand and receive its rights in this respect."
>
> The New York publisher said that the chief external attack against the newspapers comes now from Communists and fellow travelers. But, he had previously emphasized, "most important among the dangers to press freedom are the shortcomings of the press itself."

The article then proceeds:

> The present administration, Mr. Sulzberger said, "unlike the last, has not sniped at newspapers." On the contrary, he went on, this administration "has advanced the theory of press freedom as an element of democracy to such an extent that those who are in conflict with our American way of life are those making the most propaganda against the newspapers on the ground that they are not free.
>
> "But also," he stated, "we must not forget the honest critics who have no ulterior motive and who, quite the contrary, are fully aware of the importance of press freedom, and who wish to have the product improved in order that the threats to the institution can be removed or at least minimized."

Mr. President, I consider myself in the category there referred to by Mr. Sulzberger as an honest member of a group who criticizes the press because I want to preserve its essential freedom to be a free press. But I am also one of the public, who, as Mr. Sulzberger says, has the right to demand a fair presentation of the news, and one of those who have a right to demand fair and full reporting of the news.

My application is this, Mr. President. I commend to Mr. Sulzberger's consideration the article in the New York Times reporting the speech made in this body yesterday by the senior Senator from Florida. I say it was not fair, it was not full, it was not accurate, in the information and in the impressions it conveyed of the remarks made. In that whole report not one reference was made to the fact that the Senator from Florida, in two speeches made to his colleagues on this floor, has made the burden of his argument that the measure now pending should go through the United Nations organization, and that the vice of it lay in an attempt to achieve the objective enunciated by the President through unilateral action on the part of the Government of the United States.

No man on this floor has gone further than the Senator from Florida in those two speeches in saying that he would vote and do what he could to resist Russian aggression, and that if it took arms to do it through the United Nations, he would support that objective in every possible way. But in the New York Times report of the speech it took out of the context a little colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico, and played it up into a sensational journalistic report hardly better than would have been done by a part of the press of this country that does not claim to be in the category with the New York Times.

Mr. Sulzberger has a great responsibility, not only to keep his word, but to set an example to the American press. I understand his paper gets more newsprint than any other paper in the Nation, when many little papers in our country are having to curtail or to shut down because they are just little newspapers, and do not have Mr. Sulzberger's access to the great newsprint cartel of America or the world.

I say that Mr. Sulzberger would do better to practice what he preaches. I say he would do better to give in his paper a representation that comports with his principles as he has declared them to his fellow publishers, and I brand as unfair, as inaccurate, as giving a wrong impression, the report of the New York Times of the particular speech yesterday to which I have referred, of which I have knowledge, because I was the one who delivered it.

Mr. President, this is why I called attention a moment ago to the speech being made by the Senator from West Virginia. It is no function of the American press to censor public speeches, either. Whether they like them or do not like them, they owe a duty of fair representation of the facts. It is none of their business whether they like a Senator's speech or whether they do not like it, their duty is to report it, and let the people determine whether they like it or not, whether they give it their approval or whether they reject it. Yet we have seen in this debate that when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] made an address in the Senate on Tuesday, and spoke all afternoon, one paper stated, in a dignified report of the speech, that all Senator TAYLOR did was to spend an afternoon speaking, waiting for the Senator from Florida to return.

Would anyone call that freedom of the press being fairly exercised, responsibility being fully discharged? It was the duty of the press to report the substance of what the Senator said. He is one ninety-sixth of the senatorial power of the United States. The papers cannot carry all that all of us say, or all of what any of us say, when we make protracted speeches; but I denounce the kind of newspaper reporting that will castigate a Senator's remarks on this floor with that kind of an epithet and that kind of disregard.

The representatives of the American press are meeting here in Washington. They are fine, honorable, patriotic gentlemen, and I wish a test could be made of the report of this debate, not by all—and I am not criticizing the press services, either—but by some of the papers who have read into their news reporting their editorial policy. They are the enemies of a free press. Any paper that censors its news columns attempts to deny the fundamental civic right of a free press. It is its own worst enemy. It betrays a public duty. I say the pending issue is a matter of colossal import, and that the people are entitled to know the facts; they are entitled, as best they can, to get the arguments made and to weigh those arguments according to the information they have. A press that denies them the fullest possible information betrays its duty; it does not deserve the freedom it enjoys if in that manner it discharges its obligation.

I conclude by saying that I come squarely within the principle enunciated by Mr. Sulzberger. I have tried to be an honest critic in order to preserve the freedom of the press, which we cherish. Let the newspapers write any kind of an editorial they desire to write. But they do owe a duty to us all that they report

the facts to the people. When they have done that, they are entitled to give any interpretation in their editorial columns they care to give. But as an honest critic, and as one who cherishes the fullest freedom of the press as a part of our great democracy, I wanted to call attention to what I believe has been a failure on the part of the press adequately, at this important moment in American history, to discharge its commanding obligation.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very glad to have heard the statement of the able Senator from Florida. I think it is entirely timely. I know that he advocated—I heard him do so upon the floor of the Senate—that the question involved in the bill before us should go to the United Nations. In that suggestion I certainly concur, and I advocate here today that such a course be followed. It is not a burden which the United States should carry alone. It is wrong for this Government to saddle it upon the backs of the American people alone. It is a matter which should go to the organization which was established for the purpose of meeting these problems—the United Nations.

Mr. President, before I yielded I was discussing the message of the President and certain statements therein which dealt with the subject of the scope of this problem and whether or not it was an extension of the principles that we know, and that are known to all the world, as the Monroe Doctrine. I quote further from the President's message:

> But we cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion, or by such subterfuges as political infiltration. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

This means nothing less than that the United States is taking upon itself alone the obligation to see that existing governments of all nations in the world are to be held in status quo. It further means that we are adopting a policy of taking upon the United States alone the duty to carry out the objective of the United Nations because the President says if we will do this the United States would be effecting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

To me, it is inescapable that, through the President's language when he presented this new plan for Greece and Turkey, he desires to extend to every country in the world a policy to sustain their governments, to protect them against disturbances within or invasion from without.

That goes further than the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. President. It is to protect the status quo of the governments of the world. That is definitely in true essence an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. It is even broader than the Monroe Doctrine, in that it applies to internal insurrections. Furthermore, the President, by the language which I have quoted, states that by following this policy we, the United States, alone will be carrying out the purposes of all those who have joined together in the United Nations. We divest the United Nations, if you please, of its duties and purposes, and take them upon ourselves.

I remember that when the question of the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations was pending before the Senate, a strong appeal was made that there would be taken from the shoulders of the American people and of the Government of the United States the duty, alone, to settle difficulties and troubles in parts of the world remote from us and that such responsibilities would be placed in the hands of a united group of nations for the purpose of maintaining peace and stopping wars that might burst forth. When, in the Senate, we voted for the United Nations organization, we did so in the belief that it would carry the burden of such problems as might arise in the Middle East. "But, oh," it is said, "the United Nations cannot act." Has it been tried? No. Has this question been submitted to the United Nations? Not once. It was presented first to the Congress of this Government, not to the Council of the United Nations. Why is it said that the United Nations cannot act? The able Senator from Florida on yesterday pointed out the instance of the United Nations, upon complaint of Iran, compelling the Russians to withdraw their troops from that country. There have been other instances in which the United Nations have intervened to bring about settlements.

(At this point, Mr. REVERCOMB yielded to Mr. COOPER, whose remarks, by request of Mr. REVERCOMB, appear at the conclusion of Mr. REVERCOMB's speech.)

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I have said, Mr. President, those who continue to argue before the Senate that this question cannot be taken to the United Nations are themselves taking a course which it seems to me is a belittlement of and the beginning of the end of that organization. It stands as a great and beautiful structure of uselessness, if we permit any country that is a member of it to take upon itself the duties and work of the United Nations. It is regrettable indeed that the United States of America, where it had its birth and its organization, should be the first to avoid the use of that great instrumentality in an attempt at least to meet the problem that exists in the southern part of Europe.

The President, further in his remarks, made it clear that this was the beginning of a new policy. He said in his address to the Congress:

> This is a serious course upon which we embark.

He, himself, recognized the true seriousness of it. He was fair to the Congress in saying that it is serious.

It is so serious because it is fraught with the danger of early involvement of this country in war without an ally to aid in the cause. Our country would be acting alone and creating situations or incidents which could plunge us into a devasting war at any time. When the President says it is a serious course upon which we embark, I agree with him; it is not only a serious course but, if adopted, would be a tragic course.

If the Monroe Doctrine is applied to all the world and to every country in it, it means that the Government of this Nation has assumed, on behalf of our people, an obligation to protect every country in the world against invasion or aggression from another.

The best example of such a policy is summed up in the language of those who have said that wherever there may be trouble in the world it is the trouble of the United States of America. We become the police force of the world. We shoulder as one nation the burden that was to be that of the United Nations.

Perhaps wherever trouble may be in the world it may indeed be of interest to us, but we now confront the question of carrying that policy to the extent of using the wealth and the armed forces of the United States to enforce such a doctrine in lands far remote from us.

The bill now before the Senate of the United States marks the first definite step on the part of those who seek to place an obligation upon this country to protect every established government, wherever it may exist, and to underwrite and guarantee the security and safety of every government in the world. If we consider the proposal thoughtfully we can but wonder where such a course will carry us.

First, Mr. President, let me discuss the matter solely from a financial and monetary viewpoint. This is, in fact, not a completely new monetary policy. Our Government has heretofore used the wealth of our people for others. We have loaned billions of dollars to other countries. Such a step was taken after the First World War. Much of the money we advanced was not repaid, and a Second World War was not averted. Mr. President, I say that the action we are now asked to take, if taken, will not avert a third world war.

We were cursed for our beneficence, but failed to learn a lesson therefrom. Already we have again set out upon the same course. We have loaned approximately $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, a country which still owed us $6,000,000,000 on a debt it had refused time and again to honor. When the subject of the loan to Britain was before the Senate I said that it was not so much the matter of a particular loan to Great Britain wherein the danger lay for us as it was the renewed establishment of a policy of loaning the wealth of America to other countries. The charge that we were beginning such a policy was denied on the floor of the Senate. Now we see that not only the loaning of money to other countries was established as a policy, loaning money whether there was any hope of it ever being repaid or not, but we see established as a policy the giving away of money to other nations. That, in candor, is the plan which is now before us. How long can this Nation survive such a course without impoverishment?

Even today we are advised that these donations will not stop with the four hundred millions proposed to be sent to Greece and Turkey, but we are told that we must give six hundred millions to Korea, a country which has today no

settled government and is divided into spheres of government between Russia and the attempted influence of America.

This new billion dollars to be given away is but an inkling of what it will mean if we are to set ourselves up as the guardians and supporters of every remote country in the world, whatever our motive may be, whether to aid them to have what they want or to insist that our ideas of government shall prevail for them.

We are at once confronted with the very practical question of how long the wealth of America and her people, who even today struggle under a crushing debt, can long endure a constant drain upon our resources for the benefit of crumbling governments abroad. Can we dare take the chance of throwing our own country into economic turmoil and impoverish our own people through any such policy?

It seems to me that such a plan whereby America must shoulder the financial burdens of the world and pour out what she may have here can mean only the end of a wealthy America and the end of a strong America. When her strength is gone this country will be begging alms and who will there be to help?

Such a plan as that proposed is bound to carry us to that end if we follow it with consistency.

Mr. President, history is replete with examples of nations which have fallen. I doubt if anyone who lived in the days when the Roman Empire was rich and powerful dreamt for a moment that that great power could crumble. But we who read her history know how she extended her borders farther and farther throughout the world, and we know how she eventually fell. The power that was Rome has long since ceased to exist.

If we cannot follow the proposed plan with consistency, we should not begin it, because unless we follow it through to its end certainly that which we pour out will be of only temporary aid, and will be lost both in purpose and in repayment. Abandonment of the plan will bring hate from those we promised more than we can give.

We are confronted now with the question, plainly, clearly, are we to undertake a course whereby the people of America are to finance the governments of the world? The proposed plan is the first step on such a course.

It is but the beginning of the spending. We should not ignore the practical effect of what is sought here to be done. It is $250,000,000 to Greece this year and one hundred and fifty millions to Turkey this year. Having started this undertaking, I warn Senators that the budgets of next year and the appropriations of next year will carry additional millions and millions to meet the cost of the plan that we have set up for those countries. No man can foretell when it will end, whether in 5 years or in 20 years. This Nation's wealth can be exhausted in such a venture. Once embarked upon there can be no turning back without the charge of failure, and those we would make the beneficiaries of our bounty will rise to hate us for not carrying through to the end the plan we declared upon.

Great Britain undertook this scheme, and it had to stop.

There was reason for the British people to undertake such a plan. Their very life on their rugged islands depended on it. Great, strong people that they were, they had the plan of empire. They had to protect the ways of commerce through the Middle East. But, Mr. President, we have in Great Britain the example—with her great wealth—of having failed, and today we are told, and it has been told here upon the floor of the Senate in the course of this debate, that the British people now face ruin economically.

To quote the President's own language, the Government of Great Britain today had to "liquidate its commitments."

Great Britain has liquidated its commitments in Greece and in the Middle East. It made certain commitments, certain promises. It undertook to sustain its former course and carry out its commitments. It failed and it has withdrawn, and we are asked to take up the burden in the face of the failure of another powerful nation.

Liquidating a commitment simply means repudiating a policy because of inability to fulfill it. Is America to place herself in the position not only of liquidating her commitments abroad, but also failing in her first obligation to her own people? If we pass this bill she will have to do so or go down the road to virtual economic ruin and bankruptcy. She will have to abandon this plan. She will have to suffer the dishonor of repudiating promises, or else pour out the wealth of the people of this country to support all other governments in the world. That is the reason why I oppose starting upon such a program. I can see no other end if we follow this program to its logical conclusion. We shall be helpless to prevent the spread of communism in our own land. Cannot men see what lies ahead? Why embark upon a course which may bring us to such an end?

The President himself frankly stated to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress that if the sums of money which he requested did not meet the needs of his policy he would again come to us. Senators recall that statement. He said that if the sum of $400,000,000 did not meet the requirements in carrying out the world-wide policy, he would come back to us and ask for more. He will be back if this policy is adopted. It will become a regular part of the yearly expenditures of this Government. He will come to us again and again if we ever embark upon so fateful and tragic a course. Can Senators ignore those facts? Shall we, in our zeal to carry out a plan which now seems beneficent, blind ourselves to reality?

There is a publication known as the Kiplinger Letter, which is issued at intervals. It deals with government activities. In this week's issue the statement is made that this plan will cost between $10,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000.

The people of this country are crying out to their Government to relieve them from the taxes they now bear. This must be done if we are to progress and if our people are to have the use of their own money. Senators have urged the retirement of the great public debt which hangs around our necks like a millstone. The people, by their votes and voices, have asked that expenditures be curtailed so that less expense of government will be placed upon them. If we pass this bill and embark upon this policy, we cannot hope either to reduce the debt or to reduce taxes. Yet in the face of this call of the people we embark upon a policy which means increased debt and increased taxes for no good end.

Mr. President, let me say as earnestly as I know how that this measure will not stop the spread of communism. The expenditure of $400,000,000 will not stop the spread of communism. We plunge into a policy of giving away our wealth and sustaining governments which totter, with no assurance whatever of success, and with the certain result in the end of our own country being weakened. Only in the preservation of our own strength lies our security and the security of the world.

Figures have already been placed before us in the course of this debate, but a recapitulation of them will, I hope, impress them upon us and bring them more definitely into the consideration of the decision we are about to make.

We are told that since July 1, 1945, this country has obligated itself and its people to the extent of almost $16,000,000,000 to assist those in foreign lands. That has already been done, before any move is taken upon the course we are now asked to undertake. We are told that that figure does not include our military costs abroad or most of our aid to Latin-American countries and countries of the Orient. These expenditures include commitments and loans to Great Britain; the support and feeding of people in the invaded countries of Europe; loans from the Export-Import Bank to help the Allied countries rebuild their commerce; and money given through UNRRA.

What has happened to the Bretton Woods project? America committed herself to the extent of $6,000,000,000, with a contingent liability for even more. We were told that that fund was created so that countries which found their economies depressed through war could borrow money to reestablish themselves. All of this is apparently forgotten. We now embark upon a new scheme which, in effect, is a commitment to support with money all the governments of the world if they will but call upon us and say that their regimes are threatened by an uprising from within or attack from without.

Are we ready to sacrifice America, to weaken her, to destroy her, under a plan which has no end in sight, a plan which can carry us to impoverishment and weakness? I am not willing to go along with such a plan.

No one deplores more than I do the spread of communism anywhere, and particularly in my own country. It seems to me that our first duty is to meet the threat of communism at home. But I am not willing to sacrifice the strength and power of America and destroy the

freedom of our own people and our right to enjoy the fruits of our labor in order to protect tottering governments in other lands. I am not willing to weaken America to the point where communism can take a strangle hold upon us.

To what extent do we expect these gifts to save Greece and Turkey? Doubtless when Russia is ready she can move with speed into those countries. Yesterday I heard the statement made upon the floor of the Senate that some high military authority had stated that Russia's armed forces could move into the countries of Europe within 8 days if she so desired. Under those circumstances what good would it do to spend this money in Greece and establish a force in Europe for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism, if that is the real intent?

It was well pointed out yesterday from the map on the wall that Russia borders on other countries to the east, through which she could move. Are we going to pour out money there too? It has not yet been suggested, but if this plan is followed through it is reasonable to expect that we shall be asked to make such expenditures. What about Yugoslavia? Are we to pour money into Yugoslavia, which is now under Communist domination, to stop the further spread of communism? Where will this program end? The very fact that we, under the shadow of the borders of Russia, take such a step at this time, in my judgment, is but a reason for her to act more promptly in moving into those nations if she has the intention of doing so. She has a reason, in the eyes of the world, to say that the United States of America is attempting to set up a foreign sovereignty on her borders and for that reason she must move into those countries to protect her own border lines.

That is the hue and cry which she can make to the world. We cannot give one reason for ourselves and another reason for some other country.

This is a tragic course. It means the ruin of our internal economy. It means hastened involvement in war. Surely the future could hold no greater tragedies—tragedies that are hastened and precipitated by our own actions.

So today, as I stand here, a Member of the Senate, I earnestly plead with my colleagues to stop and consider and not to take an action which, in my judgment, can lead us only upon a path of dark regret.

The loan to Greece and to Turkey is not great in itself. But, as the President has said, this is a serious policy. Oh, how serious it is when we think of the end to which it can carry us. It can carry us to internal economic destruction. Every country shown on the map which is on that wall of the Senate Chamber wants protection against communism. This action will not stop the spread of communism. Only one thing will stop it for us and that is a strong, internal economy in America.

Mr. President, there is another feature of this policy of sending money and the military into other countries, and it is a feature which must cause other nations to shudder in apprehension of what America is up to, and that is the subject of American imperialism—of America attempting to dominate the world and the governments of other countries. We will not admit such a purpose, and, in truth, we do not have such a purpose, but, indeed, how quickly may that purpose change if we find ourselves dominating the governments of other countries or find ourselves in a position where it is necessary to dominate others in order to have them repay to us that which we have advanced them. Is America to start upon an imperialistic policy in the Mediterranean and in Asia? Can we in fairness fail to see the fear in other countries even when we start with declared good intentions? I can understand that such apprehension on their part is well founded, for the day may come when for our own economic stability it may be necessary to demand that they return to us that which we have advanced in the form of financial aid.

However, were this but an advance of money, with all the dangers fraught to our economy in such a policy, it would be less dangerous to our welfare if it were not connected plainly and outspokenly with the sending into those countries of military personnel. There is the interesting feature, and I want my country to be earnest and frank about what is intended.

There is no limit upon the number of such personnel. The Congress gives the President authority to send limited personnel. Under the language of the resolution he can send 20 or 20,000 or 200,000, depending upon what, in his judgment, is a necessary limitation under the exigencies that may arise out of this whole undertaking. Military commissions are the forerunners of war.

We are told that this combination of money and military might is necessary to stop the spread of communism from Russia into Greece. If that be the real reason, it is to stop Russia over and near her own borders from advancing her power and infiltrating her ideologies of government into a neighboring country.

To sum it up, we are undertaking to say to other nations of the world that ours is the only true way for you, whether you like it or not. That is imperialism in its strongest essence.

There is no one more opposed to communism than am I. Time and time again I have spoken openly upon the floor of the Senate and before the people of my country in the condemnation of communism. I want it eradicated completely from every phase of American life.

At the same time, I have recognized the right of the Russian people that if they desire communism that is their own choice. I recognize the right of every country within its own borders to have any desired form of government, so long as they themselves can sustain it.

Suppose Russia, or Great Britain, with her form of government by a limited monarchy, were to send military personnel into Mexico to see to it that the principles of American democracy were not to be considered in that country, what would be the reaction of America to such a step. Undoubtedly, we would consider it an overt act of hostility, and, in truth, a declaration of war.

Let us get down to facts and realities and see whether we are moving toward war. I cannot accept the statement that it is not a hostile act. We have been outspoken and we should be outspoken with reference to it.

Can we expect Russia to consider such a step on our part in any other light? In fact, is it any other step?

This is a far move toward World War III, a definite step taken by America in that direction.

If, in truth, we have found it necessary to make war upon Russia, why not tell the American people and the world that we are doing just that so that they may know where we are going and prepare for it.

This talk about this being a step to avert war is to ignore realities. It has the same sound as the words that came out of the Congress when the Harrison Neutrality Act was repealed, and we began to send arms abroad. We were told then that was a step to assure our protection against involvment in a war already raging. At first it was said that we would sell arms to combatants on the barrel head, for those who wanted to come and get them at our shores, and shortly thereafter we were shipping arms to the Allies in American boats. Why did not our Government then tell the people of America that it was to the best interest of this country to join the Allies and go to war with them. Why must the people be fooled?

We confront the very same situation here today. If we must resort to arms, why not tell the people of this country and tell them why we must go to war.

If the spread of communism into Europe is the reason for this action, and if the spread of communism over into Asia is the reason for the proposed advance to Korea, tell the people of this country and tell them why we must go to war.

It seems to me, in the light of any principle that may be laid down, that we cannot hope to avert eventual war by such a course of action.

We could hope to do so if we would take the matter to the United Nations, start with it there, and go as far as we could with it. We cannot expect to apply one principle to the government of another country and another principle to ourselves. If such action were directed at us, you and I know that war would be inevitable and immediate. Can you expect anything other than that from Russia?

There may be some lapse of time for preparation, but certainly this act on our part can never be forgotten and can be used as a cause of war against us. How practical, I wonder, is the sending of military personnel into Greece and Turkey. How long would such military personnel block the way for Russia if that country desired to make an advance or invasion?

Indeed, it seems to me that instead of preserving peace we are precipitating certain war. This is a time for men to speak frankly, and I am speaking

frankly. I do not want to take a step that will needlessly plunge us into war or hasten war. If war be inevitable, if we know that Russia is to advance upon us, then let us say so openly to the people, and go ahead. No one has yet said that, however.

The step now proposed is but a dallying step, a taunting act that cannot help but inflame the hearts and feelings of those at whom it is directed.

I do not have any defense, from my own viewpoint, for what is going on in Russia. When I went into Europe after the fall of Germany and saw that torn land, when I went into France and saw its 16 largest cities elect Communists to head up their government, and when I went into Italy and saw the red banner of communism over the graves of their Italian dead, I made the statement that we had helped to destroy a bad thing in Europe but we had paved the way for something equally bad, and that was communism. I was criticized for that remark, but I still believe I was right.

Now the question comes as to whether this country must invite another war to block the communism that is sweeping Europe, sweeping it through the people of their own lands, through the force of Russia. Communism is strongly entrenched in many countries of Europe. Are we to carry this now proposed policy into all other countries? Certainly to be effective and to be consistent in any degree would require it. Such a course, I believe, would wreck this Nation before it could defend its own shores and its own people against the spread of that threat.

If, in soundness, it could be believed that $400,000,000 taken from our own Treasury and our own people and given to Greece and Turkey would strengthen those countries so that they would be a happy people and secure against communism, even at that cost to us this particular gift would have a strong appeal.

However, I submit to you, Mr. President, that such an act will not stop communism, if communism through force is to be brought into those countries. I submit to you that if the people of Greece are going to fall for communism, this loan of money and a military commission will not stop it. It will not stop it any more than the three and three-fourths billion dollars would have saved the economy of the British Empire. We know that it has not and we know that will not. It means that much loss to this country without substantial and lasting aid to the donees.

The United Nations organization has been brought into this picture. I have referred, as several other Members of the Senate have referred, to the suggestion that this problem should be submitted to the United Nations, which is where it should have originated, certainly. The trial should be made there.

It is proposed that we give this aid and money to Greece and Turkey and that we send military missions—ours, no one else's—into those countries.

It is said that if we take this matter before the United Nations, the United Nations might veto our proposal. I believe a provision now in the bill would have us take this step subject to the approval of the United Nations, so that if the United Nations did not see fit to approve of our action, the United Nations could veto what we were doing in those countries.

In the first place, I think that is utterly unsound. If we are to permit the United Nations to veto what we are doing, why do not we go to the United Nations in the first place and ask their approval of this action before it is taken, and then take it through the channels that organization offers? Why must America suffer the cost of this enterprise and take unto herself the whole burden of the world, when such a problem was supposed to be handled by the nations acting in concert? It has been pointed out that we cannot act through the United Nations because of Russia. Naturally, Russia would veto such action of the United Nations, and reasonably so because the very step is taken against her.

Then it has been proposed by an able Member of the Senate that if Russia acts in that way, she should be faced squarely with the proposition, and should be dropped from the United Nations in such case, or that action should be taken regardless of her opposition. Mr. President, that proposal is a realistic one, to me, and I believe it deserves sound consideration. If we are to move to block communism, why not act in a practical way by getting other nations to move with us? How can we say in one breath that the proposed move is to block Russia and to block communism, and then say in the next breath that it would not be proper to ignore Russia? We are setting out not only to ignore Russia, but to block Russia.

The view of leaving Russia out of the United Nations has been criticized upon the ground that it will be the means of creating a power bloc of the other countries against Russia. Is not that just what we want if we are proceeding against Russia? Is not it better to have a power bloc of nations against Russia than to have the United States undertake the project alone. I cannot understand the reasoning of those who, having espoused and fought for an undertaking that has as its prime objective blocking the influence of Russia, would then oppose forming a power bloc against her. There is too much contradiction in that position.

The time has come here on the floor of the Senate of the United States for this Government to decide whether it wants to adopt a policy that, stripped of all decorative verbiage, means that this country is to undertake to sustain, through military force and through financing, the government of every country in the world that fears the uprising of a minority within it or an attack from without.

The alternative to such a plan—and it seems to me there is but one alternative—is to avail ourselves of the one agency and the one power and the one group that exists in the world, the United Nations, that is established for such a purpose, and go there and try to use it first, and see whether it will be successful. We should at least be fair enough with it not to ignore it, not to bypass it, or to have this country, the scene of its birth, be the first to pursue such a course.

If the United States is to follow the policy which is now proposed, then America should get ready for continuous and recurrent war, and get ready to sacrifice the lives of her young men, and get ready to exhaust her wealth, because that will be the ultimate end, and the only end, to which such a course can take us.

I am opposed to the philosophies and the brutalities of Russia. But what controls my course more than my dislike of communism or any other dislike is the security and strength of my own country and the protection and well-being of my own people. When I see my Government embarking upon a plan which in my own honest thought can but lead to another war, can but lead to a weakening of our Nation, I shall oppose that course so long as to oppose it does not mean to oppose the defense of my own country; and I do not believe that is involved in the present case. If it can be shown that the adoption of such a course is necessary for the defense of the United States, that it is necessary for the defense of the United States that we go to war with Russia at this time, let that be shown. But let us not adopt a plan under some covert step to look after all the other countries of the world and sustain their governments and, through following such a course, thus fool our people into taking a step that can only lead to war.

This subject is the gravest one which has confronted our Government in many years. Not only is it grave in respect to being a step toward war, but it is also grave in that we shall be undertaking a policy which may mean recurrent and continuous warfare for America. Furthermore, it is the making of a policy which would place upon the backs of the American people the costs of sustaining every failing government in the world.

Mr. President, I have spoken frankly today. I have spoken at great length. I have listened to the debates upon this subject. I waited some time before arriving at my own decision in regard to the pending measure and this issue. But I say to you that I have come to the sincere conclusion—a conclusion contrary to that held by many Members of this body whom I respect greatly—that the only course for the United States to take and the only way for the United States to go is through the United Nations, and that not until failure is met with there should this country attempt to act alone. This bill is the way to war and economic injury for our country; the United Nations may offer a way to peace and continued strength for us.

During the delivery of Mr. REVERCOMB'S speech,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator at this time and interrupt the train of his thought. I am a little late in my remarks, but a few moments ago when the Senator from Florida was speaking, I was moved to make a statement, and I should like to do that now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator wish to speak at length?

Mr. COOPER. No. I should like to refer to the statement just made by the Senator from Florida, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At length?

Mr. COOPER. No, for only two or three minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well; I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I can say that I was sitting on the other side near the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] yesterday when he was speaking, and I heard practically all of his speech. A few minutes before that time the Senator from Florida and I had engaged in a colloquy consisting of some questions and answers. While I can say that I do not agree with the Senator from Florida in many of the conclusions he reached in his argument, and I am not in accord with his attitude upon this bill—I am supporting the bill—yet in reading this morning the article, to which he referred, I myself felt that I had interpreted his remarks in a much different way than they were reported in the article.

As I understood the sense of what the Senator said and the context of his speech, he was speaking about fundamental governmental positions, and what one country could argue as against the position of another. It was my opinion in listening to him that he was expressing it as a matter of argument and not as his own conclusion.

I am moved to make this statement because after listening to his speech yesterday, with many of the conclusions of which I did not agree—and I am not with him in his position upon this bill—I wanted to say that I did not arrive at the conclusion that was reported in the newspaper this morning.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his characteristically kind and generous words?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the remarks by the Senator from Kentucky, and the last remark by the able Senator from Florida, appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. REVERCOMB'S speech,

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a suggestion I am making, first, that the Senate obtain immediately the recommendation of General Marshall on the Greek loan; and second, that when he returns, he be requested to furnish the Senate a full report on world affairs.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. President, I submit two suggestions with regard to our foreign policy. Rather than put them in the form of resolutions, I offer them at this point for purposes of speed and simplicity, merely in this form:

RECOMMENDATION OF GENERAL MARSHALL ON GREEK LOAN

The first is that Secretary of State Marshall, in Moscow, advise the Senate and the House, by cable, of his personal position with regard to the proposed Greek and Turkish loan program, based upon his latest experiences in the Foreign Ministers Conference. There is no single citizen in the United States of America who possesses a greater and more up-to-the-minute insight of United States-Russian relations than our distinguished Secretary of State. If my suggestion that he advise us at this time on the Greek and Turkish loan meets with favor here, and with the State Department, and the President, then I believe that General Marshall could, with that keen mind and great brain of his, within a few hours or less cable word to the Senate and to the House of Representatives on this matter. In so doing he could help resolve many of the questions and doubts in the minds of my colleagues here and in the minds of all Americans.

It has been imputed here in the Senate that Secretary Marshall is not wholly in favor of the proposed Greek and Turkish loan program. Such rumor could be spiked immediately, certainly before the Senate takes action on this measure next Tuesday. America stands at the crossroad of international policy. She deserves the benefit of the first-hand judgment of her Secretary of State. Too long have we received only the judgment of the second-level State Department officials, however able they may be.

Some might say that such a report from General Marshall at this time might embarass him in his role at the Conference. I say, on the contrary, it would strengthen his role. It would indicate the ideal, indivisible unity of United States foreign policy for a United States diplomat working out the problems of Germany to report simultaneously on the problems of the eastern Mediterranean.

POST-MOSCOW REPORT ON WORLD AFFAIRS

My second suggestion is that immediately upon the conclusion or suspension of the Foreign Ministers Conference in Moscow, that Secretary of State Marshall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session on the status of United States foreign relations. Here again we should have the direct benefit of his able judgment on the greatest single problem in the world today—the problem of the relationship between the United States and Soviet Russia, which expresses itself in the problem of the west versus the east.

I recall that some 6 years ago in February 1941 I urged that Secretary of State Hull report to the Senate in similar executive session on the crisis in the Far East. This was 10 months before Pearl Harbor. Such a session was not held, and America was not informed of the gathering war clouds over the Pacific; the result was tragic, as we know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, returning from a trip to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting at Cairo, where, during the course of our aerial voyage, we saw the remnants and the relics of the civilizations which have waxed and waned in the Mediterranean Basin, we are compelled to ponder the implications of the action now proposed. It is a matter of regret that we missed the discussions which have proceeded on the Senate floor during our absence. On the other hand, it seems possible that from the first-hand impressions gained, there might be something of value contributed to the understanding of the situation as it now exists.

Some of the things we observed might not seem to lend great support to the position of the President. Yet, on balance, it is my considered conclusion at this time that the course the President recommends is the one we may well pursue.

The brevity of our visit necessarily left us qualified as experts, as it has always been my theory that unless one stayed in a country more than 24 hours, he could qualify as an expert. If he stayed any longer, he was disqualified. So we may in some instances be in the happy state of being experts.

We returned with an overwhelming impression, which was fortified by the recurrent stories about the economic problems of Europe resting upon the lack of coal. That was the story in Italy, the story in France, the story we read in Germany. So it became obvious that the conversion of European economy to a petroleum base is apparently the only possible solution of Europe's economic ills.

Whether or not this is one world, there is certainly no doubt that there is one Middle East, and we cannot divorce Greece and Turkey from the picture of the Middle East as a whole. I think it would be utterly unrealistic for us to approach the problem without the far broader view that the petroleum sources of the Middle East are a vital stake in the economic situation, a matter to which we must give increasing attention as the days go by, not only from the standpoint of our own national security, and supplies and reserves, but from the standpoint of the reconstruction of the European economy, which must be a matter to engage and invite the interest of everyone concerned with the progress of the world.

With the timing of events I find myself somewhat concerned. The fact that the Greek commission was about to report, within a month, regarding the conditions on the Greek border, and that we were precipitated into this situation by the action of the President, seems to me to be extremely unfortunate. It is useless to indulge in speculation, but whether or not there is anyone in the world who desires that, instead of a united solution of the problem we are now considering, there should be a world in which Russia and the United States shall be opposed, and somebody else shall be in between, necessarily invites speculation.

It had been my thought for some time, for many months, that as it became more obvious that we were having difficulty in doing business with the Soviet, we must shortly begin to consider whether in the United Nations we could live with Russia, or must consider whether in the United Nations we could live without Russia, and that the other nations of the world should proceed, holding the door open for Russia to collaborate if she desired. But Russia proceeded, by the exercise of the veto, to indicate her lack of that cooperative spirit which is essential to the successful functioning of the United Nations, and it seems necessary to decide if the nations of the world must go forward, either within the framework of the United Nations or in a supplemental organization along similar lines, awaiting patiently the day when Russia will recognize the desirability of cooperation.

It is for this reason that I think all of us share profound regret that this

issue was precipitated before a finding of the commission surveying conditions in Greece had at least furnished a solid foundation on which America, well within the terms of the United Nations Charter, could have proceeded to extend the economic or military aid that was necessary. But it is a condition and not a theory which confronts us, as was said some 50 years ago by Grover Cleveland when leaving office at that time. So we face a situation in which we must resolve our action in the light of what exists, rather than of what we may desire.

There has been controversy as to how long this situation has been developing. It was my understanding that it was indicated last fall that something of this sort might develop. The pressure under which the question necessarily has been considered is, of course, unfortunate. To the extent that it represents any departure from the bipartisan cooperation to which so many of us have been devoted, it is even more unfortunate. If there is any likelihood, in connection with the present development, of there being a lack of the confidence and cooperation which prevailed so happily in the development of the United Nations Charter, which will stand as a monument to the labors of Cordell Hull, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], then indeed it is a sorry day. It is my earnest hope that if there has been any deviation from that procedure we shall soon see a resumption of that cooperation between the executive and the legislative departments, which is well within the scope of our constitutional process, which unfortunately has been ignored or disregarded many times in the century and a half of our history, but which developed so happily in the United Nations, in contrast to the tragic experiences in the League of Nations, and which seemed to augur the day when the Senate of the United States might really occupy such a position, in advice and consent in connection with our foreign affairs, as to develop a stability in the conduct of our foreign relations that is absolutely vital if America is to occupy the position in the world to which she is entitled by her preeminence in power and responsibility.

No man, as President, whoever he may be, necessarily limited in term, can possibly give to our foreign policy the continuity that could be achieved by a Senate united in the sense of its responsibility and able, if it has opportunity, by bipartisan collaboration, to carry America forward and to occupy in the world a position which, in the past century, gave us a century of peace under the Pax Britannica, and may give us a century of peace under a new concept of a Pax Americana, If we can only rise to our self-evident responsibilities in the challenge of this new world. So much for the broad outlines.

Our trip took us first to Palestine, where we landed on Easter Sunday morning. We spent the day there, visiting the holy shrines, and observing also at first hand some of the conditions in that beleaguered land. At one of the churches which we visited, we witnessed a controversy between Christian sects that invited police intervention. Neither Arabs nor Jews were involved; which indicates that arguments are not confined to the Jews and the Arabs in that land.

It was my privilege to visit a Jewish community farm on a Sunday afternoon, and to observe the miracle that had been wrought on those devastated acres by the Jewish rehabilitation of the land. There I saw 50 refugee children from Dachau and Buchenwald, who were blooming there in what had formerly been a desert and who were a token of what it is possible to do. Fifty or a hundred cows give them milk from the hills of Palestine. And yet, as I rode away from there, between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, there were thousands of idle acres, deserted by the Arabs and denied to the Jews. Meanwhile, America goes on spending millions of dollars to support thousands of refugees in the detention camps of Germany. How long this must continue, as a result of the denial of immigration by the mandatory power, is still of course in doubt. It is my earnest hope that, pending the discussions in the United Nations and the operations of the committee, the mandatory power may see fit to observe what is the undoubted international obligation of permitting the continued migration of the Jewish refugees of Europe; not primarily to relieve the American taxpayers of the millions of dollars of expense in which we are now involved in supporting these unfortunates but primarily in order that these poor unfortunates, persecuted, the remnant of 6,000,000 who have been destroyed, may establish themselves as self-respecting and self-supporting citizens in the land that has so clearly been promised to them. It is my hope that the mandatory power may, in the not too distant future, see the wisdom of that course.

Going on to Cairo, we attended the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, which has been holding sessions for many years, and which consists of members of the parliaments of various nations. In Cairo 24 or 25 were represented in an entirely informal parliament of the world, which discussed and adopted certain resolutions. The preeminence and supremacy of the United Nations was entirely recognized and only certain resolutions of recommendation addressed to the United Nations were adopted. I have copies of them here. The meeting brought home the difficulties of developing world government, which has been a fond dream. Meeting there with the members of 24 other parliaments, it became obvious that not in the very distant future could we even attempt a form of world government, that the United Nations, with its Assembly and the Council, and the very carefully worked out limitations upon its functionings, obviously represents about as far as it has been practicable and possible to go. The session of the Interparliamentary Union is rather a forum of acquaintance, of interchange of views, of the meeting of various people, and of developing gradually an understanding of various problems, without the pressure of official responsibility, which results often in acerbities which are unfortunate. There the utmost of good fellowship prevailed, although, as the American delegation walked into the scene, 5 or 10 minutes late as the result of an apparent error in time, there flooded over me a sensation that the ancient civilizations which were represented there, viewing us, must well have pondered somewhat as did the Romans in the forum when the barbarians marched in. We, who were probably the only group that did not understand the language of anybody else participating there, outside our English friends, represented America, great in her power and might and resources, which are so much desired, and while they viewed us as a people they did not understand, yet they still wanted to be friends.

The British delegation was a most representative one, with the deputy speaker of the house as the head of the delegation, who is also chairman of the ways and means committee, Lord Stangate, who had formerly been Minister of Air and is now president of the Interparliamentary Union. This delegation was also most carefully and comprehensively briefed, as I had occasion to learn when I came to the discussion of reparations. Our delegation had practically no collaboration or assistance so far as our State Department was concerned. I hasten to say this was not the fault of the State Department, but of the very casual way in which the delegations were developed, not knowing what our plans were or what our problems were, and not having any advance agenda of the meeting or of the resolutions which were to be proposed; so that we were operating more or less in the dark. The British arrived there with every resolution having been carefully considered by their foreign office and most exhaustive briefs prepared as to British policy and procedure—indicating the importance which they attach to any gathering of this kind.

The sharpest issue there developed arose in connection with the subject of reparations. There was presented to the union, a resolution which had been formulated by a committee which adopted the Russian viewpoint regarding reparations, namely, that they should be maintained at the maximum level out of current production. This was obviously squarely in conflict with the policy of the United States and of Great Britain, that we cannot feed the cow at one end while the unfortunate countries of Europe milk the cow at the other. We did that after the last war. There were paid out in reparations by Germany somewhat more than what the United States advanced to Germany. So a sharp issue was presented on this score. The resolution had no binding or legal effect, but it seemed to us that it would be most unfortunate if a resolution of that character were adopted. So we presented as strong a case as we could. It was argued on the floor. An amendment was offered, representing the American point of view as advanced by our Secretary of State at Moscow, and after considerable discussion and some approaches to the various delegations, the amendment was adopted by a vote of 119 to 74, with 73 abstentions; which is apparently a rather prevalent European system of sitting on the

fence. They did not care to offend either side in the controversy. So the resolution which was finally adopted represented the American point of view, which is that if we are to put up money for the rehabilitation of Europe that money shall first be repaid before reparations are provided out of current production as distinct from capital.

There was also considerable discussion of the question of migratory populations, and rather unanimous agreement against forceful removals of either populations or refugees. A resolution dealing with that subject, addressed to the United Nations, was referred to a committee for further study as to form.

This represented approximately the discussion and the committee work during the week we were in Cairo. We had opportunity to see the relics of the civilizations which during thousands of years had developed in the Nile Valley and had left their impress upon the history of mankind.

Then we moved on to Turkey and to Greece, making a brief visit in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, selected by Ataturk after the revolution following the First World War—a city which has been developed there in 25 years. It was formerly a little country town and now is a city of 150,000, of most modern type construction. They are building a magnificent capital there. They have acres and acres of government buildings, not equal to our own Capital City, but comparable with it when one considers that Turkey is a nation of 18,000,000 people.

What we thought was a rather significant thing—and here I seek to give only impressions as to the character of the country, and I gather that perhaps this may be helpful in considering the result of our trip—was that the residence of the President, high on a hill, is the most modest structure we saw. That is rather unusual in view of the stories we hear about dictatorships and police governments, and so on.

It is a rather modest little house, pink, not white, erected on the hill but smaller than the British Embassy or the German Embassy which had been built there, indicating that Ataturk, and his successor, Inonu, were men of rather modest inclinations. Inonu, the present President, showed himself very little. He has very little contact, at any rate, with the foreigners who are there. We met the Prime Minister and the foreign officers, and also the Minister for Air.

What impressed one about Turkey was that it is a land of ample resources to support its people; that it was under very adequate cultivation, and that democracy was making progress. We had no illusions as to how far they could have gone in 25 years, but one sensed in the conversations a sincere devotion to progress of a democratic kind.

Turkey has suppressed certain Communist newspapers, in contrast to what is being done in Greece. Perhaps anything can be proved by it, Turkey suppressed Communist newspapers which went too far, as they felt, in attacks on the government. There was what was called a free press. I talked with Americans resident there, not only in the embassy, but with those who lived in Istanbul for 30 years and who lived at Robert College, who talked freely about the suppression of the Communist press.

Whether the Turkish policy of suppressing the Communist press or the Greek policy of allowing it is the wiser is a matter of opinion, but when I hear a suggestion that Greece is a police state I find myself utterly unable to reconcile such a statement with what I hold in my hand, which is a Communist newspaper published in Athens on the day we were there, bitterly attacking President Truman and the United States of America, and praising Stalin. Here is a picture of Stalin on the front page giving his answer to a correspondent who had communicated with him about the theories of Clausewitz, and whether or not the criticism of those theories was a criticism of Lenin. Mr. Stalin had replied that that was all right; that Lenin was only speaking of Clausewitz as a statesman, not a military man, and that it was all right therefore to differ with him.

That article is not so interesting or so illuminating as the back page, which carries the caricatures and cartoons of the American position, of the Amerian loan, and again putting Stalin in a most favorable light.

It might be said that the fact that they would not suppress a newspaper such as that indicates the weakness of the Greek Government. I have here 10 other newspapers of varying points of view all the way from the extreme left, red, and pink organs through to the conservative and right wings. But whatever one may think as to Greek policy, it certainly does not indicate that the Greek Government is suppressing free speech. Certainly we have no freer speech in this country than is exemplified there. But what it seems to me it does conclusively show is that this is obviously of Soviet origin. Certainly no Greek Communist or group would be capable of producing day by day cartoons and caricatures of this character secured from Soviet sources and presented to a simple little publication there in Athens for daily issuance to the Greek people. That was to me far more significant evidence than the finding on the Greek border of a Russian machine gun with the date of 1946. One was found. What conclusion should be drawn from that? Certainly that the gun was made in Russia in 1946, that it was given to Bulgaria, Albania, or one of the other countries, and then it found its way to the Grecian border. That is material evidence that something is going on, but to me not by any means as clear in its persuasiveness as is the publication of a newspaper of this kind carried on day by day in Athens by Soviet sympathy and support in an attempt to subvert the form of government of Greece.

The Prime Minister with whom we talked in Athens was a very mild and benignant character, a man 73 years old. He had been a banker much of his life, a diminutive little banker who weighed 84 kilos, whatever that is, when the war started, and lost 40 kilos during it, as he said, not as the result of inadequate food, because he said, "I was able to get food," "but," he said, "because of the catastrophe under which my country was living." And one believed him as he said it. He talked with us very simply and directly for half an hour. He was called back from retirement. He had retired from his business, his banking, and from politics. Many years ago he was Prime Minister, and he was again trying to carry on. The curious situation is that in spite of the criticism of the Greek elections, whether or not they were right or wrong, the leader of the majority of the House of Commons there was not permitted to be Prime Minister, apparently through disapproval of the British, who were at that time furnishing the support. After a great deal of discussion a compromise was finally worked out by which the present Prime Minister took over. He certainly did not impress any of us as a belligerent or dictatorial type of man. I can say that for him. We sat and talked with him for perhaps half an hour, and he told us of the problems of the future. If one were to criticize him for anything it would be for a certain lack of force, but I am not sure that such a criticism is justified.

We later met the Foreign Minister who is the leader of the majority in the House of Parliament and who was not allowed to be Prime Minister. He was a considerably more aggressive character. It might be suggested that he was the power behind the throne.

We talked at some length with one who was in the minority in the Parliament, one of the followers of Venizelos, whose son is also a Republican, meaning by that that he had been opposed to the monarchy. The one with whom we talked was a most intelligent young man who had finally gone into the Government because he felt, although the liberal party had been opposed to it, that the crisis facing the country demanded that they should cooperate. We were very much impressed with this young man. He was a professor in the college. He was now Minister for Air. He said to us frankly that there was much of which he did not approve; that he thought there were many reforms to be carried out. We discussed the question of taxation and the fact that many wealthy Greeks were avoiding taxation. He said, "It is undoubtedly so, but we do not have the power at this time to enforce such taxation, much as I should like to do it. I should like to see the Government do it, but I recognize at the same time the very great difficulties under which the Government must carry on with the Soviet sword suspended over their heads."

He said, "A little group of us, the liberal party, decided to cooperate with our Government in this hour of crisis, although we still adhere to our ideals and ideas." He stated that they had separated from some of their colleagues.

We went from the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister to be received by the new King Paul and his queen, Fredericka. It has been a matter of discussion that Greece is still a monarchy. Our visit with the King and Queen was most interesting. We are not very familiar with kings and queens. It has been my fortune to meet a few in my travels around the world.

We were received by them about 8:30 in the evening. They had a few sandwiches for us and we stood around talking with them alone for half an hour. It was an interesting experience and afforded an opportunity to appraise what kind of people they were, which I think is a matter of some importance to America. I had seen King George, the predecessor of King Paul, when he was here. Everyone recognized that he was a rather austere, reserved character. He was a diminutive figure who had the concept that being king was a job, and that one had to carry it with him. So he rather repelled popular acclaim. When he appeared in public he did not attract the people. Whatever other good qualities he possessed, there is no doubt that he did not possess the quality of popular appeal.

King Paul, his successor, is a very different type, as I think the newspapers have indicated. One would think that he was an all-American fullback from a college football team. He is 6 feet or more tall, and splendidly built. Apparently he is in perfect physical condition. Although he is 45 years of age, he has a long record and a reputation as an athlete. That has been one of his occupations. He is a very fine looking gentleman. The only difficulty I found with him was that he still wore a monocle. I thought that if he ever came to America his public relations adviser had better get rid of the monocle. But he wore it with a skill which did him credit. He did not have a ribbon on it. It stuck all right. I suppose he was demonstrating his ingenuity.

But he had very tough competition. Personally I took pity on him and remained to talk with him, because all the rest of our delegation had clustered around the Queen, who is one of the most intriguing and interesting young ladies it has ever been my privilege to see. I do not think it was because she was decorated with a queenly crown. I have never met a more charming young lady, even among American girls—and I do not wish to compare them to their disadvantage, because I am sure they can measure up.

The Queen is a slip of a creature who appears to be about 21 years of age, although, I believe, she is really 27, and has three children. She has a very pleasing personality. The entire delegation was charmed. However, one of our comrades who is somewhat to the left, and who had evidently read something about her German background, perhaps in order to put her on the spot, proceeded, to my consternation and that of the others, suddenly to say—I do not think he even said Your Royal Highness—"I would like to know about your ancestry and education." The Queen looked a trifle aghast, as did the rest of us. In the pause which followed he repeated, with even more firmness, "I would like to know about your ancestry and education." At that point the Queen, with perfect composure, said with great simplicity and directness, "I was born a pure-blooded barbarian, and I came to Greece to be civilized."

I thought that that was not bad for any young lady under those circumstances. She said not a word about her great-grandmother, Queen Victoria, whom she might, at least, have brought into the picture to alleviate her German background. She "took it on the chin."

In my discussions with both the King and Queen I thought that perhaps some divine dispensation was moving me to have considerable confidence in what they outlined to us that they had in mind to do. This was apparently not known to our embassy. We were questioned very closely about it in subsequent discussions when we returned. We were asked, "What did the King and Queen have to say?"

The Queen indicated that she had a rather comprehensive program of child welfare, which included legislation which she hoped to have submitted to the Parliament, and which she hoped would be approved, looking to the welfare of the children of Greece.

It may be added that long before she had ascended to her present place she had given herself wholeheartedly to this work. We were told that by others, including the officials of our embassy. She had gone about laboring without limit in hospitals and welfare institutions. She had gone to Salonika among the Communists and had been received by them, although she was warned against going there. She said, "Those people are in trouble, and that is where I belong." So it seemed that the King and Queen were both sincerely devoted to their people.

The King indicated that he intended to try to organize the young men of Greece over 16 years of age—taking up, apparently, where the Queen left off—into something comparable to our civilian labor corps, to restore Greek roads and Greek utilities. He proposed to lead those boys himself, which he was evidently perfectly capable of doing. He told us with a smile that he had asked the members of the cabinet whether they would participate, and whether the 73-year-old Prime Minister would come out the first day to start digging in the road.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator know that King Paul has considerable background and experience in the business of leading young men? He was the head of the Fascist Youth group under the dictator Metaxis. I have a picture in my office of King Paul with his Youth Group giving the Fascist salute.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad that he has had experience.

Mr. TAYLOR. It helps.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am simply giving the impressions which I formed. As I shall subsequently say, I hold no brief for the King and Queen on the basis of this brief interview. My whole attitude in supporting this measure is to buy time. It has come upon us suddenly. I wish we had much more time to consider it. I am not sure that it was not forced upon us for certain reasons. But I am certainly giving the President the benefit of the doubt. I feel that at the end of 12 or 15 months we shall know much more than we now know.

So far as I am concerned, the King, the Queen, the Prime Minister, and the Foreign Minister are all on probation. By their fruits we shall know them. If 10 months from today the fears which many feel prove to be justified, it certainly will have great weight with me. I am simply trying to give my impressions. If they were selling us a bill of goods, they did a good job.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been listening with great interest to the Senator's description. When he referred to the young men the statement struck me quite forcefully, because I have just finished reading an article on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would appreciate the Senator's comment on this evidence. I have heard a great many statements to the effect that Greece is a police state. Can the Senator reconcile the document which I hold in my hand with a police state? How does the Senator figure it out?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a newspaper article written by a reporter for a reputable newspaper. The dispatch, which comes from Greece, states that newspapers of all shades of opinion are published in Athens, but that after leaving the environs of the city if one is caught with such publications, it is as much as his life is worth.

Mr. BREWSTER. They are certainly circulated freely in Athens, which has a population of approximately a million. That seems to me to be a rather curious way to suppress them. We did not get out into the country, so I do not know what was going on out there; but I do not believe that anything like this attacking the administration, could be published in Russia or in Bulgaria.

Mr. TAYLOR. Probably not. The impression I obtained from the news article—and I shall have it placed in the RECORD, inasmuch as it has been mentioned—was that the publication of such newspapers was permitted in Athens in order to impress people with how fair they were.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is a pretty labored explanation. Does the Senator take it seriously? I have half a dozen such newspapers before me. They certainly contain considerable internal evidence. I had them translated over here.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am simply repeating what the newspaper article stated. I shall get it and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. This article is on the front page, together with a picture of Stalin:

THE THEORIES OF CLAUSEWITZ OUTMODED

This article contains a letter written to Stalin by Colonel Razin, a professor of military history, and Stalin's reply.

Razin asks Stalin if articles such as one published by Colonel Baz in a military journal which say that Clausewitz's theories have been outmoded are not anti-Leninistic and, therefore, bad for the morale of the Red Army.

Stalin replies that Lenin approved of the theories of Clausewitz only as a statesman and not as a military expert. He approved the general theories of Clausewitz, some of which were Marxist, but he did not claim to be an expert on military tactics and, therefore, did not pass judgment on the military aspect of Clausewitz's book. It is, therefore, not being untrue to Lenin to criticize these theories which, according to Stalin, are outdated in this day of mechanized warfare.

That is interesting and illuminating. I thought the cartoons were more illuminating as revealing both the origin and the character of the thing, but I thought the explanation that this is published for the benefit of American visitors was a trifle strained.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I say, I shall get the clipping to which I referred. I am not saying that that is my estimate of it.

Mr. TAYLOR subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, during the exchange which I had with the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on the question of Communist newspapers published in Athens, I stated that I had read a newspaper article saying that newspapers were published but not permitted to circulate outside Athens. I should like to read a clipping at this time and, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Maine, I should like to have it inserted in the RECORD. It is a dispatch by Raymond Daniel, dated at Athens, April 4, and appearing in the New York Times under date of April 5. It is as follows:

The Government boasts that there is no censorship in Greece. That is true. Communist and other left-wing papers are sold freely in Athens. But right-wing bands see to it that they are not distributed outside the capital. It is worth a man's life to be seen reading a liberal daily in most communities in the provinces.

Right-wing bands recently turned machine guns on the office of the Communist newspaper in Salonika, killing several employees, at least two of whom were anti-Communists. No one has been punished for this, nor has there been punitive action against the rightists who raided the jail in Laconia, killing more than 30 persons in cold blood.

Greece is beginning to take on some aspects of a police state, although that is not surprising in view of the circumstances. There is a security law that enables the police to deport without trial persons suspected of subversive action. Recently in Athens 560 persons were routed from bed by security police at night and whisked to the Aegean Islands in gestapo style.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, let me say that I am sorry, but I did not hear the Senator say from what newspaper the clipping was taken.

Mr. TAYLOR. The New York Times.

Mr. BALDWIN. Was it a clipping in the New York Times from a Greek paper?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; it is an article by Raymond Daniel, one of the New York Times' correspondents in Greece.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. What does the Senator mean when he says he is in favor of this $400,000,000 loan to buy time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I mean that I frankly am not ready to take the alternative responsibility of denying it. I do not know whether the Senator heard me when I began my remarks, but I stated that I very much regretted that this matter had been precipitated so suddenly. If it could have come some months later, after we had received a report, it would have helped very much. But we are faced with a condition and not a theory, and I personally do not feel justified in taking the responsibility, under our constitutional system, of denying this course. I am giving the President the benefit of the doubt, but serving notice upon him that if there is any diminution of bipartisan collaboration—I shall go further and say that if there is any failure to develop further a bipartisan attitude, which we know has not existed except with respect to the United Nations and certain matters in Europe—unless we develop further along that line, it seems to me that it will be extremely unfortunate while we are buying time if we cannot find out more about it.

I have considerable confidence in Turkey. I saw many soldiers there who looked to me as if they were ready to fight. They were stocky, rugged men. Economically Turkey looked progressive and developing. I have high hope that Turkey will justify our confidence.

Greece has a terribly tragic problem. Many years ago when President Monroe declared the Monroe Doctrine he stated that he would consider a loan to Greece. Apparently the same problem has continued for a century.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course, conditions were different a hundred years ago. We now have a definite set of conditions. Does not the Senator think that we could buy the time he is talking about just as well by not accepting the military implications and becoming involved in a very serious situation the answer to which no one seems to be able to give at the present moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not as much disturbed over that aspect as some others may be. Personally I am not burning any bridges in connection with this matter; I am not embarking on any world program of extending our culture or democracy to all the world. I do not think we can make democracies by outside force. I think they come from within and not from without.

Mr. HAWKES. That is what I said yesterday in my speech. I do not know whether the Senator was here or not. I said we could do a thousand times more by setting an example to show that democracy will work, and make the people of the world want it, than we could do with all the bullets, bayonets, and bombs in the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is no comparison. I take the teaching of the Bible, that "I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me." I think that is the only way we can make democracy in the world, as we demonstrate the virility and power of our own democracy and our own system. We are doing a job, but we have a greater job ahead. I am not in favor of abandoning Greece to what would undoubtedly result in a Communist infiltration.

Mr. HAWKES. I would not abandon Greece at this point. I think the only difference between the Senator's position and mine is that I would not embark upon this world-wide situation without letting the people of the United States have a say about it. I want to say to the distinguished Senator, for whom I have a very high regard, that I have talked with thousands of American citizens, and I want to make this prediction: It will be found as we go along that hundreds and thousands and millions of American citizens do not want again to go into war. They want to make the United Nations work. That is their one and only hope.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I hold the Sentor in equally high regard, but it would certainly be begging the question, it seems to me, to say that those who advocate this measure are advocating leading the United States into war. I am sure the Senator did not mean to intimate that.

Mr. HAWKES. Oh, no.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are taking a method which we think is best calculated to keep us out of war. We are fallible and human. I am sure the Senator will admit that others are also.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that everything which has been put before Congress in the last few years has had to be solved immediately before Congress had time fully to understand it, because of an emergency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; and that is what I do not like.

Mr. HAWKES. And I say that the emergency method of reaching decisions without knowing the facts and the implications will ultimately destroy the United States. I do not mean that the distinguished Senator thinks that it is leading this Nation into war. I know he wants peace as much as I do, or as anyone else does, but the point I am making is that the whole history of the world shows that nation after nation has taken steps which it expected to retrace if they were found to be wrong. But the world is not built that way. Sometimes in a bad place there is many a man who would not have gone to pieces if he had been able to get out of the place he had gotten into and had been able to protect and save himself.

Mr. BREWSTER. In 1921 I was very hopeful that this Nation would be a member of the League of Nations. I formed the League To Enforce Peace in the State of Maine, as a young man out of the last war. I think the Senator and others will agree that we took the other course. We picked up our marbles and came home and thought we had taught the world a lesson. It did not seem to work. We landed in a worse mess than we had been in before.

For the past 15 years, as a Member of the House and Senate, I have supported all measures calculated to strengthen our hand in our international dealings, over the bitter opposition of most of my friends, as well as those on the other side of the aisle. A few years ago very few of us felt the danger which inhered in our being inadequately prepared, and we took a course certainly calculated not to intervene or to be active in foreign affairs, and yet there occurred the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say that what disturbs me is the very thing the Senator is discussing. I think we did contribute, perhaps indirectly, to the

destruction of the League of Nations. I thought that this time we had determined to be a part of the United Nations and to try to make it work.

Of course, the Senator from Maine and I have a right to have a difference of opinion on this matter, just as all men have a right to have differences of opinion, so long as they keep faith with their consciences and believe they are all right. But I make the prediction that once we circumvent the United Nations, and play a lone hand in the world, we shall find that all the countries that are in distress will, one after another, come to our front door and ask for assistance. I have not yet seen any exchequer in the United Nations which can be used to solve their problems. When we refuse to help one nation, after we have done something for another nation, the result will be what I predicted yesterday, namely, that we shall incur the enmity and the hatred of nation after nation in the world; and after having been the greatest philanthropist and the greatest humanitarian nation on earth, we shall end up in disrepute and shall have lost our friends.

I make that prediction. The Senator from Maine can wait to see whether it comes true; he is young enough to do that, whereas I may not live to see it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey heard me say this, but I predicated my remarks today by stating my profound regret over the failure of the United Nations and I said that for many months I have felt that since it has seemed impossible for the other nations to get along with Russia, the world must show whether it can get along without her; that if there is a party that seems to think it is indispensable, it is time for it to go. That was a principle which guided me when I was Governor of Maine—that if any man serving under me thought I could not get along without him, it was certainly time for me to do so. I take a similar position in regard to Russia, namely, that she has been using the veto in a manner incompatible with the successful functioning of the United Nations, and that therefore we should move in the direction of getting along without her. I expressed my profound regret that this problem was precipitated on our doorstep by the sudden action of Britain in withdrawing aid, and I said I hoped we could have the aid of the report of the United Nations' commission to Greece before we took action.

As the Senator knows, I have just returned from abroad. In Cairo we saw the whole European group trying to obtain reparations. The fact that in the end the cost of the reparations would come out of the pocket of the United States did not trouble them at all. But they discovered that they had taken the wrong course, that they could not get reparations through the Secretary of State, George Marshall, or through our Government, because our representatives said, "No; we will not do that."

However, I have sufficient respect for their intellectual processes to believe that they will quickly emulate the step that has been taken by Greece and Turkey, and will put themselves in a similar position.

I have no doubt that the pending proposal is not the only one we shall face, but that in the course of the next few years we shall face many similar ones; and I have no magic formula for answering all the problems we shall inevitably confront.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more, briefly?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further, because I am sure I know his attitude and his purposes, and they appeal to me strongly.

Let me say that the abandonment by the British of their Empire must have appealed to the Senator from Maine as presenting a very complicated problem. Now we find that it is proposed that we step into it. If we do take that step, I think we shall regret it as long as we live. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Maine knows that except for their sheer inability to carry on, the representatives of Britain would not be saying in meeting after meeting that their Empire is practically through. The other noon, 30 or 40 Senators heard a member of the House of Commons admit that the British cannot hold their Empire together, that Britain is through. That was an amazing statement. I think the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was present; and, in all, 30 or 40 Senators were there.

Now we are stepping into something about which we know nothing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Jersey does not quite mean that. We know a little something about it, but there is a great deal that we do not know.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course. I was in Greece in 1945, after the war; I spent several days there. We have sent Paul Porter over there, and he has found out all about Greece.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Greeks do not want him back.

Mr. HAWKES. The Greeks do not want him back?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. HAWKES. Well, he has made a report that is having the result of carrying this Nation to a place where I do not think it should go.

I simply say to the Senator from Maine that the fact is that the British have let go in this situation, and we are about to step into it. I think we all have great respect for those in Britain who wish to preserve individual liberty and freedom; but the fact is that Britain is now stepping out of that situation, and we are stepping into it—stepping into something for which we are not trained in any way, and we do not know the implications at all. With all due regard to all the brilliant men in the Senate of the United States, I say that not one Member of the Senate has the slightest idea of what is going on in Europe. Our knowledge of European affairs is merely a little skim along the surface. I myself have some knowledge of European conditions; I have been in business in Europe, as perhaps the Senator from Maine knows. I have gone there twice every year for 19 years. But even so, I do not know much about Europe. I am sure the same thing is true of people who take a trip there and shake hands with several persons, and then return to the United States—like my dear friend Eric Johnston, who went to Russia for a week, and then returned to the United States and wrote a wonderful book about Russia. He did not understand a word of Russian. He had to use an interpreter, and he never knew whether the interpreter was correctly interpreting a word he said or a word that was said to him in response to the questions he asked.

Mr. President, I have said to the Senator from Maine about all I wish to. I have a very firm conviction that we are about to take a step which we shall regret the rest of our lives.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the force of what the Senator from New Jersey has said, and I also appreciate the background for his remarks.

If one may be pardoned for learning a lesson from the ancient civilizations, which we have visited—the Acropolis and the Roman Forum—let me remind the Senator that Socrates once was asked by a young man whether he should get married. Socrates replied, "Whatever you do, you will regret it."

There, Mr. President, is some of the cynicism of the ages. I am sure that 1, 2, or 5 years from today it may easily be possible for anyone to stand up in the Senate and demonstrate conclusively how wrong almost everyone else was. No one knows what may happen in this situation. Twenty-five years ago we took one course which we thought was the proper one, but we finally arrived at Pearl Harbor.

Since the war I have rather felt that the American people have been dedicated to a different course. The Senator from New Jersey says, and I agree with him, that by following the course now proposed we would seem to be bypassing the United Nations. I profoundly regret that, and I hope it is only a temporary matter.

Mr. President, why are we bypassing the United Nations? We do so partly, perhaps, because we were precipitated into the situation. I regret that that is so; I think the administration should have waited until the United Nations Commission's report on Greece was available. I believe that should have been done, and I have said so many times.

The other reason for bypassing the United Nations is that Russia has consistently refused to cooperate with the United Nations or to permit the United Nations to form any military security organization or group or to permit the United Nations to have any means of handling such situations. Certainly we know what the Russian attitude would be in the present situation; the Russians have indicated it already.

So, Mr. President, although I say it is unfortunate, and although we think that if we could have pursued the other course it would have been more fruitful, meanwhile the situation in Greece has certainly been deteriorating, and Greece is the last outpost.

I have said before that Europe is converting from coal to oil. Oil is in the Middle East, and we might as well be realistic about the situation and realize that that is a stake in this affair. That does not mean the establishment of an oil empire. It means that oil alone can enable Europe to get back on a self-sustaining basis. If it becomes possible for oil to be laid down in Europe at 75 cents or $1 a barrel, perhaps we shall not have to support European countries for the next 25 years, and perhaps we shall not have to fight another war.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield at this point?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am pleased to hear the Senator say what he has said, because I think he and I hold very similar views, even though we shall vote differently. I wish to say that I would not let a charter, something written on a piece of paper, keep 49 nations from having peace in the world, just because one nation wished to resist that effort and was determined to do things that the other 49 nations did not wish to do. In that event, I would change that charter, and would still keep faith with that great organization. If we do precisely that we shall save time by losing time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have said earlier in my remarks; and, as I have already said, I predicated my remarks upon that.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes. As I have said, Mr. President, I am glad to know that the Senator from Maine agrees with me, even though I know that he and I will vote differently.

I might say to the Senator that I have lived long enough to know that the only thing that makes it safe to make mistakes is that nobody can prove you make a mistake, because nobody can prove what would have happened if the other thing had been inaugurated instead of what was done.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a comfortable position in which the Senator from New Jersey is going to find himself.

Mr. HAWKES. It is comfortable for the Senator and his associates, because we can never prove that if they had not done what they are about to do, the country would have been better off.

Mr. BREWSTER. The converse is true, that we who vote for the course that is taken must take the responsibility. We can never prove that those in the minority are wrong, because the course we advocate is adopted, for better or for worse.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to make a further statement to the distinguished Senator from Maine. The people of the United States are just beginning to understand what this is all about, and I wish to reemphasize what I said last night, that the first 2 weeks after the President made his address my mail was 4 or 5 to 1 in favor of the Greek-Turkish loan. Today my mail is running 4 or 5 to 1 just the other way. I have talked to audiences on this subject, and everyone who begins to understand the implications of the proposal says "No; we should not circumvent the United Nations, and we do not want to get into war."

The Senator has been away. I have been looking around the United States, while the Senator has been looking at Egypt and Greece, and I have stated what I have found in the United States. I can show the Senator some very interesting mail in my office asking, "Why do you not wait until we understand this?"

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly entertain no ideas of omniscience, either from previous experience or from this latest exploration. I said also, in beginning my remarks, in order to show appropriate humility, that anyone who spends more than 24 hours in a country is no longer an expert on it.

I should like to conclude on this note, that we are in very troublous times, and I think we must move toward mobilizing world opinion within the forum of the United Nations. I think we are here setting a precedent of unilateral action which undoubtedly will rise up to plague us. I think we can justify it in the interim, but if it were to afford the pattern, if this were to furnish the precedent, for America going all over the world and mixing into the internal affairs of every country, I would agree with anyone here that it would be a catastrophe without precedent in our history, or that of any nation in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says it would be a precedent?

Mr. BREWSTER. A precedent.

Mr. WHERRY. A precedent and a pattern?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what he would have us do when the next move was made, when we begin to unveil this pattern. Certainly the State Department must have a pattern of what they are going to do in Italy. Italy now wants $100,000,000. I understand she needs it to make the first payment on the reparations to Russia.

What would the Senator have us do when France comes and asks for another loan? What would he have us do when England comes and asks for another loan? We are told we are going to give them a billion dollars by next July.

What would the Senator have us do when we try to reestablish the economy in Germany? I have been told the peace of Europe depends on what we do in Germany, and that it is going to take $6,000,000,000.

When we get through with continental Europe, what are we to do when Korea comes in and asks for from six hundred million to a billion dollars? What are we going to do when China comes in and asks for from six hundred million to a billion dollars?

If we do in Greece and in Turkey what is proposed, under the theory that we want to preserve the independence of those countries, are we not establishing a precedent whereby we will have to grant the loans if these other countries come and ask for them?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what troubles me. It seems to me we have just as much obligation in Germany, where we have permitted the Potsdam agreement to undermine absolutely the economy of that country, fastening a starvation living upon its people. The Senator knows as much about that as I do, or more. I ask him, What are we to do when they come forward and ask to be rehabilitated? Certainly, if we are ever to establish peace in Europe, we have to start in now and terminate or cancel every secret agreement that works in direct contradiction to the freedom of those people. They are asking for freedom, just as the people in Greece are asking for it.

Certainly, if there is a people on earth we have to take care of, it is the people of Korea, because we are occupying that country. I do not see how we can get away from that.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania brought out the first suggestion that opened my eyes, that this is only the beginning. If we are to stop communistic aggression, directly or indirectly, in all these countries—and that is the statement in the President's message—then we must be prepared quickly to grant these loans; we must fit in not merely two pieces of this great jigsaw puzzle, but we must finish the complete puzzle, and we must give aid to those other countries, if we are to keep faith with their people, and insure their independence and peace.

How can we say we will give aid to Greece and then deny it to all the others? If we do, how are we going to stop communism? How are we going to stop communism in Italy if we do not grant Italy a loan? How are we going to stop communism in France if we do not grant France a loan? How are we going to stop it anywhere, where there is aggression?

There is the same occasion to grant aid to France as to Greece. Of course, Greece is almost obliterated. I am sorry for the Greeks. They are devastated. Their transportation is gone. They are probably at an economic level as low as they could reach, and my heart goes out to them. But conditions in other countries are just as bad as in Greece.

I suggest to the able Senator from Maine, beause I have the deepest respect for him, that if we start in with Greece and Turkey, we cannot say we will not do something similar when other countries come forward and ask for loans.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the questions, and also the feeling of the Senator. I may remind him that my attitude regarding the British loan has not determined my view regarding the Greek loan. So far as I am concerned, I do not consider that our attitude in any of these matters is determined by our action on any one.

The Senator referred to obligations. I do not consider that we are entering into obligations to anyone at any time. If we make a loan to Greece and Turkey,

we make a loan. I have a good many reservations and doubts, but I am giving the President and his advisers the benefit of the doubt for a time.

The Senator says the line is forming on the right. That may be true. We will have to determine our action as time goes on. We realize the German situation, the Korean situation, and all the others. It seems to me we have to live from hand to mouth, so to speak.

Whatever were the reasons why Britain suddenly abandoned Greece, I do not know. I wish they had carried on 2 or 3 months longer, say to July 1, so that we would have had time to think the matter over. I am not burning any bridges behind me in this affair. I think a great deal of what happens is going to be determined by the manner and the method of administration. I think the men who are selected to handle the thing, and their method of handling it, so far as I am concerned, will have much to do with its success.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

Mr. BREWSTER. One other statement before the Senator from New Jersey speaks. I think we all have lessons to learn in procedure, and I hope that this discussion will serve as a salutary warning to our executive departments to be perhaps more frank and more open and more mature, if I may use the word, in their approach to the Senate of the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. My experience in life has taught me that whenever anyone makes an immature request and it is granted, it does not serve as a lesson. My whole life has taught me that when anyone comes to me with an immature, an ill-considered, or a not thoroughly considered request, and I say, "Yes, all right; I do not like it, but all right," the next time he comes right back with another.

I have always trained men to work with me in this way, that when they made a request for something which had not been considered, it was turned down or was delayed until we gave it consideration.

I want to ask the Senator from Maine a question. He may have known more than I did about it, but I never heard a word about England pulling out of Greece on March 31, until the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate [Mr. VANDENBERG] told us in caucus just the day before the message was delivered. Does the Senator from Maine think it fair to me, to himself, to the other Senators, and to the people of the United States, to have us lead them into this thing without time to know all the facts and reflect upon them? After all, it is they who fight the wars, not us; it is they who pay the bills, not us; and if we lead them into a situation from which they cannot extricate themselves, it is we who must take the blame and have it put squarely upon our own shoulders.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I trust that statement does not carry the implication that I have withheld information and suddenly given it to the Senate.

Mr. HAWKES. No, no. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Michigan simply emphasizes my point, and I think he will agree with me that so far as we know nobody on this side of the aisle, at least, knew one word about this thing until the day before, March 12, 1947.

Mr. BREWSTER. Two days before.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well, the day or two days before the President delivered his message. My point is this: We are not talking about our own lives. We are not talking about our own future and our own welfare. In the history of the United States since this great country was founded, there have been—I do not have the exact figures—approximately 10,000 men and women who have represented the people of the United States in the Congress. There have been only about 70 Justices of the Supreme Court and 12 Chief Justices, and 32 men who have served as President of the United States of America. The figures are astounding. There have only been about 8,500 Representatives in Congress and 1,400 or 1,500 Senators. Those figures should impress us with the responsibility that rests on our shoulders. I cannot wash it off. I know something about the war through which we have recently passed. I paid a price in that war that was half of everything I had in this world, and there are other Senators here who paid a similar price. I am saying to the Senator from Maine that it is incumbent upon him, and I am saying to all other Senators that it is incumbent upon them, to think well before taking this step which does not have to be taken, and to realize that this question does not have to be handled in the way it is being.

I would give Greece $100,000,000—give it to her. I would give her $200,000,000, and I would leave out the military implications. I would have given England $400,000,000 and would have let her remain in there, because she knows, back through all history, the habits and the sophistries and the intrigues of those people. And then I would like to have what the distinguished Senator from Maine says he would like to have—and I think the suggestion is very wise, but he is going to vote the other way—namely, time to consider this far-reaching proposal. I want to tell Senators that, if I know anything in this world, I know that the American people would like to have time to consider it themselves and let their representatives know what they want.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not wanted to interrupt the Senator. I assumed that he was entitled to make his own speech, but I cannot allow this persistent drumfire to go without at least a casual rejoinder. I fully understand how keenly the able Senator from New Jersey feels about this question, but I should like to have the Senator from Maine know that I feel just as keenly that, if at this strategic point we surrender to Communist aggression, we have set in motion a chain reaction which may make it impossible for us ever again peacefully to meet the Russian menace. So far as I am concerned, I am just as deeply and conscientiously wedded to the fact and the belief and the conviction that the step we are proposing to take is essential to the peace of the United States, as the able Senator from New Jersey feels otherwise. I have said 50 times on this floor that no man has the right to be dogmatic about it. The Senator may be right; I may be right; but our opinions differ in respect to a net result.

In my opinion, if the Senate of the United States should decline to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in this emergency, America would have sacrificed her moral and spiritual leadership for all time in the great conflict which sweeps this earth between two rival ideologies.

I insist that there is a chance for Moscow and Washington to live together—"live and let live" in the same world, providing we now make it perfectly plain to Moscow on the one hand that we intend nothing but scrupulous fair play to her, and on the other hand, that there are deadlines—I say it again—in our ideals, which we will not surrender; and, except as this latter fact is established in the Russian conscience, we shall never have a chance to settle this rivalry short of war. So my opinion is just as deeply attached to my conscience as is that of the able Senator from New Jersey, to his conscience, that the course I shall support is the peace course, and the course he supports is the course which makes peace almost impossible.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that any manifestation of approval or disapproval by the occupants of the galleries is contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want to prolong this argument, but I should like to say that I have never implied that the Senator from Michigan was not hewing to his conscience. All that he has said in that grand speech does not change the fact one iota that the people of the United States have not had a chance to consider this thing. If the Senator does not believe what I am saying, let him go through the country and hear what I am hearing. Let him see what I am receiving in my office.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I certainly appreciate how he feels about the subject of war and peace. I also have such respect and admiration for the success of the Senator from New Jersey in private as well as public life that I have a great deal more respect for his opinion than for that of any plebiscite which can be conducted through the medium of the mail.

I have seen the Senator from New Jersey reject the conclusions of his mail on many an occasion, because he did not believe that it accurately reflected the

interests of the country that he was sworn to protect. A Senator takes an oath to uphold the Constitution and do his duty, here. He has a little duty, himself. It is not a matter of a mail referendum, which, as Senators know, may be stimulated in a variety of ways. I have had several hundred letters of one kind and another that were mere propaganda pieces.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand that I am talking about a mail referendum. I have gone out and talked with hundreds of people, and I have talked to them very earnestly and sincerely. It is not the mail referendum. It has been an exchange of viewpoints in which a person could say one thing and get an answer in return. So I do not want the Senator to think I am talking simply about a mail referendum. I am talking about the over-all picture.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think our responsibility here is greater than that of any other people in this country, because we are paid to serve here and are sworn to do a job, and we ought to know more about this question than almost anyone else, because this is primarily our responsibility, and we presumably have sources of information, and so on. We recognize our limitations; we try to carry on; and I am sure that the Senator has not, in any words he used, meant to imply any doubt as to the sincerity with which others of us were pursuing the cause of peace. His language constantly is that we are following a war part.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I must ask the Senator to yield to me, there, because under no circumstances do I wish to imply the lack of sincerity on the part of any Senator. But I do want to repeat something which I think is worth while remembering by every representative of the people. Abraham Lincoln said, when he ran for Congress, "If I am elected and go to Washington, I shall try to represent fairly all those who opposed me, as well as those who supported me. I shall make it my business to try to ascertain what my constituents believe is right and should be done. I shall use every effort to ascertain this, but if I find I am unable to do it or if I find I cannot keep faith with the Constitution in doing it, then I shall have to use my own judgment."

I am not sure that there is anything in the Constitution which gives us the right to loan to countries all over the world, hundreds of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and lead them into a situation of this kind. I have talked with some very able lawyers, who think that the question of constitutionality should be raised as to the authority of this Nation, not under attack, to grant away the money of the people, obtained by the power of taxation, without knowing the will of the people.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question is to me not free from doubt. Irrespective of the constitutionality of the proposal, I think we are embarking upon a new course taken under very distressing circumstances. The Senator says there has not been an expression of the people. The last campaign, so far as I know, was conducted so far as this side of the aisle was concerned, against communism.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; and in favor of economy, too.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. The thought was "get tough with communism." It embarrasses me a little when the President takes us at our word and suggests that he is going to get tough with communism, to note how quickly some would seem to want us to pull out from under and say, "You should not have believed what we said."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does not the Senator think that the people of the United States meant "get tough with communism" inside the borders of the United States, and not outside?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the American people are so simple as to think that communism is simply confined to the United States.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not saying that.

Mr. BREWSTER. The whole concept of communism has been a world ideology.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Whether or not communism is on the march to take over the world is the question we are considering. If it is that, then the sooner we stop it the better.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one moment, and then I shall not ask him to yield again?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say that I understand the people of the United States are not so simple as to think that communism is confined to the United States. I never suggested that. I have spoken with hundreds of people on this subject. If the Senator will go over the country and talk with them he will find that they say, "Why do you not get your own house in order before you go out to clear up the whole world?" They want to see us clean the communistic elements out of our Government. The President of the United States, himself, has brought that out lately. That is all I mean.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state to the distinguished Senator that the reason for the observation I am about to make and the question I shall finally ask him is that I am one who is trying to make up his mind about this question. I have tried to keep my mind open. I have listened to the debate which has taken place. I wish to ask a question, and I should like to have the Senator from Michigan hear my question. I think the statement made by the Senator from Michigan a little while ago that the choice he was making was the choice for peace, and that the choice which the Senator from New Jersey had already made might not be for peace, is not justified by the facts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is not what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. If I misunderstood the Senator, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me to repeat what I said?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I would not for anything in the world want to misquote the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I should like to be corrected if I did not understand him correctly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I said the course I was pursuing I thought led to peace, precisely as the Senator from New Jersey thought the course he was pursuing led to peace.

Mr. WHERRY. I will restate the question then.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is no criticism of the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Nebraska, or anybody else.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as yet I have not said what I was going to say. I do not wish the Senator to get the impression that I am saying anything in criticism of him. What I have been trying to do is to understand what the Senator from Michigan said. There was no criticism intended. The Senator from Michigan seems, for some reason, when questions are propounded to him, not only to resent them sometimes, but he has been a little impatient with those who try to seek light upon the subject. I certainly do not mean to misquote the Senator. I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and he knows it. But I want to tell him that this is the most important vote I shall have cast since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, and I shall ask questions and secure as much light as possible before I cast my vote, and I am not going to be intimidated or stampeded by anyone in my endeavor to secure all the light and information possible, so as to be able to make up my mind on the subject.

If the distinguished Senator from Michigan means that it is his opinion that the following course he advocates leads to peace, of course he has the right to his opinion, and to follow that course. But I want to receive all the information I can, so as to enable me, before I vote, to decide whether the pathway to peace is the one proposed by the Senator from New Jersey or whether the pathway to peace is the one proposed by the Senator from Michigan, and which he now follows.

The other day I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan, "What if we were to take the other course from that advocated by the Senator from Michigan?" The Senator calls it a matter of compliance or noncompliance. I can easily understand what the result will be if we do not comply, because I can visualize that communism will overrun Greece and Turkey. I think there is no doubt about that. But on the other hand I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. At that point let me say I think there is a clear distinction between Greece and Turkey.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is true. Let us speak, then, of Greece. The Senator from Maine has just come from Greece. Yesterday I asked the Senator from Michigan the question: "What will be the price we pay if we do comply and go into Greece, and Russia comes down and overruns Greece just the same, and bloodshed results. What will the price be then?" I would not want to misquote him for the world, not after the remarks he has just made, but I think the Senator said, "Your guess is as good as mine," or words to that effect. I ask the Senator from Maine, What does he think the price will be?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is what I think it will be. I do not think the Soviet is ready to fight us.

Mr. WHERRY. I said if they did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me answer.

Mr. WHERRY. I said if they did.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will come to that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the Soviet Government is ready to start a war. That is why I asked the Senator from Nebraska to eliminate the Turkish situation, because there is every indication that the Turks are lined up on the border and that they mean business. Even if they all die in their tracks, they look perfectly capable of doing it. Britain and the other 54 United Nations are pledged, if there is an act of aggression against the Turks, to come to their aid individually or collectively. That is why I want the Senator to leave the Turkish situation out of the question because I think they will fight if they are attacked, and if they are attacked the rest of the world will come to their aid. The result will be a world-wide war.

So as far as Greece is concerned the Russians will certainly pursue the policy of infiltration through Bulgaria, Macedonia, and other countries just so long as they can by the various methods through which they have taken over other Balkan countries. I think the prospect of an open Soviet attack upon Greece is so remote at this time that we do not need to take it into our calculation.

As I said, I am buying time. I am buying 15 months. I favor the idea, as the Senator from New Jersey suggested, of $100,000,000 grant. Even if we have to give $100,000,000 to Britain, I say, go ahead there and take care of them for the next 3 or 4 months and let us study this problem. I would have preferred that solution. But that did not seem to me to meet with effective response. I believe the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, at one time suggested that idea. I thought it was a good idea. But there seemed to be reasons why that was not more seriously considered and proposed.

So we came back to the original proposal. I am ready to vote for $400,000,000 for 15 months. I am going to observe very carefully what is done with that money, how it is administered, how it is handled, what the Greek Government does, what the Soviet Government does, what happens in Greece, and what happens in Turkey. We know now that we have a job on our hands, and I hope that 6 or 8 or 10 months from today everyone in the Senate and in the United States will know a great deal more about these problems, in the Mediterranean and elsewhere, than we can possibly know today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly do not want to detain the Senator. I am sorry to break into his remarks. We are all interested in his report.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am practically through.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows that already Greece has had from the United States in the neighborhood of, I think, $300,000,000, either through UNRRA or through other contributions or loans or grants or whatever they may be called. I understand that England has placed in Greece since the war nearly $350,000,000. As I understand, the Greek economic situation is even worse today than it has been. Is that not correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not in a position to say. The whole area impressed me as being in a state of cultivation. The thought which constantly recurs is, Why cannot the Greeks feed themselves, as they have done for 5,000 years? It is felt that it should not take very much to get them back on a producing basis if the program were properly administered. This money can do a great deal of good. I hold no brief for what has been done heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator favor an amendment to this bill deleting military aid to Greece, and giving Greece $250,000,000 for economic and agricultural relief exclusively?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I believe that military aid is very essential, to get them back on a going basis. Raids are obviously being made over the border, and supplies are being transported. If Soviet Russia can surreptitiously extend aid to the rebels, I do not see why we cannot extend aid to the established government.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event we should give military aid and there should be a conflict in which our military personnel were involved, resulting in bloodshed, would we be at war with Russia?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not under the present circumstances, because Russia is not showing her hand. She is operating behind the scenes.

Mr. WHERRY. If we should extend military aid and send our military personnel over there to bolster up the established government, as the Senator says, and Russia should come down from the north to aid the Communists, and there should be an engagement resulting in bloodshed, would we be at war?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not with Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. With whom would we be at war if that should happen?

Mr. BREWSTER. At the present time all that exists is what seems to be a Communist-inspired rebellion in Greece. We are extending aid to the established Greek Government, as we have done in many other instances. If any difficulty occurs, it is simply an internal problem so far as the record is concerned. We are open about it. Russia is secret. If Russia decides to move in and really start operations, we must then decide what to do. We must decide whether to back down. We must decide whether we are going to say, "If you want to attack Greece, go ahead. We are obligated under the United Nations to protect her. We are obligated in various ways, but you go ahead and take all the world you want, and when you get through we shall thank God if you leave us alone." We tried that theory 25 years ago. The Senator and I were both partners in this thing. The first thing we knew we landed in Pearl Harbor. I have conducted many investigations. One might make out more or less of a case on the ground that the President might have done things he should not have done; but by and large, without primary provocation on our part, we landed in a second first-class world war. I am as anxious as is the Senator to prevent the repetition of such a thing, and I am trying to find a course better calculated than our last one to prevent us from again landing in such a situation. I do not challenge the Senator's conclusions. I am not omniscient, and I do not claim to be. I think we shall all learn a great deal more in the next few years.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think the Senator has just said a very remarkable thing, and I hope he will stand by it. He has stated that he is not in favor of going further and further with such loans.

Mr. BREWSTER. I go along with this one with very great reluctance. I believe that democracy can spread itself only by example.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator from Nebraska inquired as to what the situation would be under certain circumstances and with whom we might be at war. I can tell the Senator with whom we may be at war. We may be at war with ourselves. We would be at war trying to find out where to get the money to pay our own bills and keep our own economy in shape if we were to become nationally bankrupt because of foolish, extended, and continuous loans to irresponsible nations and people who have no collateral and no security and little intention to pay.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his observations.

If the Senator from Maine will further yield, I stated that I would ask only one question. I distinctly recall that the distinguished Senator stated that he felt that inasmuch as the President had declared an all-out war on communism, we should all uphold his hands. I think we all want to uphold his hands.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not quite say that. I said that I would be a little embarrassed immediately to pull the rug out from under his feet. I am in favor of giving him a little latitude. We were pretty rough on him in the last campaign.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that I think the place to clean up communism is not only abroad, but here at home, as the Senator from New Jersey has said. I know that the Senator feels exactly as I

feel on that subject. Why do we go to Greece and spend $400,000,000 to whip communism when we continue a communistic policy in South America? If this administration is sincere in its desire to eradicate communism, why does it not change its foreign policy in Argentina and the rest of the South American countries?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Nebraska has struck gold so far as I am concerned. I spent a month in South America during November and December, and I came to certain very strong conclusions. I was very much gratified when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his pronouncement at Cleveland on foreign policy, stated that our current policy so far as Argentina was concerned was not a matter on which he had been consulted or with which he was in sympathy. He felt that it was time for us to reconsider our policy regarding Argentina, and he indicated that similarly, in China, the time had come for a change of front.

I welcomed that attitude. I appreciate the fact that he had been preoccupied with the European settlement problem, and problems with respect to other areas, as to which he clearly indicated he had not been consulted except in a most casual manner. I assume that in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as soon as we can get a Secretary of State who will be in Washington for a couple of weeks, he would like to have an opportunity to sit down and talk things over, and that that subject would invite most earnest attention. I hope we shall move in that direction. I think it is high time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree in toto with what the distinguished Senator has said. I trust that the condition which he hopes for will come to pass. I suggest to the able Senator that we still have in the State Department Mr. Braden, who is responsible for communistic activities in Argentina. Nothing has been done about it. The administration asks us to spend $400,000,000 in Greece to stop communism. The first place where we should start a clean-up is in our own backyard. Some of the top-flight men in the Department of State are the ones who should be eradicated.

Mr. BREWSTER. The problem is not simple, because in Brazil in the recent election the province of Sao Paulo, with the aid of the Communists, elected a governor. In Chile the President has three Communists in his Cabinet. That is the difficulty with implementing the so-called Presidential program. I was very much interested in the observations of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday as to whether this was a program, a policy, or a doctrine. I think we shall have some difficulty in formulating a policy and a doctrine to deal with this problem. I think it is much better to recognize that in Greece we confront a condition, and we are taking certain action. Under the circumstances as they exist the President's proposal is a part of the problem. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt. In Turkey we have a somewhat different situation.

In those two situations we are at this time under the circumstances taking certain action with the hope, under high heaven, that we shall be enabled as the weeks and months go by to know more about this problem as we come into the struggle with this ideology. Whether Stalin, the men in Moscow, and the Politburo contemplate a world-wide sweep, such as the Nazis planned, can be determined only by events. There are certainly disquieting aspects in the situation. The most disquieting is that so long as there remains a dictatorship we always find situations involving the fomenting of disagreements. We saw in our recent journey to Egypt and the Near East remnants of civilizations of 5,000 years, and we can apply the same formula to them all. That is why, irrespective of the benevolent intentions of Mr. Stalin or anyone else, so long as their governments are dictatorships—and that is what they are, practically—we always find that peril. I think we must recognize it and must take such measures as seem justified to try to serve warning, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that "thus far and no farther shalt thou come. Thou shalt not pass."

That is the basis upon which I go forward with all the reservations I have indicated and with no disparagement or criticism of anyone who may disagree. Here I stand at this time. I can take no other.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of figures regarding lend-lease shipments to the Soviet Union since VJ-day, and related mathematics. I asked the State Department to prepare a factual statement on the subject for the information of the Senate, and for whatever it is worth I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEND-LEASE TO THE U. S. S. R.

I. LEND-LEASE ASSISTANCE TO THE SOVIET UNION DURING THE PERIOD OF HOSTILITIES

Lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union during the period of hostilities amounting to about $11,100,000,000 was rendered under the terms of a master lend-lease agreement with the Soviet Government signed on June 11, 1942. Aid on this basis was ordered halted on VJ-day, September 2, 1945, and no further shipments were made except for goods then in process of loading or in transit to ship-side. Aid rendered from VE-day, May 12, 1945, to VJ-day, September 2, 1945, was solely for support of the Soviet Far Eastern Army and the strengthening of this area for operations against Japan. Ninety-five merchant ships now remain in Soviet possession out of the 126 which were transferred under the terms of the master agreement of June 11, 1942. The Soviet Government has now agreed to commence discussions for settlement of its obligations for lend-lease aid rendered under this agreement. These discussions will include the disposition of the 95 merchant ships.

II. LEND-LEASE SHIPMENTS TO THE SOVIET UNION SINCE VJ-DAY

On VJ-day, September 2, 1945, there remained in warehouses and in production quantities of lend-lease articles which had been ordered for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the period of hostilities. These articles were the residue of a larger quantity of orders, many of which were canceled shortly after the cessation of hostilities in Europe on VE-day, May 12, 1945. On October 15, 1945, an agreement was concluded with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act which reads in part as follows:

"Until July 1, 1949, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1946."

The agreement of October 15, 1945, was concluded independently of the master lend-lease agreement of June 11, 1942.

Under its terms the Government of the United States agreed to deliver and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed to accept under terms of payment stated below a specific quantity of these residual supplies. The supplies included in the schedules of this agreement consist primarily of industrial and transportation equipment fabricated to Soviet specifications. (No arms, ammunition, or implements of war were included for shipment under the agreement of October 15, 1945. It will also be noted from the tables below that no cargo trucks were included in the "pipe-line" schedule.) As a whole this equipment would have brought a limited return if disposed of in the United States as surplus. In many instances contract cancellation charges for material still in production on VJ-day would have been excessive. Up to December 31, 1946, materials valued at $233,000,000 had been transferred to the Soviet Government under this agreement, and only about $17,000,000 of equipment still remained untransferred, either located at warehouses or in production. All transfers are now suspended pending consideration by the Congress.

The articles shipped after VJ-day and up to December 31, 1946, were as follows:

Machine tools	$40,850,000
Steam locomotives (Russian gage)	30,634,000
Generator sets	22,800,000
Cranes, derricks, hoists, etc	8,129,000
Electric rotating equipment	8,633,000
Marine engines	6,824,000
Canned tushonka	4,054,000
Pumps	4,620,000
Crushing equipment	4,135,000
Valves and fittings	5,114,000
Gas-producing equipment	4,177,000
Secondary metal-forming machinery	4,956,000
Diesel electric locomotives (Russian gage)	3,001,000
Industrial trucks and tractors	3,768,000
Fan and blower equipment	3,182,000
Power transmission equipment	3,162,000
Power conversion equipment	3,117,000
Rolling mills and equipment	3,372,000
Mine and quarry machinery	3,690,000
Insulated wire and cable	3,765,000
Bearings	2,893,000
Metal melting and heating furnaces	2,079,000
Welding machinery	2,965,000
Meal-cutting tools	2,289,000
Mine-type locomotives	2,085,000
Leather	2,117,000
Various industrial equipment and materials	46,589,000
Total	233,000,000

The equipment remaining to be transferred to the Soviet Government under the agreement is made up as follows:

Oil-refinery equipment to expand refineries shipped to the U. S. S. R. before the cessation of hostilities Sept. 2, 1945	$6,972,000
Mine hoists	3,058,000
Locomotive-storage batteries	1,777,000
Power equipment	1,272,000
Electrical equipment	945,000
Mining equipment	674,000
Elecuric motors and controllers	350,000
Miscellaneous machinery and equipment	1,648,000
Total	16,696,000

Payment for articles covered by the "pipeline" agreement as set forth above is to be made over a period of 30 years ending in 1975, with interest at 2⅜ percent per annum. The first payment of interest will be due July 1, 1947. The first payment of principal will be due July 1, 1954.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite agree with my friends who state that the world must have a consistent policy in connection with these matters. So far as I can discover from the State Department's letter, three facts stand out: First, that no shipments of civilian lend-lease materials have been made to Russia since VJ-day, except for payment by Russia under the civilian pipe-line agreement concluded under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act.

Second, no lend-lease war materials have been shipped to Russia since VJ-day except those in transit on that date.

Third, no new procurement contracts for civilian or war lend-lease materials for shipment to Russia have been let since VJ-day.

At any rate, the full story is in the document which I presented for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I have the same document which the Senator has offered. It is a fact, is it not, as indicated on page 3 of the letter, that the equipment, which has been sold under lend-lease contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years, ending in 1975, with interest at the rate of 2⅜ percent, includes $16,000,000 of which $6,972,000 is for oil-refinery equipment which has not yet been sent to Russia, but is under agreement to be sold to Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's figures are correct. I am simply referring back to the fact that it is my understanding that this all occurred under an agreement made on October 15, 1945, which was approximately 5 weeks after VJ-day.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator; but the point which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was making yesterday and today was that this material has not yet been sent to Russia. It has been held up because the General Accounting Office would not O. K. authority for a credit of $35,000,000 worth of merchandise, and included in that merchandise is the machinery for refining 100-octane gas. That is a very serviceable piece of equipment for Russia to have, especially if there should be any difficulty in a military way.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's statement is substantially correct. I do not understand that it is an oil refinery, but equipment to expand refineries. It is a distinction without a difference, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will yield a moment further, I should like to say that I happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations and heard the matter discussed when it came up. The members of that committee were surprised, inasmuch as lend-lease had terminated on December 31, 1946, that we were still sending to Russia under 30- and 40-year contracts, at 2⅜ percent interest, equipment which from a military standpoint would certainly meet the needs of that country if there should be military eventualities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's statement is correct, and it is being done, as the record will show, under an agreement made approximately 5 weeks after VJ-day. So far as my viewpoint is concerned, it is a very simple and clear one. I very deeply regret that those shipments are being made, but I shall more deeply regret it if we do not scrupulously keep our word with the Soviet Union with respect to these last lingering contracts, lest we should not be in a totally clear, clean, and positive position to challenge the Soviet Union for its failure to keep its promises and its contracts.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not want the Senator from Michigan to think that I intended to imply that I want the United States to break its word. I should be the last man to give authority to the Comptroller General to send this merchandise over there under the terms on which Russia bought it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it is one of the major contentions of those proposing this bill for military intervention in Greece that the action is necessary to fight communism.

I do not believe there are many people in the United States or many Members of this Senate who believe that it is possible to curb an idea by military methods. I think that has been demonstrated in China; and in that connection I cite a report by Mr. William Newton, a correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a dispatch from Yenan which appeared in the Washington Daily News as recently as March 11.

Of course, Mr. President, since Mr. Newton sent the dispatch, the Central Chinese Government has overrun and captured Yenan. But on March 11, here is what Mr. Newton wrote from Yenan:

YENAN, March 11.—Here in the capital city of Red China the wind is biting cold and the people live in caves in the sides of the mountains.

They have none of the creature comforts of the big cities in the government areas. There is no electricity or water supply system and the only way to go any place is to walk or ride a donkey.

DIFFERENT SPIRIT

Their principal food is millet, a small-grained cereal which the peasants somehow manage to cultivate in the rough mountain country which makes the North Dakota Badlands look like a garden spot.

But there is a spirit here among the people which is too real to put down as Communist window-dressing, or studied propaganda. There's a friendliness among the peasants and the soldier and officials. There's a consideration for the rights and the needs of others which is not seen in many of the Nationalist government areas.

Mr. President, that is a spirit which I believe would accrue to any party or organization which would oppose the unbearable oppression of the reactionary Chinese Government of Chiang Kai-shek. That is the kind of spirit which I believe was in the hearts of the American colonists when they fought for and won freedom from tyranny in 1776.

That is the kind of spirit, Mr. President, which exists in Greece today. And it is not born of communism unless communism is the only force opposing oppression and suffering.

If we aline ourselves with the present Greek Government or the present Chinese Government, we must automatically try to kill that spirit, and I think that is an impossible job.

How much easier would be our task if we aided these oppressed peoples to throw off the yoke of reaction and tyranny, and if we generated for democracy that kind of spirit. How much better it would be, how much more in keeping with our own traditions, if instead of sending arms to the dictators, we would honor the memory of Lafayette by actively aiding other peoples to attain the freedom which Lafayette so nobly helped us achieve.

Mr. Newton's dispatch elaborates on that theme, as follows:

In most of China the people fear the Government. Here in Yenan they feel they are a part of it. The difference is noticeable in a thousand ways as you walk through the dusty streets or call on the officials in their caves or humble offices. You can see it when a soldier helps a peasant find his way, when a farmer calls at a government office, or when a merchant pays his tax bill.

This feeling on the part of the peasant toward his government is new in China and it may be that it is the greatest accomplishment of the Chinese Communist leadership.

That is plain, Mr. President. They have not brought material prosperity to those people, but they have given them a feeling of belonging to their government, of having something to say about their government, of being a part of the scheme of things, and not just being kicked around like dogs, as Chiang Kai-shek does.

I read further from the article:

EVACUATION BEGINS

Today the women and children are being evacuated from Yenan. They pile their possessions on a covered stretcherlike contraption tied between two horses or swaying precariously on a camel. The Nationalist armies are 70 miles away and may try to capture the city at any time. Stores are being boarded up and everything moved back into the mountains.

There is no confusion and no disorder and, surprisingly enough, morale is high. These people really believe they are going to win. It may take 10 years or it may take 100, but they believe it to the depths of their being.

From the standpoint of material possessions it is probable the people of Yenan have no more and perhaps no less than they would have if the city was in Nationalist hands. In the shops and stores the goods are about the same as elsewhere in rural China and the prices are comparable.

There are men here who ride horseback and men in fine fur-lined coats. There are men in tattered animal skins and rags. But rightly or wrongly the peasants here believe in the men who lead them and believe they have a voice and a part in their government.

NO BEGGARS, NO LOAFERS

"We have no rickshaw coolies, no beggars, and no loafers in Yenan," said our interpreter, Ma Moo-ming, a former professor of English at Peking who is now a Communist press officer.

Twenty or thirty peasants were dogging our footsteps as we walked through the town, grinning at us and trying to understand our text-book Chinese.

"Why aren't these men working" we asked Mr. Ma.

"They just came to town to do their marketing," he explained.

The fanciest building in Communist Yenan is a new bank. New currency has been issued by the Communist government, but the basic medium of exchange still is grain.

Mr. President, I have thought it worth while to read that article into the RECORD, just to show that people crave a measure of freedom. We have contended that communism is dictatorial. I am not arguing the point at all; but it seems, at least, that the people of China feel that they have more freedom under the Communists than they do under Chiang Kai-shek. People love freedom, even if they have only a small degree of it. At least what the people in Communist China have today is more than what they had before under Chiang Kai-shek. We have been trying to kill that Chinese spirit. I do not believe it can be done.

On the other hand, we captured Formosa, which had been under Japan for many years, and we turned it over to Chiang Kai-shek. His government robbed the people; it took their crops away from them, and sold the crops back to them at exorbitant prices. The people rebelled. Then Chiang Kai-shek sent his troops there, and they massacred 5,000 of those people and committed terrible atrocities. That simply cannot be continued. Even another government, if set up under those circumstances, might be just as bad; and if we tried to support any government of that type, we would find ourselves in an impossible situation.

Mr. President, I should like to have an article about Formosa printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1947]

FIVE THOUSAND FORMOSANS SLAIN, EDITOR SAYS—YOUTH EMASCULATION, CUTTING OFF OF EARS, MURDER OF HOUSEHOLDERS BLAMED ON CHINESE

Shanghai, March 30.—John W. Powell declared today in an article in his magazine, China Weekly Review, that Chinese troops sent to Formosa to quell riots which started ther February 28 had perpetrated "some of the most unimaginable atrocities."

Powell, son of the late famed editor, J. B. Powell, wrote that a conservative estimate placed the number of Formosans killed at 5,000, with thousands more imprisoned. He has newly returned from a visit to Formosa.

So far as is known, Powell is the only American correspondent who has succeeded in going to and returning from the big island province off China's east coast since rioting began.

GOVERNMENT SILENT

No immediate comment was forthcoming from Chinese Government sources. On March 14 Peng Hsueh-pei, Chinese Minister of Information, told foreign newsmen in Nanking that the Formosan "incident will soon be closed." He declined to assist reporters in going there, saying that the Government was too busy to look after them.

Powell said the disorders culminated a year and a half of flagrant Chinese misrule far worse than the Japanese.

China lost Formosa in 1895; it was restored to her in 1945 after the Japanese surrender.

Powell wrote that the riots were preceded by extremely severe searches of shops and peddler stands by police who, he said, were trying to enforce new economic regulations which virtually abolished private trade. On February 27, he declared, police killed a 40-year-old woman in Taipei (Taihoku), the capital, when she protested seizure of her cigarette tray.

MOB PETITIONS REDRESS

Next day the riots began, he continued, and a mob marched toward Gov. Chen Yi's office to petition for compensation. He said police fired into this crowd and killed four Formosans, wounding several others. He said mobs roamed the streets, grabbing and beating all mainland Chinese they could find and sacking many Chinese homes.

By March 1, he related, rioting had spread to most of the cities. Powell said the Government tried a countermove with flying squads which fired into all crowds with machine guns, and that examination of wounded showed dumdum bullets were used. He said such action killed 25 and wounded 125 Formosans outside the railway station.

He said a truce was arranged with a committee of prominent Formosans who drew up 32 demands which he said would have assured near independence. Powell reported that the Governor, who was expecting troops from the mainland, gave the impression he was making concessions, but when troops arrived March 8 the committee was arrested.

PEOPLE SHOT ON SIGHT

From then on through March 13, he wrote, there was a blood bath, in which troops shot Formosans on sight.

He quoted foreign eyewitnesses as saying in one instance 20 youths in a village between Taipei and Keelung were emasculated and their ears were cut off and noses slit before they were bayoneted and thrown into a creek.

He said one foreign observer watched troops searching houses wantonly shoot down whoever opened the door.

Powell concluded that "with the situation what it is in China today, there is little hope that anything constructive can be done in time to save the island economically or politically for China."

The pro-Government press in Nanking reported on March 26 that more than 70 Formosans had been executed. The official Central News Agency said 100 had been arrested and 3 executed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a telegram from Hon. Aubrey Williams, editor of the Southern Farmer, giving, I believe, a very vital and very excellent program for democracy in Greece.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Nation's leadership is confused. The natural leaders of the people are divided, and appear to be in a frenzy of fear and disillusionment because of the inexplicable course of Russia and the Communists.

Many liberals are rushing into a position which can lead only to a new version of the anti-Comintern pact. The implications of their position grow ominous. They are now allied with those who are demanding that Wallace be prosecuted for stating a position which reflects the sentiments of two-thirds of the American people—as shown by the latest Gallup polls.

The time calls for a simple, clear program which decent, peace-loving Americans can accept. It also calls for a program to which President Truman and his advisers can accede.

If Franklin D. Roosevelt were here, this is the kind of dramatic program he would probably announce:

First. The United States cannot undertake to establish democracy in a nation where a king rules surrounded by monarchists and plutocrats. Help must be conditioned on withdrawal or collapse of these forces.

Second. Order and peace must be restored within Greece. As matters now stand, our Army officers will know nothing except to arm the monarchists and assorted reactionaries. This will inevitably enrage and frustrate the Greek people who have been revolting for 20 years against these forces, despite hunger, privation, and war. We must arm only Greek republicans and democrats. This requires that Americans or UN representatives know something about political philosophy.

Third. We must rebuild the Greek economy. We must do this in a way which the American people will understand, and which is within the framework of our own system. We must not make a lot of Greek plutocrats into tyrannical millionaires in the process. Franklin D. Roosevelt would rebuild the Greek economy in the same way he rebuilt our own:

(A) Provide for electric power, which is basic, by a Greek TVA owned by the Greek people.

(B) Reestablish transportation by first paying off any private individuals who claim ownership of the dilapidated Greek railways. Rebuild these railways in the name of the Greek people to be owned as our own post-office system is owned.

(C) Establish a Greek national bank, similar to our own Federal Reserve System, or the present Bank of England.

(D) Provide for rehabilitation of private productive enterprises through an RFC. Provide for the farm economy through a farm-credit administration based on cooperative loan associations, together with a farm-security administration.

This program will make sense to the American people. It will make sense and give tremendous encouragement to democrats everywhere. It will win the support of all middle-of-the-road nations, such as Britain, the Dominions, the Scandinavians, France, Central and South America.

This program can be undertaken by American leadership acting under the sponsorship of the United Nations. If the world is in great danger, we should act to win spontaneous support of all democratic nations.

If this makes sense to you, talk it over with others who may be potentially interested. America's great need today is for a positive program to strengthen democracy, rather than a negative program aimed solely at a futile attempt to stop communism without offering anything better than the strengthening of autocracy and dictatorship.

NOTE.—The above material is the basis of article to be printed in Southern Farmer 2 weeks hence. It may be used with or without credit.

SOUTHERN FARMER,
AUBREY WILLIAMS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT IN THE WEST

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter I have received from Mr. Lynn Crandall, watermaster of district No. 38 at Idaho Falls, Idaho. Mr. Crandall's letter, addressed to all of the Members of the Idaho delegation, points out a very serious threat to continued irrigation development in Idaho, and throughout the West, in S. 972.

In Idaho, and in most other areas of the West, it is possible to use that portion of the reservoir space of a multiple-purpose project which is allotted to flood control both for flood control and for the storage of the irrigation water. That dual use of the storage space, in fact, is the difference between feasibility and nonfeasibility of many projects.

Mr. Crandall points out that section 4 of S. 972 would prohibit such dual use and, therefore, greatly impair the usefulness of our western multiple-purpose dams. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be incorporated in my remarks in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF RECLAMATION,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, April 4, 1947.

Hon. GLEN TAYLOR,
Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
Hon. ABE MCG. GOFF,
Members, Idaho Congressional Delegation.

DEAR SIRS: Beginning on page 2379 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1947, there is printed a copy of S. 972, declaration of public power policy, and comments thereon by the author of the bill.

Section 4 of the proposed bill implies that the flood-control space in a multipurpose project shall be dedicated exclusively to flood control. Such a requirement may be advisable in regions where floods may occur unexpectedly at any time from heavy rainfall. In such regions it might be necessary that the flood space should always be available to store floodwaters when they come.

In the Rocky and other western mountains, however, the floods come from the melting snows during May and June and can be foretold quite accurately from the snow surveys made from January to April. Based on such snow surveys sufficient flood-control space can be vacated in time to adequately control these snow-water floods. At the same time considerable water can usually be retained in the flood space by the time the peak flow has gone and provide a valuable addition to the reservoir supply for use during the subsequent summer months. In the arid regions the entire development of the country is dependent on the conservation and fullest use of the available water supply. In multipurpose projects such as Palisades Reservoir the irrigators expect to buy the entire active reservoir capacity, the irrigation and flood-control space to be used jointly for flood control based on study of snow-survey results by a committee representing the Bureau of Reclamation, United States engineers, and the water users.

When this bill (S. 972) is being considered the proposed section 4 should be amended to provide for a more flexible procedure in mountain regions where the floodwaters come from melting snow.

The usefulness of Palisades and other western reservoirs would be greatly impaired if it was made impossible by statute to retain any water in the flood-control space, when that could safely be done, for later beneficial use.

Very truly yours,

LYNN CRANDALL,
Watermaster, District No. 36.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Thomas M. Robinson, of Montana, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Montana, in place of Lewis Penwell.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

T. Vincent Quinn, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, help us to see clearly that the pace at which we are living these days shuts Thee out of our minds and hearts, and leaves us, even with good intentions, to wander in the misty land of half-truth and compromise.

Deliver us, O God, from the God-helps-those-who-help-themselves philosophy, which is really a cloak for sheer unbelief in Thy ability and willingness to take care of us and our affairs.

Give to us a passion for that which is in principle excellent, rather than in politics expedient, for that which is morally right rather than socially correct.

These things we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 18, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Pepper
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lodge	Thye
Connally	Lucas	Tobey
Cooper	McCarran	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Downey	McFarland	Watkins
Dworshak	McGrath	Wherry
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ecton	McMahon	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
George	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JED JOHNSON TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Keefe, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for payment of compensation to the Government of Switzerland for losses and damages acknowledged to have been inflicted by United States Army Air Force units during World War II, and authorizing appropriations therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HELIUM-BEARING GAS DEPOSITS IN NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, N. MEX.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

AUDIT REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report of a contract entered into by that Commission for the period January 1–April 1, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DECEMBER 1946 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the month of December 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

A letter from the executive secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war authorized under licenses issued by the Secretary of State, for the year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Church League for Industrial Democracy, New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions of members of the Sanford Townsend Club, No. 1, the Cassadaga Townsend Club, No. 1, and the St. Cloud Townsend Club, No. 1, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Miss J. Reimers, of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against any curb on labor unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. AIKEN:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the preservation of the richness of our topsoil is necessary for the welfare of Vermont and our Nation; and

"Whereas for the past 11 years the United States Department of Agriculture has made assistance available to some 12,000 Vermont farmers to restore and maintain the fertility of the soil; and

"Whereas Vermont farmers have matched the Government funds almost dollar for dollar in carrying on this soil-improvement program; and

"Whereas the conservation needs of Vermont are far in excess of what are now being met; and

"Whereas we believe it is the responsibility of society to see that our soil resources are maintained for America's yet unborn; and

"Whereas we believe that the health of all our citizens will be protected by the production of food on soils rich in minerals such as calcium, phosphorus, and potash; and

"Whereas we believe that farmers will be forced to exploit and drain the soil fertility if the agricultural conservation program is curtailed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the thirty-ninth biennial session of the Legislature of the State of Vermont:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to continue the appropriation for the United States Department of Agriculture to carry on the agricultural conservation program;

"2. That our United States Senators, GEORGE D. AIKEN and RALPH E. FLANDERS, and our Representative in Congress, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, be asked to support the agricultural conservation program and to vote to continue the annual appropriation of $300,000,000; and

"3. That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this memorial to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to our congressional delegation.

"Approved April 16, 1947.

"ERNEST W. GIBSON,
"Governor."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 266

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give immediate consideration to the restoration of the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the United States Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor

"Whereas the United States Division of Labor Standards, one of the oldest in the Labor Department of the United States, has done outstanding work in protecting industrial workers by securing raising of standards in the way of laws to secure shorter hours, higher wages, and by making the conditions under which they work safer by providing information of every kind which has been helpful to the directors and administrators of the labor departments of 48 States; and

"Whereas said Division has operated in such a manner that it has aroused the interest of and been adapted as a model for operation by other countries which have sent delegates here from the Far East, Europe, and South America to study methods of administering their own departments of labor; and

"Whereas the lower House in Congress has omitted to appropriate anything for this Division of Labor Standards and, in order to carry on the excellence of the work of this Division adequate appropriation must be provided by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use every effort to have the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of said Division of Labor Standards restored immediately; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to Mr. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, to Senator Styles Bridges, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and to Hon. John Taber, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations."

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 21

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Oregon, in the forty-fourth regular session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas many Indians from various tribes gather at and in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, located in Wasco County, State of Oregon, to fish at said Celilo Falls on said Columbia River and elsewhere; and

"Whereas these rights of the Indians to fish have existed and have been continued and maintained for many generations, and granted to said Indians under the treaty of June 9, 1855, with the Government of the United States of America and otherwise, and are the principal source of livelihood and food for many of said Indians; and

"Whereas said fishing operations by said Indians are a valuable source of attraction to thousands of motorists and tourists annually as they drive along the Columbia River Highway, since these fishing grounds are adjacent to said highway, and said motorists and tourists usually stop and view and visit them; and

"Whereas the present buildings for many years past used by said Indians at said Celilo Falls are entirely inadequate, unsanitary, unsightly and very dangerous not only to said Indians who are compelled to use them, but also to the traveling public, and are without sewer connections or disposal or water supply whatsoever, which leaves a bad impression on out-of-State tourists as well as to jeopardize the health and welfare of said Indians who must dwell there; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Indian Affairs is the appropriate and responsible governmental agency to relieve and remedy this deplorable and long-endured situation; and

"Whereas the Columbia River Indians have long lived at Celilo Village and are without any reservation such as other Indian tribes enjoy and their long and continued residence there makes them familiar with conditions at and near Celilo Falls and Celilo Village: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, hereby do petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to take the proper steps to immediately have removed the shacks and filth in the present Indian quarter on that certain 7½ acres of Government land at Celilo

Village in said county and State, and to have properly and adequately constructed, suitable and appropriate buildings and dwellings for the use of said Indians, as well as an adequate pure and sanitary water supply; also an adequate sewer system and/or sewage-disposal system to take care of each building and/or dwelling, as well as properly equipped rest rooms, containing wash basins, urinals, toilets, and shower baths, for the use of both said Indian Village as well as the tourists, and general public on the adjacent Columbia River Highway.

"Adopted by house April 3, 1947.

"Adopted by senate April 4, 1947."

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas it is possible to maintain livestock in health in the United States only by exercising vigilance to prevent the incidence and spread of communicable diseases of such livestock; and

"Whereas there is now prevalent in Mexico a highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock known as epizootic aphtha, or, more commonly, hoof-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas there is urgent necessity for preventing the spread of such disease across the international boundary line to livestock in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of said disease of livestock, and authorizing the Department of Agriculture of the United States through its Bureau of Animal Industry, and other appropriate Federal departments and bureaus, to render expert advice and practical assistance to the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of controlling and eradicating communicable diseases of cattle and other livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate March 20, 1947.

"Concurred in by house March 27, 1947."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 19

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the processing and marketing of crab meat is an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska that is capable of supplying the needs of the United States for such product, if given a fair opportunity so to do; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign crab meat has hampered the development of this industry and will, if unrestricted, seriously curtail and impede the growth and development of an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed, or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, to the Committee on Finance.

"House Joint Memorial 18

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the State of Oregon by extending public assistance on the basis of individual need bears more than 50 percent of the cost in many instances especially for recipients of blind assistance and aid to dependent children because of existing Federal maximums for purposes of matching funds; and

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act contains no provision for Federal matching funds for the aid of the parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children receiving aid to dependent children; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon, in order to extend assistance to all needy persons in accordance with their needs irrespective of cause, is providing general assistance and to the extent of 85 percent of such total expenditures, there being no Federal financial participation through grants-in-aid for general assistance; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon through general assistance is expending large sums of money for medical care for persons who are receiving old-age assistance, aid to the blind and aid to dependent children as well as medical care for other needy persons who are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind or aid to dependent children.

"Whereas foster family home care is provided to a large number of dependent and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent by the State of Oregon at a considerable cost from general assistance funds; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon carries sole financial responsibility for the administration of general assistance; and

"Whereas the present limitations in the Federal matching maximums particularly with respect to aid to the blind and aid to dependent children and the lack of Federal financial participation in the assistance of all other needy persons and dependent children as well as in the administration and expenditures of general assistance place excessive demands upon general taxpayers of Oregon, and constitute an increasingly serious financial burden for the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully petition and request that the Congress of the United States, during the present session thereof, do enact appropriate amendments to the grants-in-aid program of the Federal Social Security Act providing: (1) for the elimination of Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children, and the deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, (2) for Federal financial participation in assistance to a parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children who are recipients of aid to dependent children, (3) for Federal grants-in-aid to States for general assistance to any needy person as well as for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, (4) for Federal financial participation in the costs of medical services made available to needy persons under State public-assistance programs and in assistance payments to needy sick persons who reside in public or private medical institutions other than mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanitaria, (5) for Federal grants-in-aid or other appropriate provision of Federal aid to States in providing foster family home care for children in accordance with their individual needs, (6) for Federal financial participation in the administration of general assistance, including such welfare services as the States provide through the staff of the public welfare agency to help persons become self-supporting or avoid becoming dependent, and to contribute to their general welfare.

"Adopted by house March 13, 1947.

"Adopted by senate March 28, 1947."

CONSERVATION PAYMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF STRIPPER WELLS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution 24 of the Kansas Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 24

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof

Whereas oil in the United States is one of the principal sources of taxable revenue from which funds are derived for building and maintaining roads and schools; and

Whereas there are thousands of independent oil operators who own neither gathering lines, pipe lines, refineries, nor marketing systems, and who depend upon the sale of crude oil from their stripper wells to maintain their business, and support their families, while other thousands of men are employed in producing this oil; and

Whereas the stripper-well oil in the United States is estimated to represent 25 percent of our known national reserves of 20,000,000,000 barrels and is vitally needed to supplement production from newer fields to give our Nation adequate reserves so essential to our national security; and

Whereas as a nation we have entered upon an era of changing economy made necessary by labor-saving machinery, shorter working hours, and a higher standard of living among the laboring classes of people, which system of economy has resulted in laws being passed by Congress regulating wages and hours of workmen employed in producing oil from stripper wells, and other laws such as social

security, and workmen's compensation which tend to fix the lifting costs of a barrel of oil regardless of the posted price thereof, so that when and if the posted price should decline to a point where the operators can no longer meet the requirements fixed by Congress and still realize a profit, they will be forced to plug and abandon their wells and thus cause wholesale unemployment, loss to the State in a taxable commodity, and a loss to the Nation of a large percent of our national reserves; and

Whereas a practical oil-conservation law would prevent the abandonment of these stripper wells before all practical known methods of recovery (secondary recovery) have been utilized thus adding millions of barrels to our recoverable reserves so vitally needed for the welfare of our people and the safety of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact such laws as will provide a reasonable conservation payment designed to protect and preserve the stripper well reserves of the United States, and will protect and preserve for the benefit of our Nation the millions of barrels of crude oil that otherwise would be lost, to the great detriment and deterioration of our national resources, the producing wealth therefrom, the employment afforded, and the revenue from taxation therefrom derived; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members from Kansas in the Congress of the United States.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.)

PROHIBITION AGAINST ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition signed by 263 citizens of Wichita, Kans., requesting the Congress to pass Senate bill 265, which prohibits the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic beverages over the radio. The petitioners insist that "the most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased." I present this petition and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2849. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 534. A bill to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services; without amendment (Rept. No. 108).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 522. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 109);

H. R. 173. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 112);

H. R. 193. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 118);

H. R. 490. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 113);

H. R. 729. A bill to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 114);

H. R. 804. A bill authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte project; without amendment (Rept. No. 115); and

H. R. 1584. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; with an amendment (Rept. No. 119).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 583. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 110); and

S. 800. A bill to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber; without amendment (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 666. A bill providing for payment of $300 to each enrolled member of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., from joint funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 117).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 2199. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 116).

STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY BUREAU OF CENSUS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Civil Service, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 614) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census), and I submit a report (No. 106) thereon. I will state for the information of the Senate that this report was ordered by unanimous vote of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1133. A bill providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH (by request):

S. 1134. A bill for the relief of Vito Antonio Piccinnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1135. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1136. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1137. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1138. A bill to prevent nepotism in appointments to governmental offices and positions; and

S. 1139. A bill to amend the Classification Act of March 4, 1923, as amended, to create a Mechanical Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1140. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, so as to provide that funds appropriated for secondary and feeder roads may be expended by the States on projects without securing approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which I ask may be appropriately referred and printed. At a later time during the day, I hope to be able briefly to explain the purport of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and be printed.

RESCINDING OF ORDER RELATING TO PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 22, 1947, I had an order entered, which I now ask be withdrawn. I have reference to placing on the calendar the amount of money involved in the claims bills on the calendar. I ask that that order be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is withdrawn.

HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, on Monday, May 5, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands will begin hearings on a bill to remove the 160-acre limitation in the Central Valley project, and having secured the consent of the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the main committee, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be allowed to hold the hearings in the afternoons as well as in the forenoons.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent that the committee, which is about to begin hearings on a tax bill, be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reason that I wish to attend the funeral of the late Representative Fred Norman, in Raymond, Wash., I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from Wednesday of this week through Saturday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, in order to attend the meetings of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy, and to attend to other necessary public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from Wednesday through next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

IS THERE AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO STRIKE?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR SMITH

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is There an Absolute Right To Strike?" written by him, and published in the Repubican, for April 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The First Hundred Days," delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, at a Jefferson Day meeting, Indianapolis, Ind., April 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM GREEN ON PROPOSED ANTIDISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on proposed antidiscrimination legislation delivered by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, at a dinner meeting of the board of directors of the National Council for Permanent FEPC, in Washington, D. C., April 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—STATEMENT BY GAEL SULLIVAN

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the accomplishments of the Democratic Party, by Gael Sullivan, executive director of the Democratic National Committee, broadcast over the radio on April 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRICE PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Price Problem," written by Chester Bowles, and published in the New York Times Magazine of April 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAMILY FARM VERSUS FACTORY FARM—ARTICLE BY MOST REV. ROBERT J. ARMSTRONG

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Family Farm Versus Factory Farm," written by Most Rev. Robert J. Armstrong and published in the magazine America for April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONCENTRATION IN AGRICULTURE—EDITORIAL FROM AMERICA

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Central Valley Project and United States Land Policy" published in the magazine America for April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SO-CALLED TRUMAN DOCTRINE—ADDRESS BY ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The So-Called Truman Doctrine, recently delivered by Alfred Baker Lewis, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY—ADVERTISEMENT IN THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Why We Are Opposed to the Ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty," from the Washington Post of April 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO WILEY O. COUCH, OF HAMILTON COUNTY, TENN.

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Judge Couch Worked, Lived for Others," published in the South Pittsburg Hustler, of South Pittsburg, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

DIVIDED LOYALTIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Divided Loyalties," published in the Chattanooga News-Free Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

HUNGER, CANALS, AND OIL FIELDS IN THE NEAR EAST—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL GUY INMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Hunger, Canals, and Oil Fields in the Near East," delivered by Samuel Guy Inman, guest professor of international relations, Ohio Wesleyan University, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE—STATEMENT BY FRED P. MYERS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the so-called Truman doctrine, written by Fred P. Myers, attorney, of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED LOAN TO GREECE AND TURKEY—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the President of the United States regarding the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—ADDRESS BY WILSON WYATT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on April 8, 1947, by Wilson W. Wyatt, national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDS TO FIGHT CANCER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK EVENING NEWS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Give To Conquer Cancer," published in the April 1, 1947, issue of the Newark Evening News, which appears in the Appendix.]

TIME FOR DEBATE ON GRECO-TURKISH LOAN BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as Senators know, under the unanimous-consent agreement we are to vote on the pending measure and all amendments at 4 o'clock tomorrow. I wish to call the attention of Senators who are opposing this measure to the fact if they anticipate they will take any time tomorrow, they should so inform me, in order that I may list them. Up to the present time, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated that he wants about 40 minutes. I shall need about 40 minutes myself. If there are going to be other speeches in opposition to the measure, perhaps the Senate should meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow; I do not know. That can be decided later, if requests come in for additional time; but it seems to me that we shall almost have to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock, if we are going to accommodate Senators who will desire to speak.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I have a speech that will take about 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator want to make that speech tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make it to a full Senate if possible. If I can do it tomorrow, I shall be very happy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will it be in opposition?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be in opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is good news, I may say to the Senator, and certainly we will arrange all the time the Senator may need, within our limitation. I understand that a great many speeches will be made. I have one myself on the amendments I have proposed which will take about an hour. I have had to accommodate myself to the convenience of other Senators heretofore, but today at some time I expect to be able to speak on some of the amendments which I have proposed. I simply wanted to say to the majority leader that we may have to run a little late tonight, I do not know. I shall require an hour some time today in which to make my remarks, and if it gets along toward the dinner hour, I hope Senators will not be offended if I shall then be speaking. I feel that it is absolutely necessary for me to make the speech I have in mind. Tomorrow I shall use about 40 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was not present in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent agreement was reached. I had rather assumed that the hour fixed for the time of voting gave ample time for everyone who might desire to speak; but if there is doubt about that, I think an effort should be made to provide time this afternoon. My own belief about the situation is that we shall dispose of the calendar within a reasonably short time, or any motions that might be made with respect to bills on the calendar, and that we can then proceed with the discussion of the unfinished business, the Greek-Turkish loan bill, for, I was about to say, unlimited time. So I would be disposed, so far as I can control the situation, to hold the Senate here until 6 o'clock or thereabouts this evening, if that would be of accommodation to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I think that will probably be necessary today. But the point I wish to have the Senator consider at this time, to be decided later, is whether tomorrow we shall meet at 11 o'clock, or whether we shall meet at 12. The vote is to be taken at 4 p. m., and that will give only 4 hours tomorrow, 2 hours for each side.

Mr. WHITE. If at the end of the day it appears that Members have not had a full opportunity to discuss the bill as they wish, I shall take the responsibility of moving a recess until 11 a. m., instead of 12 noon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The only resolution coming over from a previous day is that of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] dealing with the unfinished business, and the Chair assumes that it will be passed over.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

The routine morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order. The clerk will state the bills on the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. McGRATH. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the importation of garbage derived from products originating outside of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2535) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS AND OTHER SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2413) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over under objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want to give notice that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar a motion will be made to take up the bill which has just gone over, Calendar No. 68, House bill 2413, an act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 526), to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 81), authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BUTLER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 564), to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1017), providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, and transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), amending rule XXII relating to cloture, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

REGIONAL DISBURSING OFFICERS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 907), to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 249b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in case of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer or any regional disbursing officer of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, the accounts of such Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer may be continued and payments made in his name by an Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or by an assistant regional disbursing officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or designated by an official of the Treasury Department authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury to make such designation, for a period of time not to extend beyond the last day of the second month following the month in which such death, resignation, or separation shall occur. Such accounts and payments shall be allowed, audited, and settled in the General Accounting Office, and the checks signed in the name of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer shall be honored by the Treasurer of the United States, in the same manner as if the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer had continued in office. The former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer, his estate, or the surety on his official bond, shall not be subject to any legal liability or

penalty for the official acts and defaults of the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or assistant regional disbursing officer acting in the name or in the place of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer under this act, but the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or the assistant regional disbursing officer, and his surety, shall be responsible therefor under his bond. The bond of the Acting Chief Disbursing Officer or acting regional disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the Chief Disbursing Officer or the regional disbursing officer, respectively. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer, or the assistant regional disbursing officer, to renew and increase his bond to the United States."

HAROLD TURCEAN

The bill (S. 53), conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harold Turcean, a native of Rumania who lived in the United States from the time he was 3 years old, enlisted in the Army of the United States (serial No. 36576489) for service in World War II, and was killed in action in Normandy on June 10, 1944, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

FRANK SCHINDLER

The bill (S. 135), to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby directed to record the entry into the United States of Frank Schindler at New York City, N. Y., on June 11, 1939, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws. The Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one the immigration quota for Czechoslovakia for the first year that such quota may be available.

ANNA M. KINAT (MRS. JOHN P. TAYLOR)

The bill (S. 166) for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation in the case of the alien, Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor), and she shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which said warrant and order have issued.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1023) to amend the act of March 14, 1944, to include Coast Guard personnel in the exemption from payment of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The bill (S. 460) to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe a reading of the bill itself—which is very short—will give the explanation that is necessary. It is as follows:

SEC. 327. (h) The officers in charge of property owned or leased by the Government are authorized, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General, to provide quarters, without payment of rent, in any building occupied by the Service, for a photographic studio, operated by welfare organizations without profit and solely for the benefit of persons seeking to comply with requirements under the immigration and nationality laws. Such studio shall be under the supervision of the Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I, subchapter III, section 327, subsection (h), of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1151; 8 U. S. C. 727 (h)), be and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 327. (h) The officers in charge of property owned or leased by the Government are authorized, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General, to provide quarters, without payment of rent, in any building occupied by the Service, for a photographic studio, operated by welfare organizations without profit and solely for the benefit of persons seeking to comply with requirements under the immigration and nationality laws. Such studio shall be under the supervision of the Commissioner."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I give notice that after consideration of bills on the calendar has been concluded I shall move the consideration of House bill 2404.

The bill (S. 273) to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? If no Senator is ready at this moment to make an explanation, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCOME FROM AGRICULTURAL LABOR AND NURSING SERVICES

The bill (S. 1072) to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants in aid under the Social Security Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (f) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 72), as amended (57 Stat. 125; 59 Stat. 80), and section 5 (f) of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (58 Stat. 15), are each amended by striking out "prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to July 1, 1949."

FARM LOANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The bill (S. 245) to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, particularly in view of the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture which appears in the report of the committee which accompanies the bill. In his letter the Secretary refers to a broad general report, and suggests that the bill should be held over until that report has been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a similar bill was unanimously passed by the Senate last year. The bill simply proposes to do the same thing for the farm boy that is now being done for the city boy. The RFC cares for the second mortgages of the veterans, and this gives the right at the present time to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to take over the second mortgages from the various banks. The Corporation has asked that we pass this bill in order to do for the farm boy the same thing we are doing for the city boy. We have money, and the Corporation can not lend it now because the farmers seem to be paying off instead of borrowing. One billion dollars in the possession of the Corporation are now lying idle. This money can be made use of in that field, and the Corporation wants to go into that field. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the Secretary of Agriculture had asked that the bill go over?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said that the Secretary in his letter said, as shown on page 2 of the report accompanying the bill:

Thus the future status of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation will be up for consideration by Congress after March 1, 1947.

My question was only a technical one. If the report referred to by the Secretary has not been rendered, I wonder if we should pass the bill before we consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the question by saying that, regardless of the future status of the Corporation, this part of the agricultural program for it will have to be carried on regardless.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 245) was considered, ordered to be en-

grossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1020d), is amended by inserting after the first sentence of said section the following new sentence: "The Corporation is further authorized to purchase from approved lenders, for cash, loans made under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended, for such prices and upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors of the Corporation finds appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

AMENDMENT OF THE PLANT QUARANTINE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 338) to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "stock", to insert "and bulbs"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "stock", to insert "and bulbs"; in line 7, after the word "stock", to insert "or bulbs", and in line 9, after the word "stock", to strike out "is" and insert "or bulbs are", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, be amended by adding thereto a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. In order to protect American agriculture, horticulture, and forestry from injurious insect pests and plant diseases new to or not widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to limit entry of nursery stock and bulbs from foreign countries to that needed for propagation purposes, under such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary, including the requirement, if necessary, that such nursery stock and bulbs be grown under postentry quarantine by or under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture for the purpose of determining whether imported nursery stock or bulbs may be infested or infected with plant pest not discernible by port-of-entry inspection and provided that if imported nursery stock or bulbs are found to be infested or infected with such plant pests, he is authorized to prescribe remedial measures as he may deem necessary to prevent the spread thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

REINCORPORATION OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The bill (S. 993) to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank has been chartered under the laws of the District of Columbia, and it is essential that it continue to operate after June 30, 1948, when the charter expires. The bank operates under a Federal charter. That is all there is to the bill. It does not change the provisions of the charter at all. It allows the continuation of the charter for a 5-year period.

Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank has beyond any question at all made the finest record of any Federal agency that I know of. It is operated with great efficiency. It has been ably managed. There is no criticism of it in any sense of the word. I recommend the passage of the bill. The Committee on Banking and Currency also unanimously recommends its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 526, 666), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a corporation with the name Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall be an agency of the United States of America. The objects and purposes of the bank shall be to aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its Territories or insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof. In connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes, the bank is authorized and empowered to do a general banking business except that of circulation; to receive deposits; to purchase, discount, rediscount, sell, and negotiate, with or without its endorsement or guaranty, and to guarantee notes, drafts, checks, bills of exchange, acceptances, including bankers' acceptances, cable transfers, and other evidences of indebtedness; to purhase, sell, and guarantee securities, but not to purchase with its funds any stock in any other corporation, except that it may acquire any such stock through the enforcement of any lien or pledge or otherwise to satisfy a previously contracted indebtedness to it; to accept bills and drafts drawn upon it; to issue letters of credit; to purchase and sell coin, bullion, and exchange; to borrow and to lend money; to perform any act herein authorized in participation with any other person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association; to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to sue and to be sued, to complain and to defend in any court of competent jurisdiction; and the enumeration of the foregoing powers shall not be deemed to exclude other powers necessary to the achievement of the objects and purposes of the bank. The bank shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government. The bank is hereby authorized to use all of its assets and all moneys which have been or may hereafter be allocated to or borrowed by it in the exercise of its functions. Net earnings of the bank after reasonable provision for possible losses shall be used for payment of dividends on capital stock. Any such dividends shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 2. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out from section 6 thereof the words "Such obligations shall be redeemable at the option of the bank before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations and shall have such maturity and bear such rate of interest as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the bank with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury" and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Such obligations shall be redeemable at the option of the bank before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the bank with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the bank."

SEC. 3. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out section 8 therefrom and substituting in lieu thereof a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. Export-Import Bank of Washington shall continue to exercise its functions in connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes until the close of business on June 30, 1953, but the provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing the bank from acquiring obligations prior to such date which mature subsequent to such date or from assuming prior to such date liability as guarantor, endorser, or acceptor of obligations which mature subsequent to such date or from issuing, either prior or subsequent to such date, for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which mature subsequent to such date or from continuing as a corporate agency of the United States and exercising any of its functions subsequent to such date for purposes of orderly liquidation, including the administration of its assets and the collection of any obligations held by the bank."

SEC. 4. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is hereby amended by the addition of a section 12 as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Export-Import Bank of Washington created hereby shall by virtue of this act succeed to all of the rights and assume all of the liabilities of Export-Import Bank of Washington, a District of Columbia corporation, and any outstanding capital stock of the District of Columbia corporation shall be deemed to have been issued by and shall be capital stock of the corporation created by this act, and all of the personnel, property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds now available), assets, contracts, obligations, and liabilities of the District of Columbia corporation are hereby transferred to, accepted, and assumed by the corporation created by this act without the necessity of any act or acts on the part of the corporation created by this act or of the District of Columbia corporation, their officers, employees, or agents, or of any other department or agency of the United States, to carry out the purposes hereof, and it shall be unnecessary to take any further action to effect the dissolution or liquidation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, a District of Columbia corporation. The members of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia corporation, appointed pursuant to the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, shall, during the unexpired portion of the terms for which they were appointed, continue in office as members of the Board of Directors of the corporation created by this act."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and prevent monopolistic labor practices, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, looking at the calendar I notice that there is in conference House Concurrent Resolution 20, having to do with expenditures for the fiscal year 1948. I notice that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is one of the conferees. It is my recollection—I have not verified it—that the Senate passed on the total budget near the end of February, almost 2 months ago. I was curious to know whether any common guess had been arrived at by the conferees so that they could bring their estimate or guess back to the Senate so that we could hear about it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am unable to testify as to a common guess or any other kind of a guess. I can say that there has been no agreement among the conferees.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, can the able Senator tell me when he expects an agreement among the conferees upon the so-called legislative budget, which has been under discussion for months?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I regret to say that I cannot make a durable estimate.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it the intention ultimately to submit to the Senate some kind of a report on the proposal for a $6,000,000,000 cut or a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cut?

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as I am concerned, there is such an intention.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been rumored that all that was expected to be done with respect to the budget was to let the subject lie in conference and there die a peaceful death. I wonder if there is anything to that rumor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have no authority for giving any credence to that or many other rumors floating around.

Mr. LUCAS. I was sure that the able Senator would not want it to lie unacted on in conference, because I know that he took the position that four and a half billion was all that could be cut from the budget. He was very adamant in his position, and apparently has been so in the conference, for which I congratulate him. But it seems to me, in all seriousness, that we should have a decision of the conferees at the earliest possible time, especially in view of the fact that we are starting tomorrow, as the Senator knows, on a very important tax matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am in hearty agreement with the last statement of the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I was sure he would agree with me. I hope we may have some enlightening information about the tremendous budget which occasioned so much discussion in the early days of the Congress.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, along the same line, I wonder how the conference committee could agree on any figures when the President keeps changing his figures.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not believe there has been any change in the Executive budget, as indicated by the Senator from Indiana. If he is talking about a change in the estimate of income, there has been a change, of course, because of day-to-day fluctuations. As I understand, the Chief Executive has made no suggestion for a change in the budget which he submitted to the Congress at the first of the year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that as to the fiscal year 1947 the President has admitted an error of approximately $3,000,000,000 in his estimate of receipts.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator think that from a New Dealer's standpoint $3,000,000,000 is a small mistake?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I am afraid so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in addition to the estimate of receipts being larger, I may say furthermore that the President's last estimate with respect to expenditures is one and a quarter billion dollars under what he estimated in January.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that that ought to help the conferees very materially to submit some indication of what they think. Under the present administration taxes are coming in, and business is proceeding at a good level. I wish the conferees could bring back to us, so that we could see it, their common guess, or, as the Senator from Colorado put it in the debates, a rough judgment.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 97, House bill 2404, to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "articles," to insert "(other than copper sulphate)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the committee amendment is designed to exempt copper sulfate from the 2-year suspension of the copper-import tax which is proposed by the bill. The committee took testimony on the production and consumption of copper sulfate in this country, and found that there is no shortage, but that, on the contrary, we have been exporting copper sulfate; and no theory was advanced by anyone as to why the suspension should apply to that particular commodity.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret that I have been absent from the Chamber during the discussion of the bill. Notice was given by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as to another bill, and I thought that would take precedence.

I ask the Senator from Colorado if he has inserted in the RECORD the letter which he received from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not done so, but I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado to insert that letter in the RECORD, because many of us who would be opposed to the bill had it not been for the letter from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House will now permit the bill to pass with no opposition at this time, based upon the express statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. Had it not been for that letter written to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, many of us would have vigorously opposed this bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am among those who would have joined in resistance to the bill in its present form had it not been for the receipt of the letter which I shall now read to the Senate, from Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. The letter is dated April 17, 1947, and reads as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1947.

Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that there is some apprehension in the Senate that the 2-year suspension of the 4-cents-per-pound import tax on copper as provided by H. R. 2404, is excessive and that during such period of suspension, copper imports might increase to such an extent as to injure our domestic copper producers and that those sharing this view favor a shorter period of suspension. Senator, may I say to you that these fears were also expressed by certain Members of the House, when the measure was before our committee and in the House. At that time I gave my personal assurance that if copper imports should increase to a point where they jeopardized domestic production I would immediately use my best efforts to have the 4-cent tariff rate reimposed without delay. Speaker MARTIN and Majority Leader HALLECK gave similar assurances.

I now renew that pledge and in talking with MARTIN and HALLECK less than an hour ago they again gave assurances that the 4-

cent import tax on copper would be reimposed if imports were to assume such proportions as to jeopardize the domestic copper industry.

Please feel free to make the contents of this letter known to your colleagues if you so wish.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that letter is, of course, comforting to those of us from the States where copper is produced, because we have been very much disturbed about the length of time as provided in the bill. At the moment there is a great quantity of copper needed in American industry. The normal consumption in the United States prior to the war was about 600,000 tons. It went up to approximately 1,000,000 tons during the war, and the normal capacity to produce now is approximately 900,000 tons. When the pipe lines are filled and when business gets to going again we are very well satisfied that the American mines can produce the copper necessary for the country. On the other hand, there is an available production abroad amounting to approximately 2,000,000 tons, and from what can be learned with reference to the European demand they cannot absorb that amount, so that there will be somewhere from one-half million to 750,000 tons of copper available for importation to this country. If importations build up a great surplus of copper, at the end of 2 years our mines will be forced to shut down.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to remind the Senate that of course legislation of this kind originates in the House. I assure the senior Senator from Arizona that if any of these dangers should materialize, I, as chairman of the Committee on Finance, would give the heartiest cooperation toward remedying the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if the major problem is not really one of price rather than that of difficulty in obtaining copper. In other words, is it not true that copper could be obtained by paying 4 cents extra, just as it could be by repealing this act?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is a strong price element. At the present time the world market for copper, as I understand, is approximately 26 cents per pound. Our domestic price is about 21½ cents. An independent fabricator in this country not having his own domestic copper supply might have to go to the world market and pay 26 cents and an additional 4 cents representing the tax. That puts him at a severe disadvantage with our domestic fabricators who also produce copper domestically and thus are in position to control that production.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator further if it is not a fact that these same fabricators are protected by a tariff on the finished copper, but yet they are asking for repeal of the tariff on the raw copper which they themselves fabricate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They are protected as is the domestic producer-fabricator. As the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said, there is no doubt at all that there is an annual copper shortage at the present time in the order of 400,000 tons to 500,000 tons.

Mr. McFARLAND. I concede, Mr. President, that there is a shortage of copper. I was willing to compromise on this legislation for a shorter period of time, but I feel very definitely that there is danger in repealing this provision of the tariff law for 2 years. I am forced reluctantly to accept the judgment of the majority who are also interested in the protection of the copper industry with respect to the 2-year period of repeal. But I want to warn the Senate of the United States now that if we are beginning a program of repealing these tariff protections on essential industries I do not know where we are going to end. We shall not stop with copper; we must go all the way up and down. It is neither equitable nor just to repeal a law to help one industry at the expense of another. There is danger in that kind of legislation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the distinguished Senator will allow me to associate myself with his warning.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator. I personally feel that a 2-year repeal is too long. It is only because of the letter from the chairman of the committee in the other House and the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN] that I acquiesce, however unwillingly, to the passage of this bill. I consider it dangerous legislation. I consider it legislation which may come right back to haunt those who would like to protect industry in the United States. I give that warning.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the Senator will permit me to say that he has done a fine job in presenting the side of many copper producers with reference to this particular legislation, and I thank him for his cooperation and assistance.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator. I want to add that if it had not been for the copper industry of the United States—the American mines and the American men who work in them—this country could not have won the war. I refer solely to copper produced in our domestic mines, not to copper that came from abroad. If we adopt policies which will or may result in forcing American mines to shut down it might spell disaster some time in the future. The industries of our country should be encouraged, not discouraged. Of course, there are those who would like to repeal this copper tax permanently.

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to call attention to the fact that our stock pile of copper is becoming exhausted, and, according to the testimony before our committee, it is necessary to have at least 500,000 tons of copper in the stock pile. We have not that much at the present time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Coming, as I do, from the State of Connecticut, to which this bill is of vital consequence from the standpoint of keeping our industries going and from the very vital standpoint of the production of a needed building material, I should like to say that I greatly appreciate what has been said by other Senators whose interest in this matter is not any different from mine. I want to thank the committee and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for the fine work they have done on this bill, and, speaking for the people of the State of Connecticut, I desire to assure my friends who have made concessions in connection with it that their concessions are appreciated. I understand their position, and they do not have to make too much of an argument about protecting American industry to a man who comes from Connecticut.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who has done a very remarkable piece of work in connection with this bill, that no Member of the Senate feels more strongly than I do along the line of protecting home industry. I am very sympathetic with what the Senator from Arizona has said. It will be found that I am ready when the time comes to see that fair protection is maintained. If there were not now an emergency necessitating action designed to replenish our stock of copper in order to keep industry going and to avoid unemployment, I would not be found voting for the bill. But I consider an emergency to exist and this time I am familiar with the conditions of that emergency, and that is the reason I am in favor of the bill and am supporting it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. BALDWIN] with reference to the absolute and dire necessity of this proposed legislation so far as the industries of Connecticut are concerned. I also wish to express my thanks to the committee, on which I had the honor to serve in the last session, for the gracious reception which was accorded me when I appeared to express my views on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, ordinarily I should be opposed to this bill, but I wish to associate myself with those who are in favor of it, because I think that it is an emergency measure. All over the Northwest REA improvements cannot be made because of the shortage of copper. My colleague and I agree that the bill is very important in the REA situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

DIRECT PURCHASES OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I wish to have the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 68, House bill 2413, an act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2413) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the House of Representatives some time ago, and thereafter it came before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the motion of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. The committee was unanimous in reporting the bill favorably.

I wish to say a few words about the bill, Mr. President. This bill extends until July 1, 1950, the authority granted the Federal Reserve banks under the Second War Powers Act to purchase and sell Government securities directly from or to the Treasury of the United States instead of in the open market.

This authority to purchase and sell Government securities directly from or to the Treasury was granted by title IV of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942, which amended section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act. The authority expires March 31, 1947. The Federal Reserve System had used this direct purchase authority without any limitation as to amount of holdings from the time of its creation in 1913 to 1935, when the National Banking Act of 1935 limited such purchases and sales of Government securities to open-market transactions.

Mr. President, the authority existed for more than 20 years prior to 1935. It is more needed today than ever, because of the great size of the Federal Government's debt and the refinancing operations. The direct purchase authority contained in the bill merely provides a line of credit available for use by the Government at any time. Without it the Treasury would have to carry much larger cash balances, which would mean that it would have to borrow more money, and thereby increase the size of the Federal Government's debt.

Enactment of the bill is desired by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System merely as a convenience in the management of the public debt. No question of monetary theory or policy is really involved in the bill, which simply provides for a mechanism which will make for efficient, economical, and businesslike management of the Government's debt.

The bill renews for 3 years the existing authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase up to $5,000,000,000 worth of Government securities directly from the Treasury, in contrast to open-market operations or purchases. Most of the purchases of Government securities by the Federal Reserve banks are made through so-called open-market operations and come from the dealers in Government bonds. But by having the right to purchase up to $5,000,000,000 worth of Government securities directly from the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks are able to extend what amounts to a line of credit for this amount to the Treasury, on which it can draw if need arises, as it sometimes does, chiefly at tax-payment periods. With this available line of credit, even if not used, the Treasury is in position to carry smaller cash balances than otherwise, and that means that the outstanding debt can be further reduced and interest costs can be saved.

As will be noted, two limitations are contained in the bill at the present time: namely, that the amount of securities bought directly from the Treasury which the Federal Reserve banks may hold at any one time shall not exceed $5,000,000,000; and, also, the authority will expire on June 1, 1950, unless further extended by Congress.

I may say that the bill has the united support of the presidents of all twelve Federal Reserve banks, as well as of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The bill has been endorsed unanimously by the Federal Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System, which is composed of 12 prominent bankers representing the local banks in all the Federal Reserve districts. It has also been recommended by committee on Government borrowing of the American Bankers' Association, which likewise is composed of outstanding bankers who thoroughly studied the matter.

Mr. President, today much of the debt is in short-term maturities, which means that refunding operations are frequent and necessary, and careful planning is required to meet them.

It should also be borne in mind that a large part of the debt is equivalent at all times, potentially at least, to a demand liability on the Treasury. The holders of savings bonds and notes, which together are outstanding in the amount of $5,800,000,000, may cash them at will. Accordingly, $5,000,000,000 seems to be a most modest line of credit for the Treasury to have in relation to the size of the debt, the monthly maturities, and the varying demands for the redemption of outstanding issues.

This direct-purchase authority, which under the original Federal Reserve Act existed without practical limitation until 1935, was revived in 1942 as an aid in war-financing operations. As I understand the situation, frequently around tax-payment dates the Treasury also has to make large payments for interest, debt retirement, or other purposes, and these payments may be due before taxes and proceeds of sales of new Government securities are received and credited to Treasury deposits. At the same time there are heavy drains on the banks as people draw out money by check to pay their taxes to the internal-revenue collectors, who deposit the checks with the Federal Reserve banks, to the Treasury's account. As long as the Treasury can meet temporary needs by borrowing directly from the Federal Reserve banks for a few days, it is not obliged to carry as much in its war loan or Federal Reserve accounts as would otherwise be needed.

Mr. President, the place to stop inflationary Government spending is in the Congress. If Congress authorizes appropriations which it fails to cover by taxation, the Treasury must borrow. When Government obligations fall due, they must either be paid or refunded. The Treasury has no choice.

In closing, Mr. President, I repeat that the bill has the endorsement not only of the committees of the House of Representatives and Senate which handle banking matters, but also of the Board of Governors and the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and of the American Bankers' Association. It seems to me to be the part of wisdom to enable the making of such direct purchases to the extent of $5,000,000,000 for the requested length of time, or 3 years, while refunding operations are being conducted on so great a scale and while the Government debt is so large.

Mr. President, I now rest my case.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I objected to this bill when it came up on the calendar. I still do not like the provisions of the bill, but I am willing to withdraw my objection at the present time, in the light of various circumstances which I shall set forth.

The bill permits the Treasury to sell up to $5,000,000,000 of Government bonds directly to the Federal Reserve banks and, of course, in effect it directs the Reserve banks to buy those bills. That means that the Federal Government would really issue $5,000,000,000 worth of currency directly, in order to pay its bills. It is, therefore, a printing-press bill, if you please; and under the provisions of the bill the United States Government may at any time simply print $5,000,000,000 worth of currency.

When the bill came up in 1942 or 1943, as I recall the date, I objected at that time. At the time the bill contained no limit as to the amount which could be purchased. I think I offered an amendment which limited the total amount of such bonds to $5,000,000,000. Five billion dollars is a smaller figure today than it was then, in view of the very large budget of the Government; and I do not think I would care to change that figure at the present time.

The claim is made that enactment of this bill is necessary in order to give the Government the right to get cash on tax-payment days, when there is a very

large draft on all the banks, in order to restore the reserve of the banks over a few days; and such authority has been used since 1943, I believe, for that purpose. The report shows that it is used four times a year in connection with tax-payment days, and at a few other times, and that it has never been used in excess of the amount of $1,300,000,000, which was used on March 15, 1943.

One of the arguments of the American Bankers' Association is that since this power has not been abused, the association has no objection to continuing it. That seems to me to be a rather unsound view, because I do not think we should confer a power which may be abused. Yet I believe that for a short time, and in view of the fact that the bankers are satisfied that it will not be abused, there can be no objection to granting some authority to provide this cash over tax-payment days.

My difficulty is that those who are behind the bill really want to give the Government unlimited power to issue paper money, and I do not like to give any support to that philosophy of currency. But so long as there is this compromise both as to a limit in time and a limit in amount, I do not object at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2413) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Fred Norman, late a Representative from the State of Washington, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM TO HOOVER DAM

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 52, Senate Joint Resolution 45.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Cooper
Baldwin	Butler	Cordon
Ball	Byrd	Donnell
Brewster	Cain	Downey
Bricker	Capehart	Dworshak
Bridges	Capper	Eastland
Brooks	Chavez	Ecton
Buck	Connally	Ellender
Ferguson	McCarran	Saltonstall
Flanders	McCarthy	Smith
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stewart
Gurney	McGrath	Taft
Hatch	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hawkes	McMahon	Thye
Hayden	Malone	Tobey
Hill	Millikin	Tydings
Hoey	Moore	Umstead
Holland	Morse	Vandenberg
Ives	Murray	Watkins
Jenner	O'Conor	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	White
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Kem	Overton	Williams
Knowland	Pepper	Wilson
Langer	Reed	Young
Lodge	Robertson, Va.	
Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the question stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will again report the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Chair holds that the motion is not debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to take up the joint resolution is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert the following:

That the name of Hoover Dam is hereby restored to the dam on the Colorado River in Black Canyon constructed under the authority of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), and referred to as Hoover Dam in the act approved February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1146); in the act approved April 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 118); in the act approved July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 535); in the act approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 717); and in the act approved February 17, 1933 (47 Stat. 845). Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of Boulder Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Hoover Dam.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, before I start the discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 45, I wish to say there has been so much misinformation circulated about the change of the name of Hoover Dam that it seems desirable to set the record straight.

The story unfolds in five chapters: First, Mr. Hoover's contributions to the project; second, Secretary Wilbur's action in naming Hoover Dam; third, the five acts of Congress ratifying the name of Hoover Dam; fourth, Mr. Ickes' attempts to get rid of the name; and, fifth, the question of the restoration of Mr. Hoover's name to the dam for which he was so largely responsible.

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution was introduced by me in the Senate on January 29, 1947, and was reported to the Senate on March 17, 1947, by the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment as proposed by me. The joint resolution carries forward an effort I made in the last Congress to have Boulder Dam called by its proper name, Hoover Dam, and at the same time to provide by law that all the records which may have been made in the name of Boulder Dam shall be legalized when the name is changed to Hoover Dam.

I introduced the joint resolution after talking with a substantial number of Senators, nearly all of whom are favorable to its objectives and willing to correct an error that has been made in applying a different name to this dam.

Mr. Hoover is the only living ex-President of the United States, and he has the respect and admiration of millions of our citizens, as well as the respect of millions more who may not agree entirely with his political and economic philosophies.

Millions of men have the ability to be good winners but a far lesser number have the ability to be good soldiers in a cause after they have met with defeat.

To my way of thinking, the greatest accomplishment in life is to be a good loser and still find one's self able to contribute in a subaltern position toward the achievement of a great objective, notwithstanding a defeat which might dampen the ardor of other men.

Mr. Hoover has held himself ready to serve this Nation for the good of its people as a whole, in any capacity in which the Chief Executive of the Nation, or the Government, might call upon him to serve.

One of the finest things that President Truman has done is to utilize the experience and the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of ex-President Hoover in one of the greatest emergencies that has faced the world since time immemorial. President Truman called, and ex-President Hoover responded, and at the age of 72, he has made his experience and his abilities available to serve in the vital capacity of finding a way to feed humanity throughout the world, until it can stand on its feet and serve itself after recovery from the effects of a world torn by war.

I do not believe there is a man in this Chamber, and few men and women in the United States, who does not respect ex-President Hoover for making these hazardous and dangerous trips throughout the world as an emissary of President Truman and the American Government in bringing to the people of the world such relief in food and the vital necessities of life as it lies within our power to provide in this period when we hope we are passing from war to peace and the reestablishment of the world on a sound foundation.

Mr. President, I could spend a great deal of time setting forth the sequence of events which led to the settlement of the seven-State Colorado River water compact, the making of the contract with the metropolitan water district, the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the several appropriation measures necessary to carry the plan into effect, as well as the part performed in all these events by ex-President Hoover.

However, I shall ask unanimous consent to have the chronological history of this case, which I now present, included in the RECORD following my remarks and as part of this presentation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am not breaching a confidence when I say to the Members of the United States Senate and the people of the Nation, that I have had several interviews with our distinguished President, Mr. Truman, regarding this question of the name which belongs to the great dam under discussion.

The first time I saw the President of the United States in connection with this subject, I presented to him evidence that the name, Hoover Dam, had been used in five acts of Congress, which specifically referred to the dam as Hoover Dam. The Interior Department appropriation bill, which came to the floor of the House of Representatives in December 1930, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, specifically referred to the dam as the Hoover Dam. This fact was called to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives by Democratic—note, I say, "Democratic"—Representative Taylor, who emphasized to the House Members, among other meaningful things:

> There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence. I refer to three words in the second line which are "the Hoover Dam."

Representative Taylor went on to say:

> Do you realize those words just read by the clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?

Representative Taylor's statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, (Dec. 12, 1930, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646). No one could say that the Congress did not know that the dam was being named Hoover Dam. Democratic Representative Taylor's views were approved by the House. The Senate concurred, and the bill became law, establishing the name of Hoover Dam in the act of Congress of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1115, 1146).

Four succeeding appropriation acts likewise referred to the dam as Hoover Dam. Furthermore, the dam was officially named Hoover Dam by Secretary of the Interior Wilbur, who in public services gave it that name in accordance with the authority established in the five appropriation bills which went through the Congress with due notice to the Members of Congress given to them by Democratic Representative Taylor, of Colorado, in his presentation of the appropriation bill to the House of Representatives on December 12, 1930.

When I told President Truman that in my opinion the name of the dam was and is Hoover Dam, the President said that in his opinion the dam was and is Hoover Dam, and that my joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) was probably necessary in order to straighten out all the legal technicalities that had come about through the interchangeable use of the names.

On January 21, 1935, Attorney General Homer Cummings, replied to a letted he had received from Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, in which Mr. Ickes wanted the name Hoover Dam removed from litigation between the United States Government and one of the States, which, as I recall was Arizona. In his letter Attorney General Cummings said:

> I believe these acts refer to the dam as Hoover Dam. Moreover, the dam is referred to as Hoover Dam in the contract between the United States and the metropolitan water district under which contract, I understand, the dam is actually being constructed.

Attorney General Cummings went on further to say:

> I rather doubt whether it is feasible to do anything about the matter at this late date, even if it were deemed appropriate so to do. I call attention to the specific words, "even if it were deemed appropriate so to do."

In these days when there is so much difference of opinion on vital matters affecting the people and our Government and way of life, it behooves us to try to reduce all our feelings to a better understanding. At no time will all the people in this great Nation admire the same man in the same way, and that is probably beneficial to representative democracy.

Thackeray, the author, said a wonderful thing in these words:

> It all depends upon the viewpoint. As we turn the perspective glass, a giant appears a pygmy and a pygmy appears a giant.

It is my firm conviction that when the story of this era in the history of our great Nation is finally written, after the passions of men have subsided, and in the cool retrospect of those who follow, the people of this country will be proud to have the name Hoover applied to this great public project, and will realize more as time goes on the contributions he endeavored to make for the preservation of American ideals and standards.

I am purposely refraining from going into details regarding the important part taken by Mr. Hoover in connection with the negotiations of the interstate compact to apportion the waters of the Colorado River system. Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, and as one of the preeminent engineers of the world, was appropriately designated as the Federal Government's representative in these meetings. He presided over some two-score meetings of the seven States, in every State in the basin, and on November 24, 1922, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., succeeded in obtaining the signature to the Colorado River compact, allocating the waters of the Colorado River system between the upper and lower basins. He was responsible, in a large measure, for the consummation of the contract with the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles which was the necessary underwriting contract that formed the basis for the Boulder Canyon project.

His wise judgment and desire to see such projects pay their own way and ultimately pay for themselves was likewise in substantial measure responsible for the fact that the Boulder Canyon project was so established as to pay back to the Government the entire cost of the project with interest.

It is most interesting to me to note, when a joint resolution similar to the one I introduced came to the floor of the House for consideration, that it was received and acted upon with practically no evidence of partisanship. The very fact that great Democrats, as well as great Republicans, in the House took it upon themselves to pay tribute to Mr. Hoover for work he had done for the good of the American people and humanity in general, and expressed their feelings that the name of this dam should be Hoover Dam, and that the joint resolution would receive their vote, augers well for the future of democracy. They saw fit to put aside petty politics and pay their respects to a great American. One Democrat, in speaking of him, said: "America's No. 1 private citizen, Herbert Hoover."

Democrats themselves pointed out the fallacy of the argument that a public project should not be named after a living man by demonstrating that on many occasions we have named great public projects after living men, as is evidenced by Wilson Dam, Roosevelt Dam, Coolidge Dam, Norris Dam, and the Ashurst-Hayden Dam. If it were vital to the question, I could name hundreds of parkways and airfields, such as LaGuardia Field, which have received the name of a living man as an expression of the people's appreciation for his works and accomplishments. Perhaps some day we will pay more attention to naming public projects and great works after men who have contributed their lives to the public welfare while those men are yet alive, on the theory that it is far more effective and satisfactory to give flowers to the living as a token of our respect and affection for them. Alexander Pope said:

> What's fame? a fancy'd life in others' breath.
> A thing beyond us, e'en before our death.

We have lived long enough since Pope wrote this to make a change in the process and show our kindness and appreciation while people yet live. I hope this may be the policy of the future when the tribute and reward are justly deserved.

I trust all Senators will join me in the hope that Mr. Hoover may live many years with the same vigor of mind and body as he now possesses, and that he may be given the power to continue to contribute as he has been doing to the welfare of humanity and the establishment of peace on a sound and enduring basis.

Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate may see fit to pass the joint resolution unanimously.

EXHIBIT A

I. HERBERT HOOVER'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

As early as 1917, it was recognized that a dam at Boulder or Black Canyon was essential to protect the Imperial Valley against floods, and to store irrigation water for the satisfaction of the water rights which were rapidly building up in the lower basin, and

which, without the construction of that dam, would have rendered it impossible for junior appropriations of water in the upper basin to be perfected into new projects. However, it became equally apparent that if such a dam was to be built, the upper basin States would have to be protected by some agreement which would preserve to them the right to develop their water uses (during several decades to follow), free of the doctrine of prior appropriations. Accordingly, in 1921, when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce, the seven Colorado basin States prevailed upon the Congress to authorize the negotiation of an interstate compact to apportion waters of the Colorado River system, under the chairmanship of a Federal representative. Mr. Hoover, as one of the preeminent engineers of the world, and a Cabinet officer, was appropriately designated as the Federal Government's representative. He presided over some twoscore meetings of these seven States, in every State in the basin, and on November 24, 1922, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, succeeded in obtaining the signatures to the Colorado River compact, allocating the waters of the Colorado River system between the upper and lower basins. Every person who participated in those negotiations recognized that the genius of Herbert Hoover was primarily responsible for achieving the apparently impossible task of bringing the States into agreement.

The compact was submitted to the several States for ratification, and Mr. Hoover's masterly interpretation of the document, and public confidence in his fairness, won approval in all of the States except Arizona, whose ratification was delayed for two decades.

The compact was submitted to Congress for ratification as a part of a bill authorizing the construction of a dam in Boulder Canyon or Black Canyon. Mr. Hoover's testimony before the Senate and House committees in 1925 provided much of the basis for the legislation which followed in 1928, when he was President-elect. The debates on that controversial legislation demonstrated the degree of the incoming President's responsibility for the settlement, and had a great deal to do with inducing Congress to accept the compact in the Boulder Canyon Project Act for 1928, notwithstanding the fact that Arizona steadily fought ratification.

This act was signed by President Coolidge on December 21, 1928. When Mr. Hoover took office in March 1929, he at once assumed the responsibility for carrying the statute into effect.

The act stipulated that it should be inoperative until certain supplemental agreements had been entered into between the States, and the President should so proclaim. These agreements were obtained, and Herbert Hoover, as President of the United States, on June 25, 1929, issued the public proclamation which placed in effect this historic statute and the Colorado River compact on which he had placed his signature 6 years before.

This act was unique in that it forbade the making of appropriations and the commencement of construction until the Secretary of the Interior should have in hand contracts for the sale of the power to be generated at the dam, adequate to fully repay the United States with interest. The market for the power was 240 miles away, in southern California primarily, and located within easy access of competing power generated by cheap natural gas. There was at that time a bitter conflict between public and private power agencies which threatened to make it impossible to market the power at all, or in any event at prices which would repay the Government investment. Mr. Hoover, through Secretary Wilbur, brought about an agreement between the public and private agencies for the equitable allocation of the power, and succeeded in negotiating contracts by which they unanimously agreed not only on the allocation but upon rate bases which assured the United States full recovery of the cost of the dam and power plant with interest, as well as paying to Arizona and Nevada substantial sums in lieu of taxes, and providing a fund for the development of the other basin States. This power transaction involved firm contracts for about a quarter of a billion dollars and set a landmark in the policy of self-liquidating public works as well as in the peaceful solution of regional power controversies.

These contracts, which were contingent on congressional appropriations, were submitted to Congress, and Arizona renewed her attack upon them. A bitter fight developed in the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. Hoover intervened personally and through Secretary Wilbur, and directed the Attorney General to supply the legal opinions requested by Congress on the validity of the Project Act and of the Hoover contracts.

Mr. Hoover prevailed, Congress made the first appropriation in June of 1930, and President Hoover signed the act which enabled construction to proceed on July 3, 1930. His signature thus appeared on three of the four keystone documents of this project—the Colorado River compact, the Presidential proclamation, and the critical first appropriation, and he participated as Secretary of Commerce in shaping the fourth basic document, the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Arizona subsequently brought suit in the United States Supreme Court to enjoin construction of the dam and to declare the compact inoperative. The Hoover administration successfully defended the action and the project went ahead.

II. SECRETARY WILBUR'S NAMING OF HOOVER DAM AND THE PRECEDENTS FOR IT

There was wide recognition of Mr. Hoover's invaluable contribution to the Boulder Canyon project, both in Congress and out. A number of bills were introduced in Congress in 1929 and 1930 to name the dam Hoover Dam.

However, at that time the first appropriation had not been obtained, and Secretary Wilbur suggested that the naming of the dam be deferred until Congress had appropriated for it, and thus assured its construction.

On September 17, 1930, following enactment of the first appropriation act, Secretary Wilbur drove the silver spike which inaugurated actual construction of the project near Las Vegas, Nev., and at that time personally named the dam Hoover Dam. He issued an order to the Commissioner of Reclamation, so designating it, on that date. His action was based on a long line of precedents. The Secretary of the Interior unquestionably had the authority to name Reclamation Bureau dams, and his predecessors had repeatedly exercised that authority over the years. Such dams as the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona, the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, the Shoshone Dam in Wyoming, and the Ashurst-Hayden Dam in Arizona had all been named initially by action of the Secretary of the Interior. Wilson Dam, the forerunner of the Tennessee Valley Authority, had first been named by administrative action. Norris Dam was later named by the TVA in the same way. Furthermore, contrary to some assertions, precedents were heavily in favor of designating such structures for living persons, whether they were originally named by administrative officers or by Congress. Rooseelt Dam had been named while President Theodore Roosevelt was in office; Wilson Dam while that President was in office; Coolidge Dam had been so named while President Coolidge was in office, on the suggestion of Congressman Hayden; the Ashurst-Hayden Dam in Arizona had been so named while both the Senators were in office; and Norris Dam was subsequently named on August 2, 1933, by the Tennessee Valley Authority Chairman, Dr. Morgan, while Senator Norris was in office. Indeed, Norris Dam was christened with the statement that—

"The great Nebraskan and the New Deal will be remembered together in historic Norris Dam in eastern Tennessee, upon which work shortly will begin."

There is nothing improper about naming a structure for a living person. Congress has done it repeatedly. As late as 1943, by act of Congress, two locks in the St. Marys River were named, respectively, for Gen. Douglas MacArthur and a civilian engineer named Sabin.

It is probable that an examination of the names given to several of the structures built by the Public Works Administration under the direction of Harold L. Ickes, Administrator, will likewise show that the names of then-living statesmen were annexed to appropriate structures. While Lake Franklin D. Roosevelt, impounded by the Grand Coulee Dam, was named after Mr. Roosevelt's death, if it was appropriate to name a lake for him after he died, there would surely have been no impropriety in giving him that recognition during his lifetime, except for the embarrassing argument to the contrary about the name of Hoover Dam.

In short, Secretary Wilbur, in naming Hoover Dam, was not only following the precedent with respect to Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Wilson Dams, but was honoring a President who, as it happened, had a great deal more to do with the construction of the dam bearing his name than had any of his distinguished predecessors with the structures honoring their names.

III. THE FIVE ACTS OF CONGRESS NAMING HOOVER DAM

It has been noted above that at the time Secretary Wilbur named Hoover Dam, Congressman Ed Taylor, the Democratic chairman-elect of the Appropriations Committee, had a bill pending (H. J. Res. 81, introduced Mar. 27, 1929) to do the same thing.

It will be recalled that in November 1930, the Republicans carried the House of Representatives by a narrow margin, but that six Members of the majority died before the new Congress took office, and that in March 1931, when the new Congress met, the Democrats succeeded in organizing the House.

When the next Interior Department appropriation bill came to the floor of the House in December 1930 (it was the bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932) Congressman Taylor, who was in charge of the bill on the Democratic side, called the specific attention of the House to the fact that the Appropriations Committee had used the name Hoover Dam in referring to this great structure (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 12, 1930, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646). His speech is so comprehensive and directly to the point that it should be read in its entirety:

"THE HOOVER DAM

"There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence.

"I refer to the three words in the second line, 'the Hoover Dam.'

"Do you realize that those words just read by the Clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?

"This is the first time that name has ever appeared in any bill or official act of Congress. This Interior Department Appropriations Committee thought that following the precedents of the naming of the Roosevelt Dam during President Roosevelt's administration, and the Wilson Dam during President Wilson's administration, and the Coolidge Dam during his administration that

President Hoover was very justly entitled to the same distinction, so we unanimously and very gladly wrote into this action those words making the naming of that great dam the Hoover Dam by the action of Congress that will be a monument to him for centuries after every other act of his administration, and of this Congress will have passed into utter oblivion.

"In fact, it will be a tribute to him as long as this planet is inhabited by human beings. This committee hopes and believes his administration and entire life will be preeminently worthy of this honor, and that history will approve this action of Congress. If I may, without impropriety, refer to my own personal sentiment in this matter, I will say that when that act was passed, I thought that dam should have been given the name of the President and, because it was not, on May 27, 1929, I introduced House Joint Resolution 81 as follows:

" 'House Joint Resolution 81

" 'Joint resolution naming the Hoover Dam

" '*Resolved etc.*, That in appreciation of his distinguished services as the official representative of our Government in the negotiation of the Colorado River compact, signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922; and in recognition of his preeminent ability and international reputation as one of the world's greatest engineers; and as a fitting tribute to our President, the highest and greatest dam ever built, authorized to be constructed on that river by the act of Congress of December 21, 1928, shall be known and designated on the public records as the Hoover Dam.'

"In the summer of 1930, when the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, dedicated the project with appropriate ceremonies at the site, he formally christened the dam the Hoover Dam. Thereafter he wrote the following letter:

" 'THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
" '*Washington, September 17, 1930.*

" 'DR. ELWOOD MEAD,
" '*Commissioner of Reclamation,*
" '*Washington, D. C.*

" 'MY DEAR DR. MEAD: This is to notify you that the dam which is to be built in the Colorado River at Black Canyon is to be called the Hoover Dam.

" 'Sincerely yours,

" 'RAY LYMAN WILBUR.'

"So that the dam is now officially named by both the Secretary of the Interior and by Congress."

Mr. Taylor's views were approved by the House, the Senate concurred, and the bill became law, establishing the name of Hoover Dam (act of Feb. 14, 1931; 46 Stat. 1115, 1146). In the next four succeeding appropriation acts, Congress likewise called the dam Hoover Dam. These were the acts approved April 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 91, 118), July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 525, 535), July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709, 717), and February 17, 1933 (47 Stat. 820, 845). It will be noted that the last four of these acts were passed at a time when the Democrats held a majority of the House of Representatives, and that the latest of them, approved February 17, 1933, was passed by both Houses after Mr. Hoover had been defeated for reelection to the Presidency. No one in the Democratic Party was small enough to suggest that the name of the defeated President should be removed from the dam.

When Mr. Hoover left office, in March 1933, the grave engineering decisions as to the height and design of the dam had been made, many of them on his responsibility; the construction contracts had been let; the river had been successfully diverted; and work on the great structure was nearly 2 years ahead of schedule.

IV. THE ACTION OF SECRETARY ICKES

We now come to Mr. Ickes' chapter of this story. Viewed as objectively as possible, it appears to be as follows:

In the spring of 1933, after the New Deal took office, the Bureau of Reclamation built a model of Hoover Dam to display at the Chicago Century of Progress. It prepared the proof for a descriptive pamphlet, to be handed out to tourists, explaining the working of the dam. Commissioner Mead sent over a copy of that proof to Secretary Ickes for approval. It used the name Hoover Dam. Commissioner Mead's views on the propriety of naming that dam after Mr. Hoover were well known. In January 1930, he had written:

"President Hoover's influence in shaping the Boulder Dam project makes it fitting that the dam should have his name, and the public would approve the change."

When Secretary Ickes read Dr. Mead's proof of the tourists' circular, he didn't like it. He sent back to Commissioner Mead a six-line memorandum saying that he had read the pamphlet, and—

"I would be glad if you will refer to the dam as Boulder Dam in this pamphlet, as well as in correspondence and other references to the dam you may have occasion to make in the future."

No order or official action was taken.

That was all there was to it at the time. It is doubtful if Secretary Ickes at that time intended to officially change the name of the dam. For example, he later wrote Congressman Treadway, who had questioned him about the change (May 17, 1935):

"Two bills introduced in Congress to change the name to Hoover Dam failed of enactment, and so I decided again to adopt the original name of Boulder Dam. There was no Executive or administrative order issued. Therefore, I cannot supply you with one."

Mr. Ickes was wrong about the bills; five appropriation acts had called the dam Hoover Dam, and the special bills had been withdrawn for that reason, as Chairman Taylor had explained on the floor.

While Secretary Ickes issued no order changing the name himself, he had the Director of the National Park Service tackle the Board on Geographical Names to do so. He apparently thought that this Board, which had been transferred to his Department and renamed in 1933, had jurisdiction over the naming of such structures. But on June 16, 1933, the Director wrote him that the Board declined to take a hand in the matter.

The absence of any official action changing the name was shortly to become more embarrassing. In 1934, it will be recalled, the State of Arizona called out its militia to stop the building of Parker Dam on the Colorado River. The United States brought an action in the Supreme Court to enjoin Arizona's interference. It became necessary for the Department of Justice, in the pleadings, to make reference to Hoover Dam. When the pleadings reached Secretary Ickes, he wrote the Attorney General on January 17, 1935 (Collected Papers of Homer Cummings, Scribner, 1939, p. 254), as follows:

"JANUARY 17, 1945.

"DEAR HOMER: On page 4 of the bill of complaint in the case of the United States of America, plaintiff, against the State of Arizona, defendant, there is a reference to 'water discharged at Hoover (Boulder) Dam.' Having gone to great lengths to give to Boulder Dam its original and proper name which my predecessor in office attempted feloniously to take from it, for which praiseworthy and meritorious public act I have been roundly condemned by reactionary Republican papers in all parts of the country, I may say that the reference in this bill of complaint to 'Hoover Dam' gives me nothing at all to cheer about. I should have been glad to point out what was undoubtedly merely an inadvertence, but I lacked the opportunity, since I did not see the bill of complaint until after it had been printed and filed with the Supreme Court."

Mr. Cummings replied as follows:

"JANUARY 21, 1935.

"DEAR HAROLD: This acknowledges your letter of the 17th of January about Boulder Dam, and I am not surprised by your perturbation. Even in the midst of great events, the misuse of a cherished name is apt to be upsetting.

"The difficulty in this particular instance seems to grow out of the fact that, while the term 'Boulder Dam' is used as often as possible and scattered somewhat promiscuously in strategic places in the bill of complaint, nevertheless the drafters of that document seemed to feel it necessary in describing the dam to use the title employed by the Congress in the acts appropriating money for its construction. I believe these acts refer to the dam as 'Hoover Dam' (see 46 Stat. L. 1146; 47 Stat. L. 118; and 47 Stat. L. 535). Moreover, the dam is referred to as 'Hoover Dam' in the contract between the United States and the metropolitan water district, under which contract, I understand, the dam is actually being constructed.

"Our Department was not aware that you had officially rechristened the dam, or that there had been any change in its technical name since the order of Secretary Wilbur made on the 17th day of September 1930.

"I rather doubt whether it is feasible to do anything about the matter at this late day, even if it were deemed appropriate so to do. In other words, it looks to me very much like water over the Hoover (Boulder) Dam. When I see you, I shall extend my commiseration in person."

There the matter rested until Rand McNally, the map publishing company, on May 23, 1939, wrote the Interior Department that it planned a forthcoming map to show both names, Hoover and Boulder Dam, "because no official decision on which name is correct seems to have been made."

This inspired Secretary Ickes to approach the Board of Geographical Names again, this time armed with an opinion on its jurisdiction from Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold. On August 10, 1939, the executive secretary replied, saying that if Secretary Ickes insisted, he would submit the matter to the executive committee of the Board for formal decision, but he recommended that that not be done, saying that his Board dealt only with natural parts of the landscape, and not with any man-made structures. So Hoover Dam it remained, so far as any official departmental action was concerned.

Secretary Ickes still took no formal action. He did see to it that the Department's budget, and hence the appropriation acts, used the name Hoover Dam. They call it, from 1933 to 1940, the Boulder Canyon Dam (although it was built in Black Canyon), and called it Boulder Dam after passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, in 1940 (act of July 19, 1940, 54 Stat. 774). This act, as rewritten in the Interior Department, referred to the dam as Boulder Dam. There was no discussion of the name in the reports or debate.

V. THE QUESTION OF RESTORING THE NAME OF HOOVER DAM

The clean-cut question now presented to Congress is whether, on this record, it now chooses to use the name Hoover Dam, or the name Boulder Dam, in such further legislation as it may enact from time to time. The appropriation acts for this project came be-

fore Congress every year. Congress is free to use any name it likes. If it chooses to restore the name of Hoover Dam, it will be repairing a rather petty injustice, and will be restoring a deserved honor.

To Mr. Hoover's unique and imperishable service in the formulation of the Colorado River compact, in the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, in setting the power policies on which the project's financial structure was based, and in successfully inaugurating its construction, there have recently been added new honors in a wider field. After a period of 14 years, during which the administration avoided the recognition of Herbert Hoover wherever it could, President Truman, to his credit, has seen fit to follow a different course. Mr. Truman has called upon Herbert Hoover to render an invaluable service to this Nation, and to humanity, in the fight against famine, as he did during the First World War. Mr. Hoover has responded as no one else could have done.

If Congress now resumes the use of the name Hoover Dam, it is reasonable to believe that Mr. Truman will applaud the unselfish service which Mr. Hoover has rendered not only to this President, but to all Americans, and will approve Congress' recognition. Any other course would be out of character for President Truman.

APPENDIXES

Annexed are texts of, or extracts from, the following documents referred to above:

A. Letter, Chairman Thomas, of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, to Secretary Wilbur, January 8, 1930, S. 2978, a bill to name "Hoover Dam."

B. Memorandum, Commissioner Mead to Secretary Wilbur, January 10, 1930, approving the proposed name.

C. Letter, Secretary Wilbur to Chairman Thomas, January 13, 1930, suggesting deferment until Congress approved appropriations.

D. Opinion of Solicitor Finney, July 9, 1930, reviewing prior departmental action in naming other dams.

E. Excerpt from speech of Secretary Wilbur, September 17, 1930, announcing naming of the dam as Hoover Dam.

F. Order of Secretary Wilbur, September 17, 1930, naming the dam.

G. Press release, September 17, 1930, on naming of the dam.

H. Speech by Chairman-elect Taylor, December 12, 1930, calling attention to unanimous action of the appropriation committee in naming the dam "Hoover Dam" in the Interior Department appropriation act.

I. Extracts from five appropriation acts using the name "Hoover Dam"—1931-1933.

J. Memorandum, Secretary Ickes to Commissioner Mead, May 8, 1933, directing him to use the name "Boulder Dam" in future references.

K. Memorandum, Commissioner Albright to Secretary Ickes, June 16, 1933, stating the refusal of the United States Geographic Board to pass on the name.

L. Excerpt from New York Times, August 2, 1933, reporting naming of Norris Dam by TVA, in honor of Senator Norris and the New Deal.

M. Letter, Secretary Ickes to Congressman Treadway, May 17, 1935, stating that no executive or administrative order changing the name of Hoover Dam had been issued.

N. Memorandum, Secretary Ickes to Board on Geographical Names, August 8, 1939, transmitting opinion of Assistant Attorney General Arnold on Board's jurisdiction to pass upon name of the dam.

O. Memorandum, secretary of Board on Geographical Names to Secretary Ickes, August 10, 1939, recommending that the matter not be submitted to the Board.

Appendix A

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1930.

Dr. RAY L. WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For your consideration I attach printed copy of S. 2978, the same being a bill to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

This has been introduced by Senator Smoot and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A statement of your views as to the proposed legislation will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

JOHN THOMAS.

Appendix B

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, January 10, 1930.

Memorandum for the Secretary:

There has been received letter to you dated January 8 from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, enclosing copy of S. 2978, a bill to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam. This was introduced by Senator Smoot.

President Hoover's influence in shaping the Boulder Dam project makes it fitting that the dam should have his name, and the public would approve the change. Heretofore the naming of important reclamation works has been done by the Secretary as an administrative act, though the Gibson Dam, in Montana, was named by a congressional resolution. It is believed that action should be postponed until an appropriation for the work has been secured.

ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner.

Appendix C

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 13, 1930.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on
Irrigation and Reclamation,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your request for a report on S. 2978, a bill to change the name of Boulder Dam, I have to advise that heretofore the naming of important reclamation works has been done by the Secretary of the Interior as an administrative act, though the Gibson Dam, in Montana, was named by a congressional resolution. In the case of Boulder Dam I believe that action on the bill might well be deferred until construction has commenced, or at least until an appropriation has been provided by Congress. While the Department would have authority to name the dam, as I have indicated, there would, of course, be no objection on the part of the officials here to Congress taking whatever action it desired in naming the dam, either now or later.

Very truly yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary.

Appendix D

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, July 9, 1930.

Memorandum to Secretary:

The question has arisen whether a name has been designated by Congress in its enactments for the dam to be placed in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon or Boulder Canyon. The act of Congress approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), gives a name to two specific things connected with the project. Section 707t, title 33, United States Code, provides that the short title of the act shall be the "Boulder Canyon Project Act." This is a designation by law of a name for the project, but the act covers more than the construction of a dam in the Colorado River. Section 707 of the title, supra, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain, a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon or Boulder Canyon, and a main canal and appurtenant structures located entirely within the United States connecting Laguna Dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California, and also to construct, equip, operate, and maintain at the dam a complete plant for the development of electrical energy. These are the things authorized to be done under the terms of the act.

Section 707 a creates in the Treasury the Colorado River Dam fund. This is a congressional naming of the fund and the Treasury Department will probably use those words without change as designating the fund which receives money returned from the sale of electrical energy or money obtained from other sources.

Section 707k defines certain work like "political subdivision," "reclamation law," "maintenance," "Federal Water Power Act," and "domestic." The only names designated by law to the entire development on the Colorado River is, first, the Boulder Canyon project, and, second, Colorado River Dam fund. The principal legislation succeeding the original act referred to is found in the second deficiency bill approved July 3, 1930. In this legislation the project is referred to as the Boulder Canyon project and provides that the appropriation of $10,660,000 shall remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund.

In none of the legislation has Congress designated a name for the dam which will be constructed in the main stream of the Colorado River in the location generally designated as Black Canyon.

The further question arises whether the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate a name for the dam to be constructed across the Colorado River. Since there is definite authority to construct the dam across the river, there can be no doubt of the authority of the Secretary to give the structure a definite name. Section 707m provides that the Boulder Canyon project shall be deemed a supplement to the reclamation law. Under the reclamation law the Secretary is authorized to do any and all acts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Many of the dams constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation have been designated by order of the Secretary of the Interior, like the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona, the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, and the Shoshone Dam in Wyoming. Naming the dam to be constructed across the Colorado River as a part of the Boulder Canyon project would lead to brevity in referring to the structure in the correspondence, accounts, and records made relative to it.

In my opinion, the Secretary of the Interior has authority to designate a name for the dam to be constructed in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon as part of the Boulder Canyon project.

E. C. FINNEY,
Solicitor.

Appendix E

(Excerpt from Wilbur's speech naming Hoover Dam at the spike-driving ceremony at Las Vegas, Nev., in connection with the commencement of construction of the project, September 17, 1930:)

"The present dam, which will rise up through the lava walls of Black Canyon near

here, is but one in a series of such structures scattered throughout the United States. Each has been an achievement of man, a company, or a community; each is outstanding in its influence on its neighborhood. Each seems to have reality, even personality, to those who see it. The placid waters above the turbulent falls below appeal to nearly all of us and tug at some deep but common emotion. Each is entitled to some recognition. We have fastened to some of them the names of the great of our Nation. We have the Roosevelt Dam, the Wilson Dam, the Coolidge Dam, and today as Secretary of the Interior and acting in accordance with many requests, I have the honor and privilege of giving a name to this new structure. I choose that of the great engineer whose vision and persistence, first as chairman of the Colorado River Commission in 1922 and on many occasions since, has done so much to make it possible, and declare that the dam to be built by the Reclamation Service of the Department of the Interior in Black Canyon under the Boulder Canyon Project Act shall be called the Hoover Dam."

Appendix F

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, September 17, 1930.

DR. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. MEAD: This is to notify you that the dam which is to be built in the Colorado River at Black Canyon is to be called the Hoover Dam.

Sincerely yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

Appendix G

The Secretary of the Interior announced today that he had notified Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation, that the dam to be built in the Colorado River at Black Canyon is to be called the Hoover Dam. This is in recognition of the services rendered by President Herbert Hoover when Secretary of Commerce, who, as chairman of the Colorado River Commission, played a large part in the initiation of this project. He presided at a meeting of representatives of the States concerned in Santa Fe, N. Mex., in the month of November 1922. He assisted in the formation of the necessary legislation, has contributed to the development of the project throughout its whole history, and his assistance has determined the favorable action taken in its recent legislative phases. The naming of this dam by the Secretary is in keeping with the adopted policy as in the case of the Coolidge Dam, Shoshone Dam, and the Elephant Butte Dam.

Appendix H

Statement by Congressman Ed Taylor, Democrat, of Colorado, ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee, and subsequently its chairman, December 12, 1930, in the course of debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1932 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646):

"THE HOOVER DAM

"There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence.

"I refer to the three words in the second line, 'The Hoover Dam.'

"Do you realize that those words just read by the clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?

"This is the first time that name has ever appeared in any bill or official act of Congress. This Interior Department Appropriations Committee thought that following the precedents of the naming of the Roosevelt Dam during President Roosevelt's administration, and the Wilson Dam during President Wilson's administration, and the Coolidge Dam during his administration that President Hoover was very justly entitled to the same distinction, so we unanimously and very gladly wrote into this action those words making the naming of that great dam the Hoover Dam by the action of Congress that will be a monument to him for centuries after every other act of his administration, and of this Congress will have passed into utter oblivion.

"In fact, it will be a tribute to him as long as this planet is inhabited by human beings. This committee hopes and believes his administration and entire life will be preeminently worthy of this honor, and that history will approve this action of Congress. If I may, without impropriety, refer to my own personal sentiment in this matter, I will say that when that act was passed, I thought that dam should have been given the name of the President and, because it was not, on May 27, 1929, I introduced H. J. Res. 81, as follows:

" 'House Joint Resolution 81

" 'Joint resolution naming the Hoover Dam

" '*Resolved, etc.*, That in appreciation of his distinguished services as the official representative of our Government in the negotiation of the Colorado River compact, signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922; and in recognition of his preeminent ability and international reputation as one of the world's greatest engineers; and as a fitting tribute to our President, the highest and greatest dam ever built authorized to be constructed on that river by the act of Congress of December 21, 1928, shall be known and designated on the public records as the Hoover Dam.'

"In the summer of 1930, when the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, dedicated the project with appropriate ceremonies at the site, he formally christened the dam the Hoover Dam. Thereafter he wrote the following letter:

" 'THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
" '*Washington, September 17, 1930.*

" 'Dr. ELWOOD MEAD,
" '*Commissioner of Reclamation,*
" '*Washington, D. C.*

" 'MY DEAR DR. MEAD: This is to notify you that the dam which is to be built in the Colorado River at Black Canyon is to be called the Hoover Dam.

" 'Sincerely yours,

" 'RAY LYMAN WILBUR'.

"So that the dam is now officially named by both the Secretary of the Interior and by Congress."

Appendix I

Extracts of Acts of Congress Using Name "Hoover Dam"

1. Interior Department Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1932. Public Law No. 666, Seventy-first Congress, third session, approved February 14, 1931 (H. R. 14675) (46 Stat. 1115, 1146):

"Boulder Canyon project: For continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *, $15,000,000."

2. Interior Department Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1933. Public Law No. 95, Seventy-second Congress, first session, approved April 22, 1932 (H. R. 8397) (47 Stat. 91, 118):

"Boulder Canyon project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *, $6,000,000."

3. Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1932. Public Law No. 235, Seventy-second Congress, first session, approved July 1, 1932 (H. R. 12443) (47 Stat. 525, 535):

"Boulder Canyon project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *, $7,000,000."

4. Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932. Public Law No. 302, Seventy-second Congress, first session, approved July 21, 1932 (H. R. 9642) (47 Stat. 709, 717):

"(5) For continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works, as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 43, ch. 12A), $10,000,000."

5. Interior Department Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1934. Public Law No. 361, Seventy-second Congress, second session, approved February 17, 1933 (H. R. 13710) (47 Stat. 820, 845):

"Boulder Canyon: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *, $8,000,000."

Appendix J

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 8, 1933.

Memorandum for Commissioner Mead, Bureau of Reclamation:

I have your reference of the text for the pamphlet descriptive of the Boulder Canyon project for use at the Century of Progress Exposition. I would be glad if you will refer to the dam as "Boulder Dam" in this pamphlet, as well as in correspondence and other references to the dam you may have occasion to make in the future.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Appendix K

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, June 16, 1933.

Memorandum for the Secretary:

Some time ago you asked me to ascertain the policy of the National Geographic Board in reference to the naming of such features as roads, trails, dams, etc. Mr. Frank Bond, the secretary of the Board, tells me that it is not their practice to name such features. It has only been in rare cases that they have officially gone on record as naming any man-made thing.

In a few cases several roads have been named by them where they are historically important or in the case of an extremely difficult piece of construction. The only case of a dam being named by them is the Roosevelt Dam. They have not acted on the Boulder Dam or the Coolidge Dam.

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT,
Director.

Appendix L

[From the New York Times of August 2, 1933]

"NORRIS DAM" IS NAME OF COVE CREEK PROJECT

WASHINGTON, August 1.—In honor of the 12-year fight made by Senator Norris, of Nebraska, for Government operation of Muscle Shoals, the proposed dam at Cove Creek today was named for him by Arthur E. Morgan, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"The great Nebraskan and the New Deal will be remembered together in the historic Norris Dam in eastern Tennessee, upon which work shortly will begin," Dr. Morgan said.

Norris Dam will be located on the Clinch River, nearly 80 miles above where it enters into the Tennessee. It will be linked with Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals by a tie transmission line some 220 miles long and will form one of the world's largest reservoirs.

Appendix M

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 17, 1935.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: I have received your letter of May 2 asking to be informed when and on whose authority the original

name of Hoover Dam was changed to Boulder Dam.

The dam, now practically completed at the Black Canyon site on the Colorado River, was authorized by an act of Congress, known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act. The structure was known as Boulder Dam for many years. This name became established by usage. On September 17, 1930, Secretary Wilbur officially drove the silver spike beginning the railroad over which construction materials would be hauled and on that occasion he referred to the dam to be constructed as Hoover Dam. Subsequently two bills introduced in Congress to change the name to Hoover Dam failed of enactment and so I decided again to adopt the original name of Boulder Dam. There was no Executive or administrative order issued. Therefore, I cannot supply you with one. I hope this gives you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Appendix N

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 8, 1939.

Memorandum for George C. Martin, Executive Secretary, United States Board on Geographical Names:

Please read and consider this opinion from Acting Attorney General Thurman Arnold with reference to the name of Boulder Dam. You will note that this opinion indicates the belief of the Department of Justice that the United States Board on Geographical Names might properly pass upon this matter.

H. L. I.,
Secretary of the Interior.

Appendix O

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 10, 1939.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Interior:

In accordance with your memorandum of August 8, 1939, I have read and considered the opinion of the Acting Attorney General, dated July 19, 1939, concerning the name Boulder Dam, which you enclosed therewith. I have noted that this opinion indicates the belief of the Department of Justice that the United States Board on Geographical Names might properly pass upon this matter.

I will submit the case to the executive committee of the Board for formal decision, if that be your pleasure, but I recommend that it not be so submitted, for the following reasons.

This Board has consistently declined to act upon the names of structures, on the ground that buildings, dams, bridges, and other structures are not geographic features, and can be authoritively named only by the organization that controls the structure, or by legislative enactment. * * *

* * * * *

This office received a letter from Rand McNally & Co., dated June 5, 1939, copy of which is attached, in which request was made for a decision on Boulder Dam. * * *

I suggest that Rand McNally & Co. be given such reply as you see fit concerning the legal status of the name, on which point this Board is not qualified to render any opinion. I also recommend that my letter of July 5 to Rand McNally & Co., stating that names of structures are not within the province of this Board, be allowed to stand as the Department's reply to their suggestion that the name be referred to this Board for decison.

BOARD OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES,
_____,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. HAWKES subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter written by Harold L. Ickes under date of March 12, 1947, and published in the New York Times on March 24, 1947, in regard to changing the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam, together with a letter in reply thereto written by Northcutt Ely on March 31, and published in the New York Times on Monday, April 7, 1947. These two letters throw much light upon the discussion in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 15.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1947]

NAMING OF BOULDER DAM—FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR EXPLAINS BACKGROUND OF NAME

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your Topics of the Times for March 8, there is a reference to the "move in Congress to rechristen Boulder Dam with its original name, Hoover Dam." It is further said, "Future historians of the United States may yet come to study the swing of the political pendulum at Washington by tracing the changes from Hoover Dam to Boulder Dam and back again through the decades and the centuries."

Probably I am not the first to call your attention to these misstatements of fact. There can be no doubt that the name was Boulder Dam to begin with and not Hoover Dam. On January 7, 1930, Senator Smoot introduced a bill (S. 2978) to change the name to Hoover Dam. This bill was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate, but the committee never reported it out. This is significant in view of the fact that the Senate was Republican and Senator Smoot was the most powerful individual on the majority side while President Hoover was living in the White House.

BOULDER DAM BILL

Never once during the debate on the Boulder Dam bill was it referred to other than as Boulder Dam. Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, on January 9, 1930, commented upon the fact that Senator Smoot had introduced the bill referred to. He said in part:

"I want to read the bill introduced: '*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and afte the passage of this act the dam authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928, and heretofore known as Boulder Dam, shall be known and designated on the public records as Hoover Dam. * * *' Wha' was the reason for the Senator from Utah wanting to name this particular project after Hoover? It may be that the reason why he did not call it the Hoover-Johnson Dam was because he knew that the Senator from California did everything for it and the President of the United States did nothing for it, and the twin appellation would not be appropriate."

In addition to citing the foregoing, I suggest that you turn to your contemporary, the New York Herald Tribune of March 4. Under the heading, "Twenty years ago today in the New York Herald Tribune," you will find the following under a Washington date line of March 4, 1927: "The Boulder Dam bill * * * was practically defeated yesterday, when the Senate flatly turned down closure on the measure. Senator Hiram Johnson championed the bill, which has been resisted by a spectacular filibuster."

REPRESENTATIVE QUOTED

In the debate on the resolution to change the name that has recently passed the House of Representatives, Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 6, said, among other things: "It was in that same year (1930) in the month of December that a great Democrat who later became chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and under whom I had the honor to serve, introduced the joint resolution officially naming it Hoover Dam * * *."

I have not verified this reference by Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether this was the same resolution introduced in the Senate by Mr. Smoot or whether it was a separate resolution introduced by the Congressman referred to, the late Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado. It is significant that Mr. DIRKSEN does not say that the joint resolution was passed. It was not, notwithstanding which he apparently was not unwilling to create the impression that not only was there a joint resolution changing the name to Hoover Dam but that that resolution had been adopted.

Certainly, if it had been known originally as Hoover Dam, as the New York Times so carelessly avers, it would not have been either necessary or appropriate to have "rechristen(ed) Boulder Dam with the original name, Hoover Dam." A further conclusion may legitimately be drawn from the circumstance of the failure of either House to adopt the resolution to name the dam after Mr. Hoover. The Congress can legislate negatively as well as affirmatively. In refusing to adopt the resolution to change the name to Hoover Dam, it is proper to conclude that the Congress wanted to retain the name Boulder Dam.

NAME RETAINED BY CONGRESS

Notwithstanding this very clear action on the part of Congress, my predecessor, Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, feebly attempted to name the dam after the man to whom he owed his office. He issued a memorandum to that effect to the Commissioner of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. He also referred personally to the dam as Hoover Dam. However, there was never any formal order or formal christening. It seems to me that, considering the circumstances, Secretary Wilbur had no power to name the dam, although it may well be that he could have called it Hoover Dam if it had not been for the clear indication that the Congress, having had the suggestion presented to it, firmly declined to accept it, thereby affirming the name Boulder Dam.

When I succeeded Secretary Wilbur there was a good deal of confusion about the name. Most people called it Boulder Dam, but some used the name Hoover Dam. The same Commissioner of Reclamation to whom my predecessor had indicated a wish that the dam be called after Mr. Hoover asked me to clarify the situation and thus avoid further confusion. I sent him a memorandum to the effect that the dam was to be called Boulder Dam. I do not think that I had any more right to ignore a clearly expressed wish of the Congress than had my predecessor, although he exercised that right.

If an injustice has been done to Mr. Hoover, it was by the Congress of 1930, and that was a Republican Congress. That Congress refused to change the name to that of Hoover, the incumbent Republican President. Now, with another national election approaching, it is natural that the present Republican Congress should want to do a little soft-soaping with a view to healing the festers that are beginning to show on the elephant's hide. But it might not be out of place to suggest that the Republicans tell the truth about Boulder Dam and not try to blame the succeeding administration for not adopting a name that a preceding Republican Congress had not favored. It might be well also for the New York Times to inform itself before it goes sentimental.

HAROLD L. ICKES.

WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1947.*

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1947]

RESTORING HOOVER DAM NAME—EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO SECRETARY WILBUR RECALLS SPECIFIC NAMING

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On March 24 the New York Times printed a letter from Harold L. Ickes complaining of an editorial favoring restoration of the name of Hoover Dam.

Curiously, former Secretary Ickes' defense of his changing the name ignores five acts of Congress specifically naming the dam Hoover Dam—all passed while the Democrats controlled the House. See the remarks of Congressman Ed Taylor, of Colorado, Democratic chairman-elect of the Appropriations Committee, December 12, 1930 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646):

"There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence.

"I refer to the three words in the second line, 'the Hoover Dam.'

"Do you realize that those words just read by the clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?

"This is the first time that name has ever appeared in any bill or official act of Congress. This Interior Department Appropriations Committee thought that, following the precedents of the naming of the Roosevelt Dam during President Roosevelt's Administration, and the Wilson Dam during President Wilson's Administration, and the Coolidge Dam during his administration, President Hoover was very justly entitled to the same distinction, so we unanimously and very gladly wrote into this action those words making the naming of that great dam the Hoover Dam by the action of Congress that will be a monument to him for centuries after every other act of his administration, and of this Congress, will have passed into utter oblivion."

OFFICIALLY NAMED

After referring to Mr. Taylor's pending "Hoover Dam" resolution (H. J. Res. 81), and Secretary Wilbur's order of September 17, 1930, naming the dam, he continued:

"So that the dam is now officially named by both the Secretary of the Interior and by Congress."

Mr. Taylor's appropriation act was approved by the House, the Senate concurred, and the bill became law, confirming the name of Hoover Dam (act of Feb. 14, 1931; 46 Stat. 1146).

The dam was publicly and formally designated by Secretary Wilbur as Hoover Dam in the general regulations authorized by section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act controlling the disposition of water, and in all the power, water, and construction contracts thereafter executed. In the next four succeeding appropriation acts Congress likewise called the dam, Hoover Dam. These were the acts approved April 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 118), July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 535), July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 717) and February 17, 1933 (47 Stat. 845). These five acts appropriated $43,000,000. The latest of them was passed after Mr. Hoover had been defeated for reelection to the Presidency.

Mr. Ickes' notion is that Congress "legislated negatively" by taking no action on Senator Smoot's "Hoover Dam" bill in 1930. Congress legislates by voting. The Smoot resolution was never voted on, in committee or on the floor. The five appropriation acts deliberately naming the dam Hoover Dam were voted on and became law, superseding and rendering unnecessary of enactment both the Smoot bill and the Taylor resolution.

CORRESPONDENCE CITED

Although Mr. Ickes now seems to have forgotten about the Hoover Dam appropriation acts, they were brought to his attention in 1935 by Attorney General Cummings (Selected Papers of Homer Cummings; Scribner, 1939, p. 254). Mr. Ickes had written Mr. Cummings complaining of the use of the name "Hoover Dam" in the case of *United States* v. *Arizona*. Mr. Cummings replied, in part, as follows:

"JANUARY 21, 1935.

"DEAR HAROLD: This acknowledges your letter of the 17th of January about Boulder Dam, and I am not surprised by your perturbation. Even in the midst of great events, the misuse of a cherished name is apt to be upsetting.

"The difficulty in this particular instance seems to grow out of the fact that while the term 'Boulder Dam' is used as often as possible and scattered somewhat promiscuously in strategic places in the bill of complaint, nevertheless, the drafters of that document seemed to feel it necessary in describing the dam to use the title employed by the Congress in the acts appropriating money for its construction. I believe these acts refer to the dam as 'Hoover Dam.' See Forty-sixth Statutes at Large, 1146; Forty-seventh Statutes at Large, 118; and Forty-seventh Statutes at Large, 535. Moreover the dam is referred to as 'Hoover Dam' in the contract between the United States and the Metropolitan Water District, under which contract, I understand, the dam is actually being constructed.

"Our Department was not aware that you had officially rechristened the dam, or that there had been any change in its technical name since the order of Secretary Wilbur, made on the 17th day of September 1930."

NAMING OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Ickes points out that Hoover Dam was frequently called Boulder Dam during the debates on the Project Act (although that act did not name the dam; it was actually built in Black Canyon, not Boulder Canyon). But Wilson Dam was called Muscle Shoals Dam until christened during the Wilson administration; Roosevelt Dam was called the Hudson Reservoir Dam until President Theodore Roosevelt christened it; Coolidge Dam was called San Carlos Dam until christened during the Coolidge administration. There is nothing unusual about naming a public work to honor a man while in public office. Norris Dam and Ashurst-Hayden Dam are additional examples.

President Hoover presided as Federal representative over negotiation of the compact allocating waters of the Colorado River, without which the upper basin States opposed construction of any such dam; his administration made the power revenue and water contracts required by Congress as a prerequisite to construction; he personally participated in the difficult engineering decisions, signed the Presidential proclamation that put the compact and the Project Act into effect, signed the appropriation act which launched construction of the project; his administration made the construction contracts; and when he left office, construction had been pushed more than a full year ahead of schedule under the five appropriation acts for "Hoover Dam."

The House, in approving without a dissenting voice Congressman JACK ANDERSON'S resolution (H. J. Res. 140) to restore the name of Hoover Dam, has recognized Mr. Hoover's contributions to both the Colorado River Compact and the dam which that compact made possible, as well as Mr. Hoover's recent world-wide service to President Truman and this Nation.

NORTHCUTT ELY.

WASHINGTON, *March 31, 1947.*

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to add a word to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey on this subject. My words will be of a personal nature. For 30 years I have been a close associate and intimate of former President Hoover. I lived with him through the days when he was high in popular esteem, and I lived with him through the days when he had lost his popularity. I lived with him in the days when he was thinking in terms of humanity and making his contributions during and after World War I to relieve the suffering of people all over the earth, and I lived with him through the days when he was struggling with the difficulties of the Chief Executive's Office, with all the turmoil and trouble that came at that time.

And now, at the evening glow of his life, at the invitation of President Truman, he has once more answered the call to give of his knowledge, experience, and his interest in human beings, to see what the problems are abroad in regard to relief, and to give his advice and judgment to this administration—the Democratic administration—and to all of us in trying to solve these difficult postwar problems.

It is a fitting tribute that now we should once again recognize the great service he has rendered, and restore to this dam the name that was originally given to it and, unfortunately, was changed for reasons we need not go into. The whole history of the project has been ably stated by my colleague, and the history is in the books. I simply want to say from my heart that I hope sincerely that the Senate will join with the House in paying this worthy tribute to a great American, and, in my case, a great personal friend of many years.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let it be understood at the outset that I am not going to speak as to Mr. Hoover. I have no quarrel with Mr. Hoover. He was the President of the United States. It may be that the period in which he served was unfortunate for him. Be that as it may, I am speaking now of events that transpired after the construction of the Boulder Dam.

Let it also be understood at the outset that the Boulder Dam was known as Boulder Dam from its very inception. Following the construction of that great project, which cost nearly $300,000,000, communities grew up and became established. Today, in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, there is a magnificent community known as Boulder City, the population of which serves Boulder Dam and the Boulder Dam project. Boulder City has in the neighborhood of 6,000 souls. It is a thriving, prosperous, law-abiding, God-fearing community, progressive in every sense of the word.

Boulder Dam as a natural object of interest has attracted the civilized world. It is known from pole to pole and around the world as Boulder Dam. It has been publicized and advertised and placed before the traveling public as one of the great objects of interest in America, if not in the entire world. So today this community of which I speak, in the State of Nevada—Boulder City—is carrying on its business largely in the name of and under the publicity of Boulder Dam.

Perhaps when the original bill came before the Senate or when the question was before the House for appropriation in the first instance, if anyone had sought to call the great project Hoover Dam there might have been little or no objec-

tion. But today, after 14 years following the completion of the great project known the world around as Boulder Dam, to proceed to change the name of that object of human interest affects not only the past but the future, and affects very materially the private and business lives of the entire community in southern Nevada.

It must not be lost sight of that from its very inception this project was known as Boulder Dam. The House hearings are entitled "Colorado River Basin," 1926. On page 4 of the printed volume, the bill which was basic to the establishment of Boulder Dam, which bill was presented by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on February 5, 1926, is set out. I read from section 10 of the bill:

> That for the purpose of constructing said dam and incidental works, canals, and appurtenant structures and acquiring lands and rights-of-way therefor, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of $70,000,000, to be appropriated from time to time, upon estimates made by the Secretary of the Interior, and transferred to a subfund of the reclamation fund established under the said reclamation law and to be designated "Boulder Dam project fund."

Mr. President, I am reading from the original act, the act which gave authority for the construction of Boulder Dam. The very fund which stood behind the project, in the language of the bill, is "Boulder Dam project fund."

> All moneys received from the allocation of power rights or privileges at said dam or moneys received under contracts respecting the construction of canals and not used for construction purposes shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States. Moneys thus received during the course of construction are hereby reappropriated for said construction purposes for which said moneys were received, and moneys received on account of expenses of operation are hereby reappropriated for such purposes.

So we see at the very outset that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States, in concert with Congress, designated the project as Boulder Dam, and the fund as Boulder Dam project fund.

That was under the administration of the great President Coolidge. At that time Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Coolidge was President of the United States when the Boulder Dam Act was passed, and he signed the bill which carries the language in it, "Boulder Dam Project Fund."

What was Mr. Hoover's turn of mind on that occasion? What was his inclination as a public official? Was he in favor of the construction of this great project? He was a member of the Cabinet of the President who signed the bill. He has been designated as one of the three greatest engineers of the world. The able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has just so designated him. He evidently had thoughts of his own on the subject of Boulder Dam and on the subject of public works generally. I find that Mr. Hoover had very definite ideas, because in his speech of acceptance when his party nominated him for President on August 12, 1932, he said:

> I have opposed the Federal Government undertaking the operation of power business, and I shall continue that opposition.

This was a great power project. This was to be, and is, one of the greatest power projects in all the world. Mr. Hoover was then, and indeed has been nearly all his mature life, opposed to Government power projects.

The statement of Mr. Hoover as Secretary of Commerce, while appearing before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on February 5, 1926, also emphasized his position and his turn of mind on public institutions of this kind for the production of power. He said:

> I am not at all in favor of the Federal Government undertaking construction of public works of this character.

There he was expressing himself with regard to Boulder Dam.

> I am not at all in favor of the Federal Government undertaking construction of public works of this character.

I merely refer to these expressions coming from Mr. Hoover as indicating his own turn of mind with reference to Boulder Dam. Probably it would have been the same with reference to Grand Coulee. It probably would have been the same with reference to any of the other great public works which were established for power production. That is no criticism against Mr. Hoover. It is my judgment that anyone possessed of the fine training which Mr. Hoover possesses has a perfect right to take a position one way or the other regarding the production of electric energy by the use of public funds. Today many Senators question whether public funds should be expended on projects which come in competition with private enterprise.

Mr. President, I make mention of the facts antecedent to the construction of Boulder Dam and the time Mr. Hoover was President so that it may be known that his turn of mind at that time was not in favor of the construction of Boulder Dam.

Mr. President, considerable time will be required in order that the Senate may know and understand all the considerations which are involved here. My discussion of the subject is based solely upon the reason that the people of my State are affected. They are seriously affected in their private business because they have taken up life in Boulder City, which is immediately adjacent to Boulder Dam, which grew out of Boulder Dam, and which exists because of Boulder Dam. The people of that community have carried the term which they were authorized to carry into all of their publicity, into all of their business, and private life. I am in receipt of hundreds of telegrams and dozens of letters from the business people of Boulder City, requesting that this bill be defeated. It is not that they have any antipathy toward Mr. Hoover. The letters which I have received have come in many instances from outstanding Republicans, men and women who were perhaps supporters of Mr. Hoover, both in his first and second campaigns; but today they are citizens of a community which has been builded by reason of a business, builded on a name, and that name is Boulder Dam. The community itself would not exist were it not for the fact that Boulder Dam was constructed. From the day the first shovelful of dirt was turned on that great project until the present hour it has been known and designated as Boulder Dam. Nowhere has the term "Hoover" or "Hoover Dam" come into the project.

The first funds for the construction of Boulder Dam were requested in the message of President Hoover. He had then become President. That was on May 1, 1930. I draw the attention of the Senate to this because it is the act of Mr. Hoover himself. The full message made two references to the name "Boulder Dam."

Mr. President, the message to which I refer bears the date, "White House, Washington, May 1, 1930." The letter of transmittal is signed by Herbert Hoover, and the message carrying the supplemental appropriation states as follows:

> I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1930 to remain available until expended, amounting to $10,660,000, as follows:
>
> Boulder Canyon project. For the commencement of construction of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon, to create a storage reservoir, and of a complete plant and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy from water discharged from said reservoir; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain or otherwise all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes; and for incidental operations; as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 43, ch. 15A), fiscal year 1930, to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund, $10,660,000, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, and for all other objects of expenditure that are specified for projects included under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation" in the Interior Department appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931, without regard to the limitations of amounts therein set forth, $10,660,000.

What for, Mr. President? It was for what the President's message said it was—the Boulder Canyon project, as he said.

Mr. President, if it had been the intent of Congress or the intent of the authors or drafters of the first bill that the project be called by some name other than Boulder Dam or the Boulder Dam project, would not they have so designated in the original act? Mr. Hoover was an outstanding citizen of the United States; in fact, at that very time he was occupying a powerful position in the Cabinet of the then President, Mr. Coolidge. Not only that, but at that time his party was considering Mr. Hoover for their nominee for 1932. With all that before them, would not one think that the Congress of the United States, then Republican, would have designated

the project as the Hoover Dam? However, they did not. They called it Boulder Canyon project from the very beginning.

The message which President Hoover sent to the Congress on May 1, 1930, states:

> The purpose of this estimate is to provide funds for the commencement of construction work on the Boulder Canyon project, authorized by the act of December 21, 1928. The Secretary of the Interior advises that, as required by the act, contracts have been secured which will provide revenues adequate in his judgment to pay operation and maintenance costs, and insure repayment to the United States, within 50 years from the date of completion of the dam, power plant, and related works, of all amounts to be advanced for the construction of such works, together with the interest thereon made reimbursable by the act.
>
> The following items of expenditures make up the total amount of this estimate—

Mr. President, as I have said, I am reading from the message of the then President of the United States, Mr. Hoover:

> Construction railroad, $2,500,000.
> Construction camp, $525,000.
> Construction power plant, $1,750,000.
> Rights of way, $500,000.
> Commencement of construction of Boulder Dam, division works, etc.—

Here again the then President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, spoke of commencement of construction of that which the Congress itself had designated in the original bill as "Boulder Dam." So Mr. Hoover repeated the language of the Congress of the United States:

> Commencement of construction of Boulder Dam, diversion works, etc., $5,000,000.

That is a part of the message which President Hoover sent to the Congress.

On June 11, 1930, in the Seventy-first Congress, second session, in a bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, we find that the Bureau of Reclamation has the following appropriation:

> Boulder Canyon project—

Again we find it repeated in the appropriation bill:

> Boulder Canyon project: For the commencement of construction of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon, to create a storage reservoir, and of a complete plant and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy from the water discharged from said reservoir; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain, or otherwise, all lands, rights of way and other property necessary for said purposes; and for incidental operations; as authorized by the Boulder Canyon project act approved December 21, 1928, * * * $10,660,000, to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River fund.

So, Mr. President, all through the history of this project we find the language "Boulder Canyon" and "Boulder Canyon fund" and "Boulder Canyon vicinity."

The second appropriation for construction and continuation of construction of the dam was requested in President Hoover's budget message of December 30, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932. The Interior Department's requested appropriations make reference only to the Boulder Canyon project.

I address that point to the attention of the Senate—not that I have any quarrel with the idea of naming any great project after Mr. Hoover, but because thousands upon thousands of people in my State have built their businesses around the names "Boulder Canyon" and "Boulder Dam," and those names have been publicized the world over. Now, after 15 or 20 years, to say that we are going to set aside those names and thus destroy the business of those people, whose lives have been established in the shadow of Boulder Dam, simply to do honor to a man who publicly said he did not favor public investments for projects of this kind, seems to me to be most undesirable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the rule Senate Joint Resolution 45 will be returned to the calendar, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Pepper
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lodge	Thye
Connally	Lucas	Tobey
Cooper	McCarran	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Downey	McFarland	Watkins
Dworshak	McGrath	Wherry
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ecton	McMahon	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
George	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The junior Senator from Michigan has the floor. Will he yield to the Presiding Officer to lay down a very brief message from the Secretary of State?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By way of explanation, the Chair may say that on April 18 the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as appears as page 3691 of the RECORD, made the suggestion that Secretary of State Marshall, in Moscow, advise the Senate and the House, by cable, of his personal position with regard to the proposed Greek and Turkish loan program, based upon his latest experiences in the Foreign Ministers Conference. There is no single citizen in the United States of America who possesses a greater and more up-to-the-minute insight of United States-Russian relations than our distinguished Secretary of State. If my suggestion that he advise us at this time on the Greek and Turkish loan meets with favor here, and with the State Department, and the President, then I believe that General Marshall could, with that keen mind and great brain of his, within a few hours or less cable word to the Senate and to the House of Representatives on this matter. In so doing he could help resolve many of the questions and doubts in the minds of my colleagues here and in the minds of all Americans.

Pursuant to that suggestion, the President pro tempore of the Senate requested that the State Department communicate with the Secretary of State, and the Secretary has replied in a message which is addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I understand some question has arisen as to my participation in the Greek-Turkish aid program.
>
> As you know, prior to my departure for Moscow, I participated in the formulation of this program and in the decision to go forward with it. When I reached Paris on March 6, the President telegraphed the proposed text of his message of March 12 and I informed the Department that I fully concurred.
>
> I, personally, and, for the State Department, attach the highest order of urgency to immediate passage of the Greek-Turkish aid legislation. In my opinion, the program proposed is indispensable and I am in complete accord with the actions taken by Mr. Acheson for the Department and by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in urging the Congress to pass this legislation.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the foreign policy of America should be based upon reason and sound judgment. If a great calamity overtakes a country, we in America, have been the first to aid the peoples of that country so her suffering may be alleviated. In such a case the grant is to the people and does not involve our continued foreign policy.

No one will dispute the fact that the people of Greece need aid because of a great calamity. In the past we have granted such aid and in the future we will do so, not as a foreign policy, but as an act of humanitarianism.

Today we are confronted with a different question. Are we to make our aid to Greece a part of our foreign policy and back it up with diplomatic and military commitments. This is a vital and important step.

As we are about to embark on an uncharted course in the seething Balkan Sea of historic frictions and conflicting interests, let us not be unmindful of re-

cent experiences in which our Government has not been distinguished for the foresight and sagacity of its decisions. Let us now take steps to insure that in this new program we will do better than we have in the past so that we may merit the confidence of the freedom-seeking peoples of the world who can turn to no one but us for leadership.

The main responsibility for this program must obviously rest upon the President, in whom the Constitution vests the authority to conduct foreign relations. But Congress is not without its share of responsibility as well. The Senate must advise and consent to treaties and appointments of officials, and the Congress must appropriate funds to implement our foreign policy. Under our system of checks and balances, these responsibilities of the Congress must be independently exercised.

We need but look at the map and travel over and around the Mediterranean to reach the conclusion that from the air and naval point of view Greece is a strategic point.

Greece and her people have had a hard battle to survive. She has all but perished at the hands of Italy, Germany, and even some of her own people.

We remember in the early days when little Greece defied Mussolini and Hitler, held them at bay, and by her gallant stand gave Britain and her allies an opportunity to prepare and consolidate, and today Greece asks for our assistance.

When the Germans left she had to have a government, and she had the unhappy choice between a King and communism. She chose the King.

Greece is not a democracy as we in America understand it. She has a Parliament building, but I say a Parliament building and House of Deputies does not make a democracy. It is a starting point. The Parliament must have the authority and capacity to make laws and then there must be a system of courts to see that there is government under law and not under men. With our aid she stands a much better chance of developing democratic institutions and establishing freedom as we know it here in America.

The present Prime Minister, Maximos, is not a member of their Parliament. Under their constitution he should be. He is not of the party holding the majority in Parliament. Tsaldaris, who is the leader of the majority, is Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. From reliable information, this policy was dictated from the outside, and was followed for the sake of getting a so-called working government.

Greece is a small nation. She has only about 7,000,000 population—less than the population of New York City, and about a half million of her people are now ill with tuberculosis, caused by the suffering they underwent during the great war. Her people are undernourished and many are homeless and under the pressure to which they were subjected a large percentage has succumbed to Communism. The Communists have their leaders in Greece who are so powerful that the day following President Truman's address to the Congress on the subject of the Greek loan, these Communist leaders called on the Prime Minister and urged him not to accept the loan, stating that America was interested in imperialism, and would take over Greece.

The present Greek Government knows we are not making the loan for imperialistic reasons nor do we want to take over Greece. Little has been done, however, to check communism in Greece. There is in Greece a free press, that is, it is free so far as the Communists are concerned, and so far as criticism of the United States and of the proposed loan is concerned.

The Communists, being powerful and well organized, have formed into armed bands and are permitted to cross the northern border into Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Many Grecian youth have been forced to join these armies and are now fearful of returning to Greece.

England has maintained an army in Greece to keep order and thus keep the present Government in Greece. She has now, I am reliably informed, some 7,500 troops there and both a military mission and a naval mission helping to train the Greek military forces. It is apparent a country the size of Greece cannot maintain an army sufficiently strong to do anything except to serve as an internal police force.

Greece, as I have said before, while not a democratic Nation as we understand democratic institutions, is not, however, a dictatorship. Our example and aid in her hour of need should help her on the road toward democracy.

Our people and the world should understand that this loan is only a stopgap. Communism cannot be stopped by cash alone, and so means must be found whereby the integrity of small countries will be guaranteed and their boundaries must be protected from aggression. This can be done only by a United Nations organization, with or without Russia in it. Unless this is done before the loan provided by the pending bill is expended, similar loans will have to be repeated over and over again in order to save Greece. If, however, we do not take a firm stand after being presented with this problem by our Chief Executive, it appears to me it would be a clear green light to the communistic elements in Greece and other countries, and there would be grave doubt that Greece could survive except as another satellite of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an open path for Russia to the Near East.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has said there is grave doubt. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind?

Mr. FERGUSON. I used the expression "grave doubt." I wish to say that almost no doubt was left in my mind. Miracles can happen, but it appears to me that if we did not now grant this aid, it would be a miracle if Greece could survive other than as a satellite of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the Senator mean that if this aid is not granted the situation in Greece will be absolutely hopeless?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way it appears to me at the present time, and that is the way I feel. If Greece becomes a satellite of Russia—and we might as well speak frankly here today, for the people of this country should know these things—the path would be open to Russia to the Near East and even to the Far East. The vital natural resources of the Near and Far East would then be closed to the United States and other democracies.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is waging a war of nerves on the Turkish Government and its people. Turkey is convinced that her two western provinces are in danger of invasion, if not her whole country. This has caused the present Government to strengthen her army to about 820,000. The Secretary of State in answer to one of the questions submitted to him said that between 500,000 and 600,000 were under arms, but from the best information I could obtain, it being somewhat of a military secret there, they have under arms as many as 820,000 men.

Mr. President, Turkey has outlawed communism, and one sees very little evidence of communism in that country. The situation in Greece is different. The fear which exists in Turkey comes from the war of nerves, from a feeling of what Russia will do from the outside. This war of nerves by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics aims to burden Turkey with a defense expense so great that the people will demand an appeasement of Russia and break down the present attitude and resistance.

Naturally—and we all know it—Union of Soviet Socialist Republics demands joint control of the Dardenelles with Turkey. The Bosporus is equally important and as one drives along the Bosporus he realizes that just on the other side is Asia's and Russia's great expanse. At the Bosporus entrance to the Black Sea, one sees the nets laden with bombs guarding this vital entrance. This is Turkey's way of saying to Russia—"this far and no farther without our consent."

The present Turkish Army of 820,000, out of a population of from eighteen to nineteen million, though paid poorly and poorly equipped, is a drain on the Turkish economy. The private in the army receives 8 cents a month, measured in the terms of money value here in the United States. A colonel receives $130 a month. The question of army pay is small. The greatest drain on the economy of Turkey at the present time is that her young manpower is taken away from her production for a period of 3 years.

Turkey has only single-track railroads, and when it is necessary for the Government to move troops they must shut down all other transportation. This affects the economy, and, as I said, the war of nerves on the Turkish people will, unless they can receive help, cause grave, serious trouble.

Turkey, of course, is interested in aid to Greece because she knows that Greece may become politically and economically weak and be taken over as a satellite, and unless Greece can remain politically and economically strong—or become so, I had better say—Greece and her islands

in Russian hands or under her influence would place a greater strain upon Turkey.

What is this burden in dollars, so far as the budget of Turkey is concerned? Reliable information indicates that the direct percentage of the budget for military purposes is 19 percent. But when the indirect costs involved are considered the percentage of the budget for military purposes rises up to 60 percent. Therefore, I must say to the Members of the Senate that, in my humble judgment, this is but a stopgap unless we insist on an agreement with Russia that the border of Turkey be secured and the war of nerves as to the Dardenelles be permanently settled. We have the other alternative that the United Nations be made sufficiently strong to insist that all borders be made secure from aggression. This appears impossible since we read the headlines of April 20, 1947:

United Nations' police role limited to small nations' strife. Military staff committee's decision based on veto of any action against Big Five.

I was much disappointed when I read that in yesterday's newspapers. In other words, it appears to me that Greece and Turkey and other small countries, no matter where they may be, are left in such a position that they cannot look to the United Nations at this time for the protection of their borders.

This is a serious question not only to America but to the world. I am satisfied that the people of Greece and Turkey felt that if they could be carried along for a short period they would find themselves in a position where the United Nations could take over this problem and protect their borders. However, we must insist upon the integrity of those borders, for we cannot survive in this world unless small countries are protected and allowed to travel along the democratic road, rather than the totalitarian road as satellites of Russia. The U. S. S. R. being one of the Big Five, Turkey's border and the road to the Dardanelles will not be protected from aggression unless something can be done in a short time through the United Nations and the police power which it was thought the United Nations would be able to exercise.

As I have previously stated, what has happened has been a blow to small nations. They will be in constant fear of aggression by the large powers, and even by small powers which may be protected by one or more of the big powers. Therefore at the present time we are left in this position: Only an agreement between Russia and Turkey and the western powers will permit Turkey to recover politically and economically.

I find no evidence that we in the United States have attempted to obtain a guarantee of Turkey's borders or the borders of Greece. This is another case of our foreign policy trying to put the cart before the horse, and then we wonder why it does not work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have been listening to what the Senator from Michigan has been saying, as I have listened to many other speeches on the subject. I have not been in the Chamber during all the debate. Perhaps the question I am about to ask has been previously asked and answered. I am wondering if anyone in authority in our Government—the Secretary of State or any other high official—has had a conference with representatives of Russia and has said, "We do not like what you are doing. Are you going to stop it?" Have we made any effort, through conference with Russia, to say: "We do not like this. What are you going to do about it?" Has there been such a conference?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no such conference. If the Senator and I had been dealing with each other, that is the way we would have started. We would have started by realizing what was essential, what was necessary to be done. But the difficulty with diplomacy is that it consists of double-talk, which not only deceives other nations, but deceives the American people.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, so far as the Senator knows, no high official of our Government has sat down at a table with representatives of Russia and said, "We do not like what you are doing in Turkey. We do not like what you are doing in Greece. What are you going to do about it?" Have we given Russia an opportunity to withdraw from Greece and Turkey?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have gone carefully over the answers to the questions submitted to the State Department. I have read the information contained in the report, and I find no such evidence. In my opinion this situation takes us back to the year 1938, when Hitler in Germany was doing certain things, and was on the move. While no one can say with assurance what would have happened, personally I feel that if we had taken a firm stand, if we had said exactly what we meant, as we did in September of 1941, Hitler would have taken a different attitude. In going through the Pearl Harbor hearings I gained some insight into our foreign relations and our diplomacy.

If we had said to the American people that certain things were essential if we were to avoid trouble in the future, the American people would have come to the aid of anyone who had taken such a stand, and would have said, "We will support you."

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must advise occupants of the galleries that any demonstrations are against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator know whether our Government has sent a letter or communication to the Russian Government pointing out the things to which we are opposed, things which the Russians are doing that we do not like, and saying to them in no uncertain terms that if they do not discontinue them we shall have to take appropriate action? Does the Senator know whether or not that has been done?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no such action. The difficulty is that diplomacy does not work that way. It places a veneer over everything and speaks in language which can be understood one way or the other. I am speaking frankly because I believe that not only should Members of the Senate know, but the people of America should know, and Russia should know, where we stand on this question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator believe that if we were to say to Russia in no uncertain terms that we are opposed to certain things which she is doing, she would discontinue doing those things?

Mr. FERGUSON. My judgment is that if we were now to present this question to Russia and tell her exactly where America and the American people stand, that we have certain principles from which we cannot vary, principles involving the integrity of boundaries and the rights of people, Russia would go along on that basis. I am satisfied that the choice we are about to take now is the lesser of two evils. Perhaps the alternative to that choice is war with Russia. God forbid that such a war should ever come; but if there are two choices, I am convinced that the choice we are about to make is the lesser of two evils. If I did not feel that way I could not vote as I intend to vote, and I would not speak as I am speaking here today.

We must be frank. We must say exactly what we mean; and our actions must be supported by commitments which show that we mean exactly what we say.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, so far as the Senator knows, we have not told Russia, either in writing or through conferences, the things we will stand for and those we will not. So far as the Senator knows, our Government has not objected to the attitude of Russia and her actions in Turkey and Greece.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of nothing of that nature except the President's address to the Congress.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any Senator present who can inform us whether or not we have sat down at the table with Russia's representatives, or written a communication, or in any other way officially objected?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Indiana, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Except for the address which the President delivered to the Congress, I know of no communication which has been sent to the Russian Government along the lines suggested.

Mr. CAPEHART. Prior to the President's address to the Congress, does the Senator know of any message which was sent to Russia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of none.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator knows of no conference. He knows of no meeting in which Russia participated on one side of the table and our Government on

the other, in which we said to them, "We do not like your actions. You had better desist or we will go into Greece and Turkey and lend them money."

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no such thing.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been intrigued by the questions asked by the Senator from Indiana, because so much stress seems to be placed upon the argument that our country has failed, that we have not done what we should have done.

Mr. President, the present Presiding Officer of this body [Mr. VANDENBERG] could step down on the floor of the Senate and tell us of the long and bitter hours during which our representatives in the United Nations have contended for the sovereignty of small nations and for their right to select their own governments. We have not failed.

I will go back further than that. I will go back to the foundation of this country, when we asserted our right to decide for ourselves and accorded to every nation in the world the same right which we demanded for ourselves.

I go back to the Fourteen Points laid down by Woodrow Wilson in the last World War and to every ambition, every motive, and every purpose this country had in going into either of the world wars. It simply was that every nation had the right to live in peace according to the dictates of the desire of its own people and without outside influence of any kind.

Mr. President, the question has been asked as to what this country has done. It has given billions of its dollars; it has given the lives of many of its sons; it has laid down principles by which the whole world could live in peace.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I remember correctly, we gave our billions of dollars and our boys gave their lives to protect Russia—the very same people whom we are told we must go into Greece and Turkey to fight. Where is that liberty-loving communism we have heard so much about for so many years? What has happened to it? I asked a simple and direct question, and the Senator from New Mexico launches into a speech and deals in generalities. I asked as a matter of practicality whether or not, in trying to come to a decision in this matter, we have actually sat down and discussed the questions involved with that great liberty-loving ally of ours, our partner and ally. Only a few months ago the Russians were our great partners and allies. They were liberty loving, but now we are told they are no longer liberty loving; they are no longer our allies; but are trying to gobble up little Turkey and Greece, and we must appropriate $400,000,000 to keep them from accomplishing that objective. I say that there is nothing but confusion and inconsistency in our State Department with reference to our foreign policy. One can talk about it as lightly as he cares to and deal with it in generalities, but I say that the American people are confused, and it is easy to understand why they are confused.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am very sorry if I displeased the Senator from Indiana. I did not mean to deal with him in generalities. The Senator said I was dealing in generalities. I do feel rather deeply, Mr. President, when Senators rise here and criticize our Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can the simple question as to whether we did or did not take this matter up directly with Russia be a criticism of our Government? I was seeking information. The American people are seeking information. Would it not be much better if it were possible to sit down with the Russians and discuss this matter at a conference? I do not know whether it can be done or not. I rather have my doubts. I ask the simple question, Did we sit down at a table and say to Russia: "We do not like what you are doing. What are you going to do about it?"

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator that I should be delighted if we could sit down at the council table and calmly and dispassionately discuss these questions and reach a fair, just, and honorable conclusion. But I am not deceived. I realize what has gone on, and I realize that every time we have attempted to do that we have been stopped and balked by first one thing and then another. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Indiana, we have made these suggestions to Russia. We have tried to sit down at the conference table; we have tried to iron out these questions, and it is not our fault that it has not been done.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, the answer is that we have tried to do it?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. And it has been impossible?

Mr. HATCH. It has been impossible. Even since the President delivered his address, if there had been nothing beyond that, there has been ample opportunity if the other people had wanted to do it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What has happened to the friendship of Russia and the United States? What has happened between those great partners? One country, meaning our own, gave them billions of dollars worth of war material and protected them. What has happened? Were they always the kind of people it is said they are today? Were we fooling when we said they were liberty loving? Were we fooling then or are we fooling now?

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Michigan will yield for a moment I will say that of course I cannot answer the Senator's question within any permissible time to be taken from the Senator from Michigan, but I will say to the Senator from Indiana that there is much to be said for the valiant work which the Russians did in the war. I shall not further intrude upon the Senator from Michigan except to say that I have listened to what he has said, and he is presenting a fine and magnificent argument. With every word which he has uttered I am in complete accord. He understands the situation and is trying to tell the Senate of the United States truthfully what he and I have both discovered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall take only 1 second. I have listened on the floor of the Senate, I have listened over the air, and have read page after page of remarks of Members of the Senate praising the great Russians, praising their love of freedom, praising their strength—praising them to the skies. Did they mean it or did they not? What has happened in the interim to change the opinion of Members of this body and to change the opinion of many people in the United States who, not many months ago, were praising the Communist government. Thank God, I was one that never praised them. I was always opposed to them, and I still am today. But I question whether I can follow people who months ago were praising the very thing which they are condemning today. There should be a little consistency at least in the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we must take our position on the basis of the facts as we find them. No matter what might have been done, we face the situation as of today. We find that we have a commitment. I say that if we do not implement it, we shall find that Russia will construe our action to mean that we in Congress do not believe that Turkey should be politically and economically free, and we would not object to Russian aggression in either Turkey or Greece. Therefore, I find myself compelled by all the facts of the case as they now present themselves to support what some people may call the lesser of two evils, and carry out our commitment.

However, these loans can be a two-edged sword. We hear the cry of imperialism on our part in those countries, and the question is asked whether we should attempt to dictate to the Government of Turkey or the Government of Greece or to dictate to the people of Turkey or the people of Greece. If we are not careful, Mr. President—and this is but a warning to the Executive—we shall find ourselves in the unenviable position in which England now finds herself in the Near East.

When we grant this aid, we must make certain that it is correctly administered. Again, we in the Congress and the people of the United States must rely upon the Executive. We can approve the top official, but we have no more than the right to make a postaudit, which is really of little value except in reversing our position and canceling the appropriation. Mr. President, a bipartisan foreign policy, formed only upon the right to make a postaudit, or an autopsy, is not what the people of America want or expect.

This bill will authorize an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the program in Turkey, and all of it will be used for military equipment, or, to a lesser extent, for economic projects directly related to Turkish security. I take that last sentence from the answer submitted by the State Department to question numbered 26.

Mr. President, I now wish to take up something in relation to what the Appropriations Committee will face when there comes before it the appropriation which is to implement the loan. When we made the settlement on lend-lease with the British Empire, we found there was unconsumed lend-lease material in the hands of the United Kingdom to the amount of approximately $5,000,000,000 worth. When we made the agreement concerning lend-lease with Great Britain, we stipulated in the agreement:

> The United States reserves its right of recapture of any lend-lease articles held by the United Kingdom Armed Forces but the United States has indicated that it does not intend to exercise generally this right of recapture.

Mr. President, when I was recently in Egypt, I had a conversation with the Central Field Foreign Liquidation Commission, an agency of the Department of State. I then learned that there were 11,000 American-made trucks standing in the Egyptian desert, outside Cairo. Mr. President, we have not seen fit to recapture them. No one seems to know why. But we have not done so. No one knows the amount of lend-lease material in the Near East. We have not seen fit to exercise our rights under that agreement, although it has been practically 2 years since the material was used.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it not indicated that there was somewhere between $40,000,000 and $80,000,000 worth of material in Iraq?

Mr. FERGUSON. The first figures I received, before I received the report in writing, went as high as a possible $250,000,000 worth. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And does not the report which the Senator now has in writing indicate that there was estimated to be somewhere between $40,000,000 and $80,000,000 worth?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it says that there is an estimated amount of from $40,000,000 to $80,000,000 worth.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does it not further show that some of the material is now being shipped back from Iraq into Palestine, for use by the British military forces there?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not have direct evidence as to its actual shipment, but there is evidence that the British forces are still using this material in the Near East.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have read the report which the Senator from Michigan holds in his hand——

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall put in the RECORD the entire report. I do not recall the exact language.

Mr. BREWSTER. It refers to the back loading of this material in Iraq, from the tremendous military dump near Shaiba, into Palestine.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. That has been a matter to which I have addressed myself before. But I still feel very great concern that this material, furnished by us under lend-lease, should be used in Palestine at this time for the purpose of shooting Jews who consider that they are in lawful insurrection against the action of the British Government. It has always seemed to me that the United States Government should not lend itself in any form to such an activity, and that the recapture of this material would be fully justified and warranted, particularly since we are now being asked to appropriate $400,000,000 to furnish military matériel for Greece and Turkey. It seems to me it would be much better from the American standpoint, if this material in the Middle East could be turned over to Greece and Turkey, for such benefit as might accrue to the United States rather than to be taken into Palestine for the purpose of shooting Jews who are seeking to establish what they conceive to be their rights of immigration into Palestine under a treaty made between the United States and Great Britain, which assured them the right of entry into Palestine, and that avoidance of which by the British Government under the so-called white paper has been denounced by the Mandatory Commission of the League of Nations as utterly in violation of international law and understanding.

I hope that those concerned with the administration of our mission and our military requirements will address themselves very seriously to this situation without more delay.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I read the exact language from page 3 of the report, given to me while I was in Egypt:

> However, the British are continuing to back-load lend-lease items from Shaiba to the Canal Zone, Palestine, and East Africa for continued military use.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the report from our diplomatic attaché at Cairo; is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have great sympathy for the position taken by the able Senator from Michigan and the able Senator from Maine that United States equipment should not be used in Palestine to shoot down the Jews who are trying to further what they believe to be their legitimate interests there; but I would also extend the same principle against using United States equipment in Greece to enable the Royalist Government to shoot down Greeks who are trying to achieve their idea of democracy in their homeland. I am sorry the two Senators do not apply the same principle in both cases.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Appropriations Committee will come the matter of whether our Government should spend American taxpayers' dollars for war matériel and military matériel for the armies of Greece and Turkey. Then the question can be raised why the billions of dollars worth of material which is now in the Near East, yes, all over the world, for that matter, should not be used for this particular purpose. Why should it be necessary to spend perhaps billions of dollars more to manufacture more military and naval matériel?

Particularly is this true since we are relieving England of the burden in the Near East, and she will share the benefit we will share in preserving a free and independent Greece and Turkey, and a Greece and Turkey which can travel the road to democracy as we understand it.

To sum up, I will say that the loan to Greece and Turkey is imperative as a stopgap while the United Nations is being strengthened to take over the permanent job. This is the best example the world can ever have for the need of a strong United Nations organization so that the United States will not be called upon every time a humanitarian crisis or a border dispute threatens the safety of the world.

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF CENTRAL FIELD
FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Cairo, Egypt, April 11, 1947.

The Honorable HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator,
Shepheards Hotel, Cairo, Egypt.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Pursuant with your request of yesterday, I am attaching a memorandum prepared by the Chief of our Lend-Lease Division, giving an estimate of the value of the United States lend-lease interest in British holdings in the Middle East—stores and installations. These are estimated values and are not as complete as I would have liked to have had them, but your contemplated departure today limited me in the amount of detail I could incorporate in this memorandum.

The sale of United States surpluses in the Middle East have been completed and there remains only the accounting by our Fiscal Division, which we hope to complete on or about June 1, at which time all records will be sent to Washington.

Realizing the importance of the lend-lease situation in the Middle East, I have recommended to Washington the continuation of a small staff through 1948 to handle the sale of lend-lease arisings. This recommendation is now under consideration in Washington and the size of the staff continuing here will be determined largely by action on the budget.

I was delighted to have the opportunity of meeting you and discussing with you in a very limited way the problems we are facing in the disposal of lend-lease materials.

Assuring you of my very high regard, I am,
Sincerely yours,

WILBUR B. HART,
Central Field Commissioner.

APRIL 10, 1947.

To: Mr. Wilbur B. Hart, central field commissioner.

From: Jeffrey C. Kitchen, director, Lend-Division.

Subject: Estimated value of United States interest in British holdings in the Middle East (stores and installations).

PART 1. RESULTS TO DATE

(a) FLC Cairo has realized approximately $7,250,000 (sales value) from acceptance of British offers to return lend-lease and resulting direct sales by this office. Direct sales were undertaken to allow this office to handle disposal of certain types of American-made equipment, meet the requirements of preferred customers such as American oil companies, and obtain the best possible return to the United States Government in price and currency received.

(b) The British have made sales for our account to a value of $8,500,000.

(c) Our best estimate is that the United States Government will receive from future sales of lend-lease in this area an amount equal to the above total, $15,750,000.

PART 2. PROPORTION OF SALES TO LEND-LEASE INTEREST REMAINING

(a) FLC Cairo has accepted British offers to return of $16,000,000 worth of equipment (cost value), which has been sold for $7,250,000, representing a return of roughly 45 percent on declared value. Two million dollars of the money received was in United States dollars or dollar obligations; the remainder in local currency. We have been offered an additional $5,000,000 worth of lend-lease equipment, sales for which are now being negotiated. Continuation of FLC direct sales is dependent upon the desirability of maintaining the advantages outlined under 1–a above.

(b) The British have made sales for our account roughly divided as follows: VJ-day to March 27, 1946, $3,500,000; March 27, 1946 (date of the Washington Specific Agreements to the lend-lease settlement), to April 1, 1947, $5,000,000. These sales have been in local currencies. The British now estimate that they are at the peak of their disposal program and will continue to maintain their present sales volume through October of this year. They expect that the volume of surplus declarations will then taper off and the operation can be terminated around March 31, 1948. However, the British Army in Iraq has not reached the maximum number of declarations per month and probably will not do so until June.

Material offered in return is cleared for sale by representatives of this office sitting on the Anglo-American Joint Stores Clearing Committee. Clearance includes rejection of the offer to return and approval for sale by the British if this office cannot arrange a more advantageous sale. Items cleared are followed through an accounting system and check of British sales vouchers. FLC representatives on this committee also challenge categorization (identification as lead-lease or non-lend-lease) on questionable items reported as being of British origin.

PART 3. ESTIMATE OF VALUE REMAINING

Any estimate of remaining lend-lease interest in British stores and fixed installations in the Middle East must be conditioned by the political and financial implications of the British evacuation of Egypt and settlement of sterling balances. The evacuation of the delta area and consequent reestablishment of British installations in the canal zone has tended to confuse the lend-lease picture in Egypt. Similar difficulties as related to the sterling balances have been characteristic of operations in Iraq, but to a lesser degree.

The British were prepared to sell the various military installations in the Egyptian delta to the Egyptian Government. The lend-lease interest, largely represented by items of plant, piping, wiring, and installed machinery, would have been taken into account in these negotiations, either through an agreed evaluation formula or direct United States participation. However, the Egyptians were reluctant to separate negotiations for the purchase of these installations from the renegotiation of the 1946 Anglo-Egyptian treaty and settlement of sterling balances. The result was that the British removed, just before the March 31 dead line, all easily removable items of plant and machinery to the canal zone for reuse in the construction of the new GHQ and other installations. We are now determining the lend-lease interest in the few items of plant and equipment turned over to the Egyptians on a care-and-maintenance basis, and are inventorying the equipment in the canal area.

Another major obstacle to evaluating future returns is the fact that, under the lend-lease settlement, the British Army is allowed to continue military use of lend-lease items for as long as they are required. As a result of the political factors described above, it has not been possible for the British to project definite military building plans for the area. This has been a particular problem as related to lend-lease interest in fixed installations in Egypt and in the clearing of stores from the vast dump at Shaiba, Iraq. The lend-lease interest in stores at Shaiba has been variously estimated as having a cost value of between forty and eighty million dollars, although the smaller figure is considered more probable. To date we have approved sales for United States account from which we will realize some $1,000,000. We have also accepted several offers to return, but have experienced considerable difficulty in developing a market due to the Iraq Government's reluctance to grant export licenses. We have recently overcome this problem and are now in a position to make or approve sales as fast as the British declare surpluses. However, the British are continuing to backload lend-lease items from Shaiba to the Canal Zone, Palestine, and East Africa for continued military use. Until the British position in Palestine is clarified by UN, and until the status of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty (and consequently Britain's position on the canal) has been settled, it will be impossible to determine the exact extent of the British military program and their consequent long-term requirement for the lend-lease supplies which they now hold.

The lend-lease interest in installations which will be disposed of intact within the present calendar year, if present plans are followed, is primarily concentrated in two pipe lines—the Cairo-Suez line and the pipe line in southern Iraq. The return to the United States from sale of these lines may be estimated at $1,000,000.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the objective of the American people, perpetual peace, with all nations raised to our standard of living, is clear and well defined.

The road to take in reaching this objective is not so clear and well defined, and should be subject to the most serious study and consideration before this Nation is committed to a policy from which there is no turning back.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is fond of the phrase "the chips are down," and has used it it connection with the Greek-Turkey loan. Mr. President, I have heard that phrase used since I could walk, but in my section of the country there is one further right the players have—they are entitled to look at the "pot."

Warren Austin, a former member of this body, and now our representative in the United Nations, said before the American Society of Newspaper Editors day before yesterday that "the United Nations can be represented by an arch, with one end resting on political cooperation and the other end resting upon economic cooperation."

We have never had Russia's political cooperation, and few will say that we have ever had the economic cooperation of England, France, or the Netherlands.

The United Nations organization is presently the hope, the only hope, of our people for world peace. In 1919 the League of Nations was the hope, and the only hope, of world peace.

Mr. President, 30 years ago, on April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson addressed a joint session of Congress advocating a "war to end all wars," and to make the "world safe for democracy."

Four days later, on April 6—Good Friday—the Congress of the United States declared war. We plunged into the European conflict with all the power and all the material resources of America, and won the first real all-out world war.

On November 11, 1918, President Wilson spoke to the Nation saying, "My fellow countrymen: The armistice was signed this morning. Everything for which America fought has been accomplished."

World War II has ended so recently that it is not necessary to review the start of that conflict or the help furnished the Allies against the Central Powers in equipment and material prior to Pearl Harbor—or the shipments of scrap iron and oil made to Japan by this Nation almost up to that fatal day.

This time it was the "four freedoms," and again, furnishing all the power and all our material resources necessary to defeat the enemy, America won.

It is not necessary at this early date following World War II to refer to the $300,000,000,000 debt left in its wake, or to the unpaid billions of lend-lease funds furnished to our allies during that greatest of all conflicts, or yet to the many billions to these nations following World War I that we naively thought at the time we were lending our neighbors to rehabilitate themselves, including approximately $6,000,000,000 to England upon which the interest has never been paid.

Mr. President, is it not about time that we looked at our "hole card." For a man to plunge with his money when he does not hold the cards is not considered good judgment. As a matter of fact, in my section of the country we have a name for that, too.

Now, Mr. President, I will say at the beginning that I object on principle to a policy which seeks to stampede us into further huge loans and gifts and actions which all agree will in all probability result in establishing a definite policy trend for this Nation, about which no adequate reliable information is available and with no opportunity for the thorough investigation which is certainly justified before a great country embarks upon a definite policy which could well lead it into a third devastating world war in one generation.

As the matter now stands, we have no world-wide pattern of action which

has been clearly considered and accepted after sober deliberation by those authorities charged with the direction of our policy. We suddenly find ourselves in detailed situations which we are with equal suddenness told are of such critical importance that no opportunity for due deliberation and investigation can be sensibly allowed. No provision is made to cover those further steps to which this pattern of action must inevitably lead us.

In short, we not only do not have a long-range goal covered by a definitive pattern of action in which we have carefully weighed both our own needs and the dangers to which our Nation will be thereby exposed, but we have not even gaged the capacity of the American people to support such a program in all its implications.

It is both useless and childish to assume that by giving money to Greece alone we can stay the hand of Soviet aggression and power. Any first-class military man will testify that the little Greek peninsula, even if it were united in our behalf, could not stay the hand of the gigantic Soviet military machine for three full days in the event of war. I shall again refer to the whole subject of the physical realities of the military position in the entire Near and Middle East.

At this moment, I should call attention only to the fact that in any considered program of resistance to Russian expansion, if such a program is to be required, the $400,000,000 we are being asked to give to Greece this year is not the end, but the beginning. It is the entering wedge in a program whose full implications must be properly considered before any portion of it can be voted upon. It is like the opening engagement in a war between gigantic nations. It is not the cost of the first skirmish which must be considered, but the total preparations which must inevitably be involved, as well as the cost of a total struggle all along the line.

At this point I should like to have inserted in the RECORD a list of the appropriations and gifts already made to the Greek Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNRRA and other U. S. Government aid given to the Greeks

UNRRA aid through Sept. 30, 1946	$309,656,000.00
Lend-lease aid through Dec. 31, 1946	81,562,821.63
Credit through Export-Import Bank	25,000,000.00
Credit through the U. S. Maritime Commission for purchase of ships	45,000,000.00
Credit through the Office of Foreign Liquidation Commission	45,000,000.00
Total	506,218,821.63

In 1940 Great Britain had made a loan of $184,000,000 to Greece. In January of 1946 this loan was canceled and an additional credit for $40,000,000 extended.

Sources: President's Ninth Report to Congress on Operation of UNRRA, pages 28 and 29; Cumulative Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations, cumulative through December 31, 1946, page 7; The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1946; Christian Science Monitor, January 29, 1946, page 2; Washington Post, October 9, 1946, page 1.

Also, information from Department of State, by telephone.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these payments amount to approximately $506,000,000, beginning in 1946 and coming down to the present time, not including the $400,000,000 we are now discussing.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada asked permission to insert a list in the RECORD, and I did not wish to object, but if I understood him correctly, he said we had given the Greeks $506,000,000 since 1946. I should like to have him elaborate on that subject.

Mr. MALONE. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HATCH. I understood the Senator to say that he was placing in the RECORD a statement showing that we had given to the Greeks $506,000,000 since 1946. Will he please explain just how those gifts were made?

Mr. MALONE. I should be delighted. UNRRA aid, through September 30, 1946 $309,656,000——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought the Senator said it had been a direct gift from our Government to Greece, but he is including UNRRA. I understand, now.

Mr. MALONE. That is what it will amount to. I would say further to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico there is little doubt that it is a real gift to the Greek people, if the history of our loans and so-called lend-lease is any criterion.

If our action is, indeed, dictated by the danger of communism, then we must consider that any state which will shout this danger is in a position effectively to blackmail the United States into supplying money and arms, even if such a state were Fascist in character and devoted to objectives contrary to the entire spirit of freedom, for whose sake we recently fought a great war.

In short, I point out to the Senate that after Greece comes Turkey. We are shortly to be asked to give $600,000,000 to Korea, another $1,000,000,000 to China, and $6,000,000,000 more to France and Britain. Italy, which is even more strategic than Greece will urge stupendous loans based on the same premises. I am informed on good authority that Great Britain is already preparing to ask for loans for her Arab satellites, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, and that Iran will come to us with the same purpose.

Even this stupendous outlay will only be the beginning. The first loans will demand ensuing and even larger loans, and in the end we will find ourselves committed to a program of gigantic proportions which will represent a gigantic drain upon the American economy comparable to a long-drawn-out wartime operation.

We must, therefore, ask ourselves now: Are we prepared for this result or is it only our intention to go into isolated places and risk the loss of face which must result from our subsequent withdrawal?

A policy of loans and gifts alone is insufficient to accomplish any of the results we ask. This was more than evident in reference to our mistaken policy in Latin America. Here we expended many billion dollars with more than questionable result. I need only to point out that Rio de Janeiro this year elected a majority of Communists to the city council—certainly an ominous fact. The Argentine, no matter how we may seek to placate her, is openly the enemy to our system of government, and in the event of a war with Russia could as easily be on the side of the Russians as was Nazi Germany for that period of time which followed the attack on Poland.

We are warned that even in the Caribbean, at our very back door, little Cuba is so strongly under Communist influence that its economy could be paralyzed upon a moment's notice by a general strike of the Communist-dominated federation of labor there. Chile, I am informed, has a tremendous Communist section within the actual Government, with the Communists possessing more power than they do even in France.

All of this followed after a policy of loans and gifts and subventions, and not before.

The basis of our failure in South America was that our policy was one of subsidizing dictators. It possessed very little real relation to the ultimate welfare of the South American people themselves and bore no sensible relation to the powerful motivations which are now arising and which are leading all men to seek the blessings of personal freedom and security.

This failure of our policy, and it must be recognized as such, should lead us to be very suspicious of being stampeded into any action based solely on the opinion of the so-called experts.

The experts insisted with the full force of Government behind them that the United Nations would prevent war, would create international law and would, in fact, prevent the very circumstances which have brought about the present debate. Now, despite the lip service still given to the United Nations, we are told that we must ignore them and make a unilateral decision in relation to the Greek situation.

I believe, Mr. President, that now is the time—with the United Nations nearly 3 years old—to put this problem squarely up to that organization with an offer to furnish the preliminary funds to initiate the program recommended by their own Food and Agriculture Organization Mission to Greece.

Put this sane and reasonable program before the United Nations now and let us find out who our friends in that organization really are.

The experts told us that if we voted huge sums for UNRRA we would succeed in buying the good will of suffering peoples everywhere. Now we know that UNRRA was a great failure not only in reaching the objective of peace, but much of its funds were misdirected. In fact, we are told today by Tito, the Yugoslavian dictator, that it was only through UNRRA that Yugoslavia succeeded in stabilizing its economy. In fact, we are told that we have participated at huge

cost to ourselves, in an action hostile to our own political future.

When the Bretton Woods agreement was written, we were told that this would solve the economic difficulties of the world so that unilateral actions in the way of loans by the United States would be unnecessary. We were told that this would bail the world out of its impending economic chaos. Now we know that this, too, has to date been a failure. As a result we were asked to give a gigantic loan to Great Britain. Here, again, we were assured by the highest authorities of the administration that this unilateral action on the part of the United States was absolutely necessary in our own interests.

It was painstakingly explained by Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. White that the loan was necessary for the purpose of revitalizing British industries in order to buy the necessary machinery, and so forth, for their rehabilitation.

We were promised that the British currency bloc which now acts to exclude American business in large sections of the world would be dissolved. Mr. White told the Committee on Banking and Currency that if we committed ourselves to the loan, England would be willing to assume the risk of selling her products in fair competition with the exporters of other countries." He told us that "she is willing to commit herself to our program of fair currency and trade practices in order to encourage an expansion in world trade."

What is the result? British discrimination against American trade has continued in full force just as before. Her actions constitute a conspiracy of restraint against the American exporters just as surely as did those of Nazi Germany. The rigid system of licensing which is operated by the British Government is directed specifically against our trade in view of the fact that we are the great exporting nation of the world.

The sterling-bloc system is one by which the British pound is artifically overvalued by more than twice and by which American goods can be successfully kept out of great world markets, which the British seek to dominate and control.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to comment upon the use of the sterling exchange to further British exports at the expense of the United States exports.

In a telephone conversation with an official of the Export-Import Bank, I was informed that in Iran last week the Iranian officials quote lower rates on sterling than on dollars so that Iranian importers will tend to buy goods in London rather than New York. Iran is theoretically an independent Nation, but British influence is strong there and may be responsible for the practice of selling sterling cheaper than dollars.

Many nations before and during the war sold goods to Britain and took the proceeds in the form of a sterling deposit in London banks as Britain did not have the cash to pay for the goods bought. Then Britain blocked the payment of all these debts to foreign countries. This is what is meant by blocked sterling exchange. These blocked sterling balances in London total billions of dollars and can be used by the British as a lever to control the trade of the countries to whom Britain owes the money.

Last year Britain borrowed $3,750,000,000 from the United States. So far we have paid her one and one-tenth billions of it.

It was understood at the time of the loan that Britain needed the money to buy machinery and to modernize and reequip her industries so that she could successfully compete once more for foreign markets and regain her lost export trade.

Considerable criticism has developed over the way the proceeds of the loan have been spent to date. It appears very little has been spent on machinery and industrial equipment. The bulk of the money has been spent for petrol, film, and food.

The expenditure of the money to date is reported in the January 11, 1947, issue of the Economist, page 77, to be as follows:

	Percent
Foodstuffs	47
Raw materials	15
Manufactured goods	9
All other	29

The purpose of the loan again was to prevent any bilateral agreements in restraint of trade. Instead of this, we find that great Britain has entered into more of the agreements by which our individual manufacturers are finding themselves faced with the full force of totalitarian competition.

Favored agreements have been made in reference to the sterling balances with France, the Argentine and other countries. These involve not only the usual restrictions, but even bulk purchasing of a nature such as that employed by the Russian Government.

At the very moment when we were in contest with the Argentine, Great Britain made a bulk purchasing arrangement under a favored trade agreement with the Argentine, which effectively weakened any policy we possibly could have employed there, as well as placing the American businessman, who must operate as an individual, under the most serious disadvantages.

Already we discover that the American air lines, insurance, and other businesses are demanding protection against this kind of unfair activity which, I shall point out to the Senate, was financed by American loans.

We discover today that the British are using up the American loan in only a fraction of the time that it was to have been used by them, and that they have not employed it for the purposes of reorganizing their manufacturing economy, but have used it for still other purposes: for financing social reform and other radical experimental undertakings at home, which may or may not be successful.

Their satellite, Burma, has an annual income of 400,000,000 rupees and an expense of 1,000,000,000 rupees. The difference is made up by the British Government.

Another satellite, Saudi Arabia, has shown a deficit of ten to twenty million dollars a year, also made up by the British Government. Hungary, a satellite of the Soviet Union, was given as an outright gift this year more than a million dollars' worth of machine tools by Great Britain.

Today we understand that serious discussions are taking place between the Soviet Union and Great Britain for another bilateral arrangement involving raw materials and trade—all of this at a time when the tensions between the United States and Russia seem to be increasing. These and innumerable other costs which are part of a British worldwide scheme of support and exploitation have come directly out of the American loan.

Is it not time, Mr. President, that we study the effect of the manipulation of the currency systems of the world upon the economic structures of the countries making up the membership of the United Nations, including our own?

Is it not time that we formulated basic policies and principles that would prevent such manipulation, instead of always trying to cure its effects by pouring money in from the top?

In fact, Mr. President, is it not about time for us to have a conference in our own country and formulate a truly American foreign policy coordinated with a sound domestic policy—one that will keep us solvent and strong—a policy that will enable us to help our weaker neighbors over the years; help them to reach our standard of living?

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Arthur Krock, commenting upon a round-table discussion by Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, appearing in the New York Times, March 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An informal round table the other evening, the subject being our future economic foreign policy, is in point. Persons were present whom committees of Congress have asked for counsel in these matters before and doubtless will again.

The most emphatic view offered was that of Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain. Because it seemed to make an impression, and also because Mr. Kennedy has an influential following in finance and politics, a summary may be of value. * * * Before any other foreign grants or loans were considered by the Government, we should take stock to find out (a) what we have, (b) what we need to maintain our own way of life, (c) what is sought of us abroad, and (d) what good purpose it will serve.

This was also the general position of Mr. B. M. Baruch, who was the first to urge on Congress a national economic stock taking and who now, fearful of the current proposals for new foreign commitments, is repeating his earlier counsels. Since Mr. Baruch cannot be classified either as a political or economic isolationist, this can hardly be applied as a term to demolish Mr. Kennedy's round-table thesis, proceeding from the above base, as follows:

1. The purpose of our foreign policy, economic and political, presumably is to secure and maintain peace, preserve and expand our own system, and prevent the establishment of any other, including a police state, in areas and on a scale that would threaten our system, which is founded on the principle of the superiority of the individual over the state.

2. If this is so, then a prodigal foreign economic policy is directly hostile to our objective. The survey of our resources, which should be made before any further commitment is considered, will clearly show that, with approximately $100,000,000,000 in short-term internal obligations, the United States cannot possibly finance resistance to other systems of government, to the extent and for the period proposed or required, without impoverishing this Nation; and even then the effort would fail in enough places to make the general attempt a failure. Thus impoverished, the United States would itself be in extreme danger of a forced importation of the very political philosophy it was trying to check elsewhere.

3. No one knows what communism can do for a people because the only exhibits are behind the iron curtain of Soviet Russia. Therefore the Soviet, if its system is confined there, remains in a position to promise everything without having to put its promises to a test, while western capitalism with all its defects operates in the world limelight for the discontented to make their target. Assuming (which Mr. Kennedy disputes) that American loans to certain countries could so confine communism, it would remain the promise to the discontented while our own system was being starved to a point of fatal weakness.

4. Therefore, the wise policy is to keep the American way of life as strong as our resources can make it, and permit communism to have its trial outside the Soviet Union if that shall be the fate or will of certain peoples. In most of these countries a few years will demonstrate the inability of communism to achieve its promises, while throughout this period the disillusioned experimenters will be observing the benefits of the American way of life, and most of them will then seek to emulate it.

5. With communism once a demonstrated failure, its appeal to the unfortunate and the discontented will disappear, and the United States can then proceed to make sound investments in the rehabilitation and economic future of those nations which will form an effective bulwark against the threat some statesmen are now seeking to avert by resistance loans in useless driblets. These loans at this time, since the United States could not possibly supply enough—and maintain its system—to be effective, would accomplish their stated objective as little as if one sought to make everyone prosperous in a community of 100,000 persons by distributing pro rata the $1,000,000 possessed by one citizen alone.

6. In the meantime, however, while allowing those nations in the Eastern Hemisphere which want to try communism to try it, or even have it imposed on them, the United States should permit no people to starve: It should make loans, grants, and consignments to assure that. The United States also should make it possible for all nations that need farm machinery to obtain it so as to restore themselves to the position of being able to feed their own and neighboring populations. This is the outline of what Mr. Kennedy said at the informal round table which seemed to win the approval of listeners who wield great power and influence in the financial and economic community of the United States and who, like the former Ambassador, are not without their disciples in Congress and in the administration. And there is considerable reason to assume that the viewpoint will find reflection in the debate that is beginning in the country and in Washington over the implications of the proposed loan to Greece.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the crux of Mr. Kennedy's statement is that this country should remain strong and keep the American way of life as strong as our resources can make it and demonstrate its superiority to any other form of government, including communism, and contrasts this method to that advocated by some statesmen who would seek to avert it by resistance loans in useless driblets.

Now Great Britain is exactly where she stood before, or if anything in an even worse economic situation, and, as I have pointed out, is prepared to come again asking for an even larger loan than before.

What does all this mean? It means only this: That on the basis of the Russian specter we are asked to finance every evil and self-serving operation, and even the most brutal and reactionary Nazi-like regime such as I shall point out is present in Greece. We are asked blindly to write a blank check seeking to keep bankrupt outsiders in continued power even when such regimes themselves have been rejected by their own people.

The fault I find with all of this is not the fact that we have been helping someone else or even the fact that we have done so to our own immediate disadvantage. I think I speak the true mind of the American people when I say that we are generous but that we also are sensible to our own larger interests.

In the end, we will make the sacrifices necessary for either purpose. But it must not be forgotten that the American people are working to produce this wealth which is now so lavishly being spent over the world. They will want to know and will be entitled to know what is to be gained by these actions. If my mail and the mail received by the other Members of this august assembly are any indication, the American people are becoming fed up. They are overwhelmingly against any more loans without a clear picture of the result to be achieved.

Even in the face of the massive Government propaganda in favor of the present Greek loan, the mail received by all of us indicates that the average American is strongly against it. If we are to have a depression such as that forecast by the group of experts who met with Mr. Truman, then the temper of the American people against this sort of thing will certainly rise.

Here, Mr. President, I should again remind the Senate that we are all the servants of the American people, and not their masters, and in the last analysis the decision will be made by the people themselves; if necessary, by the election of a totally new group of men to represent them in the conduct of the national affairs.

The evidence all seems to indicate that the judgment of the experts has been faulty to the point of absurdity, and that many measures similar to the present bill which this body is asked by the administration to pass, have in the past been presented to us in the light of half-truths which made the subsequent results grotesque. Before examining the Greek situation in the light of such information as we possess, it seems to me that if we are to back certain governments, we cannot hand them these subventions and subsidies without taking responsibility for their policies throughout the world.

In short, if we are to give any more money to Britain, we must realize that what we are actually doing is supporting all British policy everywhere—their policy in Ireland, Palestine, Greece, and Italy, their trade policy as well as their Marxist experiment at home. There is no escape from that simple fact.

We are supporting British policy in Ethiopia, where the British have replaced the Italians as the masters; in Siam which Britain recently has made a new colony, and in North Africa which Britain appears to be seeking to add indirectly to its already swollen Empire.

We cannot make a loan to Greece without estimating the character of the government which we are supporting and without considering what its own objectives might be. If Greece has become a British colony, as much evidence seems to indicate, then we will have to consider our loan based on this fact.

If Greece is ruled by a government which is looked upon as the minion of a hated invader by its own people and which is so weak and detested that it would fall instantly if foreign troops were withdrawn, we cannot blind ourselves to this fact, nor blind ourselves to the shocking and dangerous implications which are involved.

At this point I should say that I agree heartily with two statements in the President's message covering this problem. The first is that "the foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved," and the second is: "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

It is in the light of both of these statements that we must examine the the Greek situation.

Whenever a government is purported to be so weak that it would fall instantly if foreign support were withdrawn as is alleged to be the case in reference to the present Greek Government, grave suspicions must arise as to its character. As I have mentioned before, there is very little in the way of absolute information at hand as to what is taking place behind this facade of claims being made in reference to the present loan. The facts of the matter seem to be that Greece entered the war as a republic, bravely striving to resist a foreign aggressor. She has ended up as a monarchy reigned over by a Hohenzollern prince without a drop of Greek blood in his veins, and occupied by foreign troops, with its administration controlled by foreign sources.

This is precisely the definition of armed conquest, no matter how it is covered up or presented. If such a condition were true in America today there would be continuous turmoil and determined revolt against it by people who would not consider themselves as Communists, but as patriots.

According to a long series of dispatches by Robert Conway, the foreign correspondent for the New York Daily News, the present royalist regime in Greece is one of the most repressive in history. It is fascist and nazi in character and is cordially detested by the Greek people. It rules not with the support of the people, but by force of arms and outside intervention. I quote Mr. Conway

not only because he is a distinguished journalist, but because no one could accuse the New York Daily News of being a pro-Communist newspaper. The stories of butcheries and suppression as well as the most extreme corruption which Mr. Conway gives in his vivid descriptions of the present Greek Government indicate why the people of Greece, or any other free people, would hate such a government and would do their best to overthrow it.

I think it is ridiculous to assume that a brave and gallant people like the Greeks would suddenly go Communist. It is fairer to assume that they will become Communist or turn to some other radical expedient in order to rid themselves of a vicious and unwanted Government which is suppressing all human liberties, reducing Greek economic life to chaos, and allowing a corrupt and venal class of royalists to fatten themselves upon the people's miseries.

I understand that there are fewer than 18,000 valid Communists in Greece. This may be compared to more than 100,000 in Britain itself.

This does not mean that there are not huge forces in Greece which resent the policies of the present Government and do their best to overthrow it. For example, among the opposition, according to George Weller, the Chicago Daily News foreign correspondent, are such highly conservative individuals as the leading financier Emmanuel Tsouderos and the venerable statesman Themistocles Sophoneis, both ex-Premiers and both bitter anti-Communists.

It is reliably reported that when the British moved into Greece they not only sent an armed force to suppress the Republican elements, but lavishly expended huge amounts in gold to seat the present decadent royalty and their retinue. Mr. Churchill cabled Gen. Roland M. Scobie, the British commander in Greece, as follows:

> Do not hesitate to act as if you were in a conquered city. * * * You should not hesitate to open fire on any armed male in the Greek Capital who assails the authority of the British or of Greeks who are collaborating with the British. Keep and dominate Athens.

In this tragic story of the destruction of Republican and free institutions the British, and the Greek minions they support, went the whole way. Liberties were as ruthlessly suppressed as in Nazi Europe. Men were shot out of hand. Even the low scale of wages paid by the Germans were arbitrarily diminished. To understand the caliber of the present administration it is necessary to understand that in addition to the guerrillas operating in the north, some 30,000 Greeks are in jail under the new thought-control law which is very similar to the Japanese law by which men were jailed for thinking dangerous thoughts.

The present Greek Minister of National Defense, Napoleon Zervas, was pro-Nazi during the war. Fredericka, the present Greek Queen, a Hohenzollern, was notorious for her openly expressed pro-Nazi views.

The condition of the Greek people by and large is miserably bad, with a Romanofflike aristocracy subsisting on graft, rigid suppression of human rights, and an almost total indifference to the economic welfare of their country.

These are facts which should be brought out into the open. They involve not only a collapse of the Greek economy, but a cynical indifference to the ordinary rights of humanity. They seem to involve, further, the total exploitation of the brave little country of Greece by a foreign government for its own purposes with a complete indifference to the needs of the Greek people. If, for example, we were to ship from America a boatload of automobiles to Greece for sale, it would be necessary to get British permission before they would be allowed to dock in Greece. I do not think it is too much to assume that the gentlemen in London would be guided, in part at least, by the competitive position in reference to British manufactured goods before they would give permission for the goods to be unloaded. In this sense, the situation is not much different than it is in British colonies elsewhere which are looked upon as sources of raw materials and in which any competitive industry is to be discouraged. This, too, is a matter I shall wish to touch on a little later, since it has a direct bearing on the over-all implications of our problem.

Here let me digress in reference to another pertinent matter which should be called to the attention of this assembly. Though it has been stated on this floor that no knowledge was had about the present Greek crisis until February 27 at the President's private conference, there was an important report which was available 6 months before and which gives information implying a situation quite at odds with the present representations made to us. This report, issued by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, commonly referred to as FAO, is of enormous interest.

The chairman of this mission was Franklin S. Harris, president of the Utah State Agricultural College, and its vice chairman was Panos D. Caldis, an executive of the California Packing Corp.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the 10 recommendations made by the mission to Greece from the United Nations. These recommendations begin on page 3 of the report, which was available to the administration in October 1943 and was printed March 17, 1947. The first recommendation appears on page 3.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION 1. PRINCIPAL GOALS AND GENERAL PROGRAM

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government—

(a) Act vigorously to deal with immediate or transitional problems which block progress toward any long-range goal;

(b) Adopt as its long-range goal the transformation of Greece from a predominantly agricultural country employing mostly primitive methods to a more industrialized country employing efficient modern methods in agriculture and in industry;

(c) Start a program of modernizing its own agricultural and other services to provide the facts, guidance, education, and public facilities necessary for its people to carry this program into action;

(d) Give special attention to the improvement of agricultural methods, better utilization of water and soil resources, the encouragement of cooperative action by farmers and consumers, and the development of greater industrial activity and employment;

(e) Request the appropriate United Nations agencies to furnish the technical and financial assistance needed to help Greece meet immediate transitional problems and to start toward these long-range objectives.

RECOMMENDATION 2. THE IMMEDIATE FOOD SHORTAGE

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government continue at least through the 1947 crop year an agricultural program with maximum emphasis on food production for direct human consumption, and continue bread rationing and other control measures to secure the most effective use of domestic and imported foods.

RECOMMENDATION 3. MAINTAINING ESSENTIAL IMPORTS AFTER UNRRA ENDS

It is recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council, and the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to aid it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal, until expanding exports, international development loans, and expanding production enable Greece to balance its international accounts without special aid.

RECOMMENDATION 4. CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL FEEDING PROGRAM

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government immediately explore ways of continuing the special feeding programs in schools, and for mothers, infants, and other vulnerable groups, after the withdrawal of UNRRA.

RECOMMENDATION 5. RETURN OF FACILITIES TO CIVILIAN USE

The Mission urges the rapid return from their emergency wartime use of the facilities needed for rehabilitation in agriculture and related fields to the agencies normally responsible for their utilization.

RECOMMENDATION 6. REHABILITATION

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government—

(a) Give special emphasis to speeding the rehabilitation of the country's most essential productive equipment, especially transportation and communication facilities, repairs to industrial plants, and repairs to drainage and flood-control works;

(b) Adopt a temporary program of citizen labor on the roads, participated in by all able-bodied males, from country and city and also from the armed services, to put roads back promptly into passable shape;

(c) Use portions of existing funds, especially from the unspent remainder of the $25,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan, to purchase at once essential equipment and engineering and other technical services to hasten rehabilitation;

(d) Push vigorously the purchase of war-surplus equipment, especially automotive equipment, and small and large ships, using promptly the credits already granted for these purchases; and

(e) In housing reconstruction, hasten the building of temporary shelters, especially for the bombed villages, until permanent needs for shelter are clearer, and until larger resources are available to rebuild permanent housing.

RECOMMENDATION 7. VILLAGE REHABILITATION

With respect to the large number of villages damaged or destroyed during the war, the Mission recommends:

(a) That the work of rehabilitation should be clearly divided into—

(i) immediate and temporary measures of relief;

(ii) a long-range program aiming at permanent rebuilding.

(b) That immediate and transitional work should be continued only as long as it is absolutely necessary, utilizing the maximum cooperation of the persons concerned.

(c) That the permanent long-range program be based upon—

(i) a nation-wide rehabilitation program, to include special programs to suit the different needs and varying conditions of each village;

(ii) a general rehabilitation plan, broadly drawn, to include the future development of every aspect of village life;

(iii) consultations between committees of village people and qualified experts;

(iv) priority for projects of health and agricultural improvement, whenever it becomes impossible to act on all aspects of the plan simultaneously;

(v) a program for housing and general village development which takes into account the possibilities of future increases or decreases in population, as water facilities are developed, agriculture is modernized, and opportunities for nonfarm employment expand; and

(vi) modernization and remodeling of each village in accordance with modern rural developments.

RECOMMENDATION 8. INFLATION CONTROL

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government act to prevent further inflation by taking the following steps:

(a) Consider the advisability of extending the use of rationing and price controls for scarce basic goods for a transitional period.

(b) Adopt measures to speed and expand industrial production from existing plants, and to move the products to consumers without excessive merchandising mark-ups.

(c) Speed the import of goods by advancing foreign exchange, within the limits of that available, to cooperatives and cooperative unions to buy products abroad and to distribute them to their farmer and consumer members at cost, aiding this program by—

(i) providing funds for purchase of consumer goods, such as clothing, textiles, shoes, and foods where available, and simple producers' goods, such as tools, pumps, fertilizer, repair parts, etc.; and

(ii) setting up permanent joint buying and selling offices of the Agricultural Bank and the Confederation of Cooperatives at major world merchandise centers, to aid cooperatives to place orders for goods abroad.

(d) Undertake at once to negotiate commercial or exchange arrangements for the exchange of goods with countries which still have controlled foreign trade, pending the general resumption of freer foreign trade.

(e) Provide increased public support to expand cooperative collection, processing, and sale of farm products, giving cooperative organizations equal facilities with those provided private enterprises.

(f) Reduce expenditures for military purposes as rapidly as increasing international confidence and increased reliance on the United Nations make possible.

RECOMMENDATION 9. RESTORATION OF EXPORT MARKETS

The Mission recommends that the Greek Government aid the restoration of export markets of tobacco, currants, and other products by:

(a) Seeking to reduce internal prices by pushing vigorously the measures already recommended under inflation control;

(b) Reducing or removing production, sale, movement, or export taxes on export commodities;

(c) Managing the internal distribution of UNRRA supplies and other governmentally controlled products so as to provide adequate supplies of industrial goods and production equipment to farmers producing export crops, especially at the time they are receiving funds from the sale of their crops;

(d) Providing special technical and financial assistance to farmers, farm cooperatives, and private exporters to restore and improve the quality of export products and their processing and packaging for export requirements; and

(e) Opening negotiations with the major United Nations purchasers of Greek products, to secure special consideration for those exports, outlined in recommendation 10.

RECOMMENDATION 10—SPECIAL CONSIDERATION BY ALLIES FOR GREEK EXPORTS

It is recommended that—

(a) The Greek Government request the major allies of Greece in the last war to give special consideration to the need of Greece for the reestablishment of her exports, and give Greece special consideration, especially as compared with nations which were neutrals or enemies in the war, in devising their programs and placing orders for imports for 1947; and

(b) The occupation authorities for Germany and Austria give special examination to the import of Greek products, and at the earliest date possible permit at least a partial resumption of trade or exchange between Greece and those countries, especially with regard to tobacco exports.

Mr. MALONE. Eight of the nine members of the Commission were Americans. Though the Commission was directed to report only on the agriculture, fisheries, and related industries of the country, it could not help but notice and report on the mass poverty which existed—inflation—as well as the oppressive taxation directed almost altogether against merchants, workingmen and the other productive elements of the nation, while the privileged Fascist-Royalist ruling class was largely exempted. It states with modest sarcasm that—

Most careful consideration should be given by the Greek and British Governments to the wisdom of continued military occupation of schools and research stations as barracks or headquarters.

Also, the Assistant Secretary of State testified before an important Senate committee in October 1946 that the situation was known to be very bad. This was the time when the report became available to the Secretary of State.

All of this is shocking; and to imply that we are supporting a democracy, or the last democratic frontier in Europe, is not only to state an untruth but to make ourselves party to an action of the most dangerous possible import. The plain fact of the matter is that the Greek people not only hate the present regime, which could not stand without foreign intervention, but they hate the British invaders even more. If we go in under the present terms, this hate will be transferred to us.

If there is a better way to build communism than this, I do not know what it is. It seems to me that Communism is a direct result of the misery and humiliation of a people, and that no people who have once experienced freedom would accept this course unless they were reduced to such distress that they were willing to reach for any straw.

If in our reaching to create a free world we find it necessary to associate ourselves with every blackguard, exploiter, cartelist and reactionary, we shall earn the hatred of peoples all over the world.

I venture to point out that freedom and security are rights which are demanded by all men and that if we back those despotic regimes which exist only for exploitation by a special class or foreign interests, the result will be sullen resentment and continued unrest. The British have not only discovered this in Greece; they have discovered it everywhere. The Russians are now discovering it in Poland and throughout the occupied countries where resistance to the quisling regimes they are supporting grows daily.

Good authority tells me that there are not more than 5,000 guerrillas in Greece. While it is true that the Communists are undoubtedly the dominating element among them, all of these people certainly are not Communists. I should remind this body that in the resistance in Europe against the Nazi invasion in many countries, if not in all, the Communists also were the dominating element, even though collaborating with them against the hated foreigner were such widely unrelated groups as the Catholic Centrists, the Social Democrats, and others.

Now let us take a look at the loan which is proposed and the purposes for which it is being used. The report of the FAO mission for Greece stated unequivocally that if Greece were to be put on her feet in an economic way a national loan of $100,000,000 was demanded.

This would have to be spent principally in road-building machinery and other productive equipment by which the Greeks could return as a productive element in human society and not as a people dependent upon British and American handouts. This report was made by able and distinguished men, but it was ignored because it made no provision for the political objectives of the Fascist-Royalist clique now ruling Greece, or of the bureaus in London whose principal objective is always empire.

The present purpose by which Greece allegedly is to be made safe for democracy is to give $125,000,000 to the military alone. Assuming 5,000 guerrillas in Greece, which I believe to be the correct figure, this comes to $25,000 per guerrilla.

I read in an announcement a few days ago that Princess Katherine, of Greece, is to marry a British major soon, and is to be given a dowry of $40,000. There are a lot of American girls who could use a substantial dowry. This is, however, all part of the same pattern. Presumably, this dowry, too, will be paid for by American money just as presumably when Great Britain underwrites the deficits of the desert despot, Ibn Saud, American money is paying for the same 550 women who languish in his harem.

I think there is reason to be disturbed also by the fact that this loan, if granted, even if new loans were not promptly voted, presents big loopholes. The Army and Navy could give a billion dollars in equipment to the same Royalist gang simply by marking it down as salvage

and letting it go for a song. A loan also could be made from the World Bank without reference to the American Senate, but it would directly involve American money since it is from the United States that the great support of the World Bank comes.

Other questions would arise. For example, for years practically one-third of the Greek national budget has been devoted to servicing debts due to British bankers. The British may state a willingness to forego this, but in the end they will "get their pound of flesh."

As all of this money flows out, is it not a fact that we have gradually placed ourselves in the position of espousing, not freedom, not liberty and democracy, but the cartelists and the ruthless Fascist exploiters who are just as anxious to turn the clock back to the days of human slavery as are the Communists? What a strange position this is for a Nation which grew in the traditions of Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln.

We also may ask ourselves, "How are we going to finance all this?" Is it our intention simply to print currency as the Weimar German Republic did and thus risk a wild inflation, or is it assumed that money is something abstract to be written down on a piece of paper, and which does not represent work hours, the blood, sweat, and accumulated savings of the American people? The British loan alone was equal to 3 years normal income tax in this country, and since the record shows that the great bulk of all loans made by us are in complete default, it will have to be paid for by Americans.

We may easily tax ourselves into a new form of government, for which we would not vote and which we would not voluntarily accept.

There is a factor which may be even as serious. If it is the intention of this Nation to really devote this money to building armaments all over the world, then we come down to the American need to repair our own economy which is badly suffering. There are few automobiles, and many additional houses are needed. All of which comes back to the scarcity and high price of steel. If money is to be poured into the armament sink-hole the price of steel certainly will not go down and may even rise, thus defeating our own domestic policy.

Nor is it a certainty that in the event of war any of these Royalist regimes will be on our side. Faced with overwhelming force on the part of the Soviets they can easily capitulate and go to war on the Soviet side. Dictators notoriously stick together. We have discovered that the only warrant for a realistic hope of alliance is the freedom of peoples who are prepared to fight for their dignity and independence.

There are no such ideals in this batch of Fascist-Royalist, hangers-on from a decadent line with whom we are now attempting to treat. If it were our intention to go into Greece or any other country on the basis of treating with a free government responsive to a free electorate, I could understand the situation better and wholeheartedly support it; but the present situation seems to me a blasphemy against the very purposes for which the American people have fought and against the very ideals for which they exist.

At the back of this entire situation is a sinister factor which we cannot ignore. This is the existence of an unseen world government in the hands of the old cartels. This group of men, housed largely in London, are interested in world price fixing. Their operations are gravely complicating the German situation for us. They are busily engaged in recreating German industry under the control of German cartels, to be intimately associated with the same anti-democratic groups which were instrumental in creating many of the conditions out of which World War II arose. These people are now interested in oil and oil profits and conduct a massive public-relations campaign which has been influential in creating a totally false picture of the Near and Middle Eastern situation.

The entire Turko-Greek situation is tied up directly with the business of oil. It becomes not a quest for the welfare of humanity or even of the security of the United States, but the same old international quest for profits and for the power which this type of economic buccaneering gives.

I point out, for example, that this is the reason why the British, with our consent and support, are keeping alive in Arabia one of the most ridiculously despotic regimes ever seen on this planet. It is the reason for the difficulties now experienced in Palestine where patriots are being hanged as gangsters. It is the reason why we are forced to pay out of our national exchequer the heavy expense of maintaining the many hundred thousand Jewish displaced persons in the concentration camps of Europe since Britain will not allow them to be evacuated to the country of their choice to which legally they have the right to go.

There are in Palestine 120,000 highly mechanized British troops whose major purpose is to keep the Jews out. The British are maintaining there the best organized anti-Semitic regime which has existed in modern times outside of the Hitler regime.

Why would it not be in the interests of the United States to have removed these troops and the vast expenditures involved and allow the Jews of Palestine to defend that country themselves as they desire to do, and, incidentally, to solve one of the most serious problems now confronting Europe?

The British maintain a heavy military establishment in North Ireland, which the Irish claim is entirely for the purpose of keeping the island from its appointed destiny of unity and freedom. Other British troops are elsewhere in the world and at a great cost to the starving British people in addition to the 10,000 who, according to the last figure I received, are in Greece.

Why cannot these troops be moved to Greece if the Greek people desire foreign intervention? They are not wanted in the present places where they are stationed any more than the Soviet troops are wanted in Poland or Bulgaria.

Here I come to the most important point which I shall make today. It is more serious even than the huge sums of money which must be involved in the kind of policy which we are formulating. If this policy is in reality an oil policy, we must investigate with a view of what is good for America and not for a limited group of individuals. Certainly we are not interested in the support of some dying empire whose whole purpose is deindustralization in other countries in order to exploit them for its own profit.

If the oil of the Near and Middle East has any value to us at all as a nation, it is solely because in time of war we will require it for our Army and Navy. In times of peace we can purchase it, anyway, on the open market.

This brings us squarely to the military realities which it appears to me run contrary to our present blind backing of British policy.

These realities are simple, and any sound military man can tell how far we could go in defending this area.

British policy throughout the world wherever it exists is that of deindustrialization. Britain depends on its exports, particularly of low-level commodities. She requires assured sources of raw materials and assured markets. Wherever the Empire reaches, except in the case of the Dominions, who can look out for themselves, and who would not submit to such a process, the first element of consideration is always the welfare of Great Britain, and no other. Regardless of whether Britain rules directly or through military and civil commissions, as in Ethiopia, Iraq, and Greece, the policy is one of privilege for British exports and deindustrialization as far as local manufacture is concerned. This is the principal reason, which I believe to be behind the present British policy in Palestine, where the economic competition of the Jews is feared.

The factor which results is that of absolute vulnerability throughout the Near East and Middle East. In none of the Arab countries is there either industry or modern organization of any kind. If a rebellion takes place in Iraq, it is put down by British troops, not by the Iraqian Army. When Egypt was invaded by the German-Italian forces not an Egyptian soldier fired a shot in defense of the country.

Modern wars are fought on industry and require some 86 tons per month, I am told, to keep every fighting man in the field for every month that he is there. Either these materials, which include not only weapons but pharmaceuticals and all the other materials needed in war, must be provided locally or they must be shipped great distances from America and from Britain.

That the Greek Army could stop the Russians for even half a week is an unamusing joke. As far as the present Arab armies of the Near East and Middle East are concerned, they could not withstand the Russian war machine for 12 hours. They have neither organization, discipline, training, nor industry of any kind. Moreover, their rulers are despots who were sympathetic with the Germans during the last war, and will make common purpose with other dictators rather than lose their preferred position.

The strength of these forces may be indicated by the following sample facts: When Iraq rebelled and went into World War II on the German side, the entire country was retaken by one company of mixed Hebrew troops from Palestine and British colonials. When Ibn Saud attempted to invade Trans-Jordan in 1924, his entire army was routed and put into ignominious flight by half a dozen British airplanes.

On the Russian side of the Middle East is being erected the largest industry in Asia, specifically in Turkestan. If a war were to occur, no power under heaven could prevent them from going through that territory like a knife cutting through butter, taking the oil territories at their convenience.

If, then, our military were to depend upon the oil we would be in the same dangerous position that we were in when the Japanese took away from the British, under similar circumstances, the rubber and tin of the East Indies.

The military situation would mean that we would have to ship all the way from America, over some four or five thousand miles of tortuous supply lines, the main bulk of our supplies, everything required to maintain our armies in the field, even including the packaged food supplies. It is this element of distance alone which would force us into the most difficult of situations.

If, in the alleged name of freedom, the United States is to directly associate itself with such destructive processes as those to which I am calling attention, we shall earn, not the love and fealty of these people, but their hatred. We shall then be in the unenviable position of attempting to force the allegiance of these peoples to our common cause at the point of guns. The British are discovering how ineffective that is in India, Egypt, Palestine, and elsewhere. We shall undergo an identical experience.

I have no objection to going into Greece or anywhere else if we do so with the consent of the peoples involved, and not as a matter of backing repressive and antihumanist regimes against which every American would rebel if they were forced upon him. If there is to be a free election of the Greek people along standards such as those we can envisage, and free of intimidation from foreign troops and local quisling collaborators, then we can go into Greece as friends dealing with a truly democratic and representative Greek Government which, by its very existence, will put the present resistance to an end. Then we shall be creating a sound and reasoned situation conducive to the best welfare of both the Greek and American people. But that is not what we are being asked to do at the present time.

Under the circumstances, and in the form in which they are offered, I am compelled to argue against the commitments to which the administration is asking our consent. I regard them as dangerous in the extreme to the future of free men, and a mistaken policy of the first magnitude. I regard them not only as a step toward war, but as playing directly into the hands of our chosen opponents.

Nothing could illustrate with such clarity our complete lack of an international policy as the recent revelation of our recent shipments of goods and equipment to Russia, the nation that we are now asked to stop at the Greek border.

On Friday, April 18, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting and revealing list of articles shipped to the Soviet Government following VJ-day and prior to December 31, 1946, and a list of equipment yet to be shipped to the U. S. S. R.

We find that we shipped $233,000,000 worth of equipment to the U. S. S. R. following VJ-day, which included power transmission and conversion and generating equipment, pumps, mine and quarry machinery, cranes, machine tools, locomotives, and many things that we were unable to purchase in this country.

We also find that $16,696,000 worth of such equipment, including oil-refinery equipment suitable for manufacturing high-octane gas, is on the schedule, and is yet to be shipped to the U. S. S. R. All of this is being done while the President is making a plea to this body for money and material to train an army to stop Russia.

It savors of the old pre-World War II policy of furnishing scrap iron and oil to Japan prior to her entry into that conflict.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point the list of such equipment and materials from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, page 3701.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The articles shipped after VJ-day and up to December 31, 1946, were as follows:

Machine tools	$40,850,000
Steam locomotives (Russian gage)	30,634,000
Generator sets	22,800,000
Cranes, derricks, hoists, etc	8,129,000
Electric rotating equipment	8,633,000
Marine engines	6,824,000
Canned tushonka	4,054,000
Pumps	4,620,000
Crushing equipment	4,135,000
Valves and fittings	5,114,000
Gas-producing equipment	4,177,000
Secondary metal-forming machinery	4,956,000
Diesel electric locomotives (Russian gage)	3,001,000
Industrial trucks and tractors	3,768,000
Fan and blower equipment	3,182,000
Power transmission equipment	3,162,000
Power conversion equipment	3,117,000
Rolling mills and equipment	3,372,000
Mine and quarry machinery	3,690,000
Insulated wire and cable	3,765,000
Bearings	2,893,000
Metal melting and heating furnaces	2,079,000
Welding machinery	2,965,000
Metal cutting tools	2,289,000
Mine-type locomotives	2,085,000
Leather	2,117,000
Various industrial equipment and materials	46,589,000
Total	233,000,000

The equipment remaining to be transferred to the Soviet Government under the agreement is made up as follows:

Oil-refinery equipment to expand refineries shipped to the U. S. S. R. before the cessation of hostilities Sept. 2, 1945	$6,972,000
Mine hoists	3,058,000
Locomotive storage batteries	1,777,000
Power equipment	1,272,000
Electrical equipment	945,000
Mining equipment	674,000
Electric motors and controllers	350,000
Miscellaneous machinery and equipment	1,648,000
Total	16,696,000

Payment for articles covered by the "pipe line" agreement as set forth above is to be made over a period of 30 years ending in 1975, with interest at 2⅜ percent per annum. The first payment of interest will be due July 1, 1947. The first payment of principal will be due July 1, 1954.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, at the moment the Russians are economically weak. They are having their own troubles at home. Those are hidden behind the iron curtain of which so much has been spoken, but there can be no question as to the existence of those troubles.

Our present action, if we are to support this unwholesome crew of Greek reactionaries, will only serve to harden the Russians against us and to prevent any moderate elements which may exist among the Russian hierarchy from being heard. Perhaps the greatest single service done for the Russian Red Revolution was the invasion of Russia by British troops and British support of such Royalist reactionary gangs as those of Denikin, Baron Wrangell, and Semenoff. The net effect was to consolidate all of Russia behind the Red banner at that time.

I do not claim for a moment that we should sit inert in a world beset with difficulty and danger. I only claim that what we are doing is either too little or too much; that we have no right to back Fascist dynasties against the wishes of peoples involved; and that if it is our intention to operate independent of the sound moral principles upon which our Nation was founded, we shall lose the support of the peoples of the world who now are looking to us for leadership out of this great morass.

I claim that it will be necessary to make a general master plan in support of our security, in which our objectives will be made really clear, the total expenditures estimated, and the pathway down which the American people are to travel completely shown.

Anything else than this is inept, and will leave us floundering. The result will be war—not a short war, but a long war. If it is necessary, we will not flinch from the necessity; but if we can avoid it, it is the goal of common sense to do so. Above all, we should not drift into it or be pushed into it by the selfish interest of those whose attitude toward common humanity is as much to be criticized as that of the masters of the Kremlin. Mr. President, the possibility of threatened war must not be surveyed lightly. If this possibility truly exists, all our actions must be carefully blueprinted as being

the most pressing obligation of the United States Republic. It cannot be approached piecemeal. To do so would be to invite disaster.

Mr. President, I submit to you that the time has now come for us to take our time and to formulate an American policy which must be a coordinated national and international procedure predicated upon remaining a strong nation and assisting and encouraging the other 54 members of the United Nations organization to improve their condition and way of life and, for those who care to reach our standard of living, to furnish them the know-how necessary to improve their industrial status.

But I also submit to you, Mr. President, that this is not the time to rush blindly into foreign countries without the necessary information upon which to predicate a sound policy, and it is not the time to make random commitments throughout the world until such a policy, geared to our domestic economy, has been formed and agreed upon.

We have been forced into two World Wars without any clear idea of where we were going. Now is the time to stop, look, and listen; and if we are going into a third World War, let our action be taken after full consideration and understanding that it is in furtherance of an American policy formulated by Americans and for Americans.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate will recess today until 11 o'clock tomorrow. The Committee on Foreign Relations is to have a hearing tomorrow, which was previously scheduled, which will run to 12 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be permitted to stay in session tomorrow during the Senate session if the Senate shall meet at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is proposed that the Senate shall recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit until 12 o'clock, if necessary, to complete the hearings and testimony of witnesses who have come to Washington for this hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment, to be included in the RECORD at the proper place, the same being an amendment to the pending legislation. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, never in the history of our Nation have the American people and the United States Senate faced an issue more grave and far-reaching than confronts us here today in the proposed Greek and Turkish so-called loan. In making this statement I am not unmindful of the decisions leading up to the Civil War.

This is no mere financial arrangement or relief project. It is a military adventure. This is a commitment of the United States to an entirely new foreign policy of such magnitude and potentialities that every honest American man and woman is compelled to the deepest soul-searching in its consideration. It is a question which causes us—and I include myself—to lie awake nights striving and praying for the ability to foresee the ultimate consequences should the Congress accept or reject this proposal.

Mr. President, there is much to be said in favor of both sides of this problem—and there is much to be said against both sides of the problem. Who here has any clear conception of what course we should take based on any knowledge of what the results will be?

Even the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. VANDENBERG], who, of all Members of Congress, has the most intimate knowledge of this problem, has frankly stated on the Senate floor that no one can be dogmatic in determining which is the wiser course to pursue. He says, further, "It is only a guess, and your guess is as good as mine."

The Senate has a profound respect for the integrity and the ability of the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, but this is a question upon which honest men—even bosom friends—may divide and divide completely.

It is proposed that we turn our backs upon all of the warning, upon all of the advice, upon all the policies of such architects of American statesmanship as Washington, Jefferson, and their contemporaries. They found it to America's advantage to remain free from foreign entanglements. That policy has brought us to greatness in 160 years. We are searching here for some glimmer of the results that will flow from the action the Senate is about to take on the pending measure.

If we intend to force the iron curtain of Soviet concealment back to the borders of Russia, how will it be accomplished?

If it is our intention to prevent the iron curtain from extending over all of Europe and the Orient, what are we going to do about Poland, honest little Finland, Rumania, Estonia, and all those countries which have already been encircled by that iron curtain? Are we going to attempt to free them in order that they, too, may know the blessings of the four freedoms? The American people and the Senate are justified in asking what is to be our action in that connection.

We all recognize that this $400,000,000 grant to Greece and Turkey is the first of what will be many demands upon the United States Treasury from more than a score of other nations including Italy, France, England, and China.

How much, eventually, is such a policy to cost the American taxpayers? One estimate is found in the Kiplinger letter on national affairs dated Saturday, April 12, in which it was stated:

> The State Department is working feverishly on a big-scale plan for an economic-diplomatic offensive going right up to Russia's borders, even to Hungary and Rumania. * * * The object is to prevent them from cracking up; keep Russia from moving in. Amount, ten to fifteen billions, preliminary estimate next 2 years.

The American people will have to sweat and toil to produce the goods and services which will be sent abroad under such a policy, just as the American people will do the fighting if war eventuates as a result of the action of the Senate. These so-called loans will never be repaid, and I think the American people are entitled to some knowledge of how many billions of dollars we will finally distribute abroad.

If we undertake the proposed course, it will have a tremendous impact upon our domestic economy. Such spending will drain the United States of goods, services, and rapidly dwindling raw materials, which, once exported, will never return again. The $400,000,000 is but the first cost. The results will be scarcity of products, sustained high prices, inflation, higher taxes, and the poor will be the hardest hit.

I would feel easier if I could be sure any enduring good would come from these sacrifices, but I have heard no Member of the Senate go on record to say the sacrifices will bring such desired results. The best we hear is that "one guess is as good as another." I am apprehensive, because even the supporters of the pending measure condemn it as filled with uncertainties, unforeseeable possibilities for disaster, and then almost with an attitude of futility say they will have to support it.

If we embark upon this program, we will have to employ imperialistic methods; we will have to send swarms of American commissions abroad to supervise the expenditure of such money, to prevent its waste, and to keep it out of the hands of those who would use it for communistic ends.

For myself, I should want that done. If the measure is passed, it should be made crystal clear that there will be an accounting so that we will be informed exactly where and for what purposes the money is spent. The utmost care should be exercised to see that the money and materials do not finally fall into the hands of those against whom the loan is directed.

If we intend by this method to stop the march of communism, let us first say so frankly to the American people. Let us tell them that the $400,000,000 is the first installment of appropriations that will run into billions of dollars in the next 2 years; and let us tell them further that we should prepare for whatever future military eventualities may flow from such a course.

If we are going to organize and finance the world for American ideals and freedom, let us face frankly and realistically what the cost will be; what the potential dangers are; how we may become involved; and what may happen to us in the process. Let us not do it blindly or

by subterfuge. We know now the results of having drifted, without clear purpose, into World War II. We now know we were in that war 18 months before the White House admitted that a state of war existed.

It is a tragic situation that after our sacrifices in two world wars to uphold freedom that we are now confronted by what proponents admit is a choice of the lesser of two evils.

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss these problems in detail, to analyze this proposal and to clarify, if possible, some of its dangerous obscurities.

In the last election, the American people issued a clear-cut mandate to their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress to repudiate the New Deal bureaucracy; to put an end to the dictation of governmental controls; to root out communism at home; and to put an end to appeasement policies in our dealings with Russia. There were others, but certainly those were included in the mandate.

The record clearly shows that on five specific occasions, I have sought to crystallize attention on the long-existent confusion in our domestic and foreign policies. I hoped, thereby, to stimulate efforts to find an answer to the question of whether or not America was being deliberately sabotaged and betrayed by Communist fifth columnists at home and abroad, or whether our policies simply were suicidal in themselves.

On September 24, 1945, I read into the RECORD the reasons I opposed the confirmation and nomination of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State. I did so because I could not find out from Mr. Acheson how American interests were to be protected in the implementation of the commitments which were being made, and the policies being carried out.

On October 22, 1945, I sought similar information concerning the policies Mr. Braden had been carrying out in South America. Again I could not get any light on how American interests were being protected by those who were administering our policies in the Western Hemisphere.

On November 28, 1945, I submitted Senate Resolution 197, to investigate the State Department. That was after Ambassador Hurley openly charged that—

> The professional Foreign Service men in the State Department sided with the Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against itself.

On January 29, 1946, for myself and on behalf of several other Senators, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5. It provided for a joint congressional committee to investigate claims that our policies in occupied Germany were forcing starvation and the steady deterioration of already subhuman living standards; that our policies were creating such chaos and despair as to drive Germany directly into the hands of Russia. The administration did not consider that request.

On February 15, 1946, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on behalf of himself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself offered a resolution (S. Res. 231) calling upon the President to give us detailed information on our economic commitments in foreign countries. This resolution was again renewed in an up-to-date manner by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], by Senate Resolution 103, on April 9, 1947. Up to this moment, we have not had any response from those responsible for our relations abroad.

Again, on July 31, 1946, I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate Resolution 197, calling for an investigation of the State Department. I substantiated my charge that this investigation was more desperately needed than ever with a documentation of the facts and the consequences of the policies this administration had been pursuing all over the world. This documentation stands unchallenged to this very day.

I have taken the time of the Senate for this brief review of my position for these reasons:

A bipartisan moratorium on any Russian talk in both Houses had been urged upon us. A United Nations Board of Commissioners, which had been set up on December 19, 1946, was trying desperately to arrive at a judicious and impartial determination of the causes and cures of the Greek crisis. We were currently engaged in peace negotiations with our alleged peace-loving allies, yet—out of the clear sky, on March 12, 1947—President Truman charged Russia with being a world aggressor. He demanded the revival and extension of lend-lease powers to carry out a policy which I call armed intervention, on a global basis, in an all-out war on communism.

Here are the President's own words:

> At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.
>
> One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guaranties of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.
>
> The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

The President said further:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

No less a person than the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee says this belated action by the President is a long overdue answer to the people's mandate of the last election; he declares the President's stated objective of combating communism at home and abroad receives the wholehearted support of all real Americans, but he laments the methods by which the President has maneuvered Congress into its present position as methods which merely continue the "government by crisis technique."

When he reported from the committee Senate bill 938, to provide asistance to Greece and Turkey, the senior Senator from Michigan in his speech at that time said:

> It is regrettable that policies of such magnitude could not have more time for consideration. I knew nothing of the matter until we were called to the White House on February 27. It is unfortunate when such important decisions have to be made, on a crisis basis. * * * The truth of the matter is that even though we had months of study at our command, Congress does not have an unprejudiced chance to exercise truly independent and objective judgments in such circumstances as we here confront. * * * Congress does not enjoy original jurisdiction in foreign relations. That is the prerogative of the Chief Executive. We come in, usually, only at the eleventh hour, when our choice is the lesser of two evils.

Mr. President, the American people want to halt the spread around the world of the evil Communist totalitarian tyranny. But there is no enthusiasm, apparently, no confidence, in the methods by which it is proposed to implement this so-called Truman doctrine.

As my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts, himself a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said on the Senate floor the other day, this is "an unhappy and sickening moment."

Mr. President, it serves no good purpose to becloud the issue by continuing to assert that the implications of the Truman doctrine merely extend precedents of American foreign policy in the past. We have heard that said many times in recent days.

On March 25, 1947, David Lawrence wrote under the title "Truman's Greek Policy Is Based on Precedents":

> What President Truman said a fortnight ago to Congress may be compared with what the late President Wilson told Congress when America entered World War I:
>
> "The world must be made safe for democracy * * * and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."
>
> What President Truman has so courageously done is to reaffirm in peacetime the basis for which America fought two wars.

Mr. President, such assertions as these are staggering in their implications. The basic implication of the Truman doctrine is that it will compel the return to and the perpetuation of wartime conditions and controls.

In both instances, in 1917 and in 1941, we abandoned our democratic processes; we set up the Presidency as a virtual dictatorship. At this very moment we are struggling desperately to repair the damage that has been done to our own form of government, and our own way of life.

To use our military intervention in 1917 and in 1941 as precedents for the continuation of a perpetual state of war emergency and government by control and crisis, which is implicit in the Truman doctrine, to me would be suicidal.

That the Truman doctrine would reestablish these controls is implied in the statement from the senior Senator from Michigan. The Senator said:

I am not one of those, Mr. President, who conceives that we are launching what has been called by some a new doctrine in any such unique sense as did James Monroe a century and a quarter ago. Rather, in my opinion, we are launching a plan which has numerous precedents—although we must frankly and honestly assess the fact that it has new and broad implications as President Truman himself declared in his message of March 12.

The pending plan unquestionably broadens our precedents when it enters the Mediterranean—although the Marines were there in the earliest days of the Republic and in the finest American tradition. The plan broadens geographically—although we long since pronounced the open door for China. It broadens when peacetime military missions, heretofore largely confined to pan-America, enter the Near East.

Mr. President, again I say these broad implications of the Truman doctrine involve decisions which we are now called to make in which the fate of civilization hangs in the balance.

These broad implications and decisions are likened to requests for declarations of war. The senior Senator from Michigan said:

As when we have been asked, upon other occasions, to declare war, the fact is that by the time these issues reach us for ultimate conclusions, we are heavily precommitted by the fact of the Presidential request.

That statement applies now. Commitments have already been made, and we are asked to uphold the hands of the President after the commitments have been made.

The senior Senator from Michigan recognizes the seriousness of the decisions which we are being called upon to make. Even while he himself supports the President's proposals, he recognizes that this is a time for men to search their hearts and minds and to obey the dictates of their own conscience, when he said:

I do not for an instant mean to say we cannot act on our own independent judgments. I do not mean to say that it is not still our solemn duty to act in keeping with our own estimate of the national welfare and security.

Mr. President, in just such a time of crisis as this President Monroe stated in his message to Congress on December 2, 1823:

The people being with us exclusively the sovereign, it is indispensable that full information be laid before them on all important subjects, to enable them to exercise that high power with complete effect. If kept in the dark—

I want to repeat those words:

If kept in the dark, they must be incompetent to it * * *. To the people every department of the Government and every individual in each are responsible, and the more full their information the better they can judge of the wisdom of the policy pursued and of the conduct of each in regard to it. * * *

Their interests in all vital questions are the same, and the bond by sentiment as well as by interest will be proportionately strengthened as they are better informed of the real state of public affairs, especially in difficult conjunctures. It is by such knowledge that local prejudices and jealousies are surmounted, and that a national policy, extending its fostering care and protection to all the grand interests of our Union, is formed and steadily adhered to. A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers as respects our negotiations and transactions with each is thought to be particularly necessary.

Yet, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said he did not know anything about this loan until February 27. What do we know about it now?

THE BROAD IMPLICATIONS OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The Truman doctrine constitutes, of course, a complete break with traditional American foreign policy.

Mr. President, America is something new, something unique in history. America was carved out of the remnants of five ancient empires—the British, the French, the Dutch, the Russian, and the Spanish.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. At the beginning of my remarks I said I would decline to yield because I wanted to complete the statement. When I conclude these remarks I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who desires to ask any questions. The statement is a long one, and I should like to get it into the RECORD this evening.

From its very beginning, America was dedicated as a sanctuary of freedom for all the politically and spiritually oppressed who came to our shores that mankind might have a new birth of freedom under God.

America was founded on the belief that this sanctuary of freedom could only be maintained so long as the external relations and commitments of this Nation grew out of and reflected the pattern and the needs of the internal economic, social, and political structure.

It was this belief that moved George Washington to state in his Farewell Address:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests.

It was this conviction, Mr. President, that compelled Thomas Jefferson to admonish the American people ever to follow the course of—

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political * * * peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations * * * entangling alliances with none * * * the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies * * * the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home, and safety abroad.

The founding fathers of the American Nation believed that no democracy could exist which placed entangling alliances in external conflict above the need for progressive internal development.

Our earliest American statesmen were determined to build a representative society by remaining free from the constant curse and threat of external dangers and by assuring the security which would permit debate and experimentation with the development of a full and free economic, social, and political system. It was for this reason that there was written into the Articles of Confederation of 1777, article 9, which states:

The United States in Congress assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war.

Abraham Lincoln declared, in a letter of February 15, 1848, to William H. Herndon:

Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such a purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect, after having given him so much as your purpose. If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us;" but he will say to you, "Be silent; I see it, if you don't." The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

There are those who continue to insist that the President has always had authority to send American troops anywhere he wanted to. The record so conclusively proves otherwise that I take this opportunity to again remind my colleagues that every single departure from this traditional American foreign policy by the abuse of Presidential power has met an inglorious end, with only one or two exceptions in our entire history.

I want to cite the major instances in the past which are being used to justify President Truman's request for a complete break with America's traditional domestic and foreign policies.

Mr. President, three important military interventions and occupations in our history have been initiated under Presidential authority in Caribbean countries. These are the cases of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. All were the result of disorder and bloodshed. All were forced by the fear of intervention of European powers. Not one of them constitutes anything for which the American people have reason to be either proud or grateful.

So far as I can determine, there are four major instances in which the President has used American troops to implement a treaty without the specific and prior consent of Congress.

First, there was the treaty with Colombia, ratified in 1846—100 years ago. To implement that treaty American troops were sent to Colombia in 1856, 1860, 1868, 1873, 1885, 1895, 1901, 1902, and 1903. But I submit, Mr. President, that the nature of the treaty itself is very enlightening. The treaty merely provided that the United States could send troops into Colombia, not for armed intervention, but for protective purposes only. In other words, the treaty itself provided that we could send troops to Colombia for the purpose of protecting American property and American citizens. I submit further that the last incident, in 1903, resulted in the Panama Revolution, and in the payment of $25,000,000 in reparations by the United States Government. Would anyone cite this as a precedent he desires to see repeated?

The second instance is a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed in 1862, which purported to suppress the slave traffic at sea by setting up courts and authorizing seizure and search of slave-bearing traffic. But Mr. President, there are no recorded instances in which American troops were used to implement this treaty.

The third treaty was signed between Mexico and the United States in 1882 as a reciprocal agreement that permitted the pursuit of cattle thieves by either party into the territory of the other.

The fourth treaty is really a series of treaties with China, dating all the way from 1858 to 1901, which were purely protective in character, and which provided only for the protection of American lives and property on the pirate- and bandit-infested Chinese seaboard.

I believe there is one instance, namely, the Boxer uprising, of the President using American troops for the political purpose of preventing the domination of China by any other power, although so far as I know such an admission has never been forthcoming from this Government.

In the December issue of Reader's Digest, 1943, Mr. William Hard graphically portrays the disastrous consequences of the three alliances America has joined in her history.

> In the course of our history we have given three outstanding permanent commitments to foreign countries. The outcome of all three has been extremely embarrassing and distressing.
>
> (A) In 1788 we signed with France a treaty of alliance. It was the only alliance treaty that we ever signed. We promised to guarantee forever against all other powers the French possessions in America. In 1788, by a simple act of Congress, without French consent, we repealed and repudiated it.
>
> (B) In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by this proclaiming to the world that Korea, our ally, had ceased to exist as an independent country.
>
> (C) In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to guarantee the sovereignty of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces over the Isthmus. For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

Mr. President, four conflicts at arms which amounted to undeclared war have taken place in our history.

The first was the naval war with France from 1798 to 1800.

The second and third instances were the first and second Barbary wars.

The fourth was the Mexican hostilities from 1914 to 1917.

All of these were carried on by the President—without the authorization of the Congress.

But I challenge any interpretation of these armed conflicts to prove that they constituted a use of American troops by the President of the United States without the prior authorization of Congress, for any other purpose than that of protecting American lives and property or providing for the defense of our national security.

Our traditional American foreign policy has been reiterated time and again as the only basis upon which a free and republican America could cooperate with the rest of the world.

In 1933, on December 28, the late President Roosevelt states, in speaking of his attitude toward the League of Nations:

> I believe that I express the views of my countrymen when I state that the old policies, alliances, combinations, and balances of power have proved themselves inadequate for the preservation of world peace. * * * We are not members and we do not contemplate membership. We are giving cooperation to the League in every matter which is not primarily political and in every matter which obviously represents the views and the good of the peoples of the world as distinguished from the views and the good of political leaders, of privileged classes, or of imperialistic aims.

Again on September 15, 1936, Secretary of State Cordell Hull reaffirmed this traditional policy when he said:

> At times there has been criticism because we would not depart from our traditional policy and join with other governments in collective arrangements carrying the obligation of employing force, if necessary, in case disputes between other countries brought them into war. That responsibility, carrying direct participation in the political relations of the whole of the world outside, we cannot accept, eager as we are to support means for the prevention of war. For current experience indicates how uncertain is the possibility that we, by our action, could vitally influence the policies or activities of other countries from which war might come.

Mr. President, while for the past few years our statesmen have let our traditional foreign policy fall into disuse, both in spirit and in practice, on June 13, 1946, Walter Lippmann warned our statesmen that they could not count on the continued support of the American people if the basic policies of this Government were not firmly rooted in traditional American principles.

Mr. Lippmann said:

> The American people will never deeply accept a foreign policy which seems to them a mere entanglement in the rivalries of the Old World. For while American foreign policy can and must change, the tradition and instinct of our people will continue to be in essence what Washington meant when he said that "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation." Whoever forgets this enduring truth in conducting our affairs, will in the end be reminded of it sharply. This is not isolationism, though isolationists like to quote it, and Washington and his contemporaries were not in our sense of the word isolationists at all. But Washington's statement is a recognition of the fact that America's relation to the Old World is different from that of any of the powers in the Old World. And whenever this difference is lost sight of by American statesmen, they risk offending the instinct of the people and so they lose their support.

The broad implications of the Truman doctrine constitute a sharp break with American tradition. They constitute a sharp break even with the powers which the implementing treaty to the United Nations vested in the President. This act, entitled the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945," constituted such a radical departure from America's traditional foreign policy that the Committee on Foreign Relations stated in its report:

> The committee realizes that the powers proposed to be granted to the President under this section (sec. 5) are very great. However, the basic decision in this regard was made when the Charter was ratified and this provision is a necessary corollary to our membership in this Organization.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee reveals that in the minds of its members these findings and recommendations did not rest on any constitutional basis whatever, for the report concludes:

> In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our armed forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the Charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council.

The Truman doctrine, with all its broad implications, not only bypasses but actually repudiates the United Nations.

President Truman, in urging prompt ratification of the United Nations Charter, in his speech before the Senate on July 2, 1945, stated:

> The choice before the Senate is clear. The choice is not between this Charter and something else. It is between this Charter and no charter at all. * * * This Charter points down the only road to enduring peace. There is no other road.

Yet in President Truman's speech on last March 12, without consulting the United Nations, without consulting the American people, and with no intention

of submitting this proposal to the United Nations, he admitted:

We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required.

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson who was a foremost promoter of the United Nations Charter, firmly insisted before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on March 20, 1947, that this administration had determined to bypass the United Nations in this Greek crisis when he said:

There is no possibility of putting the responsibility for extending the aid which Greece has asked from the United States on some other nation or upon the United Nations. Even if the project were not blocked by the objections of certain members of the United Nations, much time would have been lost and time is of the essence.

They never intended to give it to them.

On March 19, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced in the United States Senate a bill to aid Greece and Turkey, but that is not the bill with which we are now dealing. That bill provided for a direct bypass of the United Nations, and was withdrawn after public pressure impelled the Senator from Michigan to submit a preamble to this Greek-Turkey loan bill in the form of an amendment which would attempt to bring it into line with our publicly declared policy of adherence to the United Nations.

I cannot help thinking that. I have tried to bring myself to some other way of thinking.

On March 12, 1946, in a speech before the Senate, the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said:

The United States must meet each (international question) in the Security Council or the assembly or in diplomatic conduct as it arises and take a stand firmly under rights, under the charter, under treaties, and under international law, and hold to that position with firmness and persistence.

The distinguished Senator from Texas went on to say:

I would set before the peoples and the nations two placards, two pointing fingers indicating directions and the fate of the traveler.

One would say, "We have set up the United Nations—here is the road to peace." The other would read, "There is the road to misery and ruin and death—war."

Yet, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas, who stood on the Senate floor and helped to sell the United Nations to the American people as the only hope of peace, only last week made the following statement on the Greek-Turkish loan proposal at page 2529 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. President, if it were a problem that the United Nations was authorized to handle under its charter, I would say yes. If the situation were not emergent and did not demand quick action, yes, perhaps. But, Mr. President, one cannot go to a well and draw water when there is no water in it.

A few minutes later—and I refer again to the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 2529—the distinguished Senator from Texas further stated:

Mr. President, we face a reality. Shall we face it with courage, with patience, with determination, or shall we face it by beginning to trim and hedge and say, "Oh, no: wait a minute; this is not our obligation. This is the obligation of the UNO." The UNO what?

The response to that witticism as I call it, says the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was, "Laughter."

It is not a wise course for us uncritically to follow recommendations of the very men who, having been the foremost champions of the United Nations, as our only hope of peace, now turn out to be the first ones to declare its impotence.

There is a deep misgiving in the highest and most informed circles of American public opinion that the Truman doctrine, with all its broad implications, goes away beyond any utterance of any other American President in time of peace.

Ann O'Hare McCormick, one of President Roosevelt's closest confidants, recently stated in the New York Times of March 15, 1947:

Not even Roosevelt's lend-lease policy, though it practically put us into war, marked as revolutionary a departure from traditional foreign policy as the course Mr. Truman sponsors. * * * The Truman message contemplates a bigger role for America in world affairs than was envisioned by Roosevelt when he thought of himself as the symbol and leader of democracy.

If the United States intends to intervene effectively to save democracy in Europe, there must be a much broader, more carefully thought-out and more positive plan than a relief program for any one country.

Walter Lippmann has gone even further in his criticism of the Truman doctrine. I quote from the New York Herald Tribune of March 15, 1947:

The implications are stated so vaguely, so broadly, that no workable policy can be deduced from them. They can mean anything, everything, or very little, and words of that sort, when pronounced by the head of a great state in a time of intense crisis and of passionate confusion, are imprudent. * * * The big hot generalities which we have loved so well when the primary responsibility in the world was not ours are no longer for us.

THE WHOLE STORY OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE IS NOT BEING TOLD

Mr. President, in such a critical hour as this, we look to the administration to be honest and frank to the fullest degree with the elected representatives of the American people. We cannot intelligently and courageously decide upon our future course by making a global leap in the dark. Yet, we are being asked to do this, in spite of the fact that on February 7, 1947, the United States News revealed that Under Secretary Dean Acheson has developed an over-all American foreign policy embodying our particular relations with every nation, in a document which is marked "top secret," only two copies of which are in existence.

I quote from the United States News:

During Mr. Byrnes' tenure Mr. Acheson's principal contribution was a codification of American foreign policy, the first in many years. This was largely written by the Under Secretary, outlining in detail the United States policy toward every nation and area. In preparing the document, Mr. Acheson acquired what some had complained that he lacked: a knowledge of the minutiae of international dealings.

The brochure is, of course, top secret. Only two copies of it exist. One is kept in a State Department vault; the other by the Army's Chief of Staff, so that military and diplomatic policy may be integrated. As former Chief of Staff, General Marshall, of course, was kept up to the minute on foreign policy everywhere. He now is familiarizing himself with developments during his year in China, mostly by a study of Mr. Acheson's book.

While the Secretary digs into his job and prepares to attend the meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers at Moscow in March, Mr. Acheson is largely running the Department on the basis of his own guidebook.

So far as I know, Mr. President, that statement still remains unchallenged. I have heard no satisfactory explanation of it. Time and time again I have challenged the members of the Foreign Relations Committee to state whether they had a foreign policy for this country, and, if so, to bring it out in the open so that the Congress and the country might see it. Why should we not see it? Why should not we know what commitments have been made? Why should we not know what the implications are?

Mr. President, it seems incredible that such a condition as is described in that United States News item could exist in a representative government.

I have tried for years now to find out where we were being taken by the executive branch of this Government. I have done my best to bring into the open the basic policies of this administration so the people might have some faint knowledge of what they were being committed to. The consistent refusal on the part of this administration to take either the United States Congress or the American people into its confidence can be interpreted only as a fear that if their remedies for the disastrous consequences of their blundering policies in the past were presented to the light of day, brought in all at once, their proposals would die under the withering contempt of the American people.

Mr. President, we are told this administration wants Congress to provide $400,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey over a period of 15 months.

There are many different reservations attached to this proposal by its supporters. Some are not sure the job can be done in 15 months. They do not know. Some were not sure whether the job can be done in 15 years. Some want to make this aid available until after the peace treaties have been signed. Some call it a stopgap between the present time and the time when the peace treaties are signed, a proposal to do what the Foreign Relations Committee says it is impotent to do. Some want to continue this aid until the United Nations either stops it or takes over the burden itself. Others feel this aid ought to be continued until the countries themselves are able to go it alone.

Certainly we ought not to permit ourselves to be deluded into thinking the objectives of the Truman doctrine can be accomplished in any such period of time as 15 months. The report of the FAO

Commission for Greece has recommended a 25-year over-all program of economic rehabilitation to put Greece back on its feet. It is obvious that our support of an all-out offensive against communism around the world makes all the time reservations on the extent of these proposed loans now ridiculous.

We are told that of the $400,000,000, $150,000,000 would be for military support to the Greek Government. The sum of $130,000,000 would be for basic economic reconstruction; $20,000,000 would be for agricultural rehabilitation, plus $50,000,000 for relief, as provided in the general relief bill now pending in the House.

There is no one who has a greater respect and admiration for the heroic Greek people than I. If this were merely a relief measure, I would vote today to provide these sums to relieve the suffering of these tragic people, if the contribution now proposed for that purpose were to be the end of the contributions. But what assurance do we have that the Truman doctrine, implemented through this present bill, will solve the problems of the Greek people or stem the threatening advance of Communist aggression? Suppose we embark on this adventure; suppose Stalin moves into Greece; then what do we do? What action would we then take? I have asked that question time and time again. I repeat, Mr. President, what action would we take then? What would be the result? What are the implications under those circumstances? Those questions have to be answered.

The truth is that during the past 2 years, either directly or indirectly, we have poured nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars into Greece, and Greece is worse off today than she was when the war ended, even though she has received the contributions I have just mentioned.

A moment ago, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] asked for an explanation as to how the various gifts made by the United States to Greece were made, and the Senator from Nevada said they included our share of UNRRA aid. Mr. President, why cannot any further aid which we extend to Greece be made a part of the UNRRA aid, because 70 percent of the UNRRA funds are a direct contribution upon the part of the people of the United States?

Greece has perhaps a dozen small locomotives. She has no transportation to speak of. Her light and power plants are practically at a standstill. Her system of communications remains in disrepair. Her harbor, the Port of Piraeus, is still a shambles. Even after all the aid that has already gone to Greece, today the Greek people need to import $15,000,000 of food a month just to keep alive. That is their condition.

Mr. President, the point I make is that if we are now going to turn Greece into an outpost in a series of military bases around the rim of the present Russian sphere of influence, it becomes perfectly obvious we are going to take over Greece as a permanent colonial responsibility. We do not have to call it an imperialistic possession; it will be a colonial responsibility, to say the least. This means that once we start, we shall be forced to continue to underwrite an increasing deficit economy by pouring funds into military installations, which are so desperately needed in Greece, as elsewhere, to halt the steady deterioration of economic standards which is turning the whole world into a chamber of horrors.

I am convinced that this point is not debatable. It has taken me a long time to reach it, but I am now convinced. It is impossible for even the miserable prewar standards of the Greek people to support a military machine that would constitute anything remotely resembling an adequate defense against the offensive action of Russia, or any of her satellite powers which we have helped to equip and rearm.

At this very moment the Greek Government is bankrupt. It is unable to implement even a minimum tax program to support itself. It cannot control the ruinous inflation which has set in. It cannot provide even a minimum standard of living for its people. It cannot even maintain order within its own borders. Yet, according to a special dispatch to the Washington Post of March 14, 1947, from Lake Success, N. Y., we are going in "to provide American military training and equipment for 100,000 Greek soldiers."

Now, what of Turkey?

On March 15, 1947, Barnet Nover writing in the Washington Post said:

> The Turks have been compelled to maintain a very large standing army. According to reliable estimates, the maintenance of this force plus the police apparatus absorbs about 65 percent of the Turkish Government's revenue. The country is being bled white in order to be prepared. Yet should Russia go on the warpath, it is questionable whether Turkey would be able to offer more than a token resistance.

The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the other distinguished Senators who have recently returned from a trip abroad did not make exactly the statement I have just repeated, but they have said about the same thing as does this writer from Washington, that the taxation required to keep the 500,000 men in readiness is almost prohibitive. So far as their economy is concerned, they need nothing, but to arm these men in order to keep off the Russian threat is going to be hard on the economy of Turkey.

Again, on March 26, Ann O'Hare McCormick wrote in the New York Times:

> Turkish economy, not very solid at best, is being wrecked to maintain the army—another example of the ruinous cost of fear.

If these estimates are correct, Mr. President, the whole question of further support to other nations seeking to maintain a military establishment able to cope with threats of aggression from Russia, or Russian-dominated countries, lines up one-half of the world at the front door of the United States Treasury.

Is there any doubt that the State Department knows this, and that they have a foreign policy for all of these countries? Certainly they must have. Each and every Member of the United States Senate is entitled to know what the program and policy are. We should have the blueprint before we are asked to commit ourselves on this first installment. We should know what the total program is and what the total cost is going to be.

If for no other reason than that, one should withhold his vote on this measure until the State Department gives us the full information.

The State Department should not only give it to the Members of the Senate, but to the American people as well.

If the State Department insists that it has no plan—that there is no blueprint—then no Member of this Senate could be justified in voting for any such a blind course as would be proposed, because if we do this for Greece and Turkey, certainly we are obligated to do it for other peoples under like circumstances.

THE PATTERN OF COMMITMENTS WE WILL ESTABLISH

If we accept the President's own statement of why these funds for Greece and Turkey are needed, we can trace the pattern which they will set for the future, a pattern from which we cannot possibly escape.

On March 12, in speaking of the need for maintaining the independence of Greece and Turkey, the President said:

> That integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] goes even further by saying:

> If the Middle East falls within the orbit of aggressive Communist expansion, the repercussions will echo from the Dardanelles to the China Sea and westward to the rims of the Atlantic.

Then, at least, let us be honest about the nature and extent of the commitments for which these Greek and Turkish gifts will set a precedent. We will, by taking this step, serve notice on all the nations of the world which are still left outside the Russian sphere of influence, that they have become our first line of defense. Naturally these nations will be only too glad to unload their burdens on us if by that means they can get us to use our own resources and our own finances and manpower to supplant theirs.

The President, in declaring an all-out offensive against the spread of communism, must realize that the economies of these nations which lie in the path of Russian expansion cannot support adequate military defense against such threats.

It is admitted by the Senators who have returned from abroad that Turkey has an economy which excels even our own, yet they cannot continue to arm themselves to meet the advances of Russia. There is the story. They cannot support adequate military defense against Russia.

Thus we will be undertaking to rehabilitate the peacetime economies, raise standards of living, encourage economic reconstruction, and at the same time superimpose on all of these requirements military establishments which cannot be maintained except through endless drains on American resources and raw materials.

For instance, if we underwrite Greece and Turkey, what about Syria? Syria will need perhaps $150,000,000 next year. Then there is Palestine where the British kept 100,000 troops last year at the cost of $340,000,000. Conditions in Palestine are steadily deteriorating into civil war and anarchy. Surely we will have to underwrite the British commitments here. Then there is Egypt which guards the entrance to the Suez Canal. The Egyptian economy will certainly call for a financial shot-in-the-arm from Uncle Sam in the very near future.

And, oh yes, Mr. President, let us not forget Iran, where already we are told arrangements are being made for us to provide a loan of a quarter of a billion dollars.

Then, what of Italy? The British are now reneging on their commitments there. Italy is bankrupt, and seething with conflict and Communist agitation. Will we have to grant the Italian Government great sums of money to prevent its collapse? As a matter of fact, negotiations are already under way, I understand, to grant Italy $100,000,000, so she can make her first payment on reparations to Russia when the peace treaties are signed. That information came to me. I, for one, shall never consent by my vote to compel the American people to make grants to any other nations to enable them to pay reparations to Russia. That is one thing I will not agree to.

Then there is France. France has already borrowed $1,200,000,000 and will be coming back very shortly for more, especially if the international crisis continues to intensify as a result of President Truman's call for an all-out offensive against communism.

I have been in France, and I know to what extent communism flourishes in France, and if we are to stop it, according to the words of the President, directly or indirectly, France will be entitled to a loan, because stopping communism in France will be a difficult task.

Then, there is England. On April 5, Walter Lippmann wrote:

> The British had about $6,000,000,000 hard money at the beginning of this year. They are using it up at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year. There is no prospect as things stand now even if their plans work perfectly that they can do any more than postpone the day when their funds are exhausted.

On March 19, James Reston wrote in the New York Times:

> Britain's economic situation is declining rapidly and in many ways the seriousness of her situation threatens the whole world trade program of the Truman administration.

The full import of this situation is fully pictured in an article by Jay Reid in the Washington Star of March 25, 1947, in which he says:

> The shaky financial condition of the British Empire threatens a serious weakening of British economic and military positions all along the lines that separate eastern and western ideological controls in Europe.

This leaves Austria and Germany in the heart of Europe for the United States to underwrite. These economies have been permitted so to deteriorate that the State Department is admitting privately we cannot even make a dent in the problem of recovery for less than $6,000,000,000 just for Germany alone.

I spent nearly 2 weeks in Germany, and I can say without hesitation that it is going to take a vast investment in the zone which we occupy jointly, if the German people are to be brought back where they can even become self-supporting. I am unable to estimate the amount, but I doubt that $6,000,000,000 will be sufficient.

When we turn to the Far East, we find ourselves with Japan on our hands.

Then Korea will need a billion dollars next year. It must not be forgotten that we occupy Korea, and that we must do something for her.

China is in such tragic circumstances that no matter how much we pour in, civil war, starvation, corruption, and despair will make economic recovery a long laborious task at best, with the end nowhere in sight. Certainly in the solution of the peace of the world one of the big question marks is China. I think the peace of the world depends on what is done in China. We must change our policy in China if we are to get anywhere in the fight against communism that we are told we are making, as we pay the first installment of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey.

Then there is the problem of India. India is to receive its independence in 1948, yet where are the funds coming from to enable the new Indian Government to maintain itself in power? With civil war threatened, with England unable to redeem the $5,000,000,000 loan which the Indian Government had made to England during the war, and with terrible food shortages inevitable, unless the United States pours out tremendous amounts of money into India she may well collapse. I do not say she will. I say she well may.

Mr. President, the extent of these needs staggers the imagination. It certainly staggers mine. The United States cannot possibly rearm and rebuild the world.

Most of the emphasis in the President's message has been placed on the economic aspects of these grants. But these economic aspects cannot be divorced from the total offensive against communism, which is the essence of the Truman doctrine.

The President has asked that we first use financial and political force to implement his policy. But if that fails, what does he say? He has said he will not hesitate to ask for further authority.

At the outset $300,000,000 of the $400,000,000 being asked is being made available for military purposes. That is admitted. This leaves no doubt that the President is going to attempt to revive economic standards of nations that stand in the path of communistic aggression, and yet superimpose on these economies military establishments which neither they nor we can possibly continue to maintain.

On November 17, 1946, the New York Times reported the official Government policy toward foreign trade which was revealed at the thirty-third foreign trade convention at the Waldorf-Astoria.

The conference report approved by all the foreign traders present and concurred in by our State Department officials, is as follows, and I quote:

> Our foreign economic policy is seen to embrace the responsibility for promoting and safeguarding the interests of American foreign traders—this responsibility lies in the area of assuring the safety and security of American investments abroad, and of providing conditions which will make possible receipt of an adequate volume of useful goods and services in return for our exports of goods and capital.

Mr. President, such a revival of dollar diplomacy of necessity requires that American armed forces shall follow the American dollar all over the world.

That such a dependence on military force is uppermost in the mind of this administration is nowhere better revealed than in the memorandum submitted by Secretary of State Marshall accompanying the detail of military missions bill in which Secretary Marshall states:

> The United States Government has received requests from several foreign governments for the detail of military and/or naval missions with which, in the opinion of the interested departments, it would be in the advancement of the public interest to comply, but with which it cannot comply for the lack of the legislative authority which is being requested herewith. There are also a number of other missions now serving with foreign governments which, in the absence of such legislation, may have to be terminated before they have accomplished their task—

Iran is one of them—

> should the present state of war or of national emergency be officially declared terminated. It is also anticipated that additional requests will be received from other countries with which it would be in the national interest to comply.

Mr. President, there is no good purpose to be served by ignoring the military implications of the Truman doctrine. On March 2, 1947, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, military analyst for the New York Times, wrote:

> Today the United States and Russia are face to face in a struggle for the world, a conflict short of war, but a struggle nevertheless that will alter world history. * * * The United States alone is capable of sustaining western civilization.

On March 25, 1947, General Eisenhower, for whom I have the highest regard, issued a grave warning to the Nation to prepare for troubled times ahead. And in his plea for more adequate military power, he said:

> Weakness cannot cooperate in the world today. All it can do is beg.

Mr. President, this raises the whole question of the advisability of endorsing the Truman doctrine just from the point of military preparedness alone. It would be suicidal for the United States in such a critical hour to undertake the impossible task of adding the unbearable weight of military establishments to the national economies which it seeks to revive. We would spread ourselves so thin across the world, even while we are bleeding ourselves of our finances and resources, that we would become vulnerable on every front. We would set up conditions where Pearl Harbors and Corregidors could be repeated simultaneously in a score of places.

It was this danger—I am certain—that led Hanson Baldwin to write on March 2, 1947, in the New York Times:

Today we have in real truth no finished over-all military policy. Our fighting forces are handicapped not only by demands for economy but by lack of legislation and by piecemeal legislation. There is no rounded and complete policy to guide them in organization or development of our postwar forces. The formulation of a sound and well-founded military policy, which will provide effective support for our foreign policy and promote efficiency and reasonable economy is probably the most important job the Nation confronts.

Mr. President, in spite of all that we have done and continue to do to help the other nations of the world get back on their feet, the economic conditions around the world, the miserable plight of hundreds of millions of people, are going to be worse next winter than the last. It is, indeed, little wonder that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] declared:

In a sense we are a tragic generation, despite our blessings and our place in the sun. We have been drawn into two world wars. Something has been wrong.

What has been wrong, Mr. President; what has gone wrong—so wrong that now the only choice this administration has given us as Members of the Senate is the lesser of two evils?

Somewhere there has been a tragic miscalculation. We have been led to believe that by pouring out our resources and the blood of our finest youth to destroy Germany and Japan, peace once again would return to the earth, and men once again could resume the task of finding a better way for men and nations to live together.

The President, himself, now charges Russia with being a major aggressor. All across this land voices are now being raised in a chorus of angry denunciation of Russia as a far greater menace to world peace and to our own way of life than the Nazis themselves.

As far back as June 7, 1946, David Lawrence wrote in the United States News:

There is no use camouflaging the truth about what is going on. We are up against the ruthless rule of totalitarianism in world diplomacy. * * * A government that cannot be trusted can make war over night. Russian aggression has begun.

In the March-April Monthly Study issued by the American Federation of Labor we find the following grim assertion:

Soviet Russia is ready to move in as Britain moves out, spreading a totalitarianism more cruel and far-reaching than Hitler's over countries our boys died to free.

Certainly there is no question in the mind of Winston Churchill himself that a terribly tragic blunder has been committed when he writes:

The schism between communism on the one hand and Western civilization on the other is the most far-reaching and rending the human race has ever known.

On March 12, 1947, Sumner Welles wrote:

The postwar period has entered its most critical phase. Events are moving rapidly toward an inevitable crisis. The American people have entered the valley of decision.

Russia would never be where she is today if it had not been for the criminal betrayals of hundreds of millions of helpless human beings, to say nothing of the betrayals of American principles, entered into under pressure of expediency by American statesmen at all the secret conferences of the Big Three from Cairo to Potsdam.

On March 14, Dorothy Thompson reminded the American people of this very fact when she wrote:

The western powers collaborated systematically for the creation of the situation which we are now called upon to halt. What—we now see with fright—started at Casablanca with the unconditional surrender formula. The result of that formula was the refusal of any aid whatever to what we now know was a formidable movement in Germany to overthrow Hitler and set up an honorable regime. We could have made peace with that regime and avoided the horrible destruction of the last year of the war.

Then came Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Each one of these conferences brought nearer the present inevitable crisis. Governments supporting western civiliation, governments that had fought with us, were thrown into the ash can. It was not Russia, but Britain and ourselves who introduced Tito in Yugoslavia, and opened the Polish vacuum to his longtime comintern collaborators Beirut and Berman.

Mr. President, I need not dwell longer on the tragedies of the past. Suffice it to say that the crisis now confronting us has been made inevitable by the policies which this administration has been a party to throughout the critical years of the war.

The whole of Europe, England included, is being dragged down to a subhuman level of existence. Germany is impotent.

When we couple with our deindustrialization program of Germany the terrifying effect on German law and jurisprudence, and on any semblance of individual security, which our denazification procedures are having, our policies become all the more questionable.

When we add to these things the continued starvation level which we are forcing on the German people, it seems perfectly obvious that it is futile to talk about stopping the spread of communism when our own policies toward defeated peoples are preparing the very soil of hunger, misery, despair, and degradation upon which communism thrives.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the record statistical tables which illustrate the vital relation which prewar German industry had with other European nations, including Greece, and Turkey.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE GERMAN ECONOMY FOR EASTERN EUROPE

A survey of foreign-trade figures, according to official League of Nations statistics, reveals that in normal trading years Germany used to be both the largest supplier and the best customer of almost all eastern European countries. To illustrate this point, I have chosen the years 1928 and 1929 as representing the only 2 years of real prosperity in Europe between the two World Wars, and the years 1935 and 1936, after the stabilization of the Nazi regime. The latter figures already show trade distortions caused by bilateral Nazi trading practices, but are not yet completely distorted by war preparations and political alignments.

To begin with, I single out Greece and Turkey, the two countries now in need of American aid. These figures show convincingly that the economies of these two countries would immensely benefit by a revival of trade with Germany and of German productive power. This, in turn, would reduce the extent to which American aid is needed, and would help put these countries on a self-paying, instead of a relief, basis. At the same time, it would benefit the German economy and thus cut relief costs to that country. The figures are:

Greek imports from Germany (in millions of drachmas):

1928: 1.07 or 8.6 percent of total imports (next to United States and United Kingdom).

1929: 1.25 or 9.4 percent (next to United States and United Kingdom).

1935: 1.99 or 18.7 percent (first place).

1936: 2.67 or 22.8 percent (first place).

Greek exports to Germany (in millions of drachmas):

1928: 1.63 or 9 percent of total exports (next to United States and United Kingdom).

1929: 1.61 or 23.1 percent (first place).

1935: 2.11 or 29.7 percent (first place).

1936: 2.68 or 36.4 percent (more than United States and United Kingdom together).

Turkish imports from Germany (in millions of Turkish lira):

1928: 31.7 or 14.2 percent of total (first place).

1929: 39.2 or 15.3 percent (first place).

1935: 35.5 or 40 percent (first place).

1936: 41.7 or 45.1 percent (first place).

Turkish exports to Germany:

1928: 22.2 or 12.8 percent (next to United States and Italy).

1929: 20.6 or 13.3 percent (next to Italy).

1935: 39.2 or 40.9 percent (first place).

1936: 60 or 51 percent (first place).

Just to illustrate this point further, I shall add some corresponding percentage figures for other leading eastern European countries, mostly now behind the iron curtain. The figures reveal how the loss of these markets affects the German economy, and how the economy of these countries suffers from the lack of German goods, which Russia, due to her low standard of living, is unable to supply. All figures indicate the percentage of the country's exports and imports coming from or going to Germany.

	1929	1936
Austria:		
Imports	20.9	16.9
Exports	15.7	16.1
Hungary:		
Imports	19.7	25.8
Exports	11.5	23.1
Poland:		
Imports	27.3	14.3
Exports	31.2	14.2
Rumania:		
Imports	[1]22.3	39.9
Exports	[1]18.6	20.8
Czechoslovakia:		
Imports	25.0	17.5
Exports	19.3	14.5
Yugoslavia:		
Imports	15.6	26.7
Exports	8.5	23.7
Bulgaria:		
Imports	22.2	61.0
Exports	29.9	47.6

[1]1927.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on April 12, 1947, General McNarney backed up Herbert Hoover's warnings concerning

the desperate plight of the German nation when he said:

This concentrated population of nearly 70,000,000 must be offered an early hope for economic and political stability. If they are forced to live without hope, the inevitable result will be chaos in central Europe, followed by a rebirth of totalitarianism.

Not only are we confronted with the prospects of such a collapse of central Europe as a result of the policies of this administration; we are also confronted with the tragic and almost irreparable damage that has been done to our relations with South America.

It is not at all reassuring to note that in the United States News of February 7, 1947, Under Secretary Dean Acheson is reported still to be a stanch supporter of Mr. Braden and his interventionist policies in South America, especially when we are reminded by Sumner Welles that—

Unless the United States returns to the basic principles of the good-neighbor policy, no inter-American conference can now be held without risking a break-up of the inter-American system and the total destruction of pan-American solidarity.

The good-neighbor policy was founded on respect for the freedom and the sovereign rights of the peoples of the Americas, on our abstentation from every form of interference in their domestic concerns, and on the consultation and friendly cooperation between all of the American Republics with regard to every problem which affected the security or welfare of the hemisphere.

I wonder whether there is any Member of the Senate who would care to state just when any member of this administration took the trouble to consult with a single member of the inter-American system on the President's speech calling for an all-out offensive against the spread of communism?

Certainly the President's own speech in Mexico in which he recently reiterated his continued support of the good-neighbor policy does not mean what it says in the light of his own unilateral repudiation of our promise to consult with our neighbors to the south on every matter affecting the welfare and security of the Western Hemisphere.

And what about our policies in the Far East? After the failure of General Marshall's truce team to stem the tide of Communist advance, are we to believe that the administration is about to make a complete change of policy toward China and Japan, while the whole Far Eastern Division of the State Department under the lead of John Carter Vincent still holds the reins?

On April 12, 1947, Li Chi-shen, a former aide of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, warned:

China is facing her most serious crisis.

Are we now going to reverse our efforts to force communism on the Chinese Nationalist Government, Mr. President, and are we going to continue to permit Russia to obstruct General MacArthur's administration of Japan by dominating the councils of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission? I ask those questions.

They are questions which have not yet been answered.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I raise the whole question of these basic American policies for only one reason. I am convinced that we cannot plunge headlong into the "broad implications" of the Truman proposals: that we cannot underwrite the staggering commitments to rearm and rebuild the rest of the world which still is outside the Russian sphere, and remain a sound, solvent, and free people.

We have already spent a large part of the $31,000,000,000 appropriated for world reconstruction and relief since VJ-day. Yet we find the nations of the world confronted next year with a worse winter than the last.

If we continue the same kind of international cooperation in the future as in the past, we shall only drain ourselves further of our own desperately needed raw materials. For instance, during the last year, in spite of the fact that Europe has all the coal she needs right under her feet, this Government sent 500 Liberty ships across the Atlantic carrying 2,000,000 tons of coal a month to Europe at the cost of $400,000,000 to the American taxpayer, or a sum equal to the proposed Greek and Turkish loan.

We now confront the iron curtain of a state-controlled slave-labor trade monopoly around half the world. Every American dollar that now goes abroad feeds the fires of world inflation and sends our own inflation spiral further upward. Each dollar earmarked for foreign aid bids in the American market for scarce American goods. Please do not forget that.

The American people should understand with crystal clarity that already our world relief efforts have prolonged rationing and Government controls, and have thwarted our desire for a descending cost of living.

We would by now be well on the way to a normal price structure in the United States, were it not for the inflationary world economic effort in which this country is engaged.

Those who complain of high prices in this country are the loudest advocates of the very kind of world economic program which makes it impossible for the American economy to work its way back in an orderly fashion to a healthy and balanced level. I sold corn within 90 days for $1.09 a bushel. Last week I sold the same kind of corn for $1.55 a bushel because of this export program. That is how it affects our economy.

At this moment our own Assistant Secretary of State is in Geneva, urging the acceptance of an international trade organization upon all but the Russian-dominated countries, which will put half of the world on a ration system and turn our own national credit agencies into agents of a new form of state capitalism.

On March 19, 1947, President Truman admitted that this kind of international cooperation could not be carried on by the United States without another year's extension of export controls.

The President said:

Our international responsibilities cannot be fulfilled without this machinery.

Mr. President, we cannot ride off in two directions at once in pursuit of two conflicting foreign policies without tearing ourselves to pieces. Until we renounce the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements, which compel us to build up Russia's strength and legalize her aggression, we are in no position to take seriously President Truman's declaration of an American "quarantine" on Russian aggression around the world.

Once more I repeat that I am duty bound, and stand prepared today, to vote whatever relief measures are necessary, within our capacity to provide.

But, Mr. President, as to all the implications of the military interventions here proposed, the plea that an emergency exists can no longer be justified. We are no longer confronted with the March 31 dead line, first urged upon us. Whatever action we take cannot be interpreted either as upholding or betraying the hand of Secretary Marshall, since the Moscow Conference awaits only its formal adjournment. Time is of the essence no longer.

Therefore, under these conditions, I cannot in good conscience cast my vote, at this time, to commit the American people to the implications of a global military intervention, with all its terrifying potential of a third world military explosion.

Rather it seems to me the Senate could better serve humanity, the welfare of the American people, and the cause of those who sincerely desire to arrest the march of Communist tyranny by eliminating from this bill and laying aside for further earnest consideration its appropriations for military intervention.

Finally, let me anticipate those who will charge that this is another Munich, another Dunkerque, or a Pearl Harbor.

The real Munich will occur in this case only if, by providing too little too soon, we lull the American people into a false sense of accomplished security, while the very forces of tyranny, over which the American way of life must finally triumph, feed and grow strong on the utter inadequacy of our action.

Let us not lead the American people down an uncharted trail in the darkness, burning our bridges behind us, without knowing whether the bridges ahead are down.

For myself I prefer to continue working to piece together the whole pattern of future American foreign and military policy, out in the open for all to see, and only then to determine America's final answer to the challenge of communism.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Nebraska a question and make a brief statement?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the hour is growing late and I do not want to yield for an extended colloquy.

Mr. HAWKES. There will be no extended colloquy. I merely wish to say a few words.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask whom the Chair has recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HAWKES. I am asking the Senator from Illinois to yield to me so that

I may make a brief statement. It will not take long.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I take it from what the Senator from Nebraska has just said that he is in almost the same position I am in. He does not know where we are going, and that is why he is not willing to consent to go there. He does not know why we are going there, and that is the reason he is not willing to vote to go to some unknown destination without knowing what we are going to do when we get there.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. If we had a well-organized plan which would give us a picture of what we are going to do, the Senator and I might both be willing to go along with the plan. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. WHERRY. The able Senator from New Jersey has answered the question better than I could. I have stood on the floor time after time and asked question after question. We are told that if we comply with the request, that is one way to peace. I have asked the question, "If we do not comply, what will happen?" We are told that one man's guess is as good as another's. I have asked why the problem has not been referred to the United Nations. It is said that it would be referred to the Security Council, and that no action would be taken. My theory is that if the United Nations can solve this problem, it ought to be sent through the front door, and not the back door. We are now up against the choice of voting either to make these installments on the first commitment, or not to make them.

I have tried hard to solve this question. I have lain awake at night. This is the most difficult vote I have yet had to cast in the United States Senate. I want to go along. I have tried my level best to go along. But I cannot find any precedent on which to go along. I have gone into the question in detail. Since the time element is out of the picture, I should like to see conferences in which the State Department would unfold to Members of the Senate the foreign policy which they want us to carry out. I would be the first to subscribe to a course of stopping communism if I knew where such a course would lead us.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish I were able to tell exactly what I am going to do tomorrow during every minute of the day. If I were able to do so; if I were able to anticipate the future; if I had some kind of a device by which I could tell what the conditions of the world are going to be tomorrow, then I am sure that I could answer the questions of the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. But I do not know anyone who is omniscient. All we can do in these unusual world circumstances is to do the best we can in an effort to do what is right for our own national safety and security. As has been said times without number, every Member of the Senate will have to use his best judgment as to what he believes is the right thing to do in guiding the destiny of this Nation so far as our future is concerned.

On January 27 I engaged in a colloquy with the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. On reading a recent article in Life magazine I recalled what I had said at that time. I quote a part of it:

> I think it would be the better part of wisdom, and it probably will be done in due course of time, to ascertain, if we can, how much other nations of the earth are spending in lands other than their own in attempting to put across their theory of government or their form of economic life or any other thing in connection with building up their own national philosophies on foreign soil. I anticipate that other great powers of the earth are spending so much more than we are it will make us look rather niggardly when our budget is compared with theirs.
>
> I have always thought that if we utilized every possible means at our command to sell America, over the air or through magazines or by other types of propaganda, we would be doing a great service to the people of this country and would be doing much for our own security in the future. But it will be found that many people object to our spending even the $19,000,000 now alleged to be used for this type of work.

At that time I was referring to the appropriation of last year which was made to the State Department for work of that kind under the able supervision of Mr. Benton. Mr. Benton is now seeking money from the Congress of the United States to carry on this important work. I have been told by some Members of the Senate that there are those in this body and in the House of Representatives who are so economy-minded and who so firmly believe that Mr. Benton's work has utterly failed that they are willing to eliminate every dollar from the appropriation which he is seeking at the present time.

I wish to address my remarks at this late hour in the afternoon to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate which soon will be listening to the State Department's representative requesting money to carry on work of this kind in foreign lands. I am talking about selling the United States of America. I am not selling the United States of America short, as some people have been doing, but I am interested in selling America in a way that will advance the doctrine which will be laid down tomorrow by the Senate so far as the Greek-Turkish loan is concerned.

Mr. President, Life magazine, in an editorial in its April 14 issue, cited a non-attributable speculation recently indulged in by a competent observer of the national scene in Washington. "If the Russians were thinking of putting $250,000,000 into Greece," this observer was quoted as saying, "they would probably advance $175,000,000, spend $25,000,000 on propaganda, and save $50,000,000." The question raised by the Life editorial is pertinent. Though no official figures are available, we know that the Soviets are conducting extensive information activities abroad, probably as large as all other major countries put together, and that propaganda is a basic instrument both of Soviet foreign and domestic policy.

The Senate is now considering the bill for economic assistance to Greece and Turkey, a program aimed to aid these countries maintain their independence against the threat of totalitarian aggression. Since the announcement of this program by the President, all the propaganda resources of the Soviets have been concentrated on misrepresenting and distorting to the Greek and Turkish peoples the purposes of this aid and the policies of the United States Government. A review of the output of Radio Moscow for the past month shows that the Russians and their satellites have spared no propaganda effort to misinform the world about United States policy. This again illustrates the normal pattern of the Soviet propaganda technique.

What are we doing to tell the people of Greece and Turkey, as well as the rest of the world, about the United States and its policies? In comparison with the magnitude of the job to be done, the expenditures are pitifully small. Please note the figures.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, the State Department, through the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, is planning to spend approximately $125,000 on information activities in Greece, and approximately $190,000 in Turkey. In comparison with the amount of the proposed loan, it is evident that these estimates are far too small, and should be radically revised upward. Despite the urgent need for overcoming misrepresentation and telling the facts about this country, there are those, including some Members of the Congress, who are reported to favor a drastic cut in the proposed OIC appropriations, if not the elimination altogether of the overseas information program.

The war has enormously increased our responsibilities in the world. We have large overseas commitments, and we cannot escape our responsibilities as the world's greatest power. I do not think it makes sense to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Greece and Turkey, without making certain that the people of these and other countries are fully informed of the scope and purpose of our help.

To me it does not make sense to send military missions and an administrative force to aid in the spending of this money in Greece and Turkey without informing the people of those countries by every conceivable method exactly what we are doing, how we are spending the money, and for what we are spending it.

The Moscow radio has charged that the United States is embarking on an imperialistic-expansion program, as Frank Kelley so vividly pointed out in an article in the New York Herald Tribune on April 13. Here are some of the things Mr. Kelley said:

TECHNIQUE FROM HITLER

Moscow tells France that Truman "has revived the hopes of all enemies of democracy." Moscow tells Austria that the new American policy "is a combination of dollar

policy with the policy of the truncheon," borrowed from Hitler.

Moscow tells the British that "the dollar, with clear designs on Greek independence, is to take Greek fascism under its protection."

Moscow tells the Italians that American aid for Italy is "a worn-out banner * * * hoisted by all the pretenders to world domination."

Moscow tells the Near and Middle East in Arabic that the Truman and other speeches "indicate clearly that the United States not only fully supports the Turkish policy of retrogression and imperialism in the east but also desires to extend Turkey's activities in this field."

TWO VERSIONS FOR TURKEY

Moscow tells Greece that it is ruled by a monarcho-Fascist dictatorship. Moscow tells Greece that Paul Porter's plan will bring all of Greece's commercial and economic life under the absolute control of the United States.

Moscow tells Japan that American interest in rebuilding China has the goal of trying to make China a colony of the United States.

So it goes. This is psychological warfare which is going on at the present time over the air in every one of those countries where we have made loans.

Mr. President, we must do more, of course, than combat this wave of misrepresentation. We must also conduct an aggressive campaign to sell democracy, and create a better understanding of the democratic processes among the peoples whose continued independence we are seeking to maintain. We cannot lose the war of ideas by default. As surely as I am standing here, that is what we will do in the event the State Department is not equipped with sufficient funds to carry on an honest counterpropaganda as to exactly what the American people are doing in Greece and Turkey at this time.

In many areas, particularly those behind the so-called iron curtain, and in those in which few people understand English or have the money to purchase American periodicals, and those in which the press is controlled by the government, private American agencies cannot operate or can do only an inadequate job. The Government, through its information service, must continue to do much of the work of giving the facts about the United States. For this reason, the OIC today is an integral part of the foreign service. We can no longer afford to be indifferent to what other peoples think about us. It is in our own interest to see that foreign countries are provided with accurate information about the United States and its policies.

According to the best information available, Great Britain is spending over $1,000,000 this year for information and cultural activities in Greece. Though I have no official information, it may be assumed, in the light of her similar expenditures elsewhere, that Britain will continue to regard a sustantial expenditure for information and cultural activities in Greece as a good investment.

I prophesy that as the military forces of England are withdrawn from the Middle East her propaganda will increase their further appropriations, because it is the war of psychology which is next in importance after the military has failed, when the protection of the country is involved.

It is estimated that Great Britain this year is spending between $40,000,000 and $45,000,000 for overseas information and cultural work. This compares with the approximately $31,000,000 which the State Department is asking for the same activities for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Great Britain is spending about $16,000,000 for the overseas operations of the BBC, about $14,000,000 for the cultural activities of the British Council, and between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000 for information—pictures, press, exhibits, film strips, magazines, and so forth—a total of from $40,000,000 to $45,000,000 in all, on overseas information and cultural activities.

Here are a few comparative expenditures for information and cultural activities. The British figures are estimated for the current year; the United States figures are those for the fiscal year 1947–48:

	Britain	United States
Belgium	$250,000	$81,000
France	1,000,000	360,000
Portugal	300,000	75,000
Egypt—more than	1,000,000	193,000
Mexico	300,000	287,000
Argentina—more than	400,000	307,000
Chile	200,000	148,000

So we see from the preceding figures that in Mexico, our neighbor on the south, Great Britain is spending more money for that kind of propaganda than the United States itself is spending to carry on our good-neighbor policy, which is so vital to the defense and security of the United States.

Furthermore, Mr. President, Britain is spending about half a million dollars in each of several Near Eastern countries, as compared with a proposed United States expenditure in each of those countries of less than $100,000.

Mr. President, I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time because it seems to me it is apropos of what we are discussing in the Senate today. I know and everyone else knows that the present proposal will be adopted; and if it becomes the policy of the United States of America it must be, if it is to be successful, implemented with a sufficient appropriation to carry on the type and kind of work found in the State Department under the supervision of Mr. Benton.

PROPOSED INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. President, I have just one other matter which I wish to discuss briefly. It does not relate to Greek relief, but it relates to American relief—in short, taxes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it seems to me that while we are on limited time, with debate restricted, it is undesirable to have Senators discuss extraneous matters. The majority leader is very anxious to have an adjournment taken at once, and Senators are anxious to go to their homes tonight. It was understood that there would not be a night session tonight. So it seems to me that the debate should be confined to the question now pending before the Senate, inasmuch as debate is restricted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if I can obtain unanimous consent to have my remarks incorporated in the body of the RECORD, perhaps that will take care of the situation. I was about to make a statement upon an amendment which I offered earlier today to House bill 1, known as the Knutson bill, which is now pending before the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Illinois is a member. Certainly I have no desire to detain the Senate any longer. Nevertheless, I have the floor, and I think I am entitled to speak about any matter which I wish to discuss.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado raised the point that he might wish to debate this matter for some length of time tonight, but he was afraid that a motion to take a recess would be made.

So far as I am concerned, let me say that I shall remain as long as the Senator from Colorado desires to have us remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to take advantage of the situation.

Mr. HATCH. It will be no advantage at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But I do have some amendments which I should like to discuss. I shall try to discuss them briefly, in order to accommodate fellow Senators.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator please not to take me off the floor.

Mr. WHITE. I am not going to attempt to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in order to expedite the procedure and to accommodate my good friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask unanimous consent that I may have incorporated into the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared. It is not very long. It deals directly with the amendment I submitted earlier today as a substitute for the tax bill now before the Finance Committee, known as House bill No. 1, and better known as the Knutson bill. If I may obtain such unanimous consent, I shall yield the floor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois realizes full well that the majority party is more or less committed to the American people to pass at this session of Congress tax legislation of some kind, regardless of whether or not such a step is in the interest of a sound fiscal policy.

I am convinced that this is not the time to pass a tax measure, primarily because once again we are considering important legislation without sufficient facts upon which to base a prudent judgment and a sound conclusion. I cannot believe that a majority of the Senate will vote for H. R. 1, known as

the Knutson bill. It seems perfectly plain that it is an economically unsound, inequitable, and untimely piece of legislation. Although the flat 20-percent across-the-board proposal has been modified somewhat, the bill has not been changed in any fundamental way. It still gives the greatest relief to those who need it least.

Mr. President, a sound fiscal policy requires that before any tax reduction is put in effect, the budget be balanced and a substantial payment on the national debt be made—only after those two things have been provided for should consideration be given to the reduction of taxes. H. R. 1 would reduce taxes before a single major appropriation bill has been passed by the Congress. Moreover, it reduces taxes at a time when inflationary pressures are at their peak. There can be no doubt that H. R. 1 will sharply aggravate these pressures by creating an additional amount of money to compete for goods which are in scarce supply. Income payments have risen from $71,000,000,000 in 1939 to $165,000,000,000 in 1946. They are expected to go even higher in 1947.

Even if this were the time to reduce taxes, H. R. 1 is the worst way to do it. It discriminates harshly against low-income taxpayers. For example, it would increase spendable income for a married person, with no dependents, with an income of $1,200 by 1 percent, by 4.2 percent at $6,000, and by 34.2 percent at $100,000.

Because of my belief, that there is a determination on the part of the majority of the Senate to vote for some tax reduction, without regard to the economic factors I have just mentioned, I have thought it wise to introduce a tax-reduction plan which, in contrast to H. R. 1, is fair and equitable, spreading tax reduction among all taxpayers in a sensible fashion. In view of the high level of employment and national income likely to persist for the remainder of this calendar year, this bill would be effective for the tax year beginning January 1, 1948.

The bill raises the personal exemption for each taxpayer and each dependent from $500 to $600, and in case of a joint return by a married couple from $1,000 to $1,200. This accords with the President's statement that low-income taxpayers will have high priority in any tax-reduction program. This provision of the bill is designed to help low-income taxpayers meet, to some extent, the increase in the cost of living. It also has administrative advantages in that it removes 3,200,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls. Removing taxpayers from the tax roll is the surest way to remove a large number of employees from the pay roll. It will cost the Government $1,500,000,000 in revenue. If it be argued that every citizen ought to pay some taxes, the plain answer is that a citizen who is struggling to maintain a minimum level of subsistence ought not to be required to make even a token payment in taxes. Increasing exemptions as a method of tax reduction is advocated by all progressive-minded tax groups.

When the need for increased revenue to finance the war became clear, one of the methods of increasing revenue adopted by the Congress was to lower the exemption rate. This increased sharply the tax load upon the lower-income brackets over prewar levels, and added millions of taxpayers to the rolls. Increasing exemptions tends to modify somewhat the harshness of the wartime tax load upon the low-income groups.

One of the most glaring inequities in the present tax law is that citizens of nine States (Washington, California, Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, Nevada, Louisiana, and Oklahoma) and Hawaii enjoy the privilege of dividing income between husband and wife for Federal income-tax purposes. The result of this privilege is that a husband who has a surtax net income of $20,000 is able to escape with a tax equivalent to twice the amount of tax upon $10,000 surtax net income. Since the highest surtax rate upon $10,000 is 31 percent and the top rate at $20,000 is 50 percent, the family is enabled to save a very substantial amount in taxes. This inequality has been protested for years by the citizens of the non-Western States, with complete merit.

In 1941 an effort was made by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to meet the problem through the requirement of mandatory joint returns, which would have deprived the Western States of their special privilege. Unless a measure similar to what I propose becomes the law someday, the citizens of the States enjoying this preferential treatment will be compelled, no doubt to their disadvantage, to submit to a program of uniform taxation which will place them on an equal basis with all other States. This measure failed of passage on the floor of the House of Representatives. The opportunity is now here to remove the inequity, not by depriving the Western States of their special privilege, but by generalizing this advantage to citizens of all States, so that husband and wife will, in every State, be permitted to split incomes. This privilege is of immense administrative advantage to the tax-gathering authorities. It will eliminate the host of litigation now indulged in by the Treasury Department to put down tax-avoiding schemes based on assignment of income to a wife, or through the creation of a spurious family partnership. It places families with earned income in a more equitable position with families receiving their income from investment, since families receiving their income from investment are readily able to divide up the property and the income between family and wife.

The third significant provision of the bill is the reduction by two points of the surtax rate in each surtax net income bracket. This has the effect of giving each taxpayer a reduction of 2 percent of surtax net income. This proposal, as a whole, in contrast with the reductions contained in H. R. 1, gives a more equitable amount of savings in dollars to all taxpayers rather than relating the savings directly to the amount of taxes paid.

I estimate that this bill will cost $3,800,000,000 in revenue at present levels of national income. The $100 increase in exemptions will cost $1,500,000,000, the splitting of family income $1,000,000,000, and the reduction of 2 percentage points in each surtax bracket $1,300,000,000.

I hope every Senator will give fair and impartial consideration to this substitute, having in mind only the taxpayers' interest.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks for the RECORD on the action of the House Appropriations Committee as it relates to the reclamation projects of the West. Periodically I intend to keep the record perfectly clear on this issue, because of its great importance to the economy of our Nation and its great political importance to my party. I refer to a report which I have received today that the House Appropriations Committee proposes to cut the budget of the Interior Department approximately 47 percent. I further understand that within that cut the great reclamation and conservation program and projects of the West have suffered shocking injury.

For example, Mr. President, I understand that the Bonneville project appropriation has been cut from approximately $26,278,000 to approximately $6,900,000, or thereabouts. I understand that the appropriations for some of the services vital to the welfare of the people of the West as provided for in the budget for the Department of the Interior have been eliminated entirely—for instance, such items as appropriations for the construction of transmission power lines. In a moment I shall say what I think is the significance of that action. I further understand that it is proposed by the House committee that in the construction of the reclamation projects private contracts shall be let in all instances. In other words, construction cannot be built by a Government agency itself irrespective of any savings that might accrue to the public by such a procedure. That is a policy which not even the private utility companies follow in connection with a considerable amount of their construction, such as some of their high-voltage construction. Many of them take care of their own construction for various reasons, one reason being that they want the construction done by their own experts. Another reason is that they have learned that such a procedure as that which the House committee proposes shall be imposed upon an administration such as the Bonneville administration is a very expensive one and will raise the cost even further, at the expense of the consumer or in the instance of Bonneville at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I understand, Mr. President, that should the Senate Committee on Appropriations go along with the policy inherent in the cut by the House in the Interior Department appropriations, it would be practically impossible to go forward with these great projects in the West. Not only that, but great losses would be sustained by the American taxpayers, because it would not be possible even to maintain economically the present projects on the basis of the amount proposed in the House figure.

Mr. President, this is an exceedingly serious situation from a great many angles. For example, let us take the proposal that we shall eliminate the construction of the transmission lines by the Government. That raises very squarely—and let us have the record show it, because I am ready to meet the issue—the drive of the private utilities of the East against the development of the people's power resources of the West. Let those power interests come on, if they wish, and make that a political issue in the campaign of 1948. I am ready to meet the issue. I am ready to meet it because I think it needs to be made clear to all the people of this country that a great record has been made in the West in the development of power so that the little fellows, the average citizens, out on the farms in the remote areas of the West, through REA and other power projects, can have their light, too. The western power program is making it possible so that there will be an end to the hardships the farmers have had to endure because of lack of power which the private power interests have not been willing to afford them at a reasonable profit. Through such projects as Bonneville facilities have been made available at rates which they can afford to pay but at the same time at rates which

result in paying for the costs of the services.

Let the record be crystal clear on this issue. These western projects for which I am speaking are not costing the taxpayers of the East, of the South, and the North any money. They are not built at the expense of the taxpayers in the East, the North, and the South. I am perfectly willing to meet the issue that they are self-liquidating projects when one figures in all the benefits that accrue to the economy of this country from such projects. They are projects which are creating tremendous wealth for this country. Out of that wealth new tax dollars will flow. Out of that wealth new jobs of a permanent production expanding type will bring a stable economy to the West. The opponents of these projects in this Congress will get no aid, assistance, or comfort from the private utilities of the West. The private utilities of my section of the country have come to see the absolute essentiality of these projects to the future of the private utilities themselves. I think the Tacoma agreement of February 1947, which I have on another occasion introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and discussed, makes clear that the private utilities of the West cannot be counted as members of the hatchet team that is proposing to cut the heart out of the budget of the Interior Department.

I think we might as well have it out at this session of Congress as to whether or not we are going to permit a blockage of these great assets, in the form of these power developments in the West, and the conservation program of the West, by selfish power interests of the East which do not like to see low power rates made available to the people of the West in self-liquidating projects.

Mr. President, I have only started to discuss this issue in the Eightieth Congress. I intend to discuss it innumerable times, until the people of my section of the country know what is at stake. I want them to understand what is at stake so that they can take the action necessary to hold responsible politically those in both parties who are seeking to sell the people of the West short in order that certain interests in the East can exploit them.

Mr. President, the next point I desire to make is that these great developments in the West are essential for national security. I do not want my record in the Senate of the United States to show that I sat here in the Eightieth Congress and permitted my country to be sold short from the standpoint of national security, by failure on the part of Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to go forward with the great and needed power development works of the West. At least I intend to oppose any such course of action by this Congress.

Let me say, Mr. President, that if that unfortunate day should ever come when we actually find ourselves in a third world war, we will thank God for any action taken in this Congress to make available to this country the western power projects for which I am pleading today. We need them for national defense and security. In the event of war the people of this country will thank the memory of those of us who are fighting now to save these projects.

Where would we be today, Mr. President, just where would we be today, if we had not had the foresight to develop TVA? Where would we be today if we had not had the projects which were available for use in the Second World War in the Pacific Northwest? How far would we have been able to go in the development of the atomic bomb if we had not had those great projects? Time did not permit building them during the war. They were ready for war use. New ones are needed for security as well as for peacetime production.

I say, Mr. President, we are not only going to need those projects which have already been completed, but we are going to need to complete Grand Coulee, McNary, Hungry Horse, and Foster Creek. Every one of those projects on the Columbia and Snake Rivers is needed now as well as the projects down in California, about which the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] well knows. Further, every other Western State without exception is the site of one or more projects vital to the expansion of the West. Every one of those western projects is going to be needed for national security alone, not to speak of their being needed for the economic development of that section of the country in time of peace. They are needed for war and peace. They are needed as a check against depression. They are needed to keep the American private-enterprise system an ever-expanding one. This is no time to restrict our economy. This is a time to expand, because without an expanding economy and ever-increasing production stagnation overtakes our system of supply and demand and depressions follow. I do not think we have scratched the surface of the potentialities of our capitalistic system. The West is the industrial frontier of America. It must be freed of the financial control through certain interests that want to keep it as an economic appendage to the industrial East.

The people of the East have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the industrialization of the West. Such a development means larger markets and more purchasing power for the people all over the country. Yet there are forces in this Congress working as hard as they can in the name of economy, trying to defeat this program. They are selling the American people short on a false economy program.

One of their arguments is that we are going to have to economize straight across the board. I repeat for the RECORD today what I have heretofore stated, that I am opposed to the principle of a horizontal cut across the board. Some vertical cutting needs to be done in some instances where we can dispense with some services. Waste needs to be eliminated wherever it is found, but increases in the budget, not decreases, not cuts, are needed also in many instances.

I can cite no better example of the need for budget increases than in regard to the great services of the reclamation and power program of the Western States. The argument that these projects for which I am speaking have to be cut along with other cuts is based on a false economy, a penny-wise and pound-foolish philosophy. Therefore I think my party, the Republican Party, should take cognizance of the situation, and proceed to ascertain the facts in regard to these projects from the standpoint of the economy of the country including our national security and military defense.

I wish to say another word, Mr. President, in regard to the political significance of what is proposed, because there are those in both parties—the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party—who would like to see this type of devastating attack made upon these great wealth-creating projects. In my judgment—and it will be my position in the campaign of 1948—it is very much in the interest of all the people of this country as well as in the interest of the people of the West especially to defeat those who in the name of economy are attempting to do such great injury to the West. I care not whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I happen to be one who is going to place the economic welfare of my country and its national security above party politics. I believe the soundest of Republicanism is to elect Republicans who will stand for the type of program for which I am pleading here this afternoon.

My party is not entitled to the support of the West in a national campaign if in this Congress its leaders cut the heart out of the reclamation program. Fine-sounding political promises made in 1948 to catch our western votes are not going to fool the people.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield. Before I close I wish to mention the Willamette Valley flood-control project. I want to refer to this project in order to stress, Mr. President, that we must do something about flood control now. The waters of our rivers do not wait for the Congress to appropriate money. The waters of our swollen streams are washing into the sea each year millions upon millions of dollars' worth of property, far in excess of the cost of building the control dams necessary to check the destruction caused by floods. So let my party know clearly that when it goes before the people in 1948 it must be ready to answer to the western people on its program in regard to reclamation, power development, conservation, and flood control. I do not want to see my party contribute to a delay in the building of these projects. Our national welfare does not justify the action proposed by the House. Such delay year after year will turn, through the working of the elements, certain sections of the West into another eroded China. I do not want to see our great natural resources sacrificed, even for a year, by my party's inaction in the Eightieth Congress, simply because it may think it is good politics, in the name of economy, to participate in what, in fact, is false economy. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maine has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am through.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one moment?

Mr. WHITE. I yield one moment.

Mr. HATCH. I want to join the Senator from Oregon in everything he has said about the development of the West. This is not a political issue, it is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue. It is vital to our section of the country, and I want to join most wholeheartedly in everything the Senator from Oregon has said. If any candidate for political office in New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, or Oregon disagrees, I shall join with the Senator in asking that he be defeated. It is not a political issue, but it is a vital issue for the economy and the well-being and the welfare of our section of the country. I am sure the Senator from Colorado joins me wholeheartedly.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I want to have printed in the body of the RECORD an amendment which I have offered to Senate bill 938. It pertains to the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey. If the American Congress is going into the banking business, it owes it to itself and the millions of taxpayers it represents to adopt the age-old banking techniques. When an American corporation applies to the RFC for a loan, a painstaking and searching inquiry is made to ascertain the financial condition of the borrower. That, briefly, is the purpose of my amendment, which is to insert at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. —. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any loan pursuant to this act, the government requesting such loan shall (a) register with the United States Treasury Department all holdings of gold held by such government, and by the nationals of such government, both at home and abroad; (b) register with the United States Treasury Department all foreign assets, stocks, bonds, or other holdings, of such government and of the nationals of such government; (c) make public the full foreign and domestic indebtedness of such government; and (d) relegate all foreign indebtedness of such government to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss my amendment.

GREEK FOREIGN INDEBTEDNESS

My amendment to S. 938, which, "as a condition precedent to the receipt of any loan pursuant to this act the government requesting such loan shall (a) register with the United States Treasury Department all holdings of gold held by such government and by the nationals of such government, both at home and abroad; (b) register with the United States Treasury Department all foreign assets, stocks, bonds, or other holdings of such government and of the nationals of such government; (c) make public the full foreign and domestic indebtedness of such government; and (d) relegate all foreign indebtedness of such government to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act."

Mr. President, if the American Congress is going into the banking business it owes it to itself and the millions of taxpayers it represents to adopt the age-old banking techniques. When an American corporation applies to the RFC for a loan, a painstaking and searching inquiry is made to ascertain the financial condition of the borrower. That, briefly, is the purpose of my amendment.

Members of Congress are accused of being notoriously generous with taxpayers' money. That is a serious charge and one which prudent Congressmen dare not ignore. Today, very properly, we are attempting to reduce the President's budget by four and one-half to six billion dollars. Very properly, too, every tax-spending agency is required to come before the committees of Congress and make a strong case for every cent appropriated. Every proposed expenditure is gone over with a fine-tooth comb. My amendment merely extends that wise precaution to the pending Greek-Turkish loans. No taxpayer can make these inquiries; the RFC is not empowered to do so; no banker has any such right; only the Congress can order it done. I urge the Congress to adopt the simple traditional practice of looking before leaping.

How much gold does the present Turkish Government hold? How much gold is held by the nationals of the Turkish Government at home and abroad? For example, Mr. President, what are the foreign assets, stocks, and bonds of the Turkish Government, of the nationals of the Turkish Government? Is it true, Mr. President, that the Turkish Government has $250,000,000 in gold reserves deposited in other countries outside of Turkey? If we make a loan to Turkey or to Greece, will that loan be repaid before any payment is made on the present foreign indebtedness of Turkey or Greece?

I know, Mr. President, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been somewhat troubled by the complete failure to observe business practices in the act which they recommend the Senate pass. The fact that the committee adopted an amendment presented by Senator LODGE to the effect that no part of the present loan or grant or other assistance should be used to pay either interest or principal of present foreign indebtedness indicates that the committee is somewhat troubled by the business situation in which we are asked to vote $400,000,000. The amendment by Senator LODGE, which the committee accepted, desirable as it is, does not go far enough. It does not require that all present foreign indebtedness of the borrowing government shall be relegated to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act. That is the precise provision inserted by the RFC in all of its loans. Senator LODGE proposes that no part of the funds appropriated under this act shall be used to pay the indebtedness already existing, either interest or principal, but it does not give our debt priority. Indeed, it is questionable in my mind if Senator LODGE's amendment has any material effect. By a simple matter of bookkeeping either the Greek or the Turkish Government may arrange its financial affairs so that it can repay principal and interest on its present foreign indebtedness and yet not employ any part of the present aid to make those payments. Our moneys would be used merely to replace Greek or Turkish funds which would be applied on the debt.

The Lodge amendment, desirable as its purpose is, does not meet the issue. It leaves the barn door wide open. My amendment states clearly that any indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act shall take priority over any other foreign indebtedness of the government obtaining the assistance which we are now asked to vote. According to my amendment, our debt must be repaid before any payments can be made by either Greece or Turkey on interest or principal of foreign indebtedness now existing.

Mr. President, the Turkish Government in actual fact is in a better financial position at the present time than is the Government of the United States, in respect to its per capita indebtedness, the amount of its foreign holdings, and the total of its present indebtedness. Turkey succeeded in obtaining several hundred millions of American dollars during the war. Ninety percent of Turkey's exports during the war went to Germany, and the payment was made in gold, not worthless German marks. Relatively, Turkey is in a favorable financial position. It is likely that the foreign assets, stocks, bonds, and holdings of gold of the Turkish Government may be 5 or 10 times as much as the loan which we are now asked to extend them. In order that the American people and the United States Government and the Senate shall know exactly what the situation is, it seems to me entirely reasonable that a government requesting aid under this act be required to register with our Treasury Department its holdings of gold and its foreign assets, stocks, and bonds, and to make public its foreign indebtedness. Moreover, if the government requesting assistance is actually in a desperate position, as Mr. Truman has indicated; if the situation is tragically serious; if this loan is really vital; if in fact it is essential in order to maintain the present government of Greece or Turkey, it seems entirely reasonable and feasible to me that such governments should be glad to give this American loan priority in repayment over its other present foreign indebtedness. I can see no reason whatsoever for denying the validity and the desirability of my amendment. It only requires good banking practices.

I am particularly anxious that this amendment be adopted by the Senate because of the ancient history of financial exploitation to which the Greek people have been subjected. In 1927 the Greek Government was forced into the treaty

of Geneva, which recognized the International Finance Commission established in 1897. That finance committee has jurisdiction over the servicing of all of the present foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government. Apparently that indebtedness, Mr. President, now totals well over $500,000,000. Ever since 1897 a very large part of the revenues of the Greek Government were pledged for the serving and repayment of its foreign indebtedness. In fact, the only unpledged public revenues left to the Greek Government after 1927 were direct taxes, miscellaneous excise taxes and export duties. It is an incredible story of international financial intrigue and exploitation which the Senate now must review if it is to act intelligently on the proposed loan. I do not wish to extend the debate on the present amendment, but I insist the Senate learn who owns the Hambro Bank of London. The Hambro Bank is the authorized agent to receive practically all payments of interest and principal of the Greek Government. I call attention to the loan of 1881 of £2,800,000; the loan of 1884 of £2,400,000; the loan of 1887 of £3,800,000; the loan of 1889 of £4,200,000; the loan of 1890 of £1,600,000; the loans of 1893, 1902, and 1906—all of these loans are payable at the Hambro Bank, both interest and principal.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the loan of 1907; the loans of 1910 and 1911 of 3,400,000 pounds; the loan of 1914 of 11,500,000 pounds; the loan of 1923 of 6,200,000 pounds; the loans of 1924 of nine and ten million pounds each; the loan of 1925 of 9,100,000 pounds; another loan made in 1925 of $5,100,000; the loan of 1928 of 3,900,000 pounds; an additional loan in 1929 of $11,000,000; the loan of 1928 of $16,000,000; the loan of 1930; the loan of 1931 of 4,500,000 pounds—all of these loans almost without exception are payable at the Hambro Bank in London, both as to interest and principal.

If we were to check the history of Greece, we would discover that for over a hundred years since the first wars of independence which the Greek people fought with Turkey, we would discover that the international bankers of London and later of Paris and Berlin decided that the Greek people needed a monarchy and that they needed foreign loans.

It is an astounding fact, Mr. President, that since 1824, the year of the first external loan floated in London, the Greek people have paid out more than three times the total of the principal of all of their foreign loans. They have paid three times the principal in interest and service charges. In short, Mr. President, the bankers discovered that they had a happy hunting ground in Greece and they poured in the loans and took out interest, excessive interest, excessive servicing charges, and various deductions of all kinds. Loan after loan, financial crisis after financial crisis; loans of eighty-nine million francs; loans of sixty million francs at 6 percent interest; loans of ninety million francs; loans of one hundred and thirty-five million francs; vast sums of money lent to the Greek Government, but Mr. President, when we examine the details of those loans, what do we discover? For example, let us take a look at the loan of 1887 of one hundred and thirty-five million francs at 4 percent interest. First, the loan sharks got forty-five million as a bonus; twenty-six million was set aside to buy three ships for the Greek Navy; thirteen million francs were set aside for the servicing of the public debt and fifty-one million francs were utilized to cancel old debts. Take a look at the loan of 1881. Out of a loan of one hundred and twenty million francs, fifteen and a half million francs were used to cancel advances; forty-four million francs for military supplies; and that, Mr. President, is the way the whole financial history of Greece has been built up—huge loans, big portions of the loans set aside for interest or service charges, large hunks required to be used to purchase materials and supplies from the nation making the loan; all types of financial manipulations and juggling; all handled in such a manner that the principal constantly built up—Greece going deeper and deeper into debt with no hope of getting out of the grip of the international bankers of London.

In 1897 the Greeks fought a war against Turkey which they lost. Apparently some large reparations were demanded by the Turks and the Great Powers came in to assist Turkey. In order to obtain funds sufficient to pay the reparations, the Greek Government agreed to the establishment of an International Finance Commission. That Finance Commission obtained the power to control finances in order to safeguard service payments. The Greek Government bound itself not to contract any debt and not to change its revenue laws without consent of the International Finance Commission. In addition, the Commission administered the stamp tax; the customs dues of the Port of Piraeus; the Government monopolies in salt, kerosene, matches, cigarette paper, and emory; and certain taxes on tobacco. The total net revenue from these sources was divided by the Commission according to a complicated scheme between the service of the foreign indebtedness, the domestic indebtedness, and the general fund of the Greek Treasury.

Between 1900 and 1925 several wars occurred in the Balkans in which Greece was involved. I would not suggest, of course, Mr. President, that the international bankers had anything to do with instigating those wars, but one of the results of the wars was that the foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government rose from 840,000,000 gold francs in 1912 to 1,650,000,000 gold francs in 1933. So, Mr. President, year after year, war after war, monarchical extravagance after monarchical extravagance, Greece sank further and further into the clutches of the international bankers of London and Paris, but principally of London.

In 1927 the International Finance Commission was pledged additional revenues for the servicing of the Greek indebtedness. Remember, Mr. President, that this International Finance Commission had existed ever since 1897 with legal status. It continued to function up until the German invasion. It was taken over by Germany and Italy during the occupation. Today the International Finance Commission still has legal status, but its operations are suspended temporarily. After our proposed loan is consummated the International Finance Commission undoubtedly will resume operations at the old stand unless my amendment is adopted. We may expect the British bankers to insist on the International Finance Commission being set into operation once again, and the exorbitant interest rates on a debt already repaid more than three times over will once again be set in operation.

Senator LODGE's amendment states that no part of the present loan or grant can be employed to pay interest or principal on foreign indebtedness. Will such an amendment be made effective and close the door against the manipulation of the International Finance Commission? The only way we can check the blood-sucking tactics of the London loan sharks is through such a provision as contained in my amendment.

Mr. President, when I first considered offering this amendment I wondered if the present Greek Government should not be required to cancel its outstanding foreign indebtedness, particularly in the light of the fact that between 1824 and today the Greek Government has paid out in service charges and interest three times the principal of their foreign indebtedness. Why should not such foreign indebtedness be canceled? Can the Greek economy ever be put on its feet, Mr. President, so long as the Greek people are saddled with a foreign indebtedness of over $500,000,000, an indebtedness which carries an excessive interest rate, an indebtedness to which are pledged certain important revenues of the Greek Government, and which have been pledged legally ever since 1897 and again pledged in the Treaty of Geneva of 1927? How can the Greek economy be expected to function under such a handicap?

If we examine the financial history of Greece in connection with the political history of Greece we would discover that the great powers placed a monarch on the Greek throne in order that this type of financial exploitation could be satisfactorily executed. Many of these loans from 1824 onward apparently were made at the request of the Greek monarchy. They were sought by the Greek monarchy and they were expended by the Greek monarchy. The Greek people are justified in believing that the Greek monarchy has been the agent for the London and Paris bankers. Perhaps, Mr. President, this hundred-year-old international banking system explains why one Greek King was assassinated, why other Greek Kings fled into exile, perhaps it explains why the late George II was driven into exile in 1924. The exploitation of the Greek people by the international bankers of London via their stooge, the monarchy, explains the intense hatred and unpopularity of the present Greek monarchy. Perhaps it explains the present civil war in Greece, which we are asked to quell.

We know, of course, that the British supported the Greek monarchy; we know that Winston Churchill forced a hand-picked, foreign-born monarch back on

the Greek throne and we know that this arbitrary act has caused a civil war in Greece. With the help of four hundred and fifty millions of relief dollars from the American taxpayer, the monarch has conducted a civil war for 2 years to reestablish his right to rule. Now we become the inheritors of British mistakes in Greece, we must sustain a monarch restored by force of British arms. What are the implications? Are we to assume British liabilities throughout the Near and Middle East and are American taxpayers expected to pour out their funds to restore corrupt and venal regimes which can then begin repaying age-old debts to London bankers? Is Uncle Sam asked to enter the scene as the No. 1 sucker to make good on all of the foreign indebtedness fostered by London bankers for the past 100 years? Frankly, Mr. President, I want to know the answers to those questions. That, Mr. President, is one of the reasons that led me to introduce this amendment requiring that all the foreign indebtedness shall be made known to the United States Congress; that all foreign assets, stocks, and bonds shall be registered, and that all foreign indebtedness shall be relegated to a subordinated position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act.

I am told, Mr. President, that Mr. Winston Churchill's family are heavy owners in the Hambro Bank of London. I do not know if this is accurate or not. I do not care whether it is Winston Churchill, his uncle, his nephew, his daughter, or himself. I do not care what particular "fat cats" of British nobility or British aristocracy own the Hambro Bank in London. I basically object to the money of American taxpayers being poured out to maintain regimes—corrupt regimes—in various parts of the world in order that international bankers may continue their exploitation and continue to receive exorbitant rates of interest on foreign indebtedness which has already been repaid three times. I object, also, Mr. President, to the systematic secrecy with which the State Department has smothered the entire question of the financial manipulations incident to the proposed Greek-Turkish loan.

At the time that Premier Tsaldaris of Greece was in this country requesting a loan the Export-Import Bank made a confidential report on the financial status of the Greek Government. That loan was not then extended. Why, Mr. President, has not the administration made public the text of that report of the Export-Import Bank? The American people have a positive right to know the truth in regard to the foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government—to whom their debts are owed, how much is owed, what interest rate is pledged and what provision the Greek Government intends to make in regard to the repayment of its foreign indebtedness, and whether or not American funds will be used directly or indirectly to pay these loans.

We are sick and tired, as a Nation, of secret diplomacy. We are sick and tired of being dragged around the world by the nose by the fancy footwork of international bankers. American taxpayers should not be required to bail out the Hambro Bank. The American people expect the United States Senate to protect their interests. They object, to corruption. They object to a hundred-year scandal of international financial intrigue. We should refuse to vote for legislative proposals about which the American people have not been told the whole truth. We should refuse to vote for a bill which does not place every possible safeguard around our funds. We should refuse to vote for a bill which makes a sucker out of the American Government and the American people in behalf of feeble self-serving monarchies and their bosses, the international bankers. We should refuse to throw away our money to sweeten their kitty. We should refuse to vote for a bill which does not require the repayment of American indebtedness before these loan sharks' accounts are paid. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate adopt my amendment which will protect us at least to some extent.

I have another amendment which I want to have appear in the RECORD. It is to insert at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States has adopted as its policy in international affairs (a) intervention in civil strife, civil war, or political conflicts in foreign countries; or (b) unilateral action, either now or in the future, in disregard of its obligations to the United Nations.

(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms the basic policy of the United States to bring before the United Nations all economic, political, or military conditions which may endanger the peace of the world.

I want to suggest to Senators that before we embark upon the diabolical policy of intervening in Greece and Turkey, we should explore fully the exact situation which confronts us. We should also attempt to understand where it will lead, what it implies, what it will cost, and where it will end.

I now wish to discuss my amendment.

INTERVENTION IN CIVIL CONFLICT

I have offered an amendment to S. 938, an amendment which reads:

SEC. —. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States has adopted as its policy in international affairs (a) intervention in civil strife, civil war, or political conflicts in foreign countries; or (b) unilateral action, either now or in the future, in disregard of its obligations to the United Nations.

(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms the basic policy of the United States to bring before the United Nations all economic, political, or military conditions which may endanger the peace of the world.

President Truman in his speech to the Congress stated, "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures," and President Truman added, "I believe our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid." Mr. President, I have commented on the President's speech stating that in my opinion it was nothing short of an undeclared declaration of war, and that if we recognize its world-wide import, it is nothing more or less than a considered policy of underwriting the status quo throughout the world. Mr. Truman's policy, if adopted, will lead to American intervention in every country in the world which is in a process of social change either because of political unrest or of actual revolution. Mr. President, if the Truman doctrine is adopted by the Congress without corrective and clarifying amendments, we will have radically altered American traditional foreign policy. We will have adopted a policy of aggressive unilateral imperial action in behalf of reactionary governments throughout the world.

I suggest to the Senators that before we embark upon this diabolical policy that we should explore fully the exact situation which confronts us. Also we should attempt to understand where it will lead, what it implies, what it will cost, where it will end.

This new policy, as I understand it, is a doctrine of frustration, disaster, financial bankruptcy for the American Nation, an all-out armament race, and ultimately war.

All the world today is in a process of social ferment and political change. New forms of government are coming into existence, new ways of managing a nation's economy. Perhaps America, Australia, and South Africa alone in the entire world are the only nations which are not now caught in the grip of powerful political and economic crises. Surely China, India, the Near and Middle East, Egypt, Italy, France, the United Kingdom, most of the Republics of South America—every area that we can mention—is under economic and political strains undreamed of before in world history. The world is in gestation. Traditional, orthodox methods and the old ways of doing things are being challenged. New systems of government and of economics are coming to birth. In many cases as in Europe, we have mixed free enterprise with regimentation and semisocialism. In some cases it is government ownership; in the Soviet Union, three times the size of the United States, we have the first gigantic experiment in communistic society. Apparently it has great internal sources of strength. The world is changing, Mr. President, and before we, with all of our economic and political and military resources, embark upon a policy of opposing that change, or attempting to turn the clock back, we should calculate whether it can be done; and if it can be done, whether it should be done and whether we can develop a successful formula for doing it. Of one thing I am certain; the American people will not want our substances poured out to support monarchies, feudal hereditary shiekdoms, ancient moth-eaten empires, systems of war lords and private feudal armies. The American people will not want to shell out their hard-earned money and their blood to sustain the status quo of every outworn ancient type and form of government anywhere that they may be challenged throughout the world. They will not want to support a cruel, ruthless, worthless monarchy in Greece nor a tyrannical dictatorship in Turkey nor the hereditary feudal authority of the Arabian shieks. The Ameri-

can people will not want to pour out billions on billions of dollars to uphold the hand of venal, completely, and utterly corrupt war lords in China. And what is more—the American people do not want the Senate to vote for a policy of American imperialism and exploitation throughout the world nor for intervention in every family quarrel and civil war all over the world. But these things are the substance of the Truman doctrine.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, writing on the subject of bypassing of the UN, stated:

If the pattern of our conduct in this affair becomes a precedent, we shall have cut a hole in the Charter which it will be very difficult to repair. The President has told us, quite rightly, that the "seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife." Suppose we cannot all around the world relieve quickly encugh the misery and the want. Suppose that in Greece later, or in some other wracked and hungry land, there comes into power by elections like those in Greece a government of the extreme left, dominated by the Communists. That could happen. It could happen elsewhere in Europe, in Asia, or even in an American republic.

What happens then if that government calls upon the Soviet Union for aid, asks it to equip and train its army, to supervise its budget, to plan and direct its economy? What under the "Truman doctrine" do we do if the Soviet government says there is an emergency, that it has been invited to intervene, that the United Nations is not in position to extend the kind of help required?

I call attention to Mr. Lippmann's statement "It could happen elsewhere in Europe, in Asia, or even in an American republic."

It is begging the question to say we are not intervening in a civil war. Mr. Lippmann in the same article puts it very bluntly. He says:

The official picture of what we are getting into in Greece has been softened and simplified. The emphasis has been put on the need of the Greeks, the dire results of not helping them, and the benevolent and innocuous character of our assistance. This picture needs to be supplemented by a full realization that we are intervening in a civil war, that we shall be responsible for the Greek Army, not only its training and equipment but its strategy and tactics, that since our financial assistance is measured to balance the Greek budget, we shall become responsible for the whole operation of the Greek Government.

Mr. Lippmann cautions that we need "a full realization that we are intervening in a civil war, and that we shall be responsible for the Greek Army." Mr. Lippmann goes on to point out that the Greek and Turkish situations have been international problems for over 100 years and that the imperialists of Britain and France have interfered in Greece times without end just as we now propose to do. I quote Mr. Lippmann again:

Now, the Government of Greece has been a European problem ever since the country was liberated from Turkey in 1829 by the combined intervention of Britain, France, and Russia. Never for long has Greece not been an international problem, and while we may be able to succeed where so many others have failed, it is, I believe, extremely unwise on our part to accept the sole responsibility. The British Government, which has dealt with Greek affairs for over a century, has failed and has suffered great moral injury.

Fools tread where the wise hesitate to go.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Cripps Says Nation Needs a New Loan," by Herbert L. Matthews, published in the New York Times of March 30.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIPPS SAYS NATION NEEDS A NEW LOAN—£350,000,000 MORE MUST BE BORROWED, BRITON DECLARES—SEES A CUT IN FOOD

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, March 29.—Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the board of trade, lived up to his reputation for plain talking today. He told workers that there was going to be a cut in the clothing ration, that food imports could not be increased, and that workers were not yet experienced enough to become managers.

He declared that Government had calculated it would have to borrow £350,000,000 abroad this year. "That is the amount by which we cannot balance our payments by exports," he said.

* * * * *

Textile mills have been turning out only one-third of their potential production in the past 2 months, he said, whereas even the meager clothing ration had been based on full production.

There were groans from the audience when he talked about clothes coupons, but he repeated that there just was not the yarn for spinning and that manpower was very inadequate.

On food, he intimated that the United States was partly responsible.

"We wish we could afford more food imports," he said, "but we have not got the dollars with which to get them, and unfortunately food prices in America have risen by 30 percent. That means the dollar loan is less valuable than we calculated it would be when we got it from America."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We should not evade, soften, obscure, or in any way disguise what the President actually has proposed to the Senate. He has proposed a new policy of American intervention and interference in the civil affairs of every nation throughout the world on a unilateral basis whenever we choose to do so—a policy of intervention economically, politically, and militarily.

In his message to Congress the President stated in a somewhat indirect manner that our security was at stake unless the new policy which he advocates is followed.

The radio-press-political commentators describe the Truman doctrine as a policy to encircle Russia and oppose her in every single point everywhere in the world. Imagine tens of billions of dollars of American money and millions of American troops flowing endlessly to each of those critical points over the next period of years. It will be no simple matter to encompass the Soviet Union and her satellite nations by pressure, by manipulation, by armed warfare everywhere.

To me the policy means that we declare war upon every liberal or revolutionary movement anywhere in the world that may be struggling against old forms of oppression and exploitation. Thus in spite of the President's specific observation to the contrary, the status quo does become sacred. If this policy is logically adhered to, it requires that we engage from now henceforth in economic and political warfare with Russia everywhere in the world. It is an undeclared declaration of war against her.

If the Brititsh should say to us: Either the United States must come to our rescue and maintain the British Empire on our terms or else we will turn to the Russians, what is to be our policy? A few days ago Mr. Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, stated to a Labor Party rally that his Government had calculated that it would have to borrow £350,000,000 abroad this year.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the New York Times report of this speech on March 30:

Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, lived up to his reputation for plain talking today. He told workers that there was going to be a cut in the clothing ration, that food imports could not be increased, and that workers were not yet experienced enough to become managers.

He declared the Government had calculated it would have to borrow £350,000,000 sterling abroad this year. "That is the amount by which we cannot balance our payments by exports," he said.

Textile mills have been turning out only one-third of their potential production in the past 2 months, he said, whereas even the meager clothing ration had been based on full production.

There were groans from the audience when he talked about clothes coupons, but he repeated that there just was not the yarn for spinning and that manpower was very inadequate.

On food, he intimated that the United States was partly responsible.

"We wish we could afford more food imports," he said, "but we have not got the dollars with which to get them and unfortunatel, food prices in America have risen by 30 percent. That means the dollar loan is less valuable than we calculated it would be when we got it from America."

Where, Mr. President, do the British expect to get $1,000,000,000—from us? From Russia?

The British have promised to the Indian people that India will become independent in the year 1948. What does that imply? Suppose that civil war breaks out all over India. Thousands of people have been killed in religious civil wars in India in the past 2 years. Suppose, Mr. President, that Mr. Pandit Nehru, a very liberal thinker—perhaps even a Socialist—becomes the head of a new Indian government, what will be our policy economically and politically toward India? Do we stand ready to bolster by economic, political, and military means the British Empire everywhere in the world? Suppose, Mr. President, that we do bolster the British Empire. Suppose that we pour out another $31,000,000,000 to the British as we did under lend-lease between 1941–1946 and then we discover that the workers of Britain and the people of Britain are determined to institute socialism or communism throughout the British Isles and throughout the British Empire—what will be our policy?

Mr. President, let us go a step further and examine the situation in France. In

the opinion of all observers, France has a government which today is a radical left-wing government. We have poured into France since VE-day roughly $2,500,000,000 in aid; yet this has not prevented the French people from moving to the left. Suppose, Mr. President, that a civil war were to break out in France within the next year—what will be the policy of our government? Will we undertake to supply modern arms in unlimited quantities to those groups in France who might oppose the present left-wing government?

France today has a mutual defense pact with the Soviet Union. If the Truman doctrine, as I interpret it, is an undeclared declaration of war, what are its implication in respect to France? I trust that the Senate has enough courage and enough information to consider logically what this policy means in respect to China—a nation which has been in constant turmoil and civil conflict ever since the turn of the twentieth century. Today in China two massive social forces are engaged in conflict to the death for control of the political and economic life of 400,000,000 people. Since VJ-day, we have poured in China anywhere from 1.7 billions of dollars to 3 billions of dollars in aid and equipment, depending upon what statistician is playing with the figures. That aid has gone primarily to the Chiang Kai-shek government, a dictatorial overnment having the support of feudal war lords whose venality and corruption is one of the seven wonders of our modern world. Opposed to them are the Chinese Communists whose formula for existence is very simple—they move into an area—they kill the large land owners and military war lords—they parcel out the land among peasants and then they put a gun in the hand of the peasant and tell him to defend his land. After thousands of years of oppression and exploitation, the Chinese peasant finds that he not only possesses a gun but he has the duty to fight for land which is now his. How in God's name is it possible to stop such a ruthless social movement of high-handed banditry by supporting corrupt war lords? And yet, if this bill passes, it will be our policy to attempt to do this impossible and repugnant thing.

If the Vandenberg bill is adopted, it will be logical to intervene much more actively in China than we are at present. Instead of $3,000,000,000 which we have kissed good-by in the past 2 or 3 years, we will have to budget four or five—perhaps ten—billions a year to maintain the present government in that vast area. Senators ask, if we are to fight the Communists in Greece, why do not we fight them in China? It becomes necessary if this policy of world-wide intervention is to be adopted that we estimate what it will cost—ten billions a year—twenty billions a year—thirty billions a year—and for how long. It behooves us to remember that the American national debt is now more than two hundred and sixty billions. It is also pertinent to mention that between March 1941 and September 30, 1946, we expended over $50,000,000,000 in lend-lease. Since VJ-day we have expended actually $16,000,000,000 as reported by the senior Senator from Arkansas, JOHN MCCLELLAN, on this floor a few days ago. For example, to UNRRA we have given two and seven-tenths billions; to the International Monetary Fund we have pledged two and seventy-five one-hundredths billions; to the International Bank three and one-tenth billions; in loans and credits to the United Kingdom four and six-tenths billions; to France two and five-tenths billions; three hundred million to Italy; six hundred million to Holland; six hundred and sixty million in outright gifts to the Philippines. Even Turkey has received gifts amounting to fifty and sixty millions since VJ-day; Belgium one hundred and seventy-five; Greece seventy; Finland one hundred and ninety-nine—everywhere in the world. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Mr. Bertram D. Hulen from the Sunday New York Times of March 30, entitled "Twenty Billion Dollars Paid for Postwar Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS PAID FOR POSTWAR AID—THAT IS THE COST SO FAR OF OUR HELP TO OTHER NATIONS, AND THE AMOUNT IS BOUND TO INCREASE

(By Bertram D. Hulen)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—The Truman doctrine of providing assistance for free nations that are in imminent danger of succumbing to Communist pressure has thrown into high relief our entire program of foreign assistance since the cessation of hostilities.

While precise figures are not yet available in exact amounts down to the last dollar, the round estimate is made that the total of such payments since the end of the war is approximately $20,000,000,000. This probably will not be found far off from the final, official figure that is arrived at through the present study.

Admittedly, $20,000,000,000 is a sizable figure. It approaches the total of our debt as a result of our participation in World War I, even though it is only a fraction of the debt produced by World War II.

As matters stand the budget for the fiscal year 1948 that will begin on July 1, 1947, calls for appropriations of nearly $3,500,000,000 for the several purposes covered in our foreign programs.

This figure, of course, does not include the requests made by President Truman for aid to Greece and Turkey. He has asked for $400,000,000 for them and in circumstances that do not necessarily mean that this will be all as the program of assistance proceeds.

ESTIMATE IS UNCERTAIN

The approximate estimates that are thus far available include not only actual expenditures but also commitments and funds that have been earmarked for specific purposes, all covering foreign financing, relief and rehabilitation, credit, supplies and, in general, the many aspects of our far-flung activities.

Of the major items, the British loan amounts to $3,750,000,000. Our contributions to the International World Bank call for outlays of $3,175,000,000 and to the International Monetary Fund of $2,750,000,000.

We increased the capital of the Export-Import Bank after hostilities by $2,800,000,000 to $3,500,000,000, practically all of which has been expended or earmarked so that the bank is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

The cost to us of winding up lend-lease, of emptying the pipe line after hostilities, is placed at $1,200,000,000. But $700,000,000 should be added to this sum in the calculations because of an authorization to China after VJ-day in that amount as regular wartime lend-lease.

Surplus property disposals are estimated to have cost us over $5,000,000,000. Goods valued after deterioration at $7,200,000,000 have brought a return of only $1,700,000,000. Yet it is not considered fair to place this in the rank of outright contributions, since the sales represented a liquidation operation.

OCCUPATION COSTS

Similarly, the costs of our armies of occupation are so involved in the set-up of the regular Military Establishments that it is difficult to arrive at a true figure in terms of net outlay. But our officials have not liked pouring $200,000,000 in Germany on this account and for relief every year.

Outlays for the Maritime Commission are placed at a net of $107,000,000 since the war. Expenditures in behalf o the Philippines involve $700,000,000 for war damages, rehabilitation, surplus materials, and budget purposes.

The budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1948 contemplated $780,000,000 in Export-Import Bank loans, $1,200,000,000 in further withdrawals by the British from their loan, $650,000,000 for costs of occupation, $555,000,000 for the UNRRA and relief purposes, $137,000,000 for rehabilitation and other purposes in the Philippines, $40,000,000 on an old RFC loan to the United Kingdom, and $12,000,000 for the lend-lease pipe line.

Now to these are to be added the costs on behalf of Greece, Turkey, Korea, and perhaps other countries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Between now and 1950 what is to be the budget for the new doctrine? Is it thirty or fifty billions? Where does this policy of pouring out billions on billions end? What good purpose does it serve? If we were to extend a billion dollars to Korea in the next year, will it do any good? If we put out one-half billion a year for Hungary and Austria, what will be the practical results? If we pour three billions or five billions a year into China, will it prevent a peasant with a gun in his hand fighting for land which is not his? What will the policy of intervention everywhere in the world in every civil and political conflict cost us?

Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann has discussed this subject in his column Today and Tomorrow appearing in the New York Herald Tribune under the title "Policy or Crusade?" Permit me to quote the conclusion of his searching observation. He accurately describes the Truman doctrine as a crusade:

A vague global policy, which sounds like a tocsin of an ideological crusade, has no limits. It cannot be controlled. Its effects cannot be predicted. Everyone everywhere will read into it his own fears and hopes, and it could readily act as incitement and inducement to civil strife in countries where the national cooperation of parties is delicate and precarious.

Mr. Lippmann suggests that such a policy might very well act as an incitement and inducement to civil strife. This policy may create the very condition that it seeks to stop. So then, I ask again, Mr. President, what does the policy cost and let us be frank enough and blunt enough to acknowledge that this policy, if it is adhered to logically, will cost the American people from ten to twenty billions of dollars per year. And if it is not to be followed, consistently and vigorously, why adopt it?

I wish that the Senate would recall what happened following World War I. We poured billions of dollars into foreign investments and loans for several years, and then when we began to realize that these debts could not be paid back, our investments ceased; and when they ceased, our foreign markets evaporated; and as our foreign markets vanished, industry faltered and the boom burst. The days of October 1929 are still fresh in the memory of the American people. This new policy of reckless spending is certain to end in another 1929.

A long time ago we discovered that an economy geared to economic war could maintain employment but at the expense of our own living standards through the media of inflation. We are now engaged in an economic warfare which is devouring American resources just as surely as the war against Hitler's fascism devoured those resources during the past 6 years.

Our declared policy prior to March 12, 1947, has been a policy of peace and adherence to and support for the United Nations. That agency, representing as it does the conscience of all mankind and the sovereign authority of 50 or more nations, has taken hold of the imagination and hopes of the American people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, District of Alaska, vice George F. Alexander, term expired; and

Charles Lee Spillers, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Joe V. Gibson, deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be Representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified immediately of the action of the Senate with respect to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I ask what happened to Order No. 106 on the Executive Calendar, the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp of Tennessee to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination was not stated.

Mr. HATCH. Why not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination has gone over from day to day, and for that reason it was passed over as of today.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp on the calendar be stated. If there is any objection I shall not raise any question about it. I suggest, however, that the nomination be stated.

Mr. STEWART. I certainly shall object.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator will not insist on the nomination being stated.

Mr. HATCH. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request has been withdrawn.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE NORMAN, OF WASHINGTON

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives (H. Res. 189) which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED NORMAN, a Representative from the State of Washington.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 106) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRED NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints as the committee to represent the Senate at the funeral of the deceased Member of the House of Representatives the senior and junior Senators from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN].

RECESS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 21, 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William Bruce Lockling, of Arizona, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Clarence Boonstra, of Louisiana.
Willard O. Brown, of Texas.
Joseph L. Dougherty, of Iowa.
Hugh D. Farley, of Virginia.
John C. Payne, of New York.
Edward J. Rowell, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
H. André Weismann, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of careers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Armitage, of Tennessee.
Denis A. Baumhover, of Iowa.
William B. Cobb, Jr., of North Carolina.
Richard T. Davies, of New York.
Lambert John Eichner, Jr., of New York.
Baird E. Emmons, of California.
John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina.
Elmer C. Hulen, of Kentucky.
John A. McKesson 3d, of New York.
Paul M. Miller, of Maryland.
Miss Susannah Mirick, of Massachusetts.
B. Frank Poe, Jr., of South Carolina.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Joseph Stephen Magrath, Jr., Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from January 15, 1947.

TO JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Eugene Mead Caffey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1942.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Frank Arthur Bogart, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 11 1941.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Robert Howard Allan, Infantry, with rank from January 12, 1947.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

Maj. Frank Glover Trew, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

TO INFANTRY

Capt. Donald Kenneth Hughes, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from November 30, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. William Frank Steer, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

Maj. Richard David Wentworth, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Capt. George Lovelace Poor, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 31, 1944.

Capt. Jack Emmert Wert, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 1, 1944.

First Lt. John Robert Blunk, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 7, 1947.

First Lt. Nolan Edward Burch, Infantry, with rank from August 30, 1946.

First Lt. Andrew Lacock Cox, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Roy Arthur Dix, Coast Artillery Corps with rank from January 7, 1947.

First Lt. Neil James Graham, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from January 4, 1947.

First Lt. James Porter King, Finance Department, with rank from March 11, 1944.

First Lt. Francis Carmel Lozito, Chemical Corps, with rank from January 7, 1947.

First Lt. Henry Bailey McDaniel, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 7, 1947.

First Lt. Marvin Leroy Wells Peters, Infantry, with rank from January 6, 1947.

First Lt. James Hyram Phifer, Jr., Pharmacy Corps, with rank from September 24, 1946.

First Lt. Charles Ernest Tychsen, Signal Corps, with rank from November 13, 1946.

First Lt. Arthur Brown Van Buskirk, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 10, 1941.

First Lt. Thomas Renan Waddleton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 7, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

Warren R. Austin to be the representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Herschel V. Johnson to be the alternate representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. John R. Williams, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Wooster, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Father of all generations, we would praise Thee for Thy providence in making us a great nation. Lay a double portion of Thy spirit upon Thy servants, the Members of this House, in their deliberations, that these deliberations may be held in all truth and may lead to justice, liberty, and peace. We commend to Thy loving care the spirit of Thy servant who has finished his course and is at rest with Thee. Thy comfort we pray on his family and friends and coworkers. May we here rededicate ourselves to Thy loving service and strive to honor Thee in all our dealings, that we may try to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight and in accord with Thy holy will. Through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1947, was read and approved.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JONES of Ohio, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 279), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NORRELL reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for 45 minutes I have for this afternoon be transferred to Wednesday afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE LATE KING CHRISTIAN X

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 188) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States has learned with profound sorrow of the death of His Majesty, Christian X, King of Denmark, and sympathizes with his people in the loss of their beloved King.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of Denmark.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED NORMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, we are shocked and grieved indeed to hear of the death, early Friday morning, of our friend and colleague, the late Mr. FRED NORMAN, of the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington. His qualities of quiet, steadfast devotion to duty, and his unobtrusiveness in pursuing a hard and relentless pattern of work are noteworthy. In this amazing city of contrasts, he followed a steady and conscientious course, undazzled by the manifold side lights here. A poor boy, he exemplified the American dream, creating his own business and arriving at a very successful position in life. But he never lost the common touch, and retained the utmost sympathy for his fellow men. The Third Congressional District of the State of Washington and the entire State have lost a tried and loyal friend, who cherished as his first interest the welfare of his country, his State, and his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 189

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED NORMAN, a Representative from the State of Washington.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to attend the funeral on the part of the House Mr. ANGELL, of Oregon; Mr. JACKSON, of Washington; Mr. HORAN, of Washington; and Mr. JONES, of Washington.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until

tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

570. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of December 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

571. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the State Department, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for payment of compensation to the Government of Switzerland for losses and damages acknowledged to have been inflicted by United States Army Air Forces units during World War II, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

572. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a supplemental report of contracts entered into under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning January 1, 1946, and ending April 1, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

573. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

574. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $17,400 for the Smithsonian Institution (H. Doc. No. 209); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

575. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to certain existing funds of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

576. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 involving a decrease of $20,474,300 for the War Assets Administration (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

577. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

578. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board (for the Acting Secretary of State), transmitting two copies of a report covering the activities carried on by the Department of State during the year 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

579. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the procurement of physicians and surgeons in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

580. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3123. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1009. A bill to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the base 6 property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; without amendment (Rept. No. 280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3122. A bill to provide for the recording of the proceedings in one of the courtrooms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia by sound-recording equipment; and for the reproduction of the sounds of such proceedings, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court of the United States upon the review of any such case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 3123. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3124. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 3125. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain housing projects at Corpus Christi, Tex., known as La Armada No. 2 and La Armada No. 3, to the Housing Authority of the City of Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3126. A bill to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of United States citizens who, during World War II, served in the armed forces of countries allied with the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3127. A bill to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3128. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics that become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after interstate shipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the extraordinary disaster at Texas City, Tex., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution creating a World War II Enemy Property Commission to study and report to the Congress on the liquidation of the assets in the United States of certain enemy countries, and other matters regarding the disposition of such assets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to provide for the construction of a protective sea wall along the shore line of the city of Hilo; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with regard to request that the Civil Aeronautics Board grant a hearing to trans-Pacific air lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the president and the Congress of the United States, to continue the wool-purchase program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to support the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Uruguay, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with regard to reaffirming their sentiments of confraternity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Hyakujiro Watanabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Nathanielsz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

356. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 34 citizens of Eau Claire, Butler County, Pa., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

357. Also, petition of 28 members of the Ella Lyle Guthrie Missionary Society and the Women's Missionary Society of the White Oak Springs United Presbyterian Church of Conoquenessing, Butler County, Pa., opposing Public Law 374; to the Committee on Public Lands.

358. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, advocating adoption of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

359. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petitions of groups of citizens in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

360. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Coconut Grove Townsend Club, No. 1, Coconut Grove, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

361. Also, petition of members of the Cassadaga Townsend Club, No. 1, Cassadaga, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

362. Also, petition of members of the Sanford Townsend Club, No. 1, Sanford, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, who didst fill three short years with the revelation of all eternity, in life, precept, and promise, that we have not yet learned and can never forget, help us to make every minute count, making time our servant and not our master. Thou didst never ask for time to prepare Thine answers, but always had the word of Truth for every occasion. Reveal to us now Thy word for today. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2413) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to hold a meeting which was previously called for 11 o'clock this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is chairman, be permitted to meet until noon today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation.

The Senate is proceeding today under a unanimous-consent agreement reading as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, April 22, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and upon the final passage of the bill itself.

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, April 22, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and said hour of 4 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair cannot recognize any Senator except the Senator from Colorado, who is in charge of half the time, or a Senator to whom the Senator from Michigan, controlling the remainder of the time, may yield. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as we consider this bill to extend military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey there are two important questions we must first answer. The first question is, Is it right that we should adopt this new foreign policy now proposed by the President, which represents such a wide departure from our previous conception of international diplomacy and which bypasses the functions of the United Nations, an organization which was to guarantee the peace of the world? This question has already been discussed at length during the debate.

The second question is one that seems to have been overlooked during most of the debate. It is, Can the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States finance this new global policy? Last week the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] forcefully brought this second question to our attention and warned us to take heed of the present plight of Great Britain, that great power which now is threatened with financial bankruptcy. Neither the President nor any member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has ever yet attempted to predict how much this new global policy will eventually cost the American people.

I agree with the able Senator from Virginia that we should first take an inventory of our remaining assets lest we find ourselves in the embarrassing position of having kept the candles of democracy burning in Europe and letting the lamp of democracy in our own Nation go out. History teaches us the cold fact that the government of no nation has ever survived national bankruptcy.

Before adopting this new policy it is our duty first to inform the citizens of our country the full extent of what is being proposed. This is not a question of furnishing $400,000,000 relief to a needy ally. On the contrary, it is announcing a new American political doctrine for the world, the cost of which could reach untold billions of dollars and involve the deployment of American manhood in the front-line trenches of global ramparts. Already we have furnished relief and supplies to the people of Europe since VJ-day alone to an extent of approximately $20,000,000,000, and we are now committed to many billions of dollars more through our occupational program for Europe. These figures do not include the $50,000,000,000 of lend-lease funds used during the war. These gifts, or so-called loans, of $20,000,000,000 since the war represent about one-third of the entire revenue of our Government during the same postwar period. Reduced to simple mathematics, it means that since VJ-day approximately one-third of all the money the citizens of the United States have paid and are now paying as taxes has been allotted to European relief.

Expressing it in another way, by combining the total of lend-lease during the war of $50,000,000,000 and the $20,000,000,000 for relief granted since the war, we have a figure representing more than 25 percent of our entire national debt. This means that down through the generations in excess of 25 percent of all the taxes which we are going to collect for both service and the retirement of our $260,000,000,000 debt will in reality be for the gifts which we have already made to Europe during the past 7 years. The question we must answer today is, Can the American people bear this additional load and survive as a free democracy?

I know that one of the answers to this question is that we do not value human lives in terms of dollars. We agree that it is much better to send American dollars than American boys to the front, but I cannot help remembering that we were told the same thing when we adopted lend-lease before the last war. The governments of Europe then said, "Give us financial assistance and we will furnish the men"; but what really happened was that after we were in the war we were not only called upon to finance the cost but we also had to furnish most of the men.

I have earnestly sought the right answer to the question, How should I vote on the pending bill? I feel very reluctant at any time to vote against the foreign policy proposed by our President. On the other hand, I cannot help being sincerely alarmed as to what effect this gigantic

program will have on the economy of our Nation. We cannot close our eyes to the grim reality that in adopting this new program we are gambling not only the financial security but the very existence of our own people. There is one cold fact which keeps staring us in the face, and that is the knowledge that we cannot obtain the perpetual friendship of any nation with either money or force. Real friendship is achieved only through obtaining their respect and confidence. The United States Government today stands out as the only citadel of free democracy, and if through financial insecurity this Government of ours should collapse, then the hope of both Christianity and democracy in this world would be doomed.

In reaching my own decision, I shall not attempt to wash my hands of my own responsibility by saying that it is the President's program, and that nothing that I may do or say can alter the final decision. The Federal Constitution places in the hands of the Members of the Congress the power to accept or reject the foreign policy of the President. Our forefathers, foreseeing such decisions as those facing us today, gave Congress this power in order to force the President of the United States to seek first the advice of Congress before launching any new foreign policy. As a Member of the Congress I accept that responsibility, and I shall accept upon my own conscience the results of my vote on this most important decision.

Mr. President, the record of our leaders and the State Department in handling international affairs up to date compels me to ask the question whether or not they are sure they are right this time, when they ask us to underwrite with finances the military and manpower necessary to a world-wide extension of our international policy.

Since Britain is balancing her budget for the first time in 10 years and reducing her taxes, why should we be asked to assume her responsibility in the rehabilitation of the world, and preserve her empire? Why should the United States continue to send money, materials, and food to aid Communist Russia and her satellites and at the same time send money, materials, food, and men to fight communism in Greece and Turkey?

This Truman global policy is merely a small beginning, conceived in haste, without adequate consideration or appreciation of its ultimate effect, which not only dooms it to failure, but commits the United States to a program which we are not powerful or rich enough to carry out without ourselves becoming financially and morally bankrupt. Why should we take this leap in the dark to destroy communism elsewhere in the world before we first destroy it in our own country?

I am anxious and willing to assist the hungry and destitute anywhere so they may help themselves, provided they are not antagonistic to our American way of life, but I am not convinced that the proposed Truman policy will accomplish this purpose. I am convinced that the adoption of this policy today would embark our country upon a gigantic commitment which could easily lead to national financial chaos and disintegration.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, reports from various organizations through which the United States has furnished relief, both during the war period and also during the postwar era.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Expenditures for relief through various agencies since VJ-day for European countries*

Surplus disposal	$5,114,000,000
Lend-lease (since war)	2,113,186,000
UNRRA (United States contribution)	2,700,000,000
Export-Import Bank	1,966,750,000
Maritime Commission	193,000,000
British loan	3,750,000,000
International Bank (United States share)	635,000,000
International Refugee Organization (pending)	75,000,000
Post-UNRRA relief	350,000,000
Direct assistance to civilians	842,000,000
Government relief in occupied areas	1,450,000,000
Total	19,188,936,000

TABLE 2.—*Lend-lease aid, by country*

[Thousands of dollars]

	Mar. 11, 1941, to VJ-day (Sept. 2, 1945)
British Empire	30,949,870
U. S. S. R.	11,058,833
France and possessions	2,842,082
China	870,435
Netherlands and possessions	182,000
Belgium	90,278
Greece	71,697
Norway	45,820
Yugoslavia	32,000
Turkey	27,397
Saudi Arabia	14,988
Poland	16,874
Liberia	7,237
Ethiopia	5,152
Iran	4,798
Iceland	4,797
Egypt	1,016
Czechoslovakia	349
Iraq	4
American Republics:	
Argentina	0
Bolivia	5,155
Brazil	326,913
Chile	21,499
Colombia	8,120
Costa Rica	155
Cuba	6,083
Dominican Republic	1,594
Ecuador	6,979
El Salvador	894
Guatemala	1,779
Haiti	1,437
Honduras	374
Mexico	38,468
Nicaragua	902
Panama	84
Paraguay	1,963
Peru	18,553
Uruguay	7,132
Venezuela	4,407
Not accounted for by country	1,900,805
Total lend-lease aid	48,578,923

TABLE 3.—*Lend-lease aid, by country*

[Thousands of dollars]

	Sept. 2, 1945, to Sept. 30, 1946
British Empire	442,291
U. S. S. R.	239,050
France and possessions	391,777
China	694,263
Netherlands and possessions	66,896
Belgium	68,320
Greece	3,907
Norway	6,683
Yugoslavia	36
Turkey	60
Saudi Arabia	2,543
Poland	80
Liberia	0
Ethiopia	100
Iran	0
Iceland	12
Egypt	44
Czechoslovakia	154
Iraq	0
American Republics:	
Argentina	0
Bolivia	456
Brazil	4,738
Chile	381
Colombia	7
Costa Rica	0
Cuba	10
Dominican Republic	20
Ecuador	562
El Salvador	0
Guatemala	0
Haiti	6
Honduras	0
Mexico	149
Nicaragua	0
Panama	0
Paraguay	2
Peru	480
Uruguay	9
Venezuela	11
Not charged by country	189,939
Total lend-lease aid	2,113,186

TABLE 4.—*Maritime Commission credits to European countries*

	Credits committed
Italy	$51,000,000
France	56,000,000
Norway	41,000,000
Greece	45,000,000
Total	193,000,000

TABLE 5.—*Export-Import Bank (as of Feb. 28, 1947)*

	Credits committed
Austria	$750,000
Belgium	100,000,000
Czechoslovakia	21,500,000
Denmark	20,000,000
Finland	79,500,000
France	1,200,000,000
Germany	----------
Greece	25,000,000
Hungary	----------
Italy	130,000,000
Netherlands	300,000,000
Norway	50,000,000
Poland	40,000,000
Total	1,966,750,000

TABLE 6.—*UNRRA*

	Amount	Remaining to be shipped after Apr. 1, 1947	
		Percent	Amount
Albania	$27,178,000	11	$2,989,500
Austria	136,127,000	3	4,083,810
Byelorussia	60,700,000	1	607,000
Czechoslovakia	264,075,000	2	5,281,550
Greece	350,500,000	2	7,010,000
Italy	420,750,000	1	4,207,500
Poland	481,260,000	3	14,437,800
Ukrainian Soviet Socialistic Republic	188,050,000	1	1,880,500
Yugoslavia	420,552,000	5	21,027,600
China	529,650,000	21	111,226,500
Unaccounted for	59,371,000	13	6,718,230

TABLE 7.—*Summary of major OFLC bulk sales, as of Dec. 31, 1946*

Country to which sold	Cost price of surplus	Realization or sales price
United Kingdom	$588,000,000	$60,000,000
Canada	59,000,000	12,000,000
India	593,000,000	39,000,000
France	1,398,000,000	300,000,000
Egypt	36,000,000	12,000,000
Brazil	20,000,000	9,000,000
China	837,000,000	175,000,000
Italy	565,000,000	190,000,000
Philippines	638,000,000	137,000,000
Belgium	380,000,000	54,000,000
Total	5,114,000,000	958,000,000

ELIMINATION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to speak to an amendment which I now have on the desk the purpose of which is to strike from this bill all provisions granting military aid to Greece and Turkey. The President, in recommending this program to Congress, stated:

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms. I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It is my contention that, under the provisions of this pending bill, the United States is doing precisely the thing in Greece which the President says we oppose. It is my contention that the Greek Monarchy is an armed minority forcibly imposed upon the majority and that the Congress of the United States under the terms of the pending measure is to be the outside pressure group which will be subjugating the Greek people. That is the whole trouble with taking sides in a civil war. Giving our blessing to the Monarchy does not make its tyranny just, nor its persecution holy.

Apparently the present Royalist regime, like all totalitarian dictatorships, can only be sustained by intimidation and oppression. Certain it is that it controls the press and the radio and that it suppresses the personal freedoms and that, through threats and hints of reprisals, it did fix its recent election. Certain it is that it employs terror and oppression. The President of the United States, who submitted this plan, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], its chief sponsor, and almost every Senator who supports it apologizes for the present Greek Government. Knowing the facts, they cannot do otherwise. I cannot escape, therefore, the conviction that in the policy here proposed, we are doing exactly what we say we abhor.

Turning to the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, page 2 reads:

Up to the present time the guerrillas have had considerable success creating chaos and uncertainty in various parts of Greece, particularly in the North, and the evidence presented to the committee indicates that the Greeks' security forces will be unable to restore domestic tranquillity without outside assistance in the form of equipment and supplies.

The Foreign Relations Committee suggests that since the guerrillas now fighting against the Government in Greece cannot be subdued without outside assistance, it proposes that America on its own decision and by its own action, shall furnish that outside assistance in the form of equipment and supplies. The question could not be stated more sharply or more clearly than that. Since the rebel forces are said to be receiving outside assistance, the committee proposes that their antagonists shall receive outside assistance from us. Two wrongs do not make a right. If it is wrong for outsiders to aid one armed camp, and it is wrong, then it is equally wrong for us to aid the opposing armed camp. It is unfortunate and it is unprecedented for the United States to compete in such a bloody enterprise. That is the certain way to fan a small civil war into a full-fledged world war. How much better it would be if the United Nations with our backing would compel all outsiders to stop providing military aid to either side in the civil war in Greece, and follow that action up by taking the next step toward resolving their bitter differences. I shall outline a proposed plan.

First things must come first. First, let us insist upon political democracy in Greece, and next provide the money and material necessary for her economic rehabilitation. No amount of American arms, no amount of American troops will overcome or enslave the Greek people. History has made that point crystal clear.

Economic, military, and political security in Greece depends upon the establishment of a democracy representative of the great mass of Greek people. Since we do not intend indefinitely to support, supply, and advise a dictatorial Greek army which holds the Greek people under an iron heel and in an armed camp, we should not undertake such an enterprise now as a stopgap or an expedient. No policy can possibly make sense which does not put democracy first in the life of the Greek Nation. If Greece might have a government representative of the great mass of Greek people, order would be restored, rebellion would cease, and the entire nation would go back to work again and reconstruction would be well on the way. Mr. Truman's policy begins with the premise that military repression of patriots fighting for liberty is the first requirement of the Greek situation. On the contrary, the first requirement is the establishment of a genuine political democracy which commands the respect and the support of a great majority of Greek people. That condition does not obtain, and so we are called on to render military assistance to a government which cannot itself maintain order because it does not have popular support. The proposition that we enter Greece to guide, support, sustain, and supply a dictatorial and corrupt monarchy and its army is a repulsive and wicked proposal. It is false to our obligations to the United Nations. It is contradictory to the political ideals under which our Nation has grown strong. It is a betrayal of the very principles on which the American Republic was established.

The President, in advocating this policy, stated:

In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is an act of extreme arrogance on our part to assume that we alone are the judges of what should be done under the Charter of the United Nations. It is not the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to make decisions for the United Nations.

Under the United Nations Charter, we have committed ourselves to the solemn and sacred procedure of bringing before the United Nations any condition—economic, political, or military—which endangers the peace of the world. According to the Foreign Relations Committee, a dangerous situation to world peace exists in Greece today, and yet it is here proposed that, without consulting UN, we, and we alone, take unilateral military action to cure it. By giving military aid rather than limiting our assistance to economic help through constituted channels set up for that purpose, we deliberately sabotage the United Nations. Our unfortunate policy of unilateral assistance is bad for us, bad for the United Nations, and bad for the world. If our program of outside military assistance is justified, would not some other nation be equally justified in extending military assistance, training, observers, advice, and equipment to the rebel forces? If we undertake, as a matter of policy, unilateral military action in civil wars throughout the world, we assume the impossible and thankless task of policing the world. A few days ago a number of marines were killed and several scores were wounded because our armed forces found themselves in a theater of civil war in a country 10,000 miles from where we now debate.

I suggest that the decision on what will give effect, or will not give effect, to the principle of the Charter of the United Nations is a matter for the United Nations itself to decide. It is indeed an act of unadulterated insolence to assume otherwise. This Nation is committed to a policy of bringing before the United Nations any situation which endangers the peace of the world. Instead of carrying out that obligation, Congress is about to undertake the policy of giving effect to the principles of the Charter. If such a course of action is legitimate, it follows logically that any other nation now a member of the United Nations can likewise decide for itself, and by itself, to give effect to the Charter with respect to civil wars or any other incident, or trouble, wherever it may occur. The United Nations is made impotent and ridiculous by such procedure. No, Mr. President; let us not hide behind pretty phrases. The basic fact is that we have violated our obligation to the United Nations. The basic, blunt, brutal fact is that we, by ourselves alone, have decided to police the world alone. All of this is done under the pretense that the United Nations is not yet ready to function. When, may I ask, is it to be

ready to assume the responsibilities for which it was created? I say now, in this tragic hour of peril, it must act, or, in humiliation, disappear from the hearthstone of peace-seeking mankind. This is the hour of positive action, not procrastination and petty quibbling. It is either now or never.

The tremendous responsibilities which we undertake when we send military men and military supplies to Greece is breathtaking. The bill states that the military personnel we dispatch will be advisers. Does that mean that our military men assume the authoritative direction of the Greek Army? Does it mean that we undertake the strategy, tactics, and military movements of the Greek Army? Does it mean, Mr. President, that our military men will go into the front lines and direct operations? It must comprehend all these things if it is to be effective. Do we intend to use American pilots? Will we use American observation planes? Will our advisers participate in battle itself? The answer must be the very shamefaced answer of "Yes." In effect, the pending measure puts the military forces of America in charge of the warfare of the present Greek Government against the rebel guerrilla fighters in the mountains of Greece, many of whom are fighting for the same precious principles we fought for in 1776.

Mr. President, if the present program is unsuccessful, if the assistance is not sufficient; if the basic civilian population of Greece does not approve; if it does not support the coercive measures undertaken by the American Government; if the program itself should fail, we must make additional military commitments to continue the present Greek Government in power or get out, humiliated before the world, as the British Army beating a retreat from Athens is humiliated. We cannot retrace our step down Niagara Falls once we take that step. Americans, be not deceived, therefore. Military aid of this character and a military commitment of this scope is not aid short of war. It is war. And it is all-out war and war to the death. So this innocent-appearing proposal is in reality a declaration of war. Little wonder that the President's tense and solemn appearance before a gloomy, unresponsive Congress on March 12 had all the aspects of a declaration of war. It was a declaration of war. It was a declaration of war with Russia.

The United States, with its atomic bombs and other frightful weapons of mass destruction, is the only military power on earth that the Soviet Union fears. Greece and Turkey could be overrun by her in a matter of hours. Greece is so weak and so torn by dissension that she cannot put down the guerrilla warfare which has been raging in her mountains for weeks. Turkey also is a relatively weak state. Regardless of how unfriendly she might be, she does not by herself constitute a military threat to anyone. But Turkey now has consummated a military alliance with the greatest military power on earth, the United States of America, and that is a far different matter.

The Congress of the United States is about ready to underwrite this alliance. At 4 o'clock today the Senate will take this fateful step, I fear. The pending measure provides for guns and soldiers to implement that alliance. Little wonder, then, that when a naturally happy and optimistic President submitted it to a joint session of Congress he was tense and anxious. He alone seems to comprehend the full import of this fateful step. Easygoing Senators and a shifty State Department, with considerable experience at deception, may pooh-pooh its serious aspects week after week, but that does not make it a joking matter. Little wonder that the American people regard it as merely another relatively unimportant money-spending spree, or relief for hungry people, or a belated move to stop the spread of hated communism.

Americans, it is none of these things. There are no humanitarian aspects to this proposal. Its ultimate cost cannot be measured in hundreds of millions. Only in billions can it be counted. It is a military maneuver of monstrous scope. Obviously Greek relief was thrown in to capitalize on the traditional love and devotion of America for a heroic people plagued with malnutrition, disease, and rebellion. With America's current wave of hysteria presently shooting at communism it is easy to enlist support for any program earmarked "Stop communism." But communism is a way of life which can only be stopped by a better way of life. War is its ally. War, and the aftermath of war, spread it.

Russia dare not ignore a military move which threatens her security and the peace of the world. Turkey by herself is no threat to Russia, but an Anglo-Turkish military alliance constitutes a military threat of the first degree. We are going into Turkey for no other reason. The United Nations, if it is ever to serve mankind, must view this military alliance with unsuppressed alarm. The UN, puttering around with less consequential matters, should be on top of this rapidly developing crisis with undisguised concern. When our soldiers march across the Turkish border a war of aggression in the Middle East cannot be denied by us. UN ought not permit it.

If we were having misunderstandings with our good friend and neighbor, Mexico, we could not and we would not permit a military alliance to be consummated between her and Russia. We would declare war within the hour. But now the shoe is on the other foot.

Hanson W. Baldwin, a widely read writer on military strategy, is a strong supporter of the pending measure. In an illuminating article published in the New York Times on Sunday, April 13, on the Greek-Turkish plan in which he gave his blessing to the Truman proposal, he made this comment which is especially revealing:

> This spring, unlike last spring, last summer, and last fall, there have been no great Russian troop concentrations or threatening troop movements on or around the border of Turkey or near other Russian political objectives; even the concentrations in the Caucasus, still considered dangerous as late as last fall, have been reduced. Russia has retired to a large extent from Manchuria, is preparing to move out of Dairen, has left northern Iran. There can be no doubt that the world politico-military situation, as distinguished from the economic situation, is better today from the American point of view than it was a year ago.

According to this reputable and well-informed writer, the situation on the Turkish border has improved markedly. High-ranking generals in our own Army verify this fact also. The crisis has almost disappeared. The situation has not worsened; it has improved. And yet, now we move in with our Army.

The explanation for our present policy of Middle East aggression is that sentiment is growing in Turkey for settling with Russia the Dardanelles dispute amicably. There is opposition there also. It is to bolster that opposition that we intervene. Britain and the United States are determined at any cost, including war, to keep Russia out of the Dardanelles.

Russia has insisted as her long-range policy that she have friendly nations on her border. At Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam we agreed to, acquiesced in, and fully supported that aspiration. Everywhere except on the Black Sea she has now developed that protection. From the Black Sea with its 500 miles of Russian shoreline, it is only 1,000 miles to Moscow. In the words of that master of pungent language, Winston Churchill, the Black Sea area is the "soft under belly" of Russia. In every other direction, Russia has full protection. On the Black Sea and the Turkish front, she is vulnerable and there only is she vulnerable. Study the Black Sea area on the map for an understanding of its geopolitical and its full military implications.

Any alert military strategist contemplating war with Russia would select Turkey as a made-to-order springboard for that purpose. We have made that selection. The pending measure plants the American flag plus $100,000,000 worth of military instruction in Turkey. More, much more, will follow. It is hoped that this first relatively small shot in the arm will bolster Turkey to refuse to cooperate with Russia in resolving the century-old Dardanelles dispute. It is our military strategy at this time to prevent any agreement which will authorize Russia to build protecting fortifications on this gateway to the Mediterranean. For centuries Russia has craved commercial and military access to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles. Always she has fretted over the likelihood of an enemy fleet striking at her defenseless Black Sea ports through these straits.

Under the provisions of the pending measure, when our military engineers go to Turkey, maps will be drawn and plans will be made depicting the battleground of World War III; nothing will be left to accident or speculation. Every inch of Turkey will be surveyed and blueprinted. Airfields and air bases will be prepared on paper. I understand the

first military shipment to Turkey will include 1,000 modern antiaircraft guns.

I do not know who the author of this bold and brilliantly conceived military strategy may be. Cloakroom gossip gives General Marshall the credit. It could be. His telegram to Senator VANDENBERG read to us on yesterday almost confirms it. I understand that this distinguished and popular military genius and very wise diplomat subscribes to the Karl von Clausewitz 1830 definition that "war is merely diplomacy by force of arms." I agree with President Truman that General Marshall is perhaps the greatest soldier America or the world has yet produced. I do not know now just how he will rate as a diplomat. History must answer that question, but undoubtedly he is a statesman of great capacity. The Senate will recall the remarkable statement of that distinguished soldier and American, Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood. Years ago, in response to the form question as to whether he would desire to have the then Captain Marshall serve under him in time of war, General Hagood wrote this historic reply: "Yes; but I would prefer to serve under his command. He is a military genius."

I respect the opinion of every Senator wherever that may lead him, but I do deplore the "Shucks, this is nothing" approach of legislators and of the State Department to the most tragic decision of our time.

Twice I have seen the United States drift into a European blood-bath. I know the signposts. Denials and contradictions and double talk pave the road to war. In America today their resounding and emphatic echoes bounce from crag to crag and forum to forum. Everything is running true to form. Not one fatal criterion is missing. Once again without their approval and against their will the American people are being sold down the river of blood.

I have ever been an implacable foe of peacetime conscription. I have fought this Prussian-inspired miltitary system at every turn of the road. I have made hundreds of speeches against it, published a few articles, and written thousands of letters to my friends pointing out its vicious nature. I am still opposed to peacetime conscription; but if Congress enacts the pending war measure I will support conscription and military training, and a renewal of selective service on a wartime scale, immediate mobilization of a huge army and navy, increased military appropriations and every other step necessary to defeat our enemies quickly.

I understand that the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate are supporting this measure and at the same time demanding a drastic cut in military appropriations. That illustrates well the prevailing error here of not putting two and two together. Armament races cost money with slavery the reward for holding second-best hand.

Violently opposed to conscription and militarism as I am, this is an especially hard reversal for me to make, but our military alliance with Turkey which we are about to implement by passage of the pending measure leaves me no honest alternative.

We ought to begin at once the training of 20,000 very young fighter pilots a year. David Lilienthal and his Atomic Commission ought to be instructed to move ahead under full steam. B–29's and B–36's and all the other implements of death and destruction ought to roll off the assembly lines in great volume once again. I do not believe we can fight communism successfully with arms, but if that be our decision we must fight it in Moscow, not Greece, not Turkey, not France, not all over the globe. If it be our decision to fight communism with guns, and I fear at 4 o'clock today we shall so decide, then we must fight it at its fountainhead.

However, I beg my colleagues to act before it is too late. If they will agree to my amendment which will delete from the pending bill all military provisions, war can be averted. I have felt impelled to present such an opportunity to the Senate. I pray that my admonition falls not on deaf ears. This is my last appeal to my colleagues.

And now, may I make one last plea to UN. I am speaking as an humble Member of the United States Senate, in the United States Senate, but my words are for the ears of the representatives of the United Nations organization.

If the Vandenberg bill is enacted without corrective amendment, I beg UN to rise to its challenge and demand that Russia and the United States compose within the UN their dead-end differences. Russia, in her stupid, stubborn, exasperating policy of suspicious negation, and the United States, in her new dynamic policy of unilateral military intervention everywhere, are both dead wrong. Two dead wrongs do not make one right. Tell them. Call a spade a spade. UN must realize that time is running out and this is its last and best chance to avert World War III.

The United Nations should tell Russia and the United States that any military move across the borders of Turkey by either of them must be deemed aggression; that unilateral military intervention in Turkey by either the United States or Russia is an act of war.

An impressive majority of the American people have placed their whole faith in the UN. It has their prayers and it is their one hope. If it lets them down in this crisis, UN might as well fold its tent and steal silently into the night, another dream shattered.

Russia's contentions with respect to the Dardanelles are not entirely without merit. Obviously, it is a dispute to be resolved through the offices of the United Nations. Unless UN can measure up to the challenge implied in such a problem, it is worse than worthless. The sands of time are running low. We must have action now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 20 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before proceeding with the remarks which I have in mind to make, I desire to make a brief statement concerning the absence of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and his attitude toward the pending bill.

For approximately 2 weeks, in company with other Senators and Members of the House, I traveled over the area of the world affected by this particular loan, visiting both Turkey and Greece, and conferring with responsible officials and citizens in both countries. During the greater part of that time I had the pleasure of being constantly associated with our great, able and distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky. For most of the time we occupied the same quarters in the various hotels. Naturally early in the morning, during the day and late at night we discussed every phase and angle of the pending proposal. From that most intimate contact, in addition to his previously announced views, I want to assure my fellow Democrats that the Senator from Kentucky has a deep and strong interest in the passage of this measure. He is so utterly convinced that our course is the correct and wise course that it was only by considerable persuasion that we induced the Senator from Kentucky to remain in Paris for a long delayed visit with his daughter and a greatly needed rest. Had it not been for our persuasion and insistence, he would have returned with us and would have participated in this debate with his usual force, logic, reason, and eloquence.

I make this statement merely that Members of our own side of the Chamber may know, as I am sure they all do, that the absence of the Senator from Kentucky is not due to any lack of interest in this proposal. Even though we all miss his presence here and the fine, effective leadership he always gives, I am sure we all agree that the Senator from Kentucky is entitled to the visit he is now making in Paris with his daughter and his grandchild, and that he certainly deserves the rest and relaxation which he is now obtaining for the first time in many years.

Mr. President, in the limited time in which we have to discuss this all important question it is impossible to reply to all the arguments and statements made, such as the argument just concluded by the able and distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. But I would in the beginning emphatically deny practically everything the Senator from Colorado has said, especially that we are embarking upon a course of unilateral military intervention, because, Mr. President, the action proposed is not intervention. At the request of a friendly nation we are rendering aid and assistance which that neighbor thinks she desperately needs. It is not unilateral military intervention.

Mr. President, the able and distinguished Presiding Officer of this body, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], eloquently referred to our generation as a "tragic" generation. True it is, Mr. President, that within the lifetime of those who sit in this body our country has twice gone to war. Tragic indeed are those grim experiences, for which we have paid a terrible toll in the lives of our sons and in the depletion of our wealth and resources. Shocking and horrifying as this has been, the tragedy lies deeper. The tragedy of World War I and the tragedy of World War II lie

not on the battlefields, not in the expenditures we have made. We have not failed in any of those matters. The tragedy of this generation lies with the statesmen of the world, with the diplomats of the world, who have failed to achieve the goal for which our fighting men fought and for which many of them died.

Despite the cynicism of the critic, I am not ashamed to say—no, I am proud to declare here on the floor of the Senate today—that America has fought in both world wars following high ideals and noble purposes, without hope of selfish gain, with no goal to achieve, save one—a world of peace.

Here, then, Mr. President, lies the true tragedy, that having sacrificed so much, having given of our strength and sinew, we have not as yet won either war. Victory is not ours and will not be ours until the goal for which we fought has been achieved and won. Today we embark upon a course which some of us believe is definitely aimed to achieve the objectives for which we fought in both wars to make our victory secure.

Grave, then, is the moment; extreme is its importance. We must not waver in our course, and, Mr. President, we dare not be afraid. May we examine as calmly and dispassionately as we can some of the arguments which are advanced for and against the pending proposal, and may we in the discharge of our duties exercise some small degree of the fortitude and courage which our sons so valiantly displayed on the battlefield.

With those who assert that this course bypasses the United Nations I have some sympathy and some understanding, because at first the question came to me, Are we bypassing the organization which we ourselves have set up and for which we are chiefly responsible? Are we establishing a policy which does ignore that organization? It was only after some reflection and with such consideration and thought as I could give that I reached the firm conclusion and decision that we are not bypassing the United Nations, and that we should proceed with the legislation as it is proposed. It is unnecessary to argue this. It has been recognized and admitted by practically everyone. In fact, I do not think it has been denied that the organization of the United Nations cannot possess the means, the power, or the procedure to fill the emergency needs of the moment. In making this admission, those of us who strongly favored a world organization long before some of its present advocates deemed it even possible to achieve it do not reflect upon either the present or future course for strengthening the United Nations. As yet it is in its infancy. Probably there is no proverb better known than that which reminds us "Do not send a boy to do a man's job." The foundations for the world organization have hardly been laid. The pillars of strength are yet to be erected. The truth of these things is self-evident. Frank recognition of the present defects of the United Nations organization should only strengthen our resolve to make it the strong organization which we have envisioned, able to cope with every situation, such as that which we now confront. We must build the organization so strong that when any question shall arise, whether it be one of law for the International Court or a question of warfare or aggression for the Security Council or the General Assembly, whatever the questions or disputes may be, the procedure and machinery of the United Nations organization will be ample and able to assume and carry the full responsibility. That is my concept of the world organization. That is our job. May the United Nations grow ever stronger, and never be weakened.

Mr. President, it is said that Turkey does not need our aid and assistance. An amendment will be offered to eliminate any loan to Turkey. Many are the arguments on this point, but on this as on other points I must say that time will not suffice to permit a detailed discussion. It is not my purpose to answer everything that has been said about Turkey. Briefly, I shall give the Senate some of my own impressions and reasons why I favor including Turkey in the loan as provided by the pending bill. In passing, it might be well to say that I am familiar with the general feeling which has prevailed in this country about the Turkish Nation. All of us, I believe, recall most vividly the massacre of the Armenians, and we know that Turkey was an ally of Germany in the First World War. Contrary to popular opinion, however, it should be said that the position occupied by Turkey in World War II was of direct aid and assistance to us and our allies, and this aid and assistance amounted to more than merely remaining neutral.

It should be said in fairness that in the past 25 years Turkey has made great strides in progress and advancement. The Turkish Government of today is not the government of the "terrible Turk." It is today the one strong nation in that section of the world. It is a nation which is definitely opposed to communism and in which communism has not as yet gained any substantial foothold.

Notwithstanding her strong position, and notwithstanding her will and desire to oppose the forces of communism and prevent it from obtaining a foothold within her country, Turkey does need, and I think she rather desperately needs, our aid today. Presently she is maintaining against her own wish and desire a standing army which has been estimated to be all the way from 500,000 men to 1,000,000 men. Yesterday the Senator from Michigan said her army is approximately 800,000 men. But whether it be half a million or whether it be a million men, the fact remains that it is too large an army to be maintained and supported by Turkey, a nation of less than 20,000,000 people, who are thus required by circumstances against their will to maintain within their army a half million or more of their most able-bodied and most efficient men. Mr. President, certainly that constitutes a drain upon her resources and a drain upon her finances which eventually, if continued without aid and assistance, will bring economic collapse. Those men should be engaged in peaceful pursuits. They should be engaged in agriculture; they should be engaged in industry; they should be engaged in production.

The funds which we now propose to advance to Turkey—and I say this with the utmost candor and with full knowledge of what I am saying—will be used to modernize the Turkish Army. The direction of the purchases, however, and the expenditure of the funds will be under the supervision of our own Ambassador, Mr. Wilson. I regret that every Member of the Senate could not have had the privilege and opportunity of hearing Mr. Wilson when he appeared before our committee. If they could have heard his vigorous, frank, and intelligent statement of the conditions which exist in Turkey and in that part of the world today and of what will happen if this aid is not granted, I do not believe there would be any doubt left in the mind of any Senator.

Of course, Mr. President, there is the question, Why should Turkey maintain such an army? We know the reason why. We know that Russia has refused to renew a friendship pact. We know that five times daily there is broadcast into Turkey, in the Turkish language, propaganda to spread communism and to destroy the Turkish Government and to bring Turkey within the orbit of Soviet influence and to extend it from there into Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and eventually India and China; for if Turkey falls, if Turkey goes communistic, let us not deceive ourselves what the result will be; it will be that all that part of the world will also become communistic.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. During the debate much has been said to the effect that Turkey is not a democracy. Does the Senator think it makes any particular difference whether Turkey is a democracy, so long as she is resisting aggression?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has ably stated the exact situation. As a matter of fact, what right have we to tell Turkey that she should be a democracy? The very purpose of extending this aid is to enable a small nation to have the kind of government it wishes to have.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me further state that we aided Russia, although she is a dictatorship, when we believed that the Nazis were making aggressions upon her; did we not?

Mr. HATCH. We certainly did.

Mr. McMAHON. And contrariwise, we denounced Russia for attacking Finland, when she made that attack.

So, as I see the situation, the test is not the kind of government which exists in a nation, but the test is whether aggression is on its way.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the test is simply that every nation in the world, including Russia, including little Greece, has the right to determine for itself, without let or hindrance from any other nation, the kind of government that country wishes to have and the kind it chooses for itself.

That is the very thing that is being destroyed all over that section of the

world today. Communism is being forced upon those nations, not by military might now, but by the processes of infiltration, propaganda, and ecomonic collapse, so that those nations will not have the right to choose for themselves, but will have forced upon them a government, a theory, a philosophy of life which they do not want. For that reason, we are standing for the right of those small nations to choose for themselves.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of that course. It is a principle for which the United States has always stood, and for which I pray to God it may ever stand.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, the Senator from New Mexico says that we stand, as we stood in 1918, under Woodrow Wilson, for the self-determination of peoples. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. Absolutely.

Mr. McMAHON. If they want communism, let them have it.

Mr. HATCH. That is their privilege, if it is a voluntary choice.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; if they choose it in a free and open election.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that if we were to follow any other course than the one which is proposed today, all our fine words would fall, and our action would belie our tongues.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The accusations which are made against the United States by irresponsible people to the effect that we are pursuing an imperialistic course, it seems to me, are completely refuted by the statement which the Senator has just made—a statement of the truth as to our basic and underlying policy—which is to see to it, so far as we are able, that the peoples of other countries shall determine for themselves the kind of government they want.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am afraid I cannot yield further. Will the President pro tempore inform me how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, naturally I shall have to skip and leave out much that I wanted to say, but I feel I must reply to a statement made by the able Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. Here on the floor he said, "If we aid Turkey, the next-door neighbor to Russia, Russia will take offense at such a course or policy." He then asked, "What if Russia were to give aid to Mexico?" This morning the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] reaffirmed the same argument.

Mr. President, in response to those arguments, let me say that there is only one thing for us to determine. It is not whether we are afraid we are going to give offense to some other nation. It is not whether we would like what some other nation might do. There is only one thing for the Congress of the United States and for this Nation to determine, and that is what is right. Having made the right decision, nothing else matters.

Mr. President, if my own country were doing to Mexico, our sister Republic on the south, what Russia has been doing to adjoining countries, if the United States were massing her troops and armies, threatening military occupation and invasion, if the United States were broadcasting daily into Mexico doctrines or ideals of government and were seeking to destroy that nation and to bring her into our orbit as a satellite under our domination and our control, I say to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Florida that in such case, if Russia were a friend to Mexico, she should give her aid and assistance under those circumstances. I say that, regardless of the Monroe Doctrine, or any other doctrine, if my country ever seeks to subjugate and dominate and control a weaker and lesser nation by virtue of the strength of either our military or our economic power, then every other nation in the world should raise her hand against us and should give the weak and lesser nation assistance.

Mr. President, I should like to reply to the charge of imperialism, but my time is already up, and my only reply now is that we should look at the record of the United States. It is not altogether blameless, but look at that record and it will be found one of unselfish devotion and sacrifice to the cause of peace, and against aggression. Not one single thing have we asked for ourselves out of either World War I or World War II. Notwithstanding the billions of dollars we have spent, notwithstanding the sacrifices in blood, America has told the world that our only hope, our only desire, is to live in a world of peace. That is all we ask now, and in giving aid to Turkey and to Greece we are merely furthering that aim and that objective.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is much more to be said, and there are many things that I have prepared to say. I now ask unanimous consent that my prepared address may be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, our able and distinguished Presiding Officer the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] eloquently referred to our generation as a tragic generation. True it is that twice within the lifetime of us who sit in this body our country has gone to war. Tragic indeed are those grim experiences, for which our Nation and our people have paid such a terrible toll in the lives of our sons and in the depletion of our wealth and resources.

Shocking and horrifying as is this terrific cost which we of this generation have already paid, the tragedy lies deeper than costs. The tragedy of World War I and possibly of World War II lies not on the battlefields nor in the expenditures we have made. On the battlefields we have not failed ourselves or the peoples of the world. We have not failed in the vast expenditures we made, wasteful as they were. The tragedy of this generation lies with the statesmen, with the diplomats of the world, who failed to achieve the goal for which the sacrifices of the fighting men were made.

Despite the cynicism of the critic, I am not ashamed to say—no; more than that—I am proud to declare that America has fought in two world wars for no ulterior purpose, for no hope of selfish gain, with no goal to achieve save one, the sole desire for a world of peace.

Here, then, Mr. President, lies the true tragedy: that, having sacrificed so much, having given of our strength and sinew, we have not as yet won either war. Victory is not ours and will not be ours until this goal is finally reached and attained.

Today we embark upon a course which some of us believe is definitely aimed at the objectives for which we fought in both wars. Grave, indeed, is the moment; supreme is its importance. We must not be mistaken. We dare not be afraid.

May we examine as calmly and as dispassionately as we can some of the arguments and reasons which are advanced both for and against the pending proposal. May we in our duties exercise some degree of the fortitude and courage with which our fighting men met their problems on the battlefield.

With those who assert our course bypasses the United Nations, I have some sympathy and some understanding. The first thought that came to me when the present plan was suggested was a most disquieting one. Were we establishing a policy and procedure which did ignore the organization of the nations designed to protect and preserve the peace of the world? It was only after reflection and with as much serious consideration and thought as I was able to give that I reached the firm conclusion that we were not bypassing the United Nations in this instance and that we should proceed as is proposed in the legislation we now consider.

It is unnecessary to argue why this is true. It has been recognized and admitted practically by all who are familiar with the present organization of the United Nations that it would not be possible for that organization to do the things necessary to be done in the immediate future. Such an admission on the part of us who so strongly favor strengthening the United Nations to that point and degree where it will always have available the means and power to meet any and every situation, is no reflection upon the present organization. As yet it is only in its infancy. The foundations for this world structure have barely been laid. Pillars of strength are yet to be erected. Of these things all of us are aware; the truth is self-evident. Yet, I must repeat and say again this is no reflection on the present organization or upon its future possibilities. Frank recognition of its defects must only strengthen our overwhelming purpose to build the United Nations stronger, to equip it with everything it needs as fast and as quickly as we can. We must build it so strong that whenever in the future any question arises, whether it is a question of law for the International Court or questions of aggression for the Security Council or the General Assembly, whatever the question or disputes may be, the procedure and machinery in the United Nations organization will be ample and able to assume and carry the full responsibility. This is my concept of the world organization. May it ever grow stronger and never grow weaker.

Mr. President, it is said that Turkey does not need our aid and assistance. An amendment will be offered to eliminate any loan to Turkey. Many are the arguments on this point, but on this as on other points, I must say that time will not suffice to permit a detailed discussion. It is not my purpose to answer everything that has been said about Turkey. Briefly I shall give you some of my own impressions and reasons why I favor including Turkey in the present loan. In passing, it might be well to say that I am familiar with the general feeling which has prevailed in this country about the Turkish

Nation. All recall most vividly the massacre of the Armenians. We know that Turkey was an ally of Germany in the First World War. Contrary to popular opinion, however, it should be said that the position occupied by Turkey in World War II was of direct aid and assistance to us and our allies, and this aid and assistance was in more ways than merely remaining neutral.

It should be said in fairness that in the past 25 years Turkey has made great strides in progress and advancement. The Turkish Government of today is not the Government of the "Terrible Turk." It is today the one strong nation in that section of the world. It is a nation which is definitely opposed to communism and in which communism has not as yet gained any substantial foothold.

Notwithstanding her strong position, and notwithstanding her will and desire to oppose the forces of communism and prevent it from obtaining a foothold within her country, Turkey does stand in need of aid today.

Presently she is maintaining a standing army of anywhere from 500,000 to a million men. Various are the reports as to the size of the army. But certainly it is not less than a half million men out of a nation of about 20,000,000 population. The maintenance of this army constitutes a heavy drain upon the resources of Turkey. The best men of her country are in that army. They should not be there. They should be engaged in peaceful pursuits of agriculture and of industry. Her economy, instead of being depleted, should be strengthened and her production should be increased.

The funds proposed to be advanced to Turkey—and I speak with utter candor and without concealment of a single fact—will be used to purchase modern military supplies in our country. The direction of the purchases, the expenditure of the funds, will be under the supervision of our Ambassador to Turkey. Mr. Wilson, our Ambassador, is a man whose testimony before our Committee on Foreign Relations was so forceful and strong he convinced every one of us who heard him of Turkey's great need for this assistance. My only regret is that every Member of this Senate—no; I wish every American citizen—could have heard his testimony. I deeply regret all could not have seen the strength of character and the broad vision of intellect which he displayed. Many doubts raised here would have been removed.

But, naturally, the question arises: Why the need for the large standing army? Why does not Turkey demobilize and put her men back into productive labors? The answer is obvious. It is known to everyone. The forces of communism—not necessarily military but they may become militaristic—are a constant threat to the peace and security of the Turkish nation. Propaganda through five daily broadcasts from the Soviet Union is directed into Turkey. Infiltration processes are going on daily. The fear of a possible military operation is always present in Turkey, although the Turkish people are not afraid. In fact, they do not actually believe a military operation will begin; but when a great, strong nation refuses to renew a friendship pact, when the war of nerves is continued until the smaller, weaker nation feels compelled to maintain an army far beyond her financial strength to support, a deadly process of weakening is going on which, if continued, can ultimately bring about complete economic collapse of the whole country. And it is on such economic collapse that those who would spread the doctrine of communism throughout the world rely most strongly. By giving this aid to Turkey now, it is believed by responsible officials in that country they can so modernize their army that with far less men in numbers they can have greater strength and can return to industry and agriculture thousands and thousands of needed men, and in the end be strengthened both militarily and economically.

From my standpoint, these are some of the strong reasons why we should aid Turkey to maintain her present position. Is it necessary to say that, if Turkey should fall and become communistic, not a single barrier against communism will remain in that part of the world? Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, eventually India and China, will certainly fall within the orbit of Soviet influence.

But what concern is that to us, is repeatedly asked. Are we out to stop communism everywhere and to destroy it in all lands? The answer to that is "No." We establish but one single precedent in granting aid to Turkey in this instance, and it is a precedent for which our Nation has always stood and one for which we have fought in two world wars, that is the right of every nation in the world, large or small, to determine for itself and without outside interference what kind of government it shall choose. We give Turkey aid in order that Turkey may determine and maintain for herself her own type and form of government. To that principle this country has been dedicated almost from the day of its foundation. From that principle I shall not depart when I cast my vote on this measure today. In voting aid to Turkey, we give to Turkey that assistance necessary for her to determine for herself whether she chooses her own form of government or whether she is compelled to accept one she does not want. Whichever course the Turkish people pursue it is for them and for them alone to determine. We make no demands upon them. We do not ask her to change her form of government to suit our whim or fancy. We ask only that she have the privilege of choosing for herself.

But it is said that in pursuing this course we may give offense to the Soviet Union. The able Senator from Florida argued this at length the other day and compared our giving aid to Turkey as though the Soviet Union should suddenly go into our sister republic on the south and grant military aid to Mexico. Eloquently he said, "We would not like that." But, let us examine that argument a moment and see whether there is any such point or force or analogy in our giving aid to Turkey.

May I make this suggestion: If we were doing in and to Mexico what the Soviet Union is trying to accomplish in Turkey; if we were sending broadcasts and propaganda and infiltration processes into Mexico, trying to destroy her form of government, and substitute one which we chose for them; if we were trying to make Mexico a mere satellite of ours, under our domination, influence and control, then I would say, under such circumstances the Soviet Union should send aid and assistance to Mexico, and though we might take offense we would have no right to be offended, for, under such circumstances, we would be wrong and the Soviet Union would be right. She would be right in aiding Mexico to protect her own sovereign integrity and her right to choose her form of government and to resist our own wrongdoing—for such it would be.

Regardless of the Monroe Doctrine or any other doctrine, whenever my country adopts a course which would destroy the sovereignty of any government in this or any other hemisphere and any nation comes to the aid of the weaker country resisting our wrongful course of conduct, I say without hesitation that aid and assistance given the weaker country under such circumstances would be amply justified. The integrity and sovereignty of all nations, strong or weak, must be protected and preserved if there is to be any safety and security in the world for any nation. So long as the safety and sovereignty of any nation is endangered the safety and sovereignty of all nations is in danger.

It is said this is a dangerous course for us to pursue. I frankly admit the truth of that statement. We live today in a dangerous world. Every step taken is a step fraught with danger. There isn't enough wisdom in all the Senate of the United States, or for that matter in all the country, to foretell where there may be danger and where danger does not lie. But of this one thing there is not a shadow of a doubt: The most dangerous course of all is to take no stand at all—to do nothing. Backing and filling, going forward and then retreating, assuming responsibility today and refusing to discharge it tomorrow, strong in time of war but weak in time of peace—these are the dangerous ways, these are the ways which will lead inevitably to war, perhaps to death and destruction. We have but one thing to determine today and it isn't whether the course is dangerous; it isn't whether someone is going to be offended. The thing we must determine is what is right. Let us be convinced that we are right and nothing else matters. In defending the principle of any nation to determine its own internal affairs, its own form of government without interference from outside sources, we are right. On this issue there can be no difference. Turkey needs our aid. It is right that we give it.

Is it necessary to speak of Greece, that valiant, gallant country—a country which has contributed so much throughout the generations past to all the world? I think the story of Greece is fairly well known. If present conditions are not known or understood, one need only read the testimony of our ambassador, Mr. McVeigh, who appeared before our committee, another brilliant man, able and courageous, who thoroughly understands the conditions not only in Greece but in all that part of the world. The story he told was a pitiful one. It was a story of long years of an unfortunate dictatorship, of five long years of enemy occupation, of deliberate attempts to destroy the country, its resources, even the morals of its people, and yet it was not altogether a hopeless story. The picture of Greece is of a country that has the possibility of rebirth, of revitalization, and of a strength to come back, a strength which will enable her to recover from all the ravages of war and strife.

Of course, it has been argued that the Government of Greece is corrupt, monarchial in form and character, and that we should not aid such a government. Ambassador McVeigh believes otherwise. Given our aid, and with the courage and strength that will come to the Greek people and to her Government, a state of peace and tranquillity within Greece can be established within a comparatively short time, he emphatically asserts. With the return of peace and tranquillity, with the return of some small degree of prosperity, the Greek people, Ambassador McVeigh says, will be amply able to and will determine for themselves the type of government they choose and desire. Can we do less than to give to this people the opportunity to have that peace and tranquillity which will enable them to build their own country, to make it safe and secure from the outside pressure which everyone knows is bearing heavily upon the maintenance of any kind of government save one within Greece? Dare we profess to believe in the principle of sovereignty and integrity of small nations and do less than give Greece the chance to mold her own destiny?

What is the alternative if we refuse aid to Greece? The collapse will come so suddenly and swiftly that Senators who vote against this aid will be appalled, for Greece has absolutely no chance against the pressure from the outside if we refuse the aid she so desperately needs in this fateful hour. These are not alone my own thoughts, but my utterances are based upon information gathered and gleaned from every responsible source at my command.

Now I must pass on to another subject which I do not like to discuss, one which I deplore has ever entered into the consideration of this proposal. It is said that when we give aid to Turkey and Greece we pursue

an imperialistic pattern. These charges are currently made against us by nations who are opposed to our giving such aid. It is a part of the propaganda that is hurled daily into Turkey. That we might well expect. At it I would be neither shocked nor surprised, but, Mr. President, when these self-same charges are made on the floor of the United States Senate, when they are made in other countries by men who have held high and responsible positions of trust in the United States, I am not only shocked and surprised, but I am deeply disappointed and grieved. I shall not criticize former Vice President Henry Wallace, a man for whom I have always held the highest regard and in whose sincerity and good purposes I have always believed. Today I shall neither question his sincerity nor his purpose. I shall not inquire into motives. Those things are not for me to determine about Mr. Wallace or any other man. None of us can look into the secret recesses of a man's mind and conclude and say what motives inspire any course of action. Today I shall grant to every man the right to whatever opinion he may choose to hold for himself and shall not question his purpose or his motive. But when any man, Mr. President, says that my country pursues an imperialistic course, that statement I stoutly dispute and deny. In so doing, Mr. President, I do not have to rely upon my own views. I am not compelled to advance theories, beliefs, or opinions. I look only to my country's history. I look to the record she has written on the page of world affairs. and, as I look at it, I am not ashamed. I do not apologize; rather I steadfastly affirm that the record of our country, so far as imperialistic design and purpose are concerned, is as clean and clear as the record any country has ever written or ever will write.

In answering this charge of imperialism, I choose today to use the words of a man who was fighting the battles of the common man, the little fellow, long before those who now so loudly protest against imperialism were known in public life. This man of whom I speak wrote an article on this very subject which appears in the March issue of Harper's magazine. I wish the gentleman who now advances this argument had read that article. Mr. Norman Thomas, many times candidate for President on the Socialist ticket and who by no stretch of the imagination could be called an advocate of imperialistic power nor of aggressive advancement of capitalism, has, in part, this to say in the article to which I referred, and which is entitled "What Is Right With America," and I quote from this article:

"I do not retract my criticisms of American foreign policy or lack of policy since Pearl Harbor when I say that I know no remote historical parallel to the fact that a Nation has emerged victorious in two world wars, unequaled in economic and military might, with so little desire for aggressive, imperial power as America has yet shown.

"Consider the record. We not only raised and equipped enormous forces as they never were equipped before, while at the same time we fed our civilians on an average better than in peacetime; we also gave to our allies in lend-lease, according to the latest figures, fifty and a half billion dollars and received back less than seven and a half billion in reverse lend-lease. Now—and here is the point—our Government has not demanded in return either from its former enemies or its debtor associates any territory or special trade and economic concessions. (Even the Pacific island bases now in controversy are only partially an exception to this statement, since they were held by Japan only on mandate or by occupation, and the United States has proposed some recognition of the trusteeship of the United Nations. The problem would disappear under the universal national disarmament with international supervision which I have advocated.)

"So far from demanding material rewards for victory we made a further $3,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain and extended generous credits to France. Not too graciously or adequately we have carried the main burden of allaying famine. The record is not all that the highest wisdom or the most enlightened humanity would have dictated, but when in history has it been remotely paralleled by any tribe, state, or nation in ancient, medieval, or modern times?

"It was not thus that mighty powers from ancient Rome to modern Britain and France gathered and held their empires. It is not thus that the Soviet dictatorship has utilized victory. On the contrary, Stalin has annexed some 270,000 square miles of territory, mostly at the expense of nations with which he had treaties of nonaggression; established his rule through puppet states from the Baltic to the boundaries of Greece and the Adriatic Sea; quartered his armies on starving peoples; stripped them of machinery; extorted more than the Czar's imperial 'rights' in Manchuria; and taken from this territory more than $2,000,000,000 worth of machinery necessary to any recovery of Chinese economy.

"Nor is this all. We carried through our promise of independence to the Philippines and seem likely to correct the just grievances of Filipinos at the conduct of American troops still quartered in unnecessary numbers in the islands. In Japan MacArthur enjoys a respect and popularity heretofore unheard of in the temporary rule of a conqueror over a defeated foe.

"After the First World War America showed a similar disinclination to aggressive imperialism, but also in disappointment over the results of the war it refused to accept the responsibility of membership in the League of Nations. After World War II there was no such attempt at isolation. America fostered and joined the United Nations and all its subsidiaries. Our Senate ratified the Bretton Woods agreement. Most remarkable of all, our Government voluntarily proposed to turn over to a properly constituted international authority its temporary monopoly of atomic energy, the greatest physical force in the world. Say, if you will, and so I do, that we ought also to have suspended the making of bombs, and that our action is only what wisdom dictates. So rare is such wisdom in politics that it should count as unprecedented virtue. There was never, of course, a situation remotely like our monopoly of atomic energy, but I could safely offer a reward far beyond my ability to pay for a citation of any action by any other nation since the dim dawn of history which might have suggested such a sharing of power."

Thus does Mr. Thomas answer the charge of imperialism laid against our country by both the Soviet Government and some statesmen of America. With this quotation I might well conclude, but to it I must add and I do it without boasting but simply from a sense of fairness and justice to America and her people. True it is we have had some lapses in our dealings with other nations, but, on the whole, they have been of minor character.

While we did fail to ratify the League of Nations and we did more than once refuse to adhere to the International Court, and we did, following the last war, withdraw from the rest of the world, for which follies and mistakes we have paid a terrible price, nevertheless the purpose of America has been only to live in a world of order, one of peace and not of war. We have no designs upon any nation or upon any people. If permitted, we can live at peace in a world where every nation determines for itself its own form of government, whether that form be democratic, republican, monarchial, or communistic. I repeat, if permitted, we can and will live in that kind of world and live in peace with all nations everywhere. It was for that purpose that we fought in two world wars. It was to achieve that objective that we took the lead at Dumbarton Oaks, that more than any other nation, perhaps, we sponsored the charter adopted at San Francisco. We have passed the necessary legislation to implement an international police force; we have adhered to an international court of law. Some of us are now willing to give to that court compulsory jurisdiction. And, if the other nations of the world will join with us, we will resolve every difference by arbitration, by submission to a court of law or by amicable decision. We have offered to set up an international control for the atomic bomb and are more than willing to forego the use of that terrible weapon, provided only that we may be made safe and secure against its use by other nations against us.

We do not like to boast of our wealth and should not do so, but, as a matter of fact, we are contributing more financial aid to the distressed peoples of all the world than any other nation. In honesty and in good faith if complete disarmament of all nations can be provided and all the world be made secure against any attack by an aggressor nation, the United States will not fall behind any nation in the world, in providing whatever means are necessary to achieve this great aim. We will this day adopt the amendment to the legislation, offering to place with the United Nations the full responsibility, the full program of carrying out the promised aid to Turkey and Greece whenever that organization can carry that responsibility and burden.

To show our good faith we have offered to and will waive any right of veto, a magnificent step of which I am proud. I am proud of its author, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who conceived the thought, proud of our committee which adopted it, and equally proud of the Congress which will incorporate that great gesture into this measure.

Mr. President, I have spoken earnestly. With 100 percent of the people of America, I have but one wish and one desire, and that is to live in a world of peace, where each nation, no matter what may be its strength or its size, may determine its own way of life, that the terror and horror and fear of war may be eliminated from the world, that law and order be substituted instead of the rule of force and might, that peoples and nations may live together in one true brotherhood, cemented and bound together by ties of friendship, good will, peace, and understanding.

Such a world, Mr. President, can be accomplished. To achieve it, I would gladly reach out the hand of friendship from our own country across the vast expanses of space to the Soviet Union and gladly sit down with them and say: With you and the other great powers of the world we will bring about a world which will not be the tragedy of our generation. On the contrary, it will be a sublime drama in which all the aims and objectives of men of good will can be realized. Mr. President, it is eternally true that there is room in the world for all of us. There is room for understanding, growth, and development. There is not room for hatred, for fear, for dispute, for discord, or for war. By working together earnestly and honestly, all differences and disputes can be removed and dissipated.

Finally, Mr. President, I conclude by presenting the issue squarely in the words of Mr. Walter Lippmann, writing in the Washington Post, April 1:

"Thus intervention in the Middle East is one of the means to an end. It is a strategic operation to check and reduce Soviet military expansion. Its complement is a comprehensive political and economic op-

eration to release Europe so that it may unite, and to help finance Europe so that it may recover.

"This is a policy of which the risks and the costs are large. But they can be borne because the policy itself is directed without obscurity or equivocation to a settlement in which the vital interests of all are recognized, the security of all, including Russia, established.

"The alternative is a stalemate and increasing chaos, rising tension and animosity, and in the end civil strife and a catastrophic world war."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, after very careful thought and deliberation, and after giving the pending bill as much study as it was possible for me to devote to it, I have concluded to vote against the bill giving $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey at this time, and changing our long-established foreign policy of not interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

I shall make only a short speech, and shall content myself largely with merely summing up my reasons for my vote.

First, Mr. President—and this will be surprising news to a great many—we have not the money with which to embark upon this plan. I repeat, we have not the money with which to embark upon the proposed plan. Whatever surplus money we have had in days gone by we have long since expended, including a comparatively small proportion in carrying on World War I, and a simply enormous proportion in carrying on World War II, and thereafter giving lavishly to every nation asking for enormous sums of money, aggregating, I am advised, in lend-lease and UNRRA, $55,000,000,000, giving away in lend-lease and UNRRA $55,000,000,000 for the protection of our own Government, of our own people.

I am here talking in favor of America today; not in favor of other nations. I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Government of this country, and that is what I propose to do. This $55,000,000,000 was appropriated for the protection of our Government and our own people, and of our own prosperity and happiness. We must put a stop to the lavish generosity we have been engaged in toward our neighboring nations since the close of the great war.

The United States Government today owes $257,847,453,151.15, to be exact, according to the last figures. This is the greatest debt ever owed by any nation in the world's history, and probably a greater debt than is owed by all the going nations of the world today.

Mr. President, in this connection let me say that there are two things imperatively necessary for the United States to do during the course of the present Congress. First, we must cut down expenditures and appropriations so that beginning July 1 we will live within our means. Second, we must begin, in the fiscal year beginning July 1 next, paying on this $257,000,000,000 indebtedness, and arrange to continue reasonable payments until the debt is not dangerously large.

To my mind—and I ask Senators to listen especially to this—it is a thousand times more important for us to make and to live up to those two policies than it is to continue to give bounties to other nations, or to establish a new policy of interfering in the internal affairs of any other nation.

To attain these ends, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations I am doing my best to cut down every appropriation consistent with good government, so that we can begin to live within our means and begin to pay on the stupendous national debt.

My first reason for voting against the pending bill, therefore, is that we are not in a financial position to make this great change in our foreign policy and enter upon a new program of giving great sums of money to other nations.

Let me digress here long enough to say that we have indulged in two giving activities since the beginning of the last war. One was lend-lease, the other was UNRRA, and the Congress has abolished both, in one way or another. Now here is a third attempt to establish another giving proposal.

As certainly as that the sun shines in the heavens, if we begin this new policy of interference in other nations' local affairs, accompanied by rich gifts of money to Greece and Turkey, we will soon be called upon by practically all the other nations of the world to do the same thing for them.

I repeat, Mr. President, that we have not the money with which to indulge in such prodigality.

Second, Mr. President, we must not enter upon a career of interfering in the affairs of other nations. Our Government's old foreign policy of not interfering with the internal affairs of other nations is too just a policy, too fine a policy, too honest a policy, too successful a policy, too profitable a policy, too tried-and-true a policy to be forsaken at this time, when we are now at the very zenith of success in our history.

Such a change cannot be productive of permanent good to those upon whom we bestow these rich gifts, and it cannot have any other result on us except to create trouble and perhaps to lead us into war.

Third, President Truman has very outspokenly and fairly announced his purpose in making this change in American foreign policy, and he is entitled to great credit for being outspoken and frank about it. That he honestly and sincerely believes it will be best in the future for our country, as well as for Greece and Turkey, and perhaps other nations, I have not a doubt. But, Mr. President, I do not believe with the President that we should make this change in our foreign policy, even if we were able to make donations to the various countries of the world, and were financially able to conscript our young men—for that is what it is going to mean—for army service, and perhaps go to war in carrying out such a policy. I still do not believe that it is a part of our duty or within our province or within the limits of our form of government to make donations to the various governments of the world and to set up our Army or Navy in order to give them a better or more secure government. I am utterly opposed to such a change in our foreign policy.

Again I say, Mr. President, that we have not the money to make such a change.

Fourth, some say the President's reason for changing this foreign policy and for going to the aid of Greece and Turkey at this time with large sums of money is that he fears that Communist Russia is getting ready to move over and take Greece and Turkey in, as Russia has already taken in many other countries near her; that she will then have an open southern seaway from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and out to the Mediterranean, and then out to the oceans to the world; and that the President thinks this would be unwise and hurtful to all the world except Russia.

Fifth, Mr. President, heaven knows—and I could call on the Senate to approve what I say—heaven knows that I do not want to help Russia or the Russian Communist form of government. I am utterly and unalterably opposed to doing anything that would help communism or a government of Communists.

I especially oppose the present Russian Government. It is the most despotic government on the face of the earth, and it is the most ungrateful government on the face of the earth. It has been and is most ambitious to extend not only its territories but its communistic influence and to extend its power over other nations.

A few years ago Germany had overrun the main portion of Russia. She had defeated the Russian armies and had taken over European Russia. She had driven the Russian armies beyond the Caspian Sea, as we all recall.

Under President Roosevelt the United States went to the succor of Russia and sent arms and ammunition, funds, clothes, ships, and materials of all kinds all the way around by the Indian Ocean and the Caspian Sea for the help of the Russian Army and at enormous expense saved that army and the Russian Government from the then victorious Hitler. Whether it was wise to have done so is a matter of opinion. Bad as Germany was under Hitler, I very seriously doubt, whether the present Russian oligarchy is much better. In the meantime, since and before the war, Russia had taken over in addition to her European territory, Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Austria, Hungary, Albania, and perhaps other smaller territories—the very cream and heart of Europe—and all are now attached to Russia. She was enabled to do all this and establish her present strong government only by the help and aid of America, whom she now despises and with whom she agrees on nothing.

I believe Russia admits she owes us approximately $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease, and, including UNRRA, some $2,000,000,000 more. But in all the long negotiations which have taken place since the war and in all the various meetings

which have occurred, there has never been a suggestion from Russia to the effect that she was returning the money we had expended and given to her to save her from the German attack or that she intended to return us the money. Did anyone ever hear of any suggestion of that kind from Russia? In my own judgment she will never pay it back. She has demanded the lion's share of everything since the war, has actually taken to herself more than all the other nations put together, apparently with our consent and certainly without our protest. She has taken probably two-fifths of Germany, of the very best of Germany, and we are told on good authority that she has robbed the Germans in her division of practically everything they had. Nor has she said anything about giving back any of the vast territories she has acquired from Germany or others, or about setting any of them free.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I allot the Senator 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, Russia is apparently opposed to agreeing to a peace with us or anyone else, and at the present moment our splendid Secretary of State, General Marshall and other excellent representatives associated with him are, sitting around at Moscow, begging for a fair peace and receiving not an encouraging word. Secretary Marshall was in Moscow some 6 weeks without ever seeing Stalin, and when he did see him he apparently received no encouragement from him. In my humble judgment, President Truman is making a great mistake in keeping Secretary Marshall in Moscow under these circumstances. I sincerely and prayerfully hope he will soon recall him, and our representatives with him. I am sorry they were ever sent there. They must be working under the most humiliating and mortifying circumstances. Therefore, it is easily understood that when I vote against the giving of this money, this $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, and vote against changing our foreign policy in respect to such cases, it is not because of any sympathy whatsoever that I have for Russia, or the Communist government. In thus voting I feel that my first duty is to America and not to Greece or Turkey or any other nation.

Mr. President, my sixth reason for voting against this bill is that we are ignoring the lessons of history—and I want to call the Senate's attention particularly to this—and especially of recent history, if we take this course. In this connection I want to discuss some of the large indebtednesses of the world.

The facts of history demonstrate that all governments, except our own, which have inordinately built up and increased their foreign indebtedness have failed.

Italy and her colonies, now all on the brink of ruin, at the end of the war owed $34,228,483,000.

Japan and her empire at the end of the last war owed $39,848,990,000.

Germany upon her late demise owed the astonishing sum of $138,847,960,000.

In like manner, it has been ascertained that the bonded indebtedness of France and her colonies is $35,452,752,000, and France has slipped, and is slipping, financially in a tremendous way.

Likewise, Mr. President, it has been ascertained that the bonded indebtedness of the British Commonwealth is $133,464,434,000. We see Great Britain no longer moving forward and in the lead of the great nations, but rather we see her seeking to get from under the many burdens which she has been carrying.

Therefore, it is easy to see, Mr. President, that the bonded indebtedness, as above set out, of these former great nations, when compared to our own bonded indebtedness of $257,847,453,151.15, and especially when compared to the assets or wealth of each of those countries to our own assets or wealth, tells a remarkable story.

These figures make the danger perfectly plain to any nation with a great bonded indebtedness like ours. They stare us in the face and show us the absolute necessity of our not following the fiscal example of these former great nations of the world.

These figures show us beyond the shadow of a doubt that we must live within our means, spend not more money than we receive in income, and that we must take immediate steps to reduce our enormous indebtedness.

They show beyond the question of a doubt that we must decrease our bonded indebtedness rather than enter new enterprises or increase it a single cent.

The bonded indebtedness of Germany, Italy and her colonies, and the Japanese Empire, together amount to the enormous sum of $212,224,443,000. Their bonded indebtedness, as we all know, has little or no value. We must not follow the example of these other nations, and we must not adopt any new policy that will increase our bonded indebtedness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield me a few more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. McKELLAR. As my seventh point I want to call the especial attention of the Senate, Mr. President, to the bonded indebtedness of the United States and of Russia. I want to compare them. According to the best figures available, our indebtedness, as I have said before, is $257,846,453,151.15.

It has been rather difficult to obtain the figures of the bonded indebtedness of Russia, but from the best sources I could consult I find that the Russian bonded indebtedness is only $27,985,461,000—as compared to our bonded indebtedness of more than $257,000,000,000. It is true that Russia owes us $13,000,000,000 by way of lend-lease and UNRRA, but she is not going to pay it. Everyone knows she is not going to pay it. In other words, the United States owes $257,000,000,000. Russia, a great nation, with all the new territory which has accrued to her, has a bonded indebtedness of only $27,000,000,000.

We must remember also, Mr. President, that Russia has in addition to her own territory taken over at least two-fifths of Germany, all of Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and today is snatching at Austria, and perhaps other smaller and richer territories. Under these financial and political situations in the world, and especially with these great accessions of territory and wealth to Russia, we must not put ourselves at a disadvantage by the reckless giving of our wealth to others. Such giving, as we have all seen, is wholly unappreciated and may bring about our great misfortune.

Suppose we had a contest with Russia. I believe we could win. But when she owes in the neighborhood of only $28,000,000,000 not including her lend-lease indebtedness to us, and we owe $257,846,543,151.15, what a fight we would have.

Mr. President, we do not have the money to embark upon the new policy proposed in the bill and we should not take further chances.

I am against this bill because I believe its effects will be extremely hurtful to our country and to our Government and to our Constitution. When I became a Senator I took an oath of office to uphold our Constitution and our Government and our country. I have tried to keep that oath, Mr. President, until now and so long as I am a part of this Government I shall continue to try to keep that oath.

Fortunately, Mr. President, American bonds are owned almost entirely by her own people; our material wealth is large and our capacity to produce more is almost unlimited. Fortunately, in case of attack we are well located geographically for defense; and, fortunately, at present in any event we still retain the secret of the atomic bomb. These things make us not afraid, but we must not trifle with fortune and we must not take chances that are unnecessary.

Mr. President, it is charged that Henry A. Wallace is opposed to the bill and therefore no man of discretion or good sound mind or ordinary sense should oppose the bill because Wallace opposes it. I frankly admit that it may be that Mr. Wallace is opposed to it and it may be that he is opposed to it because of attacks upon communism and the virtues of the Communist government. If those are his reasons, of course, they are childish and senseless. I will not say more, except perhaps I might add that, in my opinion, they are exceedingly foolish. I have no view of that kind at all.

As before stated, I am utterly opposed to the Russian Government and to communism practiced under it and I am opposed to the views of anyone who is in favor of the Russian Government or communism. I am against this bill for entirely different reasons, as I have attempted to point out. I am against the bill because of its effect upon our own country. I am opposed to it because we

do not have the money to give away. Our Government is today operating at a loss, and we must live within our means. We must begin the payment of our debt.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its attention, and I thank the Senator from Colorado most cordially for yielding additional time to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 20 minutes to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I am supporting the bill.

Much has been made here of the charge that we are bypassing the United Nations, and that our action here will destroy it. I believe the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, when he made his opening statement on the bill, disposed of that charge completely.

The United Nations is in no position and is not organized today to do the job which we are trying to do in the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Even if it were functioning, it would probably be very difficult for the United Nations to deal with this particular type of fifth column aggression so long as Russia uses the veto in that organization the way she has been using it.

I think it would have been much better if our Government had informed the United Nations first of what we intended to do, and consulted perhaps with its leaders. But that is water over the dam, and I think the amendments inserted in the bill by the Foreign Relations Committee have made it abundantly clear to our own people and to the whole world that we intend no slight to the United Nations; that we are perfectly willing to abide by its judgment; that we even waive the veto in giving the Security Council the right to terminate this assistance any time the Security Council is willing to take over the job itself.

But speaking of the United Nations as one who has always supported international organizations for peace, I believe that sooner or later we and the other democratic peoples will have to face squarely the issue which has arisen with respect to the United Nations and determine whether we want to go on with an organization designed to maintain peace in the world but which is virtually impotent to enforce peace against aggression, or indirect aggression, by a great power because of the use made by one of the great powers of the veto, or whether we will either force a modification of the veto in practice, or in the Charter itself, and if that cannot be done, then proceed to organize the nations of the world who really want peace and want an organization which can keep the peace, and let those who insist on using the veto, not as an instrument of unity among the great powers, but as an instrument of unilateral obstruction, go by themselves. I am afraid if Russia continues to use the veto as she has used it in the past, as an instrument of obstruction, that the people of the world will be fooled into thinking that the United Nations can maintain peace, when as a matter of fact it is completely impotent to attain such a result.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the proposed assistance to Greece and Turkey is intended to give democracy to the peoples of those countries. I happen to be one of those who believe that the only way a people can ever get democracy is by going after it and finding it themselves. I do not think it can be given to a people from outside. It is true that our financial assistance may help to create an economic situation in which democracy will stand a better chance than it might otherwise stand.

I do not believe that this bill is imperialism, as has been charged; but I do believe that it is power politics. I would define "imperialism" as one nation seizing power in another country for the purpose of exploitation. If spending $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey, which most of us know we shall never get back, is exploitation, then I do not know what the word means. It is not imperialism, but it certainly is power politics. We are using our economic power to stop Russian Communist aggression in the eastern Mediterranean in what we now regard in this foreshortened world as an area vital to our security. Viewed in that light, as a measure to stop and contain Russian aggression, certainly it would be the height of folly to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and to strike out of this bill assistance to Turkey.

From all the information we have, we can be relatively certain that Turkey will not succumb to communism. If the worst comes to the worst and there is a struggle between the tyranny of communism and the freedom of the western world, Turkey will fight. Therefore we can be sure that our money spent there will not be wasted. It is much more of a gamble, I believe, in Greece, because for many decades the Greek people have been deeply divided politically, and it is questionable whether they will be able to build a strong and stable government capable of resisting the indirect, insidious fifth-column aggression of Russian communism.

Of course, power politics always involves the risk of war. If the objective of a nation's policy is important enough, in the final analysis it seems to me that any nation must be prepared to fight at a certain point, or the policy does not mean very much. But, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said, this is not merely a question of the risks involved in this particular policy. It is a question of those risks calculated against the risks involved in doing nothing. If we should do nothing and Communists should take over the Greek Government, as we have been reliably informed they would do, and Greece should become another satellite of Russia, like Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland, the result would probably be to topple over Italy and perhaps France, and in the final analysis all of Europe would become a part of the Russian dictatorship. It seems to me absolutely clear that if that should happen, the United States would be headed inevitably toward a war with Russia—a war in which we would fight virtually alone.

I do not believe that this measure represents the final cost if we really follow through on this policy. I believe that each case will be decided on its merits, and that we shall decide the type of action we wish to take. However, if we really intend to stop Russian Communist aggression where it now is, we must stop it at other points in the world which are vital to our security. There are a great many such points. When a plane can fly around the world in a few days, as was done recently, the world is foreshortened.

I do not believe that this is an absolutely new policy for us. In the past when we have considered situations outside our own borders as vital to our security, we have not hesitated to take action, as we did in Panama, Cuba, and the Philippines. This is the first time that we have gone quite as far as the eastern Mediterranean, but the world has shrunk a great deal in the meantime.

Throughout the consideration of this legislation, I have been struck by the similarity to the lend-lease bill, which we passed in 1941. I cannot help but regard the Russian policy today as almost identical with that followed by Nazi Germany in the middle 1930's. The Russians are following the same type of war of nerves, pressure on their immediate neighbors, bloodless conquest, if possible, and fifth-column infiltration. The only difference is that they have a fifth column in the Communist Party, which is organized in virtually every major country in the world, which is about 100 times as effective as anything the Nazis ever had.

It seems to me that the only great difference between this measure and lend-lease, which alined the strength of the United States against Axis aggression, is that Russian aggression is not yet fully committed to war. So far the Russians are using the war of nerves and fifth-column tactics. There is hope that if we can contain Russian aggression for a few decades, perhaps they will realize the folly of trying to conquer the whole free world, and their policy will change. Frankly, I believe that is our best hope, if not our only hope, of avoiding eventual war with Russia.

But if the Russian dictators, acting through their own people and through their Communist Party fifth columns in other countries, are determined not to permit the peoples of the world who want to enjoy freedom and have their own free government instead of a dictatorship, to have it except at the cost of war with Russia or civil war, then, Mr. President, we are headed for war inevitably, and nothing that we do here today can alter that fact.

But if we pass this measure, if we save an independent Greece and Turkey, and the horrible eventuality of a war between Russia and the western countries comes about, at least we shall fight with allies at our side, rather than alone.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the distinguished Senator contend for a moment

that Greece is an independent, free country?

Mr. BALL. No; I would not say that Greece is completely independent, but it has been so in the past.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understood the Senator to say that it was.

Mr. BALL. I think Turkey is independent and free. I believe that the Greek Government is much closer to a democratic government than any other country in eastern Europe among the Russian satellites.

It is true that this program will cost us $400,000,000 at a time when we can ill afford it. However, I have sat in this Chamber and seen passed a bill appropriating 100 times that amount—more than $40,000,000,000—for the expenses of the War Department for 1 year during a world war. If spending $400,000,000, or 10 times that amount, in this way can contain Russian aggression and avoid a third world war, then I think it is the best expenditure of funds that we can make.

Finally, Mr. President, I become a little tired of the apologists for Russia who are always telling us that any firm policy on the part of the United States, any firm support of the principles of freedom in which we believe, will be regarded by Russia as an unfriendly act. They become convinced that we are planning an aggressive war on Russia and that our course will make war inevitable.

Mr. President, it seems to me that those who make that kind of an argument—and too many are making it in the United States—do not give the Russian dictators credit for very much intelligence. Let us look at the record. What nation was it which made the deal with Hitler in 1939 which started the Second World War? Was it the United States? No, it was Russia. What nation wantonly attacked her neighbor, little Finland, gobbled up the Baltic states and held on to half of Poland's territory, all as the partner of Nazi Germany? That was not the United States; that was Russia. Which nation looted Manchuria and Austria of all their factories, is blocking any kind of a stable government in Korea today, has set up its own puppet regimes in Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, and is trying now to overthrow any one opposing communism in Hungary? What government was it that attempted by almost identical tactics as those being used in Greece to take over northern Iran? That was not the United States; that was Russia. What nation has consistently exercised a veto in the United Nations to block any constructive action? Again, not the United States; it is Russia. Russia is the one great power, except China, which got Formosa and Manchuria, which has gained any real territorial aggrandizement out of this war.

What did the United States get? A few barren islands out in the Pacific for which our Marine Corps paid very heavily. Even so, I think the United States, so far as I am concerned, would be glad to turn them over to an international organization as international bases to maintain peace if we had the kind of an organization which could use them.

No, Mr. President; international cooperation and international understanding and good faith are not a one-way street, but a two-way street. Any time Russia wants to convince the United States that she really wants peace with justice, not peace at her own terms or at "any price" for us, she can do so very easily by disgorging some of the territory she has grabbed during the war, by liberating some of the peoples she has enslaved in the war.

This debate has shown very clearly how distasteful to the American people and the Congress is even this minor venture into power politics. But, Mr. President, if power politics is the only way we can stop Russian aggression with some hope of avoiding a third world war, then I am in favor of power politics, and I am most certainly in favor of the expenditure of $400,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator feel, with me, that what we are really doing in the last analysis in passing this legislation today is to put a sign up over the borders of Greece and Turkey which, in effect, says to Russia, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther?"

Mr. BALL. That is my interpretation. I think we are telling the world that any further aggression in that particular area means trouble with the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. I so interpret it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I now yield 20 minutes to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I intend to vote against this Greece-Turkey gift-loan bill just as I voted against the British gift-loan bill. I believe my position is well taken because I am standing on the same principles approved and laid down by our first President, George Washington, in his immortal Farewell Address. Here are some warnings and some advice handed down by him to posterity in that memorable document:

> The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.
>
> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.
>
> The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.
>
> Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

I believe, Mr. President, that in giving consideration to President Washington's Farewell Address we should bear in mind that it was in this address that he announced he would not be a candidate for reelection. By placing himself in that position nobody can truthfully charge that he was looking to the next election instead of looking after the welfare of the people of this Nation.

In addition to opposing this Greece-Turkey gift-loan because of the advice and warnings given to posterity by the Father of our Country, I oppose it also because George Washington and his colleagues gave us something stronger than advice and warnings. They gave us the Constitution of the United States, and, Mr. President, every elected public official since its adoption has taken a sacred oath, under God, to support and defend that Constitution. Mr. President, I fail to find any provision in the Constitution of the United States permitting the citizens of this Nation to authorize any of their public officials to tax the citizens, or borrow money on the taxpayers' credit, and lend or give away the proceeds to any foreign nation.

I cannot vote for this Greece-Turkey gift-loan bill, Mr. President, because I have no constitutional authority to do so. If I had the constitutional authority to vote this $400,000,000 away, I would not do it, because I am opposed to the spending spree this Government has been engaged in for the past 14 or 15 years. During this spending spree the New Deal dynasty has, by legislation and Executive orders, tax-sapped the earnings of our people to almost the vanishing point and gotten rid of every dollar of that tax money, and on top of that has borrowed against the credit of this and future generations of taxpayers around $260,000,000,000 and gotten rid of every dollar of that borrowed money.

Mr. President, I believe this taxing, spending, borrowing, and lending program has led our Nation to the brink of economic disaster, and unless we stop it now, turn right-about face immediately, and proceed in the opposite direction rapidly, we will go over the brink of economic disaster and land squarely in the bottomless pit of national bankruptcy and governmental chaos.

And again, Mr. President, in viewing reckless spending, excessive borrowing, and crushing public debt as dangerous and threatening to the welfare of our Nation, I find myself in company with the good and sound philosophy of President George Washington. In that same Farewell Address he gave the following advice and warning:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One

method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belong to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate.

So, Mr. President, I have stated my reasons for opposing this Greece-Turkey gift-loan bill. My opposition as expressed so far is based on one little sentence of 25 words, tucked away in section 4, paragraph b, reading as follows:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

That one sentence, Mr. President, constitutes about the only real meat there is in the bill that can be intelligently discussed. The rest of the bill consists largely of implications, suppositions, and theoretical if's, and's, and but's, with a few whereases thrown in for embellishment. After listening to and reading much discussion, pro and con, I gather the impression that there is some hidden motive and altruistic objective involved in the plan. It is, indeed, difficult to intelligently discuss any subject which is as elusive as an implication or supposition, but I shall attempt to perform this difficult task in order to try to make my position clearly understood.

Mr. President, one of the implications suggested is that the plan contained in this bill pretends to counteract communism abroad, and prevent its spread. Nobody has a better long-time record than I have for opposing communism and all other foreign "isms." I have fought this menace ever since, and long before, I came to this Senate. I am not only in favor of eradicating communism in foreign lands, but I am more particularly and more insistently in favor of eradicating communism in our own Nation, and especially running all the Communists, fellow travelers, and communistic sympathizers out of the Federal bureaus and departments right here in Washington. While we are about it, I also favor repeal of all communistic legislation that has been placed on the statute books of our Government during the past 14 or 15 years. I am in favor of cleaning up our own Government first, and making such a shining example of our own Government, that foreigners will have more confidence in our sincerity of purpose when we talk about attempting to rid other countries of communism.

Mr. President, I want communism abolished everywhere on earth, but when the plan which is proposed to abolish communism is the identical plan that brings on communism, I do not care to adopt it. The plan proposed in the pending bill undertakes to abolish communism by borrowing $400,000,000, increasing our enormous public debt, and giving the money away. The main objective of communism is to overthrow democratic or capitalistic forms of government. The easiest way to overthrow democratic or capitalistic governments is not by sending invading armies, but by bringing about financial collapse. What can bring on financial collapse more quickly and definitely than continually going into debt deeper and deeper?

Mr. President, this initial $400,000,000 is only the beginning. It is the beginning of a new world program.

The President in his address before the joint session of Congress on March 12 said, "This is a serious course upon which we embark." He also said, "I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey." He must have envisioned the possibility that additional funds might be needed when he made this statement:

> If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress.

I can also imagine seeing the slimy hands of Joe Stalin setting the stage in Greece and Turkey to entice us into this action. He no doubt figures that he can keep up a disturbance on the Greek-Turkish frontier until the United States, like England, will be forced to withdraw from the scene of action because of the unbearable cost.

England started out bravely to stem the Communist tide in the Balkans. She poured millions into the area. She maintained an army in Greece. She sustained a vast force of civilian government employees throughout the Mediterranean area. But finally England came to the end of her financial rope. She no longer could stay the assassin's knife from severing the jugular vein of her trade lane through the Mediterranean. Russia by psychological maneuvering lured England into dumping her money by the hundreds of millions into Greece, until finally England's weakened financial condition at home opened the doors of Parliament to a socialistic government. So, now the socialistic government at London turns to the United States for protection from the consuming fires of communism, and attempts to shunt the financial responsibility from her shoulders to our broad back. Thus, we take up where England leaves off. By following the same course, how can we expect to reap a different fate?

Mr. President, one of the implications is that this is only the beginning. Loans to China, loans to Japan, loans to the Philippines, loans to Germany, loans to every country where there is communistic encroachment, are the order of the day. This is exactly as Stalin wants it. This is the way Stalin has planned his world—loans to be made by the United States, and not loans to be made by Stalin. Four hundred million dollars is but a tiny start which will soon soar to four hundred billions. Mr. President, we simply cannot eradicate communism by spawning it.

Another implication in this bill is that this plan will ward off war with Russia, at least, for some time. I do not profess to know when the next war will start, or what nation or nations will be against us. I do feel certain that we shall not start the next war, because we do not start wars; we end them. So if Russia and the United States ever engage in war against each other, Russia will start it, and Russia will therefore make the decision as to when it will start. One thing is certain: Russia is not as well prepared to go to war right now as we are. But every day and every month and every year that the start of the war, if one comes, is delayed, it enables Russia to become stronger. She is increasing her war strength all the time. So the more we help to delay the start of the war between Russia and us the more we are helping to strengthen Russia for the conflict.

Mr. President, by this reasoning it is apparent that the plan proposed by the pending bill plays right into the hands of the enemy, providing it is true that Russia intends to go to war against us. It also plays right into the hands of any other nation that might go to war against us at any time in the future. This is true by reason of the fact that carrying out this plan will weaken our financial and economic structure at home. Certainly there is no greater guarantee of security for our people than a strong domestic economy.

I would strengthen our domestic economy by not giving away any more borrowed money as proposed in the pending bill.

I would also strengthen our domestic economy by cutting our budget this year to $25,000,000,000, and next year to $20,000,000,000, and then reduce it drastically each following year until we get it down to a sound level.

I would cut income taxes by 50 percent effective immediately, and thus reduce the cost of living for our people by reducing the cost of producing consumer goods.

I would retire 50 percent of the civilian employees on the Government pay roll, and would permit them to go back home and engage in the production of useful goods.

I would free the laboring people of this Nation from the domination of labor-leader racketeers by repealing all the labor laws that banished their rights as free American citizens.

I would put the Federal Government on a diet until it would fit comfortably into the clothes prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. I would return the federally usurped power to govern the people back to the State capitols and the county courthouses, and I would let the people of this Nation enjoy a little old-fashioned American freedom.

I would then send a chaplain to the United Nations to open each session with prayer to Almighty God for divine guidance, and leave the convention doors open so that the representatives of any nation who did not like the procedure

would have no difficulty in finding their way out.

If Russia still remained in the United Nations, I would honor her by making her the leader in a world disarmament program. I would guarantee her against foreign aggressors for the next 100 years in return for having her completely disband the Red army within 6 weeks. I would rip out the iron curtain, so that news reporters of all nations might enjoy freedom of the press throughout her domain.

I would guarantee all the other members of the United Nations freedom from foreign aggressors in return for their cash contributions on a proportionate basis to defray the expense of maintaining our American military forces at sufficient strength to carry out our obligations.

Then, Mr. President, all disputes between member nations could be settled by the United Nations or adjudicated by the World Court. The appalling cost of sustaining competing armies throughout the world could be saved, or diverted to improving the living standard of the peoples of the world.

This, Mr. President, is my suggestion for bringing peace to this war-torn and war-weary world.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to speak only briefly, and particularly about the pending amendments. There is a large sheaf of amendments on the desk. I do not know how many of them will actually be offered. In most instances the amendments have been passed upon by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and have been rejected.

One amendment which was submitted was not passed upon by the committee. It is the only one to which I personally am prepared to give my support, and in doing so I do not speak for the committee. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] submitted an amendment reading as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments.

Obviously nothing of the sort is contemplated in connection with the proposed program. In my opinion, the language is not remotely needed or required. In my view, the protection sought is quite unnecessary. But inasmuch as the proposal has been made, I prefer to take it into the bill, rather than invite any remote implication to the contrary by rejecting it.

With that single exception, Mr. President, I wish to submit very earnestly to my colleagues that the other amendments to the bill should all be rejected. The bill contains a pattern leading toward a central objective, and that objective was described in the first two sentences of the message of the President of the United States when he appeared before our joint session. He said:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.
>
> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

Mr. President, the bill must be taken as a whole for the purpose of serving the foreign policy and the national security of this country. I beg Senators, even though they are opposed to the bill as a whole, to permit a fair and square showdown on the fundamental purpose and pattern of the bill, and not to undertake to attack it by flank movements which merely emasculate its purpose to produce a net result which is entirely worthless.

There are a few general classifications under which these amendments fall. Some of them seek to remove Turkey from the bill. Some of them seek to confine the bill to relief.

If we remove Turkey from the bill, we might just as well pass no bill at all, insofar as the program and the address of the President of the United States are concerned. If we confine the bill exclusively to relief, and eliminate the military aid contemplated, particularly in Greece, we might better pass no bill at all, and rely upon the relief bill which is to follow, because relief in Greece without adequate peace assurance behind it is nothing but transient bounty, which would mean the same ultimate loss that occurred always before.

I repeat, Mr. President, what is proposed must be taken as a pattern. This is infinitely more than a relief bill, and no one has pretended otherwise. This is a bill, in the language of the President of the United States, involving "the foreign policy and the national security of this country." I beg Senators to permit a fair and square vote on that fundamental challenge, the challenge of the foreign policy and the national security of this Nation.

Mr. President, I repeat, this is infinitely more than a relief bill. If we were thinking in relief terms, there should be no bill of this nature at all, because the bill is to be followed by a direct and specific relief bill, which is a relief bill in fact.

The only other amendments which are pending, generally, fall into the classification of seeking to turn over to the United Nations, in total fashion, the responsibilities contemplated by the pending bill. Again, I respectfully suggest that we fairly and squarely and honestly meet the issue.

There can be no question on earth that the fact is that the United Nations cannot accept this responsibility in the form contained in the request of the Greek Government and the Turkish Government to the Government of the United States. Under the plan which is contemplated in the bill, we propose to take advantage of every possible function the United Nations can exercise. We are proposing that just as soon as the Border Commission reports, if we can avoid a veto, the United Nations will take jurisdiction over that section of the problem in northern Greece.

We are proposing that just so soon as the World Bank can be qualified to take over any phase of the financial burden subsequently, that shall be done.

We are proposing, in textual language within the bill, that the jurisdiction and the final and paramount priority in respect to jurisdiction shall remain in the United Nations, through the adoption of an amendment which gives the United Nations unlimited and unqualified power to speak in its united name whenever it pleases in respect to what we are doing.

I beg Senators, I repeat, to help us keep this issue clear. I beg of them to permit us to submit to a yes-and-no showdown in the Senate whether or not the Senate of the United States, in response to the recommendation of the President of the United States, in response to a message from the Secretary of State in Moscow that this action is indispensable to the United States—I beg of my colleagues to permit a square yes-and-no answer in the Senate to this challenge.

Mr. President, it is needless for me to debate the issue further. I have debated at great length during the intervening days. Every Senator knows what is involved. Every Senator knows what he intends to do about the matter.

I have said many times in the last 10 days, and I repeat now, that I completely respect the good conscience of every Senator's decision. No man has a right to be dogmatic in such trying and uncharted times as we confront. No man can say "I know." The best that any of us can do is to say "This is my honest conviction." The best that any of us can do is to say "I would vote as I shall vote if I knew I was casting the deciding vote."

The Senate knows what my own convictions are. I am content, in this final hour of the debate, to summarize my own attitudes. It is my conviction that the bill must pass for the following epitomized, strategic reasons:

First. Heroic Greece, pleading for American aid, will almost inevitably become a totalitarian satellite within a few months if the bill shall fail. Her independence will disappear. It is her independence—her right of self-determination—not her monarchy which is at stake.

Second. Neighboring Turkey, the only independent country left on the immediate perimeter of Soviet Russia from the Baltic to the Black Sea, has been sturdily resisting a "war of nerves." If Greek independence fails, Turkey will be exposed upon every side. Her independence may well be the next sacrifice.

Third. From such key impulses, if the bill shall fail, we cannot ignore the probability of a Communist chain reaction from the Dardanelles to the China Sea, and westward to the rims of the Atlantic. All independence may disintegrate. We cannot ignore the enormous effect of our attitudes everywhere.

Fourth. America, though free herself of any imperialistic or expansionist designs, cannot escape a primary self-

interest that America shall not be stranded in a totalitarian world. An ounce of precaution is worth a pound of cure. And please remember, Senators, I repeat, that our Secretary of State, in a message from Moscow within the last 24 hours, says to you that the passage of this bill is indispensable to the United States.

Fifth. If we act, we "hold the line" for the United Nations until such times as the United Nations can progressively take over these responsibilities—an evolution which we not only crave but openly invite. If we do not act, the United Naions soon may face responsibilities which it never can take over.

Sixth. We act in the name and in the hope of peace, seeking nothing for ourselves or for the world except peace. But if we fail to act, we present the Communist sectors of the earth with an encouraging spectacle of divided American policy on this vital, basic issue. We sacrifice our moral and spiritual leadership in behalf of democracy and independent peoples. We may never again be able to make our viewpoints and ideals persuasive short of the very war which we all abhor and would prevent. If we fail to act, aggression gets the green light; and the rest of the world, including America, gets the red.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that any Senator should say upon this floor today, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] repeatedly said, that this bill is a declaration of war on Russia. Any such statement is an invitation to alien misunderstanding, which otherwise would have no possible basis whatsoever. Any such statement is an invitation to the precise disaster which this measure is intended to prevent. Any such inflammable statement is in my opinion a grave error. I deny the accuracy of any such statement. I deny any such intent. I deny any such purpose in the heart of any Senator who today supports the President of the United States in respect to this proposed legislation. In my opinion if war should ultimately come between two great countries, neither of which wants any part of war, it will come from such tragic misunderstandings as are, Mr. President, invited by just such statements as I here categorically repudiate.

I say again, as I have from the first, that I would encourage no illusions. We must choose the better "calculated risk." In my view, the "risk" is greater if we desert the President of the United States and his Secretary of State in Moscow. In my view, the risk is less if we stand up for traditional American ideals of self-governing independence in these areas; if we stand up for the human rights and fundamental freedoms to which all of us are wedded in the United Nations. In my view, the risk is less if, in friendly firmness, we indicate the dead lines which we cannot compromise; and then, in equally friendly firmness, seek prompt and equitable treaty arrangements to settle and stabilize these areas of immediate controversy, and seek a total survey of our relationships with the Soviet Union in pursuit of an over-all agreement under which these rival ideologies shall "live and let live."

I profoundly believe, Mr. President, that the passage of the bill would be in the interest of peace with justice for us and for freemen in a free world, and would afford a better chance of reaching that consummation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I allot 25 minutes to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, an adequate discussion of the pending bill providing for military aid to Greece and Turkey makes it necessary to define its scope, purpose, and methods.

The President established its scope in his message to Congress on March 12 when he said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

The President recognized that the $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey was only the first installment on this global venture by adding:

> If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress.

BYPASS U. N.—ACTING ALONE

We intend to bypass the United Nations and undertake this venture singlehandedly. We will be without an ally, if our acts provoke war, and without a partner to share the cost, which, in time, will be huge and, I believe, overwhelming.

Are the American people, acting alone, ready to "support"—so called—"free peoples"—everywhere—"who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures"? Since the Greek-Turkish bill is offered in this context, that is what its passage will mean to the world, unless some reservation is made in the text. Any effort to do this would be strongly opposed by the proponents of this bill.

Approval by Congress of this bill will be approval of this new world-wide policy as American doctrine. I shall cast my vote in this light.

Nobody knows the cost of such a program or whether we are capable of carrying it. Its proponents have not estimated the cost, or even discussed our ability to pay. There has been no discussion on this floor of whether we are able to pay the cost of the program we are about to undertake. Under such a policy we, alone, will determine who is aggrieved, who is pressured, and thereby—as long as the money lasts—who is to become a member of our own world power bloc.

By this same token, it also must be expected that the recipients of our bounty will become bitter converts to some other bloc if our pipe line of money to them should run dry. One makes enemies of those to whom he gives money for a while and then withdraws it. We are not only taking over the burdens of the British Empire but are extending its commitments. Great Britain has been financially crippled by doing the things we now propose to do on a larger scale.

REAL STRENGTH OF AMERICA

If and when this America-alone plan should falter, because the financial burden is too heavy, there will be none to whom we can throw the torch of democracy and freedom. We ourselves may, by then, have dissipated the sources of our strength necessary to our own defense against outside pressures and aggressors. If we then fail, no one remains to take over from us.

Let us never forget that the real strength of America is our strength at home—our fiscal solvency, our productive capacity under the free-enterprise system, and our ability to finance our obligations without crushing taxation. Upon our financial security depends our capacity to protect our defense if another war should come. Can we afford to jeopardize that security by immense and continuing foreign expenditures? That question has not been answered either by the President or any proponent of this bill. In fact, as I have said, it has not even been discussed, although it is a most serious objection to this world-wide assistance to other nations. As one of America's leading businessmen recently expressed it:

> One of the greatest responsibilities of our world leadership is that we maintain financial stability in this country.

On less than 3 weeks' notice we were asked to adopt a new foreign policy which establishes as American doctrine military and economic intervention by the United States in any and all places on the globe where so-called free peoples are threatened by aggressors or outside pressures. Every effort has been made to emphasize that the emergency was acute and that Congress must act in haste. England has been in Greece for 100 years, yet we were asked to take over the British failure in Greece, make our decision and, in effect, establish a new foreign policy within 20 days.

Every effort has been made to cloak the passage of this legislation with an atmosphere of a great impending crisis, but in Greece it was never alleged that more than 9,000 Communist bandits threatened the Greek Government of more than 7,000,000 people. I dare say the 7,000,000 Greeks could hold out against these 9,000 bandits long enough for the people of the United States to get the facts and to give proper consideration to legislation which is certain to open a new, costly, long-range policy with war implications, and later embrace areas of the world far beyond the borders of Greece and Turkey. It certainly may include China, Korea, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Spain, France, Italy, Palestine, and there are other nations which could qualify.

In Turkey it has never been alleged that any danger from foreign invasion was imminent, but that Russia was conducting a war of nerves against Turkey. That, however, is no new reason for precipitate action. In the end, this haste and lack of complete candor may defeat

its own purpose, for here in America, under our democratic processes of government, a foreign policy is only as strong as an enlightened and supporting public opinion. A policy approved without due consideration by Congress under the stress of emotion and high-powered propaganda may become very distasteful when the financial impact of these new foreign burdens is reflected in increased taxation on an already overburdened people.

Certainly this great global venture should not be undertaken without some plans or programs in order to achieve the objectives outlined in the President's message.

I cannot escape the conclusion, Mr. President, that the effort to dramatize this as an imminent crisis has been overemphasized and exaggerated. And I say further that the Congress and the people have not been told all the facts as to the extension of aid to other countries, so that a true picture of its cost and extent can be appraised.

The news comes from Korea through Dr. Syngam Rhee, a Korean leader, that President Truman has promised a loan of $600,000,000 to Korea. If such a pledge has been made by the President, Congress should be told of it. If Dr. Rhee has made an inaccurate statement, it should be corrected. What other commitments have been made? The Congress has the right to know what the plans are before we vote on the pending legislation. Surely a bill of particulars can be furnished to give some general idea of the commitments we may be asked to undertake. In dealing with a matter of such vital consequence, frankness with the American people is the only course to a continued support of a long range foreign policy, the cost of which is certain to grow rapidly through the years.

Many in Congress, and millions of American citizens, are thinking of this issue in terms of aid to Greece and Turkey alone, and limited to $400,000,000. The President, inadvertently I believe, gave this impression when in his speech he said: "The assistance I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of the cost of World War II." "It is only common sense," he said, "that we should safeguard this investment and make sure it was not in vain." If this were both the beginning and end of the program, it would be another story. In fact, however, the Greek-Turkish gifts are only the beginning—a tiny rivulet in the mighty stream of American dollars that will flow to foreign countries to make effective this new policy.

In our first installment to Greece we are appropriating $40 per capita to be spent in a 15-month period. I predict that within 12 months, or sooner, another appropriation will be asked for Greece and Turkey and for the other nations that will be subsequently included, and such appropriations will become regular items in our Federal appropriation bill for many years to come. Add up the population of the various countries that could come under this global policy, then multiply the number by $40 per capita annually, and we may form some rough idea of the cost which may be involved in this undertaking.

I do not say that this expansion will come overnight, but I do say with all confidence that our foreign commitments and expenditures will grow and grow under this policy, because it is certain that once we begin giving aid to a country we will not dare to withdraw, for then we will admit failure and encourage our enemies.

I say again, because it cannot be repeated too often that an American internal collapse would be the best weapon for the advocates of expansion of world communism. The financial strength of America is the chief bulwark in the world today against autocracy and totalitarianism. Weaken the financial security of America at home, and you have made the whole world defenseless to the assaults of communism.

The New York Times, on April 5, published a dispatch from its responsible and very accurate correspondent, Raymond Daniell in Athens, indicating that the conditions in Greece will make the sum now proposed a very small payment on the amount finally required. Mr. Daniell reports that Greece has a budgetary deficit of at least $175,000,000 for this year, and that the imports for Greece in 1 year will be $316,000,000 as compared to $8,000,000 in exports. He stated that:

> Greece is probably one of the few countries where there is no budgetary control over the ministers, who are relatively free to raise wages in their departments or spend more than is allocated to them. The British, who have been acting in an advisory capacity, say they have failed utterly to control the use of more than £80,000,000 they have put into Greece.

More than $800,000,000 has been spent in Greece by the United States and Great Britain combined since the end of hostilities, with the result that Greece is in more desperate condition today than she was before the expenditure began. To rehabilitate Greece economically and militarily will be a long and costly undertaking.

The $150,000,000 designated for military aid in Turkey cannot be expected to go far toward effectuating in that country "that modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity," which the President proposed. This means that United States money will be used to modernize the defense of Turkey so that country can preserve its national integrity from aggression by Russia. A mere $150,000,000 will be hardly a dewdrop toward the attainment of that goal.

No investigation or survey has been made to determine how much we can increase our expenditures and still survive as a free Nation under the system of private enterprise. Let us be warned by the example of Great Britain, whose Ambassador, Lord Inverchapel, speaking recently in Richmond, said:

> I am prepared to concede that we (the British Empire) may have overdone our expenditure abroad. In fact, we have. That is why we have come here to ask your Government to take over our financial responsibilities in Greece and Turkey.

There are those who appear to believe that America is immune to financial difficulties; that our wealth and resources are so great that we can continue to spend and spend and borrow and borrow and still remain solvent. There is a bottom to every pocket. There are those who believe the American dollar is all-powerful; that all we have to do is to send our money abroad and everything will be fine and dandy. To those who think that American dollars are a panacea for all ills it is well to ponder the words of Winston Churchill, uttered just a day or so ago, that the Socialist British Government "is living upon the American dole and squandering with profligate rapidity" the loan from the United States. Despite all the extraordinary aid that the Government is receiving, conditions in Britain "are in almost every respect worse than they were even in some of the wartime years, and incomparably worse than before the war," Mr. Churchill said.

It is well worth considering that the per capita debt in Great Britain is only a little more than the per capita debt in America. In England, it is $2,152 and ours, including the debts of the States and localities, is over $2,000 per capita, nearly as great as Britain's—and it may soon be greater, as the British are reducing their obligations, while we are increasing ours.

Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who has performed such notable service to the American people, said some time ago: "Before we decide domestic and foreign problems confronting us, we must get an over-all picture of the balance sheet of the country—a kind of inventory that would show the facts." This inventory should show how much we can increase our public debt without the danger of insolvency; how much we can collect in taxes without destroying the profit motive; the extent of our national resources; what will happen when our present inflated tax revenue declines. These and many other questions are pertinent to such an inquiry, and Congress and the people should have the facts.

If Mr. Baruch were appointed by the President to conduct such a survey of America's assets and obligations, it would do much to clear the minds of millions of Americans who are asking themselves the question: Where are we going and can we pay our way?

We do know that we have a Federal debt of $258,000,000,000, and a State, county, and city debt of fifteen billion, making a total of two hundred and seventy-three billion. This compares to a debt of one billion before World War I and about forty billion before World War II. We are not in a position to make new experiments in world-wide spending. Who can say that communism can be wiped out with American dollars?

We do know that World War II consumed vast amounts of our natural resources, especially copper, oil, iron ore, and timber. We do know—and I regard

this as one of the most serious objections to this new adventure—that here at home there is not the slightest spirit of sacrifice to deny ourselves luxuries to finance this burden of cost for our foreign operations. I can see no such spirit. The President says his budget of $37,500,000,000 should be approved without the reduction of $1, although in the year before the war the Federal Government expended $9,000,000,000. If we undertake these new expenditures abroad, it is very obvious that our Government expenses at home should be cut to the very bone.

Those who labor are asking higher wages and shorter hours. The taxpayers are asking reduced taxes and greater services. Not one single official of the Government, or advocate of this legislation in Congress, has indicated to the American people the sacrifices at home which will be necessary to carry these new burdens abroad. England made such sacrifices. She went so far as to reduce the living standards of her people and effected every possible economy, and, notwithstanding these hardships and efforts, she stands today before the world acknowledging her present weakened financial condition.

Between July 1, 1945, and the present, the United States Government has embarked on foreign assistance programs totaling nearly $16,000,000,000, exclusive of all military costs, and largely exclusive of aid to Latin America and the Orient; yet we are told that we have done nothing in Europe to correct the conditions which exist there. While this figure represents the value of gifts, grants, loans, credits, goods, and so forth, it is my opinion that a very small percentage of the total will ever be repaid. These expenditures and commitments are summarized as follows:

Direct assistance to civilians from military-civilian supplies	$842,000,000
Government relief in occupied areas	1,450,000,000
British loan	3,750,000,000
Export-Import Bank loans	2,011,700,000
Surplus-property transfers	1,030,000,000
Lend-lease aid (postwar)	$1,848,000,000
Maritime ship transfers	107,000,000
Philippine aid	695,000,000
Post-UNRRA relief	350,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid (pending)	400,000,000
Assistance through international organizations—UNRRA (United States share)	2,617,000,000
International Bank (United States share)	635,000,000
International Refugee Organization (pending)	75,000,000
Total	15,970,000,000

Of this amount, $1,525,000,000 went to Russia and her satellite nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing United States postwar foreign assistance programs for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, authorized or pending before Congress.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States postwar foreign assistance program for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, authorized or pending before Congress

(In millions of dollars)

NOTE.—This table covers foreign aid furnished or to be furnished under existing authority plus additional aid for which authorizations are now pending before the Congress. Estimates of aid to be furnished after fiscal year 1948 do not include aid which may be financed from 1949 and later appropriations, except where an authorization extending beyond 1948 contains a specific monetary limit. The table includes both programs involving budget expenditures and nonbudget items such as the transfer of accumulated stocks of goods. Aid is shown in terms of the date the country actually received it rather than the date it was finally recorded in the United States accounts. Therefore, figures for aid in the form of goods and services are on the basis of deliveries or transfer of title. Figures for loan programs, such as the British loan and those by the Export-Import Bank, and for cash grants, are based on cash disbursements.

The table excludes: (1) Items transferred to China and Latin America under military lend-lease programs; (2) payments by the U. S. Government for procurement of strategic and other materials abroad, including advances; (3) short-term credits such as the Export-Import Bank cotton credits; (4) postwar payments in goods or cash for supplies, services, and currencies furnished by foreign countries to the United States as a phase of military operations during and after the war, such as payment for currencies acquired for pay of troops; (5) postwar payments for supplies and services furnished to foreign countries during the war, such as bills for foreign war relief furnished through the Red Cross and for wartime lend-lease; and (6) aid for currency stabilization, including a 1946 advance to China and the United States subscription to the International Monetary Fund.

Because reporting of expenditures usually lags considerably behind deliveries or transfers of goods and services, the amounts shown in this table are not the same as those shown in the President's budget or in fiscal reports for the same periods.

Category of assistance	Total	Assistance already given, July 1, 1945, to Feb. 28, 1947			Projected further assistance				Sources of funds for further assistance			
		Fiscal year 1946	July 1, 1946, to Feb. 28, 1947	Total	Estimated, Mar. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947	Estimated, fiscal year 1948	Estimate after 1948	Estimated total	Available, Mar. 1, 1947		To be made available	
									Committed	Uncommitted	Amount	Method
Direct assistance:												
Military civilian supply [1]	842	741	51	792	30	20	----------	50	50	----------	----------	
Government and relief, occupied areas. [2]	+1,450	----------	330	330	226	645	+249	+1,120	95	----------	300 725	1947 deficiency appropriation. 1948 appropriation.
British loan [3]	3,750	----------	900	900	600	1,200	1,050	2,850	2,850	----------	----------	
Export-Import Bank loans [4]	2,011.7	469.6	598	1,067.6	313.5	530.6	100	944.1	944.1	----------	----------	
Surplus property transfers [5]	1,030	192	631	823	107	100	----------	207	207	----------	----------	
Lend-lease aid [6]	1,848	1,626	197	1,823	----------	----------	----------	73	73	----------	----------	
Maritime Commission ship transfers [7]	107	----------	34	34	(?)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Philippine aid [8]	695	----------	32	32	127	196	340	663	345	----------	462	Appropriation.
Post-UNRRA relief [9]	350	----------	----------	----------	100	250	----------	350	----------	----------	350	Do.
Greek-Turkish aid [10]	400	----------	----------	----------	100	300	----------	400	----------	----------	400	Do.
Assistance through international organizations:												
UNRRA [11]	2,617	1,184	881	2,065	552	----------	----------	552	----------	----------	----------	
International Bank [12]	635	159	317	476	159	----------	----------	159	159	----------	----------	
International Refugee Organization. [13]	75	----------	----------	----------	----------	75	----------	75	----------	----------	75	Do.

[1] Best available estimate of that portion of United States supply program for liberated and occupied areas which was included in general military activity appropriations rather than as a separate appropriation.

[2] Financed from specific appropriation for occupied areas. Expenditures are a charge against each area's economy. Does not include appropriations beyond fiscal year 1948.

[3] Total loan available for withdrawal until Jan. 1, 1952. Repayment to be made in annual installments thereafter.

[4] Does not include commercial-type and ordinary developmental loans nor $500,000,000 earmarked for possible future credit to China. Incorporation of Bank under Federal charter by June 30, 1948, is assumed. Repayment period in loans varies up to 30 years.

[5] Figures are for actual or estimated sale value rather than original cost. The difference represents a cost of the war. The total excludes property delivered in settlement of debts owed to foreign governments or in exchange for real property or similar benefits. The figures are based on credit agreements made through Feb. 28; the amounts of future credit agreements cannot at present be accurately predicted.

[6] Includes post VJ-day nonmilitary shipments plus VJ-day foreign-held inventories of civilian-type articles, less cash received; excludes unshipped portion of lend-lease supplies to Russia and Russian VJ-day inventory, for which no settlement exists; repayment terms vary with country settlement and include dollar credits, local currency, real estate, and other benefits.

[7] Based on credit agreements reached and transfers made through Dec. 31, 1946. Extent of future credits and rate of use of remaining $73,000,000 of existing credits is uncertain.

[8] Amount to be made available includes $144,000,000 in recommended appropriation for 1948 and $318,000,000 which may be included in 1949 and later appropriations under existing authorization. Includes: Philippine Rehabilitation appropriation; Philippine War Damage Commission; RFC loan; and free transfer of surplus property.

[9] Proposed, pending congressional action.

[10] Proposed, pending congressional action. Includes an indeterminate amount of military aid.

[11] Completes United States contribution to UNRRA.

[12] Completes basic United States cash subscription to the Bank. Further payments on our subscription will occur only if calls are made to members to make good any defaults by borrowers.

[13] Proposed, pending congressional action.

Assistance given and to be given, as shown in this table, totals $15.8 billion. This amount is a measure of the value of United States postwar relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction aid to foreign countries, but it is not a measure of the ultimate cost to the United States, which will be considerably less than $15.8 billion. Repayment is scheduled in case of the British loan, Export-Import Bank loans, surplus property, lend-lease, and Maritime Commission credits, and the RFC loan to the Philippines. In addition, relief furnished to the occupied areas is a charge against each country's economy. The proposed legislation authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey provides for loans and credits, as well as grants. The United States contribution to the International Bank is in the nature of an investment. Only the UNRRA and post-UNRRA relief programs, the contribution to the International Refugee Organization, and a portion of the Philippine and Greek-Turkish aid program are grants. Because the extent to which repayment will be required for such programs as aid to occupied and war-devastated areas is still uncertain, it is impossible to estimate at this time what part of the $15.8 billion will be a final net cost to the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing a break-down of United States postwar foreign-assistance programs for all countries as of March 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States postwar foreign assistance program for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, authorized for U. S. S. R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria

[The data in this table constitute a break-down, in millions of dollars, for the above countries of data furnished on Mar. 31, 1947, for all countries, and should be read in terms of the explanatory material on that table]

Category of assistance	Total	Assistance already given, July 1, 1945, to Feb. 28, 1947			Projected further assistance				Sources of funds for further assistance			
		Fiscal year 1946	July 1, 1946, to Feb. 28, 1947	Total	Estimated, Mar. 1 to June 30, 1947	Estimated, fiscal year 1948	Estimate after 1948	Estimated total	Available, Mar. 1, 1947		To be made available	
									Committed	Uncommitted	Amount	Method
U. S. S. R.:												
Export-Import Bank												
Surplus property transfers												
Lend-lease aid [1]	231.5	197.2	34.3	231.5								
UNRRA [2]	203.1			173.3	29.8			29.8	29.8			
Total	434.6			404.8	29.8			29.8	29.8			
Poland:												
Export-Import Bank	40.0		6.4	6.4	1.6	32.0		33.6	33.6			
Surplus property transfers [3]	40.0	1.6	30.8	32.4	1.0	6.6		7.6	7.6			
Lend-lease aid	.09	.06	.03	.09								
UNRRA [2]	383.5			336.2	47.3			47.3	47.3			
Total	463.59			375.09	49.9	38.6		88.5	88.5			
Czechoslovakia:												
Export-Import Bank [4]												
Surplus property [5]	8.4	3.7	4.7	8.4								
Lend-lease aid	.18	.06	.12	.18								
UNRRA [2]	193.7			180.6	13.1			13.1	13.1			
Total	202.28			189.18	13.1			13.1	13.1			
Finland:												
Export-Import Bank [6]	65.0	10.6	32.2	42.8	10.2	12.0		22.2	22.2			
Surplus property transfers	25.0	7.2	7.7	14.9	2.0	8.1		10.1	10.1			
Lend-lease aid												
UNRRA [2]	2.1			2.0	.1			.1	.1			
Total	92.1			59.7	12.3	20.1		32.4	32.4			
Hungary:												
Export-Import Bank [7]												
Surplus property transfers	15.0	3.4	7.7	11.1	2.0	1.9		3.9	3.9			
Lend-lease aid												
UNRRA [2]	3.6			2.6	1.0			1.0	1.0			
Total	18.6			13.7	3.0	1.9		4.9	4.9			
Rumania:												
Export-Import Bank												
Surplus property transfers												
Lend-lease aid												
UNRRA [2]												
Total												
Albania:												
Export-Import Bank												
Surplus property transfers												
Lend-lease aid												
UNRRA [2]	17.6			13.4	4.2			4.2	4.2			
Total	17.6			13.4	4.2			4.2	4.2			
Yugoslavia:												
Export-Import Bank												
Surplus property transfers												
Lend-lease aid	.04	.03	.005	.04								
UNRRA [2]	296.8			274.6	22.2			22.2	22.2			
Total	296.84			274.64	22.2			22.2	22.2			
Bulgaria:												
Export-Import Bank												
Surplus property transfers												
Lend-lease aid												
UNRRA [2]												
Total												
Grand total	1,525.61			1,330.51	134.5	60.6		195.1	195.1			
Recapitulation by program:												
Export-Import Bank	105.	10.6	38.6	49.2	11.8	44.0		55.8	55.8			
Surplus property transfers	88.4	15.9	50.9	66.8	5.0	16.6		21.6	21.6			
Lend-lease aid	231.81	197.35	34.455	231.81								
UNRRA [2]	1,100.4			982.7	117.7			117.7	117.7			

[1] Excludes unshipped portion of lend-lease shipped to Russia and Russian VJ-day inventories for which no settlement exists.

[2] For UNRRA figures, data for "Assistance already given" is through Jan. 31, 1947, instead of Feb. 28. Estimate for the remainder of fiscal 1947 is from Feb. 1 rather than from Mar. 1. Break-down between fiscal 1946 and first 7 months of fiscal 1947 is not available.

[3] The remaining credit of $10 million available after fiscal year 1948 is not expected to be used because of a low priority and difficulties of collection and delivery.

[4] Excludes short-term, commercial-type loans of $24 million authorized for export of cotton ($22 million) and for tobacco ($2 million).

[5] Remaining credit of $41.6 million is not expected to be used; new sales have been suspended since September 1946.

[6] Excludes short-term, commercial-type loans of $14.5 million authorized for export of cotton ($7 million), for private American exporters ($5 million), and for private Finnish traders ($2.5 million).

[7] Excludes short-term, commercial-type loans of $7 million authorized for export of cotton.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if spending American money is the answer, then we cannot be accused of a do-nothing policy in the foreign field.

BYPASSING THE UNITED NATIONS

Millions of Americans are asking themselves: Will unilateral military intervention by the United States in Greece and Turkey result in bypassing the United Nations and repudiate the covenant we as a signatory nation solemnly promised to obey and respect? It cannot be denied that the pending bill does provide for the undertaking of unilateral action, without either approval of or consultation with the United Nations. This is the purpose, and this will be the result.

In the hearts and minds of a war-weary people everywhere, the United Nations has become the symbol for world peace—a movement in which 55 nations have joined for the holy purpose of keeping the peace of the world through collective measures. Collective action, in fact, is the very foundation stone upon which the United Nations is builded, just as the Constitution of the United States is the foundation of our representative democracy. To emphasize this point, I hope I may be pardoned for quoting from the magnificent speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in reporting to the Senate on the United Nations Conference in San Francisco on June 29, 1945, page 6982 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Michigan said:

> Here, Mr. President, are 50 sovereign nations each one of which is under the most solemn pledge that can be made under God among the peoples of the earth—under pledge to do what? Listen:

The Senator then quoted the first section of the first chapter of the charter of the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> To maintain international peace and security; and to that end: to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international disputes or situations which may lead to a breach of the peace.

In the same speech the Senator from Michigan said further:

> It is my conviction that the great hope is here held out to humankind stems largely from the solemn formula which the San Francisco charter creates for the pacific settlement of disputes before they ever reach a fighting state.

Again, on July 23, 1945, at page 7956 of the RECORD, the Senator from Michigan said:

> My faith is in the council table. There was no force at San Francisco, yet there was unanimous agreement at the council table. This is the primary and paramount endowment of this United Nations Organization. In my view, Mr. President, that is the hope of the world.

I emphatically, categorically, and utterly agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan that every one of the signatory nations to the United Nations "is under the most solemn pledge that can be made under God to maintain international peace and security" by collective measures, as set forth in the language of the Charter of the United Nations.

I quote from another speech made by the able Senator from Michigan, before the Variety Club in Detroit on February 5, 1945, delivered after Dumbarton Oaks and before San Francisco. In this address, had he been gifted with a prophetic vision, he could not have described more completely the situation confronting us today. After quoting the late President Roosevelt as saying that—

> The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we become inevitably conscious of differences among the victors.

The Senator from Michigan went on to say:

> How do these dangerous differences disclose themselves? Usually by unilateral decisions in which one or another among the United Nations makes its own announcement, pronounces its own interpretation upon its own rights regardless of the fact that these rights, for all of us, flow from our common effort. I assert that all vital decisions should also flow from the same sort of common effort.

Is not this a vital decision which should "flow from the same sort of human effort"? Indeed in all of its implications and future commitments, it is a decision so vital as to well determine the future destiny of the world.

In the same speech the Senator from Michigan summarized his three dedications to peace, which he said were:

> First, the inexpressibly vital need to prevent World War III through collective security.
>
> Second, the paramount importance of a just peace if it is to be a permanent peace.
>
> Third, the hazard to these objectives if each of the United Nations starts going its own way even before we have clinched total victory.

What are we doing except going our own way?

I have quoted the Senator from Michigan at some length, because in this year 1947 I agree completely with all he said in 1945. I have shown this faith by supporting, until now, the lead taken by him and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in all matters relating to the establishment of the United Nations for the purpose of preventing war by collective action.

The Senator from Michigan is so right in speaking of the hazards to peace "if each of the United Nations starts going its own way" that his warning strengthens my conviction of the wisdom of my vote in opposing the pending bill.

The United Nations was not consulted either before or after the President proposed this action to the Congress. The matter was not discussed at the council table. Sixteen days after the President's address to Congress, our representative merely gave notification of a course the President had already decided upon and had already asked the Congress to approve. It is little wonder that this action called for the following warning from Secretary General Lie, the official head of the United Nations, who said:

> A willingness among nations to give and take and to make sacrifices, an insistent seeking after agreement, a determination to find a meeting of the minds, a readiness to resort to the United Nations even when the most vital national interests are at stake—always on behalf of the solemn principles and purposes of the United Nations—this is the bedrock on which alone the United Nations can build solidly and securely for the future.

The preamble to this proposed legislation which attempts to justify our bypassing of the United Nations is merely window dressing, a lot of pious words without effect or legal validity.

Let me discuss now the Vandenberg amendment from the standpoint of whether it conforms to the Charter provisions of the United Nations, "to take collective measures to remove causes of war."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. This much-discussed amendment does not in any way answer the challenge that we are taking unilateral action, as unilateral action means affirmative, direct, and independent action, while the Vandenberg amendment is negative, providing a veto procedure for withdrawal after the action is taken. It will take practically a two-thirds majority of the Security Council to ask the United States to withdraw after our operations in Greece and Turkey have actually been undertaken. Then the General Assembly of Nations can also ask our withdrawal, but this can only be done by a two-thirds vote, or 37 out of 55 nations so voting.

It is inherent and basic, as I have said, in the Charter of the United Nations, that affirmative, collective action was the principle upon which the world relies in the hope of preserving future peace. Such a back door and negative procedure as now proposed was not envisaged by the framers of the United Nations.

Is the United States willing to take the position that any and all members of the United Nations can undertake military interventions subject to a subsequent veto of two-thirds of the member nations? If so, in the name of candor and consistency, let us agree to an amendment to the United Nations Charter providing for such a procedure. A test of the sincerity of the United States would be to support an amendment somewhat as follows:

> Upon receipt of a request, any member nation can give military equipment, material, or money to finance the purchase of such, and send military personnel to train the military forces of any requesting nation, providing such intervening nation agrees to withdraw if requested to do so by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Such a provision in the Charter of the United Nations, of course, would make it a farce and turn the clock of peace back to the time and conditions which sowed the seeds of World Wars I

and II. We ourselves cannot take unilateral military action without setting an example which would invite other member nations to do the same. The veto-provocative action already taken by a member nation is vastly different from affirmative action, whereby the United Nations not only would approve of the proposed military intervention in Greece and Turkey, but would actually be a party to it, and this, I submit again, is the concept of collective action adopted as the underlying principle of the United Nations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his able speech opening this debate, said that the United Nations is not a relief organization, and the answer to that, of course, is that this is not a relief bill. It is a bill which provides for military intervention—for arming the Greek and Turkish Armies and training these armies with American military personnel.

If our unilateral action in arming other nations is provocative of war, upon what ally can we depend? If we act independently and arm nations to oppose communism, can we assume that Russia will not follow our lead and establish a counterpolicy? In that event, who will stand by us? Have we the assurance of a single ally? We have not. We have undertaken this course alone, and we must take the consequences alone.

In my speech in the Senate on April 1, I stated my views with respect to the future of the United Nations. I shall not elaborate on my statements made then except to say that the question of arming Greece and Turkey and all other like matters should come before the United Nations, in accordance with the direct mandate of its Charter. If the United Nations is not strong enough for the task, then let us take steps to make it strong. For myself, I will go the whole way in enabling America to perform her responsibility within the framework of the United Nations to preserve world peace.

SHOW-DOWN WITHIN U. N.

In that address to the Senate I proposed a show-down with Russia within the framework of the United Nations, and I repeat it now. We should not act single-handedly and alone. It is, of course, important to have Russia remain a member, but the time comes when patience ceases to be a virtue. If Russia continues to sabotage every effort toward world peace, then the only thing to do is to recognize the realities and to establish a group of nations who will cooperate effectively and act together. A Russia sabotaging the United Nations from within is even worse than a Russia outside of the United Nations.

I make the confident prediction that shortly the necessities of the situation will force a show-down with Russia within the United Nations. If this showdown has to come, it is better to do so now than later. I believe that all America wants to work cooperatively with Russia in the United Nations, but we must insist upon two parties to this. Russia has deliberately and arrogantly used the veto power in 11 instances to stymie the constructive actions of the United Nations. It is significant that most of these vetoes were directed against even the investigation of conditions which other nations believed to be desirable in the cause of peaceful relations.

VETO POWER

The veto power is now absolute. It would seem reasonable to me to amend it so that the veto power by any one of the Big Five would be subject to being overridden by a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly of 55 nations. Thus, the members of the so-called Big Five would have protection but not the absolute power to stymie essential action. This would provide a workable and fair procedure.

Let us say a word as to the statement that has so frequently been made in this debate: That it is either this bill or nothing; that a do-nothing policy will bring more dire results than to do something. If we are doing nothing in foreign affairs, then why has America in less than 2 years—since July 1945—spent and obligated herself to distribute money, credit, and goods in foreign countries, exclusive of military expenditures, aggregating the sum of $16,000,000,000, to which I have already referred? Out of this $16,000,000,000 the sum of $1,525,000,000 has been, or will be, given to Russia and her satellites. Again I ask, Can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right?

Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows:

Russia	$203,000,000
Poland	463,000,000
Czechoslovakia	202,000,000
Finland	92,000,000
Hungary	18,000,000
Yugoslavia	296,000,000

More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

In view of our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly $16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than we can be expected to do within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations. Right today the State Department is urging the Congress to approve $17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, yet, at the same time the State Department requested the Congress to approve $400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey. Such a contradictory foreign policy certainly requires clarification and adjustment.

In this connection, it is interesting to examine the details of the $11,729,000,000 that the United States has furnished to Russia as lend-lease aid since 1941. Of this total, nearly five and one-half billion was not for military assistance but for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities, including commercial vessels. This emphasizes the great amount of aid given to Russia by the United States, outside of military equipment, to strengthen the Russian form of government.

It is significant, also, to note that of the more than $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease to Russia, only $10,000,000 has so far been repaid, including what is known as reverse lend-lease. Under the terms and conditions of lend-lease, it is very doubtful that even a small part of the nonmilitary aid to Russia will be recovered. So this again indicates the extent to which this country has helped to establish communism in Russia, which it is now preparing to oppose. Surely now, in the light of our proposed actions, Congress should demand that all aid to Soviet Russia and her satellites be stopped immediately.

DEPTH OF CONVICTIONS

Before I take my seat, let me say that no Member of this body is more anxious than I for the United States, wholly and without reservation, to discharge its obligations in world affairs. In the past I have supported all measures to this end. This is the first time that I, as a Senator, have voted against a foreign policy proposed by the Executive. I do this now out of the depth of my convictions that the United States should not violate the Charter of the United Nations and start out alone on a venture impractical in its operations and fraught with the greatest dangers. I want to strengthen the United Nations—not destroy it.

I am firmly convinced that the only road to world peace is by the collective action of all peace-loving nations. If the definition of a peace-loving nation does not embrace Russia, then the sooner we know the better, for in that event it would be essential for us and other like-minded nations to take united measures necessary for our future security.

I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 8 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has spoken as forcefully as anyone has in the Senate on the basic reasons why this measure should not be passed. I hesitate to attempt to answer the Senator's arguments because of his great experience, his tremendous ability and his long service here. But, humbly and as a new Senator, it seems to me that there are answers to the arguments he has advanced, and that they are most potent and forceful ones. They have already been expressed on the floor of the Senate.

This program will cost us a great deal of money; it will constitute a tremendous drain upon the American economy; it will require much thoughtful attention and care; it will require speeding up our production and strengthening our economic life, and that will require sacrifice on the part of all of us.

When, Mr. President, shall we be better able to meet the threat which the bill is designed to meet than now? When shall we be stronger? When could the opportunity be more propitious than now?

I am reluctant to see American money spent for this purpose when I know it could be very usefully spent for the

benefit of our own people; but it seems to me that the choice is one which we have inevitably to make in favor of spending the money as is proposed in the bill, for our own security, for our own safety, and for the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the Congress, as well as the President of the United States, has a very definite part in the administration of this particular part of our foreign policy, and because of that fact I have proposed an amendment which would give to the President pro tempore of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives the right to appoint as representatives of the respective branches of the Congress members of the mission which will go to Greece and Turkey to administer the funds provided for in the bill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the adoption of such an amendment would not be a manifestation of lack of confidence in the President or a lack of confidence in the State Department. It would indicate, perhaps, a new turn in the administration of American foreign policy. Since the Congress is directly responsible to the people for raising the $400,000,000 provided for in the bill, it appears to me that the two Houses of Congress should have directly on such missions representatives of their own choice who could come back and report to the respective branches of the Congress concerning the administration and handling of this particular money for the purposes set forth in the bill. In that way we probably could obtain a more effective administration and a more economical administration of the funds, and certainly, Mr. President, the Congress would know more directly and more completely how the matter was being handled by our representatives in Greece and Turkey.

The other argument which has been advanced in opposition to this bill is the argument that it bypasses the United Nations. In my opinion, Mr. President, it is a very fortuitous circumstance that this question has been raised and that it has been met by an amendment which demonstrates as well as could possibly be demonstrated our sincere interest and our earnest intention to support the United Nations. The statement, Mr. President, that the United Nations is at this time incapable of assuming and unable to assume this obligation has not been successfully controverted.

It has been stated, and not disputed, that Greece and Turkey have asked us directly for help, and that we, in turn, must make some reply. That reply cannot be to deny their requests and refuse our help.

But in the amendment proposed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], we have set forth our good faith in unmistakable and completely understandable terms. In that amendment we say that if so requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, the President is directed to withdraw any or all of this aid. That leaves it in the hands of the people of Turkey or in the hands of the people of Greece to say if and when they want us to get out. What can be fairer than that?

Moreover, the amendment contains the provision that we will withdraw—

if the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

There is the expression of our will and our purpose to leave to a majority vote in either of those bodies in the United Nations the determination as to whether the aid which we now offer should be withdrawn. It seems to me that is the most forceful help and the most significant thing any nation has yet done, since the adoption of the United Nations Charter, to show its good will and to show its earnest intention to support the United Nations to the end that there may be peace in the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, many other Senators have received from their constituents, as I have, letters expressing doubt and anxiety as to certain phases of this bill. Among the letters which I have received is one expressing certain objections and doubts on the part of a Rhode Island lawyer. After receiving it I wrote to Dean Acheson, the Acting Secretary of State, sending him a copy of the letter, and asking for his comments thereon. Under date of April 18, he wrote me a letter which I should like to present to the Senate, because it clears up some of the doubts. I should like to read the entire letter, but time will not suffice for that, so I shall read only excerpts from the letter; and I now ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, together with the letter to which it is a reply, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GREEN. Dean Acheson wrote me as follows:

I have received your letter of April 9, 1947, enclosing a copy of a letter dated April 7 from Mr. I. H. Strasmich. It appears that Mr. Strasmich is disturbed by the proposal to extend American aid to Greece and Turkey, and that his concern in this regard arises over the following considerations.

Then he summarizes those considerations. Thereafter he wrote as follows:

First of all, I want to assure you emphatically that the proposed program of assistance to Greece and Turkey is in no way inspired by any concern for American oil interests nor any desire to obtain American military bases in Greece or Turkey. As I stated before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, our policy would have been exactly the same in this instance if there had not been a single drop of oil in the Near East. Our policy is based solely upon the desire to assist in the preservation of the independence of the two nations which have requested that assistance. In the testimony before the House and Senate committees and in other public statements, the Department of State has made it abundantly clear that we do not intend to send combat forces of any kind to either Greece or Turkey, and that, therefore, no question of the establishment of American bases in those countries can arise.

With respect to the possibility of utilizing the United Nations to provide assistance required by Greece and Turkey, I would refer you to my statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 24, reading in part as follows:

"The situation of Greece and Turkey confronts us with only two alternatives: We can either grant aid to those countries or we can deny that aid. There is no possibility of putting the responsibility for extending the aid which Greece has asked from the United States on some other nation or upon the United Nations.

"This becomes clear when we consider the specific problems that confront Greece today and the specific kinds of assistance that Greece has requested from the United Nations on the one hand, and from the United States on the other.

* * * * * *

"If Greece had applied to the United Nations or any of its related organizations, the essential element of time would have been lost and the end result would have been the same. The funds would have to come primarily from the United States. The United Nations does not of itself possess funds. The Economic and Social Council is an advisory body that recommends economic, financial, and social action to member states. The International Bank, which is just now completing its organization, is set up primarily to make self-liquidating loans for long-term reconstruction purposes. It has not yet made any loans whatsoever. The Economic Commission for Europe is still in its early organization stage.

* * * * * *

"In the longer range, the United Nations may be able to take over various parts of the economic and financial problem in Greece and Turkey. We are giving serious study and consideration to ways in which the United Nations may take hold of this problem after the present emergency is past."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I have one more minute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may have one more minute.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to read a further portion of the letter from Dean Acheson, as follows:

Finally, I wish to repeat what I have previously said in both the Senate and the House with regard to the extent of the proposed American commitment. The President, in his message to the Congress on March 12, made it very clear that our program of assistance at this time is limited to Greece and Turkey. Any other cases in which American assistance may be requested will be carefully considered on their individual merits, and it is not to be assumed that our Government would necessarily furnish the same kind of assistance to any other nation. If, however, a similar situation should arise elsewhere, the Congress will have full opportunity to consider whether financial aid should be extended in that case.

* * * * * *

On the contrary, I am convinced that it is an essential measure to protect our security and our way of life.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. President, I think it will be a satisfaction to some Members of the Senate who themselves have some doubts

about the pending proposal, similar to those which have been expressed by my correspondent, to find that the Acting Secretary of State has expressed himself so clearly in reply to those questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1947.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have received your letter of April 9, 1947, enclosing a copy of a letter dated April 7 from Mr. I. H. Strasmich. It appears that Mr. Strasmich is disturbed by the proposal to extend American aid to Greece and Turkey and that his concern in this regard arises over the following considerations:

1. He believes that the proposal is really just a mask for military objectives, namely, the preservation of American oil interests in the Near East and the utilization of Greece and Turkey as American military outposts.

2. He feels that if the motives of the United States had been strictly humanitarian, our objectives could have been obtained from the United Nations, since the veto does not exist in the General Assembly or the Economic and Security Council. He suggests that the United States could have provided the necessary funds for use by the United Nations.

3. Mr. Strasmich thinks the United States is "writing off the United Nations as an instrument for waging peace," and is therefore guilty of a breach of its agreement in signing the United Nations Charter.

4. He feels that the United States, in undertaking the projected assistance, would be forcing the Greek and Turkish people to submit to oppressive governments, and he asserts that we cannot form democracy by bolstering undemocratic governments.

Mr. Strasmich feels that the economic and military drains of the proposed program would force the United States into fascism.

I believe that most, if not all, of the considerations raised by Mr. Strasmich have already been dealt with in the testimony given before congressional committees and in the answers furnished by the Department of State to the series of questions formulated by Members of the Senate and published by the Committee on Foreign Relations. For your convenience, however, I am glad to restate the Department's views in this regard.

First of all I want to assure you emphatically that the proposed program of assistance to Greece and Turkey is in no way inspired by any concern for American oil interests nor any desire to obtain American military bases in Greece or Turkey. As I stated before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, our policy would have been exactly the same in this instance if there had not been a single drop of oil in the Near East. Our policy is based solely upon the desire to assist in the preservation of the independence of two nations which have requested that assistance. In the testimony before the House and Senate committees and in other public statements, the Department of State has made it abundantly clear that we do not intend to send combat forces of any kind to either Greece or Turkey and that, therefore, no question of the establishment of American bases in those countries can arise

With respect to the possibility of utilizing the United Nations to provide assistance required by Greece and Turkey, I would refer you to my statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 24, reading in part as follows:

"The situation of Greece and Turkey confronts us with only two alternatives: We can either grant aid to those countries or we can deny that aid. There is no possibility of putting the responsibility for extending the aid which Greece has asked from the United States on some other nation or upon the United Nations.

"This becomes clear when we consider the specific problems that confront Greece today and the specific kinds of assistance that Greece has requested from the United Nations on the one hand, and from the United States on the other.

"Let us consider first the problem arising from outside Greece's borders. Greece has charged before the Security Council that armed bands operating within her territory are partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, and that these bands are moving back and forth across the border. Greece has asked the United Nations for help in dealing with this situation, and the Security Council has appointed a commission which is at the present moment investigating the Greek charges on the spot. It is expected that this commission will begin writing its report early in April, and that report should be ready shortly thereafter.

"We do not know what the report will contain or the action that may be taken by the United Nations upon it. We hope and believe that United Nations action in this matter will result in the cessation of disturbances along Greece's northern borders. Such a result would be a most vital contribution to the situation in Greece and make possible the task of stabilization and rehabilitation. It would not be a substitute for the assistance which Greece has asked from the United States. More is needed to deal with internal disorder and economic break-down.

"The second problem confronting the Greek Government is the need for supplies and funds to enable it to cope with its internal difficulties, namely, the restoration of order in the country and the averting of economic collapse. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the British Government have been helping Greece with those particular problems, and the present crisis has arisen because those two supports must be withdrawn.

"To whom was Greece to turn? The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which recently sent a mission to Greece, recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the United States and the United Kingdom to extend aid to it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal until expanding exports, international development loans, and expanding production should enable Greece to balance its international accounts.

"If Greece had applied to the United Nations or any of its related organizations, the essential element of time would have been lost and the end result would have been the same The funds would have to come primarily from the United States. The United Nations does not of itself possess funds. The Economic and Social Council is an advisory body that recommends economic, financial, and social action to member states. The International Bank, which is just now completing its organization, is set up primarily to make self-liquidating loans for long-term reconstruction purposes. It has not yet made any loans whatsoever. The Economic Commission for Europe is still in its early organization stage.

"It may be that at some future time the United Nations will be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey. But, as the President said, the United Nations and its related organizations are not now in position to extend help of the kind that is required. Even if some organ of the United Nations should decide to recommend assistance to Greece and Turkey, it would have eventually to turn primarily to the United States for funds and supplies and technical assistance. Even if the project were not blocked by the objections of certain members of the United Nations, much time would have been lost, and time is of the essence.

* * * * *

"In the longer range, the United Nations may be able to take over various parts of the economic and financial problem in Greece and Turkey. We are giving serious study and consideration to ways in which the United Nations may take hold of this problem after the present emergency is past."

There is nothing in the letter or the spirit of the United Nations Charter which forbids one member of that organization from extending assistance to another. On the contrary, it is the firm belief of the Department of State that action of the kind we have proposed is completely in accord with the principles of the Charter and constitutes a positive contribution to the strengthening of the United Nations. The UN can be no stronger than its members, and their sovereign independence is an essential condition to the proper functioning of the organization.

It should also be pointed out that the United States has shown its full respect for the United Nations not only by the active role taken by this Government in the creation of the Investigating Commission on border difficulties in Greece but also by the provision of the pending Greek-Turkish aid bill, which offers the United Nations an opportunity to take over the task of assisting Greece and Turkey at any time it desires to do so and is in a position to provide the necessary assistance. I should like to say once more that this Government remains firmly devoted to the principles of the United Nations Charter and intends to continue its policy of full support for that organization.

In undertaking the projected program of aid, the United States does not propose to support any particular regime in either Greece or Turkey. Our assistance is designed to preserve the independence of those countries, to establish and maintain conditions which will relieve them of fear for their security and so permit their continued development on the road of democracy. It is essential to remember that both countries have already made great progress on that road but that this progress is gravely imperiled by alien influences which menace their whole way of life. If they are not relieved of this threat, all possibility of democracy will disappear in both countries. It is the firm conviction of the Department that the Greek and Turkish peoples are fully capable of working out their own destinies if they are given the opportunity, and that the proposed American assistance would provide them with this opportunity.

Finally, I wish to repeat what I have previously said in both the Senate and the House with regard to the extent of the proposed American commitment. The President, in his message to the Congress on March 12, made it very clear that our program of assistance at this time is limited to Greece and Turkey. Any other cases in which American assistance may be requested will be carefully considered on their individual merits, and it is not to be assumed that our Government would necessarily furnish the same kind of assistance to any other nation. If, however, a similar situation should arise elsewhere, the Congress will have full opportunity to consider whether financial aid should be extended in that

case, and it would of course take into account the extent of the drain of such aid upon American resources. I need hardly assure you that the executive branch of the Government would also take this question into account before formulating any proposals. Consequently, I do not believe there is the slightest reason to fear that the Greek-Turkish aid program would so strain the resources of the United States that our way of life or our form of government would be in danger. On the contrary, I am convinced that it is an essential measure to protect our security and our way of life.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

PAWTUCKET, R. I., *April 7, 1947.*

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Although you must ultimately make up your own mind about issues arising in Congress, I know that in times like these you are most anxious to have the considered views of such of your constituents as have thought matters through and are willing to take the time to write you. The following is written in a spirit of the utmost helpfulness and with a grave concern for the welfare of the United States.

I ask you to take the initiative to defeat the Truman doctrine and all proposals unilaterally to uphold the Governments of Greece and Turkey with our money, supplies, and men. I ask it in the name of the United States, for these compelling reasons:

Because the Truman proposal (including the Vandenberg amendment or other variations) as presented to the American people wears a disguise. What purports to be the extension of aid to suffering peoples in Greece and to a Turkish Government hampered by large military expenditures really masks United States military objectives, namely, oil concessions in the Near East and advance military bases. If the Government's professed humanitarian aims were sincere, it would have been a simple matter to accomplish them through the United Nations (the veto exists neither in the General Assembly nor in the Economic and Social Council, whose problem it is to handle such assistance). The President could have requested Congress to make available to the UN such resources as he now asks Congress to furnish unilaterally. That he chose not to invoke the UN strongly indicates his unwillingness to inform the American people of these facts:

1. Oil reserves in the United States are ample for peacetime use, but our military wishes to preserve such reserves for war by the device of using Near East oil now. The military feels our "life line" to the Near East oil is in danger.

2. As long as the British were in Greece, our military felt we had advance military bases in the Near East for use against the U.S.S.R. With the British withdrawal, our military is seeking to bolster up the present Greek and Turkish Governments to use those countries as United States outposts.

Because the Truman proposal is a shocking repudiation of the United Nations. Our signature to the UN Charter (Senate approved with but two dissenting votes) irrevocably committed us to the policy of collective security. Henceforth, the resort to war as a means of settling disputes between nations would be held in as much abhorrence as a resort to murder where individuals are disputing. The world forum provided by the UN, together with the economic and, if necessary, military sanctions which could be levied against an aggressor were considered realistic guardians of peace. The techniques of negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement (which are not taught at West Point) are the processes by which international disputes were to be settled, after the strong spotlight of world public opinion had been focused upon them. Referring to our real objectives in the Greco-Turkish situation and our Government's reluctance to apprise our own citizens of these matters, one can see why our Government prefers to disregard the UN. One can see that disregard has been deliberate, based upon an ill-considered and unworthy writing off of the UN as an effective instrument for waging peace. Our military still puts its trust only in our military forces and the atomic bomb, even though it was the UN which succeeded in making the USSR remove its troops from Iran. If the Truman doctrine and any proposal based thereon prevail, the United States will be guilty of a flagrant breach of its solemn agreement—a breach of good faith holding the probability of incalculable harm to this country and the civilized world—a breach as completely unforgivable as it is unnecessary. There are no differences between the United States and other nations which cannot be settled within the instrumentalities of the UN Charter, if we invoke the UN in good faith, honestly set forth our legitimate demands and beliefs, insist that peaceful settlements be arrived at, and fully support UN decisions. If we scuttle the UN by our unilateral action, there is nothing that can prevent a world divided into armed camps and a civilization-destroying war.

Because the Truman proposal reeks with the taint of failure. Short of annihiliation there is no permanent way to force peoples to submit to tyranny. King George made us suffer at Valley Forge, but the United States stands today as a monument to his ultimate defeat. The people of Greece, no less than the people of China, have their sufferings aggravated by a graft-ridden, corrupt, reactionary government—for conservative indictments of the present Greek Government I refer you to the April 5 edition of the Saturday Evening Post, for Ernest O. Hauser's "Something Rotten in Greece," and the magazine section of the April 6 New York Times. No fair person would even suggest that Turkey is anything but a dictatorship. We cannot promote democracy by bolstering up undemocratic governments; we cannot stop communism by supporting fascism. Surely, that lesson ought now to be clear to all but the willfully blind. We can help democracy spread by insisting through the United Nations that peoples everywhere should have the benefit of the "four freedoms," by assisting downtrodden peoples everywhere with economic aid channeled through the UN, by supporting the liberal and progressive forces throughout the world which are fighting for political and economic democracy—like the New Deal—those forces which at the present time are being squeezed into either the reactionary or Communist camp because we have not supported them. In Spain and China, to name two outstanding examples, our policies encouraged reaction. We failed in both instances to bring about either political or economic democracy. If we back reaction in Greece and Turkey, we will be doing more to spread communism in the Near East than anything Stalin might invent. And we will be underwriting an unlimited unilateral program which will dissipate our resources, earn us the just hatred of all progressive forces, and cause us to become a totalitarian state ourselves, for the economic and military drains of this program must force us into fascism.

You will have my heartfelt thanks if you give the above your most serious and sympathetic attention.

Kindest personal regards.

In the utmost sincerity,

I. H. STRASMICH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 20 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield for that purpose, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the time for the calling of a quorum be taken out of the time allotted me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that the Senator from Colorado would have to consent to a quorum call, because the time required would have to be charged to both sides alike. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, the time remaining to him is not sufficient to permit of the calling of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, Mr. President, I do not yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the President of the United States came before a joint session of Congress recently he was not asking just for a loan to Greece and Turkey, not just for aid to people who were struggling to keep their independence, not just for enforcements in the effort to check the spread of an ideology which is contrary to all our beliefs—he was asking America to see clearly and assume the role in the world which destiny has chosen for her. He was asking America to take the necessary steps to protect her safety and security from aggressors everywhere.

Mr. President, when the first settlers cleared the forests and turned the soil of this land, so rich in all the good things of life, the first step was taken on that road which destiny pointed out. When the founders of this blessed system of free government wrote into the Constitution the principles by virtue of which this country was to develop, America was on an inevitable course. For more than a century and a half generations of Americans applied their genius and their brawn to the utilization of our immense natural resources, and in a way that could be possible only under our system of government this Nation accomplished spectacular development. I doubt that those past generations always knew where they were going; they simply forged ahead, making their country the wonder of the world in its power and its potentialities.

I do not believe that even a few years ago all of us realized how far we had come on that road, and the future which destiny was pointing out to us. It took World War II to make us feel our might in material things, and make us realize our responsibility in the defense and protection of spiritual values. I doubt that we fully sensed these things even as we grasped victory, after having concentrated every thought and every effort on bringing the awful conflict to a quick and successful end. But we are realizing these things now. America has become of age. We have passed beyond the adolescent period in world affairs.

Whether we like it or not, our victory in World War II has thrust upon us the mantle of world leadership, and it will require all of our ingenuity, our patriotism, and our industry to wear that mantle successfully. It may be, Mr. President, that this duty has confronted us before but because of our youth and our inexperience in dealing with the nations of the earth, we were not spiritually and politically equipped to discharge it. In our meteoric rise we could not see, and perhaps we did not try to see, that faraway place in the road when America would be out in front of the other members of the family of nations with the smaller and weaker members looking to her for help in the journey of life. But we have reached that place in the road on which destiny set us so long ago, and from here on we must chart our course with that responsibility for leadership, world leadership, if you please, always in mind.

That is what the President was telling all America when he spoke to us in a solemn joint session recently. It took courage for the Chief Executive to make the Nation face the facts. It is taking courage today for the Members of this body to enact into law this step America is taking in assuming her newly acquired leadership. It will take courage for every American to adjust his thinking and his living to fit his new role in a troubled world.

Mr. President, I think we are meeting the challenge in the way America could be expected to react. I am impressed with the courage and the vision of the President of the United States. I am proud of the high spirit of nonpartisan patriotism with which the Congress is dealing with this legislation. I am glad that there has been so little evidence of selfishness and prejudice as the people of this country face the situation.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is to be commended on the manner in which it handled the proposal before us. They held open meetings. Every United States Senator was free to come and voice his opinion, cross-examine the witnesses, and make his own record before the committee, if he so desired. In addition, the able presiding officer, who is chairman of that important committee, went out of his way to obtain from Members of the Senate questions touching on every conceivable phase of the proposed loan. I recall no time since I have been in the Senate when a committee of this body went so far in attempting to obtain all the facts relating to a proposal upon which fair and prudent minds could intelligently base final judgment.

The candid and forthright testimony of Dean Acheson and Will Clayton and other high officials of the State Department was enlightening and heartening. Nothing was suppressed by the committee. Nothing was suppressed by the State Department. Nothing was suppressed by any other branch of the executive. The facts and the implications of the program were laid on the table and discussed, and as a result the American people are thoroughly informed today on the entire program.

Mr. President, I repeat what I have said before in colloquy with other Senators in this debate. With all the facts before us, we can follow the President, the State Department, and the unanimous recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee, or we can do nothing, as suggested by some. We all know there is danger in either course. Every United States Senator must search his soul and call upon his best and most impartial judgment in choosing the course he feels it is best for his country to take.

I have done this, and I am convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that the less dangerous, and the wisest, of the two courses before us, is to follow the proposal of the President of the United States. I believe that this road will lead America and the world to freedom and peace. I fear that the other road, narrow in its short-sighted, political, and economic isolationism, threatened at every turn by the danger of the spread of communism, will surely lead us at some future time to World War III.

This, of course, is only one man's opinion, but I am confident it will be sustained today by a great majority of United States Senators. It is sustained by the leading businessmen of this Nation. It is sustained by the great majority of the press of the country in its editorial policy. It is sustained by columnists and radio commentators, all of whom both mold and reflect public opinion in America and the world. Yes, it is sustained, Mr. President, in my humble opinion, by the great majority of the American people.

Mr. President, I repeat, I am deeply grateful for the non-partisan spirit in which the Congress and the country have dealt with this extraordinary proposal. The able senior Senator from Michigan reminded us long ago that politics in our foreign policy should stop at the water's edge, and, sir, so long as I remain in this body, regardless of the political complexion of the Chief Executive, I shall use whatever power is at my command to keep active and inviolate that bi-partisan policy upon all international problems. When I say international problems, I mean just that. I am convinced that there are few great issues arising in foreign countries, in this atomic age, which would not be the concern of the executive branch of the Government, as well as that of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and all the Members of the Senate.

I am convinced that whether a problem is large or small, whether it arises in Cuba, China, Germany, Greece, or any other country, if it will have an effect on other nations in the world, the American people, through their Chief Executive, who is responsible for our foreign policy, and through their chosen representatives in this body, have a right to and should take cognizance of it. In so doing we keep a united front in America on our foreign policy. Mr. President, just so surely as the American people divide on important foreign questions as they did in the days previous to Pearl Harbor, sooner or later, as old Ben Franklin said, "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately." God forbid that we should ever suffer the same fate so many helpless, yet one time brave and heroic people, are suffering in European countries today. Let us look for a moment at the tragedy of Poland. Torn and divided for many years, first by one power and then another, Poland has during World War II been dealt almost fatal blows first by the Nazis and next by the Russians. But Poland's greatest catastrophe is the loss of her independence. Her people suffer more as a result of that loss than they have suffered from all the cruelties and hardships of bitter warfare.

Mr. President, in the hearts of all Americans is a profound prayer of thankfulness that we have not suffered the fate of stricken Poland, and we pray that we never shall. As we look out over the rest of this weary, tormented world, that prayer of gratitude swells to a paean; but as we compare our blessings with the destitution and the dejection, the enslavement and the hopelessness elsewhere, America cannot and will not turn away with only a feeling of self-satisfaction and self-indulgence. What I have in mind is that smug complacency, that organized selfishness which so frequently exists in mankind. Humanitarian reasons as well as our own security tell us we cannot turn away from human misery at this hour, Mr. President. We must face the fact that the deplorable conditions which exist today in almost every country of the world are the breeding places for the germs of communism. We must face the fact that out of that mire can come a poisonous growth which will some day spread its tendrils around the globe, entwining and choking free America. We must face the fact that America in its new role is the only nation which has the means, and the strength, and the invincible vitality which freedom gives to stop that insidious growth and prevent its spread. Mr. President, we can no more shut our eyes to these facts, and retreat from our position, and maintain our integrity, our honor, and our decency throughout the world and at home than we can accept communism as a philosophy which should govern the daily lives of our people.

We cannot, even though some should desire to, ever again retire into an economic and political shell, stick our heads in the sand like the ostrich, and ignore the other nations of the earth in whom the spark of freedom is kept alive only by the hope that some day through the leadership of this great country they too may rise again and call themselves free and independent people.

Mr. President, I like to think always of the sentiment expressed by Stephen Decatur in the toast he gave at Norfolk in 1816:

> Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

And when I see, Mr. President, men like our good President of the United States, men like the great George Marshall, Secretary of State, who is recognized by all as the greatest military genius in history, recommend this program; when I watch able men from the

Department of State come before the Senate committee, sir, to present facts, as they did, in such a capable and serious fashion; when I note that men like yourself, Mr. President, and Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, along with all other members of the committee, of which you are the chairman, presented to the Senate and to the country a unanimous report as to what should be done in connection with the Greek-Turkish loan, all this is of material aid in helping me to reach an honest conclusion as to what I should do.

Mr. President, America achieved a united front in the waging of a global war. How much more vital to ourselves and to the world that we maintain a united front in waging a battle for freedom and peace. I believe that America should give solid and enthusiastic backing to this program on which we are launching, not only in the interest of her own future, but for the preservation of the fundamentals which have made us what we are and which we so fervently desire to protect.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let the world understand that there is no imperialistic policy in this Greek-Turkish loan. We do not seek to conquer the world, as has been portrayed at home and abroad, I regret to say. Nothing could be so far from the truth. We ask for nothing. We covet nothing. In fact, we give and sacrifice in order that we may have safety, security, and peace on American soil.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that demonstrations of any kind are against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I allot 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, today the United States Senate is called upon to make a great decision, the effects of which will be fundamental in shaping the future peace and welfare of the world. It is a decision which each of us must make, not from cold statistics, not from personal likes and dislikes, not on the basis of political partisanship, but from the best foresight and judgment which each may have, keeping in our mind's eye the obligation we have to this and future generations.

From the day when the President presented his request for military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey until now I have pondered the possible consequences in the light of past and present international developments. I have listened to the debate here in the Senate and have read many pages of public expressions pro and con. I have reviewed in my mind events of the past few years. I have tried to look realistically at the world situation as it exists today. After weighing all factors at my command, I have concluded that I cannot support the proposed program and wish to state my reasons for that conclusion:

First. The United Nations organization should be given a chance to carry out its major purpose, namely, to prevent aggression of one nation against another. When I voted for our affiliation in the UN, I determined that it should be given every opportunity to function as it was intended. Only by such an attitude could it succeed. In the present instance an investigation by a UN commission has been made and a report is being prepared. I charge that the United States, by sending military assistance to either one of the parties involved before the UN report and recommendations are made, can be guilty in the eyes of the world of violating our allegiance to the principles of world peace through international cooperation, principles which we originally championed. If one of the nations is condemned by the UN, then our path is clear for action. But should we act without that sanction, we, not the primary aggressor, are subject to condemnation from all sides. To those who contend that the UN cannot work in carrying out the objectives for which it was established, I say give it a fair chance or forthrightly abandon our membership in it. I want it to work, I feel it can work, and I do not wish to be guilty of not giving it every opportunity to do so.

Insofar as loaning or giving money to assist starving and homeless peoples, I have no objection, but rather wholehearted support. Let us aid the destitute in Greece and Turkey, but when we enter the field of armed force, we liken ourselves to those whom we so recently condemned and defeated in the name of world peace.

Second. The United States cannot purchase the defeat of communism. I abhor communism, and I want no other conclusion drawn concerning my attitude. If we could defeat the spread of that philosophy by building strong Greek and Turkish armies and navies, there would be little doubt in my mind of the soundness of such a program. But with the finest equipped military possible, short of the atomic bomb, which I am sure we do not propose to turn over to them, how could Greece and Turkey defend themselves against a mass attack from Russia? If it is contended that it is premature to consider such a possibility, let me remind Senators that Greece and Turkey are not the only countries into which communism is moving. What are we going to do in Korea, Italy, China, France, and even England if communism begins to rear its horrid head in these countries, whether or not we are successful in our aims in Greece and Turkey? Even without a $258,000,000,000 debt and depleted national resources, our economy could not support such a program. And will we continue to garner the support of other nations whom we ignore when they call for help as did Greece and Turkey? Or will we suddenly find that our $400,000,000 has bought us two friends and a host of enemies? I believe a world-wide police program against communism by ourselves is economically impossible and will bring nothing but ill returns in the future.

Third. Our present State Department policy is inconsistent. Continued shipment of materials, supplies, and even a proposed loan to Russia are not consistent with a program to prevent a spread of communism. Two hundred and thirty-three million dollars in aid has gone to Russia since VJ-day. Twenty-five million dollars for oil refineries is requested. A billion-dollar loan is being held in abeyance. I cannot follow the lead of the State Department, the President, or anyone else who advances such a program. Should I be charged with weakening the President's hand, this type of diplomacy fully justifies my stand.

Fourth. Gloomy and depressing as the statement may be, communism here at home can suddenly become a greater problem than communism abroad. Continued strikes, lack of production, high taxes, shortage of housing, racial intolerance, and dependency of the people upon the tax collector for a living can destroy basic Americanism and our republican form of government. Scattering our wealth and general interest everywhere but at home, can assist in the spread of communism right here, while we nobly fight it elsewhere. To be of help to weaker nations, to be an inspiration for other nations to adopt our philosophy of free government, we must present a smooth working, well integrated, happy people for inspection. This we cannot do today. Our first task, therefore, is cut out for us, not in Greece and Turkey, not in Korea or Italy, but here in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 20 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have listened with increasing interest to the debates on the bill before us. As the hour grows near for a decision, I am deeply impressed with the fact that throughout the entire debate there has been expressed the sincerest regret that we should be compelled to make the decision which we are now about to make. There has run throughout the speeches and comments on the floor of this body an earnest criticism of the policies which have brought us to our present position.

Frequently in the corridors, in conferences, and on the floor of this Senate, the statement has been made that we are not free, that we do not have freedom of action, that there is not anything left for us to do but for us to pass the bill as requested. We have been told by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that we must face the facts, that we must say what we mean and mean what we say. I believe that has been the attitude of those who have spoken for and against this measure. In this brief statement I wish to speak in that same spirit of utter frankness.

The question that comes into my mind as I listen to or read these discussions has been this: Why are we not free to act? How did we lose the freedom of choice?

If we were to follow this query back through the history of World War II, we would inevitably come to the declaration of principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter. There sometime early in August 1941 the President of the United

States and the British Prime Minister adopted the principles, as follows:

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizment, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

* * * * *

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Commenting on that statement in a message to Congress on August 21, 1941, the then President of the United States declared:

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which east and west are waging war against dictatorships.

The portion of the sentence which I have just quoted is a recognition of the fact that we had joined the democracies in their war against dictatorships. Later on we implemented that declaration and the principles upon which the Lend-Lease Act was based by entering the shooting war.

I know it will be said that we fought only when we were attacked, but I believe that any fair-minded historian or student of history will admit that regardless of the attack on Pearl Harbor the United States would have joined the conflict. Our actions under the Lend-Lease Act and our conduct in other respects would have been designated in normal times under international law as acts of war, and all of this was prior to Pearl Habor.

I proceed now in my quest to the declaration of the United Nations adopted January 1, 1941, in which the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, among other nations, declared that they had subscribed—

To a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter.

From these statements it should be clear beyond all doubt that we committed the United States to a policy which recognized "the right of the people to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and "to a restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." And as a part of that commitment we were bound to see established "a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." Incidentally, it should be remembered that Russia joined in that commitment.

Our declaration of war affirmed these principles and these commitments. We had adopted a policy which committed us to the maintenance of high standards of human liberty, and our ideological war against the dictators became a shooting war on December 7, 1941. Without going into detail, let us trace the high spots of history which follow with reference to the maintenance or abandonment of these principles.

With no attempt to place the events chronologically, these things happened: In the Baltic states when Germany was driven out there was a semblance of a plebiscite to decide if these countries should become a part of the U. S. S. R. But there was no freedom of choice in the way we understand freedom. Russia absorbed those countries. We and Great Britain, who had announced the Charter, did little if anything to restrain our ally. On the contrary, by our failure to act, we acquiesced, we appeased, we retreated, from our stand on the Charter.

Later at Tehran and at Yalta we again appeased our ally Russia. Stripped of all verbiage, we acquiesced in her taking part of the territory of our ally Poland as her own without the consent of Poland. Thus we once more retreated from the stand we had taken in the Atlantic Charter.

At these same historic meetings, without the consent of China, Korea, or the people of Manchuria, we promised as a reward either a part of the territory of these countries or a zone of influence therein if Russia would join us in the war upon Japan. And when victory over Japan came, our ally quickly gathered to herself all the rewards, and more, that we had offered.

Again we appeased Russia, and in doing so retreated from our stand declared in the Charter. Technically speaking, these appeasements and these acts were the acts of the President without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States as required by the Constitution, but for all practical purposes the appeasements became consummated and our ally received the spoils we promised.

Other events during the war demonstrated that we were also appeasing Russia in other ways. We were urged by the Prime Minister of Great Britain to wage our campaign for the defeat of Germany through the Balkan states. Russia demanded otherwise. All the Communists and fellow travelers in our own country joined in the demand and we attacked the enemy from the west. Again we appeased Russia and by adopting her plan of campaign, we put that nation, as she had deliberately planned would happen, in control of all of the Balkan countries except Greece.

By adoption of her plan of campaign we also firmly established Russia in eastern Germany, Austria, and Hungary. At the demand of Russia we deserted our one-time allies in Yugoslavia, thus clearing the way for the execution of their leader in one of the great tragedies of the war.

In the heat of the war and moved by the hatreds engendered by the war, we turned a deaf ear to all entreaties for peace except for unconditional surrender of our foes. We thus discouraged the underground movement in Germany, which might, with our help, have overthrown the dictator Hitler and his cohorts. As a result, when the war ended and we had completely smashed our foes, we had no one to deal with, and have been forced with our allies to take over the government of Germany.

We now find ourselves in utter and complete disagreement on many fundamentals, not only on the future of Germany but on present occupational policies.

In preparation for the making of the peace and for its preservation, we planned the United Nations organization, which was to be made up of all of the peace-loving nations of the world. We adopted a charter, and that charter, among other things, declared that one of the principal duties of the organization was—

To maintain international peace and security, and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

With these lofty purposes, the UNO came into being. It had its first test in the dispute over the withdrawal of troops from Iran. It succeeded in that case in preventing an immediate breach of the peace.

When VE- and VJ-days came, we thought the war was over, but we have found as a matter of fact that while the shooting stopped, the war of ideologies goes on apace as it did before the days of the Atlantic Charter. Instead of dictatorships of Germany and Japan, we now have standing entrenched not only in central Asia but in Europe and the Far East a dictatorship which by its past history has been shown to be as ruthless and as despotic as those we destroyed in World War II.

We find that partly as a result of the errors and blunders we made in the field of diplomacy and strategy as the war progressed this dictatorship is now a menace to world peace and our own security. It has been said that what we are to do now in Greece and Turkey will

lead to war. I think it can be truthfully said that war is now being waged between the democratic concept of government and the dignity of man as exemplified by the democracies, and the concept of government and its attending philosophy as represented by a communistic dictatorship.

In our past history we have lived peaceably with absolute monarchies and dictatorships of various types and kinds, and possibly we could do so again if the one we now face were an ordinary monarchy or dictatorship. But the Politburo of Russia is no ordinary dictatorship. It is not content to keep its ideologies and philosophy of government at home, but it conceives its mission to be the promulgation of this philosophy and ideals of government throughout the world. It has mistakenly assumed that the capitalistic or private enterprise system is a direct challenge to its way of life and that one or the other must succumb.

The Politburo and its auxiliary organization, the Third International, implement this mission by subversive activities throughout all the nations of the world.

It is now a fact, which I think will not be denied, that the United States as the principal representative of the democracies clashes at every point of contact throughout the entire world with communism and its proponent, Russia. Great Britain has stood in the path of the expanding totalitarianism of Russia. Weakened by the war, with her treasury depleted, she has told us that she can no longer hold the bastion in Greece and Turkey.

The President has asked for authority to take her place and to make a loan to those countries so that they may maintain themselves as independent nations and repel the aggressions of their neighbor which are brought to bear either directly or indirectly. In such a situation the United Nations should act, but neither Great Britain nor the United States has asked it to act.

These nations take the view that because of the veto power of Russia the United Nations is powerless to do anything in this case. It is also said that the task to be accomplished is beyond the purpose of the organization and that it has no funds or machinery with which to prevent the aggression and save the peace. It is asserted that it needs more time to become organized, but is it not a fair conclusion that if the veto power now prevents it from taking over the present situation, the same veto power will prevent it from accomplishing its stated purposes even 10 years from now? The weakness is not in the youth of the organization but in its failure to agree on a convenant which would give it the power to stop aggression no matter from which source it came.

Mr. President, in my campaign last year for election as Senator from the State of Utah, I pledged my full support of the United Nations to give it every opportunity to succeed in its purposes. This I should like to do now. I favor strongly the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and his accompanying speech, in which he proposed in substance that this entire matter be referred to the United Nations; that the United States and Russia lay all of the facts before that body; that we have a show-down between Russia and the democracies; that in the event Russia will not agree to a policy which will prevent war, we oust her from the United Nations. But from the way the matter has developed here, I shall probably not have the opportunity to vote for that resolution.

I believe very strongly that the United Nations should have at first been given an opportunity to handle the Greek-Turkish situation. I believe we should have offered to loan to the United Nations money and personnel sufficient to have accomplished the same results that we now expect to accomplish through loans to the two nations by unilateral action.

That we bypassed the United Nations seems to be an accepted fact. To correct the error and to put it more mildly, the oversight, we attempt to recognize the United Nations by inviting it to step in at any time by a majority vote and have us stop action on our activities in Greece and Turkey. We are very ingenious about this—very much like we were when we called our gifts and our direct help to the Allies in World War II lend-lease.

We now propose, by coming in the back door of the UN, to recognize that organization. But we came in on our own terms—that is, we want the veto vetoed. It may make us feel better to say we now have placed the matter in the hands of the United Nations. We have now given the United Nations authority to have us stopped. It is like asking ourselves to stop ourselves. We are the backbone, the main support of the democracies in the United Nations organization, and unless we propose the action by this body, it will never be taken because without our support it would fail.

Without a hope of having the Byrd resolution or others similar to it, adopted, I am compelled to come to the next choice, and that is to vote for the pending bill with its amendments. We must either do that or take the position that we should get completely out of Europe and Asia. But, if we should do that, we confess that we have lost the war because we would be right back where we started from, with a ruthless dictatorship in both Europe and Asia dominating the lives and liberties of its peoples and a constant threat to our own security.

Mr. President, we made commitments in the Atlantic Charter and in our declaration of war which, together with the repeated blunders and errors of diplomacy and strategy during the war, have placed us in a dangerous situation, from which we dare not retreat any further unless we are willing to confess that we have lost the war and that our future defense will take place entirely from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I am voting for this bill with the belief and the hope that this is only the first step; that we shall now come back to the first principles as set forth in the Atlantic Charter not only in Greece and Turkey but in China; that we will reverse the action we took in that nation recently when we decided not to take sides as between the Nationalists and the Communists, but decided to get out; that we will redeem our promise made to the Koreans that they shall have their independence; that we shall refuse to make any more agreements with Russia until she gives some evidence that she is willing to honor and respect the agreements she has already made from the days of the Atlantic Charter down to the present time; that as a logical outgrowth of that stand we shall not ratify the treaty with Italy which renders Italy defenseless for a long time to come against a constant threat of the Communist Tito and his government which is a satellite of Russia; that with respect to Germany we make no further agreements of any kind with Russia respecting that nation until such time as Russia honors her past agreements; that we lay all of the facts on the table before the United Nations.

Let us also declare it as our policy that we expect to honor all our agreements and expect other nations to do likewise; that we shall be glad to help Russia attain any of her legitimate ambitions and her necessities by peaceful means. In fact, let us declare to her that as we are a Christian Nation, we shall be willing to abide by the doctrine of the Christ, known as the Golden Rule.

By taking this stand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe we can stop the present ideological war and prevent a shooting war of World War III. Half-way measures, in my opinion, will not do. We must go the full distance. This is a case which requires the boldest of action. By any other methods I believe we court disaster, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we have the atom bomb. It should be clear that we cannot in any warfare in Europe use the bomb indiscriminately against any nation because we may in doing so have to destroy millions of innocent people who have had no part in the bringing on of the struggle.

From England only a few days ago, Mr. President, came a message from some of its common people, inspired, no doubt, by some of the utterances of government officials and our wandering missionary, Henry Wallace, that in the coming struggle between the United States and Russia England will necessarily have to be neutral. She is weary, it is said, without funds, her industrial production machinery practically worn out, and in all ways in no position to fight. Not only that, but this message stated that England would be the receiver of the bomb attacks, the super propelled missiles, and would always bear the brunt of the battle while the United States, the principal in the fighting, would be some 3,000 miles away.

Mr. President, unless we act promptly and resolutely and with firmness we are in grave danger of losing our friends among the other nations. The passage of this bill will be but the first step. From here on, no matter what the cost in money may be—and I believe it will be less if we act firmly—we must proceed to do everything in our power to win the

war we are now waging to bring about a just and lasting peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the Greek and Turkish loans for the reason that the President's announcements have committed the United States to this policy in the eyes of the world, and to repudiate it now would destory his prestige in the negotiations with the Russian Government. On the success of such negotiations I believe ultimate peace depends.

I do not regard this action as a commitment to any similar policy in any other section of the world, or to the continuation of the same policy in Greece or Turkey when peace negotiations are completed. Insofar as the loans are for reconstruction and rehabilitation, we are only doing in Greece what we have done elsewhere. Insofar as they help to preserve order, I think they must be justified as a means of maintaining the status quo during the period while the sound basis for peace in Europe is being worked out. I am in thorough accord with the Vandenberg amendments proposing that we withdraw whenever a government representing the majority of the people requests us to do so, and whenever the United Nations find that action taken or assistance furnished by them makes the continuance of our assistance undesirable. I believe that we should, in any event, withdraw as soon as normal economic conditions are restored.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Saturday last, I was one of a group privileged to listen to a young man speak the sentiments of his heart and mind. His name is Cord Meyer. He was wounded in World War II. He was adviser and consultant to Governor Stassen, at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations. That young man spoke as a scientist of the horrors of the next war, of the futility of trying to avoid war by armament for war. He spoke, Mr. President, of the necessity of preventing war by strengthening the United Nations organization, of building toward a world government which might effectively promote the welfare and preserve the peace of the nations and the peoples of the world.

I became convinced in my heart, Mr. President, that that young man was pointing to the future, and that those who were advocating this measure were pointing to the past, to the old ways and to the old wars. I determined, therefore, Mr. President, that, contrary to a previous announcement which I had made, and which I had sincerely made, I could not square with my conscience support of this measure unless the amendments which have been offered in the Senate and are now pending, stripping it of the provisions authorizing the sending of military missions and freeing us of the obligation to support foreign armies, were adopted by the Senate. In that case, and if all that were involved was economic aid to Greece, however strongly I feel that such aid should be extended through the United Nations, I would still vote for the measure.

But, Mr. President, I would prefer at a late hour to make the right decision rather than to continue in error because I was afraid to have someone make against me the charge of inconsistency with a previously announced course and position.

Mr. President, I take my position squarely behind the United Nations organization. I hold in my hand excerpts from the Charter of the United Nations organization. I submit it to my colleagues. The very declaration of purposes contained in that Charter provides as follows:

The purposes of the United Nations are—

Mr. President, I am quoting from the Charter itself—

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures—

Not unilateral measures—

to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. President, we solemnly committed the good faith of this Government and this Nation to that obligation.

That Charter also provides:

1. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

I am still quoting from the Charter of the United Nations, Mr. President:

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

I continue to quote:

The members of the United Nations agree—

And we are a member of the United Nations organization; therefore, we agreed—

to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

I continue to quote:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I quote again:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures.

Finally, Mr. President, I quote again from the Charter:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate, or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Mr. President, I charge that this unilateral action on our part is a breach of our solemn covenant assumed to the United Nations organization. It is a breach of our moral commitment to observe the Charter of that organization. Mr. President, this proposal means in substance that the nation which was the chief creator of the United Nations organization will now depart from it, and will seek to preserve the peace of the world by single-handed, unilateral United States action.

Mr. President, I say that the Vandenberg amendments, coming with all the authority that they have from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also are in violation of the Charter, for there is no provision in the Charter of the United Nations organization which would permit any nation to assume the right of unilateral action, relying only upon the subsequent veto of the United Nations organization if it does not like such unilateral action.

Mr. President, I say that the Vandenberg amendments are to be commended, for the bill as thus amended is better than the proposal originally was. I honor the able chairman and the distinguished committee. But, Mr. President, to make half of a correction of a wrong does not make it right. Giving the United Nations the veto power over what we do does not discharge our obligation to work collectively with other nations in the United Nations organization in trying to keep the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the proposed step will be a precedent which this Nation will rue in the years ahead. For the first time we are proposing to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere. For the first time, we are, in time of peace, after hostilities have ended, beginning with American money to equip, support, train, and maintain foreign armies. Once that precedent is established, Mr. President, once we are entered upon that dangerous course, where will there ever be a turning back until the United States shall have to encircle the globe in the embrace of its might and conquer mankind to keep it at peace.

Mr. President, I say, therefore, that our rendezvous with peace is in the United Nations organization. We can make it succeed if we will put our mighty strength to its side. The United Nations can meet this present challenge if we assert our majesty and might.

But, Mr. President, if we, its defender, shall be the first to disparage and discredit it, if we shall strike at it a mortal blow which may mean its destruction and ruin, I ask what hope is there for all the young boys now growing to manhood, in the public schools of America? What hope is there for a citizenry which faces annihilation from atomic and biological warfare? I ask, where is peace to be kept, if not in the strength and might of

the United Nations organization, Mr. President?

Mr. President, the present proposal launches this Nation upon a tragic course in international relations. I hope that, before it is too late—even now—we shall turn back, and that America will lead the world in the way that it was destined to lead: as a great democracy, valiantly leading peace-loving people everywhere toward keeping the peace of the world; resisting, if need be, by force, but in the unity of the United Nations organization, any aggressor, whoever it be; and spending our substance, not upon armies for destruction, but upon trying to eradicate tuberculosis and to restrain all disease and to lift up the standard of living and to increase the inheritance of health and happiness in peace to all the nations and the peoples of this torn earth.

Mr. President, I proclaim that for nations as for man, as Brutus said to Cassius—

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune:
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

On such a full sea are we now afloat, and we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures. Our ventures, Mr. President, are democracy and peace. That is the full tide of challenge to the leadership of this great American Republic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill is to stop the spread of the ideology of communism. We entered World War II to stop the ideology of nazism. I have always been opposed to the ideology of communism, nazism, fascism, and all other isms, because I believe wholeheartedly in the American system. I love our form of government. I have been fighting communism for years. For at least the last 10 years I have recognized the threat of communism.

I shall vote for the bill because of my abhorrence of communism, but there is one thing which rather confuses me. I shall indicate what it is by the question I am about to ask. I dislike to ask the question, but I shall do so any way. Six months ago where were those who in the last 2 or 3 months have discovered that communism is a threat to the world? Where were they a year ago; where were they 2 years ago? The administration, which now, all at once, overnight, discovers that communism is a threat to the world and to this Nation, was building up the very robot which it now tells us we must tear down.

While I was opposed to communism 10 years ago, where were these people? I was opposed to it 6 months ago; where were they? The Republican Party has been opposed to it, and it has expressed its opposition in its platform for many years.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill in the hope and in the faith that the administration which is now proposing this measure, which is now admitting that communism as an ideology is a threat, is serious and sincere about its declarations. I hope it is prepared to go through with its announcement, because I believe today, as I have for many years, that the threat of communism within and without this Nation is our greatest danger.

There are many things about the bill which I do not like. I regret exceedingly that we today must do things in direct opposition to a nation which only a few months ago, at least a year ago, was one of our allies. Two years ago I did not think there was any good in communism; indeed, I have never thought so. I am opposed to the ideology, and I propose to fight communism whenever I find it in the United States or any part of the world.

The very administration which has told the world that Russian communism is a liberty-loving ideology, that the Communists are a liberty-loving people, that they believed in freedom, are now telling us that they were wrong. They are admitting they were wrong. In other words, they are following those of us who for 10 years have been fighting that ideology. They are following the Republican Party. I shall vote for the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for 7 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before we vote on the question of aid to Greece and Turkey, I should like to express some thoughts that have been on my mind as I have listened to the debate on this subject.

I shall vote to aid these countries on the distant shores of our diplomatic frontiers. However, in assuming this responsibility in the realm of foreign affairs, I am not forgetting my responsibility to our people here at home.

I hope that my colleagues may be mindful also of our responsibility to provide adequately for the development, growth, and strengthening of our own country.

It is well and good for us to aid our fellow men across the seas. It is well and good for us to mend the dikes of our foreign policy. But while we do this, let us not say that because we cannot afford it we cannot go forward with the development of our own country, our own resources, both human and natural, or the promotion of the welfare of our own people.

I shall not take the time to review the financial assistance to foreign countries for which we have voted for in the Seventy-ninth Congress or the present Congress. I am neither criticizing this action, nor implying that we should have acted otherwise. My sole purpose in speaking now is to stress the fact that security, like charity, begins at home.

I dare say, Mr. President, that there are some Members of the Congress who will vote for the aid to Greece and Turkey in the belief that this will serve the best interest of our country, but who will oppose important domestic legislation designed and urgently needed for the growth and strengthening of our Nation. As a matter of fact, the surest way to fortify our foreign affairs is to strengthen and expand our own economy here at home. We cannot achieve this unless we are willing to continue to make a reasonable investment in our present and future well-being.

In casting our votes on the aid to Greece and Turkey, I am sure that we shall rise above party affiliations and above class and special interests. My concern, then, is that we show the same brand of statesmanship in voting on such domestic issues as the soil-conservation program; the development of our natural resources, such as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the rural electrification program; an adequate development of transportation facilities, including highways, airways, railways, and waterways; Federal aid to health and education; and on other matters directly affecting the welfare and security of our own people here in the United States of America.

As I see it, Mr. President, in the Greek-Turkish-aid issue, we are facing the choice of taking a positive, calculated risk now or the alternative of possibly greater risks that may come later as the result of negative action now.

We are confronted with the same situation with regard to our home front. We face the choice of taking bold, progressive action now in matters relating to the development of our human and natural resources, or the alternative of defaulting now and suffering the consequences of a stagnant economy; a disillusioned, restless people; a nation stalemated and withering on the vine—all because we lacked the courage to go forward, or because we were too shortsighted to invest in the future of our own country.

Let us not sow the seeds of class disunity at home.

Let us strive toward racial peace and economic democracy, and stamp out bigotry and intolerance.

The best foundations for unity here at home are jobs, education, comfortable homes, better health, productive land, and developed resources.

We have been prodigal in the use of our resources. The time has come for sound conservation in this field.

I cannot imagine that any other country in the world in our position would sacrifice the transportation and power we are permitting to go to waste through failure to develop our rivers.

We have shown in the past what can be accomplished by a free people. We cherish our form of government, based on the dignity and freedom of the individual.

The best defense of our American way of life lies in the spirit of the Nation. That spirit is the bulwark of our democracy.

It is believed that through aiding Greece and Turkey in a military sense we are preventing the spread of an alien ideology over the world. It is frankly conceded that this step may either involve us in war with Russia, or be the means of averting such a war.

Should such a terrible consequence as war ensue, we would learn that we cannot destroy communism by military

might alone. An ideology can filter through the strongest military defenses.

In this atomic age, requiring enormous expenditures for the establishment of military defense, we can impoverish our Nation and break the morale of our people if the burden of war proves excessive. If that comes to pass, then communism is more likely to seep through and find fertile ground behind our lines.

Hence, only the road to peace and disarmament can finally protect us. That is the only salvation for mankind. As nations, we must either learn to live together, or commit national and international suicide.

Let us now bind the wounds of bleeding and desolate nations. Let us help them to gain true economic stability and political freedom; let us help restore the courage and health of their people; and let us call on all nations to join in a real and lasting peace effort, exerting all our power to make the UN a united nations in fact, dedicated to the principles of peace and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I allot 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I recently spoke on this subject, and in the course of my remarks I quoted from a document prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy, distributed to members of a Senate committee by W. John Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I should like to quote a passage from that document, as follows:

> Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked.

It was a frank statement, Mr. President, that whenever it was desired to get the country into a war for economic reasons, or to fight somebody that was not liked, it was dressed up with the heading "Ideology." Certainly that has been done in the present instance.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Senate a statement from the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947. Previously I have said in the course of debate on this floor that our Department of State had ceased to function as a civilian branch of Government and that it was dominated by the military. Since that time I came upon this statement in the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, reading as follows:

> Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs, commencing on the home front with General Marshall as Secretary of State, and his Assistant Secretary of State (for occupied areas) Maj. Gen. John H. Hildring, who directs the military commanders controlling our foreign policy in occupied Europe and Asia. The chain of control in diplomatic hot spots, both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements, lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities.

That, Mr. President, is a statement from a military publication. Certainly our foreign policy has ceased to be a diplomatic policy; it is a military, strategic policy.

I make the charge that those responsible for the welfare of the country have given up hope—I think wrongly—that we can get along with Russia peaceably. We have therefore embarked upon a course looking eventually to a showdown war with Russia. I do not believe the American people want that. I know that the public-opinion polls demonstrate that they do not. Sixty-three percent of those interviewed, according to a Gallup poll, said "Turn this over to the UN." On a radio program the other night, the poll of an audience, in which some 8,000 returns were received, showed that, 11 to 2, the answer was "Turn it over to the United Nations."

This is a strange situation. Never before have I seen so many Members of Congress ignore such an overwhelming voice of the people as in this instance.

I should like to point out another instance, indicating that we are not voting as free agents here. The Associated Press, on March 16, said:

> Anyone who stood out against Mr. Truman's request would be in danger of appearing to favor communism.

It was therefore argued that there would be few votes against the measure. The United States News took care of the Republicans especially, by saying that on this issue it was unlikely there would be a Communist-Republican axis.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote to eliminate Turkey from this proposal, and will vote for the other amendments, to make it as palatable as possible, to make it as decent as possible; but I hope, further, Senators will vote against the measure itself, as I intend to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I understand I have 18 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this debate has continued for many days during which time many very able and sincere speeches have been made.

During this time my mind has been open and receptive, that is, open and receptive so far as a mind can be that believes that communism means the end of the world as we know it, as we live in it, and as we are proud of it.

I strongly object and protest this sudden "must" legislation. President Truman suddenly canceled a trip to the South, came to the Capitol, and before a joint session of the Congress urged the immediate passage of a bill calling for $400,000,000 to help support Greece and Turkey in their fight against communistic infiltration and Russian domination.

The stage was well set to emphasize the must and urgent factors.

The fight communism theme was, and is, popular.

I believe that we must take the lead in this fight; we are the only Nation that can do it; but we must go into the fight with both hands clean. We cannot hope to get the support of other nations unless our actions are above suspicion.

In the last days of February of this year, just 6 or 7 weeks ago, President Truman advised the congressional leaders of the perilous situation.

How long before that had the State Department and the President known that Britain could no longer carry the load, and that it was up to us to take up the burden?

Did the State Department and the administration know of this approaching withdrawal of Britain in January? Did they know of it November and October? Britain must have known it, and it is inconceivable to me that our Ambassador in London was not advised. And it is equally inconceivable that the State Department did not know.

In spite of this spurious must and rush policy, to which we have become accustomed in the last 15 years, I was, and I am, determined to do everything in my power to fight this Communistic cancer, creeping through the world body, largely unseen and in many cases unsuspected.

I said that we must go into this fight with both hands clean. In other words, we must be consistent. Our policy must be consistent, and during the debate it seems to me it has become apparent that the attitude of the administration toward this particular question is totally inconsistent. Our policy must be consistent. We are hoping to live at peace with friendly nations of the world. We can only do this if our policy is consistent. The inconsistencies of Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran, and Port Said cannot be a part of the permanent policy of the United States.

The Russian policy is entirely consistent and of single purpose. That policy is one of maintaining an iron grip behind an iron curtain of every function and phase of life in their own country, and so far as possible in the satellite countries of Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Their infiltration policy is consistent in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Iraq, India, Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, China, Italy, France, and in the United States. Theirs is a policy of creating world unrest, knowing full well that a world of unrest, dissatisfaction, hunger, and misery is the hotbed in which the foul weeds of communism thrive.

Are we consistent?

President Truman and this administration have asked us to authorize the spending of $400,000,000 to help check the consistent policy of communistic infiltration into Greece and Turkey, and at the same time it has developed that since VJ-day we have sent to Russia some $230,000,000 worth of equipment on lend-lease and that today this administration is sending Russia oil-refinery and other equipment to the tune of $16,000,000. Is this consistent? Is it fair? Is it right? Is it honorable?

I shall be quite candid with the Senate. In order to crush communism I was prepared, and I am prepared, to lend a helping hand to other countries to fight the infiltration of communism there. But I cannot, as a Member of the United States Senate, say to the people of my State that I advised and cast my vote to spend

$400,000,000, or any sum, to fight communistic infiltration when out of the back door of this country $230,000,000 has already been sent since the war ended and a further $16,000,000 is in the process of being sent to help the very nation that is responsible for this infiltration and which this bill is designed to fight. My own conscience would not permit me to do this thing.

I had hoped that when the news of this inconsistency came to light the bill would be recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that before it was returned to the Senate for further consideration every vestige of aid to Russia, of aid to its satellite nations, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, not to mention Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and all aid to Russian-occupied territories, would be eliminated and ended for all time, and that the United States Senate could then consider this bill consistently and with both hands clean.

I am going to make a motion that will enable such action to be taken, such action as would enable the people of this country and of the world to know that the United States has a completely unified front in its fight against communism, and that we are no longer contributing on the one hand to fight communism and on the other hand ecouraging the nation that is promoting it.

Mr. President, I move that the pending bill, Senate bill 938, be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the Senator's motion is out of order at the moment, because the motion is not debatable, and the unanimous-consent agreement calls for a vote on the bill and all motions in connection with it beginning at 4 o'clock. Therefore the Chair will rule that the motion will be entered and called up when the unanimous-consent process of voting at 4 o'clock starts.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the motion of the Senator from Wyoming be the first question to be voted upon at 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair that is correct.

The Senator from Michigan yields the remainder of his time to the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, the debate upon the present bill has been notable and distinguished by great ability on both sides of the question. I thank God that we have here in the Senate a forum of free discussion, and free speech, and free thought. I am happy that no dictator can cut off discussion in this Chamber—no dictator, unless it be its own dictator, who I trust to God may never appear. No totalitarian master can issue an edict to prevent the Members of the Senate from expressing their thoughts freely and fully, without any question upon matters dealing with the welfare of the people of the United States or in this field that affects the relations of his Nation with other countries bevond the sea.

I trust that this form of free discussion and free debate will be forever preserved and never denied to the people of the United States, because it is not in our own right that we utter these thoughts, that we entertain these emotions; it is because we represent the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to say that in my view this is not a bill against someone; this is not a bill against any particular nation or any particular people. It is a bill for aid to Greece and Turkey. If it be against anything it is against aggression. I think there is a distinction to be drawn between communism and aggression. Aggression is charged with a disregard of the rights of others. Aggression means the acquisitive impulse of nations or individuals to seize or to possess those things which are not their own according to right and law. So this measure may be termed a bill against aggression, against aggression toward free and independent nations. Whether they be small or whether they be great they have rights under international law, under human law and under the United Nations Charter, of which so much has been heard in this debate, because they are free and independent. Every subscriber to the United Nations Charter has assumed a solemn obligation to respect the integrity, the sovereignty, the rights, and the territory of every free and independent nation, be it large or be it small.

Mr. President, the chief objections to this measure are two, in my opinion. Many reasons have been urged, but the two outstanding are, first, that we should have gone to the United Nations. I have a great attachment to the United Nations. It was here in the United States that, under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, the seed for the United Nations was nurtured and where it was germinated. It was here in Washington, under the leadership of those two great Americans, that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference was held and the framework of the United Nations was drafted.

Before San Francisco, I had a humble part in the work, and I, together with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], was a delegate to the San Francisco Conference. The Senator from Michigan and I worked together toilsomely. We hoped to achieve the dream of the people of the United States for peace. We hoped to achieve the ambitions of the great leaders since World War I in the field of peace. We sought to create an agency for the settlement of international disputes, for the arbitration, conciliation, and settlement by peaceful means of all disputes among nations, whether great or small. Under the United Nations Charter the weakest nation on earth has an equality of right, an equality of possession of the pledges made in that instrument, along with the greatest and most powerful nation upon this revolving globe of ours.

Questions coming within the functions with which the United Nations is endowed should always go to the United Nations. But we all now know, if we did not know when this debate began, that the United Nations is not constructed for the purpose of granting relief to various nations in the world. That is not one of its functions. I challenge any Senator to point out, with the same ingenuity with which he has urged his arguments on the floor of the Senate, where in the United Nations Charter the United Nations is given authority to grant relief and aid of the kind described in the pending bill.

Mr. President, if the United Nations had the power, it does not have the facilities. It does not possess a dime in its treasury that could be devoted to these purposes. It does not have a single soldier to give military training or aid, in the form of a mission or otherwise, to either Greece or Trukey.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no craving to yield, but I will yield. The reason I answer the Senator in that way is that the Senator asked if I wished to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am prompted to interrupt the able address of the Senator from Texas lest my silence be construed as consent to the proposition which he has stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Florida never shines in silence.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. Let me say that the golden luster of the senior Senator from Texas was never made distinct in silence, either.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. The point was that I wanted to call attention to the fact that the United Nations was the organization which set up UNRRA, which distributed more than $1,000,000,000 for relief all over the world, with 50 nations contributing. Last year in the Assembly it was proposed that an international relief fund be established, and the record shows that it was the United States which prevented the establishment of an international relief fund.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not dispute what the Senator from Florida says about UNRRA; but it required legislation. There was no authority under the Charter to furnish such aid. The United Nations, under its general organization, was not authorized to do so. That was not one of its functions. Under the suggestion of the United Nations the various nations pooled their resources, and we furnished .72 percent of every dollar that was spent for UNRRA.

Where did that money go? Part of it went to Byelorussia, a part of the Russian organization. That shows that we are not unfriendly toward Russia. Part of it went to the Ukraine, a part of the Russian dominions. That shows that we were not unfriendly to Russia, and were not discriminating. A large amount of that sum went to Poland, which every one knows is under the finger of Russia and absolutely within her control. We were not discriminating. A part of it went to Yugoslavia. Four hundred million dollars of UNRRA funds, of which we furnished $280,000,000, or 70 percent, was distributed to the needy—I hope—and the hungry in Yugoslavia. As Senators know, Yugoslavia is an obedient, subservient follower of Russia, absolutely under her dominion and control; but we made no distinction in that regard.

We were giving aid, we thought, to the needy of the world, and we were repaid by denuniciation and hate in Yugoslavia. Senators recall the tragic incident of their shooting down our airplane. I make no point of that fact. A needy man who is hungry, regardless of the sovereignty which rules over him, ought to be helped and sustained, in order that when he regains his strength he may think a little and change his views.

What else has happened with regard to the United Nations? Day before yesterday the United Nations Security Council had presented to it a resolution offered by the representatives of the Soviet Union in the Security Council. What was that resolution? Without quoting it all, it provided for the appointment of a commission "to establish a special commission composed of representatives of the member states of the Security Council, the task of which shall be to insure, through proper supervision, that aid which Greece may receive from the outside be used only in the interests of the Greek people."

There was a suggestion by Russia itself that the Security Council supervise the aid which this bill proposes to grant, and that such aid be restricted to absolute relief necessities.

What did the Security Council do? What did the body to which Senators would turn over all of this problem do? Did it show any anxiety to grasp this authority? Did it show any hunger for a function which it did not possess? Poland and Soviet Russia were the only nations in the Security Council which voted "yes." Voting against the resolution were Australia, Belgium, Brazil, and the United Kingdom. China, Colombia, France, Syria and the United States abstained from voting. We had the good grace and the good taste to abstain from voting upon a question which affected our own interest.

Mr. President, this circumstance reflects the fact that the United Nations knows that it has no proper function in connection with a matter of this kind. It further shows that it does not desire to assume the responsibility of administering the aid proposed in the pending measure. Yet Senators would dump the entire question into the lap of the United Nations, when they know in advance that the United Nations would in turn drop it somewhere else and would not assume the responsibility or take on the burden. No, Mr. President; that argument is not valid.

Furthermore, the bill provides, specifically, both in the preamble—with respect to which I was associated with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—and in other portions of the bill, that whenever by resolution of the Security Council or by resolution of the General Assembly, the United Nations shows evidence that it desires to take over the problem in Greece and Turkey, the President of the United States must at that very moment withdraw any aid under this bill or any funds which may be appropriated.

What more generous attitude could we have adopted? Does not that show a desire to cooperate with the United Nations? Does it not show that we bow to the collective will of the nations with which we are associated in that great organization?

It is said that the proposed action is unilateral. Senators know how few nations in the world, if any, other than ourselves, are able to undertake the task proposed.

Russia granted a loan to Poland. Did anyone want to take that matter to the United Nations? I never heard any suggestion that it should go to the United Nations. We made a loan to France. The negotiators were in Washington over a considerable period of time. Did any Senator rise in his place and say, "Wait a minute, Mr. President. We are about to make a loan to France. She needs it. But let me tell you now, Mr. President, we do not want that loan made unless it goes through the United Nations"? I heard no such voice raised. I heard no quivering tone uttered on this floor in connection with that loan. I saw no breast beaten in an effort to divert that matter to the United Nations.

We made a large loan to Italy. Did anyone demand that it go through the United Nations? Not a voice was raised; not a protest was heard. Why those loans to France and Italy? The purpose was to preserve the integrity of their governments, to let them stand upon their own feet, to maintain their own independence, to protect them from any infiltrated alien doctrines, and to prevent their governments from being overturned and another form of government installed in their stead.

We heard no complaint whatever regarding the United Nations in that instance. The United Nations does not want this job. God knows, if it were equipped, if it possessed the facilities, if it had the funds, I should be among the first to vote to hand the problem over to the United Nations. We would then have the support and the intellectual force of all the members of the United Nations that participated in the adoption of that policy. But in the present state of affairs it is impossible for the United Nations to perform the functions of this bill and assist regarding the obligations which it entails.

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senators who are so much concerned about the United Nations that UN will have an opportunity later on to busy itself with the problems related to the one now before us. If Russia or Yugoslavia or any other nation purposes to take over Greece, it will have to go to the United Nations. It will have to proceed with armed forces or, under the Charter, and under treaties, it will be forced to go to the United Nations. There is where the jurisdiction of the United Nations will begin. That problem will be on their doorstep to solve. Later on, if Russia or any other nation in that portion of the world should conceive the idea that it wants the Dardanelles, under solemn pledges in the Charter of the United Nations it cannot get the Dardanelles except by peaceful means. What are those peaceful means? They are either to get the Dardanelles through a treaty or by action of the United Nations.

The Dardanelles is now controlled by treaty. Under the Montreux Treaty the Dardanelles is recognized as the property, in time of war, of the Turkish Government. In time of peace the ships of all nations are free to pass through the Dardanelles. Even warships may pass through except in time of war.

But the Dardanelles presents the further question of demands being made upon it for the right to erect fortifications on the soil of Turkey, which would be plainly an invasion of her sovereignty, her respect, her integrity, and her own security. That is a question which must go to the United Nations, unless it be bypassed by force of arms by Russia or such other nation as may decide to take over the Dardanelles.

No, Mr. President; the United Nations will have plenty to do when it solves the integrity of Greece as an independent nation, and when it solves the question of the Dardanelles and the independence of Turkey itself.

I am not without trust in the United Nations. I am not without hope that it will grow in strength and in influence and will become a mighty influence in the world. I want it to grow so that no nation, however strong, whatever its military power, whatever its resources may be, dare not disregard the United Nations, made up of representatives of more than 50 independent and free nations of the world. When that time comes, I am hopeful the peace of the world may be assured and that peoples may live in security and without the fear of war breaking out among them.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out, the United Nations has not the funds, the facilities, nor the military force to provide the objectives of this bill. As I have suggested, these matters must be adjusted by a treaty for action by the United Nations organization. When it comes to that question we shall expect them to proceed according to the rules of international law and according to the solemn obligations which they have assumed by their signatures to the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. President, another argument which is urged against the passage of this bill is that it envisions the danger of war. It is really, according to my opinion, a bill for peace and not a bill for war. Oh, I know that that statement will arouse the smiles of those who are opposed to the bill; I know it will be received with a shrug of the shoulders. But let us see. If present conditions continue, war, in that area particularly, is almost inevitable. Yugoslavia already houses the headquarters of the armed forces which are attacking Greece. They are located in a town in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia has a tremendous army. Marshal Tito poses as a military figure and a military master. If war should break out between Yugoslavia and Greece, almost inevitably sooner or later we would, for one reason or another, become involved. I cannot forget, and neither can the Senate, that World War I began in the small, obscure town of Serajevo in Bosnia. World War II was generated and started yonder at Danzig on the Polish Corridor.

So, Mr. President, if we can prevent war in that particular area, if we can bring to the view of Russia, which should not be without reason, that we are acting in behalf of peace between the countries in that area, I believe this measure can fairly be classified as a bill in favor of peace rather than of war.

There is aggression now to an extent which might possibly eventuate in war. If Greece is attacked war may follow. Already there is civil war there, and it does not take civil war long to grow and spread and to attract interests from beyond its borders.

Mr. President, there is not a single dollar provided for in this bill that is intended to go beyond the borders of Greece and Turkey. The funds to be appropriated are for their own domestic tranquillity, for the sustenance of hungry men, for giving them such arms as are necessary—not for war, not for conquest, not for aggression, but to protect their own territory and their own homes from aggression which may be motivated and inspired from beyond their own borders. This bill is confined to the territorial limits of Greece and Turkey.

Why have a war over this question? Suppose we pass the bill: Who will fight us on account of it? It is said that Russia will fight us. Let us see. There is a map here. I ask the Senators to turn their eyes yonder on Greece. Does Greece belong to Russia? If it does not, why should Russia make war on that nation because we feed its hungry people and give them a few arms to protect themselves from aggression from the outside? Does Russia own Greece? I thought Greece was an independent nation standing in the councils of the United Nations upon the same standard of equality as do Russia, Yugoslavia, and the other nations of the world. What right would Russia have to make war on us because we interfered, as she might think, with Greece? Greece is not hers. Greece by no treaty has been awarded to the jurisdiction of Russia. By no edict except her own, if she has one, does Greece belong to Russia.

No, Mr. President; Russia could not justify herself before the world. She could not justify herself in history. She could not stand at the door of public opinion and defend the idea that she would go to war with us because we extended aid to suffering Greece and to Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired. The Chair yields 2 minutes more to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many minutes, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Two minutes. Mr. President, I thought we were going to vote at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The other side has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry; I thought I had more time.

Mr. President, the same is true of the Dardanelles. Does Russia own Turkey? She has had many wars with Turkey, but she has never yet brought Turkey within the folds of her dominions. Why should she go to war?

No, Mr. President; where is the treaty that awards Turkey to Russia, as a Russian territory? Where is the mandate from the League of Nations or from the United Nations itself that turns over Greece and Turkey to the control and dictate of Russia alone? Where is the trusteeship that would do that? We have trusteeships under the United Nations. Where is the trusteeship under the Unted Nations that gives Russia a trusteeship over these lands?

Mr. President, let me say one more word, and then I am done—not willingly, but by force of aggression. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the United Nations wants friendship with Russia. We have no hatred of her people. If she wants to have communism in Russia, let her have it. It is none of our concern. If she wants a totalitarian dictator, let her have it; that is her business. We want to be friendly with Russia.

This bill is not aimed at Russia. It is aimed toward the relief of Greece and Turkey; and if it is against anything, it is against aggression.

I have never thought that to give a hungry man a crust of bread was to invite war. I have never believed that to give a hungry man a gun to keep out a burglar and to protect his hearthstone was to invite war. Bread for the hungry and a few arms for defense is all this bill contemplates.

Mr. President, we have ample justification to vote for this measure. We are a free and independent Nation. The nations which we seek to relieve are free and independent. I approach the vote on this question, Mr. President, holding my head high, as I believe the people of the United States are holding theirs. We want no territory; we want no reparations; we want no tribute; we want nothing, except we do want peace and we want the free nations of the world to maintain their integrity and their independence. If we achieve that end by simply making a grant of money—not a combat soldier—God knows, Mr. President, that it is on the basis of those principles and with that view that I shall cast my vote for the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized. Does the Senator desire to yield to another Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I will take the remainder of the time, if the President pro tempore does not object and if the Senate does not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is entitled to the remainder of the time until 4 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am glad to have these few minutes, because during this time I desire to withdraw the pending amendment, with the idea of substituting another one.

I now withdraw the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado is in control of his own amendment, of course he may withdraw it, as he has done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I now offer to the bill a series of amendments which delete from the bill all references and all provisions and everything else pertaining to military assistance and to the military.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to have the amendment stated at the desk?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. First, Mr. President, let me say that the purpose of the amendments is limited to one matter: namely, to delete from the bill all its military aspects. However, it has been necessary to draft a great many amendments to accomplish that one purpose. So I ask unanimous consent that all the various amendments which are incorporated in this one amendment may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in his very eloquent and his very pleasant style has presented a powerful argument for the amendment which I am offering. He informed the Senate—or, at least, that is what I understood him to do—that what the pending measure proposes to have us do in Greece and in Turkey is nonmilitary, that it is economic aid, that it is help for the starving. If that be the case, my amendment will not change that situation.

What I object to and what a great many other Senators on this floor object to are the military aspects of the pending bill—in short, the sending of our soldiers, the sending of our flag, the sending of our weapons, not only into Greece but into Turkey.

So, Mr. President, this amendment is devised to remove those military aspects and to make the pending bill conform to the presentation which we have just heard from the Senator from Texas.

I noticed that a great hue and cry was raised and many headlines appeared in the newspapers the other day, to the effect that the Governor of New York had endorsed the pending bill. I read very carefully what the Governor of New York had to say about the bill, but I could not find in his statement one word or even a hint that he favored military intervention and military help to either Greece or Turkey.

I think the point regarding military aid should be cleared up. If the present proposal is solely for economic aid, then such a purpose is entirely in harmony with my amendment. If the pending bill is a military proposal, as I contend it is, then my amendment would remove from it all military features, and would make the bill truly an economic proposal, a bill to provide relief for the hungry and the starving.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, as I have just described it, and which is now the pending amendment, be given

priority over the motion which was entered by the Senater from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], when the voting begins. In other words, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be voted upon before the vote is taken on the motion of the Senater from Wyoming to lay on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state the parliamentary situation. Unless unanimous consent, as just requested by the Senator from Colorado, is given, when the hour of 4 o'clock arrives the Chair will submit to the Senate the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] to lay the bill upon the table, although the Chair feels that it is necessary to say that in the mind of the Chair there is a very serious question as to whether the motion is in order under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair wishes to point out that there is a conflict in the construction of the unanimous-consent agreement. On the one hand, it provides for the final passage of the bill by continuous voting after 4 o'clock. Obviously there could be no voting upon the final passage of the bill if the bill were laid upon the table.

On the other hand, it also provides for voting at 4 o'clock upon any motion which may be pending.

These two interpretations collide; but it is the purpose of the Chair to give the motion of the Senator from Wyoming the benefit of the doubt, and in the opinion of the Chair it is fair that the pending question should be the motion to lay upon the table.

The Senator from Colorado now has requested unanimous consent that the amendments which he has just submitted shall be voted upon before the motion to lay upon the table is voted upon, although the motion to lay upon the table has the right of way.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none.

Therefore, the hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which, by unanimous consent, the Senate has agreed to vote upon en bloc. The clerk will state the amendments for the RECORD.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "furnish", it is proposed to insert "nonmilitary."

On page 2, line 9, after the semicolon, to insert "and";

On page 3, line 6, to strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period;

Beginning on page 3, line 7, to strike out all down to and including line 20 on page 5;

On page 5, line 21, to strike out "3", and insert in lieu thereof "2";

On page 6, line 20, to strike out "4", and insert in lieu thereof "3";

On page 7, line 9, to strike out "5", and insert in lieu thereof "4"; and

On page 8, line 9, to strike out "6", and insert in lieu thereof "5."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will check what the Chair now states. The reading of the amendments does not indicate to the Senate with any clearness what the issue is. As the Chair understands the series of amendments submitted by the Senator from Colorado, upon which a vote is now to be taken, the purpose and effect is to remove all reference to military aid from the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; and the amendment was prepared by our own legislative counsel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Debate is over. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that, if present, the Senator from New York would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote each of the Senators whose absence I have announced would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—22

Brooks	Kem	Revercomb
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McKellar	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Moore	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	

NAYS—68

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Morse	Young
Green	Myers	

NOT VOTING—5

Barkley	Magnuson	Wagner
Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.	

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question reverts to the motion submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the bill be laid upon the table.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that the Senator from New York, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote each of the Senators whose absence I have announced would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Brooks	Kem	Revercomb
Buck	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McKellar	Taylor
Butler	Malone	Wherry
Byrd	Moore	Williams
Dworshak	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Daniel	

NAYS—67

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Holland	Russell
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Capper	Jenner	Smith
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarran	Thye
Downey	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Myers	

NOT VOTING—5

Barkley	Magnuson	Wagner
Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.	

So the motion of Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming to lay the bill on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer the so-called oil amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to be offered to the bill? If not, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that the Senator from New York, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote each of the Senators whose absence I have announced would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—67

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Holland	Russell
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Capper	Jenner	Smith
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarran	Thye
Downey	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Myers	

NAYS—23

Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Brooks	Kem	Revercomb
Buck	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McKellar	Taylor
Butler	Malone	Wherry
Byrd	Moore	Williams
Dworshak	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—5

Barkley	Magnuson	Wagner
Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.	

So the bill S. 938 was passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Governments of Greece and Turkey have sought from the Government of the United States immediate financial and other assistance which is necessary for the maintenance of their national integrity and their survival as free nations; and

Whereas the national integrity and survival of these nations are of importance to the security of the United States and of all freedom-loving peoples and depend upon the receipt at this time of assistance; and

Whereas the Security Council of the United Nations has recognized the seriousness of the unsettled conditions prevailing on the border between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other, and, if the present emergency is met, may subsequently assume full responsibility for this phase of the problem as a result of the investigation which its commission is currently conducting; and

Whereas the Food and Agriculture Organization mission for Greece recognized the necessity that Greece receive financial and economic assistance and recommended that Greece request such assistance from the appropriate agencies of the United Nations and from the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom; and

Whereas the United Nations is not now in a position to furnish to Greece and Turkey the financial and economic assistance which is immediately required; and

Whereas the furnishing of such assistance to Greece and Turkey by the United States will contribute to the freedom and independence of all members of the United Nations in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter: Now, therefore

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, because of the lack of time it has been impossible for me today to speak, as I had wanted to do, on the bill just passed. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SELF-INTEREST REQUIRES AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

After the President had delivered his speech, urging aid to Greece and Turkey, I commented to the press as follows:

"America is at the crossroads again. I pray God we take the right road."

What has placed us at the crossroads? Was it the President's speech? No. It was the current of swift-moving events—first, our failure to reach basic understanding during the war years, then Allied victory, bankruptcy of the nations, Britain's resources cut to the bone so that she no longer could keep troops in Greece, a victorious Russia, ambitious not only to dominate the eastern Mediterranean but to take over all of Europe and fill the earth with her doctrines.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN NONINTERVENTION

In the early days of the Republic, we laid out a pattern of noninterference in the affairs of Europe. That was Washington's heart's desire and in the Monroe Doctrine, we restated our position in this language:

"In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense * * * our policy in regard to Europe * * * is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers."

Jefferson, Polk, and Secretary of State Olney, and even Secretary of State Hull, restated this doctrine time and time again. In 1940, Secretary Hull stated the United States "pursues a policy of nonparticipation and of nonintervention in purely political affairs of Europe."

THE RESPONSIBILITY NOW ON CONGRESS

World circumstances, including two wars, entry into the United Nations organization, and now this eastern Mediterranean situation, show how circumstances alter cases. We in the Congress are asked to make a decision. The President pointed out what he thought the decision should be, and it is for us of the Congress, with the facts and the judgment that we possess, to accept or reject his suggestion. It is our responsibility. We cannot duck it.

CHOICES BEFORE AMERICA

There are two courses open to America: One is to revert to our doctrine of yesteryear and disregard the tremendous changes that have taken place in the world, the most significant of which is that time and space have been eliminated by the invention and ingenuity of man. The second choice is to recognize that an ideology which is spearheaded by Russia is contesting with the democratic way of life for the occupancy of men's minds and souls everywhere in the world.

It is my opinion that America should take that second choice and extend this aid for these reasons:

(a) In the self-interest of our country in this atomic age.

(b) To uphold the spiritual values which America has always championed.

(c) To come to an understanding with Russia as a means of preventing armed conflict.

(d) As a means of stimulating the UN to revitalize itself so that it will be adequate to its responsibilities.

INABILITY OF UN TO HANDLE CRISIS

It is argued by many that we will be bypassing the United Nations if we pass this resolution. On the other hand, the United Nations has not demonstrated the ability or the vitality to step into a picture such as is presented to us.

Folks are asking why the United Nations has not been made adequate to deal with a crisis such as we now face. The Christian Science Monitor answers the question in this language:

"We of the democracies thought we were adequate, but at Yalta and San Francisco, the two conferences where the heart of the Charter was drawn, Russia put it all over us and we didn't even know it. We thought we were bringing Russia into the arms of the United Nations. It turned out that actually we were putting the United Nations in the arms of Russia."

This arises from the fact that any one of the big powers in the Security Council can exercise a veto and thus block any important action. Thus, we reach the conclusion that in a case like this, the United Nations would have no power to act, because Russia, which is interested in dominating Greece and Turkey, would veto any steps that might be taken to right this situation.

In the bill, S. 938, America waives her right of veto and virtually proffers to the United Nations the opportunity to take over the job.

Let us bear in mind that Greece and Turkey, both members of the United Nations, did not apply to the United Nations, but applied directly to the United States for assistance.

There is, however, a significant fact that brings the United Nations into this picture. The Security Council has had a commission on the Greek border investigating disturbances between Greece, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, and that commission will report shortly. It is hoped that a permanent border commission, after the report has been made, will be constituted by the United Nations.

I am sure that every Senator and every person in America would sing Hallelujah if the United Nations would take over this job and do th job. But from reading the Charter and noting UN's past activities, it is clear that the United Nations is not presently equipped to take emergency action. It hasn't the financial resources; it possesses no international police force; and Russia has the veto power.

On Friday last, April 18, the Security Council of the UN did take action. It voted 4-2 against a Russian proposal to send a supervisory commission to Greece to insure that

the proposed help from the United States would be used only in the interests of the Greek people. By its action, UN thus designated clearly it felt inadequate at the present time to handle the situation.

To be adequate, UN must be reborn. This is the opportunity for its rebirth. It certainly is a moment for men to become truly great. I pray God that the representatives of the lands in the United Nations will seize this dynamic moment and make the United Nations what it should be and what the hope of the world is that it will be.

PROVISIONS OF UN CHARTER

We well recall that the Charter of the United Nations starts out with these significant words:

"We, the people of the United States, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind" * * *. Then there follows three other paragraphs, and this significant language: "and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security and to insure * * * that armed force shall only be used in the common interest and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all people, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these ends."

Then, we are told in chapter I, where the purposes of the United Nations are outlined, that among those purposes is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of the threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Greece, Turkey, Russia, and the United States are signatories to this instrument—the Charter of the United Nations. Under chapter 7, there are provisions relating to action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression; but up to date the United Nations have done nothing in relation to creating an international police force. The reason therefor is plain. One of the members, Russia, has been actively engaged in pursuing her course of action outside the United Nations.

RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PENETRATIONS

Now, what is that Russian course? Let me cite the language by R. H. Markham, distinguished columnist for the Christian Science Monitor. He says:

"During long, intimate observations I have seen that organized Soviet-inspired communism has come to be the most menacing world force. It is an imperial conspiracy with a global aim. It seeks to set up a system of centrally directed world Soviets. To do that it must destroy established order everywhere, especially in the United States, because America is its chief opponent. It works through confusion, uncertainty, and the undermining of faith. It promotes misery as a preparation 'for the revolution.' One of its mottoes is: 'The worse it is, the better it is.' It seeks a proletariat of uprooted people. It has a morality of its own, employs violence, uses deceit, violates obligations. It scorns compassion and debases the individual. It exalts mass man, belittles individual judgment. It functions as a totalitarian religion, using man and material forces as idols. In its basic teachings and practices, it is opposed to the basic teachings and practices of Christianity."

RUSSIAN-UNITED STATES DIFFERENCES

I believe that any thinking person realizes that America is in opposition to the Soviet policy in Germany, Greece, Turkey, and Korea, in fact, everywhere in the world, due, in turn, to three factors:

1. The broad difference in political, religious, and economic ideology. Russia minimizing the individual and maximizing the state—America struggling to maintain and perfect the democratic way of life.

2. Russia not only desiring to extend her ideological influence but to extend her territorial borders, already covering one-fifth of the earth's surface.

3. America awakening now to the need of seeing that natural resources, such as oil and minerals, will remain in sufficient supply for her.

That is why America must take this step, must take her stand in the Near East at the bridgehead of 3 continents in order to halt Russia's march to world domination. I differentiate, of course, between Russia and her present leaders. I understand that there are no more than 10,000,000 Communists, but they are the iron rulers of 200,000,000 Russians, and these Russians are made up of over 80 different races who speak that many different tongues. All these might well constitute a boiling pot. Thus, the closing of the "Iron Curtain" may well be because of Russia's desire to hide from the eyes of the world the information of what goes on in Russia as well as to hide from the Russian people a clear view of what is going on in the world.

RESPONSIBILITY ON RUSSIA TO COOPERATE

Now, if Ambassador Gromyko means what he has been saying, he might ask America to join with him in asking the United Nations to convene in extraordinary session to consider this situation.

It is time that Russia demonstrates to the world that she wants the United Nations to become vital and dynamic in world affairs. Russia heretofore has used her veto right, right and left. She has refused to have an international police force created. She has continued her communistic penetration in every direction.

UNITED STATES AID REDUCES POSSIBILITY OF WAR

I personally feel that when the leaders of the Communist Party have it finally borne home to them that "this is the end of the road, or else," that there will be more getting together. From evidence that I have been able to obtain, I am reasonably satisfied that Russia does not want war and that war can only come as an overt act on her part, probably in pursuing the European maxim that a foreign war is the solution for internal trouble. When we think of what she has suffered in the loss of lives and the devastation of her homeland, we are sympathetically inclined toward her and we can partially understand her desire to get all she can while the getting is good.

The aid which we are proposing now to render will, I am sure, lessen the chances of an overt act on Russia's part and war.

RESULTS OF UNITED STATES AID

If this agreement is ratified by the action of the Senate and the House, what does it mean? The answer is very simple.

(A) Something like $250,000,000 worth of war materials will be turned over to these two nations. This will be taken partly from our accumulated supply which will mean that our war plants will use the appropriated money to manufacture new material that is required.

(B) The balance will be in the nature of goods and other needed supplies to rehabilitate Greece.

Those who are voting for this so-called loan do so on the theory that it is the same as when one pays an insurance premium. Some may think it is a large premium. Well, it is about $100,000,000 more than we were spending each day during the last war. The purposes of this aid are similar to our purposes during the war: to protect America's self-interest, to champion spiritual values throughout the world, to make for conditions that will lead to lasting peace.

WHY MILITARY AID IS NECESSARY

Everyone agrees that we should provide Greece with food and help so as to get her on her feet. The big question seems to be whether we should furnish Greece out of our war supplies. As was stated in the United Nations Security Council, Russia did not hesitate, after the war, to furnish supplies to Marshal Tito. Russia did not then ask the United Nations. If this were simply a fight between two factions in Greece, as was the case in Yugoslavia, and nothing else were involved, I am sure that America would not be thinking about furnishing war material to one faction. Let's be frank about that. But we know that to the north of Greece there is a communistic army equipped, ready to take over Greece. We know also that Turkey is the underbelly of Russia. If Greece falls and Turkey falls to Russia, we know that the bridgehead of three continents ere long will be in the hands of the Soviet; and should this happen, it would only be another step for the Communists to take over all of Europe. This must not happen.

WHAT AMERICA MUST BE WATCHFUL FOR

This is a moment of great decision for America and the world. I have indicated that America must be vigilant in her aid program:

(a) She should seek in the course of this program a quid pro quo—that is, some form of return—for the resources of the American taxpayers which she is expending.

(b) She should see that the administration of this program is conducted on the highest possible plane and with the greatest efficiency and integrity.

(c) She should seek constant information on the progress of the program. I have urged that as soon as Secretary of State Marshall comes back from the Moscow Conference, he should report in a joint session of the Senate and House on the status of world affairs. I had previously urged that he advise Congress by cable directly from Moscow of his feelings regarding the proposed loans. This Secretary Marshall has now done.

CONCLUSIONS

I conclude as I began. America is at the crossroads again. I pray God we take the right road—the road to peace, to progress and plenty. There comes to my mind, after listening to all the few thoughts expressed in the Senate, a saying out of the Book of Books: "Fear not * * * I am with you always." If our purpose is right and if we have no ulterior motive except to save peoples from Communist slavery and to keep the world as free as it can be, then we should not fear when we are doing good.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 21, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to submit my resignation, effective immediately, from membership on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

My work on the standing committees has so absorbed my time that I find it difficult to devote the additional time that will be required to attend further meetings and participate in the other committee work of the National Defense Committee. I feel very strongly that a member of a committee should be able to participate fully in the committee work and in its ultimate decisions.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To fill the vacancy thus created on the Special Committee To Investigate the National

Defense Program, the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT ON CARRYING AND HANDLING MAIL MATTER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Post Office Department Cost Ascertainment Report showing the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and of performing the special services for the fiscal year 1946, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Caribbean Post, No. 700, Veterans of Foreign Wars, San Juan, Puerto Rico, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 652) to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of military, naval, or air training for the common defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 50 citizens of Caldwell, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPROVAL OF AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement, dated April 22, 1947, by the World Order Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace on assistance to Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WORLD ORDER COMMITTEE OF CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

We approve the principle of preserving the national security of the United States and that of more immediately threatened nations and of safeguarding the peace and freedom of the world as outlined in President Truman's message to Congress requesting aid for Greece and Turkey.

We support the principle underlying the Vandenberg amendment as a step in the development of the international authority of the United Nations. We consider the Presidential policy as amended an emergency measure which should be terminated at the earliest practicable opportunity. We recognize that the policy contains unsought but inherent dangers of economic and political imperialism by the United States. We believe that the best way and the speediest way to avoid this in the future and to make unnecessary unilateral assistance to other countries is to strengthen the United Nations so that it can handle such problems within its own organization.

The new United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and all the specialized agencies of the UN should be fully assisted by the United States to the end that European countries through economic security and cooperation may increase their political independence and integrity, and become stronger members of the UN. To provide effective international over-all security against aggression by large as well as small powers and to prevent World War III, immediate and determined efforts must be made to equip the United Nations with necessary power even at the expense of limitation of national sovereignty.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Alva R. Moore; with an amendment (Rept. No. 121);

S. 423. A bill for the relief of John B. Barton; without amendment (Rept. No. 120);

S. 620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122);

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart; without amendment (Rept. No. 124);

S. 665. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 125); and

H. R. 326. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 123).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1141. A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Anna Pechnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1143. A bill to provide for the procurement of physicians and surgeons in the Medical Department of the Army and for other purposes; and

S. 1144. A bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1145. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Edith Olson;

S. 1146. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Yellow Boy; and

S. 1147. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Swift Bird; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of Boris Lifchitz Souvarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (for himself and Mr. McGRATH):

S. 1149. A bill to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1150. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Margert Pickett Yellowtail; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1151. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1152. A bill to provide that the unused portions of immigration quotas for the years 1940 through 1946 shall be available for issuance during the next 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 1153. A bill to incorporate the National Committee for All War Widows and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAPEHART introduced Senate bill 1154, to amend the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1155. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT OF 1946

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946.

This bill is designed to recapture $300,000,000 of the $400,000,000 authorized for expenditure on building subsidies by the Seventy-ninth Congress since the need for subsidies has been eliminated to a great extent by the termination of price controls.

Under the authorization the balance of the $400,000,000, or about $335,000,000, of unspent funds could be expended without further congressional controls any time after this session of Congress has been adjourned.

It is the purpose of this bill to leave more than sufficient funds under authorization to meet the cost of the two remaining subsidy programs for pig iron and soil pipe. The saving of $300,000,000 of the subsidy funds was made possible through the elimination of the need for most building materials which previously could not be obtained because of price limitations.

Existing subsidy programs cannot extend beyond December 31, 1947, under the authorization of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Any need for subsidy after that time can be provided in the next session of Congress.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1154) to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROTOCOL ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before

the Senate Executive N, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol amending the agreements, conventions, and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912, at Geneva on February 11, 1925, and February 19, 1925, and July 13, 1931, at Bangkok on November 27, 1931, and at Geneva on June 26, 1936. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD, together with the message from the President and the letter from the Secretary of State. The Chair hears no objection.

The message, letter, and protocol are as follows:

EXECUTIVE N, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912, at Geneva on February 11, 1925, and February 19, 1925, and July 13, 1931, at Bangkok on November 27, 1931 and at Geneva on June 26, 1936.

This protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on December 11, 1946, and was signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding this protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1947.*

(Enclosures: 1. Certified copy of protocol, opened for signature December 11, 1946, amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs. 2. Report of the Acting Secretary of State.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 21, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of the protocol amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912, at Geneva on February 11, 1925 and February 19, 1925, and July 13, 1931, at Bangkok on November 27, 1931, and at Geneva on June 26, 1936.

By resolution adopted February 12, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations decided, with certain reservations, to take the steps necessary to insure the uninterrupted exercise of the functions and powers of a technical and nonpolitical character vested in the League of Nations by virtue of international agreements. Questions with respect to those functions and powers relating to the control of narcotic drugs were referred to the Economic and Social Council with a view to the drafting of amendments made necessary as a result of the dissolution of the League of Nations and the willingness of the United Nations to assume the international control of narcotic drugs. Accordingly, the Economic and Social Council undertook a study of existing international agreements in order to determine how the administrative and enforcement powers conferred by such agreements on the Council of the League of Nations and other bodies could best be transferred to the United Nations without altering the substantive provisions. Subsequently, a draft protocol adopting certain amendments, as set forth in an accompanying annex, was referred to the General Assembly which, on November 19, 1946, unanimously approved the assumption by the United Nations of the functions and powers exercised by the League of Nations in respect of narcotic drugs. The protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on December 11, 1946, and was signed by the United States representative to the United Nations on that date.

The six agreements, conventions and protocols, amendment of which is contemplated by the present protocol, represent the entire field of existing multilateral undertakings of a formal character in regard to narcotic control. They had been drawn up from time to time, as closer collaboration in this field between nations gave reason to expect that they would be accepted by a sufficient number of governments to make further regulation practicable. This explains the existence of six separate international agreements on the subject and the complexity of the control system resulting therefrom. Each of these agreements covers a special aspect of drug control. Each is made effective by its own terms, irrespective of the others, although the 1936 convention does not enumerate the narcotic substances covered by its provisions, merely providing that they are the narcotics referred to in the 1912, 1925, and 1931 conventions.

The Convention for the Suppression of the Abuse of Opium and Other Drugs, signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912, first of the series and antedating the League of Nations, laid the groundwork for drug control by defining raw, prepared, and medicinal opium, morphine, cocaine, and heroin and providing for the adoption of certain measures by the participating Powers for controlling the traffic in those drugs. The United States of America became a contracting party to that convention. The Netherlands Government was designated depositary and remained such until the General Assembly of the League of Nations, by resolution of December 15, 1920, entrusted to the League of Nations, with the consent of the Netherlands Government, the exercise of the powers conferred upon that Government by the Hague Convention. The first Assembly of the League created the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs to secure the fullest cooperation between the various countries in regard to narcotic control and to assist and advise the Council in matters pertaining thereto.

The Agreement Concerning the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared Opium, with Protocol, signed at Geneva on February 11, 1925, by representatives of the British Empire (with India), China, France, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Siam, was designed to implement Chapter II of the Hague Convention of 1912. The contracting Powers undertook, with respect to Far Eastern possessions or territories, to make the importation, sale and distribution of opium a monopoly of the Government with a view to the gradual and effective suppression of the trade in, and use of, prepared opium.

The International Convention Relating to Dangerous Drugs, with Protocol, signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925, further strengthened the Hague Convention of 1912 by extending control to ecgonine and Indian hemp, establishing a system of import certificates and export authorizations, and entrusting supervision over such trade to a Permanent Central Opium Board. The contracting powers were required to furnish this Board estimates of annual drug requirements and statistics showing annual drug production. The United States of America did not become a party to the Geneva Convention of 1925. However, it has cooperated with the Permanent Central Opium Board by making the reports which the Board has requested. Since 1933 it has participated in the nomination of candidates for the Board and in the nomination of a representative to join with the Council in the selection of the Board.

The Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, with Protocol of Signature, signed at Geneva July 13, 1931, advanced the area of control by limiting the world manufacture of narcotic drugs to the world's medical and scientific needs and by limiting in each country the accumulation of stocks of such drugs. In both cases the limitation was to be accomplished by means of a system of government estimates of annual drug requirements, to be examined by an international supervisory body provided for in the convention and to be binding upon the estimating governments. The United States of America was a signatory to this convention and became a party.

The Agreement for the Control of Opium Smoking in the Far East, signed at Bangkok on November 27, 1931, by representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Siam, reaffirmed their desire to suppress and discourage opium smoking by providing that the retail sale and distribution of the drug shall take place only from government shops, in the absence of a system of licensing and rationing of smokers. This agreement was applicable only to Far Eastern possessions or territories of the contracting powers, including leased or protected territories in which the use of prepared opium was temporarily authorized.

To standardize penalties for illicit trafficking and to formalize arrangements for extradition of persons guilty of drug offenses, the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs was signed at Geneva June 26, 1936. The United States of America participated in the consideration of this convention but the convention as drafted was regarded as unacceptable to the United States of America and was not signed by the American delegates.

The present protocol has the effect of lodging in new administrative and judicial bodies created as organs or under the auspices of the United Nations the authority formerly exercised by various bodies. More particularly the transfer of functions in regard to narcotic control may be shown as follows:

NARCOTIC CONTROL

Functions of	*Transferred to*
The Council of the League of Nations	The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
The Secretary-General of the League of Nations	The Secretary-General of the United Nations
The League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs	The Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
The League of Nations Health Committee and the Permanent Committee of the Office International d'Hygiène publique in Paris	The World Health Organization
The Permanent Court of International Justice	The International Court of Justice

The provisions of the prior agreements, conventions and protocols which refer to states members of the League of Nations and to non-members shall, upon the coming into force of the present amendments, apply to states members of the United Nations and to nonmember states. During the period preceding the entry into force of this protocol,

the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Supervisory Body established, respectively, by the Geneva conventions of February 19, 1925 and July 13, 1931, shall continue, as constituted, to perform their functions. Thereafter the Board and Supervisory Body will continue to function subject to the amendments contemplated by the present protocol.

A Commission on Narcotic Drugs has been created by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to assist in exercising such authority in respect of narcotic drugs as may be vested in the Council, and particularly to carry out functions formerly entrusted to the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs. Should the amendments relating to the conventions of February 19, 1925 and July 13, 1931, come into force before the World Health Organization is in a position to assume its functions, the functions conferred on that Organization by the amendments shall, provisionally, be performed by its Interim Commission.

The present protocol provides in Article VII that it shall come into force in respect of each party on the date upon which it has been signed on behalf of that party without reservation as to approval, or upon which an instrument of acceptance has been deposited. The amendments set forth in the Annex shall come into force in respect of each agreement, convention and protocol when a majority of the parties thereto have become parties to the present protocol. However, states which are parties to any of the instruments which are to be amended are invited (Article II, paragraph 3) to apply the amended texts of those instruments so soon as the amendments are in force even if they have not yet been able to become parties to the present protocol.

This protocol does not terminate, amend, or add to the substantive provisions in the instruments mentioned above. It is designed solely to transfer functions and responsibilities in the field of narcotic control from the old organisms to new organisms of, or under the auspices of, the United Nations. The substantive commitments of contracting Powers under the several existing instruments remain as before. No additional financial obligation is imposed on the Government of the United States of America and it does not, by this protocol, become a party to any of the existing instruments to which it is not already a party. The provisions in such existing instruments with respect to the procedure for becoming a party thereto and with respect to denunciation are to remain in effect.

It is of the greatest importance to the world that states collaborate in the interest of unbroken control of the traffic in narcotics, so long as danger of drug addition remains unabated. The danger is greater than ever. Because of the recent war there are many new factories engaged in drug manufacture and processing. A number of countries had been cut off from their normal sources of supply and, to assure for themselves the largely increased requirements which the war necessitated for legitimate medical and scientific operations, they found it necessary to cultivate the raw materials and build factories to convert the raw materials into drugs. The danger is increased by scientific progress. Now the straw of the poppy can be used for making morphine. A new synthetic drug, demerol (isonipecaine), with properties similar to morphine, is being manufactured in many countries. With new drug sources, increased production, and the susceptibility of war-torn peoples to the taking of drugs to escape suffering, there is a pressing need for further concerted effort to avoid the diversion of dangerous and habit-forming drugs into illicit channels.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON.

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS CONCLUDED AT THE HAGUE ON 23 JANUARY 1912, AT GENEVA ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 19 FEBRUARY 1925, AND 13 JULY 1931, AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931 AND AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

The States Parties to the present Protocol, considering that under the international Agreements, Conventions and Protocols relating to narcotic drugs which were concluded on 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931 and 26 June 1936, the League of Nations was invested with certain duties and functions for whose continued performance it is necessary to make provision in consequency of the dissolution of the League, and considering that it is expedient that these duties and functions should be performed henceforth by the United Nations and the World Health Organization or its Interim Commission, have agreed upon the following provisions:

ARTICLE I

The States Parties to the present Protocol undertake that as between themselves they will, each in respect of the instruments to which it is a party, and in accordance with the provisions of the present Protocol, attribute full legal force and effect to, and duly apply the amendments to those instruments which are set forth in the Annex to the present Protocol.

ARTICLE II

1. It is agreed that, during the period preceding the entry into force of the Protocol in respect of the International Convention relating to Dangerous Drugs of 19 February 1925, and in respect of the International Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, the Permanent Central Board and the Supervisory Body as at present constituted shall continue to perform their functions. Vacancies in the membership of the Permanent Central Board may during this period be filled by the Economic and Social Council.

2. The Secretary-General of the United Nations is authorized to perform at once the duties hitherto discharged by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in connection with the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols mentions in the Annex to the present Protocol.

3. States which are Parties to any of the instruments which are to be amended by the present Protocol are invited to apply the amended texts of those instruments so soon as the amendments are in force even if they have not yet been able to become Parties to the present Protocol.

4. Should the amendments to the Convention relating to Dangerous Drugs of 19 February 1925, or the amendments to the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, come into force before the World Health Organization is in a position to assume its functions under these Conventions, the functions conferred on that Organization by the amendments shall, provisionally, be performed by its Interim Commission.

ARTICLE III

The functions conferred upon the Netherlands Government under articles 21 and 25 of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912, and entrusted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with the consent of the Netherlands Government, by a resolution of the League of Nations Assembly dated 15 December 1920, shall henceforward be exercised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

As soon as possible after this Protocol has been opened for signature, the Secretary-General shall prepare texts of the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols revised in accordance with the present Protocol and shall send copies for their information to the Government of every Member of the United Nations and every non-member State to which this Protocol has been communicated by the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE V

The present Protocol shall be opened for signature or acceptance by any of the States Parties to the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs on 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931 and 26 June 1936, to which the Secretary-General of the United Nations has communicated a copy of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE VI

States may become Parties to the present Protocol by

(a) signature without reservation as to approval,

(b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance or

(c) acceptance.

Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of a formal instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VII

1. The present Protocol shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date upon which it has been signed on behalf of that Party without reservation as to approval, or upon which an instrument of acceptance has been deposited.

2. The amendments set forth in the Annex to the present Protocol shall come into force in respect of each Agreement, Convention and Protocol when a majority of the Parties thereto have become Parties to the present Protocol.

ARTICLE VIII

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the United Nations will register and publish the amendments made in each instrument by the present Protocol on the dates of the entry into force of these amendments.

ARTICLE IX

The present Protocol, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations Secretariat. The Agreements, Conventions and Protocols to be amended in accordance with the Annex being in the English and French languages only, the English and French texts of the Annex shall equally be the authenic texts and the Chinese, Russian and Spanish texts will be translations. A certified copy of the Protocol, including the Annex, shall be sent by the Secretary-General to each of the States Parties to the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs of 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931, and 26 June 1936, as well as to all Members of the United Nations and non-member States mentioned in Article IV.

In faith whereof the undersigned, duly authorized have signed, the present protocol on behalf of their respective Governments on the dates appearing opposite their respective signatures.

Done at Lake Success, New York, this 11th day of December 1946.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on

Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Executive E, Eightieth Congress, first session, the protocol prolonging until August 31, 1947, the international agreement regarding the regulation of the production and marketing of sugar signed in London on May 6, 1937, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session the report will be received, and the protocol will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

MORAL ASPECTS OF USE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the moral aspects of the use of the atomic bomb, written by him and published in the magazine Air Affairs of the issue of March 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL FOR A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "An Appeal to Citizens of the United States of America for Support of a United States of Europe," together with the names of the signers of the appeal, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—RADIO ADDRESSES BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several radio addresses delivered by him during the past 2 weeks on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, which appear in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—LETTER FROM CAPT. NISHAN DER HAGOPIAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 16, 1917, from Capt. Nishan der Hagopian on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1126, Calendar No. 104.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, I submit various supplementary views, and the individual views of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which I ask to have printed as part of the report heretofore submitted.

There being no objection, the views referred to were ordered to be printed as part of the report (No. 105).

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to accompany the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and prevent monopolistic labor practices, and for other purposes; which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of report (No. 105), heretofore reported.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that we do not intend to proceed with the bill this evening. We intended simply to make it the unfinished business at the present time. I may say further that I have agreed to three possible interruptions. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, desires that the labor bill be set aside at 3 o'clock on Thursday afternoon in order that the Senate may consider the deficiency appropriation bill. I have agreed to that procedure.

I have further agreed that the bill be set aside in behalf of the further consideration sometime tomorrow of order No. 52, Senate Joint Resolution 45, introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], which was given consideration by the Senate yesterday.

Personally I shall have no objection, though it has not been agreed to, to the Senate going into executive session sometime tomorrow or Thursday in connection with the nomination of Mr. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I wanted to make inquiry about from the able Senator from Ohio, because it was my understanding from colloquies we have had from time to time during the debate upon the measure which was just passed, that the moment we finished the Greco-Turkish loan bill we would then take up, in executive session, the nomination of Mr. Clapp.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works that we do so, but I wish also to be certain that it is agreeable to the opponents as well as the advocates of Mr. Clapp. However, when that nomination is reached, I hope tomorrow or the next day, I shall make no objection to the Senate going into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Clapp.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works from which the nomination of Mr. Clapp was reported, I will say that I have conferred with the Senator from Ohio, and it is entirely satisfactory to me that the nomination be taken up tomorrow. I have also conferred with other Senators, some of whom are supporting the nomination and some of whom are opposed to it, and so far as I am aware at this time it is entirely agreeable that the nomination be taken up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1126.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. TAFT. To restate the situation, it is understood that the labor bill will be deferred in behalf of three other matters: First, Senate Joint Resolution 45, the author of which is the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]; second, the Clapp nomination; and, third, the urgent deficiency bill, but for no other matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did I correctly understand the chairman of the Committee on Public Works to say that there was an agreement to vote on the Clapp nomination at tomorrow's executive session?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There was no agreement as to the time for voting. It was agreed that tomorrow, in executive session, we would proceed to the consideration of the Clapp nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments in the nature of corrections of typographical errors in Senate bill 1126, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and myself, I send to the desk several amendments intended to be proposed to Senate bill 1126, and ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be in-

serted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: 'or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier' and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: 'or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier'. Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

"(a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: *Provided*, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Vermont make a statement explaining the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is the report on the farm labor supply bill, which the House has just acted upon, and as to which it has just advised the Senate.

The House agreed to the Senate bill and the amendments to the Senate bill, including, in substance, the one offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The Senate conferees agreed that section 2 (a) of the House bill might be reinserted in this bill. That provision reads as follows:

The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriations Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

The reason for the House insistence on retaining this section was that unless the State employment bureaus had the right to place farm laborers who came before them, there was no way by which they could keep them off the unemployment-compensation rolls. They could tell an applicant to go and see the county agent and get a farm job; but if he declined to do so, he could go on the unemployment roll and draw unemployment compensation. Therefore, the Senate conferees agreed to restore this proviso in the House bill.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of love, Lord of the mystery of life, we pray Thee to pierce all earth-born clouds and inspire our best natures into the path of those who have unfeignedly followed Thee. In the sphere of broadening knowledge and advancement, deliver us from all coldness of heart and narrow thinking; forbid that we should be divided through prejudice or suspicion. Constrain us, dear Lord, to seek the good for others rather than for ourselves; to be strong for others rather than seek strength for ourselves; and to look upon all men with brotherly consideration, never with pride or arrogance. Amid confusion and misunderstandings, O Thou who art the sheltered haven for all storm-tossed souls, be Thou the beacon that leads to the city of God. We pray in the name of our Redeemer, whose forgiving heart faltered not in the shadow of the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean;

S. 135. An act to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 245. An act to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department;

S. 993. An act to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 106):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

death of Hon. FRED NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the President pro tempore had appointed the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

CONTESTED ELECTION, EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

APRIL 15, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: This office has knowledge of the bringing of a contest out of the election held November 5, 1946, for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, by the filing of a notice to contest the seat of the returned Member and by the filing of a reply thereto.

The time prescribed by law for the taking of testimony having long since expired and being informed by both parties that no testimony has been taken in this matter, the Clerk transmits copies of the notice of contestant and the reply thereto for reference to the Committee on House Administration, together with this communication.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED NORMAN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may be permitted to extend their remarks on the life and character of our late departed colleague, Hon. Fred Norman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include Joint Memorial No. 9, adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, concerning Federal income-tax returns.

Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Blaine County Citizen of Hailey, Idaho.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

JAMES P. MARTIN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in a special ceremony conducted at his home at Marcus, Iowa, 99-year-old Civil War veteran James P. Martin was installed as State commander of the Iowa Grand Army of the Republic, of which he is the only surviving member. Amy Noll, of Des Moines, department secretary of the Iowa GAR, who was in charge of the installation and members of other Marcus organizations—the Women's Relief Corps, the American Legion, and the American Legion Auxiliary—together with many friends, also participated.

Commander Martin and I rode together in a Memorial Day parade at Sutherland, Iowa, several years ago when I gave the Memorial Day address at the local cemetery. On that occasion I congratulated him on his long life and the splendid service he had rendered his country and his community. I little realized at that time that he would some day be the State commander of the Iowa Grand Army of the Republic, and its sole survivor.

The community of Sutherland and the State of Iowa are very proud of the honor conferred upon this outstanding soldier and citizen. I am especially proud of the fact that Commander Martin is one of my most distinguished constituents and my personal friend. May God richly bless him and keep him in his declining years.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE B. TERRELL

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixed feeling of reverence and regret that I call to the attention of the House that on Friday, April 18, 1947, the Honorable George B. Terrell, of Alto, Cherokee County, Texas, a former Member of this House, was called to his Maker.

The name of Terrell occupies a high place in the political history of Texas. One of the outstanding contributors to that place of eminence was Mr. George B. Terrell.

Mr. Terrell was born December 5, 1862, not too far distant from his home at the time of death. The necessity for assumption of responsibility for the family's welfare, occasioned by his father's death when the son was at the age of 13, placed severe limitations on his efforts to secure an education. Notwithstanding much difficulty he became a student at Sam Houston State Teachers College at Huntsville, Texas, and Baylor University at Waco, and qualified as a member of the teaching profession. He followed that vocation for several years, during the course of which he taught at Sam Houston State Teachers College in Huntsville, until he was 34 years of age.

At the age of 35 he began the first of his great strides in an illustrious political career by seeking the office of representative in the State legislature from Cherokee County. He served in that body with distinction for eight two-year terms between 1898 and 1932. From 1920 to 1930 he served as State commissioner of agriculture.

His contributions in the legislative halls of the State house of representatives to the welfare of Texas were outstanding. He sponsored legislation requiring the teaching of courses in agriculture and domestic science in all State teachers colleges; the law prescribing regulations for grading and packing of vegetables; and a law to establish four experimental stations in Texas to ascertain the crops best suited to the various sections of the State.

His keen interest in and valuable contributions to the agricultural economy of the State contributed largely to his successful effort to become commissioner of agriculture. He retired from the agriculture commissioner's office to return again to the State house of representatives for his eighth and last term in that body from 1930 to 1932.

In 1932 Mr. Terrell was elected as one of Texas' three Congressmen at Large, a campaign made easy by reason of his State-wide reputation as an able and distinguished public servant. He retired from active political life at the end of one term by declining to be a candidate for Representative in Congress when the redistricting bill became effective. He enhanced his stature in public life during his term in the House by earning and enjoying the respect of his colleagues for his integrity, sincerity, staunchness, and devotion to his work.

George B. Terrell continued his keen interest in public affairs, both national and local, throughout the rest of his lifetime notwithstanding illness which impeded his activity during his last years.

No tribute of mine could do ample justice to the husband, the father, the citizen, the statesman, who has left behind him as his own monument a record of conspicuous achievement in every undertaking. To those of us who knew him personally, he was a lovable and kindly counselor; a cherished and sympathetic friend; an illustrious and conscientious public servant. By those who were not so fortunate, he was esteemed and venerated from afar. His passing

will be marked and mourned by a host of admirers throughout the land.

It is for Him who keeps the scroll of mankind to say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," while we who reflect on his services to his Nation may say:

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

May God comfort his loved ones, giving them strength to bear this loss, which we have all sustained.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I join with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] in expressing my own deep personal sorrow at the passing of my long-time friend, the Honorable George B. Terrell, of Texas. Some 25 years ago I had the honor to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Texas and I had no more loyal or more able friend to advise and support me in those days than Mr. Terrell. He was a man of great industry, high character, and strong convictions. Many times he and I were not in agreement on public questions, both in the Legislature of Texas and during the term he served in this body; but nobody ever questioned his integrity, his honesty, his good purposes, or his devotion to his country. He was an expert on agricultural problems and the farmers of Texas owe him a debt they will never be able to pay. I have been a guest in his home and I counted him, as I do all his family, my very dear and valuable friends.

I take this means of expressing my own sorrow and I am sure that of every Member of the Texas delegation when I say that we want his devoted family, and many friends in Texas, to know that he was honored and respected here and we are regretful at his passing. He lived a long, useful, and honored life.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNJUSTIFIABLE CRITICISM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, during my absence a couple of weeks ago the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] made one of the most vicious attacks upon me that has ever been made upon a colleague, to my knowledge, in this Chamber.

I shall answer him next Monday during the period for which I have just been granted an hour's time to address the House, and I shall try in that time to demonstrate the futility and the lack of wisdom of a colleague who knows not of what he speaks getting up on the floor of this House and parroting language that has been put in his mouth by people outside of Congress who have an ax to grind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a statement he made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House on April 14 in support of H. R. 2185, and in the other to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of a free trade zone in Los Angeles harbor.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a recent radio speech.

AID TO GREECE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I talked to an educator, the head master of a small private school, about the President's proposal regarding Greece and Turkey and its implications in reference to combating communism in still other nations throughout the world. He stated that he wanted to see America help feed and rehabilitate the Greek people, but that he wanted to see it done through voluntary contributions of our people by way of an unofficial organization under the protection and with the assistance of the Government of the United States rather than by that Government itself. He said he did not favor mixing humane relief with political pressure to control the forms and policies of foreign governments and he said further that he was unequivocally opposed to military occupation and the use of military force for this purpose.

RETAIN THE PENNY POSTAL CARD

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the Binghamton Central Labor Union, an organization representing all of the affiliated unions of the American Federation of Labor in my area. The CLU hereby goes on record as being against the doubling of the penny postal card charge. Speaking for myself, I join with those people in saying that I think it is ill-advised for a proposal of this kind to be made, when important communications by means of this service to the rank and file of our people are being sent through the mails by the millions every month. The penny postal card is the only way they have ever been able to send messages, because they cannot afford telegrams, or in many cases, special-delivery letters, or in some instances even regular postage. So I bring the Central Labor Union's protest against the doubling of this rate to the floor of the House. This is a reasonable request and should be seriously considered. I think the penny postal card ought to be kept at a penny.

I have heard the argument that raising the cost of postage all along the line is the only possible way we can balance the Post Office budget. That sounds like bunk to me.

You will get as much revenue from people who depend on the penny post card as you will by charging the public 2 cents. This is a small thing, but the little things sometimes hurt the masses of Americans more than the big ones.

Let us forget about socking those who depend upon the penny post card to get their messages to loved ones and friends. Let us figure out a more equitable way to tax the public. I hereby declare myself against this skulduggery and demand that the lowly but dependable penny post card be kept inviolate to the American people for one red cent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post commending the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item appearing in the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN (at the request of Mr. EATON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that ratification of the Italian peace treaty will be withheld. I expressed that hope several months ago. Since the President's address to the joint session of Congress on the subject of Greco-Turkish aid, it has become more than ever apparent that if the Italian peace treaty is ratified we shall be traveling in one direction in Greece and Turkey and in another direction in Italy.

In the first place, the economics provisions of the treaty will unquestionably place an added burden on the American taxpayer. More important than this, however, are the military provisions which provide for the defortification of the Italian frontier, the dispersal of the Italian Navy, the reduction of the Italian Army to 160,000 men, and the withdrawal of the Allied forces. Thus it would be made easy for totalitarian forces to accomplish in Italy what we are trying to prevent them from doing in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we brought all the elements of our foreign planning in line with our foreign policy.

THE GRECO-TURKISH REQUEST

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the $400,000,000 lend-lease request for Greece and Turkey made by President Truman is the first step in a 3-year program of world rehabilitation that will cost American taxpayers at least $21,000,000,000. This estimate is made by conservative authorities in the field of world finance. Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, says it will exceed $31,000,000,000. If we extend this new lend-lease to Greece and Turkey we will be forced to follow through with a complete program of world rehabilitation as a part of our new policy to "Stop Russia now."

If we do this, however, we should not lose sight of the fact that the financial burden we are assuming is not the whole burden. This new foreign policy will mean that we must continue to export huge quantities of scarce goods—food, clothing, fats and oils, sugar, farm machinery, and so forth—thereby boosting prices of these scarce articles higher and higher. It is estimated that the program will require us to export between thirteen and fourteen billion dollars worth of goods each year for the next 3 years. This will result in an ever-increasing spiral of price and wage boosts, with their attendant labor frictions and work stoppages.

President Truman's new foreign policy, if adopted, will also mean that Uncle Sam accepts the role of world policeman; that from now on he will have to furnish the military might required to stop trouble wherever and whenever it arises in any corner of the world. It will mean that he has taken over the responsibilities and obligations that we had hoped a strong United Nations organization would assume and carry. The world now recognizes the fact that the U. N. is a "weak reed," and so Uncle Sam is being called upon to feed the world, to finance the world, to police the world, and to support the world, in order to save the world from communism.

Mr. Speaker, we saved the world from Hitlerism at a cost of $300,000,000,000, plus thousands of lives, and "blood, sweat, and tears." Now we are asked to save the world from communism at a cost that can neither be estimated nor predicted. Is Uncle Sam strong enough to do all this, even if he should be willing to do it?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Prof. Richard Adams, professor of farm management at the University of California. This address exceeds the limit fixed by rule 10. I have therefore obtained from the Public Printer an estimate, and he advises me that it will require three and one-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the cost will be $230.75. However, I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Lilienthal on Saturday to the editors at their banquet, together with certain clippings from the newspapers regarding the speeches of Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. Bush.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Philippine veterans.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article and in the other a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while candidates for President at the other end of the Capitol continue to turn mental somersaults in the international stratosphere, the Communist Party continues to use the press of this Nation to try to undermine and destroy this country, as you will see from the advertisements which appear in the Washington Post and also the one that appeared in the Baltimore Sun of yesterday attacking Members of Congress and the President of the United States. They keep telling you that we are trying to pass laws to outlaw communism in this country. That is correct. It should be driven from American soil, for it is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, and the destruction of our Christian civilization.

George Gallup recently took a poll on this proposition on three points:

1. Do you think membership in the Communist Party in this country should be forbidden by law?

The replies thereto were: Yes, 61 percent; no, 26 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

The next question was:

In general, do you think most American citizens who belong to the Communist Party in this country are loyal to America or to Russia?

The "loyal to America" was 18 percent; "loyal to Russia," 61 percent; and, no opinion, 21 percent.

The third question:

Should American citizens who are members of the Communist Party be forbidden to hold civil-service jobs (regular Government jobs) or should they have the same rights as others to hold Government jobs?

The answers were, "Should be forbidden to hold Government jobs," 67 percent; "should be allowed to hold Government jobs," 19 percent; and, no opinion, 14 percent.

These Communists also should be driven from our educational institutions and our moving-picture industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROOKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by Rt. Rev. John J. Butler in St. Louis.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a speech delivered by one of his constituents.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a telegram, and in the other an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news letter from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Camden News of Camden, Ark., of March 13, 1947, entitled "Will It Be War or Peace?" and in the other to include an article on the retirement of Miss Mary Lucinda Nance.

INSURANCE BUSINESS ASSISTS VICTIMS OF TEXAS DISASTER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the sympathy of the country and most of the civilized world has been extended to the sufferers of the tragic Texas City disaster. While it is of little comfort to those who have suffered so greatly, I think the rest of the people of the country may have and should have their attention called to the fact that the great insurance industry will come to the assistance of those sufferers and the survivors and dependents. Many millions of dollars will be paid by the people of the country partially to compensate that section for its great losses. One large company in New York, I am informed, will pay upwards of $15,000,000 in claims. It is a tribute to the people of America that we have this great industry ready to assist in this emergency and we must be conscious of the importance of providing insurance protection to more of our people. A strong system of private insurance companies must be maintained in our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a report made by the Justice Department to the Senate Committee on Small Business.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include two editorials.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times and also to include a petition which was published in the New York Herald Tribune.

THE GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate which has taken place, and which will take place, in this body on the vital question of the Greek-Turkish loan.

I shall, of course, support that policy, but I have the same reservation that many Americans have, which is: Where do we go from there? With that thought in mind, and following the splendid statesmanship of that great British statesman, Winston Churchill, and the nonpartisan expression of Americans from all over the country, I recently introduced a resolution to the effect that this Congress declare itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe.

I would like to call the attention of this House to the stirring and moving editorial which appeared in favor of that idea in the New York Times on last Friday. The petition is signed by 81 prominent Americans in every walk of life, representing every political faith, pointing to the dire necessity for such a positive plan for Europe and pointing out that Europe must federate or perish.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LOVE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay on world peace.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two essays on world peace.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include an address delivered at a dedication; second, to include an editorial that appeared in the Lynn Item on a centennial at Lowell, Mass.; and third, to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on the same subject.

Mr. POTTS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's New York Sun.

REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported in the local press that a small fire in the attic of the old Wylie House on Thomas Circle tied up motor traffic in that vicinity in all directions for hours. All motor patrols in Washington were ordered out to untangle the jammed-up mass of motorcars.

If a small fire in an attic can tie up Washington traffic in all directions for hours, necessitating the work of all motor patrols to untangle the traffic knot, imagine the holocaust resulting from a panic-stricken public trying to get out of the District of Columbia to escape immediate disaster. During the cherry blossom festival you had a good illustration of how easily Washington traffic is jammed. All bridges across the Potomac were blocked by motor traffic.

When I recently called attention to the vulnerability of the Nation's Capital to air attack, pointing out the terrific loss of life that would follow in the event the people tried to get away from such attack, the city planners replied there could be no danger because of the wide streets here in Washington. But these streets lead into bottlenecks at every circle and at the District limits. Even with no traffic congestion motorists cannot drive over 40 miles an hour with safety on any Maryland highway leading out of Washington. It staggers the imagination to picture what would happen if all motorcars tried to get out of Washington simultaneously.

The only solution of this ever-present danger to the lives of the entire population of our Nation's Capital is to decentralize Washington governmental departments, with their thousands of employees.

Instead of talking about an overpopulated supercity of millions of inhabitants, the city planners should be making plans to cut down the population of Washington. Instead of allowing governmental departments to send out representatives to meet with the girl graduates of high schools all over the country in an attempt to induce them to come to Washington to take jobs with the Government, Congress should take steps to remove all governmental departments to safe places in other parts of the United States. Again I say there is no better place for the War Department than Camp McCoy, in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the appointment of a committee of the House of Representatives to investigate this most serious situation with the view of recommending action to bring about a solution of the problem of overpopulated Washington and its consequent traffic congestion.

ARMY OFFICERS NOT WRITING HISTORY OF NUREMBERG TRIALS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include the text of a letter from Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, budget officer for the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with other Members of the House, I have been disturbed by various reports that a large coterie of American officers and others were being detailed to write a history of the Nuremberg trials, the expense to be paid out of the War Department appropriation. I addressed an inquiry to Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, budget officer for the War Department, and I include herewith his reply.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET OFFICER,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In your letter of April 5, 1947, to the undersigned, you have requested a little résumé of the project for writing the history of the Nuremberg war trials, how much housing is used, and what is the cost to the Government.

From information presently available it does not appear that there is such a project supported by public funds of the United States. Inquiry has been made of Brigadier

General Taylor presently on duty at Nuremberg, of former Brigadier General Gill, who was formerly on duty at Nuremberg with the International Military Tribunal for the trial of war criminals, and of other officers and civilians who would be in a position to know about such a project. Information available discloses that only private persons are writing such a history. They apparently consider that there is sufficient public interest in such a document to make it financially profitable. Such projects are being carried on without expense to or help of the United States.

A transcript of the testimony is being published on a quadripartite basis and is charged to reparations. Present information is not complete but indicates that only two persons from the United States are engaged on that project. It is assumed that your inquiry does not pertain to such a publication.

There was a report in the American Wool and Cotton Reporter for March 13, 1947, that 70 Army officers and 30 professors with their wives and secretarial staff have been sent by the Army on a 3-year mission to Germany to write a history of the Nuremberg trials. That report is entirely without foundation.

It is hoped this covers the questions you asked. If there is any further information in regard to the matter which you desire, I shall be happy to try to get it for you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Major General, GSC,
Budget Officer for the War Department.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Meyer
Angell	Fuller	Miller, Md.
Arnold	Fulton	Mitchell
Barden	Gallagher	Morrison
Bland	Gary	Murdock
Bonner	Gearhart	Murray, Tenn.
Boykin	Gerlach	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	Pace
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn, N. Y.	Patman
Buckley	Gwynne, Iowa	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Hall,	Poage
Burleson	Leonard W.	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Halleck	Rooney
Celler	Hartley	Russell
Chapman	Horan	St. George
Clark	Jackson, Wash.	Scott, Hardie
Clements	Jenison	Scott,
Clippinger	Johnson, Ind.	Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Cooley	Jones, Wash.	Short
Courtney	Kee	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Teague
Dawson, Utah	LeFevre	Towe
D'Ewart	Lusk	Trimble
Dingell	Lynch	Vorys
Domengeaux	McGarvey	West
Ellsworth	Macy	
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. ARENDS, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the National Tribune on the subject Sniping Attacks on Veterans' Administration Officials Unwarranted.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union, and in another instance to include an article by Ernest Lindley.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. CLASON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therewith certain articles.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lewiston Evening Journal.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from Life magazine of April 14.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial from the Oregon Legislature extolling a bill presented to the Congress by himself.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, April 19, 1947.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST LEON JOSEPHSON

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT CITING LEON JOSEPHSON

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), caused to be issued a subpena to Leon Josephson, of 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y. The said subpena directed Leon Josephson to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947, at the hour of 10 a. m., and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the same committee. The subpena served upon Leon Josephson being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, of 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chambers in the city of Washington, D. C., February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington, this 3d day of February 1947.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS,
"Chairman.

"Attest:

"JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk."*

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Stephen W. Birmingham, a licensed detective of the State of New York, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena under the provisions of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), which states in paragraph 3 that subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member. The return of the service by the said Stephen W. Birmingham being endorsed thereon which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, before the committee on the 6th day of February 1947, served at 161 West Sixteenth Street, at 1:10 p. m., on February 4, 1947, New York City.

"STEPHEN W. BIRMINGHAM."

The said Leon Josephson, on February 5, however, sent a telegram addressed to J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, Old House Office Building, which contained words and figures as follows:

"Unable appear before your committee February 6 due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

"LEON JOSEPHSON."

This telegram was received by the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS on the morning of February 6, 1947, and with reference to this telegram, the following commentary appears in the transcript of the proceedings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947:

"The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, presiding. All members present.

"Staff members present: Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Louis J. Russell, investigator.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. Stripling, do you have all of your witnesses here?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there are two witnesses who did not respond—Mr. Samuel Liptzen and Mr. Leon Josephson. Both have sent telegrams to the committee. I think that the telegrams should be read into the record and that the committee should take some action concerning the matter for the reason that these two are very necessary witnesses.

"The CHAIRMAN. I will read the telegrams to the commitee. One is from Mr. Leon Josephson. He says [reading]:

" 'Unable to appear before your committee February 6, due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

" 'LEON JOSEPHSON.'

"The other telegram is from Samuel Liptzen, and it reads:

" 'Critical illness of one very dear to me requires my presence at bedside. Am therefore unable to appear on February 6. Will attend any other day you set after this week. Please notify me.

" 'SAMUEL LIPTZEN.'

"Now, gentlemen, this hearing has to do with a conspiracy and these two witnesses are key witnesses in the conspiracy. What is your pleasure as to these telegrams?

"Mr. Stripling, what do you suggest?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think the facts should be investigated, in the case of Mr. Liptzen, to determine if that is a reasonable excuse for not being here. However, in the case of Mr. Josephson, I consider that 2 days is sufficient notice to come from New York to Washington. In the case of Mr. Liptzen, I think it should be determined whether or not he is at the bedside of a very dear friend.

"The CHAIRMAN. Supposing you do that, and then make arrangements for us to hear them at a later date, and as soon as possible.

"Mr. STRIPLING. All right, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Stripling, call your first witness."

The said Leon Josephson failed to make an appearance on February 6, 1947, as indicated by the aforesaid transcript of the proceedings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

On February 21, 1947, at a meeting of six members of the committee, a discussion was had by the committee regarding the matter of the nonappearance of Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen. Contained in the minutes of the meeting mentioned, is the following:

"A discussion was initiated by the chairman in regard to future action in connection with the investigation and hearings in the case of Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen. It was suggested by the chairman that a subcommittee, consisting of Mr. NIXON, Mr. VAIL, and Mr. BONNER, be appointed to proceed to New York to hear in executive session Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen."

Subsequently, the subcommittee mentioned in the minutes of the meeting hereinbefore described proceeded to New York and conducted hearings on March 5, 1947. On that date, after the subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities had convened in the Federal courthouse in New York City, a subpena was served upon Leon Josephson, which said subpena was set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms or his special messenger, you are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, 161 West 16th Street, New York City, to be and appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON is chairman, in their chambers in the city of New York, March 5, 1947, in room 2301, Federal Court Building, at the hour of 'forthwith' then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; that he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of New York, this 5th day of March 1947.

"RICHARD M. NIXON,
"Chairman, subcommittee.

"Attest:

"JOHN S. ANDREWS, *Clerk.*"

This subpena was duly served upon said Leon Josephson by Louis J. Russell and the return executed thereupon is in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., to appear before a subcommittee on the 5th day of March 1947 forthwith. Served the within named in the hallway adjacent to room 2301 of the United States Court House, Foley Square, New York City, at 11:08 a. m., March 5, 1947.

"L. J. RUSSELL."

The authority of the subcommittee to conduct a hearing in New York City, in relation to the matter under inquiry, is derived from paragraph 3, section 2, of Public Law 601, subsection Q, which is set forth as follows:

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and to produce such books, papers, and documents and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. The subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee or by any member designated by any such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

The said Leon Josephson, pursuant to said subpena, and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said subcommittee. The said Leon Josephson, after making his appearance in the chambers of the said subcommittee, refused to be sworn by the chairman of the said subcommittee and as a result of the said Leon Josephson's refusal to be sworn as a witness before the subcommittee, your subcommittee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter of inquiry committed to said subcommittee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said Leon Josephson.

The record of the proceedings before the committee on March 5, 1947, during which the said Leon Josephson refused to be sworn as a witness and to give testimony, is set forth in part as follows:

"Mr. STRIPLING. That is all I have at the present time.

"Mr. Leon Josephson will be the next witness.

"Are you represented by counsel, Mr. Josephson?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes; I am.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you desire counsel?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Before I am sworn, I wish to make a motion——

"Mr. STRIPLING. In the interest of orderly procedure, I ask that the witness be sworn before any statements are made.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee is perfectly willing to hear motions or statements by the witness at any time that we set that up in the agenda of the hearing——

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I wish to make a motion contesting the constitutionality——

"The CHAIRMAN. First of all, do you refuse to be sworn at this time?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes; I refuse to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I wish to raise the question of the unconstitutionality of this committee, and I propose to take the case through the courts to the United States Supreme Court, if necessary.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that the witness stand and be sworn. I ask that the Chair administer the oath to the witness.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you stand to be sworn at this time?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will not.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I contest the right, the legality of this committee to examine me.

"The CHAIRMAN. You contest the legality of this committee, and on that ground you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. On the ground that you question the legality of this committee?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. That is correct.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show that counsel has accompanied Mr. Josephson, and I would like counsel to give his name and address for the record.

* * * * *

"Mr. STRIPLING. That will be up to the committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. I will entertain a motion at this time that the committee go into executive session to consider the procedure to be followed.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Before that is done, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention of the committee to a subpena dated February 3, 1947, which states:

" 'To the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington on February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

" 'Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

" 'Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington, this 3d day of February 1947.

" '[Signed] J. PARNELL THOMAS.

" 'Attest:

" 'JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*'

"That subpena contains the seal of the House of Representatives. This subpena was forwarded to New York to be served upon Mr. Josephson. The subpena was served by Mr. Stephen W. Birmingham at 1:10 p. m. on February 4 at 161 West Sixteenth Street in New York City. On February 5, 6:20 p. m., Mr. Leon Josephson sent the following telegram to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which reads as follows:

" 'J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, Old House Office Building: Unable appear before your committee February 6, due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

" 'LEON JOSEPHSON.'

"Mr. Josephson did not appear, and has not appeared before the full committee.

"He was served this morning by subpena calling for his appearance forthwith before the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Hon. RICHARD NIXON is chairman.

"I should like that this subpena be made part of the record, and show that Mr. Josephson did appear in the committee's chambers, and that he did then and there refuse to be sworn and to testify concerning matters which are pertinent to the committee's inquiries.

"I should also like for the committee to take under advisement the remarks made by Mr. Josephson's counsel, and also consider the statement submitted by Mr. Josephson's counsel, and I would also like, Mr. Chairman, since Mr. Josephson is still here, to ask that he stand and be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Josephson, will you stand and be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will not be sworn.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Will you stand?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will stand.

"(Mr. Josephson stands.)

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I refuse to be sworn.

"Mr. STRIPLING. You refuse to give testimony before this subcommittee?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Until I have had an opportunity to determine through the courts the legality of this committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn, and you refuse to give testimony before this committee at this hearing today?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I would like for the record to show that Mr. Josephson is still considered by this committee to be under the subpena which was served upon him on February 4, to appear in Washington, D. C., February 6 at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 226 before the full committee on Un-American Activities.

"I should also like the record to show that Mr. Josephson was served with a subpena this date to appear before the subcommittee and that he has not been excused by this subcommittee.

"The CHAIRMAN. The record will so show.

"Off the record.

"(Discussion off the record.)

"The CHAIRMAN. The record will show that neither the subpena of February 3, nor the forthwith subpena served today has been satisfied, and that they are still in effect and are continued, and that Mr. Josephson has physically appeared, has refused to take the oath and to testify before this committee."

CITATION

Willful, deliberate, and inexcusable failure of Leon Josephson to appear before the full committee on February 6, 1947, in response to a subpena.

The said Leon Josephson, as indicated by the foregoing, failed to appear before the said committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947, as directed by the subpena served upon him on February 4, 1947, and willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of the witness to be sworn and to testify on March 5, 1947, as hereinbefore set forth, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared; and his willful refusal to be sworn and to testify deprived your subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 190, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as to the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on February 4, 1947, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Leon Josephson may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the 18th day of February, the Committee on Un-American Activities asked the House to consider contempt action against Gerhart Eisler for his refusal to be sworn and to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities. This body, by a vote of 370 to 1, cited Eisler for contempt, and he has since been indicted by a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia for this offense against the House of Representatives. Gerhart Eisler is an important figure in international communism. He was the commissar of communism in the United States.

We are here today to ask the House to cite two other important Communists for contempt of the House of Representatives. They are Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, and Leon Josephson, a Communist who has been described by witnesses before our committee as being even more important in the international set-up of communism than Eisler. There is no question concerning the contemptuous actions of these two individuals. They have defied the authority of the Congress—they have indeed challenged it. They have scoffed at and violated the Federal statutes.

The cases against these two Communist leaders will be presented by two of my distinguished colleagues of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. MUNDT and Mr. VAIL.

We are not dealing here today with the mere refusal of two individuals to appear and testify before a committee of Congress. What we have is a bold and contemptuous challenge of the very sovereignty of our Government by the leaders of a conspiratorial organization which is bent upon destroying that very Government. These three top Communist conspirators invited contempt because it was a lesser offense than perjury. They would not dare submit themselves to the questioning, nor to confront the evidence which our committee had amassed against them and against their joint conspiracy. Conviction for contempt of Congress will be indeed a light "rap" for these three, for they have violated statute after statute with impunity. Yet, they have never been brought to the bar of justice on any score, and would not now, if your committee had not gone out and dug up the evidence against them.

Now this brings up an important question, and it is, Where has the Department of Justice been for the past 12 years? What were they doing when these comrades were traveling throughout the world on fraudulent American passports in furtherance of their foreign-directed conspiratorial activities? Oh, sure, last week the Attorney General finally got around to indicting Gerhart Eisler for swearing to false statements, after we had exposed the fact and submitted the evidence to him. But here was a man that J. Edgar Hoover has described as "the representative of the Communist International to the Communist Party, United States of America, by virtue of which position he was responsible for and instrumental in the determination of American Communist policy and the control and the direction of American Communist operations, a figure of primary importance and also unlimited authority" and yet he operated in this country for 15 years as a foreign agent, under the alias of Liptzen, Edwards, Berger, and Brown. But was anything ever done to thwart his activities? Was anything ever done to thwart the activities of Eugene Dennis, alias Waldron, alias Milton, alias Walsh, and many others, when he obtained a fraudulent passport in the name of Paul Walsh, with which he went to the Soviet Union? Was anything done in 1940, when he falsified his draft registration, thus avoiding service in the Army? Was anything done after he was arrested five times in California and jumped bail, or was anything done to Leon Josephson, whom we exposed as the official procurer in the United States of fraudulent American passports which were used by the Communist functionaries? Oh, yes, he was arrested as a GPU agent of the Russian Government in Denmark, but was he ever arrested in the United States? The answer to all of these questions is "No." All of these individuals have been flagrantly serving as agents of a foreign government. All three could have been convicted long ago under the MacCormack Act of 1938, or the Voorhis Act of 1940, yet not a single Communist, official or rank and filer, has been indicted under these laws by the Department of Justice, and to keep the record straight, I want to tell the House that on last October 7, I wrote the Attorney General as follows:

The purpose of this letter is to urge you, as the chief law-enforcement officer of the Federal Government, to immediately crack down on the Moscow-directed fifth column operating in the United States.

At the outset I want to make it clear that I am not proposing that your Department engage in a witch hunt. I am simply asking that the Federal laws be enforced to apply to the Communist Party, its members and network of fronts, just as they do to the average citizen or organization in the United States. Why the Communist Party has been immune from prosecution by the Federal Government I cannot answer, but I think it is high time that this immunity cease, and that their license to carry on their activities in open defiance of the Federal laws be revoked and that they be prosecuted to the full extent.

As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives for the past 8 years, I have become familiar with the activities of the Communists. I presume that you, as the Attorney General of the United States, heading the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other enforcement agencies in your Department, must likewise be familiar with their activities. I should, therefore, like to call your attention to certain specific violations of the Federal statutes and ask that you take appropriate action.

1. I assume that no one in authority is naive enough to view the Communist Party of the United States as the domestic political party it purports to be. The evidence is overwhelming that it is a conspiratorial organization set up by a foreign government for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States. The evidence is equally clear that since its inception, it has been directed by that foreign government. As the agent of a foreign government it is carrying on its activities in violation of the Voorhis Act (54 Stat. 1201) which requires that "Every organization subject to foreign control which engages in political activity; * * * shall be required to register with the Attorney General." The act further provides that "Every organization, the purpose or aim of which, or one of the purposes or aims of which, is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of a government or subdivision thereof by the use of force, violence, military measures, or threats of any one or more of the foregoing; * * * shall be required to register with the Attorney General."

2. The MacCormack Registration Act (52 Stat. 631) of 1938 requires that "every person who is now an agent of a foreign principal shall register with the Secretary of State." To my knowledge, none of the officers or members of this foreign-controlled organization have registered under this act.

* * * * *

I am sure, Mr. Attorney General, that there are other violations being committed by these foreign agents, and it is my sincere suggestion that you proceed at once to break up the activities of these forces that are working constantly to destroy our Government.

I set forth in my letter three other statutes that they were in violation of. I received a reply from the Attorney General to the effect that he would investigate my charges. Again on March 31 this year I wrote the Attorney General and urged him to prosecute the Communist Party under the terms of the MacCormack Act and the Voorhis Act. He again replied that the entire matter was receiving diligent and continuous study of the representatives of his Department.

Several weeks ago we had before our committee Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. Let me read you one paragraph of what Mr. Hoover had to say about the Communist Party of the United States:

The Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column if there ever was one. It is far better organized than were the Nazis in the occupied countries prior to their capitulation.

They are seeking to weaken America just as they did in their era of obstruction, when they were alined with the Nazis. Their goal is the overthrow of our Government.

There is no doubt as to where a real Communist's loyalty rests. Their allegiance is to Russia, not the United States.

Now, certainly, Mr. Hoover should know. We know it; what I cannot understand is why does not the Attorney General know it? Why does he not prosecute the Communists just as he should any other violator? Why do they enjoy a special privilege? Back in 1940 the Dies committee, which I was a member of, cited some five Communist officials for contempt for refusal to testify and supply their records. The House promptly certified these contempt actions to the United States attorney in the District, and it took 6 years before they were finally disposed of; some being dismissed, and one received a stiff fine of $150.

Is the Government of the United States to be cowed and insulted by this Communist conspiracy?

President Truman has asked the Congress for $50,000,000 to get the Communists out of the Government. Without dwelling upon the question of who is responsible for bringing about such a condition, I should like to ask why the purging of the Communists from the Government should be predicated upon whether or not $50,000,000 is appropriated. Why not start today? Every agency of the Government has the proper machinery to deal with disloyal persons—all that is needed is the will to do it. Our committee has had the will for 8 years to expose the Communists, and other subversives, and frankly I think we have done a good job with the $714,000 that it has spent. Compare that if you will with the many millions annually appropriated to investigative agencies of the executive departments of the Government.

The Communists and other subversives will be thoroughly exposed by your committee, but exposure is not the complete answer. They must be treated for what they are, an enemy within our midst. They must be prosecuted for their violations—their immunity must cease. The American people rightfully have a deep sense of fear about communism. Apparently all that the President and the Attorney General see in it is a chance for more spending through more investigations, which become the burial ground for action. I call upon the Attorney General for action now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 13 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has come to the attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I understand most of the Members of this House, that some question has been raised by the party cited in this resolution and others who will presently be cited, with reference to the constitutional and legal authority of this committee to enforce its subpenas and require the attendance of witnesses, I think it might not be amiss to say a few words about the power and authority of the Congress to make investigations and to require the attendance of witnesses as provided by our law.

It is well settled that the House of Representatives has power through its own process to compel a private individual to appear before it, or before one of its committees, and give testimony needed to enable it efficiently to exercise the functions belonging to it under the Constitution. The same is true of the Senate, of course.

While there is no provision in the Constitution expressly investing either House with this authority, in actual legislative practice the power to secure needed information by such means has, with judicial approval, long been treated as an attribute of the power to legislate. It was so regarded in the British Parliament and in the colonial legislatures before the American Revolution, and a like view has prevailed and been carried into effect in both Houses of the Congress and in most of the State legislatures.

This power was both asserted and exerted by the House of Representatives as early as 1792, when it appointed a select committee to inquire into the St. Clair Expedition and authorized the committee to send for necessary persons, papers, and records—Third Congress Annotated, page 494.

Congress early enacted legislation in aid of the effective exercise of this authority. On May 3, 1798—First Statute, page 554—Congress provided by law that oaths or affirmations might be administered to witnesses by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of a Committee of the Whole, or the chairman of a select committee, "in any case under their examination." By an act of February 8, 1817, it enlarged that provision so as to include the chairman of a standing committee. On January 24, 1857, it passed "an act more effectually to enforce the attendance of witnesses on the summons of either House of Congress, and to compel them to discover testimony."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that such power is inherent in all governments and is necessary for their very existence?

Mr. WOOD. The Supreme Court has so held.

This act provided, first, that any person summoned as a witness to give testimony or produce papers in any matter under inquiry before either House of Congress, or any committee of either House, who should willfully make default, or if appearing, should refuse to answer any question pertinent to the inquiry, should, in addition to the pains and penalties then existing—that is, the power of the particular House to itself deal with contempt—be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to indictment and punishment as there prescribed; and secondly, deal with the right of the person summoned to make the claim that the evidence required to be given might tend to incriminate or disgrace him. This latter feature was further amended on January 24, 1862. The enactments above referred to, as amended from time to time, are now embodied in sections 101 to 104, and in section 859, of the Revised Statutes, United States Code, 1940 edition, title 2, sections 191 to 194; title 28, section 634.

There is a long line of judicial decisions recognizing the inherent power of Congress, through the Houses and committees thereof, to conduct investigations and to exact testimony from witnesses for legislative purposes.

The most recent Supreme Court case in which this power was considered comprehensively is that of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135), decided on January 17, 1927.

In that case, after a general discussion of the nature of the power, the court stated as follows—at page 168—with respect to the purpose of the statutory provisions referred to above:

They show very plainly that Congress intended thereby (a) to recognize the power of either House to institute inquiries and exact evidence touching subjects within its jurisdiction and on which it was disposed to act; (b) to recognize that such inquiries may be conducted through committees; (c) to subject defaulting and contumacious witnesses to indictment and punishment in the courts, and thereby to enable either House to exert the power of inquiry "more effectually"; and (d) to open the way for obtaining evidence in such an inquiry, which otherwise could not be obtained, by exempting witnesses required to give evidence therein from criminal and penal prosecutions in respect of matters disclosed by their evidence.

In upholding the exercise of this power by Congress, the Supreme Court said in that case—pages 174 and 175:

We are of opinion that the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. It was so regarded and employed in American legislatures before the

Constitution was framed and ratified. Both Houses of Congress took this view of it early in their history—the House of Representatives with the approving votes of Mr. Madison and other Members whose service in the convention which framed the Constitution gives special significance to their action—and both Houses have employed the power accordingly up to the present time. The acts of 1798 and 1857, judged by their comprehensive terms, were intended to recognize the existence of this power in both Houses and to enable them to employ it more effectually than before. So, when their practice in the matter is appraised according to the circumstances in which it was begun and to those in which it has been continued, it falls nothing short of a practical construction, long continued, of the constitutional provisions respecting their powers and, therefore, should be taken as fixing the meaning of those provisions, if otherwise doubtful.

We are further of opinion that the provisions are not of doubtful meaning, but, as was held by this court in the cases we have reviewed, are intended to be effectively exercised, and therefore to carry with them such auxiliary powers as are necessary and appropriate to that end. * * * A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it. Experience has taught that mere requests for such information often are unavailing, and also that information which is volunteered is not always accurate or complete; so some means of compulsion are essential to obtain what is needed. All this was true before and when the Constitution was framed and adopted. In that period the power of inquiry—with enforcing process—was regarded and employed as a necessary and appropriate attribute of the power to legislate—indeed, was treated as inhering in it. Thus there is ample warrant for thinking, as we do, that the constitutional provisions which commit the legislative function to the two Houses are intended to include this attribute to the end that the function may be effectively exercised.

At the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress a resolution was overwhelmingly adopted by the Congress creating this Committee on Un-American Activities as a permanent standing committee of the Congress and empowering it with authority to conduct investigations into the infiltration and dissemination of subversive influences and activities into the United States detrimental to our form of government, and to make report of its findings to the Congress, and in so doing to require, by subpena, the attendance before it of witnesses and the production of such records and documents as may be necessary to such investigations. Likewise it is given authority to initiate, consider, and report to the House proposed legislation with its recommendations thereon.

In the discharge of the duties and powers thus conferred upon it, this committee caused to be served upon the persons named in these citations for contempt subpenas requiring them to appear before the committee and give testimony pertinent to its investigations, which subpenas were willfully and contemptuously ignored.

Whatever may be the political philosophy of any Member of this Congress, or their opinions as to the importance of the work being performed by this committee, it seems to me that the sole issue now before the Congress is the broad and fundamental question of upholding the dignity and preserving the sovereignty and authority of the Congress itself, and upon this question there should not be a dissenting voice amongst its Members.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a subpena for Leon Josephson, of 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, calling for his appearance before the committee at 10 a. m., on February 6, 1947, in the committee's chambers in the Old House Office Building. The subpena was served upon Josephson in New York at 1:10 p. m. February 4. On the morning of February 6, the chairman received a telegram from Leon Josephson, in which he stated he was unable to appear before the committee due to inadequate notice of less than 48 hours, and that his counsel had advised him such short notice was unreasonable. This was the hearing at which the committee brought before it Gerhart Eisler and exposed him as being a Comintern representative in the United States, directing the affairs of the Communist Party. Leon Josephson was to have been an important witness at that hearing, for it was later brought out before the committee that it was he who had forged the fraudulent American passport in the name of Samuel Liptzen, which Eisler used to travel back and forth from Moscow to the United States. In other words, it was not as Mr. Josephson claimed, the unreasonableness of the notice which prevented him from appearing. Rather it was his complicity with Gerhart Eisler and other top Communists in a vast conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. By appearing before the committee and testifying under oath, Josephson would have had to choose between committing perjury or implicating himself and other top functionaries of the Communist Party in numerous violations of the Federal statutes.

On February 21, 1947, the chairman of our committee appointed a subcommittee composed of Mr. NIXON, chairman, Mr. BONNER, and myself, to proceed to New York to conduct an investigation and hold hearings in connection with Leon Josephson and his failure to appear before the full committee on February 6.

The subcommittee convened in executive session in room 2301, United States Federal Courthouse, at 10 a. m., March 5, 1947. The chairman of the subcommittee issued a forthwith subpena calling for Josephson's appearance before the subcommittee in New York. He appeared accompanied by his counsel. He was asked to be sworn and to testify. He refused to do so on the grounds that he contested the legality of the committee.

On March 21, 1947, the subcommittee reported back to the full committee and recommended that Leon Josephson be cited for contempt and that all the evidence in the committee's possession be forwarded to the Attorney General with the recommendation that Leon Josephson be prosecuted for the various violations of the Federal Statutes which were manifested by the documentary evidence in the possession of the committee. The full committee unanimously adopted the report of the subcommittee, and on March 24, in executive session, the full committee adopted unanimously a motion made by Mr. MCDOWELL and seconded by Mr. WOOD, that Leon Josephson be cited for being in contempt of the full committee as well as the subcommittee.

In accordance with this motion, we have therefore come to the House today with two resolutions of contempt against Leon Josephson:

First. For his willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal to appear before the full committee on February 6, in response to the subpena which had been served upon him 2 days previous on February 4. This contempt citation would be referred to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia for prosecution.

Second. For his willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal to be sworn and to testify on March 5 before the subcommittee in New York. This contempt citation, however, would be referred to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York for prosecution.

Now I want to point out to the House that 2 days is certainly sufficient notice for a person to come from New York to Washington—a distance requiring 4 hours by rail and 1½ hours by plane—to appear before a committee of Congress in response to a subpena. Secondly, I want to point out that when Josephson appeared before the subcommittee in New York, he offered no explanation for his failure to comply with the original subpena calling for his appearance before the full committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I am convinced that Josephson never intended to testify either before the full committee or the subcommittee. He was acting in accordance with the present policy of the Communist Party which is to be as contemptuous as possible before committees of Congress and to refuse testimony.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAIL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, did he not treat the subcommittee with contempt even when they went to New York to cross-examine him?

Mr. VAIL. He did. This action, to my mind, makes the entire leadership of the Communist Party guilty of an even more serious charge than contempt, namely, conspiracy to commit contempt. This point, however, will be discussed, I understand, by my distinguished colleagues of the committee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Now, who is Leon Josephson? The record shows that he was born in Libau, Latvia, now a part of the Soviet Union, June 17, 1898. He came to the United States in the spring of 1900. He was naturalized in Newark, N. J., April 25,

1921. He joined the Communist Party in the early twenties and became a member-at-large. He is a graduate of New York University Law School. He is a member of the Bar of the State of New Jersey, admitted in 1921. In 1932 he was an employee of the Amtorg Corp., official trading agency of the Soviet Government. It is not known definitely how many trips Josephson has made abroad, but the committee has evidence that he traveled to the Soviet Union in 1923, again in 1929. In 1927 he went to Berlin, Germany, and in 1935 he was in Denmark.

The subcommittee had before it two witnesses who were at one time very high in Communist Party circles. Both testified that Leon Josephson was a GPU agent of the Russian Government. The committee received considerable testimony showing that Josephson obtained by forgery many fraudulent American passports which were used by Communist functionaries and GPU agents of the Russian Government. He was a top "fixer" and "procurer" for the Comintern.

As an indication of the kind of Communist international operator Mr. Josephson is, I should like to advise the House that in February 1935 Leon Josephson was arrested with George Mink, a GPU agent of the Soviet Government, and others, by the Danish Policy in Copenhagen and were charged with having fake passports in their possession and with espionage. They had in their possession detailed plans for the installation and operation of a secret radio station in Denmark and were directing and operating a courier system which carried messages in secret code between Copenhagen, Antwerp, the British Isles, and New York.

After Josephson and two of his associates had been in prison for approximately 4 months, they were brought to trial on May 11, 1935. Josephson was acquitted and the other two men were convicted. After his release from prison, he was interviewed by the American consul general in Denmark, Mr. Lester Maynard. I should like to read from the official dispatch which was filed with the Department of State by Mr. Maynard concerning his interview with Josephson, and I quote:

> He came to the consulate general on Tuesday, May 14, having been released from prison on Monday, and then enlarged considerably on the information which he had previously given. He stated that to him, communism is more than a political theory or belief, and is a religion. He stated that he is an atheist and a member of the active Communist Party in America and its inner circles.
>
> * * * * *
>
> He then explained to me his personal views in regard to the Communist movement, the pertinent part of which was that he considered the orders of his committee (central committee of the Communist Party) superior to the laws of the United States, and that he would do anything "short of murder" to carry out the committee's orders.

Those are the statements, Mr. Speaker, of Russian-born Leon Josephson, who, although he became a citizen in 1921, has devoted practically his entire adult life to the destruction of the very Government and country which has been so generous to him.

As he told our consul general at Copenhagen, he has no respect for the laws of the United States; he likewise has none for the Congress of the United States, as indicated by his recent contemptuous attitude toward the subpenas of this House.

The accumulated evidence in the hands of the committee is clear, complete, and indisputable. There can be no question that Josephson is the leader of the so-called forged passport ring and high in the councils of the Communist Party in America. Let us by our unanimous approval of both resolutions serve notice upon such traitors that we intend to preserve the dignity of the Congress of the United States in the fullest measure and that contempt of its assigned committees will bring certain and swift punishment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. PLUMLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in each a speech.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST LEON JOSEPHSON

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the issues in this matter have been very clearly covered by the members of the committee who have preceded me. The right to cite for contempt has been definitely decided in the courts. The facts in this case as very vividly brought out showing in this particular case that the witness studiously planned to be in contempt of the committee. It is not such a case as where, in the course of examination, a question comes along and a person tries to rely upon his constitutional rights, but it is a case in which, first, the witness claims that he was not given enough time to appear. The committee in a sense of decency and fairness took that into consideration. The subcommittee was in New York where the witness was located. Again, the witness flatly refused actually to be sworn. That is a part of the pattern of Communist technique that has shown up from time to time in the course of the investigation.

We have had situations ofttimes where they want to give a prepared statement. They will ask to appear before the committee, and then before they are sworn they want to hand out their own statement and not be subjected to cross examination. That happened in the Dennis case. When the questioner asked him his name, he did not even want to tell his name, but he had a statement which he wanted to hand out at that particular time. My colleague who preceded me told you something about who this witness was. He stated definitely in the course of the hearing the important part he has taken in the Communist Party in this country.

On page 54 of the hearings the following language appears:

> Mr. Beal, in this connection, testified that he and the other defendants did go to Russia, and that Mr. Leon Josephson was instrumental in obtaining false passports for the group of defendants in order that they could travel to the Soviet Union. Prior to the obtaining of these passports, Leon Josephson, according to Mr. Beal's testimony, was active in the trial of Mr. Beal and the other defendants at Gastonia, N. C.
>
> Mr. Beal also testified that, after he arrived in the Soviet Union, he saw Leon Josephson in Moscow upon several occasions.

Mr. Beal in testifying of his trip there, said that as a matter of fact he went to Russia and came back, and that he would rather face a 20-year term in the penitentiary in this country than live in Russia after learning of the operations in Russia. Beal himself stated:

> I would prefer to stay over here, no matter if it was in the penitentiary, than in Soviet Russia, but at that time, and I still do believe in socialism. I didn't think that the Russian Government, under the Communist Party, was putting forward the Socialist idea.
>
> I could see that the workers were not really running the government and I had been advocating such a thing for years here and I became greatly disillusioned and returned.

He said they did not want to bring to this country the disillusionment that he had felt after he had gone to Russia.

The truth of the matter is that this witness did not want to appear on the stand. He was afraid to answer the questions of the committee itself because it had been testified in this hearing that he was on a higher level or echelon and was probably in the policy-making group of the Communist Party. But he preferred to come contemptuously, deliberating conspiring to absolutely refuse to testify in the case.

In the interest of time, I would like to talk about the Dennis case. Dennis asked to appear as a witness before the committee. When he came before the committee he wanted to hand out a statement. Then, when we asked him his name, he refused to answer his name. When he was asked if that was the name he was born under, he refused to answer. He refused to answer simple, ordinary questions that any man would not mind answering unless he was afraid of those particular answers. So it is not just the Committee on Un-American Activities that is being challenged; it is the Congress of the United States; the right of the Congress to send out and bring witnesses before them. In this particular instance, the committee which was created by the House of Representatives was given powers, specifically set forth in the rule itself, the right to subpena, the right to investigate, the right to report legislation, and the right to make its findings.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making before the House. Is it not a fact that the probabilities are that the witness would rather have subjected himself to contempt proceedings than to

have answered questions which would have resulted in his prosecution for perjury?

Mr. PETERSON. There is no question about that. Had he answered the questions he might have subjected himself to prosecution for perjury. Otherwise, he would have been embarrassing those associated with him in the iniquitous work he was carrying on in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolutions which are now being considered by this House will bring up in sharp contrast a change in one of the aspects of the American Government and a change in the procedure and the operations of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, today, brings before the bar of this House the name of one Leon Josephson, a resident of the State of New York, and a native of Russia, whom, the committee, unanimously holds, is in contempt of this House, and who should be cited for that contempt and who should be punished for that contempt. I will digress from the case at hand for a brief moment to discuss the history of contempt of Congress.

Exhaustive research through the archives of the Nation and the precedents of the Congress of the United States reveal that contempt of the House or the Senate of the Congress is not a common matter. The precedents reveal that it largely came in the past from overwrought tempers, misunderstandings, bitter personal hatreds and dislikes, sectional differences, political opposition and other matters that were entirely human and common to the men of ability and temperament who were members of these bodies or associated with membership or opposed to their membership.

The common remedy for contempt of the House and the Senate for many generations of the American Government was apology to the House or the Senate. Offenders, so judged by either House, were called to the bar of the House or the Senate and officially reprimanded by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, and that had always been sufficient to maintain the dignity and authority of the Houses of Congress.

However, Mr. Speaker, these matters, without exception, had to do with Americans who were involved with affairs wholly within the United States of America. Now, we have something else. Now, we have something different. Now, we are contending with the brains and the ability and the desires of the enemies of the American people to destroy this Congress and its authority and its respect and its reputation and to destroy this Nation. We are considering here the case of Leon Josephson, a lawyer of New York City, who has lived as a prosperous and well-fed and a completely safe citizen of these United States since his early childhood. The committee has been informed of this man's activities for sometime. My distinguished colleague of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], has already described to you in great detail the life and the activities of Josephson, and he has described to you the events which occurred both here in Washington and in New York that have caused him to be cited for contempt in two instances.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was created and has been assigned by this House to look into and to investigate if there are enemies of the United States, its Constitution, and its people. This the committee is doing. We are attempting to find out if they exist, who they are, where they are, and how they operate, and in the judgment of this committee, Leon Josephson is one of those enemies.

In the pursuance of this duty, your committee recently subpenaed the self-admitted German Communist Gerhart Eisler to appear before it, so that the committee might question his presence in our land and further question him about subversive activities of which we had knowledge in which he was engaged. This man, in response to a subpena, appeared. He was most arrogant, thoroughly contemptuous of the committee and the Congress, and was cited by the Un-American Activities Committee. Subsequently, this House agreed to that with but one dissenting vote.

It has been revealed to the committee, and subsequently to this House, that a gang of conspirators in the pay and under the direction of the head of a world-wide conspiracy in Russia, directs all of these puppets in the United States. Gerhart Eisler appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities. It was apparent to all of us that he had been trained to deliver a contemptible address, without responsibility at that high moment, but the orderly procedure demanded by Chairman THOMAS changed that by informing this foreign agent that this was still America and that he must be sworn. He refused to be sworn.

Gerhart Eisler, the murderous little Moscow agent, who was trained in China to point out Chinese, so numerous, who were to be murdered to enable the advance of the Moscow culture there—set the pattern for all of his Red associates who were sure to follow. Eisler, the big shot of Europe, who has given orders to the Communist Party for the past years, set the pattern that was followed by Leon Josephson, and the acting head of the Communist Party in the United States, Eugene Dennis, alias Waldron. Now, today, we consider the conspiracy against all of us, and the things we hold sacred and dear here in America, by considering these citations of contempt of Leon Josephson. This man is a lifelong Communist and his record, which is available to all of you, indicates that most of that life was spent in defying the laws of the United States. His shuttling back and forth on forged and fraudulent passports to Russia, to Denmark, to Germany; his activities in associating with other conspiratorial figures in circumventing and violating the laws of our Republic had created a situation that if he had testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities he would have seriously complicated his life with either a charge of perjury or the confession of crimes and admittance of crimes that would have taken him out of circulation for many years to come.

The Bolshevik newspapers and speakers and pamphlet writers in America are trying desperately to tell the world that the Congress of the United States and the Committee on Un-American Activities framed Eisler and framed Dennis and framed Josephson, by the simple act of demanding their presence in pursuance of instructions of Congress. The Daily Worker and its fellow travelers lies as they lie about everything. The facts are these:

Those of you who have devoted time in years gone by to the study of the operations of Red fascism know that there is no pigeon so dead as a Communist leader who has failed. Exposure of the shady Eisler and the even more shady Josephson renders them in the eyes of the Communist overlords in Moscow a couple of dead pigeons. The committee has been charged with many things which are not true, but these hysterical and silly falsehoods have not slowed down the action of the Committee on Un-American Activities to doggedly follow the instructions given it by the authority of this House itself and with the power that was granted it by the votes of this House. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, to my fellow Members of the House that we are not wasting our shots and our time on a small army of trifling would-be conspirators who hold an obedient membership in the Communist Party—that we have nothing at all to do with liberals or even radicals. This is still America, and to be a liberal and to be a radical has many many times in the history of our country been an honored position here in America. Our sole function is to ferret out those who are actual menaces to the American ways of life and to the things that this Capitol and this very Chamber stand for. America has looked complacently on these destructive rodents that have been busily gnawing at the foundations of our country and screaming for the protection the Government provides decent citizens when their criminal activities are exposed.

It is time for flag waving here in America. It is time for patriotism and for a revival of that American spirit that enables and permits a Member of this House to stand here in the well of the rights of the people of America and hurl the defiance of those people that this conspiracy, or any other conspiracy, that is designed to take away those things that have been created here in the United States will not be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I will anticipate that every Member of this House will vote for these resolutions. Who could argue against them? Nor will the Member who may quibble, or who may be blinded by the lies that this is some sort of a frame-up, be on solid ground. Read the record. It says bluntly and frankly that Leon Josephson defies the authority of Congress, quibbles about the constitutionality of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and invited the citation that will surely be given him today—contempt of Congress. This is the least thing that could happen to this man.

He is a smart lawyer. He chose the least of the troubles that befronted him. Were he to be sworn and testified to the questions that he knew we were going to ask, his punishment would undoubtedly have been long and severe. These people that are caught do not turn to Russia for help as help cannot come from there. Their eyes turn instantly to the Constitution of the United States and they pray for all of the protection that immortal document gives to all decent people in America.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up the arguments that have been presented in this House today for support of two citations of contempt of Congress of Leon Josephson, may I state that I believe this to be an important historical action on the part of lovable, affable, and kindly Uncle Sam—that the Congress of the United States is no longer going to stand by and permit the agents of a foreign power to operate freely in our midst within or without the laws of our land—that from this day on they cross our borders to urge rebellion and treason at their own peril, and for those in America with treason in their hearts we pledge here and now, by this citation, to protect the cherished rights of being an American.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the privileged resolution before the House.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 118, noes 1.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 357, nays 2, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—357

Abernethy	Bradley, Calif.	Combs
Albert	Bradley, Mich.	Cooper
Allen, Calif.	Bramblett	Corbett
Allen, Ill.	Brehm	Cotton
Allen, La.	Brooks	Coudert
Almond	Brophy	Courtney
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ga.	Cox
Anderson, Calif.	Bryson	Cravens
Andresen, August H.	Buchanan	Crawford
Andrews, Ala.	Buck	Crosser
Andrews, N. Y.	Buffett	Crow
Arends	Burke	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Burleson	Curtis
Bakewell	Busbey	Dague
Banta	Butler	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Camp	Dawson, Utah
Bates, Mass.	Canfield	Deane
Battle	Cannon	Delaney
Beall	Carroll	Devitt
Beckworth	Carson	D'Ewart
Bell	Case, N. J.	Dirksen
Bender	Case, S. Dak.	Dolliver
Bennett, Mich.	Chadwick	Dondero
Bennett, Mo.	Chelf	Donohue
Bishop	Chenoweth	Dorn
Blackney	Chiperfield	Doughton
Blatnik	Church	Douglas
Bloom	Clason	Drewry
Boggs, Del.	Clevenger	Durham
Boggs, La.	Coffin	Eaton
Bolton	Cole, Kans.	Eberharter
	Cole, Mo.	Elliott
	Colmer	Ellis
Elsaesser	Kerr	Ramey
Elston	Kersten, Wis.	Rankin
Engel, Mich.	Kilburn	Rayburn
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Rayfiel
Evins	King	Redden
Fallon	Kirwan	Reed, Ill.
Feighan	Klein	Reed, N. Y.
Fellows	Knutson	Reeves
Fenton	Kunkel	Rich
Fernandez	Landis	Richards
Fisher	Lane	Riehlman
Flannagan	Lanham	Riley
Fletcher	Larcade	Rizley
Fogarty	Latham	Robertson
Foote	Lea	Robsion
Forand	LeCompte	Rockwell
Gamble	Lemke	Rogers, Fla.
Gathings	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	Lewis	Rohrbough
Gillette	Lodge	Rooney
Gillie	Love	Ross
Goff	Lucas	Russell
Goodwin	Lyle	Sabath
Gordon	Lynch	Sadlak
Gore	McConnell	Sanborn
Gorski	McCormack	Sarbacher
Gossett	McCowen	Sasscer
Graham	McDonough	Schwabe, Mo.
Granger	McDowell	Schwabe, Okla.
Grant, Ala.	McGregor	Scoblick
Grant, Ind.	McMahon	Scrivner
Gregory	McMillan, S. C.	Seely-Brown
Griffiths	McMillen, Ill.	Sheppard
Gross	MacKinnon	Sikes
Hagen	Madden	Simpson, Ill.
Hale	Mahon	Simpson, Pa.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maloney	Smathers
Hand	Manasco	Smith, Kans.
Hardy	Mansfield, Mont.	Smith, Maine
Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Harness, Ind.	Mason	Smith, Va.
Harris	Mathews	Smith, Wis.
Harrison	Meade, Ky.	Snyder
Hart	Meade, Md.	Somers
Havenner	Merrow	Spence
Hays	Michener	Springer
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Stanley
Hedrick	Miller, Conn.	Stefan
Heffernan	Miller, Nebr.	Stevenson
Hendricks	Mills	Stigler
Herter	Mitchell	Stockman
Heselton	Monroney	Stratton
Hess	Morgan	Sundstrom
Hill	Morris	Taber
Hinshaw	Morton	Talle
Hobbs	Muhlenberg	Thomas, N. J.
Hoeven	Mundt	Thomas, Tex.
Hoffman	Murdock	Thomason
Holifield	Murray, Wis.	Tibbott
Holmes	Nixon	Tollefson
Hope	Nodar	Twyman
Howell	Norblad	Vail
Huber	Norrell	Van Zandt
Hull	Norton	Vinson
Jackson, Calif.	O'Brien	Vorys
Jarman	O'Hara	Vursell
Javits	O'Konski	Wadsworth
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Toole	Walter
Jenkins, Pa.	Owens	Weichel
Jennings	Passman	Welch
Johnson, Calif.	Patterson	Wheeler
Johnson, Ill.	Peden	Whitten
Johnson, Tex.	Peterson	Whittington
Jones, Ala.	Philbin	Wigglesworth
Jones, N. C.	Phillips, Calif.	Williams
Jones, Ohio.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Jonkman	Pickett	Wilson, Tex.
Judd	Ploeser	Winstead
Karsten, Mo.	Potts	Wolcott
Kean	Poulson	Wolverton
Kearney	Preston	Wood
Kearns	Price, Fla.	Woodruff
Keating	Price, Ill.	Worley
Keefe	Priest	Youngblood
Kennedy	Rabin	Zimmerman
Keogh	Rains	

NAYS—2

Marcantonio	Powell

NOT VOTING—72

Angell	Cole, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Arnold	Cooley	Gwynne, Iowa
Barden	D'Alesandro	Hall, Leonard W.
Bland	Dawson, Ill.	Halleck
Bonner	Dingell	Hartley
Boykin	Domengeaux	Horan
Brown, Ohio	Ellsworth	Jackson, Wash.
Buckley	Folger	Jenison
Bulwinkle	Fuller	Jensen
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulton	Johnson, Ind.
Celler	Gallagher	Johnson, Okla.
Chapman	Gary	Jones, Wash.
Clark	Gearhart	Kee
Clements	Gerlach	Kefauver
Clippinger	Gifford	Kelley
LeFevre	Pace	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Lusk	Patman	Shafer
McGarvey	Pfeifer	Short
Macy	Plumley	Taylor
Mansfield, Tex.	Poage	Teague
Meyer	Rees	Towe
Miller, Md.	Rivers	Trimble
Morrison	Sadowski	West
Murray, Tenn.	St. George	
	Scott, Hardie	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Halleck with Mr. D'Alesandro.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Gary.
Mr. LeFevre with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Chapman.
Mr Towe with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Short with Mr. Pace.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Dingel.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Jackson of Washington.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott Jr. with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Jensen with Mr Folger.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Kee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, after "articles", insert "other than copper sulphate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEON JOSEPHSON

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

REPORT CITING LEON JOSEPHSON

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection Q (2),

caused to be issued a subpena to Leon Josephson, of 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y. The said subpena directed Leon Josephson to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947, at the hour of 10 a. m., and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the said committee. The subpena served upon Leon Josephson being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America to the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, of 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chambers in the city of Washington, D. C., February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the Seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington, this 3d day of February 1947.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*"

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Stephen W. Birmingham, a licensed detective of the State of New York, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena under the provisions of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), which states in paragraph 3 that subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member. The return of the service by the said Stephen W. Birmingham being endorsed thereon which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, before the committee on the 6th day of February 1947, served at 161 West Sixteenth Street, at 1:10 p. m., on February 4, 1947, New York City.

"STEPHEN W. BIRMINGHAM."

The said Leon Josephson, on February 5, however, sent a telegram addressed to J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, Old House Office Building, which contained words and figures as follows:

"Unable appear before your committee February 6 due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

"LEON JOSEPHSON."

This telegram was received by the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS on the morning of February 6, 1947, and with reference to this telegram, the following commentary appears in the transcript of the proceedings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947:

"The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS (chairman) presiding. All members present.

"Staff members present: Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Louis J. Russell, investigator.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. Stripling, do you have any of your witnesses here?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there are two witnesses who did not respond—Mr. Samuel Liptzen and Mr. Leon Josephson. Both have sent telegrams to the committee. I think that the telegrams should be read into the record and that the committee should take some action concerning the matter for the reason that these two are very necessary witnesses.

"The CHAIRMAN. I will read the telegrams to the committee. One is from Mr. Leon Josephson. He says [reading]:

" 'Unable to appear before your committee February 6, due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

" 'LEON JOSEPHSON.'

"The other telegram is from Samuel Liptzen, and it reads:

" 'Critical illness of one very dear to me requires my presence at bedside. Am therefore unable to appear on February 6. Will attend any other day you set after this week. Please notify me.

" 'SAMUEL LIPTZEN.'

"Now gentlemen, this hearing has to do with a conspiracy and these two witnesses are key witnesses in the conspiracy. What is your pleasure as to these telegrams?

"Mr. Stripling, what do you suggest?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think the facts should be investigated, in the case of Mr. Liptzen, to determine if that is a reasonable excuse for not being here. However, in the case of Mr. Josephson, I consider that 2 days is sufficient notice to come from New York to Washington. In the case of Mr. Liptzen, I think it should be determined whether or not he is at the bedside of a very dear friend.

"The CHAIRMAN. Supposing you do that, and then make arrangements for us to hear them at a later date, and as soon as possible.

"Mr. STRIPLING. All right, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Stripling, call your first witness."

The said Leon Josephson failed to make an appearance on February 6, 1947, as indicated by the aforesaid transcript of the proceedings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

On February 21, 1947, at a meeting of six members of the committee, a discussion was had by the committee regarding the matter of the nonappearance of Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen. Contained in the minutes of the meeting mentioned, is the following:

"A discussion was initiated by the chairman in regard to future action in connection with the investigation and hearings in the case of Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen. It was suggested by the chairman that a subcommittee, consisting of Mr. NIXON, Mr. VAIL, and Mr. BONNER, be appointed to proceed to New York to hear in executive session Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen."

Subsequently, the subcommittee mentioned in the minutes of the meeting hereinbefore described proceeded to New York and conducted hearings on March 5, 1947. On that date, after the subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities had convened in the Federal courthouse in New York City, a subpena was served upon Leon Josephson, which said subpena was set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms or his special messenger, you are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, to be and appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON is chairman, in their chambers in the city of New York, March 5, 1947, in room 2301, Federal Court Building, at the hour of 'forthwith' then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; that he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of New York, this 5th day of March 1947.

"RICHARD M. NIXON,

"Chairman, Subcommittee.

"Attest:

"JOHN S. ANDREWS, *Clerk.*"

This subpena was duly served upon said Leon Josephson by Louis J. Russell and the return executed thereupon is in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., to appear before a subcommittee on the 5th day of March 1947 forthwith. Served the within named in the hallway adjacent to room 2301 of the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, at 11:08 a. m., March 5, 1947.

"L. J. RUSSELL."

The authority of the subcommittee to conduct a hearing in New York City, in relation to the matter under inquiry, is derived from paragraph 3, section 2, of Public Law 601, subsection Q, which is set forth as follows:

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and to produce such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. The subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee or by any member designated by any such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

The said Leon Josephson, pursuant to said subpena, and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said subcommittee. The said Leon Josephson, after making his appearance in the chambers of the said subcommittee, refused to be sworn by the chairman of the said subcommittee and as a result of the said Leon Josephson's refusal to be sworn as a witness before the subcommittee, your subcommittee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter of inquiry committed to said subcommittee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said Leon Josephson.

The record of the proceedings before the committee on March 5, 1947, during which the said Leon Josephson refused to be sworn as a witness and to give testimony, is set forth in part as follows:

"Mr. STRIPLING. That is all I have at the present time.

"Mr. Leon Josephson will be the next witness.

"Are you represented by counsel, Mr. Josephson?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes; I am.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you desire counsel?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Before I am sworn, I wish to make a motion——

"Mr. STRIPLING. In the interest of orderly procedure, I ask that the witness be sworn before any statements are made.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee is perfectly willing to hear motions or statements by the

witness at any time that we set that up in the agenda of the hearing——

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I wish to make a motion contesting the constitutionality——

"The CHAIRMAN. First of all, do you refuse to be sworn at this time?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes; I refuse to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I wish to raise the question of the unconstitutionality of this committee, and I propose to take the case through the courts to the United States Supreme Court, if necessary.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that the witness stand and be sworn. I ask that the Chair administer the oath to the witness.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you stand to be sworn at this time?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will not.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I contest the right, the legality of this committee to examine me.

"The CHAIRMAN. You contest the legality of this committee, and on that ground you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. On the ground that you question the legality of this committee?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. That is correct.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show that counsel has accompanied Mr. Josephson, and I would like counsel to give his name and address for the record."

* * * * *

"Mr. STRIPLING. That will be up to the committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. I will entertain a motion at this time that the committee go into executive session to consider the procedure to be followed.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Before that is done, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention of the committee to a subpena dated February 3, 1947, which states:

" 'To the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Leon Josephson, 161 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their Chamber in the city of Washington, on February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

" 'Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

" 'Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington, this 3d day of February 1947.

" 'J. PARNELL THOMAS.

" 'Attest:

" 'JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*' "

"That subpena contains the seal of the House of Representatives. This subpena was forwarded to New York to be served upon Mr. Josephson. The subpena was served by Mr. Stephen W. Birmingham at 1:10 p. m. on February 4 at 161 West Sixteenth Street in New York City. On February 5, 6:20 p. m., Mr. Leon Josephson sent the following telegram to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which reads as follows:

" 'J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, Old House Office Building: Unable appear before your committee February 6, due inadequate notice of less than 48 hours. Counsel advises me such short notice unreasonable and that I am entitled to reasonable notice. Willing appear at later date fixed by you if reasonable notice given me.

" 'LEON JOSEPHSON.'

"Mr. Josephson did not appear, and has not appeared before the full committee.

"He was served this morning by subpena calling for his appearance forthwith before the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Hon. RICHARD NIXON is chairman.

"I should like that this subpena be made part of the record, and show that Mr. Josephson did appear in the committee's chambers, and that he did then and there refuse to be sworn and to testify concerning matters which are pertinent to the committee's inquiries.

"I should also like for the committee to take under advisement the remarks made by Mr. Josephson's counsel, and also consider the statement submitted by Mr. Josephson's counsel, and I would also like, Mr. Chairman, since Mr. Josephson is still here, to ask that he stand and be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Josephson, will you stand and be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will not be sworn.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Will you stand?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I will stand.

"(Mr. Josephson stands.)

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. I refuse to be sworn.

"Mr. STRIPLING. You refuse to give testimony before this subcommittee?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Until I have had an opportunity to determine through the courts, the legality of this committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn, and you refuse to give testimony before this committee at this hearing today?

"Mr. JOSEPHSON. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I would like for the record to show that Mr. Josephson is still considered by this committee to be under the subpena which was served upon him on February 4, to appear in Washington, D. C., February 6 at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 226 before the full Committee on Un-American Activities.

"I should also like the record to show that Mr. Josephson was served with a subpena this date to appear before the subcommittee and that he has not been excused by this subcommittee.

"The CHAIRMAN. The record will so show.

"Off the record.

"(Discussion off the record.)

"The CHAIRMAN. The record will show that neither the subpena of February 3, nor the forthwith subpena served today has been satisfied, and that they are still in effect and are continued, and that Mr. Josephson has physically appeared, has refused to take the oath, and to testify before this committee."

CITATION

Willful and deliberate refusal to be sworn and to testify before a subcommittee on Un-American Activities on Mar. 5, 1947

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the right to receive the sworn testimony of the said Leon Josephson relative to the subject matter under which Public Law No. 601, section 121 subsection Q (2), the said subcommittee was instructed to investigate and the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of the witness to be sworn and to testify on March 5, 1947, as hereinbefore set forth, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared; and his willful refusal to be sworn and to testify deprived your subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as to the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to be sworn and to testify on March 5, 1947, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on March 5, 1947, and his willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal to be sworn and to testify before the same subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities after he had appeared before it on March 5, 1947, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Leon Josephson may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House on this citation is slightly different from the one on which action was just taken. The one which was just voted by the House involved the question of Mr. Josephson's being subpenaed to appear before the full Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, D. C., and his failure to appear under the subpena.

On this citation we have the problem of Mr. Josephson's failure to be sworn and to testify before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in New York. He did appear in answer to the subpena, but after appearing he refused to be sworn and he refused to testify. There is no question about his guilt insofar as contempt is concerned, and from a reading of the record here I think that every Member of the House will see that a clear case has been made of contempt. Four times during the course of the proceedings the committee gave him the opportunity to testify and be sworn, and each time he refused. Insofar as the citation that has just been voted by the House is involved, the contempt will be prosecuted in the District of Columbia. Insofar as this citation is concerned, the contempt will be prosecuted in the Federal Court of the Southern District of New York.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST EUGENE DENNIS, ALSO KNOWN AS FRANCIS WALDRON

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a

privileged report, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT CITING EUGENE DENNIS, ALSO KNOWN AS FRANCIS WALDRON

The Committee on Un-American Activities as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), caused to be issued a subpena to Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, who is general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. The said subpena directed Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on April 9, 1947, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the said committee; the subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to Robert E. Stripling: You are hereby commanded to summon Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, general secretary, Communist Party of the United States, to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on the 9th day of April 1947, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 26th day of March 1947.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*"

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena and who served the said subpena upon instructions received from the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The return of the service by the said Robert E. Stripling being endorsed thereon, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Eugene Dennis also known as Francis Waldron before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, served at 11:35 a. m., March 26, 1947, in the committee's chambers in Washington, D. C.

"ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
"Chief Investigator,
Committee on Un-American Activities."

On April 7, 1947, a telegram was sent to Mr. Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist party of the United States, which is set forth herein in words and figures as follows:

"APRIL 7, 1947.

"Mr. EUGENE DENNIS,
"General Secretary,
"Headquarters, Communist Party,
"50 East Thirteenth Street,
New York, N. Y.

"This is to notify you that in response to the subpena which was served upon you March 26, you are to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, at the committee's chambers, 225 Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., April 9, 1947, to then and there give testimony under oath concerning matters pertinent to the committee's inquiry.

"ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
"Chief Investigator,
Committee on Un-American Activities."

The said Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, failed to appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on April 9, 1947, as directed by the subpena served upon him on March 26, 1947, and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities is a violation of the subpena served upon him by the Committee on Un-American Activities and places the said Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 193) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as to the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, to appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on March 26, 1947, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this is the third and the final piece of legislation we are bringing in today from the standpoint of citing for contempt various and sundry members of the Communist Party who have engaged in a program to destroy Congress if they can, to weaken our influence if they cannot destroy the institution entirely.

We have before us in this particular case a Communist of unusual importance and power.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eugene Dennis is the general secretary of the Communist Party of America, which makes him either the No. 1 or the No. 2 official Communist in the country, depending upon whether W. Z. Foster, the chairman of the party, is considered by party followers to have more authority than the general secretary. In either event, this man is before you on an incident for a contempt of Congress largely by his own volition and on his own invitation.

At the time we were conducting hearings on legislation to circumvent, circumscribe, and curb the activities of communism in America, Mr. Eugene Dennis, in his official capacity as general secretary, wired the committee asking for permission to appear before us in public hearings. After considerable debate and over the opposition of some of the members of the committee, it was finally decided to permit him to come before our committee to testify, since, after all, he was an official of the Communist Party which we were endeavoring to curb through our hearings and the legislation to emanate therefrom. At the appointed time, Mr. Dennis came before the committee but he refused to identify himself by his proper name; refused after repeated requests by the committee counsel and the committee chairman to testify before us after he had requested permission to do so.

We did not know until later just why Mr. Eugene Dennis refused to identify himself by his proper name, but it has since developed that he is a fugitive from justice in California under one of his aliases; that he has been a draft dodger in the United States under one of his numerous names; that he obtained a passport fraudulently under one of his aliases; and, consequently, he was unprepared to reveal his correct name before the committee at that time. So his request to appear before us having been granted, he himself declined to testify because it is a long-standing rule of our committee that the first question a witness has to answer is a question to identify himself by his real name, his address, and his occupation. Thereupon, we served a subpena upon him, discovering that here is a man who makes a profession of trying to sabotage America. Here is the Fritz Kuhn, if you please, of the Red Fascist bund, organizing Red Fascist bunds all over the country, trying to destroy freedom here in the most important bastion of its existence. Here is a political Rhett Butler trying to create chaos and destroy and wreck our free civilization.

Mr. Eugene Dennis, as I say, serves as a sort of political jackal along with his fellow Communists, realizing that they grow fattest when the state comes closest to death. So they do what they can to create disorder; do what they can to create labor troubles; do what they can to create tension and conflicts between races, creeds, and groups, because they realize, as we all do, that the best antidote in the final analysis for communism is a successfully working democracy in America which distributes the benefits of its production as equitably as possible to every class and every creed and every group. So the Communists work to disrupt that; work to deny that; and work to create chaos and conflict and uneasiness because as democracy functions better they function less successfully.

Consequently we subpenaed this man and asked him to come before us, to find out what it was that he tried to foist upon us under an assumed name in his voluntary appearance. He failed to answer that subpena. He refused to answer it. He sent an attorney to represent him at the appointed time, after having accepted service of the subpena. I will read the first sentence of his attorney's statement:

This is to inform you that I shall not attend the meeting of your committee on April 9, 1947.

In other words, over his own signature, Mr. Eugene Dennis points out that he is in complete contempt not alone of our committee but of Congress and of the American system of government and the American system of jurisprudence.

He refused to comply with an official order of Government.

I hope that whatever judge has before him this particular contempt case, after the House votes it, as I am sure the House will, that that judge will uphold the dignity of the courts and the Constitution to the point of giving Eugene Dennis the maximum penalty allowable under the law which is 1 year in jail, plus a $1,000 fine. I think it is disgraceful when we have a case, as we had not long ago, when a judge in one of the courts of the District of Columbia evaluated the reputation of the Congress at $250 and fined somebody that amount because he was in contempt of Congress. I hope that the judge who hears this case will make a more appropriate evaluation of Congress and the country and the Constitution which we all so dearly love.

Some of you have said, "What can we do besides citing these fellows for contempt?" There is something you can do tomorrow, if you care to. If you will talk to the members of the Judiciary Committee of the House and urge them to get early action on a bill which is now pending before that committee, you can make these contempt cases less frequent; you can make them more significant, because we have before the Judiciary Committee of the House a bill which would increase the penalty for contempt of Congress from $1,000 and 1 year in jail to $5,000 and 5 years in jail as a maximum. So if you really want to do something yourself in that connection, you will urge your closest friends among members of the House Judiciary Committee to act promptly on that legislation and thus serve a constructive purpose in that capacity this week.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I agree with what the gentleman has said. There is also a resolution before the Judiciary Committee to make the FBI an independent agency so that it can represent all committees of Congress and all branches of the Government. The resolution ought to be passed by all means.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say, in addition to asking the Attorney General to proceed against Eugene Dennis because he is in contempt of Congress, that this committee will also by official letter to the Attorney General ask the Department of Justice to proceed against Eugene Dennis for conspiracy to commit contempt, which carries with it a maximum fine of $10,000 and a jail sentence of 2 years. It has now become obvious that Eisler, Josephson, and Dennis, and the rest who have been brought before us, including Marshall and Tom Lamont, Jr., have all been directed in their proceedings by a master mind somewhere. That master mind is at Communist headquarters in New York, aided and advised and counseled, of course, by the Communist headquarters for the world in Moscow.

The Communists have decided upon this particular plan of conspiracy to do what they can to bring down contempt upon Congress, feeling that if by chance they can literally and figuratively thumb their noses at the American Congress and escape with immunity they will have escape with immunity they will have succeeded in detracting from our status and our standing. So we are going to ask the Attorney General to proceed in a dual capacity in this particular case to prosecute Eugene Dennis in full conformity with the intent of Congress.

I want to say too that because I have every hope that Eugene Dennis will wind up in the penitentiary as the result of the present proceedings, that when and if that happy eventuality occurs I hope Americans will not have a false sense of security through saying to themselves, "Well, now we do not have to worry about the Communists any more, because some of the top brains are behind the bars in America." Unfortunately, that is not the case. In fact, the master plotters behind the Communist movement work out of Moscow through the international headquarters and also in Paris, and have a long succession of potential leaders, native-born or immigrants, whom they can throw into the breach to take the place of the Browders, the Fosters, and the Dennises once they are brought to justice. So we cannot let down in our alertness, cannot decrease our vigilance, even if we have succeeded now and then in checking off one of their leaders or putting them in jail. New leaders will come in to take their place just as long as communism has a following in this country, just as long as its directive agency in Moscow continues to seduce Americans to pay first loyalty to the U. S. S. R. instead of the U. S. A.

I am sure we all wonder this afternoon what it is that a Communist has that an ordinary American citizen has not; how it is, for example, that Mr. Eugene Dennis can violate the draft law as he has and be a draft evader with complete immunity, and nobody in the Department of Justice prosecutes him for his law violation. It seems to me that one of the good ways to operate beyond the law in America is to be identified as a high Communist official in this country. At the present time there is no doubt—it is in the records—about Eugene Dennis' evading the draft by fraudulently filling in his selective-service card, and yet he has not been prosecuted by any of the law-enforcement agencies of the Government. He obtained a passport fraudulently under the name of Paul Walsh. Nothing whatsoever was done to punish him for his violation of the law.

I wish we could have in the high law-enforcement offices of this land men of courage and patriotism enough so that youngsters in America would not feel that the easy way to beat the law with immunity is to join the Communist Party, get an office in the party, and then thumb his nose at the Government because nothing is done to punish such an individual.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the speaker might also add to the list the fact that in wartime Communists were able to steal a truckload of files of the most secret nature out of the State Department and Naval Intelligence, and were arrested by the FBI, but then were dismissed with a nominal fine.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. The list can be extended as long as a bamboo fishing pole of law violations which have occurred in the last 6 or 8 years in America by Communists without anybody in the Attorney General's office taking any step whatsoever to punish them. In fact, it was only after repeated speeches in the well of the House this year that we succeeded in getting the Attorney General to move in on the contempt proceedings which the House of Representatives voted by overwhelming majorities nearly a year ago.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Have any of the cases which have been cited for contempt been acted upon by the Justice Department?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I have just said that they have finally gotten some of the cases started that we recommended nearly a year ago.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has the gentleman reason to believe that the Department of Justice will act upon these cases any more quickly?

Mr. MUNDT. They are either going to act upon them or they are going to be the object of the greatest campaign of prodding that any Attorney General of this country ever endured.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there any way in which the Attorney General can be forced to act upon these cases?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that the American public on November 5 forced him into action by their verdict at the polls.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can he not be impeached if he refuses to do that?

Mr. MUNDT. I think he is too good a politician to refuse to act very much longer in view of the change in sentiment in America.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That does not answer the question. I would like to know if he can be impeached.

Mr. MUNDT. Any Cabinet officer may be impeached.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. For failing to do his duty?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is, he has failed to do his duty if he does not prosecute these cases, and the only recourse we have, if he does not act, is to impeach him?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When we are considering the question of the investigation of Communist activities in the country, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman who is now addressing the House a letter I received a few days ago from a constituent in my district inquiring as to what evidence

I had that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow, by force and violence, of the Government of the United States. I think that is an important question. It was answered by Attorney General Biddle a few years ago in the famous Harry Bridges case, in his report on the activities of the Communist Party, when he said that the Communist Party from the date of its inception in 1919 up to the present time has been dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion and comment on that.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, the array of evidence is ceiling high to prove that. You have the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover who has said the same thing many times from the great research files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. You have the testimony of Louis Bedenz who himself served as one of the Politburo of the Communist Party in the United States. He has told us that the purpose of the Communist Party is to overthrow the Government of the United States and that their first loyalty is to Russia. The evidence is clear-cut on that question.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the lackadaisical manner in which the law enforcement officials of America permit the Communists to flirt with violations of the law, if not actually to violate them, may I call your attention to the advertisement appearing in the New York Times and the Washington Post in which the Communists have been soliciting funds to promote their cause, saying that what they hope to promote is American freedom and protection of the common man and so forth. The Daily Worker tells us they have raised recently $250,000—that is a quarter of a million dollars—for the purposes of a campaign fund, every dime of which was raised in violation of the law because every dime was raised under false pretenses made through the mails. They could be prosecuted for violating the statutes which preclude procurement of money by false representation through the mail. At no place in their representation do they point out that what they hope to do is overthrow America, that why they are raising money is to set up in this country a large fifth column to help sabotage freedom; at no place do they tell what the Communist program really contemplates, yet they try to associate themselves with a great American liberal, Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it can also be proven that the Communist Party took part in the congressional elections last fall in two or more States. They have never filed a report under the Corrupt Practices Act. The other political parties were compelled to do that. The Communist Party is in violation of that law. That has been called to the attention of the Attorney General, but I do not believe any indictment has been returned.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly right. It all adds up as further evidence to the fact that our present Attorney General and his predecessors certainly are guilty of one of three things: Either they are afraid of the Communist Party or they are dominated by the Communist Party or they do not know that the Communist Party exists. One of the three things has to be true.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Does the gentleman not think it would have a rather salutary effect if this House should give some thought to impeaching some of these Attorney Generals we have had and do have?

Mr. MUNDT. Well, I certainly do not object to the House giving thought to that, and I am certainly in favor of doing everything that is necessary to get action out of the Justice Department which has slept at the switch ever since the advent of the present incumbent in the Attorney General's office and long before that.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. In line with what the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] said about the Communist Party being in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act, the gentleman served with me last fall on the Campaign Expenditures Investigating Committee. We forwarded to the Department of Justice a recommendation when we filed our final report following that investigation that the Department of Justice investigate the Communist Party, looking toward a possible indictment and prosecution for violation of the Corrupt Practices Act, since we had evidence brought before our committee that the party did take part in congressional elections in two or more States.

I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that no prosecution has been brought, but I believe that it should be stated that that investigation is going forward and the Department of Justice has had men in my office checking our files very recently, and I believe very seriously working on recommendations sent down by the Campaign Expenditures Investigating Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. That is encouraging. If the gentleman from Tennessee can do anything at all to make that activity move out of low gear into high gear, he will certainly be doing a great service to this country, because if it is moving at all it is moving at a snail's pace at a time when we need fast action to meet an important problem facing the country today.

I would like to point out that Mr. Eugene Dennis is not quite as circumspect in what he says at the Communist convention as in what he says by remote control in a mimeographed hand-out. I have in my hand the latest speech of Dennis before the national Communist convention. It is entitled "The People Against the Trusts." Here is his personal pronouncement, and if time will permit, I will quote certain passages by Mr. Eugene Dennis to see what kind of activity he engages in as general secretary of the Communist Party.

On page 39 of this booklet entitled "The People Against the Trusts," Mr. Eugene Dennis says this:

> Capture the Democratic Party.

I hope you good Democrats who have voted so consistently with the Republicans in trying to stamp out communism will pay close attention to this, because this is his plan for you and your party. He says:

> Capture the Democratic Party.

He says:

> Of course, while the outlook for "capturing control of the major Democratic Party organization" is far removed, this does not exclude the possibility that the Wallace-Pepper Democrats and the independent labor-progressive forces may not yet succeed in bringing great pressure to bear upon and in influencing the outcome of the 1948 Democratic National Convention. This task is of unusual and extreme importance and must receive the maximum and most acting consideration of all progressive forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to read one or two more passages from this very interesting booklet. On page 44, Mr. Eugene Dennis, in his official Communist publication, discusses the struggle for peace, and here is what he says:

> Now a few words on the struggle for peace. As is well known, there now exists two main trends in international affairs. One trend is expressed in the position of the USSR and the new European democracies who are striving for a just and stable peace—

Think of it. He is talking about Yugoslavia, I suppose, when he is talking about that kind of democracy, or about Poland—

> who are promoting the equality and sovereignty of all nations, great and small. The other trend is reflected in the position of the Anglo-American powers who are following an aggressive and bellicose policy, who are striving to saddle the peoples with an imperialist peace and seek to impose their will upon the entire world.

There is clear-cut evidence that the Communists here have always found themselves completely in harmony with the Soviet foreign policy and completely opposed to the American foreign policy. In their consistency in that regard they are excelled only by Henry Agard Wallace.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. About 2 or 3 years ago Stalin dissolved the so-called International Comintern. Ostensibly that was to separate the forces of the Communist Party in America from the Internationale. Would the gentleman say from Stalin's admission of the dissolution of the Comintern that that brought about the separation of the forces and the cessation of the direction of orders from Moscow to the Communists in this country?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because that touches on a point which is greatly misunderstood in America. The so-called dissolution of the Comintern was simply a trumped-up piece of staging to deceive gullible people all over the world. In actuality, the Comintern by that time had achieved its purpose, which was to place some of the trainees of the Comintern in strategic spots around the world as little dictators. So the functions of the Comintern having been achieved, it was dissolved. Among its members, Tito in Belgrade, is the new dictator of Yugoslavia, Georgei Dimitrov is the Communist ruler of Bulgaria, and Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos are two of the Communist leaders of the movement in France. Scattered throughout the world are the members of the Comintern. The new functions of the Comintern have been taken over by the Politburo, the executive committee of the Communist Party in Russia, which directs world Communist affairs just as surely as the Comintern used to direct them under its formal regime.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you one more quotation from this booklet containing the convention speech of Eugene Dennis before the last Communist national meeting. On page 58 of the booklet is a heading entitled "More Attention to Youth." Under that heading we find the following language, and I again quote the exact words of Dennis as he addresses his comrades and cohorts in New York City:

> It is time that we Communists stopped relegating Communist mass work amongst the youth to a small corps of young comrades in AYD—devoted and able as they are—and begin to direct the attention of the entire party to solving the problems of the veterans and the students and of the unemployed and the working youth. The youth will determine the future. Therefore we Communists must help determine the future of America's youth.

There you are, Mr. Speaker. Here we have the general national secretary of the Communist Party openly announcing the Communist crusade to pervert and control the youth of America. Here we also have the written evidence of one of the highest officials of the Communist Party admitting that the AYD—American Youth for Democracy—is a Communist unit and that it is controlled, directed, and financed by the Communist Party.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me urge this House to vote this citation of contempt of Eugene Dennis by an overwhelming majority. This will help to achieve one additional step in the direction which 95 percent of all Americans want to travel—toward the goal when we can expose and circumvent the sinister plots and plans of all American Communists.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the issues involved in these contempt proceedings are much more fundamental than the mere superficial and technical legalistic aspects of them. What I state now applies to the previous contempt proceedings. I shall vote against this one also, because of the issues of fundamental democracy involved.

I think it is quite apparent that the objective of this committee is to outlaw the Communist Party. I do not believe any member of the committee will deny it. I think they will admit it. As a matter of fact, one member of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], stated so earlier in the day in one of his 1-minute speeches. Such an objective, I submit to the calm and deliberate consideration of the Members of the House, is an unconstitutional objective and antidemocratic. These proceedings are in furtherance of that objective and therefore they are unconstitutional and antidemocratic.

We have a Constitution in this country and we are all striving to preserve it. Amendment No. 1 of that Constitution, in my opinion, is the cornerstone of the Bill of Rights of the American people. Weaken the spirit and the letter of that amendment and the constitutional democracy that you say you seek to preserve here this afternoon will be severely damaged. That amendment, as you well know, guarantees the constitutional rights of individuals, freedom of the press and freedom of speech. That amendment was enacted not for the benefit of those who appeared to be in the majority but for the protection of those who were allegedly in the minority.

The courts of this country have often scrupulously, and properly so, defended that amendment time and time again. You are trying to do by indirection here what you cannot do by direct legal action. You are trying to outlaw the Communist Party. You are trying to do it by prosecutions, citations for contempt, and by investigations. Investigation, like the power to tax, becomes the power to destroy when the objective is to destroy. In this case, the objective is admittedly to destroy—to destroy and outlaw the Communist Party. You cannot circumvent the Constitution. For that reason, irrespective of the question, of the answer to the subpena, or the nonanswer to the subpena—irrespective of those questions, the fundamental question is the objective. The objective, therefore, being clearly unconstitutional, this proceeding is unconstitutional. Every measure taken to carry out an unconstitutional purpose must be treated by this Congress as a violation of the Constitution.

Further, the objective is antidemocratic. The same applies to these proceedings. This is not the first time that Americans have witnessed this hysterical persecution of those with whom the so-called majority disagree. We had it in the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts, the first time it was attempted in the Republic of the United States. It lasted for about 10 years. People were investigated and were prosecuted and it was political persecution. A wave of revulsion on the part of the real majority swept this country and not only wiped off the statute books the Alien and Sedition Acts but wiped out of power and into complete extinction the Federalist political party that was responsible for that kind of legislation.

Then, too, the question of foreign agents and foreign affiliation was raised. Those who were in the political saddle and who sought to protect the greedy economic sinecures that had been fraudulently obtained in the newly born republic sought to destroy and silence the opposition to what then was the forerunner of today's monopoly capital. They used the Alien and Sedition Acts and they had to use a term and give that term an ugly connotation. The terms that were used then were Jacobin and Republican. Jefferson and the followers of Jefferson were subjected to the appellations of Jacobin and Republican. They were subjected to those appellations and were called foreign agents because they maintained at that time that the future of liberty in the world depended upon collaboration between the Republic of the United States and the new Republic of France. So, on domestic issues and on foreign policy, the Jeffersonians were labeled Jacobins and Republicans and everything that was said about the Jacobins and the Republicans by the Tory press in this country was quite similar to what is said today of the Communists. I recommend as required reading to the House, Claude Bowers' Jefferson and Hamilton.

We witnessed another example of this hysterical persecution of an alleged minority right after World War I. Then, they did not use the word "Communist." My colleagues from New York will remember the disgraceful spectacle which everybody today deplores when the New York State Legislature ejected from its halls the five Socialist members of the assembly. At that time the word was "Socialist," and the connotations given the word "Communist" today are the same as those given the word "Socialist" at that time. It was the technique employed by reaction then just as it is now to wage warfare against progress and democracy. No self-respecting American now condones the Palmer raids of that period. And yet, they were condoned then with the same language and hysteria used now.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Did the gentleman hold the same position when the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the German-American Bund?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No, I did not; definitely not.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Did the gentleman hold the same position when the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated Pelley's Silver Legion?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Definitely not; but let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. One more question. Did the gentleman from New York also hold the same position when the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Definitely not. Those organizations were not really investigated. No damage was done to them by the committee, especially the Klan; it was never subjected to a thorough investigation. I brought that

out in a speech I made in 1939 in this House in which I disclosed the solicitude with which those organizations were treated. Further, those organizations are Fascist organizations. They are definitely subversive of the democracy of the United States, and what is more they seek to impose upon these United States fascism, by force and violence. They seek to impose fascism on America by using the Red-baiting technique. They were alined and gave aid and comfort to the enemy before and during the war. They constituted then and now a clear and present danger to the Nation. Then there is a most important distinction and that is that these organizations aid and aided fascism and nazism, while the Communists are anti-Fascist and did fight in the war against fascism. That is undeniable.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Now I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman has asked me three questions. I think I am entitled to ask him one. When will this committee place its accent on the Ku Klux Klan and on similar organizations, and bring before this House contempt citations against those organizations?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman well knows that this committee has a subcommittee under the chairmanship of our able colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] that does nothing but investigate so-called Fascist organizations. Furthermore, I want to say to the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from New York has never once given one single clue to the Committee on Un-American Activities, in the ages I have been a member of that committee, about any Fascist organizations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from New York has at all times consistently opposed this committee, and will continue to do so for the reasons I have been advancing in my argument. However, I still say that we have seen no signs of any action against domestic Fascist organizations. I hope the gentleman will now permit me to continue with the argument I have been making.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I hope the gentleman will give me a few more minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman know that, as a result of the investigation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Fritz Kuhn and Pelley both went to jail?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, there is a great deal of denial about that on the part of the Department of Justice, on the part of the New York law-enforcement agencies, and on the part of anyone who has had anything to do with the case against Kuhn and Pelley.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman now give me some additional time?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I do not have any additional time.

I will give the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am the only one speaking in the negative on this proposition. I yielded to the gentleman in the hope that he would give me more time, and he said he would, but now he gives me 1 minute.

Very well, let me say this: One fact you cannot deny, and it is a historic fact, and time and events as they go by prove it more and more to be correct. That is, that if the people of Germany had defeated Hitler's efforts in his attempt to destroy the constitutional rights of Communists in Germany, Hitler would never have gained power and there would have been no World War II. It is my considered judgment, in the light of contemporary history, in the light of how fascism came into power, that the defense of the constitutional rights of the Communists that the defeat of red baiting is the first line of defense of democratic rights. Deny that historic fact. Again I repeat, that if the people of Germany, if the Reichstag in Germany, if the people as a whole had defended the constitutional rights of the Communists in Germany, there would have been no Hitler to make war on the democracy of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Again I have listened with interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. Over a period of years in which the House has endeavored to take action against those who defy the power and authority of this House and of the United States Government, the gentleman from New York, especially when action is proposed to be taken against Communists, rushes to their rescue, and like the able lawyer that no doubt he is, he undertakes to becloud the issue with many immaterial matters. He talks about the alien and sedition laws of 1807 and about what happened in France a hundred and fifty years ago, and what happened in Germany 30 years ago; but never for a moment did he touch the matter at issue; and what is it?

This man is charged with contempt in willfully and deliberately refusing to testify before a legally constituted committee of this House after being duly summoned and sworn and in that action he defies the authority of this House and in effect defies the power and authority of the United States Government.

Did he refuse to testify? Of course he did. Not only had he been summoned to testify before this committee but he had wired the chairman that he desired to appear and be heard, and then when he comes before the committee, he refuses to testify. The hearing is postponed, he goes back to New York, and insists that he will not return unless he is allowed to talk for 2 hours. The committee consented to his having 2 hours to speak, and when he appears he refuses to answer questions. He offered no valid reason or legal excuse why he should not testify. If he had any reason that his testimony would subject him or would likely subject him to any criminal prosecution he could have claimed such right under the Constitution of this country and not been required to give any testimony that might incriminate him or might tend to incriminate him; but he did not claim any such constitutional right.

This man is known as Eugene Dennis and also as Francis Waldron. He is general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. There is also information that he goes under a number of other names. He is No. 2, if not in fact the No. 1 Communist in the United States. He knew that he would be called upon to give his correct name, with all of his aliases, and his place of residence. He is a known draft dodger, also guilty of giving false information and false names in securing passports to travel from this country to Moscow, Russia, and Paris, France, the headquarters of the International Communist organization and from whom he takes orders and to which he pays allegiance.

Inasmuch as the Communist Party believes in the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, this man is one of the most dangerous men to our security as a Nation.

I cannot commend too highly Chairman THOMAS and the other distinguished members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has through the years and now is doing a wonderful job to protect our country from the Communists and other subversive groups in this country. I voted to help create this committee and voted to continue the committee and voted for ample appropriations to carry on its work. They are not persecuting anybody. Their efforts are directed solely to ferreting out any and all subversive groups that threaten the security of this Nation. The 140,000,000 American people owe to this committee and its predecessors a great debt of gratitude for the splendid work that they have done and are doing.

This defiance of the House of Representatives and the United States Government has become a very common matter on the part of subversive groups and their members and officers in this country. The House has been called upon to try two other cases today against another Communist, one Clinton Leon Josephson. He defied and refused to testify when summoned and called upon before the Committee on Un-American Activities here in the House Office Building in Washington and also before a subcommittee in New York. Now, we have before us this same sort of defiance and contempt on the part of Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron—three of these cases in a single afternoon.

Our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has made speeches in defense of both of these men. I am pleased to observe, however, that he and only one other Member voted against

the resolution involving Dennis, alias Waldron and it is hoped that when the vote is taken on the resolution before us that no one will oppose this resolution except the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] himself.

This defiance and contempt has gotten to be a common thing among members and officers of these subversive groups. The House is justifiably impatient. These contempts were willful, deliberate and inexcusable—an open defiance of the power and authority of the people's House of Representatives and the authority of the Government of the United States. The House has before it many very important matters affecting the 140,000,000 American people and also the people throughout the world. Yet, we must take hours and hours today to try these men who defy the Congress, the Constitution and laws of this country.

We know what would happen if an American citizen went to Russia, that these Communists love so much, and would threaten to overthrow the Russian Government, as the Communists here threaten our country. He would be shot before sunrise.

What do they believe in? What do they practice? They advocate the overthrow of this Government, not by constitutional means, but by force and violence. Here is the bellwether of the Communists in this country hiding behind the Stars and Stripes, dodging the draft, getting in and out of the country under false passports, taking his orders from Moscow. Yes, many times he has engaged in crimes, according to the evidence. Yet he comes here and defies the Congress and the Constitution of the United States.

The objection I have, Mr. MARCANTONIO, to the Communists and other subversive groups is that they come to this country by hook or crook, and plot to overthrow our Government; then when we catch up with one of them he squeals and attempts to draw about him the American flag and the Constitution. If they had their way they would destroy that same flag and Constitution. Today we are giving to this man all the rights of an American citizen. We are giving him a legal trial. He would not be here today but for his defiance of our Constitution and laws.

I want to say something about the courts of this country. They know and the highest court of this land has said, and Attorney General Clark and Biddle, and J. Edgar Hoover have said, that communism preaches, teaches and practices the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. Then we bring one of these men in here after we have spent hours and days investigating him. He goes before the court and the court assesses a little measly fine of $250. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am in favor of a bill that will put such punishment on enemies of this kind that they will not take up the time of this House, trying them for contempt.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to take this time to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his kindly support of that bill and to urge that he use his great influence with the committee to get action on it now. It has been there several weeks. It is important business. Let us get action on it. The gentleman is a member of that committee and he can get action.

Mr. ROBSION. The Judiciary Committee needs no lecture to have it to do its duty. Out of 3,000 bills offered in this Congress since January 3 over 50 percent of them have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is a busy committee working day and night. It will get to this bill and consider it as speedily as possible.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WALTER. My distinguished friend from Kentucky just completed a very fine job in revising the criminal code; therefore when I ask him a question about procedure I am certain I am seeking the answer from the person who knows best.

According to this resolution the report of the committee would be certified to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia. Under this procedure would the Attorney General of the United States ever have anything to do with that prosecution?

Mr. ROBSION. Well, only that he is over the United States district attorney for this district, and I think he could have considerable to do with the district attorney. He cannot appear in court and try all these cases; we know that. Attorney General Clark has been very active in speeches and in other ways, bringing to the American people the danger of communism and Communists to our country.

Mr. WALTER. But these proceedings are cited to the United States district attorney and not to the Attorney General.

Mr. ROBSION. That is right. And I will say I have the kindest feeling and respect for Attorney General Clark, and I appreciate what he has done; but it is up to him to see that the United States district attorneys do their duty. But we must put a stop to these contempts for laws. We cannot stop this House every few days here and argue and debate and vote and vote and hear our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] defend these persons who deliberately violate our law and defy the House of Representatives. I wish to repeat and ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] what does he suppose would happen to an American citizen if he wormed his way into Russia by some hook or crook, and was over there, and they proved that he belonged to an organization that was trying to overthrow the Russian Government by force and violence? There would not be any argument before a lawmaking body in Russia. They would take him out and shoot him. We are proceeding in this case under the Constitution, according to the Constitution, and giving full protection of the rights of this man or any other man; but he is not above this Congress, and he is subject to the laws of the United States Government. Socialists, as individuals and as a party, have not and do not take the attitude of the Communists. No informed person makes any such claim.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the House is very anxious to vote, and after hearing the silly argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] I do not think it is necessary to say anything else in favor of this resolution.

I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, this question has already been exhaustively covered, and I think very well summarized, by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who just preceded me. I think, however, in summarizing the case that it would be well for the House as it votes or this matter to recall the three cases that have come before the House in the last 4 months and to note the similarity of the approaches these three people have used in expressing their contempt of Congress and of the Government of the United States.

Now, it has been suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that in considering approval of this contempt citation we are embarking upon a program which will eventually destroy democratic traditions and democratic principles in America. He pointed out, for example, that there was a great similarity of the proceedings that are going on here today with those that took place at the time that the great Democratic Party of this country was founded under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson.

I am sure that the Members of the House will agree with me that certainly there is no similarity whatever between the men and principles which made up and were responsible for the founding of the Democratic Party and the principles which have been advocated by those who are following the Communist line today. I think that it is the ultimate in political blasphemy even to suggest such a similarity.

It is absolutely correct to say that the question before us today is one of liberty, freedom, and free speech, but what is involved is not whether we by our action are going to destroy freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the other great American freedoms which Members on both sides of the aisle have often so eloquently defended; what is involved here is a conspiracy, a concerted effort on the part of these three men and their followers to destroy the very Government which protects their right to freedom to express their views. When we vote these contempt citations, we are striking a

blow for the very freedoms the gentleman from New York talked about, because the first thing that would happen in America, in the event that these three were able to impose upon us the form of government in which they believe, would be the adoption of laws which would allow freedom of speech and freedom of the press only to themselves and members of their own party. They would destroy and deny those freedoms to the rest of the people in this country.

The fundamental issue involved today is this: Three men have been subpenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Each of them has expressed his utter contempt for that committee and in doing so his contempt for the Congress and for the Government of this country. The committee has been both patient and fair. Four times we gave Leon Josephson an opportunity to be sworn, and four times he refused to be sworn and to testify.

In the case involving Eugene Dennis, which you are going to vote on in a few moments, you have read some of the things he said to the committee which appear in the report, but you should also know what he said after refusing to give his real name as requested. As he was being served with a subpena by the clerk of the committee at the request of the chairman of the committee, Dennis took the subpena, threw it on the floor, turned to the clerk and said, "Who the hell do you think you are?" Then he stood up and, before the crowded committee room, the representatives of the press, and the members of the committee, he raised a clenched first and said, "I hold this committee in contempt." There is no question about the contempt in the case of Mr. Dennis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the man that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] says Congress is persecuting.

Mr. NIXON. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. As to the matter of free speech mentioned by the gentleman from New York, does not the gentleman think that was covered some time ago by Mr. Justice Holmes when he said that persons in a crowded theater cannot shout "Fire" and consider it free speech?

Mr. NIXON. I thank the gentleman for his very pertinent comment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the RECORD should show that at no time has the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. That question has not been ruled on by the Supreme Court. It had the Bridges case before it and it had the Schneiderman case, and in both cases the Supreme Court did not rule directly on that question.

As a matter of fact, some of the language used by the Supreme Court can be interpreted as ruling to the contrary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, Attorney General Biddle——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Attorney General, yes, but not the Supreme Court.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did not Attorney General Biddle, the highest law officer of the Government of the United States, say in that report that the Communist Party from 1919 up to the present time is dedicated by force and violence to the overthrow of the Government of the United States?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I said that the Supreme Court has not ruled, and the gentleman will have to admit, irrespective of what the Attorney General states, it is the Supreme Court's ruling on the question that counts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am giving you the benefit of what he had to say.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is the Supreme Court to which the gentleman from New York should refer, and that is William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish you would.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down. I referred to the Supreme Court of the United States as the Supreme Court, and not to any individual.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that he is not stating a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has asked that the words be taken down. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Here is the Supreme Court, to which the gentleman from New York should refer, and that is Mr. William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot see that that is any reflection upon the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California had yielded to me, and I want to read from the testimony of Mr. William Z. Foster. Anybody who does not know that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government should read this testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. Do the Communists in this country advocate world revolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the Communists in this country realize that America is connected up with the whole world system, and the capitalist system displays the same characteristics everywhere—everywhere it makes for the misery and exploitation of the workers—and it must be abolished not only on an American scale but on a world scale.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] does not understand that to be advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States, then, of course, I would not attempt to educate him on the subject.

Mr. NIXON. Commenting further on the statement that was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I think it is well for this House to bear in mind that in these cases, although we have had before us only the technical violations of contempt, which I think have been very effectively proved, the records of all three men are full of violations of other criminal statutes of the United States, including forged passports, draft evasion, perjury, and conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

So I think in summary this is what we can say: In all three of these cases these men, rather than come before our committee and tell the truth as to their activities, preferred to express their contempt of the committee because they feared the consequences of what the truth might bring out. These are not cases of persecuted liberals; but they are cases of three men who have been guilty of violating the laws of this country and who have expressed their contempt of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows and the record shows that William Z. Foster has said time and time again that the Communists recognize only one flag, and that is the red flag of Russia.

Mr. NIXON. And speaking to that point, what we have here are three birds of a feather who flock together, and the color of their feather is not white and it is not pink. It is very, very red.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] to make a unanimous-consent request.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 196, noes 1.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and I were acting on the Board of Visitors at Annapolis today, and although we made every effort to get here in time,

we missed the vote on the first citation proceedings by 2 minutes. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: 'or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier' and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: 'or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier'. Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

"(a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm-labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: *Provided*, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ELMER THOMAS.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same. Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The House bill authorized the continuation of the farm labor supply program for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947, and provided that such program should be liquidated by December 31, 1947. The Senate amendment directed the continuation of the program up to and including December 31, 1947, and provided for its liquidation within 30 days thereafter. The conference agreement accepts the Senate provision but makes the continuation of the labor supply program permissive rather than mandatory.

The bill as it passed the House amended section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 so as to permit the use, in connection with the farm labor supply program, of labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and other facilities set up under such act, until December 31, 1947. The conference agreement extends the period during which such facilities may be used in connection with the farm labor supply program to January 31, 1948, so as to make such facilities available for use during the liquidation period.

The Senate amendment added a new section 3, which provides that any Mexican farm laborer presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect and he continues in agricultural employment if the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico and posts an appropriate bond with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service for the return of the Mexican farm laborer without cost to the Government when such farm employment is terminated and in any event not later than December 31, 1947. The conference agreement accepts the Senate amendment in this respect.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not recorded on the last roll call. I would like to be recorded as voting "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman's statement will be made a part of the RECORD.

FARM-LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is substantially the same as the bill which passed the House except in two particulars. The Senate adopted an amendment extending for 30 days the time within which the program might be liquidated. The time was extended from December 31, as we had it in the House bill, until January 30. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

The Senate also adopted an amendment which provided that Mexican laborers who had entered this country illegally might remain in the country until December 31, 1947, if they were engaged in agricultural employment and remained so engaged, providing the employer gave a satisfactory bond and other assurances to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service. As I understand it, representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service have been picking up these people who came in illegally and taking them back to Mexico. They are badly needed now as agricultural labor. This amendment simply provides that they may stay here under certain conditions, but they must all leave by December 31, 1947.

With those two exceptions the bill, as I say, is substantially as it passed the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was pending before the House I was very careful to emphatically state that this should terminate on December 31, 1947, and when I said December 31, I meant December 31, 1947. However, I do not wish to be picayunish about that and I am willing to let this go through without asking for a roll call vote on the conference report at this time.

The other agreement with the Senate looks rather ridiculous to me because as

one individual Member I am tired of seeing a lot of catering being done on the basis that you are doing something for the farmers that you are not doing for somebody else, because usually when you do that you are simply taking a dollar out of one pocket and putting a cent back in the other. We are getting to a pretty bad situation in this country when we have to say to those who enter it illegally: "That is all right, you may remain here as long as you work on a farm. We will call it legal then."

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not go any further down that road.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule making in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devasted by war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who is now addressing the House has greater personal experience on relief operations than any other Member of this House, more experience than any American you can think of, except his great chief, arising out of the last war. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] was executive secretary of the European Relief Council from 1920 to 1922, under Herbert Hoover, and has had vast experience in European relief, and, although he is not on the committee which considered this measure, I am hoping that he will give us his views on this legislation, which is of such great importance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it the purpose to try to pass the bill tonight?

Mr. HERTER. This is merely on the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Merely to adopt the rule tonight, and take up the bill when?

Mr. HERTER. I assume tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. In response to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has said, it is going to take a genius to convince me that we ought to feed Communist Russia with one hand and fight her with the other.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 4 hours of general debate. It is an open rule. I am very glad that it is an open rule, Mr. Speaker, because I am convinced on a very careful reading and consideration of this bill that before it is adopted by this House it ought to be subjected to a number of amendments. I say that without any criticism of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which carried on long hearings on the bill. I feel that the reason that the bill should be amended is primarily due to the fact that the information which has been given either to the committee or to the Members of Congress on this bill by the Department of State is completely inadequate, and that in order to safeguard the taxpayers' money, in order to do the type of relief operation that we can properly justify, both in our own interest and in the interest of those who are going to receive relief, that a number of amendments should be adopted, and I will get to those in just a moment.

To begin with, the bill is a blank check. It provides for an authorization of $350,000,000 without specifying where a single penny of that money shall be used, except in countries devastated by the war. It likewise does not specify to what extent that money shall be used in any given country. I say it is a blank check which is extremely difficult for us to analyze for this reason: During the hearings the Under Secretary of State testified that this money would be used in six countries, and six countries only. Those countries were: Poland, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Greece, and China. When you begin an analysis of the position in which each one of those six countries find themselves, you have to come to the conclusion that it is impossible to see how $350,000,000 could be used for relief in that group of countries prior to the next harvest, and until we know what the next harvest is it is impossible to ascertain what the relief needs will be after the harvest.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman tell us which of those countries are under Communist regimes?

Mr. HERTER. Two of those countries are controlled by Communists today. One of those countries is Hungary, which is controlled by the Communists. Poland is controlled by a Communist regime. I do not call it a Communist country.

Mr. RANKIN. It is under a Communist regime.

Mr. HERTER. Hungary is in the same position, and a part of China is in the same position.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, Poland and Hungary have these Communist regimes imposed upon them.

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. By pressure from Moscow.

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. I never intend to vote a single dime to feed communism throughout the world, if I can help it.

I think those countries that are dominated by Communist regimes ought to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. HERTER. I do not want to debate that particular question with the gentleman at this particular time.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I notice that one of the countries the gentleman named was China. I have some reports that a very small percentage of the relief that is going to China actually accomplishes the purpose for which it is sent. I am not talking about the Communist area of China, but the other areas, where there is civil war, where there is a ruler in one county and another ruler in the next county. One report is that about one dollar out of every sixty actually goes to the place it is intended for. Is that true?

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman is probably correct. I am not personally familiar with the situation in China, but I know that at one time the misuse of relief funds was so great in China that UNRRA stopped sending any further relief supplies. From the viewpoint of continuing the relief operation in China, I can give the exact figures. The UNRRA program for China totaled $529,650,000. That program is still in operation. Shipments will continue through until July under that particular operation. That is getting right into the harvest season. For that reason, I do not feel that China, even though it may be named in the bill, is really an appropriate recipient of the type of relief I think this country ought to be giving at the moment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman propose to go so far as to set up a world-wide WPA to feed all the nations of the world?

Mr. HERTER. I should like to answer that in a moment when I come to the amendments that I think ought to be adopted. I think we ought to name the specific countries in which we think relief ought to be carried on, and then allow some leeway for emergencies. I believe some member of the committee will offer such an amendment.

When you go from China, which has just been covered, to Poland we have no adequate figures of any kind whatsoever.

I am told there is in the city of Washington today an individual who has made a very careful calculation as to Poland's needs between now and the next harvest. I have not heard what those are, but no competent American officials have surveyed the Polish scene to make an accurate estimate of what is required in that country. However, I am perfectly willing, if there is actual starvation and it can be handled without strengthening the Communist Party, to vote money for Poland, but I should like to be convinced of that fact.

To go to Austria: Austria without any question is in very bad shape. It is a country which is economically a monstrosity. It has been from the time Austria was severed from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is going to require economic aid unless it can in turn become a part of a larger customs union, but at the moment it is in very difficult shape. However, Austria was envisaged in the program at a time when the State Department thought we would have a peace treaty with Austria, when it would be considered a member of the family of nations. It is still an ex-enemy country under military domination. Approximately one-third of that country is under Russian troops. To figure the exact needs of Austria is again a very difficult thing. I am convinced that Austria needs food and needs it badly, and needs relief supplies badly.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not Austria occupied by the military forces of Russia, and are they not living off the resources of Austria?

Mr. HERTER. No; only approximately one-third of Austria is occupied by the Russians. There is an American military zone, a British military zone, and a French military zone.

The city of Vienna itself is divided into seven different military zones—two Russian, two British, two French, one German, and one middle zone that they call Innerstadt, which is controlled by all four countries.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman would not leave the impression that food from Austria is not being siphoned off into other countries at this time, would he?

Mr. HERTER. I do not know what the situation is in Russian-occupied Austria. Austria never could feed itself. Austria has to import foodstuffs to carry on. Of all the countries in Europe today, Austria probably needs food the most. I think probably the chairman of the committee would agree with me on that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. When General Patton was here in the fall of 1945, he came by to see me, and in the course of our conversation he asked me why we wanted to feed Germany. He said, "They have the best crops in Germany I ever saw." He said, "We did not shoot up the fields; we shot up the towns."

I asked another general last year what changes had come about. He said for one thing the Communists drove off the Germans' livestock and took away their machinery with which they had to make a living. They have had time to make two crops since the war closed in Europe. Are we going to be called upon, are the people of this country who now have the greatest national debt the world ever knew, going to be called upon from year to year to feed the people of Europe because the Communist regimes spread over Europe will not let those people make their own living?

It seems to me we are asked to aid countries that have had ample time and ample opportunity to produce at least two crops since the war closed. If we keep this up, I am not sure that some of them will be calling on us for years and years to come.

Mr. HERTER. If I may continue, I have not the time to go into countries occupied by the military forces of the United States. Those are countries that are today under the American flag, wholly in Japan, wholly in Okinawa, and certainly wholly in Germany, within the American-occupied area of Germany. I certainly would not like to see people starving under the American flag.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Since the report of former President Hoover to President Truman, we have had the significant activity of General Marshall in Moscow where he has finally taken the position that the United States is not going to permit a system of reparations or a level of industry in Germany which will mean that reparations go out at one end while we pour relief in at the other end indefinitely. So, we have taken a firm stand finally on the proposition that the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman that it is an awful thing to think of people starving to death. But we have seen them starving to death in India, even in the streets of Calcutta, for years and years and years. What I am kicking about is that we have permitted the spread of communism over Europe, the most infamous influence the world has seen in 2,000 years, and it has prevented those people from making their own living. What I am afraid of is that if we continue to feed communism on the one hand, although we are ostensibly fighting it on the other, this condition never will cease, and we will be called upon for years and years to feed the hungry people of Europe.

Mr. HERTER. I would like to run through a part of this picture that deals with finances and then perhaps get down to further details. In Hungary there is no question but what food was taken out at one end. They had a very bad crop season last year. They are undoubtedly suffering. I am convinced the people of Hungary are not Communists. The one election that was held shows that extremely clearly. They are not Communists. They are today in peril under the domination of a stronger power adjacent to them. I think if we can assure help to these people it would strengthen our hand in the very direction that the gentleman from Mississippi is worrying about rather than weaken it.

On the other hand, I am very disturbed by the fact that no American officials have made an inspection on the spot or have any detailed information as to the requirements.

On the subject of Greece we will be hearing a great deal more about Greece in connection with the Greco-Turkish aid matter before long.

We have been told that Greece had to have food prior to the harvest. Estimates have been made that roughly $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 of this fund will be applicable to Greece. For how long a period that applies I do not know, but I have before me a letter from the Controller of UNRRA, of which I want to read one paragraph to show the confusion in which we are, from the point of view of the over-all sum that is envisaged in this picture. This letter is signed by Mr. Harry E. Howell, Controller of UNRRA:

> As for your second set of questions on food shipments to Greece, 81,424 metric tons of wheat were shipped to Greece by UNRRA from October 1, 1946, to February 28, 1947, inclusive, consisting of 7,893 metric tons paid for by UNRRA and 73,531 metric tons paid for by the Government of Greece. Scheduled for shipment in March are an additional 34,874 metric tons of wheat financed by UNRRA. An additional 17,880 metric tons of grains and grain products other than wheat are scheduled for March shipment to Greece. Grain shipments by UNRRA, supplemented by direct purchases of the Greek Government, are expected barely to meet Greece's minimum import requirement prior to the 1947 harvest.

Incidentally, this letter is dated March 24.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman fix approximately the date or the month when the 1947 harvest comes in? I think that is very important.

Mr. HERTER. The 1947 harvest varies in different countries. In the southern countries you get more winter wheat. In the northern countries you get more spring wheat. You have to fix it, therefore, between July and September, depending on the months in which they do their harvesting.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We have heard a great deal about the need, and we know the need is very great, but basically, is it not a question as to how much we have got to give?

Mr. HERTER. I agree with the gentleman entirely. That is one of the things that I regret, and which I think all members of the Foreign Affairs Committee regret. I do not think it is their fault in any way whatsoever that it is just impossible to add up what you might

say was the minimum requirement, and then have a clean-cut housekeeping budget as to what we are going to do.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder from what source this request comes for this $350,000,000.

Mr. HERTER. The initial source was an estimate that was made at the United Nations by the head of UNRRA, in which he figured to carry out the UNRRA program to the time when the various countries which have had poor harvests, could stand on their own feet. That estimate was a little over $600,000,000. The sum that appears in this bill, $350,000,000, represents the American share of that, which is roughly 57 percent. I think that is the way the figure was arrived at.

Mr. O'HARA. We have been contributing about 72 percent, have we not?

Mr. HERTER. Seventy-two percent to UNRRA.

Mr. O'HARA. Then, this is an actual donation to UNRRA and the UNRRA organization?

Mr. HERTER. No. This is being done solely by the United States, under United States administration and under our own direction and guidance. We are free here to make our own rules.

Mr. O'HARA. And failure to do that was one of the reasons that caused me reluctantly to vote against UNRRA.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is one question that I would like to ask and I hope this will be answered clearly by the members of the committee tomorrow, namely, what, if any, is the constitutional authority and power for us to take action such as this?

Mr. HERTER. I do not think there is any question in the world but what we have the constitutional authority to appropriate money for charitable purposes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Where in the Constitution is that power found?

Mr. HERTER. I am sure I do not know. I cannot answer the gentleman. All I know is that there are many precedents for it. As a matter of fact, in 1922, after the last war, Russia was given, roughly, $25,000,000 of assistance by a vote of the Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman explain to the House just how these funds are to be administered? Who is to administer these funds in the event the House passes the resolution?

Mr. HERTER. If the gentleman will excuse me, the members of the committee who have been following this matter very carefully, I think, ought to be answering those questions. I personally inquired and am not satisfied. I am hoping a number of amendments will be adopted to clarify and improve the proposal.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is it not the gentleman's understanding based on information we have now that the entire $350,000,000 is to be issued in a blank check to the President of the United States and that the State Department, which has never been an administrative branch of the Government but rather a policy-making branch, is going to administer these funds?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct, and personally I do not feel that the State Department should be the administrator. I do not think that is the function of a policy-making body.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I believe the gentleman said that Russia was administering one-third of Austria. As to that part of Austria which the Russians control, are the Russian troops living off the land?

Mr. HERTER. They certainly are.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why is it that we in the Congress ask the Federal Government to relieve the needs of all the countries of Europe when heretofore relief in the different countries of the world has been through the Red Cross and charitable subscriptions from the people of this country? Why is it we want to depart from that custom?

Mr. HERTER. The American Red Cross has never gone into foreign relief work. The American Red Cross has helped American soldiers and American units overseas. It is the International Red Cross which has worked internationally. The American Red Cross has never done any international relief work.

Mr. RICH. Why not give this money to the International Red Cross instead of to the President of the United States to administer for relief purposes?

Mr. HERTER. That question I believe has been taken up with the Red Cross on numerous occasions, and the Red Cross has taken the position that they were not organized to handle a continuing program, that what they were organized for and wish to continue to do was to give aid only in cases of dire emergency. They do not wish to change their basis of operation.

Mr. RICH. On Easter Sunday in one church I know of a collection for relief purposes was taken. It amounted to more than $10,000. For years it has been the practice in the various churches of the country to contribute for relief purposes, and the people of this country have responded generously. They have given of their means to relieve suffering. They will do it again. I believe that if we were to ask the people of this country through their churches and various organizations to make contributions we would get sufficient money in a very short time to feed those people over there and thus relieve the fear that the United States is now going into things which will eventually no doubt lead us into all kinds of trouble in the future and probably cost thirty, forty, or fifty billions before we get out of it. Perhaps we will not be able to get out of it by the methods we have been pursuing. Does not the gentleman believe this is a matter that should be taken care of by church organizations?

Mr. HERTER. If the gentleman will let me proceed. I do not want to take too much of the time on this side and there are a few things I do want to touch upon. I do not believe that private help will be sufficient to take care of the needs. The Quakers, the Unitarians, the Catholics, the Methodists, the Jewish, and other private organizations have been doing a splendid job, but the amounts involved are so large that they are way beyond the ability of private charities to handle.

The other country involved is Italy. Italy without question is a problem such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania just raised, where private charity cannot do the job. It is near the end of their crop year now, they are near the end of their resources. They usually can produce in their own country something like 9 months of their food supply, but they have to import, roughly, 3 months of their food supply even in peacetimes. They have had a lot of hard luck. For 2 years they have had hard luck. They suffered greatly from the severe drouth that devastated the whole of southern Europe last year.

Italy undoubtedly will require help and probably presents the clearest-cut case of any of the nations that have been mentioned.

I hope from what I have said appearing critical of the provisions of this bill that no one will feel that I am not sympathetic to doing what must be done, nor that I am going to vote against this bill; I am going to vote for it.

I am hoping that the bill will be amended, and I have in mind roughly eight different amendments. I may say that my former chief of many years ago, Mr. Hoover, ex-President of the United States, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate. He was sent to Europe to look into this very situation by President Truman. He came back and reported to President Truman. Then he came and testified before the two committees of the House and Senate after he consulted with President Truman. Nothing can make me believe that the recommendations that he gave to us at that time were made without the President's approval.

I hestitate taking any more time and perhaps when the bill comes up for general debate I will be able to get a few minutes to discuss some of the amendments and the recommendations of President Hoover. I understand most of them are being offered by the committee. I may add that every one of them is an amendment that has been recommended by Mr. Hoover, that Mr. Hoover has favored this bill as it stands after investigating the situation on the ground, provided the safeguards that appear in these amendments are adopted. I hope therefore that they will be adopted when offered.

Again I want to make it clear that the committee itself is not at fault either because it has not adopted these amendments or because it has very meager information in regard to this whole problem. It is the way in which the matter was presented to us by the officials of the Government.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It was my impression that former President Hoover only visited Germany and Austria.

Mr. HERTER. That is correct. That is, on this last trip. The year before he went to Greece and other countries.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The information of the members of our committee is that he visited approximately 30 countries.

Mr. HERTER. That was the previous year, not the last summer.

Mr. STEFAN. He did not visit the Far East but he had his own committee in the Far East investigating the food situation there.

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. He himself visited approximately 30 to 38 countries, two or three of which were during this present year.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. He himself only visited Germany and Austria, is that correct?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct insofar as his last trip is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the specific amendments which I understand are going to be offered and which I hope very much will be adopted cover the following points:

First. The naming of the countries which will be eligible to receive relief. In the naming of these countries I hope that the wording of the amendment will be such as not to make commitments insofar as these countries are concerned and to leave perhaps $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 for use in emergency areas outside of those countries;

Second. An amendment to permit the President to transfer to the International Children's Emergency Relief Fund of the United Nations a sum from the amount authorized in this bill not to exceed $50,000,000, or 57 percent of the total contributed;

Third. An amendment to limit purchases of supplies to this country with the exception of 10 percent;

Fourth. Make all purchases through United States purchasing agencies or under the direction of the United States so as to avoid competitive bidding for scarce commodities in our markets;

Fifth. Provide for a review as to how much of the amount authorized should be used after the harvests have been ascertained this fall;

Sixth. Require recipient nations to segregate any funds which they may receive from the sale of relief supplies; said funds to be used only for other relief and rehabilitation purposes or such purposes as the United States representatives may approve;

Seventh. The appointment of a Relief Administrator under the President to be responsible for the carrying out of the administration of the program rather than to have the State Department as the administrative agency;

Eighth. No relief to be granted to any country unless reparations required by treaty are postponed during the period of relief.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

WE SHOULD AID DEVASTATED COUNTRIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as has been skillfully and fully explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] in presenting the rule, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs after hearing many prominent and well-qualified witnesses and long consideration of the testimony and the evidence, and the open rule provides for 4 hours of enlightening debate. The gentleman has indicated his position that the rule should be adopted and the joint resolution passed, though he said that he would perhaps offer two clarifying amendments.

I agree with the gentleman that the rule and the joint resolution should be adopted; I have no opposition to them. At the same time, it has naturally occurred to me, since the other body today passed a bill providing specific funds for the relief of Greece, why the amount authorized to be appropriated by this joint resolution before us could not be increased by $100,000,000 or by whatever amount is necessary, and earmarked for Greek relief. That would save many hours of debate on two separate bills.

UNITED STATES RIGHTS AND INTERESTS ARE SAFEGUARDED

Reading the bill and the report, I am persuaded that all rights and interests of the United States are carefully safeguarded, and that all reasonable precautions have been taken to prevent abuse of this assistance either through political chicancery or through plain undisguised stealing.

Nevertheless, I cannot agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] when he says that any or all countries can come in under this authorization and be the beneficiaries of the program. The language is plain and inescapable.

WHY IS CZECHOSLOVAKIA EXCLUDED?

I am, in fact, more concerned by the fact that the language of the committee report indicates that little Czechoslovakia, first of the United Nations to feel the Nazi heel, nearest to the United States in the form and spirit of her government, apparently is to be excluded from the benefits of this relief program.

As every student of history knows, no people have suffered longer or more grievously from German exploitation and harassment. For long years the people of Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia, who now make up the independent nation of Czechoslovakia, bore the heavy yoke of the Austro-Hungarian Empire until in 1918, encouraged by the Allies, she led the revolt of the small central European countries, which speeded the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the victorious end of the war.

REPUBLIC MODELED ON UNITED STATES

Even before Czechoslovakia was liberated, she had a government-in-exile in the United States which drew up a constitution modeled closely on the American Constitution; and this was adopted and President Masaryk, a brilliant political philosopher who had spent many years in the United States and was imbued with our spirit of freedom and equality, became President and administered the Czechoslovakian Republic in the American way until the shameful British sacrifice of Czechoslovakia at Munich under Chamberlain.

We all know how bravely the Czechoslovakian people resisted the Nazi barbarians, and of how bitterly they paid for that resistance.

The world will not soon forget Lidice.

ONLY SIX NATIONS MENTIONED

Yet, according to the committee report on this joint resolution, the funds provided will be for relief only to Austria, Greece, Italy, Hungary, Poland, and China.

Certainly I am not in any way opposed to relief in any of these countries, though some of them fought against the United Nations in alliance with the beastly and murderous Nazis. My heart and my sympathies go out to starving peoples everywhere, who seldom can have any control over what their rulers do.

Surely no country, except Poland, suffered greater destruction and looting at the hands of the Nazis than little Czechoslovakia, left defenseless against Hitler's avarice and lies and exploitation after Munich.

NO COUNTRY SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

I hope myself that every country which needs assistance will receive it, and that no country in need of aid will be discriminated against for any reason.

Since the committee heard the testimony of well-informed representatives of the State Department, who had estimated the degree of aid needed very carefully, I hope that Czechoslovakia was excluded from the program only because that brave and industrious country has been able to lift herself by her bootstraps to a position where no further assistance is needed.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA NOT COMMUNIST-DOMINATED

I am not blind nor deaf, Mr. Speaker, to the assertions made by prejudiced or ill-informed people that Czechoslovakia is oriented toward and dominated by communism.

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The Czechoslovakian people are deeply and strongly devoted to the ideal of democracy—to democracy as we know it in America, a democracy of individual freedom and majority rule. Not only in government but in temperament Czechoslovakians are like Americans. They are eager, busy, industrious, and ingenious.

APPRECIATE LOYAL SUPPORT

It naturally follows that after the Munich betrayal, when Russia, though separated from Czechoslovakia by the barrier of Poland, was the only great power which showed any disposition to support Czechoslovakian claims against the ruthless aggression of Hitler, and after the liberation of Czechoslovakia by Russian armies as the cruel Nazi empire began to crumble, the Czechoslovakian people quite properly feel a strong bond of gratitude to the great power which

has continuously shown by concrete action its friendliness.

No nation has been more friendly toward the American people than Czechoslovakia, yet to our shame we must admit that in 1937 and 1938, when Czechoslovakia needed our help desperately, we did not and could not be of aid.

HELP WILL COME BACK MANYFOLD

I repeat, then, Mr. Speaker, that it is my profound hope that those delegated by the President to administer this program will be free of any sense of discrimination, and that if any country other than the six named is found to need aid it will be forthcoming freely and equally, not only for Czechoslovakia but for any other.

Though this authorization of $350,000,000 seems large, I want to say that history proves it will be an investment which will be returned to us manyfold in trade, in good will, and in gratitude from the starving, cold, and homeless people we help to rehabilitate themselves and to rebuild their ravaged countries.

TRADE INCREASED WITH RESPONSIBILITY

Ever since America began to reach political maturity, and to fulfill her role as a world power of liberal sympathies, our commerce has increased profitably, and our ready willingness to help others has moved them to help us in return.

Moreover, a relatively small amount of this authorization calls for actual cash. Much of it will be filled by transfer of surpluses from war supplies, or will be supplied through lines of credit for the purchase of our products, which will further aid our own economy in maintaining its present phenomenal prosperity.

Surely no American will begrudge such aid as we, the richest nation in the world, with our own shores untouched by the ravages of the Nazi war against civilization can give; and by the giving we shall forestall that jealousy and avarice which otherwise our prosperity might engender.

Since I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that there can be opposition either to the rule or to the joint resolution, I shall detain the House no longer.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include articles and editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of reciprocal trade.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TURKISH PRESS CONTROL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the House, I have pointed out that the Turkish Government is in a better financial position than we are. I have pointed out that the State Department, in effect, is proposing that we form a military alliance with a dictatorial government, whose refusal to honor its own agreements is a matter of record. I have challenged the intelligence of such a policy. Indeed, I have questioned the intent behind such nonsense, such colossal and stupid arrogance with which the State Department assumes that we will rubber-stamp anything that they may propose.

Mr. Speaker, we cherish the freedom of the press in this country. Our forefathers believed in the freedom of the press so thoroughly and completely that they wrote it into the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. So, Mr. Speaker, in the preparation of the Greek-Turkish military alliance bill, a clause has been inserted which says that our newspapermen and our radio men shall have free access to information in regard to the carrying out of the provisions of this act. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this clause in the proposed bill should guarantee American newspapermen the right to inquire, the right to report news in Turkey and Greece without censorship and without hindrance.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of the Members of the House do not know that there is no freedom of the press in Turkey. Perhaps they do not understand that Turkey is a dictatorship. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the correspondent for the New York Times had his license to file cables taken away from him within the past month because he dared to report the existence of press censorship in Turkey. Because I believe that this question touches the roots of the American democratic system I wish to read to the House the story which the New York Times correspondent wrote concerning the Turkish censorship of the press. I want the Members of the House to bear in mind that this correspondent had his right to file cables taken away from him because of the story that I am now going to read from the New York Times of March 29:

EASING OF TURKISH PRESS CONTROL IS SOUGHT WITH LOAN AS LEVER—PROGRESSIVES DECRY "CHINESE WALL" AROUND COUNTRY—SEVERE PENALTIES PRESCRIBED FOR REPORTS DEEMED OBJECTIONABLE

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, March 28.—In the light of the latest developments in Turkish-United States relations progressive individuals and newspapers are renewing their efforts to ease what is considered to be the difficult position of foreign press correspondents here.

A leading opposition paper, Vatan, which is campaigning for freedom of the press, editorially urged the Government today to accord more facilities and cheaper cable rates to foreign correspondents "if we want to pull down the Chinese wall surrounding us." Interpretative reporting here is hazardous in view of the Turkish law relating to the dissemination of information. Although unofficial censorship of cabled press messages ended last June and no signs of visible, direct censorship exist, correspondents still face what is known as the German system, censorship at the source, which puts correspondents on the carpet for printed cables judged by the authorities to be objectionable.

The Turks, who still are shy of foreigners, consider the correspondents a sort of spy, one to be avoided. No Government officer except the Premier is allowed to make a statement to the press without authorization from the top and it took the proposed American loan to induce Premier Receppeker to grant an interview recently.

The penal laws that apply to foreign correspondents and the local press have convinced reporters than an assignment in Turkey is no easy job. Article 140 prescribes a minimum of 5 years in prison for anyone sending abroad unfounded or exaggerated information on Turkey's internal political situation that might harm her dignity in foreign countries. The penalty applies to the person giving such information and to the correspondent who sends it.

Article 158 prescribes a minimum of 3 years in prison for anyone insulting the Turkish President or writing aggressively about him. A penalty of 1 to 6 years' imprisonment is provided in article 159 for any person insulting the moral personality of the national assembly, the Turkish Republic, the Government, the armed forces, the police, or the judicial system.

Article 162 provides that the act of transmitting a story or information that the law considers criminal is a crime.

The Government has argued that the laws are not invoked. They are enforceable, however, and hang over every reporter's head.

Mr. Speaker, this correspondent finished his story saying the laws are enforceable, and hang over every reporter's head. Two days later his right to file cables was revoked by the Turkish Government. This man felt his duty to tell the truth. He risked his job to send us, the Congress, this story. His job was taken away. It is interesting that several days later, the Turkish Government—doubtless under pressure from our State Department—restored the rights of this correspondent, pending the arrival of another correspondent from Athens.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House notes that the Turkish Government undertook to exercise its censorship in a most flagrant manner at the very same time that a bill to assist Turkey was before this House. The Turkish Government knew when it suspended this correspondent's license that a clause in the Greek-Turkish military bill provides for freedom of the press. The Turkish Government knew we will pass this bill only if the provision that freedom of the press is guaranteed. The Turkish Government deliberately flaunted in our faces its censorship. In effect, the Turkish Government told us that if we pass this present bill it has absolutely no intention of abiding by the provision of this bill.

Is there any Member of the House who is willing to defend the Turkish censorship of the press? Is there any Member of the House that really believes in his

heart that the Turkish Government will abide by the provisions of the proposed Turkish military bill? Does anyone honestly believe that the Turkish Government will grant a free press if this bill is passed?

Mr. Speaker, I have previously pointed out that the Turkish Government is completely unreliable—that it violated its sworn agreement and alliance with the British during the war. I have pointed out how they are holding today looted Nazi gold which belongs to the American taxpayer. For God's sake, let the Congress of the United States not be betrayed by an arrogant State Department into a completely hypocritical position. We may as well recognize now that the provisions guaranteeing free press in the present bill before us will be violated every day in the week by the Turkish Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing which will in any way justify the formation of a military alliance with the present dictatorial Turkish Government. If Turkey is threatened in any way she should turn this problem over to the United Nations of which she is a member. If, as some think, the Turkish Government needs financial assistance, let the Turkish Government apply to the International Bank of which she is also a member. I, for one, refuse to vote for a single cent of American taxpayer money to be poured down this international rat hole of dictatorial power and intrigue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from the Olympic Luggage Corp., of Kane, Pa., in reference to a reduction in prices, and a letter they sent out to their trade.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DEANE, for April 23 and 24, on account of official business.

To Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for this week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 135. An act to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 245. An act to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 993. An act to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

581. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report and appendix for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

582. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the proposed transfer of vessels to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

583. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the proposed transfer of a vessel to the Girl Scout Mariner Troop, No. 12, of Peekskill, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

584. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting copies of the notice of contestant and the reply thereto in the case of contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia (H. Doc. No. 213); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

585. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report citing Leon Josephson (Rept. No. 281). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report citing Leon Josephson (Rept. No. 288). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report citing Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron (Rept. No. 289). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1412. A bill to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1624. A bill to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 619. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; with amendment (Rept. No. 282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Norman Abbott; with amendments (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Robert Hinton; with amendments (Rept. No. 284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2631. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Barrett; without amendment (Rept. No. 285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to

be reappointed to the Foreign Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3131. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3132. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 3133. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3134. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3135. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens born in Puerto Rico who reside abroad and to restore citizenship to persons living in Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899, and to persons born in Puerto Rico thereafter who may have lost it by operation of subsection (c) of section 404 of the Nationality Act approved October 14, 1940, as subsequently amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3136. A bill to extend the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3137. A bill to provide that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 shall not apply to divorce proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3138. A bill to provide for the periodic audit of the records of the accountable officers of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3139. A bill providing that additional compensation be paid to navy-yard employees who worked on any holiday during the period beginning January 2, 1941, and ending on September 2, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3140. A bill to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for fair and impartial regulation of car service subject to the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 3141. A bill relating to the rent paid by certain veterans pursuing courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3142. A bill relating to the rent paid by certain veterans pursuing courses of vocational rehabilitation under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 3143. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3144. A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3145. A bill to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 3146. A bill to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3147. A bill to amend section 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics which become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H. R. 3148. A bill to provide for the establishment in the city of Munfordville, Hart County, Ky., of a suitable memorial community center building to the late Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., and others who gave their lives in service to their country in World War II, Munfordville being the birthplace of General Buckner; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3149. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3150. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3151. A bill to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3152. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3153. A bill to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3154. A bill to amend section 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 3155. A bill to authorize the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3156. A bill to provide additional compensation for widows and orphans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution declaring May 1 as National Loyalty Day, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the extraordinary disaster at Woodward, Okla., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public-works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Committee Print No. 13, a report of the Senate Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 191. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 18; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Uruguay, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to the extension of sympathy because of catastrophe which occurred in Texas City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the proper steps to immediately have removed the shacks and filth in the present Indian quarter on Government land at Celilo Village, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Gerson Gustave Kotanyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of Theodore G. Pilalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3160. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3161. A bill to provide for the extension of Patent No. 1,774,060, issued August 26, 1930, relating to gun pads manufactured from rubber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3162. A bill for the relief of Carmen Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3163. A bill for the relief of Gladys Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3164. A bill for the relief of Lydia Cortés; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3165. A bill for the relief of Aida Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 3166. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of I. M. Cothron, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:
H. R. 3167. A bill for the relief of Ikumori Sakihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Antone G. Pina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MUNDT:
H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Simon Kirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WINSTEAD:
H. R. 3170. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3171. A bill for the relief of Miss Maggie Sue Eakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

363. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Vida M. Fletcher and 298 citizens of Lamoni, Iowa, urging adoption of H. R. 142, to take beer out of Army training camps, and alcohol, prostitution, and gambling away from their vicinity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

364. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mary E. Forbes and 20 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

365. By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., recommending that Congress provide added authorization and appropriations to the War Mobilization Act and Reconversion Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

366. By the SPEAKER: Petition of a Negro-American group, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Labor Secretary Lewis B. Schwellenbach's proposal to illegalize the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. Also, petition of Athens Democratic Associations, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting financial aid to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, help us to understand that when we try to live without Thee, we are unable to live with ourselves; and when we say "No" to Thee, we are denying our own best interest. Whatever other rewards or punishments Thou hast ordained, we are finding out that we cannot do wrong and feel right, for there is a law within Thy universe that acts around us and in us. Give to each one of us, we pray, that intelligent self-interest that shall persuade us to do Thy will. Teach us that obeying Thee and Thy will is a forced option—like eating. We do not have to eat, but if we do not, we cannot live. We are not forced to obey Thee, but if we do not, we hurt ourselves. Convict us of the folly of walking against Thy lights, that we may live longer and better.

By the grace and mercy of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 22, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the base 6 property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore.

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL BY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM — VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 45)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate accompanying a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
April 23, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On yesterday, April 22, 1947, after the Senate had taken a recess, a message was received by me from the President of the United States, addressed to the Senate, vetoing Senate Joint Resolution 97, limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

I am herewith delivering to you the said message for presentation to the Senate.

Very respectfully,
CARL A. LOEFFLER,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Presidential message will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Senate:

I am withholding my approval of the resolution (S. J. Res. 97) "limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46."

Senate Resolution 46 created the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

The purpose of the resolution is to limit the application of certain provisions of existing law to counsel employed by the special committee. Mentioned specifically in the resolution are sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203). Section 109 of the Criminal Code forbids officers of the United States to aid or assist in the prosecution of claims against the United States. Section 113 forbids officers and employees of the United States to receive any compensation for services rendered in connection with any proceeding or other matter in which the United States is interested before any administrative body.

Exemptions similar to the foregoing have been contained in a number of previous statutes and are not unusual (55 Stat. 861; Public Laws 287 and 456, 78th Cong.).

The resolution, however, enumerates sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 306, 314, 315). The inclusion of these sections in this type of legislation is novel. Section 361 provides that the officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, shall give all opinions and render all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law necessary to enable the President and the heads of the various departments, and other officers, to discharge their respective duties; and shall, on behalf of the United States, procure the proper evidence for, and conduct, prosecute, or defend all suits and proceedings in the Supreme Court of the United States, and in the court of claims, in which the United States, or any officer thereof, is a party or may be interested. Section 365 provides that no compensation shall be allowed to any person, other than the United States attorneys and their assistants, for services as an attorney or counselor to the United States, except when specially authorized by law, and then only upon the certificate of the Attorney General to the effect that the services were actually rendered, and that they could not be performed by the officers of the Department of Justice, or the United States attorneys. Section 366 provides that every counselor or attorney specially retained, under the authority of the Department of Justice, to assist in the trial of any case in which the Government is interested, shall receive a commission as a special assistant to the Attorney General, or to one of the United States attorneys, or as a special attorney, as the nature of the appointment may require; and shall take the oath required by law to be taken by the United States attorneys, and be subject to all liabilities imposed upon them by law.

The exemptions with respect to sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes do not appear to be necessary in order to carry out the intent of the Congress. Of more importance, however, is the fact that the inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal

proceedings on behalf of the United States.

I am confident that this was not the intention of the Congress and it is for this reason that I am withholding my approval of the legislation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the time being the message together with the letter and joint resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, there was received today a veto message from the President dealing with the authorization to the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program to employ counsel. There apparently was a misunderstanding regarding this proposed legislation. The President apparently was misinformed regarding its content and purport.

There are two exactly similar pieces of legislation now on the statute books. One was signed by President Truman in December 1945, and the other was signed by his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in May 1944.

When these facts were brought to the attention of the White House the question of how to solve the situation was discussed. I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and we are in agreement that if the veto message may continue to lie on the table temporarily we can then take appropriate action, either by introduction of similar legislation, or by such other action as the Senate may determine is the best way to deal with the matter. I may say that meanwhile there will be no prejudice so far as the conduct of the affairs of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Maine in what he has just said. The basis of the veto message is clearly erroneous. The legal advisers of the President evidently made a simple mistake—which happens many times. The Senator from Maine and I are in accord on this subject.

I have also conferred with officials of the White House and I think they are also in accord respecting this matter, and it will be a simple matter for us to work it out either by the introduction of new legislation or by the overriding of the Presidential veto. No prejudice, however, will arise, so far as the committee itself is concerned, if the message may be permitted to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The veto message is on the table, and will remain there until the Senate takes action.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum respecting the matter prepared for me by the office of the Legislative Counsel, which originally gave the advice on which the joint resolution was prepared, also a copy of Public Law 257, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 575, first session, approved December 14, 1945, and Public Law 298, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 191, second session, approved May 5, 1945, both of which are in identical language with the measure on which the Senate took action a short time ago, and which was the subject of the Presidential veto, and a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 97, the joint resolution here immediately concerned.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR BREWSTER

Pursuant to your request I am submitting these comments with respect to certain phases of the veto message on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

With respect to the part of the message commenting on the novelty of including sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes in this type of legislation, it would seem to be sufficient to point out that at least two identical statutes have been passed within the past 3 years and have received the approval of the President. The first of these statutes is Public Law 298, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 5, 1944, exempting counsel for the Senate Special Petroleum Committee from the application of the same statutes referred to in the veto message. This legislation was approved by the late President Roosevelt. The second statute is Public Law 257, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 14, 1945, exempting counsel for the Pearl Harbor Committee from the provisions of the identical statutes referred to in the veto message. This legislation was approved by President Truman.

You have also requested our opinion on the passage in the message suggesting that counsel for the Senate Committee might by reason of Senate Resolution 97 be authorized "to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States." With respect to the above point, please be advised that in our opinion sections 361, 365, and 366 did not have to be included in Senate Joint Resolution 97, Eightieth Congress, to accomplish the objective which appears to have been in the mind of its sponsor. In our judgment, it would not be absolutely necessary to exempt counsel for a Senate committee from the application of the three statutes referred to in the veto message (sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes). However, it would appear that in the light of the recent precedents cited above in situations identical with the situation sought to be covered in Senate Joint Resolution 97 and in the endeavor to lean over backwards in protecting counsel to be employed under Senate Resolution 46 all of the statutes referred to in these precedents were included.

An examination of sections 361, 365, and 366 discloses that some of their provisions could conceivably apply to counsel for Senate committees, and that was evidently the view of sponsors of prior legislation adopted in such situations. For example, section 365 provides that no compensation shall be allowed to any person for services as attorney or counselor to the United States except in cases specifically authorized by law and then only on the certificate of the Attorney General that such services could not be performed by the Department of Justice.

With respect to the suggestion in the veto message that inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States, such a construction would, to say the least, be a very strained construction and it is our opinion that no court would accept this novel theory of creating a new Department of Justice through a provision in a resolution applicable only to Senate committee counsel in which it is sought to exempt such counsel from the provisions which at least for their principal purpose apply to the executive departments only. We are confident that the dire consequences feared in the veto message are without foundation, particularly in view of the fact that it is apparent from the legislative record that this resolution was passed solely for the protection of counsel to the committee.

Respectfully,

CHARLES F. BOOTS.

APRIL 23, 1947.

[Public Law 257—79th Cong.]
[Ch. 575—1st sess.]
Senate Joint Resolution 110

Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the Unted States, shall apply with respect to counsel serving under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, passed by the Senate on September 6, 1945, and passed by the House of Representatives on September 11, 1945.

Approved December 14, 1945.

[Public Law 298—78th Cong.]
[Ch. 191—2d sess.]
Senate Joint Resolution 122

Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted March 13, 1944.

Approved May 5, 1944.

[80th Cong., 1st sess.]
Senate Joint Resolution 97

(In the Senate of the United States, April 3 (legislative day, March 24), 1947; Mr. BREWSTER introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed)

Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing re-

strictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Bushfield	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarran	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INFORMAL JOINT SESSION ON MAY 1 TO HEAR ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On Thursday, May 1, at 12:30 o'clock, the President of Mexico will address an informal joint session of Congress in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Without objection, an order will be entered that on Thursday, May 1, the Senate will stand in temporary recess at 12:15 o'clock for the purpose of attending the informal joint session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California and a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which were ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of Maryland and the Girl Scout Mariner Troop, No. 12, of Peekskill, N. Y., had requested the transfer of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation placing residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes

"Whereas most of the residents of the non-community-property States are in effect taxed at a higher rate upon their incomes than are residents of community-property States under existing Federal income-tax laws; and

"Whereas then the non-community-property States are thereby placed at a distinct competitive disadvantage in that many persons establish their residences in adjacent community-property States in order to obtain the income tax benefit thereby accruing to them; and

"Whereas it is proper that this disadvantage be removed by amending the Federal income-tax laws rather than by the adoption of community-property systems by the respective States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is requested and urged to enact legislation that will place the residents of non-community-property States on an equal basis with residents of community-property States with respect to the Federal income tax; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members from Kansas in the Congress of the United States."

A memorial of the board of trustees of the Labor Lyceum, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of Brooks Memorial Methodist Church, Jamaica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing aid to Greece and Turkey without military personnel; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by approximately 100 citizens of Winfield, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Federal Security Administrator to enact legislation and regulations amending chapter 531, title X, concerning aid to the blind

"Whereas chapter 531, title X, sections 1001 et seq. embraces Federal legislation concerning exclusively aid to the blind and does not confuse aid to the blind with other forms of public assistance; and

"Whereas the present national average to the needy blind is $33.72 per individual per month which is insufficient during normal times and is completely inadequate in the present inflationary period; and

"Whereas certain States although requiring additional Federal aid to increase the State average in blind grants are unable to supply the required State funds in proportion to Federal funds due to lack of State resources or an impoverished State economy; and

"Whereas to correct further this situation and remove the blind from the class of the destitute it is necessary to increase the national average per individual blind person and allow earnings and income to the blind receiving aid, exclusive of any blind assistance, to permit a decent standard of living and development of initiative; and

"Whereas the regulations of the Federal Security Administrator are unduly restrictive on States in limiting States in interpreting need and eligibility for aid; and, further, requiring close supervision by State personnel of the individual blind recipient in the disbursement of his assistance with a consequent burden on the taxpayer to maintain salaries for such State personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring herein), as follows:

"1. That chapter 531, title X, dealing exclusively with aid to the blind be retained as a separate title concerning itself exclusively with aid to the blind;

"2. That legislation be enacted to authorize and direct an increase in the present national average per needy blind person to $75 per month by removing the present limit of the Federal Government's contribution to the States and permitting an increase in the amount of Federal funds available to the States;

"3. That the present Federal requirement on the States that they must consider any income or resources available to a needy blind applicant be abolished. To encourage initiative, raise morale, and remove the blind,

needy because of a physical handicap, from their present pauper position it is necessary that at least a minimum amount of earnings be allowed in addition to any blind aid;

"4. That the Federal Government require the States to exempt the relatives legally required under State poor laws from the duty to support a needy blind person. This requirement is a vestige of the poor laws and fails to recognize blindness as a handicap that may be partially overcome by a reasonable opportunity for self-support. It further places a heavy financial burden on the family that may result in strife and discord;

"5. That the Federal Government enact legislation compelling States to abolish the requirement that the blind must transfer their property to the State as a prerequisite for receiving aid;

"6. That the Federal Government establish a definite and certain grant system to replace the present system based on budgetary need, and that the present budget system be abolished with its present close supervision of all the details of a recipient's life;

"7. That the Federal Government allow the States freedom to adopt their own interpretation of need and eligibility for aid; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States together with the Federal Security Administrator."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend certain legislation relating to a constant and stable water level in the upper Mississippi River

"Whereas a constant and stable water level in the upper Mississippi River is highly desirable and of vital importance in the interest of agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation, and sanitation in Minnesota; and

"Whereas the United States War Department is by Federal law restricted to operation and administration of the 9-foot channel dam pools in said river solely in the interest of navigation and flood control with resultant winter and other periodic drawdowns; and

"Whereas such draw-downs have caused lowering of lakes and marshlands and taxed the subsurface moisture of the State, causing undue damage to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, and recreation values, and further, causing extreme aggravation to many communities in their efforts to maintain necessary sanitation standards; and

"Whereas these periodic draw-downs are very detrimental to the fish and wildlife resources and recreational values, which the Federal Government has recognized and sought to perpetuate by creating and maintaining the Upper Mississippi River Fish and Wildlife Refuge: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That we memorialize the United States Congress to give proper and due recognition to these valuable assets by enacting legislation amending the present act governing operation of said dam pools in such manner as will give the same position to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation, and sanitation as is now given by law to navigation and flood control; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"Approved April 15, 1947.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; ordered to lie on the table:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the wool-purchase program

"Whereas the wool-purchase program conducted pursuant to act of Congress expires on April 15, 1947; and

"Whereas the purpose of said program is to prevent the collapse of the sheep and wool industry of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota has now about 736,000 head of stock sheep and lambs on its farms and holds rank as the fifteenth State in sheep population; and

"Whereas the number of stock sheep in the State of Minnesota has declined from 972,000 head in 1940 to 736,000 head now, and in the United States has declined from 40,129,261 head in 1940 to 32,542,000 head now; and

"Whereas the continued decline in the sheep and wool industry will be an economic catastrophe; and

"Whereas if said program is discontinued on April 15, 1947, the price of wool will suffer a rapid decline to the detriment of the State of Minnesota and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled, That we petition the Congress of the United States and the Members thereof from the State of Minnesota to extend the wool-purchase program by appropriate legislation until December 31, 1948, and particularly by the immediate passage of House Joint Resolution 158; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker, and the chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Representative and Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota."

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and for printing in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 of the Kansas Legislature memorializing Congress concerning unemployment compensation and employment service.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress concerning unemployment compensation and employment service

Whereas the Congress, by the enactment of the Social Security Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act, attempted to established a cooperative program between the several States and the United States in the operations of unemployment compensation and public employment offices; and

Whereas the Federal levels, through control of funds provided by Congress, have perverted the congressional will by creating and carrying on programs of dictation and close supervision of the States; and

Whereas the present method of financing such programs is unsatisfactory both to the Federal Government and the States, as well as being expensive because of the dual staffs required for purposes of collecting the payroll taxes by which these programs are financed; and

Whereas it is essential that governmental costs be reduced and efficiency restored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the house of representatives concurring therein): 1. That it is hereby recommended to the Congress of the United States that legislation be passed creating certain indefinite minimum standards for State legislation and administration in the fields of unemployment compensation and public employment services, and that upon compliance by the States with such standards the taxpayers deemed liable for Federal unemployment compensation tax be given full exemption therefrom.

2. That it is hereby further recommended that in the event the Federal Government, through the agency charged with this responsibility, determines that the State has failed to meet such standards, that said decision be reviewable in the appropriate court upon request by the State and that pending the outcome of such appeal the State legislation shall be considered as having complied with such standards.

3. That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Kansas.

Mr. REED presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

MEMORIALS AGAINST ANTILABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference various and sundry memorials signed by approximately 30,000 citizens of the State of California expressing their opposition to certain described antilabor legislation now pending before Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorials will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present to the Senate a memorial from the Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada, and also an accompanying letter from Mr. Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, stating that the memorial is over 280 feet long, contains more than 15,000 signatures, and that it is from a union which has been in existence over 50 years and has never had a work stoppage. The signers of the memorial ask the Senate not to pass any restrictive or antilabor legislation.

I ask that the letter and memorial be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter and memorial will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. TAYLOR) introduced Senate bill 1156, to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, to provide for unified water con-

trol and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1157, to promote the general welfare by providing funds to assist the several States in paying adequate salaries to teachers in public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADEQUATE SALARIES FOR PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing for grants-in-aid and for assistance to the school teachers of the Nation, a class of our citizenry who suffer particularly as a result of the increased cost of living and the inadequate compensation they have received in recent times.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1157) to promote the general welfare by providing funds to assist the several States in paying adequate salaries to teachers in public schools, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF RAILROAD FREIGHT CARS

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 107), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized and directed, in connection with its investigation of railroad freight-car shortages, (1) to make a study with respect to the authority and administrative policies of the Car Service Division of the Association of American Railroads in the distribution of railroad freight cars to serve the commerce and industries of the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States, including any contiguous States affected by the current critical shortages of such equipment; (2) to determine whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has permitted such association to assume the duties and responsibilities imposed upon the Commission by the Congress with respect to the distribution of freight cars among the various railroads and geographic areas of the country; and (3) to ascertain whether such association is dominated by particular railroads to an extent which would interfere with the proper and impartial exercise of such duties and responsibilities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date concerning the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us to the bill (S. 81) to assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries, which we introduced on January 8, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and will be printed.

SUGAR RATIONING AND CONTROLS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, recently the question of sugar rationing and further controls on sugar was before the Senate. It was with interest that I read in today's Wall Street Journal the following news item:

Sugar supplies back up for the first time since before the war. Behind the back-up: Slowed buying by both industrial and household users. Growing clamor for abandonment of rationing before the currently scheduled date of October 31 can be expected. But the prospect is that the Agriculture Department won't heed the clamor before early summer at the soonest. Not before then will officials be sure that the Cuban crop is as big as expected and that a big fall sugar-beet harvest is assured.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO AS STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on March 27 I received a letter from Nicholas Murray Butler, the president emeritus of Columbia University, in which he enclosed a copy of a letter which he had written to the Secretary of the Interior on March 7 opposing the admission of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico as States in the American Union.

Although Mr. Butler is well along in years, he expresses his views with his usual force and clarity and makes a contribution which I believe should be carefully studied by Members of the Senate.

In a letter to me of April 15 he commented further on this topic, saying:

May I again say that in my judgment we are at the turning point in the history of our Nation when we deal with the question of admitting to statehood outlying islands. The moment we begin upon this policy it will have no end and the United States of America, as it has existed, will become a wholly different kind of nation. On the other hand, by adopting some such plan as I have suggested we can set up these outlying islands, over which we have jurisdiction, in a way which will give them independence and a right to self-government and at the same time protect them from being overrun by other nations. We may be assured that if we begin a policy by admitting Hawaii to statehood, it will be followed by attempts to admit one outlying island or Territory after another until we shall have destroyed the United States of America as we have known it.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to the Secretary of the Interior of March 7 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1947.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR SECRETARY: May I call to your attention a matter which I regard of extreme importance to the Government and people of the United States. Under no circumstances should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or Territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background, might easily mark, as I said, the beginning of the end.

Think of what would happen were the vote of one Senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world. It is unthinkable that we should allow any such possibility.

On the other hand, I suggest that each one of these Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—be set up, by treaty, as an independent and self-governing nation, subject to but two limitations. These are, first, that their relations with foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President of the United States and the United States Senate. This would prevent any foreign power from using them to our disadvantage. The second is that litigants in any one of these countries should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of this would be to establish a uniform system of public and civil law in this part of the world. This privilege now exists in the case of Puerto Rico and I am told works extremely well.

I earnestly ask your most serious consideration of this proposal and the avoidance of the damage that would be done to our Government and our people by extending the United States beyond its present very compact and naturally defined boundaries.

I regret that on account of my total blindness, I cannot sign this letter myself.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary conducting hearings on the nominations of certain Federal judges may continue its meeting while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOW TO CUT PRICES—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How To Cut Prices," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, at a meeting in Kansas City, Mo., April 22, 1947, under the auspices of the Republican National Committee, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE SCHUSTER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

the activities of UNESCO by Dr. George Schuster, president of Hunter's College, New York, at the National Catholic Education Association Convention at Boston, Mass., April 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER TO YOUNG REPUBLICAN WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Young Republican Western Regional Conference, at Salt Lake City, Utah, on Saturday, April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Roscoe Drummond in regard to pending labor legislation, published under the headline "State of the Nation," in the April 21, 1947, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to cooperation between the President and the Congress, written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATISM IN PUBLIC FINANCE—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. OWENS

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Something Rare Under the Sun," by John W. Owens, published in the April 23 issue of the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senate's Approval of the Aid Program," published in the April 23, 1947, issue of the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before taking up any of the miscellaneous matters which were discussed yesterday, I desire to make a comprehensive statement regarding Senate bill 1126, which has been recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after 6 weeks of hearings and long consideration in the committee. Members will find the bill on their desks, together with the committee's report, which represent the views of 11 of the 13 members of the committee.

After the preliminary statement the report proceeds to set forth in detail each amendment and what the amendment provides for.

On page 31 of the report is a rewrite of the National Labor Relations Act showing the amendments proposed to be made by the committee bill. That is in accord with the new rule under the La Follette-Monroney Act, and follows the practice which the House has followed for many years, in order that the amendments of an existing act may be clearly understood.

The report also contains the separate views of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and supplemental views by myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] proposing some additional amendments in addition to those which appear in the bill. At this time I do not intend to discuss those amendments. I wish merely to present the committee bill, which is a substantial step forward in improving labor relations in the United States, and which redresses many of the injustices which have arisen under the interpretation of past laws.

Mr. President, why is a labor bill necessary? Why is it demanded today by an overwhelming proportion of public opinion? Of course, on the surface it is due to the fact that we have had a large number of strikes, inconveniencing the public, even threatening their safety and welfare. I think even more, the widespread demand for some correction of the existing labor legislation arises because of many injustices which have developed in labor relations, injustices which are perfectly clear to all the people who come in contact with particular disputes which in effect are without remedy in the courts under present laws.

I myself feel that the larger employers can well look after themselves, but throughout the United States there are hundreds of thousands of smaller employers, smaller businessmen, who, under the existing statutes, have come gradually to be at the mercy of labor-union leaders, either labor-union leaders attempting to organize their employees, or labor-union leaders interfering with the conduct of their business for one reason or for another.

Mr. President, originally, before the passage of any of these laws, the employer undoubtedly had an advantage in dealing with his employees. He was one man; the employees might be thousands; and he could deal with them one at a time. In negotiations of that character he had such a superior advantage that Congress came to feel that it must legislate specifically in order to correct that situation and bring about a balance. Congress passed the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act in order to limit legal actions against unions. Congress passed the Wagner National Labor Relations Act in order that the employees of a single employer might act as one in dealing with the one employer, in order that they might be on a sound and an equal basis, a principle which I think no one can question, and which certainly is not questioned in the pending bill.

The difficulty with the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is that they went at the situation with a meat ax. They practically eliminated all legal remedy against unions for any action taken by them. In effect they provide—as construed by the courts, at least—that any action by a union taken in order to advance its own interests is proper, and there is no legal recourse against the union. The laws referred to do not discriminate between strikes for justifiable purposes and strikes for wholly illegal and improper purposes. They do not distinguish between strikes for higher wages and hours and better working conditions, which are entirely proper and which throughout this bill are recognized as completely proper strikes, and strikes in the nature of secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes of the racketeering variety. The acts simply eliminated all remedy against any union, leaving the union leaders free, practically without any control even by their members, to order strikes and boycotts and various kinds of actions that interfered, I believe certainly unlawfully under common law, with the activities of many other persons who were entirely innocent.

The National Labor Relations Act was enacted for a proper purpose, but the result of the actual administration of that act has been completely one-sided. It was simply for the one purpose of equalizing, or permitting a large number of employees to act as one; in effect to compel them to act as one if the majority desired such action.

Of course, it was one-sided, and the first board that was appointed, I believe, established a method of procedure which was completely prejudiced and completely on the side of labor unions. In 1939 I sat through the hearings for nearly 6 months on the operation of the National Labor Relations Board up to that time, and I do not think I have ever heard, certainly in America, such a series of miscarriages of justice as occurred under the first National Labor Relations Board.

The members of that board were gradually dismissed by President Roosevelt, the protests being so violent against their acts. As their terms expired other men were appointed to take their place, and they disappeared from the picture. The most violent testimony we had in that particular hearing that I remember came from the A. F. of L. unions themselves, from Mr. Green and Mr. Padway, who took the position, as I think correctly, that the board regarded themselves not as a judicial board to determine rights under the law in a lawful manner, but as crusaders to put the CIO union in every plant in the United States. In every way they could warp the law to accomplish that purpose, they did so.

Since then they have been succeeded by others who have proved to be much more judicial and who today I think constitute a very fair board. Yet much of the personnel that was appointed under the original law remains. Many of the precedents which were established by the original board still exist, and the result is that in the administration of that law, as testified to before our committee, there were so many injustices that it seemed impossible to correct them without legislation.

The greater part of the bill which is now before the Senate is a revision and amendment of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which is rewritten from the

first section to the last, with amendments dealing with particular injustices which were called to our attention, and which we believe can be corrected by an amendment of the law. These various injustices have been frozen into the law by the fact that for 8 years since the hearings in 1939 there has been no labor bill, no comprehensive consideration of the problem, and nothing for action by the Senate except the Case bill of last year, which was only a partial approach to the problem, and which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, the interpretations not only of the laws themselves but of the administrative regulations and the administrative rulings, and the decisions of the Supreme Court itself—holding in effect that there was no way in which any court could revise injustices perpetrated by the National Labor Relations Act—resulted in gradually building up the power of the labor leaders, so that today, in my opinion, the weight in collective bargaining negotiations is all on the side of the labor leaders, except perhaps against the very largest companies in the United States. In particular I believe that in dealing with small business, with farmers, and even with the workers themselves, the labor-union leaders have acquired a power which today the people resent and which inevitably has been abused. Many of our labor leaders are just as judicial and as fair as anyone could wish them to be, but extreme power, unreasonable power, cannot be granted to any group of men without a large number of them being willing to exercise it to accomplish ends which are not reasonable. Polls taken today show that union members themselves resent the power of labor-union leaders. Even on the question of the closed shop, which the union leaders are most vigorously defending, the polls show that more than half their men are actually opposed to the position the leaders are taking, because apparently they feel that today they are at a great disadvantage in dealing with union leaders, and that the power given to the leaders by existing legislation is so great that the individual is unable to exercise their right to free speech, his right to work as he pleases, and their general right to live as he pleases.

As to the proper method of correcting the situation, certainly there is no panacea. I have been interested in talking with employers. A group of employers will say, "This situation must be corrected." When asked, "What is the most important thing?" one man will say one thing, another man will say another thing, and a third man will say something else, because those are the matters that have come to their attention in dealing with labor unions.

The problem is infinitely complicated. I suppose there are at least 50 amendments to the present law in the pending bill. Wherever we found an injustice we tried to correct it; and, of course, the net result of correcting a number of injustices is incidentally to decrease some of the power of the labor-union leaders. It seems to me that our aim should be to get back to the point where, when an employer meets with his employees, they have substantially equal bargaining power, so that neither side feels that it can make an unreasonable demand and get away with it. If neither side feels that it can get away with certain demands, I do not believe that the demands will ever be made. If there is reasonable equality at the bargaining table, I believe that there is much more hope for labor peace. That is the method pursued by the bill which is now before the Senate. It is not an antilabor bill. It is not a bill inspired by a desire to wreak vengeance on anyone because of what he may have done. It simply proposes to deal with the causes of labor trouble and the injustices and inequities of the present law.

Basically, I believe that the committee feels, almost unanimously, that the solution of our labor problems must rest on a free economy and on free collective bargaining. The bill is certainly based upon that proposition. That means that we recognize freedom to strike when the question involved is the improvement of wages, hours, and working conditions, when a contract has expired and neither side is bound by a contract. We recognize that right in spite of the inconvenience, and in some cases perhaps danger, to the people of the United States which may result from the exercise of such right. In the long run, I do not believe that that right will be abused. In the past few disputes finally reached the point where there was a direct threat to and defiance of the rights of the people of the United States.

We have considered the question whether the right to strike can be modified. I think it can be modified in cases which do not involve the basic question of wages, prices, and working conditions. But if we impose compulsory arbitration, or if we give the Government power to fix wages at which men must work for another year or for two years to come, I do not see how in the end we can escape a collective economy. If we give the Government power to fix wages, I do not see how we can take from the Government the power to fix prices; and if the Government fixes wages and prices, we soon reach the point where all industry is under Government control, and finally there is a complete socialization of our economy.

I feel very strongly that so far as possible we should avoid any system which attempts to give to the Government this power finally to fix the wages of any man. Can we do so constitutionally? Can we say to all the people of the United States, "You must work at wages fixed by the Government"? I think it is a long step from freedom and a long step from a free economy to give the Government such a right.

It is suggested that we might do so in the case of public utilities; and I suppose the argument is stronger there, because we fix the rates of public utilities, and we might, I suppose, fix the wages of public-utility workers. Yet we have hesitated to embark even on that course, because if we once begin a process of the Government fixing wages, it must end in more and more wage fixing and finally Government price fixing. It may be a popular thing to do. Today people seem to think that all that it is necessary to do is to forbid strikes, fix wages, and compel men to continue working, without consideration of the human and constitutional problems involved in that process.

If we begin with public utilities, it will be said that coal and steel are just as important as public utilities. I do not know where we could draw the line. So far as the bill is concerned, we have proceeded on the theory that there is a right to strike and that labor peace must be based on free collective bargaining. We have done nothing to outlaw strikes for basic wages, hours, and working conditions after proper opportunity for mediation.

On page 48 of the bill we have provided for the delay of national emergency strikes. We have provided that when a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States, if permitted to occur or to continue, would imperil the national health or safety, the Attorney General may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues and make a statement of the issues and report back to him as promptly as he may direct. He may then seek from the court an injunction against striking for a period of 60 days, during which time the Government has another opportunity, through the Mediation Board, to try to bring about an agreement between employers and employees which will prevent a Nation-wide strike.

If such mediation should fail, then at the end of 60 days it is provided that there shall be an election by the employees to determine whether or not they accept the last offer made by the employer. If they vote to accept it, of course the strike is terminated. If they vote not to accept it, the injunction is dissolved and they are free to strike. The bill provides that when that happens the Attorney General shall submit to the President a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, and that the President shall transmit such report, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make, to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action.

If there finally develops a complete national emergency threatening the safety and health of the people of the United States, Congress can pass an emergency law to cover the particular emergency.

We did not feel that we should put into the law, as a part of the collective-bargaining machinery, an ultimate resort to compulsory arbitration, or to seizure, or to any other action. We feel that it would interfere with the whole process of collective bargaining. If such a remedy is available as a routine remedy, there will always be pressure to resort to it by whichever party thinks it will receive better treatment through such a process than it would receive in collective bargaining, and it will back out of collective bargaining. It will not

make a bona-fide attempt to settle if it thinks it will receive a better deal under the final arbitration which may be provided.

We have felt that perhaps in the case of a general strike, or in the case of other serious strikes, after the termination of every possible effort to resolve the dispute, the remedy might be an emergency act by Congress for that particular purpose.

I have had in mind drafting such a bill, giving power to seize the plants, and other necessary facilities, to seize the unions, their money, and their treasury, and requisition trucks and other equipment; in fact, to do everything that the British did in their general strike of 1926. But while such a bill might be prepared, I should be unwilling to place such a law on the books until we actually face such an emergency, and Congress applies the remedy for the particular emergency only. Eighty days will provide plenty of time within which to consider the possibility of what should be done; and we believe very strongly that there should not be anything in this law which prohibits finally the right to strike.

I have dealt with this question, Mr. President, because it is one of perhaps greater interest and one which affects more the fundamental philosophy of the bill than the other provisions. It is contained in title 3 as part of the mediation procedure.

But of course the injunctive process does not deal with the main causes of labor trouble, the injustices, and the inequalities of the present law. The bill seeks to restore equality of bargaining power and imposes on the unions the responsibility to balance the power which they have acquired. The bill is not inspired by mere theory or by any hostility to unions. It is based on specific testimony of specific wrongs.

I shall try to summarize the changes which have been made. They are important. They make a substantial step forward toward the furnishing of equal bargaining power.

The bill provides that foremen shall not be considered employees under the National Labor Relations Act. They may form unions if they please, or join unions, but they do not have the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. They are subject to discharge for union activity, and they are generally restored to the basis which they enjoyed before the passage of the Wagner Act.

It is felt very strongly by management that foremen are part of management; that it is impossible to manage a plant unless the foremen are wholly loyal to the management. We tried various in-between steps, but the general conclusion was that they must either be a part of management or a part of the employees. It was proposed that there be separate foremen's unions not affiliated with the men's unions, but it was found that that was almost impossible; that there was always an affiliation of some sort; that foremen, in order to be successful in a strike, must have the support of the employees' union. A plant can promote other men to be foremen if necessary. The tie-up with the employees is inevitable. The committee felt that foremen either had to be a part of management and not have any rights under the Wagner Act, or be treated entirely as employees, and it was felt that the latter course would result in the complete disruption of discipline and productivity in the factories of the United States.

The definition of foremen is applied to persons who are strictly foremen. We have not extended it to timekeepers or guards or any of the others about whom controversy has arisen.

For many years the National Labor Relations Board held that, under the existing amendment of the National Labor Relations Act, foremen were not employees. By a two-to-one vote that was changed, and it was held that they were employees and that decision as an interpretation of the existing law was upheld by the Supreme Court by a vote of 5 to 4. The legal question in the past has been whether they are included as employees under the existing law but we felt that on the questions of theory and of intention of the law, and on the considerations which I have submitted, foremen should be excluded from the operations of the National Labor Relations Act.

Some other changes have been made in the method of classifying employees, particularly professional employees. Professional employees are defined to be those who are strictly professional, men with highly specialized professional qualifications, who may, if they desire, vote themselves out of a plant unit and establish a special union for professional employees. Such a union would have the protection of the Wagner Act. It is not a situation similar to that of foremen. It would mean that the Board could not include professional employees with nonprofessional employees if the majority of the professional employees in a plant did not desire to be in the general union.

In the third place we have provided further protection for craft unions. Today the situation is that when a new plant is organized the Board ordinarily permits the craft members of that plant to vote as to whether they will have a special craft union or join a general plant union. The Board has followed the desires of the craft unit on that question. But if at the time of the first certification a craft unit is not organized, or if no action is taken, and if by default they are all included in a plant union which is certified to the Board, the Board has taken the position that after 1 year of such bargaining no craft union will be recognized or given an opportunity to be heard in connection with establishing a craft unit.

All this bill does it to provide that such a previous finding shall not have that effect, and that if a year later the craft people want to form a separate union they shall have the same consideration at that time as they would have had if they had taken that action when the plant was first organized. In effect I think it gives greater power to the craft units to organize separately. It does not go the full way of giving them an absolute right in every case; it simply provides that the Board shall have discretion and shall not bind itself by previous decision, but that the subject shall always be open for further consideration by the Board.

The provisions of the bill regarding the closed shop are found on pages 12, 13, and 14. They present a substantial change in the present law. They present, I think, so far as I have been able to study the House bill, very much the same change as has been made in the House bill. They do not abolish the union shop. They do abolish the so-called closed shop. A closed shop is a shop in which the employer binds himself not to employ anyone unless he is a member of the union at that time. A union shop is defined as a shop in which the employer binds himself not to continue anyone in employment after the first 30 days unless he joins the union. In other words, an employer may employ anyone whom he chooses to employ, but after 30 days such employee has to join the union or else the employer can no longer employ him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What occurs if the union will not accept him into membership? Is that point covered?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I shall deal with that question.

In the first place, Mr. President, the bill does abolish the closed shop. Perhaps that is best exemplified by the so-called hiring halls on the west coast, where shipowners cannot employ anyone unless the union sends him to them. That has produced a situation, certainly on the ships going to Alaska, as the testimony before our committee showed clearly, where there is no discipline. A man may be discharged one day and may be hired the next day, either for the same ship or for another ship. Such an arrangement gives the union tremendous power over the employees; furthermore, it abolishes a free labor market. A man cannot get a job where he wants to get it. He has to go to the union first; and if the union says that he cannot get in, then he is out of that particular labor field. Under such circumstances there is no freedom of exchange in the labor market, but all labor opportunities are frozen.

As a matter of fact, most of the so-called closed shops in the United States are union shops; there are not very many closed shops. If in a few rare cases the employer wants to use the union as an employment agency, he may do so; there is nothing to prohibit his doing so. But he cannot make a contract in advance that he will only take the men recommended by the union.

There are two conditions which we have imposed even on the union shop. In the first place, the men must vote that they wish to have such a union shop provided for in the contract with the employer, and the vote must carry by a majority of all the men in the unit—not just a majority of those voting, but a majority of all the men in the unit. That follows, in a somewhat reduced form, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. Certainly it seems clear to me that unless a ma-

jority of the men in the unit want a union shop, they should not have to have a union shop imposed upon them by some agreement made by their leaders, thus giving the leaders increased power over their men.

In the second place, we have proposed a proviso in the case where a man is refused admittance to a union, when an employer employs a nonunion man, and during the first 30 days of his employment he goes to the union and says, "I want to join the union," but the union refuses to take him. It is provided that in such case the employer shall not be compelled to discharge the man simply because the union will not let him join the union on the same terms and conditions as any other member. In effect, we say, "If you are going to have a union shop, then you must have an open union. You cannot say to people, 'We have a closed union shop, and we are not going to let you in under any circumstances.'"

The bill further provides that if the man is admitted to the union, and subsequently is fired from the union for any reason other than nonpayment of dues, then the employer shall not be required to fire that man. In other words, what we do, in effect, is to say that no one can get a free ride in such a shop. That meets one of the arguments for the union shop. The employee has to pay the union dues. But on the other hand, if the union discriminates against him and fires him from the union, the employer shall not be required to fire him from the job. During the testimony we heard of a case in which a union member saw a shop steward hit a foreman. That union member was called to testify in court, and he testified that he saw the shop steward hit the foreman. Subsequently, the union called him before their board for discipline, and said that for him to testify as he did was unfair to the union, although he had been subpenaed to testify in court and sworn. Thereupon he was fired from the union, and under the union agreement the employer would have to fire him. Under this bill the employer would not have to fire that man unless he did not pay his union dues.

I think the justice of such an arrangement should be clear. As I have said, either we should have an open shop or we should have an open union. I do not believe we should permit the complete exclusion from any industry of a man who wants to work in that industry, and whom the employer wants to employ, and who is perfectly competent to work there, simply because the union says, "We do not want you and we will not let you in" or "We are going to fire you from the union because we do not like the way you act."

Mr. President, I have hesitated to support the complete outlawing of the union shop, because the union shop has been in force in many industries for many years, and to upset it today probably would destroy relationships of long standing and probably would bring on more strikes than it would cure. I think there are abuses. I mentioned three or four during the course of the hearings. With respect to abuses of that kind, we have attempted to deal with them by this proviso.

Mr. President, on page 16 the bill contains a provision guaranteeing free speech to employers. That provision in effect carries out approximately the present rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. It freezes that rule into the law itself, rather than to leave employers dependent upon future decisions. That is one of the matters which has been most widely discussed, and I believe that we deal with it in this section with reasonable adequacy.

We have completely revised the nature of the National Labor Relations Board. That is required for the reason that we have created a number of unfair labor practices on the part of unions. The Senate is aware that in the past there have only been unfair labor practices on the part of employers. All action taken has been taken against employers. The Board has been given a necessary bias because the Board's only job has been to act against employers and to take action in the case of wrongs which it has been alleged that employers have committed. This bill designates a number of unfair labor practices on the part of employees and labor unions as being unfair. I shall describe those later. The result is that it changes the nature of the Board; it gives it more work to do, and we have increased the number of the members of the Board from 3 to 7, in order that they may sit in two panels, with 3 members on each panel, and accordingly may accomplish twice as much in the way of the number of hearings held. Today the Board is behind in its work, and of course this bill will impose a considerably greater volume of work upon the Board.

We have attempted to deal with the obvious fault, in the early days, that the Board not only prosecuted a man or initiated the prosecution of a man, but also judged the fairness of its own prosecution, almost completely free from any review by the courts. That has offended certainly my sense of justice and it has offended every principle of Anglo-Saxon law. We have tried in various ways to assure that there shall be a separation of those functions. We have not provided for a complete separation, because the Board itself, as time has passed since 1939, has gradually separated those functions in most respects, and a good many of the really serious abuses which occurred previously could not occur today. We have abolished the Review Section, so that this Board will act more as a court; the cases will go directly to the Board, and must be heard by the Board; and each member of the Board is to be given attorneys to work for him, just as each Justice of the Supreme Court has attorneys working for him. So the policy of the Board will not be determined by some anonymous Review Section, but will be determined by the Board itself.

It is provided that when a trial examiner makes a report he shall not then enter into secret meetings with the Board in an attempt to persuade the Board that he is right, after the hearing has been held. His point of view is to be presented in open hearings, and the other side of the matter is to be heard in open hearings. Thereafter, it will not be possible for the trial examiner to have a private or secret meeting with the Board, to argue against a possible reversal of his opinion, just as it is not permissible for a United States district judge to have a private meeting with the judges of a circuit court of appeals, after a hearing has been held before that court to determine whether the district judge's opinion shall be reversed.

If exceptions are taken in representation matters, the hearing officer, who is in effect in the prosecuting end of the job, shall make no recommendations; he shall simply pass on the hearing to the Board, and the Board itself shall pass on the question of representation, and shall do so on the basis of the facts that are shown in the hearing.

The general attempt is to separate those functions, so that we do not have the confusion which has existed and which has operated unfairly against those prosecuted by the Board.

I think the very fact that we specify unfair labor practices on the part of labor unions, as well as on the part of employers, will necessarily restore the Board to a more judicial attitude of mind. I think that in itself may eliminate much of the difficulty which has arisen.

What are the new unfair labor practices on the part of unions? The provision starts on page 14 of the bill. First, it is provided that—

> It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—
>
> 1. To interfere with, restrain, or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances.

Last night David Lawrence, in a completely puerile analysis of the bill, referred to that as not meaning anything, and being something to fool the public.

This unfair labor practice referred to is not perhaps of tremendous importance, but employees cannot say to their employer, "We do not like Mr. X, we will not meet Mr. X. You have to send us Mr. Y." That has been done. It would prevent their saying to the employer, "You have to fire Foreman Jones. We do not like Foreman Jones, and therefore you have to fire him, or we will not go to work." This is the only section in the bill which has any relation to Nation-wide bargaining. Under this provision it would be impossible for a union to say to a company, "We will not bargain with you unless you appoint your national employers' association as your agent so that we can bargain nationally." Under the bill the employer has a right to say, "No, I will not join in national bargaining. Here is my representative, and this is the man you have to deal with." I believe the provision is a necessary one, and one which will accomplish substantially wise purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, did the Senator say that that is the only provision which relates to industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, that is the only one. The Senator will find in the supplemental report an amendment proposing to deal with the subject, but there is nothing else in the bill in that regard, and I shall not deal with that question today.

Secondly, it is made an unfair labor practice for a union to try to get an employer to discharge a man who has been improperly fired from the union. That is supplemental to the provisions I have dealt with relating to the closed shop.

In the third place, it is made an unfair labor practice for a union to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer. Up to this time the obligation to bargain collectively has been solely on the employer. Now it is on both the employer and the employee.

The fourth unfair labor practice is an extremely important one. It is made an unfair labor practice for any union to engage in a secondary boycott. That is subdivision (4) (1).

It is made an unfair labor practice for any union to engage in an indirect organizational strike. That is to say, the teamsters cannot go to a store and say, "Unless you sign up with the clerks' union, we are going to boycott your store," unless the clerks' union has been certified as a bargaining agent by the National Labor Relations Board.

The third type of strike which is made an unfair labor practice is the strike in which one union is certified by the National Labor Relations Board and another union strikes against the decision of the National Labor Relations Board.

The fourth type of unfair labor practice is the ordinary jurisdictional strike, in which two unions compete for work on a particular job.

I think the committee all agreed that those types of strikes are in effect racketeering strikes. They are strikes which are not direct strikes to settle questions of wages or hours or better working conditions. They are strikes which are, in effect, attempts to bring indirect pressure on third parties, to get third parties to work in some way to bring about a result which may ultimately be favorable to the one initiating the pressure, which has no direct relation to the work except perhaps with regard to the question of power.

As to the secondary boycott, I shall later describe that type of strike, but I ran into one over the last week end. The plant of a manufacturer of neon signs in Connecticut, I think in Hartford, or near Hartford, had not been organized, and finally his men were organized by a CIO union. The result was that the A. F. of L. sign hangers' union refused to hang this man's signs before any store. Almost the same type of case occurred in Ohio. In Lima, Ohio, a small manufacturer of neon signs was forced out of business because he recognized under the provisions of the act, the union which the National Labor Relations Board compelled him to recognize. Yet he could not get his signs hung. If the stores were able to get them hung, they were broken by stones. They are particularly vulnerable objects, of course. This man was driven out of business. The man from Hartford told me he had lost $100,000 in the last 3 months, and that he would be bankrupt in another 3 days and out of business, so far as he was concerned. That is an example of the secondary boycott, the A. F. of L. sign hangers' union boycotting an employer using certain material because it was made by a CIO union. Senators have heard of other instances. I cite this one only as a type of that kind of action.

The bill provides that that type of strike is an unfair labor practice. When a strike occurs, the man who is damaged by it is to go to the National Labor Relations Board and file a charge, and they give him a hearing. If he can persuade them to do so the Board can go to court and get a temporary injunction against further operation of the strike while the National Labor Relations Board is hearing the question as to whether it is an illegal strike or not, and deciding whether it will issue a permanent injunction against that particular strike.

Mr. President, I think what is provided in the bill is a substantial step forward. The provision is a most important one. At a later time I shall state why I think there should be a more direct remedy than is given, in this type of strike. The members of the committee who favored the method set out have provided the best possible means by which to get action if it is necessary to go to the National Labor Relations Board at all. The same remedy applies to organizational strikes and one type of jurisdictional strike.

Finally, violation of a contract by a union or an employer is also made an unfair labor practice which may be enjoined by the Board.

Mr. President, one of the matters which created the greatest complaint in the early days, and still does, is conduct of elections by the National Labor Relations Board. An election under present law may be sought only by a union. In the early days the Board exercised its discretion in favor of particular unions. It would not order an election until the union told it conditions were favorable, and it might win. Many of the greatest abuses on the part of unions occurred in the use of that discretionary power by the Board in the early days.

Today an employer is faced with this situation. A man comes into his office and says, "I represent your employees. Sign this agreement, or we strike tomorrow." Such instances have occurred all over the United States. The employer has no way in which to determine whether this man really does represent his employees or does not. The bill gives him the right to go to the Board under those circumstances, and say, "I want an election. I want to know who is the bargaining agent for my employees." Certainly I do not think anyone can question the fairness of such a proposal.

We provide, further, that there may be an election asked by the men to decertify a particular union. Today if a union is once certified, it is certified forever; there is no machinery by which there can be any decertification of that particular union. An election under this bill may be sought to decertify a union and go back to a nonunion status, if the men so desire.

It is provided that where there is a ballot having three proposals on it, the A. F. of L. union, the CIO union, and no union at all, the two highest shall be certified in the run-off. Under existing conditions if, we will say, the A. F. of L. has the highest number but not a majority, the no-union has next, and the CIO union, third, the Board says that since the A. F. of L. and CIO together had a majority of the total, therefore the men want a union, and they do not put on the ballot the no-union proposal which was second in number of votes cast, they simply put the A. F. of L. and the CIO on it.

This bill requires them to pursue the policy that has been pursued in every run-off election I know of—the two highest have to be certified in the run-off. The bill also provides that elections shall be held only once a year, so that there shall not be a constant stirring up of excitement by continual elections. The men choose a bargaining agent for 1 year. He remains the bargaining agent until the end of that year.

The bill provides further that in these elections, and otherwise, there shall be equal treatment of independent unions. Today the Board refuses as a rule to certify an independent union. Most of the independent unions had some cloud on their original formation.

Originally, perhaps they were a company union, or they had some aid from the company. The Board has taken the position that if those facts are once shown, they never will certify such a union, although it may have purged itself of that connection for the last 10 or 15 years. The telephone union was originally a company union. Now, nobody can question it is bona fide.

If there be an A. F. of L or CIO affiliate union which is company dominated, but which affiliates itself with the national A. F. of L. union, then the Board will permit it to purge itself promptly and will certify it as bargaining agent.

This bill provides that it must give independent unions, under those circumstances, the same treatment that would be given a union affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the CIO. Numerous representatives of independent unions appeared before the committee who told us how unfairly they had been treated. It was felt that theirs was a good case.

The bill provides, that in elections, one shall not have the right to vote if he has no right to be reinstated in his employment. In the Redwood case, in California, the men in a particular sawmill company plant, struck, and walked out. They have been out now for 18 months, and gradually they have been replaced, mostly by returning veterans, until there is a full force working in the plant, and the men who were formerly employed are out, working on other jobs; and yet, when an election is held, the old men still vote, still select the bargaining agent; and there is no possible way for the employer to stop the strike or stop the picketing, that still continues, because he can deal only with the union which is represented by men who are no longer there. The men who are in the

plant cannot be strikebreakers, they cannot be men who are given more money than the ordinary employee; but under present decisions if the new men are standard replacements, men willing to work, and taken on for permanent work, then they take the jobs of men who are striking and the former workers are not entitled to have their jobs back. This bill provides in that case that the former employee cannot vote in the election, so that the new men can form a union and can make finally an agreement, an effective legal agreement with their employer.

Mr. President, the bill provides that unions must file financial reports on forms certified by the Secretary of Labor, and furnish the reports to all their members, and file a copy with the Secretary of Labor. Such reports are not open to the public, any more than corporation reports are open to the public; but they are open to inspection by the members, and they are also open to proper Government officials. There is no special provision, but they are not specifically provided to be open to the public.

The filing of such report is a condition of certification as bargaining agent under the law, and is also a condition of the right to file any charges under the National Labor Relations Act. One of the most important things, I think, that the public feel should be done, is to make unions responsible. This bill provides that such reports shall be made. They are made in many unions today. Many unions favored the proposal. No man may longer conduct a union as his private concern and conceal from his members the salary he receives or the methods by which he disposes of their funds.

The bill makes a change in the provision regarding court review of National Labor Relations Board decisions. The present rule in the law is simply that any decision supported by evidence shall be final as to the facts, and the result has been that as a practical matter it is almost impossible for a court to reverse the National Labor Relations Board.

Under this proposal, it is said that the finding of the Board with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

In the first place, the evidence must be substantial; in the second place, it must still look substantial when viewed in the light of the entire record. That does not go so far as saying that a decision can be reversed on the weight of the evidence. It does not go quite so far as the power given to a circuit court of appeals to review a district-court decision, but it goes a great deal further than the present law, and gives the court greater opportunity to reverse an obviously unjust decision on the part of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, title III of the bill, on page 53, makes unions suable in the Federal courts for violation of contract. As a matter of law unions, of course, are liable in theory on their contracts today, but as a practical matter it is difficult to sue them. They are not incorporated; they have many members; in some States all the members must be served; it is difficult to know who is to be served. But the pending bill provides they can be sued as if they were corporations and if a judgment is found against the labor organization, even though it is an unincorporated association, the liability is on the labor union and the labor-union funds, and it is not on the individual members of the union, where it has fallen in some famous cases to the great financial distress of the individual members of labor unions.

Finally, Mr. President, the bill provides for a joint committee to study and report on basic problems affecting friendly labor relations and productivity. We have not had time to study a good many fundamental questions relating to labor relations. There are various subjects which were not covered by the testimony, and we felt that there should be a more fundamental study leading to better relations between employer and employee, leading to better productivity on the part of the individual workman, with his willingness and consent, because, after all, his standard of living depends ultimately on his particular productivity.

We see today what has happened in England where the productivity of workmen has for one reason or other steadily decreased.

The committee is to study, first, a means by which permanent friendly cooperation between employers and employees and stability of labor relations may be secured throughout the United States;

Second, the means by which the individual employee may achieve a greater productivity and higher wages, including plans for guaranteed annual wages, incentive profit-sharing and bonus systems. There are many such plans proposed as solutions of the labor problem, and we believe all of them should have a hearing and that they should be studied by Congress;

Third, the labor relations policies and practices of employers and associations of employees;

Fourth, the coordination of welfare funds with the social-security system.

We have an amendment to offer later which will deal with the question of holding up the formation of wide open welfare funds until this study is made but in any event, a study should be made of the relationship between the security funds of special corporations and industries and the social-security plan, whether they can exist alongside, whether they should be coordinated, and what the relationship should be.

Finally, the methods and procedures for best carrying out the collective-bargaining processes, with special attention to the effects of industry-wide or regional bargaining upon the national economy, and such other problems as the committee sees fit to study. That committee is to be composed of 7 members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and 7 members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, a total of 14, which is given the usual power of joint committees.

Mr. President, I did not mention the fact that the bill proposes to revise the Federal Mediation Service. The revision, which occurs in the section dealing with the emergency injunction process, provides for a single Director of Mediation, who is not to be under the jurisdiction of the Labor Department but is made an independent agency, for the reason that it was felt that the Labor Department was formed to represent the interests of labor, and that a conciliation service should be absolutely impartial between labor and employer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Ohio has said that the Director is not to be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. Under which of the executive departments will he come?

Mr. TAFT. He will occupy the usual status of an independent agency, which will make him responsible directly to the President of the United States.

I might say that in this mediation procedure we have provided greater power for the Mediation Service. We hope that the prestige which it acquires may lead to more successful mediation than there has been.

We have provided in the revision of the collective-bargaining procedure, in connection with the mediation process, that before the end of any contract, whether it contains such a provision or not, either party who wishes to open the contract may give 60 days' notice in order to afford time for free collective bargaining, and then for the intervention of the Mediation Service. If such notice is given, the bill provides for no waiting period except during the life of the contract itself. If, however, either party neglects to give such notice and waits, let us say, until 30 days before the end of the contract to give the notice, then there is a waiting period provided during which the strike is an unlawful labor practice for 60 days from that time, or to the end of the contract and 30 days beyond that time. In that case there is a so-called waiting period during which a strike is illegal, but it is only brought about by the failure of the union itself to give the notice which the bill requires shall be given. So it seems to me to be no real limitation of the rights of labor unions.

Mr. President, I have covered the bill. I shall be glad to answer any questions dealing with it today or at any other time. I feel that the bill makes an extraordinary reversal along the right lines toward the equalizing of the power of labor unions and employers. It is certainly a substantial step forward. There are four other things that I think ought to be added to it, but they are in no way inconsistent with the bill itself. I hope very much that the Senate will proceed to a consideration of the bill and will act upon it promptly.

I do not think that labor can claim that any of its legitimate rights are interfered with, but if anyone can point out language which seems to be broader than the legitimate purposes shown to be necessary by the hearings we have held, certainly we shall be glad to modify such language.

I think I can say that I support wholeheartedly the bill which is here presented, and I believe it will deal with a majority of the serious problems which now exist in the relations between employers and

employees; that it will impose upon unions a responsibility more equal to the power which they have acquired, and that it will tend to bring about industrial peace in the United States.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM TO HOOVER DAM

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45, Calendar No. 52, in accord with the statement made on the floor of the Senate yesterday, and without in any way displacing the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45), to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the name of Hoover Dam is hereby restored to the dam on the Colorado River in Black Canyon constructed under the authority of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), and referred to as Hoover Dam in the act approved February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1146); in the act approved April 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 118); in the act approved July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 535); in the act approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 717); and in the act approved February 17, 1933 (47 Stat. 845). Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of Boulder Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Hoover Dam.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to his colleague for that purpose?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to my colleague for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the folowing Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McMahon
Ball	Green	Malone
Brewster	Gurney	Martin
Bricker	Hatch	Millikin
Brooks	Hawkes	Moore
Buck	Hayden	Morse
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	O'Conor
Byrd	Hoey	O'Daniel
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Capper	Ives	Overton
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cordon	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Downey	Langer	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	Lucas	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarran	Stewart
Ellender	McClellan	Taft
Ferguson	McFarland	Taylor
Flanders	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McKellar	Thye
Tobey	Watkins	Williams
Tydings	Wherry	Wilson
Umstead	White	
Vandenberg	Wiley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am speaking on Senate Joint Resolution 45, Calendar No. 52, which was discussed at considerable length on Monday last. It was returned to the calendar at 2 o'clock because the regular order of business took preference. I shall not take the time of the Senate to go back over the ground which I covered the other day, because it is now a matter of public knowledge. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I urge the passage of the joint resolution, which has been on the calendar for several weeks. The subject was before the Senate a year ago. I shall take a few moments to read a part of what I said on Monday, because I believe that Senators now present who did not hear it should hear it:

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am not breaching a confidence when I say to the Members of the United States Senate and the people of the Nation, that I have had several interviews with our distinguished President, Mr. Truman, regarding this question of the name which belongs to the great dam under discussion.

The first time I saw the President of the United States in connection with this subject, I presented to him evidence that the name, Hoover Dam, had been used in five acts of Congress, which specifically referred to the dam as Hoover Dam. The Interior Department appropriation bill, which came to the floor of the House of Representatives in December 1930, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, specifically referred to the dam as the Hoover Dam. This fact was called to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives by Democratic—note, I say, "Democratic"—Representative Taylor, who emphasized to the House Members, among other meaningful things:

"There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence. I refer to three words in the second line which are 'the Hoover Dam.'"

Representative Taylor went on to say: "Do you realize those words just read by the clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?"

Representative Taylor's statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Dec. 12, 1930, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646). No one could say that the Congress did not know that the dam was being named Hoover Dam. Democratic Representative Taylor's views were approved by the House. The Senate concurred, and the bill became law, establishing the name of Hoover Dam in the act of Congress of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1115, 1146).

Four succeeding appropriation acts likewise referred to the dam as Hoover Dam. Furthermore, the dam was officially named Hoover Dam by Secretary of the Interior Wilbur, who in public services gave it that name in accordance with the authority established in the five appropriation bills which went through the Congress with due notice to the Members of Congress given to them by Democratic Representative Taylor, of Colorado, in his presentation of the appropriation bill to the House of Representatives on December 12, 1930.

When I told President Truman that in my opinion the name of the dam was and is Hoover Dam, the President said that in his opinion the dam was and is Hoover Dam, and that my joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) was probably necessary in order to straighten out all the legal technicalities that had come about through the interchangeable use of the names.

On January 21, 1935, Attorney General Homer Cummings replied to a letter he had received from Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, in which Mr. Ickes wanted the name Hoover Dam removed from litigation between the United States Government and one of the States, which, as I recall was Arizona. In his letter Attorney General Cummings said:

"I believe these acts refer to the dam as Hoover Dam. Moreover, the dam is referred to as Hoover Dam in the contract between the United States and the metropolitan water district under which contract, I understand, the dam is actually being constructed."

Attorney General Cummings went on further to say:

"I rather doubt whether it is feasible to do anything about the matter at this late date, even if it were deemed appropriate so to do. I call attention to the specific words, 'even if it were deemed appropriate so to do'."

In these days when there is so much difference of opinion on vital matters affecting the people and our Government and way of life, it behooves us to try to reduce all our feelings to a better understanding. At no time will all the people in this great Nation admire the same man in the same way, and that is probably beneficial to representative democracy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think it is very fitting that this joint resolution should be passed. The dam was constructed, as I understand, during the administration of President Hoover. Wilson Dam was constructed during the administration of President Wilson and remained Wilson Dam. Coolidge Dam was constructed during the administration of President Coolidge and was named Coolidge Dam. Although I do not agree with his political philosophy, Mr. Hoover is a great American. No man in the world has done more to alleviate human suffering than has Mr. Hoover.

In 1927 one of the greatest calamities in the history of this country occurred in the Mississippi Valley. A great part of my State was practically washed away. Mr. Hoover was placed in charge of relief there. He conducted the relief program, saved thousands of lives, and did more than anyone else to alleviate the suffering and the terrible conditions which were caused by the disastrous flood of that year. We in the South appreciate his services to us in that catastrophe. Mr. Hoover is a great American. Regardless of the original intention, whether it was to name the dam Hoover Dam or not, it should be named Hoover Dam.

It is fitting and proper, Mr. President, that the pending joint resolution should be passed.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. That is just the kind of stand I should expect him to take, regardless of whether he agreed with all the philosophies and economic views of any man.

Mr. President, I shall not take more time at present unless some Senator desires to interrogate me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have listened very attentively to the Senator from New Jersey and also to my colleague who has just spoken, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi. While it is true that those of us who are Democrats do not always agree with the political philosophy of Mr. Hoover, he has been recognized by the people of this Nation as a great man and a great American. In view of the contribution which he actually made toward the construction of the great project referred to, and in view of the long-established precedent which has been set in connection with the naming of such projects, I think it is not only fitting but is an act of proper respect to Mr. Hoover and recognition of his services that the dam be named in his honor.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this subject, but it may not be inappropriate for me to say a few words.

I first came in contact with the humanitarian activities of former President Hoover in World War I. I saw his work in connection with relief at that time, and I came to have an admiration for his ability as an administrator, for his work as an individual citizen, and for his performance of public and semipublic duty. Since that time I have watched him in various capacities, including his distinguished service in the office of President of the United States.

The dam referred to was built during his administration, and it was named for him. I think that in the period since he was President many things have been attributed unfairly to former President Hoover. I think what is now proposed may be considered as in the nature of a gesture of admiration and respect for him, and it is appropriate that the action should be taken. I hope the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a 4- or 5-minute statement on this subject. I have no objection to honoring former President Hoover, but I think we could find a more appropriate monument to him than a dam in view of the fact that he was not, to put it mildly, outstanding as a supporter of public power. A public power dam might, after all, be distasteful to him. He might find it embarrassing to have his name tied up with what he would call a socialistic enterprise. Has anyone asked him whether he would consent to having his name used in this particular way?

It will be remembered that Mr. Hoover, in his veto of the Muscle Shoals bill, made it clear that power dams were not his favorite form of governmental activity.

Of course, I could think of more appropriate things to name after Mr. Hoover. For example, right here in Washington there is Anacostia Flats, a location intimately associated with the Hoover administration. I think that we might very well change the name of that to Hoover Flats.

As I say, I have no objection to honoring our only living ex-President. Since this move seems to be a political one, I might say that I am in full agreement with it as a political matter. I think that nothing can be more valuable to the party of which I am a member than keeping the name of Mr. Hoover before the public. I am particularly anxious that the fact be more firmly fixed in the mind of all of the citizens of this country that the Congress is now controlled by the party of Mr. Hoover. While this should be known to all, I fear that there is often public confusion; and I believe that acts like the present one will do much to clarify the situation in the minds of the public.

I would go even further. I think that we ought to honor other notable Republicans here today. The lake which is backed up by Boulder Dam is now called Lake Mead. I think we might very well change that name, and name it for one of Mr. Hoover's great predecessors, the Honorable Warren G. Harding. All of us who have seen the dam have recognized that its spillway is a magnificent sight. I think it might well be used to honor another Republican, and I can think of no name which could more appropriately be affixed to a spillway than that of the illustrious gentleman who served as a Cabinet colleague of Mr. Hoover and who controlled the public domain as Secretary of the Interior. In short, I think the spillway should be named Albert Fall Spillway.

I think, perhaps, that in addition to naming the dam after Mr. Hoover, we should authorize the authorities at the dam to adopt as a public insignia for the dam a large H superimposed upon a shiny apple. The apple will remind us of the numerous apple sellers who lined the streets during Mr. Hoover's administration and who served so well to illustrate the solution of that great engineer and economic wizard to the unemployment problem of his day.

Mr. Hoover once made the dire prediction that, if the American people rejected him, grass would grow on the city streets in this country. Alas, that prediction did not come true. Now, at last, when Mr. Hoover is coming into his own and is becoming a prophet with honor even in his own country, it would be a touching tribute to sow grass seeds between the pavements of Boulder City in the hope that somewhere a bit of green would sprout, bringing to fruition those heroic words of prophecy. Of course, it will not be Boulder City any longer. Since it is named for the dam which made it possible, it will no doubt change its name along with the dam. I trust that the new name will not be Hooverville, for that is a name which was once all too common, and whose connotations the local chamber of commerce might resent.

If this measure passes, I think we might very appropriately commemorate for the ages the philosophy of former President Hoover by an appropriate monument at the site of the dam. My own suggestion would be that we engrave across the face of the dam some of the immortal words which Mr. Hoover used in 1931, when he vetoed the Norris bill to erect a power dam at Muscle Shoals—a project which has since been constructed and has become known as the TVA. Let me quote one sentence from that message which would be singularly interesting:

> For the Federal Government deliberately to go out to build up * * * a power and manufacturing business is to break down the initiative and enterprise of the American people; it is destruction of equality of opportunity amongst our people; it is the negation of the ideals upon which our civilization has been based.

I suggest that that inscription be engraved upon the monument at Hooverville, or Boulder City.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have been very much intrigued with the exhibition of real American humor which has come from the Senator from Idaho. I wish to present another expression of sentiment by another American humorist, Will Rogers, whom some of us remember. In the instance to which I refer he was speaking seriously. He used to send a little syndicated telegram to the newspapers of the country every day. On October 19, 1934, this was his syndicated telegram:

> The madam and I just been visiting Hoover Dam. That's not a typographical error; it is Hoover Dam. There must be some justice left among us.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for bringing that new thought into the situation.

I may say that when we speak of Hoover Dam we find that all of the documents show that people all over the United States, including those connected with the great railroads, thought it was Hoover Dam, because all their circulars, time tables, scenic literature, and so forth, referred to it as Hoover Dam; and I assume that they had some reason for doing so. However, I do not care to go into that argument.

I am happy to say that it is perfectly proper for the Senator from Idaho to express his opinion as he has done; but I thank goodness that the President of the United States does not look upon Mr. Hoover exactly in the same light as does the Senator from Idaho; otherwise President Truman would not have chosen Mr. Hoover for the important task which he has performed. Much to President Truman's credit, he chose the ex-President, a Republican, a man with some of whose philosophies certain classes of the

people of the United States do not agree. Nevertheless, President Truman chose that great man to perform one of the most remarkable humanitarian tasks that has ever been performed in the history of the world. I may say that, regardless of how some persons in the country may feel toward Mr. Hoover, I found that the people all over Europe and pretty much around the world, particularly the common people, are deeply grateful to him for the work he has done in trying to bring food to them and to save them from starvation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Jersey yield the floor?

Mr. HAWKES. I do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Nevada, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 21

Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the Nevada Representatives in Congress to retain the name "Boulder Dam":

Whereas the Boulder Dam, located in the Black Canyon of the Colorado River, was completed in the year 1935; and

Whereas prior to its completion it was officially named and designated as "Boulder Dam"; and

Whereas because it is the highest dam in the world it has become widely known and heralded, described in current encyclopedias, and delineated upon maps under its official name "Boulder Dam"; and

Whereas Boulder City, located in the immediate vicinity of the dam, and being the city which serves the dam, bears its name because of the official name and designation of the dam itself; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada that the dam being a national monument of outstanding importance its name should not be changed or redesignated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby memorialize and petition that the Congress of the United States retain the name and designation, to wit, "Boulder Dam"; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of the resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Washington and to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed assembly, March 15, 1947.
Passed senate, March 19, 1947.
Approved by Governor, March 27, 1947.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on Monday we discussed this matter briefly, and at that time I made a statement which I deem worthy of repetition, namely, that I have no quarrel with either the politics or the political action or the regime in which Mr. Hoover served this Nation as President.

My opposition to the pending joint resolution does not stem from any dislike I have for Mr. Hoover, because I have no dislike for him. I said yesterday, I say again today, that anyone who was President in the period in which Mr. Hoover sat as President might have encountered the same experiences, regardless of his political affiliation.

The reason for my opposition to the joint resolution is that the people of my State have, as set forth in the resolution just read to the Senate, which was passed almost unanimously by the Legislature of the State of Nevada, are opposed to changing the entire economic set-up of a community of six or seven thousand people. Boulder City is a thriving little city, established by reason of Boulder Dam, as a service community to Boulder Dam, and for 13 or 14 years, by consent and approval of its citizens, it has borne the name "Boulder City." Throughout the length and breadth of the world the name "Boulder Dam" has gone, and with it has gone the name of Boulder City. People have builded their business on that name. They have set up their economy on that name. Nowhere has "Hoover" been mentioned with reference to the dam. Nowhere has there been any activity to change the name of that dam.

It has been stated that sometime or other a law was enacted carrying the name "Hoover." That is not the fact. The original act, as I read yesterday, carried definitely in section 10 the name "Boulder Dam." I read it again from the House hearings on the Colorado River Basin, 1926, page 4. Section 10 of the original bill reads as follows:

That for the purpose of constructing said dam and incidental works, canals, and appurtenant structures and acquiring lands and rights-of-way therefor there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of $70,000,000, to be appropriated from time to time, upon estimates made by the Secretary of the Interior, and transferred to a subfund of the reclamation fund established under said reclamation law and to be designated "Boulder Dam Project Fund."

"Boulder Dam project fund." There is the name written indelibly in the original act which established and set up the Boulder Dam project.

Mr. President, that is not all.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HAWKES. I merely wanted to say that the date the Senator is reading precedes the dates when the several appropriation bills containing the name "Hoover Dam" were passed, does it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the original act from which I am reading.

Mr. HAWKES. But as we go along we often change our opinions, and change other things, too. My point is that what the Senator has read was written prior to the several appropriation bills in which the dam was named "Hoover Dam."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. Hoover did not change his mind about it. I am going to read to the Senator now what he said.

After the original act had passed the Congress, on May 1, 1930, President Hoover sent a letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives reading, in part, as follows:

I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1930, to remain available until expended, amounting to $10,660,000.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted herewith, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

That was President Hoover speaking. This is what the Director of the Budget said:

The last item contemplates reimbursement to the reclamation fund of the expenditures on account of—

Of what? Of the Hoover Dam? Not at all—

on account of Boulder Dam and power plant.

I have read what Mr. Hoover said, after the act had passed and had been approved. The act was passed under a previous administration. It was passed under the administration of President Coolidge. It was not passed in the administration of President Hoover.

Mr. Hoover, recognizing the fact that the dam had been called Boulder Dam all over the world, that the act itself, when it went through the Congress, declared it to be Boulder Dam, as I read from the record here, as it is written indelibly into the act, sent up a letter attached to which was a supplemental estimate, not for Hoover Dam, but for Boulder Dam.

Mr. President, many things may be said about this subject, including many things which may be said in error. I again say to the Senate that I take no issue with the politics of Mr. Hoover. I regret that he had an unfortunate administration, a fact of which in connection with this matter some people might take advantage. I am not doing that. I am opposing the pending joint resolution because it affects the life of the people of my State, in which this project is located. This project is not in Alabama; it is not in Mississippi; it is not in California; it is in the State of Nevada, and the people of the State of Nevada have built an economy about this project which no one can take away from them, and now this joint resolution proposes to take away the very thing on which they have founded their name, which has become known throughout the entire world.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator from Nevada familiar with the newspaper Las Vegas Age, southern Nevada's oldest newspaper?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very well acquainted with it.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator aware of the fact that on Sunday, March 16,

there appeared an editorial in the Las Vegas Age——

Mr. McCARRAN. What year?

Mr. SMITH. March 16, 1947, about a month ago. The editorial appeared in one of the leading newspapers, or supposedly one of the leading newspapers, of the Senator's State, and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to read portions of it. I omit some parts of the editorial because they are an attack on Mr. Ickes, which I do not wish to repeat for the RECORD, but I want to read what is said about Mr. Hoover from this newspaper published in the Senator's own State. The editorial is entitled "'Hoover Dam' History," and it reads as follows:

There is considerable confusion when it comes to discussion of the name of the great dam erected by authority of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, passed by Congress and signed by President Coolidge in December of the year 1928.

When construction of the dam was begun, it was named "Hoover Dam" by Secretary of the Interior Wilbur, in conformity with the tradition of the Bureau of Reclamation. When the Salt River Valley project in Arizona was under construction, the dam was named "Roosevelt Dam" in honor of Theodore Roosevelt who was President when the work was undertaken. In like manner, the great structure built as part of the Muscle Shoals project was named "Wilson Dam;" the San Carlos project dam on the Gila River in Arizona, was named "Coolidge Dam," and no one, either Democrat or Republican, ever had the pettiness to propose a change of those names.

It remained for * * * Harold Ickes, who held the position of Secretary of the Interior under the New Deal * * * to change the name "Hoover Dam" to "Boulder Dam" (although there had been an abortive attempt made in the Nevada Legislature to make the change).

Ickes made the change apparently for the sole purpose of insulting and belittling a former President of the United States. He gave some silly reasons in trying to justify his act, which was approved neither by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, nor by Nevada's great Senator Key Pittman.

There is just now a move in the Congress of the United States to attempt to right the wrong by declaring the name of the principal dam authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act to be "Hoover Dam." It appears that the Senate will follow the lead of the House of Representatives which has already passed a bill authorizing the change.

It will make no particular difference to the public what the great dam in Black Canyon is called, but it will take many years to remove from the Roosevelt administration the odium of having been a party to the Ickes attempt to insult Herbert Hoover.

I wanted to put that in the RECORD, because it is the editorial expression of a newspaper published in the distinguished Senator's own State of Nevada, and apparently in the area in which the dam is located.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it merely goes to show that even editors can be mistaken. I hold in my hand a copy of an order, over the signature of Ray Lyman Wilbur, dated July 4, 1930, addressed to Dr. Mead, who was then Commissioner of Reclamation in the Interior Department. It is order No. 436, reading as follows:

DR. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation:

You are directed to commence construction—

On what? Hoover Dam? No, sir.

You are directed to commence construction on Boulder Dam today.

Respectfully,
RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary.

Does that sustain the editorial published in the Las Vegas Age, a newspaper that comes out weekly? The Senator talks about a leading newspaper.

That was the order of the Secretary of the Interior of that day, and he did not hesitate to call it Boulder Dam in his order to Dr. Mead, who was then Commissioner of Reclamation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further to the junior Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH. I merely want to question the date of the order which has been read, because I know that Dr. Wilbur personally named the dam Hoover Dam when the cornerstone, if that is the appropriate term, was laid or when it was dedicated.

Mr. McCARRAN. July 4—that is an outstanding day in our history—July 4, 1930. That was the date. I am not taking issue with the fact that Mr. Wilbur later made an attempt to name it Hoover Dam. I will call it an abortive attempt, too, in view of the language of the editorial from the Las Vegas Age. If the act of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, passed with only one dissenting vote in the upper house, and with but few dissenting votes in the lower house, is an abortive act, then I wonder what Mr. Ray Lyman Wilbur's act was when he attempted to name it Hoover Dam. It had not gone into Congress as Hoover Dam. It came into Congress and was passed by Congress as Boulder Dam. In the act that created the project, it was named Boulder Dam. It was spelled out, as I have read it twice to the Senate.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HAWKES. I merely want to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada why he thinks Attorney General Homer Cummings, under the Roosevelt administration, would write a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, and tell him that it was too late to do what was contemplated, that he could not remove the name "Hoover Dam" from the brief in the case between Arizona, as I recall, and the United States, because it was "water over the Hoover Dam," and he said, "I will see you some time soon and commiserate with you." Why would the Attorney General write such a letter?

Mr. McCARRAN. If he wrote such a note, I do not know why, and I do not care, because he had no authority to write such a note, and it had no bearing whatever. The Congress of the United States named it Boulder Dam, and no Attorney General had the right to change it.

Mr. HAWKES. The distinguished Senator from Nevada will admit that different people have a right to their different viewpoints on what the Congress named it. The Senator has just been reading from the 1926 bill, which was never enacted. It never became a law. In 1928, the Swing-Johnson bill, unlike the 1926 bill which never became enacted, does not say "Boulder Dam project fund." It says, "Colorado River Dam fund," and nowhere contains the name "Boulder Dam." Is that not correct, I ask the Senator?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Well, how about the bill that was enacted? What did that call the project?

Mr. HAWKES. What did the Senator read from the bill that was enacted?

Mr. McCARRAN. I read from the original act of 1926.

Mr. HAWKES. That was not enacted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. It was enacted later, was it not?

Mr. HAWKES. No; the Swing-Johnson bill was enacted in 1928, but it does not refer to the Boulder Dam project fund. That is the point I am making.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator mean that it leaves out that name?

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does it call it Hoover Dam?

Mr. HAWKES. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; of course it does not.

Mr. HAWKES. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly, it does not.

Mr. HAWKES. But Secretary Wilbur called it Hoover Dam, and so did an appropriation bill, which was passed with the approval of the entire Congress. I think it is important for every Senator to have in mind this statement of a Democratic Senator: "I call attention to three words in this bill, which are making history for a thousand years. Those words are 'The Hoover Dam'." After he made that statement the appropriation bill was passed, and it was a finished article. I am talking about something that is a finished article, not something proposed in the Congress which never became a law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not care to yield further for the Senator to make a speech in my time.

Mr. HAWKES. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is entirely all right.

Mr. HAWKES. I hope some time the Senator will make a speech in my time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have a call that must be responded to at

the White House very shortly, and I must leave the floor. I come back again to this one feature I want to leave with the Senate, that nowhere officially was this dam ever called anything other than Boulder Dam. I challenge contradiction of that statement.

The able Senator from New Jersey says that in an appropriation bill, somewhere along the line, the name Hoover Dam was used, but I go back again to the order that I read, which was the first order ever issued in the construction of this great structure, and it was issued by the man who then, of all people, had authority to name it, and that was Ray Lyman Wilbur. He said to Dr. Mead, the Commissioner of Reclamation:

You are directed to commence construction on Boulder Dam today.

The appropriation had been made before that, and if it carried any implication that it should be under a different name, would not the Secretary of the Interior have said so?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator bear with me a moment, to enable me to make a brief statement in the form of a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does not the Senator from Nevada realize that Mr. Hoover exhibited unusual business ability in connection with the building of this dam, in that it never was started until the underlying contracts were made, and that it is one of the great public projects which is really paying its way, so as not to take any money out of the pockets of the American people?

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator want me to extol President Hoover?

Mr. HAWKES. I should like very much to have the Senator do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. If he does, I can stand here all day and extol the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like very much to have Mr. Hoover extolled by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. Hoover's name does not belong on that structure, wherever else it may rightfully belong. It may have belonged on a thousand other things, but not on that structure, because the Congress of the United States said otherwise, and I am relying upon what Congress said, and upon the appropriations which were made. I want it distinctly understood that I never imply anything against the name of Mr. Hoover. So far as that is concerned, there is no difference between him and me, except in the fact that he was at the head of an unfortunate regime, an unfortunate administration, at least unfortunate for the people of the United States. But that has no relation to present conditions pertaining to the domestic life and industrial life of six or seven or eight thousand people who are living in a community, Boulder City, which has been established with the Boulder Dam as its background.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH. If permitted, I should like to correct the statement the Senator made that there was nothing in the laws of Congress referring to this dam as Hoover Dam. I can say to the Senator that I have here four citations which I should be very glad to read, if permitted to do so. I should like to read first an extract from the act making appropriations for the Interior Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think the Senator is asking a question. It does not start as a question.

Mr. SMITH. I am trying to correct a statement made by the Senator from Nevada. It should be challenged, because there are four appropriation acts which refer to this dam as the Hoover Dam. I should like permission to read the citation in order that the RECORD may be correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator has in mind has been stated a half dozen times.

Mr. SMITH. Why, then, did the Senator say that it had not been referred to in acts passed by Congress as Hoover Dam.

Mr. McCARRAN. Because it had been designated by Congress as Boulder Dam, and it had been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as Boulder Dam, before any appropriation act was passed. The fact that some one may have inserted the name Hoover Dam into an appropriation act does not mean that the project was called Hoover Dam.

Mr. SMITH. Then the Senator will admit that the name "Hoover Dam" did appear in four different places in the appropriation acts? That is all I want to place in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARRAN. It might have appeared in 40,000 places without designating the project as Hoover Dam.

Mr. SMITH. It was so designated in the appropriation act.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I want to have that point made clear. If the Senator will yield I should like to read the quotation from the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. How long is it?

Mr. SMITH. It will take about 2 minutes to read all the quotations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. SMITH. The first is an extract from the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1932. The citation is 46 Stat. 1146, and this is the quotation:

Boulder Canyon Project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *; $15,000,000.

The second extract is from the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933, and the citation is 47 Stat. 118. The quotation is as follows:

Boulder Canyon Project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *; $6,000,000.

The third extract is from the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, and the citation is 47 Statutes 717, section 301 (a) (5), and the quotation is as follows:

For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works, as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 * * *; $10,000,000.

That is the record.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in reply to the senior Senator from New Jersey I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Boulder Canyon Project Act, signed by President Coolidge and providing for the contruction of the works for the protection and development of the Colorado River Basin, for approval of the Colorado River Compact, and for other purposes, the act of December 21, 1928—this is the act to which the Senator from New Jersey referred, the act of December 21, 1928—chapter 42, 45 Statutes 1057, provided in section 1 for a "dam at Black or Boulder Canyon for flood control, improving navigation, storage, and delivery of water, and a power plant." There again we find the name "Boulder Dam."

Mr. President, again I state that I do not intend to hold the floor for a great length of time, but an injustice is about to be done to the people of a sovereign State. I am speaking here because the legislature of my State, by almost a unanimous voice, has requested the Congress of the United States not to change the name of this great project. I am speaking here because thousands of people in whose midst this great project exists, who have used the name "Boulder Dam" to publicize this project and also to publicize their community are asking that the name be not changed, because if it is changed it will alter the entire economic set-up of their community.

Mr. President, Boulder Dam is not a mere object which few people see. It is the highest diversion dam or storage dam in the world. It is known from pole to pole and round the world as Boulder Dam, and it is advertised and publicised everywhere as Boulder Dam. Every tourist agency, even the tourist agencies of the Government itself, sponsored by the Government, carry the name of the dam as Boulder Dam.

The people of my State do not want the name changed, and I think a grave injustice will be done to them if it is changed.

If the change of name would do any great amount of good to any one individual, living or dead, perhaps some of us would not declaim against it so much. But, Mr. President, if Mr. Hoover has not achieved glory and honor enough for himself up to the present time, if, after the 14 or 15 years during which the

dam has been known around the world as Boulder Dam—and Mr. Hoover, himself, has used the term "Boulder Dam"; he, himself, has called the dam Boulder Dam—he now must look for honor and glory by the destruction of the economic set-up of a community which is sustaining itself, by having the name of this dam changed to his own name, then he is a little bit short on sources of honor and glory.

Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, a call to the White House compels me to leave the floor. I do not intend to go further with this debate nor with this argument, although at first I did intend to. I present the matter as one of fair play and justice to the community of a State which has sent a resolution here memorializing the Congress not to pass this joint resolution, and stating the reasons therefor. Representing that State in part, I protest the passage of the joint resolution, and hope that it may not receive the sanction of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on two or three occasions proponents of the joint resolution have referred to the administration of the late President Roosevelt and the New Deal. As a follower of the New Deal, and as a follower of the late President Roosevelt, and without any apologies whatever for following the New Deal and the late President, it is my purpose to vote for the joint resolution.

I believe I know the history of the legislation which brought about the construction of Boulder Dam. Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, presided at a meeting of the representatives of the States located in the Colorado River Basin. That meeting took place in the capital of my State, Santa Fe, N. Mex., and while it is true that as a result of the proceedings of that meeting legislation was passed by the Congress of the United States which in my opinion unduly protected the interests of California, the interests of the State of my good friend from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the interests of my good friend from the State of Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], nevertheless we still feel in New Mexico that Mr. Hoover took an important part in furthering this great work, in bringing about the legislation which resulted in the construction of the dam.

Mr. President, if we really believe that fair play is a characteristic of the American people, what is wrong with calling the dam "Hoover Dam"? Oh, yes; attention is called to the fact that it is a policy of the Department of the Interior not to recommend that any Government project be named for a living person. But, Mr. President, as humans we should, once in a while at least, show a little respect for living persons. I say this as a New Dealer—and I am still one. I say this as a Democrat. Why not be fair? I did not help elect Mr. Hoover President in 1928. I did not contribute to his election. I fought him.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have stated the necessity for my leaving the Chamber. I understand that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] wishes a yea-and-nay vote on the joint resolution. I am entirely content. I wonder if it can be agreed that as soon as I can return to the Chamber a yea-and-nay vote may be had, so as not to interrupt the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not know that I can make such an agreement. I obtained an agreement to set aside the unfinished business temporarily, in order to take up the joint resolution. I do not wish to lose the opportunity of having this question come to a vote. I think the Senator from Nevada is clearly on record as to how he stands. He has made his speech. I should like very much to accommodate him; but it must be remembered that I have been waiting for months to have the question considered. It has been held up by objection after objection. I believe that the Senate will be ready to vote in a very few minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to proceed, I think we can vote very soon.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I have stated, I did not help to elect Mr. Hoover President of the United States. I did not want him to be elected President of the United States. I am one of those who can still admit that they were for Al Smith. I helped to defeat Mr. Hoover in 1932. Nevertheless, he has been President of the United States. We might not have agreed with his administration; but still he was President of the United States. Even now, under the administration of one of our former colleagues, under the administration of a respected American in the White House, Mr. Hoover has contributed to the public welfare and interest of the people of the United States.

What is wrong with changing the name "Boulder Dam" to "Hoover Dam"? Suppose it does him a little honor during his lifetime? He will not know about it after he is dead. If one wishes to send flowers to his neighbor, he should do it while his neighbor is alive. He will appreciate it much more.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the joint resolution, and I hope it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass without inviting the attention of the Senate to the patriotic and indefatigable work which was done in the Congress of the United States by two citizens of California in securing the appropriations and the law leading to the building of Boulder Dam.

I refer to the late Senator Hiram W. Johnson, who served here for more than 28 years, and to Philip D. Swing, a distinguished attorney of San Diego, Calif., who served in the House of Representatives from 1921 to 1933. These men had the vision and courage to fight for the development of the Colorado while the majority of this Congress for many years doubted its feasibility. But in the end they won the approval of the Congress because they were right. They were practical men—practical and imaginative, as well. Senator Johnson is no longer with us. I believe that it would have been far more worthy of the Congress to have named this dam after him rather than after President Hoover.

Ranking equally with Hiram Johnson is Phil Swing, who, while a member of the House of Representatives from San Diego, labored as a crusader in the struggle for this great project. Phil Swing was born at San Bernardino, Calif., and is today one of the outstanding authorities on the development of the Colorado Basin. As a young man he held the vision of controlling the turbulent and mighty waters of the Colorado River for the upbuilding and refreshment of the great desert areas of the Southwest.

I do not believe—and I say this tolerantly and in the most kindly spirit—that what the Senate is about to do will be popular with the people of the West. In that respect I perhaps differ with my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has just addressed the Senate. It happens that over the past several years I have come into intimate contact with hundreds of the irrigationists, agriculturists, and engineers of the Colorado River Basin. The great majority of them are Republicans, and the overwhelming majority feel that it would be a serious mistake to single out any particular man and honor him by naming Boulder Dam after him. Boulder Canyon is a picturesque part of the historic and geographic pattern of the West. Boulder Dam is now advertised world-wide. The name meets with the approval of the people of the West. I do not believe that even the Republicans from the Colorado River Basin States would approve an act changing the name Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam. In my opinion, among the great masses of our people it would be a very unpopular thing to do.

I believe that most Republicans in the Southwest basin think it is a mistake to pass by all the engineers, technicians, farmers, and public officials who led and lived in crusades for this dam and this development over the decades, and center upon one man the great honor and glory of having this dam named after him. That is merely my own opinion. I have no statistical analysis from Mr. Gallup to support it, but it is the opinion I have formed from talking with several hundred vitally interested men who have lived in the Colorado River Basin for many years.

I rose principally to extol the departed Hiram Johnson and the living Phil Swing, of San Diego, for their indefatigable, courageous, efficient, and finally effective work in bringing Boulder Dam into existence. Boulder Dam is the great example of public power. It is regally paying its way by reason of the development of public power and the sale of such power largely to public agencies.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it was my purpose to speak very briefly in support of the joint resolution; but, as I understand, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] desires to leave to keep an engagement at the White House. I merely wish to say that I believe that the joint resolution is an act of simple justice to a great American, a former President of the United States, who contributed so much to this project.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the action of the Senate any further, because I realize that the Senator from Nevada wishes to leave to keep a very important engagement. However, I wish to say that, as I am sure he knows, all the people of Boulder City are not opposed to the joint resolution. I have letters from a number of persons in Boulder City who are not opposed to it but who are very strongly in favor of it, as correcting the injustice which has been done.

I wish to close my remarks by saying that it is sometimes a little inconvenient or annoying to do justice, but it always pays in the end. Today the fate of the whole world hangs upon justice between individuals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not expected to make any comment on this issue other than the comment which I made the other day on the floor. I assured the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] that I would support his resolution. However, in conversation with the Senator today, I told him that I would express a certain point of view of which I think he knows.

I listened with interest and good humor to the satirical remarks made a few minutes ago by my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. However, I wish to suggest to him that I think he should join with me in encouraging the Republicans to name a great power, reclamation, and irrigation dam for a distinguished Republican. I feel that our western development program should be bipartisan in nature, and I want to do everything I can to identify the Republican Party with these western projects.

Further, I want to say that I think the Senator from Idaho is very much in error, if I understood him correctly, when he implied that Herbert Hoover was not a proponent of western reclamation development. I agree with the Senator from Idaho that Hoover was very much mistaken in the stand he took on Muscle Shoals. Time has clearly proved him wrong on that issue.

However, today we are talking about doing credit to him for the constructive statesmanship for which he stood. It is easy for any of us to point out mistakes in the public record of any public official because no one in public life can meet the controversial issues of our day and age without making a fair share of mistakes. I admit that Hoover made his fair share of them but he also made many sound contributions to the history of our Nation. Thus, I say the Senator from Idaho is in error when he gives the impression that Herbert Hoover was not a friend of western reclamation, flood control, and power development. We may disagree with some of his views on public power but the main thing to remember is that he did favor the development of western projects that would make available the generating of power.

I cite as evidence in support of my views on this matter a significant speech which Herbert Hoover gave at Boulder City on November 12, 1932. It is a speech which sets forth the contributions he made first as Chairman of the Colorado River Commission in 1922, then as Secretary of Commerce, and then as President of the United States, to the development and final construction of the great dam we are discussing today.

I want to say to the members of my party in this Congress that I am perfectly willing to accept the stand on power development, reclamation, irrigation, and flood control which Herbert Hoover supported and defended in his speech of November 12, 1932, as the sound principles which the Republican Party should follow in 1947. Surely, if they were good enough for Hoover in 1932 they ought to be good enough for the Republican Party in 1947. In his speech in 1932 he pointed out what some of us have been stressing in the Senate of the United States these past several weeks, namely, that destruction by flood is very costly to the West. He referred specifically to the flood of the Colorado River but what he said in 1932 about the Colorado River is equally applicable today along the banks of many rivers in the West.

I cite again the situation along the Willamette River in Oregon where last year in a little area of approximately 40 square miles 6 percent of all the flood damage in the entire United States was done when the Willamette River went on a rampage.

I am very much in favor of naming the dam, at Boulder City, Hoover Dam in honor of Herbert Hoover for the contribution he made as an engineer, as Secretary of Commerce, and as President of the United States, to the program of western reclamation, flood control, irrigation, and power development. I think it is a fitting memorial to this particular phase of his public life.

I want to point out, Mr. President, that it was in 1922 that Herbert Hoover was Chairman of the Colorado River Commission. This Commission not only laid the necessary legal ground work for the subsequent development of the particular dam which is under discussion today, but also it gave great impetus to the development of Western State compacts in regard to water rights, thus making it possible for us to cut away a great deal of the underbrush of legal obstacles. Further it has made it possible over a period of years to develop by joint State action agreements enabling us to go forward with our reclamation program.

I want to quote a little from the speech which Herbert Hoover made on November 12, 1932. He said:

> It is now 10 years since I became Chairman of the Colorado River Commission. That Commission solved in a unique way the legal conflicts as to water rights amongst six of the States which had long held up any possibility of the realization of these works. This was accomplished after 3 years of negotiation finally closing with the Santa Fe Compact. It was the first time that a provision in the Constitution of the United States for treaties amongst the several States was utilized on so great a scale. That compact was ratified by six of the States and is held open to the seventh to join at any time it may desire. It cleared out the legal underbrush in a way that enabled the next step to be taken. And I again had the satisfaction of presenting, both as an engineer and as head of the Commission, to President Coolidge and to the Congress, the great importance of these works. And I had a further part in the drafting of the final legislation which ultimately brought them into being.
>
> This legislation required the making of an extremely intricate arrangement by which the Federal Government should advance the money, but the byproduct of power arising from this dam should be sold in such fashion as to return to the Federal Government its entire cost with interest. That contract for the sale of power was successfully negotiated by the present Secretary of the Interior with my approval and contracts were let for actual construction which was begun during my administration. The work has been carried forward with such rapidity that it is already more than a year ahead of schedule in its progress toward the specified period for its completion. Within a few days the river will be diverted through massive tunnels in order that the foundation of the dam may be laid.
>
> This dam is the greatest engineering work of its character ever attempted at the hand of man. Its height alone is nearly 700 feet, making it more than 100 feet higher than the Washington Monument and far higher than any other such construction ever undertaken.
>
> To understand its purpose our people must realize that the Colorado River in its freshets from the snows of the Rocky Mountains flows at a rate as great as that of Niagara. In the dry season it diminishes to less than 5 percent of its maximum flow. The purpose of the dam, therefore, is to store the freshet; and the amount of water is so gigantic in its proportions that the lake created behind it is over 100 miles long and will require the entire flow of the river for more than 2 years to fill it.

So I say, Mr. President, that one deserved reason for honoring a former President of the United States in connection with this dam is that, in my opinion, the record is perfectly clear that it was through his efforts in the days of the Colorado River Commission that the ground work really was laid for this dam. I feel that great credit and honor are due to him for the foresight which he showed back in 1922 when, as a distinguished engineer, he did this monumental work on the Colorado River Commission.

In that speech, Mr. President, Mr. Hoover went further, pointing out the position he took in regard to the development of this dam, which I think doubly entitles him to the honor which the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] seeks to have the Senate of the United States pay to Mr. Hoover this afternoon.

He further pointed out that it was essential to build the dam in order to prevent the devastating floods which were doing great injury to that section of the West each year as a result of the overflowing of the Colorado River. That principle is still an important one in connection with some of the other great dam projects which some of us from the West have been pleading for in the past few weeks in this Congress. There is too much indication, so far as some leaders

in Congress are concerned, that those works may be irreparably injured by the failure of this Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to go ahead and prevent, by the building of those projects, damage to the great West similar to that which was being done by the Colorado River at the time Herbert Hoover put his hand to the problem in connection with the construction of this dam.

Thus it is that I say I think my party can very well afford to go back to Mr. Hoover's words of November 12, 1932, and carry forward the sound principles of flood control which he developed in his speech of that date.

In that speech, Mr. President, he also pointed out the power benefits that would flow from this dam, and he stated that it was a self-liquidating dam, pointing out that the returns from the power would pay for the dam, and that the dam would supply power to that section of the country, which at that time seriously needed it.

At this very hour there are other sections of the West which need the same type of power which will come from other projects for which many of us are pleading, and with which I think my party in this Congress should go forward without any delay.

In his speech, Mr. Hoover also spoke of the need of providing farmers in that section of the country with the necessary water for domestic use and for irrigation purposes.

In fact, I want to close my remarks on the same plane on which I started. I want to commend the speech of Mr. Hoover on November 12, 1932, as laying down very sound principles for the development of power, irrigation, reclamation, and flood control in the West; and in view of the fact that he has laid down such a sound Republican program for reclamation and power development, I think it is particularly fitting that we name this dam in his honor, and call it Hoover Dam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not take very much of the time of the Senate. I was foreclosed from making any remarks earlier because I had been presiding over the Senate in the temporary absence of the President pro tempore.

While I agree with my colleague from California that as we take action here today, of course we should not lose sight of the splendid contribution made to this great project by my predecessor, the late Senator Hiram W. Johnson, who for so many years served the State of California as Governor and later as United States Senator, or of the work of his colleague in the House of Representatives, Mr. Phil Swing, who also contributed greatly to this project. Nevertheless I do not feel that I could let pass in silence the implication that the action proposed by the joint resolution would not be taken with the approval of at least a substantial number of the people of the State of California and, I believe, of a substantial number of people of the West.

Mr. Hoover served his country well as World War I Food Administrator, as relief administrator after the First World War, as Secretary of Commerce, and as President of the United States. Any man who contributed so much to the project and has given service both as President of the United States and in the field of relief, to aid humanity both at home and abroad, certainly is entitled at the hands of the American people to this slight recognition of the tremendous contribution which he has made.

For that reason, Mr. President, I do not agree with my colleague from California in his opposition to this measure. I shall vote to restore the name Hoover Dam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) was passed.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 140, which has been passed by the House of Representatives, has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and is now before that committee. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of that measure, because of the fact that the language of that measure is identical with the language of the joint resolution just passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Public Lands will be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 140, which is identical with Senate Joint Resolution 45, which has just been passed by the Senate.

Without objection, House Joint Resolution 140 is considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Without objection, the vote on Senate Joint Resolution 45 is reconsidered; and, without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 45 is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years;

Delwin W. Classman, and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Navy;

Warren E. Aeschbach, and sundry other officers for appointment in the line of the Navy;

Richard J. Sullivan, aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps;

Lt. Col. Harry Innes Thornton Creswell, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Capt. Charles North Howze, and sundry other officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

First Lt. William McKinney Mantz, and sundry other officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States.

GORDON R. CLAPP

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate is now in executive session, I ask that the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority be taken up and considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination is the first one on the calendar, and is proper to be laid before the Senate at this time. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, Gordon R. Clapp was nominated by the President to become chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to succeed David Lilienthal, who resigned that position. The nomination came to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Public Works. I may say that under an interim appointment Mr. Clapp is now serving in the position to which he was nominated.

Extensive hearings were held upon this nomination before the Committee on Public Works, 30 witnesses being heard upon both sides of the issues which were raised.

I must state, Mr. President, that I find myself in a rather unusual position as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, in that the committee voted to report the nomination adversely, and the nomination is now upon the calendar with an adverse report against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clapp, although I, myself, as a member of the committee, voted for a favorable report on the nomination of Mr. Clapp. As I recall, the only situation in any way similar to the present one was one in connection with a nomination which was reported from the Committee on Commerce a few years ago. A nomination

had been before that committee, of which the late very able Senator Bailey of North Carolina was chairman. In that instance he was opposed to confirmation of the nomination and he was against having the committee make a favorable report on the nomination. But he proceeded as chairman to bring the nomination before the Senate.

It is my purpose today, speaking as chairman of the committee, to lay before the Senate the issues which were presented in connection with the nomination, and to discuss briefly and with fairness, I hope—certainly that is my intention—the evidence presented by the witnesses and all the other evidence adduced at the hearings.

The committee, after hearing the evidence for 13 full days, by a majority of its members disapproved the nomination. The nomination now comes to the floor of the Senate with the disapproval of a majority of the committee.

Among the witnesses who were heard were Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, many of the citizens of the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, of course, the nominee himself.

With respect to the issues which arose, let me say that it was charged that the nominee was active in his support of communistic activities in the Tennessee Valley Authority operations and in the area of Tennessee where it had its bases of operation, and that he was friendly with such communistic activities. It was further charged that he was sympathetic toward those who were Communists, and that he was unfriendly to and took action against those who fought communistic activities in that area.

Let me say that from my own point of view, I do not believe it can be doubted for a moment that there was real activity on the part of avowed Communists and known Communists and Communist sympathizers in the Knoxville area, where the Tennessee Valley Authority had its offices, and which is the center and heart of its operations. It may be interesting to note that two of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, Henry Hart and Mrs. Roxie J. Paris, who was secretary of a union in Knoxville, admitted that they had been active members of the Communist Party. Hart was an employee of the TVA. He went to work there, as I recall, as a young man of 19 years of age, just after he had graduated from Vanderbilt University. He worked there for several years, leaving there in 1943, when he was drafted into the Army. Hart testified that he was an active, orthodox member of the Communist Party while he was employed at the TVA, joining the party in 1937, and resigning from the party in December 1938 or January 1939—the exact date he could not give. In his testimony he detailed some of his activities. There were meetings of Communists. They were working in the Tenessee Valley Authority as what is called a cell of the Communist Party. I shall not detail all the activities; but they were trying to expand communism.

On behalf of young Mr. Hart, who now is 30 years of age, and who since 1943 has not been connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and who has renounced communism and, as I have stated, says that he severed all connections with that organization in either December 1938 or January 1939, let me say that today he is studying at the University of Wisconsin.

He came before the committee and testified as to why he had joined the Communist Party, about his activities, and why he resigned. He said he had joined perhaps because of an overzealous desire to try to do good, and he thought that organization would do good, but resigned, he said, when he found it was not an American organization, and that it was acting on commands and orders issued from abroad.

Mrs. Paris says she held membership in the Communist Party, that she deliberately joined for the purpose of finding out what they were doing, and that she regularly reported their activities to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; that she was very much opposed to them; that she became a member, and held her card in the organization after discussing her membership with the FBI.

She told of the activities of communism in that area. She told particularly of the activities of Henry Hart. Hart denied some of the testimony of Mrs. Paris, there is a conflict between them, but there can be no doubt that there was in Tennessee at that time, as the head of the organization, and very active in the Knoxville area, a leader in the movement who apparently devoted his whole time to building up the Communist organization.

Mr. President, that, in summary, is the story of the activity of that organization as I see it. I do not mean to say these were the only two members. It was brought out in testimony that there were others, and I may say that the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives in 1940 investigated this whole communistic activity in Tennessee, and the evidence taken by that committee was before our committee. However, there was not any direct statement of any admitted Communist or of any other person who connected Gordon Clapp with membership in the Communist Party, or with direct activity with the Communists.

The charge was also made, and it is one of the issues in this case, that Gordon Clapp, in the position which he held at that time as head of the personnel department of the Tennessee Valley Authority, knew or should have known that this communistic activity was going on. There was a good deal of conflict about that statement. I wish to say in behalf of Mr. Clapp that when he was directly faced with the question of his connection with communism he denied that he was ever connected with any Communist organization, and he went on to say that he had nothing but distrust and dislike for communism, and those who acted in the name of communism.

Along the same line of thought, and under the same issue, the charge was made that Mr. Clapp was responsible for the wrongful dismissal of Mr. James L. Smith, who held an executive position in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. Smith was summoned before the committee, and testified. It seems Mr. Smith did hold an executive position in the personnel department. Charges were filed against him by some of the employees of his department. He was very active in his opposition to communism and the activities of those who leaned, as he believed, toward communism, and he felt he was not given a fair trial upon the charges which resulted in his dismissal from his employment.

Mr. Clapp did not try the case, he did not conduct the hearings in the investigation of Mr. Smith, but he reviewed them, as I recall, and approved the findings dismissing Mr. Smith. Clapp's explanation was that a situation had arisen in that department which had become unbearable, and that in order to insure proper conduct of the department it was necessary, he felt, for Mr. Smith to leave the service of the TVA. As best I can, I wish to review all the points advanced in opposition to the nomination which is now before the Senate.

Another subject of inquiry in connection with the nomination was TVA itself, its conduct. Undoubtedly, from my own viewpoint, the Tennessee Valley Authority has gone very far in its activities beyond the original intention of what it should do. It has expanded its operations, and under the guise of giving aid and help to the farmers, it has gone very far in the free distribution of fertilizer, it has been a very costly operation; but so far as this nomination is concerned—and we must constantly get back to the issue at hand, whether or not Gordon R. Clapp is a fit person for the position to which he has been appointed—I will say that two things, from my own viewpoint, relieve Mr. Clapp from any guilt, I might say, with respect to the activities of the TVA. One is that Gordon Clapp was not a policy maker. He will become a policy maker if the nomination shall be confirmed. The policy of TVA was under the direction of Mr. Lilienthal and the other two members of the Board of Directors. The highest position held by Mr. Clapp, prior to his present appointment, was that of General Manager.

The second reason is that the conduct of TVA is chargeable to Congress itself, in that it enacted the most lax, open-handed law that perhaps has ever been written upon the Federal statute books, giving almost complete autonomy into the hands of the Tennessee Valley directorate. That, of course, is not chargeable against the nominee.

A third charge made, and one which was followed vigorously, was the charge of activities in political matters outside the scope of TVA. There is some very strong evidence on this charge. I must say the Tennessee Valley Authority has gone far in its bulletins in making statements with respect to political issues in Tennessee. But, again, it seems to me that that was a matter of policy and could hardly be chargeable to one occupying the position which Mr. Clapp then held.

One of the inquiries naturally made from my own viewpoint was whether or

not Gordon Clapp was qualified, through experience, to conduct this gigantic undertaking. I think it well at this point to read a résumé of his experience with TVA:

Gordon R. Clapp, General Manager for the Tennessee Valley Authority, became associated with the TVA in July 1933—

Some 14 years ago——

Mr. WILEY. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am reading from page 2—

during the early days of the agency's organization in Washington.

Entering the service of the Authority as an assistant to the Director of Personnel on July 13, 1933, Mr. Clapp was later appointed Assistant Director of Personnel on November 16 of the same year. He became Director of Personnel on January 1, 1936. General Manager on October 1, 1939.

Mr. Clapp was born October 28, 1905, in Ellsworth, Wis. He was educated at Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., receiving the degree of bachelor of arts in 1927. Following graduation he became successively personnel officer, director of publicity, and assistant dean at that institution during the period from June 1927 to July 1933. During the year 1932–33 he was granted a leave of absence for graduate study at the University of Chicago, where he received the degree of master of arts.

He served on the President's Advisory Committee on Education from 1936 to 1938.

In other words, Mr. President, Mr. Clapp's work since he left college has been with the Tennessee Valley Authority from the beginning of its operations. I can only say for my own viewpoint that I was impressed with his complete knowledge of the operations of that great work, and one very important point of inquiry was his fitness for the work.

I believe that I have summed up in the main all the issues which were raised before the committee. I have not discussed, nor shall I attempt to discuss in detail in this opening statement, all the evidence bearing upon the different questions involved and the collateral issues which naturally arise, when as many as 30 witnesses are examined, and various data are furnished the committee. I want to say, however, that while the committee divided in its opinion upon the fitness of Mr. Clapp for this position, not in my experience in any committee work have I ever known of more earnest consideration given to a subject before a committee. While I differed with the majority of my colleagues in arriving at a conclusion upon this subject, every member of the committee was present, and wrote portions of the report; most of them were there all the time; all were present when a résumé of the evidence was presented and discussed before us and by us. Every member voted his own convictions and there was no suggestion of partisanship; indeed the division in the committee was on a nonpartisan basis. The conclusion was reached by the majority that Mr. Clapp was not a proper person for the position and therefore his nomination should not be confirmed. I differed with that conclusion, and cast my vote for Mr. Clapp, because, in summary, I have felt that although there were communistic activities in and about the operations of the TVA, Gordon Clapp was not connected with them.

If I may refer to one other point of evidence on that issue, it was said that he was a sponsor of a meeting of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, in 1940, in Memphis, Tenn., and that his name appeared as a sponsor. He admitted that. That organization has been branded and listed by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as one of Communist inclination if not domination; but Mr. Clapp said that he knew nothing about the organization except what he learned through Dr. Graham, who had written him and asked him to become a sponsor of that meeting. Dr. Frank P. Graham is President of the University of North Carolina, and, as Mr. Clapp said before the committee, "I have known Dr. Graham, and I cannot believe that he was friendly to communism or that he would take any part in the sponsoring of a communistic meeting or organization." He acted, as he said, solely upon the request, through a letter, from his friend, Dr. Graham.

I feel, Mr. President, from my own viewpoint that Gordon Clapp is not guilty of Communist activities or of sympathy with communism. I feel that the activities which went beyond what should have been done by TVA under the law are not chargeable to him, because he was not a policymaker at that time, and because of the laxity of the law itself, which is open to abuse if anyone want to abuse it. Correction of that situation should be made by Congress through changes written into the law.

I feel in my own mind that, because he is qualified and is thoroughly familiar with the large operations carried on by TVA and, because of his familiarity with them and his work on the project, Gordon Clapp is better fitted to take over the chairmanship of the Board of Directors of three, than would be another person who did not have such extensive knowledge of the TVA operations, and was not so familiar with them.

So I lay this case before the Senate. I lay it before the Senate upon an adverse report of my committee, stating at the same time my reasons for voting against the majority of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Not being a member of the committee, and not having seen the report submitted by them, I should like to ask one or two questions, if I may.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Has there ever been an audit made of the TVA?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know whether there has been an audit made of the TVA. I cannot answer the question whether there has been an audit made during the years since it has been inexistence. I know that Comptroller General Warren has time and again complained about their reports; that there is not a proper reporting system, and that that has long been an issue here before the Congress; but as I say, we shall never cure that until we have changed the law, which gives to them very special rights about what they may do with their funds.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask a further question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the fact that in a great many States a sheriff or a treasurer cannot be elected more than twice. The purpose of that, of course, is to get into the office a new man, who can go over the financial affairs of the treasurer's office or the sheriff's office. It occurs to me—and I want to ask whether the committee gave consideration to the fact—that Mr. Clapp has been in the TVA with Mr. Lilienthal for a long time, and if he should become its head might it not be said that almost the same crowd would have charge of this enormous organization and the millions upon millions of dollars it has to spend?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the able Senator, of course, that such a deduction can be drawn from the fact that he has been there for some 14 years in different positions; first, in a very minor capacity, then as head of the personnel department, then as General Manager; and now, if his nomination is confirmed as general director, of course, it might be said that he will follow out policies that have been in force, but if the law is changed to restrict him, if I may so express it, as it should be changed, I do not see how he could violate or go beyond it.

I referred to Mr. Warren, the head of the General Accounting Office. He has constantly complained, not of Mr. Clapp, I will say, but of Tennessee Valley Authority matters such as its accounting system and reports.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that the Senator from West Virginia voted with the minority, but is the Senator in favor of confirming the nomination of Mr. Clapp?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I said I was in favor of confirming his nomination. Let me put it this way: When the President of the United States, who is charged with the duty of selecting a person to fill a position of this kind, refers the nomination to the Senate for consideration and confirmation, if, after investigation, Senators find there is no reason not to confirm him, or if he is a fit person and is qualified for the office in the opinion of the individual Senators, I think his nomination should be confirmed.

Mr. LANGER. It seems to me there ought to be some kind of audit or investigation made so that the people at large would know what is done with the money that passes through the hands of such an organization as this which handles hundreds of millions of dollars a year. There ought to be either an audit made or some kind of investigation so as to give assurance that former practices will not be continued in the hands of the same crowd. Has the committee, of which the distinguished Senator is chairman, given that matter any consideration?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh yes, we discussed that subject at length, and I speak for myself, and I believe perhaps for some of the other members of the committee, when I say that we feel the law must be changed so the TVA will be required to make a certain kind of accounting. The TVA does make a report each year when it comes before the Senate Appropriations Committee requesting money. It makes a report, but as Mr. Warren has said, the report is not so revealing as it ought to be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will secure the report made by Mr. Warren, as I recall under date of March 17, 1947, a very recent report, he will find that Mr. Warren gave a summary of the relations between the TVA and the General Accounting Office, and what has been done. I will say to the Senator first that there has been an annual audit made of the TVA. I must also say to him that the TVA has enjoyed a certain flexibility in this matter which has been accorded to some other Government corporations, but which is not accorded ordinarily to what we know as a Government agency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that, as he well knows, the TVA is a very privileged child of the Government in the matter of its reports, and that Mr. Warren, of the General Accounting Office, has time and again stated to the committees of Congress that it is impossible properly to follow the reports and the accountings made by the TVA under the present law. Is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, it was in the year 1943 that Mr. Warren and the representatives of the TVA sat down together around the table and worked out amendments to the TVA Act, and came to Congress with those amendments, and the amendments were adopted by the Congress. The TVA has been operating under those amendments to the basic act. If the Senator will secure the last report under date of March 17, 1947, I think he will find therein a summary made by the Comptroller General himself, Mr. Warren, of the whole financial picture of the TVA in connection with the Accounting Office. He will find that annual audits have been made. The TVA has enjoyed, as I stated, certain privileges and a certain flexibility not accorded the usual, ordinary Government agency. But other governmental corporations, such as the Panama Canal Railroad, as I recall, and, I know, the Maritime Commission, have enjoyed many of the same privileges and flexibilities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question on a subject which perhaps he has already discussed. The Senator has stated that the nominee has worked for TVA for some 14 years. Did the committee go into his record as an administrator in the various departments in which he had worked and was there any questionable record in connection with handling funds?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no questionable record whatsoever with respect to handling funds. That issue, as I recall, was not raised. A question was raised, as I have previously stated, concerning the trial of Mr. Smith. A witness, Mr. Bolt, made charges that, in his opinion, things were not operated rightly. But, as I recall Mr. Bolt's testimony, it was directed more at the directorate than it was at Mr. Clapp himself. There has been no charge of improper use of funds made against Mr. Clapp. The charge was made that he was sympathetic toward those who had communistic inclinations, and that such sympathy was exhibited, as charged by Mr. Smith, in Mr. Smith's trial, which resulted in his dismissal from TVA.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the record of Mr. Clapp as an administrator?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is nothing to show that it is not good.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to address a question to the able Senator from Alabama with respect to the audit which is now authorized under the amendment to the act, to which the Senator referred. I wish to inquire whether the General Accounting Office, after having made an audit, if it discovers that an expenditure is probably illegal or unjustified, has authority with respect to the TVA to disallow such a claim, as it would with respect to other Government agencies, or can the General Accounting Office only report that it finds the account one which is not authorized under the law?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, it can make only such report as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The TVA management is still independent with respect to its interpretation of what it can do and cannot do, and, although the TVA is now required to submit to an audit, the General Accounting Office, after making the audit, can make only a report. It cannot, as it can in the case of other Government agencies, put on the brakes and stop the practice against which it complains?

Mr. HILL. I will say that there has been an audit made every year. Furthermore, as I previously stated to the Senate, the TVA does enjoy a certain privilege which is not accorded to the normal Government agency. But it has been accorded to other Government corporations which have been operating beyond the jurisdiction, so to speak, of the ordinary Government agency. I cited the Panama Canal Railroad as one, and the Maritime Commission as another, and, as I recall, there are perhaps several other agencies throughout the Government which enjoy the same privilege; in fact, I am sure there are.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make a further comment. While Congress, as the Senator has stated, has made some progress in the right direction, I wish to express my own view of the matter. I think every Government corporation, including the TVA, should be required to submit to an audit by the same agency of Government we have set up to audit the various departments of the Government, and that that agency should be vested with the power and the authority to disallow illegal claims with respect to Government corporations just as it does with respect to other Government agencies.

Mr. President, the fault in this respect probably lies with Congress. I simply point out the fault. This does not go directly to the issue of whether Mr. Clapp should be confirmed or not confirmed. But back of all this there is something which has an important bearing on the whole subject, and which went very far with me with respect to Mr. Lilienthal's nomination, and that is the attitude taken by certain individuals all the way through of opposing a proper auditing of their accounts. That is something which goes a long way with me. I believe any public servant ought to be subject to check and recheck, and ought to be subject to supervision——

Mr. LANGER. And ought to welcome it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, and ought to welcome it instead of opposing it. It is such an attitude as that which goes a long way with me in determining the character and the fitness of an individual to serve in public life and to handle public funds and to be vested with public authority over the affairs of State.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for having yielded to me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am glad to have the views of the Senator from Arkansas. I think there is much force in what he has said. But he must bear in mind that we are not dealing with Mr. Lilienthal or any other member of the board of directors who direct the policies of the TVA. Gordon Clapp had nothing to do with that. He took orders. He followed the rules which were laid down. He was not a policy maker. Even if it were wrong for him to oppose a change in the law, that cannot be charged against him, because he is not the one in TVA to say, "I am going to oppose changes in the law." I think the Senator is absolutely correct when he says that the law ought to be changed; but let us not charge the policy of TVA against the man who had nothing to do with it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not charge it against Mr. Clapp. I made reference to Mr. Lilienthal, who was chairman of the board, and who did have the authority and was exercising the authority. If any application to Mr. Clapp is to be made, I think it should be based on this consideration: I did not take time on the floor of the Senate when the Lilienthal nomination was before us, but I can now say to the Senator that one of the reasons why I did not wish to support Mr. Lilienthal was that he did not want to recognize Congress. He did not pay the proper respect to this body, and never has.

We now have before us the nomination of a man who is being elevated to succeed Mr. Lilienthal. In my judgment, he will continue to operate under the shadow of David E. Lilienthal. Lilien-

thal, having been advanced to the position he now occupies, is placing his protégé in the position he formerly held, and Lilienthal will be the shadow behind the throne. We shall have the same influence to contend with in the future that we have had in the past, unless the Congress amends the law and strengthens it so as to bring this agency under the control of the Congress and under the control of the General Accounting Office, just as other Government agencies are.

Mr. President, I am for the TVA and its great program. I do not favor everything it has done. It has probably gone too far in some respects. But I do not care what the program is, or how good it is; it is not too good to come within the purview of the Congress and of the accounting agency and authority of the Government. Congress ought to bring it under that authority.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment. I wish to make a statement in view of what my friend from Arkansas has just said. I am very heartily in accord with him as to the necessity for a change in the law. I am heartily in accord with the view he took as to the actions of Mr. Lilienthal. Not only did I vote against Mr. Lilienthal, but as the RECORD will show, one of the main reasons I urged upon the Senate in opposition to him was that in TVA he had exceeded his legal authority. He showed an inclination to step beyond and without the law, but that does not apply to this man. I make a differentiation. I believe that the cases are quite different. First, on the basis of the records of the men, Lilienthal was the policy-maker. Clapp was the man who took orders. He was directed.

I cannot join in the conclusion that Mr. Clapp will give up his position as policy-maker of TVA and listen to Mr. Lilienthal in the future. Doubtless they are friends. They have worked together. But that would not necessarily condemn Mr. Clapp, in my judgment, as being disqualified for the place.

However, I heartily agree with the suggestion as to a change in the law. I am glad that the Senator brought out the activities of Mr. Lilienthal. I spoke on that very subject when the issue of the Lilienthal nomination was before the Senate. The main reason why I voted against Mr. Lilienthal was that he had exhibited a record of stepping outside and beyond the law in TVA. As I said then, perhaps that would not do such great injury in TVA; but when he serves upon the Atomic Energy Commission, it might become a gravely serious question to this country. But that issue has been decided. The Senator from Arkansas and I lost on that issue. This is the Clapp case; and it is entirely different, from my viewpoint.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said, the question of the auditing of the TVA accounts does not, and in all fairness and justice could not, go to the question of confirmation of Mr. Clapp's nomination, because, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said, Mr. Clapp has not been in a position in TVA where he had any voice in the policy, or in the question of audit or nonaudit.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] asked a question about the audit. I told him that I thought he could find his answer in the report transmitted with the letter from the Comptroller General to the Congress. The letter was dated March 17, 1947. I now hold in my hand that letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. It is House Document 172, Eightieth Congress, first session, and therefore is available to all Senators.

If the Senator will bear with me I should like to read from the report submitted by the Comptroller General with respect to this audit. Under the heading "Methods of Financial and Accounting Control," I find the following:

> The act requires that the Authority shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account, and shall file with the President of the United States and with the Congress, in December of each year, a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of the Authority covering the preceding governmental fiscal year.
>
> Beginning with the fiscal year 1938, but covering the period from the beginning of operations (June 16, 1933) to June 1938, the Authority's financial statements have been examined annually, to and including the fiscal year 1944, by independent public accountants. The Comptroller General of the United States has made annual audits of the books of account of the Authority through June 30, 1944, and, in accordance with section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), the General Accounting Office settles the accounts for all cash receipts and disbursements of the Authority.

Of course, the audits will be brought down to date. They have been made, as stated, from the very beginning, June 16, 1933, and they have been completed through June 30, 1944. They will be brought down to date.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Who hired the independent auditors who made the investigation?

Mr. HILL. The Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, Lilienthal hired his own people to examine his books.

Mr. HILL. He hired one of the best auditors or public accountants in the United States. I can give the Senator the name. I do not recall it offhand. However, this question has arisen before. I will say that it was one of the most reliable and trustworthy firms of public auditors in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I call attention to the fact that when McKesson & Robbins were robbed of millions of dollars the president of that concern had the authority to employ independent auditors, and he employed one of the best firms in America.

Mr. HILL. That may be true. I do not know anything about auditing; but I have understood that whether it is the Comptroller General or whether it is a private auditor, what may be deep down beneath the books is not always found. In the case of an embezzlement in a bank, there may have been a recent audit which did not show it.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows that I am very friendly toward TVA.

Mr. HILL. Yes; I know that, and I appreciate it.

Mr. LANGER. But I do not propose to vote for this man unless I am satisfied that it is in the best interests of TVA.

When did the Senator first learn that the TVA Authority was paying $50,000 to a private lawyer?

Mr. HILL. If my memory serves me correctly, I learned that when the suits first arose many years ago. TVA had employed Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who I understand was paid a fee of $50,000 for his work over a period of 2 years. I do not have the information at my fingertips, but I think I can also advise the Senator as to the fees which were paid by private power companies in the same litigation. The fees paid by private power companies were far in excess of the $50,000 paid by the TVA.

Mr. LANGER. I will say, if the Senator will yield further, that the Attorney General of the United States may bring a lawsuit against a monopoly. He receives only a small salary, but millions of dollars may be paid out. Does the Senator not think that that example is comparable to that of a man who is hired by TVA?

Mr. HILL. Yes; but I think there was a very special reason for the TVA's hiring a man. Mr. Clapp had nothing whatever to do with the employment of the attorney. If the Senator will look at the record he will see that at the time Mr. John Lord O'Brian was employed by the TVA, Mr. Clapp held a very minor position in that organization. He had nothing whatever to do with the employment of counsel. I can see that the employment of Mr. John Lord O'Brian might raise a question in connection with the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, but it would not be germane in any way so far as Mr. Clapp is concerned, because I do not think he had any more to do with the hiring of that attorney than had I or the Senator from North Dakota. He was in a minor position. He had nothing whatever to do with it. He was not consulted in any way. I suppose he hardly knew that Mr. O'Brian was employed until he appeared in some case. He may have read about it in some newspaper. He was in a very minor positior at that time.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think that it would be better if someone were chosen for that place on the Commission who had had no connection at all with it?

Mr. HILL. No, I do not; for two reasons. In the first place, it is a very important job with many responsibilities. It requires great knowledge, in my opinion. To render the best possible service a man should have the experience, knowledge, and training which Mr. Clapp has had and the insight which he has had. Having been in the different departments of the TVA and having worked

himself up makes him peculiarly qualified for the job. Certainly in view of his knowledge and experience he is the best qualified man in the United States for that position.

I will say this to my friend from North Dakota, and I hope he will consider it carefully, that I think it is very fine that here is a man who started out as a comparatively young man. He was really a very young man when he started in a very minor position in the TVA organization, but by his ability, and his devotion to his work he had the opportunity to build himself up so that now he is nominated by the President for the top position in that whole organization.

I think we need to encourage young men, without any particular influence or political power or anything of that kind, to go ino the Government service, knowing that if they have the proper stuff in them, if they are willing to work, they can build themselves up and can some day hope to occupy positions of great responsibility. I think nothing in the world would do more for our public service than to encourage young men to do the very thing which Gordon Clapp has done. I think it is a wonderful example to hold out to the young men of America, that they can enter the Government service and, by devotion to duty and a willingness to work, can, without political power or "pull," work their way to the top. One of the most striking features of our private-enterprise system is that a man who today may be greasing a switch, or working under a locomotive, if he has the proper stuff in him, some day may become the president of a great railroad company. I think we need to encourage our young men. The case of Gordon Clapp is a wonderful example to hold up to the youth of America.

Mr. LANGER. How long have the other two directors been on the board?

Mr. HILL. Dr. Harcourt Morgan has been on the board since the very beginning; he was one of the original appointees. Former Senator Pope, as I recall, has been on the board since the spring of 1938.

Mr. LANGER. If that be true—and, of course, I take the Senator's word for it—why have not those two men on the Board sufficient experience without having Mr. Clapp also on the Board?

Mr. HILL. Both those men have had wonderful experience. I do not know that either of them wishes to have the added burden and responsibility of being Chairman of the Board. Dr. Harcourt Morgan has made a great contribution to the work in his service on TVA. He is not as young a man now as he was when he went on the Board. I have not talked to him about the matter, but I am sure that he would prefer to remain as an associate member rather than to have the additional work and the burdens of the chairmanship of the Commission placed upon him. I do not presume to speak for Dr. Harcourt Morgan or former Senator Pope, but knowing the situation as I do, I cannot but feel that the appointment of Mr. Clapp would be perfectly agreeable to them.

Mr. LANGER. Have those two gentlemen voted consistently with Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. HILL. I cannot answer that question. The only way I could answer it would be first to examine the records of the Board. But I will say to the Senator that, so far as I know, those gentlemen have worked together as a team.

Mr. LANGER. Have they ever asked that an independent audit be made by the Government?

Mr. HILL. Not to my knowledge. Speaking with reference to an independent audit, let me say that I want the Senator to have all the information he may desire, but I do not want to confuse the subject of an independent audit with Mr. Clapp, because he had nothing whatever to do with it. He had no responsibility, no authority, no say in the matter. Congress itself in writing the law prescribed the audits, the accounts, and the financial statements. I think that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was right about the matter when he stated that those who feel that the financial program has not been as it should be must really place the major responsibility on the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. I went to call the distinguished Senator's attention to a further fact. I am sorry the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is not present, for I refer to the cafeteria organization which has been serving food. The records show——

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator mean here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. LANGER. Here and outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILL. That has nothing to do with Mr. Clapp or with the TVA.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that; but it is the same kind of an organization as to which the Comptroller General could not do any investigating, and the result is that it has been found that for 6 years the organization has not even kept books. The investigation shows that they have not turned in money which belongs to the Government. Mr. Clapp, as the Senator says, may not be to blame, but if he is a stooge of Mr. Lilienthal I do not want to be in the position of voting for joining him with men who have resisted an audit by the Government of the United States.

Mr. HILL. As I have read from the Comptroller General's statement, there has been an audit each year. I hope the Senator will get a copy of the letter, which is available in the document room. There has been an audit each year since TVA has been in existence; but, as I stated earlier, the audit or the financial statement is not a matter which has come under Mr. Clapp.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I suppose I inherited the floor from my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have just one more question. What good would it do to have an audit made by an employee of the man who is to conduct the audit?

Mr. HILL. I would say that an independent audit would be available for the TVA, just as an audit of the General Motors Corp., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., or any other great corporation might be made either by auditors within their organization or by reliable, efficient, capable auditors outside of their organization.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let us consider an organization such as General Motors. The stockholders—not the president nor the board of directors—hire an independent auditor. It is the stockholders who hire him; he is appointed at a meeting of the stockholders. Certainly such a procedure is vastly different from that of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates in picking out someone to audit their services, year after year.

Mr. HILL. I am not familiar with the practices of General Motors or similar organizations in that respect, but I take it that in such companies the board of directors suggests that, "Here is an able, capable, and efficient firm for the purpose."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in that connection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] to permit me to yield at this point to the Senator from Alabama. The Senator has been very courteous, and I do not wish to be discourteous.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think it is most apropos to the very question raised by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to read this little expression from Mr. Warren, of the General Accounting Office, as shown on page 7 of this report:

> In our opinion, TVA's accounts generally are well conceived, supervised, and maintained, and the Authority is to be commended as one of the foremost Government corporations in the use of accounting in management, comparing quite favorably in this respect with well-managed private corporations.

That statement comes from the head of the General Accounting Office himself.

Mr. HILL. In other words, that is a statement by the Comptroller General contained in a report on March 17, which is a very recent report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for that contribution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask a question. I understood the Senator to say that Mr. Clapp did not have a position of authority for the making of policies. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. HILL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I also understood the Senator to state that the TVA has had

certain special privileges and certain flexibilities that have been afforded, not only to it, but also to some other Government corporations. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that, as I recall, when President Roosevelt sent to the Congress his message requesting the creation of the TVA, he stated that it was necessary to bring into being a corporation with the power of government but also with at least some of the flexibilities of a private corporation—because, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, this corporation goes into a field into which the ordinary Government agency or department does not go. It is in business, generating and selling power, among other things.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator be so kind as to yield once more, so that I may ask a further question of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]?

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. I could ask this question of the Senator from Alabama, but I understand that he was not on the committee.

Mr. HILL. No; I was not. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee can answer the question with great authority.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia one or two questions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to answer them as best I can.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood, not only from the Senator from Alabama, but also from the Senator from West Virginia, that Mr. Clapp was not in a policy-making position. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the position I take. His last position was that of general manager, but we know fairly well that the policies were made right down the line by the directors.

Mr. DONNELL. The point I have in mind is that Mr. Clapp is now nominated to be a member of the Board of Directors.

Mr. REVERCOMB. He is to be Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Mr. DONNELL. He is to be Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. In that connection, of course, the making of policies would become a direct function of Mr. Clapp, were his nomination to be confirmed. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator whether, even though Mr. Clapp did not occupy a position which was in the nature of a policy-making position, the committee interrogated the witnesses along such lines as in the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia would disclose what the attitude of Mr. Clapp would be in respect to policy making, were he to be made a member or Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Questions were directed along that line—not extensively, but I recall that Mr. Clapp was asked questions on that very point. I do not have those questions before me.

But his answers generally were that he would act within the law as it is written, and that he felt that the Tennessee Valley Authority had previously acted within the law.

Mr. DONNELL. Was there any testimony to show whether Mr. Clapp, if placed in a policy-making position, would show a cooperative attitude in an endeavor to make the corporation more directly responsive to the Federal Government, along the line of furnishing financial statements and direct reports to the Government?

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I have said, the law permits them to have very complete autonomy in themselves. That is the law today. My recollection of the sense of the answers of Mr. Clapp upon those questions was that he would stay within the law; and, as I recall, he read from the statute, in answer to questions as to whether the things done there were within the law.

I will say that if this change is made, it is my belief that the Tennessee Valley Authority will not be run with the same degree of laxity, but that Mr. Clapp will act in accordance with his view of what he should do under the law. But that is not the question; the question is, What is the law?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not question what the law is, but I ask whether there is any evidence which the distinguished Senator thinks would throw any light on the question as to whether Mr. Clapp, if placed in this policy-making position, would show an attitude favoring a change in the law, so that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be more directly responsive to the Congress than it is today. Was there any evidence along that line, showing what his attitude probably would be if he were placed in the position of chairman of the Board of this great activity?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I speak solely from recollection. When the Senator from Missouri seeks to pin me down to the point as to what Mr. Clapp would do in his new work, I can only answer by saying that I am impressed with the view that he would not go outside the law. But when the Senator asks me whether he will be more responsive than the law requires him to be, I cannot answer as to that.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the Senator another question. I take it that the demeanor of a witness upon the witness stand frequently is of considerable importance, indeed, sometimes, perhaps, of as much importance as the direct testimony given by the witness. Will the Senator from West Virginia state whether in his opinion, after observing the demeanor of Mr. Clapp upon the witness stand, the Senator believes that Mr. Clapp would be reasonably cooperative toward securing some amendment of the TVA law so as to make that organization more directly and immediately responsive to Congress than it is today?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that I cannot tell from the demeanor of any witness what he would intend to do in the future. But as to the demeanor of Mr. Clapp on the witness stand, I will say that I was impressed with it; I was impressed that he was willing to answer questions. He did answer at length. Some members of the committee complained of indirect answers on his part; but he answered the questions. He stayed there throughout the hearings; he was always present and responsive.

His appearance and the answers he gave impressed me as being those of a man of ability to do the job. But when the Senator asks me to judge from Mr. Clapp's appearance what his feelings would be about the future, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. DONNELL. On page 480 of the hearings—and let me say parenthetically that I did not see the hearings until today—I observe a paragraph in the testimony of Mr. Clapp, reading as follows:

> The TVA is not under civil service, we cannot pass the buck for our employment selection or for the terminations we made. In testifying before this committee I represent the only Federal agency that can take full responsibility and that has to take full responsibility and accountability for the selection, placement, termination, and dismissal of employees.

Let me say to the Senator that I do not mean to imply any criticism of Mr. Clapp. I have never met him. But I am interested in knowing what is the opinion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, on the basis of a comment such as that and on the basis of the general demeanor of the witness and on the basis of the general testimony of the witness, as to whether, if he, Mr. Clapp, were made Chairman of the Board of Directors of the TVA, he would or would not adopt a cooperative attitude toward immediate responsibility, direct and unrestrained, toward the Congress of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator, though it may be repetition, that my own conclusion, my own impression, was that he would act within the law. He says, as he stated in what has been read that they have their own civil-service set-up, they make their own rules. By the way, that was one of the complaints made against TVA. But that is not Mr. Clapp's fault; the law permits them to do it. It is the only Government agency of which I know which, by express authority of Congress, can set up its own civil-service methods of employment. When he said, in answer to that question, "I am working for the only Government agency which has its own civil service, and is solely responsible for its own employees, and cannot pass the buck to some other branch of the Government," he was telling what was correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I noted in one of the eariler responses of the Senator that he stated, as I recall, that he would not say that Mr. Clapp, if he were placed in authority, would proceed with laxity, but that he would remain within the law. Did the Senator mean to infer that the general impression which he derived from the testimony of Mr. Clapp was

that he would be insistent upon staying just as near to the border of the law as he could, and avoiding cooperation with Congress to the full extent that the law might afford, or did he mean that Mr. Clapp would be cooperative, in the judgment of the Senator, and would favor some reasonable type of immediate accountability to Congress?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that he is asking me to state my personal impression about Mr. Clapp from seeing him on the witness stand, and from hearing him testify, as to what his attitude would be with respect to how far he would stay within a written statute. I cannot answer that to a degree. I have said that I thought he would stay within the law. If he stays within the law, he has performed his duty. When the Senator asks me whether he will cooperate, and how closely he will cooperate, that involves another matter of degree. I cannot form an opinion on that. But I am impressed with the man's ability, I am impressed that he will stay within the law. Then I say that it is up to Congress to fix the law within which he must stay.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the Senator, if he will yield further for this inquiry, does not the Senator think that it is of great importance to the Senate, in determining whether or not Mr. Clapp's nomination should be confirmed, to have some reasonable assurance as to the attitude of Mr. Clapp in the event he should be placed in an important policy-making position? Is it not of importance that the Senate should know, as nearly as the committee can advise the Senate, whether or not in the opinion of the committee Mr. Clapp is or is not going to be favorable to some further restrictions upon the broad attitude now allowed to the TVA?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I would say to the Senator that, from the whole testimony, and from seeing Mr. Clapp and hearing him, it was my opinion that he was qualified, and would perform the duties of his office well. That sums up, as best I can, the particular ideas and views the Senator would elicit from me. My whole impression is that the man is qualified, and that the charges against him were not sustained, that he will perform his work within the law. When I say that, I mean that he will not perform it adversely to the wishes of Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the committee interrogate Mr. Clapp with respect to his opinion as to whether or not the law should be changed so as to make the TVA more immediately and directly responsible to the Congress than it now is under the law?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not have any clear recollection as to whether the question was ever asked. I shall be glad to look for it in the record. It has been some time since the hearings were held.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be so kind as to state to what his reference was when he used the term "laxity" in responding to one of the earlier inquiries which I put to him?

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I recall the Senator's inquiry, it was directed to the point, as I understand, as to whether or not Mr. Clapp would stay within the law, and I said I did not think he would act with laxity, but would stay within the law.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is in error as to my question. I did not inquire as to whether he would stay within the law. My inquiry was directed along the line of what conclusion the Senator had reached as to whether or not Mr. Clapp, if his nomination should be confirmed, and he should be placed in a policy-making position, would or would not be cooperative in an effort to restrict these broad general powers, free from Congress, so to speak, which TVA now possesses, not whether or not he would violate the law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I said he would not act with laxity. I said that; and that I thought he would stay within the intent of the law.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to point out to the Senator from Missouri that on pages 203 to about 210 several questions were directed to Mr. Clapp along the line the Senator has opened up, and I think the testimony there gives some light on his attitude. I know he says in several places that there is no intent upon the part of TVA—and I suppose he was speaking for himself—to extend the activities of the TVA.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the Senator calling this portion of the testimony to my attention, and I ask the Senator from West Virginia if he will yield to me to make an inquiry of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Kentucky recall any specific question of Mr. Clapp by the committee as to what would be his attitude in the event he should be placed in this policy-making position, with respect to whether he would advocate, or the contrary, legislation to change the unrestricted nature of the authority which TVA now possesses in certain respects?

Mr. COOPER. I have been attempting to find testimony on that point while the Senator was propounding the questions. It is my recollection that that direct question was not asked Mr. Clapp. It was my understanding, from listening to him testify, that he was an ardent believer in the purposes of TVA but he stated, I think, in several places in his testimony, that, in his opinion, he had followed the law which the Congress had enacted with respect to TVA; that he would continue to follow that law; and that there was no intention upon his part to extend the activities of TVA outside the law; but it is my opinion that is as far as he went. Before tomorrow I shall attempt to find the answers in the hearings for the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the establishment of a Government corporation to be known as the Missouri Valley Authority, patterned on the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think this is a very appropriate moment for the bill to be introduced, after we have listened this afternoon to the many expressions of approval of the TVA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred. The Chair would like to say to the able Senator from Montana that the Chair has inquired into the matter of reference under the terms of the Reorganization Act, and in the opinion of the Chair the bill must be referred to the Committee on Public Works. Knowing that the Senator has a different view, the Chair does not wish to make the reference now if the Senator wants to have an opportunity to appeal from the reference.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be very glad to take advantage of the suggestion made by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the bill will lie upon the table, and not be referred for the time being.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

The bill (S. 1156) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River its tributaries and watershed to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. President, the purpose of the corporation set up in the bill, or the Authority, as it will be known, is to provide for the control and prevention of floods in the Missouri Valley region, the reclamation of public lands, promotion of navigation, the development and utilization of its resources, and for the agricultural and industrial expansion and general welfare of the area.

Mr. President, for half a century, the control of the great river systems of the Nation has presented the most serious problem the Congress has been called upon to consider. Periodically raging floods course down these great rivers and their tributaries blighting, eroding, and destroying vast stretches of valuable agricultural lands. These floods are often followed by prolonged droughts adding further to the devastation of the affected areas. No one can fail to see that the future wealth and productivity of our country is threatened by these conditions. We cannot afford to permit any selfish economic or political considerations to interfere with the sound solution of an issue which holds such tremendous consequences.

It is universally recognized that the basic wealth of the United States comes from the ground. It consists of our vast expanses of rich agricultural lands, our extensive forests, our mineral deposits, our great system of rivers and potential

electric-power resources. These assets form the basis of our boasted economic wealth and power upon which we have grown to be the greatest industrial Nation in the world.

Mr. President, the American people are trustees of this great heritage. Acting through their government, they have the sacred responsibility to preserve these riches for the benefit of present and succeeding generations. We know from history that other nations, once powerful like ours, have long since passed into oblivion. They were once rich in natural resources; they possessed great forests, mighty rivers, and vast expanses of wealth-producing soil. But they neglected their responsibilities; they had failed to conserve and develop their resources; they had failed to protect and preserve their soil from the ravages of floods and erosion. Through their neglect, they became impoverished and bankrupt countries and finally passed from the pages of history.

In the United States for years, we have been witnessing in many sections of our country the same forces at work that operated to ruin other rich areas of the world.

At great expense, the National Government has carried on huge emergency projects in efforts to stay the ravages of these recurring floods and destruction of agricultural lands. These ineffective methods have failed.

Following the First World War, the great depression emergency made it possible for our Government to carry on a carefully planned experiment in this field. The Congress, after a heated and prolonged debate, succeeded in 1933 in providing a method or program to meet just such conditions in one of the most dangerously eroded areas of the country. It is described as the Tennessee Valley project, carried out under the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Government corporation.

I shall not take the time here, nor do I think it necessary to explain in detail that most successful undertaking, launched by the Congress in 1933, the fame of which has spread over the world. The story of the TVA is known to practically every school boy in the country. It is enough to say that it covered seven States in the Tennessee Valley which, because of uncontrolled floods, soil erosion, and failure of resource development, was rapidly becoming one of the most benighted areas of the earth with its citizens facing poverty and distress on a constantly increasing scale.

There are Senators here today who know the history of that project better than I can relate it. They took part in its promotion and have reason to be proud of the contribution they have made in rescuing the Tennessee Valley from the fate of an eroded and abandoned territory.

Mr. President, as I indicated in my opening remarks, we have other great river valleys of the Nation confronted with the same conditions and problems that threatened ruin in the Tennessee Valley in 1933. I refer particularly to the Missouri River Valley.

In previous sessions of the Congress, I sponsored legislation providing for the creation of an agency to be known as the Missouri Valley Authority to accomplish the task of developing the water and other resources of the Missouri River Valley. That proposed legislation was based on the successful operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the application of that experience to the Missouri Valley. It was made the basis of extensive hearings and prolonged studies.

Those hearings developed the fact that for half a century the people of the Missouri Valley have witnessed the futile efforts of the Corps of United States Engineers to control the devastating floods along the Missouri, the Ohio, the Mississippi, and other great rivers. From the end of the War Between the States until 1927 they saw the Corps of Engineers raise levees ever higher and higher along the lower Mississippi to control the constantly increasing floods, destruction, and devastation in that area. During all this period the Army engineers had continued without variation the outmoded process of downstream control. They failed to pay heed to the fact that floods do not originate in the main stems of our rivers but higher up in the tributaries, and that to find the best means of meeting the problems of flood control, as an entire program, we must consider all of the problems involved, such as flood control, irrigation, reclamation, drainage, navigation, and hydroelectric power development. It also appeared from those hearings that notwithstanding the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended in efforts to find a solution to these problems, they had grown steadily worse. The reason for this appeared to be that the problems of the Missouri Valley were being attacked by several independent agencies of the Government, each working independently and oftentimes at cross purposes with the others. It was developed that the Army engineers had complete control of all problems in the Missouri River area dealing with flood control and navigation. They had no jurisdiction over the problems of the river in its upper stretches, where interest was centered in reclamation, irrigation, power development, soil-erosion control, protection of forests, and development of natural resources, all of which were under the direction of other agencies of the Federal Government, particularly the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Mines, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Commerce, and other minor agencies.

The conflict between the Government agencies having to do with reclamation, power development, land utilization, soil erosion control, and forest conservation on the one hand, and the programs of flood-control and navigation, directed by the Army engineers, on the other hand, developed into disputes which became so serious that they interfered with the effective solution of the problems as a whole.

The failure of the methods followed by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation became so well recognized that the Governors of the Missouri Valley States joined in recommending to the President that he should call on the Congress to set up a single over-all plan to deal with the river and its problems. Following this appeal, the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress on September 21, 1944, in which he recommended that a Missouri Valley Authority patterned on the TVA be set up in the Missouri Valley to take over all the problems of the Missouri River and the development of resources of that area. Mr. President, I ask that the message of the President to the Congress which I have just mentioned, together with the petition of the Governors of the Missouri Valley States, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, immediately upon the filing of my original bill for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority, which proposed to tackle these problems in the same manner in which they were met under the TVA, a desperate effort developed on the part of those opposed to the application of the TVA plan to get these conflicting agencies together on some sort of a compromise program that might forestall any possible action of Congress in the matter.

This effort to forestall a unified integrated program for the development of the Missouri River as recommended by President Roosevelt finally resulted in a hasty and ill-conceived plan purporting to unite the activities of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the two chief agencies involved. That hasty and poorly conceived plan has been the subject of considerable debate and criticism. It was called by some a "shotgun wedding" of these conflicting agencies—a wedding under which there was only a pretense that they had buried their differences. Time has shown that these conflicts still continue and the so-called unified program is a failure. In short, it was apparently designed to prevent the establishment of a single unified authority to take over the entire problem such as my bill, patterned after the TVA, proposes.

In the 2 years since that joint arrangement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers has been in operation it has been completely demonstrated that the plan is unworkable. In the first place, the program of the Army engineers was not a well-laid-out, thoroughly engineered, program of any sort. It has been referred to as a mere prospectus, and the report which presented it was called an interim report, meaning that it was not a complete and final program. Likewise, the Bureau of Reclamation was wholly unprepared in the impromptu arrangement with the Army engineers and presented in the joint arrangement its part in the merest outline.

Only in recent months has the Bureau of Reclamation come forward with a more complete and detailed plan, and this plan conflicts with the original proposal and is not sufficiently correlated with the over-all program to be considered an authentic basis for development.

And so, Mr. President, in view of the utter failure and repudiation of the present piecemeal method of treating the problems of the Missouri River Valley, it has become more apparent than ever that a single integrated authority must, without further delay, be provided, if we are to meet the problems of that vast area. I have, therefore, introduced in the Senate today a new bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority for the unified development of the Missouri River Basin. This bill is constructed upon the experience gained from the extensive hearings and the numerous discussions and events which have transpired in the 10 Missouri Valley States since I introduced the original Missouri Valley Authority bill in 1944.

I should like here briefly to sketch a picture of the area and its problems.

The Missouri River has its source at Three Forks in my State of Montana where the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin Rivers converge. Starting in my State, it flows through a wide land of varied topography, rainfall, soils, and forests until it empties into the Mississippi River above St. Louis, Mo. The watershed of the Missouri embraces a territory of nearly 530,000 square miles—17½ percent of the area of the continental United States. The area includes all or substantial portions of nine States: North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri.

It sustains a wide variety of agriculture, ranging from dairy farming to cattle ranching and wheat growing. It has an abundance of forest and mineral resources which, properly developed, can help to place the region on a basis of continuous high prosperity. It has rich soils. It has water resources with magnificent potentialities for development. In short, the Missouri is a valley of gigantic resources and potential productiveness.

Here in this great midland empire of our country, possessing vast agricultural and economic opportunities now being neglected, lies the richest area in the United States awaiting the establishment of an intelligently organized system of development, to advance it to the high position justified by its resources.

But the Missouri River Valley is plagued, as are many other river valleys in this country, by problems of great scope and variety. Frequent floods cover the productive land, damaging and disrupting commerce, destroying homes, farms, and factories and harassing the people. Because of the slow, costly, and wasteful methods now employed in attacking its problems the vast territory of the Missouri Valley which I have described has been steadily declining in agriculture and industry and in population.

Fortunately, the startling census of agriculture for 1945 has just appeared with positive proof of the accuracy of my statements. There are 430 counties in the 10 States drained by the Missouri and its tributaries. Let me high light the census statistics for these counties for the period from 1930 to 1945.

The number of farms declined more than a tenth, or 12.2 percent, during the last 15 years. When 1 out of every 10 farms disappeared, acreage in the remaining farms increased almost a sixth, or 15.7 percent. But despite the prosperous conditions of the country in 1929, and the especially favorable conditions prevailing when crops were harvested and sold in 1944, the cropland actually harvested had declined 7 percent.

In a blighted area people abandon farms, acreage is absorbed by adjacent farmers, where much of it is allowed to go back, to be made to produce healthgiving food crops again only after costly expenditure of time, energy, and money.

Cold statistics of the Census Bureau do not reveal the heart-rending story of the struggle and loss of nearly 80,000 farm families who gave up farming. But they do show that the money value of farm lands and buildings dropped more than a fourth from 1930 to 1945. Those who owned farms in the Missouri Basin counties suffered a money-value loss of more than two and a third billion dollars during the past 15 years.

The one factor of difference between the two great valleys of the Tennessee and the Missouri during the past 15 years, which shows up so favorably for the former, is the establishment of the TVA and the successful launching of a unified, federally aided but locally administered program of resources development.

It would be blind stupidity, an exhibition contrary to the aggressive pioneering spirit of the American people, if we did not profit by this experience in the Tennessee Valley to solve the increasingly aggravated agricultural problems of the Missouri River Basin.

But important as agriculture is to the people of the Missouri Basin States, in this day and age it must go hand in hand with industrial development. The agricultural West has all too long been a dependent agricultural colony of the industrial East. When measures are taken of private production income and income per capita, the Missouri Basin States, potentially amongst the richest in the Nation, are actually found to be amongst the poorest. Lack of profitable industries complementing a vigorous and profitably sustained agriculture account for these deplorable conditions.

Experience has shown us the way to step up industrial development rapidly, under democratic auspices, within the framework of our free competitive enterprise system, for the benefit of all the people. That way is the establishment of an MVA modeled after and calculated to reach the successful industrial achievements of the TVA. Here, again, objective proof is at hand to dispel the fogs of confusion and falsehood, designed by special selfish interests to prevent the benefits of unified resources development being extended to the Missouri Basin States.

What do the facts show? The Government census of manufacturers shows that in all of the vast area of the 10 Missouri Valley States there were only 20,177 manufacturing establishments operating in 1929, employing 528,000 wage earners. By 1939, when a very substantial degree of economic recovery had been achieved nationally, the number of factories still in operation had fallen to 17,140, and employment had dropped a fifth, to 418,000 workers.

The great problem of the United States is the huge concentration of industry in certain favored sections, which in many instances has produced serious economic and social problems. We need a more nearly balanced economy in the sparsely settled States of the West. Testimony will be introduced in the hearings under this bill showing that population trends for more than 30 years have been away from the Missouri Valley area, and that there is stagnation of business and industry there while other sections of the country have been rapidly advancing. In the last analysis, the loss of population in the Missouri Valley is due to lack of opportunities for its citizens. A large proportion of the youth who are educated and grow to manhood there are compelled to move to other sections of the country in search of opportunities for a livelihood. Yet, with proper development, the natural resources of the Valley would provide the basis for a very considerable industrial expansion, thus putting an end to the steady loss of population in the region.

Mr. F. O. Melby, president of the University of Montana a few years ago, pointed out that following the First World War only a slight proportion of our boys returned to Montana, because they had nothing to return to. Annually, thousands of these young people who are educated in Montana and other Valley States seek opportunities in life in other sections of the country.

The people of the Missouri Valley have come to realize that industrial development, with its richer and more diversified economy and higher standard of living, is possible only to the extent that we increase our electric energy resources. That has been the key to the rapid industrial expansion of the Tennessee area. It is the principal reason for the continued industrial stagnation of the Missouri River States. In all that vast region of the Missouri, the installed capacity in 1943 was only 4,362,000 kilowatts. Most of this is owned by the private utility companies. Yet the great natural sites for tremendous expansion and development of cheap hydroelectric energy are owned by the Government, and can be developed only by the Government. It is not strange, then, that the Missouri Basin States shared very little in the industrial expansion of the war years, when we note that only 8 percent more kilowatts were generated than before the war.

Contrast this with the TVA area, where installed capacity was 4,455,000 kilowatts in 1940. Set to go ahead, with a unified plan or organization and control, and the initial plans for orderly expansion already available, the installed capacity to generate low-cost hydroelectric power was increased almost 30 percent by 1943. Industrial demands were so great that in these 3 years electricity generated increased 59 percent. And while the critics and maligners of the TVA effort predicted black gloom as soon as war production demands should stop, today the TVA is unable to provide any substantial quantities of additional new

power to the many hundreds of factories engaged in peacetime production in the Tennessee area.

Mr. President, for a century and a half we in the United States have been trying to cope with the problem of controlling our rivers and developing the agricultural and other resources of our river basins. But never until the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, almost 14 years ago, did we approach the problem in the way nature herself intended, by looking upon a great river as a single and indivisible whole.

We give one bureau the authority and the funds with which to improve navigation and prevent floods. We give another agency, jealous of the first, the authority and funds with which to reclaim land and produce hydroelectric power. Then as the second agency proceeds with its program of dams, reclamation, and power development, the Congress, under pressure from private interests, clips the necessary appropriations and renders the program ineffective.

A sound program of soil conservation and reclamation is based on the theory that as much as possible of the rain must be captured and held where it falls, so it is clear that the agency which has jurisdiction in this field is permanently and irreconcilably at war with any agency which insists on having the water come downstream for the purposes of a navigation program.

Obviously this divided authority is outmoded and should be repudiated as a wholly inconsistent method of meeting the problem. This objection finally became so clear and unanswerable that the governors of the Valley States, as I have pointed out, joined in petitioning the President to have Congress provide a single unified program for the entire river valley.

Mr. President, there is no evidence to support the belief that an effective program of comprehensive river-basin development in the Missouri Valley can ever be successfully prosecuted under the so-called joint operation of these conflicting agencies—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. To continue this ineffective and costly system any longer is a violation of the obligation of the Congress to the American people.

The unified development of the great Missouri River Basin, under the bill which I have filed, calls for a careful study and understanding of the many problems of the area, and a willingness to work them out together through an organization set up by the people and responsible to them, but possessed of sufficient delegated authority to work efficiently along strictly business lines with a minimum of red tape and political interference.

It is set up by the Congress, and Congress at all times retains final authority over it. As President Roosevelt pointed out in his message of September 21, 1944, it must be under the constant surveillance of the Congress and its plans and program must have approval in order to obtain appropriations to continue its work. It has its seat of administration not in far-distant Washington, but in the region of the Missouri where it is immediately responsible to the people served by it. Here is an instrument of democracy, the modern way people organize and delegate certain necessary powers to a creation of their own, the authority, to get a big job done efficiently and democratically.

This is no arbitrarily controlled agency directed by irresponsible management. Its splendid achievements in this field speak for themselves. The Comptroller General of the United States in a recent report gave the TVA's management "highest commendation for the effectiveness with which the Authority functions" and for "accomplishments in carrying out the objectives of the TVA Act."

The TVA was commended in the report as "one of the foremost Government corporations in the use of accounting in management, comparing quite favorably in this respect with well-managed private corporations."

The bill which I have introduced for this purpose is a new bill in many particulars. It has been improved and perfected by taking advantage of every legitimate criticism which has been offered. It is necessarily a long bill, because the subject matter of which it treats must be couched in appropriate legislative language. The problems in such comprehensive program are necessarily involved and require careful exposition. I believe its main purpose and intent will be clearly understood from the explanation which I shall now make. The bill provides that the Federal Government shall establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resources development for a region definitely limited to the Missouri River and its tributaries as located in the States of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa.

As a means for carrying out the program, a Missouri Valley Authority, a Government corporation, is established, which shall have its residence, principal office, and other offices in the region being served.

The Corporation shall be directed by a board of three directors, all of whom shall be citizens of the United States, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, for staggered 9-year terms, and removable from office by the President. At least two of the three directors shall have had not less than five continuous years of residence in the region immediately before being appointed.

All officers, agents, and employees of the corporation shall be appointed by the board, classified and remunerated according to the Classification Act and pay scale of the United States Civil Service, except certain exempt positions.

The Corporation shall be assisted by an advisory committee consisting of the principal officer or his designee of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, War, Federal Power Commission, Federal Security Agency, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank, and 12 members who are resident of the region, chosen by the President, so that 3 each represent the following interests: agriculture, commerce, labor, wild and aquatic life, and recreation.

The advisory committee is in no sense simply an honorary body. It meets in regular meetings in the Missouri Valley; advises on the major plans of the Corporation; reviews the annual report; and assists in interpreting the purposes and program of the Authority to the people. Membership on the advisory committee of the responsible heads of the Government agencies whose bureaus are working on various related problems in the Missouri Valley insures an interchange of views at the policy-making level which should prove most helpful in creating a common understanding of purposes. Membership of citizens chosen to represent the major interests of the Missouri area should likewise prove of great value in furthering the common interests of the people, in their agriculture, industry, recreation, forests, wildlife, and resources development.

The Corporation is required to make the necessary surveys and report to the President and to the Congress a comprehensive plan for the unified development of the resources of the Missouri Valley as soon as possible, but in any event not later than 2 years after it is established by law.

Works and programs already approved by the Congress falling within the scope of river-basin development as defined in this act, for which appropriations have already been made, shall be included in the plan insofar as may be practicable. They shall be carried to completion without regard to the time which elapses between the enactment of this act and the approval of the unified plan.

The unified plan shall provide for such participation of existing agencies of government as the Corporation deems consistent with obtaining the maximum river-basin development under the unified system of planning and management contemplated in the act.

Projects for construction and the required funds must be authorized by Congress. Net proceeds derived from the business transactions of the Corporation shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, except an amount required by the Board for operating capital, and funds to be devoted to new construction, provided that no funds can be used for new construction without express legislative approval of the projects by the Congress.

The Corporation is authorized to negotiate agreements with States and their subdivisions to effect mutually satisfactory transmountain diversions of water.

The Corporation shall maintain complete accounts. The system of accounts to be used must receive prior approval of the Comptroller General of the United States as to their adequacy for the accounting purposes of the Corporation. The Corporation shall maintain its power-accounting system in conformity with the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts.

The Corporation is prohibited from carrying out any part of its program of unified river basin resources development in any public park or monument, except by the expressed consent of the Congress,

or of the State by which said park or monument was established.

The President is empowered to transfer Government property in the Missouri Basin States to the Authority when, in his judgment, this is in the public interest. But certain safeguards are laid down. For instance, there can be no order of transfer of any moneys in the reclamation fund which has been built up over the years, and to which States other than those directly included in the Missouri Basin have made contributions.

It properly recognizes the existence of an important body of law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, grazing, geological survey, national parks and monuments, forest lands, mines, and mineral holdings of the Government. The Corporation is required to take such law into account in formulating plans for the development of the area, showing just how each is fitted into and guaranteed its proper place in such development.

In this bill, the provisions limiting the amount of land for which an owner can obtain water for irrigation is carefully defined. An owner is entitled to and can receive water from the Authority for 160 acres. Because it is impossible to rigidly administer such a provision without hardship in some cases, the bill provides that the landowner may petition the Corporation and receive authority to receive irrigation water on land in excess of these 160 acres, but not to exceed a minor fraction of a second 160 acres.

A period of time, not to exceed 5 years, is allowed any landowner having excess irrigable land within which to dispose of such excess land. If, during these 5 years, economic conditions depress land values unduly, he may apply for and receive an extension of time during which he may make such disposition.

The Corporation is authorized and directed to develop a program of production and distribution of low-cost hydroelectric power and sell such power to public bodies, private corporations, and REA cooperatives, and may sell electricity directly to farmers whenever it is found necessary.

In multiple-purpose projects providing electric power, irrigation, flood control, and other activities, the Corporation must make allocations of costs and rates between various users only after formal public hearings in the areas concerned. Its findings and recommendations must be made known to the Advisory Committee which may make its views known to the Board and to the President. If the President does not specifically disapprove, the plan of allocations of costs and rates shall be effective. Such safeguards insure a high measure of democratic dealing and require the reaching of understandings only after careful deliberations held in public.

Much has been said in the past about stripping the States and localities of their tax resources for Federal purposes. The MVA bill meets this issue squarely. It provides that the Corporation must pay each fiscal year a sum in total not less than the revenue lost to the State and locality because of property being acquired by the Corporation formerly subject to State and local taxation. The first annual payment shall be based on the then current tax rate. Subsequent payments shall be based on the tax rate effective for the major portion of the year for which payment is being made.

To insure the properly coordinated promotion of navigation, flood prevention, reclamation, prevention of pollution, and protection of property, no dam, appurtenant works, sewer, dock, pier, wharf, bridge, trestle, landing pipe, buildings, or other obstruction affecting the property of the Corporation or its program shall be constructed or maintained except on approval of the Corporation. But so as to create no hardship on those who require incidental or minor temporary structures such as a roadside canal or footbridge, the Corporation is required to draw up and publish rules whereby these may be constructed. Such structures shall be listed with the Corporation.

While the right of eminent domain is granted the Corporation, rules are drawn up to control the manner in which it will be exercised. Court proceedings under this right shall be instituted in the United States court for the district in which the property in question is located. Provisions are made in the bill for safeguarding the rights of property owners in such proceedings.

The Corporation, as an instrumentality of the United States, is given access to Patent Office records. Any patent owner who feels himself injured by the exercise of this right, may take action in the district court of the United States.

Any invention or discovery made by virtue of or incidental to service with the Corporation shall become the property of the Corporation, except that the Board may pay the inventor such sum from the proceeds of any sale or license of said invention, as it may deem proper.

Mr. President, this brief outline of the purposes and powers of the Missouri Valley Authority bill indicates that this is a sound and desirable program to meet the problems of the Missouri Valley. It should meet with the ready acceptance of the Congress because it effectively answers all the questions presented against the original bill filed in 1944 and will not only benefit the people of the Missouri River Basin but will add tremendously to general productivity and wealth and prosperity of the whole Nation.

Mr. President, I have been engaged in the study of these problems in the Missouri River Valley now for several years. I feel confident that the bill which I have filed is in keeping with sound and democratic principles and processes, and efficiently and effectively administered will bring to the Missouri Valley the same beneficent results which were gained by the people of the Tennessee Valley under the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As I stated in the opening of my remarks, I do not stand alone in offering this legislation. I have as cosponsors with me a group of able Senators who have devoted careful study to the problems of river-valley development such as took place under the very successful program carried out in the Tennessee Valley.

From our studies of these problems of the Missouri River, we are convinced that the so-called Pick-Sloan plan of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, supported by the voluntary and powerless consulting machinery of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee and the Missouri River States Committee, has proven to be a complete failure as a substitute for a Missouri Valley Authority. Many serious deflections amongst the Pick-Sloan plan's original supporters have occurred since the plan was first proposed. These people have come to recognize the weaknesses of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan and are now ready to support the Missouri Valley Authority, because they are fully convinced that it offers the only solution of the many overlapping problems of river-basin development. The several State governments in the region have become increasingly dissatisfied with the slow and awkward handling of the piecemeal plan now being followed. More than rumblings of this discontent have already reached Washington of the disregard shown their views by the different Federal agencies now in charge of river-basin development.

Mr. President, in presenting this important legislation, I am speaking in behalf of the citizens of my own State of Montana and the several States of the Missouri Valley. There they continue to live in constant fear of unpredictable and uncontrolled floods—floods which have caused not only loss of life but property damages in excess of $150,000,000 during the war years alone. There are farm families, watching in troubled silence while their neighbors move away from drought-stricken, soil-wasted farms. The businessmen of that area are forced to witness their sons migrating to distant States because of the absence of industrial and business opportunities at home. All this has been going on in good and bad times for these many years as Government statistics amply prove.

Mr. President, here is a section of our country well worth saving. Here is produced nearly half of the foodstuffs of the Nation with a potential productive capacity of life-giving foods far in excess of present production. Here is the greatest river basin in the United States with unsurpassed scenic wonders, rare natural beauty, and undeveloped recreational features. Here are seemingly boundless deposits of coal and phosphate, timber and minerals, little explored and awaiting intensive commercial development. But here, too, we find the swift-flowing waters of the Missouri and its tributaries rushing away to the sea in destructive floods and torrents destroying annually thousands of acres of rich lands and irreplaceable resources. Here are vast hydroelectric possibilities in natural deep gorges and waterfalls, and here also exists a greater need for electricity for farm and industrial use than any other part of the Nation.

Mr. President, while we appropriate millions of dollars to industrialize other sections of the world, at home we must not fail to protect our own undeveloped and impoverished areas. The people of the Missouri Valley seek the solution of

these problems in a truly American way. They come to the Congress of the United States urging the passage of this legislation designed to bring that potentially rich area into balance with the progress and prosperity of the country as a whole. We who sponsor this measure are confident that it is sound and wisely conceived legislation essential to the development and conservation of the great resources of the Missouri River Valley. We submit the bill for the study and consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this point the Chair will suggest to the Senator that, if it is agreeable to him, the bill which he has introduced will be referred when the Senate meets tomorrow at 12 o'clock, and at that time, if the Senator desires to appeal from the reference to the Committee on Public Works, he may do so. Is that arrangement satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it is very satisfactory. Mr. President.

EXHIBIT A

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ALL BUT ONE OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES, REPRESENTED IN A RECENT MEETING OF THEIR GOVERNORS AND THE MEMBERS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE, REQUESTING EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE ACTION TOWARD PROCURING A SINGLE COORDINATED PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 21, 1944.

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by all but one of the Missouri River States, represented in a recent meeting of their governors and the members of the Missouri River States Committee. In general, the resolution asks for executive and legislative action toward procuring a single coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin "for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States."

As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States were involved. The general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority might well serve as a pattern for similar developments of other river basins. The Tennessee Valley Authority was charged by the Congress with the development of practically all of the factors which are important in establishing better living standards and a better life for the people throughout that great watershed.

The benefits which have resulted in the Tennessee River Valley include flood prevention, irrigation, increased electric power for farms and shops and homes and industries, better transportation on land and water, reforestation and conservation of natural resources, the encouragement of small businesses and the growth and expansion of new businesses, development and widespread use of fertilizers and improved agricultural methods, better education and recreational facilities—and many kindred improvements which go to make for increased security and greater human happiness.

The Congress has at all times retained the final authority over the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the Authority comes before the Congress each year to obtain appropriations to continue its work and carry out its plans.

I have heretofore suggested the creation of a similar authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way west to its source in Colorado.

I have also suggested the creation of an authority to render a similar service in the Columbia River watershed, including the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

I now make a similar recommendation for the Missouri River Basin.

The resolution very properly asks that the legislation dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin recognize that it is dealing with one river and one problem; and points out the necessity of a comprehensive development of the Missouri River, indicating that there can be no piecemeal legislative program. The resolution asks that "the Congress should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Easin and their economic destiny and that of the United States."

I am in hearty accord with these principles. I hope that the Congress will give careful and early consideration to the creation of this Federal authority to consider the problem in its entirety, remembering always that any appropriations to carry out any plan are and will be within the complete control of the Congress, and that the interest of each of the States in the basin will, of course, be given full consideration. I am sure that none of the States in the Tennessee River Basin have lost any of their rights because of the creation of the Authority in that Valley.

May I also ask that renewed consideration be given to a study of the Arkansas and Columbia River Basins? The fact has been established that such legislation can do much to promote the welfare of the great mass of citizens who live there—as well as their fellow citizens throughout the United States.

I need hardly point out to the Congress, in addition, how helpful this legislation will be in the creation of employment and in the stimulation of industry, business, and agriculture throughout the areas involved, in the days which will follow the end of the war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

AUGUST 21, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: There is attached hereto a copy of a declaration unanimously adopted by the Missouri River States therein named, acting through their governors and the committee members of the Missouri River States Committee who were jointly assembled in meeting. The last portion of the declaration shows one statement agreed to by eight of the States and to which one dissented. In general, the declaration asks executive and legislative action toward procuring a single coordinated Missouri River development plan.

One of the most valuable benefits to be obtained from this project would arise from the large amount of labor and material required, with resultant general benefits to business conditions as a part of postwar readjustment. It is reasonably certain that the project would be completely self-liquidating and so the country might get the benefit of very effective postwar readjustment aid and, at the same time, get this great internal improvement which would pay dividends continuously thereafter.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the resolution.

Yours sincerely,
M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor and Chairman,
Missouri River States Committee.

RESOLUTION OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE TO SECURE A BASIN-WIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

We, the Governors of the States in the Missouri River Basin, namely: Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri, and the members of the Missouri River States Committee, meeting at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5 and 6, 1944, after hearing and conferring with representatives of various Federal agencies, including the United States Army Engineer Corps and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, do now firmly and earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States to give force and effect to the following conclusions:

1. That in dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin it be recognized that we are dealing with one river and one problem.

2. That in approaching that problem and in order to serve all the people of the Basin to the maximum possible degree and to safeguard their present established rights and their future development and prosperity, there can be no piecemeal legislative program.

3. That there must be an over-all comprehensive plan and suitable legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States which will accomplish that purpose.

4. That the omnibus flood-control bill, insofar as it deals with the Missouri River furnishes the framework for flood control and related purposes.

5. That authorization of the Bureau of Reclamation plan now before Congress and embodied in the Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is necessary to a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin.

6. That those provisions of the rivers and harbors omnibus bill which relate to navigation on the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, vitally affect the economic life and plans for future development of the entire Missouri River Basin.

7. That to develop the basin fully and for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States of America, the Congress of the United States should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin and their economic destiny and that of the United States of America.

8. That in order to accomplish this unity of purpose and action we ask the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the United States Army Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation to bring before the Congress a coordinated plan, based on the proposed legislation and official documents heretofore mentioned which will make possible the authorization by the Congress, now, of the Missouri River Basin development program in its entirety by such amendments to legislation now pending as are feasible from the standpoint of legislative procedures.

The foregoing was unanimously adopted by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent at the time, the vote of that State was not recorded.

Thereupon the meeting considered the following statement:

Nothing done in the interests of flood control or navigation shall adversely affect the use of water for irrigation west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

This statement was agreed to by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent, the vote of that State was not recorded. The State of Missouri being present and represented did not choose to join in the last-mentioned statement.

NOMINATION OF GORDON R. CLAPP

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of

the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the benefit of the RECORD, let me state that it is my understanding that the Senate is now in executive session, and that the pending business is the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss (colonel, Medical Corps), assistant to the Surgeon General, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Surgeon General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Maj. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk, United States Army, whose term of office expires May 31, 1947.

Col. George Ellis Armstrong (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, United States Army, nominated for appointment as the Surgeon General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who takest up the isles of the sea and weighest the mountains in scales and the hills in the balance, our inmost instincts reach toward Thee. O Divine Galilean, who lived the only earthly life of supreme good ever known, teach us Thy secret that we may achieve the ends of our being without haste, tumult, or worry. Bless us today with tranquil minds that point to victory over the problems of our beloved country. These days, these hours, measure our wisdom, our sense of duty and sympathy, and even our lives.

Blessed Lord, take us and shield us, and if unworthy rebuke us; if our aims are low, challenge us and spare us from the regretful way that ends in failure. O hear us for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 938. An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) entitled "An act to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes."

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site—commonly known as the base 6 property—which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes," as amended (Public Law No. 655, 79th Cong.; 60 Stat. 901), is hereby amended by striking out "6 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 months."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials and a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from Mr. Palmer, of General Cable Corp., on the subject Cooperation of Industry in Lowering Prices.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram sent him by the Oregon Department of the American Legion, and also by the Oregon Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A SCAPEGOAT FOR HIGH PRICES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, at a recent news conference, and also at the AP meeting in New York on Monday, President Truman blamed present high prices upon American business and industry. He said the responsibility for price reduction rests solely upon business. He stated, in effect, "American business must either get prices down or wages will go up."

In making that statement, the President chose to ignore entirely the following facts, not one of which is under the control of business:

First. The Federal Government, through its farm-price-support program, maintains high food prices, and high food prices account for 70 percent of the rise in living costs.

Second. The Federal Government, through its enormous purchases for export of scarce items, accentuates those scarcities, thereby forcing prices still higher.

Third. The Federal Government still retains control over many items that enter into the cost of living.

Fourth. Mr. Truman himself, early in 1946, set the pattern for spiraling Nation-wide wage increases. His action was based upon an erroneous report from the Department of Commerce, headed by Henry Wallace—a report that said a 20-percent raise in wages could be granted without a rise in prices.

Fifth. The high cost of Government—$37,500,000,000 as against $8,000,000,000 in prewar years—is an important factor in the high cost of living.

Every economist agrees that scarcities, coupled with high wages, produce high prices. When the President made his statement he chose to ignore this well-known economic fact and the five causes listed above. That proves that he is either uninformed concerning the factors responsible for the present high level of prices or he prefers for political reasons to ignore these factors and do as his predecessor did—make a scapegoat out of American business and industry by loading the administration's sins upon them.

We all want a reduction in prices. We welcome the reductions that business leaders have already made, and are still making. We are ready to commend any and every effort that the administration may make in that direction. But we cannot refrain from pointing out at this time that President Truman and the New Deal administration, having jacked prices up to their present high level—by creating scarcities and by greatly increasing the purchasing power of the people—must now assume a large part of the responsibility for bringing about a

reduction in our present-day inflated prices. President Truman cannot escape this responsibility by making a scapegoat of American business and industry.

THE BRINGING OF ILLEGITIMATE NEGRO CHILDREN INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the press correctly quotes me this morning as being unalterably opposed to bringing to this country a lot of illegitimate half-breed Negro children from England. They are the offsprings of the scum of the British Isles. I said that probably they would inherit the vices of both races and the virtues of neither.

I am backed up in my position by one of the leading Negro bishops of the South, Bishop E. J. Cain, of Arkansas. He seems to represent the views of the real Negroes of this country.

He said that "the intelligent Negroes of America" will oppose the proposal to bring from Great Britain to the United States approximately 10,000 children whose fathers were alleged to be American Negro soldiers.

He said:

The intelligent Negroes of America are trying to discourage the mongrel in our race.

In other words, they are trying to discourage mongrelization; they are trying to build up their own people.

He said:

We couldn't be proud of these children, and neither could the white race.

I continue to receive letters to the effect that Mrs. Roosevelt advocates bringing them over here. Now, I hope that is a mistake, for it would be one of the worst blunders she could possibly make.

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great women of all times is the wife of the former President of the United States. You may not always agree with what she says. I think no one can doubt her sincerity, her great courage, and her great love for humanity. We hear much these days about democracy, and we are willing to invest hundreds of millions of dollars, even the lives of our sons, to promote democracy in the world. Democracy rests on the religious concept of the dignity and the worth of the individual, and the recognition of God. God does not draw boundaries; at least, not the God I learned to worship in my church. He does not draw boundaries any place on earth, and I say that Eleanor Roosevelt, and those like her who have walked down through history with light around their heads are the true disciples of Jesus Christ and the true practicing Christians on this earth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition from the citizens of Gering, Nebr.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Angell	Elsaesser	McGarvey
Barden	Fallon	Macy
Battle	Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland	Fuller	Meyer
Bonner	Fulton	Miller, Md.
Brooks	Gallagher	Mitchell
Brown, Ohio	Gary	Morrison
Buckley	Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Gifford	O'Toole
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patman
Celler	Holifield	Pfeifer
Chapman	Horan	Poage
Clark	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Clements	Jenison	Rivers
Clippinger	Jensen	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Snyder
Coudert	Johnson, Tex.	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Jones, Wash.	Towe
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Trimble
Dingell	McDonough	West
Domengeaux	McDowell	
Ellsworth		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. EBERHARTER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the National Republican Committee by Mr. HALLECK on last Monday at Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 194, Rept. No. 293), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the appropriation and language contained in the bill, on page 50, lines 13 to 21, inclusive, and on page 81, lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with the closing up of UNRRA the United Nations took into consideration the problem of how to finish up the task of caring for starving people in the devastated areas of Europe and perhaps of China. It was decided that this would be a unilateral performance, and our share would be 57 percent instead of 72 percent. The amount allotted to the United States of America of the $610,000,000 is $350,000,000, provided for in this bill.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I wish to call attention to a very troublesome situation.

The psychology in the House at the present is very simple. The Republicans are in the majority. We still have a Democratic administration in the executive branch. When anything comes up from the executive department, or any proposal comes up for legislation of a domestic nature, you Republicans are perfectly free to raise hell with the administration, and you do.

But in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it is different. We in that committee represent all the people regardless of political labels. We speak to all the world. Whoever is Chief Executive is our President, and so far as the world knows, his is our administration until in the providence of God the people make a change. It so happens that in view of the conditions of the world, our committee is going to bring before the House many requests for money. This first one is for $350,000,000. Next week it will be $400,000,000. After that it will be $72,000,000,000, and beyond that I do not dare to prophesy, but I am afraid we will be asking for money almost continuously.

Now, do not blame it on our committee. Do not blame it on anybody except upon the conditions in the world. Let us hope and pray that we can face this demand upon our resources, spiritual and material, with an open mind.

I call attention to another situation that we have to deal with in our committee. We have not at the present any knowledge of the resources of this Nation which may safely be drawn upon now and in the future for the assistance of mankind. I feel the time is here when we ought to have a complete and authoritative and intelligent study made of the financial resources and conditions of this Nation of ours so that we can base our appeal for help for the rest of the world upon reality rather than upon mere sentiment.

In the second place, we have as yet no permanent policy announced to us by the executive branch of the Government as to our relationship to the devastated world. In my judgment, we need an administration of relief which will be intelligent, if possible, under present world conditions, and which will be representative of all the people of this country.

With that background, I call attention to the fact that the preparation of this bill took 12 very exhaustive hearings. I may say that it is the reasoned result of those hearings and those deliberations that your committee brings to you. I understand that it is proposed to rewrite this bill on the floor of the House. I congratulate the membership of the House who have had access to more information than the committee has been able to find. I have no doubt that with your wide information you will be able to write a much better bill, and I hope you have a good time doing it. As far as the committee is concerned, I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], whom I hold in high esteem, yesterday proposed six amendments. There will be a great flock of others, legitimate and illegitimate, presented here. When we are through, it will amount to a vote of no confidence as far as the Committee on Foreign Affairs is concerned. If you go to that length, it will, of course, be my very pleasant duty to call the committee together and ask them when they wish to disband. We will now proceed to the autopsy.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman yields the floor, will he be kind enough to yield to me to propound a question?

Mr. EATON. I will be very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. COX. My objection to the resolution, if I have objection, grows out of the fear that it is proposed that we be further used to fulfill obligations that rest more directly and more immediately upon Russia. I note the countries in which you propose to extend some part of this $350,000,000, and from that list I observe that the greater part of the fund will be expended in countries that are now overrun and under the domination and control of Russia. What provision is there in the resolution, what is proposed shall be done by way of making known to the recipients of this fund that it is being provided by the United States?

It is my conviction, and it is a solemn conviction, that we have permitted ourselves to be used pretty liberally by Russia in providing funds, the benefit of which has gone to Russia and not to the countries intended. Now, are we traveling at cross purposes when we set up this fund?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say for myself that I recognize with deep distress the fact that mankind is face to face with the most profound and far-reaching decision in its history. That decision is between the establishment of a world civilization based upon freedom, which is the American way, or upon slavery, which is the Russian way. The ideology of communism is our mortal enemy everywhere, all the time. Personally, I am averse to helping our enemies, and strong for helping our friends. But we have been sound asleep. We have been appeasing Russia; gently patting this communistic tiger and saying, "Poor pussy," while the communistic ideology has been taking possession of these stricken European countries and penetrating every other country in the world.

How are we going to assist these starving men, women, and children in a desolation unequaled in the history of the world, and avoid apparently helping a communistic country in some way? Let me read certain reservations:

> No relief assistance can be provided to the people of any country unless and until the government of that country gives assurances satisfactory to the President that:
>
> 1. There will be no discrimination in the distribution of relief supplies.
>
> 2. There will be complete freedom of press and radio of the United States to observe and report on relief activities.
>
> 3. Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program.
>
> 4. Such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, steps to reduce its relief needs and provide for its own future reconstruction.
>
> 5. Upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning production and use which would affect its relief needs.
>
> 6. Representatives of the United States Government will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the relief supplies.

In addition to that, we have provided that the Congress of the United States can cancel this program at any time it sees fit.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Further answering the gentleman from Georgia, is it not a fact that in this legislation we carefully stayed away from enumerating any specific amount to go to any particular country. The idea is that if the Administration handling these funds in the different countries finds that in a particular country the food or material is not going to the people who are deserving, the administrators can automatically shut off the relief. It is a different proposition, is it not, than UNRRA? UNRRA was an international proposition. This is a proposition where the Government of the United States controls every penny it has appropriated for this purpose and it cannot go to any other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman take a little more time?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such additional time as I may need to satisfy this passion for information.

If the Members will read sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill they will find an answer to most of their questions.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I say first that if we had had a little more passion for information when we passed the original UNRRA bill maybe we would now have a little more information.

Mr. EATON. I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is all right. Witnesses before one of my subcommittees testified that in some of these countries where UNRRA relief was distributed Russia told the people that UNRRA was the name of a town in Russia and that the relief came from that town Unrra in Russia. Will this bill, if passed, enable the administrator of the funds to stop that sort of thing?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In other words, can that be repeated by Russia again? Can they go into a country and use similar methods and tactics?

Mr. EATON. My answer is that nothing short of divine intervention can keep communism from lying; that is its foundation.

Mr. COLMER. But if they do lie we can stop them from going to those countries.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will look at the top of page 4 he will find this provision that must apply:

> Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

The prevention of the abuse about which the gentleman is talking is specifically provided in this bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, is this not the situation: Every dollar of

this money is in the hands of the President of the United States. Is not that correct?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. And the President of the United States does not have to allow a single dollar to any country or any group unless in his considered judgment that country or that group needs it and will use it to the best advantage of the starving people in devastated areas.

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee knows, I wish to bring this matter to a focus and an issue in the House. It is therefore my purpose at the proper time to offer an amendment to bring this issue up for discussion and decision: Whether it is the will of this Congress that any of this money shall go into either the Soviet Republic or those countries dominated by the Soviet Republic.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. On that, there may be Soviet-dominated governments in the world for the moment, where the people are not Soviets, but would like to shed Soviet rule; but they are hungry people just the same as they are in other sections of the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] use some of his time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], to state that the committee had not been presented with any program for the allocation or the spending of this authorized amount of $350,000,000.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not hear the gentleman say that. I tried to make it clear that when Mr. Clayton came before the committee he did not want to have in this bill anything specific which would compel the committee or the administrator of these funds to give to any certain country any specific amount. Now, let us be reasonable about this thing. If we provide in this bill a certain number of dollars for Italy, Greece, or some other country, then the people of those different countries will expect that amount of money whether they conform to the rules and regulations laid down by the President, who is administering these funds. In this bill we provide the rules and regulations they must conform to and the President of the United States has full control. A gentleman referred to UNRRA, but that has nothing to do with this. This is a different kind of administration. It is a unilateral administration. If they do not conform to the rules and regulations laid down by the United States Government then we can automatically, without any notice at all, shut them off from any further relief.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for raising that question is this: Hitherto in making appropriations under authorizations, and that was true in the appropriations which were recently reported by the Deficiency Committee making $300,000,000 additional available for relief in the occupied countries, it has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee to ask those presenting the estimates for the amount of money that they propose to spend on given items and the country or countries in which they propose to spend it. I should like to know for the RECORD whether or not there is anything in this legislation which proposes that if this money is authorized, when the time comes for appropriations it must be appropriated purely as a blank check, or whether the Appropriations Committee will be permitted and expected at that time to get a detailed program of the money that is to be appropriated for what and where and to determine the amounts in any given bill.

Mr. BLOOM. That is a very important question, but I am going to hand it right back and put it in your lap. This is merely an authorization. When the administration comes in and asks for further funds, the Appropriations Committee has full control. It has all the evidence. It can do anything it wants. But remember that there are so many different branches and many different ramifications to these different things we have in here. A resolution may be offered covering a children's fund. This does not say anything about that. I am for it. I think it is a wonderful thing. But we have people here starving and we have to do everything we possibly can now. They are starving over there and we cannot wait until the ideas of all the people in the world are presented. If we do, there will not be any people to feed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the gentleman's answer is that if this authorization is passed by the Congress and approved, when the matter of appropriating funds comes up the gentleman will expect the Appropriations Committee to do its customary duty.

Mr. BLOOM. They can do whatever they want, certainly. It is all in their hands.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. For a question; yes.

Mr. COX. Let me preface it with just this brief statement. If we mean what we say about stopping Russia and intend to make the first move in that direction by extending aid to Greece and Turkey, then should we not accept the amendment which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] states he will offer, that no part of this fund should be expended in any country dominated by Russia?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do think this is a tremendously serious matter, so let me repeat: Where the Government of a country might be under Communist domination, or where infiltration of communism into the government has taken place, are we going to refuse to feed the starving people of these devastated war-stricken countries and permanently drive them into the arms of communism? I think we ought to think of that for a moment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better go on with the debate. I am sorry I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to throw a little light on this subject, if I can. To start with, I know all you ladies and gentlemen are in favor of relieving suffering throughout the world. I believe that most all Americans are. You know, you cannot find two more typical Americans in this country, I think, than Harry Truman and Herbert Hoover. Both of these great men addressed the Congress; one of them through the committee and one directly to the Congress, endorsing the proposals of this bill. It is true that Mr. Hoover made a few other suggestions as to how we should do the thing sought to be done here. If the Members of the House will just get this clearly in their minds—and I am speaking particularly to the gentleman from Georgia who has just asked the question about Soviet domination and Soviet use of the funds proposed here—I want to assure them that the very thing we are trying to do in this bill is to get away from the thing that the gentleman from Georgia is afraid of. Through this bill, the Russian Government will not be able to get its claws on these relief supplies, directly, or indirectly, through some other government in Europe favorable to the communistic theory.

Heretofore this Congress has gone along with the other nations of the earth to provide relief funds through UNRRA. We have spent about $2,500,000,000 as a contribution to that fund. The whole relief fund used up, or committed, to this time I think is about $3,500,000,000.

As a matter of fact, we have contributed 72 percent of that entire fund for world relief to this date. In addition to that, we have turned our funds over to an international organization, and in some cases we have been disappointed in the methods of distribution and the results.

This bill speaks for itself. By its provisions, somewhere, sometime, relief to these countries has got to come to an end. It is not envisioned in this bill that more than $610,000,000 from all sources will be used for relief. The United States is to provide $350,000,000, which sum comes to 10 percent of our original contribution since the world relief program started 2 years ago, so you can see we are gradually tapering off, you can see

we are gradually getting away from this load. But we paid 72 percent of the total amount in UNRRA used for relief. In this bill we do not propose to pay proportionately as much; we propose to pay 57 percent of the $610,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. That is the amount that was allocated by the Committee of the United Nations. This is all regulated by the one committee that was formed by the United Nations, and the $610,000,000 was the amount they set.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is substantially correct, and I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to it.

We are not only cutting down the relief contribution by this country but we are also cutting down our proportionate share of world relief contributions in this bill. But the most important thing about this bill is that it blazes a new American policy in the field of international relief. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia, and every other Member here, we are determined through this bill that this relief money that will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America will go to no country or people hopelessly under Communist domination. How can we assure that? Because the United States keeps control of its own money, because we can say tomorrow, "We do not like the way you are doing in your country, and we will cut it off."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman certain that he is correct in that statement, in view of the fact that the very resolution itself says that part of this fund shall be expended in Poland, in Hungary, and in other countries that are completely dominated by Russia?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia is incorrect. It is not provided in this bill that any part of this fund will be used in any particular country. It is advisedly left out of the bill.

Mr. COX. Why name the countries in which it is contemplated that a part of the fund will be expended?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia knows that there is a reasonable demand in this Congress to give some information about where this money is going, but it is unwise, I say to the Congress, to make it compulsory that this money go to any particular country.

Mr. COX. In view of the gentleman's statement, will he permit me to propound this question?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman be willing that 1 penny of this fund be expended in Yugoslavia, in Poland, or in any other countries that are dominated by Russia? Does he have the slightest doubt in his mind that if a penny of it were to go into those countries it would be controlled by the local government?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not be willing for one thin dime of this money to be spent in Yugoslavia, and not a dime of it will be spent there, though it is not guaranteed in the bill. Some of this money will probably be spent in Poland, for well-known reasons.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to test out the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed a little further, I shall then be glad to answer any questions.

It is suggested that this money will be used in Hungary, Poland, Austria, Italy, Greece, and China. Those are the countries that are suggested. It is not made mandatory in the bill.

We know that $610,000,000 will be a drop in the bucket to meet all relief needs in every country, but it seems the best we can do for this year. We know we cannot feed all the people of the world and we know we cannot abolish misery from the face of the earth. But following the leadership of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman, we must do what we can in a Christian way to bring this suffering to a minimum. The testimony throughout the hearings was that $610,000,000 is a minimum.

So far as Italy is concerned, we have a peace treaty with that country and there is much misery and want there. So far as Yugoslavia is concerned, we know that Tito is under the domination of Stalin, and none of this money is intended to go there. So far as Greece is concerned, we know that human misery and suffering there is at a maximum.

So far as Austria is concerned, there is a real relief problem there. Austria is divided into zones. France, Russia, the United States, and Great Britain each control a zone there. Reliable reports are that there is not only starvation there, but that an ideological conflict is also going on.

General Marshall is in Moscow right now trying to consummate an Austrian peace treaty but has not been able to succeed in doing so. The Russians are hoping we will get worn out and move out of there and leave these people disillusioned. Right now there is a battle going on for freedom in Austria. There is Hungary, the only nation that while suffering under the heels of Russian troops voted for a democratic form of government and turned the Russian proposition down cold.

My friends, it will not be long before the question of aid for Greece and Turkey comes up in the House. Do not forget for 1 minute that the proposal now pending is related to that question. If we help Greece and Turkey, do not forget that we must also help other sections there where the people cannot speak for fear of being punished. We must give them hope. We must show them that we have not forgotten them in their misery.

We are going to see that this money is spent under American supervision. That is one thing we could not do under UNRRA. We are going in there with this money and we are going to say to those governments, "This is the way you must administer this relief." And if they do not do as we say they should do, then we have the greatest weapon in the world to handle a situation like that, all we have need to say is, "This money stops today."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what other countries are going in with us on this proposition?

Mr. RICHARDS. In reply to the gentleman, may I say we are somewhat in the same position here as we were in the case of UNRRA. In the case of UNRRA, other countries agreed to pay proportionate shares, most all did so. We are not only going to make agreements with recipient countries as to how we are going to do the job, and determine other conditions upon which we will give this relief, but we are also going to try to make agreements with contributing countries, as to how much they will contribute. England has already promised to put up $40,000,000 for Austria. Canada has already given assurance that she will do her rightful part in this deal. Canada usually does. I think we have reasonable grounds to expect that the nations to the south of us and the other nations that have not suffered like Europe has will do their part. But if they do not, we still have control of this fund to say where it will go, what it will be used for, and how long this program will continue.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like the gentleman to explain how, after we enact this legislation, we will then have control of where the money will be spent and how much will be spent. Who is going to control it?

Mr. RICHARDS. For the very reason that we do not state in the bill where it will go and how much will go to a certain place. If the gentleman will permit, elasticity is a supreme requirement in a thing like this. For that degree of control we should have, you must have a great deal of discretionary power in the distributing agency.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But we give authorization for $350,000,000 to be spent by the State Department.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right; or by the President.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But once the Congress passes this bill, we have no control.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, there is control.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Do the rules require Members to address the Chair in order to get permission to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. The rules do so require.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will answer that a little further. I do not know how you could administer legislation like this without discretionary power. We know from our constitutional set-up that if you give discretionary power with respect to making agreements with foreign countries, it has to be in the President or the State Department. I understand amendments will be offered to try to place this thing in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. But it would not work that way.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from New York did not address the Chair.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York did address the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York as having addressed the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that this legislation specifically provides that the Congress can, by concurrent resolution, stop the whole thing right away, as well as the President? So that you have two checks?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think that is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just recently I noticed in the local papers a story about children out in the receiving home, several hundred of them. This morning there is an editorial in the News about a 14-year-old boy confined out there with the insane and with people who have contagious diseases. Can any of that money be used for relief of the Washington children?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; I do not think so. I think Washington people and other people around here will take care of that. We will always have a case like that, but we have less suffering in the United States than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] just asked where the other 43 percent of this $610,000,000 was coming from. I was very much interested in having that information given. I did not understand the gentleman to mention but $50,000,000 from England and an indefinite promise from Canada. Could the gentleman answer specifically the question that the gentleman from Louisiana asked?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say this: The method of raising this fund was suggested by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The nations all joined in voting for this method, and we are hoping to get the money. To be honest with this House, we cannot guarantee that we will get that part of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has said that in the agreement with the representatives of the United Nations there was $610,000,000 that would be necessary to complete this program.

Mr. RICHARDS. Let me say right there, it was not an agreement with the United Nations. It was at the suggestion of the General Assembly of the United Nations that this method be used.

Mr. HARRIS. A general understanding then?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And we are providing $350,000,000?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; 57 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. If the other member nations do not provide the additional $260,000,000, then will the United States be called upon to supply that difference?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; certainly not.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Following the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to my belief that he erred in stating that the other countries did not come forth with their portion of UNRRA. My recollection of the testimony is that every one of them did, with perhaps one minor exception.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. JARMAN. Ninety-nine percent of them.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think there were two small exceptions, involving about $15,000,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. How much is being contributed to this fund by that other great world power, Russia?

Mr. RICHARDS. None; and none of this fund goes to Russia. Under UNRRA we mistakenly went into Russia and gave relief to Russians. But through this new method we are deciding that Russia had better do some relieving herself of her own Ukraine White Russian people, and the same applies to Yugoslavia, where Tito rules. We are intimating to Russia here that we are not going into any country, dominated by her, feed the starving there, and then be accused of dollar diplomacy by the hirelings of Stalin. Instead we are going to keep control of the reins over the taxpayers' money spent through this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the great heart of America has always responded to the limit of its ability in answering the call of human suffering. President Truman and former President Hoover reflect the spirit of America in urging that we continue some form of relief to the war-devastated nations. This bill must pass. On the other hand, there can be legitimate discussion as to the terms and provisions and administrative machinery of this bill; and amendments which will be offered, suggestions as to the form of administration, do not injure the bill but may well help the bill to pass.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, because, unfortunately there is a general attitude in the House Chamber that this bill should not be amended.

I agree 100 percent with the gentleman from Ohio. We have the responsibility to aid the suffering people over there, but this bill can be tremendously corrected and strengthened by the adoption of amendments, some of which were offered in the committee and defeated by but one or two votes.

Mr. VORYS. And I am sure amendments will be offered to this bill by those who are devoted friends of the suffering and who want to aid them to the utmost.

But let us get a bird's-eye view of the relief needs of the world. There are about 2,200,000,000 people in the world, and most of them need relief, according to American standards. If we attempted to relieve all of them who need relief we would succeed in prolonging their lives by only a few months and going bankrupt ourselves. And let us remember always that when we impoverish ourselves to the point where we need relief there is going to be no country in the world available to relieve us.

At the hearings on this bill when Mr. Clayton, the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, was before the committee, he was unable to tell us the amount of the relief and assistance the United States has rendered and is planning to render; but Senator BYRD yesterday gave the figures and they are very fully set forth in the RECORD. Since VE-day we have furnished or we plan to furnish relief and assistance to foreign nations in the amount of $15,970,000,000. We have got to be thinking about the ability of the United States to continue relief and assistance.

Mr. Clayton had no idea as to the number of people who might be involved in this bill. As I figure it out under this bill, in the five nations in Europe to which it applies, there are 93,325,600 people. In China there are 457,835,475 a total under this bill of 551,160,075—half a billion people. If we add Germany and Japan, which are our continuing responsibility, we have 693,894,283 people, for whose relief we are accepting responsibility. We must therefore proceed with care.

Something has been said about UNRRA, that this is to take the place of UNRRA. I was an original supporter of UNRRA on this floor and I wish to call attention to a couple of things: First, UNRRA did a lot of good; second, its failures were for two reasons; first, because of Soviet interference, and second, because of poor administration furnished by this country. We named the head of UNRRA each time. In contemplating this bill remember there will be the same people in the State Department administering it who practically administered UNRRA and supervised

our part of it. They are the people who are going to run this bill. We have just ahead of us IRO, the International Refugee Organization and the children's fund, both of them international organizations. I suggest that we must go forward and finish up with this program, but we better get to making these international organizations work by furnishing good American administration instead of going it alone, as we are in this case.

For these reasons I am going to propose at the proper time that a relief administrator be appointed, to be confirmed by the Senate, to administer this bill, the same sort of amendment that is in the Greek-Turkish loan bill that is on the way here from the Senate.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with the gentleman who preceded him that as the bill is presently written we are fully protected in its administration, that we can cut it off whenever we believe that any of this money would go to countries that are now dominated by Russia?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman agree with the statement that the gentleman made that the bill as written guarantees us against the use of this money in those countries in the administration of the fund?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. The only provision that I want to add is to provide, as was done in the Greek-Turkish loan bill, an administrator to be confirmed by the Senate, so that we will have an administrative business head to it, because the State Department is not set up as an administrative organization, and they admit it.

The criticism will be made: Well, suppose you get into a situation like the Lilienthal confirmation, will there not be a great delay? I want to remind you that the United States Senate has confirmed 12,896 Executive appointments this year up to April 15 and if a good man is proposed for this job there will be no delay.

What are the needs? Where does this relief go? The Foreign Affairs Committee knows the answer, but we do not dare tell you. It is a secret. I have here a secret document furnished us and just for safety, for fear some of you would try to look into it, I have sealed the pages with Scotch tape. I am going to carry out this secrecy policy of the State Department, although it is idiotic and insulting. The secrecy policy is carried on because, as Mr. Clayton said, it might cause embarrassment or resentment in some other countries if we mention where we are going to furnish certain relief and then do not furnish that much. I would like to call the attention of the State Department to the fact that it causes embarassment and resentment in this country when we are not told what the needs are and where we intend to pour the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that all of us or practically all of us who have carefully perused that secret document think there is not a single statement in there that needs to be kept from the Members of this Congress or the whole of the American people? It is all hush, hush, it is unnecessary, it creates unnecessary suspicion and, naturally, develops opposition rather than support of the program, too.

Mr. VORYS. I can tell you that it is mostly from published figures. It is based on a United Nations report which was made public on January 28, 1947. The only considerations of secrecy are, in my judgment, insulting to the intelligence of the American people and of the Members of this House. I can say without revealing any secrets that the $350,000,000 figure was picked out of the air. Look at the statement on page 81 of the printed hearings. It is not based on relief needs but on foreign exchange deficits "to prevent economic retrogression," language picked out of the United Nations report.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In furtherance of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has pointed out, and what we have said, it is interesting that some of the top secret material which we of the committee were sworn to withhold from the Members of Congress has subsequently been incorporated in speeches by the Under Secretary of State in Washington and by the Secretary of the State in Moscow, so apparently the only people who are not permitted to reveal the secrets of life to the Members of Congress are the humble servants you have on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has pledged its cooperation to the State Department, and we have preserved inviolate the secret matter here, although we think the secrecy is idiotic. The leaks have come from the State Department; from the Under Secretary and from the Secretary.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. With reference to the gentleman's reference to the amounts having been picked out of the air on page 81, I wish to call attention to a question of mine——

Mr. VORYS. Now, would the gentleman please take his own time to read that? I have so little time.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not blame the gentleman a bit.

Mr. VORYS. I refer all of you Members to the record, page 81 of the hearings, where it will show how this was arrived at. The United Nations report, which is a public document, does not come to $610,000,000 but comes to $514,000,000 for the five European nations; recommends nothing to China; is on a basis of 2,300 calories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. I want to point this out that as far as I have been able to determine, this $350,000,000 was picked out of the air as 57 percent of a figure which was not a United Nations figure but is a secret figure in this book based on a higher calorie content than any European nation, except the neutral nations, is now getting. I think it was planned that this was minimum relief, to carry the whole load if we go it alone, I think it was planned that way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the $350,000,000 was picked out of the air, will the gentleman tell the House what part of this whole proposition has not been picked out of the air?

Mr. VORYS. Well, if the gentleman will read on page 81, he will find the colloquy which shows how it was picked out of the air, but he will not find out how the rest of the amount was arrived at.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not talking about the amount; I am talking about the whole proposition.

Mr. VORYS. The whole proposition is this, and I am going to answer the gentleman right now. I have criticized as violently and as strongly as I could the way this was presented to us and to the House. We had 12 meetings. There are only hearings of 6 meetings. I think this testimony should have been public and the full information should be public. I have suggestions to make as to administration.

Why should we do this at all? Well, I will tell you why. The people of these countries are hungry, people whose salvation means much to us. They had a pretty tough time of it over there in the war. We are getting along, comparatively, pretty well over here. This bill is an authorization only. The Committee on Appropriations will examine each appropriation under it later. It amounts to a contribution of $2.50 apiece from the American people to finish up war relief, and we have been told that this will finish up the job of relief to these war-devastated countries—$2.50 a head over here; one four hundred and ninetieth of our national income. We are told this is temporary. We hope it will be. It goes to our friends. It will help to fight communism. We have control over it, and I hope every one of you will read these sections 3, 4, and 5, which provide that we not only direct and supervise what we distribute, but the distribution of similar goods in that country must be to our satisfaction. If there is a loaf of bread this big, and we furnish one-tenth of the flour in it, we must approve the rationing system for the whole loaf, and it must be distributed without discrimination. We have control over it, and this is a great responsibility, but it assures us that the relief will go where it is intended, and that the people there will know every day through publicity who it is coming from and how it is being administered, and that the Americans are there and helping.

A representative of one of these countries said to me informally, "If you Americans can be over there and supervise it, that is as important as the relief you furnish." I said, "If we furnish supervision, that will cut down the amount of relief." He said, "The assurance that America is interested while we fight this battle against communism, even when Communists are in our country, even when Communist troops are in our country, would help more than just the relief."

So, I say that when we get this bill fixed up we should pass it. It is good power politics; it is a friendly, decent thing to do; and America must not fail.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Is it not true that this will wind up like most of the other programs, that America will have to pay all of the $610,000,000 instead of $350,000,000?

Mr. VORYS. No; it is not true. Get this straight. Some misstatements have been made, I am sure by mistake, as to whether 57 percent is an allocation by the United Nations or anybody. The United Nations merely got up a $514,000,000 suggestion, and they urged that all countries come in and do whatever they could. We are doing that, and we are assured that our country is going to ask and urge other countries to participate. But there are no allocations at all, and they will not need the whole $610,000,000 to get by.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am interested in the amount and the length of time until this money is spent. Does the gentleman feel that that will eliminate all the hunger and starvation in Europe at that time, that there will be no more hunger, and that our obligation and responsibility will end?

Mr. VORYS. No; it will not. Due to delays caused by Soviet pillage and Soviet obstructionism, and due to delays caused by American maladministration in UNRRA, the whole process has been delayed, but I think another year should see us through.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the statement just made by my good friend from Ohio, who knows I am very fond of him, that mistakes have been made. Certainly I would not even insinuate that any colleague of mine, particularly one of whom I am as fond as I am of him, would intentionally make a mistake that would mislead the House. Yet I realize that, busy as we are, confronted with so many problems both in the House and from our constituents back home, we very frequently do not have time to read a matter through. Consequently I wish to read a paragraph from the same page 81 referred to by my friend a moment ago. In fact, since he declined to yield for that purpose, it will now be necessary for me to read a little more.

On page 81, Colonel Wood, Under Secretary Clayton's deputy, was testifying when I asked him this question relative to the investigation of the need.

I said:

As I recall, Secretary Clayton stated that this study had been in progress 4 months; is that right?

That is, referring to the study of the needs.

Mr. WOOD. Four to six months.

Mr. JARMAN. How many people were engaged in that study?

Mr. WOOD. I would just have to make a guess, but I think at one time or another the people working almost full time on it would perhaps amount to about six.

I would say there were 20 or 30 people involved from time to time just in this country.

Now we have had cables back and forth between all the embassies in these countries and all the agricultural and commercial and financial people in the embassies of these countries have worked from time to time on this. It is almost impossible to give you a categorical answer. It has involved the work of many people spread all over the world.

In addition, of course, we have had the benefit of a great number of surveys. For example, the United Nations sent a subcommittee on devastated areas, on which some of our people were represented, all over these areas. They took about 2 months, I think, for their trip.

It has been an extensive thing. I would say that the people here in Washington who have put all these data together would be six or eight.

Mr. JARMAN. Six or eight in addition to those around the world?

Mr. WOOD. And there have been a lot in the Department of Agriculture. It has not been confined to the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. They were patriotic American citizens who had the interests of this country at heart, were they not?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JARMAN. They were not doing that in the interests of any other country, were they?

Mr. WOOD. I should think not.

Mr. JARMAN. Refresh my memory as to how the 57 percent contribution of ours and the $350,000,000 were arrived at.

Now I come to the sentence quoted by my good friend a moment ago.

Mr. WOOD. The two, of course, are related. We finally came out with a figure for total relief needs of these countries of $610,000,000. This figure of $350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment and in part picked out of the air.

That is the "picked-out-of-the-air" sentence to which my good friend called attention. But let us read on:

We had given 72 percent of the UNRRA funds. We thought it ought to be less because there are many countries, as Mr. Clayton explained, or at least some countries, that have recovered now to the point where they can help on this thing, such as Sweden and Norway. We think we could get more help out of the Argentine, for example.

We thought our proportion ought to be less than 72 percent. We got it down to a figure of 57 percent by considering those various aspects of the situation and applying our judgment to it.

Mr. JARMAN. And the 57 percent makes our $350,000,000? It is 57 percent of the total?

Mr. WOOD. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. Now while it was taken out of the air, as you say, in a way, it was taken out of the air by competent people after 4 months' study?

Mr. WOOD. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. They did not just grab it out of the air, it was taken out of the air by competent people with the interests of this country at heart after mature study?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the author of the minority report which also includes that quotation and which may have misled my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman speaks of Norway, Sweden, and the Argentine as possible contributors. Is there any evidence in the hearings that any consultations were had with these governments and that there is any probability of their contributing?

Mr. JARMAN. I am not sure as to that. The pressure of business of which I spoke necessitated me missing several hours of the hearings, but I ask the gentleman if he heard the testimony that I just read or if he has read it after the hearing.

Mr. JONKMAN. With reference to the thin air?

Mr. JARMAN. When he prepared the minority report.

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes. It is still grabbed out of thin air. I do not care whether 36 people or 1 person does it.

Mr. JARMAN. You put one part of it in and did not refer to the rest? I do not like to refer to a half truth, but you put part of it in and did not refer to the rest?

Mr. JONKMAN. The fact that 36 people grabbed it out of thin air does not make it any the less so than if one person did.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman, of course, is entitled to his opinion. As I said, I am very fond of all three of the gentlemen who signed that minority report; but I am frank to say that I do not think much of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. In the nature of things, it must be to some extent grabbed out of thin air, because it is based on the future. It is a question of estimate, and every estimate is grabbed, to some extent, out of thin air. When you call it an estimate you dignify it. When you say it is grabbed out of thin air you do not. Of course, this is an estimate. There is no question about that.

Mr. JARMAN. By the very nature of things, but what I resent is the quotation of one sentence and the omission of the preceding and following ones.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman from Alabama that although this is an estimate, it is an advised and studied estimate?

Mr. JARMAN. That is the testimony. Not only is it an advised and studied estimate, but I say to the Members of this House and to the people of this country that should we wait until we are able to know exactly what the relief

needs will be in any country, the unfortunate people of those countries would all be dead and long since buried before we could ever bring a bill to this House.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DORN. On line 22 of this bill it is stated that it will be dispensed regardless of political beliefs. I want to know if it is not possible, then, for some guerrilla outfit in Greece or Austria or anywhere else to obtain our money, in order to overthrow the established and legal government existing in that country?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true, if you have no confidence in those of our people who will be supervising the dispensation of the relief. I do not feel that way myself.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the charming lady, my colleague on the committee.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does not the gentleman think he should point out to the gentleman that no money will be given directly to any nation?

Mr. JARMAN. That is quite true. No money will be given. It is all goods or certificates of credit on banks of the United States, to purchase material.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as has been said, the people of America always have been and ever will be humanitarian people, who not only gladly but eagerly respond to the calls of their fellow men for relief when they are suffering. We have witnessed that in the drives for the Red Cross, the Finnish relief, the Greek relief, and numerous other national and international drives. We have witnessed it back in our little towns when the Community Chest put on a drive for relief of the suffering or when someone in a little town such as I live in went around with a subscription list for a particular family which was in distress. It is that sentiment that will continue, I believe, as long as this is a nation, regardless of whether there is adequate investigation or not, which caused our country to take the lead in sponsoring UNRRA. Foreseeing the suffering that would exist in the liberated countries, our country called a conference at Atlantic City, and UNRRA was born.

Now, the fact has been referred to that UNRRA made mistakes. Yes, UNRRA made mistakes, just as any huge, cumbersome international organization, which had to secure its personnel at a time when it was necessary to literally scrape the bottom in order to get personnel, will make mistakes; just as any of us will make mistakes; just as I have pointed out, not many moments ago, that some of our colleagues sometimes make mistakes, and just as they doubtless think I make mistakes. But, on the whole, the part we played in the organization and functioning of UNRRA is something on which this country can, by and large, reflect with pleasurable pride. There is nothing in the large picture to be ashamed of regardless of these mistakes and errors which naturally crept in. UNRRA was not intended to be a permanent organization and it was fully realized that when it concluded there would remain necessity for residual relief; consequently, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization last December took under advisement the matter of furnishing this necessary residual relief—after UNRRA ceased to function. It was decided, as has been said, that this be done on a direct basis, unilaterally in a way, that each country would provide its own relief to the country which it wished to relieve under the supervision of the nationals of that country and with the authority it would possess under those circumstances to throw restrictions around the distribution of this relief which we hope and believe will prevent the mistakes that we learned were made by UNRRA. These restrictions are spelled out in the bill and are such that it is entirely possible that one of the countries which the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi are particularly interested in excluding will not be able to meet these requirements and will not enjoy any of this relief. But we feel that while UNRRA was an international proposition in which we could not unilaterally change the rules of the game here on the floor of the House as was attempted, that now when it is our organization and our money entirely, our relief, that as to our part of it we have the right to make the rules and that if the governments of the countries receiving the relief are unwilling to meet the requirements we stipulate in advance that is all we can do and that if any of their nationals starve or suffer because of their unwillingness to meet those requirements, having done our best, we can only be sorry and relief will not be continued, as has been stated so well by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, in countries which refrain from doing so.

What will be the result in many areas if additional relief is not furnished? Food stores will be completely exhausted very soon and inroads will soon occur on seed stocks, seriously threatening future harvests and producing chaos and general conditions quite unpleasant to contemplate. Certainly, it would not be to our advantage to take action which would require starving people to eat the seed which by being planted, can place them on their feet and cause relief to be unnecessary in the future. Even delay will greatly undermine the humanitarian work already done.

Do not overlook the fact that it is contemplated to furnish only the basic essentials of life primarily food, medicine, seed and fertilizers. No reconstruction or rehabilitation whatever is intended. It is hoped that after this program all countries, for the relief of which it is being sponsored, will be self-sustaining with the possible exception of Austria.

I wish to emphasize the fact that specific amounts for the various countries are deliberately not stated or determined. One of the lessons of UNRRA was that when even a tentative allocation to a certain country occurred, that country expected to receive the full amount and felt that it was being mistreated if such did not occur. This was true despite such excellent reasons for a reduction as better crops in the country, lack of supplies or inadequate transportation. It is but natural for hungry people, and particularly starving people, to look rather graspingly on food which they believe has been promised them. As I say, restrictions have been thrown about this relief. If they are not complied with, the President or the Congress can discontinue it to a given country at any time. It is undoubtedly much preferable not to stipulate definite amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, while it is of course the right of any Member of this body to introduce an amendment at any time he wishes, I desire to emphasize and thoroughly agree with the statement made by our great chairman in reference to the deliberations and hearings on this bill. I have read the amendments which will be proposed. I say to you advisedly and after mature consideration that every single one of them was considered by the committee and every single one, at least a majority of them, which came to a vote in the committee was rejected, generally by a rather large vote and not by a partisan vote, for there were Democrats and Republicans voting against each amendment. I agree particularly with the reference by our great chairman, that lovable and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, to what I believe he said was the tortuousness of these hearings, because we went into exhaustive testimony on all these matters much of which was frankly repetitious. Under those circumstances, my friends, while any Member has the right to advance amendments, it seems to me it is not only the right of his colleagues in the House but I think they also have some kind of duty to vote those amendments down about as rapidly as they are brought up; and I believe I can speak for the Democratic side in indulging the hope that such will occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am against House Joint Resolution 153 in its present form and I felt constrained to join in supplemental views on this measure.

The heart of America has always responded to distressed humanity wherever found but it seems to me the time has come when we must blend humanity with common sense. It is not as though the people of our country have not gladly given more than their share to help a distraught world, but the time is fast approaching when the best way we can aid the world is to prove to everyone concerned that democracy will work here at home by keeping this country strong and economically sound.

Let us examine the record. Because of the war it was necessary for us to make vast expenditures until our national debt reached the astronomical figures of $279,000,000,000. We furnished to our allies during the war over $35,000,000,000 under lend-lease. According to the Spe-

cial Committee of the House on Postwar Economy and Planning, since the war, we have made loans and credits available to foreign countries amounting to over $17,000,000,000. In addition we have furnished through UNRRA almost $3,000,000,000 for relief. This does not take into account the hundreds of millions we have spent for the same purpose through the military in occupied territories not only during but since the war.

In view of these facts it might be well to pause and examine what is proposed to be done under this bill.

A BLANK CHECK

This bill would authorize an expenditure of $350,000,000 anywhere in the world and without a break-down as to the specific amount for any particular country. So far as the House is concerned, outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Members must rely on the mere statement of the State Department that they would use this authorization in countries where they deem it desirable and in the amounts they consider advisable.

This is blank-check legislation and cannot be justified. There should be named in the bill the countries as well as the amount of assistance each is to receive. It is argued that by so doing you would lead those countries to believe we have made definite commitments to provide the full amount under any and all circumstances. However, it is to be noted the bill provides that relief may be stopped instantly if certain conditions are not complied with by the recipient countries; and it is also within the power of the President to determine the actual needs of a country from time to time. So I do not believe such an argument is valid. But by placing such designations and limitations in the bill it would give the necessary assurance to Congress that relief is only going to be given to those countries that have justified the need, and not in excess of the amount stated in the bill for a particular country.

SECRECY

Most of the important testimony on this bill was given to our committee in executive or secret session. There was furnished us a secret document in which the foreign relief needs for 1947 were estimated for specific countries and the justification for such a program. This secret document is not to be confused with another secret document furnished the committee in justification of the Turkish-Greek program.

I believe my colleagues in the House, outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, should have access to the facts disclosed in this secret document and secret evidence so that they can base their decision on the same evidence that was presented to our committee. The public is entitled to the facts. If this program will not stand upon its own merits in the light of day, and cannot be justified by public testimony disclosing just what is to be done, I do not believe such a program is deserving of our support.

THE BILL FURNISHES MORE THAN FOOD

This bill asks us to authorize $350,000,000 for relief purposes. An estimate was made for relief requirements for 1947 in certain countries which amounted to about $610,000,000. Out of thin air the State Department determined the United States should furnish 57 percent of this amount or approximately $350,000,000, and other countries should furnish the remainder.

May I say at this point there is no evidence that other countries will furnish the remaining 43 percent of the relief necessary, but on the contrary there is reason to believe this amount will not be forthcoming.

The American people have been led to believe this program is purely a food program to relieve the starving people of Europe. A cursory examination of the bill will disclose that besides food there is to be furnished coal, textiles, and other products for agricultural rehabilitation. I have no quarrel with these objectives. I merely desire to call attention to the fact the relief to be furnished by this bill goes farther than just food.

On what basis were the relief needs fixed at $610,000,000? According to Under Secretary Clayton's testimony, estimates were based on "imports required to provide the basic essentials of life and to prevent economic retrogression which threatens the supply of these basic essentials." The $610,000,000 therefore represents, in the countries under consideration, the deficits or the difference between the costs of necessary imports for all purposes and the value of their exports and other available assets for the current year 1947.

For example in order to prevent Italy from "retrogressing" it is not only necessary to import food but also such items as oil, seed, cotton, wool, cellulose, jute, rags, hides, lumber, pig iron, scrap iron, steel, copper, nickel, industrial chemicals, rubber, machinery, etc. So while we are in fact furnishing food to Italy for relief purposes under this bill, by doing so we release sufficient of her foreign exchange to permit her to purchase essential consumer goods, raw materials and other equipment to help rehabilitate herself. If for example Italy's necessary imports for all purposes for 1947 were $950,000,000 and her exports were $800,000,000 then she would have a deficit of $150,000,000 of which we would furnish 57 percent. Again, I have no quarrel with this objective if we understand what we are doing in this bill, but it would be just as logical to say we are going to furnish Italy these other items that are essential, exclusive of food, so that Italy would therefore have sufficient exchange to purchase her own food. It is a case of six of one and a half a dozen of the other.

THE AMOUNT IS EXCESSIVE

According to Mr. Hoover's testimony there is available in the United States out of the present crop year only $125,000,000 worth of agricultural products which can be used for the purpose of relief. There was some dispute as to this amount. There was other testimony that estimated the supplies available for this year as $296,000,000—including the new crop—but in no case did the estimate disclose $350,000,000 worth of food would be available for this purpose.

The State Department apparently contemplates the $350,000,000 to be used through the first half of 1948—the termination date of this bill. President Truman, however, in his message to the Congress recommending this appropriation, stated:

> The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

He also recognized there would not be an immediate need for $350,000,000 because he placed in his 1947 budget only $100,000,000 for this purpose, and placed the other $250,000,000 in the 1948 budget.

No human being is in a position to know at this time what supplies will be available after the next crop year. This depends on conditions beyond human control. Because of the fact there is not $350,000,000 of supplies available this year, and this amount is not needed for relief this year, it might be well that we cut down the authorization at this time to an amount more commensurate with the initial need. Then after a spot check as to this year's crop and after the needs are determined for next year, the Congress could authorize additional appropriations early in 1948, if at that time it is justified by the evidence.

Another plan has been suggested that we authorize the full amount at this time but make immediately available only the amount that would be necessary for the relief load this year. The remainder of the authorization would be available only after the approval of a joint committee of this Congress appointed by the Speaker and the President of the Senate. At least these two alternatives are worthy of serious consideration by the House because it is very easy to allow our humanitarian instincts to be prodigal with the taxpayers' money.

SHOULD THIS ASSISTANCE BE REPAID

Mr. Hoover, probably the world's greatest authority on relief assistance, believes the program we are undertaking should be repaid. He suggested a practical method how this could be done without in any way crippling the recovery of the recipient countries. His suggestion was that they agree to pay for this aid by placing a tax of 5 or 10 percent on all exports from the debtor country to be paid for in the currency of the countries which receive such exports, and these payments should not begin for 2 or 3 years hence. In addition Mr. Hoover felt that these payments should be made before reparations were paid by any of the recipient countries.

I offered an amendment in committee which in substance provided for such an export tax but received very little support. It is apparent it is the determination of a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee that we continue to give relief all over the world at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

SHOULD WE GIVE FOOD RELIEF TO COUNTRIES DOMINATED BY THE SOVIET?

We are told it is our obligation to furnish food and relief to countries which we occupy. That is the reason we must assume this obligation in Austria and Germany. On the other hand, our ally, Russia, apparently is not asked to fulfill

a similar obligation in countries she occupies or completely dominates. This in spite of the fact Russia is spending huge amounts for armament, occupies the regions which are the bread basket of Europe, and has stripped those areas of the means to provide for themselves. Why should we furnish food to countries where the Soviet have forced the peasants to deliver to them grain under the worst imaginable conditions. Because of our humane instincts we are expected to relieve famine which is, to a considerable extent, the consequence of the coerced economy imposed on the helpless people of eastern Europe by Russia.

While it is very "hush-hush" that the purpose of this bill is not entirely altruistic and is not confined to feeding starving men, women, and children in devastated countries, it is obvious that one of the primary purposes for doing so is to try to win these people away from Soviet domination and to assist those who honestly believe in the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations. I not only think we should recognize this fact but should support it openly.

I, however, see little hope of accomplishing anything in this regard with our relief program in Poland under its present puppet government, dominated and controlled by Russia. In making this statement I am fully aware of the millions of loyal, patriotic Poles who will fight to the death if given the opportunity to remove the yoke of tyranny that Russia has now imposed upon them, but to give aid under existing circumstances would simply shift the burden of relief from the shoulders of Russia to our own, and, I am afraid, would foster Sovietization, as has so often been done in the past, under UNRRA, by liquidating the very ones we desire to help.

The situation is somewhat more hopeful for helping the cause of freedom in Hungary if we should give her assistance, but you cannot blink away the fact the only reason relief is needed today in Hungary is because Russia is currently demanding $23,000,000 a year reparations from that country including huge quantities of food. Are we at taxpayers' expense expected to supply relief needs to Hungary so that she will be able to pay reparations to our ally Russia?

NOT SUFFICIENT RESTRICTIONS IN THE BILL

Mr. Hoover, after careful consideration, suggested eight or nine restrictions to be put into this bill for the protection of this country, including the appointment of a relief administrator under the President. Amendment after amendment was offered in committee carrying out these and other suggestions but most all of them were opposed by the State Department. According to their viewpoint we are expected to have faith they will do an efficient job as they do not wish to be bound even by reasonable limitations. From my experience I definitely feel we must spell out in this bill the necessary conditions and limitations which we desire if they are to be carried out.

CONCLUSION

I have repeatedly pointed out that I am in full sympathy with the objective of this bill. No one wants to let people starve. Everybody wants the United States to do its full share. But I again urge while we have this bill before the House we try to make it a constructive piece of legislation which will accomplish its objective with a minimum disturbance to the financial structure of this country, and with restrictions which will assure its administration along sound and economical lines.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I notice I have carried this blue document up here inadvertently, but I will put it down on this table where I will not look at it, because it contains part of the secret testimony our committee received. We had 12 days of hearings. Six days of the hearings are included in this meticulous blue document which means nobody can read them except members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, nobody can speak about them except the members of the State Department who gave them to us, including State Department press releases from Moscow, from Washington, from New York, from Philadelphia, whenever the spirit moves State Department officials to speak. However, I shall turn this document face down so nobody will be disturbed about what we know in reference to this bill and are unable to reveal to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk now about the legislation before us. I find myself in much the same position as the gentleman from Ohio. I am going to support this legislation. I voted for it in committee. I believe that America should undertake its fair share of the responsibility of feeding a hungry, wartorn, and distressed world. I certainly cannot get myself in that marvelous state of happy complacency, however, of the gentleman from Alabama, who preceded me, when he said, "Do not change it, do not dot an 'i' or cross a 't'; this is the finished product. Rise to your patriotic obligation and turn amendments down as fast they come up."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I am going to indulge in the thought that the gentleman misunderstood me, because I did not mean to infer that any legislation at any time is absolutely perfect. All legislation is the result of compromise. What I did try to infer was that this legislation had very careful consideration and study in committee, that the majority of the committee had brought forth what the majority thought was the best it could produce. Under such circumstances I do not consider this floor the proper place in which to write legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have the statement of his modified position. Probably I did not understand the gentleman and I shall therefore solicit his support for some of my amendments which I think are very necessary if we are going to perfect this bill as much as we should.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. I have a question that is troubling me and I trust the gentleman will discuss it as he goes along in his talk. I have it from sources which I consider unimpeachable that in Greece today the casinos are filled, that they have been redecorated and refurnished, that the people are in them 24 hours a day spending more money than they have spent in years.

Mr. MUNDT. Probably they are well-paid UNRRA employees.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, there are poor people in Greece. There have always been poor people in Greece. I gather from the discussion here this morning that part of this money will go to Greece. I am also informed that in Greece they have a practice that has been in effect over a long period of years that every time there is a change in regime all of the army officers are retired, and they are retired at a certain stipulated pay; also that if any government worker files a statement or an affidavit that he has two more relatives dependent on him he is given an increase.

Mr. MUNDT. May I interject to observe that I wish the gentleman's unimpeachable source had been a little more short-winded because he is going to take a lot of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. They file this statement and they get an addition to their pay. The thing that troubles me is, What are the countries themselves, for instance, Greece, doing to meet the problem which is facing their nation through starvation? Are they doing what they can do? I would like that matter clarified somewhere along in this debate and also as it applies to other nations.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be glad to answer the question insofar as it pertains to Greece and in so far as my knowledge makes it possible to do so. I was a member of the congressional committee which inspected the UNRRA operations in Greece late in 1945, and am happy to report that of the four countries in which we inspected the operations of UNRRA—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Greece—that it was only in Greece that we found UNRRA doing a commendable and respectable job. We found there a very shaky and uncertain Greek Government, but it was cooperating with UNRRA splendidly and it was taking the steps that it had available to feed its own population. I do not doubt a bit but what the casinos are filled with people who want to speculate on the roll of the dice. Probably a great many of those casino attendants are American employees of the UNRRA mission and other people who are abroad with American currency as well as people from foreign countries and some of the wealthy Greeks themselves. I know nothing about whether they change the army officers every time they change kings, but if they do, pretty soon there will be no more taxpayers, no more privates, and everybody will be a retired army officer, because they are changing kings awfully fast in Greece. So, I think eventually the retirement system would defeat itself.

I think your main worry should be directed to the Greco-Turkish aid bill, which deals with the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. This does not pretend to deal with internal affairs except to bar the extension of relief to countries which are trying to play politics with it. We are not undertaking to analyze their tax system or their system of representative government beyond that point in this particular legislation. I think that the Members of the House who we hope are going to support this legislation, and who I hope are going to attend the debate and the amendments under the 5-minute rule, will pay close attention so that they can correct this legislation, because if Congress fails to write its will into this legislation and if Congress fails to assume its responsibility for helping to make it more operative, and if Congress fails to measure up to its responsibility as a coordinate branch of Government to work its will on this law, it will simply be because the Members of Congress have not measured up to their opportunities here. I am convinced that the arguments presented partly by the people who signed the minority report and partly by others are so convincing that you will realize that unless you want to become a blank-check Congressman, there are modifications which must be made in this legislation if it is to be made completely effective.

Let me say, first of all, this is not an UNNRA bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was entirely off base when he talked about this in terms of UNRRA. It is not at all an UNRRA bill. There were three glaring weaknesses in UNRRA which this bill corrects, in addition to the fact, of course, that under UNRRA we found it administered by political hacks who did very little about the human philosophy which UNRRA was intended to cope with. Every time a "lame duck" crossed the State line of New York he got a job or an administrative position with UNRRA, and we got the kind of people you might expect, who were rejected by the electorate of New York State.

I want to say in the first place, then, a unilateral approach has been provided in this bill, and that was not true of UNRRA. I attended in Yugoslavia a business meeting of UNRRA in which they were speaking some 16 different languages, and it took them all morning to get through a motion to adjourn and get it interpreted so that everybody understood what the motion was.

Now that feature has been abandoned. This is an American project, conducted unilaterally. It will work out helpfully or harmfully, depending on the type of its administration and the attention that Congress gives to writing in appropriate safeguards when it comes to the amendments suggested. It is an American effort, and it will enhance our reputation abroad or it will detract from it in conformity with the manner in which this legislation is enacted and administered.

The second step is that the House of Representatives has at different times under UNRRA passed amendments which required free access of reporters, newspaper people, and radio folks to report back the operations of UNRRA. It was called the free-press amendment, you will recall, offered once, I believe, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and once by an author whose name I cannot recall just at the moment. I do know I was among those vigorously supporting both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. This bill includes the free-press provision. It is one of the provisions of this bill.

The third place where this legislation is an improvement over UNRRA is that UNRRA did not enforce any provisions against using its supplies for political purposes. I have in my office a letter from a lady in Warsaw, for example, complaining that in Poland she and her family could not get any relief supplies because they did not belong to the Communist Party, and under UNRRA relief was being used for political purposes. Wherever the Communists had control of the government they took the UNRRA supplies, which were paid for to the extent of 72 percent by us, and used them to condemn America and to promote communism. We can, if we will, as Members of Congress, write into this bill provisions which will make that impossible. Some weak and fluid language is now included. We can make it emphatic and direct and effective. If we fail to do so, we should not complain of the results.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman, for whom I have the greatest respect, not only because of what he has seen but from his study of these problems, can give us any assurance that this political group of UNRRA, as far as our end is concerned, what we furnish to them from our people, will not be administering most of this program.

Mr. MUNDT. That is something to which I think Congress should devote its attention. Already rumors have reached this committee that some more of these political hacks and lame ducks from New York are to be placed on the administrative staff of this bill. I think Congress should write something into the legislation in the way of the amendments I now propose to discuss which would make that impossible.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As to the information that may come out under the provision in the bill that there shall be a free exchange of information, does the gentleman believe that kind of information can be obtained from the present Polish Government? Is there not still an iron curtain in that country?

Mr. MUNDT. I doubt very much that relief can reach the right people in Poland, but I think if the House will adopt an amendment which I propose to offer we can put in provisions which would make it impossible for this bill to give relief to Poland unless the Government there meets provisions which would distribute this relief without political prejudice or personal bias.

I want to discuss briefly some more amendments I should like to have this body consider pretty seriously before acting favorably on the legislation. The first is this:

At the present time, if this thing is a failure and a fizzle and a flop, no Member of Congress under the bill the way it is now written will know at whom to point the finger of responsibility. The administration of this is scattered all over the lot. President Truman sent former President Hoover abroad to study the bill and report back to Congress, to advise it. His first recommendation was, if you are going to pass this bill you must have a relief administrator who can be held responsible. An amendment will be offered to follow Mr. Hoover's recommendation on this point. I hope it will be looked upon with favor.

Incidentally the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said Mr. Hoover was sent by President Truman to investigate the situation. He came back and he favored it.

He said, "Oh, he made one or two suggestions."

My friends, if you will look at page 54 of the printed hearings you will see that former President Hoover made nine specific suggestions and what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] was talking about was the fact that the committee seriously considered one or two of them before rejecting all of them. That is what he was referring to. But Mr. Hoover did make nine specific suggestions. I hope this House will treat them more graciously than did our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss the other amendments as they are presented to the House for its consideration.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, why do some countries still need help? Within a few weeks the last shipments of UNRRA supplies will leave our shores for the needy people of Europe. The program of that great agency which did so much to bind up the wounds of Europe after the war will be grinding to a stop. I say of that great agency because it was the first international organization in the United Nations. I say great agency because I think it did a perfectly magnificent piece of work.

I do not say that certain funds were not abused, not only by Russia, as has been mentioned here, but they were abused in Greece also. But we could not expect a program of the enormity of the UNRRA program carried out free from all abuse; just as in our relief programs at home with our own people where we speak one language and where we know one another, there have been certain abuses.

The question is: Did the abuses outweigh the good that was done? I think an objective estimate of the job accomplished by UNRRA adds up to the answer—no. I think an objective estimate adds up to the answer that if we had not

had UNRRA there would be chaos in the world today. Maybe we think we have troubles today, but if we had not gone into the war-devastated countries that were literally in ashes, running with blood where the people were exhausted, and where community services had been completely disrupted and transportation no longer existed, where businesses had been blown apart—if we had not gone in with a program of the scope and vision of the UNRRA program, we would not be at the place where we could even contemplate a going concern in Europe in the immediate future.

At this point I pay my respects to the two heads of the UNRRA undertaking—one, Gov. Herbert Lehman, former governor of New York State for 10 long years, and a distinguished public servant. I wish to pay my respects to Fiorella LaGuardia, mayor of New York City for 12 long years, a distinguished public servant and former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I should be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Reference was made to "lame ducks." Does the gentlewoman recall that Governor Lehman was ever defeated in running for the office of Governor of the State of New York, or for any other office?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentlewoman recall that Mayor LaGuardia was ever defeated in running for mayor of the city of New York?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not. Both of those gentlemen were not only capable of understanding the program which they were charged with heading, but they contributed much to the solid achievement accomplished under UNRRA. UNRRA's resources were not unlimited, even though they were greater than three and one-half billion dollars. This is now known to have been insufficient to meet the total relief needs of a number of liberated countries. The job of relief is not quite finished. When UNRRA was first established, it had to determine which countries seeking relief really needed it. This depended not only upon the need for food or clothing and other relief supplies, but also upon the ability of the country to finance the importation of sufficient supplies to supplement its indigenous resources. Some of the UNRRA receiving countries are back on their feet, but others still do not have the foreign exchange to purchase the imports essential to the well-being of their people. It is entirely a problem of the availability of sufficient foreign exchange to finance the necessary foreign imports. If a country does not have adequate foreign exchange, or if its foreign exchange is barely adequate and will be exhausted by purchasing foods for the minimum needs during the next 6 months, they are considered eligible for relief.

The only method whereby starvation and political and economic chaos can be avoided is for those nations which have the strength to do so to make those supplies available without charge, or, conversely, to make the necessary foreign exchange available without reimbursement.

In other words, if a country has very limited foreign exchange, and they have to use all that foreign exchange simply to buy food to keep them from starving, or a little cotton or a little coal, and they are not able to use that money to rebuild their bridges, to rebuild their roads, to rebuild their factories, they never can get back on their feet. Their last resources run out. Finally they are right up against a wall. What we propose to do here is to help those countries which do not have foreign exchange; to give them the necessities of life so that they can get back on their feet; so that there will be an end of this relief program—this direct relief program. There will be other programs under the United Nations, but this direct giving of food, this direct giving of the bare essentials of life, we hope, will be finished.

If the nations which have enough fail to make supplies available without charge, those countries which are still unable to finance their minimum essential imports will face a grave crisis between now and the time when their summer harvests will become available for consumption. The peoples of those countries have been undernourished for so many years, and for the last 18 months have had so little from the bare minimum rations needed for subsistence, that they cannot physically stand 6 months' submarginal feeding. Many will actually starve. Many others will become the prey of disease, and still others will become permanently weakened.

The United States has taken an active lead up to the present time in restoring these people to normal health. We cannot, in good conscience, drop them at this point, when a little further effort on our part over a period of months we hope will complete the job which we have undertaken.

Someone asked a little while ago, Was there a guaranty that the job would be completed in 6 months? Of course there is no absolute guaranty, but estimates at the moment indicate that the need for direct relief will come to an end under this program. I would like to point out that the children's program is still to be presented to Congress.

The best evidence currently available indicates that Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Poland will each, in some measure, need further relief during the calendar year 1947, and particularly before the crops are harvested and become available for immediate consumption. It is anticipated also that China may have emergency needs for food imports, to prevent suffering and starvation in certain areas, and some financial assistance may be required for this purpose.

How was the program that we are asked to vote on arrived at? In this last session of the General Assembly the nations of the world agreed that after the UNRRA pipe lines ran out there would be short-term residual relief needs, of approximately 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The United States took the position in the General Assembly that we did not want to continue UNRRA. The reason we took that position was that Congress had made it pretty clear that they did not want to continue UNRRA. For the same reason the United States took the position that we did not want to continue this residual period of relief under an international organization. The United States and Great Britain in the General Assembly and in committee No. 2 urged that further relief be carried on for the next 6 months on a unilateral basis. Every other nation was against such an approach to relief, but because the United States is the great contributor in the world you can see that that put the other nations in a rather embarrassing position. The reason they were against the unilateral approach was because they feared an organizational departure from the United Nations pattern. They feared this pattern might set a dangerous precedent; but finally the nations voted unanimously to carry on the 6 months' needed relief in the unilateral manner proposed by the United States and Great Britain.

Last December the General Assembly of the United Nations appointed a committee of experts to estimate the relief needs of all the liberated areas. This committee met in January on a number of occasions and finally arrived at the estimate of $583,000,000 as the minimum all-over relief requirements of the liberated areas of Europe; but our own State Department, after exhaustive studies of the figures, concluded that the total need to meet these requirements would amount to $610,000,000 from the end of UNRRA shipments until the end of 1947.

They believe that no further assistance will be required in any country except Austria. It is pretty well understood that even after the 6 months' period is over Austria may need some more help.

The needs for each country are arrived at by estimating the minimum import requirements in the light of local supplies available based upon minimum feeding ration for the population and the furnishing of other bare essentials. The foreign-exchange resources in each country are then investigated to determine how much of the essential imports each country can finance without foreign assistance and without depleting its foreign exchange to a point at which it would exhaust itself in caring for its immediate requirements.

As I have said, the conclusion of the State Department, which presented detailed facts and figures on this matter in the Foreign Affairs Committee, is that the total relief needs of the liberated areas which must be financed from foreign sources amount to $610,000,000.

How did we arrive at our share? The administration has requested Congress to authorize $350,000,000 as the United

States contribution to the total relief needs. It figures out that the United States contribution is 57 percent. You will remember that we contributed twice in UNRRA and that each time we contributed 1 percent of our national income other members of UNRRA also contributed 1 percent of their national income.

You have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] tell you that the contributions made to UNRRA came to 99 percent of the total obligation. By reason of the fact that the United States was not damaged during the war and was hurt as a result of the war very little by comparison with other nations of the world, by reason of the fact that our wealth is so much vaster than all the other countries put together, our 1 percent to UNRRA constituted 72 percent of the total resources of that organization.

Now, during the year and a half since the end of the war other nations have recovered in considerable degree from the ravages they suffered. It is hoped that not only those countries which contributed to the UNRRA program but perhaps some of those countries which were greatly helped through the UNRRA program may be able to help now in this last 6 months of relief which is needed. We do not know. The reason we do not know and the reason nobody can answer that question on this floor is that having decided in the General Assembly that the unilateral approach to relief was best, the program was deliberately left in a more or less loose state among the nations of the world with each one pledged to contribute what they could.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman four additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, each country was to go home and try to find out what they could contribute. The United States does not have to give a red cent to this program. We have not said definitely that we would give three hundred and fifty million but we have implied that we would make our contribution. It was a gentleman's agreement. We do not know what the other countries will give. It was not as though we sat around a table and agreed that each country would give a certain percentage of its income.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentlewoman was one of our delegates to the United Nations Assembly. The United Nations Technical Committee made this study and gave the figures to the world as to the needs of each of the countries. Can the gentlewoman tell us why the United States cannot make its study of the needs of the countries public to the world, why it must be kept secret even though the United Nations has made a similar study and released it to the entire world?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Yes. I can tell the gentleman what the State Department told us and to me it makes sense. Maybe it does not make sense to the gentleman from Ohio. There is quite a difference between estimates arrived at by the United Nations experts and the estimates arrived at by one government.

The United Nations experts were picked from different parts of the world to estimate the relief needs of the world. Now it is up to us and others able to do so to meet these relief needs as best we can. We propose to contribute $350,000,000. We do not propose to say to Poland, "You will have so much," and to Austria, "You will have so much," and to Italy, "You will have so much." That is why we have not broken down the $350,000,000 figure.

Why? Because a few countries are still in desperate need. When we talk about relief needs for another 6 months we are not talking about getting the people of these countries to a place where they live on caviar and champagne. We are talking about getting them on their feet so they can begin to do a good day's work.

If in Italy, for instance, they have a harvest which would make it look as though Italy would not need as much as we planned to give her and we could give an additional amount to Austria because Austria might then be in greater need than Italy, we should be free to do so. If we had published a definite figure for Italy, the Italians would have counted on that exact amount no matter what the conditions, and there would be tremendous resentment. It is very understandable that this should be so—we are not talking about people who are living on the fat of the land.

If we were to suggest that the Italians are a little better off than the Austrians, and therefore we are going to reduce our aid to Italy, I assure you this decision would not be greeted happily. We are talking about people living at levels that are low, so terribly low that to refuse food for the reason that somebody else is more miserable is not appealing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not think there is any division of opinion as to trying to help those people who are in need, but how about the governments themselves that perhaps will ask for the money and which governments might spend large sums on military establishments within the boundaries of their own country. Should we help them? Is that a condition of the bill?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think that would be a condition embodied in an agreement between ourselves and countries receiving relief; we do not propose giving relief to any country that might be spending money on military establishments or equipment.

THE TYPES OF RELIEF SUPPLIES

The bulk of whatever funds the United States contributes to post-UNRRA relief will, of course, be expended for the purchase of foodstuffs, particularly grains, fats, and meats here. However, there are certain other supplies which are essential even to a bare minimum relief job. These include medical supplies of which all the liberated areas are very deficient; seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides which are urgently needed for summer and fall planting. It is also necessary that a very small amount of fuel be imported into some of the receiving countries since otherwise they will be unable to make adequate use of their transportation facilities and of farm machinery for producing and moving food supplies. Every failure on the part of one of these countries to utilize fully its available resources in such equipment and machinery will add to the total food imports that will be essential to avoid submarginal feeding and to avoid undue exposure to the weather where clothing is in extremely short supply. For the same reason it is anticipated that either clothing will be required or some cotton should be supplied to the textile mills of some of these countries in order that they may manufacture the clothing which they so badly need.

RELIEF IS BASIC TO INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Regardless of what policy we may now or hereafter decide upon in relation to the various countries of Europe, not only the liberated areas but others as well, if we fail to furnish the basic relief supplies to the liberated areas we shall inevitably find that the resultant unrest and chaos in those countries will nullify our best efforts to implement our foreign policies. We can consider what additional economic and political action we may desire to take, but if the liberated areas which are still in need of relief degenerate into political and economic chaos because the people do not have the bare essentials of life, we will soon find that the disease is contagious and will spread over much of the rest of the world. Such an effect could destroy all our best attempts to restore normal trade and to establish strong democratic governments. The needy countries look to us for assistance knowing as they do that we have more with which to aid them than all the rest of the world combined. If we fail them our influence in those countries will be permanently shattered and we will be looked upon with increasing distrust by other nations. Thus, for our own personal advantage as well as for the noblest humanitarian reasons, we cannot afford to shirk the relief job which faces us today.

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT TO RELIEF

The bill which has been reported out embodies a number of conditions which must be agreed to by any country before it can receive the benefits of the United States contribution. Further conditions will be covered in agreements which the State Department proposes to negotiate with each country before it can receive relief. Each receiving country must promise to distribute supplies obtained from us in an equitable manner and without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief. Each country must provide for effective price control and effective rationing. Local funds received from the sale of relief supplies shall be set aside in a special fund and utilized for such other relief purposes as may be agreed upon between the receiving government and the United States Government. Another requirement is that officials of our Government

and representatives of the press and radio shall have freedom to observe distribution and to report fully concerning it, and that the receiving government shall make available to us upon request full information concerning its indigenous resources and its imports from other sources. It may not export any supplies similar to those which we are sending in. It must give full publicity and credit to the United States for its assistance so that the people will know we have not abandoned them in their hour of need. The United States could, and we are assured by the Under Secretary of State would, stop all shipments immediately if any serious abuses should occur. It is thus apparent that in this bill full recognition is given to the need for assuring the proper utilization of relief supplies.

We cannot fail in this critical hour to pass this bill which is so basic to the creation of the kind of a world in which we want to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, Representatives of agricultural districts all over the country are tremendously interested in the far-reaching effects of the relief bill now pending before the House. A group of California Representatives recently met with representatives of agricultural producers in California and thoroughly discussed this entire subject of food for foreign relief. We believe that particular emphasis should be given to former President Hoover's recommendations that in addition to simply providing food, the necessity for an adequately balanced diet is also essential. I am sure that the interested Government departments are not overlooking this question but there are a few points that I believe should be brought out at this time.

It is the feeling of California agricultural district Representatives that in the administration of purchasing of foodstuffs for all foreign relief by all agencies, consideration should be given to domestic economic effects. It is recognized that the expenditure of funds made available should be with a view to providing the utmost of nutrition for needy peoples. In modification of this, it is, however, urged that since the wherewithal proceeds from the bounty of this Nation, careful consideration should be given to domestic economic effects.

Insofar as practicable, purchasing agencies should consult—should, in fact, voluntarily and jointly set up a coordinating committee including representation from the Department of Agriculture. Requirements should be carefully studied and valued in terms of domestic economic effects. Whereas purchasing heretofore for relief by UNRRA and under current policy, by the Army and other agencies, has been and is concentrated on certain basic commodities such as wheat and other cereals, lentils, fats and oils, milk products, and meat, continued observance of this policy may unduly inflate prices and may influence production of other commodities unfortunately. It is suggested that through such coordinating agency as is suggested, consideration should be given to domestic economic effects with a view to avoidance of undue inflation of values of certain basic foodstuffs, and that at the same time consideration be given to certain other commodities in bountiful supply having nutritive value reasonably approaching that of the basic essential heretofore enumerated.

It is suggested that whereas the War Department and the State Department may be authorized and may be very properly concerned for the investment of relief funds in the acquisition of the utmost nutritive value, the Department of Agriculture under current statutes has a certain obligation to the agriculture of the Nation. Certain funds are made available to the Department in support of price levels for certain basic commodities. Certain other more limited funds—section 32—are made available for price support for a wide range of agricultural production.

Insofar as some commodities may become available in such bountiful supply as to unduly depress prices and threaten disaster to producers, and insofar as such supplies may have any fair adaptation to relief uses, and may incidentally have enjoyed export outlets under normal conditions, it is respectfully suggested that purchase for relief may avoid impending undue deflation of values.

Although the caloric value of investment for relief purposes may not in every case be quite comparable to investment in wheat even at current values, the cost to this Government may be much less than the latter cost of making good the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to support prices.

In another sense it is suggested that the vast investment which this country must make in winning the peace and sustaining a sufficient segment of the world under the system of democracy which will permit our continued enjoyment of the institutions we cherish, must be regulated and coordinated in a fashion comparable to that which applied to the recent greater investment in the wasteful purposes of war. These influences threaten the stability of the capitalistic profit-and-loss system on which our type of democracy depends for its existence.

Whereas the productive capacity of this Nation finally won World Wars I and II for this Nation and its allies, the same productive capacity must now be made available and applied to the winning of the peace. Consideration must be given to economic stabilization.

Members from the great agricultural Midwest, from the grazing lands, from industrial areas, in fact, Members of the Congress generally, should have concern for avoidance of economic disclocation. The world program today calls for an extraordinary direct expenditure by our Government and indirectly from funds loaned or otherwise made available by our Government, largely concentrated on foodstuffs. Price of foodstuffs more than anything tends to determine through labor and otherwise the domestic inflationary trend. Certainly our suggestion for avoidance of dislocations through a studied application of this purchasing power should command support from Congress.

We do not recommend a spread of the investment to provide luxuries but as we consider the national program of investment, loans, and beneficence which may amount to billions over the period of a few years, we do suggest the broadest possible application in the reinvestment in the products of this Nation.

We do not recommend that our Government take over purchasing for foreign government missions, but that in connection with a coordination of its own procurement program steps should be taken to coordinate the activities of foreign agencies.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes UNRRA residual relief for such countries as the administration may select in the sum of $350,000,000, to be distributed up to June 1948.

It is an administration bill. It seems to come to the Congress as "must" legislation. In other words, innocuous amendments are permissible. But the sum to be authorized, the term of the duration of the relief, and the countries and peoples to receive relief, as well as the nature and extent of that relief, apparently are matters the Congress must not inquire about and upon which it is not competent to pass judgment. These things the State Department apparently knows best.

I am sure that most of us would like to be able to believe that. The administration has had an intimate experience in and with UNRRA for 2 years since VE-day. It should be able to present facts and figures that would carry conviction with them, and make the needed legislation simple for the Congress. But I am apprehensive that such is not the case.

The original bill in its preamble states that—

> Whereas for humanitarian reasons and in order to promote healthy economic conditions abroad which are essential to the security and economic well-being of the United States and of the world, the Government of the United States desires to assist in the furnishing of such relief: Therefore—

And so forth. This could well support the presumption of the administration that for any Member of Congress to oppose this legislation would mean that he was wanting in humanitarian instincts and indifferent to the security and economic well-being of the United States, and that, therefore, there would be no opposition to the administration's promoting healthy economic conditions abroad. They did that through UNRRA—67 cranes at $20,000 each and 5 or 6 bulldozers at $10,000 each, most of which were never used, and so forth. That is the way UNRRA gave relief to starving people.

However, the problem is not so simple as that.

The American people have a deep sympathy for the seriously undernourished men, women, and especially chil-

dren in other lands. The American people have always been generous and liberal in helping the unfortunate. And they still are, and wish to help feed them, where help is needed. But they want to really help, and in accordance with their means. Members of Congress have the same feelings and objectives. But as representatives of the people, they are also bound by the time-honored maxim that "they must be just before they are generous with the taxpayers' money."

Before considering foreign grants by our Government for the relief of any and all nations of the world who may be in destitute circumstances, we should consider—

First. What resources and substance have we at our disposal?

Second. What do we need to maintain and support our own way of life?

Third. What is sought of us abroad, and how long will the need continue?

Fourth. What good purpose will be served by any program we may initiate?

We have to consider our national debt of two hundred and sixty billion; our over-all National, State, and local tax burden amounting to 35 percent of our national income; whether that national income, at present amounting to one hundred and seventy billion, is temporary or permanent. We have to consider the drain on our production machine—already the State Department admits that we are short two-fifths of the grain cereals in this program and they will have to come from the next fall crop. We must bear in mind that these exports are destroying our economy like a two-edged sword by their cost in taxes on the one hand, and the inflation from the resulting scarcity on the other hand.

In the proposed prodigal program to reach occupied, liberated, and even neutral nations we will be dissipating our strength and service without having reached the children, the men and women who really need help, and whom we could reach by a judicious, well-considered application of the limited means at our disposal. If we are to relieve the peoples of foreign nations, it must be done on the limited scale of seeking to meet only the most urgent and necessary needs, and only in those countries where these needs exist.

If our substance is strewn about with prodigality, waste, and worse, we will soon find that we are unable to help where help is really needed. We do well to bear in mind that there is another four hundred million proposed for Turkey and Greece, four hundred million to reimburse war damages for Filipinos; that we will probably be called upon by the United Nations organization for seventy-five millions for the International Refugee Organization, forty millions for infant feeding; that Korea apparently wants six hundred million, and so on ad infinitum.

It seems that the administration has paid very scant attention to these considerations.

In the first place, we know that this bill grows out of the recommendation of the General Assembly of the United Nations, made last December. However, it made a proposal of residual relief for a term of 6 months following the termination of UNRRA on March 31. Herbert Hoover also recommends a 6 months' term to end with the fall harvest. The budget contains a provision for $100,000,000 for 1947 and $250,000,000 for 1948. In his message to Congress recommending this appropriation, the President stated:

> The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

The Under Secretary states, on page 3 of the hearings, in accord with the President's message, with Hoover and the United Nations, that the need is "particularly acute during the spring and early summer months," and that "there is every reason for anticipating that these countries will not need further free relief after 1947." And yet, in the bill, the State Department asks for sufficient relief to operate until June 30, 1948. Why should they ask to operate until June 30, 1948, when every recommendation, including their own, rebuts the necessity for such a long term? The only reason I can see is that if they should ask for three hundred and fifty million for 6 months, this would mean at the rate of seven hundred million a year. That is considerably more than half of what we contributed to UNRRA per year, and this would not sound well as residual relief. When the Department finds that our stock of grain cereals is only sufficient for three-fifths of their requirements, they blandly propose that the other two-fifths be supplied from our crops next fall—page 97. How will that help for the spring and early summer months of the present year?

In the second place, the State Department asks for blank checks up to the amount of $350,000,000 to be used in any country they see fit. It is true, they say, that at the present time they have in mind six countries—Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and possibly China. But that is only their present intention, and they reserve the right to make changes and additions if the relief funds are not used in the above areas or if, in their judgment, they should find that the money should be diverted to other areas.

Not only that, but they wish to keep secret the break-down of this $350,000,000 and the figures they have used as the needs of each country. In other words, they are asking the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to stultify themselves and come to Congress and the people, advocating the grant of $350,000,000 without giving the basis of their calculations. This ostensibly is none of the business of the Congress or the people.

It is true, they use as an excuse the pretext that once the allocation for each country is given, that country will consider that allocation as our debt to them, and a cut would cause dissension. We are not impressed by this argument for keeping Congress and the people in the dark. How can the State Department assure enforcement of the stern conditions precedent proposed in the bill for the giving and continuation of relief when they show the aforesaid weakness? How do they expect to enforce nondiscrimination, freedom of the press, full publicity, and supervision if they dare not discontinue relief when it is not needed?

The State Department proposes to lay down such conditions for the distribution of this relief without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; they tell us that where such assurances are not given, they positively will not go in and give relief; that in such cases the allocated amount will be used in other countries.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBSION. It is said that it shall be distributed without regard to creed or politics? That would include Communists and other subversive groups, would it not?

Mr. JONKMAN. It certainly would.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The purpose will be, however, to prevent discrimination in favor of Communists. That is the purpose of that restriction, is it not?

Mr. JONKMAN. Certainly. I am not satisfied that such conditions will be accepted, for instance, in Poland or Hungary, which are absolutely dominated by the Communists; and in such event I do not approve of spending it in other countries with prodigality. But even if such conditions were accepted in those countries, does anyone believe relief would go to deserving Polish patriots as freely as to the adherents of the Communist Party line? Past experiences all show the contrary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that the reason that the amendment which the gentleman just spoke about was put in the bill, to make sure that it is not prejudicial either for or against Communists?

Mr. JONKMAN. It ostensibly was put in so that if a country is Communist-dominated relief will not be given there if discrimination in distribution favors Communists.

I am just as desirous of aiding those really in need in these countries as any other person; but if those people cannot be reached, is it wise to give such supplies to the governments of such countries where they will be used to bolster up the Communist movement?

There are other considerations which fall almost within the same category. For instance, on page 75 of the hearings it is admitted by the State Department that by this relief to Hungary we will be paying Hungary's reparations bill of 23 millions a year to Russia; that if Hungary had no reparations to pay, the relief would not be needed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman submit to a question at this point or at least yield for an observation?

The gentleman has in his last statement developed a very important point, which is that if we do not want this money to be used by Russia for the purposes of that country, we ought to adopt the so-called Colmer amendment or a similar amendment that will be offered by the gentleman or some other Member

of the majority providing that no part of this fund shall be expended in any country presently dominated by Russia.

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, that would not go to the people that we want to reach but to those they want to reach.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman is correct in his statement with reference to the admissions made by the Department of State.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then in Greece, of course, there will be duplication in that another economic mission will be set up there under the so-called bill for $400,000,000 relief to Turkey and Greece. Paul Porter has already admitted that the undertaking to Greece provided for in this bill should be merged with that in the four hundred million to be authorized by the Greece-Turkey bill.

It is even questionable what provision this bill makes for feeding undernourished children in the countries designated. Certainly they should be our first care and consideration. A reading of page 41 of the hearings speaks of a future contribution for that purpose. Certainly, such supplementals as cod-liver oil and milk for children are in as much immediate need as anything for anybody.

While the Greece and Turkey aid bill is primarily concerned with reconstruction and military aid, the bill presently under consideration also transcends the bounds of strict relief and goes into rehabilitation and reconstruction, as indicated on page 4 of the hearings and in the bill itself, reciting processed and unprocessed materials for clothing and fuel, while the so-called secret documents seem to go even further than that.

In the third place, the State Department, while assuming that other nations will contribute as in UNRRA, has no assurance that they will join us in this understaking.

The over-all cost of this relief undertaking has been set at $610,000,000, of which the State Department proposes that we pay 57 percent, or $350,000,000 with the other 43 percent, or $260,000,000 to be borne by other countries. However, this seems to have had only scant consideration. On page 81 of the hearings, the State Department says:

> This figure of $350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment and in part picked out of the air.

With reference to the willingness of other nations to contribute, according to the hearings on page 10, the only definite assurance they had was with reference to Great Britain's contribution in Austria, which they claimed had already received $40,000,000 from Britain. They emphasize this time and again—pages 3, 10, 11, 88, and 90—althought on page 88 it is clear they are pessimistic about further aid from Britain. As this seemed rather anomalous that Britain would be pulling out of Greece and yet be distributing relief in Austria, inquiry at the proper source elicited the information that this $40,000,000 was a straight sterling loan to Austria and not a grant. The State Department later qualified its statement and admitted that it was partly a grant and partly a loan, and there the matter stands with reference to Britain.

The only other nation consulted, as far as the record shows, was Canada. After several discussions, they got no further than that the Canadian Government was sympathetic and thinking about it.

Australia last year suffered severely from drought and probably will be unable to assist. Yet if other countries contribute in the same ratio as they did in UNRRA, these three countries, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, will have to contribute two hundred fifteen millions of the two hundred sixty millions expected from the other nations of the world under this program.

Under UNRRA the United States contributed annually $1,350,000,000 to the operational fund against a total of four hundred ninety-nine million by all the other nations combined. Of this amount the United Kingdom subscribed three hundred twelve millions, or about 62 percent, Canada sixty-nine millions or about 14 percent, and Australia thirty-eight millions or about 8 percent. At the same ratio the United Kingdom would have to contribute under this program one hundred sixty millions, Canada thirty-five millions and Australia twenty millions.

In other words, the $260,000,000 to be contributed by other countries has by no means been assured to the State Department; or do they seem to have considered whether, if any countries should contribute, these would have to set up their own relief agencies or whether the United States in this venture would become a fiscal agent of foreign countries.

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity. Its analysis of needs might be very misleading. To arrive at a country's needs it strikes a balance of the excess of estimated imports over exports and assumes that the resulting shortage is the exchange needed to buy necessaries of life and to prevent economic retrogression. In other words, if, as was reported from Greece on March 29, she squandered her foreign exchange by "importing 19 tons of colored combs of all sizes, huge quantities of toy balloons, nylon, and lipsticks of all shades, and other fantastic types of commodities," this would raise her imports that much in excess of exports; and according to State Department diagnosis, she would need that much more exchange to purchase the necessaries of life.

In short, there may be no relation of this unfavorable trade balance to the food supply. It is similar to a squandering family which may produce or earn—export in goods or services—$100 a week and spend—import—$125. It is certainly running into trouble and will need credits or loans, but that does not necessarily mean that the children are not being fed, although, of course, such may be the case.

Or, if you want to absolutely clinch this fallacy, just consider what the administration includes under import needs. The American people are led to think import needs means food, seeds, medicines, and so forth. But to arrive at the needs of, that is, one country for the authorization in this bill—in other words to feed starving people—the import needs for 1947 include industrial oilseeds, cotton, wool, cellulose for rayon, raw jute, wool rags, cattle hides, calf hides, cellulose for paper, lumber, pig iron, steel products, iron scrap, copper, tin, nickel, rubber, totaling $250,000,000. Of course, a part of this can be paid for with exchange received from exports, but the bulk we are furnishing under the name of direct relief. This probably explains why, as I said at the outset, the preamble speaks not of direct relief, but of promoting healthy economic conditions abroad.

The same uncertainty lies in their proposed machinery for the distribution of relief. The relief goods will be turned over to the controlling governments for distribution. This is the same hurdle that caused such a miserable flop in UNRRA. But the State Department says, on page 33 of the hearings "if you did it effectively—direct distribution with American personnel—it would take all this money to pay for the personnel to look after it."

The question may well be asked: How much of the money will it take to make an effective check on ruling governments' distribution? And if we do not make this supervision effective, how do we know our aid goes to the right people?

I propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization in this bill to $200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947. Then if there is urgent need at the approach of spring and early summer of 1948, Congress will be in session and can make further authorization at that time. We will also have a better view of the over-all picture at that time.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, including the time yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, has 1 hour remaining; the gentleman from New Jersey, 55 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter into this discussion or to analyze the provisions of the bill until I heard about the so-called Colmer amendment which, along with other countries, would exclude the people of Poland.

What I wish to say to the Committee—and I would that this might enter the hearts of the membership of the entire House—is this one warning: Do not let your hatred of communism blind you to the extent that it will strengthen communism itself and drive into the arms of the communistic ogre the millions of anti-Communist Poles in that unfortunate country. Remember, there are

fewer than 600,000 Communist Poles out of something like 24,000,000 people, and do not forget that they are only nominal Communists. I have talked to some of them. I would hate to mention their names here or state who they were, or what their standing in the affairs of Poland because of the results which might follow such disclosure.

The people of Poland, nearly all of them are waiting, they are biding their time; at present they are helpless and to a great extent it is our fault that they are helpless today. We have put them in a position where they could not properly take care of themselves, could not defend their ideals. That was a long time ago.

If you want to encourage the democratic elements in Poland and the other countries—and do not let anybody tell you that they do not know their friends, for they do—give them assistance. Suppose you do give assistance to some of these nominal Communists in Poland. It will be on the basis of less than one 1 to 24. Twenty-four will be anti-Communist Poles. Remember that. Do you want to nourish, strengthen that element? Do you want to stop communism dead in its tracks? Then give some encouragement to this desperately driven element in this country which finds itself in that unfortunate condition due to a certain extent to the lack of foresight on the part of ourselves.

Our people had too much of the wrong kind of advice at Tehran and at Yalta, and I am not so sure whether that kind of advice was not still present at Potsdam. It is not the fault of the people of Poland that communism is on the loose in that country.

The time to make some amends, the time to strengthen the anticommunistic element in Poland, and in the other countries similarly situated, is now. In every instance the relief that you give to these people will go, nineteen-twentieths of it, to the people who despise and hate communism just as much as you and I.

Let me say by way of presenting my credentials, to the Members of this House, particularly with regard to some of the younger Members, that long before this war I consigned to the nether regions, to just plain hell, Stalin and Hitler. I said the same thing about the other criminal or second team of Molotov and Ribbentrop. Two of these have already gotten their just reward—Hitler and Ribbentrop. The others, Stalin and Molotov, I hope, will join that bestial quartet soon. However, my hatred of communism does not blind me to the fact that we have a job to do, that there are desperately needy people in Poland. Yes, take Yugoslavia, which is not included here. Do you know that there are millions of Serbians and Croatians and others who are fighting communism today as much as ever? Do you know, and doubtless you must because it is something that is of current knowledge to everybody, that in the hills of Yugoslavia there is a radio voice which blares out to the world, particularly to communism, its defiance of communism and all it stands for. Those people need our assistance. They are looking to avowed anti-Communists, their friends here in America and elsewhere, for whatever encouragement we can give them. What they need mostly right now is sustenance, food, machinery, things to help them get on their feet. You strengthen Poland sufficiently and you will have the strongest anti-Communist force in Europe. She always has been anti-Communist. In 1939 there were less Communists in Poland per capita than there were in this country or in any other place in the world. Do you know why? Because they told me that all they had to do was turn to the East and sniff, and they got the stench of communism in their nostrils. They know communism better than we do and they abhor it. The hate of communism in the heart of every liberty-loving Pole is so strong that he will bide his time and suffer anything, but in due time he will turn on the vile Communist and drive him back to where he came from. The Poles will forever remember the treacherous stab in the back Russia gave them in fullfilment of her agreement with Hitler.

If you want to aid this genuinely democratic element, now is the time to do so. I did not have the opportunity to listen to all that went on in the hearings, but I did read certain excerpts from the testimony of Will Clayton with reference to agreements to be made with recipient countries. I am confident from what I know of Will Clayton and as to his ability, as to his character, as to the warmth of his patriotism, when the time comes and the appropriation is made and the agreements are made, I am confident, I say, that men of the type of Will Clayton will see to it that the right parties will in all probability disseminate the goods that are provided under the terms of this bill. This is not an appropriation; it is merely an authorization.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman can assure us that there has been such a change in the personnel of the State Department that we are going to get any better advice now than we got before at Tehran and Potsdam?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I could not say. I could not speak for anyone else. I think that the State Department on the whole has always been trustworthy and guided by very able men; by such able men as the illustrious Cordell Hull, a former Member of this House, and one of the outstanding citizens of his time. I felt pretty much the same way about the sincerity and ability of Mr. Stettinius, and I have the highest possible regard and affection for the great Secretary of State, George C. Marshall. I am confident that he and his advisers will not only do everything they can to help the people of Poland, but that whatever action they take will be for the purpose of establishing freedom, independence, and all the things that we believe in.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that the State Department could enter into a valid, enforcible agreement with the present Government of Poland so that we could be assured that this relief will get to the people?

Mr. DINGELL. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I certainly do believe that we could enter into such an agreement with that government. My knowledge of the personnel of that government—and I do not know them individually, but there are some, I dare say, who despise and hate the very thought of communism, the same as the gentleman who raised the question, and that they, too, are waiting their time when the situation will change and Poland once again will be free.

Might I say now, too, that so far as the personnel of this great committee is concerned, I believe that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the distinguished chairman of this committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], whom I have known so long and so favorably for all these years, are not being fooled about the possible effect of the fulfillment of this bill. I do not think they would have cooperated and reported it favorably if there was any doubt that a valid and enforcible agreement could be entered into with the present Government of Poland. We hold the whip hand and the control and can revoke any agreement that has been violated.

Let me just say this: We have distributed much of the worldly goods in Poland, not only through UNRRA, but through private sources and through the Roman Catholic Church, and I have assurance from at least the source that had to do with the distribution of food through the Roman Catholic hierarchy that the food did go to all the needy people in Poland, and if it did—and some of them might have been nominal Communists—the distribution by the law of averages went more than 24 to 1 in favor of the anti-Communists.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to subscribe to the argument the gentleman has presented so forcibly that the more we are opposed to communism in Poland, the more we must do our best to help those who are fighting it, and who are fighting it on the ground. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not a fact that ordinarily Poland has agricultural surpluses?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; ordinarily that is true.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not more likely to be true this year than before because of the fact that she has taken over some of the richest agricultural areas of Germany?

Mr. DINGELL. I should not agree to that for just this year. I think it is possible for the future, but from my understanding of it that is not so and it is not

contemplated that there will be any surplus this year. But should it be so, the agreement is not irrevocable.

Mr. JUDD. That is the point I want to bring out. Does the gentleman have any information as to the prospects for crops this year in Poland?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not.

Mr. JUDD. We could not get information on that in the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. From what little I know of that phase, some crops have been hard hit in Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JUDD. What is the big reason for the failure when they normally have surpluses, internal confusion?

Mr. DINGELL. They have had one of the most severe winters in the history of Poland, which has decimated the wheat crop, and the rye upon which the Poles depend so strongly is also in short supply.

Mr. JUDD. Have the work animals been taken away?

Mr. DINGELL. The work animals have been taken away, and of course that is a basic thing that has to be corrected. You remember that the Germans took every horse and milk cow in the nation, all the livestock and fowl, down to the last goose; they took every piece of industrial and farming machinery that was in Poland, it all went into the maw of the steel mills in Germany. Remember that in Poland they had far more mechanized farming than they did in Germany. I remember seeing it there in 1939. I saw American tractors, I saw American threshing outfits, I saw men and women working with American farm machinery, then I saw women using hand sickles just across the border in Germany. But that is all changed. Their farm implements and animals sequestered by the German invaders are only now being replaced by UNRRA and other relief sources.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think that if we get Poland through this particular hard year she ought to be on a self-sustaining basis?

Mr. DINGELL. That is my hope and my prayer, and I think it will materialize.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I just want to call attention to the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. EATON], and the distinguished gentleman from New York, were fooled when they supported and pushed through the UNRRA program.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman may have his opinion about being fooled about UNRRA, but the fact of the matter is that UNRRA on the whole did a splendid job in spite of the fact that it had its human defects. It nevertheless did a splendid humanitarian job.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will yield, I cannot agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] with reference to UNRRA. I think UNRRA did a very good job under the circumstances.

Mr. DINGELL. I said that.

Mr. BLOOM. If it were not for the job that UNRRA did at the time, I hate to think of the condition the world would be in today.

Mr. DINGELL. And how many additional corpses there would have been in Poland and in all the other needy countries.

Mr. BLOOM. We would not have enough money in this country today to do the job we are trying to do now with $350,000,000. We ought to be thankful for the job UNRRA did so, notwithstanding the fact that it made a lot of mistakes.

Mr. DINGELL. May I say in conclusion that if it had not been for UNRRA not only in Poland but in the other unfortunate and in large part subjugated countries there would have been millions of additional persons who would have died of hunger, cold and disease. Remember it is said that as a result of the war most of the children in Poland up to 18 years of age are tubercular, and various other diseases are rampant throughout that unfortunate country. What would have happened if it had not been for UNRRA? You may find fault with UNRRA, and it was humanly defective, no question about it, but it did an emergency job and it did a splendid job in spite of the fact that we were not fully satisfied.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak at all today, as I have had the unfortunate mishap of losing most of my voice. But there have been things said during this debate which impel me to make an attempt to speak briefly.

May I say just one word about UNRRA because I was among those who fought very hard to have that bill contain some protection against the political use of food. Unhappily, we were unable to get any such restrictions or limitations into that particular legislation. Though I am quite in agreement with the statements that have been made about UNRRA doing a great deal of good, I have been forced to realize that, in addition, UNRRA did a good deal of harm—political harm.

But to get on to my subject. Your Committee on Foreign Affairs began its study of this bill a good many weeks ago. Since that time certain changes have taken place in the general situation. But there is no less desire on the part of the people of this country to do whatever we can to feed the hungry and to give medical aid. Naturally, we had to take cognizance of some of the things which have been brought to our attention in the meanwhile. One of those is that the demands upon us are going to be so great that we should know rather more definitely than we do what our own possibilities are. We are not going to be able to do the job which lies before us to do—to be the hope of the world—unless we have a certain strength here at home. That strength is of many different varieties. I am not going to enlarge upon that.

It would seem that we do need in this legislation a definite control of the money and we need a very real plan. It has been noted to you that Mr. Porter suggested that this relief, or part of it, be added to the bill which will be coming to us in the not too distant future with reference to a different kind of assistance to Greece and Turkey. I think it is very important that this bill be not mixed up with that bill and that we stop thinking of it as an extension of UNRRA because it is not an extension of UNRRA.

The reason for House Joint Resolution 153 is not to stop totalitarian expansion. We get the opportunity to have something to say about that in another bill. It is really to feed the hungry; and if we are going to feed the hungry we better do it before they starve to death. We cannot wait indefinitely before helping them. Of course, indirectly, if we feed the hungry, and they know it comes from a capitalistic country, and if it is done well and it reaches those who really need the help, we will do something to stop some of that expansion because we would then be demonstrating what we as free men and women can do in the world. We have shown them that nobody fights quite so well as a man who is free and no woman in any part of the world goes to his help and is quite so capable as the woman who is free.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the lady from Ohio five additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. In order to make my own position clear on this legislation, I would like to state reluctantly that I am as impatient at the tactless and rather stupid action of the State Department with the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House as anyone in the House. I regret extremely that they still feel they can bring us with impunity a lot of material all bound up, top secret stuff, when that same material is available to all in other places. It would appear that they feel we are of very little account. I confess I am inclined to serve notice on them that if they are not careful the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, at least the majority side of it, may notify them that we will oppose legislation presented to us in such fashion on the basis that such methods do not give us adequate material with which to present it to you. In the matter of this bill it seems to me that it is so necessary that we provide some method of giving expression to the generous inclination of the American people, recognizing the need to feed adults and children, that I shall vote for this bill.

I have a great deal of confidence in the membership of this House, Mr. Chairman. I trust that what is written in by the membership in the form of amendments will have the proper constructiveness necessary to make it possible for us to do the job in an efficient American fashion, that will satisfy our people, and that will not make such inroads upon us that we cannot meet the needs of our expanding responsibility. Those needs are going to be very great, Mr. Chairman,

for upon us, without any doubt, will rest the future of our civilization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the lady yield for a question?

Mrs. BOLTON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Under section 4 of this resolution it is provided that when these supplies are transferred or made available, the President shall cause representatives of this country to see that certain things are done to supervise their distribution. I do not seem to find in the next section, in the provisions for cutting off relief, any correlative provision, to say in effect that if the President's representatives are not able to make that report, the relief may be cut off.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman will find the answer on page 4, line 16, under clause (g). They must give assurance, before the relief is given to them, that they will allow representatives of the United States to supervise. Then, under section 5, it says he shall terminate the supervision of relief assistance if he finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not carried out.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. And if the President does not stop it at this point, the Congress has the power to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, covering this legislation.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Is that secret?

Mr. EATON. It is not secret.

The CHAIRMAN. That request would more properly come when we are in the House.

Mr. EATON. Then I wish to read the letter if that be appropriate at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. EATON. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read this letter for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 23, 1947.

The Honorable CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

MY DEAR DR. EATON: In response to your request I am indicating below our answers to certain questions regarding the proposed post-UNRRA relief program.

Question. What will be the agency set up in any Government department or independently for the purpose of administering this relief, and who will be appointed to be the administrator?

Answer. It would be our intention to appoint a relief director in Europe who will supervise the relief program. We believe that the most important and critical function in connection with the proposed program is the supervision of the distribution of our relief supplies and the enforcement of the undertakings which would be required of the countries receiving relief. This can most effectively be done in Europe rather than from Washington. It is planned to recommend that Mr. Richard F. Allen be appointed to this position. He was in charge of Red Cross relief activities in Europe after the First World War and during the Second World War was vice chairman of the American Red Cross in charge of all its activities in Europe. Mr. Allen would receive his instructions from the Secretary of State. A relief mission consisting of well-qualified American citizens would be established in each country receiving our help. These missions would work closely with our Embassy and would function under the general supervision of the relief director.

In Washington the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Bureau of Supply, and other agencies would perform the procurement, supply, and shipping functions which they are properly equipped to handle. The programing of supplies and the coordination of the activities of these agencies would be done by a staff under the direction of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. William L. Clayton.

Question. What will be our policy regarding relief grants to countries, the governments of which are not in our opinion representative and democratic, or have not been elected in elections held pursuant to applicable international agreements?

Answer. It would be our policy to offer to help in preventing suffering and serious malnutrition in such a country to the extent that our assistance is clearly needed for this purpose. We have subscribed to the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations which states the principle that at no time should relief supplies be used as a political weapon and calls upon all members of the United Nations to assist in the furnishing of relief when needed and where needed. Our help would be made available only on the condition that the government of the country agrees to the stringent but fair conditions specified in the bill and lives up to these conditions faithfully. These are calculated to provide adequate assurance that relief aid would reach the people needing it and would not be used to promote the political aims of the government. Furthermore, the requirements for full publicity in the country would insure that the people would know the American source of the help and would understand its purposes. Our estimates indicate that Poland is the only such country which may need relief from us.

Question. Is it intended that the amounts authorized in the bill will be adequate to take care of the relief need of the countries assisted through to the end of the crop year 1948?

Answer. The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program, some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria, we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur.

Question. What measures will be taken to see that each country receiving relief assistance does everything possible to help itself and reduce its needs for relief as soon as possible through utilization of its own resources and the work of its own population?

Answer. The bill requires that any country receiving relief must exert all possible efforts to speed its own recovery. It further provides that our relief shall be terminated if we are not satisfied that this is being done. We would keep a close check on the activities of the countries in this regard.

Question. What assurances or expectations do we have of assistance to the countries to be benefited from other countries than our own as contemplated by the program?

Answer. The British have announced a program of $40,000,000 in aid to Austria. The Norwegian Parliament has voted the equivalent of $3,000,000. Denmark is making available the equivalent of $4,000,000. New Zealand has stated its intention to make available some meat and other commodities. On the basis of consultations which have been conducted with other countries, we believe that additional contributions will be forthcoming if favorable action is taken by the United States, since some countries are waiting to see what action we take.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I must take just a few minutes to express my opposition to the warped thinking behind these so-called Colmer amendments that will be offered later. I cannot understand how anyone can have this bitterness, this hatred, this inhumane feeling toward the Polish people. What have they done to deserve this? What other people have suffered as much as those people have in this war? What other people were greater allies of ours than were the Polish people? Why this attitude toward those people? Was it their fault that they were overrun by the German Army and by the Nazis? They did not wish it, they did not desire it. It happened. Nazism and Nazi ideology was sought to be impressed on those people. Was it their fault that they were overrun by the Russian Army, that the Communists came in? They resented it. They have fought communism and nazism more than any other people in the whole world.

You may say, "I do not like the government in Poland." Well, 95 percent of the people of Poland may not like their government either. Does that mean they must starve to death? Is it of their own choice? Is it of their own choosing? How can anyone take that position now and say, "We are not going to continue to aid these people who have suffered so much because they happen to be bordering along Russia?" Geographically they are in a bad way, it is true, but they cannot help that. Geography made it so.

Let us help those people. Everyone who has come back from Poland, including Bishop Woznicki, of Detroit, as well as the people who have gone down there with Catholic relief organizations and with the UNRRA organization, everyone that I have talked to said to me that the Poles are not Communists; the Poles are Catholics, the Poles are good Christian people. They cannot make Communists out of the Polish people.

Mr. Chairman, six or seven million of those people died during the war. Five million more would have died if it had not been for UNRRA aid. They need this aid and assistance and they are entitled to it.

The Polish people have gone to work digging coal in the mines. It is one place in all of Europe where production is above prewar production. Coal production is

above prewar coal production in Poland. It is really amazing. They have rolled up their sleeves, they have gone to work. The people are working. There are no strikes over there. They are struggling. They know what condition the whole world is in. They gave of their own coal, thousands of tons of it, to UNRRA for distribution to other countries. UNRRA was distributing Polish coal, mined by Polish workers. Those Polish miners must have clothes. They must be fed so that they can work. Those people are not lazy. They are hard-working people. They are struggling bitterly to reconstruct their land and to rebuild their means of livelihood. Certainly we cannot take the position that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and some other of these gentlemen are taking today and say that we shall deny them aid, because, unfortunately, Joe Stalin's armies happened to run through those countries and taken over control. That is against the will of the people in those nations. Do we not understand that? We cannot let those people starve. We must help them.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Did the gentleman from Michigan hear one word in this Chamber today indicating that they would not be willing to give the people of Poland any relief or even indicating they would not be willing to give the people of Poland every bit of that $350,000,000 mentioned here instead of approximately 50 cents a person for the persons who have to be helped throughout the world?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I heard language used here that the satellite countries should not receive any of this aid. But what does that mean? You are referring to Poland as a satellite country, are you not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a blank check presented to this House, this is it. This bill comes in here much in the same way that previous bills have come in wherein we are asked to appropriate huge sums and trust to the particular department to use its judgment in the dispensation of those funds.

There is not a Member in this body who does not want to do all he possibly can to assist the starving people throughout the world. This is a relief program on a piecemeal basis. It is a hodgepodge proposition. We know that the relief problem is not limited to those countries which have been named. As a matter of fact, the relief problem in occupied areas, central Europe, Germany, today is very, very serious. The relief problem in China is likewise very serious. What we should be considering today is an over-all relief problem so that we then might intelligently approach the problem as it exists.

Former President Hoover testified that if we were to consider the world-wide relief problem that we would be spending between $1,200,000,000 and $1,500,000,000 within the next year. Obviously, we are going to be called upon to handle the whole problem eventually. Now, why is that not in this bill?

There is one question I want to call attention to. We hear constantly this statement that the need is great, and it is, too, but it is not a question of need. What have we got to supply that need? Mr. Hoover says we can spend $125,000,000. Now, why appropriate $350,000,000? But that is what we are asked to do. We cannot, and I challenge anybody on either side to show how we can spend $350,000,000 the balance of this year.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman says Mr. Hoover said we can spend $125,000,000. If the gentleman will look on page 59 of the hearings, he will find that Mr. Hoover said we were warranted in authorizing $350,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I remember that testimony very well. Nevertheless, there has been no showing in the testimony that there is more than $125,000,000 worth of materials available.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that at the very place mentioned, Mr. Hoover said, "I think you are warranted in authorizing $350,000,000 if the administration will undertake to carry out the suggestion I have made here"—a whole series of suggestions, which were to carry over to make it last for 2 years, and many of those suggestions have not yet been adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is absolutely right. As a matter of fact, none of them have been adopted.

Mr. KEE. I think if the gentleman will read the bill he will find that at least half of the suggestions are incorporated in the measure itself, and the other suggestions have practically been carried out by the plans of the State Department.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman.

The testimony on this bill occurred last February. Great stress was laid on the fact that the great need was for carrying them for the spring and summer prior to the harvest. Within 3 or 4 months they will be harvesting in some of these countries, and I say there is no justification at this time to appropriate $350,000,000.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. In lines 7 and 8 of this bill we have this expenditure limited to certain things, among which are fertilizer and seed. I know from personal observation in Europe that the potato crop is being planted right now, the sugar-beet crop is being planted, and the wheat crop and the rye crop will be harvested, as the gentleman says, in the latter part of June and July. In another section of the bill it is stated that no appropriations will be spent after July 30, 1948. I want to know about this appropriation for fertilizer and seed for crops that are already in the ground, that are being planted right now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct. It does not make sense. We should not spend for seed and fertilizer now.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the first section I propose to offer this amendment:

Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country, is authorized to utilize not more than $15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other countries.

I believe the time has come for the Congress to designate the countries where relief will be administered. It is true this is not an UNRRA proposition, but certainly it is a matter over which we should have some control. The days of the New Deal blank checks are over.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. If we do that, this is what is going to happen. If we designate specifically in the bill certain countries and certain amounts, then we practically are obligated to give those countries that amount of money, whether or not they live up to the rules and regulations as laid down by our Government. We make the rules. The United States Government makes the rules and if they do not live up to those rules, then we can stop all relief instantly. That is the only reason that that is not inserted in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry, but I do not agree with the gentleman. That does not make sense so far as I am concerned in the light of our experiences with UNRRA. We were going to do all those things, but they were never accomplished.

Mr. BLOOM. UNRRA was an international organization.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, yes, I understand that, too.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree that it can be done but it is on account of the experiences that we have had with UNRRA. I say it is not advisable to do it. There is no reason why you should do it except that you would foreclose yourself from stopping any relief if you legislate that the relief is to go to certain countries in certain amounts, irrespective of what they do.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But we are providing $15,000,000 that can be expended any place where the administrator might find it necessary outside of those countries I have named.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment does not specify the amounts that are going to any country but merely specifies the countries to which the relief must go?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true in the Greco-Turkish program it has been rec-

ommended that we specifically name the countries so that apparently in the matter of assistance there is no objection to naming the countries although what we furnish is conditioned upon their performance?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact also that even though we do name the countries any relief to them is still conditioned upon these later provisions of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Positively.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. What provision of law would it be where, if we should name the countries which are to receive relief, that we would not have the right to rescind because of some action which they might take, and why it would be otherwise if we were not to name them?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BENDER. What percentage of this money would go for administration expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am not able to answer that question. I am sorry.

Mr. VORYS. About $500,000 for 53 persons. That is the amount that is proposed.

Mr. BENDER. Fifty-three persons to spend $350,000,000? That is amazing.

Mr. VORYS. Fifty-three additional persons in addition to our missions all over the world.

Mr. BENDER. That is, additional persons?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. How many of the people who are taken off the pay rolls here in Washington will be put on this pay roll over there as experts? That is, people who are being taken off the Interior Department and other departments?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 153, now before the Committee, provides for the authorization of an appropriation of $350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of devastated countries by the late war. If the first sentence contained in the bill should control, then I am confident many of the members would be inclined to give it their full support. Every Member of the House wants to extend aid, by way of food, clothing, medical supplies, fuel, and other necessary items for people who are hungry and starving, and who are in great need and distress. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my constant desire to aid all those who are in great distress, and which distress has come upon them not by choice, and not by their own invitation.

Mr. Chairman, this pending resolution is far different from the initial sentence, in the resolution. That sentence does not relate all there is to this measure. There is no provision contained in the pending resolution which announces to what countries, or to what particular people, this aid is to be extended; there is also a complete lack of information, from all of the debate, and from all of the information imparted by the report, as to who will handle this huge sum of money; and, there is a positive lack of any information, given during this debate, as to what group, or agency, or individual or collection of individuals, or what "presumed-to-be-Government-head" in any country, will handle the fund allocated within that country; and, there is no information given to any Member of Congress as to whether this fund will be used to aid, or sustain, the communistic element in any of those countries. In many of those countries in Europe there is no staple government—there is no one with whom our country can deal. And, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no definite information as to whether Russia, which nation has taken a "dog-in-the-manger" attitude toward the United States of America, will or will not participate in the division of this large sum of money. These are some of the reasons, which now present themselves to me, which appear to urge me to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, not only the above statements have a definite bearing upon this question, but coming, quite soon, is another measure whereby we will be asked to make a loan, or a gift, to Greece and Turkey. Both Greece and Turkey may be considered as a recipient of funds under the present resolution—and there can be no doubt but those nations can be included in the allocation of the fund here asked, in the sum of $350,000,000. The measure which will soon be presented to the House will embrace the huge sum of $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. I wonder how many other nations, in Europe and elsewhere, will finally come in and ask for financial aid either for aid or for the development of their military establishment.

Mr. Chairman, some information has been suggested that the bill to be considered in the future will have much to do with the stamping out of communism in Greece and Turkey. Of course, that sum of money would not scratch the surface in any effort to combat communism in those countries. Recently, the President sought to secure an appropriation of $50,000,000 to rid the agencies of our own Government from the Communists now upon the pay rolls. That is but one small segment in our country, and relates only to our Federal Government. Of course, if any care had been exercised by the Department heads, in employing the people who work there, there would be no need for the sum of $50,000,000 with which to eradicate that un-American group from our Federal agencies and departments.

In this brief period, may I say that our Nation has suffered from the ravages of war; we have lost our boys; we have given money, munitions of war, food, and equipment of every character for victory; we have suffered greatly—and in finances, we have been the chief sufferer. Now, it is proposed that we feed, and finance, many of those European countries—and I am confident—and I am constrained to say—that the United States of America will ever do her full part, but she is unable to continue that program, unless our own people are made to suffer immeasureably thereby. Quite often, it is apparently easy for some people to urge the spending of the people's money—and the instant case is an apt illustration—but the people, those whose money is used for this and other spending purposes, have a voice in such matters. The people are worn out—they are sick and tired—they have given their all to aid. This proposal, here made, without any definite information upon the very material matters involved, is merely another plan to make it hard for our own people to exist in these post-war days. It is my fervent hope that every Member will give most careful consideration to this proposal—and think first of the United States of America, before she is weakened or entirely given away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill before this House in which the Republican majority is called upon to assume the obligations and responsibilities of a bipartisan foreign policy. I think that should be made very clear. We are asked to appropriate money for a relief—a program undertaken by our Government as part of this bipartisan foreign policy. The reason is this: We have heard a great deal about the great heart of the United States. The United States has a great heart, but the United States also has a conscience. The United States also supports her international commitments. The United States made a commitment before the United Nations that, if the United Nations would not go ahead with the UNRRA program, to which we were then the greatest contributor, we would go ahead with the unilateral program to relieve starvation and suffering in the world right now; not yesterday or the day before but right now, within this year 1947. I am very glad to note that no Member who has addressed the House has advocated that in any way we should not comply with that commitment. The debate has all been about the amount and about the conditions which would be established, to carry through our commitment. Accordingly I think it is only fair to our distinguished chairman and to all the members of the committee, including the minority members, that we analyze for a minute just what the Committee on Foreign Affairs did with this bill—just what conditions they established in the bill.

When the committee received the bill as House Joint Resolution 134, the only conditions upon the expenditure of this money which the bill provided were three: First, that the supplies transferred pursuant to the bill would be distributed without reference to race, creed, color, or political belief.

Second, that representatives of the United States press and radio could observe and report freely what was done in the country assisted with the relief; and, third, that the country furnished

relief would give us information as to what was being done with it.

Now, let us see what the committee wrote in as strong conditions. First, that full publicity had to be given in every country which was getting this relief assistance about where it was coming from and all other details. Second, that each country benefited would make the maximum effort itself for its own reconstruction, a very important point in view of the legitimate criticism about this very aspect of the situation.

I was in Greece as recently as December 1946; there I obtained information on Greece's alleged failure to have an adequate taxation policy; on the allegedly improvident use of her gold reserves and of her foreign exchange at certain times; on her oversized civil service; and on other features of the national economy requiring reform before Greece could be said to be doing everything to help herself. Much of this reform has already been undertaken, I understand, but the basic principle for us in extending relief aid to the countries that need it is that we shall be entitled to make these reforms a condition of our granting relief.

A third condition the committee wrote into the bill is that representatives of the Government of the United States should be permitted to supervise the distribution of this relief directly, right on the ground. If we are going to have a bipartisan foreign policy and take the responsibility as the majority in Congress, then we must have a certain amount of faith in the agencies of the United States that are going to carry it out. We cannot assume that the people in the State Department are any less servants of this country than we or any less conscientious or any less honest until we have reason to know they are. In writing the provisions of this bill the committee certainly tried to make them tough, but if the Members can do any better, well and good. I will go along with them so long as it does not impede or stop this relief of essential food. Make the conditions tough but let us not condemn anybody in advance of intent to subordinate the interests of the United States in the bill's administration. Finally, the committee provided expressly that the President had to terminate this relief—he had no discretion—he had to terminate it if the conditions set out in the bill were not complied with. Those are pretty strong conditions, but just to add one further, the committee provided that by concurrent resolution of both houses of Congress at any time the relief could be terminated; and that, Mr. Chairman—and I believe many of the members are lawyers—will be written into every single relief assistance contract made with any country which is to benefit under this act so that they will know it in advance.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, as I understand it, intends to make on-the-spot checks on the relief assistance granted through its own means, through its subcommittees. It intends to observe on the spot, as former President Hoover suggested, how this relief program is being carried out and to bring in a recommendation to Congress that it should be terminated to any country when it is satisfied that the will of Congress, the intention of Congress in the matter of this relief is not being carried out.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Permit me to say to the gentleman that I admire the statement he has made. It shows a knowledge of the subject. For that reason will he tell me whether the statement that has been attributed to former President Hoover that we would have to use possibly $1,500,000,000 if the program included Turkey and Greece, and whether or not the gentleman from New York is in accord with such statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, the conditions set by former President Hoover in naming that figure but I believe it included other countries; for instance, Germany and Austria, the only countries to which he went on his last trip.

Mr. OWENS. And one other question, whether or not the gentleman would be favorable to the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to the gentleman that the program for Greece and Turkey will be before the Congress for consideration in the near future. I hope it shall be possible for me to vote for it, and I make this statement in the expectation that amendments which I propose to offer will be found possible of adoption by the House; but I would like to make this point perfectly clear, that if this Greek-Turkish aid program is undertaken it will have no duplication with the relief program which is now before us. The former is a reconstruction program with certain phases of economic rehabilitation and military equipment, but the program now before us is a food program dealing with the basic essentials of life. There is no duplication whatever. But I would like to make this perfectly clear, if you are going to give relief, and I think most of us want to, you have got to pass this bill or you will not have anybody to save from communism.

The minority report on this bill was prepared by Members of much greater seniority than I, but I submit, with the greatest deference, that their proposal to offer amendments which will reduce the appropriation in the bill to $200,000,000 should not prevail. The minority made two main points: One, that the program will terminate as of the end of the year 1947; and, two, that our expectation of getting help from the countries in need from other nations will probably be unfounded. Certainly, as to the latter point, if our expectations are going to be unfounded, we need more, not less, money; and, as to the former, we had an expression in the testimony of a very distinguished witness of the people in the matter of dealing with food, D. A. Fitzgerald, Secretary General of the International Emergency Food Council—on leave from the United States Department of Agriculture—that to supply the basic essentials of food alone in 1947 to the European countries to be relieved under the bill we will have to spend $296,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not also true that Mr. Hoover recommended the full figure of $350,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; Mr. Hoover recommended the full figure in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. Is there any reason why the fund of $200,000,000 recommended should be increased until definite evidence of need beyond $200,000,000 is shown? What evidence is there that $200,000,000 is not enough?

Mr. JAVITS. I may say, when my senior colleague asks that question, that this bill has been pending in the House for over 2 months and it promises to be pending another 2 months before it is finally passed; therefore, you cannot expect emergency appropriations. You have to make plans in advance, which is what this bill does. On the other point, namely, the adequacy of the sum authorized, the expert witness whom everybody relied on before our committee, Mr. Fitzgerald, said that we need $296,000,000 for food alone in 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with keen interest to all of this debate and I think I would be remiss if I did not mention at this time the character, the hard work, and the honest approach that has been brought to this subject by our beloved and distinguished chairman the gentleman from New Jersey. I do not know of anyone who is more devoted to the principles of humanity, who has more hatred of things which are not American in their concept or in their application than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. I do not know of a man in this House who typifies Americanism more than the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I should like to say that every subject that has been under discussion here this afternoon was considered in all of its ramifications by the committee. There has not been one question posed upon the floor of this House, there has not been one amendment suggested that was not explored, that was not voted upon by the members of the committee. Extensive hearings were conducted and thousands of words of testimony were taken. Everyone who could reasonably be expected to offer anything to the committee in the way of constructive help was heard. The fact, the fundamental fact, and the thing we cannot afford to lose sight of is the certainty that unless we take positive, definite action, millions of human beings will starve. I am not

a sentimentalist. Four years at war have made me more of a materialist than a sentimentalist. But I do think we have a definite obligation to do something and to do it fast.

This program has one thing which preceding programs have not had. This is an American program under American supervision and direction. We are not subject to the vetoes of any other power and we are not subject to the direction of any other nation as to where or how or in what manner this food relief is to be distributed. I think that is a most important point.

You may or may not agree with the choice of the recipient nations to whom this relief is to go; but if I do nothing else I would like to add a word to the remarks of the gentlemen who said: "Let us distinguish between Communist dominated governments and Communist-dominated peoples." Let us not offer our aid and assistance through any channels to those who oppose our order, but let us not, on the other hand penalize those who are made subservient to communism by the bayonets of the Red army at their throats.

We have done everything in committee possible under the circumstances to hedge this program about and to assure that it will be a well-ordered and well-organized program of relief. I am not a slave to either the language of the bill as it now stands or a slave to the report as it stands. I agree with some of my colleagues on the committee and with a great many Members of this House that the bill can probably be well and properly amended. I voted for several amendments in committee that were defeated. It is still my intention to support the bill. I will support amendments which I think will strengthen it; but I did want to make one brief appearance on the floor in behalf of the bill because I do consider that it is not only humanitarian in its purpose, but essential to our continued well-being. UNRRA is ending. The one thing that is not ending is famine, and it will not. If we are to uphold the highest precepts of our Nation, if we are to uphold those principles of humanity which have always distinguished the American Nation, I feel that it is essential that we go along with this bill as properly amended.

In conclusion, and to answer those who fear or appear to fear that some of this aid and assistance may be channeled through the recipient nations into countries where the aid is not needed, I should like to read a brief excerpt from the testimony before the committee in which I questioned Mr. Hoover, and I quote:

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Hoover, through your great experience in this field I should like to hear your considered opinion as to whether or not this program, as it is presently contemplated, and with your suggested amendments, can be depended upon to actually deliver this aid down to the grass roots of the recipient countries without undue fear of diversion of the supplies into the black markets of the countries concerned, or the channeling of the aid from the American people past the individuals who need it and into countries totally unrelated to the subject needs?

Mr. HOOVER. There are a number of problems involved in your question: In the first place, I have never found any difficulty about determining whether food is being taken out of a given country. That is a matter of some inspection at the border which is not difficult to arrange. The passing of consequential amounts of food into channels that go over frontiers is not so difficult.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was wondering whether, in further answer to your question, President Hoover indicated whether he would feel as he does if these amendments were not adopted, or whether you feel that some of his suggestions were adopted.

Mr. JACKSON of California. In answer to the gentleman, I feel that some of his recommendations have been included in the bill, and I will go further and say that some more might well be included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], a member of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my personal tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee. I want to complement him on his wisdom, his forbearance, and his deep understanding, not only of the personalities which compose the committee, but of the human problems which are involved in this bill. I think we are very lucky to have a man of his caliber with us in this body.

I have listened with great interest this afternoon to the various arguments which have been brought up on the floor. I am in agreement with many of them. I am not in agreement with them all. I think it would be easy for us to find many reasons why we should not do this thing: That the relief will go into the hands of the Communists, or that we cannot trust the State Department, or that we do not know that these countries are doing what they can to help themselves. There are plenty of reasons of that sort that we can conjure up. But all of these reasons ignore one signal and overwhelming question: What is the constructive alternative? If we do not give this relief, what will happen? And I think that when we approach that problem we can look at this whole subject, not only in the light of human decency and charity, but in the light of our own national self-interest. I yield to no one in my desire to help feed and clothe these destitute people in Europe, but I suggest to you gentlemen that it will be impossible for us to implement whatever foreign policy we may have, short of isolationism, unless we are dealing with a people who have at least got a bare minimum of existence, who have the basic essentials of life. If we do not have that type of humanity to deal with, then all that we may plan here in Washington with respect to foreign policy will come to naught. If you feel that we must have a constructive foreign policy—perhaps you do not think it should be President Truman's, but perhaps you feel, nevertheless, that isolationism is not the policy; I personally feel strongly that isolationism is not—then we must have contacts with the rest of the world. How can we have contacts, friendly contacts, fruitful contacts, contacts which will symbolize our own ideas of freedom, if we are dealing with a people who are starving to death?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the minds and hearts of the speakers preceding me have been wandering across the seas all this afternoon. Their hearts have been bleeding for the people of other countries. In the short time allotted me I want to turn your thought and attention to the people of the United States of America for a change and say something for them in closing this debate.

Dean Acheson and the State Department promoted UNRRA, and more money was wasted, three to five times over, than the $350,000,000 proposed in this bill. I wonder how long the State Department will be able to come down and wave the magic wand and continue to lead this committee and the Congress in their deliberations and help to form their policies, when as an administrative office they have shown absolute incompetence through waste and squandering of the people's money. Out of the $2,700,000,000 that was given them through UNRRA they have wasted probably $1,000,000,000, and helped to build up communism to oppress the people of the European countries and of China.

They talked about Dean Acheson and others picking this estimate of $350,000,000 out of the air. I want to speak for the American taxpayer, and say that it will not be so easy on them or you when you pick the $350,000,000 out of their pockets. You have been so used to throwing millions and billions around for the past 14 years that you have lost sight of the value of money.

They ask for $350,000,000 in this bill, but Senator BYRD, a Democrat, says we will probably be called upon to support appropriations for relief in total to the extent of $15,000,000,000. We are committed to appropriate for relief something like $1,500,000,000 during the coming year. Can we afford it? Is it not time to give more consideration to the taxpayers of this country, more consideration to preserving their financial solvency in this country, so that we can take care of our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I will be against this bill unless some amendments are offered to it and passed which will give this country control of the distribution and which will cut this bill down to $100,000,000.

This amount is all they can spend between now and the fall harvest, when they should be able to feed themselves.

Of course, the State Department wants to put in an extra $250,000,000 more, and they will then keep on spending millions till the money runs out.

There will be opportunities for other aid to be extended through Government departments such as the War Assets;

Then there are many millions of dollars contemplated in further aid for the rehabilitation of foreign countries which will doubtless go through the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank for Reconstruction.

May I call to the attention of the Members of this House that you are acting here only as the agents of 100,000,000 taxpayers, who are going to have to furnish this money. I sometimes wonder what has taken hold of the thinking of the Members of this Congress, or rather, what has so dulled their conception of the value of money.

I realize that for the past 14 years billions have been thrown around by the Government as though no one had to pay the costs piled upon the people by the action of their representatives. It seems to me that the sensibilities of the Members of this House and the appreciation of what it means to vote millions and millions of dollars has been case-hardened and dulled. It seems that we do not fully appreciate the man-hours of work and production it must take to create such savings of hundreds of millions of dollars.

When you vote to appropriate $350,000,000, as requested in this bill, your are, in fact, compelling all of the people to work extra hours or days for the Government without pay, because the Government takes their earnings in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, some of you get so sympathetic and high-minded for peoples of other countries that you very willingly cast their burdens of making a living on the backs of the American taxpayers in our own country.

I know of no other group of men in the United States who, for the past number of years, have been so liberal with spending the other man's money and loading him down with taxes as has the Congress of the United States. You have allowed billions to be wasted, and probably over a billion dollars which we have paid into UNRRA for relief and foreign countries was wasted by that reckless organization. Millions of it went to strengthen communism in several European countries. I predict that unless restrictions are put on this fund when it is voted this same UNRRA group will show up on the pay rolls to continue their nefarious work and waste of the American taxpayers' money. I have no faith in the State Department on its record in conjunction with UNRRA in being capable and trustworthy for the administration of any relief funds in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give you some authentic figures of just a part of the money we have spent in the last couple of years in our effort to play Santa Claus to the world. When you have read these figures you will have a little better appreciation of how well you have tried to serve the world and how poorly you have served the American Government and the American taxpayers in the past.

First, we are committed to about a billion and a half dollars in relief for 1947. During the war we gave Russia $11,320,864,109 in lend-lease.

To Russia since VJ-day, $226,000,000 and yet the State Department further wants to send her some $25,000,000.

To France since VJ-day, $411,500,000; to Czechoslovakia, $174,000,000; to Tito and Yugoslavia something over 33 millions; to Poland, 20 millions.

Under UNRRA we have expended $2,700,000,000. To Greece, 560 millions; to Italy 500 millions. We have spent nearly a billion in Germany, Austria, and Japan. We gave England $4,000,000,000 and France $500,000,000.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. Chairman, through the Export-Import Bank there is earmarked for France $550,000,000, also another credit line to France of $650,000,000. For Belgium, $100,000,000; to the Netherlands, $293,000,000; to Denmark, $20,000,000; to Finland, $35,000,000; Poland, $40,000,000; to China, $64,000,000; to Czechoslovakia, $20,000,000. We gave in relief to China $750,000,000. Our total lend-lease to China was $1,543,000,000.

Then, through the Bretton Woods, we set up the International Bank for World Reconstruction, which will make loans to various other nations of the world. This bank has a capital of $8,000,000,000. The United States Government has underwritten the "lion's share" of $3,175,000,000.

In addition to this we have set up the Monetary Fund for Stabilization of Currencies capitalized at $7,300,000,000 of which again, the large sum of $2,750,000,000 of that capital structure is underwritten by the United States Government. I ask the question, How long will this Congress continue to commit the United States Government to finance the world? We cannot continue to do it without bankrupting our Nation financially.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have made a chart covering what I want to say because I believe it will be easier to see it that way. The reason I did that is because to me it shows a situation that should be presented to the American people. The American people at this time are being asked as taxpayers to furnish $350,000,000, which they will have to pay, of course, in taxes. But, in addition to that, every time we ship any of these things away we must realize we are also asking the people to make another contribution in the form of higher prices for their groceries. It is becoming a little irritating at times to hear people get up and shed tears because food prices are high, and then turn around and advocate shipping of enormous quantities of the scarcer food products all over the world. Who is making food prices high? I am willing to assume my share of the responsibility but I would just like to have the rest of the people in Washington assume their share of the responsibility. If I vote for this appropriation, surely I should in fairness assume my share of the responsibility for causing higher food prices. If you do, please accept your share of the responsibility.

This chart happens to show the beef situation in the last 25 years. We have heard about how much beef we shipped after World War I. We shipped considerably more than we have in any year since World War II. For practically 25 years we have been a Nation that did not furnish her own beef. We were on an import basis. Yet, all at once we blossom out and tell the world we are going to feed it. You can see what happens. If in 1945 we exported 25 times as much beef as we did in 1944, are you surprised at advances in the domestic market price?

I ask you: Is it any wonder that your wives have difficulty when they go to shop in order to secure a good cut of meat?

Do you realize that in many cases only the choicest cuts of meat are being purchased for export? I read this in an editorial in the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern. I checked it. I asked a representative of a big packer in Chicago the other day why it was that certain buyers only took the choicest cattle. I said, "Can they not buy them much cheaper somewhere else?" He said, "I presume they could but they would have to pay for them." I said, "Don't they have to pay for them if they get them from the United States?" He said, "You will have to use your own judgment, the same as I do."

I do not want them to be misled by a lot of this propaganda about OPA, because there never were any calories in OPA and there never will be. Important food products not exported are bringing at the farm level, a price comparable to the OPA price plus subsidy. If it were not for loans to other countries and for UNRRA shipments many farm products would be at support levels this very hour. The American people are entitled to know this and to know the economic reasons behind the scenes that have put prices at their present level. When the American farmer has not been provided a market for 25 years for a product and all at once we step out and try to feed the world, you can see what effect that has on our own markets, and how much difficulty that makes for our own consumers. They should realize that. They should realize that as one of the reasons why they have to pay more when they buy meat.

I did not show the imports on this chart with reference to pork, because the imports do not amount to much. But you can see here the large percentage of American pork that is being exported during the last year. Our exports in the fiscal year 1945 were nine times the amounts exported in 1941. Pork exports are not as much as they were after World War I, but it is a large amount when you consider the increase in the number of people in the United States in 1947. When you take this amount of pork off the American market you can see the effect that has on the meat counters. From 1920 to 1930 we exported one and one-half to two billion pounds of pork each year. In 1945–46 fiscal we exported 600,000,000, and this dropped to 159,000,000 in 1935 and to 253,000,000 in 1941. In 1945 we exported 2,221,000,000 pounds, so you can see the effect that has had on the meat counters of America. If it is good policy to do it, the American people should

know they are paying for it first in taxes, and they should know they are paying for it in their grocery bills, they should not be misled into thinking that it is done by some magic or that it is just picked out of thin air. No one can boast about feeding the world and giving the farmer high prices and then complain about the food prices at the grocery stores of our land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are more or less troubled about this legislation. I know of no one who wants to withhold aid from people who are hungry. There are some things I cannot understand. I notice the plea has again been made by one of the distinguished members of this committee that there should be no amendments offered to this bill. I recall that when the UNRRA bill was before the House the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], now the ranking Member of the minority on the committee, made the same strong plea. I was one of those who then protested against UNRRA. I said I was in favor of helping in a relief program, but I thought if the United States of America was to furnish 72 percent of the money, we should have something to say about how and where it was spent. But the gentleman held up his hands in holy horror and said: "No; we must not amend the bill." We now know by sad experience that our contribution should have been safeguarded.

I find now that there has been considerable change in sentiment. I find now, after American dollars and American goods, representing approximately 72 percent of all of UNRRA, were going into some of these countries that are encased behind the so-called iron curtain and the people of those countries were told it was benevolent Russia that was furnishing the relief, we could not even get into those countries to see how the funds were being administered. It might have been well to have had some safeguards in the legislation at that time. The people of this country who are paying the bill are entitled to know how their money is being used.

I recall very well that amendments were offered to the UNRRA bill through which we would permit the press to go into those countries and publicize the things that were going on, but the same gentlemen who now say, "No, no; we must not amend this bill" objected strenuously to any amendments along that line and so we find today, that our communist ally made good use of Uncle Sam's money and commodities in promoting their own ideologies, knowing that the Congress of the United States had refused to permit their activities to be given the bright light of publicity. And I want to pause here long enough to say that I do not go quite so far as some who would permit the people in some of these communistic countries to starve, just because they happen to be under communistic influence. It may not be their fault. And so I do not think we should say to them "No, we cannot feed you because the communists control you." I certainly would not want some administrator to point to some fellow and say, "Well, you happen to live out in a communist ward; for that reason we are going to let you starve to death." Certainly we should see to it that none of our relief funds or goods are turned over to communistic governments or communist administrators and I assume we have now had enough experience that we have learned our lesson.

The thing I cannot understand is why this committee did not give more heed to the recommendations made by Mr. Hoover. I know, of course, that Mr. Hoover at one time was very unpopular with my friends over here on the right, but the present President of the United States has found it necessary to call on Mr. Hoover's great ability and experience in handling relief and has commissioned him to go over into Europe on two occasions in the past 2 years and make a report to the President.

Mr. Hoover came back with a report. Mr. Hoover did not say that he thought the State Department should be given a blank check to handle this relief matter; no, no; Mr. Hoover made among other suggestions that further careful study be made of the need for this relief in each of these countries and that the relief should be made after full consideration and examination on the ground by specialists appointed by the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the International Emergency Food Council.

He goes on further to say that the distribution should be continually under the supervision of and satisfactory to specialists from these same agencies.

But for some reason I do not understand, this great committee saw fit to ignore that suggestion of Mr. Hoover and they have said, "No, we are just going to give a blank check for $350,000,000 to the State Department." Certainly in my opinion the State Department has never exhibited any great administrative ability. The State Department is not an administrative agency, it is a policy-making agency. Yet we are asked to pass this bill without amending it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me another 5 minutes?

Mr. EATON. My time has expired, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me that minute?

Mr. EATON. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot yield right now.

One reason I am a little bit skeptical about turning the distribution of these funds over to the State Department is that I do not believe that the State Department under UNRRA has done too good a job in protecting relief funds. I have a letter here I intended to read but time will not permit, where the State Department through UNRRA permitted UNRRA relief funds to be used to buy 21 transport planes at a cost of approximately $5,000,000. Those planes were turned over to a Chinese relief organization and the Chinese relief organization in turn, turned the planes over to General Chennault. General Chennault has established a commercial air line with these planes that were purchased with UNRRA funds to the tune of $5,000,000. I have a letter here from UNRRA. The general is going to pay for those planes how? In the use of his commercial air line he is going to distribute some UNRRA relief and at a price that he is going to fix with the Chinese Government, pay for the planes in services. He will become the owner of this commercial air line, paid for by the relief funds, made available by the taxpayers of this country who thought their tax dollars were to be used to feed and clothe hungry people.

I think this bill should have some safeguarding amendments.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of certain references which have been made this afternoon to former public officials, particularly the reference just indulged in by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, about the attitude of certain people on this side of the aisle toward former President Hoover, it occurs to me that it might be appropriate to conclude the debate on this side by reading a brief statement I made to President Hoover, and, incidentally, I was the only man on the committee, Democrat or Republican, who addressed him as "Mr. President" instead of "Mr. Hoover," when he was before our committee:

> Mr. President, the chairman very appropriately referred to you, in introducing you, in some such language as "the outstanding authority in the world on relief."
>
> While I have no question, I wish to express to you my deep appreciation, which I feel sure is shared by the people of the United States generally, of your great accomplishments, not only in the immediate past but after World War I, and what I am sure you are destined to do in the future, not only directly for suffering humanity, but indirectly, in view of the good will and other benefits coming to this country for your own countrymen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, does it seem at all logical or reasonable for a committee, the majority of the membership of which I believe feels toward President Hoover just as I expressed there, to wave aside blandly his recommendations without good reason? No, it is not logical, Mr. Chairman. All these matters, as I said before, were thoroughly discussed and thoroughly considered. The bill was considerably amended and the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought to the House a bill which the majority of its Members on both sides of the aisle believe to be for the best interest of this country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I like the remarks the gentleman made concerning ex-President Hoover. Is the gentleman in accord with what he stated there, namely, that he believes in order for funds to be administered sufficiently and economically we should appoint an administrator to administer that fund?

Mr. JARMAN. That is passingly strange, coming from the gentleman. On the gentleman's side of the aisle you have talked about bureaucrats all of these years and I imagine still are; yet you want to create a bureaucracy to run this relief program which is comparatively small. No. I want the State Department, which has embassies in all those countries, to supervise this program, under the direction of the President, who I imagine will designate an excellent and able administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has observed my position in regard to international affairs and the foreign policy of this Government well knows my position in regard to these matters.

I have frankly admitted that I have been confused and could not understand what I considered as so many inconsistencies in our actions and policies since, and during the last World War.

Some of my criticisms were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title of "Santa Claus" and so forth, and like my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], who has just preceded me, I have time and again claimed that we should think about of our own country, our taxpayers, and not continue to give the resources and substance of our country away to other countries, and have long ago called attention to the fact that it was time for the peoples of all of these other countries to go to work and do something for themselves.

Of course, I have not been opposed to render such aid as was possible to starving peoples, within the limitations of our resources without depriving our own people, and, while I know the vast majority of the American people approved of such programs by the Government, and many thousands participated in relief by charitable and religious organizations, I have doubted the wisdom and the ability of 6 percent of the world's population being expected to continue to feed the balance of the world indefinitely.

It is true that I voted for appropriations for UNRRA for relief to countries devastated by war; however, I was shocked by the manner of administration of this program, and it is not necessary to reiterate what every Member of Congress knows in respect to the administration of that program.

Only yesterday during debate on the rule on the bill H. R. 153 now under consideration, my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN], in discussing our aid to other countries, brought an admission from one of our colleagues who is considered to be fully informed on the subject "that about $1 out of every sixty actually goes to the place it is intended for."

Mr. Chairman, in justice to our constituents who have to pay the taxes for such programs, how can we continue to vote millions of dollars when administered in this fashion? And for how much longer and for how much more will we be called upon in the future?

Mr. Chairman, while I feel certain that the bill under consideration will pass, I do hope that amendments will be adopted which will at least protect us against a repetition of the waste in former programs, and that this country will at least obtain credit for furnishing the aid and relief and accomplish the end for which it is claimed.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution because I believe that we must utilize every resource to relieve human want in the distressed areas of the world. We have expended billions in a war to preserve our institutions and we cannot be indifferent to potential threats related to the misery which the appropriation is designed to alleviate.

The Government will not be asked to continue this program indefinitely. The Foreign Affairs Committee gives us an encouraging picture of progress but leaves no doubt in my mind as to the urgency of the current appeal. I am confident that the people will approve our action in authorizing this aid. Our own national interests are vitally involved.

At the same time we do not discount the humanitarian element in this program. We would have to renounce one of our finest traditions to hold that the suffering in foreign countries is not an official concern of the American people. The problem is too great to be solved outside of governmental enterprise.

The minimum safeguards are in the bill. I believe it will be constructively administered. I know that will be true if we stick to our emphasis upon "helping people to help themselves."

As a device for stabilizing conditions and building good will for America as well as conserving human values the program embraced in this resolution should be approved.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am of course moved by the humanitarian considerations contained in this bill. No one is more anxious than I to do what I can to alleviate human suffering and the awful hunger and despair that has followed in the wake of the great war.

I realize also that communism feeds on human misery; that if the democratic countries desert the overridden peoples of the world, these peoples may feel that they have no place to turn except to communism. I cannot, however, see us take this step without expressing my own reservations.

First of all, I do not want to see us pour relief into one frontier of communistic-dominated countries, while Russia shovels it out on another frontier.

Secondly, we are now confronted with the greatest war debt in the history of the world, and we are forced to take account of our own economy.

Thirdly, we face tremendous responsibilities to our veterans, and I, for one, am going to insist that they be fully met. Need I call attention to the fact that my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has introduced a bill to provide for the immediate cash payment of terminal-leave bonds? I am happy to state that I was one of the very first to sign the petition to bring this bill to the floor. After all these weeks the bill still lacks the necessary signatures.

Fourthly, are we going to do anything about our old-age-assistance program? It seems to me to be high time that we took care of our own old people. Numerous bills to correct this situation have been introduced. When can we expect one of these measures to come to the floor?

What are we going to do for soil conservation, for our crop-insurance program next year? What are we going to to about our long-standing obligations to our Indian citizens?

I cannot say that there is no need for this foreign-relief bill. Nor do I have any doubt but that our great President will see to it that it is administered in such a way as to enhance the cause of humanity, of democracy, and of American idealism throughout the world. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the fact that we have obligations to our own people, obligations to our own country. It must remain, as it has been for all these years, the greatest Nation in all the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, such relief assistance to be limited to the following: Food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a very illuminating and instructive debate here today. It is very evident that it will be impossible to deal properly with the great mass of amendments that are pending this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I might suggest that I have consulted the minority leader, and I announce at this time that if the Interior Department appropriation bill is concluded on Friday, we will go over until Monday. Our plan is, of course, to take up the Interior Department appro-

priation bill tomorrow, and so we have agreed to put this matter over until Monday, as the gentleman from New Jersey so well says, in order that the amendments may be considered at that time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST LEON JOSEPHSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 192, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to be sworn and to testify on March 5, 1947, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on March 5, 1947, and his willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal to be sworn and to testify before the same subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities after he had appeared before it on March 5, 1947.

The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 190, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on February 4, 1947.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST EUGENE DENNIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 193, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpena served upon him on March 26, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an American Legion essay.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT and Mr. GAVIN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

A SUGGESTION REGARDING THE GREEK LOAN PROBLEM

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered before this House on March 12, by the President of the United States, has been acclaimed by some as the outstanding statement of a new American world policy. It has been condemned by other people as an invitation to disaster not only for the United States, but for world civilization and world order. It should be obvious, Mr. Speaker, that any message, on any subject, which has in itself the power to invite such divergent opinions, warrants the close and careful scrutiny of the Congress. We must recall the law of true statesmanship, that panic never creates policy.

In writing a weekly letter to the newspapers, immediately after the delivery of the message, and attempting to set down my first reactions to the President's message, one of my comments was that the President himself seemed to be more nervous than should have been expected under the circumstances. Some observers, both here and abroad, have commented that the tone of the President's message seemed to reveal a state of panic. I am not entirely sure that I agree with the comment, and certainly a state of panic is not warranted by the facts of the present world power situation.

I base that statement, Mr. Speaker, and my following arguments on the fundamental fact, to which every thoughtful person will agree, but which has been permitted to become more and more obscure since Potsdam, namely, that the Soviet Union is an economic and industrial vacuum rather than a big power ready for any new war.

The fact that Mr. Stalin, and the other players on the red squares of the international chess board, have been permitted a certain amount of success with their propaganda—or, in the words of a country in which poker is a national pastime, their bluff—should not blind democratic people everywhere in the world to the basic fact that the Kremlin has every reason to think twice before it oversteps the weak line of defense which the devastation of a long and cruel war has left the USSR. I am sure every military expert will agree with my contention that it is preposterous for a mighty and peace-loving United States to cringe before the rumblings of a propaganda machine from a weakened postwar Moscow.

If we keep in mind this basic fact of present world power politics, I then submit, Mr. Speaker, that the ever recurring "emergency situations" with which the executive branch of this Government continues to present us, reveal a basic weakness in the present administration's over-all approach to problems of foreign affairs. Evidence accumulates to show that the present administration is panicky, confused, and short-sighted in the way it is handling foreign relations of the United States. Frankly, it would seem as though the State Department is never satisfied unless it can stagger continuously from one crisis to another crisis, and from one emergency to another emergency. The poorly prepared always hide their confusions behind the cry, "Emergency."

The total destruction—moral, financial, psychological, and industrial—which World War II brought to this sad world, will remain for years as a challenge to our common labor of reconstruction. No sane student of postwar world affairs would deny that for a moment. You and I will not deny it, Mr. Speaker. This broken world is not going to be rebuilt in a year or two. This uphill work, to set the world going again, will surely be confronted with emergency world situations which must be met with long-range and well-thought-out remedial action by all the nations which look hopefully toward peace.

Admitting this obvious and tragic fact does not imply, however, that the Congress of the United States will blindly foot all the bills of such present and future "emergency situations" which our State Department announces as foreboding the end of the world, or at least as the ultimate crises in American history. The greatest power on earth cannot permit itself to fall into such cheap melodrama.

So we turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the President's request of March 12, for $400,000,000 of American taxpayers' money to protect and reestablish the democratic way of living in Greece and in Turkey. It is necessary to examine the stated purposes of this emergency aid. The reason given by Mr. Truman for the urgent need of this American assistance was the fact that if we did not step in where Great Britain is pulling out both Greece and Turkey would fall prey to the insidious expansion of communism, under the direction of Moscow. I am as militantly opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the blackmailing and to the undermining of other nations by our former ally, the Soviet Union, as is any Member of this Congress. I cherish the hope that, by the grace of God, the present human suffering everywhere in the world will teach the peoples of the world the way of peace and the road to freedom. If this issue could be decided on the basis of moral emotions alone, I would immediately cast an affirmative vote for this emergency gift to the two nations around the Dardanelles. I submit however, Mr. Speaker, that $400,000,000 is an amount which the present administration has arrived at by a sheer arbitrary guess. Military experts have indicated to me, and to other Members of this Congress, that if we have any thought of doing a real job, from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf, we had better be prepared to spend $4,000,000,000, rather than $400,000,000, for such a purpose. Once again it seems to me that Congress is being asked to underwrite

the guesswork of the executive branch of this Government.

But staggering as these figures are, to be taken from the tax moneys of the American people, and concerned as I am on the practical issue of the ability of this Nation to keep on supporting the world, what gives me the greatest and most genuine concern is the fundamentally false philosophy which seems to underline the whole thinking of the present administration on world affairs. We are still being asked to believe that we can buy friendship. We are supposed to accept the idea that we can purchase freedom with dollars. We are to believe that when we are asked for help by a distressed neighbor that it is enough for us to draw a check and mail it to him. We are supposed to believe that the spiritual and moral battle against Communist tyranny can be settled in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to keep on living in the valley of lend-lease. I want to move out. I think every thoughtful Member of this Congress wants to move out. This is certainly one place where we are not required to keep on living where we do not want to live because of a housing shortage, also created by the policies of the administration. We should arm ourselves with moral and spiritual power and unite freedom-loving nations everywhere on the battlefield of liberty, decency, and international understanding.

If the representatives of the Moscow Government wish to continue their mad and treacherous blocking of all recovery and reconstruction of this postwar era, then why do we not go before the United Nations General Assembly and identify the Moscow Government as the potential, if not the actual, enemy, not only of the democracies in fact, but of human liberty everywhere in the world? The time has come to put Mr. Molotov and Mr. Gromyko in the international isolation ward.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Divince Providence has made the United States of America the strongest Nation on the earth today for reasons which we ourselves may not yet see clearly, but in which we have great and enduring faith. I reject the shallow philosophy which dominates the State Department. American world leadership must have a much more profound meaning than simply for the United States to be the banker for a defunct imperialism, once dominated by the British Empire, or to be a sort of petty-cash purveyor of emergency funds, for nation after nation, irrespective of the actual needs of the nations themselves. We must take the dollar sign off of our world policy, not because the United States is unwilling to carry whatever part may be decided to be ours, in bringing peace to the world. but because a petty-cash foreign policy, even to the New Deal tune of staggering billions, is absolutely out of tune with the real challenge of the present world era.

Either we will begin to lead the world in terms of spiritual and political ideas, or we will continue to throw our money, in terms of billions of dollars, out of the window to an ever-expanding world WPA.

The philosophy of the New Deal did not work at home. The present administration would like to have us believe that it will work abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the approach of the present administration to world affairs is in reality cheapening the reputation of America all over the world. I would like to have the policy makers of our State Department come out of their secret chamber, where they keep themselves hidden away from the representatives of the American people. I would like to know who they are and I would like to know what their objectives are, and above all I would like to be told why they think that these policies, proven failures at home, have any chance of success merely because they are to be tried on an international scale.

Let our so-called foreign policy experts listen to the following statement, made by the executive directors of the International Montary Fund, in their annual report of September 1946. This is what they say:

> The road ahead is not an easy one. Although foreign aid has been of great assistance, it is important to recognize that recovery has depended and will continue to depend primarily on their own efforts.

The tragedy of Greece is that the heroic people, whose heroism blends into every preceding era in the history of the world, never had a chance, under the imperialistic system, to govern their own affairs. The attitude of the representatives of Great Britain in postwar Greece was, in the words of people who have been in that country recently, an insult to the democratic spirit, and a damper on the independence to which that nation is entitled. We as Americans abhor the idea that when a situation in any nation has developed into such a mess that it threatens world security, it should then become the burdensome duty of the United States to send in another set of WPA administrators. Frankly, if three centuries have not taught the British Government how to cope with such a situation, what wonderland of maladministration can we not expect from our Paul Porters or our Ed. Pauleys, trained in the school of propaganda, politics, and extravagance, familiar to everyone in this room who has been in Washington during any part of the last decade.

That alternative does not tempt me, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, I am here today to warn this Congress that Greece has suffered, and suffered enough. We owe it to the Greek people to realize that the untold suffering of that nation should make us very hesitant before we turn Greece into a strategic arena, where two diametrically opposed world powers are to draw their battle lines. Human consideration, and statesmanship under the terms of the Republic which made this Nation great, cannot afford to look upon the homeland of a great little nation as nothing but a geopolitical area of power politics.

Of course, Mr. Dean Acheson has assured us that the American unilateral action in Greece is not likely to bring us into war with the Soviets. But then, Mr. Acheson does not have a reputation for being among the accredited major prophets. I also recall that during the discussion over the British loan, some months ago, Mr. Acheson admitted to a feeling that it was not necessary to supply the Congress with full details on matters of this kind. I would be much more inclined to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this Congress listen for a moment to words of the world's press and the world's radio. Not being a Henry Wallace, I take no interest in what the Communist world's press is shouting. The immoral obstructionism of the Communists, and of their fellow travelers, in this country or elsewhere, deserves no hearing in the halls of freedom. What I am worried about is the fact that both conservative and genuinely liberal newspapers and radio voices are warning us that the Truman doctrine is neither practical nor healthy. For example, the Hilversum radio—in Holland—says this:

> The President's address was nothing short of an ideological and economic declaration of war on the Soviet regime.

The Stockholm radio commented as follows on the speech:

> The United States initiative will hardly contribute to peace and relaxation.

A commentator on the Schwarzenburg radio—in Switzerland—pointed a finger at the never ending inconsistency of United States foreign policy, in the following observation:

> A few weeks ago, the United States refused to grant a loan to Greece of twenty-five millions. Today they offer her ten times as much and even extend their generosity to neighboring Turkey. The American Government seems to be very fond of this kind of change, which fringes on the theatrical.

The Shanghai radio summarized its views in the following not-very-complimentary words:

> It seems that Truman has asked for an America-first policy, whatsoever be the risk involved.

While in France, even a De Gaullist paper like L'Orde, which certainly does not harbor any Communist sympathies, warned:

> We don't think that Truman's speech can serve the cause of international peace.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Congress could, of course, take the rash attitude that we do not care what other nations think or say; that we are interested in American security, come what may. Such an attitude would fit the picture given by the Montreal Star, when it says, in an editorial:

> The United States action is regarded here as being strictly in the field of power politics.

Speaking of power politics, let me point out that even British spokesmen are not too sure about the possible success of our new departure in world affairs as proclaimed by the Truman doctrine. The Daily Telegraph of London, which has supported the policies of imperialism, interpreted the Truman speech as follows:

> The President's message constitutes a complete vindication of British policy in Greece.

God forbid that this Nation should ever come to be identified, in the minds of free peoples, with the exploitation and the snobbery which has followed imperialism, wherever it went. If the British record in Greece is to require vindication, let it not come from the free shores of the United States, a Nation founded by men and women who sought to escape the tyrannies and the restrictions of the Old World and who set up in the New World a Nation dedicated to freedom which has since served as a beacon light for all other peoples.

I much prefer, Mr. Speaker, to agree with the cautious words of the Manchester Guardian, which said:

It would be absurd and unworthy for us to condemn the United States for trying to do what we have failed to do.

I must ask: Why does the President insist on having the United States take over a failure, a bankruptcy? What hope have we that we will be more successful in carrying out a policy that has proven itself a failure? I can already hear the loud answer: Ah, but we are wealthier than the British; we are stronger than all nations; we can be just as tough as Mr. Stalin and his gang.

I must therefore ask in all sincerity, Is this the history of America? Is this, in fact, the American way? More than that, I must ask, very seriously, does this unilateral policy, pronounced by the President, conform with our pledge to uphold and strengthen the United Nations? I shall return in a moment to that vital question.

I want first to point out two related sets of facts: First, I want to remind the Members of the Congress that the spokesmen for this administration have been bad guessers so often that I for one see no reason at all to accept their present arguments, in favor of Greece and Turkey, as infallible, or even justified by the facts? Let me point out briefly that these spokesmen for the administration were wrong in their guesses on the effects of the Bretton Woods Agreement. How many Members recall the definite statement on this floor that the passage of the Bretton Woods Agreement would make loans to individual countries unnecessary?

How about the administration's guesses regarding the effects and significance of the loan to Britain or the loan to China? The former was to solve at once the problem of the sterling bloc, and the latter was to keep China on an even keel. In fact, let me comfort and encourage the Members of this Congress with the thought that our own guesses are at least as good as the guesses of the administration experts have turned out to be. Could it not be, in the present case, that the political experts of England, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, China, and France, quoted above, are quite as well-informed regarding world trends as are our own so-called experts? Prudence leads me to suggest that such may well be the case.

I am sure that we must all agree with the Hilversum—Holland—radio, when it sizes up the real problem before us in the following excellent statement:

The crux of the whole issue is whether or not the United States will be able to stamp out misery, hunger, starvation, and squalor in those countries that have now become American protectorates to all intents and purposes.

Now, I would ask frankly, Mr. Speaker, if we have ever begun to fathom what misery, hunger, starvation, and squalor World War II has left us with? Have we seen these countries in what would be considered normal times; can we visualize them now, in the wake of war? Do we really pretend, even to ourselves, to believe that the United States alone can stamp out this world-wide misery? Do we wish to see more and more parts of the globe turned into American protectorates?

Mr. Speaker, I reject imperialism of any kind; above all I reject the Red imperialism to which President Roosevelt bowed supinely at Tehran and at Yalta. And so I reject the false idea that what the sick and broken world now needs is an America with a check book in one hand, and supporting with the other hand a world imperialism which is slipping from the weakening hands of the British Empire. The Truman doctrine is both false and un-American.

The second set of facts is concerned with the economic side of the problem.

As practical people, we Americans have long since begun to recognize the fact that the United States cannot keep up this mad flow of dollars, east and west and everywhere. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that as of this date we have given away the following staggering amounts:

To UNRRA	$3,000,000,000
To Great Britain	3,750,000,000
To France	1,300,000,000
To China	500,000,000
To the International Bank	2,750,000,000
To the Monetary Fund	1,500,000,000
Total	12,800,000,000

To this I add, and I am sure I add it with your full agreement, Mr. Speaker, the sum of $31,000,000,000, spent on lend-lease, which gives us the staggering total of $43,800,000,000. And in a few years, our occupation expenses, to which we are obligated, will increase this amount to something in excess of $50,000,000,000, a combination of digits and ciphers which, prior to the advent of the New Deal, was thought to be reserved exclusively for the use of astronomers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this House should challenge my designation of these moneys as "gifts," I can only say that I meant no offense, but that my memory of post-World War I loans is still good, and that, furthermore, there are quite a few items I have omitted from my list; for example, the running expenses of UN, or the constantly recurring amounts, in current appropriation bills, covering expenditures that we thought, and often, are told, are concluded. In addition, I submit earnestly that, in my opinion—and I suspect in the opinion of most of us in the Congress—these $400,000,000 asked for Greece and Turkey will not only fail to meet the demands upon us for that particular area, but may well be only the beginning of a list of gifts, the scale of which might run somewhat as follows:

To Greece	$250,000,000
To Turkey	150,000,000
To Korea	600,000,000

And I interrupt my accounting, Mr. Speaker, to remind you that the representatives of Korea say that they have already been promised this loan by the President; and to remind you that what Turkey is reported to want is not money, but help in modernizing her army and her agriculture—

To China, an additional	$1,000,000,000
To Austria	250,000,000
To Hungary	150,000,000
To the East Indies	100,000,000
To France	1,000,000,000
To Italy	1,000,000,000
To Palestine	250,000,000

And finally, Mr. Speaker, if the earlier habits of the New Deal, and of this administration, and of the preceding administration, have set any precedents, or given us any historical background, we will probably start down the list again; so I will, as a reminder, add a second loan to Greece, in the same amount:

To Greece, second loan	$250,000,000

Which makes a grand total, not included in my first list, of $5,000,000,000.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that I have carefully refrained from adding that $1,000,000,000, which has been talked of as a new loan to the Soviets. After all, we did not get much return, in the way of friendship, from our $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease gifts to Mr. Stalin and his Politburo, an embarrassing fact which seems at this very moment to be troubling a distinguished Member of the other body. Furthermore, if the U. S. S. R. is so well-to-do that it can now afford, as the papers reported, to offer a loan to the British, not to mention the 500,000 tons of wheat which it took from the allegedly impoverished Russian people to send to the Communist leader, Thorez of France, I think that I meet with the concensus of opinion of this House when I omit that nation from my list.

In conclusion, the Republican Party served this Nation well by having the senior Senator from Michigan, a distinguished member of the United States delegation to the conferences of the United Nations, remind the President and his advisers of the fact that the United Nations was erected to make all nations cooperate for peace and reconstruction.

I am convinced that this is the crisis in the life of the United Nations. I have been to Geneva. I was there in 1937 on the day when the representative of China, the Honorable Wellington Koo, presently the ambassador of that nation to our Nation, made his plea to the League of Nations. I recall the encroachments into the Ruhr and the weakness of the League of Nations; I can see again the rape of China by Japan and I can hear, in my memory, only conversation from Geneva.

I can see Mussolini's legions invade Ethiopia; what a glorious revival, on a puppet scale, of the glories that once were Rome's, to conquer with modern weapons, the bare-foot and spear-armed troops of Hali Selassie. What fun it was, do you remember, to drop bombs on the natives from a plane and see them blown into the air like the petals of a flower. The impotence of the League of Nations was obvious to all the world. I do not want that to happen now. After serious meditation, however, I feel that the Vandenberg amendment does not go to the root of the present problem. I propose that Congress postpone any decision on the President's request for assistence to Greece and Turkey for the time being and, in the meantime, that Congress request the following steps be taken in this vital matter:

First. That a sum of not more than $50,000,000 be given immediately to Greece, to reestablish sound money in that exploited country, and to make such relief and reconstruction purchases as are necessary to carry her people over the next few critical months; and

Second. That the Greek Government present immediately to the United States an honest and long-range rehabilitation plan for Greek economy and Greek industry; and

Third. That the United States present to the General Council of the United Nations in September a challenge to have all member nations come to the assistance of Greece, a nation—itself—which fought the Fascists and the Nazis, and which now finds itself threatened by a foreign-inspired Communist revolution; and

Fourth. That if the General Council does not bring the case of Greece before the UN Security Council, the United States itself do so, and demand that the Soviet veto be declared unlawful if a majority vote in the Security Council shall invite the United States and other democratic nations to defend Greek freedom against totalitarian communism; and finally

Fifth. That the United States, while waiting for such practical and positive action by the United Nations in September, order adequate United States naval forces to patrol the eastern Mediterranean this summer, to keep peace in those waters for the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these suggestions to the Republican leadership in both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to the proper committees of both Houses, particularly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to the Subcommittee on State of the Committee on Appropriations, of this House in which I now speak.

I submit them, also, to that jury which will decide the answers for all of us, to the voters of the United States, the very future of which, as a free nation, may well hang upon the slender thread of this decision.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Did the gentleman from California include also the $15,000,000,000 that Wallace recommended that we give Russia?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have not come to that. I will see how much that now makes my list. Does the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin think Russia is going to get that on Mr. Wallace's suggestion?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I hope not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that Turkey is reported not to want money but to want help in modernizing her army and her agriculture.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 173, Rept. 299), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions; and

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress; and

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other; and

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee on foreign aid composed of 15 Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, 10 of whom shall be selected as follows: 1 from among the majority members and 1 from among the minority members of each of the following committees: the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Agriculture. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a continuing study of (1) actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs; (4) the administrative skills and performance of such agencies; (5) continuing wartime or other controls, if any, required to maintain prices of commodities in short supply at reasonable levels, whether such controls be domestic or international; (6) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but not less often than once in each 6 months.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, or employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary.

THE TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as everyone in the House knows, I am completely opposed to the military alliance with Turkey proposed by the State Department to the House. I am opposed to pouring American taxpayers' money into every corrupt dictatorial government everywhere in the world that may say that it is against communism, provided we will dump good, American dollars into their lap. I have pointed out that the Turkish Government is in an excellent financial position—better than we are, as a matter of fact. I have pointed out their age-old violation of sworn commitments. I have pointed out, too, their persecution of Christians and Jews for the past thousands of years. I have pointed out that even while we have been considering the bill to give aid to Turkey, they have violated one of the provisions of that bill, namely, the provision which guarantees the freedom of the press.

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not complete my objections to this bill. On this floor I have said that the present Turkish Government is a dictatorial government. Now, our State Department knows that, Mr. Truman knows it, everybody knows it—everybody who has taken the trouble to examine the facts. I have inquired from the Library of Congress and from a variety of sources, including the Turkish Embassy, to find out how many people voted in the so-called elections that they had in 1946, and I have discovered that nobody in the city of Washington, including the State Department, the Turkish Embassy, the Library of Congress, knows how many people voted in Turkey. Is not that interesting? For every other country in Europe it is possible to obtain the election figures. You can find out how many people voted in every single country in Europe, except Turkey. Nobody knows how many people registered, how many people were eligible, or how many people voted.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman trust the figures that may have been given in the matter of the votes in such a country as Yugoslavia?

Mr. BENDER. At least they have figures, but we have no figures for Turkey. I would not say that I trust the figures from the present Yugoslavian Government too much, but we do have the figures, and the figures are available in the Library of Congress. We have no figures at all given us from Turkey.

Mrs. BOLTON. Perhaps we have not asked in the right way.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of a single party government the present Turkish dictatorship decided to license an opposition party in 1946. Some of the leaders of the party which had ruled Turkey for 20 years were sent out to set up an opposition party. Other political groups were considered to be subversive, and they were suppressed. Only the so-called Democratic Party—all of its leadership coming from the single party which had ruled Turkey for 20 years—was permitted to exist. Then in the summer of 1946 elections were held for the Turkish National Assembly. I believe that the House would like to hear what the Newsweek magazine of May 27, 1946, reported on that election:

When the Democrats began to organize, however, they ran into trouble. They accused civil authorities of preventing them from setting up headquarters on a Nation-wide scale. They declared provincial state governors refused to allow Democratic rallies, and constantly intercepted mail and telephone messages. They said policemen beat up their followers. Finally, as a protest, they issued a manifesto declaring the Government nondemocratic, and decided they would boycott both municipal and national elections. President Inonu seized upon this action to imply that the Democrats were actually Communists who wanted to discredit the Turkish Government in the eyes of other states. He promised Turkey would fight political parties inspired from abroad and acting as foreign instruments.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we have a government, a dictatorship for 20 years, which set up an opposition party, handpicked its leadership, and the very moment that the new opposition party began to raise any real question about conditions in Turkey, they were called Communists. Imagine the political atmosphere which must exist in a country where a political party which advocates free enterprise is labeled communistic.

The blunt and brutal fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the present Turkish Government is an out and out dictatorship without civil liberties and without political liberties of any kind. The record demonstrates this.

Mr. Speaker, why does our State Department ask us to form a military alliance with a government which they know to be a dictatorship? Why does our State Department have the audacity to tell the Congress that Turkey is on the road to democracy? Why does our good President, Mr. Truman, expect us to pour the American taxpayers' money into a corrupt dictatorship?

Mr. Speaker, the policy does not make sense. It offends the common sense of the ordinary American citizen—the policy is one which leads to war. It is a policy of intervention throughout the world—it is a policy which destroys the United Nations. This Congress should repudiate the short-sightedness of Mr. Truman and of his State Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Colonel Johnson, and also a chart, if under the rules the chart may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the fact that this Government's international trade policy is influenced to a very large extent by a distinguished Russian-born intellectual and world planner whose name on the pay roll is Lewis L. Lorwin, but who also has used the name of Louis Levine as an author.

I understand that Dr. Lorwin's impressive title in the Department of Commerce is the economic adviser of the Office of International Trade. The OIT is being headed by an eminent New Dealer, Thomas C. Blaisdell, whose many governmental assignments have included economic adviser to Rex Tugwell during the days of land resettlement and association with that wizard of economics, Robert Roy Nathan, in the War Production Board.

Now, there is nothing mysterious about Dr. Lorwin's use of the alias, Louis Levine. You may pick up practically any volume of Who's Who in America for the past 20 years and find the name of Louis Levine, but for his biography you are referred to another page under the name of Lewis L. Lorwin.

It may not be important, but note that as Lorwin he spells his surname L-e-w-i-s, while as Levine he spells it L-o-u-i-s. It certainly would have been less confusing for his many readers of his extensive political and economics works and his lecture followings, not to mention his many committee colleagues and governmental associates, if he had made up his mind as to which way of spelling his surname he preferred. I would think he might sometimes get confused himself as to this Jekyll and Hyde sort of nomenclature he apparently adopted for himself for some inexplicable reason.

I have not had time to read through all the editions of Who's Who since 1926–27, but in that particular year, on page 1818, Lewis L. Lorwin is listed, but after his name it says, "See Louis Levine." So you look up Louis Levine on page 1183, and you find that his family name is given as Lewis Levitski Lorwin. Thereafter, later volumes of Who's Who read: "Levine, Louis, see Lewis L. Lorwin," with the exception of the current edition. The name Louis Levine is not listed in the 1946–47 edition but Lewis L. Lorwin is listed in all his Marxist glory.

While all this Lorwin-Levine rigmarole may not be known even to Members of Congress who have had occasion to consult the Office of International Trade, I find that the Library of Congress is aware of the double identity of the scholar from Kiev.

Among the books in the Library of Congress which are attributed in Who's Who to Dr. Lorwin, or Levine if you prefer, there is one entitled, "The Taxation of Mines in Montana," published in New York in 1919 by B. W. Huebsch.

On the title page appears the following acknowledgment of authorship: "By Louis Levine, Ph. D., professor of economics, State University of Montana, author of 'The Labor Movement in France,' etc."

Some one, presumably an employee of the Library, has written in pencil at the top of the same page: "Lewis Levitzki Lorwin." I note that here the spelling of the middle name carries a "z", making it "Levitzki" and not "Levitski" with the "s" as sometimes appears. I call that to your attention only because you will realize how difficult it is to speak or write with absolute accuracy about a gentleman whose name takes on so many variations in spite of his international renown earned through diligent scholarship and study in Russia, France, Switzerland, and the United States, prolific writings that are international in scope, and honors that have been heaped upon him by the New Deal and internationalist groups.

When Dr. Lorwin went to Russia last summer on a mission for our Government, I wonder if he consistently used the Lewis L. Lorwin signature or some variations of it. He is such a busy man that just signing his name to all kinds of papers must be a chore, and I doubt that he bothers to use the technique of Who's Who in listing at least two names.

But after all, as Shakespeare said, "What's in a name?" I would like to give you a bit of history about Lorwin, or Levine as you prefer, from his biography in Who's Who which I assume he prepared or at any rate approved for publication.

He is described broadly as an economist and author. He was born near Kiev, Russia, on December 4, 1883. That would make him 64 years old today. He is the son of Jacob and Anna L. I do not know whether the "L" stands for Lorwin, Levine, or Levitski. He was educated in public schools in New York, private schools in Russia, Switzerland, and France. He got his Ph. D. from Columbia University in 1912. In the same year he married Rose Strunsky, Who's Who relates, but does not say whether she is the same person who was an active anarchist, belonging to an organization known as the League for Amnesty for Political Prisoners, headed by Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman.

Who's Who tells us that Lorwin, or Levine, if you prefer, came to the United States with his parents in 1887. That would have made him at that time a tender lad of 4 years.

We then find that he was an economic expert with the New York Department of Labor from 1912 to 1916; an instructor at Columbia University from 1914 to 1915; a lecturer at Wellesley College in 1916; an instructor, assistant professor, and finally professor of economics at the University of Montana from 1916 to 1919; a special writer on economic problems for the New York World, 1919–20; professor of economics and finance at Beloit College in Wisconsin, from 1920 to 1921; correspondent in Russia for the Chicago Daily News in 1921–22; member of the research staff of the Institute of Economics of Brookings Institution, 1925–33; economic adviser of the International Labor Office, Geneva, Switzerland, 1933–39; economic consultant, National Temporary Economic Committee; National Resources and Planning Board and Board of Economic Welfare, 1933–42.

Before going on with the biographical sketch, I wish to remind the Members of this body that the Board of Economic Warfare was Henry Wallace's old outfit. Once Henry got his hands on the learned doctor, it is not surprising that he should turn up later with Henry in the Department of Commerce. I wish to make it clear that Secretary Harriman did not hire Dr. Lorwin as his staff economist in the Office of International Trade. It certainly appears that Dr. Lorwin got himself placed in this key spot, paying around $10,000 a year, with lots of expenses for travel and per diems, before Henry Wallace departed from the Department of Commerce in the wake of his shocking address before the Communists in New York's Madison Square Garden some months ago.

I also wish to point out that there was a reason for Dr. Lorwin, or Levine if you prefer, leaving the University of Montana in 1919 and going into newspaper work. It seems that his book, Taxation of Mines in Montana, brought about a crack-down because of some of the theories advocated by the distinguished economist, and he was not retained by the university after the furore caused by his book. I mention this fact because the episode may have had something to do with Louis Levine, as he was then known, deciding it would be more advantageous to him to popularize another name in educational circles. At any rate, Who's Who is authority for the fact that he subsequently preferred the name Lorwin, although he did not wish to lose any credit for writings produced under the name Levine. I might say that Dr. Lorwin in the bibliographies of his own books takes great pains to mention his own writings, and he himself lists both of his widely known names to keep the reader from being confused.

At this point I wish to proceed with the biography of Dr. Lorwin as given in Who's Who. He became economic adviser for the Foreign Economic Administration in 1943, and it was from FEA that he went to the Department of Commerce, I believe, along with so many others of Wallace's prodigies. I am sure you are familiar with the leftish Institute of Pacific Relations. Anyway, Dr. Lorwin was a delegate to the third I. P. R. at Kyoto in 1929, to the fifth at Banff in 1933, to the sixth at Yosemite National Park in 1936. That is doing all right for a Russian immigrant boy from Kiev.

He lists memberships in the Institute of Pacific Relations, the American Economic Association, the National Economic and Social Planning Association, and notes that he founded the National Economic and Social Planning Association in 1934. I am not surprised at that because as early as 1925, he presided in Washington at a People's Lobby gathered for the consideration of Socialization of National Resources, Transportation and Banking. Apparently Dr. Lorwin has not been entirely happy with the American system of Government, for he seems to have devoted considerable energy and many years to trying to change it over to something resembling the system of his native Russia. I don't think that there can be any question in anyone's mind about that. In fact, Dr. Lorwin seems to be very proud of that fact, judging by all the data he compiled, or helped to compile, for Who's Who.

In that volume, we also note that he was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Economic and Planning Association from 1934 to 1938. He founded the Institute of World Economics in 1941, served as chairman of its board of trustees, and edited its publication, World Economics.

The Labor Movement in France, published in 1912, appears to be the book that started Dr. Lorwin, then Levine, on the road to literary fame. Its publication date coincides with his winning his Ph. D. from Columbia. Two years later, he published Syndicalism in France. Next came Taxation of Mines in Montana in 1919, with the unhappy results previously mentioned.

In 1924 he published the Women's Garment Workers, and so I assume he must have had some affiliations with the late Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, current head of the ILGWU.

By 1929, Dr. Lorwin was such an important figure that his book of that year, Labor and Industrialism, was translated into the French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. Advisory Economic Councils appeared in 1931. In 1933 he turned out a book on the American Federation of Labor. His 1937 output, the World Textile Conference, was translated into Spanish. In 1941, Dr. Lorwin really hit his stride with three books, the Problem of Technological Unemployment, the Youth Work Programs, and Economic Consequences of Second World War, which was translated into Swedish and Spanish.

In 1942 the prolific doctor authored International Economic Development, followed in 1943 by Postwar Plans of the United Nations and in 1945 by Time for Planning.

Dr. Lorwin also has been a coauthor of various writings, such as ABC of the NRA in 1934; National Recovery Administration in 1935; Labor Relations Boards in 1935, and so forth.

One wonders where Dr. Lorwin, now 64 years of age, could find the time and have the energy to do much more. But Who's Who tells us that he was director of reports on workers' nutrition and social policy, the world textile industry, the world coal industry, and so forth. These documents were published between 1936 and 1939 by the International Labor Office in Geneva. He also has contributed to Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, the Encyclopedia Americana, the Encyclopedia Britannica, American Peoples Encyclopedia, and magazines. He belongs to the Cosmos Club. He lives at the Marlyn Apartments, 3000 Thirty-ninth Street NW., when he is not globe trotting, off on a lecture tour, or attending the sessions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

If any Member of Congress wishes to examine further into Dr. Lorwin's writings, he may find a half-dozen treatises listed in the catalog of the National Archives as a part of the records of the National Resources Planning Board.

I would not wish any of you to miss the treat of reading there, Public Works and Employment Planning in Germany, 1933–39; Wartime Planning in Germany, 1939–40; National Planning in Latin-America; Stabilization of Planning in Sweden; International Economic Development, Public Works and Other Problems; and International Public Works and Economic Development.

On May 14, 1933, Dr. Lorwin signed a petition to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt urging the recognition of Soviet Russia, one of the very first acts of the New Deal.

Probably due to his vast knowledge of Russia, our Government sent Dr. Lorwin to the Soviet Union last summer, but I am unable to find any report that he may have written on this trip, for which the United States shared his expenses with the Soviet Union. I understand that his travel expense to our Government was slightly over $1,200, and I think Dr. Lorwin should have turned in some kind of report on conditions there in view of the fact that writing comes so easy to him and he is such an expert on international affairs.

Now there is something omitted, I am sure, from Dr. Lorwin's biography as published by Who's Who. The 1926–27 edition, on page 1183, tells us that Lorwin, then Levine, studied in Russia, France, and Switzerland between 1903 and 1906. One of his scholastic accomplishments was taking the gold medal at the Classical College at Cherkassi, Russia, during this period. But Who's Who does not mention what part, if any, Levine took in the Bolshevik uprising that broke out in Russia in 1905 and ended disastrously for the revolutionists early in 1907.

Now Leon Trotsky was in the United States in 1902, it can be shown, and he went back to Russia for the revolution in 1905. It is possible then that Trotsky, Levine, and Hillman could have hooked up somewhere over there in Lithuania or Russia during those bloody days.

Now the reason I have gone into this historical background of the Bolshevik uprising is that there is some evidence before Congress that Dr. Lorwin may actually have been mixed up in some way in the fracas in 1905 to 1907. During those years he would have been a vigorous young man of 22 to 24 years of age, even more vigorous than he is today at 64.

Congress has a record of a colloquy that took place in Dr. Lorwin's office between two of his associates, and it goes something like this:

First employee: "Dr. Lorwin is a very powerful person."

Second employee: "Why do you say Dr. Lorwin is so important?"

First employee: "Dr. Lorwin has been a lieutenant of Trotsky. He fled with Trotsky across hundreds of miles hiding out at night. Trotsky wanted Dr. Lorwin to go on with him, but Dr. Lorwin, after a conference with friends, came to America instead with Sidney Hillman."

There is also testimony before a congressional committee that Dr. Lorwin has been identified by a close associate as a Communist.

Now the reason I have brought this matter to the attention of this body is that the people of the United States are worried about communism here in Washington and throughout this Nation, and they want to know what President Truman and the Congress are going to do about communism at home, as well as in Greece, Turkey, Korea, and other faraway places.

It would seem to me that the administration would want to look into the career of Dr. Lorwin, alias Levine. But what do we find? The Department of Justice, Office of International Trade, apparently disturbed by the rumors that are flying around about their illustrious economist, got busy and found a safe and well-paid job abroad for the doctor that would last for a couple of years at least and required him to take his family with him. If it is true that Tom Blaisdell, Lorwin's chief, has ordered him to leave in the near future for London with his family, I think that Congress should get to the bottom of the circumstances that are involved, both with last summer's trip to Russia and the allegedly planned coming trip to London at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

It seems to me that this country is being embarrassed enough with Henry Wallace running around Europe blabbing without sending his old economist over there to London to further confuse the British people as to what the United States of America stands for.

The writings of Lorwin and the speeches of Henry Wallace sound so much alike in many respects that, in my opinion, there is something about this Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde that needs looking into and should be looked into quickly. I think the Congress should look into the whole personnel setup of the Office of International Trade and raise the question as to why our Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was liquidated in favor of an Office of International Trade.

And while we are looking, we had better check to find how many relatives Dr. Lorwin has on the Government pay roll. He is reported to have at least two sons in strategic spots in top security agencies of our Government.

Dr. Levine also should be willing and eager to clear up the question as to who is the Louis Levine writing for the magazine Soviet Russia Today, and if there is any connection between Louis Levine of the Bronx, N. Y., and the Louis Levine of the United States Department of Commerce. This should be easy to clear up if there are two Louis Levines writing about Russia and both of them were in Russia at the same time last summer, as claimed by the personnel department of the Department of Commerce.

It should be very simple for the State Department to produce passports issued to Lewis L. Lorwin and another passport issued to Louis Levine if both of these gentlemen were in Russia at the same time although on different missions. To date, the State Department has not appeared to be very cooperative in helping to straighten out the confusion which would naturally arise in view of the fact that Louis Levine was formerly the name of Lewis L. Lorwin, as I have taken the pains to convince this body this afternoon. If Dr. Lorwin wants to sue anybody for libel for calling him Louis Levine, I wonder why he has not brought suit against Who's Who during the past 20 years.

It all adds up to the same sort of confusion that has characterized just about every act of the New Deal during the past 14 years, and I, for one, want to see some of this confusion cleared up. Let us call a spade a spade, a Red a Red, and a Levine a Levine.

This case of Lorwin, or Levine, a highly paid and responsible executive in Government, is just one of a long list of cases in which there is an obvious smoke screen as to the ideological motivation of the individual.

President Truman, realizing that the elections of November 1946 represented a mandate from the American people to cleanse the Augean stables of Government of the communistic filth allowed to accumulate there during 14 years of New Deal control, issued a so-called "loyalty" directive to the heads of executive agencies and departments.

Obviously the President sought to steal the thunder from the Republicans who accepted this mandate from the people.

The President, however, so trickily worded his directive that the final move in eliminating any governmental employee of doubtful loyalty from his Government position continued to rest with the head of the agency or department of the executive branch of Government appointed by the President.

Representative EDWARD H. REESE, Kansas, chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, quickly spotted this hidden method of the President by which his own appointees would continue to be the Supreme Court of loyalty in any cases of personnel of the executive branch.

I believe with my distinguished colleague from Kansas that questions of loyalty should be determined by those agencies of Government whose activity throughout the years has been the compilation, verification, and retention in readiness for call, by authorized governmental authorities, of any and all cases of individuals infiltrated into Government whose primary loyalty is not to the Constitution and flag of the United States but to the flag and ideologies of any foreign government.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military and Naval Intelligence Services, the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House, records of the United States Civil Service Commission Loyalty Board are the principal investigation agencies to which I refer.

I believe that all cases of personnel of questioned loyalty should be required to run the gamut of the files and records of these agencies. Where an adverse record is uncovered, heads of agencies and departments of the executive branch should be barred from accepting for employment in their departments such personnel until the individuals involved have been able to satisfactorily clear their records.

If ever in the history of these United States, there has ever been a time when our internal national security is so threatened, I do not know of it.

Every employee of the Federal Government is in effect a civilian soldier pledged to the defense of the United States of America, its Constitution, and its flag.

It is as vital that our civilian Government employees be loyal as it is for the members of our armed forces to be loyal.

I plead with the Members of this House to do everything within their individual powers to guarantee that only Americans be placed on guard.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is making a rather startling statement. What is the doctor going to do over there in England officially on our pay roll?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I imagine he is still going to work in the capacity of economic adviser.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS), from April 21 to April 28, on account of necessary absence from the city.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 22, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 214); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

587. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 194. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 239. A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 84. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 173. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Foreign Aid; without amendment (Rept. No. 299). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; without amendment (Rept. No. 297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, and the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3173. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3174. A bill to provide for the procurement of physicians and surgeons in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3175. A bill to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3176. A bill to permit individuals to deduct for income-tax purposes depreciation on their residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3177. A bill providing for compensation at the rate of $5 per day for members of local boards under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 3178. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942, so as to redefine the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3179. A bill to provide protection for Enlisted Reserve personnel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3180. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3181. A bill to grant certain veterans judicial review against the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3182. A bill to exempt from excise tax musical instruments sold to religious institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 195. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study reorganization and home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation placing residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning unemployment compensation and employment service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize payment of medical care rendered to recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3183. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3184. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3185. A bill for the relief of Nick Papedemus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Alvin A. Baumer, doing business as the Baumer Foods Products Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son, W. Thomas Lockerman, Sudlersville Supply Co., George C. Moore & H. A. Moore, J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc., Hobbs & Jarman, and Royse R. Spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3188. A bill to provide for the advancement of James Edgar Davis on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Joe Parry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

368. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Niagara Falls Aerie, No. 88, Niagara Falls, N. Y., in opposition to an increase in postage rates on fraternal publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

369. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Avice D. Brown and citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, regarding S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

370. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Oak Island Lodge, No. 965, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Newark, N. J., opposing any change in the Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

371. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we in this place are weighed down by the problems of our Nation and of our world. Convict us of our share of personal responsibility for the situation in which we find ourselves. May we confess our part in creating our dilemmas, lest we feel no obligation to solve them. Help us to quit waiting for the other fellow to change his attitude and his ways, lest we never give Thee the chance for which Thou hast been waiting to change us.

This we ask in the lovely name of Him who came to change us all, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

As in legislative session, on request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 23, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; and

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	Malone	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced a bill to establish the Missouri Valley Authority. The Chair postponed reference of the bill until this noon. The Chair is prepared to rule. Does the Senator from Montana wish to be heard?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President. I am satisfied to accept the ruling of the Chair, because I am sure it will be based upon a correct interpretation of the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator.

Under a careful analysis of the bill, it seems quite evident to the Chair that there is only one place for the reference to be made. The Chair bases his decision particularly on the language on page 17 of the bill, where the general purpose of the proposed corporation is set forth, requiring the Missouri Valley Authority to make recommendations, including "a complete plan for the unified control and utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system, which will reconcile and harmonize the requirements for flood control, navigation, reclamation, agricultural purposes, power, recreational, and other needs," and so forth.

The bill could be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if the single reference to agricultural purposes were considered to be controlling. It could be referred to the Committee on Public Lands if the reference to irrigation were controlling. But it seems to the Chair that clearly the overriding purpose of the bill deals with flood control, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and navigation, and, under the circumstances, it seems very clear to the Chair that under the terms of the Reorganization Act the bill must be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the able Presiding Officer for the study he has given the matter. I had hoped that it would go to the Public Lands Committee. All I wish, and all I have a right to expect, is a full, fair, and impartial hearing on the bill. I consider it a very important legislative proposal, vital to the welfare of our country. It will implement the policy adopted by the Congress in the full-employment bill. I wish to express the hope that the Committee on Public Works will give the bill the full and impartial hearing to which it is entitled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Alfredo Garofolo from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on January 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORITY FOR EXPENDITURES BY ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution providing for requests for amendments to the Charter of the United Nations resulting in a limited world federal government

"Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

"Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government; and

"Whereas the United Nations is an organization in being and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of world order; and

"Whereas the people in 255 cities and towns of the Commonwealth, by a vote of 586,093 to 63,624 favored strengthening the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to direct our delegates to the United Nations to propose or support amendments to its Charter which will strengthen the United Nations and make it a limited world federal government able to prevent war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the preparation of such amendments our delegates should advocate—

"1. Delegation to the United Nations of limited but adequate legislative, executive, and judicial powers—

"(a) To maintain such world inspection police and military forces as are necessary to enforce world law and to provide world security;

"(b) Gradually and progressively to eliminate national armaments (other than those necessary for internal policing); and

"(c) To provide for dependable revenue.

"2. Balanced representation of each nation in the General Assembly upon a just formula which will recognize influence in the world, natural and industrial resources, literacy, population, and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.

"3. Adoption of a bill of rights assuring fair trial and other adequate protection of persons affected by the Charter and laws enacted thereunder.

"4. Reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the calling of a general conference under article 109 of the United Nations Charter to review the Charter and to recommend appropriate amendments thereto; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution shall not be construed to advocate unilateral disarmament by the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the delegates of the United States to the United Nations.

"In house of representatives, adopted, March 26, 1947.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 31, 1947."

Petitions of delegates of the Townsend Clubs of the First Congressional District, members of the St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, and members of the St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 13, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 457 citizens of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize payment of medical care rendered to recipients of old-age assistance

"Whereas the cost of medical care rendered to recipients of old-age assistance may be included in old-age assistance grants which are shared by Federal, State, and county funds; and

"Whereas the grant to a recipient of old-age assistance may be increased beyond maintenance needs in order to pay for medical care provided that the total grant partially financed from Federal funds may not exceed $45 per month; and

"Whereas Federal regulations prohibit the payment of that portion of the federally shared grant which is intended to pay for medical care to any person other than the old-age assistance recipient or his guardian; and

"Whereas this regulation makes necessary an extraordinary and unnecessary amount of bookkeeping and other work; and

"Whereas because of this regulation grants of old-age assistance are changed very rapidly, much to the confusion and misunderstanding of the recipients, thus creating a feeling of uncertainty and insecurity; and

"Whereas the method approved by the State division of social welfare is administratively sound under existing regulations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of representatives (the senate concurring) memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize direct payment of medical care for services rendered to recipients of old-age assistance; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That an engrossed copy of this resolution be presented to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members of Congress from this State."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

KANSAS LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution 22 of the Kansas Legislature, memorializing Congress concerning amendment of the provisions of the Federal income-tax law, to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products

Whereas one of the prime factors contributing to the development of this country has been the inventive genius, initiative and ability of individual citizens, and the productive capacity of private capital and free enterprise unimpaired by Government restrictions; and

Whereas one of the major problems confronting the Nation in the postwar period is that of furnishing remunerative labor in private industry for our ex-service men and women and for persons who have been employed in Government service; and

Whereas it is in the public interest to encourage the inventive genius of our country and create an incentive for those interested in the development and research of new products; and

Whereas the present Federal income-tax laws hamper and retard such research and development and penalize those engaged in such work by not permitting the deduction from gross income of amounts expended in the research and development of new products as is done in some lines of business which is no more hazardous: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit the taxpayers to elect to capitalize such research and development costs or to deduct the same from gross income where such costs are incurred in connection with the development and research of a new product; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance; the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to the Members of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States with the request that this amendment be presented for consideration to the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRICE REDUCTION POLICY OF GENERAL CABLE CORP.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a telegram I have received from the president of the General Cable Corp., of New York, N. Y., relating to their present price-

reduction policy which is based upon the continuation of increased efficiency and greater production. I request that the telegram be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 22, 1947.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our economy is being challenged on every front while the widely heralded business recession continues its enlistment of recruits from the upward spiraling of costs and sales prices, each of which vies with the other for top honors.

Such conditions cannot long endure. The law of gravity still prevails.

Far better that all parties at interest try out their landing gear now, making a couple of trial landings while they can afford to, which conceivably may forestall a crash landing later.

As we review our situation we find that the earnings of our own people compare favorably with those of the highest pay industries. Also the wage bracket of General Cable is among the highest if not the highest in the electrical wire and cable industry.

Our people enjoy other substantial benefits, such as payment for holidays not worked, a liberal vacation plan, etc. These are the conditions under which our plants have been operating for some days. The management at several of our major plants has been engaged in wage negotiations with the unions representing our people. As the result of such negotiations which were concluded this past week, we increased all these hourly paid workers 11½ cents per hour effective April 13. This new wage level to be maintained for 1 year. All other terms and conditions of our union agreements remain unchanged and continue for the same period.

Notwithstanding such increases and notwithstanding the fact that our backlog of orders is at record high levels, we feel that it is our job to take the lead in our industry to meet the challenge that has been laid down. We do so confident that all of our people, hourly as well as salaried, will resolutely face their responsibility and provide increased efficiency and greater production.

Accordingly, as of April 23 we will effect the following average price reductions which will be applicable to all shipments made on and after that date, including shipments made account of orders and contracts now on our books:

Building wires and cables for home building, industrial building, and other uses, 6 percent.

Weatherproof copper wires for utility and farm lighting use, 10 percent.

Bare copper wires and cables for all purposes, 7 percent.

Magnet wires for motors, radios, transformers, automotive and appliance uses, 12 percent.

This over-all price reduction of the products listed will beneficially affect the cost of home building, electrical appliances, automobiles, farm lighting, and as a matter of fact all activities where electrical wire and cable are used. To complete the picture we are canceling our escalator clause, thereby stabilizing our prices except for fluctuations in the price of copper and lead.

DWIGHT A. G. PALMER,
President, General Cable Corp.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1359. A bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 127); and

H. R. 1369. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 128).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1368. A bill to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 133).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1381. A bill to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics; without amendment (Rept. No. 134); and

H. R. 1605. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 135).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1365. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 130);

H. R. 1367. A bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 131); and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No. 132).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 136).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1363. A bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 450. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; with an amendment (Rept. No. 126).

By Mr. HAWKES, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 554. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; with amendments (Rept. No. 141).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 866. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 140).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 640. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 137);

H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 139);

H. R. 2758. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 142); and

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 138).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 24, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1158. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the Government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1159, to improve the administration of justice and reduce expenditures by eliminating overlapping functions of Federal agencies,

preserving State and local jurisdiction, utilizing existing judicial remedies, and forbidding unnecessary proceedings, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1160, conferring jurisdiction on United States circuit court of appeals to hear certain appeals from convictions by general courts martial, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1161. A bill for the relief of Hans Doelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1162. A bill to permit overtime compensation for rural carriers of the postal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1163. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the burial of World War I and World War II veterans, who are American citizens residing in Europe, in American military cemeteries situated in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for certain flood victims in the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to improve the administration of justice and reduce expenditures by eliminating overlapping functions of Federal agencies, preserving State and local jurisdiction, utilizing existing judicial remedies, and forbidding unnecessary proceedings.

I doubt that any Member of this body has failed, during the last 10 years, to feel mounting concern over the extent to which Government has expanded its control of the daily lives of Americans. For several years we have deluded ourselves in the belief that those controls were war measures, soon to be memories. But active warfare has long since ceased, and yet evidence of mounting Government supervision is abundant; and—which is of even greater importance—a readiness for more of the same is to be found in every quarter.

I doubt that any Member of this body is not saddened every time we find it necessary to regulate, to forbid, to control, or to supervise agriculture, labor, or business. Although we may do so to eliminate or palliate this or that evil, we also know that every time we authorize Government regulation we deprive our people of some of their freedom. More importantly, we make it harder and harder for private initiative and enterprise to survive.

Americans already have come a long way toward looking to their Government instead of to themselves, in small things as well as big. Small business is being liquidated. Big business is being regulated. Agriculture demands Government support. The demands of labor operate on a national scale with legal sanctions. The soul of the individual is being smothered in the struggle of these giants. But these things are well enough known. Indeed, they are so well known that we are in danger of accepting them as commonplace and inevitable. One can hardly speak of them without being viewed as an historical throw-back, or as desiring the restoration of days beyond recall. We are in danger of finding that the evil of big Government has been converted into a virtue. We are face to face with an era in which men, as persons of human dignity, are paled into insignificance beside the modern state and superstate.

Yet I have not risen to speak of this, save as background for a more immediate problem. I refer to the preservation of the Federal system of Government itself, under which we have grown and prospered for the last century and a half. I refer to the practical necessity of limiting national functions so that our Central Government will not be too big for men to manage. I refer to the need of fostering strong State and local governments as a means of both relieving the National Government and enabling people to govern themselves in matters of local concern. I refer to the wisdom of eliminating needless duplications in the National Government itself.

There are indeed many reasons why this is the most important issue before Congress and the country. Trimming budgets, without a housecleaning of Federal functions, is a dangerous business. Cutting taxes without reducing governmental commitments may be foolhardy. Even if we must have big Government, there is no reason why it should not be made efficient. There lies the greatest field for economy; yet it is a field which the economy efforts of the present economy-minded Congress have left untouched.

The elimination of unnecessary functions is a first step in any reasonable program of governmental rehabilitation. Surely duplications can be eliminated. Surely State and local governments should not be unnecessarily and silently superseded in the things they do well enough. Surely repetitious Federal functions can be eliminated.

It is not merely a matter of economy and efficiency, but of justice and survival. Duplications, repetitions, and conflicts between State and Federal authority result in frustrations, injustices, and confusions which reduce our potential as a nation. If two or three governmental agencies are bent on the same task under similar statutes and for similar purposes, a train of undesirable consequences ensues. When we augment Federal authorities and thereby unwittingly deprive State and local governments of their functions, the consequences are even deeper. And when we do things twice where once should suffice, we have entered the realm of the inexplicable.

It is perfectly plain that our National Government needs a new audit of its functions, and we are the constitutional auditors. I suggest that such an audit start with a legislative proposal to eliminate duplications, restore or preserve useful State functions, and do away with senseless repetitions. Let these things be proposed, and then let us hear those who object and those who wish us to go even further. Cities and States should be heard, as well as others. Let us build up a record and turn our minds to the most serious problem which confronts the Republic.

As to duplications of activity by agencies of the National Government, my first proposal is a statute which will simply provide that "where more than one agency is otherwise empowered to act with respect to the same general subject and to a similar purpose or effect, exclusive jurisdiction shall be in the agency which otherwise has the more specialized interest in the subject or, in the absence thereof, first undertakes to act in any case." Perhaps that is not the right language, or enough language, but it conveys an idea which will be difficult to dispute. Rightly framed, such a law would undoubtedly be a good one. It is a proposal upon which extensive hearings should be held.

How many duplications will such hearings disclose? The most informed person can only guess. That they exist is well enough known. Take the regulation of alleged fraudulent practices. The Federal Trade Commission, the Post Office Department, the Food and Drug Administration, and others all have jurisdiction over the subject and sometimes they all act in the same case. Take the antitrust laws and you will find that in various aspects their enforcement is scattered among a dozen agencies, often with reference to the same subjects and parties.

Moreover, duplications exist apart from jurisdiction over general subjects. In a government as big and complex as that of the United States, there is a constant overlapping in details and ancillary matters. One agency may have made an adequate inspection but another may cavalierly refuse to accept any part of it for the purposes of another program. Agency X may have made an investigation extending over months, but agency Y will duplicate it without even undertaking to inquire whether it has been made.

These and similar duplications require study and some solution. We do not tolerate them in private endeavors. We are critical of inefficiency in business. Industry objects to "featherbedding" in labor contracts. Protests are loud when crops are grown only to be plowed under. And yet we are oblivious to the same sort of thing in our own governmental household. The war made us even more lax in that regard, because we then had no time to be efficient. Now we are in danger of letting governmental inconsistency and inefficiency become a habit.

In the even more important field of State and local government, where an atrocious situation has been growing in recent years, I propose a statute somewhat as follows:

Except that nothing herein shall prevent agency action necessary to protect public health and safety or to remove substantial discriminations against actual interstate or foreign commerce, no agency shall have jurisdiction to act in any case to the extent

that (a) a State or its duly empowered authorities, instrumentalities, or subdivisions have undertaken active regulation of the same subject to a similar purpose or effect or (b) courts of the United States or any State have jurisdiction to render equivalent relief.

That is a proposal which may require different or extended language, but the idea is one that is fundamental if our Federal system of government is to survive. We have gone so far along a contrary road that it will take a considerable effort of mind to conceive a workable remedy. But for that very reason it is a matter which requires us to make an intensive legislative investigation, with a view to devising a practicable solution.

Where courts and administrative agencies have the same jurisdiction, there is, of course, no occasion for the use of the lengthy and expensive administrative process. The courts are set up and functioning, our people are familiar with them, and there is therefore no wisdom in duplicating their functions. But, of course, there will be objections, and we should hear and study them so that we may find a solution.

The more important part of this proposal is that we should devise a statute which will prevent the unintentional supercession of State and local governmental functions. Senators may not be aware of it, but the Supreme Court for years has been holding that—because similar powers have been conferred upon some Federal agency—this or that function of State or local governments has by the very silence of Congress been impliedly rendered null and void. Now that Federal functions have expanded with the expanded scope of the commerce clause, blind legislation of that kind on our part may fairly obliterate effective State and local government.

I have an excellent example in a release of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency under date of April 17. It is proposed to extend the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration to articles "while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce." In other words, in order to meet an unfavorable court decision, it is proposed that this agency shall have jurisdiction of local merchandizing after interstate commerce has ceased. I express no opinion on the merits of that suggestion. My point is just this:

If Congress grants such jurisdiction to that agency, will all State and local jurisdiction to the same effect automatically cease to be valid as respects all products which have traveled interstate? See *Cloverleaf* v. *Patterson* (315 U. S. 148). Manifestly, the Food and Drug Administration cannot police the country from top to the grass roots, unless we are willing to give it funds and personnel beyond anything ever contemplated.

The other day the Supreme Court held that the New York State Labor Board had no jurisdiction because of the silence of Congress on that question in adopting the National Labor Relations Act. See *Bethlehem Steel* v. *N. Y. Labor Board* (U. S. Sup. Ct., No. 76, Apr. 7, 1947). That means that we must either endow the National Labor Relations Board with sufficient funds to police the collective bargaining of the whole country, practically from top to bottom, or make some declaration that we do not intend to kill State functions when dealing with national problems.

This is not the time or place to rehearse examples. They extend beyond functions and into details. As to the latter, there is, for instance, no reason why the administrators of a Federal milk order should not accept State tests, or why national securities regulation should not make use of equivalent regulatory functions of States, or why a thousand other things that States and cities do should not suffice when Federal authorities are seeking the same objective. A well-run private enterprise would not think of duplicating such things.

This is more than a matter of economy and efficiency, as I have said before. It is a matter of permitting State and local government to survive rather than become an empty shell. Perhaps we have gone too far along the road of a centralized state, but I have no doubt that every Member of this body hopes not. Unless we re-examine these things now, it may soon be too late.

Finally, in the matter of National Government itself and the growing tendency to do things twice or three times instead of once, I propose a statute reading something like this:

Notwithstanding any statutory authority or requirement therefor, no agency shall have jurisdiction to hold in the same case (a) any form of public proceedings when the named parties respondent default or waive them or (b) repetitious hearings or decision procedures save in reconsidering a proposed or suspended decision, after reopening a finally decided case, or on remand after judicial review.

Senators will recall that last session the Congress passed an Administrative Procedure Act designed to safeguard private rights. I now propose that we add a provision safeguarding public rights—the public right to have things done efficiently and without unnecessary repetition. Congress itself has not been without blame in this situation, for occasionally repetitious procedures are written into the statutes themselves.

I will not dwell at any length on this third phase of the subject. I include it simply to illustrate a senseless duplication of energy and waste of public and private manpower. An agency should be able to make up its mind after one full hearing, as most of them do. It will surprise some Senators, no doubt, to know that some statutes require more than one hearing, to know that some agencies insist upon hearings even though the parties default or consent otherwise, or to know that some decisions do not become final until they have been made twice. These things pass the understanding of intelligent men. Of course, some form of words can be found to justify them upon some metaphysical theory, but they have no place in practical affairs. Government has undertaken enough without undertaking to repeat the same things in the same case involving the same parties.

We have very properly heard much about economy. We have all felt and seen the growing eclipse of State and local government. We have all sensed a need for eliminating governmental duplication. Now is the time to look into those things as they actually operate. They should be spread upon the record and either justified or condemned. We must inform ourselves and then exercise our constitutional duty to devise a legislative remedy.

Perhaps many will be skeptical. But even more people will feel deeply that we have let them down if we do not inquire into these things. In the last 10 years we have investigated excesses of power by agents of government, but we have never examined duplications of functions. We have investigated subversive personnel, but we have never checked the casual and unnecessary elimination of State and local operations, even though we give lip service to the dictum that States and Nation are one. We have sought efficiency in the abstract, but we have not forbidden repetitious procedures.

There is something more to be feared than government by decree. There is an unnecessary multiplicity of administrative lawgivers, a stealthy and silent supercession of State functions, and a reasonless repetition of governmental operations. The remedy, if we can find one, will not turn back the clock but will, instead, make modern government more nearly the efficient and intelligent instrument it is supposed to be.

It will be hard work—hard mental and physical work—to probe the basic problems I have outlined. But unless we do so, we shall simply be giving up to the onrush of statism, centralism, and bureaucratic obfuscation.

I now request that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1159) to improve the administration of justice and reduce expenditures by eliminating overlapping functions of Federal agencies, preserving State and local jurisdiction, utilizing existing judicial remedies, and forbidding unnecessary proceedings, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Administrative Procedure Act (Public Law No. 404, 79th Cong.) be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Jurisdiction: Where more than one agency is otherwise empowered to act with respect to the same general subject and to a similar purpose or effect, exclusive jurisdiction shall be in the agency which otherwise has the more specialized interest in the subject or, in the absence thereof, first undertakes to act in any case. Except that nothing herein shall prevent agency action necessary to protect public health and safety or to remove substantial discriminations against actual interstate and foreign commerce, no agency shall have jurisdiction to act in any case to the extent that (a) a State or its duly empowered authorities, instrumentalities, or subdivisions have undertaken active regulation of the same subjects to a similar purpose or effect or (b) courts of the United States or any State have jurisdiction and authority to render equivalent relief. Notwithstanding any statutory authority or requirement therefor, no agency shall have jurisdiction to hold in the same case (a) any form of public proceedings when the named

parties respondent default or waive them or (b) repetitious hearings or decision procedures save in reconsidering a proposed or suspended decision, after reopening a finally decided case, or on remand after judicial review."

APPEALS FROM CONVICTIONS BY GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill conferring jurisdiction on United States circuit courts of appeals to hear certain appeals from convictions by general courts martial.

For the past several years the Congress has been deluged with complaints from many sources relating to the injustices existing under the present system of military and naval justice.

The public prints have, in all sections of the country, uniformly insisted that reform be had.

Various bar associations, veterans' organizations, and civic groups have passed resolutions requesting that military and naval law and decisions conform with civilian concepts of justice.

Wide publicity has been given to various reports of boards appointed by the Secretaries of War and Navy. These boards were appointed for the purpose of suggesting remedies for the future. As a result of reports submitted by these boards, the War Department has caused a bill to be introduced in this Congress to cure defects existent and to prevent recurrence of injustices resulting therefrom. The Navy Department has not as yet presented any legislation on this subject to this body. Having had some previous experience with respect to the speed with which the Navy Department sometimes operates, I am hopeful that prior to the adjournment of this Congress, something in the nature of a suggestion as to reform will be presented to us by that Department for our action. In this connection, it may be of interest to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to note that approximately a quarter of a million dollars has been spent by the Navy in assembling these various independent reports, so that it would indeed be shameful if nothing constructive resulted from the expenditure of this vast sum.

I am willing to assume that the bill already presented by the War Department and that any bill presented by the Navy Department will partially alleviate the situation with respect to future abuses.

I am more concerned, however, with attempting to remedy the many, many abuses of the past and in trying to restore to their rightful place in the community those victimized by the incompetent and illegal practices of which we have been apprised so often. That there must be many undetected illegalities is readily apparent from an examination of the following excerpt taken from one of the reports submitted to the Navy Department:

In fiscal 1945, 27,861 general courts-martial cases were received in the office of the Judge Advocate General. Only 60 of these cases were set aside in toto (0.0021 percent) by that office. Sixty-nine more were set aside in toto by convening authorities (0.0024 percent). Thus, in the entire Navy, 129 cases, or 0.004 percent, of general courts-martial trials were set aside in toto. The total number of cases resulting in acquittals, reversals, nolle prosequi, and in which pleas in bar were sustained was 682, or 0.02 percent.

The Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of United States Courts for 1945 under the report of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges indicates that 41,653 defendants were indicted in the year 1945. Of these, 34,117 were convicted and 7,536, or 18 percent, were not convicted. Of this 7,536, 6,369 were dismissed and 1,167 were acquitted. The same report shows that in appeals in criminal cases in Federal courts 18.6 percent of the convictions considered in 1945 were reversed.

In other words, the Navy courts were reversed in two one-hundredths of 1 percent, while our civilian courts were reversed in 18/10 of 1 percent. This discovery of the infallibility of the naval courts is a source of expanding amazement to me.

I am not disposed to occupy too much of the Senate's time on this matter at this juncture, but at some future and perhaps more propitious time I shall speak at length on this subject.

I request that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1160) referring jurisdiction on United States circuit courts of appeal to hear certain appeals from convictions by general courts martial, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who since September 16, 1940, has been convicted by a general court martial and sentenced to imprisonment for more than 1 year may, within 1 year after the final approval of the proceedings, findings, and sentence, or within 1 year from the effective date of this act, file a petition in the circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit in which he is incarcerated or, having served his sentence, resides, praying that the judgment and sentence of such court martial be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Cabinet officer under whose jurisdiction the trial was held and thereupon such officer shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the judgment complained of was entered. Upon such filing the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm, modify or set aside such judgment and sentence.

SEC. 2. The judgment of the circuit courts of appeals shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification in the same manner as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code.

SEC. 3. In the event that the petitioner had not yet reached his or her majority at the time of conviction by such court martial, such petitioner may request the United States Attorney in the district in which the circuit court is sitting to furnish him or her with counsel and the United States Attorney is hereby directed upon such request to provide such counsel for the petitioner from among the members of his staff.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be suspended with respect to convictions involving treason, sedition, or sabotage during any time the United States is engaged in actual hostilities with an enemy nation or nations.

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT—RECOMMITTAL OF H. R. 2535

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2535) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Raleigh News and Observer of April 20, 1947, giving a summary of a Jefferson Day address delivered by him at Raleigh, N. C., April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. E. R. QUESADA BEFORE CHARLESTON CHAPTER, AIR RESERVE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. E. R. Quesada, commanding general, Tactical Air Command, before the Charleston Chapter of the Air Reserve Association, at Charleston, S. C., on April 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF LOCAL NO. 1057, TEXTILE WORKERS' UNION OF AMERICA

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the financial statement of Local No. 1057, Textile Workers' Union of America, published in the April 7, 1947, issue of the Fall River Herald-News, of Fall River, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY JESSE H. JONES' "BOYS" GOT AHEAD—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of April 24, 1947, by Arthur Krock, with regard to the conduct of RFC by Jesse H. Jones, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLISTIC MERGERS—ARTICLE BY BENJAMIN L. MASSE

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What About These Mergers?" written by Benjamin L. Masse, and published in the magazine America for April 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Greek-Turkish Aid," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Test for Free Enterprise," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH—ARTICLE FROM KIPLINGER MAGAZINE

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Health Means Plans and Dollars," published in the April issue of the Kiplinger magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISMISSALS IN THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS BUREAU—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I know that many Members of the Senate are now receiving letters relative to the dismissal of employees of the Federal Government because of the proposed curtailment of appropriations. It seems to me that many such dismissals are most unfair; for example, the dismissal in the various customs districts of patrol officers and border inspectors of the United States Customs Bureau. I have an editorial entitled "Obstructing Economy," published in the April 17 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, which I believe sheds considerable light on this situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSTRUCTING ECONOMY

The way of the economizer is hard.

He isn't promoting special privileges for anyone, so nobody much applauds him. He's just trying to save money for the taxpayers, who aren't organized to support him.

The House recently appropriated $32,500,000 to run the United States Customs Bureau in the next fiscal year. That isn't actually a reduction. It's $3,100,000 more than Congress voted the bureau for the current year. But it's $3,500,000 less than the bureau asked for.

So what happened? Before the Senate had acted on the appropriation, 3 months before the end of the current fiscal year, Customs Commissioner Johnson sent dismissal notices to 1,340 of the bureau's 1,605 port-patrol officers and 236 of its 351 border inspectors.

That seems a drastic reduction of employment, hardly justified by what is, in fact, an increased appropriation. We think it is significant that the firings were only in those two categories and nowhere else among the bureau's total of 8,847 employes. And doubly significant that no dismissal notice was sent to any of the 217 employees in the headquarters at Washington, where people have no vote and no representation in Congress.

The political effect of the dismissal notices was immediate and loud. Collectors and other employes in many ports hustled up protests from chambers of commerce, importing firms, relatives and friends. Senators were bombarded with telegrams and letters saying that the reduction of customs personnel would bring on a wave of smuggling and dope-running, wreck our foreign trade and increase the difficulties of foreign travel.

We hope the Senate won't be stampeded by this political pressure. The taxpayers want the Customs Bureau to have all the employes it needs to do its job efficiently—but no more. With $3,100,000 more than it has this year, it would seem, the bureau should be able to pay a force adequate to police the ports, patrol the borders and check the imports.

The Senate also should conduct a real investigation of the blatant propaganda and lobby activities by Customs Bureau officials. The burden of proof that more money is needed is on the bureau. It is not up to Congress to prove that this bureau, or any other, shouldn't have all the money it wants.

EFFECTS OF PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have in my hand two newspaper clippings one of them a column by Ernest Lindley entitled "Shrinking Air Power" and the other an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin entitled "Schuylkill Economy." I should like to commend to the attention particularly of my colleagues from the West and the Southwest and also those from States where floods are a constant and terrifying menace some remarks I desire to make in connection with these newspaper articles.

Mr. Lindley, in his column in Tuesday morning's Washington Post, wrote that "in probing for soft spots in the President's budget, Congress will find that in some areas the Budget Bureau has already cut too deep into the muscle if not into the bone." In this column Mr. Lindley is concerned largely with the danger of our shrinking air power and the atrophy of our research activities in that field along with the maintenance of adequate aircraft production facilities in operating condition. I think he raises a very significant issue and I ask unanimous consent to insert his column in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article by Ernest Lindley was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHRINKING AIR POWER

(By Ernest Lindley)

DECLINING PRODUCTION PERILS DEFENSE

In probing for soft spots in the President's budget, Congress will find that in some areas the Budget Bureau has already cut too deep into the muscle, if not into the bone. It has already become evident that the President underestimated the funds needed for foreign economic aid. After the bill authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey will come a request for assistance in Korea beyond that already included in the budget. It probably won't be long before we are asked to take over part of the British financial load in Germany.

There are some places also in the national defense budget, which accounts for about one-third of the total budget, where the President may have cut too deep. One of these is aircraft procurement. Our first lines of defense—defense of ourselves and defense of world peace—now lie in the air. To keep these lines strong much more is necessary than well-trained units of suitable size in the Army Air Force and naval aviation. Adequate research and development are also needed. Among the essentials also is a sound aircraft production industry. The size of this industry cannot be more than a small fraction of what was needed during the recent war or would be needed if another war should come. But it must be large enough to provide a base for rapid expansion.

With the loss of wartime business, this industry has been withering back toward its prewar dimensions. Last year about three-fourths of the major airframe manufacturers lost money on current operations, although some managed to keep their books in the black by carrying back losses against wartime taxes. At present, the commercial air lines are being reequipped. But their needs are proving to be below earlier estimates and they will be largely met this year. The manufacturers do not yet see a large enough foreign demand to fill the hiatus which will come when United States-owned air lines have been reequipped. If they are to keep going, they must have enough orders from the Army and Navy.

Possibly there are too many aircraft manufacturers for peacetime. Possibly the national defense would not suffer if some of them went out of business or were merged. But there is a point beyond which such contraction would imperil the base of our air power.

The budget presented by the President contains approximately $700,000,000 for aircraft procurement for the Army and Navy combined. This may appear to be a substantial figure. Costs, however, have gone up here, as elsewhere. This sum is the equivalent of perhaps $350,000,000 to $450,000,000 in 1940. In addition, the newer types of planes are more expensive than the old, and the unit cost of producing a few planes is much greater than that of producing a larger volume.

To keep our air defense strong new planes and equipment should continually be designed and manufactured. Enough money must be spent to preserve a sufficiently large corps of designers, engineers, and workers in the aircraft industry. If these cadres are allowed to shrink too much our air defenses will become like a hollow shell.

The Army and Navy should spend continuously on aircraft enough to assure that the aircraft industry is kept up to the minimum essential for national defense. Some estimates already have been made by the Army Air Forces and probably by the Navy. These are said to show that larger appropriations than are recommended in the President's budget will be needed, at least after this year. An independent study may be desirable, possibly by a special commission or board. The problem is there. Little attention is being paid to it. If it is ignored much longer we may find that it has solved itself at the expense of our safety and the peace of the world.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Lindley's statement that the Budget Bureau cut too deeply in some areas is a truism which I have been trying to impress upon the Senate for some time, apparently without too much success, in view of the action of this body in voting for a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cut in the President's budget. Incidentally, Mr. President, I am wondering if the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, which pleaded last February that it had not had the time to make a thorough study of the budget so as to enable it to submit to the Congress on February 15 a break-down showing how savings in the budget could be effected, has made any effort in the more than 2 months since February 15 to document and footnote and otherwise produce evidence in support of the hasty and ill-considered and manifestly untenable proposed budget ceiling it recommended at that time.

In any event, Mr. President, here we are today nearly two-thirds of the way through the regularly scheduled first session of the Eightieth Congress and although it is obvious by now that the Congress is not going to be able to cut any $6,000,000,000 or even four and a half billion dollars out of the President's budget for the 1948 fiscal year, it is also obvious that some very irresponsible attempts are being made to eliminate basic and fundamental services of the Government under the guise of eliminating waste or overlapping, or bureaucratic boondoggling.

I am sure I do not have to commend to the attention of the Senators from the

West and the Southwest the latest example of this short-sighted, irresponsible, indefensible, blind, intemperate, stupid amputation of Government services represented in the Interior Department appropriation bill which we have just read about in the newspapers. Yes, Mr. President, we can have governmental economy all right if the Senators from the West and the Southwest are willing to see their great reclamation projects economized out of existence. But I do not think my fellow Senators from the great West and Southwest would appreciate that kind of economy.

For my own State I am becoming more fearful every day, and my fears were substantially increased after seeing what is proposed for reclamation, that the so-called economizers of the present Congress will attempt the same treatment on flood-control appropriations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator can draw any consolation from what I wish to say, which of course he cannot, what he said about reclamation and flood control reminds me that for the most part our irrigation and reclamation projects have been self-liquidating in the past. If they are now destroyed what hope is there at any place for flood control projects, most of which have not been self-liquidating?

Mr. MYERS. I will say to the Senator that there is no hope whatsoever, and I am now approaching that point.

It was because the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget refused to tell us what would happen to flood control, along with other vital governmental functions, under a six-billion or even a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar budget reduction, that I could not in any conscience support the "New Year's resolution" of last February otherwise known as the legislative budget.

I, Mr. President, am not going to vote for economy at the expense of the reclamation programs of the West and the Southwest. I want my colleagues from those States to know that I recognize the importance of those programs to their States. At the same time, I trust that they, while insisting on adequate appropriations for reclamation, will similarly recognize the vital importance of flood control projects in Pennsylvania and elsewhere and not participate in any attempt to economize the citizens of Pittsburgh and McKeesport and McKees Rocks and Sharpsburg, and Williamsport and Sunbury and Johnsonburg and Ridgeway and St. Marys and Latrobe and other communities in Pennsylvania into new disasters resulting from insufficient funds to go through with flood control programs now underway.

I know for a fact, Mr. President, that the Budget Bureau estimates for flood control next year are far too small to keep the projects now under construction operating at even minimum efficiency. In this instance the Budget Bureau cut not merely to the bone, but into the bone. I know for a fact that if the Congress appropriates every cent recommended for flood control for next year in the President's budget, most of the projects in Pennsylvania would get about half of what they actually require next year for efficient full-scale construction. Moreover, I know for a fact that the money which would be available for planning purposes would similarly be roughly one-half of actual need. It is my intention to attempt to increase flood control allocations for 1948 above the budget estimates so that the Conemaugh River Reservoir for Pittsburgh would not get merely the $3,200,000 recommended to keep the project operating on a halting snail's pace, but the $5,000,000 or so needed to keep it on schedule. I want to increase over the budget estimate the amount available for Punxsutawney's and for Williamport's dikes and Sunbury's project and others and also see to it that there is enough money, and not just half enough money, for planning work next year on the Allegheny Reservoir, the Turtle Creek Reservoir, the Bear Creek Reservoir on the Lehigh River, for Tyrone and for other projects in the planning stage.

After seeing what has been recommended for reclamation—after seeing how the budget estimates, which undoubtedly were low to begin with, if they were arrived at in the same manner as the flood-control estimates, but which nevertheless were cut so irresponsibly by the House Appropriations Committee—I am now beginning to worry about what this same committee might try to do to flood control. May I correct myself, Mr. President? I did not mean to say I am now beginning to worry; rather I meant that the worries I have harbored about flood control ever since this Congress began talking of $6,000,000,000 and four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cuts in the budget are now becoming intense and aching.

Unless those of us from States which would be similarly economized into disaster by separate cuts in the various appropriation bills unite in a determined effort to see to it that these cuts of such significance are reversed, we are certain, Mr. President, to be overcome as Hitler overcame the nations of Europe—one at a time. This is not just logrolling; this is a question of economic survival. Unless those of us from States where floods are a continuous and devastating menace join forces with and are joined by those from States where reclamation is recognized not as bureaucratic boondoggling, but as one of the most important aspects of economic advancement, flood control and reclamation are both doomed in this Congress by the hard-riding, whip-swinging economizers who would bully through a budget which would, after they finished with it, save us nickels and dimes and cost us fortunes and lives.

Mr. President, I would, in all respect, like to ask some of my Republican friends from the West and the Southwest, now that they have seen the handwriting on the wall for reclamation, just one question:

Have they had enough of this kind of economy?

One of the outstanding newspapers of Pennsylvania and of the Nation, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which everyone will recognize as subscribing generally to the Republican political philosophy, but which at the same time is a fair-minded newspaper, has made it clear in an editorial which appeared the other day that it has had enough of what it terms "something that goes by the name of Federal economy," meaning, specifically, such economy as would cripple rivers and harbors dredging operations which the Congress has authorized and has given its solemn pledge to carry out.

The dredging of accumulated culm, coal waste, from the Schuylkill River near Philadelphia and upstream is a combination Federal-State program of long-range nature which the State has undertaken on assurance of a $13,000,000 Federal supplementary program. Philadelphians and Pennsylvanians are now concerned—and with good reason, I think—that the Congress will renege on its obligation.

This editorial states in part:

In a budget-cutting program of the magnitude of the one being undertaken in Congress, an item of $13,000,000, the estimated cost of Schuylkill work, might easily drop out of sight.

The result, of course, couldn't be called economy in any fair sense of the term. Budget cutters could count more millions dropped out of Federal expenditures, but either the Schuylkill wouldn't be cleared or the State of Pennsylvania or perhaps the city of Philadelphia would have to put up the money.

Too much of what is passed off as governmental economy is simply unloading responsibilities on someone else.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHUYLKILL ECONOMY

Pennsylvania, and particularly Philadelphia, have been building on Federal assistance in clearing the Schuylkill of its accumulations of culm. The expectation has been that once the State stopped the dumping of silt into the upper river and got its silt-dredging work well under way down to Norristown, the Government would dredge up to Norristown.

Gratifying progress is being reported in the upper river, but neglect on the part of the State might cause the Federal Government to lose interest.

But now another threat is being mentioned, something that goes by the name of Federal economy.

In a budget-cutting program of the magnitude of the one being undertaken in Congress, an item of $13,000,000, the estimated cost of the Schuylkill work, might easily drop out of sight.

The result, of course, couldn't be called economy in any fair sense of the term. Budget cutters could count more millions dropped out of Federal expenditures, but either the Schuylkill wouldn't be cleared or the State of Pennsylvania or perhaps the city of Philadelphia would have to put up the money.

Too much of what is passed off as governmental economy is simply unloading responsibilities on someone else.

Mr. MYERS. That is about all I have to say at this time, Mr. President, on this matter, an important one to all of us

with rivers in our States which flood and with rivers and harbors which provide navigational problems requiring the assistance of the fine Corps of Army Engineers.

Some highly respected businessmen in Pennsylvania who had been derisive of my position last February on the matter of cutting the Federal budget by six billion or four and a half billion dollars are now beginning belatedly to understand and appreciate that position now that the House has indicated so convincingly what it thinks of the important functions of Government vitally affecting business in my State. Were the legislative budget to be brought out of conference now following the demonstrations we have seen by the House in its unreasoning budget mutilation, I think many of those businessmen who wrote me in February urging deep slashes of six or eight or ten billions of dollars in the Federal budget would now be writing me to stand fast against irresponsible, across-the-board, unreasoning cuts in the budget.

A DAY OF FASTING AND PRAYER—THE THINGS OF THE SPIRIT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to speak very briefly upon a matter entirely apart from the pending legislation, and I hope it will not seem like an intrusion.

Many years ago in the New England States there was instituted the observance of "fast day." It was a day set apart by a decree of the governor, calling upon the people to lay aside the normal duties of trade and commerce and business, for fasting and prayer, a day on which the people would seek divine guidance, to lead them onward and upward, for a better State and Nation. For many decades this custom was observed in the spirit of its inception, and services were held in churches and town halls. The people gathered together for such services and, moved by a sense of the need of divine power, they would seek the guidance of Almighty God in their affairs.

It is a beautiful custom, but in more recent years, as so often happens with holidays, the day has been utilized not for its prime purpose of religious supplication and examination, but for the pleasures incidental to sports and outings.

Today New Hampshire observes Fast Day, by decree of the Governor, in accordance with this time-long custom. While its meaning has largely been dissipated, and the original intent has been largely lost sight of, yet there are a few places and a few groups who still carry out the principles of the original thought behind this observance, and who, realizing their dependence upon Almighty God, gather together for prayer and supplication.

Today we sit here in Government, having to meet problems more vast, more extensive, and more complicated, perhaps, than any generation sitting in our places has ever had to face. We are here to legislate for the people; and it is a truism that the American people have constantly placed too much dependence on legislation as a remedy for our problems and ills.

Years ago Thomas Carlyle well said:

> The American people is that people which thinks it can avert fate and postpone doomsday by an act of Congress.

His words are more true today than they were when he wrote them. There is a sort of blind faith in people today that, whatever the problem, all we need to do is pass a law; yet problems persist, and law alone is not the answer.

Today, right now, in this present, we, the Congress, representatives of 130,000,000 people, face staggering problems. We sit here as trustees for the interests of the people, not only in our own land but indirectly in the interest of people the world over. That is the position which has come to America. That is the responsibility which America has assumed, and we have passed legislation this week, in this body, which evidences this larger conception of America's responsibilities.

So on this day, April 24, which has been set aside by the Governor of New Hampshire as a day of fasting and prayer, I want to bring home to my associates, my colleagues in the Congress, the truth manifested in the hearts of men who initiated this beautiful custom, in the hope that it may inspire us to put first things first, even as we legislate. May the spiritual qualities in each of us, sometimes dormant, be stimulated and aroused, to the end that we may have a clearer understanding that the hope of the world for a real solution of the problems of mankind does not lie primarily in legislation, but rather in an application of the spirit of the teachings of the Master of men. So if we will take time to apply introspection as we appraise our problems today, I think it will become patent to each of us that to implement our wisdom and purposes in legislation, there must needs be spiritual understanding. Let us remember the words of the Master when He said: "Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord."

No truer words were ever uttered, no greater character ever gave expression to them; and today, moved by the seriousness of the problems which confront us, may we set apart at least a part of this day and every day to examine ourselves and the things that move us, and realize that while the things which are seen are temporal, the things which are unseen are eternal.

This morning I had a caller in my office, an eminent member of the bar from Virginia. We were talking on kindred matters, and he told of an incident a few years ago in Bosnia, at Sarajevo, when on a street corner he saw an old mosque covered with moss and ivy. Over the door of the mosque was an inscription which he had translated, and the translation was, "Let all who enter here leave behind the thought of material things, for material things will pass away, while the things of the spirit are eternal." I commend that great fundamental truth to myself and to my colleagues as we carry on here. We are living in a time of reconversion which affects many phases of our national life.

Recently there came to my desk from a friend in New Hampshire an excerpt from a sermon delivered by the pastor of a local church in a New Hampshire town, which impressed me so strongly that I pass it on.

In speaking of the present period of reconversion, he said:

> There is so much to be done; houses to be built, factories to be erected, roads to be laid, lands to be plowed. God wants all that accomplished, mind you, but more. He wants another form of reconversion as well. Those houses must become homes, those factories must have Christian purposes, those roads must carry better people instead of more traffic, those lands must fill empty people instead of bulging barns. So one is driven to say, "Beware of what you make of life, America. Stop praying to your machines and kneel before your God."

May these sentiments and truths be reflected in our lives as we carry on. We are men of divers religious faiths. Most of us learned our religion at our mother's knee, and it is a sacred thing with us, but may it not be timely that on this day, known as a day of fasting and prayer, and dedicated as such by the fathers throughout a large section of our country, we of the Congress may think on the great truths of our own religious faiths and live them out a little more seriously, making them more in evidence as we carry on in the interests of the people.

In conclusion, if your life and my life shall reflect these qualities down through the years, when that time comes, as it will for each of us, when the evening of life draws near and the shadows fall, and our work is done, we shall be able to say in all good conscience, "We have fought a good fight, we have kept the faith and we have not been idle while we prayed: 'Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done.'"

DR. GEORGE W. CALVER—A PRESCRIPTION FOR HEALTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday night Bob Trout, the distinguished news commentator of the Columbia Broadcasting System, discussed in his Story of the Day a man whom we all know and love, the congressional physician, Dr. Calver. Mr. Trout quoted a statement made by the good doctor which we might all bear in mind, and for this reason and for the reason that the story in itself is most interesting, I ask that the text of Bob Trout's comment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Eightieth Congress of the United States is one of the healthiest that's assembled in Washington for a long time. That's the opinion of the man who watches over Congressmen's health—George Calver, the Navy doctor who moved his office into the Capitol 19 years ago and who couldn't leave now if he wanted to. The Congressmen passed a law forbidding the Navy to remove the physician who gives them cough sirup and stern advice 6 days a week from 9 to 4. Dr. Calver told our Washington correspondent the newcomers this time are younger than usual, so they have a better claim on health than an older group. Then the doctor shook his head sadly and he said, "They

won't stay healthy if they keep up the pace they've set for themselves since Congress convened nearly 4 months ago." For years Dr. Calver's been complaining, "Congressmen won't take care of themselves. They spend hours in committee meetings, more hours in sessions of Senate and House, still more in keeping office engagements with constituents, then they wind up the day with social engagements." Not that Dr. Calver disapproves of social life, he told our correspondent. He's for it in moderation. As he put it, "You don't see those smart old-timers, like VANDENBERG and BARKLEY, out at social engagements every night. If they step out once a week, that's plenty. They know how to conserve their strength." What Dr. Calver wants the Congressmen to do is give 5 percent of their time to keeping well. Then they won't have to give 100 percent to getting over being sick. That sounds like a sensible formula, but Dr. Calver is not hopeful about the prospects. He says, "I don't know what gets into these men when they get down here to Washington. They let themselves get tied down on the job, and they forget all about their health."

EFFECT OF REDUCTIONS IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared pointing out the grave effects of the reduction made in the Department of the Interior budget just recently by the House committee, which would seriously curtail research work in the field of conservation, including the elimination of activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service and of the Geological Survey.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT R. O'CONOR, SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

I am definitely in favor of reducing over-all governmental costs to the lowest point possible consistent with efficient functioning of administrative processes. However, I feel it most desirable to bring to the attention of the Senate a serious threat to the future well-being of our people if the drastic reductions announced by the House Appropriations Committee in Interior Department's budget allocations actually are put into effect.

In such an eventuality it is authoritatively stated that the reduction will mean the crippling of vital research work of the Fish and Wildlife Service and also will do away with operation of the Ground Waters Division of the Geological Survey.

One of the public services to be eliminated would be the Fisheries Technological Laboratory at College Park, Md., a facility that has been of the utmost value to the fisheries industry of the eastern seaboard and, to some degree, of the entire United States.

Working in conjunction with the University of Maryland, the Fisheries Laboratory has, on a relatively minimum budget, conducted research and economic studies which have already brought great benefit to the fishing industry and promise even more valuable advances in the years ahead.

It is worth while emphasizing here that in Maryland, along the Atlantic seaboard, and in other sections of the country as well, the sea-food industry ranks in economic importance with agriculture, despite the fact that the assistance rendered to this large and growing industry has never compared in extent with the very complete information and other helpful service rendered to the farmers.

With the Chesapeake Bay as its "proving ground," the Fisheries Technological Laboratory has engaged in research activities that have helped the fishermen and the sea-food-processing industry to improve their methods of taking and processing these valuable foods. Great strides have been made likewise in devising new economic methods and in opening new fields of distribution, as well as improving sanitation and health conditions in the sea-food areas.

Among specific accomplishment of the laboratory, I might mention the large-scale civilian application of DDT for the control of flies and other insect pests. Experiments along this line conducted at Crisfield, Md., have been most successful and have served as a basis for further civilian application of DDT in the food industries throughout the country.

Other important activities conducted by the laboratory include the following:

Packaging and freezing: The packaging and freezing of oysters and crab meat have raised a number of problems which have to be solved before these products can be successfully marketed. These two Chesapeake Bay specialties can be made available the year round if difficulties can be overcome in the freezing process. For the past 2 years investigations have been in progress in this field and successful methods are now available as far as oysters are concerned.

Nutrition: The work of the nutrition and pharmacology group is directed toward determining the food value of fishery products as affected by cooking, canning, preserving, and storage. Not enough information is yet available on what the food value is of the various fishery products when served at the table. This information is needed by the consumer in order to be able to compare rightly alternate foods at the market. Dietitians in institutions and the supply services of the armed forces have specifically requested further data on comparative food values.

Chesapeake Bay fish for school lunches: Suitability of Chesapeake Bay species for use in the school-lunch program has been investigated. Recipes have been developed for use in schools and other institutions. Two special investigations are of interest. One is the utilization of a large inventory of canned fish which was available in the bay canneries. This included not only the development of recipes but recommendations regarding improvement of the product in order to enhance its attractiveness for the consumer. The second is the development of sandwich spreads and infant foods made from fish. These projects are both aimed at increasing the consumption of fish through enhanced attractiveness and usefulness.

Chemical investigations: Due to the decentralization of the meat-packing industry under OPA, the pharmaceutical manufacturers now find themselves without certain basic materials, particularly cholesterol and cholic acid. Believing that fish might serve as a source of these products, they appealed to this laboratory for assistance. Two Chesapeake Bay resources appear likely; these are the ribbed mussel and fish offal. These investigations are still in progress, and the possibility of developing a new industry exists.

Bacteriology: Primarily through studies made in the Chesapeake Bay, two outstanding developments have occurred in the field of bacteriology. The first has been the development of a new method for detecting pollution which reduces the required time 4 to 6 hours. This permits a producer of oysters or crabmeat, for example, to determine the quality of the product before it is put into commerce. This test has saved the industry considerable money and embarrassment, by preventing seizures by regulatory agencies.

Since the beginning of the century there has been dissatisfaction with the bacterial index of pollution and because there has been no specific method for determining the significance of present standard tests, the shellfish industry has sustained a considerable loss through the years. The laboratory has developed a specific test. This is now being recognized throughout the entire United States and represents an outstanding achievement in the field of sanitation. All of the basic work was done in the Chesapeake Bay.

New plants: The Chesapeake Bay, like most other fishing areas, has a number of plants not the result of long-range planning but which have come about through the necessity for increased food supplies. Many operators have come to realize that these plants cannot be efficiently operated if a high-quality commodity is to be produced. The laboratory staff, in cooperation with State and Federal regulatory agencies, has worked with industry members in designing new plants or remodeling old ones. The idea is to enhance efficiency through proper lay-out and at the same time recommend construction which will meet all sanitary standards. The equipment in use at the laboratory has made it possible to suggest to the industry efficient and satisfactory installations.

Sanitation: A most effective sanitation campaign in fisheries has been carried on in the Chesapeake Bay. This has included not only the usual type of survey, but working units have been organized in the fishing communities which permit the program to be self-sustaining. The underlying principle has been to sell an entire community on the value of its fishery industry and to make the citizenry conscious of its responsibility in the production of clean, wholesome, attractive seafood. Not only have the fisheries benefited by these programs, but by working in close cooperation with the health authorities, the entire community has benefited.

Trailer laboratory: The mobile laboratory has been an important part of the program in Chesapeake Bay. Equipped to carry out a variety of investigations, this unit can operate in any area where work is necessary. It has been used in various parts of the bay, largely on bacteriological work. Without it the advances in bacteriology and sanitation mentioned above would have taken a much longer time.

Through the years the laboratory has come to be recognized as the outstanding research center on fisheries on the Atlantic coast. Because such agencies as the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service acknowledge its authority in the fisheries field, it is frequently able to assist the industry in preventing difficulties with enforcement agencies.

Elimination of the Ground Water Division of Geological Survey, in the opinion of scientists in the field of geology and water control, would be a startling backward step. The work now under way in Maryland and many other States on a cooperative basis has spurred undertakings to explore the extent and plan for the conservation of these ground water resources, which particularly of late years have been the subject of concern to authorities particularly in congested residential and industrial areas.

In view of the rapidly increasing demand on the ground water resources of the United States it would be most unfortunate if the advances made in the development of needed information would be nullified now in whole or in part. This is just what would happen if the Federal funds allocated for this purpose were withdrawn.

These studies are among the most important and essential functions of the Geological Survey. There is no more reason to throw this function entirely back upon the States than to throw all of the work done by the Geological Survey back upon the States. Water is the one natural resource essential to everyone.

Maryland particularly would be greatly affected by elimination of either or both

governmental activities, but I am sure that many other States would be affected likewise to greater or lesser degree. I am finally convinced that economies effected at the expense of these two services would be false economy, indeed.

NOMINATION OF GORDON R. CLAPP

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I see very few Senators present. I cannot very well convince them in their absence.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	Malone	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Public Works, which had under consideration the nomination of Mr. Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. After 13 days spent in hearings upon the nomination the committee voted that the nomination should not be approved.

I remember that at the close of the hearings the committee, sitting around the table, discussed in some detail the evidence which had been heard, and each member of the committee gave his reason for either supporting or opposing the nomination. The vote was nonpartisan, cutting across party lines, and I am sure that the decision of each member of the committee was made justly and conscientiously, according to his estimate of the evidence which had been adduced.

In the short time I shall speak today I shall not take issue with the decision which was made by any member of the committee, but because I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clapp, and because his nomination was not approved by the committee, I believe it to be my duty to explain briefly the reasons which impelled me to vote for confirmation.

As I have said, 13 days were spent in hearing the evidence. I attended all the hearings with the exception of one day. I had never seen Mr. Clapp before. Although I live in the eastern section of Kentucky, and Kentucky is served in part by the Tennessee Valley Authority, I have never known anyone connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I am not very well acquainted with its activities. Certainly I have no knowledge as to whether its work has been carried on effectively, and whether it is an efficient operation.

I reached my decision solely on the evidence which was heard. I wish to say that after hearing the witnesses, personally I could find no substantial evidence which would in any way reflect upon the ability, the loyalty, or the character of Mr. Clapp, and for that reason I voted for the confirmation of his nomination. I do not believe that his ability can be questioned.

The evidence showed that he came to the Tennessee Valley Authority as a young man, assuming at first a minor position in the Authority. He served as an assistant to the Director of Personnel. Within a short time he was promoted to Assistant Director of Personnel; later, to Director of Personnel; and, in due course, to General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Today he stands as a nominee for membership on the Board of Directors of the Authority. As I understand, he will be Chairman of the Authority. So, certainly the record of progress he made as an employee of the Authority evidences his ability and his attention to the various duties entrusted to him in the different capacities in which he served.

The chief objection made to Mr. Clapp in the hearings was directed toward his loyalty. It was charged either that he himself was a Communist or that he permitted Communist activities to take place within TVA. I desire to direct my attention to that objection, as fully as I can, developing both sides of the argument. I believe that everyone who attended the hearings would say there was no evidence at all that Mr. Clapp was himself a Communist. There was some proof that he had been a member of or had been associated for a while with the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, which was later denominated a Communist-front organization. It appeared that he himself had never attended its meetings, and that, included in its membership at that time, were people who certainly were not Communists.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall, very distinctly I am sure, that Mr. Clapp signed a call for the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, which was a Communist organization. He called the meeting, taking charge of it. The Senator recalls that from the evidence, does he not?

Mr. COOPER. As I remember, there was published in a Knoxville newspaper a notice of the meeting, to be held, I think it was, at Atlanta.

Mr. McKELLAR. At Chattanooga.

Mr. COOPER. At Chattanooga? There were a great many names on the list, and among the names was that of Mr. Clapp. I remember further he testified that he did not attend the meeting. As I remember, he said his name was upon the advertisement rather as a formality.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So as to keep the record clear, let me say that I believe that meeting was in Memphis, Tenn., in the year 1940, and Mr. Clapp's name appeared in the press as a sponsor of the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. While that organization has been listed as a communistically inclined or a Communist-dominated organization, Mr. Clapp explained the reason for his sponsorship as being solely upon the request of Dr. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, in whom he had great faith, and who, he says, is not a Communist. I desired to point that out to the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct. Mr. Clapp explained it very fully. I am sure from the testimony we have heard it was clearly demonstrated that he himself had never attended any of the meetings of the conference, and that his connection with it was purely formal.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Did the hearings not show that at the time of the Communist activity complained of, in Knoxville, about 1943, as I recall, Mr. Clapp was selected to investigate the matter and to report to the Authority about it? What was the evidence along that line? Except for 1 day I was not present, as I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. COOPER. I am going to develop briefly but as fully as I can the evidence about communistic activities under the TVA. As I remember the testimony, it appears that at the time the investigation was made, there were in the valley 55 or 56 known Communists. Not all of them were working for the Tennessee Valley Authority. From the evidence given by former Representative Starnes, who was sent there as chairman of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, to investigate communistic activity in the TVA, it appeared that he found in the TVA about eight people who were Communists. Personally, from the evidence I heard, I believe there were more than that. I gathered the impression that there may have been 20 or more within TVA at different times.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I was present one day at the hearings. As I recall Mr. Clapp's testimony that day concerning his employment of Communists, it was to the effect that, as to at least one or two to whom specific reference was made, he intended, because they had been in the service of their country during the war, to reemploy them in TVA, since they had disavowed further membership in the Communist Party. That was specifically referring to one or two who were admittedly Communists.

Mr. COOPER. I shall reach that point in a moment, if I may proceed. I shall give all the facts to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that Mr. Clapp said, not on one occasion only, but on many occasions in his testimony—because he testified on many occasions—that he would give Henry C. Hart employment whenever Henry C. Hart came to ask for it, and that Henry C. Hart was one of the best known Communists of the whole lot? Mr. Hart, who appeared as a witness for Mr. Clapp, admitted that he had been one of the most outspoken Communists in the world, but said that he had subsequently abandoned it. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. COOPER. I will say to the Senator, if he will permit me to finish my discussion on communism within TVA, if I should leave anything out, I shall be very glad to have the Senator ask me a question, and I shall try to answer it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. As I stated, I think all the evidence shows that the total number of Communists in the Tennessee Valley Authority, without regard to whether they were employed by TVA or not, was about 55. The testimony shows, I believe, that there were about 8 known Communists in TVA. As I stated, I derived the impression from the testimony that there were more than that.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have very great respect for the Senator from Kentucky, and I am certain he knows that it is very difficult to determine who is a Communist in the United States. I should like to give a little illustration. My own daughter, who, I think, is a very smart woman, had an intimate friend whom she thought was a liberal, but whom she never dreamed was a Communist. It was 5 years before she found out that her girl friend was an active member of the Communist Party. I can give illustrations in New York and in my own home town of Montclair, where people have been discovered to be members of the Communist Party, even though for years nobody knew it. I am sure the Senator understands that.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not believe the Senator thinks there were only 54 Communists within the State of Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I was talking about the evidence that was adduced before the committee.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that, but I merely wanted to bring out the point.

Mr. COOPER. I will say—and I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will agree with me—that there are probably as few Communists in Tennessee and Kentucky as will be found anywhere in the United States. I do not have much experience with them.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will eliminate from the equation the Communists in TVA, I will agree with him; but they collected there to a surprising degree. May I ask the Senator, did he see, a few days ago, a statement by Lewis Schwellenbach, who was formerly a Member of the Senate, and who is now Secretary of Labor, that the very first principle of a Communist is to deny that he is a Communist? So it is impossible to tell about it; they will falsify about it at any point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will my colleague from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose that everything the Senator from New Jersey says is true—and I know it is true—and suppose everything that the Senator from Tennessee says is correct; we are going to pass judgment now as to whether or not the nomination of Gordon Clapp should be confirmed by this body. Are we to blame the young lady in New Jersey, because she did not find out, for 5 years, that an acquaintance of hers was a member of the Communist Party? Are we as Members of the Senate going to turn down a good, first-class American citizen, because during his period of work, there might have been a Communist within the group?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will answer the question. I am not asking the Senator to do such a foolish thing as that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my remarks are based solely upon the evidence which was heard before the committee. For myself, I could not read into that evidence facts which did not appear before the committee, and my judgment is based solely upon the evidence.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one short remark?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want it to appear in the RECORD that I might believe that which the Senator from New Mexico has just insinuated. I am not asking that the Senate turn down the appointee because of what I said. I merely wanted to accentuate the fact that we do not know how many Communists are around, and I do not want anyone to think—because I do not believe it—that there are only 54 Communists in Tennessee, as great a State as Tennessee is.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to read from the record of the hearings. Former Representative Starnes, who was the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee which made the investigation, made a statement which appears on page 220 of the hearings. First, I will say that Knox County is the county in which Knoxville is located, and that is where the headquarters of the TVA is located. Mr. Starnes said:

> We found very little communism, or evidence of communism, in the Knox County area. According to the report of a Communist organizer, Kenneth Malcolm by name, who was not a native, only 55 members of the Communist Party were claimed by him in the Knox County area, and only 7 were employed by TVA as of September 1, 1937.

Then Mr. Starnes went on to say that at that time—that is, in 1940—when, acting for the Dies committee, he made the investigation—

> There were only, as I recall it, at that time three employees of the Authority who openly admitted membership in the organization, and they at that time stated they were no longer members of the organization.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a comment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that that statement appears in the evidence, but I also want to emphasize again that the Communist organizations in New York do not make known how many members they have. So I would not go to the headquarters of communism to find out how many Communists there were in Tennessee or any other place.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I shall speak for only a few minutes more, and I should like to complete my statement and then answer such questions as I can thereafter. I repeat that from the evidence, and particularly the investigation conducted by former Representative Starnes, there was evidence that only eight Communists had been, immediately prior to that time, in the TVA, and I believe that all of them at the particular time the hearings were held had been separated from the TVA, except three. Notice was given to the authorities of the presence of those three members in the TVA, and the TVA was asked to take action. Mr. Clapp testified that action was taken and that two of those persons were separated from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

A third Communist was a young man 19 years old named Henry Hart. Mr. Clapp testified that he talked to Henry Hart. He said he had known him, that he was a young man whose character and opinion had not been formed. He said that Henry Hart told him that before that time he had dissociated himself from the Communist Party. I believe that to be true. Mr. Clapp knowing the young man, and having some knowledge of his character and his mind, permitted Henry Hart to remain in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe that within 2 or 3 months after that time Hart was inducted into the United States Army.

That is the record of Communist activity in the TVA at that time, so far as it appeared from the evidence. There was no evidence to indicate that Mr. Clapp himself was a Communist.

So the question finally resolved itself into this form: Did Mr. Clapp know any-

thing about any Communist activity in the Tennessee Valley Authority? There was no proof from any source which would indicate that he knew of such activity.

A man named Barker, who was the investigator for the Dies committee, and who had preceded former Representative Starnes to Knoxville to make an investigation, testified before the committee. It happens that I am looking at the question asked by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] on page 284 of the hearings. The Senator from Pennsylvania asked:

Was there anything to indicate that Mr. Clapp had knowledge that there was communistic activity among TVA employees?

The answer of Mr. Barker was:

No, sir; definitely.

At the risk of repetition, I say again that if we are to consider purely the proof that was heard in those 13 days of hearings, it cannot be said that Mr. Clapp himself was a Communist, and it cannot be said that he had knowledge of communistic activities. If he is to be denied confirmation of his nomination upon the ground of his association with or any liking for communism it would have to be upon this one fact that he permitted Henry Hart to remain in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For myself I was convinced of the validity of Mr. Clapp's reasons for permitting Mr. Hart to remain. I believe his action indicated that he does not have an impersonal attitude toward those who work for him, but he has an understanding of their problems, and particularly the problems of a young man whose character and opinion, as we all agree, was not formed at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator will agree that evidence was brought out that Mr. Clapp appointed a Communist to try a man whom he himself had promoted seven times—try him because of his alleged unworthiness as an employee. The employee, Mr. Smith, had risen from $15 a week, or about $60 a month, to $3,500 a year, and he was promoted each time during the intervening years by Mr. Clapp, or Mr. Clapp recommended his promotion, and he was promoted. Mr. Clapp appointed a Communist, a Mr. Jandry, to try Smith, and a Communist, a Mr. Siegal, to prosecute him, and a Communist to defend him. There was a trial of this poor young man, one of the finest young men I ever saw in Tennessee, and the trial of course, as had been arranged beforehand, resulted in the dismissal of Mr. James L. Smith. The Senator will recall him as he appeared on the stand, a perfectly honest, a perfectly straightforward young man, who would not be controlled in favor of communism, and for that reason Mr. Clapp turned Mr. Smith out of TVA.

He was not the only one he turned out of TVA. He turned out one of the best young lawyers I ever knew, Mr. Bolt, who came before the committee and testified about that action. At that time Mr. Bolt was receiving a salary of either $6,500 or $7,500 a year, and he was turned out of TVA. Mr. Clapp was a party to turning him out. He appointed the officers to turn him out, and they did turn him out, and the only ground on which they turned him out was that he was not a Communist. Did not that make an impression on the Senator from Kentucky? The Senator is a fair man.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I am going to direct my remarks to that incident. I remember the testimony very well, and the Senator's inquiry has raised two points in my mind.

A man named Smith was employed by the TVA. He testified before the committee. I certainly have no reason, from listening to the man or looking at him, to say anything derogatory about him. In 1939 he was dismissed or separated from the TVA, after hearing, by the procedure followed in the TVA.

First, as to whether or not the man who tried him, the prosecutor, and his counsel were Communists, I must say that no proof was introduced before the committee that any of them was a Communist, except for the statement of Mr. Smith, who had never complained about the hearing accorded him until within the past few months.

Second, as to whether the procedure was unfair, I must say that there was no proof that it was unfair, except for the statement made by Mr. Smith. The fact that he made no complaint until 6 or 7 years after the trial was had must have some weight.

To return for a moment to the question of communism, I do not believe that I need to argue that I hold no brief for communism. It is my honest opinion, after listening to the testimony which was given, that the same thing was occurring in TVA which seems to have occurred in many other agencies of the Government, and still seems to be occurring in various Government agencies. I am sure that we are all aware of the situation, by reason of the recent orders issued by the President and by the Secretary of Labor, which orders have a certain totalitarian aspect. At least, I hold no brief for communism; but in all justice and fairness, I must say that, in my judgment, no substantial proof was introduced at the hearings which would lead to the conclusion either that Mr. Clapp was a Communist or that he knew of any communistic activities in the TVA.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What the Senator from Kentucky has stated is correct. We have had evidence that Communists probably have permeated many agencies of the Government. Only a few weeks ago our former colleague, Senator La Follette, stated that they have even permeated congressional committees. The point I wish to make is that even if there were a few Communists within TVA, this body should not on that basis reject the nomination of Gordon Clapp, who had nothing to do with communism, any more than we should condemn the chairman of a congressional committee because a Communist may have slipped in.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think anyone is making such a contention. The question which I directed to the Senator a moment ago—and I think it is important—is whether or not Clapp intends to reemploy those Communists. He said he would. I asked him that question at the hearing. He thinks they have reformed. Being a Communist is something like being a Jap—once a Communist, always a Communist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A man may sin and then reform. There is nothing in the record to show that Mr. Clapp was a Communist, or is sympathetic to Communists. The record shows that he was a typical young man who became the beneficiary of American opportunities. From a very humble position in TVA, within a few years he rose to a position of trust and confidence, to the extent that he was trusted by the President of the United States. If that is not American opportunity rather than communism, then I do not know how to define the terms.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to finish. I must leave in about 10 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. If I may make a brief observation, I shall not interject further.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. In response to what the Senator from New Mexico has said, let me say that I think the record clearly shows that Mr. Clapp was quite indifferent to communistic activities in the TVA.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to another point. I think it appears from some of the questioning in the committee and the debate which began yesterday on the floor of the Senate, that some opposition apparently directed toward Mr. Clapp is in reality directed against the Tennessee Valley Authority. Again let me say that I am not making an argument for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am speaking about Mr. Clapp. I agree with Senators who are opposed to the Tennessee Valley Authority that it is a rather unusual and peculiar agency of the Government. It has its own civil-service system. It has a peculiar system of accounting which prevent the General Accounting Office from disallowing certain claims and certain expenditures made by the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has a certain option in the use of funds developed in the Tennessee Valley Authority. It does not have to return certain funds to the Government, but it can itself expend such funds.

However, I remind the Senate, particularly Senators who were Members of this body when the act itself and various amendments were enacted—and many amendments have been enacted—that the Congress created the Tennessee Valley Authority. It gave to that Authority

the unusual powers which it possesses. Many Members of the Senate were in this body when amendments were made to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I do not believe that it would be fair to impute those matters to one who is nominated for appointment to a place in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Two questions may be asked in this connection. One of them was asked yesterday by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. I believe it is appropriate to ask whether or not there was any evidence that Mr. Clapp had violated the laws governing the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe that every member of the committee will agree with my statement that no evidence was introduced before the committee which would indicate that Mr. Clapp had ever in any way violated the provisions of the act under which the Tennessee Valley Authority operates.

A second question which might be asked is whether or not, from the evidence, there appears to be any disposition upon the part of Mr. Clapp wrongfully, illegally, or improperly to extend the powers and authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority beyond those granted by the Congress. After listening to the evidence during 12 days of hearings, I can remember no instance in which Mr. Clapp or those under him, with his knowledge, had illegally sought to extend the authority granted under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I believe I can say to Senators who are troubled by that question that all of us who were on the committee would agree that there was no evidence at all that Mr. Clapp intended to usurp authority not granted by the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am not unmindful of the fact that the Senator has an engagement which takes him away.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wanted to make this point clear: The questions which I addressed yesterday to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] were not upon the point as to whether or not there was an indication that Mr. Clapp would exceed the legal authority of the TVA or violate the law. The questions were designed to bring out the impressions of the Senator from West Virginia as to whether there was any indication from the evidence that Mr. Clapp would be cooperative in the effort to bring about a closer and more direct responsibility to the Congress.

Mr. COOPER. I understand.

Mr. DONNELL. I realize the shortness of the Senator's time, and I shall not trespass upon it. However, I ask him whether he has examined the testimony on pages 204, 206, 207, and 208, to ascertain whether or not those pages indicate anything, in the judgment of the Senator, as to the disposition which Mr. Clapp would show in the event a proposal were made to restrict the Tennessee Valley Authority's blanket powers and to make it more directly and immediately responsible to Congress. If the Senator had further time I should like to call his attention to specific questions, but I shall not trespass further upon his time.

Mr. COOPER. I think I understand the point which the Senator has raised. Last evening, after I heard him raise the point, I tried to find some testimony relating to the question and also tried to refresh my mind as to any testimony I had heard or anything which had been said which would bear upon the point. I was not able to find that Mr. Clapp had ever been asked the direct question whether he would himself recommend or initiate or even concur in any action directed toward closer cooperation between the Congress and the TVA. I did get the impression, however—although I think I would have to read all of his testimony to have a fair judgment—that he insisted again and again that they were exercising their powers clearly and strictly within the framework of the Tensessee Valley Authority. I believe his enumeration several times of the many acts which had been passed and the amendments thereto, and the ways in which they were required to report to the Congress, indicated that he had a clear conception of his responsibility to the Congress. I may say further that several times in his testimony he said: "As I believe, that is a matter for careful determination." It gave me the impression that he recognized the authority and power of Congress.

On the question as to whether he should appear before the Congress and recommend the powers of the Tennessee Valley Authority be limited, I may not hold the same viewpoint as that of the Senator from Missouri. I still say that I believe it is the function of the Congress, if it believes that the powers are too great, to limit them but it should not place the blame or the responsibility upon those who are functioning under such powers.

I do not wish to revive matters which have passed, but in reading the hearings concerning the Lilienthal appointment and the debate in the Senate, I felt that there was a tremendous difference in the attitude of the two men. In my judgment, Mr. Clapp understands his authority and the limitations upon it, and it is his intention to obey the authority which is imposed upon him by the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I infer that the Senator is satisfied in his own mind that in carrying forward the program of the TVA Mr. Clapp will administer the law as of any period of time in which the law is before him for administration. Am I also to infer that it is the Senator's position that even if he knew that Mr. Clapp, so far as his personal views as a citizen are concerned, would be opposed to giving Congress the type of control over TVA which some would give to it, Mr. Clapp can still be counted upon to administer the law in accordance with its terms, and that the Senator shares the views which I certainly hold, that it really is not of any relevancy as to the question of confirmation of his nomination whether he personally would like to see TVA exempted from the type of congressional control which some advocate?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's inquiry has brought back to my mind a question which was propounded to Mr. Clapp, the answer to which indicated to me the honesty and forthrightness of the man. I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] asked him this question: "Assume that at some future time the Tennessee Valley Authority should be able to repay to the Government of the United States the funds which have been advanced to it"—I do not want it to appear that I am quoting the words exactly, but I am trying to give their sense. I believe the Senator from Louisiana then asked him: "In such a case do you believe the Tennessee Valley Authority should be continued as it now is, as a type of independent corporation, or should it be eliminated or turned over to private enterprise?"

It would have been very easy for Mr. Clapp to have said that it should go back into private enterprise. But he did not say that. He said, "We have a function to perform and the work is valuable, and I think it should continue in the same character in which it now operates."

That, to me, was his own personal opinion. That was the viewpoint that he had with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. To be very frank about it, I had a great deal more respect for and confidence in him after he made that statement than I would have had if he had evasively said, "I believe it should be turned back to private ownership."

Mr. President, I have no further time. If there are any other questions I shall be glad to try to answer them. But I want to say that in my judgment, after hearing the testimony, I could find nothing in it which at all reflected upon Mr. Clapp's character, his ability, his loyalty to his country, or his attitude toward obeying the Congress and obeying the laws imposed upon him. For that reason I wanted to make this statement, because I am not negatively supporting him; I am affirmatively supporting him, because I believe he will creditably fill the position for which he has been nominated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want first to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the entire committee, including my friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who voted on the other side. I want to thank them all for the very careful attention which they gave to this case when it was before the committee. My honest judgment is that not a single member of the committee had been spoken to by anyone beforehand or had committed himself in any way, but that he gave to the matter his honest judgment. I was present at the hearings on 12 days. I was absent 1 day because there were two conflicting committee meetings on that day. All the members of the committee gave the subject most excellent attention. Some of them changed their minds during the hearings. I did not blame them for that. We had a fair and frank hearing before

the committee. All the members impressed me as being perfectly fair in the conduct of the hearings and in their desire to obtain the truth. I differed with the chairman and his associates regarding Mr. Clapp, but the majority of the committee differed with them also and reported against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clapp for reasons which seem to me to be very sound. I have been in the Senate a long time, and I do not believe I ever saw a committee hear a case more fairly than did the committee having charge of this matter. I take off my hat to each and every member of it. They were very fair; and regardless of how they voted, whether on one side or the other, I take off my hat to them for what they did in that case; and I thank the majority for reporting against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clapp, and I wish to give my reasons.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wonder whether I may state a little of the history of my own connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have been very unfortunate. Although I succeeded in getting the Tennessee Valley Authority bill enacted into law, as I shall explain in a few moments, I have been very unfortunate, from the very beginning to the present time, in almost everything that pertains to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

My first misfortune was this: When I was elected to the House of Representatives, nearly 40 years ago, before I came to Washington to perform my duties, I had a conversation with one of my brothers, who was a high official of the Southern Railway. As all Members of the Senate know, the Southern Railway parallels the Tennessee River from Knoxville nearly to Memphis. I mentioned to him that I wished to improve the Tennessee River by having dams built on it, both for the improvement of transportation and for the development of power. I had in mind having better transportation there. At that time, river transportation was considered very good, and there was a great deal of it on the Mississippi River. When I proposed to that able and splendid brother of mine that when I got to the House of Representatives I was going to introduce a bill to provide for the building of dams on that river, he was strongly opposed to it. He said it would take millions of dollars from his railroad company. That was my first rebuff.

But when I got to the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill providing for the building of dams on the Tennessee River, and I continued to introduce similar bills at succeeding sessions for some time.

At that time Mr. Oscar Underwood, one of the most delightful gentlemen I ever knew, was the leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. He was just as strongly against that bill or against taking any steps in reference to it as was my brother, but Mr. Underwood was a thousand times more powerful. He had no interest in it. I could not get my best friends in the House of Representatives to take any interest in the building of dams on the Tennessee River. They thought the power question was visionary and would get the Government into trouble. They did not want the Government to go into the power business. My power friends in Tennessee, too, did not like it at all. Nevertheless I continued, year after year, to introduce bills on that subject in the House of Representatives. However, I never got anywhere with them.

Mr. President, if I may give a little more of the history of this matter, before I commence what I wish to say about the pending nomination, let me say that I never got anywhere with such bills until the First World War came along. When that war came on, we were able to get through the Congress a bill providing for what then was known as the Muscle Shoals Dam. That was the first dam on the river; and it was in Alabama, at Muscle Shoals. That was completed during the early twenties. Among my opponents in the House of Representatives was the then Representative George Norris, later Senator Norris. He opposed that enterprise for many years. But in 1920 there was a change in administration. Mr. Norris was then a Member of the Senate. Mr. Harding had been elected President, and Senator Norris was made chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He changed his mind about the matter, and introduced a bill for the further improvement of the Tennessee River. I never understood why he did that, for he had been opposed to it very strongly in the House of Representatives, and had even said that neither power nor fertilizer was needed. He said that none at all was needed in Nebraska, and he thought the Government should not go into the fertilizer business at that time. But he changed his mind during the years; and when he became a member of the Senate, he introduced such a bill. Many other bills on the subject were introduced. I had one, of course; I had been working at it for years. It was one of my fads. Finally the Senate and the House, both of which then were Republican, passed the bill; but Mr. Coolidge vetoed it by pocket veto.

Later on, Senator Norris succeeded in securing the passage of a bill providing for the building of another dam. That happened during Mr. Hoover's administration. Mr. Hoover vetoed that bill. That made two bills for the improvement of the Tennessee River, which had been introduced in Congress and had been passed by both the House and the Senate, and had been vetoed by the President.

In 1932, as most of us remember, Franklin Roosevelt became a candidate for President. He went to Tennessee, and to Memphis. I saw him several times. I urged him to become an advocate, not of the Tennessee Valley Authority bill, for we did not use that name at that time, but of the Tennesseee Valley Commission bill which had been introduced. He said he would give it consideration, and he did give it consideration; and he became an advocate of the building of dams on the Tennessee River. That was in 1932. We all know the result of that election.

In January 1933, before Mr. Roosevelt was sworn in as President, he came to Washington. He sent for three men. I happened to be one of them; Senator Norris happened to be another, and Senator Dill, of the State of Washington, was the third one. Mr. Roosevelt was in Washington in his private car, he was on his way to Muscle Shoals; and he wanted to invite the three of us to go with him to Muscle Shoals. I accepted the invitation, and so did the other two; and the four of us went there. We looked at the dam. After getting on the train on our return to Washington, and after we had had dinner—and a good dinner—we went back into the large sitting room in his private car. I shall state the conversation which took place. Remember that Mr. Dill was tremendously interested in the Columbia River. Everyone, including Mr. Roosevelt, thought, as I did, that Senator Norris was tremendously interested in the building of dams on the Missouri River; and of course it was well known that I was tremendously interested in the Tennessee River. To my utter astonishment, indeed, I do not think I was ever more astonished in my life—and let me say that I do not know how long President Roosevelt had known Senator Norris at that time, but it was not a very great while; I do not know whether Senator Norris actively supported Mr. Roosevelt in 1932, although I think he did; but he had never supported him before that time, of course; he did not support him the first time, I know, in 1920, when Mr. Roosevelt was running for Vice President—but at all events, as we were sitting around the table, conversing, the President said, "Gentlemen, I have prepared a bill of my own on the improvement of the Tennessee River." We were all immediately interested. He said he wanted to change the name in the first place, that he had used the word "authority" in describing commissions while he was Governor of New York, and that he wanted to follow that practice. That was satisfactory to everyone; no one objected.

The President said, "I'll tell you what I am going to do." He turned around and said, "I am going to turn this bill on the Tennessee Valley over to my old friend George Norris to introduce in the Senate," and he gave Senator Norris a lick on the back that nearly knocked him out of his chair. I recall that distinctly.

I thought it was quite remarkable that he would give Senator Norris that honor, and my first thought was to say "Well, I thought the Senator from Nebraska was going to introduce the bill relating to the Missouri River," but I wanted to have the Tennessee River dam built—all my colleagues can understand why, coming from Tennessee, I was anxious to have the dam built, so I said nothing.

The present senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was then a Member of the House of Representatives. I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment. The President said, "I am going to give a copy to Mr. HILL, of Alabama, to be

introduced in the House." And that was done.

The House passed the bill very quickly, as did the Senate. Amendments were made to both bills. The Norris bill was somewhat different from the Hill bill. When the matter went to conference, if I remember correctly—and I think I do—the Hill bill was accepted, and the Norris bill indefinitely postponed. But they were the same bill, and Senator Norris had introduced the bill and worked for it in the Senate, and Senator HILL had introduced it and worked for it in the House. I do not believe I ever heard Senator HILL even mention the fact that he introduced the bill in the House, but he did.

The next question was about getting the money necessary. Congress had authorized the expenditure. As Senators who have ever served on the Committee on Appropriations know it is quite a task to get the money necessary to complete a great project such as this. The House of Representatives was really opposed to furnishing the money. The Senate committee was almost evenly divided, and unfortunately Senator Glass, the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at that time, was opposed to it. In the first line-up there were 13 opposed and 12 in favor. We could not get very far.

Senators remember the celebrated leaves-raking bill of President Roosevelt. I believe it was called the WPA bill, but in common newspaper parlance it was called the leaves-raking bill. If men did not have any employment, the Government made employment for them. That bill was passed because there was necessity for it, and when the people began to criticize it, I went to President Roosevelt and said, "Mr. President, my heavens, while people are criticizing your bill so much because they say it is to pay for raking leaves, why do not you forward a real good purpose by devoting some of this money to the building of the Tennessee dams under the Norris bill?" He said, "Why, that is capital. I shall be delighted to do it," and he gave the order immediately.

The two dams were started in that way. One was the Wheeler Dam, in Alabama, just above the Muscle Shoals Dam, the other was what was known as the Clinch River Dam, now known as the Norris Dam. That was in 1933, and we got a very considerable amount of money appropriated. In 1934 a similar appropriation was made, and we got an allocation of that money to continue the two dams.

In 1935 I was sent to the Philippines on a legislative investigation. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is not in the Chamber at the present moment, was on the committee, Senator McAdoo was on the committee, Senator Gibson, of Vermont, was a member, and I think the fifth member of the committee did not go.

We came back by the Red Sea, from the Indian Ocean, by the Far East steamship route. As a youngster, when my mother used to teach me about the Bible, I had thought the Red Sea was about 150 or 200 miles long, but when we got to it, coming from Bombay, I found it was quite a long sea, about 1,200 miles long.

We were traveling on a Dutch boat, and I recall there were 1,800 passengers aboard. The captain was a very learned man, one of the most learned seafaring men I have ever known. He came to us one morning and said, "I have my long glasses up on deck, and I want you gentlemen to come up and see Mount Sinai." We all did, and we four Senators got to talking about our early careers, our childhood, about learning of the Bible, and we concluded that if the captain were willing we would get off the boat when it got to Alexandria on the Mediterranean, and take a bus trip from Alexandria to Palestine, and catch the Dutch boat that would come by a week later, and return home. The captain was perfectly willing, and we made the agreement.

The next morning I received a radiogram from President Roosevelt. This was in 1935. He said in this message, "The Appropriations Committee of the Senate stands 12 to 12 on my public works bill. Hurry home and break the tie." I showed the radiogram to my three colleagues, and they all thought we should return, that I especially should, as I was a member of the committee, on which there were 25 members. So we changed our plans. I had wanted to make the trip to Palestine, as I had never seen Jerusalem; but I came on home, and cast the deciding vote in the Committee on Appropriations. The vote may be found on the record. I am sorry the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is not present, for the vote is on the books of the committee of which he is now chairman. It will be found that I cast the deciding vote. About $5,000,000,000 was appropriated for WPA. It went to the House, and the House appropriated, I think, finally, about $4,600,000,000 or $4,800,000,000, I have forgotten which, but it was in excess of $4,000,000,000. That was the amount appropriated for public works in 1935. My mind at once turned to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I called upon the President to ask him if he would not allot out of that appropriation enough money to complete Clinch River Dam, that was then about two-thirds completed, and the Wheeler Dam, which was then in about the same stage of completion. He said, "Why, certainly." He gave the order at once. That is the way the first three dams were built.

Mr. President, I have been so horribly mangled, speaking figuratively, by statements which have been made about me in the press since the Lilienthal nomination and the pending nomination have come before the Senate—and, by the way, they constitute two out of the total of three Presidential nominations to which I have ever objected—I have been so badly mangled that I hardly know how to keep from boasting a little about how those dams were built. I got the appropriation for every single dam that was built; and the way I got a majority of the committee was that Carter Glass, who was one of the grandest men who ever lived—all Senators, had they known him, would have loved him—Carter Glass came to me and told me that I had to do much of his work on the committee. His health was very bad; it had been very bad for 8 or 10 years. He said that he would change his vote on Tennessee Valley in my behalf, which was very grand of him. It was through that change of vote that I got the first appropriation, and continued to get appropriations. When Mr. Glass was not present himself to vote, I held his proxy. That was the way we got all the dams on the Tennessee River built. Even those purchased from private companies were all gotten in that way.

Senators, I am telling that story for a purpose. It shows how great was my interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The newspapers here recently have excoriated me for all kinds of alleged misdeeds. I think the worst thing they said about me was that I was a "patronage monger." I doubt if there is a Senator on my side of the Chamber who has had so little patronage as I have had, either from the Roosevelt administration or the Truman administration. The truth is that nine-tenths of the patronage in Tennessee—and I suppose in other States, too—belonged to the new organizations, such as TVA, WPA, and PWA, and the numerous other organizations which were set up. I got no patronage that way. I believe I have recommended marshals, United States district attorneys, and the important postmasters in the State. I think I have recommended them, and they have been appointed, but they constitute a very small number of appointees. I never got anyone appointed on TVA in my life, and I think I never did more than to write a formal letter or two in that behalf. I know I never asked for any appointments. I was not consulted about the first three directors who were appointed. Although I had gotten every dollar of the money to build the dams, no President ever consulted me about the appointment of any man to the TVA. I had never heard of Mr. Lilienthal at that time. I think I had heard of Dr. A. E. Morgan, who was a grand engineer and a splendid man. I had heard of H. A. Morgan in my State, but I did not know him. I would not know him if he were at this moment to walk into the Senate Chamber. So far as I can recall, I have never seen him. He has never been in Washington, to my knowledge. I know nothing about him. I know nothing about the employees at all. My principal interest was in getting the dams built, and I got them built. Now I am abused by newspapers for wanting patronage under TVA. What would I want with patronage in the situation in which I now find myself? I never expect again to be a candidate for office. I have won every campaign I ever made by an overwhelming majority. Why should I want patronage? If some friend wanted a job and came to me and asked me to recommend him, I would gladly do it. Otherwise I never recommended anybody. I was not asked to consent when Lilienthal was reappointed. I protested against it. My colleague protested against it.

In reference to the dams, I overlooked the one thing I ought to have said: My first colleague in the Senate was John K. Shields, a distinguished judge who had been a member of the Supreme Court of Tennessee—a fine man, utterly opposed to TVA. He did not want any dams on the river. I had him to fight, as well as the House which never wanted it.

And how did I get those appropriations? We put them on in the committee by a majority of 1. It was an appropriation bill. The bill had to be passed, and the House had to accept it, because I sat there and waited until they did accept it. They would cut them down sometimes a little, and it was always a problem, and all that; but we got every dollar of the money in that way. That is why, Senators, I take a real interest in TVA and its proper management.

I now come to this young man, the nominee. Some Senators heard his testimony; some did not. He is a very nice young man. He would make a splendid clerk in a grocery store or in a meat shop. He is a young man who means well, I have no doubt. I do not know whether he is a Communist or not. He is communistically inclined, because when he was told to set up organizations for putting a man out of the Tennessee Valley Authority, or keeping him in, he always appointed Communists to do his bidding; and they did his bidding. Whether he is a Communist or not, I cannot say of my own knowledge. He says that he is not; but, like many others, he belonged to Communist organizations, and the proof in the record—and there is much proof in it—is certainly to the effect that there were at least 55 Communists in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I am sorry my friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just left the Chamber, and I see some other Senators on this side about whom I might say something. Some of my friends on this side of the aisle, several of whom are now present, voted strongly a few days ago against communism in Greece and Turkey. They were determined, highly determined, greatly determined, according to that vote, and according to what they said, to do away with communism or to prevent the spread of communism into Greece or Turkey. I never heard them make a suggestion about communism in the Tennessee Valley Authority in east Tennessee. Those of us who live there do not like communism. I do not believe I am exaggerating when I say that if an election were held in Tennessee on the question of keeping communism out of the Tenneseee Valley Authority 90 percent of the voters in my State would vote to keep communism out of Tennessee Valley Authority, and their attitude would be that it is much more important to keep communism out of the Tennessee Valley Authority than to keep communism out of Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, I do not know how Senators are going to vote on the pending nomination. I shall not ask any of them to vote against Mr. Clapp. I asked them to vote against confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal a short while ago and they turned me down. Apparently they do not think I have any knowledge respecting what is going on in Tennessee. Take my friend the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Anyone would think that he would not approve what the newspapers have said about my misrepresenting the situation in Tennessee, but he voted the other way the other day, and I certainly am not going to ask him how he shall vote in this case. I am using the Senator from Georgia only as an example. There are several other Senators who have the same attitude. I do not know what I could have done to change their minds. As I stated, I started out with trouble in the TVA transaction, and while I succeeded in having the TVA built, I have had trouble ever since all the way along the line.

I was not consulted about the nomination of either Mr. Lilienthal or of Mr. Clapp. Not a word was said to me about those nominations. I think it might be well here to tell the Senate another thing. Probably I ought not to introduce politics into this matter, but I feel that the truth ought to be known. I have in my hand a long statement. I shall not read all of it. I shall simply refer to it and read some excerpts from it. It is quite a remarkable statement. I did not take any part in the last campaign. I did not ask to be nominated. I did not ask the people to elect me. My colleague is present and will vouch for what I say. I did not go to Tennessee during the campaign. I stayed here in Washington and attended to my duties. I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee and did everything I could to fill that post worthily, and I think the RECORD shows I did. I am boasting about myself, because my friends over on this side of the aisle kicked me around so much when Mr. Lilienthal's nomination was recently considered.

The two newspapers in Knoxville, one a Democratic newspaper and the other a Republican newspaper, both supported me. I believe one of the Chattanooga newsapers also supported me. All the Memphis newspapers did. One Nashville newspaper was against me, and another one was for me. The situation was about even Stephen so far as that is concerned. As I said, I did not take any part in the campaign. I was nominated by an overwhelming majority.

The newspaper that was most active against me was—I have forgotten its name, and I will have to read it from the RECORD. I believe the name was the Item. I cannot say it is a newspaper published by the Government of the United States, but it is published by the TVA at Knoxville. It is a peculiar paper. It publishes only extracts from other newspapers. So when my political enemies, with which the TVA is filled, saw that they did not have a newspaper in Knoxville against me, they put in this newspaper all the extracts they could find; direct statements, innuendoes, everything that reflected on Senator MCKELLAR they published. The TVA published it. The Government of the United States published it. The TVA, which I had created under the circumstances I have related, published those statements. I hold in my hand almost a volume of those statements. All during June and July, after I had been nominated overwhelmingly, without having taken any part in the campaign at all, they continued to publish statements against me. They continued up to the time of the election, but I carried the election overwhelmingly and, as I stated, without taking any part myself in the campaign. The most active, the most vindictive, the most outrageous publications, if I may so put it in my own defense, that were made against me were made at Government expense by Mr. Clapp, because he controlled the publication.

My good friend the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for whom I have great respect, said a while ago in speaking about Mr. Clapp that he had never heard anything against him. I had devoted most of my adult life, nearly 40 years, to building the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Tennessee Valley Authority has been successful. It is a great institution. And here we have this nominee, a young fellow who had been employed by TVA when he was a very young man—he is not an old man now—and moved up by successive gradations. The President appointed him without ever saying beans to me. I ask my colleague from Tennessee if the President consulted with him before he appointed Mr. Clapp?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir; I was not consulted at all about it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Neither one of us was consulted about the appointment. Neither one of us made any recommendations of anyone for the position. I was on the flat of my back in a hospital for 2 months, and it was during those 2 months that Mr. Clapp was appointed. I did not know about the matter until the latter part of December. That was the first time I ever heard of Mr. Clapp having been appointed. Can Senators, whether on one side of this matter or the other, blame me for feeling hurt over the fact that the President of the United States and some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—men whom I have known intimately, men whom I have sat next to in the Senate, one of whom I lived with for a long time—would take up for my enemies in such a case as this? And yet that is what they have done, and that is what they are going to do.

Yesterday my good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] made a statement. I will say that I never opposed him with respect to a nomination that was made in Alabama so long as I have been in the Senate. Yes; I did once.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Just a moment. No; that nominee was not an Alabaman. I take back my statement. He was a Tennessean. I simply cannot understand my Democratic friends. I am talking about my so-called Democratic friends. I cannot understand their attitude. I never was so hurt in all my life as I am now to think that they would participate in a campaign which made me the issue; as if I were a man who could be denounced as the newspapers

denounced me not long ago. I say publicly that the statements made in those denunciations were not true. I have already mentioned the patronage statement. There is not a single word of truth in it.

I feel that I am defending myself in this matter. When those newspapers began to publish these falsehoods about 3 weeks ago, I went over every feature of my life. I am making this statement in my own defense. God knows I am telling the truth. I believe in God. I am not a Communist. If ever I did a dishonest or corrupt thing in my life, I do not recall it. I do not believe I ever have, and yet my own friends on this side of the aisle very largely voted in a way which would indicate that they thought I must have been dishonest in some way.

I do not intend to say anything further about myself. I should like to discuss the nomination which is now before the Senate.

This young man states that he has no politics. He is not a Democrat; he is not a Republican; and he is not a Communist. But he certainly was an anti-McKellar man. At first he denied it, until the newspaper articles were produced. Later I shall ask that they be placed in the RECORD so that Senators may read what was published about me in the campaign, when I was not even present in Tennessee, and when I was not really a candidate. The people of Tennessee do not believe the statements which were made about me. I intended to bring with me some telegrams and letters. I do not believe there is 1 man in 10,000 in Tennessee who believes that the statements which have been made about me are true, or who would uphold any such proposal as this.

This young man had a fine opportunity. He says that I saw him once. I may have. He stated that he was before our committee once during the war asking for appropriations. It is possible that I may have seen him, but I do not recall him. He did not make sufficient impression on me to cause me to recall him. One member of the Appropriations Committee is seated here before me. I ask my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] if he remembers ever seeing him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not recall that he came before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall him at all. He may have been there; but if he was, he was a man with so little in his face that one naturally would not recall him. There is nothing peculiar about that.

I should like to tell about his communistic affiliations. The TVA was filled with Communists. There was a cell there, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] stated earlier in the day. A cell is the same as a chapter. Communist groups are called cells. Of course, the proof is not perfect, because one cannot pin a Communist down to tell the truth. Communists will not tell the truth. Even when they are caught, they usually deny that they are members of the party. According to the evidence, there were at least 55 TVA employees in this Communist cell, and perhaps many more. Some of them were intelligent. Some of them were burning with enthusiasm to establish another government. Some of them went to Russia to see if they could not enlarge their vision of the grandeurs of the Communist government over there. I think they came back with less enthusiasm, but several of them went there. Whether they traveled on Government money I cannot say. But they obtained leave of absence when they left, and were reemployed when they came back.

We have testimony with respect to approximately 55 TVA employees. Some of the most active and vigorous Communists were in that group. During the war they were very vigorous because they thought they would not be molested during a great war. I credit them with some degree of ability for reaching such a conclusion at such a time. But they were kept there by the TVA.

A little while ago my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] said that there was no proof connecting this young man with communism. Two young men from TVA came before the committee and testified. One of them was named James L. Smith, and the other L. B. Bolt. James L. Smith was a business man, and L. B. Bolt was a lawyer. James L. Smith was promoted. Clapp had charge of personnel and Mr. Smith was promoted seven times by Clapp. He was promoted nine times, but seven times by Mr. Clapp. He went up from $60 a month, or $720 a year, to $3,500 in 3 years, on his merits.

Then he was asked to join the Communist Party but he would not do it. He would not take part in the collaboration. He came before our committee and testified about it. He told the truth. He was as straight a young man as I have ever heard testify. There was no forgetting about whether he was a member of this or that organization. He told the truth from start to finish. The truth is that a petition was circulated requesting Mr. Smith's removal. The petition was circulated by Henry C. Hart, who was in his office. At that time Hart received a salary of $1,800 a year. Mr. Smith was receiving almost twice that much. Hart, an admitted Communist, said that he resigned, but he never knew to whom he resigned. He never wrote a letter. When he was asked to whom he wrote a letter, he said he did not know, that he had never written a letter. He simply quit. He quit for a purpose. Hart wrote the petition and signed it, and took it to Mr. Clapp. There was not a charge in it that Clapp did not know was false, not a word in it that Clapp did not know was false.

What did Clapp do? He appointed a man named Jandry to try him. Then he appointed another Communist, by the name of Siegel, to prosecute him. He then appointed another Communist, whose name I have forgotten, to defend him. Of course Mr. Smith was found guilty and was dismissed, as was Mr. Bolt, who is as splendid a young lawyer as can be found. He has a great future before him. He has a good practice in Knoxville. This was several years ago. He was asked to go over into the Communist camp, but he would not do so. This young man, Clapp, told him that he was to be tried just as Smith had been tried, and Bolt told him they could not do that, that he was going to resign. Bolt was receiving a salary of $7,500 a year. I do not know whether Clapp was receiving that much, but Clapp had the backing of the TVA, and the result was that out went Bolt. Smith and Bolt were the only two anti-Communists who where men enough to stand up in the TVA and say they were not Communists; and both of them got thrown out, and both of them testified to the facts.

I challenge any Senator, I do not care who he is, to read the testimony of Mr. Bolt and Mr. Smith and then not say that those men were discharged simply because they opposed communism.

Is this the kind of men the Senate wants at the head of TVA—this personnel clerk who always obeyed orders from above? Where has it landed him? It has landed him with a Presidential appointment. I was never more astonished in my life than when I heard of his nomination. I think he is between 35 and 40 years of age. In appointing him to be the head of the TVA the President passed over two men who had been there a long time, although that is not my reason for opposing the confirmation of this nomination. Mr. Clapp is utterly incompetent and inefficient. I do not know of a Senator who, after examining him, would employ him as a clerk in his office. I know I would not, and I do not believe any other Member of this body would.

I am not asking other Senators to vote as I shall vote. Let them vote as they think best. I have stopped asking Senators to vote as I think they should. Certainly I have been vastly humiliated as a result of asking some Senators who I thought were friendly to me to take my word regarding certain men from my own State. I know the people in my State. Recently we were considering the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, and now we are considering the nomination of Mr. Clapp. They have been in Tennessee only in recent years—one of them for 13 years and the other for 14 years. Even so, I know what they have done.

Mr. President, the TVA is one of the grandest institutions that ever was erected anywhere in the world. I am proud of it; and if it were properly managed and operated, I think every Member of the Senate would be proud of it, and every honest man would be proud of it. But it is not being honestly run.

Does the Senate know how much money I got Congress to put into it? The amount was in excess of $800,000,000. The Government is getting only a small return on the money invested. A few bonds were issued, but I do not know whether the interest on them is paid by the TVA.

The fact is that the TVA is being run very negligently. It is not paying any income into the Treasury of the United States, as every other Government corporation or agency is or should be doing. I understand that some of the other Government corporations or agencies have tried to follow the example of TVA. I do not know how they have gotten along in those attempts. The law requires them to put all the funds they

receive into the Treasury. In my judgment, the law requires the TVA to do that, too; but the TVA is not doing it, and never has done it.

In a short time I shall have a bill to present to the Senate, and also to have introduced in the House of Representatives. It will require the TVA to pay its income into the Treasury of the United States just as other Government organizations do, and it will require the TVA to come before the Committees on Appropriations to present its case regarding the money it wishes to have. That is the only honest way to do. The Government does itself the greatest injustice in the world in building a project like the TVA and then saying to some man—and I doubt that the President really knows this nominee—"Here is $800,000,000 worth of the property of the Government. Take it, and run it as you please. We have no interest in it."

The civil-service law does not apply to the TVA, under its construction of the law. The Retirement Act does not apply to it, under its construction of the law. Nothing under the Government of the United States applies to the TVA, in the opinion of the men who run it. They think that they can run it as they please, and they are doing so.

Mr. Clapp will inherit a $60,000 airplane from his predecessor. He will inherit a home from his predecessor. He will inherit a good salary from his predecessor, although until a few months ago he was only a clerk in the TVA; and I doubt that any Senator would employ him even in that capacity on his merits. That is the kind of man on whose nomination the Senate is to vote.

I am sorry that not more Senators are present to hear what I have to say. I am not falsifying about Mr. Clapp. I have nothing against him personally. He is not the kind of man I would appoint, and I hope the Senate will not confirm his nomination.

As I have said, I do not ask the Senators on my side of the aisle to vote as I shall vote. I am in a peculiar situation, and I am hurt beyond expression. I repeat that in all my long life, in all the vicissitudes of that long life, I never was more hurt. My whole system is hurt by what was done here a week or two ago, by what is about to be done now. Who is in a better position to know about a nominee than the Senators representing the State in which he resides? When the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has come to me and has told me of a man in his State whom he has recommended for appointment as judge, or for some other position, I have taken his word about the matter. When the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] or the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] or the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], from my old State, or any other Senator has come to me and has told me that he has recommended men for whom he could vouch, men whom he knew, I have never hesitated to take his word about the desirability of such nominees. Why have I done that, Mr. President? I have done it because Senators ought to know the people in their States better than persons from outside their States could know them; and I have taken the word of the Senators concerned, in such cases. But now, after having served more than 30 years in this body, I have been told by Senators, No; I will not take your word for it.

Mr. President, according to Mr. Clapp's own statement, no one recommended him for the position for which he has been nominated; he was simply appointed by the President. I did not know that the President had ever seen him or heard of him; and I know something about the people in my State. I am telling the Senate that this young man is wholly incapacitated for this position. He would make a good stooge in the TVA, to be perfectly frank about it; he will do what he is told to do. But there is nothing else that he will do, either to the credit of his Government or to the credit of himself. He may mean well; I do not know. He is simply a man who can be used. Is that the kind of man the Senate wants to have at the head of one of the Government's great undertakings, an $800,000,000 corporation, or perhaps even a billion-dollar corporation at this time, which has been successful, which has a fine income which ought to go into the Treasury of the United States, instead of going where it does? Is that the kind of man the Senate wants to have at the head of that institution? I am almost tempted to say that I hope to heaven Senators will not put that kind of man at the head of it.

Mr. President, no one in Tennessee recommended his appointment. Let me ask whether my friend the Senator from Alabama recommended him.

Mr. HILL. No; I will say to my distinguished friend that I was not consulted.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am glad to hear that. I doubt that any other Senator was consulted.

Let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether his colleague was consulted, if he knows?

Mr. HILL. I cannot speak for my colleague, but so far as I know he was not consulted.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Then let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether he was consulted.

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he was consulted.

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he was consulted.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. No.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the junior Senator from Florida whether he was consulted about this nomination.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not believe any Member of the Senate was consulted about the nomination. I have never seen anyone who was consulted in any way about it or who admitted that he was consulted in any way about it. Is that the way Senators wish to be treated? If the President makes an appointment which is not regarded as a desirable one by the Senators representing the State from which the appointee comes, do Senators wish the Senate to say, nevertheless, "We want this man put in that office. It makes no difference what you, the Senators who know that man, think about this matter; we want this man to be placed in that office in your State."

Mr. President, I know that Senators do not want that to be done. Regardless of whether a Senator is a Republican or a Democrat, or whether the President making the appointment is a Republican or a Democrat, I know that Senators do not want that to be done.

At the time when the nomination now before the Senate was made, I was supposed to be on my deathbed, I believe; perhaps some Senators thought I was. But that fact cannot be offered as an excuse for not consulting at least one Senator from the State concerned, because the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] was available. He is here today. I never saw a more robust or a healthier man in all my life, and he was that way last fall when this man was nominated. I know that the junior Senator from Tennessee was not consulted. Should not Senators be consulted about appointments of this kind, in connection with a great project which Senators have helped greatly to have constructed? Is it fair? Is it just? Is it wise?

Mr. President, do other Senators wish to be treated in the way that it is proposed to treat me and my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee, in this case? Is that the way other Senators wish to be treated? I should like to know how other Senators feel about that matter; for if I know their positions about it, hereafter I shall be able to speak more intelligently regarding their views.

I am asking Senators to do what is right. This nominee is not a proper man to be placed in the position to which he has been nominated. He would make a good clerk if he were not handled by other people.

Mr. President, I have talked longer than I should. I shall speak only a little longer.

Yesterday afternoon, after I heard that this nomination was to be brought up on the floor of the Senate, I dictated a brief statement about Mr. Clapp himself. I shall refer to it at this time.

There are still two reasons why Mr. Clapp's nomination should never be confirmed by the Senate. The first is Mr. Clapp himself. Mr. Clapp may be a well-meaning young fellow; I do not know. As I have said before, he can best be described as a stooge. If he is confirmed to the position to which he has been nominated, he, himself, will not have anything to do with the TVA; that is a certainty. I ask Senators to listen to my words: If the Senate confirms this nominee, he, himself, will have nothing under God's heaven to do with running the Tennessee Valley Authority, but he will do just as he is told. He is a man without force, without the necessary mentality to be the head of this Authority. He has had no experience except in personnel work. He has been a personnel clerk down there for many years. He never had anything to do with the management, either in

whole or in part, except in regard to personnel; and in personnel work he did exactly what he was told to do.

He knows nothing whatsoever about making policies. If Senators will read the testimony, they will inevitably come to the conclusion to which I have come: namely, that Mr. Clapp never will know anything about making policies. The best that can be said of him is that he is faithful to those who employed him—not to the Government, but to the men who selected him. He was very faithful to Mr. Lilienthal.

That brings me to the second reason why the nomination of Mr. Clapp should not be confirmed. If the Senate confirms the nomination of Mr. Clapp for this position, the Senate might just as well reappoint Lilienthal to that place. The law prevents any man from holding two posts in the Government service, of course. Mr. Clapp has been Mr. Lilienthal's stooge ever since he has been there. He will continue to be Mr. Lilienthal's stooge as long as he is there. If that is what the Senate wants, I ask the Senate not to pay any attention to what I say, but simply to go ahead and vote to confirm the nomination, as probably the Senate will vote anyway. But I certainly hope Senators will not vote to confirm the nomination.

Again I say, Mr. President, in closing, that I take the greatest pride in the Tennessee Valley Authority. It needs change. We should put it on a self-sustaining basis, on a basis on which it will make money returns to the Government of the United States. It should not be in the situation it is in now. So long as I am a Member of the Senate, I shall do all I can to keep it from being in the situation it is now in. The Tennessee Valley Authority makes ample money to pay every bill it incurs, and it makes sufficient money, besides, to be able to pay a real amount of money into the Treasury of the United States every year, provided the Tennessee Valley Authority is properly managed.

Mr. President, let us take the Tennessee Valley Authority out of the hands of the Communists. If the Senate confirms this nomination, the Senate will simply be turning that organization over to the Communists in the United States; that is what will be done. Mr. Clapp is a stooge. He will do whatever he is told to do.

I sincerely and earnestly plead with the Senate not to confirm this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the able Senator from Tennessee a question. When the Senator was discussing Mr. Smith and Mr. Bolt, who were dismissed from the service, did the Senator also cover the case of Mr. Pierce? He was dismissed on the basis of charges made against him, and he then employed private counsel in an effort to obtain a hearing under the established procedures of the Commission. But notwithstanding the fact that he employed special counsel for that purpose, he never was able to obtain such a hearing. Did the Senator cover that case?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I did not; although I recall it now, Mr. President. The Senator from Arkansas will remember that my time was devoted to two committees which were in session at the time. I believe that the testimony about that matter was presented at a time when I was compelled to be absent from that committee, attending a meeting of the other committee.

I remember that case. The Senator from Arkansas is exactly correct about it, and I am greatly obligated to him for calling it to the attention of the Senate. That was the third case. There are innumerable cases of a minor nature, but that one is not in that category; it is a major case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to call the Senate's attention to the record at page 477, where Mr. Clapp was questioned regarding this particular case, which had been testified to, I believe, by Mr. Bolt.

A part of the correspondence was placed in the record of the hearing. Since then I have received some other correspondence, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that here was a man discharged upon charges made against him, and under the procedure which prevailed, if charges were made, the man charged was entitled to have a hearing. The personnel director or manager was to designate someone under him to conduct a hearing, then the personnel director would review the case and the recommendation submitted by the hearing agent, or the person designated for that purpose. But in this case the man was discharged. He employed private counsel, as he had a right to do, and his counsel sought a hearing. He was never granted a hearing, but instead the Authority wrote back and wanted to know just what part of the charges he wanted a hearing on.

The attorneys employed wrote Members of the United States Senate in an effort to get a hearing. They wrote to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and others, but have never gotten a hearing for the man to this day. That, according to my judgment, reveals what was going on in the TVA at that time.

So far as communism is concerned, I wish to say that at that particular time there was a definite, live cell of Communists working in TVA. I think they have been removed, but we cannot thank Mr. Lilienthal or Mr. Clapp for their removal. We can thank the congressional committee which exposed them. It was not because of any diligence on the part of these gentlemen.

I have not seen any diligence manifested at any time by them to eradicate the Communist element that was in the TVA, and no action was ever taken, affirmatively or otherwise, to eradicate it, until the Communists were exposed by the congressional committee.

Mr. President, I call attention to this case especially. Any man is entitled to have charges made against him sustained by proof, and to have his hearing, under rules providing for a hearing; but even with the employment of special counsel this man has not to this date gotten a hearing.

Mr. President, I point that out as a condition which obtained in TVA at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. It continues to this very time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can, if he will let me explain. The Senator is stating the exact facts of a case I had overlooked entirely, and I thank him from the bottom of my heart for bringing the matter to our attention.

In addition to that, Mr. Clapp has openly operated that organization utterly unmindful of the Government, utterly unmindful of everybody except the Communists who came in there. I thank the Senator very much for his interruption, and I should like to yield the floor to him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the correspondence which passed between the attorney for Mr. Pierce and Mr. Clapp with respect to undertaking to get the hearing to which Mr. Pierce was entitled. I also ask to have printed two letters written by the attorney, one to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] dated July 7, 1939, and one to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on the same date, in which they appealed to Members of this body to help them get a hearing for the man who was discharged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 8, 1939.

Mr. GORDON R. CLAPP,
Director of Personnel,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. CLAPP: I have finally gotten in touch with Mr Pierce, who has been vacationing at a beach in Massachusetts, and would now like to have you advise me when we can set his case for hearing. As I stated to you over the telephone some time ago, it will be necessary for us to have two or three weeks' notice so that we can get our witnesses together. I would also like to agree on a date in order that we can arrange it so that it will not interfere with other matters that we will both have.

In addition to the above information, we would like to have a certified copy of the minutes of the Board of Directors of the Authority, showing its action on June 7 when the Board voted to terminate Mr. Pierce.

In connection with the charges made against Mr. Blandford, we would appreciate being advised whether or not you intend to make any investigation, because we presume you will call upon us to substantiate these charges, and we would like to have a few days to get in contact with our witnesses on this phase of the matter so that we may have them ready to testify.

Yours very truly,

W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.

JULY 19, 1939.

Dr. H. A. MORGAN,
Chairman,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR DOCTOR: On July 8, I wrote a letter to Mr. Clapp requesting information as to whether or not the Authority would give a

hearing to Mr. Pierce and also asking that we be furnished with a certified copy of the minutes of the Board of Directors showing the action of the Authority on June 7 when, as we are advised, Mr. Pierce was terminated. I received no reply to this letter and as I do not know who else to address in order to get a reply, I would greatly appreciate it if you will please place this communication in the proper channel so that I might have a reply to my letter of July 8 and the inquiries contained therein.

I have received a letter from Mr. Pierce in which he has complained of the fact that mail to him personally and concerning his personal business has been opened by the Authority and he has not been advised of the contents thereof, nor has the mail been delivered to him. The specific case which prompted his letter to me concerned a letter from a publication for which he had agreed to write an article. The aforesaid publication, not having heard from him, wrote him advising that it had written him in care of the Authority requesting information about the article and that a Mr. Charles E. Lex merely wrote the Publication advising that Mr. Pierce had discontinued his connection with the Authority.

It is probable that the Authority cannot distinguish between personal and Authority correspondence from the outside of the envelope in every case but it would appear that after they have read the mail they could make this distinction and if the Authority could be so kind as to forward the mail on to Mr. Pierce at the address which they have had since he left the Authority it would be deemed a great favor. If this could not be done, you could have someone in your office call me and I will come and get the mail and see that it is forwarded to him.

Mr. Pierce advises that he has received no mail of a similar nature as that above referred to since he was discharged, although that prior to that time he had considerable correspondence addressed to him personally from various companies and organizations making personal inquiries of him on office management problems.

We feel certain that the Authority will not desire to withhold from Mr. Pierce such personal mail as this and he has requested that he be allowed to receive any accumulation of such mail since he was discharged.

Trusting that we will be favored with a prompt reply, I am,

Very truly yours,

W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 20, 1939.

Mr. W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.
Testerman, Ambrose & Badgett,
Burwell Building, Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. AMBROSE: This is in response to your letter of July 8 advising us that you had finally reached Mr. Pierce in Massachusetts and inquiring about scheduling a hearing on the termination of his services in such a way as to provide him several weeks' notice.

I have inquired informally about this matter and it appears that further information would be helpful to a consideration of this request. Specifically, the Authority would appreciate knowing what particular subjects in Mr. Pierce's defense he believes it would be profitable to take up in a formal hearing. This is desired because it seems clear that the facts and conclusions set forth in the tentative charges against him were on various essential points admitted or confirmed by Mr. Pierce himself in his reply addressed to the Board under date of May 29, 1939. We shall await further word regarding this phase of the matter.

In accordance with the request contained in the second paragraph of your letter, I am enclosing a certified copy of the entry in the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Authority on June 7, 1939, at which time action terminating Mr. Pierce's services was taken.

Your letter refers finally to the charges Mr. Pierce brought against the general manager and inquires as to the status of this matter. You should be informed that the Authority considers these charges to be without pertinence or standing and suggests that there will be no need to request assistance of Mr. Pierce in considering them further.

Very truly yours,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Director of Personnel.

JULY 22, 1939.

Mr. GORDON R. CLAPP,
Director of Personnel,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. CLAPP: I have your letter of July 20 in reply to mine under date of July 8.

It will be necessary for me to contact Mr. Pierce by mail to ascertain whether or not he would consent to go through a hearing on hand-picked issues. My recommendation to him and my idea of his desire, is that the hearing be upon the broad general issue of the justification of the Authority's action in discharging him. It would appear to me that such a hearing would be the only fair hearing to both sides, and that it would be impractical and almost impossible to ascertain in advance the devious paths that such an inquiry would necessarily take.

I desire to thank you for obtaining the certified copy of the minutes of the Board of Directors of June 7 but, I imagine through clerical error, the enclosure was not in the letter. I would appreciate your checking with your secretary to see if this was not inadvertently left out.

Several days ago, since I had not had a reply to my letter of July 8, I wrote Dr. Morgan, requesting that he ask that a reply be made by the proper authority, and further calling his attention to the fact that Mr. Pierce had complained to me that he had not been receiving his personal mail which was coming to him at the Authority. I don't intend to charge the Authority with opening Mr. Pierce's mail, but as explained in my letter to Dr. Morgan, it seems that Pierce has received some mail at the Authority from companies or individuals which might appear from the envelopes to be official business but which were actually personal. It appears that Mr. Lex or someone for him has been answering these letters with the mere statement that Pierce has been discharged. It would appear to me to be a most reasonable request to ask that mail of this personal nature be forwarded on to Mr. Pierce as his discharge was precipitous enough to attract public attention without the necessity of advising his correspondents of his discharge without further explanation.

I feel certain that you will be glad to alleviate this situation.

In regard to the charges against the General Manager mentioned in your letter. You do not make it plain whether or not the Authority is making any investigation of them. Your advice in this regard will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 24, 1939.

Mr. W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. AMBROSE: Since my response of July 20 to your letter of July 8 was forwarded, we have received from Chairman H. A. Morgan's office a copy of your letter of July 19. I assume that my last letter adequately covers your request for information which is repeated in your letter to the Chairman.

With respect to the complaint which you have received from Mr. Pierce, we have inquired as to the method by which mail addressed to him has been handled since his leaving. The file of such correspondence has been reviewed. It appears that the practice has been to open only such mail as is addressed to Mr. Pierce in his former official capacity. Where the contents of such letters were purely personal, they have been forwarded to him. Wherever inspection of the envelope made it possible to distinguish personal correspondence, it was likewise forwarded unopened. As a matter of fact, Mr. Pierce's former secretary, who has continued in the same office, immediately assumed full responsibility for separating personal from official mail, and she has stated that all strictly personal mail received in the office was forwarded to Mr. Pierce.

The files contain some correspondence addressed to Mr. Pierce as Director of the Office Service Department, requesting information or pamphlets and documents which, of course, are the property of the Authority and are normally issued from the office. These requests have been answered as official correspondence. The particular correspondence mentioned in the second paragraph of your letter appears to have been a border-line case referring to an article on certain office procedures presumably utilized by the Authority which Mr. Pierce had promised to prepare. It was not clear whether the request for the article was directed to Mr. Pierce in an official or a personal capacity. In response, Mr. Pierce's forwarding address was sent to the writer. We cannot understand how there could be objection to this procedure.

Very truly yours,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Director of Personnel.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 26, 1939.

Mr. W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.,
Knoxville, Tenn.

MY DEAR MR. AMBROSE: This will acknowledge your letter of July 22.

The certified copy of the board minute which you requested in your letter of July 8 I find was inadvertently omitted from my letter of July 20. I am now informed that it was forwarded to your office Monday under separate cover. I trust that you have it by this time. The remainder of your letter of July 22, I believe, is adequately covered either by my letter of July 20 or by my letter of July 24, the latter one being in response to your letter of July 20 addressed to Dr. H. A. Morgan.

Very truly yours,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Director of Personnel.

JULY 7, 1939.

Hon. H. STYLES BRIDGES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find copy of the file in the case which I have been handling for Mr. John F. Pierce, discharged employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Pierce had a responsible position with the Authority, being Director of the Office Service Department at a salary of $6,000 per year. He administered an annual budget of approximately $2,000,000, which looks like a large sum to my narrow Republican mind. Mr. Pierce is not trying particularly to get his job back. In fact, I doubt if he would take it, but he has been trying to get a hearing on his discharge. He feels, and rightfully so, that he has been imposed on and discharged merely because of his failure to knuckle to the small inner circle now controlling the

Authority. The charges which Pierce has made under oath in his answer have been investigated by me thoroughly, and I feel certain that they are true and can be proven. The Authority, including the Directors, have refused to comment on the discharge of Pierce, which occurred upon his filing his answer and counter charges, although I have seen to it that the Directors themselves have been informed of every step in the case. The personnel policy of TVA provides that charges may be made against employees and that they will be investigated. No investigation has been made of Blandford.

This file is being sent to you not with any specific request for personal relief on behalf of Mr. Pierce but because we feel that it is important information to have before you bearing upon the mode of management of the Authority, and that it will be valuable on that certain day of reckoning when the sheep will be divided from the goats. You are privileged to use this material as you see fit.

If you desire to investigate the responsibility of the writer, please consult Mr. J. Will Taylor in the House.

Yours very truly,

W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.

JULY 7, 1939.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find copy of the file in the case which I have been handling for Mr. John F. Pierce, discharged employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Pierce had a responsible position with the Authority, being Director of the Office Service Department at a salary of $6,000 per year. He administered an annual budget of approximately $2,000,000, which looks like a large sum to my narrow Republican mind. Mr. Pierce is not trying particularly to get his job back. In fact, I doubt if he would take it, but he has been trying to get a hearing on his discharge. He feels, and rightfully so, that he has been imposed on and discharged merely because of his failure to knuckle to the small inner circle now controlling the Authority. The charges which Pierce has made under oath in his answer have been investigated by me thoroughly and I feel certain that they are true and can be proven. The Authority, including the directors, have refused to comment on the discharge of Pierce, which occurred upon his filing his answer and counter charges, although I have seen to it that the directors themselves have been informed of every step in the case. The personnel policy of TVA provides that charges may be made against employees and that they will be investigated. No investigation has been made of Blandford.

This file is being sent to you not with any specific request for personal relief on behalf of Mr. Pierce, but because we feel that it is important information to have before you bearing upon the mode of management of the Authority, and that it will be valuable on that certain day of reckoning when the sheep will be divided from the goats. You are privileged to use this material as you see fit.

If you desire to investigate the responsibility of the writer, please consult Mr. J. Will Taylor in the House.

Yours very truly,

W. L. AMBROSE, Jr.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, when the Senate went into legislative session a little earlier this afternoon I had just yielded the floor, after briefly discussing some of the testimony developed in the hearing of the Clapp nomination. I made the statement that one of the employees of that organization had been discharged, or his services had been terminated, and that he was denied a hearing under the rules of procedure established by the agency.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a while ago my statement at this time, together with the testimony of Mr. Clapp on this point, as recorded in the hearings beginning on page 477 and continuing to a point which I have marked on page 480 of the hearings. I invite Senators to read the testimony of Mr. Clapp. I do not believe there is a Senator who can read it without agreeing with the statement which I have made, that a man was discharged and that it is admitted that the regular procedure was not followed. The rules which had been established providing him the right of hearing and defense were not adhered to, and the decision was arbitrary, based on very flimsy charges. I offer the testimony which is in the record in support of the statements which I have made. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MCCLELLAN. As I recall, there had been one dismissal case referred to in this testimony, I believe given by Bolt, a case of a Mr. Pierce, is that right?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Which he supported here by a number of letters and documents in which the charge was made that he employed outside counsel who was unable in his effort to secure a hearing and that they were never able to get a hearing under the procedures that were established and in effect.

Can you give us any information about that at this point?

Mr. CLAPP. I can, and I am glad of the opportunity.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Or have you covered that case further on in your statement?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I have not.

Senator MCCLELLAN. I would like to have your explanation of that at this time.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. Bolt put into the record or referred to correspondence from me to Mr. Blanford, the General Manager of the TVA at that time, or from me to Mr. Pierce, or from Mr. Pierce to me, bearing upon the reasons for Mr. Pierce's removal and also bearing upon the procedure followed.

The last of the letters to which he referred was dated June 9, 1939, which was a letter from me to Mr. Pierce notifying him of termination on the basis of an action taken by the TVA Board of Directors on June 7. Mr. Bolt did not refer to the correspondence that took place after Mr. Pierce was notified of that action.

On July 8, 1939, a Mr. Ambrose wrote a letter to me asking for advice about the possibility of having a hearing in the Pierce case. I replied on July 20, 1939, after careful consultation with our General Counsel, who at that time was Mr. William C. Fitts. I inquired in that letter what particular subjects, in all of the subjects dealt with, Mr. Pierce believed he wanted to take up in a formal hearing. I pointed out that in many essential points with respect to the charges made in the tentative findings submitted to the General Manager as the result of an investigation and inquiry which I had conducted on instructions from the General Manager, Mr. Pierce's reply admitted the circumstances to which those findings were related. In that letter I made clear that we would want to know on what specific point among the causes for removal, Mr. Pierce wanted his hearing. I would be glad to supply the letter to the committee.

On July 22, 1939, I got a letter from Mr. Ambrose advising me that it would be necessary for him to get in touch with Mr. Pierce about those questions. I have heard nothing from him since.

Senator MCCLELLAN. What I wanted to determine—and you can answer this affirmatively, or, rather, I mean you can answer it positively—was Mr. Pierce denied the rights under your rules of procedure that you had previously established, to have a hearing on one or any or all of the charges that were made against him that resulted in his termination? Was he denied that right?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I do not believe he was. There was some discussion back and forth about what the scope of the hearing was going to be.

Senator MCCLELLAN. It strikes me from your testimony that he was dismissed and terminated without a hearing or opportunity for a hearing; that is, the order of termination and dismissal had actually gone into effect and then you notified him why, and that was the action of the Board, as I understand it.

Mr. CLAPP. That is correct.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, the Board acted before he was given an opportunity for a hearing. The Board made a decision without his having a hearing at a time when I understand that he had counsel and was seeking a hearing. That seems to me contrary to your established procedure of giving the man a chance to have a hearing as you did Smith before taking action to terminate. That is what I want explained.

What is the difference in the Smith case where the man was given a hearing and an opportunity to defend himself against the charges, and later an order was made terminating him, and in the Pierce case where apparently he was terminated by order of the Board without hearing and at a time when he had outside counsel seeking an opportunity for a hearing? That I would like to have cleared.

Mr. CLAPP. You have correctly summarized about what took place.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Can you tell me why that procedure would be followed without giving him an opportunity for hearing?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes. The nature of the facts and the evidence brought out in the inquiry I conducted, leading up to Mr. Pierce's dismissal, were corroborated in unequivocal detail by the company with which we had contractual relationship at the time, so that there could be no question about the validity of the facts. During the course of the inquiry which I was making under the direction of the General Manager, I asked Mr. Pierce—and the record of memoranda and correspondence bears this out—if he would wish to sit with me while these inquiries were being made of the people who came forward to make statements. He declined to do that.

I was under instructions from the General Manager to proceed with my inquiry and to submit findings to him. When Mr. Pierce declined to sit with me so that he could cross-examine the witnesses, there was nothing for me to do but go ahead with the investigation.

Senator MCCLELLAN. That is not the procedure that you have established down there?

Mr. CLAPP. That is not the usual procedure in connection with a dismissal case; that is correct.

Senator MCCLELLAN. I am not defending Pierce. I do not know, maybe he should have been dismissed long before he was. The point I am making is that you did have a procedure established and an employee did

have certain rights under that procedure, and in this case it appears from the documents submitted and from your testimony about it that a different procedure was adopted that resulted in this man's not having the opportunity to appear with counsel and defend himself, and that a decision was made on the high level of the Board terminating him without any hearing and without trial and without his being privileged to exercise his rights before dismissal. That is the way it appears to me.

Mr. CLAPP. I think that is a correct summary of the case.

Senator MCCLELLAN. I am not undertaking to say that Mr. Pierce should have been retained, because I do not know, but it did strike me that a different procedure was followed here to that of your rules and established practices, and different to that followed in the Smith case and some others.

Mr. CLAPP. There is no question at all but that the procedure followed in the Pierce case was different from our usual procedure.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Why?

Mr. CLAPP. The nature of the case explains it, and I am reluctant to go into the nature of it.

Senator MCCLELLAN. I do not want you to go into the details, because it is just something that comes to our attention here. It strikes me that here was a man who had counsel and was seeking to protect his rights, whatever they were, and he was not accorded the right. You can say—and your judgment may be absolutely supported by the facts—that the man deserved dismissal, but where there was procedure provided under established rules that you had promulgated, for a man to have the right of defense and hearing, and then, notwithstanding what the facts are, even if he had committed murder, it appears to have been an arbitrary decision to deny him the right to hearing.

Mr. CLAPP. A hearing prior to the decision by the Board was not given him, that is correct. It is not correct to say that TVA was not willing to hear him through his counsel or directly in his protest against the action taken by the Board; that would have been after the fact of his dismissal.

Senator MCCLELLAN. What you are maintaining is that you are conceding that the regular procedure was not followed to give him a hearing before judgment; judgment was passed, and then you say you were willing to hear him after judgment and condemnation or dismissal?

Mr. CLAPP. That I think is a fair statement, and I want to add that I think an examination of the details of the case and the nature of it, would make it clear why the procedure was different, which I am reluctant to discuss the details because the man has to the best of my knowledge made a completely good record ever since. His indiscretions were not major in the sense that there was any graft or corruption. There were mistakes of judgment that he made that raised serious doubts in my mind and in the mind of the Board about a department head having charge of negotiations for an important segment of our facilities.

Senator CAIN. They felt so keenly about it that they thought they had better not discuss it with him?

Mr. CLAPP. They felt so keenly about it, and the corroborating evidence seemed to be so clear, that they felt they were justified in taking action and taking it quickly.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Can we get, without details, some intimation as to the nature of the charges? Would they go to subversive activities or anything that would be in the nature of acts or offenses against the Government, or did they relate to his personal conduct? You might clarify a little bit.

Mr. CLAPP. They related to his personal conduct, and they also related to relationships which he had with one of the representatives of a company with whom we had contracts and where the responsibility of negotiation was on him as a department head.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Then I assume that it involved collusion in a contractual relationship with outside corporations?

Mr. CLAPP. I would not go so far as to say that. It did involve acceptance of favors from the representative of the company and contrary to admonitions previously given to avoid them. The practice had reached a point of such seriousness that the general manager and the Board felt that they could not have confidence in his judgment thereafter.

Senator MCCLELLAN. I just wanted to get the record as clear as we could.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think there was a general understanding that at 3 o'clock today the pending nomination would be laid aside, and that the Senate would proceed to the consideration of a deficiency appropriation bill. I move that the Senate return to legislative session for that purpose.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2849, the deficiency bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to make a statement on the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; except to say that the bill covers a multitude of items. There are several Senators who wish to be heard on some of the amendments, and if the questions are asked, I shall be glad to explain the position of the committee and the action taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations, legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized to install in the offices of Senators, and in other offices of the Senate as approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, special telephone wiring plans with features to pick up, hold, and intercommunicate, the cost thereof to be paid out of the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items, contingent expenses of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, information has been brought to me that a substantial number of Senators have an appointment at the White House at 4 o'clock. I am wondering if there would be any chance of reaching a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on the nomination of Mr. Clapp at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon the Senate proceed to vote on the Clapp nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was trying to object to the request for a vote at 4:30.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If that is why the Senator rose, the Chair is sure the Senate, by unanimous consent, will rescind its action, and the Chair will restate the request. The request is that at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon the Senate proceed to vote on the Clapp nomination. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire how long the consideration of the appropriation bill will take.

Mr. BRIDGES. It depends on how much debate it may entail. I do not think it will take long. I hope that we can conclude it in perhaps half an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would rather not enter into an agreement. I think we can vote possibly at the hour named, but if we enter into an agreement to vote at 4:30 o'clock, there is a possibility that the deficiency bill would not be passed by that time, and there would not be any chance for further discussion of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At this time I object to agreeing to a vote at 4:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware objects.

The Clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

For an additional amount for furniture and repairs, fiscal year 1947, $5,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, in expending this and other appropriations under his control, shall be accorded the same priority as granted agencies in the executive branch of the Government under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

Senate Restaurants: For payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with the act approved September 9, 1942 (Public Law No. 709, 77th Cong.), fiscal year 1947, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

For an additional amount for mail transportation, fiscal year 1947, $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 23, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of $300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate, for the first session of the Eightieth Congress, $29,100, to remain available until June 30, 1948.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices, Federal Security Agency, Food and Drug Administration," on page 6, line 9, after "'Certification services'", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$55,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 22, to insert:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Salaries, Howard University," $275,364.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended", $600,000: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount available for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia under section 6 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is hereby increased to $147,961.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the amendment at the top of page 7, concerning vocational rehabilitation, was considered. In connection with the adoption of that amendment I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a statement signed by several directors of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service, explaining the situation the States are in because the Federal bureau did not inform them in time that they were running into a deficiency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senators and Representatives of the Eightieth Congress:

The undersigned directors of State vocational rehabilitation programs have come to Washington at private expense because of a crisis in the State programs which has arisen without fault either of the States or the disabled under the State programs for vocational rehabilitation. We were only recently advised, without any prior warning, that the Federal grants to States for vocational rehabilitation for the quarter ending June 30 of this year depend on congressional action on a pending deficiency item of $1,734,000, and that this deficiency occurred because the annual appropriation for the current year was much less than the total of the State estimates for the year. The States had not previously known these facts.

The Federal grants are made to reimburse the States under the Federal act and are based on estimates submitted by the States of contemplated State expenditures. These State estimates, made annually, are transmitted to the Federal agency well before the beginning of each fiscal year. The State estimate of the needed amount, submitted under the Federal act, on approval by the Federal Security Agency has always been relied upon by the State in making State appropriation, planning the State program, and incurring expenses in placing the disabled in hospitals and in training, ordering prosthetic appliances, and incurring other necessary expenses.

At no time heretofore have State agencies been advised of, or felt concerned with, whether the annual Federal appropriation provided the total needed to match State expenditures. They have been advised by the Federal agency that Congress is committed to match the State expenditures under the formula in the Act and have known by experience that this commitment had always been kept as State expenditures have heretofore always been regularly matched. The States have thus reasonably relied and acted upon this advice by the Federal agency and this regular action by the Congress, and have done so this year.

The States have lived within their federally approved estimates and are not now seeking amounts in addition to sums in their approved estimates. But they have incurred indebtedness within the purview of estimates which must be paid during the present period. Before any intimation from the Federal agency or any other source that the Federal grant could not be counted on, rehabilitation of thousands of cases was commenced and these disabled people are at present in various hospitals and training institutions. Bills for these services are becoming currently due.

Since the date, a few days ago, when the States were first advised of the present situation, no new cases have been started, and every effort has been made to get the disabled out of hospitals, trainng course, etc., as quickly as possible. The most drastic curtailment has been practiced. But even this does not change the fact that obligations incurred for these rehabilitation services are coming currently due and must be met. It does not change the fact that the State programs are now in a chaotic condition and that failure to meet the commitments made the handicapped undergoing rehabilitation is causing most serious hardships to these unfortunate people.

For the foregoing reasons, the State directors of vocational rehabilitation for the first time in the 27-year history of the program are appealing to the Congress, and earnestly request that it appropriate the $1,734,000 needed for grants to the States for the current period.

W. M. WALTER, *Pennsylvania.*
SAMUEL G. BOHLIN, *New York.*
J. J. BROWN, *Texas.*
BEN R. BRAINERD, *Minnesota.*
CHAS. H. WARREN, *North Carolina.*
P. S. BARRETT, *Georgia.*
W. P. GRULKER, *Wisconsin.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 7, line 18, after the word "administration", to strike out "$9,064,000" and insert "$6,459,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I desire to discuss this item for a moment. I am in complete accord with the economy program of the committee. I am on the committee, and I voted for this reduction, but some facts were brought to my attention which I think I ought to bring to the attention of the Senate at this time about the reduction concerning grants to States for unemployment compensation administration.

In January of this year the Federal Security Agency presented data basing its request for the sum of $9,640,000 to be included in the first deficiency bill to cover State unemployment compensation administrative costs for the balance of the fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget cut back the Federal Security Agency estimate to $6,459,000. The Budget Bureau cut-back was based on a substantially lower estimate of work-load for State agencies through the remainder of the fiscal year.

By mid-February actual work loads handled by the State agencies clearly demonstrated the fallacy of the Budget Bureau's assumption not only were actual work-loads in mid-February considerably in excess of even the bureau's $9,000,000-plus estimate, and very substantially in excess of the Budget Bureau's $6,000,000 plus. On the basis of facts, the States appeared before Congressman JOHN TABER'S deficiency committee and asked for a restoration of $2,600,000 which the Budget Bureau had cut from the bureau's request. At the time the Budget Bureau made the cut it had indicated that it would be glad to reconsider its position if the course of events demonstrated its estimate to be in error.

The House deficiency committee restored the full amount of the bureau cut and H. R. 2849 was passed by the House carrying an appropriation equivalent to the Federal Security Agency's original request.

This is the report which was submitted to the House at the time:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION

The estimate submitted was $6,459,000, and the committee has included in the bill $9,064,000. It is the only important instance in the bill where the committee has recommended an amount in excess of the budget. This decision has been reached after only the most careful consideration and is based on the determination by the committee that to increase expenditures for administration in this instance will save considerable amounts of money in the payment of benefits. It is necessary to maintain a careful check of those who receive unemployment compensation in order to eliminate those who desire to receive benefits in order to avoid the necessity of productive work. The original appropriation was inadequate to provide facilities for maintaining the proper checks on this program, and the budget estimate does not, in the committee's judgment, contemplate an adequate program.

I think it is important that the Senate realize that—

Functions for this purpose are secured by the payment into the Treasury of three-tenths of 1 percent of the taxes collected for unemployment compensation, and the amount provided in this deficiency—

That is, with the full amount they have asked for—

when added to the original appropriation, is less than the amount being paid into this fund during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as I understand, not one dollar for this particular purpose would come out of the money collected by taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. No; it will come out of the money that has been collected for this purpose. The money will come out of the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. For this specific purpose?

Mr. BROOKS. This money was intended by law to take care of this particular function. The money is in the

Treasury, and it has been collected for this purpose.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator misspoke himself. The appropriation comes out of the general fund of the Treasury, and the three-tenths of 1 percent goes into the general fund of the Treasury. There is no earmarked fund there.

Mr. BROOKS. I understand there is no earmarked fund, but that this amount of money was certainly in any event to be collected for the purpose of doing this very job.

Mr. BALL. It was intended to cover this expense?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. HILL. In other words, this fund was not only intended to cover this expenditure, but if I understand the Senator from Illinois correctly, the fund does more than cover the expenditure. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. The amount collected for this purpose is greater than the total amount that is requested in this appropriation, if that answers the question.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think the figures show that during the years the three-tenths of 1 percent has resulted in a fund of $1,300,000,000 of which there has been distributed only some $500,000,000. I want to say in this connection, Mr. President, that I have heard from my State and I am informed that what will happen if the small sum does not come back to the State is that the field force will automatically be discharged. That, of course, is what is called the check force. The employees who pay out the benefits will remain, and it has been said by Stanley Rector, who is at the head of this work in my State, that every dollar invested in the field force saves the State fund from $20 to $30. It works this way: Under the law every claim that is filed is presumed to be correct, and the check force pays it. Then the inspectors go out and there is saved, as I have said, from $20 to $30 for every dollar that is paid to the inspection force. It is really an economy move for which the Senator from Illinois is speaking.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Budget Bureau customarily makes this deduction, and usually makes it too much. I wish that they would exhibit the same zeal in cutting the Federal budget in matters that pertain to moneys that come into the Federal Treasury from other sources of taxation, that they exercise in the case of money that is paid into this fund in the Federal Treasury to administer this particular function. I recall that 2 years ago the Director of the Budget pruned this item so closely that many of the industrial States that were faced with an increasing load of unemployment claims were unable to make the budget cover the need, so that in some instances it became necessary to advance State money; in other words, to make up the difference out of the State treasury. On that particular occasion, the Director of the Budget felt that he had given or approved all that should be approved. The Congress adopted his recommendations, and then he, in turn, or the Budget Director of this division, had in turn to advise the unemployment compensation divisions of the States that it would be all right for them to exceed their budget, and that he would ask for a deficiency.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the House has taken the correct view of this matter, and that the amount ought to be restored, or there ought to be some assurance that it will be restored, otherwise the administration of unemployment compensation in the industrial States will be seriously interfered with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I may point out that there has been submitted to me a graph showing that the budget's estimate was based upon a work load of approximately 890,000 applications to be processed; that there were in July almost 1,300,000 applications; that the latest figure submitted shows 1,000,000 applications, pretty nearly 200,000 more cases than the budget estimated would be the work load at the present time. The impact of the cut will be on the State unemployment compensation funds which are held to the account of employers to pay claims against their accounts. Drastic personnel reductions will mean complete inability to police these accounts for the purpose of verifying the employee's rights to the benefits. As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] stated, the applications will be there, the individuals to pay them will be there, but the employees to investigate them, to see whether the applications are just or not, will not be there.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that this afternoon I received a telegram from the unemployment officers of my State who verify the statement which the Senator from Illinois has just made both in regard to the policing problem and in regard to the increase in unemployment, and urging that from the standpoint of the interest of my State additional funds are needed, and expressing the hope that the full amount will be restored in the bill. I am glad to join the Senator from Illinois in his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that I have been in touch with the unemployment officers in Michigan. In fact Mr. Ed Cushman has been here in Washington, and he feels that unless this item can be restored until the first of July those in charge of the service in Michigan are going to be greatly handicapped. I have in my hand a telegram which has just come to me from Dr. R. M. Ashley, chairman of the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission, as follows:

> Unless we can have cut restored on the floor the first deficiency appropriation bill H. R. 2849 to carry on unemployment program in Michigan we face a grave situation. It will necessitate cutting 33 percent of our staff for the remainder of the budget period and we are undermanned at this time.

So Michigan faces quite a problem, and the proposed cut would be a very deep cut indeed at the present time. I told Dr. Ashley on the telephone this morning that we would have to make some cuts, and he wanted to know whether the cuts could not be made after the first of July, after they could become reorganized and have the smaller staff operating and performing the work efficiently. I wish to have it appear in the RECORD that the proposed cut is a very serious matter to the State of Michigan.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It is very seldom of late that management and labor have agreed, but in this instance management and labor are in harmony. The reason for that is that both segments are interested in maintaining intact their unemployment compensation fund.

It has already been stated that when a claim is filed under the law it must be paid, if payment is justified. There are so many claims filed, many of which will make a continued demand upon this fund, that labor and management are interested in seeing that each claim is inspected to find whether it is bona fide. That is why, as I said, for every dollar that is contributed, from 20 to 30 times that amount will be saved to this fund. Such a saving will be made if we do not make the proposed cut in the appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am in receipt of a telegram from the Governor of Alabama about this matter which I wish to read at this point:

> Am advised first deficiency appropriation bill as reported out by the Senate subcommittee reduced State unemployment compensation grant restored by House committee. Request you urge restoration of cut on floor this afternoon. Matter of grave consequence to our agency.
>
> JAMES E. FOLSOM,
> *Governor.*

Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois has ably stated what the proposed cut means, in which he has been joined by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Surely the House committee report makes the situation very clear. The House committee report says that to increase expenditures for administration in this instance will save considerable amounts of money in the payment of benefits, and then it goes further

and says that the money for this administration has already been collected out of a tax levied for this particular purpose. The money is available. It is not like going into the general fund of the Treasury to take out funds that have been paid in by the taxpayers for general purposes. I do not know why we should not use this money, particularly in view of the thought emphasized by the House that the use of the money will save considerable amounts of money in the payment of benefits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, line 19.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, while the amendment relating to unemployment compensation was before the Senate I sent to my office to obtain some correspondence, but it did not arrive in time to be availed of before the vote. I supported the amendment offered by the Senate from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, following the discussion on that subject, a telegram from members of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission, together was a copy of a letter from Mr. W. L. Mitchell, Acting Commissioner of the Federal Security Agency, to myself, setting forth the reason why the House item should be restored.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *April 24, 1947.*

Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Washington, D. C.:

Failure of Senate to grant unemployment compensation deficit restored by House would seriously cripple itinerant service of this agency. As result of reduced budget we have claimants, predominantly veterans, being herded into trucks and traveling as many as 140 miles to file claims. We have been compelled to eliminate 100 itinerant service points.

HARRY BENGE CROZIER,
ROBERT M. MCKINLEY,
TOM BULLOCK HYDER,
Commissioners, Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 18, 1947.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 8 transmitting a certified copy of House Resolution No. 79, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas on February 14, 1947.

For your information, there has been some delay in determining the allocation of funds to the States for the administration of civilian unemployment compensation for the current fiscal year pending final action by the Congress on the title III deficiency appropriation.

If the full amount of the deficiency appropriation, as passed by the House, is approved by the Senate, it will be possible to grant to the State of Texas approximately 91 percent of the funds requested by the State for the administration of civilian unemployment compensation for the last half of the current fiscal year. This allocation to the State of Texas will be consistent with the allocations made to other States within the limitation of the total title III funds made available and based upon each State's volume of work load and other varying State characteristics.

The certified copy of the House resolution is herewith returned.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. MITCHELL,
Acting Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration," on page 8, line 14, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 37, and"; and in line 15, after the words "Eightieth Congress", to strike out "$742,814.77" and insert "$762,181.66."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 16, to insert:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1947, to carry out the purposes of the act of August 13, 1946 (Public Law 726), creating an Indian Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; and penalty mail costs as required by the act of June 28, 1944, $15,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to interrogate the Senator from New Hampshire about this item. First, I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that this is a new agency which was created by act of Congress a short time ago, and the Commissioners have just been appointed and are in process now of organizing and getting down to work. They assure me that $15,000 for the remainder of the year is quite an inadequate sum. If the Senator could agree to make the amount $20,000, I think it would contribute to the functioning of the Commission. Otherwise the Commission is going to be badly handicapped between now and the first day of July.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say in answer to the Senator that the evidence before the committee was to the effect that $15,000 would be adequate for the salaries. I wish to be very frank with the Senator. I have talked with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] since the bill was reported, and he has shown me a budget from the Indian Claims Commission showing that they must have certain equipment, such as typewriters and other ordinary equipment in starting this office, and need money also for telephones and other items. I should be glad to have the Senator from Wyoming present in detail what he has to suggest as the supplemental amount which might meet the Senator's problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say furthermore that the Commission must buy furniture, not necessarily from the outside, but when they secure furniture from another department they must pay the other department for it. They represent to me most earnestly that this appropriation is entirely too small. There was not submitted, as I understand, an itemized budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Commissioners appeared before the committee shortly after their nominations were confirmed and simply told us the general story. In part it is their own fault because they did not present us any detailed itemized account of what the money requested would be used for. We, in turn, figured out that in the period of only approximately 2 months until June 30, $15,000 would be ample to cover what we thought would be needed. But it is evident to me, after seeing the detailed figures, that in order to function the Commission will need more than that amount in order to secure equipment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. They asked for $25,000, did they not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the committee granted them only $15,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from New Hampshire has stated, the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations was meeting at about the time the members of the Commission were confirmed, and before they had had any opportunity to survey the needs of the Commission the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate of $25,000. Members of the subcommittee, in making a computation of certain salaries which they thought would probably be necessary, as indicated by the Bureau of the Budget, felt that $15,000 would be adequate. It so happens that $15,000 would cover the salaries of 10 persons—3 Commissioners, a chief counsel, a chief of the investigating division, a chief clerk, an administrative assistant, 1 secretary-stenographer, 1 clerk-typist, and 1 file clerk. Their salaries would amount to $14,920. That takes no account whatever of $350 needed for communications service, $50 estimated for penalty mail, $500 for printing and binding, $173 for supplies and materials, and $3,000 for equipment, as well as two secretary-stenographers. As the Senator from New Hampshire has said, I have discussed this matter with him. I obtained a table of estimated expenditures after the adjournment of the full committee. In the committee I moved that the sum be increased to $20,000. My understanding now is that the Senator from New Hampshire will not object to such an amendment. Therefore, I move that, on page 8, line 23, the figure "$15,000" be stricken and the figure "$20,000" be substituted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wonder if we cannot specify that $15,000 is for salaries, and $5,000 for equipment, supplies, and incidentals.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that it would be well to have inserted in the RECORD, the table of expenditures as presented to me by the commission. That will cover the expenditures. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing an estimate of salaries and expenses for the Indian Claims Commission from April 10 to June 30, 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimate of salaries and expenses, Indian Claims Commission, Apr. 10 to June 30, 1947 (2⅔ months)

	Salary	Estimated, fiscal year 1947, total salary	Present	Additional
01 PERSONAL SERVICES				
Present personnel:				
3 Commissioners	$10,000	$6,692	------	------
1 chief counsel	9,077	2,025	------	------
1 Chief, Investigating Division	9,077	2,025	------	------
1 Chief Clerk	7,102	1,584	------	------
1 administrative assistant	3,773	842	------	------
1 secretary-stenographer	3,272	730	------	------
1 clerk-typist	2,394	488	------	------
1 file clerk	2,394	534	------	------
Total (10)	[1] 67,089	14,920	$14,920	------
Additional required by May 6: 2 secretary stenographers	[1] 3,272	1,007	------	$1,007
Grand total (12)	73,633	15,927	------	------

[1] For year.

OTHER OBLIGATIONS

		Estimate 1947
02	Travel	------
03	Transportation of things	------
04	Communication services	$350
	Payment for penalty mail	50
06	Printing and binding	500
08	Supplies and materials	173
09	Equipment	3,000
	Total	4,073
	Forwarded	15,927
	Total estimated	20,000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the Indian Claims Commission was provided for in the last session of Congress, in the month of August 1946. No appointments were made at that time. In the early part of this session I introduced a bill to repeal that provision of the law for the reasons which I set forth before the Committee on Public Lands, to which the subject was referred. The bill to repeal that part of the act was referred to the subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and testimony was taken. I made an extended statement with reference to it.

Thus far the committee has not acted upon it, but did invite amendments to the act, which I have submitted. In the meantime, the commissioners were appointed and their nominations have been confirmed by the Senate. There is before us a request for an appropriation for the Indian Claims Commission. It seems to me that the appropriation ought to be held in abeyance. I move that the item be stricken, for the reason that there is pending an amendment to the act which will create an entirely different situation. The Indian Claims Commissioners, corresponding to the present Indian Claims Commission, would become an arm of the Court of Claims. The same Commissioners who have been appointed would probably have to be reappointed if the Congress should adopt such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion to strike the item is not in order. The Senator can reach the same objective by voting against the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I think the Chair is correct. I should like to make an explanation. When we reach the point of voting on the committee amendment, I want the Senate to understand that we are setting up a commission which may be in an entirely different situation if and when the amendment to which I have referred, or something similar to it, is adopted by the Congress. I think I am speaking the general sentiment of the Committee on Public Lands, with whose members I have discussed this question. They have stated that they would consider such an amendment, and would probably report an amendment, perhaps not in the exact form in which I have submitted it. I merely wish to make this explanation so that Senators may understand the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment on page 8, beginning in line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Mediation Board," on page 9, after line 5, to insert:

Arbitration, emergency, and emergency panel boards: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Arbitration, emergency, and emergency panel boards," $60,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 4, to insert:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art," $10,430.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Forest Service," on page 18, line 21, after the word "forests", to strike out "in Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana"; and in line 22, after the numerals "1947", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$315,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 20, after line 3, to insert:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission: For necessary expenses, including printing and binding, to carry out the provisions of the act approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711), as amended, $10,000, to remain available until January 3, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice," on page 20, line 21, to strike out "Damage Claim" and insert "Damage Claims."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

Damage claim: For the payment of a claim for personal injuries adjusted and determined by the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of certain claims arising out of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation," approved March 20, 1936 (31 U. S. C. 224b), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 29, Eightieth Congress, $50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 14, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

The limitation upon the amount which may be expended for printing and binding in the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National War Labor Board, fiscal year 1946, is hereby increased from $30,000 to $49,000 so as to authorize the completion under said appropriation of the National War Labor Board termination report and war history at a total cost of not exceeding $39,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary," on page 22, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 36, and"; and in line 12, after the words "Eightieth Congress", to strike out "$20,509.56" and insert "$49,657.80."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 13, to insert:

Damage Claims: For payment of claims for death or personal injury, under the provisions of Public Law 224, approved November 15, 1945 (59 Stat. 582), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 34, Eightieth Congress, $61,478.26.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 23, line 11, after "'Salaries, Hydrographic Office, 1947'", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$217,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 14, after "In all, from 'Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, 1947'", to strike out "$1,208,000" and insert "$1,225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 4, after "'Salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, 1947'", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$652,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 10, after "'Salaries, Office of Judge Advocate General, Navy, 1947'", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$71,650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after "'Salaries, Office of Director of Naval Communications, 1947'", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$216,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after "'Salaries, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1947'", to strike out "$275,000" and insert "$425,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, after "'Salaries, Bureau of Ordnance, 1947'", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$318,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after "In all, from 'Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel, 1947' ", to strike out "$2,712,600" and insert "$3,121,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 20, after the words "Pay and", to strike out "allowances" and insert "subsistence."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 1, after " 'Medical Department, Navy, 1947' ", to strike out "$3,862,000" and insert "$4,392,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 4, after " 'Salaries, Bureau of Ships, 1947' ", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$691,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 6, after "In all, from 'Naval procurement fund' ", to strike out "$164,343,000" and insert "$165,364,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 8, after the words " 'Pay and", to strike out the word "allowances" and insert "subsistence."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department," on page 27, after line 2, to strike out the following subhead:

Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 6, to insert:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Salaries, Office of Solicitor for the Post Office Department, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 28, line 1, after "Postal Union", to insert "to be expended in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for on his certificate, which certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this last matter, I invite the attention of the Senate to line 19, page 27. A situation has developed in connection with which the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office has had various conferences with members of the Post Office Department and representatives of the War Department and of the State Department. The situation today is such that citizens of this country cannot send any money to Germany or Austria, nor can they send any package over there which weighs more than 11 pounds. Up to the present time American citizens who have relatives or friends over there have sent more than 7,000,000 packages. That has resulted in millions of dollars of relief or aid to relatives of American citizens who reside in Germany and Austria. We are endeavoring to get the weight of such packages increased from 11 to 22 pounds. In discussing the matter with the representatives of the Post Office Department, the War Department, and the State Department we have been told that the best time to take the matter up is when the Postal Union is meeting. This appropriation is for $15,000. I have discussed the question with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and have laid the facts before him, and in view of what I have stated I ask that the amount be changed from $15,000 to $20,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In what line?

Mr. LANGER. Line 19, on page 27.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have not yet completed the committee amendments, but while we are on that subject, without objection, the request of the Senator from North Dakota will be granted, and the figure of $15,000 in line 19 on page 27 will be increased to $20,000.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 28, line 9, after the word "paper", to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,769,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 28, after line 12, to strike out:

Equipment shops, Washington, D. C., $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 14, to insert:

For an additional amount for equipment shops, Washington, D. C., including the same objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1947, $300,000: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased from $869,500 to $932,800: *Provided further*, That this limitation is exclusive of the amount required to meet increased pay costs provided for in Public Law 25 of the Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military activities—Office of the Secretary of War," on page 30, line 3, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 30, and"; and in line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", to strike out "$154,130.77" and insert "$193,375.28."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 5, to insert:

Damage claim: For the payment of a claim for personal injury and damage to privately owned property, adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the act entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," approved January 2, 1942, as amended April 22, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 224d), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 39, Eightieth Congress, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance service, Army," on page 30, after line 18, to insert:

Pay of the Army: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Pay of the Army," $1,000,000, which shall be used for expediting the transportation to the United States by air of dependents of military personnel (war spouses and their children).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 31, line 12, after the figures "$300,000,000", to strike out the colon and the following: "*Provided*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the governments, military and otherwise, or nations receiving aid under the provisions of this act, shall be expected to provide, in agreements to be signed by their governments when established (if not already established) for reimbursement to the United States for such aid: *Provided further*, That not exceeding $60,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increased pay costs," on page 33, after line 20, to insert:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate: "Salaries and expenses of detailed police, Capitol Police Board," $300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Treasury Department," on page 45, line 1, after the word "Salaries", to strike out "and expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 14, to insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT

Civil Functions of the War Department:
The Panama Canal:
"Sanitation, Canal Zone," $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 47, line 20, after the words "set forth in", to insert "Senate Document No. 38, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 24, after "Department of the Interior", to strike out "$30,530.53" and insert "$30,605.53."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 3, after the words "In all", to strike out $34,040.89" and insert "$34,115.89."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the next series of amendments involve judgments and audited claims, from page 48 to and including page 53. I ask that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments referred to are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Courts," on page 49, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "Senate Document No. 33, and";

On page 49, line 3, after "Navy Department", to strike out "$40,053.59" and insert "$44,053.59";

On page 49, line 6, after the words "In all", to strike out "$54,638.24" and insert "$58,638.24";

On page 49, line 9, after the word "numbered", to insert "Civil 23,279"; and in line 12, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 28, and";

On page 49, after line 13, to insert:

"Executive office of the President, $186.75."

On page 49, line 18, after the words "In all", to strike out "$24,343.59" and insert "$24,530.34";

On page 50, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 35, and";

On page 50, after line 14, to insert:

"Department of Agriculture, $219.75."

On page 50, line 18, after "War Department", to strike out "$4,659.77" and insert "$8,397.59";

On page 50, line 19, after the words "In all", to strike out "$11,486.32" and insert "$15,443.89";

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 51, line 8, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Documents No. 32, and";

On page 51, line 22, after "Navy Department", to strike out "$201,501.58" and insert "$201,841.58";

On page 51, line 23, after "Treasury Department", to strike out "$8,294.62" and insert "$8,641.49";

On page 51, line 24, after "War Department", to strike out "$66,462.39" and insert "$114,263.39";

On page 51, line 25, after the words "In all", to strike out "$2,104,796.18" and insert "$2,153,284.05";

Under the subhead "Audited claims", on page 52 line 17, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 31, and"; in line 19, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$15,844,111.24" and insert "$20,169,985.39"; in line 24, after the word "fund", to strike out "$668.66" and insert "$679.82"; on page 53, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$40,000.33" and insert "$44,897.16"; and in line 2, after the word "all", to strike out "$15,884,780.23" and insert "$20,215,562.37";

On page 53, line 12, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 40, and"; and in line 13, after the numerals "125", to strike out "$135,529.60" and insert "$149,938.34";

Under the heading "Title III—Reductions in appropriations—Navy Department", on page 54, line 10, after "'Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, 1947'", to strike out "$210,000" and insert "$193,000."

On page 54, line 13, after "'Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel, 1947'", to strike out "$2,147,500" and insert "$1,738,700"; and

On page 54, line 15, after "'Naval procurement fund'", to strike out "$4,817,350" and insert "$3,795,650."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 22, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to issue orders to the military and civilian personnel of the United States engaged in the occupation of Germany immediately to discontinue any program for the dismantling of manufacturing plants or other facilities in Germany used for the production of fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make the point of order until I can explain the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I reserve the point of order temporarily.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I understand the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is willing to accept this amendment. There is a world-wide shortage of nitrogen fertilizer. The United States has never produced the amount of nitrogen fertilizer which it consumes. Our Army, according to Mr. Hoover and to proof which I do not think anyone will deny, has been destroying nitrate plants in occupied Germany. That has created a nitrate shortage not only in Germany but on the whole continent of Europe and other countries which historically have looked to Germany for supplies of nitrates. Because of the shortage thousands of tons of fertilizer have been shipped out of the United States, and, as a result, there is a critical fertilizer shortage in this country at the present time. Over large areas of the United States farmers are actually not able to secure 50 percent of their fertilizer needs, and our food production and cotton production will be cut down very materially because of the shortage of fertilizer. It is contemplated to destroy more plants in the future. If we permit this policy to continue the fertilizer shortage will last for many years. In reality we are penalizing the American producer.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I want to echo what the Senator from Mississippi has said with reference to this matter. I have personal knowledge of the facts, as one fertilizer production development in my own State which operates at the present time under contracts with the Government is forced to divert many thousand tons of fertilizer from use in the Pacific Northwest in order that it may be made available on orders placed by UNRRA while that organization was in operation, and it will have to continue to do so.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I hope the Senator from California will not insist on his point of order. This is a very important amendment. It is important that it be adopted promptly. It may be possible to attach it to some other bill. I have been looking into the fertilizer situation. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] offered a resolution on this subject several weeks ago. It is a rather serious situation. The War Department seems to assume responsibility for continuing the shipments of fertilizer that are being made to Korea, Japan, and Germany. The United States is not only shipping nitrates, but it is shipping other types of fertilizer each day by the trainload, from the Gulf coast and from the California coast.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at this point I should like to state to the Senator from Tennessee that from the Gulf ports in Mississippi thousands of tons of fertilizer are being shipped every month, at a time when the United States is critically short of fertilizer.

Mr. STEWART. That is correct.

Mr. President, I have at my office, although not now on my desk here figures showing the shipment of fertilizer over two or three different lines of railroads during the past several months. The amount which has been shipped—it is in the thousands of tons—is most surprising. Yet there is a shortage of fertilizer in this country. For the past several years the United States has become a large user of fertilizer; and particularly in the Southern States fertilizer is needed because the soil there requires the application of fertilizer each year.

As has been pointed out by an expert on this subject who recently appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the evil of the serious damage which now is being done is that such damage will not be confined to this year, but it will have a future serious effect on the soil.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is creating a shortage which will last for years.

Mr. STEWART. And it is damaging the soil in a way which cannot be rectified for 4 or 5 years to come. Such a policy is most shortsighted; and it is most unfortunate that the War Department seems to assume a stiff-necked attitude about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must insist on my point of order at this time. I appreciate the seriousness of the fertilizer shortage which exists today. If this matter is directed to the attention of the administration and the War Department, and if they are unable to set up proper safeguards, I think they should take judicial notice, so to speak, of the condition which exists in the agricultural world because of the shortage of fertilizer.

But I wish to call the attention of the able Senator from Tennessee to the fact that insofar as the plants in Germany are concerned, a fertilizer plant could in a very short length of time be turned into a munitions plant. Unless the Army can be assured that adequate safeguards can be set up so as to prevent the use of those plants, perhaps in a few years, for the manufacture of munitions once more, I certainly am not willing at this time to vote to write into an appropriation bill a provision which would tie the hands of the War Department.

For that reason, Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, of course I know that technically the point of order should be sustained. But how in the world could plants in an area which is controlled by the United States Army be used for the manufacture of munitions or anything else which could be used against this country or against other countries?

As a result of the point of order, if it is sustained, not only American farmers in the South, but those in every other section of the United States will be penalized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In spite of the point of order, I should like to add my voice in support of the position of the Senator from Mississippi. Not only does the present situation cause great injury to the farmers of my State—and for the last several months I have received a great many letters in which complaints are made regarding the shortage of fertilizer—but, in addition, it seems to me that the present policy in regard to Germany is absolutely stupid and indefensible, as was so well explained by President Hoover in his report. Not only are these steps being taken in the case of plants for the manufacture of nitrogen to be used for fertilizer but similar steps are being taken in the case of the production of steel. Germany is being restricted to the production of 6,000,000 tons of steel a year, whereas she could produce 19,000,000 tons of steel annually, and the production of trucks in Germany is being restricted to 10 percent of the number of trucks which could be produced there.

Mr. President, there is something basically wrong with such a policy. Accordingly it seems to me that the amendment now under consideration is a good way to approach that situation. If what the Senator has said about the blowing up of plants is true, there will be no way to remedy the shortage in the future.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we are now creating a shortage which will last for many years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Thus, there will be no way to supply these countries with fertilizer to be used in reconstructing and developing their agriculture.

It seems to me that such a policy is utterly stupid. I think it is most regrettable that the Senator from California thinks he must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. A few days ago I was privileged to hear Mr. Hoover speak in regard to the critical situation relative to foodstuffs in the world. He spoke about our policy in Germany. It seems to me that something must be done. I am sorry the point of order has been raised because, for one thing, we are told that if anything which might prejudice peace in the world were done in Germany, insofar as concerns the use of plants manufacturing nitrogen or fertilizer, that situation could very easily be ascertained. If an attempt were made to use such plants for the production of munitions, there would be no difficulty at all in ascertaining that fact.

Mr. President, we must raise our sights. We cannot let this German bugaboo frighten us into doing stupid things, for we are told that today we are facing perhaps the greatest food tragedy in the history of mankind. For 6 or 7 years the good Lord has given us a bountiful harvest. If a bountiful harvest is not had this year—and, Mr. President, unless the necessary fertilizer is available we shall not get such a harvest—then we shall face a starving world, a chaotic world, a world which will be ready for what communism is seeking.

Personally, Mr. President, I agree fully with what one of the distinguished Senators has said, namely, that by this utterly foolish policy not only are we destroying the productive plants of Germany, but we are making it impossible for thousands of acres of land in Germany to be used for the production of food, simply because the necessary fertilizers cannot be obtained.

Mr. President, I have said that we must be frightened by the German bugaboo. We must get a proper perspective in regard to the entire situation, for we are responsible for fixing a proper over-all policy. We must take some definite action, and we must take it soon. If these plants are blown up, some of the great facilities for the production of fertilizers which are absolutely needed for the production of food will be destroyed.

So I trust that prompt action will be taken to end the present policy, which is one of mere stupidity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that I hope the distinguished Senator from California will not insist upon the point of order.

For the last several months, due to the fact that my State is one of those which produce crops both in the early winter and the late winter, I have been repeatedly faced with the problem of the shortage of nitrogen and the shortage of potash. Thus far there has been no reference to potash. I am sure that in a short time this problem will be found of great concern to other sections of the Nation.

Both nitrogen and potash are produced in the German plants. Both of them now are being shipped from the United States to Germany, Japan, and other devastated countries. Because of those shipments from the United States great hardship has already been brought upon my State. So I sincerely hope the point of order will be withdrawn.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California to the fact that if the amendment is agreed to by the Senate, it will simply go to conference. For myself, and I believe I also state the position of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I take the position that if the amendment is agreed to by the Senate, and if it is then taken to conference, if the Army authorities then believe that it will result in harm and injury to their policy, I shall be perfectly willing to have the Senate recede from the amendment at that time, and I believe that the distinguished Senator who has offered the amendment would likewise be perfectly willing to have that done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly will allow immediate action, an action which can be remedied in conference if there is need. In conference there will be a chance to protect it as against the military policy.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from California will withdraw his point and permit the enactment of this particular amendment on this bill, because I know there is going to be great hardship visited upon the northern section of the Nation and the western area of the Nation such as has already been visited upon my own State. This matter can be taken care of in conference adequately, and the military authorities given full opportunity to express themselves.

I hope the Senator will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there may be a great deal of merit in the contention which is made. My objection is to writing legislation into an appropriation bill, which is not in order under the rules of the Senate. I should have no objection if, in some way, General Clay, who has the responsibility on the other side, who is an intelligent commanding general, who recognizes the problem he has to face locally there, who certainly better than any man on the floor of the Senate realizes the shortage of fertilizer there, could work this situation out. I think it would be a fine thing to do that, but my objection is to our attempting, based on the information or lack of information which we may have, to tie the hands of the man who is charged with the responsibility of administering the American occupied territory in Germany. For that reason, and that reason alone, I must insist on my point of order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I thought the Congress of the United States made policies for the Government. This is the first time I have ever discovered that General Clay or anyone else makes Government policies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in asking the distinguished Senator from California once again if he will not withdraw his point of order. I agree with the Senator from California that the amendment proposes legislation, and the point of order is good against it; but I suggest to the Senator that more than once we have written general legislation in an appropriation bill when time was of the essence, and in this particular case I think it is.

Some fertilizer is produced in my State, but in the main Nebraska is a large consumer of fertilizer. Not a day goes by that I do not receive requests from scores of people that steps be taken to relieve the shortage of fertilizer in Nebraska, a State which grows sugar beets, potatoes, and other crops which require that the soil be in a high state of cultivation and fertility.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from California that it seems to me, if I understand his remarks, that he is apprehensive that the Congress if it adopted this amendment would be dictating a policy to the Army too suddenly, and that if these German plants are saved and turned over to the production of fertilizer, it might not be possible to prevent their being used for some other purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is a part of the problem. The other part is that this matter has not been considered by the committee. So far as I am concerned, I do not know whether the adoption of the amendment might upset certain international agreements in which the State Department has participated. I do not know what the reasons are on the part of the military authorities for carrying out the program. I should have no objection, if this proposal is sound, as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska apparently feels it is, if he would have reported from the appropriate committee legislation acomplishing that purpose, after the State Department and the War Department had a chance to be heard. That is the way to handle it, not by writing legislation into this appropriation bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment, if the Senator will permit me. I agree that the Senator from California is absolutely correct, that the point of order is good, that the proper way is to legislate in a separate measure. There is no dispute about that, except that it can be handled on the pending bill if a point of order is not made, it can go to conference, as the distinguished Senator from Florida suggested, and, as I have already stated, time is of the essence; we are right at the place now where the farmers in my State are planting the crops which I mentioned. I know the distinguished Senator will agree with me that if we go through the other procedure it might take considerable time, and time is of the essence.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that legislation of this nature on the pending bill, or any other bill, is probably not needed, for the War Department can leave these plants in existence, or demolish them. I think now that this subject has been debated on the floor of the Senate, certainly the purpose will be accomplished, because I am sure the War Department recognizes the necessity for fertilizer not only in this country but elsewhere. The Department can, without notice from the Congress, leave those plants in being. Because of the possibility of the security of the country being jeopardized by leaving munitions plants in operation there, I may say to the Senator that even though the Senator from California withdrew his point of order, I should immediately make another point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that I agree with what the Senator from Nebraska has said. The same condition will occur in the western part of the country that has already happened to the Southeastern States, as described by the Senator from Florida. We started trying to do something through the War and State Departments last December. The strike of nitrate workers deprived the planters of fertilizer they needed. We worked with the Maritime Commission to get ships to import nitrates from Chile, but we found that Chile could not supply the nitrates in sufficient amount. Our stress has passed now, though many crops have been lost for lack of nitrates.

My hope is that something may be done as early as possible for the benefit of those who have not yet been affected. We have already been hurt, and I might say, to those whose seasons are a little later than ours, that the farmers in their sections will be hurt. We are going to suffer for years, unless something is done, because Chile cannot supply the increased amount of nitrates necessary, and we cannot produce the increased amounts needed in this country to carry forward on the vast acreage increase we put in during the war in order to help feed the world.

There is an appropriation of $300,000,000 in the pending bill for additional relief; that is, for food relief. The soil of this country cannot continue to produce as it has, and we cannot continue increased production, unless we get the fertilizer and the other materials necessary. So I hope those in the midwestern section of the country, whose seasons are a little later than ours, will see that something is done so that the farmers in that section will not suffer as have ours in the last 3 months.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to suggest that points of order are not debatable except for the illumination of the Chair, and the Chair is fully illuminated on the subject now before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Chair mind just a little more illumination before he makes a ruling?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not believe it is necessary for us to act hastily on this question. We are in the planting season of the year throughout the entire Northwest; the South has already gone through much of the planting season; and any action we take here this afternoon is not going to furnish fertilizer or any of the ingredients that go into fertilizer in time to help us overcome any of the fertilizer shortages with which we are confronted, insofar as this season's planting is concerned. Let us get reports and find out what the European situation is, and then act before we get into the planting season next year. Any action we might take here today would not affect this particular cropping season.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the distinguished President pro tempore raps us down on the theory that he has no need for further illumination, I should like to make one observation that I think might be illuminating, and then if we are not taken off our feet, I shall be glad to yield to the other two Senators who want the floor. I would say to the distinguished President pro tempore and also to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, that it is not only a question of fertilizer in this country, but if plants can be started in Germany, sufficient fertilizer can be produced by them, not only to maintain Germany but also most of the countries around Germany that need to be supplied with fertilizer.

I recently returned from Europe. When one goes out into the country there, what is the first thing he is told? He is told, "We can produce the food, if you will give us the fertilizer." The first thing they want is fertilizer. They have no way to get it. They have no equipment with which to produce it. That is the situation which would be cared for by the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. It would give Germany an opportunity, operating under our Army, to produce the fertilizer which we are now giving Germany. If it is a question of food, as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said—and it certainly is—why not let the German people have the fertilizer to produce the food for themselves, instead of our being required to supply them the food under the provisions of this very appropriation bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Not only would it supply the fertilizer that Germany uses, it would supply the fertilizer that goes to France, the Low Countries, and the whole continent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators understand that the Chair is not going to pass on the question of fertilizer; the Chair is going to pass upon the rules of the Senate. Under the rules, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to yield now to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the question of food is the very question that was raised by the State Department and the War Department, in December and January, when I complained about the exportation of nitrates and the shipment of thousands and thousands of tons of food. The very point the Senator brought out is that the War Department and State Department are shipping nitrates. That is why the nitrate plants should again be put to work in Central Europe for the German Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it probably is not a popular thing to say, certainly in view of the debate that has just been had here, but, at least, I want to utter a humble word of warning that is

manifest in what has been said here this afternoon. I concur in everything that has been said about the need for aiding the agriculture of this country, but I mention this, this afternoon, because it is simply the first, or among the first, of the many demands that we are going to hear in the months and years ahead as to why we should become "softer" on Germany, and I want to have kept in mind, when we are talking about aiding agriculture or assisting the economy somewhere, that the most important thing is to keep the world enemy, Germany, disarmed.

Germany in two wars of aggression has killed American boys to the hundreds of thousands. And I do not want us ever to forget that these policies that the War Department is trying to carry out were intended to keep Germany from killing more American boys in some future war, and that we must not ever forget the fact that they have, so far—I do not know what the future will show—they have so far in our time been the international criminal No. 1, and now what we are all trying to do is to keep them from ever being able again to wage another war.

I was troubled by my able friend here from Arkansas saying that the steel limitations on Germany are too severe. The first thing we know, we will, out of sympathy or some economic consideration, loosen up here, and loosen up there, and loosen up somewhere else, and get in a fight with some ally or allies about German disarmament, and the enemy will be strong again, and starting another world war and killing more American boys.

Mr. President, humbly with all understanding, and no criticism whatever of the suggestion made and the reasonableness of it, I wanted to utter as best I could a word of warning that we must never forget that the important task is to keep Germany from being able to wage war again.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate fully the fact that the President pro tempore needs no reenforcement in the ruling which he has made, yet I should like to have the indulgence of the Senate for only a moment or two to emphasize what seems to be involved in the point of order made by the distinguished Senator from California, that should not be overlooked in our RECORD. That is, while there may be temporary situations which may call upon us to set aside the rule of order of the Senate, nevertheless there is sound reason for the rule. There is sound reason for the Senate not to be moved off its feet by a temporary situation and depart from rules of the Senate which have been established by the wisdom of scores of years.

Mr. President, I undertake to say this afternoon that regardless of the import of the view as suggested here by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi—and he may well be correct upon the facts—nevertheless there is an adequate and proper method of legislation, and that method in my humble judgment is not by attaching hastily inadequately considered legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, as I said at the outset, the Chair needs no reenforcement, but I personally am pleased to note that the Chair has ruled, and I undertake to say that there is sound wisdom and judgment in the rule which he has so correctly sustained this afternoon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to observe that the pending bill provides for $6,000,000 to continue the school-lunch program. I feel that this sum, plus the $3,000,000 which was recaptured by the Department of Agriculture from previous allocations made, will be almost sufficient to carry through the program this school year.

Last month, when there was doubt as to whether or not the Congress would provide these funds, I addressed a telegram, dated March 6, to all of the State superintendents, asking them to give me an outline of how the school-lunch program worked during the past year, together with such other data as might be pertinent.

It is not my purpose at this time to read letters and telegrams, but I ask unanimous consent that a select number of the telegrams and letters be printed in the RECORD, together with my telegram. I should also like to insert in the RECORD a brief summary of the reports from 34 States, which gives data which I am sure will be of interest to the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram dated March 6, 1947, together with the telegrams and letters received in reply thereto, and also the summary, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 6, 1947.*

Am informed that within 2 weeks another deficiency bill will be presented to Congress. Understand Agriculture Department will have figures available for Bureau of Budget so that whatever funds are needed for school lunch program will be provided for in bill. Please write or wire me at once present status of program in your State and other pertinent information which might assist me in debating merits of program when bill comes before Senate. Am in favor of appropriating whatever funds are needed to continue program through school term.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *March 11, 1947.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building.

Arizona needs $55,000 to continue the school lunch program through this school year. This figure is based on present variable rates of reimbursement 6 to 9 cents.

N. D. PULLIAN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *March 8, 1947.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Re your wire. More than 20,000,000 lunches will be served this year in more than 700 schools in the State of Washington. Federal lunch program provides reimbursement maximum of 9 cents per lunch. At beginning of school year we cut our maximum reimbursement to 6 cents. Balance of fund used in partial reimbursement for January lunches. Fund now exhausted and schools having difficulty financing lunch programs locally. Agriculture Department has complete information concerning our situation.

PEARL A. WANAMAKER,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

DOVER DEL., *March 6, 1947.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building:

In order to meet requirements of a maximum supported school-lunch program, Delaware will require $23,000 for the remainder of the school year 1947.

GEORGE R. MILLER, JR.,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *March 6, 1947.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel Tennessee will need approximately $600,000 to operate our program through school year unless Federal assistance is made available; 1,832 schools receiving assistance through National School Lunch Act will be forced to close in March. Letter dated March 5 to superintendents and principals advised March 15 as deadline for payment of Federal funds at present date of reimbursement. Thanks.

BURGIN E. DOSSETT, *Commissioner.*

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *March 6, 1947.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand five hundred and seventy schools with 240,000 average daily participation now participating in national school-lunch program of California with an encumbrance of $3,533,377.77 for the school year. Estimated total encumbrance of pending applications unapproved due to inadequate funds, $84,036.88, making a total encumbrance of $3,617,414.65 for approved and pending applications. Funds now allocated total $1,821,717, leaving a deficit of $1,795,697.65. Funds now allocated will be sufficient to operate program until approximately March 31. If funds are available we estimate an additional 300 applications and pupil participation of 65,000 daily with an encumbrance of $292,500.

We need an estimated amount of $2,088,197.65 to carry on the school-lunch program for the school year ending June 1947.

ROY E. SIMPSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *March 6, 1947.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Florida unable pay March reimbursement claims. Funds exhausted. Some programs closing. Others serving less adequate lunches. Need approximately $500,000 for remainder of school year. Letter follows.

COLIN ENGLISH.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *March 6, 1947.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Arkansas will need $92,550 to complete school-lunch program through May 1947. Letter following.

RALPH B. JONES.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *March 6, 1947.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Care Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire received, addressed to E. D. Sullivan, former Administrator, regarding school-lunch program in our State. Registered letters in mail to all schools in Okla-

homa announcing the closing date as of March 31 1947, for lack of further Federal assistance. Imperative to have $357,457.21 to carry the 1,600 schools until May 15, 1947. We appreciate your interest in this matter and we can assure you that you have our good will and full support.

JAY LEE,
Administrator, State Board of Public Welfare.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 7, 1947.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Have concurred with John J. Desmond, Jr., commissioner of education, and the following is the situation in Massachusetts based on present participation: funds already allocated for public schools in Massachusetts will be exhausted on May 15, 1947; would need an additional $125,000 to continue program on present level through June 30, 1947. Could use an additional $20,000 to take in additional schools not at present approved because of lack of funds.

PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 7, 1947.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sufficient funds on hand to pay monthly claims for Iowa school-lunch program for March participation. Schools have been notified that the rate of reimbursement will be reduced to zero April 1 unless additional money is received. Our estimate is $239,000 to continue maximum indemnity rate to the end of the school year.

C. W. BANGS,
State School Lunch Supervisor.

SALEM, OREG., *March 8, 1947.*
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel March 6, Oregon allocation will be entirely depleted as of April 1 and must discontinue if more funds not available. Would need $284,300 on 6 cents per lunch basis and $150,392 on 4 cents per lunch basis for remainder school year after April 1. Funds must be made available quickly if to be effective because of notification to schools.

REX PUTNAM,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *March 7, 1947.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate:

Federal lunch funds exhausted; need $317,191.67 to guarantee maximum reimbursement. Letter follows.

E. ALLEN BATEMAN,
State Superintendent, Public Instruction.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 7, 1947.*
United States Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER:

Concur with Massachusetts commissioner of public welfare, Patrick A. Tompkins, namely. Based on present school-lunch participation funds already allocated for public schools in Massachusetts will be exhausted May 15, 1947. Would need an additional $125,000 to continue program on present level through June 30, 1947. Could use an additional $20,000 for additional school lunches not at present approved because of lack of funds.

Commissioner JOHN J. DESMOND, Jr.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, March 8, 1947.
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLENDER: In response to the request in your wire, I am glad to furnish you with information relative to the status of the school-lunch program in Louisiana.

Louisiana made every effort at the beginning of the 1946–47 school year to expand the school-lunch program so that it would reach every child who necessarily had to remain at school at noon. This resulted in a greatly increased participation and consequently a deficit of funds to carry on the program. Many schools which made application to begin operations later in the year had to be canceled because of the subsequent shortage of funds. This, in turn, eliminated a large number of the children who most needed and would have benefited by a good hot lunch.

Federal reimbursement rates for the different type lunches are the same as they were in 1943. Food and labor costs have increased materially, and these costs have been absorbed by the State. Prices of lunches had to be raised to care for these increased costs, and at present are having to be further increased to care for the loss of funds from reimbursement. Thus, the large number of children who cannot afford the increased cost are having to drop out. Some schools are reporting a decrease of 20 to 50 percent in participation because of this. Too, many of the programs, especially in the small Negro schools, are having to close since it is impossible to operate on the little amount of cash the children can afford to pay.

Louisiana, through local contributions, has far exceeded the matching requirements in meeting their share of the costs of program operation. In addition to this, there is a State appropriation of $250,000 distributed to the schools of the State to assist in carrying on the program.

Louisiana has received for reimbursement the following:

Original allocation	$1,277,334.72
Special allocation	199,968.00
Total	1,477,302.72
Amount spent to date	1,081,854.47
Balance	395,448.25
Estimated for February claims	250,000.00
Balance to be used in March	145,448.25

Based upon the amounts spent each month, approximately an additional $500,000 is needed if all schools are to operate through the entire school term.

Failure at this time to provide adequate Federal aid for the program will mean a definite backward step. Some programs will go out of existence, and I feel sure they would hesitate to begin a program another year.

The school-lunch program has paid dividends to boys and girls far greater than can be estimated. From observation, boys and girls who participated are healthier, happier individuals who attend school more regularly; there are fewer absences due to illness; they are making better grades; and a more desirable teacher-pupil relationship exists.

The enclosures may be interesting to you, should you not have received copies.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN E. COXE,
State Superintendent.

DIVISION OF WELFARE,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
Jefferson City, Mo., March 6, 1947.
Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In response to your telegram of March 6, I enclose herewith the following:

1. Copy of a telegram signed by myself and Hubert Wheeler, State commissioner of education, which was sent to all Members of the Missouri congressional delegation.

2. Copy of the news release relating to the school-lunch program in Missouri and the fact that Federal funds for partial support of this program will be exhausted March 31, 1947.

3. Copy of a letter sent to all school lunch sponsors in Missouri advising them of the closing date of the school lunch program in this State as far as Federal funds are concerned.

The school lunch program is very popular in Missouri and more schools are participating in the program this year than in any previous year. I consider this program to be of great benefit to the school children of our State and certainly believe that failure to appropriate additional Federal funds to maintain the program this year and in future years would be a serious mistake of Congress.

I hope very much that you are successful in your efforts to secure additional funds for the hot lunch program.

Very truly yours,

PROCTOR N. CARTER,
Director.

FEBRUARY 28, 1947.

To: The press.
From: Proctor N. Carter, director, Division of Welfare; Hubert Wheeler, State Commissioner of Education.

Federal funds allocated to the State of Missouri by the United States Department of Agriculture which meet part of the costs of the school-lunch program will be spent by March 31, and many schools will be forced to close the program on that date, it was announced today. School lunches are now being served in 1,200 Missouri schools, with over 140,000 school children receiving one lunch each day under the program. Children pay a nominal amount for their meals and the Federal funds are used to reimburse schools for a part of the additional costs of the meals. The allocation of Federal funds to Missouri for the current school year was $1,407,152.58. Proctor N. Carter, director of the division of welfare, which administers the school-lunch program, and Hubert Wheeler, State commissioner of education, today jointly directed a telegram to all of the Missouri congressional delegation urging their support of a pending measure in Congress which would provide additional Federal funds for the program.

FEBRUARY 28, 1947.

This telegram sent today to all Missouri Congressmen and United States Senators:

"Federal funds for operation of school-lunch program in Missouri are sufficient only to carry the program through March. One thousand, two hundred participating schools are being notified today that Federal funds will be exhausted on March 31 and reimbursement to schools for part of costs of lunch program cannot be made after that date. Over 140,000 school children in Missouri are now receiving one lunch each day under program. We are informed that House Resolution 1775, introduced by Representative MORRISON, Louisiana, would appropriate additional Federal funds for school lunches which would enable program to be continued in Missouri as well as other States. We respectfully urge your support of this measure in the interest of the health and welfare of school children in Missouri."

HUBERT WHEELER,
State Commissioner of Education.
PROCTOR N. CARTER,
Director, Division of Welfare.

DIVISION OF WELFARE,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
Jefferson City, Mo., February 27, 1947.

To All Approved School-Lunch Sponsors:

Federal funds which have been allocated to Missouri for the school-lunch program for the current school year will be exhausted at the close of the school day, March 31, 1947. Reimbursement cannot be made to any school for any part of the costs of the lunch program after that date. All claims for reimbursement of food costs up to, and including March 31, will be paid as in the past.

We have been advised by the United States Department of Agriculture that legislation is now pending in the Congress (H. R. 1775) which would provide additional funds to the States for the school-lunch program, but there is no assurance that such legislation will be passed.

We regret very much that sufficient Federal funds were not provided to enable the school-lunch program to function throughout the current school year because we feel that this is one of the most beneficial programs that has ever been initiated by the Federal Government.

In order that we may be assured that this notice is received by all sponsors of school-lunch programs, we shall appreciate it if you will sign the attached form and return it promptly to us.

Very truly yours,
PROCTOR N. CARTER,
Director.

DIVISION OF WELFARE,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
Jefferson City, Mo.

To C. E. HARTLEY, State School-Lunch Supervisor:

This will acknowledge receipt of letter of February 27, 1947, advising us that Federal funds for the school-lunch program will be exhausted at the close of the school day, March 31, 1947. I understand that the Division of Welfare will not be responsible for reimbursement for any costs incurred in connection with the serving of lunches under the school-lunch program after March 31.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE, SUPERINTENDENT
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Springfield, March 7, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your wire of March 6, requesting information regarding the present status of the school-lunch program in Illinois.

The State of Illinois was allocated $1,844,729.64 in Federal food funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which is $700,000 less than the total amount reimbursed schools in Illinois from Federal funds for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1946.

In addition, I would like to call your attention to the fact that we have accepted into the program at the present time, 2,292 schools. The peak month of participation in the 1945–46 school year was 1,756, and this year's participation is an increase of approximately 31 percent. From the present rate of monthly reimbursement, it is evident that the State of Illinois will need approximately $1,200,000 to enable full participation for this fiscal year. Unless additional funds are received, Federal reimbursement to schools will end after March 31.

A large number of our programs are located in schools where the community is unable to carry the entire financial burden of the school-lunch program. The office has been besieged by letters and telephone calls from PTA groups, mothers' clubs, and school officials, some of whom have just come into the program this year. It seems to be the feeling that if Federal aid is withdrawn at this time, just when the program has begun to function well, the effect will be disastrous to many needy programs.

We trust this gives you the desired information.

Very truly yours,
VERNON L. NICKELL,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., March 14, 1947.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: We appreciate your telegram of March 6 very much and your interest in the hot school-lunch program. The State of New Mexico, however, will have adequate Federal funds for the remainder of the 1946–47 fiscal year with which to carry on the hot school-lunch program. We would like to request an additional allocation of approximately $30,000 in nonfood assistance money for the State of New Mexico, inasmuch as all the funds appropriated to New Mexico for nonfood assistance have been expended or encumbered, with the exception of about $12,000.

Any assistance that you could give us insofar as this item is concerned will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
MURRAY A. HINTZ,
State Director.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Hartford, Conn., March 11, 1947.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in response to your telegram under date of March 6 requesting information concerning the school lunch program.

The original allotment to Connecticut was $362,820. Requests for 271 school lunch grants were approved previous to the discontinuance of approval in November. On the present estimated deficit of $30,660.98 it will be necessary to discontinue the program not later than the middle of May. However, a supplementary allotment somewhere between $56,000 and $60,000 has been assured us periodically since last November. To date this sum has not been received. Should it be received, we will be able to carry the present program through to the end of the school year with a balance of $26,000 and we can then approve payment to 10 schools whose applications were received too late for favorable action last fall. This would presumably reduce the balance from $26,000 to $8,000.

There are, however, 26 schools which have made application for grants on which favorable action has been impossible. The estimated sum necessary to pay grants to these schools for a year is $55,000. Sixty-five other schools have withheld their applications because they have been advised that the State had no money with which to pay them and, of course, could not approve their requests. The estimated amount necessary to pay these claims in full for the year is $105,000. In other words, if the applications of all eligible schools had been approved the total amount necessary to pay the claims would have been approximately $571,000. This would mean a deficit in estimated allotment of $209,000, or in case the supplementary allotment is received as promised a deficit of $143,000. Because we ceased approving applications for grants in November, the maximum deficit we can see is $31,000.

If the supplementary payment is received as promised we will have enough money to carry the program through the year with $26,000 available for picking up claims for applications of additional schools now held on file in this office or withheld locally. But $26,000 will be insufficient by $143,000 to meet all legitimate claims.

Any further information desired will be gladly furnished.

Cordially yours,
N. S. LIGHT,
Director, Bureau School and
Community Services.

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Carson City, March 8, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: On receipt of your telegram of March 6, I sent it, with a memorandum, to Miss Mildred Huber, State supervisor of home economics education, to whom, for the past 6 months, I have assigned the responsibility of supervising the school-lunch program in Nevada, pending the appropriation from the State legislature which would permit us to employ a special supervisor for the program.

Miss Huber's answering memorandum, received yesterday, is so complete an answer to your inquiry that I am enclosing a copy herewith. For their information, I am also sending copies of this letter and Miss Huber's memorandum to the three members of the Nevada congressional delegation.

With my sincere thanks for your splendid interest in this most vital piece of legislation, I am,

Very truly yours,
MILDRED BRAY,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Memorandum to: Miss Mildred Bray, superintendent of public instruction.

From: State supervisor home economics, Mildred Huber.

Subject: Information pertaining to school-lunch program.

There is a $2,522.29 deficit for the month of February and $22,453.37 will be required to continue the program through the school term. We have had a gradual increase in the number of free meals served from 7,699 in December to 10,592 in January. Approximately one-third of the schools plan to discontinue school lunches if Federal aid is discontinued and about two-thirds of the schools hope to continue until the close of the school term with an increase in the price of lunches which now range from 10 cents to 30 cents. The average daily charge is about 21 cents.

Families with a number of children taking advantage of the hot school lunches will be unable to pay higher prices and those children receiving free meals will be eliminated entirely. Nevada has a total of 44 schools receiving benefits from the National School Lunch Act, with an average attendance of 4,325 children. Should Federal aid continue other school districts expect to operate school lunch rooms next year.

Nevada has matched $3.25 for every Federal dollar received. The program expenses from September through January were $100,329.30, while $29,654.50 of Federal funds have been used for food reimbursement. The Nevada Nutrition Council's study of "Daily Food Records of School Children" shows that the school lunch, in many cases, is the only nourishing, hot meal the child receives during the day.

From September through January a total of 376,803 meals have been served to children. $69,552.67 has been spent for food alone and $2,874.53 was donated in food and services.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Raleigh, March 11, 1947.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Your telegram of March 6 and the interest you show in the continuance of the school lunch program is greatly appreciated.

In response to the opportunity offered under the new National School Lunch Act, we had an increase this year of 217 schools over the number participating in last year's program. This increase in the number of participating schools and increased participation in established programs has raised the average number of meals served daily by 78,000. This means that an additional $6,200 per day in Federal funds has been required.

Even though we discontinued the acceptance of applications on December 1, due to apparent lack of sufficient Federal funds for reimbursement, $3,908,000 was needed to carry the 1,232 approved schools through the end of the school year. The allocation of food assistance funds to North Carolina for 1946–47 is $2,633,002, leaving a deficiency of approximately $1,275,000 to operate the program through the present school year.

We have enough money to pay approximately 40 percent of each March claim. County and city superintendents were notified to this effect early in February and advised to increase, if necessary, the price of their lunches as much as 10 cents, effective March 1 to enable them to continue the program. As a direct result of the price increases the attendance in lunchrooms has already dropped 25 to 75 percent, and in many instances the lunchrooms will be closed by the end of March unless additional funds are made available. Quick action by Congress is needed if relief is to be granted in time to be effective.

The school lunch program in North Carolina plays a major part in the physical and mental development of our children. I know of no program supported by Federal funds which has proved more popular as is evidenced by the rapid increase in participation and by the fact that more than $6,000,000 is being contributed annually from State and local funds.

I shall greatly appreciate any support that you can give toward obtaining supplementary funds to be administered under the National School Lunch Act for the current year.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

CLYDE A. ERWIN,
State Superintendent, Public Instruction.

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Columbus, March 11, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am attaching a copy of a report from our school-lunch supervisor, W. A. Whitman, in response to your telegram of March 6, 1947. I thought you would enjoy reading the complete letter and for that reason I have not attempted to abstract his report.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE HISSONG.

MARCH 8, 1947.

Dr. CLYDE HISSONG,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction,
State Department of Education,
State Office Building,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR DR. HISSONG: I am attaching the telegram which Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER sent you relative information concerning the status of the Ohio Public School Lunch Program. I am also listing miscellaneous information for your use in making a reply to Mr. ELLENDER's telegram.

We are mailing letters this very day to the 1,168 schools on our reimbursement program to the effect that we will cease paying reimbursement claims in full on and after March 22. In other words, we are only guaranteeing payments for the first 15 days operation in March. We are giving schools the opportunity of keeping their contracts in force in order for them to remain eligible for the receipt of national school lunch foods and equipment assistance. It will take a minimum of $750,000 to finance the Ohio food program for the balance of this year. It would have taken an additional $1,000,000 (this includes the $750,000) to finance this year's food program for those schools which are now on the program in addition to those which were refused participation on the food program. It might be wisdom to point out that there were 806 public schools on the Ohio food program last year and that as of October 1, 1946, we were servicing 1,168 schools on this program. This represents, you will observe, an increase of practically 50 percent. We refused 51 schools during the month of October the right to participate on the program because of over-incumbrance of funds. These 51 schools would have fed between ten and twelve thousand children per day. Dozens of schools that had intended to seek application to be placed on the program did not make application when they learned these 51 schools had been refused. We now are feeding between 225,000 and 250,000 children on our food reimbursement program.

We have at least 25 or 30 schools on the food program at a zero rate of reimbursement in order that they can participate in the national school lunch foods and also be eligible for equipment assistance. One of the outstanding things which has occurred during the past 2 weeks is the number of requests we have received from schools who have expressed a desire to be placed on the program without food reimbursement in order to secure lunch foods and equipment assistance.

I turned over to Mr. Underwood on Friday night of this week a group of between fifteen and twenty letters from boards of education who contemplate remodeling their buildings or building new buildings this coming summer and who want equipment assistance in order to carry out their lunchroom plans. These boards cannot start lunchrooms until next fall. Mr. Underwood is taking it up with the Chicago office this very day to learn if anything can be done to help these boards of education. All of the requests which I just mentioned have come to our office during the past ten to twelve days. This type of request is rapidly on the increase.

We have received only one check for equipment to date. This check was in the amount of $156,000. All of our present equipment funds will be incumbered within a short time because of the rapid increase in the number of applications. Practically all equipment applications which are coming in at the present time are calling for larger payments of money. It is my hope that the Government gives us the second allotment of equipment funds in order that we may take care of all applicants. All orders for equipment must be placed before July 1, 1947. The schools will have, however, up to September 1, 1947, to secure the equipment and get it installed. Any unincumbered equipment funds which exist as of September 1, 1947, must be turned back to the Federal Government.

Yours very truly,

W. A. WHITMAN,
Supervisor, Ohio Public-School Lunch Program.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Austin, Tex., March 11, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In reply to your telegram of recent date concerning the status of the national school-lunch program in Texas I submit the following information:

Unless additional funds are provided this program will be closed for the current fiscal year on March 31, 1947. This involves the food-assistance funds only. Our non-food-assistance grant will be sufficient. The need in this State for more funds was brought about by an increase in participation both of schools and of pupils within the participating schools, as well as by steadily increasing costs of food, equipment, and services.

I feel this program is working to the distinct benefit of the school children, the schools, and the community by increasing average daily attendance, raising health and well-being of the pupils, and promoting the general welfare through efficient use of surplus farm commodities. Texas, with its many rural schools, is especially cognizant of the value of the program. Pupils are transported long distances to their schools, and a wholesome hot lunch at noon provides needed energy far beyond a cold unappetizing lunch brought from home.

I am inclosing the results of a survey made by our school-lunch division which, I believe, will be of interest to you. You will note from the inclosure that we will need $720,000 more to complete the current scholastic year. Please accept my thanks for your interest in this essential program.

Very truly yours,

L. A. WOODS,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Tallahassee, March 7, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senator for Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Thank you for your encouraging telegram. Schools in this State desperately need Federal school-lunch funds for the rest of this year and next year. Increased food costs during the last few weeks have made some schools increase the sale price of lunches in order to keep going even with Federal aid. Most schools will struggle through March in the hope that Congress will provide the additional funds needed. If funds are not forthcoming by April 1, schools will be forced to make drastic changes such as: (1) increase the sale price of lunches. This will exclude many children most in need of school lunches, (2) serve less adequate lunches, (3) close the school-lunch departments for the remainder of the year. The full effect of the exhaustion of Federal school-lunch funds will not be felt until April because schools buy on credit in anticipation of reimbursement. When March bills become due, if Federal funds are not available to reimburse schools, credit may be withdrawn. Schools will be forced to conduct money-raising activities to write off March deficits or transfer funds to food and labor accounts that were earmarked as matching funds for the purchase of equipment.

Because of increased costs, this office in the last 10 days has had requests for help from three of the larger schools in the State that have never received Federal reimbursement. They did not realize that we can no longer provide Federal aid. I believe that many other schools that have not received reimbursement this year would have been asking for aid during the last 2 months if they had not known funds were about exhausted. With Federal reimbursement, schools are

finding it difficult to serve adequate lunches. If a deficiency appropriation is not provided, we cannot hope to provide adequate lunches for the children in the State.

We need approximately $500,000 to carry us through the remainder of this year. It is expected that if Federal funds are available for the school year 1947–48, there will be from 10- to 20-percent increase in requests for Federal reimbursement. We have more than met our matching requirements and it is expected that the State Legislature which convenes early in April, will provide considerable school-lunch funds for buildings, equipment, supervision, personnel salaries, and personnel training. Even with this, we will need Federal assistance. There are many schools that do not yet have school-lunch programs, both State and Federal funds will be needed to expand the program and to assure every child an adequate lunch.

I am notifying the schools in this State of the proposed bill and urging that they back it in every way possible. If I can give you any further information or assistance, please advise.

Cordially yours,

COLIN ENGLISH.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boise, March 8, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Member, United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Our school lunch Federal funds were exhausted in the State as of March 1. Many of the schools are trying to continue their programs. Many of the poorer schools, those having children needing a good lunch have been forced to close. The price of the lunch for children has increased from 15 to 25 cents. Fewer children can afford to buy their lunch, particularly those who need it most.

Without Federal assistance, it is going to be most difficult to continue to serve those who cannot pay for their meals, particularly those who cannot pay the increased price. In general, we have been advised that meals are of poor quality.

Our need for continued funds for hot lunch is urgent.

Cordially yours,

ALTON B. JONES,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Charleston, March 7, 1947.

Mr. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: The school lunch program is very popular in West Virginia. We are now serving approximately 95,000 children and have 1,450 school-lunch centers. We could use to great advantage $25,000.

The small amount of money which we need does not signify the importance in which we hold the program or the great importance of having a deficiency appropriation to take care of other States whose funds were insufficient this year.

Fifty-three out of our fifty-five counties have a program and are very well pleased with it as it is run this year. With the increased cost of food products there probably would not be more than 100 schools which could continue with an adequate lunch program without the Federal aid.

I wish to take this opportunity to urge that we have a larger appropriation for the coming year. Even though West Virginia is one of the fortunate States this year the amount we will receive will not be enough to cover our anticipated program next year.

Yours very truly,

W. W. TRENT,
State Superintendent of Free Schools.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baltimore, Md., March 7, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ELLENDER: This is in reply to your telegram of March 6, 1947, regarding the present status of the school-lunch program in Maryland.

During September 1946 there were 200 schools operating in Maryland, serving 32,480 children daily. Of these, 1,573 children were receiving lunch without cost. During the following 5 months, the participation has increased to 421 schools, serving 60,412 children, 6,126 of whom are receiving lunch without cost or at reduced cost. While this seems to indicate a large program, actually only one-fourth of the total enrollment in Maryland schools has available a hot, nutritious lunch. We have approved an additional 70 schools, but the program has not actually started in these schools because of a threatened shortage of funds.

Maryland is reimbursing the schools with the maximum amount possible under the terms of the National School Lunch Act. While the original allocation of $465,064 has been supplemented by an additional $72,000, we are faced with the fact that Maryland will exhaust the funds available by the middle of May. This means that, excluding any expansion, we will need an additional $76,000 to carry the program through the remainder of the school year. In view of this threatened shortage of funds, we have been reluctant to encourage new schools to participate in the program, even though we recognize that those schools having little or no lunch program are even more seriously in need of help than those schools fortunate enough to have been able to avail themselves of the program earlier this year or in past years.

Maryland school children have benefited from the program, and the program is constantly expanding as a result of Federal subsidy and from the distribution of surplus commodities. These commodities have been of more than considerable help in our operation of the program, since without them many schools would have been unable to serve the well-balanced meal they are serving without increasing the cost.

If additional funds are not made available, many of the gains for which we have labored in the past years and thought had been established would be lost.

1. The school lunch operation would tend to revert to the old emphasis on profit instead of emphasis on adequate nutrition for all children.

2. Prices of lunches would increase one-third to one-half more than the present price for all children.

3. The increase in prices would result in fewer children being able to buy adequate lunches.

4. Needy children could not be fed adequately, if at all, by the schools.

5. Schools would be less able to replace and maintain equipment necessary for proper preparation of food and proper sanitation.

6. The foregoing results would greatly hamper the development of the educational values of the school lunch.

The prospect for the year 1948–49 is that Maryland will need approximately $750,000 to operate the expanding program. Your assistance in securing additional appropriations for this program is earnestly solicited.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS G. PULLEN, Jr.,
State Superintendent of Schools.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Little Rock, March 7, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In reference to your telegram of March 6, the following figures are submitted for the Arkansas school-lunch program:

Amount of money actually used as of Jan. 31, 1947	$833,387.05
Estimated amount of money needed for February, March, April, and May 1947	738,000.00
Total	1,571,387.05

The public schools of Arkansas have been allotted $1,478,836.24 for food assistance. Based on our actual use for the first 7 months and an estimated need for the next 5 months, we will need $92,550.81 to complete the school-lunch program up through May 1947, which will be the end of the fiscal year for the schools.

Arkansas has a total of 889 public schools operating the school-lunch program with an average daily attendance of 132,178 students. Sixty-eight percent of the students are receiving a complete meal with milk; 30 percent are receiving a complete meal without milk, leaving 2 percent of the pupils that are being served a partial meal. This is due to lack of facilities in the schools.

If there is additional information that you would like to have, we will be glad to obtain it for you.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH B. JONES.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, March 7, 1947.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Agreeable to your telegram of yesterday, it affords me pleasure to give you the following information regarding the school-lunch program in Minnesota operating with funds made available under the National School Lunch Act:

In Minnesota there are 1,275 schools—public and parochial—serving lunches daily to 150,000 to 160,000 children.

Federal allotment for Minnesota to date is $1,079,106.02 for the cash-reimbursement program. The comparable figure for last year was $1,119,273.

Unless additional Federal funds are made available through a deficiency appropriation, the allotment to date will assist in carrying the lunch program in Minnesota only to March 31, 1947. Minnesota needs an additional $345,000 to satisfy present contracts entered into by the State department of education with the local school boards sponsoring the lunch program to carry through June 1947.

In Minnesota we are keenly alive to the fact that the school-lunch program is the primary responsibility of the local school board and that the Federal Government simply supplements. You will be interested to learn that the children and the school boards are contributing approximately $2.50 for every Federal dollar furnished us.

We asked each school whether or not the lunch could be 100-percent locally financed to June 1947 should additional Federal funds not be forthcoming, and only 12 percent can do so. To carry on the sponsors advise that the asking price of the meal will again be increased and we know that another group of children will automatically be eliminated from participating; unfortunately, this will affect a segment of the school group that can be reached only when the asking price is average or below. The children are paying on an average of 15 cents this year compared with 10 cents last year for the type A lunch in the rural areas.

At your suggestion, I am summarizing below my reasons for requesting that the Congress make available an additional appropriation to enable us to operate through June 1947.

1. Section 3 of Public Law 396 clearly authorizes the Congress to appropriate such sums of money as may be necessary to enable

the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the act. Further that the act provided for expanding the school-lunch program which expansion was urged by the administrative officials of the United States Department of Agriculture particularly during the early part of the present school year. The State Department of Education, therefore, in good faith so advised prospective lunch sponsors and entered into a contract—not a 1-year but a continuing contract with no stipulated date of expiration at agreed-upon rates of reimbursement depending on type of lunch served.

2. The lunch program, in its fourth year under the stimulus of this Federal aid, and the acceptance of the program as an integral part of the over-all school set-up by educators, farmers, businessmen, and the communities as a whole, shows these major developments:

(a) Doubled and trebled participation by pupils in a great number of schools.

(b) Changed from the type C (milk only) and type B (the incomplete plate lunch) to the type A or complete plate lunch calling for higher Federal reimbursement and consequent heavier drawing against available Federal funds.

To illustrate: In approximately the same number of schools operating this year that functioned last year for the month of January we served in 1947, 1,724,947 type A meals compared to 1,297,286 in January 1946, or an increase of approximately 33 percent. Multiply this increase by 9 cents per meal over the school year and you can readily see that in Minnesota that this is the major reason for asking for these additional funds.

3. This lunch program should start with the first day of school and carry through to the last day of school to retain the benefits accruing to this health program in maintaining good sturdy bodies and alert minds.

4. This Federal assistance is necessary for several years to come, or until such time as the local communities and the States can assume the financial responsibility. The national school lunch is so designed and as above stated in Minnesota, and I know personally in the several States contiguous to Minnesota, the children and local contributions weighed against the Federal contribution is not dollar for dollar (as called for in the law) but rather $2 to $1 even at this time. In other words, I cannot too strongly emphasize that the States are carrying out their part of the agreement; and are, naturally, looking to the Federal Government to live up to its agreement.

I do not think there is any question, at this time, as to the worthwhileness of the school-lunch program or is there a lack of appreciation of the outstanding beneficial results that are accruing to the children, the school and the community in the operation of the lunch project; but in passing I would like to go on record as stating that in Minnesota we are daily becoming more cognizant of the important part it is playing in school and community life. We do find that the youngsters have better health and that it does enhance the scholastic standing of the pupil. In our rural schools, particularly, it continues to be a great boon to the children that have to be transported; early rising precludes in so many cases an adequate breakfast for the child notwithstanding that food may be available and it is a very long day, indeed, because of the late hour this same child arrives home.

The school lunchroom is being used as a laboratory for the nutrition taught in the schoolroom, the child is taught proper posture, he is taught the social amenities, he is taught to eat the proper kinds of food and in the proper quantities. Further there is a definite relationship established between the school and the home as regards the food consumption of the child.

Minnesota, an agricultural State, is very much interested in the food consumption. This year, with the large potato surplus, we are using 10 to 12 carloads of potatoes monthly. We will serve approximately 19,000,000 half-pints of milk this year so that it is clearly demonstrated that the school-lunch program is of tremendous socio-economic importance to us.

I have watched with interest your untiring efforts in behalf of the lunch program and we are grateful for your fine understanding of the need of such a program in bettering our education.

Should you desire additional information will you please feel free to call upon me and in the meantime may I express the hope that Congress may see its way clear to give this essential activity the necessary financial backing to permit of our continuing the program through June 1947.

Yours very truly,

DEAN M. SCHWEICKHARD,
Commissioner of Education.
By T. J. BERNING,
Assistant Commissioner.

THE STATE OF UTAH,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Salt Lake City, March 7, 1947.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Because of favorable Federal and State legislation, Utah has developed an extensive school-lunch program. Since 1943 the State school-lunch law has provided approximately 7 cents per meal.

Federal funds have been about 20 percent of the total expenditure while the local districts have raised through charges to child, and so forth, about 50 percent of the total cost. This means that the State fund has provided about 30 percent.

We will continue through the year. Our cost to child is so high that many who should participate are not able to. We are serving about 31 percent of all children registered in school.

From Federal funds we have paid to January 31, 1947, the following rates for all meals in Utah: Type A, 7 cents; type A without milk, 5 cents; type C, 2 cents.

Our Federal money at this rate is exhausted and the cost to child soars. If the Federal funds could continue, at this rate we could manage. The maximum rate, however, is what we must have if we are to expand the program and feed all who should rightfully eat at school lunch.

Herewith, we are submitting a chart of meals served to January 31, 1947, with the estimated meals to June 30. We have given also the amount of money we would receive at the maximum rate. The amount allocated to Utah for the year has now been received as noted.

In order to do the job that Congress had in mind, we must have the maximum rate of reimbursement in Utah.

Very truly yours,

N. J. BARLOW,
Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Present and projected figures for 1946–47 Utah school-lunch program

Meals	A	A/W	Total, A and A/W	C	Total funds
September 1946 to Jan. 31, 1947	3,295,983	381,488	3,677,471	95,745	
Estimated meals for—					
February	792,791	88,087	880,878	19,000	
March	812,450	90,272	902,722	18,000	
April	753,610	83,734	837,344	19,000	
May	485,622	53,958	539,580	20,000	
June	8,100	900	9,000		
Total, all meals for 1946–47	6,148,556	698,439	6,846,995	171,745	
Federal funds necessary at maximum rate of reimbursement (cents)	9	7		2	
	($553.370.04	$48,890.73	$602,260.77	$3,434.90	$605,695.67
U. S. Department of Agriculture appropriation for 1946–47 (this amount has been received)					288,504.00
Balance needed from deficiency appropriation bill now before Congress to give maximum reimbursement					317,191.67

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, March 7, 1947.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This will acknowledge and thank you for your telegram of yesterday addressed to my predecessor, Dr. Stoddard, relative to the prospect of a Federal deficiency appropriation for the school-lunch program. I am happy to furnish you the information for which you ask concerning the present status of the program in New York State. May I say that your long and vigorous support of this program to improve the health of the children and young people of the Nation through improving their nutritional status is, in my judgment, deserving of the highest commendation.

Due to the operation of the equalization factor in the Federal formula for the apportionment of the school-lunch funds among the States, New York State gets a relatively small apportionment. Indeed, despite the substantial increase in the total Federal appropriation this year, our initial allotment increased only about four per cent. Our program, as you may know, is of several years' standing and has grown extensively and substantially. This year about 553,571 children are participating in Federally reimbursed programs. These children are attending 2,658 of our public and private schools. These figures represent a substantial increase over those of a year ago.

Moreover, this year more of our schools than previously began operation of their lunch program immediately after Labor Day instead of in November or December. We are hopeful that more of them will continue into June this year. Also more of our children are getting the "A" or complete lunch with the 9 cents reimbursement rather than the "C" lunch (milk) with its 2 cents reimbursement. All these factors have resulted in a more rapid depletion of our limited share of the Federal appropriation. Consequently our Federal money is completely exhausted. It became evident in late November this would be the case and early in December we notified all the schools of the situation. Our Federal appropriation has similarly been exhausted in previous years but the congressional deficiency appropriation plus large reallocations from the unspent funds of other States have until this year made possible the continuance of the program without curtailment during the school year.

We were advised repeatedly in December that the likelihood of a Federal deficiency appropriation was slight. We are happy to learn from your telegram that the situation has greatly improved. As you well know, more of the States are participating this year

and consequently the funds for reallocation are markedly less.

Knowing all this, our Governor, Mr. Dewey, in his opening message to the legislature, January 8, recommended that the State come to the rescue of the program. I inclose a copy of that portion of his message. The same day, State Senator Thomas C. Desmond, introduced a bill—Senate Introductory No. 2—presenting "a first instance" appropriation to see us through the current school year, which ends June 30, 1947. I am inclosing a copy of this bill. Provision is made for the repayment to the State of any additional Federal funds which may be forthcoming. In order that this bill might become law prior to the adoption of the State budget Governor Dewey subsequently sent an emergency message to the legislature. The bill was passed unanimously with the hearty approval of both major political parties. It appropriates $2,500,000.

Senator Desmond now has a bill in the legislature appropriating $2,750,000 for the school year starting July 1. This is for the purpose of increasing the 9 and 2 cents Federal payments by 4 and 2 cents respectively. We believe that the possibility of getting somewhere with this bill would be considerably increased were the congressional deficiency appropriation to be large enough to permit the repayment of that portion of this year's $2,500,000 which it is necessary to spend. I estimate that it will take nearly $2,000,000 of the $2,500,000 to see us through June 30.

We understand that the total sum needed by the various States to finish out the present school year's program approximates $23,000,000.

Surely there are few uses for Federal funds which are of greater proved value to the Nation than this.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING.

Summary of information regarding the school-lunch program as reported by 34 States

State	Date funds will be exhausted (1)	Additional funds needed this year (2)	Will Congress be asked for more funds? (3)	Is your State providing food assistance now? (4)	Will your State legislature be asked for more funds for food? (5)	Will your State use all non-food funds? (6)	The cost of administration is borne by— (7)	Percent of increase in school program (8)	Number of approved programs (9)	Average daily participation (10)
Arkansas	Mar. 31	$300,000	Yes	No	No	Yes	State vocational funds.	12½ percent	889	114,834.
California	Mar. 31	$2,060,000	do	do	do	do	Emergency funds.	52 percent	2,356	152,000.
Colorado	July 1	None	No	do	do	do	Emergency appropriation.	10 percent	278	32,000.
Florida	About Mar. 1	Approximately $500,000.	Yes	do	do	do	General education budget.	Approximately 10 percent.	736	100,000 through December.
Georgia	Apr. 1	$672,914.27	do	do	do	do	Budget commission.	11.1 percent	1,443	Estimated 274,387.
Idaho	Feb. 28	$120,000	do	Yes, $225,201.59	do	do	State department education.	About same	235	30,000.
Illinois	Apr. 1	$1,200,000	do	Yes, 2½ cents.	$2,750,000 biennium.	do	State legislature.	Approximately 50 percent.	2,400	400,000.
Iowa	Apr. 1	$239,000	do	Yes, maximum rates.	No	do	State appropriations.	Approximately 10 percent.	863	101,178.
Kansas	Entire year		No	No	do	do	State funds by legislature.	34 percent	580	56,000.
Louisiana	About Mar. 1	$450,000	Yes	Yes, $250,000	do	do	Out of State appropriations.	10 percent	1,402	210,358.
Maine	Expect enough	None	No	No	do	Plan to	Government and Council order.	12 percent	462	Approximately 40,000.
Maryland	About May 1	$70,000	Yes	do	do	Yes	State funds, vocational.	36 percent	410	A, B, and C, 61,360.
Minnesota	Mar. 15	$250,000	do	do	do	85 percent.	State Department of education budget.	About 9 percent.	1,235	160,000.
Nebraska	End school year.	None	No	do	do	Yes	Special State legislation.		417	45,500.
New Hampshire	Sufficient for year.	do	do	do	do	do	Appropriation		330	18,171.
New Jersey	About last of April.	About $300,000	Yes	do	do	do	State funds Department of Education budget.	11 percent	871 schools, 421 contracts.	Approximately 135,000.
New Mexico	Sufficient for year.	None	No	do	do	do	State Welfare Department	No information.	180	23,825.
New York	Feb. 10	$2,500,000	Yes	Yes $2,500,000	Granted $2,500,000	do	Special appropriation.	50 percent	2,400 at peak	480,000.
North Carolina	Mar. 15	$1,220,000	Yes requested	No	Not likely	do	State appropriation.	21 percent	1,233	209,520.
North Dakota	Won't use entire allocation.	None	No	do	No	do	Donation from non-State funds.	10 percent	607	30,000.
Ohio	March	$750,000	Unlikely	do	do	Probably.	State	50 percent	1,168	
Oklahoma	Apr. 1	$100,000	Yes	do	Probably	Yes	Appropriations by State.	Approximately 32 percent.	1,642 schools	
Oregon	do	$202,887	do	do	No	Not sure	Emergency appropriation.	36 percent	463	54,100.
Rhode Island	About June 1	None	No	Yes $54,000	do	Yes	Appropriation requested, Department of Education.	7 percent	192	22,399.
South Carolina	Mar. 31	$300,000	Yes	No	do	do	By State	Decrease	1,620	154,765.
South Dakota [1]										
Texas	Feb. 28	$720,000	do	No	$720,000	do	State Department of Education.	15 percent	2,654	285,000.
Utah	Feb. 15	$253,000	do	Yes, 7 cents per meal.	No	do	State funds	9 percent	368 schools	47,583.
Vermont	June 1	None	No	Yes, maximum reimbursement.	do	do	Emergency appropriation.	20 percent plus.	350	25,000.
Virginia	For year			No	do	Probably.	State legislature	10 percent	863	December 1946, 114,236.
Washington, D. C.	Entire year			do		No	State funds	Approximately 50 percent	13	Approximately 5,000.
West Virginia	May 20	None	No	do	No	Yes	State department of education.	21 percent	1,420	92,000.
Wisconsin	About May 15, 1930.	Sufficient	do	do	do	Doubtful.	State emergency appropriation.	30 percent	1,266	110,000.
Wyoming	Approximately Feb. 20.	$70,000	Yes	do	Yes, $20,000.	Yes	General fund, State board.	12 percent	96	12,663.
Total		$12,377,801.27						20 percent [2]	31,451	3,794,879.

[1] Bill in committee now and may not pass.
[2] Average.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$64,000," and to insert "$104,000."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment to explain the amendment. It would add $40,000 to the fund that is provided for the municipal government of St. Croix, one of the three islands of the Virgin Islands group.

I am told that representatives of the Department of the Interior appeared before the committee at the time and made what they thought was a very strong statement in support of the total sum for which they asked, $104,000, only $64,000 of which was provided by the House and approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

A group of Senators from the Committee on Public Lands visited the Virgin Islands some weeks ago. We were on the islands of St. Croix and St. Thomas. Had Senators who are now present on the floor had the opportunity of viewing the conditions with reference to health and municipal government on the island of St. Croix at that time I am sure they would approve an additional $40,000 for this deficiency appropriation.

The organization of the government of the municipality of St. Croix, for which this annual appropriation is requested, may be divided functionally into the following major expenditure objects: First, the legislature; second, the judiciary; third, police, prison, and penitentiary; fourth, the fire department; fifth, the health department, including two hospitals, a leper asylum, a home for the aged, institutional care for the mentally ill, and a sanitation service; sixth, social welfare; seventh, education; eighth, public works; ninth, tax assessors; tenth, public library; eleventh, municipal telephone service; and twelfth, contribution to the retirement fund. It is interesting to observe that during the fiscal year 1946, $141,000 of the total obligations of $412,000 was allocated to health, hospitalization, and sanitation activities, while $71,000 was allocated to public schools.

Mr. President, the $40,000 additional which I am asking be appropriated, if appropriated, will go almost entirely to health, hospitalization, and education.

In that connection I should like to call attention to the fact that municipal government salaries on St. Croix are exceedingly low, half of the employees receiving salaries of $50 a month or less. The two top salaries in the whole set-up are paid to the two physicians in the municipal hospital, and they receive only $3,640 per annum. These salaries are so low that the municipality has great difficulty in finding competent physicians who are willing to accept employment on the island. I could continue to give additional arguments in favor of the additional $40,000.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement explaining the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Page 18, line 12: Strike out "$64,000" and insert "$104,000", an increase of $40,000.

For the fiscal year 1946, $150,000 was appropriated for the deficit of the municipal government of St. Croix. In that fiscal year, the total budget of the municipality of St. Croix was $412,000 and local revenues amounted to $262,000—the deficiency of $150,000 having been paid by the Federal Government.

For the fiscal year 1947, an appropriation of $142,400 was requested. There was appropriated by Public Law 478, 50 percent of the requested appropriation, or $71,200. Congress, however, also appropriated $6,000 for salaries and expenses of three municipal experts, to be appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, to make a study of and to report to said committees on the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix.

For the fiscal year 1947, the originally budgeted expenditures of the municipality of St. Croix were $396,000 and local revenues are estimated to be $243,000, leaving a deficiency of $153,000 which exceeds the appropriation by $81,800. However, a careful examination of the departments, agencies, and activities of the municipal government of St. Croix by the new Governor since his inauguration, has disclosed exceedingly low maintenance for essential institutions which cannot suffice in the light of increased costs of commodities and contract services. It is now estimated that, in order to correct these deficiencies during the current fiscal year, the budget of the municipality of St. Croix must be increased to $418,400 which, with operating revenues of $243,200, leaves a deficit of $175,200, or $104,000 in excess of the appropriation of $71,200. It is believed that the study which has been made by municipal experts on behalf of the committees on appropriation of Congress justifies the proposed budgetary changes. A deficit appropriation for 1947 is being requested in amount of $104,000.

The organization of the government of the municipality of St. Croix for which this annual appropriation is requested may be divided functionally into the following major expenditure objects: (1) The legislature; (2) the judiciary; (3) police, prison and penitentiary; (4) the fire department; (5) the health department, including two hospitals, a leper asylum, a home for the aged, institutional care for the mentally ill and a sanitation service; (6) social welfare; (7) education; (8) public works; (9) tax assessor; (10) public library; (11) municipal telephone service; and (12) contribution to the retirement fund. It is interesting to observe that during the fiscal year 1946, $141,000 of the total obligations of $412,000 was allocated to health, hospitalization, and sanitation activities, while $71,000 was allocated to public schools.

For the fiscal year 1948, the total expenditures of the municipality of St. Croix are estimated to be $428,500, and a deficiency appropriation of $150,000 has been recommended to Congress by the President.

The economy of the island of St. Croix is predominantly agricultural. Farming is hazardous because of the character of the soil and the amount of rainfall. There is little industrial development on the island. Under these conditions, it has been found generally impossible for local revenues to equal expenditures required even for a minimum of governmental service. Although every effort is being made to help the island to become economically self-sufficient, the policy should be continued of providing annual Federal appropriations to maintain essential services in health, sanitation, education, and other governmental activities. Any substantial change in this policy, or major reduction of the deficit appropriation, would inflict irreparable hardship on the people of St. Croix by reducing governmental services which are already below accepted American standards.

Public services in St. Croix, even with the annual deficit appropriation, are in an unsatisfactory condition. In the fiscal year 1946, one-half of the employees of the municipal government were receiving salaries of $50 per month or less. Top salaries paid by the municipality are for two physicians in the municipal hospital, and they receive only $3,640 per annum. These salaries are so low that the municipality has great difficulty in finding competent physicians who are willing to accept employment in the island. There have been several vacancies in the medical staff of St. Croix during the past few years because of these inadequate salaries. Graduate nurses in 1946 were receiving salaries of from $40 to $55 per month. There was such widespread loss of personnel, and deterioration of health services, that the municipal government was compelled to increase these salaries in 1947 by $10 per month, and they are still very low.

A total of $20,000 is appropriated for subsistence of patients in two municipal hospitals whose total capacity is 170 beds, with approximately 30,000 patient days. There are 150 aged inmates of the Kingshill home who must be cared for out of a total subsistence appropriation of $16,000. There are approximately 50 inmates in the leper asylum who are subsisted for $9,000. The average per diem ration rates of the medical institutions in 1946 were as follows: Christiansted and Frederiksted hospitals, 28 cents; leper asylum, 35 cents; Kingshill home for the aged, 25 cents.

Nurses' training is one of the urgent needs of the medical department of the municipal government of St. Croix. For years the municipal government has not been able to provide a director of nurses' training, due to lack of funds. The want of prescribed training by a specialist in this field is already evident in the deterioration of the nursing service, and will be increasingly so until such training shall have been restored.

Under public works, 86 municipal buildings, containing 491 rooms, and 140 miles of road, of which 33 miles are hard-surfaced, must be maintained and kept in good condition. Street cleaning and garbage removal are essential to health and sanitation, as well as to civic decency. Because less than 20 percent of St. Croix' homes are equipped with modern sewerage facilities, the municipality must operate a sewage-disposal system by the employment of labor to remove night soil from a majority of homes in the two towns and dump it into the sea. Until recently the labor wage in the municipal government was 18 cents an hour, but it has been necessary to increase this wage to 20 cents an hour in view of the fact that the minimum wage for agricultural labor fixed by the Department of Agriculture is now 23 cents.

For 29 years the administration and various agencies of the Federal Government have been endeavoring to put St. Croix on a self-supporting basis. Some progress has been made, but the goal is far from attainable unless rum and sugar again reach high prices and are exported in large quantities, which seem quite improbable at the present time. Gradually increasing municipal revenues have contributed to the definite advancement that has been made in health, education, sanitation, public improvements, and public welfare. However, this improvement would not have been possible without regular Federal aid. It does not appear within the range of possibility that the need for this aid can be eliminated in the near future, because of the poor economic condition of St. Croix. All possible local taxes have been

levied, including excise and internal revenue taxes on liquors and even on soft drinks. These taxes have even been increased during 1947, to assist in reducing the deficit. Expenditures have been reduced to a minimum. Any further reduction would be very serious as indicated in the report of the municipal experts appointed by Congress.

If the Congress of the United States would return to the Virgin Islands the internal revenue taxes collected on liquors exported from the Virgin Islands to the United States, there would be no necessity for the municipality of St. Croix to apply for a deficit appropriation. These revenues which, from 1934 to the present time, total approximately $50,000,000 would provide economic self-dependency and would obviate the continuing need for annual deficit appropriations. But as long as these revenues are withheld, it is believed that the Federal Government should continue to supply the budgetary deficit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he will not permit this increased item of $104,000 to go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like very much to accede to the request of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska but a matter of principle is involved. Here is a municipality in the Virgin Islands which should be standing on its own feet the same as any other municipality in any other territory of the United States. This municipality has continually, year after year, operated at a deficit. There is no reason why it cannot live within its income, particularly when the House gives it $64,000 in addition to its own income. I think the Senate committee was very generous in agreeing to the House appropriation. If I had my say about it I would not give them one cent. I do not think the appropriation can be justified. There is no reason to give any municipality an appropriation. If this municipality is given an appropriation it simply means that any municipality in any of our territories can make similar requests. I feel it my duty, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, to oppose his request, and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in further support of the request for an additional $40,000 and the statement that practically all of it will be used for the protection of the health of the people of the island, I want to call attention to the fact that the people in those islands are endeavoring to be self-supporting. That is the impression I gained from a personal visit to the islands. On St. Thomas and St. Johns they are succeeding pretty well in keeping close to being self-supporting. The island of St. Croix is almost wholly agricultural. The people of that island have made the attempt to be self-supporting. The salaries of government officials are exceedingly low.

In view of the fact that we of the continental area are trying to turn tourist traffic that way I think it is only wise that we use the precaution of protecting the health of the tourists as well as those who live on the island by adding this trivial amount to the deficiency appropriation. Therefore I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Panama Canal Construction Annuity Fund: For payment of annuities authorized by the act of May 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 257), as amended by the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 619), fiscal year 1947, $408,743.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the committee in considering this item denied it. Since that time I have received a letter from the Civil Service Commission. I may point out that this is a typical example of what is happening over the years. Congress passes an act, innocent appearing; no one looks into it. Then we find ourselves obligated year after year to make appropriations. I send the letter from the Civil Service Commission to the desk and ask that it be read in explanation of the item.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1947.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I have just been advised that the Senate Appropriations Committee, in reporting to the Senate H. R. 2849, entitled "First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1947", has declined to include an item of $588,000 for the Panama Canal construction annuity fund.

The supplemental estimate of appropriation in question was submitted to the House of Representatives by the President on January 24, 1947. As indicated in the justifications accompanying the estimate, the item of $588,000 was indicated to pay annuities authorized by the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 619) which is an amendment to the original act of May 29, 1944, 58 Stat. 257.

The Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1947, contains an item of $1,814,000 for the payment of annuities under the Panama Canal construction annuity fund. As of today, the actual cash balance remaining in this fund amounts to only $98,133.09. Disbursements during the current fiscal year to date have been limited to the payment of annuities authorized under the original act of May 29, 1944, plus 37 annuities authorized under the act of August 7, 1946.

The annuity payments for the month of March 1947 amounted to $168,958.39. At this same rate annuities for the months of April, May, and June 1947, payable to annuitants already on the annuity roll, would amount to $506,875.17. With a balance of only $98,133.09 to apply against this need, annuity payments totaling $408,742.08 which would otherwise be paid to annuitants already on the annuity rolls cannot be paid unless the Congress deems it wise to appropriate this latter amount of money for the current fiscal year 1947.

In the event the Congress does not appropriate this item of $408,742.08, it will be necessary for the Commission to inform each annuitant on the rolls that the normal annuity payment cannot be paid until the Congress appropriates sufficient funds.

It is believed that the Commission should bring these facts to your attention at the earliest possible moment. Such is the basis for this letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate's attention for a moment on this subject because this amendment deals with a matter which is typical of what we often find.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator give us the page number and the line number so Senators on this side of the aisle may follow his remarks?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment will be inserted on page 6, after line 5. It is not an amendment to any language in the bill, for this item was eliminated from the bill. The letter contains a request for its insertion in the bill. It says that under the act of 1944 as amended by the act of 1946 we have nothing to do but to adopt the amendment in order not to betray our trust to the builders of the Panama Canal, civilian employees, who worked for a time in the Canal Zone building the Panama Canal. The Congress in 1944 and again in 1946 passed bills authorizing annuities for life to civilians who participated in the building of the canal, most of whom were there for a relatively short time.

Notwithstanding whether or not we feel that this appropriation is justified, Congress has established this annuity system. Even though I regret it, I do not see that I, as chairman of the committee, can do anything else than send the amendment to the desk. However, I should like to have inserted in the Record the original law and the amendment to the law, so that they may stand as an example of the appropriations which Congress is bound to make over a long period of years as a result of action which perhaps was not fully considered.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Public Law 319—78th Cong.]

S. 683

An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the distinguished services rendered in and about the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and government of the Panama Canal, and the Canal Zone, during the construction period of the Panama Canal, from May 4, 1904, to March 31, 1914, inclusive, by civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to all and each of them so engaged or employed, who were not included in the recognition and benefits accorded by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1190).

SEC. 2. That in further recognition of the exceptional character of the services described in section 1, each civilian official and each civilian employee entitled to receive the thanks of Congress agreeably to the provisions of section 1, who has not been heretofore specially rewarded by gratuity, annuity, or other benefit under any provision of law; and who was engaged with, or employed by, the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama during the aforesaid construction period of the Panama Canal, for 3 years or more; and who, during

such service, was a citizen of the United States; and who, on the date whereon this act becomes effective, shall be living, shall be entitled to receive, and there shall be paid to him by the Government of the United States, for and during the remainder of his life, an annuity, based on the salary, pay, or compensation received by, and paid to him, for his aforesaid service, as follows:

Forty percent of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation if such service was for as much as 3 years and not more than 4 years;

Fifty percent of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation if such service was for more than 4 years and not exceeding 6 years; and

Sixty percent of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation if such service was for more than 6 years.

The term "basic salary, pay, or compensation," as used in this act, shall be so construed as to exclude from the operation of the act all bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulations.

SEC. 3. Annuities granted under the provisions of this act shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued; and payment of all annuities and allowances granted hereunder shall be made by checks drawn by the disbursing clerk for the payment of pensions, in such form and manner, and with such safeguards as shall be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing accounting that may be found applicable to such payments; and the administration of this act shall be under the Civil Service Commission.

Each application for annuity hereunder shall be in such form as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe and shall be supported by such certificate from the head of the department, branch, or independent office of the Government, or the Panama Canal, or the Panama Railroad Company, which may have in possession the record of any service described or referred to in this act, as may be necessary to determine the rights of the applicant. Upon receipt of satisfactory evidence, the Civil Service Commission shall forthwith adjudicate the claim of the applicant, and, if title to annuity be established, a proper certificate shall be issued to the annuitant under the seal of the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 4. Annuities granted under the provisions of this act shall commence from the date whereon the act takes effect and shall continue during the life of the annuitant: *Provided, however,* That in such case as where a deceased person, had he been alive on the date whereon the act takes effect, would have been entitled to receive an annuity hereunder, and shall have been survived by a wife undivorced from him, who was his wife living with him at least 1 year of his service on the Isthmus of Panama during said construction, and has not since remarried, such survivor shall be entitled to receive such annuity from the effective date of the act until her death: *And provided further,* That in any case where an annuitant hereunder shall die after he has received any annuity payment, or payments hereunder, and shall leave surviving him a wife undivorced from him, who was his wife living with him at least 1 year of his service on the Isthmus of Panama during said construction, such survivor shall be entitled to receive the annuity from the date to which same was paid to such deceased annuitant until her death.

Any surviving person as described in this section, shall become an annuitant hereunder and shall be subject to all the provisions of this act regarding applications for, and payment of, annuities, and she shall furnish such proof of her marriage and marital relationships to establish her right to become such annuitant as may be required by the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 5. If, after becoming an annuitant under the provisions of this act, any person, on account of any service rendered by him as hereinbefore indicated, or rendered by him as an official or employee of the permanent organization of the Panama Canal, or of the Panama Railroad Company, subsequent to March 31, 1914, shall elect to receive, and shall receive, any special reward or annuity, under any provision of law other than that provided for by this act, then and in that event all his further right to receive the annuity hereunder authorized shall thenceforth cease.

In any case where a citizen of the United States is receiving, or becomes entitled to receive, an annuity under the provisions of any law providing for the retirement of civilian officers and employees of the United States Government or any of its agencies, and had 3 years or more of service on the Isthmus of Panama of the character described in section 2, he may elect to have that annuity canceled, and thenceforth to become and be an annuitant under the provisions of this act, but he shall not receive both. The annuity which may thus be paid to him under this act shall begin with the date whereon his other annuity, hereinbefore referred to, shall cease because of his election to cancel same; and the substituted annuity, thus to be paid him, under the provisions of this act, shall thenceforth continue until his death. As an annuitant under this act, all its provisions shall be applicable to him.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of administration, the Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to perform, or cause to be performed, any and all acts, and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for carrying into full force and effect the provisions of this act.

The Civil Service Commission shall make a detailed comparative report annually, showing all the receipts and disbursements on account of annuities paid under this act, together with the total number of persons receiving such annuities and the total amounts paid them.

SEC. 7. None of the annuities or moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, lien, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

SEC. 8. The Civil Service Commission shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates of the appropriations necessary to pay the annuities hereunder authorized.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to pay such annuities and to carry out the provisions of this act.

Approved May 29, 1944.

[Public Law 619—79th Cong.]

H. R. 3748

An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal", approved May 29, 1944, be, and the same is, hereby amended, effective May 29, 1944, by adding to the last paragraph of said section 2 the following sentence: "The terms 'citizens of the United States' and 'a citizen of the United States', as used in this act, shall be so construed as to include those who, through naturalization, became citizens of the United States on or before December 7, 1941."

Approved August 7, 1946.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have read the original act of 1944, providing for these annuities, which we knew at the time would cost money. But certainly no one can read the second act and understand that it would cost $588,000 to make the annuities retroactive to 1944. What was put through the Senate was something which I am quite sure the Senate did not understand was going to cost any such sum of money. I join with the chairman in saying that in passing bills of this kind we ought to have information as to what they are going to cost. Once the obligation is incurred, we are bound to carry it out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that brings up the question as to whether or not, when we have on the calendar a hundred or more bills, there should be a rule of the Senate requiring either the sponsor of the bill or the committee which reports the bill to submit with it an estimate of the financial implications of the bill. Time after time we pass bills which are innocuous in sound and appearance, but which bind the Government to years of expenditure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2849 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE FOR RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title "Annual Leave":

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occurs within or at the

beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or 4 days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of February 1, 1947.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will explain the difference between the House amendment and the bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the original bill applies to rural carriers on the same basis as to all other civil employees. The only difference is that if the Saturday comes at a time during the vacation, it may be added to the other leave, which makes the application exactly similar to that in the case of other civil-service employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What did the House amendment do? The amendment as read from the desk struck out everything after the enacting clause and substituted new language.

Mr. LANGER. The change is in the proviso, which reads as follows:

Provided, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was there any objection to the bill in the committee?

Mr. LANGER. There was no objection on the part of anyone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On either side?

Mr. LANGER. On either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that two or three Senators who desire to speak at this time wish to address themselves to the Clapp nomination rather than to the labor bill. If I am correct, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION WITH UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive O, Eightieth Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on December 13, 1946, in the English and Afrikaans languages, for the avoidance of double taxation and for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on income. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD, together with the message from the President and the letter from the Acting Secretary of State. The Chair hears no objection.

The message, letter, and convention are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on December 13, 1946, in the English and Afrikaans languages, for the avoidance of double taxation and for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on income.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Convention of December 13, 1946, between the United States and the Union of South Africa with respect to taxes on income.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 23, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, the convention between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on December 13 1946, in the English and Afrikaans languages, for the avoidance of double taxation and for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on income.

The Department of State and the Treasury Department collaborated in the negotiation of the convention, which was formulated as a result of technical discussions in 1944 between representatives of this Government and representatives of the Union Government and subsequent communications between the appropriate authorities of the two Governments.

As set forth in Article I, the convention is made applicable, in respect of the United States, only to Federal income taxes, including surtaxes and excess-profits taxes, and does not apply to taxes imposed by the several States of the United States. Correspondingly, the convention is made applicable in the case of the Union of South Africa to taxes, as specified, imposed under the income tax laws of the Union, including normal and super taxes, undistributed profits tax, nonresident shareholders' tax, excess profits duty, and trade profits special levy.

The purposes of the convention are, in general, the prevention of double taxation, the reciprocal exchange of information relating to income taxation, and reciprocal assistance in the collection of taxes to which the convention relates. The convention when it enters into force, will afford a basis for the settlement of tax problems comparable to the bases established by the conventions now in force between the United States and certain other countries. These include the convention and protocol of March 23, 1939, with Sweden, which became effective on January 1, 1940; the convention and protocol of March 4, 1942, with Canada, which was made effective as of January 1, 1941; the convention and protocol of July 25, 1939, with France, which became effective on January 1, 1945; and the convention of April 16, 1945, with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which became effective on July 25, 1946, as to United States taxes imposed with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1945, and as to United Kingdom taxes imposed with respect to years of assessment beginning in accordance with the corresponding British tax system.

The convention with the Union of South Africa has been negotiated as a part of the broad program which began nearly twenty years ago for the negotiation of conventions for the elimination, in so far as possible, of international double taxation. It is believed that the convention constitutes a further step toward the removal of an undesirable impediment to international trade which results from the double taxation of income.

It appears that the Union imposes its taxes primarily on the basis of income from sources within the Union. Conflict was found to exist with respect to the determination as to whether certain income is from Union sources or United States sources, because of divergent theories of taxation in the application of the revenue laws of the respective countries, not only in regard to the imposition of the tax but also the amount of credit to be allowed in any of the countries for taxes imposed by or paid to the other country. The convention lays down certain rules by which the settlement of such questions may be facilitated. The provisions relating to administrative assistance are intended, and in fact are essential, to make fully effective the substantive provisions regarding exemptions and credits. In so far as the United States is concerned, it is expected that the administrative provisions of the convention will have an immediate and salutary effect in their application to United States citizens who may have failed to file United States income-tax returns since taking up residence in the Union of South Africa.

The convention contains a preamble and eighteen Articles. Article I specifies the taxes to which the convention applies, as referred to above, while Article II contains definitions of terms found in the convention.

Article III has three paragraphs, the first making applicable to this convention the principle of national treatment found in a large number of treaties of the United States, the second being an expression of the principle, applied in any event, that exemptions, deductions, credits or other allowances accorded by the laws of either country shall not be restricted in determining the tax imposed by such country, and the third being the general provision which permits consultation in the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either country.

Article IV corresponds with Article XIV of the convention with Sweden, Article XVII of the convention with Canada, Article 14 of the convention with France, and Article XIII of the convention with the United Kingdom. The United States, while continuing to tax its citizens, corporations, and residents as though the convention had not come into effect, would continue to allow, for the duration of the convention, a credit against its income taxes for income tax paid to the Union of South Africa. The credit would be applied in accordance with the applicable United States revenue laws. The Union, reciprocally, would exclude from its tax-base income from sources within the United States, thus satisfying the "similar credit" requirements of section 131 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Article V corresponds with Article II of the convention with Sweden, Article [illegible] of the convention with Canada, Article 3 of the convention with France, and a part of Article III of the convention with the United Kingdom. It embodies the principle of permanent establishment in the field of business income, whereby each country agrees not to subject to tax the business income of taxable entities of the other country except as to profits which are allocable to a permanent establishment within the taxing country. The provisions extend only to the ordinary industrial and commercial profits arising from the operation of a business. If, for example, a Union enterprise has a permanent establishment within the United States the entire business income from United States sources is subject to United States tax.

Article VI corresponds with Article III of the convention with Canada and part of Article III of the convention with the United Kingdom and also, in principle, with the third paragraph of Article II of the convention with Sweden and Article 4 of the convention with France. It arises from the necessity in appropriate cases of adjusting the accounts of a branch within one of the countries of an enterprise of the other country, in order to assure that the accounts of the branch will reflect its profits as accurately as possible. It is intended that Article VI, together with Article VII, will give all necessary authority for the adjustment of accounts with respect to business income. Article VII relates to the adjustment of accounts as between a corporation of one of the countries and its related company, not necessarily a subsidiary, operating in the other country. A subsidiary company is considered, as far as the permanent establishment principle is concerned, to be a separate and distinct entity, but comes within the scope of Article VII relating to interlocking businesses.

Article VIII embodies the principle, as do provisions in existing income-tax conventions of the United States, whereby salaries and wages paid by one of the Governments or by political subdivisions or territories or possessions thereof for services performed in territory of the other Government shall be exempt from taxation by such other Government. As to pensions and life annuities, paragraph (2) of Article VIII follows the principle of taxation at the source. This Article does not affect the taxation of United States citizens by the United States.

Articles IX and X, like corresponding provisions in existing income-tax conventions of the United States, such as Articles XVIII and XIX of the convention with the United Kingdom, grant exemption, upon certain conditions, to professors or teachers (Article IX) and students or business apprentices (Article X) from taxes on their remuneration or on payments made to them.

Article XI, which corresponds with Article X of the convention with Canada, provides on a reciprocal basis that income derived from United States sources by religious, scientific, literary, educational, or charitable organizations of the Union of South Africa shall be exempt, on certain conditions, from United States income tax. This is in accord with existing United States law.

Article XII, which corresponds with provisions in the existing conventions with Canada (Article XII) and the United Kingdom (Article XV), provides that dividends and interest paid by a Union corporation to individual residents of the Union, other than United States citizens, or to Union corporations, shall be exempt from United States income tax to the extent that such dividends and interest are taxed by the Union.

Article XIII corresponds with Article XX of the convention with Sweden, Article XVI of the convention with Canada, and Article 25 of the convention with France, and relates to the right of taxpayers to lodge claims with a view to having action taken toward the avoidance of double taxation.

Articles XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII contain provisions relating to administrative cooperation for the exchange of information and for assistance in collection. These provisions are substantially similar to provisions on the same subject in one or more of the existing income-tax conventions of the United States.

Article XVIII provides for ratification and for the exchange of instruments of ratification. It prescribes that the convention shall, upon the exchange of instruments of ratification, become effective as of July 1, 1946, and except in matters of administrative assistance shall first be applied in respect of income arising on or after that date. It is provided also that the convention shall continue effective for a period of three years, but may be terminated, according to the procedure and with the effect specified, by the giving of a written notice to that effect by one of the Governments to the other Government.

Apart from the delay incident to the receipt from Pretoria of the original document, the delay in completing the arrangements for transmittal of the convention to the Senate has resulted from the desire to receive assurances that the Union authorities are prepared to continue discussions with a view to the conclusion of a supplementary instrument which would contain provisions dealing with certain matters not covered specifically in the convention. Such assurances have been received. The provisions which are under consideration, for possible inclusion in an instrument supplementing the convention, relate to (a) the elimination of double taxation in respect of shipping and aircraft profits, substantially similar to provisions in Article V of the convention of April 16, 1945 between the United States and the United Kingdom relating to income taxation, and (b) the granting by the Union of South Africa, upon certain conditions, of exemptions from the Union nonresident shareholders' tax and the Union undistributed profits tax, with consequent benefits to United States corporations. Although it is hoped that it will be possible to conclude with the Union of South Africa in the near future a supplementary instrument along the lines mentioned, it may be well to point out that the benefits under the convention enclosed herewith are not in any way dependent upon the conclusion of such a supplementary instrument and it appears to the Department of State and the Treasury Department desirable to bring the convention into effect as soon as practicable, particularly to avoid needless administrative inconvenience in connection with the retroactive effectiveness of the convention.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON.

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND FOR ESTABLISHING RULES OF RECIPROCAL ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of South Africa, being desirous of avoiding double taxation and of establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income taxes, have decided to conclude a convention and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America: General Thomas Holcomb, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, and

The Government of the Union of South Africa: the Right Honourable Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr, Acting Prime Minister and Acting Minister of External Affairs of the Union of South Africa,

who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal income taxes, including surtaxes and excess-profits taxes.

(b) In the case of the Union of South Africa the following taxes imposed under the income tax laws of the Union: Normal and Super Taxes, Undistributed Profits Tax, Nonresident Shareholders' Tax, Excess Profits Duty and Trade Profits Special Levy.

(2) It is mutually agreed that the present Convention shall also apply to any other or additional income taxes imposed by either contracting State, subsequent to the date of signature of this Convention, upon substantially the same bases as the taxes enumerated therein.

ARTICLE II

As used in this Convention:

(a) The terms "person", "individual" and "corporation" shall have the same meanings, respectively, as they have under the revenue laws of the taxing State or the State furnishing the information, as the case may be, provided that the term "corporation" when used in relation to the Union of South Africa shall be regarded as the equivalent of the term "company" as used in the revenue laws of that State.

(b) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking, whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation or any other entity.

(c) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, in respect of each contracting State, and individual resident therein or a corporation, partnership or other entity created or organized in or under the laws of that State, or the laws of any of its States, Territories or provinces, as the case may be, engaged in the carrying on of an enterprise in the territory of that State.

(d) The term "permanent establishment" includes branches, mines and oil wells, farms, timber lands, plantations, factories, workshops, warehouses, offices, agencies and other fixed places of business of an enterprise, but does not include a subsidiary corporation. When an enterprise of one of the contracting States carries on business in the other contracting State whether personally, directly or through a nominee or through an employee or agent there who has authority to contract for his employer or principal or has

a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders which he receives, such enterprise shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the latter State. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States has business dealings in the other contracting States through a commission agent, broker or other independent agent, shall not be held to mean that such enterprise has a permanent establishment in the latter State.

(e) The term "Commissioner for Inland Revenue" means the Commissioner for Inland Revenue of the Union of South Africa or his duly authorized representative.

(f) The term "Commissioner of Internal Revenue" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America or his duly authorized representative.

(g) The term "competent authority" means the Commissioner for Inland Revenue or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and their duly authorized representatives.

(h) The term "United States of America", when used in the geographical sense, includes only the states, the territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(i) The term "industrial and commercial profits" means industrial and commercial income but shall not include income from or in the form of rentals, royalties, interest, dividends, management charges, compensation for labour or personal services, or income from the operation of ships or aircraft, or gains derived from the sale or exchange of capital assets, and the terms "profit" and "profits" mean income.

(j) The terms "rentals" and "royalties" shall include rentals or royalties arising from leasing real or immovable or personal or movable property or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of, or for the privilege of using, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulae, good will, trade-marks, trade brands, franchises and other like property.

(k) The term "interest" shall include income arising from interest-bearing securities, public obligations, government or municipal securities, mortgages, corporate or debenture bonds, loans, deposits and current accounts.

(l) The term "dividends" shall include all distributions of the earnings or profits of corporations.

ARTICLE III

(1) The citizens of one of the contracting States residing within the other contracting State shall not be subjected to the payment of more burdensome taxes than the citizens of such other State.

(2) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance now or hereafter accorded by the laws of either of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(3) Following any appreciable changes made in the fiscal laws of either of the contracting States, the competent authorities of the two contracting States may consult together.

ARTICLE IV

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Convention, the United States of America in determining the taxes of its citizens, or residents, or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed, all items of income taxable under the Revenue Laws of the United States of America, as though this Convention had not come into effect. The United States of America shall, however, deduct from the taxes thus computed the amount of Union income tax paid. This deduction shall be made in accordance with the benefits and limitations of Section 131 of the United States Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the day of the entry into force of this Convention. It is agreed that by virtue of the provisions of paragraph (2) of this Article the Union of South Africa satisfies the "similar credit" requirement set forth in subsection (a) (3) of that section.

(2) The Union of South Africa in imposing its taxes shall exempt from such taxes and shall not take into account in the determination of such taxes income derived from sources within the United States of America in accordance with the income tax laws of the Union in effect on the day of entry into force of this Convention.

ARTICLE V

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States is not subject to taxation by the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits except in respect of such profits allocable to its permanent establishment in the latter State.

(2) No account shall be taken in determining the tax in one of the contracting States, of the mere purchase of merchandise effected therein by an enterprise of the other State.

(3) For the purposes of this Convention, the term "industrial and commercial profits" shall not include the items of income excluded from the definition of that term in paragraph (i) of Article II. Subject to the provisions of this Convention such items of income shall be taxed separately or together with industrial and commercial profits in accordance with the laws of the contracting States.

ARTICLE VI

(1) If an enterprise of one of the contracting States has a permanent establishment in the other State, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the net industrial and commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions. Such net profits will, in principle, be determined on the basis of the separate accounts pertaining to such establishment.

(2) The competent authority of the taxing State may, when necessary, in execution of paragraph (1) of this Article, rectify the accounts produced, notably to correct errors and omissions or to reestablish the prices or remunerations entered in the books at the value which would prevail between independent persons dealing at arm's length.

(3) If (a) an establishment does not produce an accounting showing its own operations, or (b) the accounting produced does not correspond to the normal usages of the trade in the country where the establishment is situated, or (c) the rectifications provided for in paragraph (2) of this Article cannot be effected the competent authority of the taxing State may determine the net industrial and commercial profits by applying such methods or formulae to the operations of the establishment as may be fair and reasonable.

(4) To facilitate the determination of industrial and commercial profits allocable to the permanent establishment, the competent authorities of the contracting States may consult together with a view to the adoption of uniform rules of allocation of such profits.

ARTICLE VII

When an enterprise of either of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or capital of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter in their commercial or financial relations conditions different from those which would be made with or imposed on an independent enterprise, any profits which should normally have appeared in the accounts of the latter enterprise, but which have been in this manner diverted to the former enterprise may, subject to applicable measures of appeal, be incorporated in the taxable profits of the latter enterprise. To facilitate such rectifications as may appear fair and reasonable the competent authorities of the two contracting States may consult together.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) Compensation, other than pensions, for labour or personal services performed in one of the contracting States, paid by the other contracting State or by the political subdivisions or territories or possessions thereof to individuals who are not ordinarily resident in the former State, shall be exempt from taxation by such former State.

(2) Pensions and life annuities derived from sources within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals in the other State shall be exempt from taxation by the latter State.

ARTICLE IX

A professor or teacher from one of the contracting States who visits the other contracting State for the purpose of teaching, for a period not exceeding two years, at a university, college, school or other educational institution in such other contracting State shall be exempted by such other contracting State from tax on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE X

Students or business apprentices from one of the contracting States residing in the other contracting State for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received by them from within the former State for the purposes of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XI

Income derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a religious, scientific, literary, educational, or charitable organization of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation by the State from which the income is derived if, within the meaning of the laws of that State such organization would, if established in that State be exempt in respect of such income, and if within the meaning of the laws of the other State it would be exempt in respect of income derived from sources within such other State.

ARTICLE XII

Dividends and interest paid on or after the effective date of this Convention by a corporation created or organized under the laws of the Union of South Africa to individual residents of the Union of South Africa other than citizens of the United States of America, or to corporations created or organized under laws of the Union of South Africa shall, to the extent that such dividends and interest are taxed by the Union of South Africa, be exempt from the taxes imposed by the United States of America.

ARTICLE XIII

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which this Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or resident or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it was created or organized. If the claim should be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of such State may consult with the competent authority of the other State to determine whether the double taxation in question may be avoided in accordance with the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XIV

With a view to the more effective imposition of the taxes to which this Convention relates, each of the contracting States undertakes to furnish to the other contracting State such information in the matter of

taxation, which the competent authority of the former contracting State have at their disposal or are in a position to obtain under their own law, as may be of use to the competent authority of such other State in the assessment of the taxes to which this Convention relates and to lend assistance in the service of documents in connection therewith. Such information and correspondence relating to the subject matter of this Article shall be exchanged between the competent authorities of the contracting States in the ordinary course or on request.

ARTICLE XV

(1) Each contracting State undertakes to lend assistance and support in the collection of the taxes to which this Convention relates, together with interest, costs and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character. The contracting State making such collections shall be responsible to the other contracting State for the sums thus collected.

(2) In the case of applications for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the contracting States which have been finally determined shall be accepted for enforcement by the other contracting State and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

(3) The applications shall be accompanied by such documents as are required by the laws of the State making the application to establish that the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) If the revenue claim has not been finally determined the State to which application is made may, at the request of the other contracting State, take such measures of conservancy as are authorized by the revenue laws of the former State in relation to its own taxes.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) In the administration of the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information, service of documents and mutual assistance in collection of taxes, fees and costs incurred in the ordinary course shall be borne by the State to which application is made but extraordinary costs incident to special forms of procedure shall be borne by the applying State.

(2) Documents and other communications or information contained therein, transmitted under the provisions of this Convention by one of the competent authorities to the competent authority of the other contracting State shall not be used by the latter authority except in the performance of their duties in the determination, assessment and collection of the taxes.

ARTICLE XVII

(1) Such regulations as may be necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention may be prescribed in each of the contracting States. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information, service of documents and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, the competent authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XVIII

(1) This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) This Convention shall become effective on the first day of July, 1946, and except in matters of administrative assistance shall first be applied in respect of income arising on or after that date. It shall continue effective for a period of three years from that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the three-year period or at any time thereafter provided that at least six months prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective the first day of July following the expiration of the six-month period.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate in English and Afrikaans texts at Pretoria this thirteenth day of December, 1946.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] THOMAS HOLCOMB.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

[SEAL] JAN H. HOFMEYR.

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a newspaper article by Mr. Ray B. Bolton dated March 13, 1947, on the subject of public works, not only as they affect the West but all other sections of the country. Let me explain to my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who earlier in the day discussed the need of public works not only in the West but elsewhere in the country, that I certainly join with him in his observations and that I can assure him that he will have my wholehearted support in the program which he discussed.

I think it is particularly desirable to call attention to an observation of Mr. Bolton with reference to the Hoover Dam which we discussed on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, and in connection with which I made some comments concerning Mr. Hoover's views on public works as he expressed them on November 12, 1932. Speaking of that dam, Mr. Bolton points out that it was a basic factor in the establishment of 1,800 new manufacturing plants in the Los Angeles area during the past 10 years. That fact again bears out the point which I intend to stress over and over as the debate proceeds on the question of public works, namely, that if we are going to keep our economy an expanding economy—and unless it is an expanding economy, we shall certainly be headed for a depression the moment restrictive forces begin to operate—in my judgment we shall have to continue to develop the type of projects which Mr. Bolton so ably discusses in this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Educational News Service of March 13, 1947]

WASHINGTON REPORT ON PUBLIC WORKS

Washington observers from TAFT to Truman feel the President's recommendation of $2,093,000,000 for public works has the least "padding" of any budgetary request; yet, it is plain that thinking on Capitol Hill so far has crystallized into an attitude that doesn't augur favorably for public works unless some of the points discussed here are more clearly understood and more carefully weighed before public works appropriation bills for 1948 are voted upon. Illustrative of this is the statement by Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, chairman of the House Public Works Committee, that "public works must pass the test of emergency and indispensability to obtain favorable consideration by the Eightieth Congress. Mere desirability will not be an important or controlling factor in determining what public works projects are to receive funds, or how much they will receive." Senator REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate committee, states "I will favor going ahead with all public works that are needed or will be justified improvements, or which will give in service a good return for the investment. I shall definitely oppose the pork-barrel type of construction."

But if, however, Congress "gives the knife" to public works in a literal as well as a figurative sense, pursues a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, there is strong likelihood the aftermath would be marked by strong economic and political repercussions. Interior's reclamation program affords a striking illustration of the point. Reclamation needs close to $145,000,000 to continue and complete construction of dams, canals, and water distribution systems already authorized and under way. About 35 projects are involved in Western States, the major ones the Columbia Basin project, California Central Valley project, Colorado-Big Thompson project, Missouri River plan, and the Colorado River development, the latter now nearing completion.

Inadequate water supply is the paramount restrictive factor in the whole western economy. Acute shortage of power exists in California and throughout the West, for that matter, a shortage handicapping development of western industry. Western industrial needs have burst out of the seams of its developed water power, a situation rendered more acute by the West's phenomenal and continuing increase in population during recent years. Western farmers must have more irrigation water very soon—a lot more of it—or heavy capital losses will shortly ensue. The program for which funds are requested in the 1948 Budget is one for minimum needs, one on which a half billion dollars has already been invested, to bring various units of these projects into use on schedule.

Here's how the situation shapes up on the major projects. More than $100,000,000 has been spent on the Columbia Basin project to build Grand Coulee Dam and its power developments. Purpose is to provide irrigation for more than 1,000,000 acres of land. Pumps and water-distribution system must be completed and installed before any irrigation benefits can be derived. Immensity of this project is emphasized by the fact that not until 1950 will the first block of 400,000 acres have been irrigated. Some $160,000,000 has been spent already to build three major dams in the Central Valley project, to irrigate over 2,000,000 acres. The work has reached the point where extending of the water-distribution system can be started so that within the next few years appreciable results can be shown. It will take 10 years to irrigate all this land, and at present there is much more land under cultivation than the present water supply will irrigate.

The huge engineering job known as the Colorado-Big Thompson, started in 1939, has driven one of the world's longest tunnels—13 miles—through the Rockies to divert surplus water from the western slope to the eastern slope. Close to $50,000,000 has been spent up to now and the point has been reached where the work will show almost immediate results in water and power to relieve the desperate shortage of both on the western fringe of the Great Plains, where irrigation pumps were shut down last year because there wasn't any power. This particular undertaking requires around $27,000,000 for completion. Tens of thousands of men are working for the contractors involved in reclamation projects on construction of dams, ditches, power plants, etc. Around 10,000

are employed by the Reclamation Bureau directly on engineering, supervisory and maintenance work. Reclamation means not only temporary construction jobs on dams and irrigation ditches, but permanent jobs and a stable standard of living for millions of families. To illustrate, the hydroelectric power made available from Boulder Dam (Congress is renaming it Hoover Dam), was a basic factor in the establishment of 1,800 new manufacturing plants in the Los Angeles area during the past 10 years.

The East, too, enjoys a big financial benefit from reclamation projects. Before World War II, a survey showed that people on reclamation projects were spending about $250,000,000 per year for wholesale purchases of goods, and that some 80 percent was bought from sources outside of the Western States. This means, of course, a big market for eastern industry, revenue for transportation, and a general boon to the national economy. Benefits to the East are now even greater than before the war, and will increase as reclamation work moves ahead. Crops grown on reclamation lands last year were worth $500,000,000. Wealth created by reclamation is permanent. Reclamation is producing rich farms through irrigation water and developing hydroelectric power from the stream flows, both of which are basic components of the phenomenal economic growth of the West. If the program is halted, or even delayed, the western economy will die on the vine.

The sum requested for reclamation for 1948 will permit only a minimum program to go forward, providing as it does for continuing orderly work at a slow rate of speed, on projects already started. Reclamation construction is generally planned in units, and the work is scheduled so that each particular unit will be completed at the precise time it is needed so as to put the project into use at the earliest possible time. Reduction of the reclamation budget will jeopardize this schedule at the risk of grave economic losses.

Question is, will the Appropriations Committees of Congress, and the subcommittees of the House and Senate Public Lands Committees which are holding hearings on reclamation expenditures, have time to consider all these points? And will eastern members of these committees save the day for what they might feel inclined to regard as strictly a western matter, of little interest, relatively speaking to the East? Only one member of the seven-man subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee comes from farther west than Iowa, though there are 11 members of the committee from the West and Southwest. Fortunately, practically every member of the Senate Public Lands Committee comes from the far West, so that there appears to be hope for continuation of the 1948 reclamation schedule in part, if not in toto.

HEARINGS ON VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that on May 5 the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with veterans' affairs, of which subcommittee I am chairman, will commence hearings on the pending veterans' bills. The first bill to be considered will be the one dealing with the on-the-job training program, and the second subject considered will be the bill or bills dealing with requests for increases in subsistence allowances to veterans in college. Then we shall proceed as rapidly as possible with hearings on the other pending veterans' bills.

I wish to make it clear that the hearings will start at 10 o'clock on the morning of May 5, and the subcommittee will meet daily, except for Saturdays and Sundays, until it has completed hearings on all the bills pending before the committee.

NOMINATION OF GORDON R. CLAPP

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any statement at this time. However, in view of the statement of the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] with reference to a hearing on the case of Mr. Pierce, which was discussed before the committee by Mr. Bolt, who was a witness, I wish to say to the Senate—and I feel that I should make this statement because, although the Senator from Arkansas has asked that the evidence referred to be placed in the RECORD, it will appear in the RECORD after the vote is taken, and I think the Senators now present should have the benefit of the discussion of it this afternoon——

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Did I currently understand the Senator to say that what I have asked to have placed in the RECORD will be placed in the RECORD after the vote is taken?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I had in mind that possibly the Senate might reach a vote this afternoon.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I understand. The Senator means that it will not be printed until after the vote is taken, does he not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. In other words, it will not come to the attention of Senators until after the vote is taken. So I should like to say to the Senate that Mr. Bolt, who was a witness and who brought this case before the committee, was a lawyer employed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and he appeared at the hearings at the request of those who are opposing this nomination. Mr. Bolt left the service of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was very apparent to me and, I believe, to most of the other members of the committee that he did not get along with the other counsel—the general counsel, and certain others. He felt that he himself had a grievance against the Tennessee Valley Authority management, and he proceeded to testify about the case of a Mr. Pierce. The nominee, Mr. Clapp, was called upon to give his version of that matter. I shall read a part of Mr. Clapp's statement in reply to questions asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is a member of the committee. The Senator from Arkansas asked this question:

As I recall, there had been one dismissal case referred to in this testimony, I believe given by Bolt, a case of a Mr. Pierce; is that right?

Mr. Clapp answered, "Yes."

Then this statement was addressed to the witness Clapp:

Which he supported here by a number of letters and documents in which the charge was made that he—

That is, Mr. Pierce—

employed outside counsel who was unable in his effort to secure a hearing and that they were never able to get a hearing under the procedures that were established and in effect.

That seems to be the gravamen of the charge, namely, that they could not obtain a proper hearing.

Mr. Clapp answered that with this statement:

Mr. Bolt put into the record or referred to correspondence from me to Mr. Blandford, General Manager of the TVA at that time, or from me to Mr. Pierce, or from Mr. Pierce to me, bearing upon the reasons for Mr. Pierce's removal and also bearing upon the procedure followed.

The last of the letters to which he referred was dated June 9, 1939, which was a letter from me to Mr. Pierce notifying him of termination on the basis of an action taken by the TVA Board of Directors on June 7. Mr. Bolt did not refer to the correspondence that took place after Mr. Pierce was notified of that action.

The dismissal was not made by Mr. Clapp, but was made by the Board of Directors, and occurred at the direction of the Board of Directors; and Mr. Clapp was not a member of that Board.

I continue with the testimony of the nominee, Clapp:

On July 8, 1939, a Mr. Ambrose wrote a letter to me asking for advice about the possibility of having a hearing in the Pierce case. I replied on July 20, 1939, after careful consultation with our General Counsel, who at that time was Mr. William C. Fitts. I inquired in that letter what particular subjects, in all of the subjects dealt with, Mr. Pierce believed he wanted to take up in a formal hearing. I pointed out that in many essential points with respect to the charges made in the tentative findings submitted to the General Manager as the result of an investigation and inquiry which I had conducted on instruction from the General Manager, Mr. Pierce's reply admitted the circumstances to which those findings were related. In that letter I made clear that we would want to know on what specific point among the causes for removal, Mr. Pierce wanted his hearing. I would be glad to supply the letter to the committee.

In other words, as I understand the matter, Pierce had been removed upon certain charges; and he then asked, under their procedure, that he be given a formal hearing or trial, and he employed Ambrose as outside counsel to represent him. Clapp said that when it came to his attention that Mr. Pierce had admitted most of the charges, he wrote to Mr. Pierce and asked him upon what specific charges he requested a trial. I take it that was a proper procedure, so that notice of the charges at issue might be had before the hearing was begun. In other words, Mr. Clapp was asking for a statement in the nature of a bill of particulars. He said:

On July 22, 1939, I got a letter from Mr. Ambrose advising me that it would be necessary for him to get in touch with Mr. Pierce about those questions. I have heard nothing from him since.

Mr. President, in the light of that testimony I do not believe Mr. Pierce was denied a trial. Of course he obtained outside counsel, Mr. Ambrose; and Mr. Ambrose wrote a letter requesting a formal hearing. So far as I recall, there is no evidence to show that Mr. Pierce denied the charges. In fact, the evidence shows that he admitted most of them. After Mr. Ambrose, acting as counsel for Mr. Pierce, wrote a letter requesting a hearing, Mr. Clapp wrote to Mr. Ambrose, asking him to state the charges upon which a formal trial was desired. Mr. Ambrose answered by saying that he would have to consult with Mr. Pierce. Mr. Clapp testified that thereafter he heard nothing about the matter.

It seems to me that that testimony would almost put an end to the claim about a request for a hearing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Today I have submitted for the RECORD the correspondence which followed, in the effort to secure a hearing. I may say that if the Senator will read on through the testimony he will find that Mr. Clapp conceded that the procedure in that case was different and contrary to the established rules; that the rules as set up and established were not followed. He admitted that. In that case they completely disregarded the rules.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. If charges are brought against a man, and if that man wishes to defend himself against them, and requests a hearing, does the Senator think it is up to that man to say, "I will waive all the charges but one"? If a man who is in that position wishes to have a hearing, naturally he will desire to defend himself against all the charges which are brought against him.

I never heard of a procedure like the one in the case we are now discussing. The charges were made orally; they were not made in writing. After charges were brought, the man was put on leave; his employment was not immediately terminated. During all that time he tried to obtain a hearing. No formal charges were placed against him. Finally the Board notified him that his services were terminated. He never did get a hearing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. His services were terminated by the Board of Directors, composed of Mr. Lilienthal and his two associates, but not including Mr. Clapp. Mr. Clapp got into the case when Mr. Ambrose, as I understand, wrote him a letter requesting a hearing. I do not know that he wished to have a formal hearing. According to the testimony, Mr. Clapp replied, in writing, "Please state upon what issues you wish a formal hearing to be held." Then, Mr. Ambrose wrote back that he would have to consult with Mr. Pierce. Thereupon the correspondence terminated. If there is anything wrong in that, I do not perceive any great wrong in it.

That is all I have to say on the point that has been raised in that connection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the hour is late, my remarks will be very brief.

I regret exceedingly that I cannot follow the leadership of the chairman of our committee in regard to the nomination which is now before the Senate. The chairman, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], has given the Senate a clear and careful statement of the work done by the committee, and the statement he has made is very much in accordance with the facts.

As a member of the committee, I heard more than 30 witnesses testify during a period of perhaps 3 or 4 weeks. In the case of the witnesses whose testimony I did not hear, I have carefully read their testimony in the printed hearings.

I cannot vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clapp. I wish all Members of the Senate to understand that the majority of the committee voted adversely on the nomination.

I could not employ Mr. Clapp in a position of real authority in governmental work, if I had the power of appointment. I would not employ him in a business capacity where I would require a man to meet a pay roll and to meet dividend payments.

We carefully went over the reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has cost the people of the United States more than $700,000,000, and which since its inception has returned to the Government approximately only $21,000,000. Since 1939, Mr. Clapp has been the one who has made the reports to the Board of Directors, and he has presented to the Board of Directors all the financial statements regarding the operation of the TVA, which under normal conditions would be audited by the General Accounting Office of the United States Government.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I would not be able to employ Mr. Clapp in a position of responsibility in a military organization.

For those reasons, I most reluctantly must oppose confirmation of the nomination. I take this position reluctantly, because I always wish to vote for confirmation of nominations made by the Chief Executive of our country, regardless of the level of government to which the nominee is appointed. But for the reasons I have stated, I feel that it is entirely proper for the Senate to refuse to confirm this nomination. After hearing all the testimony, including the testimony of the nominee himself, when he appeared on the witness stand, and after observing his evasive manner, I do not believe that he is a proper person to hold this important position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bricker	Hayden	O'Conor
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Capehart	Jenner	Revercomb
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Connally	Kem	Sparkman
Cordon	Knowland	Stewart
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Downey	Lodge	Tobey
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is necessarily absent. If the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is necessarily absent. If the Senator from Illinois were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea." The Senator from Washington is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea." The Senator from Maine is absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea." The Senator from Ohio is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from

New York would vote "yea." The Senator from Kansas is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce the following pairs on this vote: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, if present, would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would vote "nay"; and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Holland	Pepper
Chavez	Ives	Revercomb
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Downey	Knowland	Smith
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	Maybank	Tobey
Green	Morse	Tydings
Hatch	Murray	Umstead
Hayden	Myers	Watkins
Hill	O'Conor	Wiley

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Ecton	Millikin
Bricker	Ferguson	Moore
Bridges	George	O'Daniel
Brooks	Gurney	Overton
Buck	Hawkes	Stewart
Butler	Jenner	Vandenberg
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Wherry
Capper	Kem	White
Connally	Langer	Williams
Donnell	McKellar	
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—28

Barkley	McCarran	Saltonstall
Brewster	McCarthy	Taft
Bushfield	McClellan	Taylor
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cain	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Magnuson	Wagner
Flanders	Martin	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Reed	Young
Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.	
Lucas	Russell	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TOBEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. HILL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] who is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea." The Senator from Washington is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea." The Senator from Maine is absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea." The Senator from Ohio is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York would vote "yea." The Senator from Kansas is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is unavoidably detained and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce the following pairs on this vote: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, if present, would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who would vote "nay"; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would vote "nay"; and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Revercomb
Chavez	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Downey	Lodge	Sparkman
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Fulbright	Morse	Tydings
Green	Murray	Umstead
Hatch	Myers	Watkins
Hayden	O'Conor	Wiley
Hill	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Ecton	Malone
Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Bridges	George	Moore
Brooks	Gurney	O'Daniel
Buck	Hawkes	Overton
Capehart	Jenner	Stewart
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Connally	Kem	Wherry
Donnell	Langer	White
Dworshak	McKellar	Williams

NOT VOTING—30

Barkley	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Lucas	Russell
Bushfield	McCarran	Saltonstall
Butler	McCarthy	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Taylor
Cain	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Magnuson	Wagner
Hickenlooper	Martin	Wilson
Kilgore	Reed	Young

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive E, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol dated in London August 30, 1946, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1946, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL

WHEREAS an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on the 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on the 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on the 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after the 31st August, 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on the 31st August, 1944, and the 31st August, 1945, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on the 31st August, 1945, and the 31st August, 1946, respectively;

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after the 31st August, 1946.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV and V of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting point.

2. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date the 30th August, 1946, and shall remain open for signature until the 30th September, 1946; provided however that any signatures appended after the 30th August, 1946, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

In witness whereof the undersigned being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 30th day of August, 1946, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

G. HEATON NICHOLLS.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

NORMAN R. MICHELL.

For the Government of Belgium:

G. WALRAVENS.

For the Government of Brazil:

MONIZ DE ARAGAO.

For the Government of Cuba:

G. DE BLANCK.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:

B. MESSANY.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

A. PASTORIZA.

For the Government of the French Republic:

J. PARIS.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

O. G. SARGENT.

For the Government of Haiti:

LEON LALEAU.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

A. BENTINCK.

For the Government of Peru:

F. BERCKEMEYER.

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (subject to ratification for and in name of the Republic of the Philippines):

W. J. GALLMAN.

For the Government of Poland:

ZYGMUNT TUSZKIEWICZ.

For the Government of Portugal:

FELIX B. M. DA HORTA.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

VLAS A. KLENTSOV.

For the Government of the United States of America (subject to ratification):

W. J. GALLMAN.

For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

DR. FRANC KOS.

Certified a true copy.

[SEAL] E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

LONDON, 8TH OCT. 1946.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this protocol was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It merely extends the international sugar agreement to August 31, 1947. Its purpose is to maintain the framework of the agreement in order to facilitate international cooperation in meeting problems which may arise in the future in connection with sugar surpluses. I may say that renewal of the agreement would have no effect on the sugar situation in the United States at the present time with respect either to supply or price, since all controls relating to quotas and stocks have been lifted and cannot be reimposed until the agreement has been revised. So it can have no effect on the sugar situation now; but there will be continued in existence the machinery which the State Department considers very useful, because of the fact that the national supply situation can change so rapidly, with attendant danger of disorderly market conditions. I hope the Senate will advise and consent to the protocol.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, let me ask, is this Council within the United Nations organization?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the Council?

Mr. LODGE. This is an organization which has been in existence since 1937, long before the war. It is similar to the international organization which has existed for some time regarding coffee.

Mr. WHERRY. What is its purpose? Does it come in conflict with the international organization which controls the sugar allocation and purchase of sugar today?

Mr. LODGE. No; this has nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. WHERRY. What does it do?

Mr. LODGE. This Council was set up at the time when there was a glut and a disorderly market condition in the production of sugar; it was organized by all the sugar producing and consuming countries in order to establish orderly market conditions. Due to the conditions which existed during the war, the pressing need for this agreement lapsed because we were not faced with a surplus of sugar; we were faced with a scarcity. But it is desired to continue this organization a little longer so that the machinery will be in existence in case the need for it should arise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is unanimous consent required in order to bring this matter up for consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is not necessary. The protocol is on the Executive Calendar and has been called up for consideration when reached on the calendar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the proposed protocol, if adopted, in any way prejudice or have any effect on any action

which Congress may take with respect to a sugar act this year?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think it will have any effect on it whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What financing will this protocol require? What is our contribution to it?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean its administration?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and the maintenance of the Council. What is the total expenditure involved in maintaining this Council?

Mr. LODGE. I do not have that figure here, but I can say to the Senator it is a nominal amount.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to object to this protocol if it is noncontroversial. I am one who is interested in sugar. Certainly we want to do all we can to prevent unequal distribution when there is a surplus. On the other hand it seems to me that the authority proposed to be extended is quite far-reaching. I do not quite understand the activities of the Council, and what its functions are. I should like to have a clear understanding of the matter if I possibly can. Would the Senator mind if consideration be deferred until tomorrow, and that we take it up tomorrow?

Mr. LODGE. Not at all. I shall be glad to take it up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to suggest, with the indulgence of the Senate, supplementing what the able Senator from Massachusetts has said, that this is a pure formality for the purpose of keeping the Sugar Council alive to the expiration date, which is next August, about 4 months. It is solely for the purpose of having time to renegotiate a new agreement which will be submitted at that time for the approval of Congress. It is the Chair's understanding that the entire domestic sugar trade and all related factors are in agreement that the 4 months' extension should be maintained.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say that we had a hearing on this subject. The subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and myself heard from the State Department, and we also sought out all the persons representing the various sugar interests in this country. They are all in favor of extending this device. It is simply a device that could produce a treaty sometime. It does not deal with the substantive features of the sugar situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the committee consult the sugar producers?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Do they want the agreement continued?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they do.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is also the recommendation of all the segments of the industry in this country?

Mr. LODGE. That is also the recommendation of all the segments of the industry in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to immediate consideration of the protocol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol prolonging the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar signed in London on May 6, 1937. The protocol was dated in London on August 30, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 1, district of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Lee Spillers to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the nominations in the Navy may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard J. Sullivan to be second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps from November 16, 1943.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the action of the Senate with respect to all the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until next Monday night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 25, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Charles A. Robinson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 3 years from March 4, 1947.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Robert Ewing Thomason, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas, vice Hon. Charles A. Boynton, retiring May 1, 1947.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Bryce R. Holt, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina, vice Carlisle W. Higgins, term expired.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico, vice Enrique Campos del Toro, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Sigmund Abraham, Jr.	John J. A. Berggren
Clayton R. Adams	Arthur C. Bigley, Jr.
James R. Ahern	Paul T. Bishop
Charles S. Alexander, Jr.	James R. Bjorge
Zeb D. Alford	Raymond L. Black
Thomas R. Allen	Ralph G. Blair
Lionel E. Ames, Jr.	William P. Blandy
Donald S. Apple	Lloyd S. Blomeyer
Charles E. Arnold	Charles H. Bloom
Alan Augenblick	Daniel K. Bloomfield
Jack F. Ayers	James S. Bloomfield
Francis W. Bacon, Jr.	Arthur K Blough, Jr.
George F. Ball	Robert O. Bonnell, Jr.
Earl deR. Barondes	Paul V. Borlaug
Richard W. Bass, Jr.	Frank L. Boushee
Fred H. Baughman	Paul H. Bowdre, Jr.
James M. Beggs	John C. Bowers
Ralph E. Behrends	Ross K. Bramwell
John H. Bell	Benjamin Y. Brewster, Jr.
Roland M. Bendel	Jack H. Bridges
Bruce A. Benson	Wharton H. Brooks, Jr.
Joseph H. Benton	Charles H. Brown
	Robert C. Bryan

Richard E. Bryan
Edward G. Buck
Randall O. Buck, Jr.
Donald P. Buhrer
Nathaniel W. Bullard
John Bunganich, Jr.
William J. Byrd
William J. Callahan
David W. Cammack
Roger Carlquist
Dale E. Carlson
William L. Carpenter
David C. Carruth
Robert C. Carter
Robert S. Chadima
John L. Chelgren
Russell H. Christian
Karl J. Christoph, Jr.
William E. Clark
Joseph H. Clasgens 2d
Harold S. Clay
William H. Clegg
William F. Clifford, Jr.
Philip LeR. Collins, Jr.
Robert I. Conn
Daniel Connolly
Benjamin J. Conroy, Jr.
William E. Conway
Frank W. Corley, Jr.
Paul T. Corrigan
Walter W. Cort, Jr.
Joseph D. Costello
William D. Crawford
Robert E Crispin
Robert W. Crouter
Frank L. Crump, Jr.
Edward M. Cummings, Jr.
Joseph H. Curl
Robert S. Curl
Nello A. Da Rodda
Cabell S. Davis, Jr.
Nicholas E. Davis
Walter A. DeAndrade
Tyler F. Dedman
Harold P. Deeley, Jr.
George E. DeLong
Richard T. Dempsey
Donald P. Dick
Robert W. Dickieson
Warren S. Dodd, Jr.
Walter J. Donovan
Robert C. Doxey
Gene R. Dreher
Peter Duncan
John A. Dunn
Robert H P. Dunn
James R. Duquette
Robert E. Durfos
John C. Dyer
Paul J. Early
Burton I. Edelson
Charles S. B. Edmondson, Jr.
Maurice M. Edwards, Jr.
John E. Eilert
Claude P. Ekas, Jr.
Robert E. Endebrock
Robert F. Ennis
Wesley D. Ennis
Philip W. Erickson
Roger E. Errington
John B. Fahey
Harlow H. Falevsky
John W. Fallon, Jr.
Robert R. Fargo
Gordon "H" Farmer
Willard L. Felsen
William A. Feltovic
Richard W. Fenn
Richard Ferguson
John B. Ferris, Jr.
John H. Fisher
Robert H. Flood
William H. Flynn, Jr.
Melvin "M" Forman
David G. Foxwell
Edmond W. Freeman 3d
Peter H. Freeman
Cloyd W. French
John C. Fry
Harrison C. Gaitskill 3d
James M. Gammon
Bruce B. Garlinghouse
Alan S. Garner
Irvin L. Gasser
Seth C. Gatchell
Robert K. Geiger
Peter Gengor
Julian Gewin
James H. Gildard 3d
Donald T. Giles, Jr.
Peter J. Goldman
Charles Gonia
Ben Goodman, Jr.
Charles F. Gorder
Robert H. Gormley
Walter Grechanik
Herbert T. Green
Norman K. Green
Roger M. Gregory, Jr
Robert J. Grimsley
Nicholas Guletsky
Rowland I. Haines 3d
Robert F. Hale
Robert K. Hammann
William D. Harkins
Richard B. Harris
James L. Harrison, Jr.
Donald P. Harvey
Arthur J. Haskell
James W. Hawthorne
Joseph R. Hawvermale
James T. Hayes
Thomas B. Hayward
Gail L. Heasley
Robert A. Hemmes
William E. Henson, Jr.
George A. Herbert
Russell G. Herron
Ivan Himmel
Sheldon L. Hirsch
Arthur J. Hodder, Jr.
Richard A. Hoffman
Bradley D. Hoffman
Henry A. Hoffman
Gordon McG. Hogg, Jr.
John P. Holland
Jesse A. Holshouser, Jr.
Wallace C. Holton
James M. Hornbrook
Norman T. Hornsby
Fred E. Horvath
Walter P. Houk
John C. Hufft
Arthur N. Hull
David H. Hunt
"H" Reid Hunter
Ralph J. Jaccodine
Stanley A. Jacobs
William H. Jagoe
William E. Jarvis
Harry P. Jefferson
George G. Jeffries, Jr.
Harold W. Jesse
Joseph "B" Jochum
Harvey J. Johnson
James H. Johnson
Jack D. Jones
Robert S. Jones
William F. Jones
Robert F. Jortberg
William H. Kanzler
Paul C. Keenan, Jr.
Bruce Keener 3d
James P. Kelley
Eugene F. Kelly
Ralph A. Kennedy
John S. Kern
Stephen H. Kessler, Jr.
Donald McL. Kirkpatrick
Wilbur C. Klemm
Franklin C. Knock
Edwin H. Koester
Richard E. Kosiba
Joseph Kovacs
Arthur L. Krasnow
Dale L. Kratzer
Francis X. Kuhn
Frank E. Lally, Jr.
Alphonse G Lang, Jr.
Judson D. Langston
Humphrey B. Lansden
Jerome E. Larson
Kelvin K. Larson
John R. Lastova, Jr.
Henry B. Latimer
Kent W. Lawson
William H. Layman
John C. Le Doux
Harry B. Lee
George P. Lemmon
Chantee Lewis
William S. Lewis
Robert A. Litke
George L. Little 3d
Raymond DeL. Lochner
John R. Lucas
William McK. Luckie
Melville I. Macquarrie
Francis F. Manganaro
John F. Mangold, Jr.
Martin D. Marder
Lawrence D. Marsolais
James K. Martin
Robert S. Marts
William McG. Mathew
Richard C. Maurer, Jr.
John W. McAdams, Jr.
William J. McCabe
John A. McCamont
William J. McClain
Robert B. McClinton
John A. McCook
Wayne S. McCord
Kyle C. McCormick
Wilson E. McDermut
Carlton A. K. McDonald
David B. McDowell
William B. McGinty, Jr.
William McKinley
Stewart H. McLean
James D. McNeil
John B. Mencke
Gordon K. Meriwether, Jr.
Robert P. Metzger
Charles R. Miko
Robert L. Milholland
Robert H. Miller
Ross L. Miller
Robert N. Mitchell, Jr.
William E. Monaghan
Girard W. Moore, Jr.
Richard E. Moran
Clifford L. Morgan
Max K. Morris
Wilbur M. Morrison
Eugene W. Mulligan 3d
Richard E. Munly
Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Perry W. Nelson
Roger M. Netherland
William C. Newell, Jr.
Samuel C. Newman
George A. Nicholas
Oliver LeG. Norman, Jr.
William E. Nylen
Charles H. Ogilvie
Corwin A. Olds
Lawrence A. O'Leary
James C. Oliver, Jr.
Robert C. Olson
Albert G. Opitz
Neri Osborn 3d
James W. Osmer, Jr.
James A. Ostiller
George R. Parish, Jr.
John S. Park
Harry Partridge, Jr.
Randolph F. Patterson
Samuel S. Pennock 3d
Anson C. Perkins
John R. Pesavento
Reuben W. Peterson, Jr.
Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
Kenneth E. Phillips
Edward B. Pickell
Jackson R. Pickens
Frank R. Pirkey
Clarence R. Plank
Reuben P. Prichard, Jr.
Robert E. Pyle
Burton J. Rab
Jerome W. Rabinowitz
John E. Rasmussen
Charles F. Rauch, Jr.
Robert D. Rawlins
Benton E. Reams
William F. W. Reeve
William J. Reynders
Robert G. Ricker
Baylor G. Riddell
William L. Rigot
Paul A. Riley
William D. Robertson, Jr.
Charles H. Rockcastle
Abraham Rockman
Ralph C. Rodgers
Duke J. Rose
Meyer H. Rose
Seymour N. Ross
Robert G. Roth
Thomas W. Routledge
Russell A. Rowan, Jr.
James C. Ruehrmund
John K. Ryder
Richard M. Ryder
Hugh A. Sanders
John B. Sangster, Jr.
Bayard T. Sansom
Glenn A. Savage
Robert K. Schenkel
James R. Schmoller
Marvin C. Scoggins, Jr.
Donald M. Shake
John C. Shannon
John W. Sharp
Victor V. Sharpe, Jr.
Daniel F. Shea, Jr.
William L. Shea
Daniel N. Shockey
William J. Shoemaker
William E. Shorr
Kenneth L. Shugart, Jr.
Arnold L. Silverman
Willard E. Simon
Jonathan A. Sisson
James B. Sizer 3d
Harold F. Skelly
Charles R. Skord
Robert W. Slater
Charles P. Smith
Deming W. Smith
Harold A. Smith
Robert P. Smith
Samuel T. Smith, Jr.
Francis M. Snyder
Richard L. Sonne
Joseph E. Spalding
Walter Spangenberg, Jr.
Spiro Spirson
Warren L. Spry
Henry L. Staples, Jr.
Robert H. Stickel
Troy E. Stone
Arthur E. Strauss
James T. Strong
Willard L. Strong
Jack M. Stufflebeam
Hubert B. Sturtevant, Jr.
Charles D. Summitt
David "H" Swenson, Jr.
Dean Taylor, Jr.
Theodore R. Tenczar.
Milford S. Terrass
Lee R. Thomas, Jr.
Robert K. Thompson
Sebastian Trusso
Louis T. Urbanczyk, Jr.
Robert L. Van Horn
Raymond W. Vasquez
Jay "J" Vermilya
Frank J. Viehmann
John R. Virts
Russell A. Vollertsen
John C. Waddell
Dwight Wadsworth
Edgar F. Ward
Donald C. Warren
Jonathan R. Warren
Ronald D. Waugh
Joseph E. Weatherly, Jr.
Albert W. Weems, Jr.
Robert M. Weidman, Jr.
Edward F. Welch, Jr.
Alfred G. Wellons, Jr.
John T. Welch
William G. Wepfer
Gerald H. Weyrauch
Curtis B. Wick
John G. Wick
John E. Wilkie
Bernard P. Williams, Jr.
Henry H. Wilson
Kenneth E. Wilson, Jr.
Robert E. Wilson
Cornelis Winkler, Jr.
Robert S. Wise
Alan B. Wood
John H. Wray
Andrew J. Yates
William K. Yates
Floyd F. Young
Harry I. Zankman
William L. Zedaker, Jr.
Louis J. Zeleznock
Randolph D. Zelov

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Thomas J. Allshouse
Harold R. Andrus, Jr.
Bradley L. Baker
James E. Ballard
William C. Brewer
Charles W. Butler
John A. Chapman 2d
Robert D. Darragh, Jr.
Elliot A. Dewey
Gordon M. Ehrman
Richard M. Evans
Nevin W. George
James I. Gibson
Charles C. Held, Jr.
Marvin S. Hutchison
Walter L. Kraus
Peter N. Kyros
Thomas F. Nealon
Thomas J. O'Connor
William C. Olin
Warren H. Ortland
Thomas J. Pawlowski, Jr.
Stephen W. Plarr
John W. Porter
Eugene M. Portner
Richard L. Rainey
William F. Reed, Jr.
Frank Simpson 3d
Jack C. Smith
Ernest L. Truax, Jr.
Willard H. Walker 3d
David W. Whelan
Thomas J. Wills 2d
William D. Wilson

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 6th day of June 1947:

George W. Allen
George A. Bacas
Jack T. Baker
Joseph S. Bartos, Jr.
Bonner R. Bell
Leon C. Bramlett, Jr.
Francis B. Carlon
Richard W. Crowley
Floyd A. Cuff
Thomas E. Dawson
Charles H. Dean, Jr.
George R. Earnest
Thomas H. Galbraith
Robert W. Helding
Edgar A. Hollister
Edward Y. Holt, Jr.
Edmund W. Jaworski
William L. Jesse
James H. Larson
Baldomero Lopez
Robert M. Lucy
Thomas E. Murphree
Robert B. Pohl
William A. Reavis
Charles J. Schneeman, Jr.
Lloyd L. Seaward
Philip D. Shutler
Boyd B. Sibert, Jr.
David A. Strausz
Donald W. Tardif
Thomas E. Vernon
William F. Wagner
Floyd H. Waldrop

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Gordon R. Clapp, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George W. Folta to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles Lee Spillers to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Charles North Howze et al., and the nominations of William McKinney Mantz et al., for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, may be found on pages 2832 and 2884 of the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31, 1947, under the caption "Nominations."

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels

The nominations of Harry Innes Thornton Creswell and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 3 of an act of Congress approved July 31, 1935, as amended by acts of Congress approved June 13, 1940, and December 28, 1945, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31, 1947, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Harry Innes Thornton Creswell, appearing on page 2884, and ending with the name of Charles Spurgeon Johnson, appearing on page 2889.

IN THE NAVY

OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE RANKS INDICATED IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY

(NOTE.—*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment.)

To be ensigns

Aeschbach, Warren E.
Anthony, Robert P.
Augenblick, Richard G.
Austin, William H., Jr.
Bagwell, Wallace B.
Barksdale, Allen D.
Beck, Lester H.
Bell, John, Jr.
Bennett, Walter F., Jr.
Best, Carl O.
Biscomb, Lloyd I., Jr.
Black, Owen J.
Bluestone, Max
Boland, Joseph P.
Bowden, John L., Jr.
Braid, Robert A.
*Brandenburg, Howard H.
Brewer, Norman E.
Brewington, William I.
*Britton, Beverly L.
Brooks, Claude C.
Brown, Louis F., Jr.
Bunger, Samuel J.
Burke, Edwin J.
Burt, Robert A.
Campbell, William M.
Carlin, Joseph W.
Chester, Raymond M.
Chronister, Irvin G.
Clark, Albert H.
Conditt, Leslie T., Jr.
Condon, Vernon W.
Conn, Robert H.
Craig, Robert M.
Cruse, Vernon E.
Cruser, Handford T., III
Cummings, Donald E.
Cundy, David R.
Davenport, Thomas T.
Davis, William J.
Day, Charles F.
DeCamp, Dwight E.
Deckert, Albert R.
DeLavergne, Cornelius B.
*Divine, Forrest M.
Doak, William C.
Dobyns, Robert E.
Dollard, Thomas J., Jr.
*Dowdell, James S.
Drabent, Eugene A.
Drum, Henry W.
Dura, Leon J.
Durden, Walter D.
Durkin, Michael F.
Dutton, Charles R.
Eadie, Charles J.
Eaton, Kenneth H.
Else, Leslie A.
Erdner, Lewis E.
Ernst, Francis C.
Erwin, David A.
Etcher, Robert W.
Ewald, Arden A., Jr.
Farris, George W.
Finley, John P., Jr.
Fish, Harold M.
Fisher, Paul E.
Fogg, John K.
Fullerton, Gordon W.
Galvin, Thomas F.
Gatts, William H.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Gibbs, Edward M.
Glowasky, William A.
Glusenkamp, Arthur F.
Gray, Leland T., Jr.
Grieb, "J" "C"
Gudal, Sigurd M.
Gurley, Walter P.
Gumb, Dana F.
Haecherl, Frank S.
Hahn, George C.
Hall, Donald M.
Handel, John W., Jr.
Hanson, Peter S.
Harper, John R.
Hebert, Frank C.
Henry, George L.
Herbert, Christopher A.
Herbert, Charles E.
Herzog, James H.
Hickman, Wilbur M.
Hill, Arnold M.
Hilton, Calvin E.
Hodges, Thomas V.
Hord, John W.
Howard, Donnell
Hubka, Verne R.
Hunter, Guy E.
Irving, Robert
Jackson, Lee S., Jr.
*Janson, Richard H.
Johnson, Edwin H., Jr.
Johnson, John D., Jr.
Johnston, Joseph L.
Johnston, Richard C.
Jones, Grover C.
Kaluza, Martin S.
Kauffman, Allen P.
Keefe, William J., Jr.
Kenyon, Arnold O., Jr.
Kimble, Elbert D.
King, Harry W.
Kline, Edward C., Jr.
Knight, Thomas C.
Koch, Don R.
Kohler, Frederick W.
Koster, Edwin R.
Lackore, Raymond C., Jr.
Lamson-Schribner, Frank H., Jr.
Larson, Ben R.
Larson, Wilfred C.
Lawrence, Harry B.
Leask, Joseph A.
Lee, Earl B.
Lennon, Gerard T.
Lienhard, Bernard A.
Lyons, James I.
MacDonald, Ivan L.
Magee, William M.
*Magennis, Edward G.
Mahar, Edward T.
Manly, Paul W.
Martin, Claude F., Jr.
Mason, Arthur A.
Mathews, James F.
Mathews, William R., Jr.
*McComb, Norris L.
McGowan, James V.
McKee, Richard L.
McMahon, James P.
Meadows, Roy L., Jr.
Miller, Donald L.
Mohler, Dallas F.
Monteleone, Nunzio E.
Morin, Edward C.
Morris, Adrian B., Jr.
Moseley, Richard E.
Mount, Harold W.
Muller, David G.
Nelson, Hugh M.
Nelson, Richard H.
*Newlin, John W.
Noesen, Harold
O'Brien, Richard J.
Olson, Richard A.
O'Neill, John M.
Onofrio, Edward
Owens, Albert T.
Paffe, Fabian J., Jr.
Patch, Donald R.
Pierozzi, Constantino
Pollard, Robert D.
Powell, James A.
Powell, Robert A.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Pros, Anton J., Jr.
Provost, William B., Jr.
Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.
Rauch, Robert P.
Reese, Walter "H"
Reichwein, Tremont E.
Rezzarday, Joseph, Jr.
Richardson, James P.
Riddick, John C.
Riebow, John F.
Riess, William C.
Roberts, Louis V.
Roetman, Orvil M.
Rogers, Edmund D., Jr.
Rose, Jack "D"
Roy, Robert I.
Ryan, Bayliss Q.
Sanders, Herman J.
Scheibner, Juergen G.
Schelb, William F.
Scherrer, David E.
Schimpf, Donald R.
Schubert, Allen H.
Schwan, Alfred P. G.
Scott, Howard T., Jr.
Scott, Kenneth G.
Sellman, Edmund W.
Shaner, Donald H.
Silvert, "M" E.
Sinfield, Charles P.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Burton E.
Smith, Harold L.
Smith, Wayne H.
Spruance, Owen E., Jr.
*Staley, Henry E.
Steen, Stuart M.
Stephens, Lawrence B.
Summitt, Charles K.
Sutter, Milton L., Jr.
Swanke, Charles C.
Thomas, Paul B.
Thorson, Robert L.
Tilley, Herbert S.
Tipping, William L.
Titcomb, Edmund B.
Toole, Wycliffe D., Jr.
Turner, Lee L.
Vose, Stephen J.
Walston, Claude E.
Waters, Alex "C"
Weaver, John K.
Weidman, William K.
Weidner, Virgil C.
Wells, Marvin G.
Westmoreland, Arthur E.
Woodard, David A.
Woods, William L., Jr.
Wright, Merritt R.
Young, Austin V.
Zumwalt, Marvin W.
Carpenter, Benjamin, Jr.
Kline, John L., Jr.
Seligman, Irwin H.
Wilkinson, Thomas R.

To be surgeons with the rank of lieutenant commander

Bullwinkle, Henry G.
Sherwood, David W.
Whalen, John M.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Roberts, James A., Jr.
Tandy, Roy W.

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Allan, Richard T.
Bishop, Merwood R.
Blassic, Robert S.
Britt, Ernest R.
Canton, Julian B.
Fisher, Robert D.
Ford, Robert G.
Fronke, Robert E.
Gardner, George H.
Gayle, James A.
Goetzmann, John C.
Herrick, Eugene G.
Huntress, James F.
Kramp, Henry F.
Kulow, Frederick C.
Lindsey, Bob R.
Martin, Robert W.
Matarazzo, Joseph D.
Mossing, Raymond L.
Orrill, Donald P.
Park, Eugene L., Jr.
Peterson, George W., Jr.
Peterson, Roger G.
Polk, Donald E.
Polk, Robert B.
Prosuch, Charles B.
Quinn, Gerard J.
Searcy, William C.
Sineath, William D.
Thompson, Edwin H.
Wagner, Robert L.
White, Francis H.
Bauman, Howard

To be assistant civil engineers with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Anderson, Donald N.
Atwater, Vern E.

To be assistant civil engineers with the rank of ensign

Jones, Malcolm S., Jr.
Schmoker, Robert F.
Umble, George R.

To be passed assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant

Friedrich, Eduard G.

To be assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Leberman, Odin F.

To be chief boatswains

Cadaret, Albert J.
Dreman, Wesley C.

To be chief aerographer

Mullins, Jimmy.

To be chief pay clerk

Hancock, Charles F.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

*Classman, Delwin W.
*Grening, George M.
*Joyce, Theodore W.

To be ensigns

Albert, William H.
Alderson, John T.
Applebach, Richard O.
Armstrong, Richard G.
Bagger, Gilbert D.
Baker, Morton S.
*Banner, Roy R.
*Barber, George C.
Barbour, Neil G.
Bauch, Leland W.
Betts, Joseph E.
Bishop, Lewis S.
Bohmert, Gerald G.
Bueler, Charles M.
Carment, Frederick, Jr.
Carter, Wallace R.
Cartwright, Richard L.
Chillemi, Richard L.
Cohn, William P.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
*Colenda, Frank
Condra, Kenneth I.
Cook, Berdel A.
Cramer, Maley O., Jr.
Cunningham, Thomas F.
Curless, James P.
Davis, Leslie D.
*Davis, William J., Jr.
*Deibler, William D.
DeWerd, Theodore J.
Doling, Lloyd L.
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
Drake, John D. K.
Dwyer, William V.
*Egeland, Andrew M.
Faulk, Joseph R.
Fitzwater, Harry E.
Flanigan, Frank, Jr.
Freeland, Harold H.
Friedrichsen, Leslie P.
Fuller, Richard, Jr.
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.
Gibbs, John D., Jr.
Goelz, Herbert E.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gray, Gordon L.
Gray, Theodore R.
Gresham, John I.
Grove, Nevett S.
Harmon, William C.
Harrison, Alan W.
Hart, Harry S.
Hause, Joseph R.
Hoover, John R.
Hughes, Thomas J., Jr.
Jackson, James A.
Johnstone, Frank L.
Jones, Edward H.
Kearny, Francis C., Jr.
Kebort, Leo R.
Klippstein, Thomas A.
Krueger, Roland E., Jr.
Kwitkowski, Walter J.
Lamb, Arthur W.
Landess, Herbert S.
Markham, Paul E.
McGucken, Paul M.
McKinney, Clyde B.
*Mize, Louis R.
Morgan, Lawrence E.
Mosser, Douglas
Murrill, Robert L.
O'Meara, Charles K.
Powell, Arthur E.

*Quick, Thomas J.	Stair, Robert N.
Rappuhn, Aifred A., Jr.	Stassevitch, Paul S.
	Stewart, Richard C.
Riggan, James M., Jr.	Stout, Harry R.
Riordan, Gilbert A.	Sup, George C.
Roberts, William K.	Swanstrom, Willis E.
Rodgers, Donald L.	Sweeder, Stanley E.
Ryder, Donald F.	Taylor, Huling F., Jr.
*Sar, Raymond V.	*Torrey, Julian A.
Schmucker, Stanley K.	Tribble, Gordon B. B.
	Valentine, Earnest
Schniedwind, Robert F.	Vehorn, Charles M.
	Vrolyk, Raymond F.
Schwartz, Mathew J.	Walery, Kenneth F.
Serrie, John A., Jr.	Waring, Everett D.
Sholes, Charles W.	Warren, Burtis "W"
Simons, Joseph T.	West, Gordon R.
Sisterhenm, William H.	Whitely, Joseph M.
	Whitney, William J.
*Slattery, Francis L.	Whittaker, Gordon S.
Smelz, Jervis L.	Williams, Elmer R.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.	Williams, James E.
Smith, George E.	Wilson, James G.
Smith, James J.	*Windley, William D.
Smith, James V.	*Wooldridge, Arthur R., Jr.
Smith, John E.	
Smith, Wendell K.	Caskey, James C.
Spruit, Robert E.	

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Chace, John F.
Moorman, Elmer R.
Watkins, George S.

To be assistant paymaster with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

McCreary, Arthur D.

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Babler, Richard F.	Pope, George S., Jr.
Bach, Charles F., Jr.	Primm, Jules R.
Beamon, Charles W.	Robinson, James A.
Benz, Norman E.	Ronayne, William D.
Carothers, Rodney P.	Sampson, William J.
Comfort, John R.	Schmidt, Maurice L.
Curtis, Ralph E.	Schmitt, Joseph D.
Day, Robert D.	Senulis, Alexander D.
De Pourtales, Louis J. E.	Sherrell, David P.
	Simpson, Harvey
Fairfield, George W.	Slater, Thornton L.
Fargason, James E.	Smith, William C., Jr.
Farnham, Benjamin L.	Smith, William C.
Goodreau, George H.	Starbody, John L.
Harris, Melvin W.	Taylor, William L.
Hart, Billy W.	Williams, George W.
Holland, Donald E.	Bauer, Allen F.
Jongeward, Keith W.	Hill, William H.
Kees, John D.	Odell, Jack G.
Keidel, Charles J.	Parfitt, Arthur R.
McAdams, Robert J.	Scott, Joseph E.
McKenna, James E.	Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Mulvee, Paul L.	Smith, Frank W., Jr.
O'Leary, Joseph J.	Crowell, Julian E., Jr.
Pooler, Richard P.	Jordan, Robert L.

To be assistant civil engineers with the rank of ensign

Burch, Bobby F.	Michael, Edwin M.
Chadwick, Dean O.	Mulder, William H.
Daub, Leland A.	Ross, Willard A.
Ellis, Darl A.	White, Richard D.
Hoskins, Dalton	Young, Robert "C"
Malvin, David W.	Scanlan, Melvin E.
Marron, James P.	

To be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Brimer, Eugene L., Jr.	Nystul, Oliver G.
Carney, Bruce H.	Sancier, Henry J.
Crossmire, George B.	Scrivener, Charles A.
Fowler, James M.	Shearn, Raymond S.
Kraske, Leonard M.	

To be chief torpedoman

Van Gorder, Keith R.

To be chief pharmacist

Baker, Lewis G.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS

Richard J. Sullivan to be second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps from November 16, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of the human heart, teach us the gladness of life which is responsive to Thy message through Nature. We thank Thee for the promise of returning springtime, for radiant sunlight and blue sky; for leaf, flower, and fruit which are beginning to clothe dale and hillside. All about us Thy beautiful world is thrilling with new life. Surely the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork.

Today, our Father, awaken in us a like renewal, lest cold doubt cause it to die out. O Spirit of God, direct us and rule us, and broaden our spiritual vision. Clothe us, we pray, with that wisdom that never fails to bear fruits of happiness and good will. Bless our Speaker and be very near to every Member of the Congress. In the name of our Saviour we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the minority views on House Joint Resolution 153.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter and statement by Mr. Chester T. Lane, Lend-Lease Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MILDRED HICKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 182) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mildred Hicks, widow of R. C. Hicks, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said R. C. Hicks.

The resolution was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 191) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee authorized by House Resolution 18 of the Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

RETIREMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which, for the first time, fixes a definite policy for an orderly retirement of the national debt.

The debt can be reduced, but unless we act immediately the huge burden will be frozen into a permanent debt and never paid.

My proposal is simple: The establishment of a sinking fund of $10,000,000,000 each year to pay upon the interest and principal of the public debt.

Perhaps an unusual feature of the proposal, however, is the direction given the Secretary of the Treasury to take money from a definite source of revenue—the estate tax—and place it in the sinking fund.

The interest on the public debt always has been considered a fixed charge, which must be paid each year. My proposal would place in the same category a payment on the principal of the debt. Thereafter, neither the Executive nor Congress could ignore the policy of debt reduction.

Unless the bill I have introduced, or some similar plan, is adopted, the future generations of America will be saddled with this permanent burden and the economy of our country placed in grave danger.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUSK (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain telegrams and other data.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced today.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with respect to St. Ann's Church in Bronx County.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon notwithstanding the fact that the House may be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 last year, I took the floor for 1 minute to protest the Interior Department appropriation bill brought up that day. Today we have an Interior appropriations bill coming before us which is far worse than the one of last year. I feel that the bill as proposed today deals a stunning blow to the progress of the West, and I, for one, shall have plenty of protest about some of its recommendations.

Among many other bad features, I am especially concerned about the reclamation program. Not to go now into detail, I note that existing reclamation, although hit hard, has suffered less than future reclamation under terms of this bill and under its philosophy. It is one thing to destroy a farmer's crops, but it is even worse to destroy his seed corn so that he can have no future crops. The great reclamation program for western farm land suffers in this bill a sterilizing action which aims to prevent future reclamation even more than it checks existing reclamation.

It remains to be seen how the progressive forward-looking citizens of the 17 Western States will regard the wisdom of the committee that brings such a bill as this before Congress. Of all the phony economy that I have ever heard proposed on the floor of this chamber, in my considered judgment this is the worst.

CASH PAYMENT OF TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly which is now in session requesting the Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of terminal leave for enlisted personnel who have been discharged from our armed services.

My own bill, H. R. 219, would permit applicants for terminal-leave pay to elect payment in cash in lieu of bonds and provide that bonds already issued for that purpose should be redeemable at any time. That bill was introduced on January 3, the opening day of this session of Congress. Some 25 similar bills have been introduced, and, indeed, there is now on the Speaker's desk a petition for motion for discharge of one of those bills, H. R. 3, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

I have received a great many letters and I want to read one paragraph from a letter from a veteran:

> I am in a spot and really need $150. I have my leave bond but it won't do me any good. I will even tell you why. My house will be finished in just a few weeks and if I haven't the $150 for the closing fees such as taxes and insurance the house will have to go to someone else. So please try and get me a special permit to cash my bond. Please, if you ever do anything for our sake.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter that was sent to President Harry S. Truman by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Federal aid to education and include therewith a letter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of April 21, in another an editorial from the Washington Post of April 23, and in the third a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram received by him.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld delivered over radio station WMAL.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the spy ring recently uncovered in this country and Canada. It exceeds the limit and I have a statement from the Printing Office which says that the cost will be $443.75. Of course, it will cost nothing actually except the paper and ink, but it is of such vital importance that I think it should go in the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is in the housing shortage that the only valid grounds for rent control can be found. The majority leadership knows that the American people do not want decontrol of rentals. Furthermore, a limited extension will obviously keep the rent control problem in a state of turmoil. At the height of next winter's coal and housing shortage, the problem would again be renewed with obvious further inroads into any competent administration. If rent control is kept in a continual state of turmoil, it will in practice be crippled and discredited.

In refusing to face the issue, the majority leadership is behaving in this respect exactly as it is with reference to the veterans' housing program. Veterans' housing is crippled in answer to selfish real-estate interests who are seeking to make fantastic profits at the cost of the veterans' urgent and really tragic need. That same real-estate lobby is organized in a demand for the complete elimination of rent control.

We have seen a tremendously rich and powerful lobby sweep down upon Congress. With cries of ghoulish glee they mutilated and murdered the OPA and now they are concentrating their efforts on rent control. Restraints and restrictions were called off. "Free enterprise" was to have its chance and the people were to be relieved of onerous government controls. Business was to get out from under Government interference and be allowed to surge freely ahead.

We are seeing where soaring prices are taking us. Let us stop the flood. Keep effective rent control.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1948, and for other purposes, the appropriation and language contained in the bill on page 50, lines 13 to 21, inclusive, and on page 81, lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, less than 7 weeks after the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] took his seat in Congress in 1939 he pioneered legislation to help the anthracite industry and the men, women, and children dependent upon it for a livelihood by introducing a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite industry by providing for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region.

The bill provided for investigation of the mining, preparation and utilization of anthracite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining, and for a comprehensive study of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems.

The authorization act passed both Houses in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and was signed by the President on December 18, 1942.

Funds to construct the laboratory were not requested until the last session of Congress and the appropriation of $450,000 passed both Houses, and was signed into law on July 1 past.

Although the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] was the father of this legislation, and despite repeated written and verbal requests to the Secretary of the Interior's office and to the Bureau of Mines the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] was unable to secure any real information until he became a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Such discourteous and disrespectful treatment of Members of Congress by any department or agency of the Federal Government should be terminated once and for all.

From the evidence that has developed in the hearings on this item it is clear to even disinterested observers that politics of the worst kind entered into the selection of Hazleton, Pa., as the site for the laboratory. Demands have been made from the public and the press for a thorough investigation.

That the public welfare continues to rate second to political considerations on the part of some officials in Washington was never more clearly demonstrated than in the petty jockeying which has marked the tedious progress of a project, which is one of the most practical and constructive yet conceived to solve the sorry plight of the coal fields.

It will interest this Congress to know that before the November election of last year, the War Assets Administration at the request of the United States Bureau of Mines and former Congressman Flood, froze a building in Hanover Township, near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to be considered for the site of the laboratory.

However, when Congressman Flood was defeated in the last election some other individuals got active, and the report of the Bureau of Mines' engineers shows that it was as late as December 16, 1946, that the Secretary of the Interior sent letters out which resulted in his selecting two individuals from Luzerne County, Pa., to serve on a site-selection committee. Another letter was sent out on December 23, to another individual from Philadelphia, which is outside of the coal regions, who became the third member of this site committee.

Despite countless inquiries to the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines, Mr. FENTON was unable to get any information as to what action the Secretary was taking, and he was amazed and astounded on January 8 last when he read a newspaper article which stated that the Secretary of the Interior had selected a committee of three and the laboratory site would be selected on January 9, the following day.

In desperation and to protect the future interests of the anthracite industry and the people dependent upon it for a livelihood, Mr. FENTON immediately protested to the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of Mines, but was unable to secure any further information and did not know that Hazleton had been selected as the laboratory site until a correspondent from one of the national press associations dashed into his office about 12 o'clock on January 10 last and broke the news that the Secretary of the Interior had made the announcement.

Public Law 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing the establishment of an Anthracite Research Laboratory, section 2, provides that—

> For the purpose of this act the Secretary, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized to acquire land and interests therein.

Despite the specific provisions of the act, the Secretary of the Interior named the site selection committee of three members, none of whom were officials or employees of the Bureau of Mines, and approved the recommendation of this site committee that the Anthracite Research Laboratory be established at Hazleton, Pa., the home community of one of the three members of the site committee.

It also developed at the hearing that the only member of the site committee who actually saw the site was the member of the committee from Hazleton. This same committee member, the day after he helped pick the site in his home community, wrote to a Member of Congress under date of January 10 last and stated:

> Entering the meeting my preference was Summit Hill for reasons which later could not stand up under the qualifications outlined by the Bureau of Mines in their analysis of locations, for instance, accessibility was one of the requirements and housing was another.

In other words, gentlemen, this member of the site committee admits that he went into the meeting with a fixed opinion, although this is questionable, in view of the fact that he was the only member of the committee that saw the site that was selected in his home community of Hazleton.

With reference to section 2 of the enabling act, which provides that the Secretary shall acquire the land and interests therein by acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, the Director of the Bureau of Mines recognized this provision of the law when he sent out a letter dated July 10, 1946, and enclosed a questionnaire to secure certain information which would be useful in selecting a site for the Anthracite Research Laboratory by stating:

> The Bureau's engineers will correlate the data obtained from the questionnaires, examine likely sites, and recommend a location to the Secretary of the Interior.

It was established during the hearings that although the Bureau of Mines engineers examined the 35 sites available, they were not permitted by the Secretary of the Interior to recommend a specific location to the Secretary of the Interior, as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of the laboratory.

Examination of the report of the Bureau of Mines' engineers indicated they favored locating the laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

Despite the preponderance of evidence presented at the hearings showing that the Secretary of the Interior had completely ignored the provision of the act in appointing a site committee, and subsequent written and verbal protests to the Secretary, the Secretary insisted that he "found no adequate reason for overruling the recommendation of the committee."

Members of the Appropriations Committee held a conference with the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and it was agreed that the Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the actual survey would be made available for interrogation, and this meeting was held.

One of the two Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the survey, and who was authorized to speak for the other engineer, informed the members of the Appropriations Committee that of all the available 35 sites surveyed they selected Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as the best site for the laboratory. This information definitely confirmed the evidence presented during the hearings that the Secretary of the Interior disregarded both the letter and spirit of the act.

It is the intent of Congress that the laboratory be established where it will best serve the purposes for which it is intended, and that the taxpayers' money be well and wisely spent. From the factual evidence presented, the Appropriations Committee concluded that this purpose can best be achieved by establishing the laboratory in the immediate area where the largest anthracite reserves are located, and which, of course, means where the future problems of the anthracite industry will develop.

In view of the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior, the Appropriations Committee has had no other alternative but to recommend cancellation of all funds now available, and reappropriate funds for the construction of the laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as recommended by the Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the survey, in order to carry out both the letter and spirit of the authorization act.

The Members of the House, in the face of the evidence that has been presented, and the specific provisions of the authorization act, would be derelict in their duty if they did not support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee in this matter.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all this resolution does is to waive points of order and make in order consideration of the legislation contained in the appropriation bill. The legislation has been explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and I believe it is up to the membership of the House to vote on this as on any other proposition, as to whether the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee changing the site from that which has been recommended by a special committee designated by the Secretary of the Interior, should be adopted or not. I may say that notwithstanding the reading of the report by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior has acted in good faith. He selected three men, one a labor man, one representing industry, and one who was not interested in any site and represented the public. These three men have recommended a site—1 of 7 that had been recommended out of 35 previously considered. I feel, therefore, the Secretary of the Interior acted in good faith; but, nevertheless, the evidence presented before the Rules Committee is such that, in my opinion, and in the opinion of members of the Rules Committee, points of order should be waived and the provision should be permitted to be taken up and considered. It provides for $450,000 for what I understand is a laboratory that may bring about greater efficiency and safety in the coal fields and may bring about a reduction in the cost of mining coal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is the laboratory that was provided last year under the Democratic administration?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We pursued the ordinary method of having a commission appointed or authorizing the appointment of a commission to select a site; is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that commission was constituted of Mr. Thomas Kennedy, who is a very prominent labor leader in the coal-miners organization, also the dean of the University of Pennsylvania, also the president of the Anthracite Operators Association. Is my information correct?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is always correct from my point of view.

Mr. McCORMACK. They selected a site?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Appropriations Committee, exercizing a rare jurisdiction or responsibility—I have never seen it done before in my 19 years as a Member—selects a definite site rather than letting the agency of government select a site through a commission appointed or through a board, is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is really a fight between two Republican Members from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SABATH. That I do not know. Of course, that is not the only thing I do not know about this matter. This, however, I do not know about.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is most unfortunate that this important thing from the Republican angle should deteriorate into a matter of congressional-district patronage.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Massachusetts should know by this time that it has always been my policy to leave any matters of that kind to the membership of the House.

LABORATORY MAY BRING REDUCED PRICES

From the evidence that was presented before the committee, I could not do anything else but act favorably upon the rule, and that was also the position of my colleagues on that committee. I believe that the original authorization was in the right direction, and the laboratory should be erected as speedily as possible because, as I say, it may bring about a reduction in the cost of production of coal, and perhaps an equal reduction in price to the coal users.

I may say that I read only a few days ago that there has been a reduction of 50 cents per ton here in the District of Columbia. I hope to God that similar reductions will be made throughout the United States, and that we will have not only a reduction in the cost of coal but in the prices of all products that enter into the cost of living.

GRATIFIED BY PRESIDENT'S MOVE TO BRING LOWER PRICES

I have been pleased and gratified, Mr. Speaker, as can be readily understood by those who have heard me for three long years as I pointed out the rapidly rising spiral of living costs, by the firm stand which has been taken by the President in regard to price increases, and by his demands that prices to consumers be reduced.

I have been equally gratified by the action taken by some industrialists, retailers, and wholesalers to actually reduce prices. Recently we have seen advertisements in the Washington newspapers announcing price cuts, not only in coal, which I have mentioned, but in clothing and foods.

I believe that all members received yesterday a telegram from one big wire and cable manufacturing company announcing reductions of prices on their products and the agreement with unions for increased wages. Today all of us received another similar wire from Charles Luckman, of Lever Bros., announcing reductions in the price of soaps and cooking oils at the same time the workers' wages have been lifted without benefit of the Republican union-wrecking bill. I have many similar telegrams and letters.

OPA SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN KILLED

The present situation, when we find that prices have increased as much in the last 10 months as in the preceding 7 years, is a direct result of the tremendous pressures exerted by selfish, profit-hungry forces first to break through the OPA price ceilings and then ultimately to kill price control entirely. The Congress and the people of this great Nation were fed a heavy forced diet of false and misleading propaganda. Businessmen were painted as desperate in the face of rising costs and rising wages.

Mine was one of the few voices raised then to point out that the average profits for all businesses had broken all records in 1945, and bid fair to outstrip even those high levels in 1946.

Under leave, I desire to insert at this point a short table based on figures furnished by the Department of Labor, as the figures were given in the Chicago Sun, April 14, 1947:

Percentage change in retail food prices

1941 AVERAGE IS 100 PERCENT

September 1945:	
All foods	132
Cereals and bakery products	111
Meats	122
Dairy products	119
February 1947:	
All foods	173
Cereals and bakery products	147
Meats	183
Dairy products	164

That table, Mr. Speaker, represents what is happening to people who cannot fall back on swollen profits and bonus payments to counteract the loss of income created when prices go up and dollar income stays level or falls.

That is what has happened to working people who, because of the end of overtime payments, find themselves drawing a smaller pay check than in 1943, or who perhaps have been laid off in the process of reconversion.

That is what happened to people living on retirement pay, or on insurance, or on pensions, or on the income from the bonds of these very companies which have forced prices up and up.

INDUSTRIAL PROFITS UP

Against that reduction in real income we have undreamed-of industrial profits on every hand. Let me take a single industry group, Mr. Speaker, one which exercises a vast influence over the cost of living. Here are the profit figures for the last 3 years in the meat-packing and meat processing industries:

Net income of industry groups

MEAT PACKING AND PROCESSING

1944	$46,236,000
1945	34,307,000
1946	67,857,000

LABOR HAS BEEN PATIENT UNDER ADVERSITY

In spite of the harsh, punitive laws which the Republican Party has proposed, and has passed in this House, and in spite of the deluge of abuse heaped on American workingmen and their spokesmen by some, American labor has been infinitely patient under this unfair division of the unequaled national income.

The Monthly Labor Review of the Department of Labor shows that out of a total population over the age of 14 of 106,940,000, we have a total labor force

of 58,430,000, a figure never before surpassed in peacetime.

In spite of all abuse, of prices rising above the limit of incomes to reach them, and of unfounded charges, idleness arising from labor-management controversies in January 1947 reached a postwar low and was less than for any month since March 1945.

In December 1946, which is the last month for which full figures are available, only 180 such disputes were begun, involving only 95,000 workers, while in the whole month only 400 disputes were in progress involving 525,000 workers and a loss of 3,065,000 man-hours.

In other words, in December 1946 about four-tenths of 1 percent of all workers were, during the month, either out on strike or locked out by management some time during the month.

This does not sound like the labor-management war of which we heard so much the other day.

PRICE CONTROL SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT

Last fall, Mr. Speaker, I urged the President to maintain the full force of price control and not to yield to the money-hungry profiteers; but, as you will recall, the packers went on strike against the people of the United States, and conditions arose which brought about the virtual suspension of price controls, followed by the last election, when the Republican Party gained what will be, I am certain, a short-lived majority, and the last pretenses of price control and orderly reconversion to peacetime were abandoned.

Now we are faced with the reality which I predicted time after time. I dare say there is not a Member of this House of any party who does not regret the abandonment of the administration program for slow and careful reconversion.

I hope that the vigorous action of the President in calling for a reduction of consumers' and wholesale prices, and the prompt response of some of the more responsible segments of industry, will provide a pattern for all of business.

Lest there be any thought that I may be exaggerating, or merely attempting to make business a scapegoat, I here insert a table showing the net profits of seven major meat-packing plants. Bear in mind that the consumer must provide these profits—the consumer and the worker.

Net sales and net profit of 7 major meat-packing plants, 1945 and 1946

Company	Year ending—	Operating revenue and sales	Net profit
Armour & Co.	Nov. 2, 1946[1]	$1,183,537,561	$20,791,128
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945[2]	1,212,961,355	9,172,538
Cudahy Packing Co.	Nov. 2, 1946	349,901,504	6,720,585
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	344,909,594	2,505,097
Geo. A. Hormel & Co.	Oct. 26, 1946	126,082,609	2,541,138
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	114,213,587	1,273,639
Hygrade Food Products Corp.	Nov. 2, 1946[2]	154,949,972	4,585,995
Do.	Nov. 3, 1945[1]	110,986,858	702,887
Rath Packing Co.	Nov. 2, 1946[2]	100,300,102	2,065,885
Do.	Nov. 3, 1945[1]	100,155,207	1,347,575
Swift & Co.	Oct. 26, 1946	1,308,364,155	16,394,739
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	1,307,631,681	12,303,807
Wilson & Co., Inc.	Oct. 26, 1946	440,572,155	8,311,560
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	468,638,536	5,036,602

[1] 53 weeks.
[2] 52 weeks.
Source: Standard & Poor's Corporation Records. Daily news section.

PLEASED NAM OPPOSES CARTELS

I am most pleased, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in many years I can join in spirit with the National Association of Manufacturers in their statement deprecating cartels and monopolies.

The only trouble is that this fine talk does not quite jibe with their continuous and frivolous statements that they want "free private enterprise." Free for what? Free to deprive smaller businesses of their freedom? Free to exploit the worker? Free to gouge the consumer?

These statements would have come with better grace from those who can come into court with clean hands, so to speak—or with free hands. The record of all-time record profits do not support the plaints of governmental interference. The record of absorption, despite our antitrust laws, of small concerns by big concerns does not sound like a truly "free" enterprise system. There is reason for believing that trade associations continue to act with considerable unanimity, though perhaps technical violation of the law is avoided.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I fee impelled to show how this "restricted" enterprise has "suffered" in recent months, though I know much of this has appeared before.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me draw attention to the fact that Bethlehem Steel Co. has just today reported the greatest earnings for a first quarter in all history, though in the same breath Eugene Grace finds it possible to say that a wage increase would be "inflationary."

A compilation covering 15 industries shows that the weighted average price increase necessary to cover increased labor costs would have been 2.5 percent; but the actual weighted average price increase was 17.9 percent.

The percentage increase in 1946 over profits in 1945 was, for the Atlantic Refining Co., 760.5 percent; for the Long-Bell Lumber Co., 407.6 percent; for the Food Fair Stores, 293.3 percent.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, for a long time, showing the weird disparity between the claims of business prostration made on this floor and the factual reports of business guormandizing from the financial pages; but I shall desist.

I hope that business and industrial leaders will realize that no one wins through inflation, or through sudden deflation—that is, through the "boom and bust" cycle—and everybody loses.

I certainly would not wish for any such sharp or sudden price cuts as would actually hurt our American business concerns. Let me say, as a figure of speech, that I should like to see them sweat off some of the fat; and then I should like to see our workers, our white-collar people, our annuitants, and other low-income groups, get some of that fat for their own needs.

The action of United States Steel and of other enlightened employers in settling their wage disputes before they get started is most gratifying; it proves what I have long contended, that with proper opportunity and with good will on both sides, labor disputes can be settled at the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from some of the telegrams and letters I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the applicants for the pending rule on the bill in question did not make out a very strong case. They are asking for a rule that will provide opportunity to invalidate the decision of an agency set up to determine where this laboratory should be located. In spite of the fact that a poor case was made, I think the action of the Appropriations Committee was wise. I believe in the liberal use of the purse strings on the part of the Appropriations Committee to influence legislation and public behavior. I am confident that the criticism directed at the agency that first determined this question is well supported and that the Appropriations Committee acted wisely in suggesting that the House be given an opportunity to correct the error made. Certainly the preponderance of the testimony as to the proper location is on the side of those who asked for this rule and for the invalidation of the decision made by the agency. It was not a wise decision, and although it was made regularly and under authority granted by the Congress, I think it ought to be reversed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule now before the House and in particular to the provision in it waiving any points of order that might be made to the items of the present appropriation bill. In thus opposing the rule I do so with reluctance, but under the circumstances, I have no other course. Yesterday, before the rule was placed on the Clerk's desk, I attempted to have the Rules Committee change the rule but was unable to do so. I am particularly concerned with the item appearing on page 50, lines 13 to 31 inclusive and with title II of the bill, which deal with the appropriation of $450,000 for the construction and equipment of an anthracite research laboratory. We have here, in this rule before us, a situation which, while not unknown,

is, I am told by those older and more experienced in the ways of the House than I am, rather uncommon. The rule was not asked for, however, without a reason, which I shall endeavor to point out to you.

For that purpose I should like briefly to review the history of that legislation. Under Public Law No. 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, approved December 18, 1942, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to establish a research laboratory in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. Nowhere in the act is there any designation as to where in the region it should be located, the choice of the site being left to the discretion and judgment of the Secretary within that general limitation. The erection of this institution and the appropriation of the funds for its construction were postponed by reason of the war. The Seventy-ninth Congress, the war being then over, appropriated the required funds and the Secretary of the Interior promptly took steps to comply with the direction of the Congress.

In the latter part of 1946, the Secretary, in furtherance of that direction, appointed a committee as he was empowered to do under section 4 of the act, to advise with him and make recommendations as to the location of the laboratory. This committee consisted of Dr. Frank Ernst, head of the Anthracite Institute, representing the operators, Mr. Thomas Kennedy, of the United Mine Workers, representing the employees, and Dr. J. A. Goff, dean of the Towne Scientific School of the University of Pennsylvania, representing the general public, all three of them men of standing and ability in the anthracite industry. In appointing that committee, the Secretary endeavored to comply and thought he was complying with the provisions of the act which directed that those three elements should appear on any advisory committee he should select. That committee, after careful consideration of the various possible sites in the region, coupled with the personal knowledge of its members of the problems involved, and having before it the report of the engineers of the Bureau, decided, for reasons set forth in its report to the Secretary, that the laboratory should be situated in the city of Hazleton, which is located in my district, and unanimously recommended to the Secretary that this be done.

Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior approved that recommendation and made a public announcement, in the latter part of January of this year, of his decision to locate the laboratory at that point. Full publicity was given to the Secretary's decision, and his press release announcing it appeared in all the newspapers in my district and was given wide distribution. It is, and has been, a matter of common knowledge throughout the district. Thereupon the gentleman from Pennsylvania representing the Twelfth Congressional District, comprising the counties of Northumberland and Schuylhill, in the latter of which is the little town of Schuylkill Haven mentioned in this present appropriation bill, on page 50, line 15, who had been desirous of having this laboratory located in his district, raised a great outcry, shouting that he had been robbed by this exercise of the Secretary's judgment, an exercise specifically committed to him under the act, robbed of what was rightfully his, that someone, while he was in swimming, had stolen his clothes, and that, far from exercising his sound discretion, the Secretary had been guided by other considerations. A glance at the character of the members of the advisory committee shows the ridiculousness of this assertion and makes patent the lack of bona fides behind such a statement.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which prepared the bill now under consideration making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, representing the Twelfth Congressional District, made no violent protest, I assume, at the insertion therein of title II, revoking the previous appropriation made by the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the provision on page 50, appropriating an exactly similar amount for the laboratory, but coupled with the proviso that the laboratory be constructed in Schuylkill Haven, which just happens to be in his district. Such a proviso would normally have been subject to a point of order, a fact well known to everyone. In order to bar such a point, the present rule was sought and granted. In making that assertion I am only quoting the chairman of the subcommittee who categorically stated that the only purpose in seeking the present rule was to prevent, specifically, the elimination of the designation of the place at which the laboratory was to be erected, to insure that it should be constructed at Schuylkill Haven in the Twelfth District, and, inferentially, that what was thus obtained, should be made secure and safe from legitimate attack.

Earlier I said that the gentleman had cried out to all the world that he had been robbed, robbed of what he had never had but what he assumed he was going to have. I wonder how he would characterize the proceedings which have resulted in the present rule, were the situation reversed. I think there is no necessity to paint any picture to the Members of this body of the reactions of the people of my district to what they will consider a gross injustice. On the merits, both they and I are quite prepared to justify the soundness of the Secretary's judgment, notwithstanding the statement in the committee's report.

What really gripes an anthracite sympathizer is to mention Schuylkill Haven for the laboratory. Surely the Schuylkill County Congressman must know that of all the towns in his territory, Schuylkill Haven is the one town with not only oil-burning homes and oil-burning factories, but actually a center for the distribution of oil burners and the introduction of oil burners into areas on the fringe of the anthracite coal fields. Certainly the miners of Tamaqua, Coaldale, Mahonoy City, Shenandoah, Mount Carmel, Ashland, Shamokin, etc., will al look askance at awarding a community bent on stabbing the anthracite industry by shrinking its market with the anthracite industries' most potent agency for its future existence, the proposed laboratory.

An anthracite laboratory in Schuylkill Haven, the community with oil-burning intents, should be scorned in the anthracite coal fields with the same repercussion as Heny Wallace's speeches in Europe.

The writer of this letter himself prefers a different location than either of the ones involved here. It illustrates, however, the difference of opinion among those conversant with the area, and the wisdom of the provision leaving the decision to the Secretary, assisted by experts upon whose advice he can rely. At the moment, that is beside the point. They will feel, and I assure you that they are fully cognizant of the situation, for the local newspapers have been full of it and I concur in the feeling that they should not, under the circumstances, be made the victims of someone's spleen and disappointment and of a feud with the Secretary of the Interior. They will feel, and justly so, that a committee of this great House, which prides itself on its sense of justice and fair play, should not lend itself to the furtherance of such an end at their expense, and that, if it does, the House itself from which it derives its authority should rebuke it by refusing to countenance its action. They look to this House to protect them.

Both my constituents and I are opposed to this attempt to legislate indirectly, are opposed to any change in the basic legislation which alters the intent of Congress that the site of this laboratory should be determined by the Secretary, with the advice of a committee of experts, which was the method adopted.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have stated I am opposed to the present rule. I realize that this appropriation bill must be considered, and I have no desire to be an obstructionist even though the rule is directly aimed at me and at my district. On the basis of the larger issues involved, I shall vote to have this legislation proceed, but I feel it is unfair and unjust, and at the proper time, if the rule be approved by the House, I propose to present an amendment for the consideration of the House, striking out title II of the bill and also on page 50, lines 15 to 21, thus eliminating this attempt to amend the original act by subterfuge, and restoring to the Secretary of the Interior the discretion conferred on him by the basic legislation as it existed before this ill-starred plan was concocted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand it, what you are saying is that by this bill they are canceling out an appropriation that was made last year for a laboratory which was to be in your district.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Which was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to decide where it would be located.

Mr. SMATHERS. And now they are putting it back, but putting it in some other district?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

In view of what has been stated, I want to make it clear that I have at all times insisted that a minority opposed to any proposition should be given an opportunity to explain their position before the Rules Committee before we acted upon any application for a rule. In this instance, when the rule was requested, there was no opposition on the part of anybody. Whether the minority is on the Democratic side or on the Republican side, the minority should have the right to appear and present their views or their opposition to any matter. In this instance, I believe it is up to the House to decide, since it is a disagreement between two sections or localities in the same State, after the evidence is presented more fully than it has been presented before the Rules Committee, whether the provision provided for in the appropriation bill should be sustained or not.

As to the bill itself I have not said anything. You will hear more about it later. I did not criticize the committee notwithstanding the fact that I feel the committee has been penny-wise and pound-foolish in eliminating appropriations for deserving projects, and I think it is purely a political maneuver on the part of the committee. The cuts in some of these appropriations are unfair and unjust and will deprive many sections of the country of improvements and betterments to which they are entitled.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman, of course, is referring to the majority of the committee, not the minority.

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course; I know that the minority did not have much to say and will not have much to say. It is not like it was under Democratic control when the minority always was heard and received that consideration which I myself have always advocated. I know the majority has the vote on this committee, in fact we know the majority is in the saddle. Unfortunately they seem to be drunk with temporary power but whether it will help them I doubt very much because I do not believe the American people will approve the course that is being pursued by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I want to preface my remarks by stating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] that never have I at any time suggested any specific location for the new Anthracite Research Laboratory.

I want the Members to know that my only contention has been that the laboratory be established in the immediate region where the largest anthracite reserves are located, and which, of course, means where the future problems of the anthracite industry will develop.

The statistics of the United States Bureau of Mines, introduced in the evidence during the hearings on the appropriation bill, and which I will present later, show where these reserves are located and more than justifies the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines' engineers that the laboratory be established at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

As our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has already explained to the House the history of the legislation authorizing a laboratory for research on anthracite coal, I will not go into detail or repeat that which he told you.

However, I do want to summarize for you the various steps taken up to this point in the hope that you as Members of the Congress and future Members, will be accorded all the courtesies and respect, as such, by the various bureaus and departments of our Federal Government.

First of all, the enabling legislation or authorization act which I sponsored became law on December 18, 1942. Then the war prevented securing funds to build the laboratory.

The Interior appropriation bill for 1947 included the $450,000 for the erection of the laboratory to be placed on a site to be named by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines. This is in accordance with section 2 of the enabling act.

That this was the interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Bureau of Mines is indicated in the letter that was sent out by the Director of the Bureau of Mines on July 10, 1946, and which had a questionnaire enclosed to secure certain information which would be useful in selecting a site for the anthracite research laboratory. This letter stated:

> The Bureau's engineers will correlate the data obtained from the questionnaires, examine likely sites, and recommend a location to the Secretary of the Interior.

Well, as a matter of fact, 35 sites were offered to the Government from the anthracite area, and the Bureau of Mines sent engineers to examine the likely sites. These engineers spent days and days examining all the sites. They were the only ones qualified to determine which was the most suitable site. They were neutral in their position and had a job to do. They did that job and made their report; I have a copy of it. The best they could do in the matter of Hazleton was to give it 13 points to Schuylkill Haven's 15.

As far as the matter of accessibility to nonregional areas was concerned, Schuylkill Haven was in a class by itself. That is to say, and I quote from the engineer's report:

> The nonfunctional points of Washington, D. C., Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and New York as a whole are more accessible from Pottsville (Schuylkill Haven area) than from any other population center within the coal-producing area.

This accessibility to the great metropolitan areas was one of the most basic factors to consider in establishing the laboratory site, and was so stated to me by the Director of the Bureau of Mines in a conversation I had with him about what the cardinal factors should be.

Yes, my colleagues; they even had in their report on Schuylkill Haven that the western and southern anthracite field contained 83 percent of the anthracite reserves.

Yes; the engineer's report or summary of each of the suggested most favorable sites—8 sites out of the 35 visited and surveyed—shows very plainly to any unbiased mind which site, the one site, that these professional engineers of the Bureau of Mines preferred. There was no doubt that they thought Schuylkill Haven the best site.

This was verified by the engineers themselves in an interview with members of the Appropriations Committee. Dr. L. C. McCabe, one of the two engineers who visited all the sites and who was authorized to speak for Mr. Buch, the other engineer who could not attend the conference on account of the serious illness of his mother, having been called to his mother's bedside, informed the members of the Appropriations Committee the engineers selected Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

The Bureau of Mines made Dr. McCabe available for interrogation at the request of our committee, and I am happy to state that Dr. McCabe did no pussyfooting, and gave us his honest and candid opinion that Schuylkill Haven was the best site for the laboratory out of the 35 sites they surveyed.

Now let us see how this Hazleton decision came about. Well, Mr. RICH did touch on a little of it. He told you that such discourteous and disrespectful treatment of Members of Congress by any department or agency of the Federal Government should be terminated once and for all. He was referring to the lack of cooperation and my inability to get any information from the Director of the Bureau of Mines or the Secretary of the Interior. Surely as a Member of Congress, to say nothing of the fact that I was the author of the legislation, should demand at least a reply to mail asking for information. It should not have taken the Secretary of the Interior 177 days to answer a letter and, incidentally, the letter that I wrote was in reply to a request from the Secretary to send him names of people that he might consider in appointing a "consultative committee." Note well, now, he said "consultative committee" and not a selection committee. I sent him the names of people for his consideration on August 7, 1946. He never acknowledged that letter until I brought it to his attention when he was before our committee on January 21, 1947. The reply came to me on Saturday, January 25, 1947, in a letter dated January 24, 1947, and was delivered in person by the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

Well, a lot happened between August 7, 1946, and January 25, 1947. Already, mention has been made of November 5, 1946, on which day my colleague, Mr. JENKINS' predecessor, was retired.

They certainly went a long way in the Department of the Interior to try and

establish the laboratory in Luzerne County, Pa. As has already been stated they had a certain building in Hanover Township, near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., frozen by the War Assets Administration in the hope that they could place it in Luzerne County. But after the election they unfroze it. Why? Because it was unsuitable for the laboratory and they knew it when they had it frozen.

Then the Secretary of the Interior, in direct violation of section 2 of the enabling act, named a site selection committee which picked Hazleton. That this committee was a site-selection committee is attested to by a press release from the Department of the Interior dated January 10, 1947, which states:

In selecting Hazleton on the basis of its central location in the anthracite region, the committee also considered accessibility, housing, community facilities, utilities, and local manufacturers.

Pikes Peak might be the center of a given area, but you certainly would not build something there if accessibility is one of the main factors to be considered.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has already informed you, the site committee was composed of three members who were not picked until long after the November election. Two of the members were from Luzerne County, Pa., and the third was from Philadelphia, outside of the coal regions. Of course one of the members from Luzerne was from Hazleton, the home community of one of the three members of the site committee. It developed at the hearings that he was the only one who saw the site at Hazleton, which he picked in his home community. This man forgot, and he should know, that we have miners and their families in the western and southern field in which lies 86 percent of the coal reserves. He should also know that many of the coal operators in the Hazleton area have already migrated to the fields where they could get coal for the next 150 to 500 years.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this time, as was introduced in the hearings a statement of the estimated anthracite reserves by fields as of January 1, 1943, on pages 85 and 86 from the report entitled "Pennsylvania Mineral Heritage," published by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, department of internal affairs, William P. Livengood, Jr., secretary, Harrisburg, Pa., in 1944, and based on reports of the Pennsylvania Geological Survey, the School of Mineral Industries of the Pennsylvania State College, the United States Geological Survey, and the United States Bureau of Mines.

Northern field: Luzerne and Lackawanna—Wilkes-Barre and Scranton—16 percent.

Eastern middle field: Luzerne and little part of Carbon—Hazleton area—less than 1 percent.

Western middle field: Northumberland and Schuylkill—Shamokin area—about 22 percent.

Southern field: Schuylkill, Dauphin, and a little of Carbon—Pottsville area, largely Schuylkill County where the Schuylkill Haven site is located—62 percent.

The Pottsville area and the Shamokin area combined have 13,490,000,000 tons of coal out of a total of 16,188,00,000 tons for the whole region, which is approximately 84 percent of the total anthracite reserves.

At the present rate of mining the northern field, Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, will be mined out in 50 years; the eastern middle field, Hazleton, in about 11 years; the western middle field, Shamokin in about 150 years; and the southern field, Pottsville, will last over 500 years.

The estimated reserves by counties is as follows:

County	Tonnage	Percent
Carbon	344,000,000	2.2
Columbia	543,000,000	3.5
Dauphin and Lebanon	76,000,000	.5
Lackawanna	637,000,000	4.2
Luzerne	2,023,000,000	12.9
Northumberland	1,967,000,000	12.6
Schuylkill	10,007,000,000	64.0
Sullivan	7,000,000	.05
Susquehanna and Wayne	10,000,000	.05+
Total	15,614,000,000	100.0

Inasmuch as my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] has already read into the RECORD a letter which was addressed to him, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, and me, 2 days ago, April 22, 1947, by Mr. E. V. McCullian, executive secretary, Panther Valley Industrial Association, Inc., Lansford, Pa., I shall now read into the RECORD a letter which Mr. McCullian addressed, under date of January 15, 1947, to the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, attention Mr. R. B. Sayres, Chief. This letter, which was introduced in the evidence of the hearings, is as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1947.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. R. R. Sayers, Chief.)

DEAR SIR: Your letter and your copy of the release assigning the anthracite laboratory to the section designated in Hazleton, Pa., is supporting evidence to our contention that the Department of the Interior, and its subcommittee, paid little attention to either its own Department's technical knowledge or to that of the subcommittee that inspected sites proposed in the anthracite area.

To state that Hazleton is the geographical center of the former anthracite coal fields triangle with Scranton, Mauch Chunk, and Tremont as the vertices is nearly correct.

But our understanding was the laboratory is being built for the anthracite of the future. Accordingly, your own statistics would eliminate any anthracite problems in the territory from Scranton to Hazleton, inclusive, as anthracite of this area will, by your Department's statistics, soon be but happy memories. Perhaps by the time the new laboratory is completed and functioning in Hazleton, the latter city will be purchasing anthracite from the Panther Valley or using oil as a substitute. That is how exhausted the anthracite operators and the anthracite miners of the vicinity of Hazleton figure their future coal reserves happen to be.

The district No. 7 office of the United Mine Workers, located in Hazelton, through its district provisional president, Mr. Martin Brennan, proposed as a site one of those offered your Department by our commission, namely, the one at Summit Hill, Pa. Perhaps if you check your recommendation, you may alter your statement that Hazleton had the support of the United Mine Workers of America. It would better be said the personal support of Mr. Kennedy, who happened to be a resident of Hazleton and a Mine Workers' official.

Anyone that ever traveled to or from Hazleton would not write about its accessibility for travel. Hazleton is a branch-line city. We are 12 miles from Hazleton and can reach New York City as quickly as we can get to Hazleton by public conveyance.

Insofar as air travel is concerned, there is not an airport of worth-while size nearer to Hazleton than the Allentown-Bethlehem port which is considerably closer to the Panther Valley. Traveling by train, the people of Hazleton must make their way by branch train or bus to the Panther Valley towns of Tamaqua or Mauch Chunk.

If university support was a criterion, Lehigh and Lafayette as we oft stated were at Panther Valley's back door.

As a summary, therefore, your subcommittee recommendation looked at a beclouded map when it located the geographical center of the future anthracite coal fields; the laboratory is being built to serve in Hazleton.

With your statement that Hazleton is a city of 40,000 people, and the type of city that will be satisfactory to laboratory engineers, we have no quarrel. We only know that people as well equipped as laboratory engineers find living in our midst no inconvenience. The housing problem will be just as difficult to solve in Hazleton as elsewhere.

We have filed our protest as we cannot accept the findings on the reasons given. Living in the anthracite coal fields of the future, knowing the voluminous statistics bureau of government love to play with, it is just plain stupidity and an insult to our intelligence to recommend Hazleton as the center of the anthracite fields the laboratory is being built to serve.

We congratulate the city of Hazleton for its success in acquiring that which it will have no need for, and we also congratulate its outstanding citizen (Mr. Kennedy) for feeding Hazleton as a compromise city to a gullible Government department.

Very truly yours,
E. V. MCCULLIAN,
Executive Secretary,
Panther Valley Industrial Commission.

(Copies to Hon. F. E. WALTER, Hon. I. D. FENTON.)

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has stated, Congress intends to see that the taxpayers' money is well and wisely spent.

From the facts and evidence presented in the hearings, as well as the subsequent evidence which developed, and has been presented here, the Appropriations Committee in order to carry out the letter and spirit of the authorization act had no other alternative but to recommend cancelation of the funds now available, and to reappropriate funds for the construction of the Anthracite Research Laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as recommended by the Bureau of Mines' engineers who surveyed all the 35 sites that were made available.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself; and that the first paragraph be read before the Committee rises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3123, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, Tuesday of this week in the city of Newburyport, Mass., the Newburyport plan to reduce prices of consumer goods went into effect and already, this experiment has taken on national significance with the eyes of the Nation focused on this drive to stabilize our economy in accordance with the President's plea recently that prices be reduced.

I am proud to state that I have the honor of representing the district in which Newburyport is located, and I hasten to congratulate its business leaders and people in being the first city of the Nation to undertake a program calling for a roll-back of 10 percent in the prices embracing all goods and services.

Designed to halt the postwar inflation spiral, stimulate buying, increase purchasing power, the plan is moving along with great speed and success and should pave the way for the parade of cities and towns throughout the country in this remarkable movement.

Enthusiasm is needed on the part of all for the success of such a plan and enthusiasm is running high in Newburyport and spreading to surrounding cities and towns. The following editorial by the Newburyport Daily News speaks for itself:

THE NEWBURYPORT PLAN—LET'S ALL SUPPORT IT

Primarily, the Newburyport plan for a 10-percent price reduction on all permissible goods and services, effective here tomorrow, has been devised to help you, the consumer, to buy some things you want, at figures below the unprecedentedly high level which have been reached in the postwar inflation spiral.

It is also geared to help your neighbor, the merchant, who has begun to suffer through public resistance to high prices and mounting inventories.

In a larger, more idealized sense, the plan may be regarded as the spearhead of a national movement to adjust an economic machine, seriously out of balance. Widespread recognition of the Newburyport plan will make our city famous as the place where a great idea was originated and developed. Who knows how far-reaching, how momentous the results may be?

The public has a serious responsibility in helping make the plan work. If the public fails to respond the Newburyport plan will go down in history as a flop and a folly. We can't let that happen! It won't happen!

It would be asking you too much to enjoin you to go out tomorrow and buy something you don't want or need. But if there are things you need, services you desire, join the eager trade in Newburyport parade we expect to form tomorrow and continue for the duration of the price-cutting experiment.

Remember that old song, Let's Have Another Cup of Coffee and Let's Have Another Piece of Pie? This is not a depression, but it is an economic crisis the businessmen of your city have decided to become pioneers in meeting. Get into the spirit of the song!

Get behind the Newburyport plan. Think it, talk it, act on it! Get out and make Newburyport cash registers tinkle, in a symphony whose echoes shall be heard from coast to coast!

This is big. Be a part of it!

Mr. Chairman, as its representative in Congress, I am pleased to re-echo this symphony of action toward stabilization and to the representatives of the people of this Nation, urge support of this drive in order that our economy can be more evenly balanced in the quickest possible time, and that prosperity be retained in this country of ours.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am opening general debate on the bill H. R. 3123, which, in my opinion, is the soundest Interior Department appropriation bill that has been before the House in many a year. This subcommittee has labored hard and diligently to get the facts upon which it could base sound judgment, and it has come forth with a bill that represents sound judgment. None less than the President of the United States slapped this subcommittee on the wrist last year when it appropriated and made available in the fiscal year 1947, the present fiscal year, $465,500,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations. The following table, furnished me by the Budget Bureau, shows the $465,000,000 that was available in appropriations and contract authorizations for obligation during the fiscal year 1947:

Statement of appropriations and contract authorizations available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947

PART 1. AGENCIES COVERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION ACT

Description	1947 appropriations and contract authorizations [1]	Unexpended balances of prior-year appropriations and contract authorizations as of June 30, 1946 [2]			Total appropriations and contract authorizations available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947
		Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
			Available for obligation after June 30, 1946	Not available for obligation after June 30, 1946	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)+(3)
Department of the Interior:					
Office of the Secretary	$4,247,294	$909,000	$13,000	$934,000	$4,260,294
Commission of Fine Arts	10,000			1,000	10,000
High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands		25,000	77,000		77,000
Bonneville Power Administration	12,470,000	12,840,000	2,934,000		15,404,000
Office of Fishery Coordination		4,000		18,000	
Solid Fuels Administration for War	2,950,000	48,000		572,000	2,950,000
Southwestern Power Administration	7,600,000	491,000	200,000	67,000	7,800,000
Grazing Service	1,327,500	104,000	630,000	43,000	1,957,500
General Land Office	8,756,726	837,000	6,146,000	200,000	14,902,726
Bureau of Indian Affairs	40,705,879	5,905,000	4,554,000	2,400,000	45,259,879
Bureau of Reclamation	115,795,543	8,025,000	142,555,000	23,000	258,350,543
Geological Survey	9,709,072	2,334,000	230,000	[3] −1,095,000	9,939,072
Bureau of Mines	10,845,515	4,179,000	23,109,000	831,000	33,954,515
Gas and Oil Division		1,000		16,000	
National Park Service	25,285,455	1,823,000	14,831,000	145,000	40,116,455
Fish and Wildlife Service	10,708,502	3,892,000	486,000	2,851,000	11,194,502
Government in the Territories	9,372,590	4,893,000	9,993,000	2,000	19,365,590
War Relocation Authority		1,293,000	29,000	4,976,000	29,000
Claims and judgments		275,000			
Private relief acts		1,000			
Total, covered by the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act	259,784,076	47,879,000	205,787,000	11,984,000	465,571,076

[1] Includes appropriations in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946. Excludes appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.
[2] Excludes balances which lapsed and reverted to the surplus funds on June 30, 1946.
[3] Repayment will take care of overobligation.

How did the Department of the Interior arrive at that situation? Let us see. You remember that last year the appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the regular annual supply bill was $252,300,000, in round figures. This is considerably less than they had available for expenditure and for obligation. That is the difference between the $465,500,000 they actually had available according to

the Budget Bureau and the annual supply bill. Where did they get the $465,000,000 then to spend? They got it because the Interior Department had practiced the habit of getting more money than they could spend in any fiscal year. The construction items were made available until expended and carried over from year to year when the Department could not spend them. Instead of trying to keep a safe kitty of funds behind them to cover emergencies, they just piled up as much as they could. In my opinion, the bureaucrats in the Department were certainly trying to pile up funds that they knew they could not spend in the year's time for which they were asking money in each annual appropriation bill.

The President has liberalized his original special antiinflation treatment of the Bureau of Reclamation twice. He slapped this subcommittee, and he slapped the Congress, and he slapped the members of his own party with a freeze order. In other words, his freeze order said that amount of money appropriated last year, if expended and obligated, would be inflationary not only n the fiscal year 1947, but he also had his eye on the future. He said the appropriations for construction should not be expended at a higher rate in the fiscal year 1948.

On October 26, on the eve of election, he liberalized his freeze order with reference to the Bureau of Reclamation. In the first instance, on August 2, they had available in the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure some $209,000,000 which had been piled up from the 1947 annual supply bill and previous years. The President in effect said, "If the Bureau of Reclamation spends that much money, that is inflationary. More than that, next year it will be inflationary. So I limit you for each of the fiscal years." This is the President talking now, just as we were adjourning the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. His own party had appropriated the money and had followed through the recommendations of his budget estimates. He said, "$85,000,000 is all you can spend this fiscal year for the Bureau of Reclamation, and $85,000,000 the next fiscal year."

On the basis of the President's freeze order we would not have to appropriate for the Bureau of Reclamation for two and one-half fiscal years. It is just as simple as dividing $209,000,000 by the rate of expenditure of the President, $85,000,000 a year. On October 22 he liberalized the order and allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to spend $25,000,000 more, or $110,000,000, leaving $99,000,000 still frozen.

As late as January 10, 1947, 40 days before the Bureau of Reclamation hearings were started before our subcommittee, he had only released $130,000,000 for expenditure in this fiscal year out of $209,000,000 available for construction to this one agency. The rest of this amount is tied up as indicated in the report. It is tied up today, and all of the hue and cry about the action of this subcommittee does not explain why members of his own party from August 2, 1946, to this very day have not sponsored a bill to unfreeze these funds which have already been appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I introduced a resolution a few days ago to try to unfreeze these funds because it seems to me that when the Chief Executive can freeze moneys appropriated by the Congress, whether it be the Department of Interior or for national defense, he therefore controls the pursestrings and certainly such an act by the Chief Executive should not be permitted by the Congress, particularly in this case where he signed the bill with a half a dozen pens and gave people the pens as souvenirs and said, "This is a fine bill; please step forward and get your pen."

On August 2 the House adjourned. On August 3, in a letter dated August 2, the freeze order was in effect. I have a resolution in now. I hope the committee will see fit to act on it to see tha' not only these funds but future funds appropriated by the Congress cannot be frozen or made inactive by the Chief Executive.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit me to make a correction, I did not say that the present majority party had not introduced a resolution to unfreeze these funds. I said none of the President's party had introduced a bill to unfreeze these funds.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the committee able to ascertain whether or not the authority under which the President proceeded to freeze these funds still exists?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The committee did not inquire into that because this is a committee to appropriate. We assumed since the President froze the funds they would be available in the next fiscal year and we made our appropriation on that basis. But I would like to discuss that a little further as we go along.

There has been a lot of loose talk about this bill discontinuing many worth-while projects. I call your attention to the committee report on pages 3, 4, 5, and 6, to the amount available at the beginning of the fiscal year 1947, which is July 1, 1946, calendar year. The amount that the President froze is in the second column and the net available allowed for expenditure by the President at the end of the fiscal year 1947. You will note that in the first place there had been voted for construction $287,908,605. The President reserved of this and froze so that it could not be spent $125,193,605. That $125,193,605 is there. It is in the President's hands. It is available to him. He can freeze it or he can unfreeze it. People who have been circulating this information about the committee's action, that we are discontinuing worthwhile projects, need just to look at these first few pages of the committee report to understand fairly and squarely that the committee has not been penny pinching in the appropriation of these 1948 fiscal year funds. It is quite obvious that the people have been circulating this information for political purposes or in a downright misrepresentation of the facts. It is quite obvious that a smear campaign is under way, but this Congress will not be deterred in its efforts to restore efficiency in the Department of the Interior.

If we did not appropriate a cent for the Bonneville Power Administration, for instance, it would have to expend, in the fiscal year 1948, $500,000 more than the President let them spend this fiscal year.

Let us take a look at the table on page 3. You will see they had available $23,000,000. How much did the President freeze? Eleven million seven hundred fifty-five thousand dollars. How much did that leave them to spend? Eleven million three hundred ten thousand dollars. So if we did not appropriate a cent they would have $500,000 more. The committee was very liberal with the Bonneville Power Administration. What did we allow them? Six million nine hundred seven thousand eight hundred dollars. Is this committee against the sound use of hydroelectric power in the West and Southwest with that kind of a record?

Let us look at another item. You will remember that last year on the floor of the House there was voted for the Southwest Power Administration $7,500,000, for the transmission and sale of electric energy from two dams, Norfork and Denison Dams, in Arkansas and Texas, respectively. That was appropriated by the Congress, signed and sealed by the President, and the money became available to the Southwest Power Administration. How did the President treat those funds that Congress had so liberally voted? Well, he froze $3,700,000 of it, and that is still frozen. If we did not appropriate 1 cent for the Southwest Power Administration they would have only $100,000 less than the President let them spend this year. How much did this pinch-penny committee, as it has labeled, appropriate for the Southwest Power Administration? We have been very liberal in what we think is a sound program to get a return for the Government on the investment it has already made in those dams. If we provide the additional money, money in addition to the $7,500,000 that was voted last year, we can tie the two dams together. What is the situation in the Southwest? You have a negligible amount of water sometimes in a year, and you have flash floods. These dams were built for the purpose of storing the water that comes down the rivers during these flash floods. The firm power generated at any hydroelectric dam is power that is sure during all seasons of the year, all hours of the day. It is power generated from water at the low-water mark of the river. If you consider firm energy from these two dams separately you have a smaller amount of firm power to sell, but when you connect them together you can make the low water in one river, going through its dam generators complement the low water passing through the other dam generators in the other river, and get more firm power to sell. The Ad-

ministrator of the Southwest Power Administration estimates that from 10 to 30 percent more firm power would be generated at Southwest Power Administration if we provided the money to tie the two dams together. So it may look figure-wise, and the demagog may say we have cut the life out of the Southwest Power Administration, but on the basis of sound facts and return on Government investment to build up more firm power that can be marketed successfully, we provided the necessary amount, $1,246,000. That is the necessary amount.

One dime more cannot be defended at this time.

Now, let us look at the Indian Service. I am just covering construction items now because that is where the heat of criticism has been. We are labeled as destroying these great construction projects. The Indian Service has some construction items for irrigation, and buildings, and utilities, and roads.

On the first day of the present fiscal year, July 1, 1946, the Indian Service has $11,173,000. How much did the President freeze? He froze $6,289,838, and left them to spend this year $4,883,000.

If we do not appropriate one red cent for the Indian Service construction items for the fiscal year 1948, and if the President would just unfreeze the funds he has frozen they would have a million more to spend. What did the committee do? It considered the pleas of the Indian Service and the Indian population and the committee has looked upon the needs of the Indians and said: You need this much more money appropriated for your buildings and for your utilities to carry on an orderly program of construction; so we appropriated liberally for the Indian Service, and with the freezing order funds they will have $11,736,838 for construction of irrigation systems, buildings, utilities, and roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. A few minutes ago the gentleman was discussing the question of the reduction of funds for the power section of the Department of the Interior. Control of power was given to the Department of the Interior under section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

I wish to advise the gentleman and the House that I have introduced a bill to repeal that section and to place the power authority back in the Federal Power Commission and under the Army engineers where it was in the first place.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his observation. We had to appropriate according to the law as it stands today and we have taken care of our responsibilities thereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Michigan has referred to a bill which he introduced. I noted with a great deal of interest the provisions of the bill; I have read it. I am just a little bothered to know whether it may not establish two or three different sales agencies to deal with power and whether or not it may not mean that we may have two or three different yardsticks to determine the proper price of Federal power.

Mr. DONDERO. If I may answer the gentleman——

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman to wait until we get to the theories and formulas of the basic legislation just a little later?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio regarding his comment about being liberal with the Indian Service? Does the gentleman refer only to construction funds?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I am referring to construction funds at this point; yes. I am taking up all the construction items because that is where the heat and criticism is being turned on the Committee and I want to challenge those who say we have ripped the West up the back.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I am wondering about is whether enough funds have been provided to operate the education facilities which your Indian Service already has.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I will get to that later.

Mr. CURTIS. Just one further question with reference to the freeze order on funds for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have not come to that item. Wait until I get to that.

Mr. CURTIS. I thought the gentleman had passed it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No, no.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well; I will wait.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. With the amounts allowed in the bill for the Bureau of Reclamation for the fiscal year 1948 we have provided $11,000,000 more for the fiscal year 1948 than the President allowed them to spend this year.

Bear in mind we have also allowed with the frozen funds and the amount of new money, $11,000,000 more for expenditure in the fiscal year 1948 than the President allowed to be spent in the fiscal year 1947.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the Committee that they want the President to unfreeze these funds and make available for construction the money that the Congress has already appropriated?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Let me continue and I will answer the gentleman categorically in a moment. I do not want to break up the continuity of my statement.

These facts effectively answer the campaign of misinformation that has been spread across the country and especially among the Western States.

We have some construction items in the National Park Service. Last year they had available $25,622,000. How much did the President freeze? Seventeen million dollars. He only let them spend $8,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee recognizes that there will be a large customer population in all the parks this year. We know they have been on a stand-by, caretaker basis during the war. We want to fulfill our obligations and provide the necessary roads, buildings, and facilities to take care of the public so that they may fully enjoy the great national resources in these parks. So the committee was very liberal and, although the Park Service would have twice as much money to spend on roads and trails and on buildings and physical improvements as it had last year if we did not appropriate another cent, the committee has fulfilled its obligation to the public and has provided some $2,650,000 more for this purpose.

Turning next to government in the Territories, we have a little different consideration there. The General Staff has emphasized the importance of rebuilding the Alaska Railroad; it has emphasized the importance of building roads, so that in case of a national emergency the great Territory of Alaska may be protected by the Army. So the President's freeze order did not apply last year to the funds appropriated for construction of roads and trails, as well as other buildings and utilities in Alaska. We have allowed the full amount of the budget estimate so that there will be no question but that any spot in the Territory of Alaska may be protected by our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, that winds up all of the construction items in the bill.

The people of the West are just as eager as are the people of the remainder of the country to see that the people's money is wisely spent. Westerners can see better than anyone else the carelessness and lack of sound planning that has marred some of the worth-while projects in their parts of the country. They welcome the effort of this Republican Congress to see that an orderly program for helping the West in developing its natural resources shall be put into effect, and they want that done now.

Now, the President's freeze orders did not affect only 1947 funds. The President had his eye on 1948 funds. In every letter to the Interior Department, he indicates that construction programs for public works in the whole Government should be cut in half. And he indicated that the other half would be used in the fiscal year 1948. Bear in mind, he cut the Bureau of Reclamation 60 percent.

Apparently the President thought it was more offensive to inflationary pressures than any other item in his public-works program, because you will note on page 44 of the hearings a statement by the President dated October 24 where he is only cutting all public works from $1,600,000,000 to $900,000,000. He is only cutting other public works across the board for every executive agency 43 percent at this rate.

Now, we certainly are taking the President at his word. We are not assuming that he is hypocritical by cutting the over-all public works appropriations 43 percent and singling out reclamation in the first instance for a 60-percent cut.

We are glad to have President Truman cooperate with us in this antiinflation program. The subcommittee, too, believes that inflation is deadly in its economic effect to the whole Nation. The subcommittee agrees with the President that public works expenditures are inflationary, when the Government bids in the market price for critically short materials and runs the price up on them to increase the cost of living across the board for the common man.

Now, the only difficulty with the President's letter is that his departments are trying to double-cross him. I assume that the President is sincere. We are trying to uphold his hand. But his Interior budget estimates call for construction funds of $163,810,000. Add that to the amount which he has presently frozen, available now, and which will be available in the fiscal year 1948—the same as the new funds in this bill—and he would get an over-all expenditure in 1948 of $292,071,946, for Interior Department construction.

Now did the Department of Interior double-cross the President in presenting these inflated requests? Have they violated the President's ultimatum? Or have we been handed a watered budget?

Certainly the President does not want us to appropriate his full budget request so that he can slap on the wrist a Republican Congress committed to cutting the fat and oil from Government expenditures.

We are not going to let the Department of the Interior double-cross our antiinflation program, and we have brought in a bill that, in my opinion, is still too high on the yardstick of the rate of expenditure that the President has allowed this year for construction in the west, in Alaska and all over the United States.

The President allowed in 1947 for construction $162,715,000. This bill, with the frozen funds, allows 25 percent more. Can the New Deal propaganda agencies say that we have been parsimonious with the Department of Interior?

No; there is nothing wrong with this bill. There is nothing wrong except in the 1947 fiscal year the Department of the Interior has about $300,000 to propagandize their point of view. This committee has been lambasted from the afternoon it marked up this bill in executive session. This subcommittee has observed the rules of comity between the two Houses of Congress. This subcommittee has sat quietly by as statements were made in another body based upon a misapprehension of the facts, and while those statements have gone out all over the country and while they have been reechoed with this $300,000 propaganda machine, the committee has been defenseless, and this is the first day that we have had an opportunity to present our views in any forum before the American public. You will find in the paragraphs of the report of the committee describing these actions that a major portion of the cut in the Secretary's office from $1,600,000 to $1,000,000 is to be borne by the Personnel Administration, by the Division of Information and by the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

I believe that if the great widespread activities of the Department of the Interior are sound, they will rise and stand upon the basis of their worth. If they are all good, if everything they are doing is beneficial to the public, then they do not need $300,000 to propagandize and misrepresent the facts to the public, misrepresent the subcommittee, and put us in a bad light with the country until we get an opportunity to speak our piece and make the facts known.

Now, are we in a fair fight with these propagandists? Are we? Well, I will say we are not. Only four members of this subcommittee of seven are trying to hold the position against this great Department's inflationary movement. We have only four members of the subcommittee trying to hold down inflation. What chance have four people, taking care of their constituents' business, taking care of all of the other jobs that come to a Congressman's desk, and trying to fight a great landed interest like that? I have faith that the American people will get to know the truth and that they will come forward with the right answers and will support the action of this committee. The Republican Party must face the issue with the President. Last year a New Deal majority voted new money for the 1947 fiscal year for the over-all expenditure of the Government. Thirty-three billion of new money was voted in the annual supply bills for all executive agencies for the fiscal year 1947.

The Republican Party cannot avoid the fact that there was available for all Government agencies, for expenditure in this 1947 fiscal year, not $33,000,000,000 of new money that we voted but $57,000,000,000. We talk about cutting back expenditures to $37,000,000,000. A great hue and cry has been raised that we are going to fail. I tell you that we can make good every tax cut, we can make good every promise that we made to the electorate, if we take cognizance of this great, vast, surplus of moneys which are held in a kitty by the executive branch of the Government. Nobody will challenge these figures.

New money appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 during the last calendar year was $33,019,328,535. I have a letter from the Budget Bureau, which I shall insert in the RECORD at this point, which shows that there is available for all departments and agencies of Government for this fiscal year $57,674,586,235.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: The information requested in your letters of July 3 and July 27 on the balances of appropriations and contract authorizations as of June 30, 1946, which are available for the fiscal year 1947, is contained in the enclosed tables, itemized by agencies and bureaus grouped and totaled according to the annual appropriation acts. For your convenience we have also shown on this table the 1947 appropriations and contract authorizations and the sum of the appropriations and balances available to each agency for obligation during the fiscal year 1947.

The amounts shown include all general and special fund appropriations but do not include trust fund appropriations. Column 1 includes the appropriations and contract authorizations made available for obligation during 1947 by the annual and supplemental appropriation acts, plus amounts becoming available under permanent appropriations. Appropriations made to liquidate contract authorizations are eliminated in combining the appropriations and contract authorizations in order to avoid the duplication which would otherwise occur. The total thus arrived at of appropriations and contract authorizations made available to all the agencies of the Government by the 1947 annual and supplemental appropriation acts amounts to $33,019,328,535.

The unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, as shown in columns 2, 3, and 4 of the attached table exclude the balances of 1944 appropriations which lapsed and reverted to the surplus fund of the Treasury on June 30, 1946. The balances shown in these columns also exclude the amounts rescinded by title II of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 23, 1946. These unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, are broken down between unliquidated obligations (column 2) and unobligated balances (columns 3 and 4). The unobligated balances are broken down in turn between those available (column 3) and those not available (column 4) for obligation in 1947. The unobligated balances not available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 4) are the balances of the 1945 and 1946 annual appropriations which expired on June 30, 1945 and 1946, respectively, and are no longer available for obligation. The amounts available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 3) are the balances of continuing appropriations, which remain available indefinitely.

The total appropriations and contract authorizations available to the various agencies for obligation during the fiscal year 1947 of $36,864,622,235 (column 5) are the sum of the 1947 appropriations and contract authorizations (column 1) and the unobligated balances available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 3). The unliquidated obligations of $20,809,964,000 (column 2) may be added to the total amount available for obligation (column 5) to arrive at the total available for expenditure (disbursement) during 1947, or subsequently. This total amount available for expenditure is $57,674,586,235.

Very truly yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Administrative Assistant.

What does that mean? Twenty-four billion dollars has been cached away, $24,000,000,000 the executive branch of the Government wants to hold onto from year to year, and a part of that is $465,500,000 in the Department of the Interior. This appropriation bill for the Interior Department is a fight to drag out of the sack some of that $24,000,000,000. It should not be there. Congress, if it does its duty, and this Republican Congress will, will start dragging out of the sock funds that are not in use but which are available for expenditure the same as if we voted them anew last year.

Now I want to analyze this $465,500,000 that was available at the beginning of the present fiscal year—one of the reasons why the President had to present the freeze order in order to stop

inflation. How does it work out? According to the Budget Bureau, $195,952,130 is available for administration, operation, and research, available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947. The next table is the same "in the sock" money represented by construction, and I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point.

Department of the Interior—Statement of unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, and appropriations for fiscal year 1947, for construction accounts

Organization unit and appropriation title	Unexpended balances, June 30, 1946		Appropriations, 1947	Total available for expenditures, 1947
	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system	$12,839,923	$2,433,604	[1] $12,470,000	$27,743,527
War Relocation Authority, transferred from: Community facilities, defense public works, Office of Administrator, Federal Works Agency	253	4,216		4,469
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Construction			7,500,000	5,500,000
Public Works Administration, act of 1938	416,460			416,460
General Land Office:				
Working fund (access roads)	17,082	37,518		54,600
Working fund (public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks)	2,292	16,608		18,900
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Construction:				
Irrigation systems (reimbursable)	99,090	631,702	[1] 924,038	1,654,830
Buildings and utilities, Indian Service	9,033	1,861,582	3,023,800	4,894,415
Roads, Indian reservations	357,545	371,587	[1] 3,700,000	4,429,132
Bureau of Reclamation:				
Reclamation fund, special fund, construction:				
Altus	17	1,991,225	2,664,610	4,655,852
Belle Fourche		28,547		28,547
Boise-Anderson ranch	100,615	288,166	2,040,735	2,429,516
Boise drainage		143,523		143,523
Boise-Payette	28,746	3,389,827	2,782,659	6,201,232
Carlsbad	12,887	34,747		47,634
Colorado-Big Thompson	48,717	109,383		158,100
Deschutes	135,905	1,380,597	1,716,837	3,233,339
Gila	35,605	36,510		72,115
Grand Valley		122,132		122,132
Humboldt		3,568		3,568
Hungry Horse	7,892	21,937		29,829
Hyrum		1,289		1,289
Kendrick	12,378	753,359	1,895,000	2,660,737
Klamath	84,086	1,282,805	1,281,605	2,648,496
Minidoka	11,231	646,912	1,000,000	1,658,143
Ogden River	6	40,007	62,000	102,013
Orland		35,000		35,000
Owyhee	1,704	209,557	125,000	336,261
Palisades	49,018	1,400,850	650,410	2,100,278
Paonia		848,471		848,471
Pine River		11,912		11,912
Provo River	65,585	1,534,877	2,223,520	3,823,982
Rio Grande—East Butte	28,132	893,731	360,675	1,282,534
Riverton	10,502	1,695,232	3,520,550	5,226,288
Salt River		394,261		394,261
San Luis Valley		1,000,000	650,410	1,650,410
Shoshone-Heart Mountain	13,735	1,316,170	1,917,672	3,247,577
Shoshone-Power	1,475	1,140,279		1,141,754
Shoshone-Willwood	356	70,439	196,895	267,690
Sun River	11,980	65,809	41,625	119,414
Tucumcari	15,763	1,985,116	1,738,000	3,738,879
Uncompahgre		5,182		5,182
Upper Snake River		25		25
Vale	51	139		190
Yakima		100,000		100,000
Yakima-Roza Division	101	1,637,822	2,597,100	4,235,023
Yuma		100,000		100,000
Total, reclamation fund, construction	676,487	24,719,406	27,465,303	52,861,196
Reclamation projects, payable from general fund:				
Gila project, Arizona (reimbursable)	83,190	1,500,036	2,000,000	3,583,226
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada (reimbursable)	157,614	7,844,270	7,500,000	15,501,884
Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California (reimbursable)	156,555	164,295		320,850
Central Valley project, California (reimbursable)	3,281,779	28,298,460	12,685,622	44,265,861
Kings River project, California			100,000	100,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado (reimbursable)	280,659	3,858,790	7,504,075	11,643,524
Pine River project, Colorado (reimbursable)	296	13,454		13,750
San Luis Valley project, Colorado (reimbursable)	273	385,172		385,445
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch (reimbursable)	192,984	316,128		509,112
Hungry Horse project, Montana (reimbursable)		1,491,256	867,210	2,358,466
Tucumcari project, New Mexico (reimbursable)	84,672	756,349		841,021
Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma (reimbursable)	31,338	433,650		464,988
Colorado River project, Texas (reimbursable)	3,873	46,346	68,400	118,619
Provo River project, Utah (reimbursable)	19,610	162		19,772
Columbia Basin project, Washington (reimbursable)	335,616	12,866,084	18,000,000	31,201,700
Yakima project, Washington, Roza division (reimbursable)	19,948	109,889		129,837
Water conservation and utility projects (reimbursable)	144,856	4,122,136	3,340,000	7,606,992
Fort Peck project, Montana (reimbursable)	18,029	992,602	932,893	1,943,524
Missouri River Basin (reimbursable) (no year)	140,083	8,960,273	17,500,000	26,600,356
Missouri River Basin (reimbursable)	36,663	749,084		785,747
Advances to Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project		1,175,382	433,605	1,608,987
Advances to Colorado River dam fund, All-American Canal		3,250,025	5,000,000	8,250,025
Colorado River front work and levee system	2,682	83,382	600,000	686,064
Valley gravity canal and storage project, Texas	5,037	1,716,023		1,721,060
Transferred from:				
Community facilities, defense public works, Office of Administrator, Federal Works Agency	34,896	286,702		321,598
Flood control, general, War Department	32	34,139		34,171
Geological Survey:				
Transferred from:				
Flood control, general, War Department	132,612	169,579		302,191
Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, War Department	24,431	42,962		67,393

[1] Includes maintenance and operation.

Department of the Interior—Statement of unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, and appropriations for fiscal year 1947, for construction accounts—Continued

Organization unit and appropriation title	Unexpended balances, June 30, 1946		Appropriations, 1947	Total available for expenditures, 1947
	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
Bureau of Mines:				
Construction and equipment of anthracite research laboratory			$450,000	$450,000
Synthetic liquid fuels	$2,845,817	$19,509,784	[2] 5,250,000	27,605,601
Construction and equipment of helium plants (national defense)	1,307,689	673,474		1,981,163
Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense)	20,810	37,381		58,191
National Park Service:				
Roads and trails, national parks, emergency construction	691	5,926		6,617
Roads and trails	136,220	3,819,676	[1] 6,000,000	9,955,896
Parkways			[1] 11,000,000	11,000,000
Physical improvements, buildings and utilities	9,216	167,665	1,330,000	1,506,881
Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, and George Washington Memorial Parkways	887,282	9,665,910		10,553,192
Fish and Wildlife Service: Construction of byproducts plant, Pribilof Islands, Alaska	14,937	41,283		56,220
Government in the Territories:				
Territory of Alaska:				
Wagon roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska (receipt limitation)	92,096		[1] 140,000	232,096
Construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska	821,363	50,000	[1] 2,600,000	3,471,363
Construction of Palmer-Richardson Road, Alaska (national defense)	83			83
Reconstruction and improvement of Richardson Highway, Alaska (national defense)	323,079		750,000	1,073,079
Government of the Virgin Islands:				
Transferred from: Community facilities, defense public works, Federal Works Agency	3,498			3,498
Puerto Rico: Emergency relief, revolving fund, act Feb. 11, 1936	116,400	2,927,096		3,043,496
Total, construction accounts, Department of the Interior	26,185,074	146,641,048	159,134,946	331,961,068

[1] Includes maintenance and operation.
[2] Includes research and operations.

The Budget Bureau says that, with trust funds and every other item, they have available for construction in the fiscal year 1947, $269,618,946. That gives you a sample of the problem. The subcommittee had to find out what was necessary to run the Department of the Interior on a more efficient basis in 1948. That shows you why there was a 10-pound record. I am not ashamed for one minute that we probably struck a new high in the number of pages and in the number of exhibits in conducting this hearing. We have had in the past a bunch of slipshod statements presented to the committee that are not backed up by the facts. This subcommittee intends to get the facts and it intends to be able to be in a position to prove those facts, one table against another. If you find two or three tables on the same subject you will know we are approaching it from different angles so that we can audit their books for them.

The Republican Party cannot avoid the issue that the President instead of having an over-all appropriation in 1947 of $33,000,000,000 has had $24,000,000,000 extra available to spend.

The Republican Party should either rescind that $24,000,000,000 or we ought to do in all the appropriation bills like this subcommittee did—count the $24,000,000,000 in, a part of which is frozen, because says the President, it is inflationary. In our approach to the appropriations for the 1948 fiscal year, that is exactly what we did. I think it is unsound to do otherwise. I think it would be indefensible when we have been committed to cut appropriations to the bone. If we take cognizance of this $24,000,000,000 kitty in the executive branch of the Government in our appropriation of funds for the 1948 fiscal year, I say again, we can make every promise of a tax cut to the Nation come true and we can substantially reduce the Federal debt. If we do as Mr. Krug would like to have us do, we would appropriate new money for the President and let him keep the $24,000,000,000 kitty in a frozen or inactive fund to release it in the campaign year of 1948 in an effort to whip every Republican Congressman. I am one subcommittee chairman that he could not whip with frozen funds or embarrass by freezing the money next August.

We come out on the floor and say to the House, "This is the kind of a bill we promised the electorate in 1946. This bill is an honest bill. It is an honest cut and consistent with our anti-inflation program for the fiscal year 1948."

Some folks have tried to make this a fight between the East and the West. As a matter of fact, that is a Krug political pipe dream. The New Deal bureaucrats are trying to create a rift in the Republican Party. But they will fail. The Republican Party is united for sound, economic appropriations, whether they be for something in the East, the West, the North, or the South.

The Department of the Interior has not cooperated with the subcommittee and will not cooperate with the Congress and reemphasize the most important parts of their program so that we can separate the wheat from the chaff. There are items in the bill not supported by the public for work provided in the budget estimates, so they go from one executive agency of the Government to the other drumming up business. In other words, if they cannot get the public to ask for it, then they get other Government agencies to ask for the services so they can keep the pay roll loaded. One such item appears in the Bureau of Mines. The committee very conscientiously is giving every taxpayer a fair break. Most of us when we pay our taxes only expect the blessings of liberty guaranteed by the Constitution and the protection of the Army and Navy. That is all we ask. Many people do not even own a suit of clothes, a pair of pants and vest, and coat to match. Well, then, why should the great corporations and why should individuals be able to get services from the Government and not pay for them?

There have been large items providing for special services to private enterprises with which they can make a profit. The committee eliminated such services to the oil and gas industry. One reason is that there is no basic authority for the activity. The other reason is if the Government is going to render these special services and gather statistics for the oil and gas industry, basic legislation ought to be adopted which would underwrite the cost of the special services, and private industry using them for profit should pay for them.

The Bureau of Mines proposed to give special free statistical services to the coal industry. When the Bituminous Coal Act was in force before the war, the industry underwrote the cost of this statistical service by a percentage of the coal produced. The Bituminous Coal Act has been liquidated, and during the war the Solid Fuels Administration took over the job as a war function. Now, the war is over. The Solid Fuels Administration is liquidated. What happens to the service? The Bureau of Mines proposes to do the same old job for free which the Government used to get paid for under the Bituminous Coal Act. The committee eliminated that fund. If industry wants it all well and good, but let them pay for it like they used to. So, the Bureau of Mines' estimate to continue a peacetime job for nothing so that private industry can make a profit is discontinued.

The committee says this special service without basic legislation should not be performed.

Commercial fisheries have gotten free service in past years. The committee did not cut them out altogether, because this approach has not come up before, but we have rolled them back to before-the-war and early war years. We think in the next 2 months basic legislation

can be adopted for this great industry to underwrite the cost of this commercial service, the same as we propose for the oil, gas, and coal industries. Wherever we could find the Government contributing to or underwriting completely programs that should be carried on by the States, the committee has eliminated or curtailed their operation. Several States have provisions in their laws that all children of their citizens should be educated. The committee cut the budget estimate for Indian education to $8,000,000, to give the States an opportunity to assume some of that responsibility under their respective State laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I please go on for a little bit? I will yield later.

We will look at this item very closely next year. The Indian Service has increased from $19,000,000 in 1933 to a request for $44,500,000 in 1948. We have rolled them back to $33,122,000. Remember when the Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934? The Indian Service Commissioner at that time stated that this act would mean economic freedom for the Indians. Since that time the miseries of the Indians have increased in proportion to the increase in appropriation. We have not cut the health and welfare items of the Indians, but we have cut the administrative expenses to the point of digging into the fat. This committee has appropriated funds for the Department of the Interior with an objective point of view, consistent with the mandate of the people given to us in November 1946. The main attack on the committee's action has been with reference to construction items and we repeat again that it is not wise management for the Government to plan to go forward with millions of dollars in construction at a time when private business is anxiously seeking in the market places the same commodities for which the Government will be priority buyer.

If construction projects requested by the Department of the Interior are allowed in full, the reclamation appropriations in this bill are difficult to handle, because the reclamation law is a hodgepodge of legislative bills and legislation on appropriation bills from 1902 to date. As a matter of fact, the legislative situation is so bad that the Bureau of Reclamation gets separate authorizations for projects, and then picks out the most favorable portions of every law enacted to date, to abuse the spirit and intent of the framers of the separate several laws. They try to pick out one sentence or one paragraph in the law instead of considering the entire law. They use one part of an act as a crutch in order to take advantage of the nonreimbursability features, and boldly proclaim the other sections of the law do not apply. There should be a complete recodification of the entire law in order to bring down consistent, sound policy to date, so that the committee can act intelligently on the requests. This situation has made appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation most difficult. There have been so many exceptions, divisions, and special provisions that we have a hard time making ourselves experts on the subject of considering these appropriations for reclamation. When the Appropriations Committee confronts the bureaus with their separate authorization, they run to cover under the 1939 act. At one point in the hearings Commissioner Straus quoted the directives of the flood-control law for the formula for the disposition of power from a reclamation project. That points up with the fact that we have no national power policy. It is not denied by the Bureau of Reclamation. It is simple and obvious that flood-control dams are only required to return investment allocated to power. No interest; nothing else. Reclamation projects are required to return investment in power, plus interest at 3 percent, and irrigation investment without interest beyond the water user's ability to pay.

The Interior Department is charged with the responsibility of selling power at the cheapest possible rate to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at flood-control dams. It is charged with the responsibility of making reclamation dams feasible and the only way they can be made feasible is for power to pay some of the irrigation freight. It is obvious that the two policies are inconsistent, incompatible, and that there ought to be a complete review of the whole power law to see if we are not running into a set of facts that means disaster for the West, for the South, for the East, and for the North.

Obviously, reclamation dams must charge more for electricity than flood-control dams. We are approaching a time now when flood-control dams will be backing water up against reclamation dams, and it is plain to see that flood-control power sold in the same transmission area with reclamation power will break the feasibility of the reclamation projects. That is simple, that is elementary. To have them in the same transmission area where there is the same amount of water to run the machinery of each kind of dam, you are running into real trouble. So you have reclamation in competition with flood control; it is the same as free labor versus slave labor where one has to get more money to exist than the other.

See what happened up in the Columbia River where, the Interior officials have avoided the unsound situation by creating the Bonneville Power Administration, a marketing agency within the Department. They have settled the differences in these pay-out requirements by contract in order to cover up the inconsistencies in the two laws for the two dams, on the same river, that have been joined together in one transmission system. They have provided in the contract that the War Department dam would have to return 2½ percent interest a year by contract without authority of law, instead of both agencies sitting around the conference table with Members of Congress and telling us that they had reached the point where they have an unsound program. Instead of that they try to cover it up by a marketing-agency contract with the War Department and the Reclamation Bureau.

This committee must look at appropriations as a board of directors would look at expenditure of funds in a private corporation. There is nothing more nor less in the 10 pounds of the hearings than an effort to try to put the Department's huge and vast resources, owned by the Government, where they can be maintained on a sound business basis.

I contend that when the Columbia Basin is fully developed as is presently authorized; when the dams presently authorized are constructed, you will have, on the Columbia River, water backed up by flood-control dams against reclamation dams. When that happens you will find that you have to join them together in a valley authority. How many people in the West want to belong to a Columbia Valley Authority? How many? And yet if you allow this situation to continue until all the dams are constructed you will find it will be a fait accompli—it will be accomplished—and you cannot do anything about it.

This committee wants to see the program for the West put upon a sound basis.

Now, let us go on a step further. The Columbia Basin, as you know, has an unlimited amount of water. My, the huge and tremendous amount of electric energy that can be generated there. Tremendous. And already there is authorized several miles away, over in western Montana, in the Bonneville Power Administration, a dam. One million five hundred thousand dollars is carried in this bill for that dam to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Its power will be sold by the Bonneville Power Administration.

How will that power be sold by the Bonneville Power Administration that goes across the panhandle of Idaho? Bonneville Power Administration has a 5-year-plan, and I have it with me here, the advance program of a system of development for the Bonneville Power Administration. You will find a map of their program, and you will see that the Bonneville Power Administration also proposes to transmit electric energy into the larger portion of southern Idaho.

The cost of the generation of electric energy on these Idaho reclamation dams per kilowatt-hour is much higher than it is in the Columbia Basin, but just the same they will be in the transmission area of the Bonneville Power Administration. There is the transmission area of the Columbia Dam and the Bonneville Dam. They are in the area where they must sell their power which costs more per kilowatt to generate. Already Minidoka costs 3 mills plus per kilowatt-hour to generate power. They will be in competition with this cheap 2-mill rate of the Bonneville Administration. Obviously your Idaho projects with less water are not going to be feasible. If the Bonneville Power Administration and

the Columbia system are extended to Idaho, multiple-purpose dams there are not going to be feasible. This committee, as the board of directors, wants to know what the answer is. Are we going to provide funds for these projects in Idaho when we know that its people will be coming to Congress some day and asking for relief? How can they sell 3-mill power in the area of Minidoka, Palisades, and Anderson Ranch projects in competition with the 2-mill power of the Bonneville Administration generated on the Columbia River? It cannot be done, and instead of getting the pay-back we expect to get, we will have to have the Government subsidize these projects, which is an insult to the people of Idaho. Would you throw them on the mercy of the Government and upon the mercy of the country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what is the other thing we can do? The next thing we can do is to say: "O. K., you are in the Columbia River Basin. Columbia will bail you out." If the people of the West want to see a great valley authority develop, that is O. K., but all the information that I can get as chairman of the subcommittee says that each irrigation district wants to be independent with their own project. They want their projects to be sound, and I am for that. I think we ought to write the kind of policy that will make every one of them sound.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask a pointed question. I have been trying to follow the gentleman, but I have not been able to understand how we can build two systems of dams on the same river so that the water will back up into each other. We like to build multiple-purpose dams on western rivers. I will look into that a little further.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Already there are two types of dams there on the Columbia. There is a reclamation dam, the Grand Coulee, and the flood-control dam—Bonneville. There will be a number of dams that were presented by the Bonneville Administration in last year's hearings which shows a tremendous amount of power. The Bonneville Administration spent hundreds of thousands of dollars figuring out ways and means of marketing the power that will be generated at the War Department dams and at the reclamation dams.

Mr. MURDOCK. To come to the point, what is the committee's justification for cutting the budget estimate on Davis Dam from $18,000,000 to $6,200,000? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The committee has been consistent with the President's anti-inflation program, and the over-all figure shows that we have been more liberal with the Reclamation Bureau than the President has been this year. Has the gentleman introduced a bill to unfreeze the funds of any reclamation project that were frozen by the President last August? Answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I have not introduced such a measure.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Then why is the gentleman kicking about this committee's action when we provide $11,000,000 for reclamation?

Mr. MURDOCK. That does not bear on my question. The point is, we are trying to build a dam costing $70,000,000 and do it in 5 years. How can you do that at the rate of $6,000,000 annually?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Ask the President. He set the pace. The committee is trying to provide funds for the sound development of the West. Did the gentleman complain about the President? No. He sits quietly by and says: "If the President of my party does it, it is O. K., but if a committee tries to be consistent in its anti-inflation program that we have committed ourselves to last November, then they are skunks."

Mr. Chairman, I think we have developed the point far enough.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the action of the majority of this committee will delay the completion of the Columbia River Basin project from 1951 to 1965?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I will ask the gentleman, did he complain when the President froze the Columbia River Basin project?

Mr. ROONEY. I have not heard all of the debate by the gentleman from Ohio, but he continuously refers to a date of August 2, 1946.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is a very important date.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to show the gentleman exactly what the President said at a later date concerning every appropriation for which moneys are now asked.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have read completely the President's statement, and it is in the hearings in full; every letter and every directive that the President and Mr. Steelman wrote to the Department of the Interior. There is no secret about that from beginning to end. As a matter of fact, the last letter was written to the Department just 10 days before we started hearings on this bill, when he unfroze the funds to $130,000,000 for over-all construction expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation. Did the gentleman ask any questions? Did he criticize the President in the hearings for freezing these funds amounting to $209,000,000, available for expenditure, down to $130,000,000? No, the gentleman was strangely quiet. The President could do no harm. But if the committee, standing by the Republican policy of anti-inflation, gives them $11,000,000 more, we have been inconsistent.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Apparently the committee thought that the President's freeze order had a lot of merit to it, and what I want to know is whether the argument of the President that he wants to combat inflation by that type of reduction is the pattern that this committee has set in its appropriations for the Interior Department?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee appropriates money. Last year the committee appropriated $209,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, and the President would not spend it. Now, I will ask the gentleman, in these 3 months and a half or nearly 4 months that we have been in session, has he filed a bill to unfreeze the funds?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. When did he do it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I filed one yesterday.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. O. K. But that is long after this committee report made known the facts which we developed thoroughly, away back in February, that these funds were frozen, and we challenge you why, if the committee is wrong, you did not introduce a bill to unfreeze them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not the problem. Is the pattern the President set in his freeze order the pattern that you think ought to be followed? That is a simple question.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee only has control of the legislative branch of the Government. The President has control of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And you have control of the money.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. But you have made some promises, I suppose, to cut the fat and the oil out of the appropriations for every branch of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have not made any promises along that line.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask a question merely so that we can get an idea where we are. Does the bill contain anything which specifically and mandatorily requests the President to unfreeze the funds he has frozen, or does the bill say the President has frozen these funds? We are going on the theory that if he releases them and you add those to what we appropriate, you have this much more than you had last year.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee has taken cognizance of the fact that the President has available to him these frozen funds, and it has added to those funds the amounts that are necessary to keep them on a 25-percent higher rate of construction basis than presently the President permits.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the chairman think that specific legislation by the Congress is even necessary or would it have any effect if we did pass specific legislation to unfreeze these funds? Is that not a matter entirely in the hands of the President?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee has religiously stayed away in this bill

from trying to write legislation on an appropriation bill. It has some ideas which it thinks are good for the sound development of the natural resources of our country. We believe that the subcommittee's views are sound. We could have written some legislation that might be helpful, but we did not. When it came to freezing funds, we did not legislate on that subject either, because that is a legislative matter and the legislative committee should do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the chairman does not think that it actually is necessary to have any legislation if the President will merely rescind the action he has already taken?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is right; that is all he needs to do.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the chairman of the subcommittee contend that the sum of $85,826,767 of appropriations heretofore made has been frozen by the President?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Yes; it has been frozen.

Mr. BARRETT. In view of the fact that the President has frozen that amount of money from last year's appropriation, has the Bureau of Reclamation obligated all or any part of that money?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The freeze order did not affect obligations, the freeze order reflected and limited only expenditures. The Bureau of Reclamation contended all the way through the hearings that they could obligate capital contracts in a larger amount than the freeze order, but the earnings under those contracts that were obligated should not exceed the $130,000,000. It has no reference to the amount they have obligated. All they had to watch was the earnings under the contract, that they stayed within the $130,000,000.

Mr. BARRETT. It is not true, then, that for the fiscal year 1948 the Bureau of Reclamation will be able to obligate only $62,000,000, being the new money that you have appropriated in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. We appropriate money; we do not appropriate obligations.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that very well, but the point I am trying to determine here is if the Bureau of Reclamation has obligated the entire $85,000,000 which the President froze last August. Then of course the Bureau will not have any new money available except the money that is herein appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, Secretary Krug's condemnation of this bill reminds me of a basso profundo walking out from the wings on Truman's grand opera anti-inflation production, stepping to the footlights and singing the popular ditty, "All, or Nothing at All," while the chorus of spenders, the tenors, altos, and sopranos of the New Deal, tiptoe and kick in tights across the stage. And they get their cue from the White House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Budget Bureau has made a request to Congress for $295,000,000 to run the Interior Department. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department, of which I happen to be a member, has cut that to $156,000,000. Let us try to see in simple language what that means.

Fred Allen, the radio comedian, probably one of the highest-priced comedians in radio, was taken off the air last week for 35 seconds. There appeared in the papers on Monday last a statement by him as to how much the 35 seconds he was off the air had cost the people that were sponsoring him, just 35 seconds, and how ruthless the broadcasting company was in taking him off the air. He said the way the broadcasting company took him off the air and how cruel and nearsighted they were reminded him of the time when he went into a pool parlor years ago and rented a pool table for an hour, for which he generally paid 60 cents; we all know that. When he went to shoot, somebody had taken the cue and he could not shoot. Not only did this committee that I am on take the cue, but they even took the balls to make sure there would be no game.

Back in the days of the depression the American Chamber of Commerce used to sing a song called Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf. The chambers of commerce used to open up every meeting with that song. Now, I had not heard about the big bad wolf since the early thirties until the day that this committee functioned. Every time any of the members on the majority side got a liberal idea or a progressive thought in their minds and were going to execute it, they were threatened, "If you do, I will take in the big, bad wolf," who was the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations—and he votes. That is the kind of difficulty we had in putting this bill together.

Let us see what this bill does. During this week two Members of Congress voted their convictions about a man who appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities of this Congress for saying that Russia probably was a great country and was cited by that committee for contempt. Only two Members of the Congress voted to sustain that man.

But let us turn to the fish and wildlife item that is in this bill. We cut it in half. The fish and wildlife perform a service that is rendered not only to the sportsmen of America, to the men that fish for sport, but to the men who make a living going out in the fogs and storms and everything like that. What did we do?

We had a bill before the Congress a couple of years ago, if my memory serves me right, and only one gentleman voted in the negative against that bill. He was from Ohio. That was the lease-lend bill. Under that bill, we gave to Russia, mind you—and every Republican and Democrat in this House, except one, voted for that bill—we gave to Russia 10 of the finest equipped ships in the world for research in the fishing business. The Russian fishermen go into the Seven Seas and they have already discovered where the fish beds are and where they play around. They can go and get the fish. But what have we done for John American? Remember, we gave Russia 10 of these boats. The United States Government does not have one of the boats. In this year's budget was an appropriation for one boat for the purpose of getting this information for the fishermen of America and the people of America who earn their living by fishing. We turned them down. We would not give an American 1 boat, but we gave Russia 10 boats and almost everybody in this Congress voted for it.

I wonder how they will ever record that down at the Archives? How will that be recorded in history—that they condemned one man and only two people voted against it—but to build and give a boat to America—oh, no, we cannot do that—that is for America.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the lease-lend boats which were given to Russia, that was under lend-lease. Therefore why does not your administration get them back?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about Americanism and not administrationism. I said every Republican and Democrat in the House voted for that measure at that time, and rightfully so.

Mr. KEAN. Why do you not get them back now if they were under lend-lease?

Mr. KIRWAN. The day we gave them the boats we were satisfied to give them and to give them everything they wanted to save this country and help win the war. Every Republican and every Democrat was satisfied.

Mr. KEAN. But that was under lend-lease.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is now being attended to, but let us appropriate for one boat for America. The lend-lease agreement is now being renegotiated between Russia and America, but in the interval that will take we still lack the one boat for our own people.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Going back to the gentleman's story about the pool table and the cue ball and the cue sticks, according to what has been said, President Truman has the table and we cannot play. That is what his freezing of the fund amounts to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Why did President Truman freeze the funds? Will you answer that?

Mr. McDONOUGH. You answer it.

Mr. KIRWAN. You proceeded to tell me that he had done it. Now tell me why did he do it? Why did President Truman freeze the funds?

Mr. McDONOUGH. You tell us.

Mr. KIRWAN. I can tell you very easily. After we adjourned and went back to the mountains and the seashore in July it was a godsend that somebody was down here in Washington looking after this country. We had strikes and unrest all over the Nation and President Truman froze those funds rather than put them in competition with private business. Business could not get the material to build homes for veterans, so President Truman said, "Freeze those funds and keep them frozen until the steel plants start producing steel."

Mr. McDONOUGH. But he still has the money.

Mr. KIRWAN. He still has the money and he is trying to get this committee here to let go of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the chairman of the subcommittee when he was on the floor a moment ago how he accounted for the cut of $18,000,000 down to $6,250,000 on the Davis Dam. His reply was, "Go and ask the President what he has done with the money. He has frozen it." He did not yield to me further. But as a matter of fact, the President did not freeze any funds or withhold any funds from the building of the Davis Dam. I was over there twice last autumn. The Utah Construction Co. was going along with the building and they were ahead of schedule, but they have only a limited amount of funds to work on, and they will be stopped if they do not have the funds granted in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The President's order did not stop any project under construction. It only delayed the beginning of new construction, but by this bill we will stop construction, stop contracts now under way in Central Valley, in the Columbia River Basin, on Davis Dam, and on numbers of projects, which will increase the over-all cost of every one of them and when they are completed it will make the cost of water and electricity higher for every user.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his contribution.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I have in my possession a letter from Acting Commissioner Warren, giving the dates. The letter was mailed as of November 4, 1946. In the letter he says:

> You may also be interested in knowing that this lifting of the monetary restriction on our construction program will permit the awarding of additional contracts for construction and materials on the Columbia Basin project.

The point I want to emphasize is this: There may have been a freeze order. I am not contesting that, but I am here saying that that freeze order varied with projects and with degrees of construction on those projects.

Mr. KIRWAN. After that date in August when he issued the freeze order, it was reconsidered again when materials for construction became available and then the President said, writing to the Chief of the Budget, that "in 1948 I would like to see them spend up to $177,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was very much interested in the fact that the gentleman from Washington called attention to the unfreezing on the 4th of November. Could the gentleman tell us how many other projects were unfrozen on the 4th of November 1946?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I could not tell.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Suffice it to say that no funds are now frozen. They are all released and are available for the beginning of construction, and are all now obligated, and the President has asked for these additional funds to go forward with the development of these projects.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I challenge that statement, because after the hearings were concluded the Department submitted a table, because I was anticipating that such a charge would be made. They have submitted a table which appears on pages 3 and 4, which I discussed in my statement. Those tables were prepared by the Budget Office of the Department of the Interior. The last word we had was that $130,000,000 is still frozen.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I inquired yesterday of the officials of the Department of the Interior, particularly in the Reclamation Division, if any funds were now frozen, and they told me that all funds had now been released from the freeze order. That is the latest information I have, which was obtained on yesterday.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. On what date were they released?

Mr. GORE. The final release was as of April 1.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This table was furnished at a later date than that by the Budget Office. All frozen funds for construction for all agencies was contained in this statement. Assuming that the President has released all funds, there is only two more months remaining in this fiscal year.

The result would be that the money would not be used until the next fiscal year started and we would have the same result.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was there any testimony before the gentleman's committee by any witness or by document saying that they must hold the appropriations for the Interior Department down in order to combat inflation?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. There might have been; I would not say.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] failed to distinguish between money appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 and obligated to be spent in the future and money appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 which is not obligated until that year. That is going on all the time in all appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. It is just that practice we are fighting against and that is how the department actually had $465,500,000 at the beginning of the 1947 fiscal year upon which the President operated by freezing the funds.

This Congress appropriates money. The department downtown obligates; and long after they obligate the money is earned by the contractor.

You will find from last year's hearings that the contractors building the canals in the Central Valley project could not complete their work for 600 days in some instances, in some instances 700 days, and in some instances 400 days.

Now, shall Congress appropriate the money that the contractor will earn two fiscal years ahead? Or shall we appropriate the money that is requested to pay the earnings of the contractors during the fiscal year? We have appropriated the money that is needed to pay the contractors during the 1948 fiscal year.

Mr. KIRWAN. Now I should like to proceed for a little while, if I may.

Out in California there is a project known as the Central Valley project. That project was and is not something put together by the New Deal. The people, the citizens of the State of California voted, I believe, in the year 1929 to construct the Central Valley project. The depression came and they could not continue the work so they appealed to Washington to take it over as a Federal project.

Your Committee on Appropriations this spring had the governor of that great State before it. I congratulated him as a true representative of his people. He had run for election this last year and was reelected to the office of governor. He had no opposition on the Democratic ticket and received both nominations. Surely he was a man of the people. He got the Democratic nomination and he got the Republican nomination. As a young man he grew up in the Central Valley and he voted and worked for it before there ever was a Federal project known as the Central Valley project.

He appeared before the committee this year and said that the wells were fast drying up in California, that men who had invested millions of dollars were losing their investments. When they drill for water now they strike salt water because the fresh water level is sinking and salt water comes up from the salt

beds underlying that country. The crops and trees and other vegetation are being destroyed.

He told us that the Interior Department asked for only half of the funds necessary for the construction that ought to be carried out this year to save that part of California, the funds to be used for food, transportation, irrigation and power, those things only. He said $40,000,000 is the amount necessary.

What did this great committee give them? They gave them $6,000,000 despite the testimony of a man who was born and raised with that project. He is a man who voted for it originally. He is today the governor of the State and he has at his fingertips knowledge of all parts and phases of the project. He knows what is needed in California.

If there is a man here from the State of California, a Congressman or a Congresswoman, who has the courage to vote against that governor's request I would like to see him stand up now. I see no one rise.

That is what is going on throughout this Nation.

Let us now take the Missouri Basin appropriation. That was just cut in half. That is all the funds they allowed the Missouri Basin.

What is the Missouri Valley going to do?

Remember, this is not for the people of Siam or Italy, this is for Americans who are trying to reclaim their own country. Ten out of every 100 farms in the State of North Dakota have electricity and light. The other 90 out of 100 farms are still using oil and candles. In South Dakota 13 out of every 100 farmers have electricity and light in their homes. The other 87 percent still use candles and oils. Now, this is America, this is the great country that has Marshall over at Moscow telling them about democracy and saying, "Why do you not follow in our footsteps?" The same nation that we gave 10 boats to, but not one to America.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I think our distinguished friend from Ohio might make that speech on Monday on the $350,000,000 relief bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not going into the bill for $350,000,000. I am telling you about America and I am pleading with the Congress to do something for Americans. I am not pleading for foreigners. I am down here pleading for Americans today. It is a strange thing to get down here and plead for America. We will know at the end of the day how much faith we can place in the pleading.

Let me take the place now of the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania who just rose. I am happy to say I came from Pennsylvania years ago. Pennsylvania was the first State in this Union to discover and develop the oil industry. Like all great Americans of that day, and they called them rugged individuals, they drilled many oil wells. In that day they did not have much use for gasoline, but when they got too much oil at Oil City, Pa., and Franklin, Pa., where the gentleman is from, they ran it in the Allegheny River. That is what they did. Today all our resources are being gone over where that great intelligent population resided in Oil City and those towns. Today we come in and ask for a couple of million dollars to take up all the abandoned oil wells at Franklin, Oil City and western Pennsylvania; to try to start the old wells; to let the oil seep back in and get more out. Oh, no, they would not give a quarter. They would not reclaim any of the oil.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution to Pennsylvania's great crude oil. It is the finest lubricating oil in the world. I hope some day he will fill his car and motor over to my district. I know he will enjoy it very much.

Mr. KIRWAN. I get over there quite often.

Mr. GAVIN. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks and I want him to know that I made a very pathetic plea to the Appropriations Subcommittee for the necessary funds to continue this secondary recovery work in the Pennsylvania fields to get the greatest amount of oil that is still in the earth out; but, like the gentleman, I cannot say that the committee has given us a particularly large sum to carry out this work.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman was pleading for Americans and, I may say, every dime in this bill is to be spent on Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I have been interested in the gentleman's remarks on the matter of foreign loans as against appropriations for the benefit of the people of this country. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, that while Russia received $10,000,000,000 in lend-lease during the war, I understand that Russia had some lend-lease goods in the pipe lines just at the war's end and it is the intention of this Government to shortly furnish Russia with one of the most up-to-date, complete high octane gasoline plants that is available anywhere in the world. This plant is going to cost, as I understand it, $17,000,000. We are going to ship that plant over there and show them how to produce high octane gasoline that will produce the fuel they will need for that super war plane that we may have to fight some day in the future.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. I want to put this down, that all Ohio gets out of this is just a wick which gives about enough light to keep the Perry Monument lit on Lake Erie.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to say to the gentleman that as far as the State of Wyoming is concerned, we don't get that much out of this bill, and I will tell you why. The United States owns 51 percent of the entire acreage of Wyoming. In addition to that it owns the minerals under 14,000,000 more acres. Now, then, in the last 25 years the minerals produced on the Federal lands in Wyoming have paid into the United States Treasury $89,000,000, and 52½ percent of that money or over $46,000,000 went into the reclamation fund and $9,000,000 went into the general fund; 37½ percent went back to Wyoming for our schools. So, the United States has received $55,000,000 from the resources produced on Federal lands in Wyoming and since the inception of the reclamation law only $49,000,000 has been spent on reclamation projects in our State and our irrigators must repay every dollar of it and I might say that of the $15,000,000 spent on projects that have been completed in Wyoming over one-fourth has been repaid.

Mr. KIRWAN. I hope the gentleman votes to recommit this bill and we will try to do a better job for him.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am glad to hear the gentleman state that he is in favor of our reclamation projects in the West. I wish he would help me harmonize some of the statements he made before his own committee, which appear on page 426, volume 3, of the hearings. This is on the Provo project in Utah. The gentleman makes the statement that he is opposed to the program because the Geneva steel plant is getting some of the water. I read as follows:

> In the peacetime that plant will be operating when the plants in Pennsylvania and Ohio will be shut down, because it is an up-to-date plant. That is why I do not approve of this, unless it is Nation-wide. This reclamation act was all right 50 years ago when Theodore Roosevelt was in. I say it was one of the greatest acts that was put in. I always pay respect to his memory for putting this act in. However, today we should have an act to save the East. If we do not, everything is going to go to those 17 Western States.

Therefore, the gentleman opposes the project. Will the gentleman explain why?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I did not oppose the project. I opposed the United States Steel, that had a dollar-a-year man down here in Washington, selling the idea to the Government to build a $200,000,000 steel plant on this water project that was built for irrigation purposes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Did the gentleman know that the steel plant was going to use the water?

Mr. KIRWAN. I asked that question, and here is my reason. I said, "Does the steel plant get the use of this water?" And the answer was, "Yes."

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. This project was authorized and under construction a good many years before the steel plant was ever put in there.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not denying that. But I am trying to tell you that any time a dollar-a-year man comes down here and advises this Government to spend $200,000,000 on a project, whether it is in Provo or Geneva, Utah, or whether it is in Youngstown, Ohio, I am opposed to it. And when it is sold to the United States

Steel Corp. for $30,000,000, that, in my opinion, is a steal of $170,000,000.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Why should the State of Utah be penalized because of the gentleman's views on Geneva Steel?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not asking that they be penalized. I say that I am not for erecting a steel plant, on a project built by the Reclamation Department, at a cost of $200,000,000 that hardly produced one ton of steel during the war. I am opposed to that. If we had spent $15,000,000 for a little addition to each steel plant we could have gotten all the steel we wanted during the war. In other words, they built the most up-to-date steel plant in the country and they furnished the water from the Reclamation Division.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Which administration authorized the Geneva steel plant?

Mr. KIRWAN. I tried to tell you that I do not care what your politics are or what the administration was. I do not care what it was. I tell you that I am trying to be an American. Whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, I have no use for the man that recommends the building of a $200,000,000 steel plant to be sold later at a loss. He was one of those phony Americans that comes down to Washington as a dollar-a-year man. He came down to build that $200,000,000 plant, and it was not worth a quarter.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point out to the gentleman that a continued reading of the colloquy to which the distinguished gentleman just referred will show that you said on page 427 of the hearings as follows:

> If they spend fifteen or twenty million dollars in a steel plant at Provo, fine. We need it. However, the audacity is in the spending of $200,000,000 on a plant when the war was about coming to an end. They finished the plant and in came United States Steel and for $30,000,000 they became owners of it.

Mr. KIRWAN. They knew that they were not going to sell it to anyone who was selling peanuts. There was only one group that could operate it, and that was United States Steel. No fellow selling peanuts was going to buy that steel plant. That is my objection to it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does the gentleman object to the appropriation for this particular reclamation project because of the Geneva steel plant?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. I had to take Smith Bros. cough drops to relax this year on account of the reclamation projects. Now I come to the great Big Thompson project over in Colorado, where they are moving the Colorado River from the western side of the Rockies down to the eastern side, and with five dams it generates power and takes care of the farmers and irrigates the land down there in that rich valley. You take that great State of Nebraska, they produced a great man up there; you remember just about the time Thomas Edison was inventing the electric light, they produced William Jennings Bryan out in Nebraska. They were both good men. Nebraska has been crying for power. She has no streams in that State that she could generate power on. But they are building the Big Thompson project. They want a transmission line. Did they get it? Oh, no. They cut it in half, did they not? Only 37 out of every 100 have electricity in Nebraska. Let us take the Southwest Power Development Co. What a fight they put up down there. The Government was trying to treat the Americans down there like human beings. In the great State of Oklahoma 29 out of every 100 farmers have electricity on the farm. In Arkansas 33 out of every 100 have it, and in Texas 43 out of every 100. What a great country this is to be out trying to tell the rest of the world, "Oh, we have got the right way of living. Pattern after us and you will never see daylight."

All that is asked for in this bill is $295,000,000. You read the hearings and read the report and you will find it says that they have $28,000,000 more than they got in 1938. That is not correct. There was $97,000,000 given to the Interior Department by other agencies in that year which made a total of $230,000,000. You add the increased cost today, 70 percent higher cost, whether it is food, construction, material, or whatever it may be. Add that on to the $230,000,000 and you have $311,000,000. That is what they should rightly have today. But after all the years this project has been retarded by the war, after all the screaming for material and everything to do the job, this is the first year we have it, and yet what have we done?

Fred Allen thought he discovered something when they took the cue away.

Look at the Park Service, whether we like or do not like the philosophy of the people who are running it. Just a year ago it was my privilege, on an invitation from Mr. Krug, to go to the former home of Franklin Roosevelt, now known as a shrine, to be turned over to the United States Government. Six months after it was turned over to the Government 500,000 people went through that home and visited there.

I am going to be truthful and frank about it. I do not know whether they were Republicans who went there, but it was good to see them there. I do not know whether they were Democrats and real Americans who went there to respect the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Over half a million people went there. This Government is richer by $130,000.

But the contrast that I am trying to bring home to you is this. Just 1 mile away is the Vanderbilt shrine which was turned over to the Government some years ago. It is much bigger than the Roosevelt home. It is more valuable, and there is better furniture there. In that shrine to attract the sightseer is a rug costing $300,000 and which is 2 centuries old. There is also a master bedroom there with marble fence around it. That bedroom is half as big as this Chamber. There is this marble fence which was imported from Italy. That bedroom probably came out of the sweat and hide and blood of American labor back through the years. But only 25,000 visitors went to the Vanderbilt shrine.

That is the concrete proof that America still remembers a great man and a great person. In the book that the visitors register in they tell how they went there. They went there in rowboats or hitchhiked, or in valuable automobiles, but they went there to pay their respects to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That is what we should have throughout this country today instead of having a situation such as exists in North Dakota, where 10 out of every 100 farmers are still trying to preserve this country and make a living with electricity in their homes. With 13 out of every 100 in South Dakota, and 33 or 37 in Nebraska, and 29 in Oklahoma. Is this a great country? Do you not think that we should recommit this bill—that is, if there is any Americanism left in us—and not be calling people up here and citing them for contempt because they say they know of some utopia somewhere in some other country? Again, I repeat, I will be looking for the balance of my life how they record this week when we turned down 1 vessel for research and scientific purposes for America and yet we gave 10 to Russia, and in the same week we convict and cite a man because he said the other government is a good form of government.

Oh, we will have to do something here, because I understand that over in Russia they are getting 39 or 35 air-borne divisions, and we have not got 1. They are not building those air-borne divisions to commute between Moscow and Budapest—oh, no; there is something else they have in mind. They might be going to the relief of somebody, but it is things along that line that we had better stop and do a little something about and give some research money for because the man who is the head of the Department of the Interior today said when he was head of the War Production Board he would get up some mornings at 6 or 7 o'clock and call the Department of the Interior and say, "Did you discover yesterday the thing that the Army and Navy wants which will probably save us?" Just as soon as they saved us we would not give them a quarter from here on out.

It was my privilege as a boy to work in a mine. I remember at the end of the day we used to throw a piece of coal up to try to hit the roof. The roof was high as the ceiling of the roof here. There were times when we could not do it. I asked my brother sometime ago, "Do you mind the time when we used to throw a piece of coal up to try and hit the roof?" And he said, "Yes; I remember. Now you have to get down on your stomach and the ceiling is close to your back." I am just calling this to your attention to show you how times change.

Up in the mountain range of Minnesota there is the greatest supply in the world, but it is only due to last 12 years. Then we will have to buy coal from Canada and Venezuela, and when we buy it they will charge us for it. They will tell us, "Here you are a great people and you have been ahead of us as far as the standard of living is concerned for 50 years. We will have to take a little of that standard of living."

It was my privilege to load a sack of sand as a laborer for $2 an hour at Maricopa, Calif., in 1910, when the biggest gusher in the world that was ever hit came through and threw out 35,000 barrels of oil a day for 3 weeks, and a hole came up out of it as big as this Chamber. Ask any oilman today if he has ever hit a gusher that would bring in 500 barrels. He would think he was a wealthy man and very lucky.

Our resources are gone. Yet, we do not want to give a quarter in this bill to try and go out and discover something. The resources and minerals that are closest to the surface have been discovered a long time ago, but it takes money to go down into the bowels of the earth and find out what is down there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The greatest resource of all is the water out in the West. The only way we can conserve that is by dams?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not also a fact that many of these dams that were started, like some in the Central Valley, and other parts of the West, have been waiting to get a chance to get more money to rapidly complete them?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Under this bill, if we get this amount of money for Central Valley, it will take 27½ years to complete the Central Valley project. It was contemplated to be done in 8 years by the Department of the Interior. Is that not a fact?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is a fact. And a man who wanted to do farming adds 27 years onto his life, and if he is still here he will not be able to use it then. It is the American way of doing business.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is slightly in error. At the rate of construction provided by this bill it would take not 27 years to complete the Central Valley project but 40 years.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. At page 19 of the hearings is a table furnished by the Department of the Interior, and it shows that out of the money we did appropriate last year there is $17,265,862 unexpended balance. We have in the last 5 years appropriated from ten to twenty million dollars more than they have spent.

Mr. KIRWIN. That is easily explained. They could not get the materials. But this is one year when the governor appeared before the committee and said, "Give me the money and I will get the materials."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does not the gentleman realize that with the money appropriated for Central Valley, by the time the present contracts are fulfilled, under the $6,000,000 given in this bill, they will have to tie the project up in less than 18 months?

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. All I can say is I hope there is still enough Americanism left in all of us—I mean that sincerely—to realize that whatever helps California helps Ohio, helps Nevada, helps the Dakotas, and the Southwest. It will all help Ohio. I am hoping and praying that when this bill comes up under the 5-minute rule tomorrow and a motion to recommit is placed before this House the Members of this House, who in their minds and hearts are hungering for their projects to be finished, will see their way clear to give us on this side an opportunity to recommit this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to congratulate the gentleman in two respects, particularly, although I could do so in several others. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the broad national outlook he has. He understands naturally, that in the building of the great West we have to go to Pittsburgh and to Youngstown and to Birmingham and all these great, eastern manufacturing points to get the machinery and the finished products which we need out West. Thus the gentleman recognizes the interdependency of the East and the West, which this program ought to carry out, but which it really nullifies.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on one other thing. He says that some of our natural resources are vanishing. Right now we are using scarce oil to create electricity when we should be conserving it for the great air force that we should have and must have. We could conserve it if we would turn falling water into white coal instead of using the scarce and irreplacable oil that is in the ground to produce electricity.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I am very much concerned about the reduction made in the item "Minerals on public lands in the United States Geological Survey." I notice the reduction amounts to $313,790. The fact of the matter is that the conservation branch of the United States Geological Survey supervises the production of oil and other minerals which last year were valued at $183,000,000 and on which the Government received royalties amounting to $12,500,000.

I am vitally interested in any activities of any agency concerned with the classification of the western public lands for prudent use and with the locating, measuring, and optimum utilization by prudent development and production of our irreplaceable natural resources on the public, Indian, Navy, and acquired lands. The Congress acts as trustee for the citizens of the United States and in so doing has enacted legislation providing for the prospecting, development, and disposal of these lands and resources. It has by delegation placed the responsibility on the Geological Survey to carry out its mandates. This is a multimillion-dollar enterprise and our responsibility cannot be lightly treated. That is why I am disturbed by the committee action on the "Classification of lands" and "Mineral leasing" items. I note that the bill provides only $139,000 for classification of lands, a reduction of 50 percent under present funds, and only $434,210 for mineral leasing, a 31-percent cut under present funds. Reduction in funds, imposed upon a unit whose work load has increased steadily year by year, seriously impairs the entire minerals-resource program. A resulting reduction in force of over 50 percent to a unit which, even at its present strength, cannot reduce accumulated arrearages in processing mineral-land classification cases, lease applications, unit plans of operations, effecting mine inspections, oil-well inspections, other physical tests, and supervising field operations essential to the prevention of waste, to obtain economical recovery, and to assure receipt by the United States of the maximum royalty returns resulting from such recovery, is impossible to justify.

I do not wish to burden the record with a detailed statement of facts and figures, but I only need remind you that the western public-land States, one of which I represent, contributed much to the new reserves of natural resources so badly needed during the recent war. We have great quantities remaining to be discovered or developed. The production of oil, gas, phosphates, potash, sodium, coal, shale oil, and many other minerals are still awaiting the prospectors. Is this Congress going to revert now to 1938 for classification and supervision? In 1938 the value of all natural resources produced from Federal, Indian, and Navy lands approximated $93,000,000 and in 1946 nearly $183,000,000, an increase of 49 percent. Obviously, the responsibility of development, supervision, and accounting had to exceed this percentage of increase in production, for every prospect is not a successful venture.

We must not forget that the Congress has passed considerable legislation since 1935 affecting the public lands, which added additional responsibilities to the Geological Survey. I mention the act of 1935, which became operative in 1939 and 1940; the act of July 29, 1942; the act of December 24, 1942; the act of July 13, 1946; the act of August 8, 1946; and the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, transferring the leasing and supervision of minerals, including oil and gas, on millions of acres of acquired lands from the Agriculture Department to the Interior Department. This latter item alone includes over 400 leases.

The development of public lands is vital to the West. When new mineral resources are discovered, new industries are started, thereby increasing the industrialization and settlement of these sparsely settled regions.

Of vital importance is the contribution of the income from royalties to the reclamation fund and the school systems of oil-producing public-land States. Since the enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, over $120,000,000 has been

transferred to the reclamation fund and over $60,000,000 to the State schools within which the royalties accrue.

I need only remind you of the tremendous demand for development of our natural resources to make them available for immediate use. Just a few days ago the newspapers carried a statement by responsible authorities predicting a gasoline shortage next fall. Now, it does not seem good business to cut this essential service in such a manner.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a hard-working member of the committee and a man who has a very comprehensive knowledge of this entire bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said about this bill and about the members of this committee. We expect it, all of us; and, of course, a lot more is going to be said and written.

I have no apologies whatever to make. I have nothing but the highest praise for the chairman of this committee, BOB JONES of Ohio. I think that before this debate is concluded it will be proven beyond question of a doubt that our chairman, BOB JONES, did one of the best jobs as chairman of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives that has ever been done for the American people.

I have the greatest respect for Mr. KIRWAN, the ranking minority member of this committee. I have had the privilege of sitting on this committee with the gentleman from Ohio for five consecutive terms, and the gentleman is always fair and tries to do the thing he feels is right. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], of course, does not see eye to eye with the more conservative members of the committee who try to save a dollar here and a dollar there, a hundred here and a hundred there, a thousand here and a thousand there, a million here and a million there, for the taxpayers of America where it can be saved without hurting the service of the Interior Department in any way, shape or form. We try to impress on the Department that money does not grow on trees, that we expect efficiency by those public servants as well as other public servants, that we do not expect them to throw money around like so much scrap paper; but in my estimation and in the opinion of the majority of the American people and of this Congress that is exactly what has been done in many branches of the Interior Department.

Then we have on the committee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] who has done yeoman service as has the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN]. There were times during the hearings and mark-up when the gentleman from Oregon could not agree with us; but the truth of the matter is that this bill came to the full committee after compromises to a marked degree had been made in the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the gentleman state between whom the compromise was made?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman was not there all the time.

Mr. ROONEY. My good friend the gentleman from Iowa knows that I am a member of three subcommittees, including the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; the gentleman has too much to do, I will admit.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman also knows that I sat in on this bill for 3 years and I know a little something about it. I know something about marking up the bill and that I objected to every mark-up except one.

Mr. JENSEN. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. But I honestly believe that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] feels the committee did a pretty good job and cut where cuts ought to be made in most instances. I like to work with him and the other Members regardless of our differences. He is also on other committees of which I am a member. We work harmoniously and generally we can compromise our differences and finally get pretty close together.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry our good friend and colleague, the able, conscientious gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], a regular veteran member of the committee was not able to sit on the committee this year. I think he will say before the debate closes that he intends to support this bill just as it is written.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciated what the gentleman has said. I have not been able to participate in the proceedings this year. I have the very highest regard for the entire membership of that committee, including my able colleague from New York who substituted for me. The committee may have made some mistakes, but the gentleman from Arkansas expects to support the bill as written.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. May I inquire whether a minority report has been filed in connection with this bill or not?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. At least, I have not seen one.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in some of the remarks that were made here today about giving everything away to some foreign country and leaving little or nothing for ourselves. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is a thing a lot of us have been trying to impress on the Congress and the New Deal administration for many long years. The fact of the matter is it has an effect on this very bill because actually the money pie we have here in America is just so big and no bigger and we are giving away and lending to other nations a mighty big piece of that pie.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. And, without a doubt, we will be obliged to give away many billions of dollars, and a lot of you fellows who are fighting this bill today will vote to give away all those billions, but you must realize that you will have to take less for a lot of things you want from the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States of America from now on.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my able colleague from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it might be well for the gentleman to point out that regardless of what we give away there is one thing we must save for America, and that is solvency.

Mr. JENSEN. Right. And there is another thing. The American people like to pay their own way, and I do not care whether they live in California or Oregon or Washington or Iowa or Utah or Arizona or Pennsylvania or New York or any other State. They know, and you know it, that construction, maintenance, operation, and administration costs have gone up between 50 and 75 percent during the last 5 or 6 years. But will anyone opposing this bill stand on the floor of this House today and say that they have recommended higher power rates or higher revenues for all the benefits for which the taxpayers of America have furnished for all these great Federal projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Did the gentleman recommend higher rates?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Wait until I answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes or no?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. Wait. Is your answer yes or no?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recommended rates high enough to get back every dollar, with interest, before the gentleman's committee several times.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the gentleman actually recommended higher rates?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have not studied the schedules or recommended specific rates.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman recommend higher rates today? Yes or no.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If they are necessary, yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I want a yes or no answer please.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I am no expert on power rates, but I have said repeatedly before the gentleman's committee, and I believe it today, that the rates that we charge for power on

Federal projects should return every single compensable dollar plus 3 percent interest.

Mr. JENSEN. Should! Sure they should. But will they? No, not so long as we keep on appropriating all the departments ask for.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I do not know. I assume the rate that they charge will do it.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that when they set those rates years and years ago they said, "This is the rate we need in order to pay off this project according to law and that since that time operations, maintenance, construction, and administrative costs have gone up from 50 to 75 percent."

How long do you suppose you would be in business, Mr. JOHNSON, if you bought things today and sold them for the prices in effect 5 and 6 years ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to answer that.

Mr. JENSEN. Tell me how long you would be in business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would not be in business very long.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course you would not, and the Government is no different.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to point this out: In the very area where the Central project is going to sell power, the P. G. & E. has maintained the same or lower rates, and their reports every year show a profit during the past 5 years. That is a private company, well operated and well managed.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And they have not raised any rates at all in the last 5 years.

Mr. JENSEN. The Railroad Commission of California determines the rates of the private utilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell you why they did not raise the rates.

The P. G. & E. would pay more, but the Interior Department officials lay down the contract before them at the same old rate and the P. G. & E. say, "Sure, we will sign it."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman knows the Central Valley is only selling power to them wholesale. We are not distributing any electricity; the gentleman understands that.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly I know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

If the gentleman will yield, may I point out, to finish up this colloquy, that the Bureau of Reclamation has sold power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at 3.4 mills a kilowatt-hour for firm energy, and somewhat less than that for secondary power. The average is about 2.5. It costs the P. G. & E. produced in their own plant 5.2 mills a kilowatt-hour. In other words, the Bureau of Reclamation is such a poor dealer with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that it is getting 3 mills a kilowatt-hour below what it costs them to generate power in their own plant.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have an opinion that the Bureau of Reclamation made this bad deal with the P. G. & E. in order to complain that they had to have a great transmission system in the West in order to make the project pay out, where, as a matter of fact, if they were good dealers, good sound businessmen, they would have gotten the 5.2 that it costs the P. G. & E. to generate power in their own plant.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to get back again to water.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell you how you are going to get back to water. You are going to have to change the philosophy of the Interior Department if you want to get water, because they do not give much attention to irrigation; they want power, both electric and political.

Mr. HILL. More than 10 years ago we started a project in my own county, in my own district. We mortgaged our homes, our buildings in the city, and we made a firm and solid contract with the Federal Government, the United States, that if they would bring that water under the Rocky Mountains down onto this land that is already irrigated, that has been short of water ever since it has been formed—we have water; our water systems are all in, but this is supplementary water from the other side of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is talking about the Colorado-Big Thompson project?

Mr. HILL. I am talking about the Colorado-Big Thompson project. If they would allow us to mortgage our homes and pay each year so much on that project, we would begin immediately, which we have done. Today we have paid $300,000 on that project. I notice the testimony in the hearings where some of you said that because the price had gone up, the contractor's price, material, equipment, and labor, you think we should go back to our $1,700 or $2,000 contract that we have in that valley and make that contract over. In addition, do not forget this, that it is not our fault, the farmers and home owners and city dwellers as well in that territory, it is not our fault that the Interior Department has not finished that project. It is not our fault that these prices have gone up. Yet you come along and in your own testimony you say you think we ought to throw that contract out and accept a new and higher contract for the water.

Mr. JENSEN. You read the hearings.

Mr. HILL. I did.

Mr. JENSEN. They explained it to us in detail. Has the gentleman read what I said?

Mr. HILL. I read all the gentleman's testimony.

Mr. JENSEN. I said, "Gentlemen, I think the Government is stuck." Did I not say that?

Mr. HILL. I hope the gentleman sticks to that.

Mr. JENSEN. I also said that I believed those people out there who are getting the benefits would pay more if given an opportunity. It is going to cost about three times more to complete the job than originally estimated, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Yes. We never figured anything about the power. That is the reason I came in on this. We were not talking about those five great dams that will create all this electric current. We were talking about the water on this land.

Mr. JENSEN. The Department of the Interior has not been too concerned about water, as the record will prove. Consequently, many irrigation projects in the country have been held back.

It seems clear that it was their plan to finally drive private utilities to the wall by giving them so much competition at below-cost rates that they could not exist. But I am sure the American people who believe in all honest, free, private enterprise appreciate the fact that we have held them in abeyance at least to some degree so that they have not spread all over the United States and destroyed all the good private utilities who send to the Federal Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars a year in revenue which we need so badly today.

I have said many times that they can call me anything they like, but I shall defend all good, honest private industry, whether it be the peanut vendor on the corner or the biggest private business in the United States, against unfair encroachment by the Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to say to my colleagues in this House that it has been a real pleasure to serve on this subcommittee with my distinguished friend and chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, and his colleagues on the majority side, as well as my associates on the minority side.

While there were not more than two or three items in the bill in which we concurred with the majority, nevertheless relations between all the members of the subcommittee were most cordial and friendly. I have no personal fault to find with the intentions of the chairman of this subcommittee or the other members on the majority side. I believe they are sincere in what they are doing to the Department of the Interior—wrecking it. But I know they do not realize the consequences of the 47-percent slash which they are making in the budget for the Department of the Interior. However, I say I have never questioned the sincerity of the gentleman from Ohio and his associates.

The total amount of the budget request for the entire Department is $295,420,420. This sum amounts to far less than 1 percent of the total amount of the President's budget of $37,500,000,000.

The majority of this committee have started a dangerous plan of economy, in which they allow much less than one-half of 1 percent of these $37,500,000,000 for our Interior Department, for the conservation and preservation of the natural resources of this Nation, and construction of reclamation projects which will make and have already made America great.

Not one member on the majority side of the full Committee on Appropriations raised one finger to increase any one item in this bill from the amount which was decided upon by the majority of this subcommittee. You must realize that we needed very few votes from the majority side in order to overthrow the decision of the majority of the subcommittee. I repeat, not one member on the majority side in the meeting of the full committee offered any amendment to the amounts decided upon as the result of the subcommittee's deliberations. Therefore, I wondered where the information came from to support an article I read yesterday by Drew Pearson, April 24 edition of the Washington Post, in which he says:

Though they wept, begged, and got down on their knees to fellow Republicans, GOP leaders cut the heart out of the Interior Department appropriations.

Well, if any one of them did, it was not in any meeting of the subcommittee or of the full Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, when this committee met to mark up the bill the figures had apparently already been decided upon in advance. For instance, we proceeded to mark up as the first item, the Bureau of Mines. Every item of appropriation in connection with the Bureau of Mines had been previously agreed upon with somebody, and was written out on a white sheet. There was therefore, not much sense in discussing the items. Our problem was very simple—the minority stated that they disagreed in every instance with the work of the majority of the committee unless we definitely signified our assent.

Included in the Bureau of Mines appropriation were three items for mine safety, and they cut those items, and cut them viciously. About 2 or 3 weeks later we experienced a terrible mine disaster at Centralia, Ill. One day in the committee hearing I happened to be reading a newspaper and looking at some photographs of bereaved relatives of those who died in that disaster and I inquired of my friends on the majority side, "Don't you think this will have some effect upon the decision reached by the House, with regard to moneys for mine safety appropriations?" We were then informed, for the first time, by one of the members of the subcommittee that they, the majority, in quiet session, had decided to restore the full amounts of the budget estimates for mine safety appropriations.

There is a friend of mine, a lifelong and prominent Republican, who meets quite often with a number of gentlemen from both sides of this House, at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington. I have heard him say on many occasions, "When we Republicans get back into power, do away with the school lunch program? Why, hell, we will do away with the schools."

I was therefore not surprised when the deliberations of the Republican members of this committee caused the virtual destruction of school systems and that they have done away with not only the school lunches but with the schools. What have they done in connection with the Indian Service? The cut in this bill to the extent of $10,302,646 in appropriations for the Office of Indian Affairs, from the amount available in the current year, fiscal 1947, will result in part in forcing more than 5,000 Indian children out of Government schools.

Indian education has been cut by 33 percent. Tuition payments to Oklahoma public schools were disapproved. Three million dollars must be saved by closing about 16 boarding schools which enroll only children who are homeless.

In connection with the Alaskan Native Service, a reduction, a cut, a slash if you will, of $469,000 below the current year's appropriations will result in the closing of 1 elementary boarding school for dependent children, the closing of 19 day schools, which will deny education to more than a thousand children, termination of contracts with all private hospitals for the treatment of natives, and the closing of 1 Indian Service urban hospital of 60-bed capacity.

That is more than bad economy, Mr. Chairman. That, I say, is economy created by headless horsemen of economy, headless horsemen who have no regard to the consequences that will result from their wild ride insofar as the welfare of our Nation and provisions for our children are concerned.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman concede that if we terminate the education of Indian children that the Appropriations Committee will have to come in here with an appropriation for tomahawks in order to put the Indians back into their present status.

Mr. ROONEY. I think that is a fair statement in view of what our Republican friends have done.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand the committee has recommended schooling for the Navajo Indians. That is fine. We have 17,000 Navajo Indian children of school age who are not in school. But I further understand that the cut which this bill contains will close several boarding schools, one at Albuquerque, one at Santa Fe, probably one in California at Whittier, and very likely one at Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. ROONEY. That is so.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman beside me here, from Oklahoma, probably has three such boarding schools which will be closed.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona will cover that matter more fully in the remarks he will make later on during the course of the debate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope to.

Mr. ROONEY. I now wish to say a word with reference to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

At the time the slash figures were released by the full Appropriations Committee showing what the majority had done to our great irrigation, flood control, and power projects in the Northwest and in the West, how a great many people in my town laughed with glee? Where? Up in Wall Street, in the offices of Electric Bond & Share Co. which controls many of these power companies throughout the Southwest and the West, selling power from public projects built with the people's money. Yes, the the bloated plutocrats of the power lobby which, here in the Congress, are continually seeking to have turned over to them the people's dams, the people's power built by the people's money, the dams that these private utility companies are continually seeking to monopolize. The very people who originally fought tooth and nail against the erection of every one of these dams.

The Republicans cut $83,234,600 from a requested appropriation of $145,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, or a 57-percent cut. They thereby hamstring the projects which this Congress, this very House and the other body, have heretofore authorized. They are thereby creating a situation whereby enormous claims by contractors whose contracts have to be canceled will result in an enormous loss to the United States Treasury.

With regard to the Columbia River Basin project and the question I asked my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, awhile ago, the Columbia River Basin program in the great Northwest—may I say that I have had the privilege of being out there and I have seen it. I am from Brooklyn. I have always been one of the first to say that we should further and further develop these great reclamation projects in the West. The Columbia River Basin project was supposed to be completed by 1951 to supply irrigation of 400,000 acres of land for veterans' settlement. What do you think is the completion date now, if the action of the majority of this subcommittee is supported—1965?—and we commit this crime at a time when we are now debating and debated all day yesterday on the floor of this House the matter of sending $350,000,000 to Europe for relief and with another bill now pending for $400,000,000 more to be used in Europe. The situation created by this bill, as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] very well knows has resulted in the completion date of the Central Valley project in California, which I have also had occasion to inspect, being 40 years from now instead of the contemplated 8 or 10 years.

I must say that the Governor of California did not play politics. He came before this subcommittee and requested not $20,000,000, the amount asked in the budget estimate, but $40,000,000 for Central Valley. What did the majority of this subcommittee do? They thereupon cut the amount to $6,900,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the Governor of California came here I am positive that before he made the recommendation to the gentleman's committee he consulted with a commis-

sion known as the Reemployment and Development Committee or the Postwar Development Committee that had made a thorough study of the needs of California in reference to public power.

Mr. ROONEY. As the gentleman very well knows, and from my visit to the Central Valley project, and as I have stated on the floor of the House previously, I am in entire sympathy with it. I feel it should be developed just as fully and promptly as possible, and I for one would go along with the request of the Governor of California for a $40,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. California got 600,000 new veterans in it since the war closed. They were men who were not enlisted or inducted from the State of California. The rapid development and completion of this project will be of material help to many of them.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from California.

In this bill there is an item entitled "General investigations." There has been a cut from the amount requested, $5,000,000, down to the insignificant sum of $125,000. What is the purpose of this item?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this item in the bill is to plan public projects throughout these United States in advance of a depression, which would result not only in enhancing the value of our country, in giving to the people power and irrigation and flood control, but in putting to work hundreds of thousands of other people who would be engaged in work on these projects.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In cutting out practically all of the funds for this purpose, and they might as well have cut all of the fund for investigations, is it not about like the gentleman from Arizona expressed it, taking the seed corn away from the farmer?

Mr. ROONEY. That is a very good description of the situation. Of course, we all know as we stand here and debate this bill—and as we vote on it tomorrow the Republican majority will have its well-oiled steam roller working again, and will knock down deserving amendment after deserving amendment—that the very cuts you make here will be restored over in the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a rumor going around of an inside deal to take care of a couple of projects, then let the others just be crushed under. Has the gentleman through his contacts received any information on that which might be of an enlightening nature or of an exposing nature?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; I have heard some rumblings about that, I will say to the gentleman. I understand that there will be a deal made with some of the gentlemen from California. I do not blame the gentlemen from California for trying to make a deal or for engaging in such a deal. But it is not a nice way to go about this situation. It would be much better if those of the majority in this committee had carefully listened to the testimony in regard to these reclamation projects and then decided on them sensibly, not on figures already written out in advance on a white paper. It was utterly useless for a minority member to disagree with the column of figures handed down by the high command.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am a Member from California, and I am right in that part of the Central Valley, but no offers have been made to me as yet. I wish they would make some offers to us:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is one consolation that our Republican friends, who are highly dissatisfied, have, and that is that we on the Democratic side not only have complete sympathy for them in the predicament in which they find themselves, and particularly for their own constituents, but when the motions are made, that we on the Democratic side will vote in accordance with the national interest to carry on these great projects which, while they are located in certain sections of the country, are of general concern to the entire country.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust they will, but am again afraid of the headless-horseman economy that we have had so far during this Congress.

May I ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] if he will hand me part 3 of the printed hearings of this subcommittee? Thank you, I have not weighed this, but I meant to. You will notice that part 3, which covers the Bureau of Reclamation, probably cost five times as much to print as it has in any previous Congress. The phony economy proposed by the cuts in this bill is just as sensible as the economy practiced by the majority in printing the minutes of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the principal issue involved in this Interior Department appropriation bill is whether the recent progress that has been made in western economic development will continue and go forward or will be halted through the elimination or slow strangulation of the reclamation and power projects on which this development is based.

It is commonly assumed that those of us whose constituencies are in the East have no concern with the progress of western economic development. This is a completely erroneous assumption. Every citizen of our country has a vital stake in the development of the economic potentials of the West and the speed with which it occurs.

Every citizen has a stake in this development because he is concerned with the availability of food and the price he has to pay for it; he is concerned about the shortages of critical minerals and other materials and the effect they have on the scarcity of automobiles, housing, and the other things he wants for better living; he is concerned about the shortage of lumber and the effect this shortage has upon our national economy; he is concerned about whether our economy is going to provide the expanding job opportunities which our veterans and other citizens require, or whether it is going to stagnate and require the rationing of a limited number of job opportunities among an increasing number of job seekers; he is concerned about our national security and the fact that we have no ready reserve of electric energy, such as existed at TVA and in the Northwest when World War II came upon us, available for the expansion of our aluminum, magnesium, and other industries; he is concerned about the national security implications of our present "have-not" status which led the Seventy-ninth Congress to pass the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act so that we could import from abroad and accumulate reserves of those materials essential to our national defense, that we were not producing in sufficient quantity; and he is concerned about an assured domestic market that can absorb the increased production of our fabricating industries.

The economic development of our underdeveloped regions represents in large measure the solution to the problems I have enumerated. We have in the West, for example, more than 740,000,000 acres of desert—more than one-third the land mass of the United States—which is shortchanged on rainfall. Through irrigation, much of these lands can be turned into family-size farms for the settlement of veterans and others. They can be made to produce special kinds of vitamin-packed food raised only in hot, dry climates. These farms become new markets for manufactured products from all parts of the United States—new markets that develop in these prosperous areas reclaimed from desert wastelands.

These lands are reclaimed through the construction of dams—multiple-purpose projects which serve to create hydroelectric power, prevent floods, create navigable waterways for the cheaper transportation of goods, provide recreation areas around the large water reservoirs, as well as provide dependable water supplies for the land and for domestic and industrial purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Regarding the reclamation of those lands, I know of my own personal knowledge that in my part of California the land without water varies from $15 to $50 an acre in price. When you get water on it, it goes from $200 to $1,250 in value, showing the increased productivity of the land.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think there is any question about it. The gentleman also knows, as do I, that in the Northwest in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration there is today a greater

market for power than the amount of power which can be produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams.

The cheap power that results from the construction of these dams is the key that unlocks the economic door of the area. Minerals that could not be processed economically before can now be made available at competitive prices. Areas that once were poor raw material suppliers—obtaining only the price of the labor applied to extract the resources—develop fabricating and processing plants and become prosperous. In many cases items are produced for the benefit of the whole Nation that were not produced at all before.

At 1940 prices it is estimated that the total national investment in the development of our great river basins will amount to some $11,500,000,000. I am not going to make the crack that "this ain't hay," for a good part of the lands reclaimed by these projects will grow good alfalfa hay. Alfalfa hay and sugar beets are two top-ranking irrigation crops. Both are vital to the livestock industry of the West and, in turn, they are most important to the people of the Nation. They mean more meat and more sugar on everybody's table.

Of course, this investment will take place over a period of time. The question is how much time. Unless these reclamation projects are carried forward at an economical rate, hundreds of millions of dollars already spent will be wasted and the people of the East are just as much concerned as the people of any other part of the country about the destruction of an investment we have already made.

Governor Warren, of California, appeared before this House Appropriations Subcommittee to urge the acceleration of the Central Valley project—one of the large reclamation projects of which I have been speaking—so that it would be completed in 4 years instead of the 10 or 12 years contemplated by the Interior Department. He argued that then the project would begin to pay for itself sooner and the people of California and the Nation could reap the benefits sooner. If a depression is on its way, Governor Warren would apparently like to meet it with a project that will provide the basis for thousands of additional jobs and business opportunities.

The majority of this committee not only ignored the Governor's request, but cut the funds to one-third of the amount requested by the Interior Department. Instead of the 4-year period for completing the project which the Governor asked for, it will take, at the rate of expenditure recommended by the Appropriations Committee, over 40 years to complete the Central Valley project.

These western reclamation and power projects, when completed, create millions of additional jobs and business opportunities—on farms, in new communities which will be needed to serve the new farms on reclaimed land, and in the new industries which will salvage the present waste of the forests and the unused mineral resources of these areas by the application of low-cost power to the areas' resources. Forest management can be placed on a sustained yield basis, thus guaranteeing to the Nation a continuing supply of lumber and to the people of the areas a continuous source of livelihood. It means that the relatively unpopulated areas of the West will be able to support additional millions of population.

In 1946 farmers on irrigated lands served by all Federal reclamation projects harvested corps worth one-half billion dollars. This is the type of investment that pays.

But the wealth produced on reclaimed lands is only a portion of the return to the Nation—speaking in business accounting terms—on its investment in these projects. Power revenues pay the bulk of the costs and not only does the Government get back all that it puts into the power facilities in a period of time, only a fraction of the life of the project, it gets a return of 3 percent on its investment.

The investment in these projects produce other values many of which cannot be measured quantitatively. While you can measure the 3 percent interest paid on the investment in power, the millions of dollars saved annually by flood control, and the savings involved in cheaper water transportation, how can you ascribe a quantitative measurement to the value of providing economic opportunities for our citizens or measure the cumulative effect on our economy of providing communities with a higher standard of living and a higher per capita income with which to purchase consumer goods from producers all over the country.

One of the reasons for opposition to resource development of the type I have described is the sincere belief on the part of certain eastern and middle-western business interests that the economic development of the underdeveloped portions of the country would be bad for them. The railroads, for example, think that their interests require the preservation of the South and West as raw-material reserves so that they can haul—at artificially high rates—the raw materials to the East and Middle West to be processed and then haul them back to be consumed. Actually these high freight rates may serve as a kind of protective tariff behind which southern and western businessmen will produce items for their respective areas which might be more economically produced by and purchased from eastern manufacturers.

Another argument I have heard used in opposing measures which would facilitate the economic development of the South and West is that it would create competition with eastern businessmen and would eliminate their markets. This is a completely false notion. It is frequently extended to other countries of the world and you hear the argument that we must not develop the industries of China or South America because it will eliminate our own markets there.

Actually our greatest trade is always with the more highly developed countries of the world, and so it is within our own country. As the South and the West improve their regional economies the manufacturers of the East and Middle West acquire greater markets for their goods, the lawyers and doctors and other professional men are relieved of the ruinous competition of a glutted profession because their colleagues can find abundant opportunities in these areas of growing population and wealth; and everyone is relieved of the specter of unsecurity that arises from the unsatisfied search for jobs and businesses by our veterans and others.

The development of the economic potentials of our great river basins will provide the new job and business opportunities which are the evidence of a healthy, growing economy free from the stagnation of depression; it will provide an outlet for those who are displaced by reason of new technology or worn-out resources in their present localities; it will furnish us with more food, more materials to provide us with shelter and transportation, more of everything we need for a better satisfying life.

I cannot agree with the gentlemen on the majority side of the Appropriations Committee that we should turn back the clock to 1938, or any other date of the stagnant thirties. We who live in the East want to go forward to a more prosperous America along with our fellow citizens of the West.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement just made by my colleague from New York, may I say, that, during the five years I have been on the committee we have appropriated about three-quarters of a billion dollars for reclamation. "Quite liberal" the American people will say, I am sure.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when a bill of this importance has reached the floor it is a matter for dispassionate analysis and not for oratory. In speaking here today, I prefer not to speak of the great value of reclamation nor of irrigation nor of power upon which the West has been built. I do not want to speak at length of the fact that we from the western part of the United States know by now that it is difficult to make our projects, and the magnitude of the things done there, understood by our friends in the East. When I lived in Pennsylvania and Ohio I understood just as little as anyone who has never been in the West how dependent the West is upon water.

I probably said the same things and thought the same things then, as Members do today who have never seen California or Oregon or Washington or the Rocky Mountain States.

It seems to me today that the problem is this: We have a bill before us, and what are we going to do about it? The people of the United States said last November that they wanted economy, and my people said to me that they meant they wanted economy, and that they would stand by every effort on the part of the Congress to bring about economy in a Government which for 13 years has not known what that word meant. If we are to save the world, we must first save ourselves.

I would not stand here before you today and say that this is the best bill that ever came out of the Committee on

Appropriations, and I certainly would not stand here today and say that it was the worst bill that ever came out of that committee. There has been a great deal of discussion of the bill by those of us who come from the western part of the United States. It may interest you to know that very little of that discussion was whether we of the West feel that the amount of money appropriated is not adequate. We are more concerned about certain policy matters in the bill, and those are the things that I want to talk to you about today.

I cannot defend a policy of the Bureau of Reclamation, nor would you expect me to favor it, under which Congress, having appropriated large sums of money for reclamation or power developments, finds at the end of a fiscal year, large unexpended balances. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], said that these unexpended balances were due to the inability to get material during the war years. My district has suffered more than any district in the United States because of that policy of the Bureau of Reclamation, and yet I cannot say that it was because of the lack of material, for the equipment stood on the ground and the material was available and the labor councils offered the labor.

We would have to take each one of these issues in the bill and attempt to analyze it, to see what the difficulty was. For that reason I confine myself to a few statements.

It has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], that a motion to recommit will be made, and it would be expected we would vote for that motion. I am not sure that I would vote for a motion to recommit. In fact, I do not see any point in such a motion. If the bill has not been put into shape which might satisfy us in some of its provisions, then, what chance would we have in recommitting the bill to the same subcommittee? I shall rely upon the fact that the Government of the United States is a government of checks and balances.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield willingly but briefly.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman vote for a motion to recommit if it provided that the committee report the bill forthwith back to the House with an amount of $40,000,000 for the Central Valley project?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; and for reasons which I shall be very glad to give the gentleman, because the problem in the Central Valley project is apparently not understood by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. How about the Governor of California, then? Does he not understand it when he says $40,000,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Do you mean what do I think of the Governor of California?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. You said the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] did not understand that point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; I said that.

Mr. KIRWAN. How about the Governor of California, when he said $40,000,000 was necessary?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What the Governor of California said to the committee—and I was present at the time—was that it would be economy if, instead of spreading the completion of the Central Valley project over a longer number of years at the rate of about $20,000,000 a year $40,000,000 were spent every year to complete the project in a shorter time, after which repayments would start.

I have a very high regard for the present Governor of California. I think that the country needs him on a bigger job. But I think the Governor of California would be one of the first to say that no more money should be appropriated in any one fiscal year than can reasonably be spent in that year. He would not like any more than I did the Bureau of Reclamation policy of having money appropriated, only to find it unspent at the end of the year. The subcommittee says that more than $17,000,000 right now rests in the unexpended funds of the Central Valley project. Some of my friends who live there say it is nearer $12,000,000. The point remains the same: There will be available, from the total of present unexpended funds and the new appropriation, more than the $20,000,000 asked for in the budget request. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked me if I would vote for a motion to recommit, if it increased this item to $40,000,000, and I said "No." That figure is just plucked out of the air, without analysis of the labor, material, ability to contract the work, or other items in the picture.

I would much rather have my distinguished friends the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] or the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] or the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] talk about Central Valley, but I can easily show the gentleman what I mean. The item, on page 35, line 7, shows Irrigation Facilities, $5,134,980, without earmarking the irrigation projects for which it could be expended. Our experience with the Bureau of Reclamation has been that although for years the farmers of California have begged that the water be taken down through the Friant-Kern Canal, as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has said time and time again, the Bureau will not build that canal. The committee evidently was not fully aware of the fact that when work begins upon that canal it must at the same time begin upon the Delta-Mendota Canal, because one project balances the taking of the water in the other project. It would have been better to make that item $10,000,000 and earmark it for construction on those specific projects. I would have said that would be a good idea. I might agree to other increases if you will designate them. But to ask me if I would vote for $40,000,000 is just exactly the same kind of appropriation request I have been subjected to for the 4 years I have been here, and which I, as an analyst, do not want to be subjected to any further.

I find it hard to justify the item of $256,680, in line 11, to build a transmission line from Shasta to Delta. It may be necessary, but my understanding is that the power is to be sold at the end of that line for less than it can be sold for at the dam. I will support public development of power, and I will remind the Members of this House that before power construction began in connection with the Central Valley project, power in that area, from the private company, was so high in cost that it was ruining the farmers who had to buy it to pump water for their farms. I simply do not see how you can build a power line and sell power at the end of the line for less than you can sell it for without the line being built, and then call that good business from any standpoint.

In other words, I think these are cases that require consideration and not lump-sum treatment. The gentleman from New York asked me if I would vote for some round figure in a motion to recommit. I do not want to vote that kind of an appropriation in any bill. I will not vote for flat percentage cuts if I can possibly avoid such votes, and I will not vote for percentage increases, nor for increases picked out of the clouds. However, to get back to what I was saying, I am basing my decision on what to do now on this floor, about this appropriation bill on the fact that the Government of the United States is a government of checks and balances. I never saw a perfect bill yet and I have never seen a bill that was completely bad. When a bill comes to the floor and is reviewed openly on the floor it then goes to the other body and there corrections are made on the basis of what is said in this House and upon what the Members of the other body want.

So I believe that we should say here what it is we think requires correction in this bill; and when the bill goes over to the other body and comes back to us I think that it will be a bill I can support and defend to the people of my district.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would yield gladly but only if I can get more time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will not the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The committee chairman has indicated that I cannot get more time; I am sorry. I would like to yield to the very able gentleman from Nebraska.

On page 43, the committee has specified that there shall be no more work on a force account basis. I know why the committee put that in, but the fact remains that if it stays in the bill it will be impossible to do certain work. For instance, if a weir breaks, or a bank gives way, it is absolutely impossible to wait for contract work in such emergencies; it must be done by force account. There

are types of construction and maintenance work which can be done only by force account. I know that was put in to correct a policy that I cannot defend, but if it is not changed, the effects will be disastrous.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] the chairman of my own delegation, but I have used nearly all my time, and I want to refer to specific items.

Mr. WELCH. I am sure my colleague does not want to misrepresent the Governor of the great State of California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Certainly not. I yield briefly, but I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. WELCH. Just long enough to quote the Governor correctly. Quoting from Governor Warren in his statement before the committee he said:

> It is because of the belief that the people of my State want the project accelerated that I appear before you today and urge an appropriation of $40,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. "Instead of $20,000,000 as provided in the President's budget."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I was there and heard the Governor say it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are certain specific comments I want to make regarding items and policies. I have spoken of the Central Valley project and shall not return to it.

On page 34, the bill shows that the committee cut the requested appropriation for $5,000,000 for general investigations to $125,000. That is not in the interest of economy. I understand the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is going to discuss this, and that he will submit an amendment to increase that item. I shall vote for that amendment, and I hope the Members of this House will listen carefully to the explanation and that they will vote favorably.

On page 35, at line 5, the Davis Dam project is given $6,200,000. The Congress is obligated to build this dam. It is a detail of the Mexican Water Treaty. I am advised by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] that this is not the proper amount. I do not know; but I do know, like other Members of this House, that in the short time he has been here, the gentleman from Nevada has established himself firmly. I have confidence in his statement. It should be checked carefully before the bill comes back from conference. Also, I have in my district a situation similar to one which this bill now forces on Nevada. Boulder City, Nev., is entirely on Government land; no taxes are paid to Nevada, from which school money can be secured. The Federal Government has an established policy that in such instances, a subvention is made to help meet the costs of educating the children of the workers. We cannot, and should not, change that policy here. I think perhaps the subcommittee could not visualize such a situation, as we can who have seen it in spots like this one, and that this will also be corrected before the bill comes back from conference. In connection with the Big Thompson project: The farmers in that part of Colorado contracted to pay a certain sum; a poor guess on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation, plus rising construction costs, now makes that sum inadequate. The committee thinks the farmers should pay more. We cannot decide that here. They have a contract with the Government. The item, on page 35, at line 14, should be increased by enough to keep the work moving until the matter is settled. Probably the amount at issue is not more than a couple million dollars. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], who is a distinguished Member of this House, will undoubtedly talk about this.

I know that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] will place before this House, and if necessary, before the other body, the details of the Columbia Basin project, on line 6 of page 36. These items are the only ones, to my knowledge, in which the decisions of the committee in the opinions of the western Members, justify discussion here. There are, however, items that are not money items that are important.

Turn to page 39, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, The hardest thing any of us had to do, has been to get figures regarding the unexpended balances on which we can rely. Two separate computations may be millions apart, and both may come from the Department of the Interior. We cannot decide that puzzle now. It must be decided before the bill is signed. The committee depends on these unexpended balances for the fiscal year 1948. We depend on the committee. The lines to which I just referred say that only money in the reclamation fund may be used, or only money to the total of the fund. I ask now if these lines in any way jeopardize the use of the unexpended balances and particularly I ask whether these lines would interfere with the use of any money in the unexpended balances, if that money came from the general fund in fiscal year 1947 appropriations?

On the same page, beginning with line 23, those last 3 lines, and the first 8 lines on page 40, should definitely be struck out. I shall make a point of order if the committee does not, as I hope, strike them out by previous action. Without realizing it, the committee attempts to legislate on a matter which I expect will someday go to an international court or arbitration board. At best, this is based on questionable legislative action which does not take effect for perhaps 5 years, and this decision was specifically reserved in that legislative action, the Mexican Treaty referred to on line 4.

I hope that the committee will keep in mind that water is now stored back of Hoover Dam, and no longer back of "Boulder Dam." I am looking at line 11 on page 41.

The most important item, to me personally and to my district, is on page 42. About a dozen years ago, the farmers of the Coachella Valley signed a contract under which the Bureau of Reclamation agreed to build an extension of the all-American canal into that area, where the water table was falling dangerously low. The water is not yet on the land. It lies in the canal, a few miles from date groves, the result of years of work and investment, and the wells are turning salt in the groves. The people of the valley came to Washington, and put aside the technicalities, and were willing to overlook the inexcusable delays and the broken promises, and consented to sign an additional contract for the lateral canals, and finally they consented to a change in the engineering design, to hurry the completion of the project. We are working against time, no longer years, now it is months. When a well is drilled now, a flowing well goes out.

The farmers had contracted to pay about $13,000,000. They came here and agreed to pay an additional $13,500,000. That is a big addition. The Government will save about $8,000,000. The Bureau is to pay only for the protective features, now estimated to cost only $4,500,000, one-third of which is already spent. It is a wonderful deal for the Government; and only the urgency of the need for water would compel the farmers to consent to it. The Bureau now says that, on page 42 of this bill, the words, "including distribution and drainage systems)" must be taken from line 1, and placed after the word "California," on line 4. I am not a lawyer and so I will not call it quibbling; perhaps it really is necessary. All I know is that if this is not changed in this bill, I do not know how we can possibly save the date orchards which supply more than 90 percent of the commercial dates grown in the United States. I ask no increase in appropriations; I have asked the committee for this change.

On page 43, at line 8, there is another item for my district. I am told by the engineer there that $1,000,000 is not enough. I am not asking for any increase for a reason which I will make my final comment on this bill. This bill is for the fiscal year 1948. Congress will be back in January of that year. If the Bureau of Reclamation will go to work at once, seriously, earnestly and nonpolitically, and show that this amount, or any other like it, is being expended in a business-like manner, and economically, and still is not enough for the fiscal year, I would have no hesitation in asking the Appropriation Committee for the necessary money to finish the job that year.

If the Bureau dawdles, and plays politics, and sends its propagandists swarming over the various projects like ants, as it does over the Central Valley of California, my heart will not bleed over the cuts which the committee has made in the appropriation requests. It seems to me that the prospects of good will in the Congress and good appropriations in the bills rest entirely with the Bureau of Reclamation from now on.

My own conclusion is therefore that this bill is a good bill inherently, that in almost all cases it provides the amount of money which may be spent in one fiscal year, with three major exceptions, which will be discussed by the Members

from those areas. I do not believe it provides enough money for general investigations. If an amendment is offered to correct that I shall vote for it. I shall vote for the bill feeling that what is not corrected in this House will be corrected in the other House and that there will finally be brought out a bill that we can support here and with our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, soon we will have before us for consideration the adoption of a greatly expanded and new international world policy. The President and the State Department have recommended that we extend a special loan to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000, this loan to be expended in Greece partially for food and medical supplies but largely for the revival and rehabilitation of that nation's industries and part of the loan will go for military supplies to help modernize the Greek army.

This new policy provides for sending a military mission consisting of Army officers to Greece and also to Turkey to help train and reorganize the Greek and Turkish military forces. It is estimated that about $150,000,000 of the loan will go to Turkey and with it will go a military mission of Army officers who will help to reorganize and revitalize the military forces of Turkey.

The President in laying down this new world expansion policy says in substance that the United States Government commits itself to help defend and protect any nation in the world from being overthrown either by aggression or infiltration by another power. This new world policy committing our Government to the defense of other nations throughout the world which are so threatened is a thousand times more important than the consideration of the $400,000,000 involved. The President says this move is necessary to stop the spread of communism and the possible overthrow of these two governments leading into the Middle East.

Two questions arise which we should seriously consider. Will this amount of money and what we do for Greece and Turkey under the plan likely stop the spread of communism into the Middle East? The next question arising is how much money and manpower will it take to stop communism in Italy, France, China, and a half dozen other countries in Europe which are on the verge of being thrown over by Communist organizations at the present time? Personally, I seriously doubt whether the money we are called upon to expend and the effort we intend to make in Greece and Turkey will be sufficient to stop the expansion of communism if Russia really desires to go into the Middle East. You can find able men in Washington whose judgment is respected on military matters and throughout the Nation who will tell you that most countries on the European continent are in such a state of chaos and financial insolvency that Russia, if she so desires, could occupy and conquer the continent of Europe within 8 weeks' time.

Much as I detest, as we all detest, the ideology of communism, much as we detest the reprehensible conduct of the Russian Government in the past 2 years in her failure to cooperate with the United States and other peace-loving nations, and the United Nations Organization as well, we must not let our hatred of her policies influence our judgment and mislead us in our thinking on so grave a problem as this expansion of foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, we can all endorse the laudible ideal of the President who says we must stop the spread of communism. Every decent person in America is for the ideal of stopping the spread of communism. The Congress would unanimously approve the $400,000,000 requested for the Greek-Turkish loan if they felt certain that would stop it, or seriously retard its expansion in Europe, but the Members of Congress know that we must consider the realities and not laudible ideals.

Mr. Chairman, in reality we have served notice on Russia that we propose to stop her from expanding into the Near East. Much as we may regret it, Russia is now the greatest military power on the Continent of Europe. If Russia decides now or within the next year or two to move into the Middle East we will either have to back down on our foreign policy, or World War III will be upon us and the world. When this Congress thinks of the realities coupled with this new foreign expansion policy you must realize that if this move hastens World War III, that we have in fact established a military beachhead over 3,000 miles away which we will have to defend with all of the men necessary, the munitions of war and the might of the whole Nation.

Mr. Chairman, you must keep in mind that our acts on such momentous legislation as this and on all legislation is supposed to express the approval and thought of the American people. There is no question in my mind but that the majority of the American people are opposed to us taking this step at the present time. In fact, the Gallup poll, in its latest research on this question, some weeks ago showed that over 63 percent were opposed to it. You must visualize the possible reorganization of the draft boards throughout the Nation. You should visualize the possibility of millions of young men being filtered through these draft boards, again putting on the military uniform, the organization of the entire industry of the Nation in the war effort, controls of every kind again placed on our people, our resources geared to the production of implements of war, our national debt now standing at $260,000,000,000 possibly being increased by $50,000,000,000 a year. It appears that the majority of the House will follow the lead of the Senate and approve this legislation. If it does it is to be hoped that none of the things I have pointed out here today will happen, but I submit in deciding on this question we should not decide it on our emotional desires to stop the spread of communism in Europe, and fail to look at the practical side of what it may cost in human lives, American resources, and American finances.

Mr. Chairman, another question I want to raise is, can we afford to commit our Government to such a policy that may cost us many billions of dollars, for we will doubtless find that this $400,000,000 is only a first small down payment on the commitment of the American taxpayers to finance and pay out countless billions of dollars to defend and protect the rest of the world.

Let me point out to you that England and France, who fought two world wars as our allies, are in financial ruin today and France is in social chaos. We have piled up a debt of $260,000,000,000 and now the President and the State Department want us to rush in, declare this our new foreign policy, and furnish, at least temporarily, the international police force for the world. Such a move may well wreck our Nation financially, dragging the American people down into abject poverty where we cannot take care of our own people and cannot render further aid to the world. If we, the only great nation, believing ourselves solvent today, step into this trap and become involved world-wide in financing the rest of the world, all Stalin has to do is to threaten a little here and a little there on starting war on any boundary in Europe until he bleeds this Nation white financially, causing us to finance other threatened nations with millions of dollars each in their turn, until we wreck our Nation financially.

Mr. Chairman, nothing is so important to the American people and to the contribution in leadership it can make to the world for peace in the future than for us to make certain we keep this country sound financially. Unless we keep this country sound financially unemployment, want, and chaos will envelop this Nation as it has other nations under similar conditions. Such a condition would give the Communists in this country who want to overthrow it the very opportunity for which they and Communist Russia are hoping may ultimately happen. We cannot support our Army and our Navy for the defense of this country unless we remain sound financially.

It is one thing to have laudable ideas and use courageous words, but after we have just emerged from a Second World War which has cost us $400,000,000,000 and has left a debt of $260,000,000,000 with the rest of the world broke, not to mention the 300,000 of our finest American soldiers killed and 1,000,000 wounded, which sacrifice can never be repaid, we must figure the cost and deal with realities. It is time that the Members of this Congress who are fearful to take this step stand up and be counted against it.

Mr. Chairman, this will go down in history as one of the most momentous weeks in the Congress of the United

States. It may rank as of greater importance than the week in which we declared war on the Axis Powers a few years ago. Of course, it may turn out all right if the move is made. Every decent American hopes that it will—then again, things may happen to our Nation and to the world too fearful to contemplate. Another question arises: Can you buy off or stop with money that godless thing called communism? We helped liberate France for the second time, and we have given her over $2,000,000,000 since VJ-day, yet she shows no gratitude and her Government is practically controlled by Communists elected by her people. The newspapers of France cry out against the United States Government and praise Russia. We gave Russia over $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease and kept her from being conquered.

We accepted her in the finest embrace of friendship with the hope that she would be our friend and work with us and the other nations of the world for peace. You know the blackness of her record up to the very present moment. She has never kept her word once and has grabbed all the power possible. We have expended $3,000,000,000 on China, and we have not stopped or retarded communism there. We expended over six hundred million on Yugoslavia, millions on Poland, millions on Rumania and Bulgaria, and they are all Communist today, and not one of their rulers is friendly to the United States. We have expended over five hundred million on Italy, and she is tottering on the brink of communism now.

Mr. Chairman, Great Britain has spent over $500,000,000 on Greece and we have spent $485,000,000 on Greece, and yet we are told that we must go in and help to reorganize her army, for in this nation of 7,000,000 people a few thousand guerrillas are trying to overthrow the Government. There is no income tax paid by the well-to-do in Greece today. They have 120,000 people on their federal pay roll. The well-to-do class ha. largely been the beneficiary of the aid we had hoped would go to the poor people of Greece. Now we propose another loan, and, a thousand times worse, we propose to send two military missions, one to Greece and one to Turkey, and to establish, if necessary, a military beachhead, which may mean that the Balkans again has been chosen as the site upon which another world war is to be started.

Mr. Chairman, last week on the floor of the House I said that, in my judgment, there was another and a better way. We know now that the President and the State Department made a mistake when they rushed into this thing, bypassing the United Nations organization.

The fact that the Vandenberg amendments have been offered, asking the United Nations to approve or reject in substance our going into Greece, is an admission that a mistake was made. If our first move was a mistake, when you add this to all of the mistakes in our foreign policy from Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam—mistakes which will cost us billions of dollars, made by the State Department and our leaders—that will keep millions of European people in poverty for years—how can we swallow this thing with any certainty that this new policy is not another and greater mistake against the interest of the people of this country?

Mr. Chairman, if this Government wanted to do something in a substantial way, in a sensible way, to stop world expansion of communism, it should have suggested to the other peace-loving members of the United Nations organization that this Greek-Turkish problem be brought with all the force and power before the United Nations organization, demanding that Russia and her satellite nations cease and desist putting this pressure on Greece and Turkey. You answer that the United Nations is not completed to the point where they have the power. You do not know, because you have not tried it. The United Nations was set up for this purpose; and almost a year ago, when a like and serious situation arose, where Russia would not take her military forces out of Iran, that feeble nation came before the United Nations organization and demanded that it act. It did act, and Russia took her military forces out of Iran. There is not a question in my mind but that we are starting at this thing the wrong way, no question but that we have made a mistake; and I, for one, refuse to follow through to save the face of the State Department or the bipartisan movement in the House and Senate, thereby compounding their mistakes, which may prove to be the most tragic made in the history of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the only way to call Russia's bluff is to call it before the United Nations, representing 51 nations of the world. In addition to taking this matter to the United Nations, I think that the United States should take the leadership, asking other nations to join with her, first, to immediately amend the United Nations Charter, doing away with the veto power; secondly, to provide for inspection under the United Nations organization of atomic energy from the mines through the laboratories into the factories of every country in the world; and third, that another amendment should be passed that would provide for fixing military armament quotas for nations world-wide. This can be done and should be done without further delay. If these two bold moves were made instead of the approach we are about to make, Russia would be put on notice before the world, and it is the judgment of many of the best minds of this country that the United Nations organization does have the moral power, suasion, and force to stop this expansion in Greece and Turkey by Russia as it did in Iran.

Mr. Chairman, if these amendments were rapidly driven through under the leadership of the United States and Great Britain and they can be, millions of subjugated people in Poland who want liberty, millions in Rumania, millions in Czechoslovakia, millions in Greece, millions in Austria, millions in France, Italy, and other nations could then look with hope to the United Nations as a great, powerful living force for liberty, freedom, and peace.

Mr. Chairman, these millions in the grass roots of these countries would start a pressure against the domination of communism in their countries that would drive it back into the confines of Russia. If the United Nations Charter is amended along the lines I have suggested, and I may say that I made a speech on the floor of the House almost 2 years ago advocating such a move, it will sweep the power and the influence of the United Nations organization forward to where the people of the whole world can indulge a real hope for lasting world peace.

You may answer, if these amendments are made to the United Nations organization, Russia may walk out. Well, on her past record, the sooner she walks out the better. This will call her bluff, and maybe make her dictatorial leaders think. She should be invited to stay in with the door left wide open, with a standing invitation for her to come back in, which no doubt within a short period of time she would do, because she would be given one choice to line up in full, honest fellowship with the rest of the world for peace, or become an aggressor nation, against which 70 percent of the world could be legally hurled against her through the United Nations organization. She can join with the rest of the world for peace or commit national suicide.

Mr. Chairman, they have urged that the United Nations organization cannot immediately finance aid to Greece. This Nation could authorize the expenditure of $100,000,000 through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Export-Import Bank. In fact, it could be turned over to the United Nations organization as one of our first contributions; possibly other nations, if they were invited in, would begin to make their contributions through the United Nations with the same purpose in view.

The President could be given the authority to authorize the Secretary General of the United Nations to begin to use our funds immediately through UNRRA or some other organization it would desire to bring into being. Funds for relief could be gotten to those countries as quickly through the United Nations as can be in the course provided by the legislation we are considering. In that way prompt and immediate help could go through the United Nations organization.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations organization has been dealing with Greece in a practical way. Months ago a Food and Agricultural Organization committee was sent to Greece by the United Nations, which investigated the entire situation there and came back with recommendations. That committee recommended that only temporary aid should be given by England and the United States in the way of some food and other necessary imports. They said some emergency relief was necessary and recommended a long-term permanent rehabilitation program for the Greek economy for assistance to that nation and that such assistance should be furnished through the World Bank. As I recall, the committee which made this study thought an emergency fund of about $100,000,000 would be ample at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, since VJ-day our Nation has contributed over $7,000,000,000 to help to feed, clothe, and rehabilitate the European nations and China. We are committed to a billion and a half dollars in relief to other nations this coming year. There are requests for billions of dollars through the Export-Import Bank and a great amount of money will go out through that organization. All of this money must come from the American taxpayers.

While I am willing to go as far as we can to help world humanity and while I am anxious to oppose the spread of communism anywhere and everywhere, I cannot bring myself to believe this legislation is the right approach to these vexing problems. For over 30 days I have kept an open mind, sought information from every source and thought seriously about this problem in the hope so far as I am individually concerned that I might be able to cast my vote in the best interest of the people I represent and of the entire Nation. Unfortunately, none of us can be certain, however, as to our decision. Time only will tell. From my study of this problem, however, it is my honest conviction, which I fear a majority of this body does not hold, that I will be serving the people of this Nation best by opposing this legislation.

The people in my district are divided on this question; some of my best friends favor it while I believe the great majority of my people are opposed to it. I believe the majority of the American people, if they understood this legislation, would hesitate to endorse it.

Mr. Chairman, I am so certain that this approach settles nothing and that it may ultimately prove to be disastrous to this Nation that I cannot support it.

We cannot have world peace unless we cast the burden of keeping the peace of the world on the United Nations organization and back that organization. We can have peace, world peace, in my judgment, if those who are leading us would reverse their position, and join their forces behind the United Nations organization through which, in my judgment, only can world peace ultimately be achieved.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations I was assigned to the Department of the Interior Subcommittee. I found the members of the Interior Subcommittee to be the finest type of gentlemen possible with which to be associated, and I may even say, to be locked up with, for a period of 2 months, of any group that I could have hand-picked myself. The chairman of this committee, while we have not always agreed, and many times violently disagreed, on matters as to how to proceed and arrive at conclusions on matters, I found to be one of the most estimable gentleman with whom it has ever been my pleasure to serve. He has given unlimited and precious time to a study of the problems concerning a section of this country with which he is not particularly concerned, and the highest honor that I can bestow upon him is that every proposition that I have heard him advance has been an honest conviction. As for the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the same thing can be said. I found him to possess the most comprehensive and charitable views of problems of the western part of the United States that I doubt are shared by any other member of the committee who has seen as little of that part of the country as has he. I can speak equally well of the other members of the committee, and we certainly worked under conditions of high compatibility during the entire 7 weeks time that were taken up by these hearings.

In regard to the matter of reclamation, which as you probably know is closest and dearest to my heart, there was a sharp degree of variance of opinion upon that great work. The figures for 1948 submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by the Reclamation Department was $260,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget in its wisdom cut this amount to $145,000,000. That was the amount which came before us and which was considered by our committee.

In the final analysis, we allowed $62,000,000 to carry on this great work, which as you all know is of major importance to the West.

A member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], earlier today made a statement that I think is at some variance with my understanding of what transpired in the committee and, with the gentleman's permission, I should like to give my idea of it at this time. He said awhile ago, if I quote him correctly, and if I do not I stand for correction, that this was a report of a majority of the committee. Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. The bill before you today is not a report of the majority of the committee, and I want to tell you just exactly why it is not a report of the majority. It was announced in our committee hearings on a certain day that in case of variance of opinion among the members of the committee as to the general policy that would be outlined to us, if the majority of the committee could not see fit to go along, another very important Member of the Congress was ready, willing, and waiting to come down and assist us in our work, that he would be only too happy to assist us in our work, and that he as a member of the full committee would be allowed to cast a vote in our deliberations. In other words, the sword of Damocles was dangled over the heads of the committee members.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that the "big, bad wolf," may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That could be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman that just preceded the gentleman told us that there were just a few items in this bill that were objectionable. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to a few provisions of this bill, among others, that are objectionable to Wyoming.

Now as the gentleman well knows about 75 percent of the area of Wyoming drains into the Missouri River Basin and for that reason I am intensely interested in the appropriation for the Missouri River project.

The State of Wyoming is dependent to a great extent upon irrigation for successful and well-balanced agricultural economy. The benefits derived from the lands now under irrigation have proven so great that there is no question as to the desirability or necessity among the people for expanding this irrigated land as rapidly as possible.

The committee's report provides for reducing the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri River Basin Project from $23,000,000 to $9,611,600 and restricting the use of this money to units now in the construction stage.

This appropriation as it now stands provides for continuation of construction on the Boysen and Kortes units and for continued planning on Owl Creek, Paintrock, and Shoshone extensions in Wyoming. No allowance is made for continuation of work on many other units which are in various stages of development. The following Missouri Basin project units in Wyoming have been completely eliminated from the 1948 program by the committee's action:

Belle Fourche Storage	$10,000
Glendo	200,000
Tongue River Development	25,000
Powder River Development	100,000
North Platte River Development	60,000
Shoshoni	13,000
Sheridan Canal Unit	25,000
Total	433,000

The first two units are included with that group of projects on which plans are being prepared for construction. The $200,000 requested for the Glendo unit will be used to continue detailed surveys, right-of-way negotiations, economic studies and geological explorations, in order that preconstruction work on all features can be practically complete by the end of the fiscal year 1948. The area that will be served by the Glendo Project has been under water for many years and this project will provide supplemental water badly needed. The area to be served was involved in the case of Nebraska v. Wyoming decided June 11, 1945, and apportioned the natural-flow of the North Platte River between those two States and Colorado. The apportionment was made in sections, and the last section of the river covered by the decree was that portion between the Whalen Dam, which is the diversion dam for the Interstate Canal on the North, and the Fort Laramie Canal on the South of the North Platte River, extending to the Tri-State Dam, which is just over the line in Nebraska. The natural flow of the river in this section was apportioned, 75 percent to Nebraska, and 25 percent to Wyoming.

Up until said decree was made, Wyoming had refused to recognize some 700 feet of the Tri-State Canal appropriation now owned by the Farmers irrigation district, and up until that time Wyoming had furnished her direct-flow right ditches with sufficient water; since that

time there has been, and probably will continue to be, an insufficient supply for these older ditches.

The special master in the Wyoming-Nebraska case found that the early appropriators, with their priorities and appropriations, were as follows:

Stat	Canal	Priority	Acres	Second-feet
Wyoming	Grattan	1882	614	9
	North Platte	1883	3,153	45
	Rock Ranch	1884	2,250	32
	Pratt-Ferris	1886	1,200	17
Total			7,217	103
Nebraska	Tri-State	1887	51,000	729
	Mitchell	1890	13,633	195
Total			64,633	924
Wyoming	Burbank	1891	292	5
	Torrington	1891	2,061	29
	Lucerne	1893	4,221	60
Total			6,574	94

There is usually direct flow available to the four Wyoming ditches first named, whose total requirements in second-feet amount to 103. This would require that there be 412 second-feet of water natural flow in the river, however, before these four oldest rights could be supplied.

Then in order of priority come the two Nebraska ditches, with requirements for 924 second-feet.

Then come the second group of three Wyoming ditches, with total requirements of 94 second-feet.

This makes a total of 1,121 second-feet required for the 9 ditches, but the total of the 2 groups of Wyoming ditches is 197 second-feet. Whenever there is 788 second-feet in the river the Wyoming ditches are taken care of. In other words, where Wyoming used to be able to satisfy her 197 feet of appropriations whenever there was that amount plus 195 feet for the Mitchell ditch, or 392 feet of water in the river, it now takes almost 800 second-feet to accomplish this. During the irrigation season the river frequently falls far below this 800 feet requirement.

In 1932, 1934, and 1936, the direct flow frequently fell below 1,000 second-feet. In 1934 it rose above 800 second-feet for only about 33 days during the entire season, and was below 400 second-feet about 34 days. In 1936 it was below 1,000 second-feet for over 50 days during the season, and below 800 second-feet about 28 days.

I quote the above from page 1385 of the court's decision in the Nebraska-Wyoming case in 89 United States.

During the crop season of 1946 the Burbank, the Torrington, and the Lucerne were out of direct-flow water much of the months of July and August. There would have been a very disastrous water shortage had it not been that the water users depending on storage rights in Pathfinder Reservoir graciously rented to these older ditches some 12,000 acre-feet of storage water which was temporarily available. These same ditches are trying this year to rent storage from the same source. No decision has been reached as yet, and if these storage waters are not made available to these three ditches again this year, the result will be disastrous.

It is only very occasionally that any storage is available for rental. The entire storage supply is needed by the Bureau of Reclamation districts comprising the North Platte project and the Warren Act contractors who have heretofore purchased a permanent supply of stored water from the United States. This situation affects not only the almost 6,600 acres of land under Wyoming ditches that are now made short of water, but it also affects the Mitchell ditch, whose lands lie on the south side of the North Platte River in Nebraska, and amount to over 13,600 acres. Before the Mitchell ditch can be supplied with its full appropriation there must be 924 second-feet of water available to Nebraska appropriators, and that requires that there be natural flow in the river of 1,232 second-feet. Nebraska is as much interested in the proposed Glendo Reservoir as Wyoming, or should be. With all available storage rights disposed of, some additional storage must be developed to save the lands under the Mitchell ditch and the three Wyoming ditches. This is not adding new acreage, it is not developing a new territory, the lands served by the Mitchell ditch lie in the famous Mitchell Valley, south of the towns of Morrill and Mitchell, Nebr. The Burbank ditch serves lands lying in what is known as the London Flats country southwest of Lingle, Wyo. The lands under the Torrington ditch immediately surround the town of Torrington, Wyo. Some 200 water users under this ditch reside on tracts of from a fraction of an acre to 4 or 5 acres, live on these semifarm homes, and work in or in the vicinity of Torrington. They have developed these farmsteads with trees, shrubs, lawns, berry patches, orchards, and gardens, and their future, indeed, looks dismal. The lands under the Lucerne ditch surround the town of Lingle. I venture that there is not another 4,000 acres of irrigated land in the West that produces more heavily than do these fine farm lands when they have an adequate supply of water.

The Guernsey Dam lies some 8 or 10 miles up the river from Whalen, and just above the town of Guernsey, Wyo. The original capacity of this dam was 69,000 acre-feet; it has silted up until today its capacity is only about 45,000 acre-feet, and it is continuing to silt at the rate of about 1,000 acre-feet per year. This dam was built to serve two purposes, first, as a regulating dam to assist in handling the waters of Pathfinder Dam. It takes about 4 days for water to flow from Pathfinder Dam to Guernsey, but only an hour or two to flow from the Guernsey Dam to the headworks at Whalen serving the two large Government canals, the Interstate Canal and the Fort Laramie Canal. With a small supply of storage available at Guernsey, excess waters in the river can be caught and held when it becomes necessary to reduce ditch diversion, and ditch diversion can be speedily augmented when necessary.

Secondly, the dam has served to catch and hold flash run-offs from small tributaries of the North Platte River that would otherwise go to waste.

The proposed Glendo Reservoir would catch the silt which is now destroying Guernsey Reservoir and would leave that reservoir available for regulating the flow of the two Government ditches referred to above and the waters for Warren Act contractors that depend on it, and the Glendo Reservoir would also conserve these flash floods which the Guernsey Reservoir is presently going to have to let go to waste, and would make available for these old ditches a supplemental supply of stored water, and restore the value and fertility to upward of 20,000 acres of the finest irrigated farm land in the West.

On page 42 of this bill the committee proposes an appropriation of $250,000 from the Colorado River development fund for the investigation of projects in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin. Now this money does not come out of general funds of the Treasury but out of a special fund from power receipts of the Boulder Canyon project, and I cannot see why that item was reduced 50 percent.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations and public reports of the feasibility of projects for irrigation, generation of electric power, and other purposes in the States in the Colorado River Basin, and of formulating a comprehensive scheme for the control and improvement and utilization of the water of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act provides that $500,000 annually of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the years of operation ending in 1938, 1939, and 1940—amounting to a total of $1,500,000—are authorized to be appropriated only for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary, of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and other purposes, in the Colorado Basin States. The next such receipts up to and including the receipts for the year of operation ending in 1955 are authorized to be appropriated only for the investigation and construction of projects for utilizing the waters of the Colorado River system in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado Basin, namely, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Appropriations for fiscal year 1948 would come from the second reservation in the special fund which has been set aside for investigations and construction of projects in the States of the upper division. From this fund $2,599,750 has been previously appropriated, leaving $400,250 unappropriated. An additional $500,000 will accrue to this fund at the beginning of fiscal year 1948.

Without the appropriation of the funds requested in the budget estimate the Bureau cannot proceed with a project-planning program to provide for an orderly and adequate development of the water, land, and power resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin. Without such planning, this development, which Congress provided for in the 1940 act,

will be materially delayed. The withholding of $250,000 of the $500,000 requested, which is the amount allowed by law, is false economy, as the money comes from a special fund derived from the sale of power and not from the General Treasury. If the money is not appropriated, it merely accumulates in the special fund and does no good for anyone.

There are 100 potential within-basin projects in various stages of investigation in the States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin. About one-quarter of this total are under active consideration and those investigations should be pushed. The States of the upper division are now negotiating a compact for the equitable allocation of the available water between the States. Additional information on the potential projects is urgently needed in order that the States may arrive at a fair and workable compact. The withholding of necessary funds, particularly when those funds are already dedicated to a specific purpose, would serve to slow down unreasonably this extremely vital work of the compact commission and at a time when the Bureau has a force on hand in the area to do the work.

In 1922 the States of the upper division entered into the Colorado River compact which apportions the water of the Colorado River system between the States of the upper division and the States of the lower division. In entering into this compact the States of the upper division assumed an obligation to deliver 75,000,000 acre-feet of water at Lee Ferry in any 10-consecutive-year period. To meet this obligation the upper basin States must have hold-over storage reservoirs. The experience of the past 16 years has brought to our attention the fact that the upper basin States must provide some hold-over storage in the very near future. I feel strongly about this point and I have already introduced H. R. 2841, a bill to authorize the construction of certain Federal reclamation works in the upper basin of the Colorado River. Investigations on these important storage works are performed with funds appropriated from the special fund I have already mentioned. It is extremely important that these investigations be completed so that the upper division States may know when and how best they can meet their commitments.

The investigation in the upper Colorado River area, such as those of the Lyman project now nearing completion, and of the Sublette and Little Snake River projects now well advanced would be greatly retarded. All upper basin States would be affected by stoppage of work on investigating the hold-over storage projects required to meet the Colorado River compact commitments.

Now, then, I certainly cannot agree with the cut in the general investigations fund from the requested amount of $5,000,000 to the token appropriation of $125,000, which will completely eliminate investigation programs now under way in the Western States.

The maintenance of an adequate program of Federal irrigation development is essential to a sound national economy. Irrigation is a sound investment. It pays its way. It creates new wealth and new permanent opportunities for business expansion and employment, but sound irrigation development is impossible without adequate planning.

The Bureau of Reclamation is now preparing comprehensive plans for 35 river basins and subbasins and is reviewing by means of these plans the entire water-resources situation throughout the 17 Western States, with the purpose of evolving the best plans for the optimum utilization of this resource for irrigation, power production, industrial and domestic uses, and to provide silt and flood control. The comprehensive basin plans present a program of development which will provide a means of maintaining a desirable standard of living for our future expanding population. In addition to the comprehensive basin plans being studied, the Bureau is actively investigating 115 individual projects. The token appropriation proposed will mean complete abandonment of all investigations throughout the West. It is less than 2 percent of the program now being carried out. Complete disintegration of the highly trained technical staff of the Bureau would result.

The importance of having adequate funds, so essential to sound planning, cannot be overemphasized. The costs of construction of irrigation power features of Bureau projects are reimbursable. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate thoroughly and to review the proposed plans adequately in order to be certain that all possibilities are carefully explored and the best plan selected Not only are there 115 projects now under investigation, but there is a constant demand from local interests for investigations of other new projects in all 17 Western States. This is inevitable, considering that water is the most valuable natural resource and the foundation upon which the economy of the arid and semiarid West is built.

Continuing study and planning for the best use of the combined water and land resources of the West is essential. The general investigation program now under way is designed for this need, but the amount proposed to be allotted will not permit worth-while results.

The work of the Bureau of Reclamation in investigations and planning of new projects, including the preparation of project planning reports for the authorization of construction of new projects, is carried on from three sources. These are the annual appropriations for general investigations, the Colorado development fund, and in the Missouri Basin, a portion of the Missouri Basin project appropriation. This bill, as reported out by the committee, practically eliminates all planning activities.

If the appropriation is limited to $125,000 for general investigations and $250,000 for the Colorado River development fund, together with the elimination of nearly all planning from the Missouri Basin project appropriation, all of the project planning work in the State of Wyoming will be stopped.

The type of expenditure represented by irrigation development is an investment as distinguished from a nonproductive expenditure. These projects will return the full amount of their cost to the Federal Treasury and will at the same time bring benefits of inestimable value not only to the areas in which they are located but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes. May I interject at this point that I expect to offer an amendment tomorrow upon that specific item?

Mr. BARRETT. I will certainly support that amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. While this committee was working long hours and very diligently, plans were being made for a visit of the President of Mexico to the city of Washington. One of the purposes of that visit will be to secure a loan of $25,000,000 for the development of irrigation and public power in Mexico.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Does the gentleman believe there is any question but that he will get it?

Mr. CURTIS. I am not going to give it to him.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I was going to explain why it was that it was not necessary to call in the "big, bad wolf." It was brought very tangibly to the attention of the committee that in case of disagreement under the general policy as outlined this gentleman would be brought in and he would be allowed to vote with the committee. If the contemplated or anticipated alinement of the members followed, then with the gentleman coming in it would probably make a tie vote, and if a tie vote ensued it was announced that the rules of the House would be invoked, and, consequently, no amount of money would go into the item. In other words, in case of a tie vote, nothing would be allowed.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman has explained it quite well.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say, of course, the other side of the fence played smart politics by putting my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the committee to take Mr. NORRELL'S place and, of course, knowing that Mr. ROONEY would go along with the spending of any amount of money that anyone could suggest. So, in order to offset that, it was necessary for the Republicans to do that which we thought is right and proper. That never would have been done if it had not been for the fact that the other side of the aisle had placed the liberal on that committee for the sole purpose of outvoting us.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Iowa, if it is not the fact that I have always been for proper economy in Government. I have opposed appropriations for the Grazing Service when my good friend, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and I had it out hot and heavy in this

Chamber. I have opposed appropriations in this bill in connection with the Park Service when I found out they were giving concessions entered into under the Hoover regime in 1932 which practically was a larceny on the Treasury of this country. The gentleman from Iowa knows that I never did ride on headless horseman economy where we cut out the very vitals of America by denying appropriations for projects such as the one in the district of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say the gentleman also showed his conservatism when he opposed the concession plan for the Statue of Liberty. He said that the Government was not getting a fair proportion of the money that was derived from that concession so he has shown how he stands on economy.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows that I showed in the case of the Statue of Liberty, where the little fellow could go in and buy some soda pop and a hot dog, that the revenues to the Federal Treasury were about 100 times more than they were out at Yosemite Park in California, where the concessionaire was appointed by Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, where they do $3,000,000 worth of business a year and Uncle Sam's Treasury gets the huge sum of $5,000 for the privilege of using the entire park and any number of structures and the use of Uncle Sam's roads and police and water and garbage-removal service and everything else. Uncle Sam gets $5,000 for that nice concession. The gentleman from Iowa well knows I am the one who brought that to the attention of this committee and this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. ROONEY. What has the gentleman from Iowa done about it up to date?

Mr. JENSEN. I give the gentleman credit and I want the House to know that the Republicans on the committee went right down the line with him. He was absolutely right, but the fact still remains, they renewed all of those concession contracts. It was not this committee that did it. It was the Interior Department that renewed them, just about as they were before. So I am sorry that all the work he did came to almost nought because of the fact that the boys downtown just said, "No, we cannot do this."

Mr. ROONEY. I would like the gentleman from Oregon to continue with the tale of the "big, bad wolf."

Mr. STOCKMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in answer to his nicely worded statement, I am not an analyst of politics in any degree. I am probably unable to surmise the political aspect of the various Democratic and Republican maneuvers, if there were any such.

But to proceed, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] referred to the majority report of the committee. That is, the foundation of the report. I believe you will all agree with me that that is not exactly what one would term a bona fide majority report as is usually accepted by the House.

Mr. ROONEY. I dislike to interrupt my good friend, but I will give him such time as has been taken in the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and myself. Is it not a fact that the three members of the minority, serving on the subcommittee, voted for a greater amount than the amounts allowed by the majority of this committee, in connection with the reclamation projects?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. On last Monday the Appropriations Committee, composed of 43 members, approved the committee report. It is the majority report of the entire Appropriations Committee. The gentleman did not object in the committee meeting to any part, any word, any phrase, or any figure in the report. It is the committee report.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the sense in wasting time? It is just like marking up the bill.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I continue without being interrupted? The force of the gentleman's statement is that this is a subcommittee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. As a matter of fact, this Appropriations Committee consisting of 43 members approved this report before it was made public. There cannot be any question but what it is the majority report of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not see what there is to argue, belaboring the point as to how the votes were cast in the subcommittee, because if the gentleman had any complaint to make, he should have raised it in the committee on last Monday. If the gentleman from New York feels wronged, he is in the same position I was for 6 years on the committee when I was a member of the minority. I was a part of the 17 and he was a part of the 25 that rolled this up year after year and broke the economy of Uncle Sam.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio whether or not any member of the majority in the full Committee on Appropriations offered any amendment to increase any amount in this bill as reported by the majority of the subcommittee?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. In the executive session of the committee the majority voted the bill out. The report filed was by authority of the Appropriations Committee. What happened in the committee is of no importance, except that the majority voted it out.

Mr. ROONEY. I absolutely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield, gladly.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will agree with the gentleman if he will use the remainder of his time. I would like to hear him.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Now, a belated answer to my distinguished colleague from New York in the matter of the vote in the subcommittee. I want to keep the record straight. Let me say here and now—and if I am wrong I desire correction—at no time was a vote taken in the subcommittee. But, you say, this is the majority report of the subcommittee. I just merely want to have the facts as they appear to me firmly established in the record.

Now, to proceed, this committee in its wisdom allowed $62,000,000 for the reclamation fund. The amount originally proposed by the Bureau was $260,000,000. This is a cut of $198,000,000, slightly more than a token cut, if I may be allowed to make the observation.

Mr. Chairman, there are two kinds of appropriations in my humble judgment: One is what may be termed "pork-barrel" legislation, that is money that is perhaps in most cases wisely expended and so spent for the benefit, use, and advancement of most of the people in the United States of America. It has, however, a feature and that is that that sort of money is not reimbursable. The other type of appropriation is what may be termed "for capital investment" and it is entirely reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States whether it be in the reclamation fund or the general fund, and it is under that heading that the amount of money appropriated for proposed reclamation projects come.

That makes a vast difference. This money is only being loaned to the people interested in these irrigation projects; and, in passing, let me say that the settlers on these projects are not merely citizens of the 17 Western States, they are citizens of every State in the Union. It directly benefits all of us.

A question has arisen as to whether money appropriated from the general fund and for the construction of reclamation projects is proper or not. It has been decided in one way that it is not proper. I think there is merit to the fact that the money from the general fund of the United States Treasury which is used for reclamation projects does not come back to the general fund. Instead, that money is repaid and, I may say, with 3 percent interest to the reclamation fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think that proposal to make repayments to the general fund has merit. I believe, however, it is folly and short-sighted economy at this time to cut off all the reclamation projects there are in progress of construction and limit them to money that is available in the reclamation fund. In so doing I want to subscribe to the theory of the gentleman from Ohio, that money appropriated from that fund when it comes back should be credited to the fund and the people of the United States, who furnish the money for that fund, should be reimbursed. But in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is not the right way to do it, to cut off our nose in order to be able to get even a just proposal before the American people. That may be one way to do it. There is a dif-

ference of opinion, and there is no one who is a greater admirer of the chairman who has proposed that proposition than I am, but I think this is a pretty rough method in order to enforce that demand.

In the reclamation section of the bill the committee—and I say in its wisdom—saw fit to cut the salaries and expenses budget from an amount which was based on the Bureau of the Budget request of $4,800,000 to $3,000,000. Maybe that is too much; maybe it is not. I yield to no man when I say I am first and foremost a champion of economy and especially of Government funds. I believe that the figures will justify my statement that there are some personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation that could properly be dispensed with. The Bureau of Reclamation is somewhat in the same situation as Topsy, it has just growed, to use the vernacular, and I think there may be some cut made in that connection, but if it will eliminate the key men, the top men, the brains of a great million-dollar organization, then, Mr. Chairman, it is poor and false economy to cut the amount to the amount which we did cut it.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate that the gentleman is the first speaker who has mentioned this vital point. In addition to the fund the gentleman has mentioned, the cut in appropriations, in that same section they have placed a specific limitation of $6,500,000 that will reduce the number of engineers by 1,300, destroying the whole engineering structure, design and construction program for this great project and in 1,552 pages there is not one scintilla of testimony or evidence justifying this cut.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

I would like to call attention to another matter which I intend to follow up further tomorrow. That is the matter of general investigations. The Budget Bureau saw fit to allow $5,000,000 for this item. I submit to you that the Bureau of the Budget is not giving away money and when it allowed $5,000,000 for this important work it scrutinized the item very closely. The committee saw fit to allow $125,000 in place of $5,000,000.

The work of the general investigation department is to see beforehand just what the possibilities are of a proposed reclamation project, find out what type of soil is there, whether or not it is susceptible to irrigation, whether or not it is practical for irrigation; and the saving of four or five million dollars in that item could very well in the future lead to the ill-advised use of many, many, many millions of dollars. That is one item which could well receive the close scrutiny of this House and probably be raised to a modest amount which will allow the Bureau to keep on its staff men who have been trained by lifelong experience in the work of finding out what can or what cannot be irrigated.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the amount that was spent for investigations during the past year by the Bureau of Reclamation? Does the gentleman have those figures?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No; I do not have the exact amount but I would think it would be close to the budget figure.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I have been advised that there is a large sum being carried over. I do not know whether it is enough to take care of the requirements or not, but I wonder if the gentleman has the figures. I am interested in what the gentleman is saying and I intend to support his amendment raising the amount to whatever he thinks is fair and reasonable. I think we ought to check these projects and find out those that are feasible; in other words, get all the information we can.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment to increase the amount for these general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall support that amendment too.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. MURDOCK. When I said earlier today that this bill really sterilizes the action of the Bureau of Reclamation, I had in mind just this kind of cut, taking away the seed corn from our great western irrigation farmers of the future.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In addition to finding out whether the land is susceptible to irrigation, they have to investigate the stream flow and the dam sites, which takes a great deal of preliminary work.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; and that sort of work requires trained men, engineers who have followed that sort of work for years. It is a highly specialized profession. You cannot just pick those men up off the curbstone to do a job like that because if you do it will cost a great many millions of dollars if they are entrusted with that important work.

Members of the House, I have gone along, I think, with fairly good grace on most of this bill. I do believe that the Department of the Interior has many men who could be economically dispensed with. I do feel that they spend some money in disseminating information to the people that the people probably do not want. I was very happy to go along with those cuts, but when it comes to our investing the money of this Nation in a capital investment, in other words, a reimbursable investment that will be paid back with interest, and which is producing capital that makes for the prosperity of the entire United States, we should look at it in a different light. This is a Nation-wide proposition. It is not sectional. It is not confined to the 17 Western States. It is confined, gentlemen, to the 48 States, and it is a matter which is dedicated to the 140,000,000 people of this country, to which they are all eligible, and which you will find on these projects, coming from every section of these United States. It is our last greatest natural resource to be developed.

It has been said here on the floor today that our Mesabi iron range is only good for another 12 years, that our oil resources are only known to be good for another 20 years, that our timber is fast being depleted, that our fields are being mined of what was once thought to be an inexhaustible resource. Our food production in this country is likely, in the next 10 or 15 years, to be the exact reverse of what it is today. Today we are living in the land of plenty. Fifteen years from today, which is the tomorrow of today, it can and will very likely be an entirely different problem that will face us. It takes time to get these projects ready, and within the next 15 years we must not have it said that we failed in our duty here today to advance money for reimbursable projects which have all the worth-while values that anyone who analyzes the situation any way at all cannot help but say is feasible.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that we need at the present time to exploit these natural resources? Does our agricultural production indicate that we need to bring these additional lands into production through irrigation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; in my opinion it does.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman not believe that to further increase irrigated areas at this time would displace present agricultural production in other sections of the Nation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman not believe that the opening up of irrigation projects in recent years has caused a transfer of agricultural production to be concentrated in certain specific irrigated areas?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that will continue?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes. I hope it continues.

Mr. HARDY. Then, would the gentleman be in favor of consolidating the production of certain specified crops in an area where a hazard of some water condition might completely wipe out that production?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Let me place my thoughts before the House and not accept the gentleman's viewpoint to that extent.

Mr. HARDY. I am asking the gentleman for some answers.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I am not at all in favor of concentrating agricultural produce in any area, but that is a matter that is going to come whether we like it or not. All one has to do is to take a short automobile trip in either Maryland or Virginia and see the erosion of the soil in that territory, and I think it is indicative of the eastern seaboard; that it has been mined to the point of exhaustion, and the corn crop that you see growing there is mighty scant, being as charitable as I can about it, and it seems to me like bluegrass is one of the main crops.

Gentlemen, as sure as I stand here in the well of this House today, that within the next 15 years, if we do not open up the available irrigable acreage in the West, the ones that are the most productive acres of any country in the world, this country will face a food famine.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the failure of this bill to provide adequate funds for the education of Indian children, and for the maintenance of Indian hospitals. These are, I believe, two services which the Government should perform for the Indians to the best of its ability. That cannot be done on the amounts recommended in the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

One of the increases denied is the sum of $155,000 to meet the added costs of contracts between the Federal Government and local school districts for the education of Indian children. In my State and in several others where Indian children attend the public school, it has been the practice of the Congress to permit a Federal contribution on behalf of these children. This is necessary because most of the Indians live on nontaxable land, while the school districts depend on local property taxation for funds to operate the schools. Costs in these schools have been rising steadily. In Montana we estimate they have increased from 20 to 25 percent. Meanwhile the contribution of the Federal Government has not increased, and it is not paying its fair share of the expense of educating the Indian children. Where the Federal contribution fails to increase with rising costs, the school districts will be forced to curtail their school terms, increase the ratio of pupil to teacher, or even close their doors, with consequent serious effects on both the Indian and white children of the districts.

The Federal contribution for this purpose in all States has been about $600,000. This year the Bureau asked an increase of $155,000 so that the Government's contribution would be increased in proportion to rising costs. This increase has been denied, and instead all funds for education have been cut about $2,000,000.

As an example of the effect this will have in my district, I would like to explain the situation in the Brockton, Mont., public school. In this school 71 children out of a total enrollment of 105 are Indians. Most of their parents live on nontaxable land. The land of the white people in the district, the parents of the 34 white children, certainly cannot be expected to bear the cost of the entire school district. If the Federal Government does not pay its share of the expenses, the district will have to cut its services for both whites and Indians. This situation is repeated throughout my State, and it is serious.

The Federal Government has an obligation to perform in this matter, and I believe it must accept that responsibility. When the Federal Government made wards of the Indians it also assumed the responsibility for their welfare, and that includes adequate educational facilities. The Indian Bureau has been criticized repeatedly for not advancing the Indians so that they can take their places in our society as full citizens. It cannot advance the Indians if it is not allowed funds for their education. Education of the children is the very basis of all our hopes that the Indians may someday become free and independent citizens, a goal toward which we all should strive.

This applies also to hospital facilities for Indians. The costs of operating these hospitals has increased greatly. Even now we have in committee, deficiency appropriation requests which are absolutely necessary to maintain our Indian hospitals for the remainder of the current fiscal year. We are morally obligated to maintain these hospitals. Everyone knows that the costs of running such institutions have increased. Yet the committee has refused the $766,430 increase requested for the coming fiscal year. In view of the fact that we are going to have to furnish additional funds within a few days to keep these hospitals from closing May 1, it seems to me a short-sighted policy to attempt to hold the hospitals for another year under what has been proved to be an inadequate amount.

Adequate provisions for hospitals and schools are obligations we have assumed for our Indian citizens, and I hope that the House will see fit to restore the amounts cut in the committee report.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have made at various points in the debate this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have long been interested in the work of the Geological Survey in the fields of mineral and water resources, topographic mapping, and the supervision of mineral production from public lands. Consequently, I am concerned over the action of the Appropriations Committee in regard to the activities of the Geological Survey and believe that the House should realize some of the results of that action if the committee's recommendations are included in the Interior bill when it is finally passed.

We all realize that the strictest economy should be practiced in Government operations, but care should be exercised to insure that we insist on true, and not false, economy. Large sums were wastefully expended during the war in obtaining information in a desperate hurry because earlier investigations had not been sufficiently extensive. Such a situation should not be allowed to occur again.

I note that the ground-water investigations of the Geological Survey have been eliminated entirely. These are important studies and have been in progress for more than half a century. Their worth has been proved and the well-being of the Nation demands that they be continued. The ground-water studies of the Geological Survey are supported by such organizations as the American Water Works Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce. The use of ground water today is nearly double that in 1938 and irrigation interests, industries, States, and municipalities have come to look to the water facts determined and made available by the Survey as a necessity in planning development and growth.

The committee recommends that funds for land classification be reduced approximately 50 percent below the 1947 level and for mineral leasing work about 30 percent below this year's level. The committee apparently overlooked provision for work on Indian land leases. The value of minerals produced from the public and Indian lands has increased from $93,000,000 in 1938 to $183,000,000 in 1946. The Geological Survey is responsible by law for the classification of the public land as to its mineral character and for the supervision of mineral leases on the public land. If the committee's recommendations regarding these activities become law, the Survey will have to attempt to handle nearly twice the work load with a staff equivalent to that of 1938.

The committee recommends that topographic mapping by the Geological Survey be supported by only about one-third the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Few will doubt the vital importance of adequate maps in the conservation and use of natural resources; in the location and production of minerals; for the planning and construction of highways, railroads, and airfields; for the protection of the public health; for planning industrial expansion; and for many other purposes. The amount recommended by the committee for topographic mapping would permit only a small fraction of the most urgently needed mapping to be done. The mapping possible with the funds recommended by the committee would not even satisfy the minimum needs of the War Department alone, if no mapping were undertaken for other purposes. This seems like poor economy indeed.

In spite of the facts that new mineral deposits are discovered with increasing difficulty, that our resources of many minerals have been seriously depleted, and that others are being mined at a rate far exceeding the development of new resources, the committee recommends for 1948 geologic surveys on a scale about 15 percent below those carried on in 1947. Geologic surveys provide the best, in fact the only, systematic guide to the discovery and appraisal of additional mineral resources. The Geo-

logical Survey has worked out carefully a long-range plan of geologic studies designed to keep the United States, so far as is possible, in the enviable position in regard to mineral resources that the Nation has traditionally occupied, a position that all-out war use has already jeopardized. Experience has shown that Federal geologic surveys return their cost to the taxpayer severalfold and immeasurably increase the country's security through increased mineral resources.

It seems to me that other anomalies appear in the action of the Appropriation Committee in regard to the Geological Survey. With all the drastic cuts recommended for technical operations, the committee has approved an over-all survey budget of a little more than $9,000,000. This is a little more than three times the total amount appropriated for survey work 10 years ago. Corresponding increases, however, have not been recommended for administration and some servicing operations. For example, the amount recommended for the Director's salary roll provides for the same number of people in that official's office as was necessary in 1938. Topographic mapping is to be carried on at a rate about five times that in 1938, but the committee recommends provision for no increased production by the Division of Map Reproduction which performs the final steps necessary in making maps available to the public.

The committee recommends language prohibiting the transfer to other agencies of funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation. This language would deny to the Bureau of Reclamation the specialized services of the Geological Survey in the formulation of sound plans. The bureau depends largely on the survey for essential facts related to both surface and ground water, for river surveys, for topographic maps, and for basic geologic information. All these activities would have to be abandoned by the survey except those that could be financed with funds appropriated to the Geological Survey, which funds as I have indicated are recommended in amounts far too small to even approximate the investigations that should be carried on.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the regular appropriation bills to come before the Congress. Compared with the amounts involved in the two previous bills, the sums appropriated herein are almost inconsequential. Indeed, we appropriate by the bill before us only about 1 percent of the amount the three bills will appropriate, yet the actual reductions, the actual cut-backs in this bill are several million dollars more than in the two previous bills taken together, the sum of which is ninety-some-odd times larger than that in this bill. One would think that the promised $6,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures was to be accomplished by castrating the program for development of our natural resources, particularly by the emasculation of our great reclamation projects of the West. This, however, could not be because the total budget request was less than three hundred million.

I disagree with well-nigh every change that the committee has made in this bill. My disagreement does not arise out of any desire to be profligate or prodigal with public funds. It rather grows out of a feeling and conviction that here is the real false economy about which the President warned us not long ago.

Let me cite you, as one example of false economy, the complete elimination of the Power Division in the Department of the Interior. You will find in the first paragraph of the bill, after the enacting clause, the proviso that "no part of this appropriation shall be used for a Power Division under the Office of the Secretary. One must recognize the responsibility placed upon the Department of the Interior with respect to power to realize the really false character of this economy.

By the Flood Control Act of 1945 the Congress placed sole authority for the marketing of power from flood control hydroelectric dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Interior.

I hold in my hand a list of dams now under construction and now nearing completion; some of these will come into production of power within the next fiscal year. Others are under construction, but I would like to read this list:

Center Hill, Altoona, Dale Hall, Clark Hill, Wolf Creek, and Bugs Island.

At current power prices, the output of those dams will bring revenues to the Government in a sum, I am informed, exceeding $3,000,000 a year.

The committee recommends denial of any funds whatsoever for a division within the Department which exercises this responsibility placed upon it by law. I say that is very false economy. The estimates of the amount required for this particular division is quite small, too.

You remember, Mr. Chairman, what happened with the Wilson Dam after the other war. For years the dam stood idle. The water and energy was wasted and no return was produced on the Government's investment except that meager little amount that the power company would pay for the power at the bus bar. Are we creating here six more Muscle Shoals? Is that economy?

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, in addition to these marketing of power responsibilities, the Secretary of the Interior has supervision over the largest power program in the world, taken as a whole. Nevertheless, the Secretary may have no experts at hand to supervise and review rate determinations, or cost allocations, or operating practices, or contracts involving the more than $30,000,000 of revenue which is annually received from power operations. This division was abolished entirely despite its great responsibilities and although the amount of money involved in all was probably no more than the salary of the president of a big privately owned utility.

Is this economy? God save us from such shortsightedness.

I find myself in disagreement with the political philosophy and the fear for the future of America that I think is inherent in the provisions of this bill. I hasten to add that that disagreement in no way is based on any question of personality.

I have never worked with a committee among whose members there was more compatibility and genuine regard and real affection for every member. I pay tribute to every member. It is a great thing that in this grand government of liberty, in this country where freemen govern themselves by working their majority will, where citizens, Members of Congress, and great national political parties, can disagree and resolve their disagreement by majority action.

I was quite interested to hear the inner workings of the subcommittee revealed. My distinguished, able, and fine friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] says this is not a majority report. Well, if it is not a majority report, it must be a minority report. But I hasten to disclaim that it is a Democratic report or a Democratic bill. Historically, the Democratic Party has stood for progressive development of our natural resources and development of the West. The gentleman indicates that a majority of the subcommittee opposed these uneconomic, unsound curtailments of these beneficial projects. Since he has said so, I will not disagree with him in any respect. Certainly, no member of the minority party of the subcommittee favors this kind of bill.

So if it is not a majority report and bill, and if it is not a minority report and bill, in the sense that it is a Democratic bill and report, just how can we classify this monstrosity? I suppose we will have to call it what it really is, "The bill of the Republican leadership." One cannot escape the conclusion that Western Republicans, to say the least of it, do not control the policies of their party. Through the workings of our two-party system, the people have a choice, and, practically speaking, it is about their only effective means of expressing their choice upon issues and political philosophies national in scope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. I was not only disappointed in the outcome of the election last November but I was disappointed that the people were not given the clear-cut choice between policies and programs of the two parties which the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, now the beloved Speaker of this body, promised them as the minority leader, before election. True, some promises were made, but they were rather general in character. But apparently the majority of the American people, including, may I regretfully say, some Democrats, thought perhaps it would not be a bad idea to let the Republicans have control of the Government for awhile. There are indications that many, many such people have already had enough, and are only awaiting the opportunity to correct their mistake.

But despite the many mistakes and costly bungling of public affairs, one thing stands out, the two-party system is now working to the extent that by next

year the country will for once have that "clear-cut choice." The people are now having a look at the Republican program.

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, says that this bill is brought in in response to campaign promises. I have looked over the campaign promises and platforms and I have not found one word indicating that the Republicans promised to cut Central Valley 66 percent. I have not found a single word about destroying the Columbia River Basin project. I did not find a single promise that the people were to be denied transmission lines from the Bonneville Power project, the Southwest Power project, necessary to make cheap electricity available to the people. I just wonder where those promises were made. They do not seem to be a matter of record.

Now, with respect to these transmission lines, I want to say just a word. You will find a statement in the report that the committee believes that the consumers should erect their own substations. Let us look at that a minute. Here is a very high tension power line leading from a generator in a public power dam. The high tension power must be stepped down in order to be in usable form. So this committee says to the Rural Electrification Cooperatives out in the West, they say to the municipalities out there, the small towns, cities, and villages who own their own municipal utility systems, "You build your own substations." What does a substation cost? You could not hope to build a substation to tap one of these high Bonneville power lines for less than around a million dollars. How do you expect a small rural electrification cooperative, largely composed of farmers who contribute their mites every month, to build a million-dollar substation? That is like holding bread before a hungry child, but holding it beyond his reach.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That means that private monopolies will make profits by the expenditure of public funds in the generation of electricity.

Mr. GORE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I have a very high regard for him, and I know how sincerely he feels about this. Who in the West other than the private power companies could afford to build a million-dollar substation?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No one. That is the point I am making. The only thing left is for us to turn it over to the private utilities who already monopolize the whole valley.

Mr. GORE. Then will the gentleman join me in amendments tomorrow to strike such provisions from the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these few minutes to present an eyewitness account—a kind of report highly prized by the press, but to which no particular value seems to attach here in the Congress. At least, that is often my impression, and I think it is a mistake. The Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has recently taken action regarding the Central Valley project of California, and that bill, containing an appropriation for the project, is soon to be followed by other legislation relating to different aspects of this vast undertaking. When early this month I had occasion to be in California and see the project for myself, talking with the people on the spot, it came to me that I had been acting on the basis of what was really a very vague conception of this large operation, and that most of my colleagues doubtless shared the dimness of my vision. Insofar as I can, I would today correct this situation. I make no recommendations. Simply, for the reference of the Members of the House, I am reporting what I saw and heard and learned at first hand.

I went there as an out-of-stater who had done more than the usual citizen's share of listening to the superlatives of the California story. I had heard the statistical arguments regarding the relative urgency of completing the great Central Valley project—arguments which reduce miles upon miles of fertile farmland to a figure 1 inch long and which translate the realities of human life into the tricky words of a fiscal debate. But without having seen for yourself an uncompleted canal—the water at one end and the dry land waiting, extending out from the unfinished end—you do not know really what a broken promise looks like. Those are emotional words—"broken promise"—and we do not, sitting here, approve of emotional words. But all the time that water is standing there behind its dam and the canal is taking off and then abruptly stopping, and all the time the land is lying there waiting—the land and the farmers.

Well, when you have been there and seen it and talked with the people, about all you can come back and tell anybody is that the words are not good enough—my words or anybody else's—because you have really got to see it for yourself. But the experience is so compelling that then you have got to contradict yourself and try to tell about it. I am going to do that, briefly, because I wish that this body might be able to see beyond and behind the arguments, the words, when this California project comes up for discussion here.

It is not difficult to see the Central Valley or to see and understand the meaning of the Central Valley project. Its meaning is as clear as those before-and-after photographs which show plain women becoming beautiful. Whether you fly over it in a plane or drive across it in a car or walk over the fields—I did all of these—this is an open-and-shut case of liability becoming asset, and the process which brings this about is as clearly to be seen as the result. You go along for 150 miles—and that takes a long time, even in a plane—looking at dry land with not much on it. You do not have to close your eyes and imagine what it would look like with a water supply because always, interspersed with the arid lands, are lucky lands where water is available. Often the green, watered stretch expands and almost fills the breadth of the valley, but always, again, within sight, is a stretch of the unlucky land, stricken with dryness. Then you hear how the irrigated acres are losing their water supply—how it is dropping out of reach into the ground. They tell you about the wells that used to pump at 20 to 30 feet, down now to 10 times that depth, or even as low as 450 feet. That is expensive pumping, but what is worse is that that is near the bottom. There is a bottom to that underground water. They know it, those Central Valley farmers, and they also know they have just about reached it. You can go over on the west side and see the scraggly crops that are becoming more common because there the wells have begun to bring up salt water, and again you do not have to close your eyes to see what these cultivated areas will look like when their water is entirely gone because right alongside is the desert. That is the way it will look. Sometimes—and I know it is not easy to believe this if you have not seen it for yourself—the two kinds of land lie just on opposite side of the highway. To your left, as you drive along, lush, prosperous fields; to your right, the desert. Before and after. But which is before? Which is after? Is the desert on your right hand the way the fields will look after the water is gone and no more has come to replenish it or is the desert an exhibit of the "before," which makes the scene on the left a promise of what can be?

It was a promise, and it was the Congress that promised it. The Congress set up the Central Valley project as a Federal reclamation project to secure the water supply of lands already watered, and to bring water to lands that have been dry since the time of man. The outlines of the promise are spelled out there across the land in white concrete, and you cannot miss them. The San Joaquin River is backed up behind the long, low span of Friant Dam, a half million acre-feet of water, and taking off from the pool at each side are the curving lines of the two canals—37-mile Madera to the north; 160-mile Friant-Kern to the south. Downstream, you see the natural Mendota pool, where the long Delta-Mendota Canal will terminate which is to bring water from the north to replenish the San Joaquin River supply. You see where that canal has to go, along the foothills lining the valley, but you do not see the canal itself—no trace of it until you are 100 miles farther north, near its take-off in the delta behind San Francisco Bay. There you see the raw soil of new excavation and a few miles of concrete lining. You go on north, following the Sacramento over 200 miles, and finally you reach the source of the project's promise—Shasta Lake backed up behind the great arch of Shasta Dam. Here, four and a half million acre-feet. This is the water that will flow down to the delta to be lifted into the foothills and then flow by gravity down to Mendota so that the San Joaquin can be dammed at Friant and feed its two canals. This water is waiting, too. And almost 500 miles to the south of you as you stand

there at Shasta, the dry land of the San Joaquin Valley waits.

My tour of the Central Valley began at Los Angeles and it ended there. On my return south, I looked at the farms and I talked with the people. I saw ranches that extended for miles, growing vegetables and fruit. And right next to these big operations, growing the same crops on the same soil, I saw small farms, their fields clustered about the farmhouse in the pattern familiar to most of agricultural America. On both kinds of farm the water-story is the same—the deepening pump-lift is costly, but high market prices still give a profit. If a dry year strikes, a lot of farmers will be hurt, maybe wiped out; and in any case the pumping's getting more expensive every year. I asked the same question any of my colleagues here would be prompted to ask: Why is the water table sinking so much more rapidly, when you have not been having dry years? The answer I got in each case was the same, and it was astonishing. I was always answered with an account of more intensive cultivation of lands which already had wells; or the sinking of new wells on already cultivated land; or, finally, of entirely new lands being brought into cultivation. And I reacted as probably any of you would react: I said, this expansion seemed very unwise in the face of a threatened water shortage. Privately I thought: These fellows are operating on a dog-eat-dog basis, making as much as they can while prices are high and while there is still a little water left. They are not making any effort to conserve their water supply, I thought.

But then I heard the rest of the story. This large expansion of California agricultural production on the brink of disaster was that State's calculated risk in the war effort; California was called upon to produce as much as she could; and she proved that she could produce more than that—by overextending her water lines. Almost 100,000 acres went under cultivation in the Central Valley Basin between 1940 and 1945 in a California that badly needed the Central Valley project 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago, in 1932, those people feared the consequences of a dry period. If the rains fail now, the ruin will be on a scale many times more vast. And it will affect many more people, because during the war California has grown in population even more strikingly than in cultivated acreage. I understand that one out of every six Californians has come into the State since 1940, and the wartime expansion of food production must now be maintained in order to keep this new population employed and fed. It cannot be done on the pre-1940 water supply, and it cannot be done with unfinished canals.

That is the story, as I saw and heard it. It makes sense, when you see the crowded towns and cities of the Central Valley, when you learn that over half of all these peoples work with food and fiber. The Central Valley people are aware that the wartime increase in population and production will more than absorb the water to be made available by the primary features of the project, and already they are asking for studies of new water sources by the Bureau of Reclamation. Many valley towns have felt the pinch in their domestic water supply. The situation which is bad on the valley floor, which gets the drainage water from the hills, is even worse in the foothills and in some coastal areas. Towns along Suisun—pronounced Soo-soon—Bay are hard hit by lowered wells, and many of the old mining towns, now booming with industry, are looking desperately for new water supply. The Santa Clara Valley is worried, and the city of Santa Barbara faces an acute water situation. The Reclamation Bureau has a lot of planning work ahead of it out there, and already it has had to turn down some dozen requests for investigations because of lack of funds and personnel.

Californians do not give the impression of crying before they are hurt. Their story is too convincing for that. They just point it out to you—the water waiting and the farmers waiting, and the people still coming in—and they let it tell itself. I wish every Member of this body might go there to hear it and see it. Since that cannot be, I hope I have conveyed something of the Central Valley situation to you today.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have read with alarm the report of the Appropriations Committee on funds for the Department of the Interior. I am especially surprised and shocked at the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. The 45-year history of that agency does not justify the proposed action. Since the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, 50 projects have been constructed which now provide water for 4,500,000 acres of land. In 1946 these reclamation projects produced over $500,000,000 in income from lands that were once valuable only for desert grazing purposes. The contribution of these projects to the wealth and security of the Nation is not measured alone in crops produced, but also in power, flood control, recreation, and other related services. It is measured also in increased purchasing power of the Nation as a whole and increased receipts for taxing institutions. It must also be remembered that the costs of irrigation and power development are returned by the direct beneficiaries to the Treasury. The contribution of reclamation projects to the country's war effort was tremendous. The contribution of reclamation in the postwar picture can be even more significant. The fruits, vegetables, sugar beets, and urgently needed livestock required to maintain the high-standard diet of the United States must come, in part, from western irrigated land. It should also be realized that irrigated crops are noncompetitive with other production areas of the country and they do not involve to any marked degree the surplus commodities such as wheat, corn, tobacco, or cotton. The Bureau of Reclamation more than any other single Federal agency has contributed to the development of western resources, for the benefit of the country as a whole.

The wise provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the careful planning that has followed has achieved the success thus far measured. It is the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee regarding the continuation of the careful measurement of western land and water resources and the careful planning for their development that I find most disturbing. The recommended cut in funds for general investigations of from $5,000,000 to $125,000 and the cut of from $500,000 to $250,000 in the Colorado River development fund would mean virtual liquidation of planning work carried out under these programs. If this recommendation is accepted, the total appropriation would amount to less than 7 percent of the budget and would force a complete disintegration of highly trained technical staff. The 7 percent of the budget in fact would not be sufficient to liquidate planning operations. The Nation as a whole and particularly the West would suffer for generations to come. This action would effectively tie the hands of the Congress for many years to come in the matter of the development of western resources. I cannot believe that such action was intended by the committee nor is intended by the Congress. A reduction of this kind cannot be justified in terms of curbing inflationary trends or of balancing the budget or of contributing to the efficiency of Government. Nor do I believe it the intention of this Congress to tell the West that the Nation is no longer interested in the highly profitable self-liquidating development of western water resources. The proposed cut in general investigation funds specifically would force the immediate closing of all or practically all of the project panning field offices in Utah and would require writing off all funds expended to date for incompleted investigations. Work in Utah financed from the Colorado River development fund would be materially slowed down. The Colorado River fund should be given special consideration. Money is already available from net revenues from the operation of Boulder Dam. This money is earmarked for basin development and is not available for other purposes. There is no reason for its being withdrawn. I therefore strongly urge that adequate funds be provided in the general investigation appropriation for the continued orderly investigation and planning activities in the West and that the Colorado River development fund appropriations be restored to the full budget estimate.

The proposed appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for purposes of project construction does not affect any of the projects in my district. I am, however, interested in the net result of the proposed recommendation as it will effect efficiency of project construction throughout the country as a whole. For example, it will take 9 years of appropriations at the proposed level to complete the Provo River project in the State of Utah. Nine years of ineffective and inefficient operation. Nine years to complete a program that could and should be completed in a little over a third of that time. The same is generally true of other irrigation developments

currently under way such as the Columbia Basin, Central Valley, and other great projects in the West. It should be made abundantly clear that slowing construction down not only decreases efficiency, but postpones the day when the Government can start collecting for the completed works.

In these troubled times when this great Nation is being called upon to provide leadership, stabilization, foods, and resources to a war-weary and hungry world, we must not falter in the development of our country and its resources. We must not contribute to inefficiency in our own internal operations, and we must not encourage sectional differences.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the curtailment of the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, as recommended by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Interior would seriously threaten the orderly development of our Western States and be a body blow to their economy.

It will cause stoppages of work on our reclamation projects commencing in about 6 months and paralyzing them within 18 months.

The excellent staff of engineers and other personnel built up by the Bureau of Reclamation for over 40 years, at a great expense to the Government, would be destroyed overnight.

This is no time to experiment with false economy. Time is of the essence in the development of the West through multiple use of the waters that fall in that country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], told you of the close association our western irrigation projects have in the structure of our national defense; now let me point out their effect on the domestic front.

Since the turn of the century our population has increased about a million a year. In 1900 we had about ninety million people in this country. Today we are pressing a hundred and forty million. Where are we going to get the food, the clothing, the shelter to take care of these people and the 15 additional million that we will have 15 years from now. That is what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], had in mind when he told you that our economy would change within about that period of time. The only place we have to look is to the development of new lands in the West and toward increasing, and rather let me say, retaining the present productivity of the lands now under cultivation. That spells out supplementing irrigation waters. It spells out salinity control, it spells out navigation, it spells out power at a price within the reach of those who use it.

Let me analyze briefly for you the recommended appropriations as they pertain to the Central Valley project of California:

The appropriation reported by the House subcommittee for the Central Valley project is only 34.4 percent of the amount requested. In fact, the reduction of 65.6 percent from the $20,000,000 requested to a total of $6,900,000 will definitely eliminate the prosecution of work on many features.

An amount of $12,000,000 was requested for irrigation facilities. The committee allowed but $5,134,980. This small appropriation will undoubtedly result in seriously curtailing construction work now under way on the irrigation systems and will prevent initiation of new construction. Currently, contracts in force for canal construction alone will require funds during the fiscal year 1948 for progress payments in the amount of nearly $9,000,000. It is therefore quite evident that the $5,000,000 appropriation is definitely inadequate. The $9,000,000 figure does not include the cost of materials which must be purchased nor the cost of rights-of-way, engineering, and contingencies. On the Contra Costa Canal the contract for the connecting link between the existing works necessary to complete the main canal to the Martinez Reservoir and construction of the Clayton and Ygnacio Canals, is presently in the process of being awarded. Under the appropriations as reported by the House, it will be impossible to proceed with the work even though this contract is awarded as the funds for the necessary progress payments will not be available.

The lateral system on the Contra Costa Canal could not, of course, be advertised for bids. On the Friant-Kern Canal the work currently under contract will require something in excess of $5,000,000 for progress payments; and current contracts on the Delta-Mendota Canal will require nearly $3,000,000 for progress payments. It will accordingly be necessary to suspend work on a part, if not all, of these contracts. Bids for the construction of the Delta-Mendota pumping plant near Tracy, Calif., are scheduled for advertisement about May 1 of this fiscal year. In view of the recommendation of the committee report it will be necessary to withhold award of contract until sufficient funds are available to permit this work to proceed. Work on the Delta cross channel will be held to a minimum amount of surveying and designing, and the start of construction will be delayed.

Under the power facilities, the request for $6,400,000 was reduced to $1,075,020. This amount was then further limited in its use by the fact that it was specifically earmarked for certain of the power features. The appropriation as reported by the committee will curtail the work on the power facilities at Shasta Dam, and preclude any work beyond completion of the bare installation of units 1, 2, and 5. At the Keswick Dam and power plant the reduction from the requested $645,838 to $318,040 will virtually stop operations. It will probably mean that work at the dam will have to be stopped in order to have sufficient funds to meet the progress payments on the turbines, generators, and other electrical equipment currently under contract.

Under the transmission lines, the committee report specifically provides funds for only two lines, these being the lines from Shasta to Delta via Oroville and Sacramento, and the Contra Costa 69-kilovolt line; and even for these specific lines the funds have been seriously reduced from the amounts requested. Elimination of funds for the Keswick tap line will have the effect of constructing a power plant with no physical means of conveying the power from the plant to consumptive load centers.

All switchyards, substations, and communication equipment have been eliminated; and the Keswick tap line, the west side Shasta-Delta lines, the Sacramento-Antelope line, and some transmission line additions all have been eliminated.

Under the item "Joint facilities" $1,600,000 was requested, and $690,000 was the amount allotted by the committee. This reduction will mean that the remaining work necessary to complete Shasta Dam will have to be suspended; work on the camp and warehouse area will be seriously curtailed; and work on the installation of the additional gates and valves at Shasta Dam will be slowed down.

Progress payments in fiscal year 1948 on all contracts now in force will require some $10,000,000 and about $6,000,000 will be required in connection with work proposed for performance by Government forces, administrative expenses and additional contracts for equipment and supplies to support the construction contracts, and for other materials. The estimated carry-over from the current fiscal year is $10,000,000 and with the appropriation recommended by the committee, we may not even be able to complete the contracts currently in force. Additional contracts scheduled for award during the balance of this fiscal year could not proceed due to insufficient funds. Thus, so drastic a reduction in funds makes it difficult even to hazard a guess as to when the irrigation facilities can be completed and deliver water urgently needed in the San Joaquin Valley and also in the delta area, and to construct the necessary power transmission facilities to deliver the power to the pumping plants. A good guess would be that it would take 27 years to finish the job at the rate indicated by the Appropriations Committee.

As you know, Governor Warren—see page 1232 of the hearings—of California appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of the continuing and even speeding up the construction work on the Central Valley project. The Governor pointed out to the committee the dire need for bringing the Sacramento River waters to the San Joaquin River Valley at the earliest possible moment in view of the overdraft currently being made on the ground-water supplies in that Valley. The Governor specifically recommended the completion of the public-power features of the Central Valley project, including the construction of a stand-by steam plant in the interest of providing competitive power for the people of central California.

Of course, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s president, Mr. Black—see page 1312 of the hearings—also testified before the committee, particularly with respect to the construction of electrical-transmission facilities by the Bureau. It would appear from the amounts reported out by the subcommittee that irrespective of the Governor's testimony, considerable weight must have been given Mr. Black's statements.

In closing let me say to my Republican friends that at no time do I remember the issue of sabotaging the Bureau of Reclamation, in the name of economy, being raised in the last election in California.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am totally unable to comprehend the reasons which prompted the Appropriations Committee to act as it did in emasculating the appropriation request of the Department of the Interior. The activities of every agency within the Department have been severely crippled, activities which we as a Nation cannot afford to curtail, activities which are vital to our economic welfare as well as to our national defense and security. One of those activities which has suffered most is that pertaining to electric power developed at federally constructed dams—public power, if you please, power that belongs to the people themselves. There is in this country a school of thought that believes that this natural resource should not be developed, or if developed, that it should be turned over to private corporations for private gain—that power to be sold back to the people who really own it, sometimes at an exorbitant price. Those who believe in this philosophy are comparatively few in number but extremely powerful and resourceful. They will stop at nothing to obtain their ends. At this moment there is in this city one of the most powerful lobbies that has ever confronted the Congress, the power-trust lobby headed by Purcell L. Smith, of Chicago, who is reportedly receiving a salary of $65,000 per year, plus certain expenses, as president of the National Association of Electric Cos. Mr. Smith was formerly president of the Midwest Corp., an Insull holding concern.

In spite of the opposition of these vested interests and of the tactics they have used, the Congress since the days of former President Theodore Roosevelt, has developed a Federal power policy in the passage of such legislation as the Reclamation Act, the Raker Act, the acts creating the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration, the Bonneville Act, the Fort Peck Act, and others. The fundamental principle of that policy is that the benefits of power developed at Federal projects shall not be monopolized by limited groups but that those benefits shall be widely distributed. With the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority—TVA—and the Rural Electrification Administration—REA—the Secretary of the Interior has the responsibility of administering the other power activities embraced in the above acts.

In addition, the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 placed a further responsibility upon the Secretary in that all surplus electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, preference being given to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

The responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in Federal power matters can be more readily appreciated when it is realized that at this time the Department of the Interior is operating and marketing power from the largest aggregate of hydroelectric power in the world. In 1938 the electric plants being operated by the Department had a capacity of only 579,000 kilowatts, whereas as of December 31, 1946, that capacity had increased to 2,790,000 kilowatts, with a total generation for that calendar year of over 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, bringing in a revenue of approximately $32,000,000. Projects which have been authorized or are under construction and which will be completed before 1952 will add 6,331,000 kilowatts of capacity, making a grand total of 8,121,000 kilowatts.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Office of the Secretary, which is $472 under current-year requirements, and $665,000 less than the budget estimate.

To assist the Secretary in supervising and promoting the efficient coordination of the power activities of the Department, he has in his office a small staff known as the Division of Power, consisting of 12 administrative and professional people and 10 clerical employees. The appropriation request for this staff was $131,917 and an additional amount of $32,500 for the handling under section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act of the sale of power from dams constructed by the War Department in the southeastern section of our country where there is no operating agency of the Department to which this work could be delegated.

The total investment in power facilities for which the Department of the Interior has responsibility for pay-out is over $500,000,000. Construction now underway by the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department will bring this investment figure to at least $1,500,000,000 by 1952. The return of this huge investment to the Government is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. Yet in spite of this tremendous responsibility the Appropriations Committee has, for some unaccountable reason, refused to appropriate any funds for the Division of Power. It is incomprehensible to me why the committee should take such action, thus making it impossible for the Secretary to meet his responsibilities. This is penny-wise and pound-foolish. No private corporation would so conduct its affairs. I refuse to believe that this Congress will sanction such ridiculous management of this Nation's property.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, recently a former Federal mine inspector characterized many of the inspectors employed by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior of the United States as not qualified to make an inspection; many of them were appointed and hold their jobs through fraternal and political pull; many are derelict in their duties to the extent of jeopardizing the welfare of workers in the mines; some viciously find faults with mines they inspect apparently upon orders from someone higher up; and as a whole the Bureau of Mines is like a plum tree from which plums are doled to the faithful.

Protégés find sponsors. Many of the inspectors are men who apparently have failed to find their niche in other industries or trades and some are given berths in the Bureau to fulfill promises of soft jobs.

Those are declarations of a man who should know whereof he speaks. For 5 years he was an inspector in the Bureau of Mines. Once he tried to quit, because they sent him to Montgomery, W. Va., to inspect a mine, and all the equipment with which he was equipped was an electric safe-lamp for a cap, with no means of recharging the battery.

He is a miner who resigned rather than keep up the fraud which he was expected to continue, but was dragged back into the Bureau of Mines in 1943, because he was told he was "frozen" to his job and must stay on the job for the duration. And when the "duration" was over he resigned again, this time to stay resigned.

He is P. S. MacLaine, of Cambridge, Ohio.

Mr. MacLaine has had wide experience in the mining industry. He had been a miner; he was foreman of a mine and superintendent of a mine. He has worked in some of the best mines in the country, and today works in the largest mechanical mine in Ohio, and perhaps in the country, and the mine in which he is now working, and has been since last November, was one of the 518 ordered closed by Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, as being unsafe.

Mr. MacLaine adds:

> And if the Misco mine of the Muskingum Coal Co. in Perry County in Ohio were not a safe mine, I would not be in there working.

Mr. MacLaine's comments upon the functioning of the Bureau of Mines, however, are paramount in his mind today. He is happy on his present job, but his story of the Bureau of Mines should come first.

A similar incident was in another mine inspected, with 176 recommendations made After again being criticized, the report appeared officially with four recommendations.

Typical of other experiences, Mr. MacLaine told of Inspector Joe B. Yanity, after an inspection of the Misco Mine, returned with a report that the workings were gassy, to the point of the working air containing 8.4 percent methane, or explosive gas. Inspector Yanity made numerous recommendations. Knowing the safety record of Misco Mine, a reinspection by Inspector E. M. Lewis and Inspector J. C. Reardon was made. Their recommendations were made in the September report, making suggestions, but not finding explosive gas. Incidentally, one of the recommendations made by this pair of inspectors pertained to the conveyor system, relating to grounding the electrical connections.

Mr. MacLaine only very recently—2 weeks ago—demonstrated to the Ohio State inspector, Mr. Tom Richards, that had the recommendations made been followed, there would have been repeated accidents, for it was impossible to make the proposed electrical connections. Employees of Misco had already tried to follow the suggestions, but anyone with an iota of knowledge of electricity would know how it was impossible to make the proposed electrical connections. Misco workers tried, however, but only proved to anyone it could not be done.

But prior to Inspector Reardon and Lewis visiting the mine, Mr. MacLaine, who was still an inspector for the Bureau, accompanied by Inspector Mechlin, were ordered by George Grove to make a reinspection of Misco. They found no trace of the explosive gas as reportedly found by Yanity; they learned Yanity had spent 1 day inside the Misco Mine and 1 day outside, which was described by Mr. MacLaine as not long enough to make a complete inspection of such a vast operation; they learned Yanity found his gas in a bleeder pipe—an innovation developed by Misco engineers, designed to release any possible accumulation of gas. Yanity, it was said, had lowered his gas-testing apparatus into the escape pipe and covered the vent with his cap, which anyone should know would catch every last minute portion of gas if any were prevalent.

Mr. MacLaine, as an example of the inefficiency of the Federal Department with which he was formerly affiliated, tells some of his own personal experiences, not quoting the words of anyone else. But before he began his discussions, he emphasized it was not with malice, but only in justice to the men who work in the mines; men like those who died in the Centralia, Ill., disaster.

Of the department headquarters itself, Mr. MacLaine points to the laxity of the headquarters such as in Pittsburgh, Pa., from which office he worked. He pointed out that after an inspection is duly made, the inspector or inspectors return to the mine office, or other convenient place and compile their preliminary report. When this report is finally completed, with recommendations noted, so that the mine inspected can be told of faults found and remedies suggested, it is sent to the Pittsburgh office. About 2 weeks later, after 14 or so copies have been made, it is returned to the inspector for signature, but the inspector by that time may have moved on to other stations. The reports are signed and 12 copies returned to the Bureau office, and then quite often months pass by before the official report is submitted to the company operating the inspected mine. Under this particular category, the Misco Mine in which Mr. MacLaine is now employed, was inspected in September 1946; a public information service release was submitted to the press in November, but the Muskingum Coal Co. has yet to receive the official report summary. This is not part of Mr. MacLaine's comment.

By the time suggestions made by the inspectors thus reach the mine operator, hundreds of accidents could have occurred; perhaps faults have been remedied, but also new faults could easily develop.

Mr. MacLaine pointed, as an example, to the Misco Mine, his present location. In the Misco operations, rooms 300 by 28 feet, which not so long ago in other operations required about 10 months to work out, are now worked out in a matter of days—in some instances in only 3 days.

Mr. MacLaine cited other examples of headquarters' actions, especially since the Federal Government seized the mines in May of 1946.

He cited one mine in which he made a routine inspection, and listed 161 proposed improvements. He was criticized by his superiors for being unduly hard in his inspection, being advised not to forget the United States Government was then operating that mine. And when the report was finally completed, 158 of his suggestions were wiped out and only three recommendations were made. That was in the official report.

Bleeder pipes in the Misco operation are drilled ahead of the mine as it progresses into the earth. They release any gas, if any should be found. When the diggings reach the vent, which is 6⅞ inches in diameter, there already is waiting an outlet through which electrical cables can be dropped from the surface and not carried through the main entries, thus eliminating another major hazard. After parts are worked out, the vents are then in the sealed-off areas, alleviating the threat of an accumulation of gases, if there are any, which automatically eases the pressure often discovered in sealed workings of other mines and averting the threat of explosions due to accumulations of gases in worked-out areas, if the mine has gas. English and other European coal-mining experts, who inspected the Misco mine and who were dumbfounded by the speed of operations and productivity, marveled at the idea of bleeder pipes and were enthusiastic of their success. They promised to try the same experiment in their own mines back home.

Mr. MacLaine's companion inspector—Mechlin—was described as being indifferent to his duties during the inspection, even to the extent of crawling off in a secluded corner and falling asleep. According to Mr. MacLaine, he—Mechlin—was later transferred to another Pennsylvania district. Mr. MacLaine does not know at this time whether he is still with the Bureau.

Mr. MacLaine told of an incident that occurred in St. Clairsville, Ohio, while he was still an inspector, and before he ever thought of seeking employment elsewhere. He tells how he, with Inspectors Oscar Simpson, Maize, Yanity, and others were called to the meeting, which he believed was to discuss routine subjects. When all were present—the writer believes Mr. MacLaine said George Grove arranged the meeting—the inspectors were shown a mass of newspapers and newspaper clippings and the entire session was devoted to making Earl Jones, operator of Misco, "walk the chalked line and checking up everything you can on that man and his mine." Mr. MacLaine was emphatic in his declaring it was his belief someone higher up was after Earl Jones and the Misco mine at the St. Clairsville meeting.

Incidentally Mr. MacLaine said Inspector Yanity is generally known in the Bureau as a protege of Jack Forbes.

As for Inspector Reardon, Mr. MacLaine says he believes Reardon, who has been with the Bureau about 15 years, spent about 13 of these years as a first-aid specialist, which does not qualify any man to be an inspector of mines.

Another incident relative to Bureau personnel, Mr. MacLaine told of a young man training in a class in Pittsburgh declaring "damned if he would go down into the mines." During the few weeks the school was in progress the protesting candidate for an inspector's post was given two promotions, and upon completion of the training school was given a "softer" assignment. Mr. MacLaine does not believe the candidate ever became an inspector.

Mr. MacLaine said he was personally acquainted with the inspector who had checked the Centralia, Ill., mine 5 days before the explosion which killed 111 men, and expressed the belief no inspector could have made an inspection without discovering gas such a short time before an explosion. Mr. MacLaine expressed the belief the Centralia explosion was due to gas and not dust, after studying the nature of the blast. He questioned the thoroughness of the Centralia mine.

Mr. MacLaine's record with the Bureau includes his ordering the shutting down of a Hanna Coal Co. mine at Dunglen when he discovered gas accumulated near trolley wires. He admits he had not authority to close the operations as an inspector of the Bureau of Mines, but declares he acted out of his role as inspector and only as an American citizen who seeks to protect his fellowman. Mr. MacLaine did not include the incident in his report, which he considered unnecessary, inasmuch as the trouble was cleared up at once by mine officials, but he was criticized for not making public the incident.

Mr. MacLaine also pointed out that it was Inspector Mechlin, who accompanied Mr. MacLaine on his inspection trip of the Misco mine, mentioned before, who spread around rumors at a Columbus, Ohio, meeting to "watch that Misco mine. She's going to blow up." Mr. MacLaine is at a loss to explain Mechlin's tactics, inasmuch as there was no basis for any such thoughts.

Mr. MacLaine's opinion of the Misco mine in which he now is employed, can be summarized thus:

Misco is the safest mine in Ohio, and Ohio's mines are the safest in the Nation. That makes, in his opinion, the Misco mine in Perry County, the safest mine in the United States.

Mr. MacLaine says Misco is not a gaseous mine; every precaution is taken to safeguard the welfare of the workers; the air is the purest found in any mine anywhere and is adequately kept circulating; there is an auxiliary slope entrance in addition to the main entrance; a third is to be built; it is the best-organized mine he has ever seen in a long

career of mining; its employees knowing their jobs well and working together for one objective—production; he says any mine that can produce more than 4,000,000 mine tons of coal without a fatality must be safe, for the longest record in history is about 6,000,000 tons production without a fatality; all conditions are conducive to safety and cooperation at all times on all shifts in all parts of the big operations; the "bleeder" vents such as used in Misco should be used in every mine in the country.

Mr. MacLaine made these comments in ordinary discussions, without consulting his personal notes kept for 5 years while working as an inspector for the Bureau. He added the complete books of notes are available for reference.

Mr. MacLaine expressed the belief that Bureau inspectors should be more carefully chosen, and not be cast-offs from other industries; that they are underpaid, for a competent inspector should be a mining engineer, with a thorough knowledge of electrical engineering, and the present rate of pay is too little for a man so qualified.

In conclusion, Mr. MacLaine pointed out that the Bureau of Mines itself is nothing but what might be described as a racket, for, although it has the power to make inspections, it can do nothing to see that recommendations are enforced; it has no police powers and cannot penalize offenders of violations uncovered.

He also pointed out that for many years the Bureau of Mines has directed the writing of mining laws—and none of the Bureau heads are miners—men who know mining. He advocates that when mining laws are written, setting up standards to be followed, that mining men should be consulted. He declared, "They may not be able to write the laws, but they know what the laws should contain."

He recommended that in the future when mining laws are written, or existing mining laws be amended, they first be discussed with men who know mining and not by lawyers, or protégés of "big wigs" and henchmen chosen for their fraternal and political connections.

I saw in yesterday's Washington paper that a House Labor Subcommittee is planning to check mine safety and I most sincerely suggest to this subcommittee that they include the Misco mine of the Muskingum Coal Co. in their inspection and contact Mr. MacLaine, who is now employed there in charge of safety operations, as I am sure he can give them information they will find most valuable.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1947.*

JONES MOTOR SALES, INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio:

Review of Federal coal-mine inspection reports indicate that while inspector did not find eminent danger in above mine, safety conditions are apparently deficient and makes operation hazardous. You are directed immediately to consult the safety committee at this mine with respect to these conditions. You are further directed to cease operations until either (1) mine safety committee (or if there be none, president of mine local union) joins in the certifications required by order number CAMN 16 of this date. (2) There has been a reinspection by Federal coal-mine inspectors followed by my order authorizing mine operations after consideration of his report.

H. H. COLLISSON,
Captain USNR, Coal Mine Administrator.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *April 4, 1947.*

Capt. H. H. COLLISSON,
USNR, Coal Mine Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with your telegram ordering our mine to be closed until certification by mine safety committee, you are herewith advised we have contacted the mine safety committee and the answer of the mine safety committee is this: "We are unable to talk to you until we receive orders from the international union headquarters."

JONES MOTOR SALES, INC.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, there are many features of this Interior Appropriation bill that I cannot approve. However, I wish to direct my particular objection to the cut in the amount the committee has allocated for investigations of projects for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system in the four Upper Division States as authorized by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act.

This money is set aside from the income derived from certain power revenues at Boulder or Hoover Dam. It is used for investigating potential projects and the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River. In no sense can it be considered as a direct appropriation out of the Federal Treasury. Out of moneys derived from this fund, the Bureau of Reclamation has already prepared a comprehensive report listing potential projects for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River. The next step will be to make detailed investigations as to their feasibility and the cost of construction.

Additional information on the potential projects is needed by the States of the Upper Division to aid them in their current negotiations on the division of the water of the Upper Colorado Basin. Also, a large amount of detailed work must be done before these projects can be made ready for construction. This work must not be allowed to lag if these projects are to be ready for construction at the proper time.

Regardless of whether the Committee on Appropriations allocates funds for the construction of new reclamation projects at this time, information should be made available to the Bureau of Reclamation and to Congress as to the future needs along the Colorado River, so that when funds for new construction are made available, we may have the necessary information.

The amount set aside each year for this investigational work, is small in comparison to the need, but to reduce it 50 percent, as provided in the bill, would result in almost total stoppage of the present investigations under way.

I request that the committee restore the $500,000 originally asked, bearing in mind the fact that this is not an expenditure out of the Federal Treasury, but rather is derived from the sale of power, and held in a special fund for this study along the Colorado River.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriation bill for 1948 is of particular interest to my State of Nevada, and this is especially true of the reclamation section of this bill, as we have within our borders the major parts of the Boulder Dam, including Boulder City and its great power-producing facilities.

In operation in Nevada are such widely known reclamation projects as the Newlands which was named for the late Senator Francis G. Newlands whose leadership in the House of Representatives brought the Reclamation law into being in 1902 along with the sponsorship of President Theodore Roosevelt. Nevada also has in operation the Truckee Storage and Humboldt projects that provide supplemental water for substantial areas.

Under construction on the Colorado River between Nevada and Arizona is Davis Dam, a structure that is important in the fulfillment of the treaty obligations between the United States and Mexico and which will produce substantial blocks of power for the Southwest.

I mention these developments for the purpose of illustrating the great interest the State of Nevada has in the reclamation program of the Department of the Interior. We, in Nevada, are also interested in the planning of new projects which will utilize the meager water resources of Nevada and to bring about more land development and crops. Irrigation and the use of any available water that can be stored is essential in Nevada for the production of agricultural crops, forage for livestock, and to support the increasing population of the State.

For the latter reasons, Mr. Chairman, I deplore the drastic reduction in the budget recommendation of $5,000,000 for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. With but a limitation of $125,000 for the general investigations, as provided in the bill, the State of Nevada would experience a set-back in reclamation progress.

That portion which would be allotted to Nevada would be insufficient to carry forward the program already initiated and probably would mean the closing of the project planning offices in Nevada at Carson City and Overton. The work in the Lahontan and lower Colorado River Basin areas, including the important investigations in the Carson, Truckee, and Walker River areas, would, for all practical purposes, be suspended resulting in great delay and costly shut-down.

The reduction in the items for Boulder Dam, operation and maintenance, and construction are particularly untimely, especially since all of the expenditures for these activities at Boulder Dam are reimbursable under the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 and the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940. The $51,000 reduction in the operation and maintenance item for Boulder Dam should be restored. Similarly, the halving of the

construction appropriation for the project will delay badly needed work for the completion of this great structure. I am particularly concerned that the committee on page 20 of the report stated that $35,000 of the reduction is applied "to a request for funds to complete designs and specifications and award a contract for a high school and appurtenant facilities. The committee is opposed to the Government providing educational facilities at this project, it being of the opinion that assessments levied against the beneficiaries should provide funds for such facilities as is the practice in other American communities."

Boulder City is a Government town. The land and most of the buildings are owned by the United States Government and are nontaxable by the State of Nevada. The State, therefore, is deprived of revenue which it would acquire were it to provide educational facilities at the project. I protest this effort to saddle on the State of Nevada the cost of educational facilities at Boulder City which have been borne by reimbursable appropriated funds. The previous arrangement should be continued at least until a permanent cooperative plan is worked out.

The reduction from $18,000,000 to $6,200,000 from funds for construction of Davis Dam, I believe, is short-sighted, and if such a policy is followed the construction of that great dam will be slowed up from 4 to 5 years in its completion. Power from the dam is urgently needed in the Southwest; a delay now means a putting off of the time when power will be available from the dam, as well as to the time when revenue from the power comes back to the Government. The dam is not a subsidy, but its power will pay for the cost of construction—returning the money back to the Government—as well as paying an interest charge of 3 percent.

The Nevada Legislature has provided $40,000 for the continuing of the cooperative ground-water program in that State, and this program has been underway for a year, yet this bill completely eliminates appropriations for cooperative ground-water investigation, a program I consider one of the most important for development of our latent resources in Nevada.

We all believe in economy and reductions at this time, and many appropriation cuts are justifiable, but I protest again that the West be singled out in such a deep cut in the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation pertains more to the West than the East or South, for it grew up in the need of developing the Western States.

I have been told that Davis Dam will have no unobligated balance on June 30 next, and that Boulder Dam for completion of construction will have only $797,000 unobligated to do a $12,000,000 job of completing this structure.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the House the facts about the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which is in my district, in northern Colorado, and for which the Appropriation Committee has cut the budget estimate of $14,000,000 down to $4,815,000, or only 34 percent of the amount actually needed to carry on existing construction contracts where the work is now going on.

This project was started back in 1935, 12 years ago, when the Bureau of Reclamation took over the plans of the farmers to get a better water supply from the Colorado River and worked out a combination power and irrigation project.

After several years of conferences and study, a plan was agreed on between the people of my district and the Government to get the project built. This plan left all the enormous power benefits in the hands of the Government and the final use of the water for irrigation to the farmers.

A conservancy district was organized under a new State law to guarantee the repayment of the cost of the water to the Government.

As this cost was more than the farmers could afford to pay, it was provided that the district can levy a mill tax on all real and personal properties in the district to carry a share of the cost. This tax will cover about one-fourth of the cost that the district has agreed to pay.

I think this is the first time such a thing was ever done, but it shows that all the people in the district are behind the project and willing to help pay the cost.

Then in July 1938, when all the details had been agreed to, the district made a contract with the United States to build the project. This contract listed all the features of the project that are to be built and stated exactly what the obligations of both the United States and the district are.

At that time it was understood by the district that the project would be built in 5 or 6 years.

The first construction work was started in the fall of 1938 but for several years the appropriations available from the Reclamation Fund were limited and then the war came on and construction almost stopped.

Green Mountain Dam and power plant on the western slope was completed in 1943 and has been paying good dividends to the Government from the sale of power but the people who started the project and need the water will not get any benefits until the other parts of it are completed.

Even if all the appropriations needed to expedite the plans of the Bureau are made it will take 4 or 5 years more, apparently, to complete all the work.

Last year, including the 1945 deficiency item, the Congress appropriated a total of $12,254,075 to the project which certainly indicated that it was the intention to complete the project and get it on a repayment basis as rapidly as possible.

The Bureau of Reclamation finished their plans and specifications and proceeded to let contracts for construction on that basis.

Right now there are at least 15 major construction and supply contracts, in addition to many smaller ones, on which work is underway and which will have to be stopped if money is not available.

I find that these contracts, on which work is now going on, amount to over $30,000,000 and that the Bureau estimate that over $14,000,000 will be needed to keep them going in the 1948 fiscal year.

On page 935 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings, in response to a request by Chairman JONES, the Bureau furnished an estimate showing that if all the present contracts are to be canceled at the end of the 1947 fiscal year, the losses to the Government would probably exceed $5,000,000.

Regardless of such a probability, is it good business or good government to drag out and postpone the completion of a project on which already more than $35,000,000 has been expended over a period of 10 years and which can produce no benefits to the water users or returns to the Treasury of the United States until completed?

This certainly is not economy in any sense of the word.

It is true that the project is going to cost far more than originally estimated but most of the increase is on account of changes and improvements in the power part of the project.

None of the changes in plans improve in the least the irrigation part of the project or provide any more water. These benefits are just the same as they were when the contract was made in 1938. The conservancy district, in fact, has never been advised or consulted about these changes in plans.

Anyway, the conservancy district people in cooperation with the National Reclamation Association, have presented to the congressional committee a definite detailed plan which shows that the project can still pay out in full and return interest on power features to the Treasury. This can be done with rates for the power well below the so-called competitive value of power in the area.

So, why should the Congress hold up this project any longer than necessary to get it into production?

This project was started to furnish a better water supply to the 700,000 acres of fine land in northern Colorado and stop the enormous crop losses that occur when we have water shortages.

Of course it will help the farmers themselves but the big gains will be to the country at large which needs more of the crops that we produce.

Last year, for instance, in our 13 beet-sugar factories in this district, we produced over 5,000,000 100-pound bags of sugar and we can double that yield when we have dependable water supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I include a table showing major existing contracts:

Major existing contracts

	Contract amounts	1948 requirement
Granby Reservoir: Total construction and supply contracts	$6,925,532	$3,000,000
Granby pumping plant: Total construction and supply contracts	5,639,098	3,500,000
Estes Park Aqueduct and power plants: Total construction and supply contracts	7,788,028	4,244,000
Horsetooth Reservoir: Three large construction contracts	9,937,549	3,150,000
Total	30,291,107	13,894,000

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee sharply criticizes the National Park Service for an apparent failure to follow instructions given it by the committee a year ago to investigate the concessions system in the national parks, where the committee asserts that the concessions return too little money to the Government from their operations; that better accommodations should be provided at reduced rates; and that in some parks there are virtual concessions monopolies. The committee is critical because the Service, instead of conducting such studies itself, with its own personnel, is having them done instead by an advisory group of consultants.

We are all aware, I believe, that there has been considerable criticism of this concessions system, including the charge of monopoly, of high prices, of too little return to the Government. That the whole problem should be carefully studied with an eye to recommendations that will remedy whatever faults may be found certainly is desirable. But I am unable to follow the committee when it complains that this is being done by an outside group. Director Drury is responsible for recommending to the Secretary of the Interior that the studies be conducted by such a group, and I believe his reasons are thoroughly sound. The Park Service lives very close to the whole problem; it would be much more difficult for it to perform such a task in unprejudiced and dispassionate fashion than to have it done by an outside group of highly qualified consultants. And it is persons of that sort, coming to the work without any preconceived notions about it, but with open and intelligent minds, who have been picked by Secretary Krug for it.

I do not know that the Government does obtain materially less from these concessioners than it should; I do not know that it is possible, in these days of rising costs, to provide accommodations at more moderate cost in the parks, especially considering the shortness of the season in a number of them; I do not know whether a controlled monopoly is or is not the best way to assure the public what it needs. I do know, however, that the Department of the Interior is going to find it difficult, if not impossible, to enlist private capital to provide necessary accommodations for the public as long as the concessioners continue to be subjected to uninformed criticism. I suspect that the consultants appointed by Secretary Krug will come up with about as good answers to the questions the committee has raised as can be obtained, and, without impugning the honesty of the Director of the National Park Service or any of his staff, I believe that the public would accept the findings of such a group more readily than if the committee's suggestions were followed.

I cannot offer any evidence to confirm this belief better than to name the consultants that have been called on to do the job—and who are devoting a great deal of time to it, at the expense of their own private work. The chairman is Mr. Clem L. Collins, an accountant and former President of the American Institute of Accountants; the other members are Mr. George B. Smith, president of the Mark Hopkins Hotel in San Francisco and a former president of the American Hotel Association; Mr. Elmer Jenkins, manager of the Touring Bureau of the American Automobile Association; Mr. Charles G. Woodbury, of Washington, D. C., active and prominent in the field of conservation; and Mr. Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, who has behind him a long and varied record of exceptional public service. I believe these consultants will do an intelligent and thorough job; and I believe that anything less than a thorough job is not worth having.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the work of a Member of Congress was a vastly easier program when our Government was dedicated to the principle of deficit spending. All intellectual people recognize that deficit spending if continued will destroy the very foundation of any Nation. The people of the United States have demanded that the Government of the United States cease deficit spending and balance its budget.

This makes the task of the Committee on Appropriations extremely difficult. It is well for us all regardless of the district or the State we represent to reconcile ourselves to the fact that all of us must take some reduction in the great national spending program. Now the manner in which we take it is the all-important question.

I pay great tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and his able assistants on the committee in bringing before the Congress today this bill. Surely they have made some drastic reductions—drastic in the face of the policies that have been practiced the last several years.

In considering the action of the committee, however, we must not overlook the fact that it was confronted with the humiliating experience last year when the President froze practically all of the appropriations which were made at the request of the President and his Budget Bureau. Unfortunately much of this remains frozen.

Were the committee to appropriate liberally again—and I should like to remind you that the President signed last year's bill which he subsequently froze—the Appropriations Committee would again be humiliated.

The committee has spent considerable time in listening to hearings and has performed a most conscientious duty. No man is infallible, and the committee must arrive at its decisions as a result of the information it obtains by reason of the hearings. In many instances it is my belief that some of the facts are not too well presented and the committee is therefore compelled to arrive at its decisions without all of the essential information, or at least information that is crystal clear.

The vast amount of material which must be covered in a hearing such as this makes it next to impossible for the most accomplished of human mentality to deal with all of the intricate phases involved in a great hearing of this magnitude. It is reasonable then that there should be honest differences of opinion between men seeking a common objective. I therefore do not feel that I am inconsistent with my position for a balanced budget and a reduction in Government expenditures when I call attention to a few items in the bill which in my opinion seem to have been reduced below an economy level. And I am not one who proposes to balance the budget in somebody else's State. I want the RECORD to show here and now that I propose to be in the position of North Dakota's taking its rightful share of reductions necessary for a balanced budget.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For a moment I shall deal with the question of general investigations and the reduction made thereon. This has been reduced from the five million estimate of the Bureau of the Budget to a sum of $125,000. This excessive reduction effectively eliminates all investigational work thereunder. I feel it is imperative to deal with the investigational work and its relation to the Bureau of Reclamation. Those of us who make up the personnel of the Congress of the United States are largely lawyers, professional men, and businessmen. But in the sum total we are substantially all businessmen. We have established down through the years certain definite practices in our business relationships that have been accepted Nation-wide as the best plan for the exchange of affairs among men. We find, however, in dealing with some of our governmental problems such as the Bureau of Reclamation that the situation cannot be paralleled exactly with the question of business relationships between man and man.

I am reliably informed that by this tremendous reduction the amount is insufficient to even pay the terminal leave of those affected thereby. This, you will readily understand, wipes out immediately all investigational work. This would not be so serious were it not for the fact that irrigation and reclamation is an institution which must move on from year to year, and only by the processes of investigations can its maintenance be kept up. So by the elimination, or by this extreme reduction, the machinery has been practically stopped until a later date when appropriations for this purpose can be made.

I express particular interest in this connection because in the Missouri Valley Basin we are about to enter upon an era of new development through the proposed utilizations of the waters of the great Missouri River which bisects my State, and which in varying degrees affects the economy and welfare of 10 great agricultural States in the middle of the continent.

The general plan for development of conservation, control, and use of water resources of the Missouri River Basin, described in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and approved by the 1944 Flood Control Act, provided a basis for full development of all the water resources in the

basin. This plan was based on preliminary data which was not represented as being sufficient for initiation of construction work on individual units which were proposed for inclusion in the Missouri Basin project.

Continued forward planning therefore is essential to achieve constant or orderly development of the Missouri Basin water resources. Prior to actual construction of any unit, detailed studies are necessary to anticipate fully and make provision for all of the various engineering, repayment, financial, economic, and other problems peculiar to each individual unit. As a general statement, planning must precede construction by at least 2 years and operation by 3 years or more. The halting of planning work at this time will throw the construction program off balance for several years to come.

When the problems related to planning an individual unit are considered, the necessity of a thorough and well-ordered program becomes evident. Water studies must be made and past history of rivers and rainfall studied in order to determine the quantity and quality of water available. Soils must be studied to determine their ability to support crops and provide sufficient drainage to prevent the land from becoming waterlogged.

Investigations and surveys must be made in order to select the best site for a dam structure to impound water, and the best and most economical means of conveying water to the land. These studies lead to preliminary design work and cost estimates. Current crop returns must be studied along with potential increased returns due to irrigation in order to establish the repayment ability for a project and still meet the many and complex requirements of the reclamation law.

Added to all the above factors, a basin-wide development includes many additional problems of coordination. Availability of water must not only be determined for an individual unit, but for an entire river, a subbasin, and the basin. Each unit must be considered in relation to other units. In addition, all uses of water must be considered, including flood control, hydroelectric power generation, and domestic water supply. Full consideration must also be given to the possibilities for recreational facilities, preservation of fish and wildlife, silt control, pollution abatement, and other related developments.

The operating plan of each irrigated area—management of water on the land, proper operation and maintenance of canals, ditches, and laterals, and so forth—must be developed with a view to contributing maximum support to the broad areas of range and dry farming land surrounding each of the irrigated areas. It is necessary that studies be made well in advance of construction to determine these factors and their costs. In addition, proper schedules for land development must be established.

It is my considered judgment that the program of investigations and detailed planning now under way must be considered at an increased rate, if you please, if full development of the Missouri Basin is to be achieved in this generation. I should like to remind the Congress right here that when this law was passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the people who live in the States affected had reason to believe that the development was to go forward. They have made their plans accordingly and while they will be tolerant to the extreme in a desire to assist in the stabilizing of the Nation's economy, they will insist that this program continue to live and move forward. If we fail them here it must be conceded that the Seventy-eighth Congress misled them. The most beneficial, economical development of the Missouri Basin water resources, in my judgment, requires orderly planning and construction.

MISSOURI-SOURIS

Reducing the budget request for the Missouri Basin project from $23,000,000 to $9,611,600 will seriously retard work on this all-important new development. This unit is well advanced in the planning stage and when fully developed it will provide 1,000,000 acres of new irrigated land in North Dakota, and will include canals, reservoirs, power plants, and pumping plants.

I should like to remind the Congress that many sections of the Plains areas are subject to recurring droughts. By the development of small areas scattered throughout the table lands of the mid-continent in irrigation and reclamation projects, the Government is stabilizing a very important economy. Let me remind the Congress that from these lands come most of your fine steaks and roasts. It is a difficult problem to maintain these herds in drought years, and the record reveals that there have been times when almost the entire number have been moved from the plains or killed due to lack of feed.

This Congress has been called upon to make excessive appropriations to many of these areas in the past for relief purposes, and I cannot fail to remind you that if we have these recurring conditions of drought which are sure to come, the Congress will again be called upon to make these relief grants. They are only of a temporary and passing nature. While on the other hand, by the development of irrigation and reclamation areas you provide a plan by which these areas become self-sustaining.

In these areas of irrigation, forage crops can be grown irrespective of the dry years, and the herds can be carried over from one year to the other. Thus you sustain the economy of the local community and substantially improve the general welfare of the national picture so far as food is concerned.

The action of the committee in cutting the budget request and in restricting the use of new funds to units now in the construction stage will virtually stop all activity on the Missouri-Souris development. This includes Sheyenne Dam which was to have been the first feature started and which is urgently needed to alleviate municipal water shortages for a number of towns along the Sheyenne and Red Rivers.

The Missouri-Souris unit holds more promise for the future prosperity of North Dakota than any other single development in the State's history.

HEART RIVER

Although funds are provided to permit the start of construction on a part of the Heart River unit, there is no allowance for continuation of work leading to construction of Dickinson Dam. This dam is urgently needed to provide municipal water for the city of Dickinson, N. Dak.

KNIFE RIVER

The President had recommended funds to continue preparation of plans on the Knife River unit and the Missouri River pumping unit. No allowance is made by the committee for this work in the fiscal year 1948.

CANNONBALL

Elimination of the item affecting Cannonball unit for which it was planned to use approximately $20,000 precludes the possibility of any work thereon in fiscal 1948.

GARRISON RESERVOIR DIVERSION UNIT

The item of $35,000 needed for work on the Garrison Reservoir diversion unit was also eliminated.

I should like to call the attention of the Congress to the question of cooperation with other agencies. In examining this bill and the report of the committee, I note a restriction in the report which disturbs me considerably. The bill authorizes that the appropriation for the Missouri River Basin "shall be expended either independently or through or in cooperation with existing Federal and State agencies." That is as it should be and as it has been for the past 3 or 4 years. This permits the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, and other bureaus that have a vital interest in the Missouri River Basin development to participate in the original planning so that all interests may move forward together.

Some very effective work has been accomplished by this coordinated approach, and this plan should be continued. In studying the committee's report, however, I find the following language:

> The committee has denied all funds requested for transfer to other bureaus for proposed cooperative work pertaining to their activities for which $3,850,000 was contained in the budget estimate, and has provided that this amount shall be applied to work on units selected for construction under phase A.

The people of my State and other States in the Missouri River Basin want a coordinated approach to river basin developments as the fish and wildlife resources in particular are of great value. North Dakota has more and better waterfowl refuges than any State in the Union, and many of these will be jeopardized or influenced by the river basin development unless the Fish and Wildlife Service is able to work closely with the Reclamation Service in the original planning stages. North Dakota has seven large waterfowl breeding areas where 175,000 acres of marsh and upland have been restored. This includes the Souris River

development which has been made into one of the finest duck-producing areas in the country. In addition to the Federal refuges, small refuges built on private lands under an easement arrangement have been developed on another 145,000 acres.

I understand that almost $3,500,000 have gone into this program in North Dakota alone, and I want to see that this investment is protected through proper planning of the whole Missouri River water development program so that these values can be protected and new areas created wherever feasible.

For this reason I would like to have the prohibition against the transfer of funds for the Missouri River development, as contained in the committee report, eliminated so that various bureaus in the Interior Department that have interests in this whole scheme, may continue to participate as they have in the past and as is clearly authorized in the bill. If the funds to be appropriated to Reclamation Service are insufficient to take care of the needs of the other bureaus, an additional appropriation should be provided so that this coordinated study may go forward as it has in the past.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Ground-water investigation: The elimination of all items in the bill relating to ground water activities for both cooperative and noncooperative work is, in my opinion, a most serious action of the committee.

More than 85 percent of the people of North Dakota are totally dependent upon water obtained from underground sources by means of wells and springs for all their water needs. As the State receives 20 inches or less of rainfall per year, water is a scarce commodity. The problem of obtaining adequate water supplies of good quality is, therefore, a difficult one. Critical water problems have existed in the State for many years and large sums have been spent with only partial success in remedying the conditions.

Recognizing that the Federal Survey is the only agency that has the trained staff that could render effective assistance, and because of the large interest of the Federal Government in advancing the public welfare by protecting the public health through the procurement of permanent water supplies of good quality, which are so essential in the maintenance of a sound economy, and in assuring sound and stable development of public water supplies, the State Geological Survey in 1937 began cooperating with the Federal Survey on a small basis.

Since July 1945 the cooperation has been between the State water commission and the Federal Survey with the State geological survey acting as intermediary agent for the water commission. The primary purpose of the cooperative work has been to obtain reliable information on the ground-water conditions of the State, with attention being given first, as part of an integrated program, to those areas where problems were most critical and where the largest number of inhabitants could be most quickly benefited. With reliable information available as to the nature and extent of their water recourse, the people are then in a sound position to go ahead with water-supply developments without the continued waste of funds which has so frequently occurred heretofore. The selection of the type, plan, and design of the water-supply development is then carried out by private consulting engineers who prepare the specifications and supervise the construction of the wells installed by the private well contractors.

The Federal survey has at no time engaged in the construction of producing wells. Investigations under the present program are being made in seven counties in North Dakota—Barnes, Benson, Cass, Nelson, Steele, Traill, and Wells—with very gratifying results. In Wells County, for instance, one small part of the study is estimated by the engineers for the town of Fessenden to have provided information that has saved the city $20,000. In this and other regions there had been constant haphazard and costly drilling of wells over a period of many years without obtaining a satisfactory water supply. Other localities such as those in the vicinity of Minot and in Fargo, are benefiting greatly from the program. It is upon work such as this that the Federal Government is able to provide vital assistance that can be obtained from no other source and it must be continued unless our national development is not to be seriously retarded.

The vast development program in the Missouri River Basin, which has been authorized by Congress and which has progressed to the construction stage in several units, can be successfully and economically completed only if adequate basic information on the quantities and quality of surface and ground water is available. As indicated in Senate Document 191 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, reliable stream flow records covering sufficient time to reflect variations in flow are a prerequisite to sound planning, to assure proper control and full utilization of the waters, to avoid waste of construction funds on the one hand and the hazards of water shortage, flood damages, and power shortages on the other.

Similar data are required on the salt load to determine the siltation of reservoirs and on chemical quality of the water to determine its effect on the land and on crops. Likewise, ground-water studies are needed to determine where irrigation and domestic supplies are available for small communities and for farmsteads where surface supplies would constitute serious health hazards because it is not feasible to install plants for the purification of surface waters. The pattern of the water-bearing beds is extremely complex, and haphazard drilling to discover water supplies would be very costly. Exploratory drilling for water would likely result in more failures than successes unless it were based on sound investigation.

Ground-water investigations are also needed to determine the effect on ground-water resources that will result from reservoir construction and from irrigation where special care will be needed to avoid water logging and a host of other problems.

The cooperative State and Federal programs are entirely inadequate for these purposes. A greatly expanded program is needed to the end that project plans may be confirmed or modified on the basis of more complete information before construction is started.

The State Water Conservation Commission of North Dakota recently purchased a rotary well-drilling machine which has been used in ground-water investigations under the cooperative arrangement with the Geological Survey during the past 2 years. Under this cooperative arrangement the State puts up 25 percent, the municipality 25 percent, and the Federal Survey the other 50 percent of the funds, and in addition the State furnishes the well-drilling equipment.

My State has cooperated with the Federal Survey since 1938, and in the fiscal year 1946 drilled 41 test holes, and in fiscal 1947 drilled 72 test holes. In those 2 years, my State expended approximately $40,000 for equipment and matching funds. The legislature has again appropriated $30,000 for cooperating with the Geological Survey in North Dakota for the next biennium.

I just have information from the State water commission that at this time there are more than 50 applications from municipalities requesting test-hole drilling on a cooperative basis, and elimination of funds with which to carry on this work would seriously affect those communities where the matter of obtaining a domestic supply of water is a serious problem of paramount importance.

In the face of this demonstrated value, in the face of official statements from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Water Works Association, whose membership is composed of the engineers concerned in water-supply developments, and in the face of letters from hundreds of drillers testifying to the help received from the Geological Survey, the House Appropriations Committee has reached the alarming decision that this work must be stopped.

Apparently, this decision was reached largely on the representations of one man, a well driller, whose statements have been shown to be without foundation in fact. If this bill is passed in its present form, these activities will cease on June 30, millions of dollars invested in ground-water developments will be endangered, and this highly trained group of specialists will be dispersed and largely lost to the Nation. Such wasteful economies can only lead to national economic bankruptcy.

BUREAU OF MINES

The last item I wish to mention is testing fuels in the Bureau of Mines budget. Included in this estimate is an item for lignite- and subbituminous-coal investigations, including the operation of a lignite gasification and drying plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and work at Golden, Colo., and the University of Texas.

The plant at Grand Forks is located on the university campus, the ground for which was transferred from North Dakota to the United States Government. The university is also providing free of

charge rooms and many other facilities. and Dean Harrington, of the department of engineering of his school has given a large part of his time to this investigation.

This plant was constructed primarily for the purpose of utilizing lignite for the production of a high-hydrogen gas at low cost for use in the reduction of Minnesota iron ores to metallic iron without putting them through blast furnaces that require metallurgical coke that must be made from eastern coal. Such cheap commercial hydrogen also may be used for the production of nitrogen fertilizers, synthetic wood alcohol and other materials used in the chemical industries.

This program was set up on a continuing basis and in order to realize the Government's investment therein, which now is about half a million dollars, it would seem only prudent business practice to give this operation sufficient funds with which to carry forward the work begun to the end that the experiments conducted may be proved.

The reduction in the "testing fuels" item from the estimate of $595,000 to $302,285 completely eliminates any possibility of continuing further work on lignite and subbituminous coal at Grand Forks, N. Dak. This is the information received from the Bureau of Mines. The part of the Budget estimate for the Grand Forks plant was $190,760 and in reducing the item of $302,285 barely leaves enough to carry on the regular work of testing and analyzing samples of coal in connection with the purchase of coal used by the Government, leaving nothing for the Grand Forks plant.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this measure calls for a 40-percent cut in the funds for the Geological Survey mines and the elimination of the Oil and Gas Division. This reduction will seriously cripple the Department's work in an area of vital importance to the Nation at this stage of its economy. We are now desperately short of petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, and many other vital materials, materials absolutely indispensable to our expanding economy, and materials vital in a future emergency if one should occur.

We are today establishing ourselves as the great leader Nation of the world. At the same time we are virtually the only great bulwark against the forces of totalitarianism and socialism. The achievements of this leadership was made possible not only by our idealism but by our great economic strength. That economic strength was achieved through an abundance of the basic materials essential to our industrial economy. In providing the arsenal of democracy which supplied ourselves and our allies we made substantial inroads into our visible and immediately available reserves of metals and minerals. While this does not mean that we have become a have-not Nation as the result of such expanded activities, it does mean that we must make gigantic efforts to discover and develop some part of the substantial reserves which our more enlightened engineers tell us still exist in this great country of ours. Years of forced production in the face of manpower shortages has made it impossible for our industry to keep its developed reserves as far ahead of their production as it must do to maintain the high rate they are called upon to produce. This Government must do all in its power to encourage and lead the basic materials industries back to a production commensurate with the needs of our manufacturing industries in order that we can, insofar as we are able, maintain the economic strength that backs our external operations. It does this through the agency of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey.

The constant attention that we have been forced to focus on international affairs has caused many of us to temporarily lose sight of the necessity of watching our internal economy so that it remains strong enough to support our external obligations. We have just recently committed ourselves to $400,000,000 for our economic and political operations in Greece and Turkey; we are throwing $200,000,000 per year into the rehabilitation of our zone in Germany, to mention only two very essential activities. Yet we are proposing today to slash the equivalent of just 3 percent of those two items alone from the appropriations of the two Government bureaus on whose services the Government depends for the administration and advancement of the basic raw materials industries, whose enterprises supply the fodder for the manufacturing industries the taxes from which will be required to support those very activities.

Not only our economic strength but our actual military security depends on careful planning for the use of our available resources. We appropriated last year $100,000,000 for the stock piling of those materials which will always be in short internal supply in case of an emergency. The decisions for the expenditure of these funds are based on the statistical and technical work of the Bureau of Mines, which has asked for only $1,233,000 to cover all of its economic activities, the fruits of which are used for many other governmental and industrial activities. Assuming that these statistics and the experts who assemble them were used for stock-pile planning alone, would any one of us say for a minute that 1¼ percent is too much to spend on assuring the proper technical advice and information on which to plan intelligent procurement? One error of judgment based on inadequate information could easily cause the expenditure of that amount of money needlessly or endanger our security. Yet I am told that the overworked staff of this Bureau, which in many cases can afford only one expert to cover a number of its multitudinous fields, is already behind in its technological advice needed for intelligent procurement planning.

In the face of these facts it would appear to me that the Interior Department has been too modest in its requests for funds to cover these activities. If this Congress upholds the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee on the curtailment of these activities, many of the technical brains which have been trained at great expense will be lost to the Government with the resulting actual loss of money going into ill-advised procurement of stock piles alone.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if I had 5 hours instead of 5 minutes, I could begin to discuss this bill and criticize it. In the few minutes furnished me, however, I should like to point to bad features on reclamation, Indian education, and some of the omissions regarding the Bureau of Mines.

When Chairman JONES was presenting the case in the beginning of the discussion I asked a pointed question and was not satisfied with his answer. I asked specifically why the Budget estimate of $18,000,000 for Davis Dam was cut to $6,200,000. The answer was not satisfactory. I cannot take the time now to ask him the question again, but I want to elaborate on the question, and perhaps the chairman or somebody on the committee will answer it for me later.

Why am I asking this? I think the answer given me which was unsatisfactory was, "Ask the President what he has done. He has frozen the funds." But I pointed out at the time, I recall, or as soon thereafter as I could, that the construction of Davis Dam has been going along regularly, according to schedule. There was no freeze on that. The point I wish to emphasize is that we are expected to build a $70,000,000 dam as a treaty obligation in 5 years' time, and we cannot do that by appropriating six or seven million dollars annually.

Why are we expected to build this dam? Because a recent water treaty that we have entered into with Mexico requires this to be built within 5 years to carry out the obligation of that treaty. Do we intend to abrogate that treaty? Congress can abrogate a treaty by an act of Congress, an act of commission, or Congress can nullify a treaty by an act of omission. If we do not carry out that treaty we will abrogate it, which might please Mexico.

I heard the gentleman from Nebraska ask a question a moment ago, "When the President of Mexico comes up here he wants to borrow $25,000,000 for irrigation. Do you think he will get it?" I do not know about that, but I can tell you this. If Mexico borrows $25,000,000 of us to carry on reclamation within the Republic of Mexico, I know a good place where they can carry it on. They can do it in the delta of the lower Colorado, where they have more than 1,000,000 acres of delta land that may be irrigated if they had sufficient water. How can they get the water? The treaty that we recently adopted with them provides 1,500,000 acre-feet annually out of the Colorado River. If we abrogate that treaty, they can get twice that amount of water, and use it profitably—Mexico demanded 3,000,000 acre-feet as well as the money to develop the land. That I do not want to see happen, because that robs our country of the water we ought to have for use in the Colorado River Basin.

I said quite a bit about the lack of funds for investigation. I believe the committee is practicing birth control on

the Bureau of Reclamation when they cut off funds for general investigation. Reducing that item from $5,000,000 to $125,000 will kill many good projects before they are begun. That is the worst blow of all.

I notice in the committee's report on pages 15 and 16 that they recommend education for the Navajo Indian children. I notice they also say, "Let the State take care of education for the Indian children." I want to call your attention to the fact that there are 17,000 children of school age on the Navajo Indian Reservation, and less than 5,000 of them are in school. The Navajo Indian Reservation is about as large as the entire State of West Virginia, and it is impossible for the State of Arizona and the State of New Mexico to include these children in our public-school systems.

But, by the cut which this bill contains, 1,000 Navajo Indian children who are in boarding schools will be taken out of school. In other words, several boarding schools must be closed; one, I understand, at Santa Fe, one at Albuquerque, one at Riverside, or some place in California; and I am told that possibly the Indian school at Phoenix, Ariz., will be closed.

I see the gentleman from Oklahoma in the Chamber, and he says there will be three boarding schools for Indians in his district that will be closed because of this.

Gentlemen, that is false economy. From all over this country I am receiving letters and communications from thinking people asking, "What are you doing for the Navajo Indians? Why are they not getting the schooling promised them by treaty?" Similar questions are asked about other Indians. The Christian people are more keenly alert to this very bad situation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] such time as she may require.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, as a preface to my remarks, I offer the attached telegram from the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 23, 1947.*
Hon. GEORGIA L. LUSK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest House Appropriations Committee proposed 47 percent budget cut which would wipe out all hope of reclamation irrigation, power and conservation development at this time so badly needed throughout Rio Grande Valley. To hamstring this development now by false economy can conceivably reduce this valley to America's second potential dust bowl. We urge no cut of reclamation funds. We deem such funds positively essential to preservation of human life and inhabitation in Rio Grande Valley.

CHARLES C. BROOME,
President, Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply shocked by the action of the Appropriations Committee on the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. I cannot believe that the members of that committee are aware of the vital importance of reclamation developments in the arid and semiarid States. In the 45 years since Congress enacted the first Reclamation Act, 50 projects have been constructed to serve 4,500,000 acres of irrigated lands. Those areas, which were vacant desert and sagebrush before the projects, are now highly productive farming areas, which, in 1946, yielded crops worth $500,000,000. The crops are desperately needed livestock feeds, sugar beets, and fruits and vegetables required to maintain the high-standard diet in the United States. Those irrigated crops are not competitive with the production of other areas of the country, and they do not involve any of the surplus commodities, such as wheat, corn, or tobacco. The crops produced on irrigated lands are a vital part of the economy of the Western States, and are the principal source of income which builds up the trade and interstate commerce drawing on the manufactured items and the basic food staples produced in all other States of the Nation.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the agency constituted by the acts of Congress to develop western water resources for irrigation and electric-power production. For 45 years the Bureau of Reclamation has surveyed those western resources and reported on them to the Congress with recommendations of the projects needed to maintain western communities and to provide the basis for balanced economic development. The Congress has authorized projects, with a total cost of about $2,000,000,000. The appropriations for the construction of those projects by the Bureau of Reclamation are returned to the Treasury by the water users and the power consumers so that this western program is no drain on Federal finances. It is, in fact, a profitable investment, because, in addition to securing the return of the construction costs, the Federal Government has gotten back several times that amount in increased income taxes that are paid by the project people as a result of the increased productivity of their land. I am informed that surveys show that those income taxes represent a 300-percent profit on the investment in Federal reclamation projects.

My State of New Mexico is not wealthy. In several portions of the State, there are large numbers of small farmers who must get their living from a few acres of land and incidental work when they can get it on the railroads or as migratory labor in the beet fields of other States. There are also, in my State, large groups of Indians who do not have now enough agricultural land on their reservations to support themselves, and, therefore, the Federal Government appropriates annually for their maintenance and livelihood. Reclamation projects now under study would greatly improve the farming lands of those people. Along the middle Rio Grande, projects are needed to store the floodwaters so as to provide assured irrigation supplies and to reduce the damage from inundation. There is a desperate need for completion of those project studies so that proposals may be presented to the Congress for authorizing the needed works.

In other States I know that the same need for project-planning work is as urgent to provide the factual basis for authorizations. In past years, the Congress has been fully aware of the need for project planning by the Bureau of Reclamation. Last year, Congress appropriated $5,000,000 for this work, and in previous years the appropriations were comparable. As a result of that congressional action through the years, the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to inform the people of the Western States of the opportunities for reclamation development, and there have been presented to the Congress, on a sound engineering basis, project plans which have led to authorization and construction. If the bill as reported by the committee should be enacted, all of that work would cease. There would be no information available to the Western States and to the Congress concerning the feasibility of additional projects and the economic basis for returning to the Treasury the costs of their construction. I know that that would be disastrous to my State of New Mexico and I feel sure that it would be equally disastrous to all 17 Western States.

I cannot believe that the Congress will, by this bill, legislate out of existence the Federal program based on specific legislative authority which has done more for the West than any other Federal activity. Reclamation projects now in operation are the principal basis for income and tax revenues. Additional projects are vital so that New Mexico and the other Western States can take their proper place in the national economy. With that end in view, the project-planning work of the Bureau of Reclamation must continue. The $5,000,000 appropriation requested in the budget is a very modest figure, and should be the absolute minimum of the appropriations provided in the pending bill.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for an adequate appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. My feeling in regard to this runs very deep. I have seen the hot winds blow across western and central Nebraska, leaving in their wake burned and withered crops. Some of the more fortunate sections of our country talk loud and long when they have a light crop. I have seen sturdy, hard-working, and independent farmers face, not a small crop, but a total crop failure, not for a single year, but for as long as four, five, or six consecutive years. To many people in the United States, the dust storms were something that they read about in the middle thirties. To my friends and neighbors in Nebraska they were a real experience. I have seen the dust blow so that in the middle of the day adult farmers would get lost in the field and were unable to find their way to the house. Individuals were caught on the highway with their automobiles and found the storm so severe that they could not see the radiator cap on their car. This same territory that has suffered from drought and dust storms has had other years where the rainfall was ample and a fair crop could be raised. The soil is rich and deep and black. The streams in such a territory are a divine blessing and a source for a sound solution for drought and dust storms. Yet

if these streams are uncontrolled and unmanaged that same region faces floods. The Republican River flows for approximately 200 miles in southwestern Nebraska. It is in the heart of the drought and dust bowl area, yet in 1935 we had a terrific flood that cost the lives of 110 people and millions and millions of dollars in property loss.

There are two ways to deal with this problem: One is by means of relief, grants, and other temporary measures of like character. This is costly, wasteful, ineffective, unwise, and temporary. The other plan is to develop the streams and to prevent floods and store water for irrigation. This is an all-time solution, it is the economical answer, its benefits are manyfold. Much of the cost of such a program is reimbursable. It is not a part of our current costs of government and should not be so considered.

Those people who are opposed to irrigation should come out of their shell and read the history of America. For the 70-year period from 1850 to 1920, 5,000,000 acres of new farm land were brought into production each year. At the present time 4 acres of farm land are needed per capita. This means that for every increase in population of 1,000,000 we need to bring into production 4,000,000 acres of new farm land. Our public domain has now been exhausted. The only place to which we can turn for more land and for more available farm sites is through the expansion of irrigation. It has well been said that that part of the United States west of the Mississippi River could not feed itself in peace or in war without irrigation. I am satisfied that it can be safely said that the entire United States could not feed itself without irrigation. With the exception of 2 or 3 years during the war, the United States has been an importer of food since the middle twenties. We have imported more than we have exported. We have not fed ourselves.

In order to make more farm homes available, expand production in the United States, provide a market for our industrial centers, and strengthen us as a nation, a reclamation act was passed in 1902. I wish to quote from the first message to Congress in December 1901 of President Theodore Roosevelt:

> It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every section of our country just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States.
>
> The increased demand for manufactured articles will stimulate industrial production, while wider home markets and the trade of Asia will consume larger food supplies and thus effectually prevent competition with eastern agriculture.
>
> Indeed the products of irrigation will be consumed chiefly in mining and other industries which would otherwise not come into existence at all.
>
> Our people as a whole will profit, for successful homemaking is but another name for upbuilding of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate to point out that irrigation farmers are the only citizens who pay any portion of the cost of developing our waterways or harbors. The Federal program for flood control is a 100 percent subsidy. The navigation interests repay no part of the tremendous cost of improving our streams for the purpose of navigation. Our great wealthy cities, who boast of a harbor, do not repay the Federal Government the tremendous cost for developing such a harbor.

President Roosevelt's successor, William Howard Taft, likewise was a supporter of the extension of irrigation. Speaking at Spokane, Wash., September 29, 1909, he said:

> The plan of the Government to reclaim the arid and semiarid lands manifested in the Reclamation Act has been carried out most rapidly by the Bureau charged with its execution. There are more than 30 projects which have been entered upon by the Reclamation Bureau, and I believe all of them are to be commended for their excellent adaptation to the purpose for which they were erected, and for the speed with which the work has been done.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The work has been well done and reflects credit on the engineers that have had charge of it.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the witness stand a great Ohioan. A man whose home surroundings were not influenced by the demon drought, yet he said:

> There is yet unappropriated approximately 200,000,000 acres in the public domain, 20,000,000 acres of which are known to be susceptible of reclamation and (being) made fit for homes by provision for irrigation.
>
> The Government has been assisting in the development of its remaining lands until the estimated increase in land values in the irrigated sections is full $500,000,000 and the crops of 1920 alone on these lands are estimated at $100,000,000. Under the law authorizing these expenditures for development the advances are to be repaid, and it would be good business for the Government to provide for reclamation of the remaining 20,000,000 acres, in addition to expediting the completion of projects long under way.

The above is from the message to Congress on December 6, 1921, of President Warren G. Harding.

Here is what Calvin Coolidge said in a letter dated September 17, 1924:

> Some minor criticism has been made as to the policy of our unremitting development of these (reclamation) projects by those who have thought we were already overproducing in agricultural products. They feel that these projects should be stayed until agricultural production had readjusted itself.
>
> These criticisms lie in the lack of understanding that these projects take many years for development; that they furnish but a small portion of the increased food supply required even by our increased population; that the utilization of their supplies lies in the development of the West itself.
>
> It is my purpose to unremittingly stimulate and encourage the development of these projects by every authority of the Federal Government.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made a success of things because it has had the guiding hand of intelligent, well-trained, and sound engineers. It is no wonder that Herbert Hoover, the engineer, was a stanch supporter of the extension of irrigation. As President of the United States he enthusiastically supported the program of the Bureau of Reclamation. In a letter to the conference of western governors held in Salt Lake City in the summer of 1930, President Hoover said:

> The undertaking (reclamation) has been of great benefit to this region (the West) and has been the cause of adding much wealth to the Nation.
>
> If the fundamental facts are properly appraised, it seems certain that the arguments of opponents of Federal reclamation will find satisfactory answer and that they will no longer countenance the misleading information that is now being broadcast through different agencies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The projects themselves furnish extensive markets for manufactured goods as well as for farm products not raised under irrigation, and thus seem to afford material benefits, rather than detriment, to other sections. It may be further said that crops raised under irrigation are generally supplemental to, rather than competitive with, the products of other farms.
>
> * * * No valid arguments appear to oppose this constructive Federal undertaking. Rather support should be given in the light of the contribution to the Nation's good.

While our reclamation program was initiated and developed by the Republican Party, it is not a partisan matter. Nebraskans of all political faiths are supporters of irrigation. It has always been supported by men of all parties who have investigated the problem with which reclamation deals. I predict that the money spent under the Roosevelt administration for the extension of irrigation will prove to be the soundest and most enduring of all expenditures made in that era. When money is spent on things that do not lead to the production of new wealth its value is limited. It is not so with the development of irrigation. It supplants drought with adequate moisture, poverty with a reasonable living, and citizens on relief with citizens who are substantial taxpayers. It does all of these things in addition to the fact that a large portion of the principal cost of construction is repaid directly. When the National Reclamation Association met in Boise, Idaho, in 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote:

> Reclamation as a Federal policy has proven its worth and has a very definite place in our economic existence. Spread over one-third of the territory of the United States and creating taxable values and purchasing power affecting municipal, State, and Federal governments and private industry, it is only reasonable that we should all take pride in its achievements and success.

When the drought and dust storms came in the thirties, President Roosevelt visited Nebraska on his tour of the stricken region. One of his stops was at McCook, Nebr., on the Republican River. President Roosevelt rightfully recognized that the answer was in the utilization of our water resources. In a letter of October 1938, President Roosevelt said:

> The providing of new opportunities to make homes and gain decent livings for a

large number of our farmers through irrigation of western deserts serves to increase the wealth of the Nation and to cement us economically into a more perfect whole.

I have felt concern for the large number of families which have been forced by drought and adversities from their homes in various sections. The construction now in progress in the West will, in part, solve the problem.

The fact that these projects are expected to repay the cost of their construction, through revenues from water and from power, when power is possible of development, is not to be overlooked nor underestimated. This makes it possible for me to justify expenditures on a scale commensurate with the needs for such work.

The scores of dams, the thousands of miles of canals, the many power plants, and the thousands upon thousands of homes which have resulted from Federal reclamation are monuments to the sound plan which is being so ably executed by the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Chairman, when I appeared before the Appropriations Committee urging an appropriation for irrigation, I pointed out that the Federal Government had spent and loaned in one way or another over $25,000,000 to relieve the distress in the counties that comprise the Republican River Basin. This amounts to an average of $2,458 for every farm family in the watershed. The drought will come again, for it is an area of insufficient rainfall. These expenditures have not solved the problem, the solution is the utilization of the water of our streams. Herein lies protection against floods and the storage of water to be applied on the land for the growing crops. This is the wise and economical solution. It means the saving of dollars, the saving of water, the saving of soil, and the saving of a great people.

Shortly after I came to Congress in 1939, the west coast, particularly California, was disturbed over their relief load, school expenses, and other heavy charges by reason of the fact of the migration of thousands of families to that part of the Nation. They caused this House to create a select committee to investigate the interstate migration of destitute persons. A great portion of these people came from the drought area. Believing that the answer was not more and better Federal relief programs, but in combatting drought, I sought and obtained a place on that special committee. It was headed by the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. John Tolin. The committee found that the primary cause for the disruption of these American families was drought and that the solution was the extension of irrigation.

Nebraska is where the Middle West, with its ample rainfall, and the arid West meet. This is generally true of the greater portion of the Missouri River Basin which comprises one-sixth of the area of the United States. It has not received its share of the Nation's reclamation development. It may have been partly because, in the years gone by, many of our people and their representatives hoped that the rain would come, while the people a little farther west knew that it would not. One of the first irrigation projects built by the Bureau was in Nebraska. It was started in 1902. That locality is now a rich, thriving, thickly settled, prosperous section of our country. The United States Government has collected and will continue to collect millions and millions and millions of dollars in income taxes in this irrigated section. This prosperity is due to irrigation. We, in Nebraska, are grateful for some much-needed and successful irrigation development under PWA, but the Bureau of Reclamation has not built any projects in Nebraska in the last 40 years. Other semiarid spots of Nebraska which were similarly situated in 1902 with the portion that received development in irrigation have not moved ahead like that irrigated section. They have not provided homes for the additional thousands of people, they have not paid the millions and millions of dollars in income taxes, they have not provided the huge market for the products of our industrial centers. The cost of developing this irrigation in Nebraska in 1902 has been repaid many times.

Work is now under way by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Republican Valley. This is an important part of the Missouri Basin program. That program is sometimes referred to as the Pick-Sloan plan. As a member of the Committee on Flood Control, I introduced the resolution, back in 1943, that brought forth the plan of the Army Engineers known as the Pick plan. At the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook their basin-wide plan for the Missouri The House of Representatives approved the Pick plan and authorized it by law. When the bill reached the Senate, the Sloan plan was added to the Pick plan and thus was evolved the joint Army-Bureau plan for the Missouri Valley. I served as one of the conferees on that measure. The conference accepted the combined plan and the program for flood control and irrigation for the Missouri River Basin became law in December 1944.

Nebraska is the only State that lies entirely within the Missouri River Basin. Construction work by both the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation is now under way on the Republican River. The bill before us today is the appropriation bill for the Bureau of Reclamation. The appropriation bill carrying the Army funds will come before us at a later time. Last year the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives recommended an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri River Basin. It was raised by the Senate and there was finally appropriated $17,500,000. In the bill before us today, the House Committee on Appropriations has recommended nearly the same amount as they did a year ago. I am informed that when the new year begins July 1, there will be an unexpended balance of $10,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin from previous appropriations.

Nebraska's share of this construction money will be spent in the Republican River Basin. The Frenchman-Cambridge project consists of the Enders Dam and a dam on Medicine Creek, north of Cambridge, plus diversion dams and canals. The contract for the Enders Dam was let some months ago. It was for the sum of $4,109,927. This is approximately 20 percent below the original estimate made by the Bureau. The entire Frenchman-Cambridge project is estimated to cost $19,839,039.

One other project on the Republican River is being constructed by both the Army and the Bureau. The Army is building the large on-river dam. The Army calls this the Harlan County Dam. Since the bill before us today does not deal with Army money, the figures quoted do not pertain to the Army's portion of this job. In addition to the Harlan County Dam, which is for both flood control and irrigation, there will be the diversion dams and canals to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau refers to this project as the Bostwick project. The Bostwick project will consist of the Superior-Courtland, Franklin, Red Cloud, Scandia, and Republican subunits. The total cost for this Bostwick project is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be $15,774,523. Again let me state that these figures do not include Army appropriations for the Harlan County Dam. It might be in the interests of clarity to refer to this joint project as the Harlan County-Bostwick project.

There are other portions of the program for the Republican River Basin that have not yet reached the construction stage. This does not mean that they are less meritorious. Due to the extreme drought inherent to the Republican River Basin and the very continuing danger of floods, our efforts must not stop until every possible acre of land that can be irrigated is irrigated and until the greatest possible degree of flood protection is provided.

The Bureau of Reclamation was created to bring water to the soil where the rainfall was insufficient. If there ever were any projects that fall clearly and distinctly within the original purpose for which the Bureau was created it is these Republican River projects. Compared to huge river developments elsewhere and compared to some of the gigantic projects throughout the country these developments are small. The engineers have not found the production of power to be feasible on this stream. They are farmers' projects. A great portion of the money advanced to the Government will be repaid by farmers. They will be operated by farmers and the water will be used on family-sized farms. It will make possible many new farm sites for returned veterans and others. This development should have first claim on any funds that are given to the Bureau of Reclamation, because the Bureau was created to bring water to the farmers' land in areas where the rainfall is insufficient.

Projects such as these are in the interest of long-range economy. A considerable portion of these funds are repaid to the Treasury of the United States. To that extent, at least, these items should not be considered as any part of the current costs of Government. To slow up their construction is wasteful. It means more overhead and it delays the time when the benefits will start, resulting in increased taxes and repayments to the Treasury. It is both necessary and sound that these projects move forward. In

that connection I have two suggestions. They are:

First. The appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri River Basin will have to be increased before the Congress completes its work on this measure.

Second. A permanent, long-range program must be worked out whereby the reimbursable part of reclamation projects can be financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and not carried as a cash appropriation item.

It is my information that the rural-electrification program is financed by the RFC and that it is not counted in the annual budget of the Government. The record for repayment for REA is good and this arrangement is right. It is a Government loan and not an expenditure for the operating costs of Government. The Bureau of Reclamation's expenditures, which are repaid to the Treasury, do not represent the running expenses of this Government. They constitute a loan. These loans should be made by the RFC. If a hard-up and failing business corporation gets an RFC loan it is not handled as a cash appropriation by the Congress and the issue of budget balancing does not enter into it. Such loans have been made to banks, manufacturing concerns, railroads, hotel corporations and practically every type of business. Why should not the loan part of reclamation be financed in the same manner? The answer is, it should. This Congress should write such a program before another fiscal year rolls around.

I do not suggest that the RFC be an additional agency to pass upon a reclamation program. The control of both money and RFC credit should remain in the hands of the Congress. An accounting should be made to the Congress and expenditures should be scrutinized to prevent waste and keep the cost down. Then when the Congress makes a cash appropriation to run the Bureau of Reclamation and to carry the nonreimbursable parts of the construction program, they would at the same time make mandatory provisions for the extending of stated amounts of RFC credit. Until such a financing program is worked out, wasteful delays must not be permitted nor prolonged overhead invited. The program of extending irrigation must go on and an adequate appropriation should be made therefore.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I believe if every Member of the House will seriously consider the proposed $3,856,000 cut in the budget estimates for the "Education of Indians" he will join me in regretting this action. This represents a reduction of $2,000,000 with respect to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947. If increases based on the Pay Act are taken into account, the cut amounts to an actual reduction of $2,889,700. Unfortunately, these cuts come at a time when food and other costs have reached an all-time peak.

You will pardon my reference to my own State if I say that Oklahoma has more Indians than any other State in the Union. We are proud of our Indian population. We are proud of the progress they have made. They have distinguished themselves in every field of endeavor. One of our own and most beloved colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], is of Choctaw Indian descent. To my own knowledge at least two members of the Five Tribes of Oklahoma won the Medal of Honor for "heroism above and beyond the call of duty" in World War II. Such progress, of course, is largely the result of education.

I do not like to single out my own State, for what I have said, and will say, will apply equally to many other States, particularly Montana, South Dakota, New Mexico, Arizona, and others. However, in swinging the so-called Republican economy ax the committee has seen fit in its report to refer specifically to the State of Oklahoma. From page 15 of the report I quote these words:

> The committee is aware of the fact that the Congress could spend unlimited funds in the support and education of this group. It wishes to point out, however, that the States have some obligation to the Indians and that some aid could and should be extended by local communities. In some States, such as Oklahoma, the State is obligated to provide educational facilities for all citizens. For these reasons the committee has made substantial reductions in many items in the bill for administration as well as for education and relief purposes.

Oklahoma, of course, does not deny its obligations to any citizens. In its high schools and colleges, and to a great extent in all its schools, Oklahoma has provided educational opportunities and facilities for all citizens, including its Indians.

Under various solemn treaties under which Indians were driven from their native homes; under acts of Congress, and under the ordinary rules of justice, the Federal Government has through the years assisted in the education of Indians who looked forward to the day when all restrictions might be lifted from their population. This educational assistance has been rendered through the establishment of reservation and nonreservation, boarding schools and day schools, through financial aid to school districts and to missionary schools, and to a limited extent through scholarships in special cases. If I construe this bill properly, its enactment will result in the reduction of expenditures in just about every item except with respect to aid to mission schools.

In the time allotted to me, I would like to discuss briefly the matter of aid to school districts and the matter of nonreservation boarding schools. It should be remembered that the enabling act under which Congress made provision for the admission of Oklahoma to the Union, restrictions were placed on Indian lands and large quantities of lands were exempt from State or local taxation for all purposes. The same situation is true in many other States where most Indians live on nontaxable lands and, therefore, do not contribute to the support of schools. It is obvious that in districts in which many acres of tax-exempt lands are located, it would throw an unusual burden on other taxpayers, if they were required to carry the entire load of supporting their local schools. It appears from the report that in writing this bill, the committee has not taken this matter into account and has departed from a long established practice of granting assistance, which was little enough at most, to schools serving Indian pupils. Unfortunately this cut touches many districts which have been struggling for years to maintain even minimum standards of elementary education.

In the establishment of nonreservation board schools, our Government has taken care of cases that could be taken care of in no other manner. They are limited to orphan children, to children from broken homes, and to children who reside so far from ordinary schools that attendance at such schools is impossible. They are limited to children whose parents have no financial means of keeping them in school. They are only placed in these boarding schools when all other efforts to place them in homes or in other appropriate institutions have failed. There can be no doubt under this bill that all of these schools will be curtailed, and some of them may be closed entirely.

In view of salary raises, or the 40-hour week, and increased commodity costs, these cuts cannot be absorbed by operational economies. I have known children who have graduated from these schools. They have uniformly made fine substantial citizens. Mr. Chairman, in all these cases, these are students who have had no other chance to get an education. To cripple such a program would appear to me to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Right now this Congress is in the midst of considering an authorization of $350,000,000 for relief in foreign countries. Shall we deny a pitiful 1 percent of this amount to assist, where assistance is sorely needed, in the care and education of the children of our original Americans?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, as the entire delegation from the great Territory of Alaska, although not a voting delegation, I would like to enter my bid now on a nonpartisan basis to be cut in on any deals that might be floating around. I am imbued with the spirit of compromise.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I am not happy with all the provisions of this bill and I expect to detail the reasons why I am not. I should be less than fair, however, if I were not to state here that the distinguished Chairman and members of the committee have, generally speaking, dealt most fairly with Alaska. They have recognized its national importance, they have recognized that it is at the strategic crossroads of the world. Dollar-wise, Mr. Chairman, this bill contains more for the Territory of Alaska than last year's bill and we are grateful for that. We are especially grateful that the committee saw fit to report the bill with an item of $4,000,000 for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad. That is work that has long needed to be done. The War Department made an urgent recommendation that it be started without delay. The needs of the Army in the

Territory are such that the railroad must be put in first-class shape with the least possible delay and that work can now be started under the provisions of this bill.

I am extremely happy to note that the Geological Survey is given funds over and above those available for the current fiscal year for unlocking the mineral storehouse that Alaska is.

The bill does not contain enough money for the enforcement of laws and regulations having to do with the Alaska Fishery, the bill does not contain money enough for the enforcement of game laws, but I do not think that is fundamentally a fault of this committee. Alaska produces 80 percent and more of the entire world's pack of salmon. It is a great Alaska resource, it is a great national resource, it must be protected, and I think it is the duty of the executive arm of our Government to come before the Congress with an adequate program for the protection of and building up of that valuable resource. The same is true with respect to requests for the enforcement of game laws. That is a Federal responsibility now. I do not think the executive arm of the Government has ever asked this Congress for enough money to insure adequate protection for the great herds of caribou and moose in the Territory of Alaska, for the Alaska brown bear, and for the other animals which have a value over and above that which can be expressed in terms of dollars.

In the general items not specifically referring to Alaska, Mr. Chairman, the funds are inadequate to maintain for the next fiscal year the fishery laboratory at Ketchikan. I think that is poor economy because that laboratory has been a most valuable work in connection with utilizing fishery products in Alaska that are not now commercially marketed.

Over and above all things, that which concerns me about the bill as it relates to Alaska, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that there has been a rather substantial reduction in the budget estimate for the Alaska Native Service. In that connection I should like to say to the members of the committee that I only regret that you did not have the opportunity this year as you did last year to have before you personally Mr. Don C. Foster, the very able Superintendent of the Alaska Native Service. If he could have testified I feel confident that the bill would have been more liberal with respect to the needs of the Indians, the Eskimos, and the Aleuts of Alaska.

In development of the great national resource which is Alaska there is a continuous need for intelligent direction. As a Territory we are prevented from giving that direction ourselves to the many problems which are involved, and the direction must be furnished, in large measure, by the Secretary of the Interior and his immediate staff.

The deep and undiscriminating cuts recommended for the Office of the Secretary would be particularly harmful to Alaska. They would be harmful not only to the people of the Territory of Alaska who expect soon to be the citizens of the State of Alaska—but they would be doubly harmful to the thousands of young veterans still in the States and who, with the traditional pioneer vision that has made this country so great, are making their plans and preparations to go to Alaska to live.

Our knowledge of a large part of even the most attractive parts of Alaska is still fragmentary. It cannot be denied that it is a proper and a necessary function of the Government to conserve this great natural resource. To the performance of that function we must bring the true conservative spirit—namely, to use our assets wisely today, while thinking of the needs of tomorrow. If, therefore, today we deny to our Government the very instrument which we have designed to assure the prudent development of Alaska, then tomorrow the hoped-for population will not be there—or it will be only a disappointed, embittered remnant of the group of young pioneers whose hope and courage will have carried them up there without the expert guidance which this Congress again and again promised them while they were offering their blood and their lives in defense of their country.

I have mentioned the Office of the Secretary particularly. In that office there is located the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, whose appropriation for the coming year has been cut by the committee a fourth below the amount that agency received for the present fiscal year. I am acquainted with the work load being borne by this division at the present time. Inquiries reaching the division from citizens, particularly veterans, living all over the United States and from every place where our armed forces are still stationed, number in the thousands. From this division the citizens who express interest in going to Alaska get intelligent and informed answers to their questions. The division is doing a real job of service in aiding the development of a broader economy and a larger population in Alaska. I know that the facilities of the Division of Territories are already taxed to the limit in handling this work. It is neither an economy or good sense to require the reduction of staff which will be necessary should the Interior bill as reported by the House committee pass in that form.

The bill, as reported, would abolish entirely the Division of Power. Alaska is just beginning to receive from this division substantial assistance in meeting the power problems which confront a rapidly developing area. This cut which would produce a saving which is infinitesimal in the whole picture of Government expenditures will have real and highly unfortunate consequences as far away as Alaska.

The Congress has prescribed in great detail the land and mineral policies to be followed in Alaska. The solicitor of Interior with a carefully chosen small staff has the final responsibility of assuring that the activities of the Department of the Interior and of the Government as a whole conform to these congressional requirements. To slash his small staff by more than a third would be to place upon the solicitor a task practically impossible of performance.

Hundreds of thousands of square miles of public domain in Alaska containing forest resources whose commercial volume is estimated at 225,000,000,000 board feet have been protected in the past by an organization known as the Alaska Fire Control Service. An item of $170,000 requested for this service in the next year has been disallowed.

The appropriation for the Alaska Native Service which has responsibility for the health, welfare, and education of about one-third the people of Alaska has been reduced by the committee by $819,000. This will mean that many establishments including schools, hospitals, nursing-staff stations and tuberculosis sanitoriums will have to be closed.

Alaska, which has less than 3,000 miles of roads in an area one-fifth as large as the entire United States, is never going to be developed as the Nation should insist it be developed in the interests of National defense, as well as domestic progress, unless the highway system of the Territory is expanded materially. The bill as reported by the committee would reduce by $603,000 the modest funds sought for maintenance, repair, and construction of roads.

Alaska's principal wealth is the fisheries industry which, over the past half century, has contributed something like $50,000,000 annually to the prosperity of the Nation. We thought that up until a few years ago the salmon fishery was at a level which could be maintained indefinitely, but for the past half dozen years it has been declining steadily. The decline is due to the lack of sufficient personnel and equipment to enforce the fisheries and game conservation regulations. The cut recommended by the committee will mean the closing of a fisheries research laboratory operated by the Fish and Wildlife Service at Ketchikan, Alaska, the only research institution located in Alaska and dealing with the problem of obtaining a more intelligent utilization of those rich resources.

I am sure the Congress is aware of the fact that Alaska is not standing still. Our population is increasing from month to month Our problems, too, are increasing. It happens that most of these problems under the territorial system fall to the Department of the Interior to solve. To my mind, the Department has never been equipped by Congress with the tools which it really needs to do the job in Alaska which must be done to develop that great land for the future generations who will live there and for the people of the United States, including Alaskans. No , the committee proposes to take some of even these few tools out of the hands of the Department and to weaken the Federal effort in the Territory. With the Nation in its present situation with respect to the rest of the world and with Alaska occupying so important a place in that situation, it behooves the Congress not to weaken but to strengthen the hand of its chief administrative agency in Alaska.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, the West is steeped in the tradition of reclaiming arid lands and developing natural resources. It is a part of us. We have lived with it for years. We have worked, and worked hard, in a pattern of repayment to our Government for benefits received. We have seen dust changed to green pastures, and sagebrush to truck gardens and orchards through an enlightened self-interest program of irrigation and reclamation. In 1902 the Reclamation Act was passed. It was inaugurated, supported and put through by Theodore Roosevelt and the Republican Party. The program has been carried on by both parties ever since. It is a question of national policy and has been the policy for many years.

The wealth-building power of this program has been prodigious, both through the increase of production and the building of taxable wealth.

The most valuable commodity on the face of the earth is bringing water onto the rich volcanic soil of the West. The State of Washington feels and knows through direct experience the fact that we have the collateral and we pay back.

I will place the record of the reimbursable features of Government money spent in the Western States and the repayment of these moneys for water control and development against any section of our country. I can cite you one valley in the State of Washington that in 40 years of reclamation history is not delinquent one cent in its repayments to the Government and has produced in crops alone three times the value of the gold take of the Klondike.

I can cite you one town in the same State that has a drawing this week of 1,500 applicants for 28 homesteads on newly brought in irrigated land. All of these applicants are World War II veterans, and the drawing this week will award homesteads to 28 out of 1,500 applicants, who in turn were 1,500 out of 10,000 inquiries from every State in the Union.

Do you call it economy not to offer credit to develop this great collateral? Do you call it economy not to provide generators for dams already built and sitting there waiting to manufacture power to start repaying their cost? Is that a wise use of money?

Yes; some of you may think that the West is not carrying its share of the burden. For Government moneys invested in the Western States, 50 percent is reimbursable, while for the rest of the country it is one-sixth to one-seventh reimbursable.

Is it economy to start these projects, invest millions in them, develop them from their elementary stages on through to where they are just beginning to make money and then deprive them of their ability to pay back?

It would be similar to starting a business, getting it up to its producing stage and then deciding to quit.

We are not asking for promiscuous spending of money. We are asking for a capital investment. And we are not the least bit afraid of our ability to pay back the amount advanced. And, as a specific example, I offer you the record of irrigation in my State to prove our confidence.

On February 14, 1947, the last payment on the Tieton project was made to Secretary Krug. All costs of construction were paid off—lock, stock, and barrel—in 37 years, an area comprising 27,000 acres, whose average gross per-acre yield last year was around $840.

You cannot meet these arguments, Members of the House, the proof is in the pay-off. I should think it would stir the very cockles of your hearts to want to have a part in building these investments with the people of the West, where there is the climate, where there is the soil, where the program will bring the water, and where your own fellow countrymen are clamoring for a chance at the ratio of 1,500 to 28. I should think that you would want enthusiastically to build that wealth for the Nation.

All peoples benefit. Why, some of the projects were so important during the war that the War Production Board allowed strategic materials to go into their construction, and through their production of power and produce they made one of the most astounding records of any of the segments of our economic system. Look at aluminum and light metals and their alloys. Look at the production of foodstuffs. Look at them through the actual facts which I want to present further to prove my contentions.

During the life of the Tieton project referred to, between the years of 1910 and the present, the Northwest and Nation have been richer by $157,000,000 from crops produced on this project. This represents 45 times the cost of constructing it. This does not even include the amount of taxable wealth that has been built through the use of the original construction moneys.

The entire Yakima Federal reclamation project has repaid approximately one-half of its repayment contracts.

Since 1919 the Yakima project, embracing 350,000 acres of irrigated land, has produced $819,100,000 in crops, or more than 20 times the construction cost of the project. The 1946 return alone on this project was $76,056,000, or nearly twice the Federal expenditure.

The Sunnyside division of the Yakima project from 1907 to 1946 has produced $234,000,000 in crops, or 48 times the total construction cost, which is $4,885,442. The average annual production for these years is 1.14 times the total cost of the irrigation works of this division.

The Roza division of this project, which is not yet all irrigated, from 1941 to 1946 grew crops valued at $15,366,000, or an amount approximately equivalent to the cost of the project—and let me add that this division of the project not yet fully constructed has already made its first payment back to the Federal Government.

The Columbia Basin lands are right next to them; the climate is the same, and the soil is the same quality, the potential possibilities are the same, and in order to guide your wisdom for future action, I present you the record of the past. We have the collateral. You have the power of extending the loan; we will pay for it, and promptly.

The budget request for this Columbia River Basin project was $27,500,000, cut by appropriations to not quite $9,500,000. We have in that area an investment of approximately $200,000,000 in the Grand Coulee Dam and subsidiary construction. With the appropriations granted us last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress through the wisdom of this body, we began the actual construction of canals and laterals to bring water from the great Columbia River onto arid soil. Some of these contracts are now under construction, and one of the main canals is in the process of being built. They cannot be neglected nor can they be abandoned without tremendous loss of moneys already spent.

To give you some idea of how important that is, when you are constructing a canal 30 or 40 feet wide at the base, 30 feet in depth, and approximately 100 feet wide at the top, you cannot start that construction with the heavy machinery necessary to be in there to do the job and stop it, neither can you stop lining the canal. For any stoppage or delay means a great loss in work already done and in money already spent. It is a matter of wisdom and common sense to see to it that these contracts are maintained and continued

The veteran has top priority upon this available land. The program is built and amortized upon the plan that will permit that settler to make his living, develop his land, and build revenue-earning wealth along with valuable crops. We feel that it is sound; we know what can be done; and we submit to you this record of proof as to what our State has done in the matter of its reclamation and irrigation projects. There is no doubt in my mind or in the minds of those acquainted with the whole picture, but that this is completely reimbursable. Again let me repeat, we have the land, we have the water, and we have the climate. I ask you to scrutinize the record for yourselves, with the welfare of the whole country in mind. Please judge it in relation to the creation of wealth not only through annual crops but through the creation of real property and taxable property. We are proud to stand on our record.

Certainly we believe in economy. Most certainly say, "Spend our money wisely and well." And most certainly we think such true capital investments are sound and safe. I am not afraid to spend a few dollars as an investment, repayable in American development. Are you? Suppose I were asking for the promiscuous use of money as a gift or a dole from which there were no monetary return. Yes; I could easily see disagreement. But I am not asking for any rat-hole appropriation. I am asking for an investment for the veteran, for the little man, the young fellow trying to get a start—for an investment which he will pay back.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sorry the gentleman confines me to a question, for I wanted to compliment him on his statement. The gentleman speaks of money being repaid promptly, but do not your people also buy a great deal of merchandise east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HOLMES. A tremendous amount.

Mr. MURDOCK. And do they not sell their specialized products to the eastern part, and, therefore, is there not a mutual exchange beneficial to the whole country?

Mr. HOLMES. There is complete mutual reciprocity in the interchange of trade between both the West and East.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has made a splendid statement, appropriate to his projects, but I fail to hear him say anything of the amount of income taxes which the people who have developed that project have paid during the years, as well as the amount of payments made in the form of reimbursement.

Mr. HOLMES. Naturally, they pay in a tremendous amount of money.

Economy is the wise use of money, not the absence of any use whatsoever. Economy is the wise use and not the abuse of money, and I strongly maintain that it is an abuse to withhold from a known good investment of national importance the proper funds. It is not economy. It is a lack of vision.

This is the last frontier of development, the only lands that are left in the United States, and water must be brought onto them to make them live.

The budget request for the Columbia River Basin project was $27,500,000. The amount granted by the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations was $9,435,000—a cut of better than 66 percent.

Have we so soon forgotten our promise to the returning veteran of World War II, our promise that life offers him an opportunity and not a dole? And that place of opportunity is in the West. Shall it be for only 28 out of 1,500 out of 10,000? No. You know in your hearts that the American concept of enterprise and opportunity should still prevail and that just as common man must have his day so the land of this last frontier must continue to be developed. The building of wealth in that area will diffuse its benefits to all parts of our country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill for the Interior Department for 1948, H. R. 3123, that has been brought to us is not a good bill. In the name of economy, it has reduced to crippling size the appropriation for many of the programs of primary interest to the West, such as irrigation and reclamation, ground-water studies, mineral and mining activities, and public-power expansion and operation.

Commenting specifically on one or two of these points, I would like to point out a little matter that has crept into this bill for the first time this year which is seemingly innocent but which will wreck the great reclamation engineering organization that has been built up through the years in my home city—Denver, Colo.

I refer to the proviso on page 33, beginning in line 17 and reading as follows:

Provided, That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $6,500,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects.

Heretofore there has been no limit except the limit of necessity itself on the amount used by the Bureau of Reclamation from project funds for work performed in the engineering office at Denver for the benefit of specific projects. This placing of an arbitrary limit of $6,500,000 in this bill is without regard to any information presented to the committee. It represents a cut of approximately 50 percent in the size of the operation and will force a reduction of something like 50 percent, or 1,300 men, mostly highly skilled engineers in the reclamation force at the Denver Federal Center where the great engineering office is rapidly being moved and reassembled from downtown Denver.

This reclamation engineering force is noted throughout the world. It developed and pioneered the great dams. Here Boulder Dam was designed; here Grand Coulee Dam was designed; here Shasta Dam was designed; here the highest dams in the world have been designed one after another for more than 30 years. This is the mecca for engineers from all over the world, and more than 50 nations have sent their experts as students to the Denver reclamation engineering office. There is no reason given anywhere in the 1552 pages of testimony taken by the Committee on Reclamation activities for such a reduction in the Denver reclamation engineering office. I am informed that the engineering design work and the engineering laboratory work that is conducted there must go forward unabated in the coming year if the construction program that this bill contemplates is to be carried out without disruption. I am informed that this limitation of $6,500,000, if it stands, will not save anything in the cost of design and engineering of reclamation construction but will force a dispersal of the design groups to far-flung projects and the rentention in Denver of only the top experts, consultants, and advisers. If this engineering group is broken up, technical men all over the world will mourn its loss.

This heedless action is, in my judgment, paralleled by nothing else in the bill, unless it may be the reckless reduction of general engineering and investigation funds for the Bureau of Reclamation which would force liquidation of the project planning staffs in the 17 Western States.

On page 34, line 11 of the bill, is an item of $125,000 for all the general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The budget estimate was $5,000,000, the amount appropriated for 1947 was $5,000,000. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars will not pay the terminal leave of the staff so carefully built up that will have to be destroyed.

On page 40 of the bill, line 25, is an item of $9,611,600 for the Missouri Basin project. The report indicates that this sum contains only $50,000 for general planning in the entire Missouri River Basin, and that $50,000 is confined to the investigation of a single project in Wyoming—the Shoshone project extension in Oregon Basin. Here is $50,000 substituted for approximately $2,000,000 in the 1947 appropriation act.

On page 42 of the bill in line 17 is an item of $250,000 from the Colorado River development fund into which the power users at Boulder Dam pay $500,000 each year for this purpose for investigations in the Colorado River system in the four States of the upper division; namely, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Add these sums all together and you find only $425,000 for general investigations in the entire West. That means no irrigation projects will be developed for consideration by the Eighty-second, Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and later Congresses. We are tying their hands. This bill would provide less for the entire 17 Western States, nearly half the country, than is deposited annually into a fund that can be used for no other purpose than for investigations in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin.

Irrigation is basic to the economy of the West. Its expansion through carefully planned projects will be the governor of the growth and development of the West. Should this bill not be revised, irrigation development in a few years will die on the vine because its investigation roots are herein cut.

Now to look at one of the construction items. On page 35 in line 14 is $4,815,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, a sum substituted for the budget estimate of $14,000,000. This will bring the great transmountain diversion project to a grinding discordant stop, with contracts half completed, facilities unusable, benefits postponed. There is no economy in the stop-go method of programing our construction work. It doubles the cost to liquidate, reinstitute, liquidate, and reinstitute the program as has been done and is herein proposed on the Colorado-Big Thompson project. I realize that almost the same situation would be created by this bill on the Central Valley project in California, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, and others.

Now for a quick glance at the power situation. This bill would negate the national power policy. It eliminated the Power Division of the Interior Department which coordinates activities of five Interior Department agencies in the power field and which is the only facility available to the Government to carry out the authorized task of the Secretary of the Interior to market the power from dams built in the East by the Corps of Army Engineers; it wrecks both the construction and operation programs of the Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest, an activity essential to the economy and the growing industrial strength of that region; it eviscerates the Southwestern Power Administration; it does violence to the power programs of such great reclamation projects as the Central Valley in California and the Colorado-Big Thompson in my State of Colorado.

The carrying forward of the multiple-purpose projects of the Bureau of Reclamation is not a partisan matter in the

West. The Republican Governor of California made a special trip to Washington to support, indeed to ask the Congress to double, the President's estimate for irrigation and power facilities of the Central Valley project. He said:

I am appearing, however, to plead for the earliest possible completion of the several units of the project—

The Central Valley project—

because I believe that it is in the best interests of both the Nation and California.

The Governor said further after asking for transmission lines:

I believe the vast majority of the people of our State and particularly those who live within the boundaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento River watersheds will agree with what I have said to you. Every administration of our State for 20 years and our State water authority since it was created in 1943 have consistently urged upon Congress every point that I make to you today.

The great power company—

And he was referring to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—

which serves the people of Central Valley will, of course, not agree. It has always been opposed to the project not because it objects to the solution of our irrigation and domestic water problem, but because the project includes the incidental development and transmission of hydroelectric energy and the company desires to develop and distribute all the power in that great portion of our State.

The Governor was right. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the person of Mr. James B. Black, president, would object, as he has consistently through the years, to the Central Valley project power features, especially the transmission lines. His was the only small voice raised against the transmission lines, and in favor of them were such great voices as that of the President, that of the Secretary of the Interior, that of all the witnesses of the Bureau of Reclamation, that of the Governor of the State of California, and many of the California delegation in the Congress. Except for a few niggardly exceptions, this bill as now written would give Mr. Black his way with the Central Valley project. The lines to take the power away from Keswick and Shasta Dams are not provided. The power will be bottled up and either lost or left like a ripe peach to fall into the lap of the P. G. & E. on its own terms.

On the Colorado-Big Thompson project both irrigation and power features would of necessity be disrupted. Their construction would be delayed, service to rural-electrification users would be postponed or made impossible, and the costs of the project, which already make it exceedingly difficult to get low-cost power, would be forced to take another loop on the upward spiral. The Nation cannot afford this kind of economy. The West will not soon forget, nor fail to hold accountable, that sterile leadership of the Republican Party, who lack the vision and the foresight to view the place of the West in our Nation's economy.

Let me quote to you from an editorial contained in the Denver Post. This was the paper which in 1946 urged upon the people of Denver that we send here a Republican Congress. That paper now says you are making a serious mistake. Let me read their own words:

The House Appropriations Committee of Congress may be able to delude itself with the thought that it is saving money by cutting $83,000,000 from the 1947-48 budget of the Bureau of Reclamation, but it will not fool the people of the West.

What the committee proposes to do to the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado is typical of its efforts on behalf of false economy. The Reclamation Bureau had budgeted more than $14,000,000 for the project during the coming year but the committee reduced the appropriation to $4,815,000.

Approximately $30,000,000 already has been spent on the Colorado-Big Thompson project and the total cost of the completed project now is estimated at $128,000,000.

By reducing next year's allotment for the project, the Appropriations Committee is merely delaying necessary work and postponing the time when full benefits of the project will be realized and full repayments from water and power users will begin coming in.

That is not economy—it is merely poor business.

This is the paper that stood by you in 1946, and I suggest to you that perhaps if you will not listen to a Member from the right side of the aisle, perhaps you may listen to a former friend who wants to give you fair advice.

I sincerely hope that overnight the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] may see fit to change the wording of this bill and reincorporate the basic law in the reclamation appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I will grant to no Member of this House a greater interest in economy in Government operation than that which I have myself. There is such a thing, however, as false economy. This Department of Interior Appropriation bill is filled with that false economy. I can understand how the zeal of some Members to reduce governmental expenditure will blind them to greater good by some expenditure, but this appropriation bill is fraught with danger to our peacetime economy and future national security.

As reported, this bill places in jeopardy the national reclamation program which was born under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt and which has been developed through a generation of scientific investigation and study.

Reclamation is no longer limited to the simple reclaiming of land. Out of it has grown one of the most vital products necessary to our whole economy—the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power. One of the finest examples of this work is the great Central Valley project in California.

The Central Valley project was inaugurated in 1933 through a referendum election. The project was too large for the State of California to undertake at an estimated cost of some one-third of a billion dollars. I was one of a group of Representatives who took the matter up with President Roosevelt and he gave it his wholehearted support.

The Central Valley project embraces a vast empire equal to the combined area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and one-half of New Jersey, as I have previously pointed out. It is traversed by two great navigable rivers flowing into the bay of San Francisco. One of the primary objects of the project has been to save over 1,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world from salt water filtration. Before the Federal Government undertook this project more than 50,000 acres of land had already been destroyed.

To carry out this project it was necessary to build two large dams—the Shasta Dam and the Keswick Dam—capable of developing 450,000 kilowatts of hydroelectricity. These dams with their power development are an integral part of the entire project designed as a soil conservation measure, but they are also of tremendous importance from a national defense standpoint.

Oil and electrical energy are two of the greatest assets in our national economy and national defense. Every barrel of oil we take from the ground and use is gone forever. Our national petroleum resources are irreplacable and when they are gone it will be too late to conserve them. Each and every year we diminish the petroleum resources of the United States by 20,000,000 barrels of oil used in the production of electrical energy. During the last year of World War II hydroelectric energy generated by the Bureau of Reclamation amounted to approximately 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. If that energy had been generated from fuel oil it would have required 36,000,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. Chairman, the American Petroleum Institute has estimated that the oil reserves from known petroleum deposits in the United States, at the end of 1946, amounted to slightly over 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Consumption is now at the rate of 1,750,000,000 barrels per year. This means our reserves will be exhausted in 12 years.

Hydroelectric power, on the other hand, is almost inexhaustible. Every reclamation project developing hydroelectric power conserves just that much of our oil reserves for future use and extends the life of those reserves.

Money appropriated for reclamation projects is not a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the future of America, every dollar of which must be repaid over a period of time.

Under the terms of this bill the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the Central Valley project has been reduced some 65 percent by the Committee on Appropriations, while the proposed appropriation for general investigations into such projects has been curtailed 97.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, those Members of Congress who are advocating such false economy as this are taking a terrible responsibility upon their shoulders—one which this Congress should not assume. Instead of retarding the development of great hydroelectric projects we should be advancing their construction to further conserve the oil reserves of this Nation, so necessary for our national defense.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish at the outset to refer to recently published comments on the pending bill by two eminent authorities on the affairs of the Interior Department, the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, and the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold L. Ickes.

In a press release dated April 21, 1947, Secretary Krug declared that the 47 percent reduction in the Interior Department budget requests which is recommended here by the majority members of the House Appropriations Committee "threatens to economize the Nation into a bankruptcy of the natural resources."

This is a very serious criticism, Mr. Chairman, but I know, from the anxious inquiries I have received from leading businessmen and financiers of the Pacific coast, that they do not regard it as exaggerated. They have a solemn conviction that the drastic cuts proposed in this measure for reclamation, irrigation, public power development and mining alone would break the economic back of the West in the postwar era ahead. These major slashes, and many others of lesser magnitude which are embodied in this bill, would destroy all hope in that vast section of our Nation for realization of the great program of postwar reconversion and progress which all of the Americans have so eagerly envisioned.

Secretary Krug expresses surprise that the committee should consider 1938 a sensible standard for present-day appropriations.

I quote from Mr. Krug's statement:

> The last decade has seen history's greatest war, with an enormous depletion of our mineral resources. A search for ore bodies and extraction methods at the leisurely rate of 1938 would invite disaster. In 1938 we had not made the present investment in large reclamation project expenditures, which must be continued at an economical rate, if hundreds of millions of dollars already spent are not to go to waste. In 1938, for example, the Department had not been instructed by Congress to market power from all Army dams, had not assumed responsibility for the fish and wildlife of the Nation, and had a much smaller park system.

Cutting the general investigation funds of the Reclamation Bureau from $5,000,000 to $125,000 would halt all of the vitally important river basin reports, according to Secretary Krug. He said that adoption of this provision would immediately stop all field work on several hundred projects in 17 States, and would cause the complete liquidation of the general engineering and planning organization of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Irrigation of vast areas of future farm lands for veteran settlement would be so seriously delayed, the Secretary declared, that most veterans of World War II would become too infirm to undertake irrigation farming before the projects could be completed.

The great Central Valley project of California has been described as the economic backbone of our State in the future. Recently our distinguished Republican Governor, Earl Warren, appeared before the subcommittee in charge of this bill and urged an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the expeditious completion of this great project, so that the people of California and the taxpayers of the entire Nation could begin to enjoy at an early date the rich economic and financial benefits which the project would provide.

At the conclusion of Governor Warren's testimony, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], made a lengthy reply in which he severely criticized the Governor's economic arguments, and now, instead of the $40,000,000 which Governor Warren requested, the committee has recommended $6,900,000 for construction purposes.

If this ridiculous pittance is all that is eventually allowed it might be an act of economic wisdom for the Federal Government to abandon the project entirely and charge off the $180,000,000 of Federal funds already invested in Central Valley to profit and loss, with all hope of profit eliminated.

Former Secretary of the Interior Ickes has made an interesting diagnosis of the political implications of the pending bill, so far as the Republican Party is concerned. He classifies our distinguished Speaker and the majority leader of the House, as well as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as supporters of Governor Dewey for the Republican Presidential nomination. The chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], is described as apparently an adherent of Senator TAFT, also of Ohio.

As a result of their sponsorship of this bill, which Mr. Ickes correctly assumes to have destroyed all hope of future political support in the great Western States for the present Republican leadership in Congress, the former Secretary asserts that these gentlemen are laboring, perhaps unconsciously, in the vineyard of Governor Warren. He points out that our California Governor has taken a forthright position on reclamation and cheap public power which, in the opinion of Mr. Ickes, may win for him in the Republican national convention next year important backing from every State west of the Missouri River.

"Governor Warren has annexed to himself an issue that will be very appealing in the West," says Mr. Ickes. This is undeniably true.

Unhappily for Governor Warren, however, he may be unable to reap the benefits of the unwitting aid which the proponents of this meat-ax legislation have given him. The Republican Party is not now and never will be the proper vehicle for such an issue. Its persistent hostility in Congress to the development of the West renders such a role impossible.

The Democratic Party, always the party of the people, is the traditional party of progress in reclamation and public-power development. So perhaps we of the present minority in Congress should extend our thanks to the leaders of the present majority for having created for us by the submission of this bill an issue which will restore us to leadership in the next national elections. At the same time we should perhaps voice our sympathies to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the very embarrassing political predicament, within their own party ranks, into which they have blundered.

The proper approach to reclamation appropriations is on the basis that these are Federal loans which will be repaid by western water and power users. Multiple-purpose projects, such as the Central Valley in my own State of California, are a good investment in American enterprise. Failure to advance the full amount of $20,000,000 for work on the Central Valley development will eventually put this project in the category of a white elephant.

Agriculture and industry alike are threatened by failure to appropriate enough money to permit completion of the Central Valley job in a reasonable time. Very soon urban and rural communities will be up against a blank economic wall without water and power which they have expected from this development. The Nation, as well as California, will feel the impact of failing farms and orchards, and cities darkened by power shortages.

Some of you have heard power companies do some tall talking about being able to take care of any power needs in the region. But I am wondering if you have examined the facts. As a former member of the California Railroad Commission, I know these facts.

The truth is that the California utilities have to keep every wheel turning in order to meet the present power load. They do not have surplus capacity sufficient to insure delivery of additional power loads. Here are the figures.

The estimated capability of power systems in northern California, including the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., is about 1,680,000 kilowatts. Predictions are that by August the Pacific Gas & Electric load may reach a peak of 1,870,000 to 1,890,000 kilowatts. To meet this peak, under the most favorable conditions, additional generating capacity of 75,000 kilowatts will be required.

Yet the appropriation cuts will not permit the construction of facilities to deliver this power. Power generated at Central Valley dams will be bottled up because there is no way to get the Shasta-Keswick kilowatts to the consumer.

If funds are allowed, two 230-kilovolt transmission lines from Shasta to Red Bluff can be built to deliver power from the Shasta plant to the Pacific Gas & Electric system at Red Bluff on a temporary basis. Later, this hydro system can be extended to pump irrigation water into the Delta area. A short tap line for the Keswick power plant to the existing Shasta-Oroville line is needed to provide the only outlet for power generated at Keswick Dam. Without these vital transmission lines, cities may be darkened, industries may slow down, workers may be laid off because there is not enough electricity to meet the needs of the region.

This is waste, my colleagues, waste of both material and human resources—waste of money invested in the project; waste of potential revenues. Each year that Central Valley power is not marketed the Government will lose about $2,000,000 in revenues which would help repay project construction costs.

I am asking you now to reconsider this appropriation cut and to restore the full amount of $20,000,000 for continued work on the Central Valley project, so that we can protect our investment in the project, the farmer's investment in his crops, and insure power delivery to keep the wheels of Pacific coast industry turning and employment at a steady level. I need not remind you that slowing down of the rate of construction, necessitated by limited appropriations, will increase the costs of building the whole development.

It has been rightly said that we are at the crossroads of western development. If we fail to advance sufficient appropriations for reclamation, irrigation, and multiple-purpose works, I believe we are starting down the road which leads away from the peaks of prosperity into the slough of false economy. Remember you are not asked to vote appropriations to subsidize any part of the West. You are advancing money which will be repaid to the Nation—in the form of water and power payments and taxes to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House Committee on Appropriations in reducing its appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service pertaining to services to the Nation's fishing industry amounting in some cases to nearly 80 percent, comes as a distinct shock to the fishing industry.

I am mindful of our party's pledge to reduce taxes. I appreciate that we must curtail in every direction possible. However, it would be extremely unwise and very false economy to reduce appropriations to any departments where it would be impossible to carry out absolutely essential services, some of which have been provided by the Government for several generations. The funds that will be available under this cut in this bill will provide services barely equivalent to those received 20 years ago.

Action of the House committee represents severe reduction of funds in activities provided for by laws of Congress after careful consideration by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and passage by both Houses of Congress through the normal procedure of legislation, all of this enacted previous to World War II. It is in effect a nullification of previous acts of Congress.

A decrease of these proportions set forth in the bill virtually eliminates the technological, statistical, and economics sections of the Division. It will permit only a skeleton staff, which will be unable to answer inquiries satisfactorily or to conduct even a minimum of surveys or research. Even if all activities are drastically curtailed as promptly as possible, the proposed appropriation would little more than pay for accrued annual leave of the Division's personnel on July 1, Thus payment for such leave, which is required by law, would largely wipe out the Federal fishery activities to which the industry has looked for guidance in solving its technical, statistical, and economic problems for more than 75 years.

The proposed cut, we are told, will terminate virtually all the statistical surveys, research, and services for the commercial fisheries. Thus, annual canvasses for securing statistics on catch, employment, operating units, and processed products could no longer be made. This will deprive industry of data essential to its operation; Government, of data necessary for planning; and conservation authorities, of data required for intelligent action to protect natural resources. Other statistical services which industry assumes will be available as a matter of course will be eliminated. Thus, collection and release of all the following data will cease: Freezings and cold storage holdings, landings at principal ports, canned and processed fish production, fish meal and fish oil manufactures, and vitamin A production and stocks.

Termination now destroys a continuity essential to industrial and onservation planning. Cooperative programs for the collection of fishery statistics are in effect between the Federal Government and many of the States. If funds are eliminated, the Federal Government cannot carry through its part of these programs so that statistical surveys of the States will also suffer.

The proposed cut would end virtually all economic research and services for the commercial fisheries. Thus, the studies of international fishery economics would cease, depriving the industry of data with which to combat the threat of competition from imported fish.

The proposed cut would end virtually all the technological research and services for the commercial fisheries. It would close all five technological laboratories of the Fish and Wildlife Service. They are located at Seattle, Wash.; College Park, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Ketchikan, Alaska; and Mayaguez, P. R.

All technological research and consultant services, we are told, will have to be terminated. It will end research in the Maine sardine industry, designed to improve its products and eliminate difficulties with the supply of fish.

It will end all shelifish pollution research designed to safeguard the quality of the products and to reopen closed areas and avoid the closure of open areas.

It will eliminate many other activities that we think are essential to the fishing industry.

It is suggested in the committee report that the fishing industries should pay for these services themselves. Such a suggestion would place an additional burden of expense on the fishing industry that it would be impossible for it to assume and at a time when, under reciprocal trade agreements, the domestic fishing industry is struggling to meet the competition of many foreign countries and which in most cases is subsidized by these foreign countries. While the Reciprocal Trade Conference is being conducted in Geneva, many foreign countries are pleading for the reduction of protective tariffs that already are so low that little or no protection is afforded the American fishing industry.

The commercial fisheries of this country is a very substantial industry. It provides direct employment to about a quarter of a million persons. Investments in vessels, shore plants, processing, freezing, and cold storage facilities total upwards to $600,000,000. This investment is the base of a capitalized business of over $4,500,000,000—and that does not take into account allied industries and industries that service the fishing industry.

I come from a section of the country where some of the largest of our commercial fisheries are located—New England. In the district I have the honor to serve is located the oldest, and in recent years, the largest fish-producing port in the country. I refer to Gloucester, Mass., a city of some 24,000, where upwards of two-thirds of its working population depend for their livelihood upon the fisheries or industries allied with it. Firms in the city last year handled and processed more than 218,000,000 pounds of fish.

The agency established by the Congress to assist, to promote, and to develop the commercial fisheries of the country and to give attention to its problems is Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

The two divisions within Fish and Wildlife Service most directly concerned with and of the utmost, vital importance to the fishing industry of the country are:

First. The Division of Commercial Fisheries.

Second. Fishery Market News Service.

The Division of Commercial Fisheries provides many essential services to the fishing industry that have been available and utilized by many Government agencies. Many of these services date back to 1880. This information is most essential to operations of the industry and provides a base for State and Federal conservation programs to protect our natural fishery resources.

The only source of data on daily prices, production, storage, and shipments would be closed, and the result would be chaos in the industry at a time when it needs every help this Government can possibly give.

As I have previously stated, I subscribe to our party's pledge to reduce taxes and to effect every economy possible. I wish to emphasize, however, the extreme importance of these two services to the fishing industry. It would be disastrous to the industry for this Government not to continue to provide them.

It is my most studied conviction that the cuts in the appropriation bill on these items in the Fish and Wildlife Service are altogether too severe and it may be well for us to consider the prewar 1942 budget as a base to determine what services should be retained rather than to wipe out these activities altogether as it is intended to do by these drastic reductions.

In respect to the Division of Commercial Fisheries:

The 1942 appropriation was $186,940; personnel, 60.

The 1947 appropriation was $400,000; personnel, 93.

This Division submitted a budget for the current year of $401,000. The subcommittee's recommendation reduces this amount for the current year to $75,000, a reduction of nearly 80 percent.

This proposed reduced appropriation would permit only a skeleton staff which could hardly answer inquiries satisfactorily, and would eliminate practically every service this Division now provides.

In respect to the Fishery Market News Service: The 1942 appropriation was $86,220; personnel, 25. The 1947 appropriation was $136,900; personnel, 66.

This Division submitted a budget for the current year of $141,600. The committee's recommendation reduces this amount for the current year to $75,000, a reduction of about 46 percent. This proposed reduced appropriation would eliminate at least five of the eight market news field offices. The fishing industry consists of so many small and widely scattered enterprises that it could not possibly in itself assemble complete and accurate market information.

For instance, in the frozen-fish industry, fish must be processed and held in storage for shipment to inland centers. It is imperative that processors know the amounts of fish of the various species in storage over the country, how the fish is moving, whether inventories are going up or down, what the price levels are over the country. If the processor does not have this data, he has no basis on which to determine the price he should, or the price he can afford to, pay for the fish to process. Any curtailment of this vital information would result in a chaotic condition throughout the entire industry.

These reductions in appropriations come at a time when the fishing industry itself is trying desperately to effect every possible improvement and economy through the formation of a national trade association designed to assist the Federal and State Governments in an orderly manner to build an industry that will provide more employment for our people, more animal protein food for our people and to provide the necessary meals and oils to aid the agricultural industry, to assist the poultry program and provide the life-giving vitamins and amino acids that medical science claims is available in a greater degree from marine resources than any other source.

These greatly reduced appropriations practically eliminate all hope for the American fishing industry to grow and develop and occupy its proper place among the natural resources of the Nation, and at a time when our foreign competitors are spending and girding to take their fair share of the products of the seas. It places a potent weapon in the hands of our competitors and takes away from American industry the sources of vital statistical and market news information that is provided agriculture and other American business.

It comes at a time when the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations is getting under way a uniform method of fishery statistics which is essential if the United States is to occupy its rightful position among the nations of the world in the development and utilization of the products of the sea.

The fishing industry does not seek aid and support of the Government. It historically has stood on its own feet; it has sought no subsidies, no crop insurance, no parity. It has sought none of the Government aids that have been extended to agriculture and to other industries. It has carried its own responsibilities and intends to continue to do so, but the fishing industry does expect the Federal Government to carry its own responsibilities. It has a right to expect proper and adequate Government services.

It seeks these services to be in a position to fairly compete with foreign nations, the majority of which are heavily subsidized by government aids of various kinds.

No complaints were registered by the fishing industry in World War I and World War II, when the armed services took over its ships and men to wage war. Throughout our history, the fishing industry has served as the first line of defense in every way. It was the fleet of the fishing industry that enabled us to build fortifications in the Aleutian Islands; it was the North Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf fishing fleets that supplied the vessels and men in a few hours' notice when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

Just at a time when the fishing industry is trying to organize for the difficult days to come, it finds appropriations for the one Federal agency that renders a service to the fishing industry, severely cut. If the House permits this action, the services and statistics that are hardly adequate at present to guide the industry will be pared to such a low point that what few are left will be almost worthless.

Facts have just been released to show that through lend-lease funds we have expended some $21,000,000 to equip Russia with a large, modernized fishing fleet, yet we are called upon to eliminate the few services available to the American fishing industry when they are struggling to keep abreast with foreign competition. Other nations are rebuilding their fishing fleets. Almost every country is enlarging its fishing fleet. We know the French Government is building a considerable fleet of fishing vessels at Bath, Maine; Great Britain has increased her fleet by 25 percent; Norway is enlarging her fleet; Iceland and Newfoundland are adding to and further modernizing their cold-storage facilities—yet we propose to abolish the information supplied by the Government as to cold-storage holdings, catch records, and so forth.

These inadequate appropriations will destroy the one source of information upon which fishery biologists must depend to check the trend of our fisheries. This is information used by the Government, not by the industry, insofar as the life histories of such valuable fish are concerned, such as salmon, halibut, mackerel, cod, haddock, shrimp, crabs, oysters, sea trout, herring, and a host of other food fishes that contribute so much to the American way of life. There is no other source of fishery statistics in the United States. Time and again the Budget Bureau, the Bureau of Statistics, and other impartial Government agencies have studied ways and means of providing this information through other Government sources. Without exception, these studies have all reached the same conclusion, that this information can be attained more efficiently and at less cost by the Commercial Fisheries Section of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Surely we do not have to turn back the wheels of progress to such an unwarranted extent.

There are many American communities whose sole means of livelihood depends upon the fisheries. Are these people to be denied the limited Federal services that have heretofore been provided? Is the fishing industry to receive no services for their share of tax dollars? Is the industry that throughout history furnished America its first line of defense in times of great emergencies to be thrust aside? If the few services now provided are to be dispensed with, then does it mean that the American farmers are to be treated in the same manner? Are we going to dispense with Agriculture Market News, with agricultural statistics, with crop forecasts? Are we to dispense with the vital statistics of the Bureau of Statistics, which surely must be used by our insurance agencies to arrive at just premiums on life insurance? If the United States Government plans to eliminate these services, then the fishing industry has no right to complain. But if these services are to be provided, then surely it is the duty of the Federal Government to maintain these varied essential services which Fish and Wildlife Service now provides.

Mr. Chairman, the following table shows the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Commercial Fisheries Division, for various years from 1938 to 1948, including the amount recommended in the fiscal year 1948 appropriation bill:

Commercial fisheries and Fishery Market News Service

STATUS OF OPERATING FUNDS, VARIOUS YEARS 1938–48

Item	Commercial fisheries		Fishery Market News Service	
	Personnel	Amount	Personnel	Amount
1948 House bill	.....	$75,000	.....	$75,000
1947 appropriations	93	400,000	66	136,900
1942 appropriations	60	186,940	25	86,220
1941 appropriations	53	150,640	25	78,900
1940 available funds	46	133,669	25	86,378
1939 available funds [1]	42	140,000	30	70,000
1938 available funds [1]	40	123,000	29	75,000

[1] Estimated in part.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK,

having assumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEWIS L. LORWIN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it probably startled most of us to read in the papers of yesterday that Mr. Henry Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, former Vice President of the United States, former Secretary of Commerce, and more recently a private citizen and editor of the notoriously radical New Republic magazine, has declared that only a $15,000,000,000 loan to Soviet Russia will make possible some degree of peace in this currently troubled postwar world.

Mr. Wallace, during his entire political career, was consistently a friend of Russia. Since his return to civilian status, he has continued his exposition of pro-Russian political vaporing, even though that trend of thought placed him in sharp opposition to the political thinking of his party and the patriotic-thinking American people as a whole.

It may be said that Mr. Wallace, no longer an official of the American Government, has every right to speak freely in any political vein which may suit him. That, constitutionally, is his right. So, too, was it the right of Dr. Rex Tugwell, of Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, the late Sidney Hillman, and scores of others who passed through the spectrum of the public spotlight during the 14 years of New Dealism until the public revolt last November against that communistic school of thought.

But Dr. Tugwell, Dr. Lovett, and many of the other outstanding exponents of Marxian ideologies have passed from the public pay rolls into the comparative luxurity of private life. They no longer can command free radio time, free publicity services through Government agencies, and the listening audience that may always be assembled when an important Government official is prepared to pour forth his words of wisdom.

Transition of these verbal generals of the Marxian army through positions of power in Government saw many of their colonels and captains and lowly privates placed in positions of Government subordinate to them while they were in power.

Many of these satellites of original New Deal generals are still in Government, still on Federal payrolls, still feeding from the public trough.

Recently the President of the United States, for motives known only to himself but possibly in response to the political necessity of meeting public demand for purging from the American Government all employees of doubtful loyalty, issued an Executive order calling for such action. He indicated that it would cost many millions of dollars to adequately screen those employees in Government and to fully investigate those whose loyalty was found by such screening to be of doubtful quality.

The President's Executive order, however, left final decision as to the removal or retention of employees in the agencies and departments of the executive branch subject to the discretion of the heads of those agencies and departments, all of whom are appointed by the President himself. In other words, the question of purging disloyal employees from the Government continued to rest under the President's Executive order with those appointees of his upon whom dependence for Democratic successes in 1948 must largely repose.

Seldom does a day pass on the floor of this House when some Member of Congress does not present documented indications at least of doubtful loyalty to the United States on the part of some employee of the Government. If the President of the United States is sincere in his demands that communism and other ideologies contrary to the American constitutional form of government be removed, a simple order on his part would go far to prove that sincerity.

The President of the United States needs only to direct the Attorney General of the United States to order the Federal Bureau of Investigation to prepare lists from existing records of all individuals now on the Federal pay roll whose documented records in the files of that agency show membership in, sympathy with, or participation in the activities of groups, organizations, associations, or other units of men and means whose motivation is in consonance with legislation, activity, or other support of movements directed at change of our American form of government by other than constitutional means.

It is a known fact that as far back as 1920, more than a quarter of a century ago, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been cognizant of and has kept documented records of the persistent and continuing efforts of international communism to overthrow the Government of the United States. Records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation prove conclusively that American Communists are merely a section of the Third International and prove that the Third International is pledged to overthrow by violence if necessary of the American system of free enterprise and its replacement by a Soviet form of government. Records of the FBI will prove that for more than a quarter of a century the Communist International has provided funds to finance this termite activity on the part of American Communists to disintegrate loyalty in the American armed forces and to inculcate disloyalty in the thinking processes of an entire generation of young Americans.

It may be that additional legislation may be required to preserve our internal security against this Russian-directed effort to destroy this Nation. The President of the United States if he is sincere in his determination to eradicate communism in the United States might call upon the Attorney General of the United States to examine all existing statutes, particularly those dealing with treason and sedition, and for the preparation of a formal opinion as to whether or not additional laws are necessary, or if a mere enforcing of the existing statutes is sufficient.

If additional legislation is needed to protect the American form of government, the President might call upon the Attorney General of the United States to draft a statute to be submitted to the current Congress to give the United States of America its Constitution and its flag the degree of legal protection demanded by the people of the United States in the elections of last November.

Only yesterday on the floor of this House, my colleague from Wisconsin mentioned a specific instance which he believed merited investigation, the case of Lewis L. Lorwin, economic adviser of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce. Mr. O'KONSKI pointed out an apparent dual nomenclature used by Dr. Lorwin in his writing of books, pamphlets and lectures. The Russian-born Dr. Lorwin aparently used the names Lewis L. Lorwin, Lewis Levitzky Lorwin and Louis Levine interchangeably.

Representative O'KONSKI indicated at least a suspicion that Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, had at one time been closely associated with Leon Trotsky and the late Sidney Hillman at that period of the Russian revolutionary era when there was no disagreement between any of the factions of bolshevism.

If investigation should prove this to be true, Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, might well be a far more important figure in the chain of command between international communism and the sections of the Third International, which are the Communist Parties in nations throughout the world, than Gerhard Eisler, Leon Josephson, or even William Z. Foster, who is currently the titular head of the Communist Party of America.

As long as such a suspicion exists, Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Chief of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, should not be permitted to send Dr. Lorwin to London in a highly paid position as an economic representative of the United States, as is currently believed to be the plan. I may add that Dr. Lorwin has reportedly told associates that he plans to rent his Washington apartment and sail on the Queen Elizabeth on June 29 of this year for his new assignment.

I believe that cases such as that of Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, and the many others that have been named on the floor of this House in the present session of Congress bring up a far more important question than the mere ideology of the individual involved. I believe that it is vital to American security to know these things:

First. Who puts these people in Government positions in the first place?

Second. Who keeps them there?

Third. Who is responsible for failure of any movement to eliminate them?

Does the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States or the Director of the FBI underwrite the loyalty of an individual who would personally write:

> A violent revolution is necessary to seize the powers of Government. Violent methods must be used afterwards to eliminate the capitalists and the large landholders who are hostile to the Socialist idea. * * * The

violence involved * * * can diminish in severity only as the workers succeed in establishing their power and in destroying resistence to the construction of socialism.

Yet Dr. Lewis L. Lorwin, economic adviser in the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce of the United States; the economist supposedly named by Thomas C. Blaisdell for an important assignment representing the United States abroad; the Dr. Lorwin who has been on Government pay rolls for 14 years, serving part of the time at least under Henry Agard Wallace, wrote those quoted words.

They will be found on pages 506–507 in his comments on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in his book, Labor and Internationalism, written in 1929 while Dr. Lorwin was on the advisory council of the Brookings Institution.

If President Truman, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Director of the FBI underwrite those words, I have nothing further to say.

If they do not underwrite those words, I have one question to ask. It is: "Why not get rid of him and all others like him?"

LIGHT UP EVERY FARM IN ALABAMA—$13,500,000 AVAILABLE—BUILD MORE REA CO-OP POLE LINES, STRING MORE WIRES THROUGH OUR COUNTIES, INSTALL MORE SWITCHES, MORE TRANSFORMERS, AND DISTRIBUTE THE AMAZING QUANTITIES OF CHEAP ALABAMA POWER NOW AVAILABLE TO EVERY RURAL TOWN, FACTORY, AND FARM IN OUR STATE

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks and include therein some several letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, spring has again come to our great South. For some years past and with its coming there arrives a deluge of letters from my constituents. They come by the dozens, telling me of their bitter disappointments at not receiving the benefits of the Rural Electrification Act, passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, and approved by President Roosevelt, April 8, 1935.

Mr. Speaker, even in those days there was little or no party opposition to a bill sponsored by the President, providing that the Federal Government finance the construction and erection of rural electrification distribution lines for the benefit of our American farmers.

Extensive committee hearings were held—and a bill was reported from out of the committee to the floor. Long, constructive arguments and debates were had in both Houses. All defects present in the committee bill were cured by deliberate, well-thought-out and constructed amendments in order to perfect the original bill.

Limitations with respect to the building of generating plants with the money to be provided were written into the law, inasmuch as it was the declared purpose of Congress in passing the bill that in no measure whatever was it their purpose to invade the field of private industry or to set anything up in direct competition with existing public utilities—except in such areas where electric power in sufficient quantities and at reasonable rates was not otherwise available to our farmers.

Merit and efficiency were made the sole bases for the appointment of all officials. The President himself was charged with the selection of the Administrator. Political tests and party qualifications were forbidden by the law, which spelled out—black on white—a stringent penalty for the violation of this provision.

With an original appropriation of $40,000,000 for each of eight succeeding years, the Rural Electrification Act passed both the House and the Senate through acclamation by a voice vote. There was no recorded opposition.

It was a day of rejoicing on both sides of the aisle. The magic of electric power to light the rural homes of America—to remove much drudgery from our good farm women—at last was made available to our rural villages, factories, and farms.

Mr. Speaker, what a reflection it is upon the administration of the Rural Electrification Act that, in spite of all the labor and the toil that this Congress put into the formulation of REA, the year 1947 finds my State of Alabama practically at the bottom of the roll of States in extending the provisions of rural electrification to the Alabama farmers.

Table 6 taken from the annual report of the Rural Electrification Administrator, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, to the Congress for this year, discloses that only 34.1 percent of Alabama farms today are electrified. Compare that 34.1 percent in Alabama with the national average of 52 percent for all States and note in the following table taken from the Administrator's report that many of the other States have averages of from 75 to as much as 96.2 percent.

TABLE 6.—*REA loans and results accomplished by their expenditure, by States, June 30, 1946*

States	Borrowers		Total allocations [2]	Funds advanced [3]	Miles energized	Consumers connected	Percentage total farms electrified June 30, 1946
	Energized	Not in operation [1]					
Alabama	23	3	$25,159,649	$11,570,294	11,473	48,855	34.1
Arizona	3	4	1,984,000	1,268,020	640	2,439	71.5
Arkansas	18	2	21,421,000	12,906,069	11,574	40,659	30.8
California	4	2	2,414,500	1,995,103	1,607	4,697	96.2
Colorado	19	2	16,044,551	10,114,419	7,941	24,210	62.4
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	89.9
Delaware	1	0	1,376,000	1,102,310	1,047	3,468	72.1
Florida	15	2	11,359,000	5,693,698	4,662	16,837	47.3
Georgia	42	4	36,975,402	19,032,319	22,632	89,015	41.7
Idaho	9	0	5,995,750	3,817,405	3,243	7,880	88.4
Illinois	28	0	32,792,803	23,980,420	22,401	66,379	64.5
Indiana	44	3	30,230,564	22,336,160	23,500	85,025	83.9
Iowa	53	2	44,647,698	33,022,212	32,557	79,693	74.2
Kansas	23	10	23,663,851	11,074,012	10,527	22,366	36.1
Kentucky	25	1	26,618,855	14,268,254	14,828	61,400	32.1
Louisiana	15	2	17,270,600	12,742,757	8,677	30,740	36.8
Maine	4	0	1,012,500	672,132	477	1,905	56.9
Maryland	2	0	5,018,500	2,926,662	2,079	9,101	71.4
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	90.0
Michigan	13	0	17,514,500	14,136,518	10,082	37,726	94.3
Minnesota	50	1	48,525,301	32,291,605	34,741	80,998	55.7
Mississippi	23	1	26,622,953	14,724,220	16,491	65,668	24.8
Missouri	39	5	44,233,325	30,379,178	24,951	85,821	38.5
Montana	16	5	11,984,598	5,070,866	3,795	11,803	37.6
Nebraska	23	9	24,522,663	14,440,106	13,331	28,961	37.
Nevada	1	1	296,000	240,383	121	518	57.6
New Hampshire	1	0	1,794,000	1,580,903	1,427	3,304	83.8
New Jersey	2	0	668,500	559,062	437	1,780	98.5
New Mexico	8	2	4,781,500	2,846,229	1,641	6,011	34.6
New York	6	1	4,548,618	3,737,029	2,773	9,540	84.2
North Carolina	33	6	32,000,352	18,875,713	13,605	54,910	43.8
North Dakota	8	15	17,054,972	5,924,777	3,673	7,570	10.4
Ohio	28	0	28,663,301	22,542,635	20,265	72,728	90.3
Oklahoma	23	4	24,581,506	16,686,206	17,277	42,191	29.0
Oregon	12	3	8,539,584	5,411,407	3,281	11,461	88.9
Pennsylvania	13	0	14,817,200	12,064,572	10,593	38,015	74.8
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	87.4
South Carolina	23	5	16,539,269	10,309,268	11,690	41,622	44.7
South Dakota	7	14	10,930,154	3,253,034	2,556	5,355	13.5
Tennessee	30	0	25,686,608	16,046,238	14,162	104,633	30.3
Texas	74	23	67,319,074	44,486,111	48,479	128,505	43.1
Utah	5	1	1,702,000	1,323,407	879	2,896	81.9
Vermont	3	0	1,905,000	1,619,724	1,210	3,262	75.1
Virginia	16	4	18,123,356	12,944,966	10,302	34,126	41.9
Washington	21	0	11,996,611	7,395,216	6,471	15,819	87.0
West Virginia	2	0	802,000	736,241	560	1,976	37.1
Wisconsin	32	1	40,462,822	22,650,018	17,465	49,371	76.7
Wyoming	13	2	5,723,000	3,119,070	2,546	6,446	52.1
Alaska	2	0	488,000	429,324	116	879	----------
Virgin Islands	1	0	275,000	273,572	52	493	----------
Total, United States	856	140	817,086,990	514,819,844	474,837	1,549,057	52.9

[1] Includes 36 borrowers with refrigeration loans only.
[2] Includes allocation from 1947 appropriation.
[3] Includes $200,000 repayments to RFC as adjustment on 1942 note.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that such a palpably low percentage of Alabama farmers are today receiving the benefits of rural electrification certainly is not due to the lack of funds made available to the State of Alabama for fulfillment of that

act. The money for electrifying more farm homes in my State has long been available.

Equally certain is the fact that the low percentage of our farm homes now electrified is not now due to a lack of available power—inasmuch as there are but two States in this whole Union of States having such a superabundance of electrical energy as is available—readied on the bus bars on the switchboards of our existing generating plants and facilities for lighting up the farms of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the honored, the beloved, the revered, and the respected Speaker Will Bankhead, of Alabama, led the fight when this bill was up in the House. God bless and prosper his soul. His spirit hovers in these halls even to this day. The memory of the good things he did will always live in the hearts of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in the cities and on the farms of his native Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, you, then the minority leader, will well recall my wholehearted cooperation with Will Bankhead in the work that was done in fostering and furthering that bill, S. 3483, and you well remember, the acclaim with which its adoption was met.

I have given wholehearted support not alone to every rural electrification measure that has ever come before this Congress in the long years of my service in this body—but I have given equally wholehearted labor and support—as the record will disclose—to every other bill, farm and nonfarm, presented that was calculated to give special benefits to the farmers in Alabama, as well as to all farmers throughout this great country.

To date the astronomical sum of $817,086,990 has been allocated to the Rural Electrification Administrator, as disclosed in his annual report of 1946 to this Congress.

Out of that total of more than $817,000,000, the sum of $25,159,649 has been allocated to my State of Alabama.

Of this huge sum, only $11,570,294 has to date been advanced, and the vast remainder of $13,589,355 is as yet, and of this moment, unexpended.

Mr. Wickard's report shows that only 48,555 Alabama farms have so far been electrified. This could have easily been made twice that number in the years that have passed. We ought to double that number this year.

That electric power is available to the REA Administrator and at very low rates to all existent and prospective rural electrification co-ops is revealed by figures furnished by the office of the REA here in Washington and by the Administrator's report to this Congress.

Inasmuch as that table in the report did not include the rates charged by the Alabama Power Co. to the REA co-op borrowers, I contacted Mr. W. W. Arnett in the Administrator's office in order that I might learn at first hand what the local public utility was charging the good farmers of Alabama and their farm cooperatives for the power furnished them.

What follows is table 5 abstracted from the report to Congress of Mr. Wickard, the Administrator, with the Alabama Power Co. rates inserted therein:

TABLE 5.—*Rates per kilowatt-hour offered by principal power suppliers contacted by REA*

Supplier	Old average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	New average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	Number of borrower co-ops served
Empire District Electric Co.	0.95	0.77	1
Kansas Gas & Electric Co.	1.14	.85	6
Mississippi Power Co.	.95	.80	5
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	.85	.68	6
Southwestern Public Service Co.	.82	.72	10
West Texas Utilities Co.	1.05	.80	11
Alabama Power Co.	.80	.70	11

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, hear me well on this point:

I want you to know that the rate for electric power per kilowatt-hour of 7 mills—0.7 cent—given by the Alabama Power Co. to the Alabama electric co-ops is even lower than the rate of 7.5 mills, or 0.75 cent per kilowatt which the TVA charges the Rural Electrification co-ops in southern Virginia, as is disclosed in the Administrator's report to this Congress.

Why, then, the deplorable condition that exists with respect to the denial of electric power to the farmers of the State of Alabama?

That deplorable conditions do exist, and have long existed, is due primarily to the fact that REA Administrator Wickard, even when as Secretary of Agriculture he was administering that act, for some reason, determined he was going to build a power plant in southern Alabama—at an ultimate cost of $12,000,000—"come hell or high water."

He is determined to spend that money, despite the fact that the Alabama Power Co., without home markets for all of its available surplus power, is now exporting outside of the State of Alabama more than 13 times as much power as would be required to service all of the Alabama electric co-ops' customers and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that the building of rural lines throughout Alabama has been sacrificed and the funds permitted to accumulate in ever-increasing amounts to build a power plant in order to rejuvenate the old, obsolete, dilapidated physical properties acquired from the Alabama Water Service Co., and which it has been alleged should never have been acquired.

These properties had for years been notorious for their poor service—power failures—and for their frequent and long continued "outages." They are today failing the good people in my district in greater wise than ever before in the long history of their past.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago I received word of a telegram from the manager of two large cotton mills at Opp, Ala., which he had sent several days previously thereto to Mr. Claude R. Wickard.

This telegram made urgent request upon Mr. Wickard that he do something about the situation. It recited the fact that at that very time both of the cotton mills at Opp were shut down, that 1,500 employees were standing idle, and that the manager of those mills informed Mr. Wickard that they were unable to tell their people when they could resume full operations. All of this for lack of power from one of his REA co-ops in Alabama. More the worse, nothing has been done about it.

These are atrocious conditions and burdens to impose upon the good people of my State—whether they stand behind the spindle or the looms in one of our cotton factories, operate our hatcheries, our creameries, or are farmers deprived of the use of electric power in their incubators, their refrigerators, their water pumps, their milking machines, or in lighting up their homes.

Information now at hand supports the fact that, in addition to the immediate and unnecessary and wasteful planned expenditure of upwards of $6,000,000 of Federal funds, it will take from 3 to 5 years to remedy the existent hardships imposed upon the customers and consumers of the present operations.

It further means that there will be $6,000,000 less of REA funds available to put up more rural-electrification distribution lines for farmers elsewhere in the State of Alabama.

In this, a year when President Harry Truman himself has cut the Federal budget to the bone, and wants to reduce the national debt, in a year when your party, Mr. Speaker, has further trimmed the budget of our President, does it not appear wasteful and extravagant for the REA Administrator not to make use of the cheap power already available and use that money to bring electric power to twenty-five or thirty thousand more farmers in Alabama so that they, too, may "light up their homes"?

What follows are but a representative few of the many complaints with respect to REA which I have received this spring. I am not going to burden this House or the record of our proceedings by publishing all. I am, however, going to submit a few in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues the deplorable conditions now existing in my State for want of rural power.

This annual crop of letters always arrives in our "springtime in Alabama," when our good citizens see the Alabama public utilities—power, telephone, telegraph—extending their lines throughout the State and no work being done by the REA.

Mr. Speaker, let me but read one or two of these letters and then insert into the RECORD a few more in order that my colleagues may study the same. In doing so, let me say that you are going to hear still further from me about this matter until it is corrected—once and for all.

NEW YORK FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
MARTIN REALTY & INS. CO., AGENTS,
Mobile, Ala., April 21, 1947.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I understand that many of the Representatives in Washington are enjoying the telephone strike because their constituents cannot call them up to worry

them with things they don't like. Maybe some of you are wishing that the air-mail or railway mail employees would also go on strike.

About 2 years ago, I wrote to you to complain about the atrocious service we in south Baldwin County were getting from the REA, which is known as the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp. You referred my letter to the chief of the REA, who in turn sent it over to the St. Louis division (if I am not mistaken), and it finally got some very satisfactory action. They sent a number of inspectors down to Baldwin and they fired the local manager and made a number of corrections. The service was immediately improved and all last summer the electric service was reasonably dependable.

Now it has dropped back to a deplorable state. To give you an example, during the past week end the current went out Friday evening about 7 o'clock and did not come back for about an hour and a half. The same thing and about the same length of time was repeated on Saturday night. On neither of these nights was there any electrical disturbance nor strong wind. Again on Sunday morning about 11 o'clock, coincident with a thunderstorm, the current went off again. This failure of the electric current has now taken on a more pernicious form. Instead of cutting off entirely, the lights become very dim. There is not enough current to turn over the motors in electrical refrigerators and electric pumps, and consequently these heat up and burn out. This sort of brown-out failure is much worse than if the lights went out entirely, and it will cause thousands of dollars in damage to electric pumps and refrigerators.

In addition to giving the worst sort of service we have ever had, the management state that they will not be able to supply current to any new cottages that are being built this entire summer. It seems that they don't have enough material or substations or whatever else is necessary. Why is it that a Government-operated system doesn't have the necessary materials to supply its customers when the Alabama Power Co. seems to have unlimited supply and the Riveria Utility Co., of Foley, seems to have unlimited facilities for supplying its customers.

I think this REA should sell out to a private corporation which could give satisfactory 24-hour service, make repairs in 30 minutes instead of hours, and charge the same rates as charged by the Alabama Power Co., instead of double those rates which we are now paying.

I sincerely hope that you can get something done about this situation, which seems to be getting worse instead of better all the time.

With kind regards and best wishes, I remain,

Yours very truly,

CARL T. MARTIN.

W. W. THOMPSON DRY GOODS,
CLOTHING, HATS, SHOES,
Fountain, Ala., April 15, 1947.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: About 7½ years ago, we the citizens of the community of Fountain, Ala., signed and paid the Clarke Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., $7.50 each.

We are in receipt of information that this corporation will have to build a new line or a new power plant before they will have power enough to furnish us with electricity. The line they now have which comes as near us as Franklin, Ala., is already so much overloaded it does not give satisfaction. We are also informed that it will take them from two to five years to get a loan from the Government and build this new line. We have waited over 7 years on them, and it seems as far off as ever. In fact this is the third time we have taken up this matter with you, each time they have promised you they would build this line in a few months.

We are asking you to use your influence to get this corporation to release us and let the Alabama Power Co. furnish us with electricity. When the Alabama Power Co. finishes their line they are working on now they will only be be about two and one half miles away, and they cannot bring it to us unless the Jackson corporation will give up their franchise.

We will appreciate it very much if you will do something to help us get rid of these 7½-year promises.

Thanking you.

Yours very truly,

W. W. THOMPSON.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: I would appreciate it very much if you would let one of your admirers of long standing ask you for a little help.

I live in the small town of Fountain, Ala., which lies 7 miles north of Monroeville, in Monroe County. For several years now we have been doing everything in our power to obtain electric lights in that section.

Several years ago the REA came in and we put up deposits to obtain lights. Then the war hit us, and materials became short. After the war, we contacted them and they informed us that materials were still short.

A few weeks ago a party of us went over to Jackson and contacted the manager of this district, and he could give us no encouragement whatsoever. It seems that they need extra power plants before they can do anything, which means about 4 or 5 years.

Now the Alabama Power Co. has assured us that if the REA will give up the franchise, that they will come in and give us lights. But the catch is getting the REA to give up the franchise

My mother and I are in the poultry business. At the present time we have 500 laying hens. We wish to expand but without electric facilities we just can't do it.

I would appreciate it very much if you could find time to see just what you can do to help us in obtaining a release from the REA, or in getting them to come on in and give us lights as they are only 6 miles from us now.

I am looking forward to catching some of those big crappies out of Three Rivers Lake again this year.

Hoping you can do something for us in the near future.

Yours very truly,

(Miss) LOKEY DAUGHDRILL.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are very badly in need of electric current in Fountain, and so far we have been unable to get it. The people of Fountain have contract with Clark Washington Corp., of Jackson, Ala., but this contract has been signed for more than 7 years and they advise us it will be around 5 years yet before they can put in the line.

We would like to get this contract canceled, if possible, as the Alabama Power has already got a line within 2 miles of Fountain and cannot come into Fountain account this contract.

Anything you can do to help us will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

ORMOND DUNKIN.

DEER PARK, ALA., *April 10, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Congressman of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: The enclosed petition is our latest move toward electric service in this area. We learned that the Mississippi Utility Co., now furnishing power to Chatom, would like to sell their lines, and wanted REA to take them over. Chatom, however, knowing how consistently bad the service from REA in this area is had petitioned the public service commission to allow Alabama Power Co. to take over these lines. It looked like an opportunity for us as the high lines would likely come up No. 45 and right through Deer Park.

We have sent the original petitions to the Alabama Public Service Commission, and this copy to you is to let you know how in earnest we are about this service and in what numbers. We feel that you will "go to bat" for us with the commission, and that is just exactly what we are asking you to do.

Your old friend and supporter.

V. T. DEES.

MARCH 10, 1947.

To the Public Service Commission, Montgomery, Ala.:

We, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of Washington County, Ala., hereby petition your commission for immediate redress from both total lack of electric service for some and the irritating inadequate service for others now being served by the REA and the Mississippi Utility Co.

Those undersigned now receiving service are unable to cook their meals at the proper time because of insufficient current, and those not receiving current have been waiting for years for promised service. Some even have built and wired homes on the strength of these promises.

We believe the Alabama Power Co. is able and willing to relieve the above distress. We have been so advised. We hereby petition you to permit the Alabama Power Co. to take over existing lines, and build additional lines to service this area

Arnett W Richardson, Henry O. Richardson, Blake B. Richardson, Leroy A. Richardson, Mrs. Jacobena Richardson, Beatrice Graybill, Walter F Dees, V. T. Dees, Mary L. Dees, H. T. Baxter, Mrs. H. T. Cooley, Winfred Dees, Marion Dees, Irene K. Ritchie, J. C. Ritchie, Dovie Odom, Aron Odom, Joseph W. Odom, H. T. Cooley, George D. Landrum, Carrie B. Landrum, Ruben L. Cooley, Norell M. Cooley, Frank Dees, W. A. Culpepper, J. R. Culpepper, James P. Stringer, J. L. Gardener, C. J. Davidson, T. J. Dees, John T. Davidson, A. C. Brown, Ellis Brewer, C. A. Ard, Roy Patrick, Lee Baxter, Clifford Dees, Wes Weaver, J. L. Lewis, O. P. Lewis, C. R. Brewer, W. E. Mott, B. D. Baxter, R. A. Hennis, Dan Williams Jr., Leroy Brown, Mrs. J. B. Stringer, Jim Stringer, Mat Copeland, M. D. McFarland, W. C. Scarbraug, C. W. Wood, Mannal Nickles, Bias Lane, James Woods, Elvara Smith, Mattie McKeller, George McDonald, Daniel V. Turner, Ulesee Arso, Octavia Carter, Mary Francis Carter, Albert Turner, Clem Carter, Ike Turner, J. R. Woods, Mrs. Ernest Merritt, W. M. Williams, Peter Smallwood, Tom Mizel, G. C. Prine, Clinton Prine, Ernest E. Prine, Irvin Turner, Mrs. J. P. Turner, Mrs. H. A. Baxter, B. U. Turner, P. L. Tedder, Woodrow Mizell, Troy Turner, Woodrow Turner, G. H. Dees, Mrs. Ethel Dees, H. G.

Miller, C. B. Turner, Earl Woods, James Woods, Willie Hayes, Merrill Milton, Troy Milton, J. A. Turner, Otto Batcher, Leo Lewis, Marion Simmons.

MOBILE, ALA., *April 12, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: I have resided in Mobile all of my life with the exception of the last 5 years which I served in the United States Marine Corps as an officer.

Since my separation from the service I have started the development of a nursery and tung orchard near Silverhill, Ala. I intend, in the near future, to make my home in Baldwin County.

I have located my business in a fine community of people and have made friends with them all. In my conversations with them they have expressed their desire to have electrical power in their homes and have asked me to be their spokesman. I, too, am very interested in electrical power for my home and I urgently need it for the development of my nursery.

This is why I am writing this letter, to solicit your help. I am sure that if there is anything you can possibly do for us you will not hesitate to do it. We all know that our community is not within your congressional district, but we also know that you have a deep interest in your heart for the welfare of Baldwin County and its development.

I have enclosed a copy of the petition which we sent to the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp. and also a copy of the letter we have written to your worthy colleague, the Honorable George Grant.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. CALLOWAY, Jr.

DAPHNE, ALA., *April 8, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE GRANT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: The members of our community have petitioned the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp., Robertsdale, Ala., to extend their rural electrification lines and services to our homes. This is the third time such a petition has been presented to the corporation. The first petition was made in 1938, the second shortly after the war was over, and a copy of the third is enclosed with this letter.

We have consulted Mr. Frank Schlichting, manager of the Baldwin County REA cooperative at Robertsdale, Ala., recently. We presented our problem to Mr. Schlichting and he explained to us that the cooperative has on hand the necessary wire, poles, and meters to extend the lines to our homes. However, he further explained that it will be impossible to extend the services because of the acute shortage of high-capacity transformers. We understand that the substation at Silverhill, Ala., is overloaded to the point of danger, and that it will be some time in the summer of 1948 before the cooperative expects delivery of the higher capacity transformers which would have the capacity to carry electrical services to our homes.

Mr. GRANT, we are tolerant people, and we have waited patiently since 1938 and throughout the war for electrical power. We are within three-quarters of a mile from two different power lines, and we feel that our community, with seven families and representing some 35 people, merits the extension of the electrical power lines.

We know that you are a very busy man, but we feel sure that you will be able to help us with this problem and we will be greatly indebted to you for your kind attention to this which concerns our community deeply.

E. R. CALLAWAY, Jr.,
Spokesman for Group,
Route 1, Daphne, Ala.

[Enclosure: Copy of petition.]

MARCH 25, 1947.

Mr. FRANK SCHLICHTING,
Baldwin County Electric Membership Cooperative, Robertsdale, Ala.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Baldwin County Electric Membership Cooperative to extend their rural electrification lines to our homes.

J. C. HILL,
C. C. HILL,
C. L. CREAMER,
LYDIA CREAMER,
W. E. NEWPORT,
W. E. PERRY,
E. R. CALLAWAY, Jr.,
Daphne, Ala.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: All the citizens of this community, Fountain, Ala., signed and paid the Clark Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., $7.50 each for lights several years ago and have not received any benefit yet.

We have been informed that it will be from 2 to 6 years longer before this corporation can serve us, because they will have to build a new line and power plant to furnish us with electricity as their lines are already loaded.

We are located only 2½ miles from the Alabama Power Co.'s line and wish to be furnished with their electricity, but they cannot bring it to us unless the Jackson Corp. will release their franchise.

We are asking you to use your influence to get this corporation to release us and let the Alabama Power Co. furnish us with electricity.

We would greatly appreciate your influence and help to us in this matter.

Thanking you, I am

Yours very truly,

J. W. MCBRIDE.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 16, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: About 7½ years ago the Clark Washington Electrical Corp., of Jackson, Ala., accepted our initial fee and promised to give us service at once.

Recent information received says that it might be 5 years before this corporation can serve us, as their line near us is already overloaded, and a new substation is necessary.

The Alabama Power Co. will be only 3 miles from us when the line that they are working on is completed, and we are led to believe that they, the Alabama Power Co., will serve us on this line also.

We know that you are an influential man, and that your opinions and ideas are appreciated by everyone in the State. Will you please use your influence in helping us to get a release from the Clark ashington Electrical Corp. and a permit from them for the Alabama Power Corp. to serve us?

We have around 50 families in our community who need electricity.

Thanking you, and

Very respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ERLE B. FAIRLY.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time about 7½ years ago my mother, Mrs. Annie McDonald, signed up with Clark Washington Electric Corp. to obtain lights. Up to this date we have no lights and from what we understand will be probably 5 years before we do get any. Sometime last year the Alabama Power Co. made a survey in here and would have put us lights in Fountain but, due to fact the corporation at Jackson, Ala., had franchise, were unable to do so.

What we would like to do is to get release from the RWA Corp., at Jackson, Ala., so the Alabama Power can come in, and they have promised they will.

If you can help us get this release it will be very much appreciated.

Thanking you for any assistance you may give us.

Yours very truly,

GUY MCDONALD.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The people of Fountain are without power line. We signed contract with Clark Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., REA 7½ years ago. We have made several investigations and they claim it will be 5 years before can arrange loan and get current in this territory.

The Alabama Power Co. has a line within 2 miles of Fountain, but claim cannot come into Fountain on account of our contract with REA. We will appreciate anything you can do for us in having this contract canceled and getting the Alabama Power or some other corporation in this territory.

Yours very truly,

B. ROBINETTE.

Mr. Speaker, picture with me the enormous generating capacity of the great TVA, available to our farmers from the North. Couple their production to the tremendous electrical capacity of the Gulf Power Co., entering our State from the great neighboring State of Florida in the South. Add to these the magical operation of the gigantic hydroelectric plants supplementing the most modern steam-driven turbo generators of our own Alabama Power Co., never faltering, ever turning, ceaselessly and hummingly dispatching a never-ending current of over a million kilowatts of electrical energy—one and a third million—H. P.—out over the Alabama Power hi-lines, crossing and crisscrossing our State, all of which create a veritable empire of power, now existent—and available to the Rural Electrification Administrator—at one of the lowest wholesale power rates which he has ever been able to contract for anywhere in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in order to assure myself and my colleagues with respect to the actual availability of power necessary to relieve the distress and the overburden created by lack of power of the generating co-ops, I posed a question to the chief engineer of the principal supplier of the 87,000,000 kilowatt-hours purchased by the Alabama Electric Co-op last year.

What follows is the telegraphic response to my inquiry:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 18, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In response to your request: Alabama Power Co. has available capacity now in its 110-kilovolt transmission lines on both east

and west of the Alabama Electric Cooperative's system to supply all this cooperative's needs now and for time to come. Each line has a capacity of 50,000 kilowatts, which is twice capacity of the cooperative's proposed generating plant at Gantt.

The only limiting factor now is the cooperative's connections to company's system. Company has offered to help them in any way possible to strengthen these connections, and if cooperative will accept company's recommendations the immediate troubles can be corrected in 90 days.

The cooperative's 44,000-volt transmission lines are now of limited capacity and must be improved before good service to this cooperative's customers can be improved irrespective of the source of power.

If the cooperative will work with the company it can relieve the present emergency with a new connection to company's 110-kilovolt line from the east and within 12 to 14 months extend taps from company's two major 110-kilovolt transmission lines to approximate load centers of Alabama Electric Cooperative on the east and west and there install modern 110,000-44,000-volt substations. It will require approximately 3 years to build a steam electric generating plant at Gantt located on one side of the Alabama Electric Cooperative's system and only 12 to 14 months to provide high capacity connections on both sides of the system from Alabama Power Co.'s 110-kilovolt transmission lines.

There is no need for the construction of an REA generating plant as company is ready and willing to supply all present and future needs of this cooperative's at costs less than cost of power that might be so generated in a plant at Gantt.

CHESTER GAUSE.

You can therefore see, Mr. Speaker, that we in Alabama do not need any more federally-paid-for power plants—we do not need to spend any more Federal money whatever for generating equipment and we do not have to wait 3—or maybe 5 years—to solve our immediate power problems. The immediate distresses can be solved in 90 days—with a local company and at the lowest-cost power in the United States.

I want personally to see this Administration in its every department of Government use every last dollar available to the REA in the State of Alabama and in all other States throughout this Nation in extending rural electrification to our every last farm.

I want personally to see the Administrator of the REA give the people in my district and elsewhere in Alabama what they want—a good dependable power source, and at once.

The dirt-root farmers of Alabama and our other rural citizens want cheap electric power, and it does not have to come from a bureaucratically imposed and "super-duper" supervised federally-paid-for power plant.

My people in Alabama do need and they do actually want more rural electric co-ops, more rural electrification lines, more poles, more wires, more switches. They want to avail themselves now of the great quantities of cheap power now at hand, and transmit this low-cost energy to every farmer in Alabama.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and other extraneous matter prepared by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some radio script.

Mrs. LUSK (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on wool legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Sanity and Steel" from the Washington Daily News.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACKSON of California, for Friday and Monday, April 25 and 28, on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 23, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 25, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

588. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

589. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed donations to the Borough of Haddon Heights, N. J., and to the city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

590. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a printed copy of the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

591. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

592. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request that the case of Alfredo Garofolo be withdrawn from those 1,187 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of January 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

593. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

594. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, involving a decrease of $220,000, for the legislative branch, Library of Congress (H. Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

595. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $5,420 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 217); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

596. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,175,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 191. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 18; without amendment (Rept. No. 301). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the

acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3190. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," without amendment (Rept. No. 304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 182. Resolution authorizing the payment of 6 months' salary and funeral expenses to the widow of the late R. C. Hicks; without amendment (Rept. No. 300). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 3190. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3191. A bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3192. A bill to establish a sinking fund for the payment of Government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3193. A bill to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code granting percentage depletion with respect to vermiculite permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3194. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEOGH (by request):

H. R. 3195. A bill to extend the coverage of Panama Canal employees eligible to the benefits of the act of March 2, 1931, chapter 375, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3196. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 3197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos water conservancy district increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3198. A bill to provide for recognition of the State of Pennsylvania as a community-property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3199. A bill to divide income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3200. A bill to provide for the leasing of trust and restricted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3201. A bill to require approval by Congress of Executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3202. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3203. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating David Wilmot, author of the Wilmot proviso which was finally adopted as the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 196. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 197. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by Rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 198. Resolution providing that the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress shall be effective from February 13, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Costa Rica, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to expression of sympathy to the American people because of the Texas City tragedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3204. A bill providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 3205. A bill for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3206. A bill for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3207. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

372. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Communication from Edward F. Doolan, regional director, Textile Workers Union of America, disclosing financial reports of local unions of the TWUA; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

373. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of a group of citizens of Milton, Wis., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

374. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the First Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. Also, petition of members of the Victory Townsend Club, No. 13, St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, petition of Civil Rights Congress of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of any legislative measures for the suppression of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

377. Also, petition of members of the St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father which art in Heaven, we pray for all the people of our country, that they may learn to appreciate more the goodly heritage that is ours. We need to learn, in these challenging days, that to every right there is attached a duty and to every privilege an obligation. We believe that, in the eternal order of things, Thou hast so ordained it, and what Thou hast joined together let us not try to put asunder. Teach us what freedom is. May we all learn the lesson that it is not the right to do as we please, but the opportunity to please to do what is right. Above all, may we discover that wherever the Spirit of the Lord is there is freedom. May we have that freedom

now, in His presence here, to lead us and to help us keep this Nation free.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	Malone	Umstead
Ellender	Martin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murray	Williams
Gurney	Myers	Wilson

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT EWING THOMASON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, May 2, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of the Honorable ROBERT EWING THOMASON, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas, vice Hon. Charles A. Boynton, retiring May 1, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NURSERY AND DAY-CARE BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I announce that on next Tuesday, April 29, beginning at 9:30 a. m., the Subcommittee on Public Health and Education of the Committee on the District of Columbia will begin hearings on Senate bill 751, providing for the establishment and operation in the District of Columbia of a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO ELIGIBLE MUNICIPALITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of eligible municipalities which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, favoring the enactment of social-security legislation to establish a cooperative program between the several States and the Government in the operation of unemployment compensation and public employment offices; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CAPPER on April 23, 1947, p. 3832, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a memorial from C. R. Weakly, chairman, Shelby County Production and Marketing Administration, Field Service Branch, Shelbyville, Ky., remonstrating against any further reduction in the appropriation for the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Petitions of delegates of the Townsend Clubs of the Second Congressional District and members of the Newport Richey Townsend Club No. 1, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 169 citizens of the city of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, of Englewood, N. J., urging favorable action on the school-lunch program. I heartily approve her request and I ask unanimous consent to have her telegram printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *April 23, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily favor continuing for balance of this year and for next year Federal assistance to national school-lunch program and hope you will do all you can to secure in support of it necessary deficiency fund appropriation for the current year and sufficient appropriation for next year.

ELIZABETH C. MORROW
(Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow).

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD two joint resolutions passed by the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes and to amend the social-security law relating to persons in public institutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolutions will

be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

To the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relating to memorializing Congress to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes

"Whereas Congress has expressed the desire to relieve the tax burden on individuals subject to income tax; and

"Whereas the amount of the exemptions was lowered at or near the commencement of World War II so as to increase revenues for that war; and

"Whereas the increase of the amount of exemptions will not materially decrease the amount of revenue from taxes on individual incomes but will relieve the burden upon persons in the low-income groups: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress is hereby memorialized to enact legislation raising the amount of the personal exemptions in the Federal income-tax law; be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions

"Whereas section 3 (a) of the National Social Security Act presently provides that persons who are inmates of public institutions shall not be subject to its benefits insofar as the Federal appropriation for public assistance is concerned; and

"Whereas it is deemed desirable to extend the benefits of the act to include such persons within the benefits of the act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact with all convenient speed the necessary legislation to extend the public-assistance benefits of the Social Security Act to persons who are voluntary residents in a county or municipal home or infirmary; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member of the Congress."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 980) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 144) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Civil Service, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment Senate bill 637, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 143) thereon. The committee voted 8 to 1 in favor of the bill as reported. The four members who were absent indicated that they wished to be recorded as favoring the bill. The following members of the committee voted "aye": The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] voted "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed upon the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1165. A bill for the relief of Wilfred Dagenais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1166. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Richard W. Seagraves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1168. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide additional grades in the case of certain custodial employees at post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1169. A bill to restore allowances to retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1170. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, the creation of a reserve fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1171. A bill to authorize the appointment as Foreign Service officers of persons who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II but are now precluded from such appointment by reason of certain citizenship requirements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXEMPTION OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL FROM PAYMENT OF TOLLS ON GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE—RECOMMITTAL OF S. 1023

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to Senate bill 1023, order of business 94 on the calendar, a bill to amend the act of March 14, 1944, to include Coast Guard personnel in the exemption from payment of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the bill be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Public Works for further consideration.

I wish further to state that both Senators from California have made this request, and the committee has directed me to ask consent of the Senate that the request be complied with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the bill will be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Public Works.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON TONAWANDA CREEK, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 46)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 25, 1946, submitted by the Secretary of War on February 7, 1947, on a review of reports on Tonawanda Creek, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce adopted April 22, 1942. This is done at the direction of the Committee on Public Works and at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—ADDRESS BY WARREN R. AUSTIN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on aid to Greece and Turkey, delivered by former Senator Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALFRED D. STEDMAN ANSWERS WALLACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PAUL PIONEER PRESS

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alfred D. Stedman Answers Wallace," from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, of April 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT BY WISH—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government by Wish," published in the Chicago Daily News of Friday, April 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROOKS' COURAGE—EDITORIAL FROM ILLINOIS STATE JOURNAL

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brooks' Courage," published in the April 18, 1947, issue of the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be granted permission to hold a hearing this afternoon in the matter of the nomination of Marvin Jones to be chief justice of the Court of Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

REDUCTION OF PRICES IN NEWBURYPORT, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I note in the Washington press that front-page prominence is being given to the splendid cooperative effort which has been launched in the city of Newburyport, Mass., to reduce prices. Senators have undoubtedly noted the scheme which is in effect in that city, whereby retail prices are reduced 10 percent. The system is spreading all over the country, and will, we hope, cause prices to fall.

I desire to commend my neighbors of Newburyport for their high purpose, and for their public-spirited effort to solve a serious national problem. We all applaud them.

PROPOSAL FOR ACROSS-THE-BOARD RENT INCREASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post expressing the opinion of the editor that "an across-the board rent increase is not, in our opinion, a reasonable compromise of the several rent-control extension bills now before Congress."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACROSS THE BOARD

Senator HAWKES' proposal for an across-the-board rent increase is not, in our opinion, a reasonable compromise of the several rent-control extension bills now before Congress. Mr. HAWKES suggests alternative plans for landlords. One would allow a flat 10 percent rent increase. The other would permit a 15-percent increase on the condition that the landlord offer a lease extending through December 31, 1948. Either of these schemes, it seems to us, would be unnecessarily disruptive in the current campaign to bring prices down.

It is true that an element of discrimination enters in maintaining controls over a part of the economy when other controls have been relaxed. This discrimination is counterbalanced, however, by the present unnatural situation with respect to rents and housing generally. It cannot be doubted that a general 15 percent, or even 10 percent, increase in rents at this time would add fuel to inflation. It would mean an additional strain on pinched budgets and possibly would provide a basis for additional wage demands. Plainly, too, not all landlords are suffering losses. While costs have risen, sustained 100-percent tenancy plus reduction in maintenance outlays have combined to keep many landlords' returns high.

Cases of individual hardship, and there unquestionably are some, can be met better by individual adjustment by rent-control boards than by penalizing the great mass of renters. For that reason, we hope the Senate will discard any notion of an across-the-board increase and adopt the more moderate version under consideration by the Banking Committee merely extending rent control in its present form. This would be in keeping with the policy of gradual decontrol which is now proceeding in all areas except where housing conditions remain critical.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to articles in the Washington Post of April 22, 1947 in which Mr. Julius Krug, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, thundered his disapproval of the proposed cut in the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and charged this threatened action as being an invitation to a depression.

I think the Senate will be interested in what the Secretary of the Interior had to say in regard to the proposed budget cut. I quote him as follows:

That set-back might be enough to set off a major depression.

You can't hope to head off foreign "isms" if we cannot maintain a sound economy in this country.

I am quite sure that a business depression in this country would give more aid and comfort to our enemies than any other development.

By striking at the roots of our economy we are encouraging another depression.

Should the Congress uphold the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee the Department of the Interior would operate the next fiscal year on $156,000,000, which represents a cut of $139,000,000 in President Truman's budget message, and $101,000,000 less than the Department of the Interior received the last fiscal year.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, claims that this action would result in cutting the working force in his Department down from the 44,740 now on the pay roll to a number perhaps even lower than the 41,000 employees on the Interior pay roll during the fiscal years of 1938 and 1941, which were prewar years.

If correctly quoted, Mr. Krug has either shown unbelievable ignorance as to the true facts, or has deliberately attempted to deceive the Congress.

What are the facts in regard to the Department of the Interior case? Today the Department of the Interior, according to Mr. Krug, has 44,740 employees on the pay roll, while in March 1938 it had listed 41,957 employees. What Mr. Krug failed to state in his interview with the press on April 22 when he made this comparison of the number of employees in 1938 and today was that a total of more than 11,000 employees have been transferred away from the Interior Department to other Federal agencies since that date. The agencies and the number of employees so transferred are as follows:

Civilian Conservation Corps	6,999
U. S. Housing Authority	1,647
St. Elizabeths Hospital	1,710
Office of Education	198
Columbia Institution for the Deaf	92
Freedmen's Hospital	268
Howard University	313
Total	11,227

Taking the above 11,227 employees who have been transferred away from the Department of the Interior, plus the 2,783 increase of new employees since that date, we have a net gain of 14,010 employees in the Department of the Interior since the fiscal year 1938, or about 33 percent.

The reduced budget of $156,000,000 proposed for the next fiscal year still represents an amount more than double that which was used in either of the years 1938 or 1939 when the Department was operated on a budget of less than $75,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that 11,227 of the personnel of the above-named agencies employed by the Department of the Interior at that time have since been transferred to other agencies.

When Mr. Krug shouts the charge that a reduction in the Interior Department appropriation which would necessitate laying off 10,000 employees from his Department could lead us into another major depression, either he does not know what he is talking about or else he is deliberately trying to confuse the American people.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on Wednesday I made a comprehensive statement of what is contained in Senate bill 1126 to amend the National Labor Relations Act. I am prepared to answer any questions or inquiries which may arise regarding the statements I then made, or any other questions in connection with the bill.

In the meantime, Mr. President, there are a number of typographical and clerical errors which must be corrected. The bill was reported hurriedly in order to have it before the Senate after it had been approved by the committee. The technical amendments are printed and are on Senators' desk and have been there for some days. I now offer these amendments, and ask that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I inquire of the Senator, what are the purposes of the amendments?

Mr. TAFT. The amendments are technical in nature. They are printed and are on the desks of Senators. I have offered the amendments and ask that they be considered en bloc. They comprise two and a half pages, and are corrections of technical and clerical errors. I think there is no question about them whatever. The corrections would have been made as a matter of course had we had more time before reporting the bill late in the evening of the day it was reported.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the only amendment the Senator is presenting at this time?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has offered certain amendments correcting technical and clerical errors. Is it necessary, in the Senator's judgment, that the amendments be stated?

Mr. TAFT. I think the amendments should be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "Empoyees" and insert in lieu thereof "Employees";

On page 13, line 4, to insert a comma after "members";

On page 13, line 14, to insert a semicolon after "raised";

On page 13, line 20, to insert a semicolon after "(a)";

On page 14, line 14, to strike out "fee" and insert in lieu thereof "fees";

On page 15, line 3, to strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)";

On page 15, line 8, to strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)";

On page 15, line 13, to insert a semicolon after "(a)" and strike out "of the National Labor";

On page 15, line 14, to strike out "Relations Act; (3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)";

On page 15, line 19, to insert a semicolon after "(a)" and strike out "of the National Labor Rela-";

On page 15, line 20, to strike out "tions Act; (4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)";

On page 15, line 25, to strike out "National Labor Relations";

On page 16, line 2, after the word "tasks", to strike out the comma and insert a colon, capitalize the first letter of the word "provided", italicize "provided", insert a comma thereafter, and capitalize the first letter of "that";

On page 16, line 9, to strike out "the National Labor Relations Act." and insert in lieu thereof "this Act;";

On page 17, line 9, to insert "also" after the word "shall";

On page 17, to insert quotation marks at the beginning of lines 12, 18, and 21;

On page 17, line 21, to insert "Federal Mediation" before "Service" and strike out ", created by this Act,";

On page 18, to insert quotation marks at the beginning of line 1;

On page 18, lines 10 and 11, to strike out "the National Labor Relations" and insert in lieu thereof "this";

On page 20, line 11, to move the words following the ";" to the margin on the next line and continue the remainder of the subsection without indention;

On page 25, line 6, to insert at the end thereof "under section 10";

On page 25, line 8, to strike out "processed in its behalf under section 10";

On page 33, line 9, to insert after "(B)," the word "and" and strike out ", and (D)";

On page 36, line 4, to strike out "injury" and insert in lieu thereof "inquiry";

On page 38, line 7, to insert a comma after "Act";

On page 38, line 8, to insert a comma after "herein";

On page 55, line 23, to strike out the word "and";

On page 56, line 2, to insert the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of the line;

On page 59, line 10, to strike out "other" where it appears after "to" and insert "other" after "circumstances"; and

On page 59, line 11, to insert "as" after "those" and insert "invalid," after "held."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", it is proposed to insert the following: "(A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7; or (B)."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. If Senators will turn to page 14 of the bill——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator please restate the amendment he has just offered?

Mr. BALL. I ask that the amendment again be stated at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", it is proposed to insert the following: "(A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7; or (B)."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It is to insert an unfair-labor practice for unions identical with the first unfair labor practice prohibited to employers in the present act, and we carry it over into this measure, so it will read:

> It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

Section 7 is a very short section, although it is the heart of the act. It provides:

> Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to provide that where unions, in their organizational campaigns, indulge in practices which, if an employer indulged in them, would be unfair labor practices, such as making threats or false promises or false statements, the unions also shall be guilty of unfair labor practices.

If the Senators will turn to part 4 of the hearings, on page 2248, they will find a letter from a small employer in New York which I inserted in the record. He is a wholesaler, and he tells how a goon squad from Union Local No. 65 of the CIO on several occasions sent gangs of men into his plant. They pushed his employees around and threatened them if they did not join the union. Finally, in desperation, many of them said, "We do not want to be beaten up, so we will join," even though it was not their free choice.

The sponsors of this amendment believe that that kind of practice by unions is in violation of the rights guaranteed to employees in section 7, just as it is a violation when an employer directly or indirectly threatens his employees with dismissal if they join a union.

In the past 2 years there have been a number of cases before the National Labor Relations Board, mostly contesting the results of elections, in which unfair practices of this type were alleged. Such practices are not covered by any State law. They do not go to the extent of violence although quite often violence follows later. Such tactics are used by unions in organization and election campaigns.

One such case was that of *Corn Products Co.* (58 NLRB 1441). The CIO affiliate published a statement in a preelection campaign had falsely stated affiliated unions are not recognized by the National Labor Relations Board and other Government agencies as legitimate unions. The National Labor Relations Board held that that absolutely false statement was not ground to set aside the election, which the CIO affiliate won.

Another case was that of *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (43 NLRB 795). A union which won the election in the preelection campaign had falsely stated that, unlike its rival, it was exempt from the no-strike pledge given the President for the duration of the war. Again, the NLRB held that that was no ground on which to set aside the election, although if an employer had made statements similar to those made by the union in either one of the cases to which I have referred the election would have been set aside. These cases all arose within the past 2 years.

Another case was that of *Martinsville Cotton Mill Company* (57 NLRB 880). The winning CIO union in an election falsely stated in its preelection campaign that it had secured a wage increase of 10 cents an hour at another plant of the company, and also falsely stated that it had been recognized by the Government as the national bargaining agent for all textile workers. Both statements were completely false, yet both statements were calculated to coerce employees in their free choice—supposedly—of their own bargaining representatives.

Another case was that of *R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company* (59 NLRB 122). The National Labor Relations Board refused to set aside an election because of various defamatory articles and statements made by the winning union.

Another case was that of *Maywood Hosiery Mills* (64 NLRB 146). On the day before the election the union circulated a leaflet which falsely stated that the company had not asked the National War Labor Board for permission to grant a wage increase.

In all those cases if an employer had made such statements during an organization or preelection campaign, the National Labor Relations Board would have held the employer guilty of unfair practices, on the ground that he was coercing employees in their free choice of a bargaining agent.

The common practice in organization campaigns is for the business agent to threaten all employees and tell them that if they do not join the union before the election, or vote for it, they will be charged double initiation fees after-

ward. That is done in a great many cases. It is clearly an attempt to coerce and threaten employees in the exercise of the freedoms guaranteed by the act. However, such practices do not fall within the purview of State laws against violence and that sort of thing.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Does the record show that the National Labor Relations Board ever decided a case against the CIO?

Mr. BALL. I think A. F. of L. unions have won elections. However, to my knowledge the National Labor Relations Board has never set aside an election because of any kind of action taken by the union in its organization campaign, regardless of how coercive or threatening it may have been.

Mr. BUCK. But the Senator has no record of the National Labor Relations Board ever deciding against a CIO union.

Mr. BALL. I would not be sure. It may have done so in some cases.

I have received a large number of letters calling attention to the type of threats and coercion by union organizers against which this particular amendment is aimed. One such letter is from an individual who operates a small sporting goods store in Salem, Oreg. He has only one employee. Both he and his employee were asked to join a union and threatened if they did not. They were told that they faced a secondary boycott, picket line, and so forth. He was visited by what he calls the goonsters, or labor organizers. He says:

> The three men who called on me that time were of the ex-pug waterfront type of individuals trying to force us to join, by the fear of personal violence. * * * They finally became so insistent, obnoxious, and arrogant with their threats, etc., that rather than to have personal trouble with them or broken windows, etc., that I signed up. They insisted that not only my man who was not interested, but I myself also had to personally sign and pay dues. It cost each of us $9 to join, plus $3 per month dues.

Another letter is from a councilman in the city of San Mateo, Calif., who apparently works in the Olsen Nolte Saddle Shop, in San Francisco, where there are 11 employees who did not want to join the union. Nevertheless, the union, in an attempt to force them to join, picketed the establishment, and several times threatened, jostled, and beat up one of the employees as he was going to work. That is another type of coercion. If the unions, in their organizing drives, cannot persuade a majority to join voluntarily, they place a picket line in front of the shop, make scurrilous remarks about the employees as they go to work, and subject them to all kinds of abuse. even verging on physical violence, but very often not reaching the point where State laws would come into effect.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator make any distinction between what individuals do or say and the authoritative action of a labor organization itself, regularly and properly authorized?

Mr. BALL. I think most of the actions I am citing are authorized, and taken by the union. Certainly in the NLRB cases the union in its publications and the literature which it distributed deliberately falsified the facts. If an employer did so, he would be guilty of an unfair labor practice. The organizational type of picket line is not merely a voluntary act on the part of individuals who do the picketing. It is always ordered by the union, and the union should be responsible for it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator, of course, makes the distinction which we lawyers have to recognize, that a corporation is liable in its corporate capacity for what an employee may do in an individual capacity. If an individual commits an act of violence against another individual, ordinarily that is considered to be merely an individual attack, and the individual responsible is liable for what he does. But in order to find a corporation liable it must be shown that the act complained of was within the scope of its authority, that it was within the scope of the charter of the organization and was an ultra vires act. There are many cases in the law of men taking company trucks and going off on what might be called a frolic of their own. In such cases the company is not liable for the wrongdoing which may be committed. I wonder if, in the main, the abuses to which the Senator refers are not acts which are consummated by individuals and which, if wrong, are their individual responsibility, but which cannot fairly be charged against the organization, the union, itself. Seldom would it be possible to find any resolution on the part of the union, or any action by the executives or authoritative agents of the union, directing that the acts complained of be committed.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Senator. I think that when there are mass picket lines, which usually produce acts of violence, which are organized in front of the entrance of a plant, it is virtually always the union leaders who organize them. Sometimes it may be a small minority of the union. I have known instance after instance of union leaders actually calling for mass picketing. Unfortunately there are many local police officials who simply do not have the courage to enforce the law and break up situations of that kind. But we are less concerned here with actual acts of violence than we are with threats and false statements and false promises by which employees are coerced by union organizers and interfered with in their free choice of representatives, such as statements as to what the union has done or can do, threatening an employee that if he does not join today and the union wins the election the initiation fee will cost him twice as much. Such statements are not calculated to assure employees full freedom in their choice of bargaining representatives.

I have here a copy of the Daily Oklahoman of Tuesday, January 28, 1947, containing an article with reference to a local judge who found the Teamsters' Local No. 886 guilty of contempt of court for picketing an establishment although no members of the union were employed there, in an effort to coerce those who were employed there into joining a union which they did not want to join. The court said, in its decision which is quoted in the newspaper:

> None of the employees have left their jobs and the sole purpose of the picket line is to intimidate, coerce and force debtor's employees to accept Local No. 886 as their bargaining agent, notwithstanding the decision of the employees to the contrary.

Only this morning, Mr. President, I received a telegram from Ray Dorman, 19957 Wakenden, Detroit, reading as follows:

> I was driven off job at Fords 2 p. m. today by union goon squads, scattered our tools, and told us to join demonstration in Cadillac Square; signs posted in shop denied employees permission to leave, rank and file are helpless between two fires. Do something

Finally, I have a story appearing in the New York Journal and American of March 14, telling about how the employees of fuel concerns in Westchester County were being forced to join, against their wishes, a union as the price of keeping their job. In that case a picket line was thrown around the plant after the employees refused to join a union. It was a typical secondary boycott, which is covered in another section of the bill. Of interest is the comment of the owner of the business. He says that his employees, against their will, paid an initiation fee of $37.50 and joined the union. He says:

> They were told that their initiation fees would be doubled if they delayed one day longer

Mr. President, I think that the adoption of the amendment offered by me, which is identical with the provision applying to employers who interfere with the freedom of employees in organizing, is essential to equalize the rights and responsibilities of both employers and unions in this field, to really assure to employees the freedom supposedly guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act. I hope the amendment will prevail.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr PEPPER. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any time of the Senate for a matter which is principally personal. But I feel that it is so important to keep the record straight that I do want to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments.

I am sending to the Press Gallery the following 2-page statement:

> Senator PEPPER charged in the Senate today that the recent article by Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, chief of the Washington Bureau of the United Press, charging him with being a contributing columnist to the Chicago Star alleged to have "the markings of a Communist front publication," was false and part of a designed smear campaign against him. Senator PEPPER declared that he thought it was well in these crucial times to keep the record straight and to show up such dastardly attacks when they were made, not only in the interest of fairness, but also in the interest of a free press to America.
>
> "Mr. Wilson knows me personally and has known me for over 10 years since I have been in the Senate," said Senator PEPPER. "He

called me in Miami recently to ask my comment about the third party matter, mentioned by Mr. Wallace. If he found a column by me in what he thought was a questionable paper, he just as easily could have called me in Washington to have given me an opportunity to have presented a fair statement of the facts before condemning me over the whole network of the United Press with being associated with alleged fellow travelers.

"When I saw the story I called the United Press and explained that the column which appeared in the Chicago Star, attacking the monopolists and the cartelists who were denying newsprint to the smaller newspapers of the country, was a regular weekly column that I send out to all the newspapers and radio stations of Florida and to all who ask for it. And somehow the Chicago Star got hold of the column and printed it. The United Press representative said he thoroughly understood the situation and that the United Press would try to correct its story. All I saw by way of an attempted correction was a little article on page 34 of the Washington Daily News, with a caption that said Senator PEPPER hinted that the Chicago Star got the column by some improper method. The United Press in its supposed retraction, however, did not retract the insinuation of the article or in any other fair way endeavor to clear up the misunderstanding which it had given in the original article. On the contrary, in the so-called retraction, it repeated some of the innuendo of the principal story.

"Since the facts so easily could have been obtained and since no effort was made by Mr. Wilson to get the facts, my conclusion is that Mr. Wilson did not want to know the facts but used this incident as a basis of a deliberate smear attack upon me.

"This column, which I say went to all the Florida papers and radio stations, was designed, as the column itself shows, for the Florida papers and was a plea by me for the real freedom of the press by making it possible for the small newspapers, and especially the weekly newspapers of the country, to get newsprint, as against monopolistic and cartel practices today which are favoring the big-chain newspapers and the big metropolitan newspapers.

"Again, I make the plea for a free press, not only by claiming a fair quantity of the newsprint for the smaller members of the press but by fair, full, accurate, and honorable reporting by all the press."

Mr. President, the column to which I have referred is dated April 10, 1947, and reads as follows:

Dear friends, most of the newspapers of Florida, and especially the weekly papers, today are being choked and strangled because of monopoly, cartelism, and black marketing in newsprint. Florida has had one of the major increases in population and our papers have gained in circulation and therefore in need of newsprint probably among the most in the Nation.

When price control was in effect, newsprint was rationed and there was a pretty fair distribution of it among the papers of the country, big and little. There was a fixed price per ton and that was the delivery price. When rationing and price control went off, the price remained the delivered price, but then the manufacturers and jobbers began to deliver newsprint generally in the area near New York, so they would have less freight to pay. Florida being a long way from New York with high transportation costs suffered more than almost any other area.

About 85 percent of the newsprint we get in the United States comes from abroad—Canada, New Foundland, Finland, and the Scandinavian countries. It is now pretty clear that there is a cartel arrangement among all these manufacturers, that is, an agreement among them that they will put only a certain amount of newsprint in the American market, so they can hold the prices up and make larger profits. The Canadians have an association which serves as their cartel representative. All the newsprint from Finland, the largest European producer at the present time, goes through a single New York agent and no newspaper can buy from a Finnish mill except through that cartel representative. Recently, an American went over to Finland and made a contract with a manufacturer. The other manufacturers found out about it and put the most severe pressure on this manufacturer to make him stand by the cartel.

The Canadian mills pretend to live up to a fixed price of a little over $90 a ton, but there is a black market with this group also. In other words, an American publisher can get newsprint if he will pay a big black market profit. Sometimes sales are made to lawyers who make resales of paper at fabulous profits.

The Finns are supposed to sell into the American market at ninety-odd dollars a ton. It is also clear that the Finns are holding off of the American market a lot of the newsprint they could send here. This is, first, in order that they might get higher prices, and, second, a part of the cartel arrangement. I am making it clear to the Finns that I will not support another American loan to Finland if they are going to profiteer in that manner upon the American people. The Finnish people are in dire distress, and they need help. But they can't expect us to exhibit real concern for their welfare and then let some of their big monopolists exploit the American people for unconscionable profits for what they have to sell us.

It was a mistake, in my opinion, to remove controls on newsprint until the supply became reasonably adequate. Even smaller daily papers have suffered greatly, and the weeklies in some cases have nearly been put out of business.

There is plenty of newsprint today, but it is being unevenly distributed. Two percent of the production redistributed fairly would take care of all the needs of papers now, I am told. The big chain owners like Hearst and some of the largest papers who have plenty of money have been able to get all the newsprint they want. But the small papers, which could not own big mills or contract for enormous quantities of newsprint and did not know the ins and outs of the black-marketing that was going on, have had to suffer.

The Senate Small Business Committee is investigating this matter now. It has set up a volunteer committee among some of the largest publishers and also among some of the manufacturers of newsprint to see if they will not voluntarily make available to newspapers at least as much newsprint as they got in 1946.

We cherish freedom of the press, but we cannot have freedom of the press if the little paper as well as the large cannot get newsprint. This is a case, therefore, where monopoly and cartelism are striking a blow at one of our most cherished freedoms, the freedom of the press. There is an investigation going on by the Department of Justice now, and maybe there will be prosecutions. The people don't realize that today monopoly generally is at the highest peak it has ever been in America. If we are going to remain a free people, we have really got to maintain free enterprise, and that means all enterprise has got to have a fair chance without being strangled and throttled by the powerful and the greedy.

Very truly yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

Mr. President, as I have said, that weekly column was sent out to approximately 250 Florida newspapers and 32 Florida radio stations and 3 out-of-State papers which have requested the column, having in some way or other learned of it.

I send it to the Associated Press, and generally to the United Press. In fact, the Washington representative of the United Press, to whom I spoke about the matter, said that he remembered the column when it was sent out, and that they did have it and used it.

I also send the column to 111 individuals who have requested it, both in my State and in various other parts of the country.

Mr. President, it seems that somehow or another a paper called the Chicago Star saw a copy of my column and wrote in and asked if it might publish it without having to pay for it. Of course, the column is sent out free of charge to these various newspapers and radio stations and to anyone who wishes to accept it. My office told the representative of that paper that he could publish it if he wanted to.

Later on it was brought to my attention that that paper had questionable associations or leanings. At that time I directed my office to cut it off the mailing list. Of course I did not know anything about the papers which had requested permission to carry the column. As a result of my action, I received from the Chicago Star a letter dated April 5, in which the managing editor complains that they had been cut off the mailing list and had not received the column for two weeks prior to April 5.

The column which, according to Mr. Wilson's article, was carried by the Chicago Star was dated April 10; but I have the April 5 letter of the managing editor of the newspaper, Carl Hirsch, in which he complains about being cut off the mailing list for two issues prior to April 5. Prior to the publication of the United Press article, someone having called my attention to the fact that the newspaper was a questionable publication, I had directed the removal of its name from the mailing list; and I have the letter of the managing editor of that newspaper complaining that it had been cut off. How that paper got a copy of the column and published it, I do not know.

What often happens to men in public life is well illustrated by what happened in this case to me, for out came an article, with a large headline, by Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, appearing in the Washington Daily News, in which it was charged that I am a contributing columnist to the Chicago Star. The headline read: "Senator PEPPER'S column shows Red ink blots."

Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, the head of the Washington bureau of the United Press, wrote the feature article which appeared under that heading, and I now read the first part of it:

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, showed up today as a contributing columnist to a weekly newspaper which has most of the markings of a Communist-front publication.

Then he named all of the alleged fellow travelers and fellow Communists whose writings appear in that paper, and he showed that some of them have been investigated and some of them have been indicted; and he left the inference and

the designed innuendo that I am in the same class with them because I am a fellow contributor to the Chicago Star.

Mr. President, what is the effect of that? Newspapers served by the United Press, of course, carried the article For example, I have before me a newspaper published in my own State, the Miami Daily News, and in its issue of April 21 the following headline appears: "PEPPER writes for Red weekly—Chicago Star listed as front for party."

Various people read that headline and article, and then say, "Well, it looks as if our Senator is a contributor to that Communist paper, and here in the article is a list of the fellow travelers who also are contributors to it."

Mr. President, as I have said, later when I called the United Press, they readily stated that they understood the situation, and would correct it immediately. But, of course, the kind of correction that generally is made in such cases is the kind that was made in this case, for way back on page 34 of the April 22 issue of the Washington Daily News is a small article with a rather small headline reading "PEPPER hints pinko paper bootlegged his free column."

The result is that a man in public life, who cannot go and see all the people, and cannot talk to all the people who have read such an article, has his political reputation smeared. I do not know anything gained in such cases except that a newspaper, or a press association, may think it has hit pay dirt in some kind of discreditable association they can establish on the part of the man in public life, whether the charge is true as made or not.

I referred a while ago to the letter from the managing editor of this paper dated April 5, in which he says:

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We had been receiving your weekly column up until 2 weeks ago, and then it suddenly stopped.

We were wondering whether you had stopped writing it temporarily or whether for some reason your office had neglected sending us a copy.

Of course, I never responded to that. Just as I gave it to 242 papers in Florida, and also to the Associated Press, and on occasion to the United Press, these people got it and published it.

All I am saying, Mr. President, is that we all believe in a free press, we all believe in the right of criticism, we all believe in the duty of our free press to show up anything contrary to the public interest. If a Senator is writing a column for a paper that has questionable character, it is the duty of the press to show it up. But I do think that in the interest of fairness, in the interest of full reporting, where a thing is designed to smear the reputation of a public man, when the writer of such an article knows the person, and is within a few feet of him or a few hundred yards of him every day, before the writer puts a charge like that on the wires of a great and honorable news association, the probity of which people are entitled to respect, at least he might give the person involved a simple telephone call, or a simple inquiry of some kind, asking if he has any comment to make by way of an explanation, and thus give the person affected a chance to make such a statement or comment as he cared to make.

Mr. President, I am not the only one who has had something like this happen. We who are in public life run into this kind of experience, of course, a great many times. I do not make the statement out of any desire to be unfair, but I just wanted to keep the record straight, as I have said, and to let it be known that I think it is a violation of the spirit of a free press to convey an erroneous impression about a public man's conduct, and when the error is discovered, not be as diligent in a desire to correct the error as in the desire first to disseminate it.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have taken the time of the Senate but in the interest of a free press, which I cherish, which is an essential American freedom, and to keep the record straight in this crucial time, I wanted the privilege of making these comments

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to have it very clearly understood by the Members of the Senate that in what I may say in the course of the debate I am trying to draw a line—a line which, after working in this field over a period of years, I have discovered actually exists—between what seems to me to be possible for us to do in the way of bringing about corrections in the law as it stands, and that area or that field of correction which lies beyond that point, and which for one reason or another, if entered, will cause more damage than good.

As the debate progresses, I expect to speak on all the amendments which have been proposed thus far, with the exception of one which would add to the provision regarding free speech, a part of the Constitution of the United States, the first provision of the Bill of Rights, which covers the matter very effectively, and could well be added to the bill, although I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. President, the amendments which are to be offered or presented from time to time seem to me to fall into two main categories. There is the type of amendment such as that which is now before the Senate, which is definitely antilabor, for reasons which I shall explain before I get through speaking. There are one or two others which fall into the same category.

Then there is the type of amendment which in itself would seek to cure a condition, and which would, apparently, by its provisions bring about such a cure, but which in its effect would fall far short of doing so and would do so much damage as utterly to defeat its purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to read, to start with, a statement made by the National Labor Relations Board regarding the pending amendment, which I think may well be considered by every Senator at this time. They say this amendment "would make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed by the act."

This provision would certainly lead to protracted litigation, because of the difficulty of determining who are agents of a labor organization, and what constitutes interference and coercion within its meaning.

Moreover, assuming that these proscribed acts involve violence and physical coercion, the provision is unnecessary, because offenses of this type are punishable under State and local police law. In fact, the enactment of this provision would make unions and their agents liable twice for the same offense, once under State and once under Federal law. Employers run no such risk for interfering with their employees' rights.

Furthermore, the amendment is impractical, because an effective remedy against such offenses is quick arrest, criminal trial and conviction, not an administrative hearing, followed months or years later by a cease-and-desist order.

Finally, the Board would have to increase its staff tremendously to investigate the many charges of this character which would be filed.

It so happens, Mr. President, that I have been dealing with this type of amendment for about 9 years. If the Senate will kindly pardon a reference to the State of New York—I know there are some who may not like to have us talk about the State of New York—I should like to refer to the experience we had in New York in connection with an amendment on this particular subject.

This is not the first time we have had labor trouble in this country; it is not the first time we have had serious labor trouble which has threatened seriously to injure and paralyze our whole economy. We have to look back only 12 years to find a condition existing which was not greatly different from that which exists today.

It will be remembered that in 1935 the Wagner Labor Relations Act was passed, and in 1937 it was declared constitutional. At the same time, in the State of New York an act of similar nature, patterned after the Wagner Act—we called it the "Baby Wagner Act"—was enacted.

At that time there was everywhere a great deal of resistance to collective bargaining. By that I do not mean that all employers, or even a majority of them, were opposed to collective bargaining; I do not think they were; but there was tremendous resistance. Those were the years, it will be recalled, of the sit-down strike. Those were the years when, for one reason or another, the whole area in which management and labor are engaged was a scene of turmoil. Just as it had occurred to the authorities in

Washington, so it occurred to those in the State of New York that something should be done about it.

There was dissatisfaction with the working of the New York State Labor Relations Act. There were repercussions from opposition to the Wagner Act. Through legislative procedure, it was determined to go into this area, to find out what could be done. I am telling the Senators this, because it has a great deal to do with my own philosophy in this field. It is the story of the experience of a legislative body; to be sure, not the Congress of the United States, but nevertheless a reputable legislative body in a large industrial State. I think it can be safely said that New York is as large as any industrial State, and I assume that our industry may be greater than that in any other State. It is the story of the experience of our State legislative body dealing with these same problems which faced us 12 years ago.

In 1938, the legislature established a joint legislative committee. The approach in this field was rather interesting. It so happened that at that time the Legislature of the State of New York was divided. The senate was controlled by the Democratic Party; the assembly by the Republican Party; but there were five American Labor Party representatives in the assembly.

The committee was to be made up of eight members, three from the senate, five from the assembly. I happened to be the leader of the assembly at that particular time, if I may be pardoned a personal reference. That explains how I became involved in this matter. Someone had to take charge of it, and the question arose as to who was to do it. I was largely responsible for the resolution by which, in the first instance, the set-up had been brought about, and I was expected more or less to go ahead with it. The reason I did so was because I did not know anything about the whole matter, and I decided it was high time that I should learn something about it.

The first thing that occurred to me was that under that kind of set-up politics would have to be barred. If it became involved in a dispute between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party at that particular time, with the legislature constituted as it was, nothing but further harm to labor relations in New York State could be expected.

The committee was organized in a rather ingenious fashion. There were three Democrats, four Republicans, and one member of the American Labor Party. We met to decide on certain rather fundamental principles, which I expect later to discuss in this debate, because they are very important in connection with what is now proposed. Those principles guided the committee's procedure for the ensuing 9 years. Amazingly, it was then agreed to operate by unanimous consent, and from that time until the present the committee has always operated by unanimous consent.

I am stating this background because of its relationship to the first proposed amendment. Hearings were begun on a broad program which was supposed to be covered. There was a mandate from the legislature to investigate the entire English system of industrial relations, and the questions of profit sharing and incentive taxation. Our final objective was to do whatever could be done to bring about the self-government of industry through self-regulation.

The first matter to come before the committee when it began its hearings was the identical proposition which today faces the Senate. Offhand, it seems like a very reasonable proposal to say by this process that no one should be allowed to coerce anyone else, for any purpose. To begin with, that was my thought. I admit I was prejudiced. I admit that I perhaps had a tendency to feel that there should be a rather potent clamping down in this respect. We investigated, and we found, just as has been indicated in part by the memorandum I have read, that that view is not always to be accepted without qualification.

If the Senators will read carefully the amendment, which is very brief, it will be discovered that there is to be added to the bill the following provision:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

(1) To interfere with—

Please note the words "interfere with"—

restrain, or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances.

I have already pointed out the possibility that double jeopardy is involved. There can be no question that such a possibility exists.

Let us consider the words "interfere with." How is a labor organization or anyone, trying to persuade others to join a labor organization, to operate, under the possible interpretation of the words "interfere with"? If I, belonging to a union, were to sit down and try to talk with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who does not belong to a union, and if I were to say to him that I think he should join, pointing out to him all the merits of unionization, and the great value of the trade-union movement, doing my utmost to make a persuasive appeal, perhaps the Senator would not like some feature of my appeal. Possibly somebody might stir him to anger—I know that would never happen in the case of the senior Senator from Delaware, but something might stir the Senator to anger—and cause him to decide to challange what I was trying to do, by going to the Labor Relations Board or to one of its representatives, charging an unfair labor practice, because of my interference with what he might consider to be his right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. If an employer did exactly the same thing, as I understand, the Board would not hold it to be interference. Under the exact circumstances stated by the Senator, an employer can go to a man, urge him not t- join a union, and point out the disadvantages of unionism. That is not an unfair labor practice under this bill. Neither would the circumstances which the Senator has stated constitute an unfair labor practice under the language of the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in reply, I simply want to point out that circumstances alter cases, and that, very easily, the exact thing I mentioned might occur. Supposing it to be the policy of the Board at the present time to operate along the lines indicated by the senior Senator from Ohio, that does not mean it will always follow that policy, nor does it necessarily follow that the attitude of the Board toward labor organizations would always be such as to cause it to pursue the same course toward such organizations as might be pursued toward employers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that the provision regarding free speech applies both to employer and employee. The language on page 16, line 16, is as follows:

The Board shall not base any finding of unfair labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit.

Those are the circumstances. There has been no record of interpretation of what the word "interfere" means. We certainly cannot now assume because the provisions are applied to employees that there will be any different interpretation from that which has been applied to employers.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not assume one thing or the other thing. I am pointing out the possibility of what might occur. Moreover, as to this particular proposed amendment very easily there might be an interpretation placed on the language which might be exactly opposite to that which we here intend. At any rate, what would happen in this instance would be a definite restrictive influence on the part of all those who might endeavor to organize the employees of a plant or of a company. I do not believe in encouraging that sort of situation. I do not believe in placing ourselves in the position of espousing any course which may be taken to discourage the legitimate organization of employees in the trade union movement. That is definitely what could be construed in this instance. That is why labor over the course of the years has fought so bitterly against a provision of this nature because they had suspicion as to what interpretation sometime might be placed upon it, and as to its devastating effect upon what they might legitimately be endeavoring to do.

The Senator from Minnesota in his remarks referred to a number of cases. I was interested in those cases, because two of them happened to have occurred in the State of New York. I happen to have heard of them. Insofar as this proposed legislation is concerned, in at least one of those cases, and very likely in the other, I doubt that this provision or any of the provisions of this measure would apply. I happen to know that one of the concerns is engaged in intrastate business, and therefore this provision would

seem not to apply in that case in any way whatsoever, and I assume that it would not apply in many other cases which might be brought to our attention.

If, in the city of New York, or in any other places, "goon" squads enter into a plant to disrupt business, or anything of that nature or character occurs, we can have only complete condemnation for such action. But the answer to activities of that kind is not a proposal such as this. As was pointed out in the memorandum I read, there would be weeks, months, perhaps more than a year before action would be taken under this provision. For such things as "goon" squads, the only answer is immediate and decisive police action, and if the authorities of the city of New York, or of any other place, are notified and do nothing about such a situation, then I have nothing but condemnation for such authorities.

The trouble is that in too many localities people are taking too many of these absolutely unpardonable actions as a matter of course. I am a great believer in home rule. I am a great believer in solving problems which are distinctly home problems right at home, and not calling on the Federal Government every time something occurs which is to the dislike of the people at home. I certainly do not think that in matters of that kind, which are strictly police matters, as is also mass picketing, the Federal Government should be dragged in to clean up the mess. How is it going to be done? Assuming immediate action could be taken, how would it be taken? Is it proposed to deputize under a United States marshal a sufficient number of persons to carry out the purpose and intent of the law? Senators know what happened years ago in the coal fields when that was attempted. I do not need to point out what happened. Is it proposed to call out the troops? The whole thing becomes ridiculous when it is analyzed as it should be analyzed. Yet, those are the possibilities which are opened up by this type of amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Are not exactly the same possibilities opened up by the Senator's own amendments dealing with jurisdictional strikes, and secondary boycotts, making them unfair labor practices? Exactly the same kind of possibilities are opened up, that the Board may ultimately—we hope not finally—but may ultimately have to go to a court and obtain an injunction against practices which amount to violations of the law.

Mr. IVES. Oh, that is just where the difference comes in.

Mr. TAFT. But it is true that such possibilities are opened up by the Senator's own amendments.

Mr. IVES. The ne point of court injunction makes quite a difference. That is an important point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am pointing out that the unfair labor practice to which the Senator objects is parallel to two or three other unfair labor practices of the same nature which would have the same result which the Senator points out, and which are dealt with in the very amendments which he himself has supported.

Mr. IVES. But the procedure to be followed in the other cases are slightly different.

Mr. TAFT. In both cases the Board tries to work out the difficulties by hearings before the Board, by calling in the union members and saying "This is something you cannot do." In both cases, at the end, if the difficulties cannot be resolved in that way, the Board must appeal to the court. What is the difference?

Mr. IVES. The only difference is that in the other cases immediate restraining orders may be issued and in the case under discussion, this is not the case, and a considerable amount of delay results in this particular instance.

But that is quite the opposite of what I am talking about. I am talking about the tremendous possibilities for abuses that exist in this case. There is no question that they do exist. In the case of strikes involving jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts unquestionably the overwhelming public opinion and approval of the people is behind the police power of the Federal Government. Such things as strikes brought about by jurisdictional disputes as well as secondary boycotts must be eliminated. But the proposed procedure is a very dubious and questionable one to follow, when based merely on some charge which might be made, where there may be some kind of prejudice existing somewhere. It is something which to my way of thinking is utterly without justification.

So, years ago I came to the conclusion, and I have had no occasion to change my feeling since, that the adoption of such a provision which seeks to parallel employees with management, a provision which, insofar as employees are concerned, is the same as the provision governing management, governing employers in their relationships to employees, is wholly out of order. I think we have enough in the bill as it is now presented to take care of practically every situation of the type which is so obnoxious and to which we are referring in this instance. All that is necessary is to examine the provision in the bill with reference to the closed shop to see how well prepared we are to meet the situations which have been cited by the Senator from Minnesota. I dare say that that very provision alone would eliminate a great deal of this difficulty. When we come to the other provisions which I have mentioned, dealing with the secondary boycott and jurisdictional disputes, I think the field is amply covered. I see no point in placing in the bill something which inevitably will serve not alone to discourage legitimate labor organization, but may later, by interpretation and effect, defeat legitimate attempts at labor organization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment appears in the supplemental views on page 50 of the committee report. It was one of the four amendments with respect to which I joined in the supplemental report. It is one of the four things which I believe were omitted in the committee bill.

It seems to me that a perfectly clear case of necessity exists to include this amendment if we wish to secure the equality which the bill aims to give as between employers and employees. The present law expressly provides, and has provided for many years, that it is an unfair labor practice for any employer to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7. This amendment proposes to say that it shall also be an unfair labor practice for an employee organization, a union or its agents, to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

The language is perfectly clear. It has been interpreted by the courts. An employer cannot go to an employee and say, "If you join this union you will be discharged." He cannot go to an employee and threaten physical violence. He cannot employ police to accomplish that purpose. Now it is proposed that the union be bound in the same way. What could be more reasonable than that? Why should a union be able to go to an employee and threaten violence if he does not join the union? Why should a union be able to say to an employee, "If you do not join this union we will see that you cannot work in the plant"? What possible distinction can there be between an unfair labor practice of that kind on the part of an employer and a similar practice on the part of a union? We know that such things have actually occurred. We know that men have been threatened. There have been many cases in which unions have threatened men or their wives. They have called on them on the telephone and insisted that they sign bargaining cards. They have said to them, "Sooner or later we are going to organize this plant with a closed shop, and you will be out." It seems to me perfectly clear that that is a reprehensible practice, and one which is just as reprehensible and just as limiting on the rights of the employees guaranteed by the Wagner Act as would be an unfair labor practice on the part of employers.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the Senator from Ohio believe that the provisions now contained in the bill pertaining to the union shop and the regulation and control of employment under the union shop will go a long way toward eliminating the conditions to which he has referred? It seems to me that those provisions largely cover everything to which the Senator has referred, without taking this unnecessary step which could get us into a great deal of trouble.

Mr. TAFT. I think not. Many unions have not signed union-shop agreements. The building trades insist upon a closed shop, but there may be no contract in such cases. Then the unions could continue to do exactly what they are doing today.

Entirely apart from that, even if there is not a closed shop, take the case of compelling a man to sign a card to show representation. Many cases were referred to by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in which it was found that in the election the employer had made threats of one kind or another against employees in order to dissuade them from voting for a particular union and the election was invalidated. But if a union makes threats against such employees, or issues defamatory statements misrepresenting the facts that is not an unfair labor practice, and in no way invalidates the election. Under the decisions in the various election cases, therefore, the employer is bound hand and foot, and the union can use any tactics it wishes. It can make threats. It can coerce employees by every method, from persuasion to something which really amounts to a threat of force, in order to get them to vote in favor of the union.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe that the provision requiring a majority of all the employees in the organization to affirm a desire to belong to the union before there can be a union shop goes a long way toward eliminating the difficulty of which he is speaking? That provision is something new in labor organization. I realize the vigorous objections which are now being made by organized labor to this provision. I understand some of the reasoning behind those objections. However, I wish to point out that no provision was ever placed in the law which would have a more salutary effect upon the whole labor movement than will the provision dealing with the union shop, nor will any provision ever be placed in the law which will place the unions in a position of higher respect than will this provision alone. That is why I have great faith in the provision. I do not believe that some of the other provisions are at all necessary.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the best answer to that argument is that there is no union shop in the automobile industry; there is no union shop in the steel industry; there is no union shop in many other industries. So far as relying on the union-shop provision is concerned, it would have no effect whatever on coercion in those particular industries. This is a separate question from that of the union shop. It may be that if there is a union shop threats and coercion may be somewhat more effective, but they are effective just the same, whether there is a union shop or not. They have been effective in the past. I do not know whether there was a union shop in the various cases which have been cited or not. It would not have made any difference.

Unless we have a provision of this kind, a very large section of American industry will not be affected in any way, if we rely solely on the closed-shop provision. In those fields labor will be entirely free, notwithstanding the argument that in some way the limitation of the union shop protects employees against coercion. Personally, I do not see the relation of that argument.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that unions have the legal status of unincorporated associations. An employer is ordinarily a corporation or partnership, a legal entity more distinct than an unincorporated association. Is not the threat to discharge an employee, when the employer has the power of employment life-and-death over the employee, different from the case of members of an unincorporated association addressing themselves to the employee? Does not the Senator recognize a difference between those two situations, as was suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there is any difference. I do not see any difference. The amendment would make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to bring coercion to bear on employees. What is a labor organization? It is an organization with officers, exactly like a corporation.

I admit it may be difficult to prove the responsibility of a union. It is sometimes difficult to prove in the case of an employer. If the wife of a man who is working at a plant receives a lot of telephone messages, very likely it cannot be proved that they came from the union. There is no case then. There must be legal proof of agency in the case of unions as in the case of corporations; but I do not think there is anything in the fact that a union is an unincorporated association which would bring about a condition in law that the act of every member is necessarily charged to the labor organization. No; I think not.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator realize also that there is a difference between what is generally the right of redress and the right of petition on the part of members to join with others as a matter of self-interest and as a matter of protection of their common welfare, and does not the Senator consider that situation in a different category from that in which a citizen is protected against violence? We do not want to make it an unfair labor practice to prevent a man from being beaten up. Every citizen of this country has a right to protection. Is there not a difference between that case and the case of an employer who has the power of life and death, the power of holding a man's job in his hands?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot see any difference. If a man is invited to join a union its members ought to be able to persuade him to join, but if they should not be able to persuade him they should not be permitted to interfere with him, coerce him, and compel him to join the union. The moment that such a man is threatened with losing his job if he does join, it at once becomes an unfair labor practice. Threats and coercion ought to become unfair labor practices on the part of a union.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator also recognize that an employees' organization is in a little different category from that of the employer in this respect? It is possible simply to haunt and harass into destruction any organization which is made up of employees. This would be made, if the amendments proposed were agreed to, an unfair labor practice. That would mean that if a citation of an unfair labor practice were made or a complaint were made it would go to the Board and there would have to be hearings and the union would have to defend itself, because I assume if it were found guilty its certification could be taken away or it could be penalized in some manner. It would be possible for almost every address made on the part of any union member to a nonunion employee to affect the right of a citizen to petition. That could be interpreted by an organization or by some of the workers who might be identified with an employer so as to be turned into a series of harassments before the National Labor Relations Board that would practically dissipate the funds of the union and, for all practical purposes, break up the union. Does the Senator recognize that possibility of abuse in this amendment?

Mr. TAFT. There is always the possibility of abuse. In my opinion, the National Labor Relations Act has produced more abuses than any law that ever existed on the statute books. But that does not mean that such abuses need result. This whole procedure is based on the theory that the Board will deal with either or both sides equitably. An accused party will be summoned before the Board. There will be a hearing as to why they were doing these things, and a cease-and-desist order may be issued. So far as I know, there is no other penalty. If they should disobey the cease-and-desist order, the Board can obtain an injunction; and if they violate the injunction, they are liable for contempt. That is the only result of this general charge of unfair labor practices. I do not understand that the union can be decertified as a bargaining agent for the men simply because it fails to comply with the cease-and-desist order of the Board.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is there not some way by which the Board has the right of revoking the certification for the commission of an unfair labor practice?

Mr. TAFT. No; there is no such provision in existing laws, and no such provision in this bill, except for failure to file a financial report where the power is expressly given. It is not otherwise provided under this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it not be, for all practical purposes, the same? A complaint might be filed with the National Labor Relations Board and notice given of the filing of such complaint. There would be a hearing, which means practically a court procedure. Then if a cease-and-desist order were issued and

not observed, the Board would go to the circuit court of appeals of the appropriate circuit to enforce it, which means that, in innumerable cases, if they chose to proceed in the case of every workingman who addressed himself to another workingman asking him to join a union for the common good, it would afford an opportunity to drag the union into proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board or before the courts. Again, I say, would not that, for all practical purposes, mean that a union could be harassed to death by exhausting its funds, and, for all practical purposes, preventing citizens from exercising their rights as citizens?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Florida. This bill proceeds on the theory that there shall be a definition of unfair labor practices on the part of employees as well as employers, and on the part of unions as well as employers. That principle is accepted by a large majority of the members of the committee. The Senator's arguments, in effect, are arguments against protection from unfair labor practices on the part of any labor organization because it will involve their having, as the Senator says, to be dragged before the Board and made to stand up and say, "We did not do that." We feel that the Board should be given the opportunity to say, "That is an unfair labor practice and you must stop that particular practice."

That is true of the entire bill. It is based on the theory that there shall be definitions of unfair labor practices. All we have to consider in this amendment is whether this particular matter should be deemed an unfair labor practice. If it be an unfair labor practice on the part of employers, why not on the part of a labor organization?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator not have to admit that there is no definition of coercion that will leave it clear as to what can be done and what cannot be done?

Mr. TAFT. The Board has been defining those words for 12 years, ever since it came into existence. Its application to labor organizations may have a slightly different implication, but it seems to me perfectly clear that from the point of view of the employee the two cases are parallel. The effect of the bill is to include both labor union leaders and individual employers. If there is anything clear in the development of labor union history in the past 10 years it is that more and more labor union employees have come to be subject to the orders of labor union leaders. The bill provides for the right of protest against arbitrary powers which have been exercised by some of the labor union leaders. Certainly it seems to me that if we are willing to accept the principle that employees are entitled to teh same protection against labor union leaders as against employers, then I can see no reasonable objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is not the distinction which the Senator from Ohio is overlooking the fact that the workers elect their own officers, whereas they do not elect their employers? I assume that they have a constitution and bylaws, and therefore they have protection within their own organization against the tyranny of their own leaders. Certainly the Senator from Ohio will recognize that the courts of the United States are still open and that it is impossible for a person to beat up other persons or threaten to beat them up without having those who are threatened or are actually beaten up have a right to redress under the law.

The difference the Senator from Ohio is overlooking is that one of them is an association of coworkers and the other is an organization dealing with the employer, with whose selection the worker has nothing to do; and he is trying to prevent having his job taken away by the employer for some reason. That would not give him the right of redress in a court, or would not give him the right to protection under the laws of his own organization.

It seems to me that the Senator from Ohio is overlooking the fact that either under their own constitution and bylaws or in accordance with the laws of the land, the workers can surely protect themselves from the tyranny of those whom they elect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that in the case of many of the unions, the employee has a good deal more of an opportunity to select his employer than he has to select his labor-union leader; and even if he has that opportunity and even if there is a fair election in a union, the man who is elected may have been voted against by various of the employees who did not desire to have that particular man elected as the union leader. In such cases the very fact that they did vote against that man is often used later by the union as a means of coercing such employees, and in some cases the union expels them from the union or subjects them to treatment which interferes with their rights as American citizens.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further? I do not desire to interrupt the course of his remarks.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make an analogy between what the Senator from Ohio has said and what is proposed by the amendment. On the one hand, let us consider the stockholders of a corporation. Let us make an analogy between protecting the stockholders of a corporation against their chosen management and protecting the workers against their chosen leaders.

This amendment is an effort to protect the workers against their own leaders, chosen by them under their own constitution and bylaws.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me point out that the amendment protects men who may not be members of unions at all. In fact, many of the cases of coercion are cases in which there never has been a certification of a union, cases in which a union which is attempting to organize sends its representatives to the plant and coerces the employees to join that union.

I have before me a case which appears in volume 4 of the record at page 2650. It is the case of the *Hall Freight Lines, Inc.* (reported in 65 N. L. R. B. 397). Nine members of the employer unit were members of the so-called CTD union. They had been members of that organization for a long time. Five officials of another union called at the plant, controlling one type of employees in that plant, the so-called dockmen. Those officials demanded that the nine employees meet with them. They did so, meeting in a closed room. There the five officials argued with the nine employees that they must leave the union they were in, and must join the other union. The five officials could not make any dent on the position of the nine employees, so then those officials called a strike of the men of whom they had control—the dockmen—and closed down the plant. Then they had another conference with the nine employees, and in that conference they made further threats. Finally they got a 5-to-4 vote of the nine men to the effect that they would change their union. Thereupon, the five officials went to the employer and insisted upon having a contract, and, as I recall, the employer had to sign it if he was not going to have his plant closed down completely.

At the end of the evening, the nine employees came back and said they had been coerced, and most of them would not go through with the change. The employer had to fire seven of them that night, and the Board upheld the new union.

This is a case of coercion of employees who had no connection at all with the union which was doing the coercing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has related that incident, he said those men talked to the other men in a room with the door closed. I do not believe that the mere fact that those men went into a room with the officials of the union is justification for an assumption that the employees were threatened by those officials. I suppose that if a citizen asks his Senator to meet him in a reception room, the Senator can go there or not, as he wishes, or can go or not go into any other conference, according to his own wishes.

The Senator did not say that the men were threatened physically. If they were, they had a right to resort to police protection in their own State or city.

Mr. TAFT. The main threat was, "Unless you join our union, we will close down this plant, and you will not have a job." That was the threat, and that is coercion—something which they had no right to do.

The dockmen in that case were not striking for any particular benefit for themselves, but they were striking to coerce the other employees to leave the union of which they were members, and to join the other union—clearly an improper course of action, and clearly a matter which should be restrained by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, I am not condoning what those men did; but I point out that that case either comes under the category of one in which the workers can be protected within their own organization, or it comes under the category of one in which the workers can be protected by police action.

The Senator from Ohio has said that those men threatened a strike. Mr. President, this bill protects the right to strike; and if a man has a right to strike, he has a right to tell anyone that he will strike on the basis of a certain contention. So there is nothing unlawful or wrong in striking, and I have heard nothing from the Senator to the effect that it would be unlawful either to strike or to ask someone to strike, or for an employee to tell someone that he would strike upon a certain contention.

Therefore, what I was trying to establish appears in this case, I believe. First, I say that if we are going to be consistent and are to try to protect employees against their union officials, we should also protect stockholders against the tyranny of management. We know that in some cases management is just as tyrannical, or is charged with being just as tyrannical, toward certain of their minority stockholders, as it is charged that, on occasion, labor leaders are with some employees in the union who may not agree with them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. In the second place, Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would let me finish my question.

Mr. TAFT. With all due respect, Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Florida would let me answer his questions as they are asked.

Mr. PEPPER. I was trying to lay the predicate for the conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does The Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to answer the question first.

In the first place, Mr. President, the stockholders' case is not in any way parallel to the case under consideration in connection with this bill. No one threatens stockholders. They have their rights as stockholders. Also, the Congress has passed law after law protecting minority stockholders, prescribing the form of proxy statements, prescribing how the elections must be run, and so forth. The Congress has gone much further in protecting the rights of minority stockholders in corporations than it has in protecting the rights of members of unions.

Even in this bill we do not tell the unions how they shall vote or how they shall conduct their affairs, although we have done so to corporations, taking such action in behalf of their minority stockholders.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator will admit that neither any already existing law—at least, any existing Federal law—nor this bill attempts to make it an unfair labor practice, to be adjudicated by the National Labor Relations Board, if the management of a corporation does anything that a stockholder might charge to be an act of intimidation. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. TAFT. That certainly is correct; I should think anyone would know that, because I do not see any relationship between the two, or any possible reason for dragging stockholders into a bill dealing with labor relations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a basic error which I think exists in the thinking of the able Senator from Ohio. Somehow or other, he seems to think that the workers do not have the same freedom of action to select their leaders that stockholders have to select theirs.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the two are in like category. Each has or should have freedom of action with its own leaders, and we should not apply to one a rule that is not applied to the other.

Mr. TAFT. Let me point out again that the men who are coerced may not have anything to do with the union at all. They may have nothing to do with the leaders of the union who attempt to coerce them. The leaders who attempt to coerce them may not have anything to do with the plant in which the employees in question work. Sometimes the union has not even gotten into the plant when they begin to coerce employees of the plant.

We had a case last year where a union went to a plant in California and said, "We want to organize your employees. Call them in and tell them to join our union." The employers said, "We have not any control over our employees. We cannot tell them, under the National Labor Relations Act." They said, "If you don't, we will picket your plant"; and they did picket it, and closed it down for a couple of months.

Coercion is not merely against union members; it may be against all employees.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was trying to show that, first, we should treat alike the stockholders and employees who belong to the respective employer and employee organizations. Secondly, I was trying to show that if the proposal were intended for the protection of employees belonging to a union, the employees were protected by their constitution, by their by-laws, and by the fact that they elected their own officials.

In the third place—and now the Senator will allow me to refer to the case he last mentioned—if he is trying to protect citizens against other citizens, I say that this is unnecessary, because the citizens of this country are still protected by law, by the law of the land, against coercion from other citizens or organizations. Therefore the citizen, in the case the Senator has put, did not have to go up into the room and talk to these men, and if they did have a right to strike, they had a right to strike, and their telling these men that they would strike under certain conditions was not the kind of coercion against which I think they are entitled, under this sort of a provision, to be protected.

Mr. TAFT. There is no law of any State providing that a man cannot threaten another man that if he does not join a union he may lose his job, or that something may happen to him other than actual physical violence. There are plenty of methods of coercion short of actual physical violence. So that in this section there is no duplication whatever. But suppose there is duplication in extreme cases; suppose there is a threat of violence constituting violation of the law of the State. Why should it not be an unfair labor practice? It is on the part of the employer. If an employer proceeds to use violence, as employers once did, if they use the kind of goon-squad tactics labor unions are permitted to use—and they once did—if they threaten men with physical violence if they join a union, they are subject to State law, and they are also subject to be proceeded against for violating the National Labor Relations Act. There is no reason in the world why there should not be two remedies for an act of that kind.

The distinguished Senator from New York cited the opposition of the National Labor Relations Board to the particular amendment we are discussing. I think it should be made perfectly clear that the National Labor Relations Board came before our committee and opposed every amendment to the National Labor Relations Act. The only amendments to which they agreed were amendments which had already been forced upon them by action of the Supreme Court. They were willing to have those written into the law.

I like the approach of the Senator from New York with regard to a conciliatory basis, an attempt to sit down with labor unions and agree with them—and in New York, no doubt, that could be done. But so far as I can see, the situation here in Washington makes that procedure impossible. The labor unions which appeared before us opposed every proposed change, with very minor exceptions. The National Labor Relations Board, as I have said, opposed every proposed change, except the incorporation into the law of things which were already in it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I apologize to the senior Senator from Ohio for interrupting his remarks, but right at that point there is something I should like to get into the RECORD.

I think all of us, in viewing this matter, should do so from the over-all aspect. We cannot take it from one corner or one angle and look at it that way. This bill presents an over-all approach to the solution of the difficulties with which we are now confronted.

In that connection, I should like to point out, in line with what the senior Senator from Ohio has just been saying,

that I do not always agree with the National Labor Relations Board, and I am sure the Senator from Ohio himself will bear me out in that statement. I did not always agree with the State labor relations board in the State of New York. But I desire to point out, in connection with the pending bill, that it provides for a joint congressional committee; and one of the chief functions of that committee, as it was one of the chief functions of the committee in the State of New York, is not only to follow the laws which have been enacted over a period of years, to ascertain how they are working and what corrections need to be made in them and to make recommendations accordingly, but to study the administration of those laws.

One of our great drawbacks at the present time is that there is too little knowledge, generally, as to how these laws have been administered. I for one feel that one of the great troubles with the whole labor relations question has been the maladministration which occurred in connection with the National Labor Relations Act in the beginning, and which continued for a number of years.

I desire to say for the RECORD that right now we have a good National Labor Relations Board; and I think the senior Senator from Ohio will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. TAFT. I do agree, otherwise I would not be willing to grant them the great additional powers we give them in the pending bill.

Mr. IVES. We may condemn, or criticize, or find fault with some of the procedures and some of the findings of our National Labor Relations Board, we may disagree with its recommendations made before the committee. I disagree with some of them, and I disagreed at times with the board in the State of New York. But we, as a committee, used to sit down with them and work out procedures, and that is what can be done with the National Labor Relations Board.

I do not think Congress realizes the infinite possibilities contained in this bill. It will be found that governmental administrative bodies are generally pretty reasonable, and I am sure that can be definitely said insofar as our present National Labor Relations Board is concerned. They welcome suggestions. They do not think they have the final answer to the questions we are considering. So, when it comes to the techniques of administration, the procedures to be followed, I believe firmly that the Congress of the United States, the chief legislative body in America, has a responsibility in this connection. We are the ones who pass the laws which are finally enacted. We have that particular basic responsibility, and our responsibility carries beyond that point. It carries to the point where we should know definitely at all times whether the legislation we are sponsoring and passing is working effectively, and as we intend it to work.

I apologize again to the senior Senator from Ohio for interrupting him but I think this matter is so vital that I should mention it at this point.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. The mere fact that we create a board to study matters further I do not think is an excuse for not dealing with an amendment as clear as the pending amendment or one which is so obviously necessary to place employers and employees on an equal basis, and protect the rights of employees against both.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I did not want to have that construction placed on my remarks.

Mr. TAFT. I was speaking for myself, not for the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I understand, but I do not want to have it construed that I am opposing the pending amendment because I think it is something which should be studied by the committee. I assume the committee may want to go into it. It is an appropriate question to investigate, but I am definitely opposed to the amendment on the basis of the amendment itself and all that it implies.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that, but the Senator urged, as an additional argument, that we have a commitee to study the question, and I was merely answering that additional argument.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New York that we should draw a line between the things we can do and the things we cannot do. I fully agree with that distinction. I agree that many things that people would like to do are probably impractical in the labor relations field. But the particular matter we are considering is not impractical. Merely to require that unions be subject to the same rules that govern employers, and that they do not have the right to interfere with or coerce employees, either their own members or those outside their union, is such a clear matter, and seems to me so easy to determine, that I would hope we would all agree. Just as we have eliminated the unfair labor practices on the part of employers, just as they have been practically stopped by the National Labor Relations Act, I would hope that this process, while slower than direct court action, would bring an absolute end to the practices of which we complain, practices which are testified to, practices which are known to exist.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is practically contained in the Wisconsin Labor Relations Act and has been used in Wisconsin as a means not only of preventing the coercion of employees but also of attempting, bringing such action as can be brought by administrative law, to end mass picketing. Of course, if administrative law fails, it would be necessary finally to resort to the police powers of the States. The Wisconsin Act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice on the part of unions—

> To hinder or prevent, by mass picketing, threats, intimidation, force, or coercion of any kind, the pursuit of any lawful work or employment, or to obstruct or interfere with entrance to or egress from any place of employment, or to obstruct or interfere with free and uninterrupted use of public roads, streets, highways, railways, airports, or other ways of travel or conveyance.

The Wisconsin provision goes further even than the proposed amendment, and is more definite; but the words "interfere with, restrain, or coerce" have been construed so long by the National Labor Relations Board in the case of employers that it seems the simplest matter, and the matter which will bring up the least litigation, to use the same words in this law, making it an unfair labor practice on the part of unions.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a practical amendment, one which is necessary if our theory of equality is to be carried out. Most of the arguments that have been made against it in the past have been arguments against any unfair labor practices on the part of unions. There has been accepted in the pending bill the principle that there can be unfair labor practices on the part of unions, and if there are any such unfair labor practices, then it is obvious that this is a most essential one to be included, a clear-cut one, one which is most parallel to the unfair labor practice on the part of employers. I can see no logical reason why it should not be covered by the bill, and if it is covered I can see no logical additional argument, on the part of unions against the passage of the bill, against its approval by the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

THE CUSTOMS BUREAU

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I desire to make a short report to the Senate on recent studies and findings of the committee in connection with the Customs Bureau. The press has carried a number of stories relative to conditions in this agency, and I think the time has come when the facts as revealed in committee findings to date should be laid before this body.

Our inquiry into the work of the Bureau was first prompted by the sudden dismissal of a majority of its law-enforcement officers on March 28 of this year, following the action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting the 1948 budget for the Bureau. However, the Expenditures Committee has by no means limited its inquiry to this phase of the Customs Bureau's operations.

Rather extensive hearings by the committee have developed facts which have been very unsatisfactory to members of the committee. To enumerate some of them, we have found that:

First. As a result of ill-considered, wholesale firing of border-patrol officers, the entire Canadian border from the eastern boundary of Montana to a point in Minnesota was left entirely unguarded—not a single patrol officer was left on duty. However, after the dismissal of all the patrol officers in this sector, the Bureau still retained all of its 58 clerical employees in the same area.

Second. Enforcement activities were weakened not only in this one sector but along all other stretches of the Canadian border, thereby throwing hundreds of

miles open to smuggling. A full force was retained only on the Mexican border.

Third. Port patrol activities were drastically cut. The number of such officers has now been reduced from 1,578 to 659—a reduction of 919 officers, or 58 percent.

Fourth. Administrative operations within the Bureau were so poor that these cuts could not be figured with even a reasonable degree of accuracy. For example: On March 18, 1947, 1,340, or 85 percent of the Bureau's 1,578 officers, were furloughed. Five days later 421 of these men were recalled to duty because the Bureau apparently was unable to figure accurately its money needs and had overestimated the lay-offs required. This amounts to gross incompetence.

Fifth. The committee believes that the large layoff of law enforcement officers was completely unwarranted inasmuch as practically no cuts in personnel were made in other branches of the service. It appears more like a bald attempt to arouse the public into demanding a restoration of the reduction in appropriations made by the House Appropriations Committee. That this scheme partially succeeded is evidenced by many letters of protest not only from the families of the men who were laid off but from merchants and others who saw their businesses menaced by throwing the border open to smuggling.

Sixth. The Bureau heads apparently discarded every idea of making horizontal cuts in order to meet a reduced appropriation. They have steadfastly maintained that cuts all along the line could not be made and have refused to consider doing so. Instead of cutting a few clerical jobs here and there so that the burden would be evenly distributed, they have chosen to leave large parts of our border entirely without enforcement officers.

Seventh. The Bureau has presented at least two different financial pictures to the committee and its staff. Its estimates of the deficit for 1948, under the House appropriations bill, run from $4,630,000 to $3,500,000 down to $2,226,000. To be charitable, this once again indicates a lack of good administrative management.

Eighth. Not all the troubles of the Bureau are of its own making. For example, we find that there are approximately 56 political appointees as collectors and comptrollers of customs at our various ports. The committee is informed that two of these appointees are at least 80 years of age and physically incapable of carrying out their duties. Many of these appointees are unqualified for the work, are irregular in attendance at their offices, and, as I have indicated, their claims to their positions are purely political. They cost the country over $400,000 a year. In one office it was found that the comptroller was a practicing physician who visited the customs office about once every 2 weeks—presumably on pay days. In all fairness, I want to say that this officer has recently been replaced. The committee intends to investigate this situation more fully and to report further at a later date. In any event, we feel that all collectors and comptrollers of customs, whether political appointees or not, should devote full time to the duties of their offices and be qualified by training and experience to perform those duties.

Ninth. The Customs Bureau is somewhat hampered by legislation in other respects which require it to spend more money than would otherwise be necessary.

(a) Legislation is needed to revise the Federal Pay Act to provide that employees of the Customs Bureau who perform compensable overtime work for the accommodation of importers and others need not be paid for such overtime until the company incurring the overtime makes payment to the United States. This action would eliminate the necessity for appropriating $300,000 used as an "advance fund," for the accommodation of importers. There is no reason why importers and transportation companies should not pay such expense themselves at the time it is incurred.

(b) Overtime laws need to be revised so as to make it possible to prescribe rotating tours of duty, which include Saturday afternoons and Sundays, but not in excess of 40 hours per week total worktime, without the necessity of paying overtime for Saturday afternoons and Sundays. The Bureau estimates that this action will save approximately $350,000 per year without injustice to its employees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to my able colleague from Vermont that he and his committee have done a very fine job in examining into this matter. I speak as a member of the subcommittee handling the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which has been hearing testimony on the budget for the Treasury Department and the customs service. The testimony brought out before that committee confirms what the able Senator from Vermont has pointed out, namely, that the entire reduction in the funds for the customs service was apparently applied to the particular group in the border patrol.

Furthermore the testimony shows that the customs service miscalculated, whether by accident or otherwise, and sent out dismissal notices to more than 400 employees to whom they later found it was not necessary to send out such notices. Of course, that made it necessary for a great many of those employees to contact their friends, and they in turn contacted the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House from the respective States. That situation was brought to the attention of our committee. I believe that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which the able Senator from Vermont is chairman, has done a very fine job, and I hope they will continue their work along this line.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California for his contribution. It is true that more than 400 of these men were laid off, I believe from Friday night to Monday morning, but during Saturday and Sunday they and their families and their friends and the people who live in their communities were certainly busy in communicating with the Members of Congress.

I shall now continue with the report.

(c) The Bureau annually makes about $15,000,000 in refunds. At the present time, the Comptroller General cannot question these refunds or do anything about those which he considers illegal or unwarranted. Legislation needs to be enacted giving the Comptroller General a right to order payments stopped and to insure a judicial review of Bureau actions.

For example, the Bureau has a peculiar arrangement concerning imported tobacco. The tobacco is weighed and a certain duty levied per pound. It is then moved on to a bonded warehouse owned by a manufacturer and the duty need not be paid until the expiration of 3 years, or sooner if the tobacco is actually put into manufacture. When manufacture takes place, about 10 percent of the tobacco leaf is wasted. This waste, consisting of stems and butts, is swept up and weighed and the Customs Bureau refunds the full amount of the tax on this poundage. It sometimes happens that the refund is made when the manufacturer has not paid the original tax.

The Comptroller General has taken the position that these refunds are not provided for by law. A year and a half ago he wrote the Attorney General concerning this practice but to date has not received a reply. These allegedly unwarranted tobacco duty refunds now amount to about $750,000. The Comptroller General has no means at his disposal for forcing the Attorney General to act or for preventing the Customs Bureau from making payment. Legislation to remedy this situation will be offered.

Other activities of the Bureau which are related to the work of other agencies of the executive branch have been gone into in a general way. We shall make further investigations and report at a later date. These are:

First. An investigation of the possibility of transferring the principal post audit functions of the Bureau to the General Accounting Office. There appears to be considerable duplication in this audit work where people from the Customs Bureau and from the General Accounting Office perform exactly the same functions.

In other words, one does the same work over again that has been performed by the other.

Second. An investigation into the possibility of consolidating certain police and enforcement functions of the Bureau with those of other Government agencies. There are at least six agencies, each with separate police or enforcement officers, charged with some sort of activity in connection with security at our borders. These are not coordinated except as each agency wishes to cooperate with the others. This situation can be improved. The committee will look into the matter more thoroughly.

In connection with our investigation into the work of the Customs Bureau, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder was

good enough to call on me and we had a very frank and free discussion. He was very cooperative and agreed in general with the findings and recommendations of the committee, except that he withheld judgment on the amount of money required.

After reviewing the evidence in the Customs Bureau case, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments voted to make the following recommendations:

First. That personnel cuts, if required to meet the amount appropriated for 1948, be made horizontally, as nearly as possible on a flat percentage basis, with the understanding that enforcement activities shall not bear more than 30 percent of the entire volume of personnel reductions.

Second. That the Bureau be instructed to set aside not more than $100,000 of whatever amount is appropriated for it in 1948 for the purpose of defraying the expense of a management study into its procedures, operations, and structure, and that the Secretary of the Treasury be instructed to proceed with this study as soon as possible.

After conferring with the Secretary, I am satisfied that he will welcome this suggestion on the part of the committee and will be only too glad to comply with it.

Third. That no more than $32,500,000 be appropriated for the Bureau for fiscal 1948. To meet this figure it will be necessary for the Congress to enact legislation revising the overtime laws to save $350,000 and to remove the necessity for the advance fund, relieving it of costs of $300,000.

The committee intends to initiate the necessary legislation to effect the savings mentioned above and to make certain other changes in the operations of the Bureau which we think will be to its advantage.

It is our opinion that the appropriation of $32,500,000 contained in the bill as it passed the House will be sufficient, if the proposed legislation is enacted and if the Bureau is thoroughly overhauled and reorganized.

The Legislative Reorganization Act specifically provides that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall inquire into the efficiency and economy with which departments and agencies are operated. It is pursuant to this authority that the committee has acted in the case of the Customs Bureau. We firmly believe that our work will be conducive to greater economy and better administration in the Bureau.

As time goes on the committee will take up the work of other bureaus and departments with a view to rectifying inequities and removing unnecessary administrative controls created by legislation; to establish a closer working relationship between the Congress and the executive branch; and to create a more direct and uniform control by the Congress of expenditures by the executive branch.

HENRY A. WALLACE—RADIO BROADCASTS BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country a matter which I think should be brought to the attention of the Congress as a whole and of the country.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that I have verified, at least factually, the statements I am now about to place in the RECORD. I have not the details, but in response to a call to the State Department I have been told that such a broadcast as is referred to in a letter which I have before me was in fact made on the morning of April 23, 1947—that is, a broadcast embracing the subject matter.

I read from a letter from a personal friend, a man of the highest integrity and character. I read but one paragraph. The letter is dated April 23, 1947.

> What do you think of Wallace now? It is interesting that this morning—the occasion, you might say, of the climax of his European tour—our Department of State broadcast for 15 minutes to Europe a laudatory account of Wallace, the occasion being a review of the recent book on The Three Wallaces.

I have asked the State Department for a confirmation of that statement, and I have waited for more than an hour and a half to receive a definite reply. I was advised that a broadcast was made, and that in the broadcast a review of the book The Three Wallaces was made to Europe on the morning of April 23, 1947.

I rise to ask, Mr. President, whether the right hand of our State Department knows what its left hand is doing. I submit that no more untimely broadcast could have been made by our State Department than the broadcast to which I have referred, at a time when Mr. Wallace, in Europe, was seeking to divide at least the sympathies of the British and the French people from our own people, and at a time when surely Mr. Wallace, who has held high office in this Government, should have known the natural, inevitable, and logical results of his voluntary acts.

I am not critical of the book. I do not know much about the book. I am not critical of anyone who may have sent such a broadcast, except to suggest that the untimeliness of such a broadcast certainly should be obvious to any child 10 years of age.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very much impressed by the statement of the able Senator from Georgia as to the contradictory actions on the part of our State Department. Can any Senator be at all surprised that this has happened, in view of the contradictory actions and the confused policy of the State Department recently revealed on the floor of the Senate in the discussion of the measure to provide aid to Greece and Turkey, which is now pending before the House of Representatives? We found that the State Department had come before a committee of the Senate at this very session asking for an appropriation to send a high-octane gasoline plant and other materials to Russia, and had then asked an appropriation to block certain action by Russia. So we are not very much surprised at the conduct of the State Department.

It is my earnest hope that these actions will be brought before the public and before the Congress from time to time, until there is at least a settled policy in our Department of State.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, under the United Nations the Economic Commission for Europe has been established as successor to the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, as successor to the European Coal Organization, and as successor to the European Central Inland Transport Organization. It has no substantive powers. It is purely an institution seeking to correlate information and make general recommendations in respect to the united economy of Europe. The new organization is meeting on May 2 for the first time.

The President has nominated William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, very appropriately it would seem to me, to be the representative of the United States. In view of the meeting of the Commission on May 2, I am taking the liberty of asking unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the present consideration of the nomination of Mr. Clayton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will be regarded as being in executive session.

The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Ferguson
Ball	Connally	Flanders
Brewster	Cooper	Fulbright
Bricker	Cordon	George
Bridges	Donnell	Green
Brooks	Downey	Gurney
Buck	Dworshak	Hatch
Bushfield	Eastland	Hawkes
Butler	Ecton	Hayden
Capper	Ellender	Hill

Hoey	Maybank	Smith
Holland	Millikin	Sparkman
Ives	Moore	Stewart
Jenner	Morse	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Thye
Kem	O'Conor	Tobey
Knowland	O'Daniel	Tydings
Langer	O'Mahoney	Umstead
Lodge	Overton	Vandenberg
McClellan	Pepper	Watkins
McFarland	Reed	Wherry
McGrath	Revercomb	White
McKellar	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
Malone	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Martin	Saltonstall	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, before any action is taken, I believe there is need for a complete understanding of all the surrounding circumstances and conditions which form the background for this proposed legislation.

Nearly 2 years ago, we reached a victorious conclusion to a long and bitter war, but we are still in the process of transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

This reconversion process has been attended by many dislocations and disputes, not the least among them being labor-management disputes. Unfortunately, these labor-management disputes have been seized upon by various groups as pretext, occasion, or reason for a widespread attack on the rights of labor.

Backed by a barrage of publicity which almost invariably emphasized the "labor" in "labor-management" disputes, and focused with painful clarity on the mote in labor's eye, the foes of labor bent their efforts to the task of hamstringing or destroying labor's hardwon advances, and even nonpartisans were brought to believe that the consequences of labor-management disputes could be avoided in some fashion by putting restrictions on labor. The result was the introduction into Congress of a large number of bills limiting labor's rights.

Mr. President, in many respects, the bill now before the Senate is an example of unfair and repressive legislation. I am not opposed to this bill in its entirety; in fact, during the time when the bill was under consideration by the committee, I voted for many of the provisions it now contains. But I think it has gone too far in many respects. I think we must analyze this proposed legislation with great care, and must thoroughly examine into its effect upon a large section of our population.

Mr. President, I wish to iterate and reiterate what I and my colleagues who have jointed with me in submitting the minority views have said, and what we have discussed among ourselves many times during the course of the hearings on this proposed legislation. As we have pointed out, the bill is designed to weaken the effective program of labor legislation which has been, with great pains, built up over the years. It would be destructive of much that is valuable in the prevention of labor-management conflicts. It contains many barriers, traps, and pitfalls that can only make more difficult the settlement of disputes. Its principal results wolud be to create misunderstanding and conflict, and to aggravate the imbalance between wages, prices, and profits which already endangers our prosperity.

The President in his state of the Union message of January 6, 1947, recommended:

> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

The President outlined certain immediate steps to be taken: (a) Legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes intended to compel employers to bargain with a minority union instead of the majority union in their plants; (b) legislation to provide for peaceful and binding determinations of jurisdictional disputes over which union is entitled to perform a particular work task; (c) legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act; and (d) legislation to provide for final and binding arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation of the terms of collective-bargaining agreements.

We would support legislation carrying out these recommendations. We are opposed, however, to legislation which goes beyond these recommendations and undermines the foundation laid by the administration for the promotion of free collective bargaining. We are opposed to legislation such as is included in the committee majority bill which fails to distinguish between justifiable and unjustifiable secondary boycotts and proscribes all boycotts indiscriminately as unfair labor practices. We are also opposed to those provisions of this bill which instead of merely providing machinery for the binding determination of questions concerning the meaning of contract terms, opens the Federal courts wide to suits for breach of contract without regard to the ordinary prerequisites of Federal jurisdiction.

The President in his state of the Union message recommended as a second point in his program for dealing with labor-management controversies, the strengthening of facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting the processes of free and voluntary collective bargaining. As he stated in his message:

> There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

The majority bill does not strengthen the facilities of the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor as recommended by the President. On the contrary, it removes the Service from the Department of Labor and establishes a new Federal Mediation Service. This proposal violates sound principles of administration by adding to the already numerous existing agencies handling labor disputes and will promote disorder and confusion in the conduct of the Federal Government's conciliation and mediation activities.

The President also called in his message, as part of his program for dealing with labor disputes, for broadening Federal programs of social legislation to alleviate the causes of workers' insecurity. The President pointed out:

> On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill, I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor relations but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society. In this connection, for example, the Congress should consider the extension and broadening of our social-security system, better housing, a comprehensive national health program, and provision for a fair minimum wage.

The problems involved in attempting to deal with the difficult and complicated labor controversies of this time are not merely matters of governmental machinery. We cannot approach these problems solely on the basis of prohibitions and restrictions on the activities of private citizens whether they be employers, labor organizations, or their members. The causes of labor-management controversy lie deep in the complex industrial and financial structure.

Without attention to the problems to which the President directed attention in his message on the state of the Union, such legislation as the Congress may enact may well take on unwittingly the character of "vindictive," "punitive" legislation against which the Congress has frequently been warned. Measures to extend and broaden the social-security system, to provide for better housing, to establish a comprehensive national health program, and to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to a level commensurate with present-day conditions are pending before the Congress. In the absence of action on these measures by this Congress, the proposal of the majority may well promote instead of resolve the industrial discord and strife which they, like we, wish to avoid.

The proposal of the committee majority for the formation of a joint congressional committee to study labor-management relations departs in two important respects from the recommendations of the President with respect to such a study. He proposed the establishment of a temporary joint commission composed not only of Members of Congress but of representatives of the public, labor, and management. In so recommending the President had in mind, as he said, that—

> We must not, however, adopt punitive legislation. We must not, in order to punish a few labor leaders, pass vindictive laws which will restrict the proper rights of the rank and file of labor. We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

We must remember, in reviewing the record of disputes in 1946, that management shares with labor the responsibility for failure to reach agreements which would have averted strikes. For that reason we must realize that industrial peace cannot be achieved merely by laws directed against labor unions.

Accordingly, the President recommended that the commission which should study labor relations should have among its members representatives whose interests are directly involved in all labor disputes, namely, the public, management, and labor.

The President also recommended in his message that the commission which he proposed make its first report, including specific legislative recommendations, not later than March 15, 1947. The majority of the committee, however, have followed an entirely different course of action. They have attempted to deal, without prior study by a commission such as that proposed by the President, with a great variety of problems, grouped together in an omnibus bill, which include not only matters which can properly be dealt with at this time on the basis of presently available experience and study, but also questions which require the full study and investigation which the President felt should be referred to the proposed commission, including: First, Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest; second, methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process; and third, the underlying causes of labor-management disputes.

The committee has had before it since January 10, 1947, Senate Joint Resolution 22 which would create a temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations along lines proposed by the President in his message. The minority believe that such a study is an essential preliminary to any Federal labor legislation designed to promote labor-management peace and stability which will be fair to the public, to management, and to labor alike. The majority have, however, proceeded without such an investigation and have in a single omnibus bill proposed legislation which will outlaw the closed shop and secondary boycotts, both justified and unjustified, provide for the establishment of a new independent Federal Mediation Service outside the Department of Labor, revive the use of labor injunctions in certain cases, establish complicated procedures for handling disputes in Nation-wide industries and authorize suits by and against labor organizations in the Federal courts without regard to the ordinary requirements of Federal jurisdiction.

Only such completely repressive measures as the Hartley bill—H. R. 3020—could make this measure seem mild. Judged by the needs of the times, or the ideal of fairness in labor relations, or the evils sought to be reached, it is a harsh bill. Some few of its provisions are useful and progressive; some others are innocuous. But the remainder look backward rather than forward. They would seriously weaken collective bargaining which in recent days has provided dramatic illustrations of its efficacy as the solution of industrial problems. We do not say, and in the work of the committee have not said, that all provisions of this bill are unwise, nor have we taken the position that no legislation can be acceptable. We respect the motives of our colleagues, and on many matters we have found them reasonable and willing to eliminate proposals which to us seemed indefensible. On matters of such moment, however, judgment will differ.

President Truman and the people are aware that our present problem is one of swollen prices and high profits. One marvels at the audacity of those who, drawing to themselves an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth, successful with the help of congressional allies in liquidating many of the popular protections against extortion, now call for another Battle of the Bulge against workers' last and best protection—their trade-unions. In the name of "fairness" many of them would give more to those who have and less to those who have not; in the name of "equality" they would increase maldistribution of wealth; masquerading as protesters against monopoly they would weaken the remaining barrier to concentration of industrial power. Enough of their position is included in this bill to make it but one further example of a determination to resurrect those mistakes of 1920–29 which led inevitably to the horrors of 1929–33.

The negative attitude of this bill should be replaced by a genuinely affirmative program for the removal of the causes of worker protest and insecurity, higher minimum wages, improved safety legislation, a genuine housing program, expanded protection for the victims of our industrial society. We must go forward rather than stand still.

The bill seems to us a distillate of fears. The successive and creditable rejection by the committee of many extreme proposals—which may be renewed—evidences a justified fear of worker retaliation at the polls. Yet the retention of many equally unwise provisions manifests a fear that those large corporate interests which have demanded repressive antilabor legislation may not be satisfied with the measure. The necessity for grudging inclusion in the bill of many presently applied rules conceals the fear of admitting that, on the whole, Federal labor policy under the wise leadership of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman has been fair, forthright, and progressive. The adoption, in some measure, as a small segment of the bill, of the program outlined by the President in his state of the Union message illustrates a fear of rejecting present objectives as the policy of the Federal Government.

This bill does not so much turn back the clock as stop it dead. To this point, our labor policy has been premised on the assumption that collective bargaining—and trade-unions which are essential to collective bargaining—are institutions to be strengthened and fostered. We have felt that there is no alternative to collective bargaining if we are to retain a democratic society. While recognizing the imperfections and occasional past failures of collective bargaining, we have sought to improve and develop it. Now, this bill calls on industrial relations to mark time, as if we were to say to the medical profession that there should be no further advancement in surgery for a season. By the denial of well-recognized rights, by hampering restrictions, and by confining rules, this measure, in the interest only of a few industrialists who have never accepted the spirit of the National Labor Relations Act, calls a halt to progress in industrial relations.

It does this in a variety of fashions:

It excludes entirely from the number of those who are to benefit under Federal legislation certain agricultural workers who are in reality industrial workers, and supervisors, who also have their problems.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Montana is aware that all the bill does in regard to agricultural workers is to define them. They are not defined in the National Labor Relations Act as it now stands. It simply adopts the definition of "agricultural worker" which is in the Fair Labor Standards Act, and which, by reason of a rider on the appropriation bill last year, is the definition which NLRB is now following, and to which, as I understood their testimony, the Board itself has no substantial objection. The definition does leave covered by the proposed act packing sheds and the so-called "industrial operations" in connection with farming, and merely excludes packing actually done on the farm as an incident to the farmer's operations.

Mr. MURRAY. My recollection is that the definition under this bill does exempt many workers who perform industrial work on single farms, such as freezing, packaging, and canning.

Mr. BALL. I think no canning factory is affected. They are all covered by the act, as they are now. This bill does not change in the slightest degree the definition presently being used by the Board. It may exclude a few thousand that the Board, otherwise, by its own definition, since there is none in the act as it now stands, might have covered.

Mr. MURRAY. In addition to these people it does exclude supervisors.

Mr. BALL. Yes. The Senator is talking about agricultural workers.

Mr. MURRAY. I mentioned in the same sentence both agricultural workers and supervisors.

Mr. BALL. Of course, as the Senator knows, the Board is split 2 to 1, now, on that particular point.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, proceeding with my statement, the bill slices a wedge out of the Norris-LaGuardia Act by making application for labor injunctions mandatory in certain types of labor disputes.

It calls for the splitting up of trade-unions in many industries where collective bargaining is working well.

It gives an undue recognition to company-dominated unions by requiring

that they be placed on the ballot under certain circumstances.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I do not quite understand the point the Senator is making. All the bill provides is that in considering charges of company domination the NLRB shall treat independent unions and affiliated unions in exactly the same way. I cannot see that that requires them to put a company-dominated union on the ballot. It merely says they shall treat AFL unions and so-called independent unions in exactly the same way. Does the Senator think they should be treated differently?

Mr. MURRAY. My understanding is that it permits a union which has been known as a company union to be placed on the list, regardless of the fact that its past history has been that it was a company-controlled union.

Mr. BALL. There is nothing in the bill that so provides. All the bill, as it came from the committee, says is that in considering unfair-labor-practice charges, under section 8 (a) (2), that the company is dominating the union, they shall treat all unions alike, regardless of whether they are affiliated with an international union or not. If that is requiring the Board to place a company-dominated union on the ballot, I do not understand the English language. I do not think it does that. It is placed in the bill in response to many protests, as the Senator knows, from independent unions, that in the past the Board has discriminated against independent unions and followed one rule for independent unions and an entirely different rule for so-called affiliated unions.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, the Senator may have that view of it, but the language of the bill as I read it indicates the situation I have stated.

Mr. BALL. Can the Senator point out the language in the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot take the time at this moment. I shall be glad to look it up, and if I am mistaken I shall be very glad to be corrected. I should like to conclude my address as soon as I can.

It requires that charges of unfair labor practices be filed within 6 months after their commission, the shortest statute of limitations known to the law, thereby offering a premium to those employers who conceal commission of unfair labor practices.

It weakens the Conciliation Service by removing it from the Department of Labor, where it properly belongs, for no reason other than the desire to "do something," regardless of merit.

It severely limits the right to strike in a variety of circumstances.

It requires the holding of elections by the Federal Government on the issue of union security, and the holding of other elections before certain strikes become legal, despite the unhappy experience of the Smith-Connally Act.

In a multitude of ways it hampers the effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Board.

It requires labor unions to file burdensome reports with the Secretary of Labor under penalty of denial of rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

It provides, in the case of union-employer suits alone, that suits may be brought in Federal courts without the ordinary jurisdictional requirements of the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship.

It disregards in material respects President Truman's suggestions for the establishment of an investigating commission on labor problems.

We now turn to a discussion of the specific provisions of the bill to illustrate how these undesirable results would be reached.

Provisions specifically prohibiting area-wide and industry-wide collective bargaining were rejected by the committee for inclusion in the bill as reported. We approve this action by the committee but, in view of announcements by some member of the committee that they intend to reinsert such provisions through amendments offered on the floor of the Senate, we have set forth the considerations which motivated us in supporting the striking of such provisions from the bill.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that more than 4,000,000 workers in American industry are covered by contracts between a union and more than one employer. Some of these are industry-wide; most are regional or city-wide in character. A ban on such bargaining would disrupt existing relationships in these industries and make it necessary to renegotiate contracts covering 4,000,000 workers. Instead of negotiations resulting in a relative handful of agreements which cover thousands of employers as a group, the result would be piecemeal negotiations with thousands of individual employers, over a prolonged period of time, with thousands of individual agreements splintering the uniform standards previously achieved through industry bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. MURRAY. I should prefer to conclude; but if the Senator wishes to suggest a correction, I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to call the Senator's attention only to the fact that the collective-bargaining provisions which were in the draft bill and which are now presented as an amendment, which has been printed and which is on the desks of Senators, do not prohibit Nation-wide bargaining and would not outlaw any of the Nation-wide agreements to which the Senator refers. They would merely give more autonomy to local unions to refuse to participate or to withdraw from national bargaining if they wish to do so. They do not prohibit Nation-wide bargaining.

Mr. MURRAY. But they would cause dislocations to occur and cause widespread unrest.

Mr. TAFT. Only if the local union or the union of a particular company wished to withdraw from national bargaining they would permit the union to do so, just as an employer can withdraw from an employers' association and sign up with his own employees. I think the Senator from Montana overstates the effect of the amendment which is proposed.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot quite understand the benefit that would result from the provisions of the amendment in this respect. It seems to me that it would certainly be just as well to leave the act as it is.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I shall not argue the question now because it will be argued at length later, but I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that I think the Senator merely overstates the effect of the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, industry-wide bargaining is a logical development of present-day industrial organization. Employers are organized on an industry-wide scale; first in Nation-wide corporations, and second in trade associations. Competition is Nation-wide in character.

We should like to indicate what would be the effect of a ban on industry-wide bargaining on present-day industrial relations.

Any attempt to ban actions by employers to form voluntary associations for the purpose of collective bargaining would deny this group the protection accorded employee organizations. In many trades and industries, employers have joined together to bargain with unions representing their employees. In such industries as longshoring and building construction—where workers change employers from day to day or week to week—bargaining through employers' associations is the only practical method for establishing uniform wages and working conditions and eliminating cutthroat competition. Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, in a statement before the committee, warned that a ban against industry-wide bargaining would result in a diversity of wage rates and working conditions among ships operated from the same coast, plying between the same ports, tying at the same docks, and employing, in turn, the same men:

> Such a condition leads to the playing off of one steamship company against another by the unions, to extreme labor unrest, and eventually to the disruption of steamship operation.

Many employers prefer industry-wide or association bargaining. Mr. Vincent P. Ahearn, executive secretary of the National Sand and Gravel Association, testified before the committee:

> Some employers believe that if they could not bargain on an industry-wide basis, unions could simply isolate one employer after another and force capitulation to their demands.

This would create a situation where the weakest member of an industry would set the standard for the others.

Because numerous employers are covered by a single collective-bargaining agreement, less time is lost in the bargaining process. Settlements are made simultaneously for these employers

rather than on an individual employer-by-employer basis. Industrial peace is achieved in one step rather than over a prolonged period of time. Bargaining with hundreds of individual firms for the same things is both wasteful and unfair to both sides.

Many small employers lack the skill in bargaining and research facilities available to unions. A ban on associations of employers combining for the purpose of pooling their knowledge and resources in collective-bargaining negotiations would impair the bargaining power of employers.

Industry-wide agreement on wages protects wage standards from being undercut by lower-wage areas and lower-wage employers. By the same token, industry-wide bargaining may save individual employers from being singled out as wage leaders in their respective industries. A ban on such agreements would result in separate agreements with individual locals. Many firms control or own subsidiary plants in districts outside an immediate geographic area. Such firms would have to negotiate agreements with numerous local unions in widely scattered localities—a task that would unavoidably become snarled up in wage differentials and eventually would revive the old cutthroat competition and the law of the jungle between company and company, between area and area.

The charge is made that industry-wide bargaining leads to industry-wide strikes which threaten the public welfare. We should like to emphasize that it is not the character of the bargaining which brings about major strikes, but the organized joint refusal of that industry's employers to meet the union's demands. Under company-by-company bargaining employers would try to drive standards down to the level of the lowest in the industry, and unions would seek to attain the level of the highest, and the result would be an epidemic of strikes throughout the various units of the industry.

A ban on industry-wide bargaining would minimize the role of the international union and prohibit it from exercising its authority to intervene in strikes of its affiliates and prevent it from employing its prestige in its own industry for moderation and restraining counsel.

In order for the Senate fully to realize the potential impact of a ban on industry-wide bargaining by large geographical areas, we call attention to a study recently prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows the extent of bargaining in specific industries with associations and groups of employers. A careful examination of these industry groupings must of necessity uphold the committee's action in deleting that part of the bill which would seek to disrupt existing collective-bargaining practices which have developed in the past decades.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of such industries.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Area coverage of group bargaining showing area of bargaining with associations or groups of employers, by industry

Bargaining on a national or industry-wide scale	Bargaining by geographic (regional) areas	Bargaining within a city, county, or metropolitan area
Coal mining	Canning and preserving foods [1]	Baking
Elevator installation and repair	Dyeing and finishing textiles [1]	Beverages, nonalcoholic
Glass and glassware	Fishing	Book and job printing and publishing
Installation of automatic sprinklers	Hosiery	Building service and maintenance
Pottery and related products	Leather (tanned, curried, and finished) [1]	Clothing, men's [2]
Stoves	Longshoring [1]	Clothing, women's [2]
Wallpaper	Lumber [1]	Confectionery products
	Maritime	Construction
	Metal mining	Cotton textiles
	Nonferrous metals and products, except jewelry and silverware [1]	Dairy products
	Paper and pulp	Furniture [2]
	Shoes, cut stock and findings [1]	Hotel and restaurant
		Jewelry and silverware
		Knit goods
		Laundry and cleaning and dyeing
		Leather products, other
		Malt liquors
		Meat packing
		Newspaper printing and publishing
		Paper products, except wallpaper
		Silk and rayon textiles
		Steel products, except stoves [2]
		Tobacco
		Trade [2]
		Trucking and warehousing [2]

[1] There also is some bargaining on a city, county, and/or metropolitan-area basis.
[2] There also is some bargaining on a regional and/or industry-wide basis.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill as reported disregards the expert testimony heard by the committee which emphasized the stabilizing influence of union-security arrangements, voluntarily entered into, upon labor relations. Section 8 (3) of the present National Labor Relations Act permits an employer to enter into a closed-shop, union-shop, or maintenance-of-membership agreement with the recognized representative of a majority of his employees in an appropriate bargaining unit. This bill would outlaw the closed shop and would permit a maintenance-of-membership or union-shop agreement only under limited and administratively burdensome conditions. It would require revision of union-security arrangements based on the closed-shop principle covering nearly a third of all workers covered by collective-bargaining agreements when such agreements expire. Contracts covering 77 percent of all employees covered by collective-bargaining agreements would be affected.

Section 8 (a) (3) of the act, as amended by this bill, retains the present limitations upon the employer's right to enter into a union-security arrangement and adds others which would result in limiting and substantially diluting current practices and arrangements with respect to union security. This section permits an agreement requiring employees to join the union not more than 30 days after the employment begins. The agreement, however, may be made only with a recognized collective-bargaining representative which has been authorized, in accordance with a new section 9 (e), to enter into such agreements by a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit as determined in a secret ballot conducted by the Board.

Section 8 (a) (3) further forbids an employer to discriminate against an employee for nonmembership in a union even under the permitted type of union-security contract where the employer has reasonable grounds for believing that the employee was not offered membership on the same terms as the other union members or that he was deprived of or denied union membership for any reason other than a failure to pay prescribed dues and initiation fees, or that he engaged in activity to secure a new Board determination on the question of representation at a time when such question might properly be raised.

The effect of these provisions is virtually to make the employer the judge of the justifiability of firing or retaining a nonunion employee under a union-shop contract. The bill does not say that employees must in fact have been deprived or denied membership in the union for the reasons stated. It merely states that the employer must have reasonable grounds for so believing. Thereby, the right of the union to require the employment of union members only is made to depend wholly upon the subjective beliefs of the employer, even if such beliefs are contrary to the facts. The Board in controversies concerning these matters would be under the necessity of determining not a state of facts but a state of mind.

The additional burden thrown upon the Board by these provisions respecting union security is great. It is estimated that there are some twenty to thirty thousand collective-bargaining agreements containing union security provisions at present in effect. Under the present act, the Board has fallen far behind in its processing of cases involving employer unfair labor practices and representation questions. Under this bill it would be required to conduct balloting to determine authorization to enter into union-security agreements and balloting to determine rescissions of such authorizations. It would be required, too, to investigate and prohibit alleged unfair labor practices by unions as well as by employers, and it would have the task of discovering an employer's subjective beliefs in refusing to fire nonunion employees under union-shop contracts.

Section 8 (b) (2) contains further restrictions on union-security arrangements. Labor organizations which attempt to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee who has

been deprived of or denied union membership for any reason other than nonpayment of dues and initiation fees would commit an unfair labor practice. This provision together with those of section 8 (a) (3) previously discussed would deprive even permissible union-security arrangements of their effectiveness in stabilizing labor-management relations.

Even under a union-security contract which this bill permits, an employee could with impunity completely defy the union. He could defame it, he could betray confidential union information, he could seek to wreck it, attempt to bring it into disrepute, act as a spy or stoolpigeon or strikebreaker, be a racketeer or a grafter, and yet the union would have no effective sanction against him. If he pays or offers to pay his dues and initiation fees the employer need not fire him, and any attempt by the union to persuade the employer to do so would be an unfair labor practice on the part of the union. The union would be completely shorn of effective power to discipline its members for good cause.

If these provisions are merely designed to outlaw the closed-shop closed-union arrangement and to permit union-security agreements not based on the closed-union practice, they have gone far beyond what is needed to achieve that purpose.

Section 9 (c) (3) would also provide that strikers not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote in a Board election unless such strike involves an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer.

As we understand this provision it would prevent employees who go out on strike because of a dispute over such matters as wages, hours, or working conditions from voting in a Board election held during the strike. This restriction is not conditioned upon replacement or an offer of reinstatement by the employer. It is automatic.

We deem it highly undesirable because it enables an employer to secure the rejection of an established bargaining agent at the very time that the public interest makes it particularly urgent that collective bargaining continue. The employer can in some case achieve this result merely by filing a petition for an election—or encouraging a dissident group to file such a petition—as soon as his employees go out on strike. In such an election, the strikers who normally would constitute the bulk of the union's adherents could not vote. The defeat of the bargaining agent is thus assured. Antiunion employers are thus encouraged to refuse settlement of disputes in order to bring about strikes and thereby secure the defeat of the collective-bargaining representative. We can think of few provisions in this bill better calculated to produce and prolong strife and to defeat collective bargaining.

Section 9 (b) of the bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to leave the National Labor Relations Board little or no discretion with respect to the appropriate bargaining unit in two situations where the exercise of discretion is now permitted under the National Labor Relations Act and, in the interest of sound industrial relations, should be preserved. First, the bill would bar the Board from finding appropriate a unit of both professional and nonprofessional employees unless a majority of the professionals voted for inclusion in the unit. The decisions of the Board reveal that it seldom includes professionals in the same unit with other employees, but this restriction on the discretion of the Board would require the Board to wholly ignore existing and satisfactory bargaining patterns and units.

Section 9 (b) of the bill would prohibit the Board from deciding a craft unit to be inappropriate on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the craft unit vote against separate representation. This provision, in its effect, would tend to fragmentize unions based upon any membership broader than that of a single craft. We recognize that some of the State labor relations acts, such as that of New York, contain similar provisions, though that act requires a vote for rather than against separate representation. However, while these may be appropriate when applied to small enterprises such as are regulated by the State acts, they are inappropriate when applied to the large enterprises covered by the national act. The provision can only have an unsettling effect on many industries such as the automobile, rubber, and electrical industries, which include in a single enterprise numerous crafts. In such industries, raiding by rival unions would be encouraged and employers would be forced to deal with many craft unions rather than a single large industrial union. The provision, if enacted into law, would seriously disturb existing labor relations in large segments of our economy and would allow no room for the play of administrative discretion on this issue—one of the most troubled with which the National Labor Relations Board has had to deal. Any proposal such as the one here involved can only aggravate an already complicated problem. We can see no useful purpos to be served by a change in the present law in this respect but, on the contrary, feel that by permitting small groups to break up an established unit against the will of a majority of the employees, stability and responsibility in collective bargaining may be seriously disrupted.

Under the present rules of the Board, an employer may file a petition where two or more labor organizations have presented conflicting claims that each represents a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit. In addition, where an employer doubts a union's majority status in good faith, he need only decline to bargain. Section 9 (c) (1) (B) would provide, however, that an employer could also file a petition whenever one labor organization presented a claim to be recognized. The most serious objection to the proposed amendment is that in situations where unions are established in a plant and only questions of continuing majority are involved, the Board would not clearly have discretion to dismiss the petition if there was no reasonable basis in fact for the employer to doubt that the labor organization still represents a majority. This is most important and should not be left to statutory interpretation. Unless the Board has such discretion, employers seeking to avoid collective bargaining acquire a useful device for delay by filing petitions. Moreover, unions would be compelled to engage in election campaigns at the close of each bargaining term and would be tempted to make unreasonable demands in order to retain the allegiance of the employees. Uninterrupted and stable bargaining relations would thus be impaired.

Section 9 (c) (1) (A) (ii) of the bill would allow a petition for an election to be filed by employees who assert that "the individual or labor organization which has been certified or is being currently recognized as the bargaining representative is no longer a representative as defined in section 9 (a)." Such a petition would be purely negative, filed by persons who do not want a collective-bargaining representative.

The encouragement of collective bargaining and the maintenance of stable relationships already established would be seriously impeded if the above provision were enacted into law. Under the guise of protecting the freedom of workers, the section would furnish employers with a useful device for undermining the position of the bargaining agent and for delaying collective bargaining. By encouraging dissident groups to file petitions, the employer can repeatedly bring into issue the majority status of the bargaining representatives. How useful a device it could be becomes apparent when we realize that under the Board's present budgetary situation, it takes approximately 6 months to process a contested election case. A year could very easily elapse, therefore, between the election and the consummation of the bargaining negotiations by a contract. At this point, a group of dissident employees, with or without the encouragement of the employer, might demand a new election under this provision, thereby delaying or defeating collective bargaining.

We have not yet reached the point in labor-management relations where employers generally have fully accepted the principles of collective bargaining. Until we reach that point we must not, in the interests of the American people, furnish antiunion employers with statutory techniques by the use of which they can avoid or defeat the collective-bargaining process.

Sections 8 (a) (6) and 8 (b) (5) would make it an unfair labor practice for either an employer or a labor organization to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement or of an agreement to submit a labor dispute to arbitration and would require the National Labor Relations Board to dismiss any charge under these subsections if the complainant has committed a similar breach. There can be no question that collective-bargaining agreements, like other contracts, should be faithfully performed by the parties. In most labor-management relationships they are so performed, and disputes over the meaning of the terms of the agreement are generally resolved peacefully by negotiation or arbitration.

These sections may appear to carry out the recommendations of the President's state of the Union message. However, these proposals contain no provision requiring the disputants to utilize procedures prescribed by their collective-bargaining agreement or to exhaust mediation and conciliation processes prior to resort to the Board. Although the bill elsewhere makes available machinery for voluntary conciliation, mediation, and arbitration, resort to these is not required as a condition precedent to filing a charge of an unfair labor practice for breach of a collective-bargaining agreement.

The effect of this omission would be to discourage the voluntary adjustment of disputes and unnecessarily increase the number of cases coming before the Board. In this connection it should be noted that experience with the War Labor Board during the recent war has demonstrated that the immediate availability of an agency for settling disputes, without a preliminary requirement of resort to all the processes of negotiation, mediation, and conciliation, discourages the parties from settling such disputes themselves by voluntary adjustment. The results, therefore, might well be a disuse of the collective-bargaining process and a congestion of cases before the Board which would make it impossible to settle disputes promptly in an area where prompt settlement is essential to the cause of industrial peace.

Finally sections 8 (a) (6) and 8 (b) (5) together with section 301 would give rise to a conflict of jurisdiction between the National Labor Relations Board and the United States district courts. This latter section permits suits in the United States district courts for violations of collective-bargaining agreements. Parties to such agreements have the choice of bringing their action before the Board or the United States district courts. Obviously the necessity for uniform decisions in such matters and the avoidance of conflicting decisional rules by judicial bodies make this legislative scheme wholly undesirable.

Section 301 of title II of the bill gives the Federal district courts broad jurisdiction to entertain suits for breach of collective-bargaining contracts in industries affecting interstate commerce, regardless of the amount in controversy and of the citizenship of the parties. This section permits suits by and against a labor organization representing employees in such industries, in its common name, with money judgments enforceable only against the organization and its assets.

The Federal courts have always had jurisdiction to entertain suits for breach of collective-bargaining contracts, and have awarded money damages where the amount in controversy fulfills the present $3,000 requirement and diversity of citizenship exists.

Every district court would still be required to look to State substantive law to determine the question of violation. This section does not, therefore, create a new cause of action, but merely makes the existing remedy available to more persons by removing the requirements of amount in controversy and of diversity of citizenship where interstate commerce is affected.

The abandonment of the present amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship requirements is an unwise departure from existing law, which would impose a needlessly increased burden upon the Federal courts, already weighted down with litigation. An examination of figures showing the case load in these courts demonstrates the extraordinarily crowded conditions of their dockets. According to the annual reports of the Attorney General, the number of civil actions of all kinds pending in the United States district courts have risen from 29,394 on June 30, 1941, to 46,840 on June 30, 1946, constituting an increase of more than 63 percent. During this period the number of such cases commenced in these courts similarly increased from 38,477 to 67,835 and the number of such cases terminated rose from 38,561 to 61,000. Although the Federal courts appear to be handling this increased load as efficiently as possible, it is obvious that there are human limitations upon the capacity of present staffs and that constant increase in litigation can only be met by an increase in the number of judges and court personnel, with corresponding increases in the cost of government. The alternative would be a break-down in our judicial system.

These cases involve not only questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States in the myriad fields now encompassed within the scope of Federal regulation, but also controversies arising under the laws of the various States where diversity of citizenship provides the basis for Federal jurisdiction. Yet, in the face of these conditions prevailing in the administration of justice, the Federal courts would be made an available tribunal for every petty cause of action between citizens of the same State, and, undoubtedly in many instances, residences of the same community, with application by the Federal judge of exactly the same principles of law which would govern the controversy if it were brought before a State judge in the more numerous State courts.

Added to these practical objections are serious questions concerning the legality of abandoning the diversity-of-citizenship requirement. The Constitution limits suits in the Federal courts, inter alia, to cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States or involving diversity of citizenship—Constitution, article III, section 2.

Reflection upon these practical and legal objections to this phase of the bill lead to the conclusion that very little useful purpose would be served by making Federal courts more broadly available for the adjudication of disputes under collective-bargaining agreements. The only advantage, if indeed it may be called an advantage, is to give many disputing parties an otherwise unavailable opportunity to choose a Federal forum rather than a State forum. The substantive law governing the settlement of the dispute would not be changed in the least, no matter which forum were chosen. It is our conviction that the added burdens upon the Federal courts and the doubtful legality of this measure constitute an extravagant price to pay for a needless indulgence benefiting litigants whose remedies are now as adequate in the State courts as they would be in the Federal courts.

It is believed that the provisions of this section, which permit suits by or against a labor organization in its common name, fail to give proper consideration to the present case with which these organizations may now sue or be sued in the Federal courts regardless of whether they represent employees in industries affecting interstate commerce. Whenever a substantive right under Federal law is asserted by or against such associations the right to sue or be sued by common name is clearly granted regardless of State procedural laws.

It was clearly shown by testimony at the hearings that unions are not immune from suit under State law because they are labor organizations. Union assets are sometimes reached only with difficulty under some State laws solely because unions are unincorporated associations. At the present time, however, a great majority of States permit effective suits against unincorporated associations or provide effective means of reaching their funds. By conservative estimate, 25 State laws now provide that these associations may be sued in their common names, in some instances with liability attaching not only to the union funds but also to the assets of every individual member of the union. At least 10 other States allow representative suits against the union members in any form of action, thereby enabling satisfaction of judgment from the joint assets. In only 13 States, at most, are there presented difficulties in reaching the assets of the unions as distinguished from those of individual members who are sued. Even in these 13 States, however, representative suits are permitted in equity cases and doctrines of waiver and estoppel are frequently applied to prevent the union from denying that it is an entity similar to a corporation when it is sued in its common name. The over-all result is that unions are readily amenable to suit in the Federal courts in at least 35 of the States in which Federal courts are held.

Sections 206–210 of the bill would provide special machinery for handling cases affecting the national health or safety. These sections would authorize the Attorney General to obtain injunctive relief in Federal courts whenever he deems a threatened or actual strike or lock-out to be of sufficient magnitude to imperil the national health or safety. The Attorney General would not be authorized under the bill to petition for an injunction until after he had received a report as to the facts involved in the dispute, to be made by a board of inquiry appointed by the Attorney General. The boards of inquiry would be given power to issue subpenas for attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents.

Upon issuance of an injunction by the district court, the parties would be under a duty to use the facilities of the Federal Mediation Service to assist them in the settlement of their dispute.

Under section 209 (b), if the parties have not reached agreement within 60 days of the issuance of the injunction, the Attorney General would reconvene the board of inquiry, and the board would report to him the current positions of the parties. Report of the board would be made public by the Attorney General. Within the next 15 days a secret ballot would be taken by the National Labor Relations Board to determine whether the employees wished to accept the final offer of settlement made by the employer.

Section 210 provides that upon the certification of the results of the ballot or upon a settlement being reached, whichever occurs sooner, the Attorney General is directed to move for the discharge of the injunction. Upon discharge of the injunction the Attorney General is directed to submit to the President a full report of the proceedings, and the President is directed to transmit such report together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action.

Under these sections of the act the Attorney General, boards of inquiry, Federal district courts, Federal Mediation Service, the President, and the Congress would all be participating in the handling of a single labor dispute. We believe that the handling of labor disputes should be concentrated in one agency. Diffusion of responsibility would confuse the handling of these important matters. The public would be unable to fix responsibility when one of these critical labor disputes was mishandled.

We believe that there are many other criticisms that warrant mention.

First. The fact-finding functions provided for in sections 206–210, if they are to be exercised, should be vested in the Secretary of Labor who has the facilities to insure their most effective performance.

Second. The wisdom of the reversion to "government by injunction" in disputes between private parties is open to very serious doubt. The Norris-LaGuardia Act has long stood as one of the safeguards against the abuse of the injunction process in private labor disputes. The majority bill must not be confused with the action taken by the Government during the recent coal strike. In that case the coal mines had already been seized by the Government. Under this bill the coercive effect of the Government's action would be completely one-sided. An employer would be assured that if he delayed negotiations for a sufficient period of time the situation would reach a point where the Attorney General would be forced to secure an injunction against the employees. Under this bill such an employer runs no risk of seizure or of any economic loss.

Third. The standards provided in section 206 as to the types of cases that might affect the national health or safety are inadequate.

Fourth. There are no statutory standards to assist the Attorney General in determining at what stage of the negotiations a strike may be "threatened."

Fifth. The Attorney General could not petition for an injunction until after receipt of a report from a board of inquiry. Hearings before a board of inquiry are time consuming. Therefore, there would be a natural tendency to appoint boards of inquiry at early stages in the collective-bargaining processes. Early appointment of boards of inquiry would completely frustrate free collective-bargaining processes.

Sixth. The broad scope of the phrases "threatened or actual strike or lock-out" and "imperil the national health or safety" would inevitably lead to heated debate as to when action should or should not be taken and would tend to aggravate rather than settle labor disputes in key industries.

Seventh. The provision in section 206 that the board of inquiry shall be limited to findings of fact and shall not make any recommendations is unwise. As we have said earlier, conciliation and mediation functions require flexibility. There are many occasions upon which it is desirable for boards of inquiry to make recommendations. It is difficult in heated controversies to limit a report to findings of fact, for the findings themselves or the way in which they are stated are frequently tantamount to recommendations. The discretion as to whether or not recommendations should be made should rest with the appointing officer.

Eighth. Section 209 (b) of the bill requires the National Labor Relations Board to conduct a secret ballot among the employees of each employer involved in a dispute subject to the emergency provisions of the bill on the question whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer. The Board is required to conduct such election within 15 days after the lapse of a 60-day period during which the court's restraining order has been in effect and to certify the results to the Attorney General within 5 days thereafter.

Experience under the Smith-Connally Act has demonstrated the undesirability of strike votes as those contemplated under this bill. This experience has shown that such votes are completely ineffectual in reducing strikes. This experience has further shown that such votes serve as an irritant to existing labor-management relations, creating an atmosphere that is harmful to the peaceful resolution of industrial disputes. Moreover, the duty of conducting such votes by the National Labor Relations Board under the Smith-Connally Act reached such proportions that that agency virtually had to discontinue the administration of the National Labor Relations Act in order to discharge its duties under the Smith-Connally Act. There is no reason to anticipate any different result in the case of the provisions of this bill particularly in view of the severe restrictions as to time. Finally, the provisions of section 209 (b) would require the expenditure of substantial additional Government funds. An indication of the amount which may be involved is found in the experience of the National Labor Relations Board in conducting a strike vote in the bituminous coal industry under the Smith-Connally Act. That strike vote alone required the expenditure over over $160,000.

After all the steps prescribed in the bill are taken a report would then be filed with the President. The bill does not prescribe the duties of the President other than to state that he should in turn file a report with such recommendations as he may see fit to make to the Congress. We believe it would be most unwise for the Congress to attempt to adopt laws relating to any single dispute between private parties.

Thus far, in our opinion, no satisfactory solution to the troublesome problem of industry-wide labor disputes has been presented. We believe the proposal of President Truman in his state of the Union message for a study of this problem warrants universal support. When President Truman in his state of the Union message requested the appointment of a joint-study commission, he placed at the head of the list of things to be studied the problem of Nation-wide strikes.

Only by such a study can a solution to this problem be found. To the argument that the majority's remedy for dealing with this problem is better than none, we say that this remedy may well prove to be worse than the disease. We believe it is imperative that the proposal for study of this problem, contained in Senate Joint Resolution 22, be adopted at the earliest possible moment. Until a solution is found, let us not be stampeded into action that can lead only to more strikes and industrial chaos.

The people of this country want less Government interference in their domestic affairs. The free-enterprise system requires that Government interference be kept to a minimum. This bill, instead of providing for less Government interference, provides for more Government interference.

Some of the provisions already discussed are, in our judgment, unduly discriminatory against labor unions, and their legitimate activities. In addition, the following points should be made:

This matter has already been discussed in the preceding section. Section 10 (j), (k), and (l) add new remedies to those now available to the National Labor Relations Board. Section 10 (j) empowers the Board to apply to any district court of the United States for a temporary restraining order once a complaint has issued (and before determination of the issues by the Board). Section 10 (k) is to be read in connection with paragraph (4) of section 8 (b) which makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to strike in connection with a jurisdictional dispute. The Board is directed either to hear the dispute itself or to appoint an arbitrator unless within 10 days the parties have adjusted or agreed upon methods for the voluntary adjustment of the dispute. The award of the arbitrator is to be final.

Section 10 (l), which directs the Board to apply for injunctions in connection with certain unfair labor practices, is discussed in our analysis of the provisions of section 8 (b).

We are not persuaded of the necessity for the additional powers conferred upon the Board by section 10 (j). The present National Labor Relations Act, in section 10 (e), grants the circuit courts of appeals power to issue a temporary restraining order once a petition for enforcement has been filed in the court, after decision of the matter by the Board. In very few instances has the Board found it necessary to exercise even this power. It may be anticipated that, if this section became law, the Board would be harassed by demands that it seek immediate injunctive relief if unfair labor practices were alleged by either employees or employers. If such applications were made the clear result would be to throw decision of the merits of such cases into the Federal district courts and thus to oust the Board of jurisdiction, since it is not to be supposed that district courts could act without some inquiry into the merits of the dispute, or that the Board could, at a later date, take a view of the case inconsistent with that of the court. Mere existence of such power might prove a handicap. While in some instances this might prove a speedy remedy, under normal circumstances the Board's docket should be at least as current as that of the district courts. We feel that expeditious handling is to be obtained by adequate funds to enable the Board to act speedily rather than resort to premature consideration of these matters by the courts.

Section 10 (k) in effect provides for compulsory arbitration of jurisdictional disputes. We agree with President Truman's statement in his state of the Union message that "jurisdictional strikes are indefensible." We believe this provision of the bill to be sound, and are pleased to note that full opportunity is given the parties to reach a voluntary accommodation without governmental intervention if they so desire. We are confident that the mere threat of governmental action will have a beneficial effect in stimulating labor organizations to set up appropriate machinery for the settlement of such controversies within their own ranks, where they properly should be settled.

As we have observed, however, we feel that the immediate requirement of a mandatory injunction is undesirable. The administrative agency charged with the duty of enforcing these provisions should be given discretion to determine whether or not such injunction should be applied for under section 10 (l). Legislative wisdom does not extend to foreseeing all possible contingencies, and circumstances may well arise in which the Government should withhold its hand.

We are opposed to such a weakening of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That act sought to protect workers in their right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing by denying the issuance of injunctions, whether on petition of private persons or officers of the Government, except in the manner and under the conditions set forth in its provisions. The safeguards against "government by injunction" which the Norris-LaGuardia Act sought to erect should be preserved.

The record of the hearings before this committee, in our opinion, contain no evidence showing a need to waive the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in preventing unjustified secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. These complicated questions require investigation and determination by an administrative agency having expert knowledge and experience in the field of labor-management relations, such as the National Labor Relations Board, rather than summary equity proceedings and restraining orders.

Section 8 (b) (4) would add to the National Labor Relations Act a new section which would provide that various concerted activities of labor unions, such as secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, and sympathy strikes, defined in broad terms, would be unfair labor practices which could be prohibited by the National Labor Relations Board.

We are of the view that legislation to ban clearly unjustifiable forms of economic action by labor unions is warranted. The President recognized this when, in his state of the Union message, he requested legislation to prevent first, jurisdictional strikes; second, secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional strikes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act, and third, the use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation or application of existing agreements.

We would support legislation which was limited in its scope to these recommendations. We do not have that in the language of this subsection. We have instead an indiscriminate attack on forms of peaceful economic action by unions which the most enlightened courts and authorities in labor relations have come to recognize as legitimate.

This is clearly demonstrated in the provision of this subsection which bans a strike or a refusal to handle "for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person."

This provision is presumably designed to outlaw secondary boycotts, and is predicated on the assumption that all secondary boycotts are unjustified. It ignores the President's observation that—

> Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires an employer to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

No one who has undertaken to examine the law with respect to secondary boycotts can help but be impressed with its present confusion. Nonetheless, an unmistakable trend in the law on this subject is recognizable. Courts are beginning to turn from the practice of considering secondary boycotts in terms of common law conspiracy doctrine, and are determining the legality of particular factual situations on the basis of tort doctrine. On this basis there is a growing acceptance of certain forms of action directed against parties who are not immediately involved in a labor dispute when (1) such parties are found to possess "unity of interest" with the disputing employer, and (2) such action is found to be necessary in order to promote the legitimate interests of the labor union.

This bill would reverse that trend. Under this bill, a refusal by union labor in one craft to handle products made by nonunion labor in the same or a related craft would be an unfair labor practice. A strike by union labor in order to compel their employer to cease dealing with a nonunion employer would be an unfair labor practice. A refusal of union workers to work next to nonunion workers of another employer engaged in a common project would be an unfair labor practice. In each of these situations the efforts of the unionized workers are primarily directed at protecting their own organizations, and their wage and hour standards against the destructive competition of nonunion labor. This bill ignores valid distinctions between justified and unjustified boycotts based on the objective of the union in carrying on such a boycott and the relationship of the boycotted employer to the disputing employer. It indiscriminately bans all such boycotts, whether justified or not.

This section also defines as unfair labor practices strikes or boycotts "for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to members of a particular labor organization, work tasks assigned by an employer to members of some other labor organization" unless the employer is failing to comply with an order or certification of collective-bargaining representatives issued by the National Labor Relations Board with respect to employees performing such work tasks. Section 10 (k) would authorize the Board to appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators to hear and determine such questions. The arbitration award in such cases would be deemed a final order of the Board and would be enforced as such. Workers would not, however, be required to go through picket lines during a strike against an employer other than their own if the strike has been ratified or approved by a representative whom such employer is required by the act to recognize.

If the activities of labor organizations dealt with in section 8 (b) (4) were more precisely defined and were limited to those which are generally recognized as clearly unjustified, and if the procedure for dealing with these activities were limited to describing them as unfair labor practices which, after investigation and after opportunity for hearing, could be prohibited as such by the National Labor Relations Board, we would have

no objection to the proposed legislation. On both counts, however, the bill which has been reported by the majority of the committee goes beyond what we believe to be necessary for sound labor legislation.

Various other restrictions, in addition to those already discussed, are imposed upon the right to strike. Section 8 (d) defines "bargain collectively" as "the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiations of an agreement, or the settlement of any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession."

This section also provides that the duty to bargain collectively includes, where there is a collective-bargaining contract in effect, the duty to refrain from terminating or modifying such contract without fulfilling the following requirements: First, serving a 60-day written notice upon the other party of the proposed termination or modification; second, offering to meet with the other party concerning the dispute; third, notifying the Service of the existence of a dispute within 30 days of the giving of notice; and, fourth, observing all terms and conditions of the contract for the 60-day period of the notice or until the expiration date of the contract, whichever occurs later. A union or an employer failing to observe each of the foregoing steps could be found by the National Labor Relations Board to have been guilty of an unfair labor practice—sections 8 (a) (5) and 8 (b) (3). In addition, however, an employee engaging in a strike during the 60-day period would lose his status as an employee under sections 8, 9, and 10 of the National Labor Relations Act unless and until reemployed by the employer.

Under the provisions of section 8, both unions and employers are required to bargain collectively. A violation of this requirement is made an unfair labor practice, subject to a cease-and-desist order from the Board. Clearly a strike or lock-out during the 30-day period would constitute an unfair labor practice. We can see no reasonable grounds for discriminating against the employees by providing an additional penalty which will cause them to lose their status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act. An order to the employer to cease and desist issued months after the violation cannot be compared in severity with the loss to the employee of his job. We feel that the treatment of employees as against employers, as provided in this section, is strikingly disparate.

Moreover, the section is silent as to the board's authority to accommodate conflicting issues such as provocation on the part of the employer. Under this section an employer desirous of ridding himself either of the employees or their representative can engage in the most provocative conduct without fear of redress except by way of a lengthy hearing before the board and a subsequent admonition to thereafter "cease and desist" from such practices. In striking contrast to the relatively delicate treatment provided for such action by an employer, employees unwilling idly to countenance abuse, who resort to self-help under the circumstances, are removed from the protection of the statute and lose "employee" status. An employer is at liberty under such circumstances freely to replace any employee bold enough to insist upon justice. The provision denies to the board the exercise of any discretion to accommodate the equitable doctrine of "clean hands." The provisions of the section are conclusive—the employee is subject to summary dismissal irrespective of the employer's conduct.

Since not every collective-bargaining contract contains a no-strike clause, the effect of the proposal is to incorporate such provisions by legislative fiat. Although we believe that such provisions are eminently desirable, it is our further belief that such agreements should be reached voluntarily in friendly, valid collective bargaining. The sanction would then be that employees striking in violation of such an agreement would lose their right to reinstatement, as presently provided by both board and court decision.

An equitable balance as between employees and employers for violation of contractual provisions during this period would require that the employer be denied his right to continue in business. No such result is desired, and in fairness we believe the employee should not be denied his employee status.

Sections 9 (g) and (h) of the bill would require unions to file, both annually with the Secretary of Labor and as a prerequisite to each initiation of a representation investigation or unfair labor practice proceeding against an employer, extensive and detailed reports on their financial affairs and other activities, such as manner and mode of elections, initiation fees, and dues, and to furnish such financial reports to their members. The effect of these provisions is to encourage resort to self-help by unions instead of encouraging them to resort to the procedures provided by the act. This is an inevitable result of erecting these additional obstacles to securing the relief the act is designed to provide. Industrial peace will not be extended by these provisions, but rather the area of conflict will be widened and trials of economic strength increase in number.

One consequence would be to compel the Department of Labor to set up a new bureau to collect and compile a tremendous quantity of figures and documents at a completely unjustifiable added expense to the Government. If these provisions are designed to secure publicity concerning union activities and finances, they are superfluous. Virtually all of the international unions of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. already furnish regular financial reports and accounts of their activities either to their members or to the public. Section 117 of the Revenue Act of 1943 already compels labor organiaztions to file detailed financial returns with the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Amending the revenue act to require publication of such returns would achieve the objective of assuring adequate publicity to the financial affairs and activities of unions, without confusing this problem with that of enforcing the National Labor Relations Act—with which it has nothing to do.

In considering S. 1126, the committee properly eliminated sections prohibiting any payment by an employer to any representative of his employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for interstate commerce, except under narrowly restricted circumstances. One of the principal exceptions was permissible payment to a trust fund solely for the benefit of the employer's own employees, their families and dependents, but only so long as the fund was used for medical or hospital care, pensions, sickness or injury compensation or life insurance, or insurance providing any of these benefits. No payment could be made unless the fund was jointly managed by employers and employees under a written agreement, the terms of which would provide a rigid method of selecting the representatives and of settling disputes which might arise in the course of administration. Other less significant but equally restrictive conditions were also attached. Among other enforcement provisions, maximum fines of $10,000 and maximum imprisonment for 6 months were provided for willful violations.

It would appear appropriate for the minority to state its reasons for concurring in this action, particularly since it has been stated that this proposal will be renewed. In discarding these sections it was recognized that welfare funds of all varieties are proper subjects for free collective bargaining and that any fetters placed upon their normal development through voluntary and independent or cooperative action of management and labor are completely unjustified. Most important was the realization that neither the methods of management or of contribution, nor the beneficial purposes for which such funds are used, follow any completely defined pattern.

Two significant features became apparent in the course of studying these welfare funds. First, it appeared in the interest of sound governmental policy to encourage rather than confine or prohibit voluntary private plans aiding citizens by medical care, hospitalization, or other methods protecting their health and well-being and easing the blow of physical or economic misfortune and distress. These plans decrease the responsibility and burdens of the State. Legal restrictions or prohibitions would, on the other hand, tend to increase the public burden and responsibility and the dependence of the wage earner upon the State. Second, existing welfare plans and funds established by employers or by unions, administered jointly or by one group or the other, in many instances resulting from collective-bargaining agreements, affecting millions of workers, might well be dealt a disastrous blow by arbitrary legislation. An examination of the scope and development of these

plans today is enough to convince of the inherent danger of such action in terms of industrial strife and injury to the public welfare.

It is indisputable that the administration of untold numbers of these systems would be adversely and needlessly affected by restrictive legislation. Some industrial experts estimate that 4,000,000 workers are covered by some form of health-benefit plan negotiated by unions and employers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics—Collective Bargaining Developments in Health and Welfare Plans, 64 Monthly Labor Review 191—very conservatively states that at present 1,250,000 are covered by such plans. These workers are employed in clothing, textiles, coal mining, building trades, fur and leather, furniture, hotel, laundry, cleaning and dyeing, office, paper, retail and wholesale trade, shipbuilding, and street and electric railway industries. Previous studies in 1945—Health Benefit Programs Established Through Collective Bargaining, 1945, Bulletin 841, page 2—state as to plans covering 600,000 workers and more than 15 international unions:

A little more than a third of the employees covered by health-benefit programs included in this report are under plants which are jointly administered by the union and the employer. Another third are covered by programs for which insurance companies assume the major administrative responsibility; and somewhat less than a third are under those administered by the union.

It is evident that the sections which were rejected by the committee would have imposed a strait-jacket upon the growth of all these plans and upon the administration of their funds.

Similar considerations apply to proposals which have been made from time to time to restrict or prohibit the check-off of union dues by employers. Such a proposal is contained in H. R. 3020—the Hartley bill—now pending on the Senate Calendar.

A recent analysis prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that approximately 6,000,000 workers, or about 40 percent of all workers under agreement, were covered by some form of check-off provision in 1946, an increase of close to three-quarters of a million from the 1945 figure. Automatic deduction of dues was specified for close to 60 percent of these workers, while the other 40 percent specified check-off of union dues on individual written authorization. Some of these may be withdrawn at any time, others remain in effect for the life of the agreement.

In manufacturing industries alone, close to 5,000,000 workers had their dues checked off, as compared to 4,000,000 in 1945. The manufacturing industries which are predominantly covered by automatic check-off provisions which would have been modified by the proposals of section 301 are aircraft engines, aluminum, automobiles, carpets and rugs, wool, cigarettes and tobacco, electrical machinery, leather—except gloves and shoes, meat packing and slaughtering, nonferrous smeltering and refining, rubber tires and tubes, basic steel, and beet sugar.

In nonmanufacturing industries approximately 1,300,000 workers were covered by check-off provisions.

No need for the enactment of proposals to restrict or prohibit the check-off was shown by the evidence received by the committee during its hearings. We would oppose the writing of any such proposal into Federal labor legislation at this time.

Title II of S. 1126 would wipe out the existing Conciliation Service and establish an independent agency to be known as the Federal Mediation Service. All of the mediation and conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service, as provided for under the enabling act of 1913 establishing the Department of Labor, are transferred to the new Federal Mediation Service. Aside from the special procedures relating to cases affecting the national health or safety, the new Federal Mediation Service would have no new or additional powers other than those now performed by the United States Conciliation Service. Since the functions and duties of the Federal Mediation Service would be identical with those now being performed by the United States Conciliation Service, there is no sound reason for creating a new agency independent of the Secretary of Labor.

As President Truman stated in his veto message on the Case bill when referring to the provision creating an independent mediation agency:

I consider the establishment of this new agency to be inconsistent with the principles of good administration. As I have previously stated, it is my opinion that Government today demands reorganization along the lines which the Congress has set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945, i. e., the organization of Government activity into the fewest number of Government agencies consistent with efficiency. Control of purely administrative matters should be grouped as much as possible under members of the cabinet, who are in turn responsible to the President.

* * * * * *

Since 1913 there has been within the Department of Labor, and responsible to the Secretary of Labor, a United States Conciliation Service formed with the very purpose of encouraging the settlement of labor disputes through mediation, conciliation, and other good offices. The record of that Service has been outstanding. During the period of 1 year from May 1945 through April 1946 it settled, under existing law, 19,930 labor disputes. Included in this total were 3,152 strikes, almost 10 each day. The Conciliation Service has formed one of the principal divisions of the Department of Labor.

* * * * * *

In the eyes of Congress and of the public the President and the Secretary of Labor would remain responsible for the exercise of mediation and conciliation functions in labor disputes, while, in fact, those functions would be conducted by another body not fully responsible to either.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I said in a message to Congress: "Meanwhile, plans for strengthening the Department of Labor, and bringing under it functions belonging to it, are going forward." The establishment of the proposed Federal Mediation Board is a backward step.

Section 203 (c) provided that when the parties voluntarily agree to submit the issues to arbitration, the Service shall provide free arbitration up to $500. Section 203 (c) further provides that when arbitration at the suggestion of the Federal Mediation Service is refused by one or both parties, the Director of the Service shall at once notify the President and both parties to the controversy that its efforts at mediation and conciliation have failed.

The provision for free arbitration is not new. It merely places a ceiling on the amount of free arbitration to be provided in any one case. At present the United States Conciliation Service provides free arbitration where the parties are able to show that they are unable to pay the costs. While we believe that the Government should provide free arbitration where the parties are unable to assume the cost, we do not think it wise to provide that the Government assume the cost in each and every case where arbitration is recommended by the Government as the means of settling the dispute. The provision of section 203 (c) providing for payment by the Government of arbitration costs is contrary to the unanimous recommendation of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee that free arbitration should be discouraged in order to avoid premature use of arbitration.

We believe there is a much more serious objection to the provision of section 203 (c) that the Director of the Service shall at once notify the President that its efforts at mediation and conciliation have failed when either party refuses to accept a suggestion of arbitration. This section of the bill is unrealistic and fails to take into consideration many of the facets of the collective bargaining and conciliation techniques. Very frequently disputes are settled after one or both of the parties refuse to arbitrate the issues. On many occasions the parties may be in complete accord on the desirability of arbitration as a method of settlement but at the same time they may be in serious disagreement as to the formula for arbitration. The disagreement may be as to the issues to be arbitrated, or the number of arbitrators, the scope of the arbitrator's discretion, or it may involve the question of whether or not there should be tripartite arbitration or arbitration restricted to public representatives.

Section 204 describes the duties of labor and management in preventing and minimizing industrial disputes and provides for an affirmative obligation by labor and management to cooperate with the Federal Mediation Service in the settlement of the dispute. We believe that this provision has a desirable objective.

Section 3 (a) enlarges the Board so that it would consist of seven members, instead of three, as at present. While the hearings disclosed that the Board is called upon to handle a large volume of business annually and has a backlog of over 5,000 cases, nothing in the hearings indicates, in our opinion, any need to

enlarge the Board itself. On the contrary, it seems to us that the real need is, by providing adequate appropriations, to permit the Board to employ a staff adequate to the exigencies of its duties. Enlarging the Board in the manner suggested is subject to the danger that it may make the Board unwieldy and interfere with efficient administration, without any legitimate compensating advantages. At most, it should not be expanded beyond five members.

Section 4 (a) also prohibits the Board from employing any individuals for economic analysis. The Board at one time employed a Division of Economic Research, which engaged in general economic research and obtained economic data and similar material for use in Board cases. The Division was abolished by the Board in October 1940. If the provision of the present bill is intended to insure that the Board does not reestablish a Division of Economic Research in the future or reemploy individuals to perform its former duties, it is meaningless. However, if, as we understand, it is not intended to prevent the Board from employing competent persons to analyze employment records and pay rolls, compute back pay or deductible net earnings, and perform other similar work in connection with specific cases, it can only lead to confusion.

The bill would amend section 2 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act by adding to the definition of the term "employer" a proviso to the effect that for the purposes of unit determinations "the term 'employer' shall not include a group of employers except where such employers have voluntarily associated themselves together for the purposes of collective bargaining."

Under the National Labor Relations Act, the National Labor Relations Board has included within a single unit the employees of more than one employer in two classes of cases: Those involving two or more companies operated as a single business enterprise with the direct control of labor relations vested in a single source (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Lund* (103 F. 2d, 815) (C. C. A. 8)) and those involving employers engaged in the same industry who have formed trade or employer associations to which they have delegated the right to bargain collectively for all the members (*Matter of Rayonier, Incorporated* (52 N. L. R. B. 1269); *Matter of California Metal Trades Association, et al.* (72 N. L. R. B. 120)).

As we read this proposal it enacts into law present Board practice. We are troubled, however, by the use of the word "voluntarily." We, of course, are of the opinion that the establishment of a multiple-employer unit should be conditioned upon employer consent. We feel, however, that assent or nonassent should be ascertained on the basis of whether a past course of conduct demonstrates the employer's desire to be bound by group rather than individual action. See, for example, *Matter of Rayonier, Incorporated* (52 N. L. R. B. 1269). The use of the term "voluntarily" in section 2 (2), however, may be construed as permitting an employer to come forward at any time and state that he had not "voluntarily" joined in group action. We view the use of this subjective standard as undesirable and feel that it should be stricken so as to make clear that the Board may base its findings of assent on the objective standard of a past course of conduct. Any other rule would allow individual employers at will to disrupt established bargaining relations which have contributed much to industrial peace.

Section 10 (a) as amended would change the National Labor Relations Act by omitting the present language that "this power shall be exclusive." This language was included to make it clear that all unfair labor practices are to be handled solely by the National Labor Relations Board. No good reason for omitting this provision has been cited to us.

The experience of the National Labor Relations Board in treating this troublesome problem gives striking emphasis to this inevitable result. A majority of the Board in 1943 in the *Maryland Dry Dock Case* (49 N. L. R. B. 733) dismissed a representation petition seeking a unit of foremen. Data furnished to the committee by the Department of Labor disclosed that immediately following the Board's decision in the case the number of strikes by foremen and the number of days of work lost as a result of these strikes increased markedly. Practically all of the strikes were for recognition. It is the more significant that the incidence of such strikes declined sharply as soon as the Board issued the first Packard Motor Car Co. decision (61 N. L. R. B. 4) early in 1945, holding that foremen were entitled to bargaining rights under the act, which holding was affirmed by the Supreme Court on March 10, 1947.

The bill S. 1126 makes a number of proposals which are ostensibly designed "to redress the balance" in labor relations. Their underlying premise is that labor has grown more powerful than employers in the economy and it concludes therefore that labor must be weakened and employers strengthened. This premise is false.

The test of power is its fruits. No candid observer can fail to be impressed with the imposing evidence that since the end of the war the real wages of labor have declined while profits and prices have risen to unprecedented heights that endanger our continued prosperity. Nor can it be denied that while on the whole the income of corporations, of small business, and of farmers has risen during and since the war, factory workers' earnings have not kept pace with them.

The basic and incontrovertible fact of our recent economic history is that prices and profits are higher than ever before in our history, while real wages have actually fallen. A prolongation of this condition spells, as all impartial economists agree, disaster for the economy.

Consumer prices rose more than 25 percent between the end of the war and January 1947, 15 of these within the last year. Food alone rose by more than 43 percent—and food bulks largest in the expenditures of most people.

While our national income increased in 1946, the total paid out in salaries and wages actually fell, even though the number of employees increased. Thus the increased prices, both at wholesale and at retail, resulted in sharp increases in the incomes of other sectors of the business population. The fact is that while the total number of wage earners was swelled by millions of returned veterans during the year, the average share of labor in the national income was smaller than in 1945.

The measure recommended by the majority, we fear, would return this Nation to an era of industrial strife between management and labor. It would substitute conflict and Government intervention for the orderly processes of collective bargaining. Its economic impact would be to further tip the scales in the direction of profiteering, and aggravate the disparity between wages and prices. It would thus strengthen the factors making for a depression, and bring nearer this dangerous economic cataclysm. We therefore strongly urge the Senate to reject this type of legislation which will harm not only labor but all the people of the Nation.

It is our belief that any genuine concern for the ecomonic welfare and future of America must be directed toward maintaining a free competitive economy and that Government intervention should be limited to guaranteeing this freedom and providing those services which the people require and which only the Government, as the instrument of all the people, can furnish.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ETC.—UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in regard to appropriations in House bill 2700, the Labor Federal Security appropriation bill. I earnestly hope the Appropriations Committee which is now considering the proposed 43 percent slash in the funds requested by the Department of Labor for 1948 will meet realistically the needs of the department. While this is the smallest department of the Government having Cabinet status, yet it has the most vital effect upon the daily lives of millions of our working citizens. I am for rigid economy and have been insisting upon a material reduction in Federal expenditures, but a department already small in size and having a tremendous responsibility should not be dealt such a drastic blow as proposed in House bill 2700.

I should like to emphasize that all the costs of operation of the public employment offices both State and Federal, are financed by the Federal Government.

A 77-percent cut in funds means a 77-percent cut in activities. The 77 percent proposed reduction in the appropriation for the United States Employment Service from $3,900,000 to $900,000 would limit the United States Employment Service activities to the allocation and distribution of funds to the States.

Obviously, there would be no opportunity for the United States Employ-

ment Service to provide the technical assistance and the exchange of operating experience to maintain a Nation-wide network of public employment offices.

Actually, the proposed reduction in the appropriation for the United States Employment Service does not represent economy. It will result in a considerable increase in the expenditures by the State Employment Services, since 48 States will be compelled to attempt to develop for themselves the necessary data which are centrally prepared on a more economical basis by one national office. Not only would there be increased costs, but the data and materials developed by the 48 States working independently would reflect lack of coordination and effectiveness.

For example, no individual State employment service can undertake to prepare the equivalent of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles now being maintained by the United States Employment Service, yet this product of Federal-State cooperation includes job descriptions for approximately 30,000 different occupations. It is constantly in use in each of the 1,800 employment offices. No local office could operate efficiently without the occupational dictionary.

Similarly, a State employment service can collect information on employment opportunities and job trends only for that State. Without the coordination and exchange of labor-market information compiled by the United States Employment Service, job seekers and employers would be unnecessarily restricted to individual States. I wish to point out, Mr. President, that labor-market information on a Nation-wide basis is an absolute requisite to assuring the maximum of employment opportunities to veterans in accordance with the Servicemen's Re-Adjustment Act of 1944.

The Wagner-Peyser Act provides that there shall be a basic uniformity in operating procedures among the local employment offices. In its manual of local office operations the United States Employment Service has incorporated the best operating experience and methods developed in all the States. The State employment services are not required to adopt this manual, yet I am advised that 44 States are using this manual without any change and are applying the procedures in their local offices. The four remaining States make only slight modifications of the manual. Without the Manual of Employment Office Operations maintained by the United States Employment Service, each State would independently have to attempt to undertake the preparation and maintenance of an operating manual. Not only would such varied and independent action result in increased costs, but it would eliminate the opportunity for an effective exchange of experience among the States. It would, at the same time, result in such widespread diversity of operating practices and services that we would have 1,800 varieties of local employment offices instead of a Nation-wide network of local employment offices as we now have.

To achieve the objectives of the public employment service on a Federal-State basis, the United States Employment Service in its day-to-day working relationships with the State employment services has made itself available to the States through field offices.

The United States Employment Service has maintained 12 field offices. Field staffs are not only familiar with the national experience but also with the operating needs of the State employment services located in their sections of the country. The United States Employment Service is to be commended for the excellence of its field offices. It has not relied upon the traditional Government red-tape method of official communications. Instead the USES has dealt on a face-to-face basis with the State administrators responsible for the supervision and operation of the public employment offices. I am convinced that much of the progress of the United States Employment Service has resulted from the fact that it has worked with small groups of States through field offices and has located some of its staff in the field to work side by side with State personnel in solving problems that are of such vital importance to our working population.

Yet, in the face of this experience the House committee report, No. 178, which accompanies House bill 2700, recommends the elimination of all except, perhaps, one field office of the United States Employment Service. Colorado is fortunate in having one of these field offices in Denver. I know the great work it does and I am convinced that if the State employment service had to rely exclusively upon instructions and assistance coming out of Washington, its work would have been greatly impaired. The Federal-State relationships of the sort that have been built up by the United States Employment Service through its field offices would collapse if the field offices were forced to close.

Mr. President, I hope this body will not go along with the House in the proposed 77-percent cut in funds for the United States Employment Service for 1948. Full employment is extremely important to everyone. We need maximum production to reduce the dangers of inflation. We cannot afford the luxury of unemployment.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no Senator who wishes to address the Senate at this time on either the pending amendment or the bill itself. Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 28, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

William L. Clayton, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1947.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be Thou exalted, O God, in our hearts and minds. We rejoice in the care of our Heavenly Father and pray Thee to adorn the inner temples of our natures with cleanliness and light, and make us acutely sensitive to all that is dark and dull. In the conflict within our souls, grant us the help we need. Preserve us from all idle luxury and teach us to realize that knowledge and power are never so sublime as when they stoop to weakness and ignorance. Let Thy light be our light, Thy service our joy, Thy peace our inheritance. O lift us above lesser things, where love weaves a living bond of fellowship, enriching our outlook upon all human life.

Our Father, touch our lips today that they may utter no irreverent word; touch our hearts that they may feel no wrong desires, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 547. An act to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers.

MISS WILLA CATHER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the passing of one of America's outstanding women, Miss Willa Cather, who spent the greatest part of her 70 years of fruitful life in the State of Nebraska and resided in Webster County, in the First Congressional District.

Miss Cather was one of the Nation's best writers and gave much to the literary world with her talents. She wrote her first novel, entitled "Alexander's Bridge," in 1912. In 1922 she received the Pulitzer Prize for what was named the outstanding novel of the year, One of Ours. Her most recent book, written in 1940, was Sapphira and the Slave Girl, which attracted national attention. Another honor awarded to Willa Cather in 1933 was the Prix Femina Americaine for distinguished literary accomplishment.

Her death occurred in New York City on Thursday, April 24, and her passing will be mourned by all in our State of Nebraska. She was born at Winchester, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article concerning the new Harvey S. Firestone Memorial Library at Princeton University.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Miami Daily News and one from the Army Times.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by him before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MATHEWS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXPEDITING THE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 199, Rept. No. 305), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks which he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain tables and statistics on the power question.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts, tables, and correspondence.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3123, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT CUT

In our opinion the savage attacks, official and unofficial, that have been made on the Appropriations Committee for recommending drastic cuts in Interior Department appropriations are unwarranted. Some of the recommended reductions are probably unwise and should be restored in whole or in part. The major pruning has been effected, however, by reducing capital expenditures for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power projects. Of course, critics have been quick to charge the committee with working for the private power interests. As a defense against this unsubstantiated charge, the committee says it is simply following the example set by President Truman last August when he requested the Secretary of the Interior to postpone work on all public works projects which could be deferred and specifically to limit expenditures for construction projects to $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

The President's reasons for restricting the scope of public works outlays not only by the Interior Department but also by other Government agencies were threefold: (1) To balance the budget; (2) to reduce the national debt, and (3) to conserve materials and not interfere with private construction. The need for budgetary economy is just as urgent today as it was last summer, while the argument against adding to inflationary pressures that hamper private construction activities is even more compelling than it was when the President clamped down on public works expenditures.

We agree with the committee's view that "perhaps in no other appropriation bill are there greater opportunities for sound economy in Government spending than in his (the Interior Department) bill." For by recommending deferral of certain developmental construction projects to a more propitious time many millions of dollars can be saved. But one would infer from the hostile reaction of Secretary Krug that the committee is plotting to bring about the economic downfall of the country, to the unbounded delight of certain unnamed enemies. Obviously the Nation benefits from the conservation and development of its natural resources. Indeed, countless billions could be spent to advantage, and eventually no doubt will be spent, for such purposes. But the needed capital outlays have to be adjusted to the taxable capacity of the people, with due regard for competing private demands for manpower and materials expended on such projects. Utopian plans for making the wilderness blossom by a forcing process are a dream of the future.

The Appropriations Committee asserts that, as a result of the President's freeze order, the Bureau of Reclamation has large unexpended balances that will enable it to spend more than $141,000,000 for construction purposes in the coming fiscal year. Secretary Krug's reply is that these unexpended funds are "not unobligated." Nevertheless Mr. Krug does not deny that the Reclamation Bureau will be able to spend the sum mentioned, which is well over twice its actual 1946 outlay of sixty-four millions. These are facts that reinforce the committee's assurance that recommended reductions do not mean that it is "unsympathetic or is unaware of the economic values of irrigation, reclamation, and sound use of hydroelectric power generated at these projects in the West to pay the portion of irrigation investment which irrigators are unable to pay."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. No one has ever accused the Washington Post of being an anti-administration newspaper. As a matter of fact, it is the best friend of the present administration, is that not true?

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior has declared that the proposed appropriation for that Department, in effect, would "economize the Nation into bankruptcy of its natural resuorces."

His words are not too strong. Those budget cuts, if left unchanged, will directly and indirectly affect the life of every citizen. They will literally choke off further agricultural and industrial development of 17 Western States for an indefinite time. They will affect many commercial and industrial activities throughout the country. Just one phase—the elimination of ground-water studies by the Geological Survey—can touch seriously nearly every municipality, industrial plant, farm well, and irri-

gation project, wherever located, by cutting out the source of necessary water-supply information.

Moreover, the saving of a relatively few dollars at this moment in the conservation of natural resources can greatly reduce the value of many of these resources in the future. The real tangible assets of the Nation—its public lands, its minerals, its fisheries, and its huge rivers—can be wasted either because they are not developed at all or developed in hit-or-miss fashion.

In a time of great crisis—such as that through which we passed between 1941 and 1945—we need every resource at our command. By failing to guard our resources now, by not developing them properly, we conceivably could be subjected in some future crisis to a disaster which would be of incalculable cost to the Nation not only in dollars but in lives.

Also, it could wipe out our relative industrial lead. We would be dropping back, in terms of development, in relation to nations with aggressively expanding economies. We would be sacrificing deliberately the development of which we are capable.

This is the long view. In the short view, by reducing this budget which vitally affects the lives of large segments of our population we will be inviting a depression. We will be reducing the opportunity to earn an adequate livelihood for many people by failing to assist in the discovery and development of minerals which are vital to our national economy. We may even be making ourselves dependent upon foreign imports of vital materials which could have been developed here. We will not be making productive now-arid lands. This will keep the food base of the Nation lower than it should be and will be foreclosing job opportunities to many farm workers. By not utilizing great streams now going to waste, we will be failing to power new industrial plants which would add to our economic strength and give employment to our citizens. We will also be withholding from farmers and other residents of large areas many of the comforts and conveniences which are already accepted elsewhere as part of the American standard of living.

Also, we will be failing to take proper care of eroded lands, thereby increasing the loss of land and soil and increasing the siltation of great reservoirs upon which we have already expended tremendous sums. We will be letting our national parks be subject to the depredations of vandals. In providing inadequately for the maintenance of the Federal range lands, we will be contributing to a decline sooner or later in our meat supply. Fishermen along our coasts and in Alaska will suffer because we will not be supplying them with the current information they need to conduct their enterprises. We will be imperiling the timber resources of Alaska by not spending $170,000 for fire-control work.

All these functions of the Department of the Interior did not get there by accident. They were legislated into being by Congress because our citizens wanted them and thought that they were necessary. To reverse that position at this late date, by indirection, by refusing funds to carry out the mandates of Congress itself, just does not make sense.

Industry is not organized or set up, for instance, to suddenly take over much of the search for new minerals which has been carried on by the Department. Yet our national existence may depend upon a knowledge of those minerals. Industry cannot and will not on a broad scale undertake the study of secondary and inaccessible minerals deposits—deposits which are, at the moment, of marginal value. But we must know, for our own national safety, what all our resources are, where they are, and how they can be quickly developed when we need them. If the Government does not carry on these and similar functions, they will not be done. Every citizen will be the eventual loser.

Congress has authorized the great multipurpose power and irrigation developments conducted by the Department in the West. If this policy is going to be abandoned and the job tossed back to whoever will do it, not only will important values be lost or seriously curtailed on many of the projects already underway but it will take at least 5 years before private capital could attempt to fill the gap for electric power alone.

Many of the other benefits of these multipurpose projects might never be achieved, for private capital is not willing to risk tying up very large sums for the necessary long periods at relatively small return.

The Secretary of the Interior has been authorized to market the power which will be developed at dams being constructed by the Corps of Engineers in various sections of the country. Yet this bill would not give him 1 cent for a staff with which to plan and execute that job.

Oil powers our fleet, drives our airplanes and moves our army. The Department of the Interior has more information on oil than any other Government agency. But this bill denies to it the limited funds estimated to be needed to carry out a job of coordinating Federal oil activities which the President assigned to it. Most of the functions of that small office, which even now is engaged in assisting the Navy, the Air Forces, and other Federal agencies to get oil, will be discontinued.

There are other features of these proposed appropriation reductions which are equally objectionable. For example, they ignore completely the fact that the Treasury derives some $95,000,000 annually in direct receipts from operations of the Department of the Interior. If no curtailments are made, even increased revenues would be certain in future years. But, by eliminating or curtailing current operations of various types, this income will most certainly decrease.

The bill can cost the Government large sums in other ways. I have already mentioned possible timber fire losses in Alaska because fire-control protection is not furnished. Another plain example, and numerous others could be cited, is the fact that several thousand dollars is refused for a study of better methods of transporting helium. The Government has a world monopoly on helium and transportation of the gas costs about half a million dollars a year. If, by expending a few thousands, any kind of saving could be achieved, it would not take long to pay for the expense of the study many times over.

Time—the biggest element of all in this situation—will be lost if these cuts stand. In the atomic age, time may be the determining factor in the Nation's very existence. It takes years to carry on these huge construction jobs, years to find and develop new mineral supplies, years to restore the productivity of eroded soil or to make arid earth fruitful. We cannot afford even a temporary halt in this program. We must keep on now or be prepared to suffer the very serious consequences which trying to do the job too late would entail.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to offer an amendment to the bill which will provide that Federal work projects and programs shall be carried out to the fullest extent authorized by the law; that this will be done notwithstanding any moratorium or curtailment policy which has heretofore or may be put into effect at the direction of the President. I say this, Mr. Chairman, because last year, you will remember, a moratorium and a screening procedure for all Federal construction projects was put into effect as soon as Congress adjourned. Now I am in sympathy with the idea of balancing the budget and stopping deficit spending, but my concern is over the power of the President to nullify laws passed by Congress. Now let us look at the facts as to what happened last year:

First. The Bureau of the Budget and the President had recommended to the Congress all appropriations that were made for Federal construction programs.

Second. Upon this recommendation the Congress unanimously appropriated the funds for the recommended program.

Third. These appropriations were sent to the President for veto or approval. He approved them without the slightest opposition being registered.

Fourth. He signed these bills in the presence of a score of the Members of Congress. Pictures were taken and pens passed out to the sponsors of the bill. It was a forward stride.

Fifth. Congress adjourned August 2, and on August 3, with a letter dated August 2, the President stopped this forward march and made inoperative, without approval or consultation with Congress, all Federal works, by a drastic limitation of their expenditures.

In the opinion of many Members of Congress, this action is without statutory or constitutional rights. If the President can abrogate a whole or part of any appropriation for public works, he could do the same for appropriations for Army, or the common defense. Once this authority is conceded there is no limit. It seems certain that this Congress must stop this unconstitutional and illegal assumption of authority by the President or anyone else. If this is not done, Congress will no longer control the purse strings as provided by the Constitution

and popular self-government is at an end.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to point out that the President has his remedy in his power of veto, and if in ordinary peacetime he can come in and stop a program which has been set in motion by the Congress, he can stop any program that we authorize by law and for which we appropriate the money.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. It is noted here that when the Congress adjourned on August 2 a letter was sent out which was dated August 2, a day or two after the bill was signed, abrogating the appropriations made by this Congress. The echoes had hardly died in the Halls of Congress before that step had been taken. My concern is that the Congress should continue to control the purse strings of this country. My concern is over the welter of confusion which comes from the various departments when you try to find out whether these funds are frozen, and, if so, to what extent. You get different answers, depending on whom you talk to.

If you will read the hearings of the committee, you will find where the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and Mr. Straus, testified that the funds are frozen. You get all kinds of reports as to these funds. I hope someone on the committee can clear up the question about how much, if any, of these funds remain frozen under the Executive order of the President issued August 3, 1946—I am concerned about the power of the Chief Executive to nullify appropriation bills and take control of the purse strings of the Nation. You remember the President waited until Congress adjourned to nullify the appropriation. I feel some resolution ought to be adopted which will prevent that sort of thing happening in the future. If it is not done Congress will lose control of the purse strings.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was some discussion regarding the unfreezing of funds which were voted and which were available in the 1947 fiscal year for expenditures. I have a letter dated as of yesterday which was written at my request by the Department of the Interior through the Director of the Division of Budget and Administrative Management which I wish to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 25, 1947.

HON. ROBERT F. JONES,
Chairman, Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: This letter is prepared in response to your request for a statement setting forth the present status of the Presidential freeze order as applied to the Bureau of Reclamation.

There has been no change in the maximum amount that the Bureau of Reclamation may expend during the fiscal year 1947 as established in the letter dated January 10, 1947, to the Secretary of the Interior from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This letter, which appears on page 44 of part 3 of the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1948, limits expenditures for the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1947 to $130,000,000, and limits expenditures from all appropriated funds to $146,500,000. Any statement made indicating that there has been a lifting of the Presidential freeze order on the Bureau of Reclamation construction program in 1947, is believed to have reference to the expiration on April 1, 1947, of the limitations on Federal construction imposed by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion in Directive No. 128, dated August 5, 1946. This directive limited the amount of construction that could be undertaken between October 1, 1946, and March 31, 1947. Inasmuch as there are no longer any restrictions upon the amount of construction work that may be undertaken, the Bureau of Reclamation is in a position to proceed with its construction program at a much faster rate than was possible prior to April 1, 1947, and still keep expenditures within the amounts set forth in the letter dated January 10 from the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON D. NORTHROP,
Director, Division of Budget and Administrative Management.

I think that clarifies the situation entirely. The committee report is entirely correct and the committee position is sound.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the bill before us for my particular district in the State of Washington, but of course I am, and I think excusably so, tremendously interested in the development of the rivers of the United States in general and in western development, particularly. It has been my contention that in the Columbia River, our own United States has perhaps one of the world's greatest assets. I feel it is excusable that I should be interested in its development at the earliest possible time.

Reclamation in the West began long before the possibilities in the Columbia River were recognized. Reclamation projects began as matters of local development. The problem of putting water on land was the prior and all-important reason for reclamation. That was back in the year 1902. In my district in the State of Washington less than 5 percent of the total land under reclamation is from Federal projects. As I said, there are no Federal projects for reclamation immediately anticipated in my district, but there are projects in the State of Washington that I think are meritorious and worthy of every consideration by the House of Representatives. Of course, I trust you will do so.

The Columbia River rises in Canada and enters the United States at an elevation of 1,400 feet above the sea level. As it traverses the distance of 800 miles to the Pacific Ocean it falls that 1,400 feet. It has done that for centuries. Of course, it is only natural that this body of water should generate power under our modern embellishments of river improvement. That power is there, and we who represent the people of that area cannot help it. Through the years we have found that there are still other uses for water than merely placing it on arid land, and today we recognize there is a multiplicity of benefits that accrue from a great river system, benefits which accrue first to the people living in the area, and through their industry, production, and achievements, to the entire Nation, and through our Nation to the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I am for development of the water power of the entire Nation; but if your party acts according to the Washington Post, my opinion is you will have hard sledding in getting permission to use the water-power resources of your own section. I led the fight to keep them from cutting Grand Coulee Dam down to a low dam. It is the most valuable asset that the States of Washington, Oregon, and possibly Idaho have, with the exception of the soil. When Mr. John D. Ross was head of the Bonneville project, he told me before he died that he was well on his way toward the development of a plan to transmit power by direct current through which he could transmit that power economically for a thousand miles in any direction. If that could be done, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and the other projects on the Columbia River would be worth more than any other development they ever had or can hope to have within the seeable future.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman raises a very valid point. It can be proven, of course, that, based upon a comparison of contracts when we were trying to get aluminum during the war, Columbia River power, as such, saved this Nation about $200,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. During the depression, as a means for solving our unemployment problem, construction of Grand Coulee Dam was begun. It was a multiple-purpose project. The dam was to be built, a sump was to be put in, and pumps installed so that 1,000,000 acres of central Washington land could be irrigated. That dam has been built; it is generating and distributing power now. The reclamation features are the ones that we are considering today.

The point has been raised that there are all kinds of dams in the Columbia River drainage area, and it is a good point. We have various kinds of developments out there benefiting various sections in the Columbia River area. It has been my work for years, and a work that I have followed up since I have come to Congress, to attempt to get the people of the various local areas in the Columbia River drainage area, the people of Idaho, the people of western Montana, of Washington and Oregon, together on some sort of an agreement so that there would be a composite pro-

gram, a compromise in a workable compact form, with the greatest amount of cooperation in the development of what is their general and common interest in the Columbia River.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The year I came to Congress, 1921, the entire Nation was using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. That year we were trying to develop the Tennessee River, as well as the Columbia. I remember the opposition we had from the Washington Post and similar publications. They said we already had more power than we needed. Last year we used over 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and there is more demand for extra power today than there ever has been. We have 230,000,000,000 hours a year of electricity going to waste in these streams. I am opposed to any program that hampers their development.

Mr. HORAN. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that it merely complicates and makes greater our problem out in the Pacific Northwest that there are in excess of 40,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy in the Columbia and the other rivers of the Pacific Northwest. They are not yet developed. Development, in fact, has barely begun. I want to assure the gentleman that as a Member trying to represent the best interests of his own people and of this Nation I am searching constantly for the pattern and the formula that will properly develop that energy in the name of the people who live there and in the name of this Nation.

Last year when this appropriation was before the Congress I pointed out the construction schedule on the Columbia Basin project. I pointed out that it was already mapped out and that we needed all of the funds that had been allowed in the budget. Eventually we came out with a fairly adequate sum for the Columbia Basin. That construction schedule was cut down to fit the amount of money allowed. Why? Because we have there managing that project not a radical, not an irresponsible manager, but one of the outstanding engineers of the Reclamation Bureau, Mr. Frank Banks, who came from Maine and 40 years ago went with the Government. He is sound as a dollar and clean as a hound's tooth. When Frank Banks tells you he is going to do something, he does it. As a consequence of the confidence they have imposed in Frank Banks, there was an unfreezing of the President's funds almost immediately last fall. The project is going on, the canals are being dug, as a result of Frank Banks' efficiency. The carry-over as of June 30 will only be $1,084,000.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of all this, I trust that the members of the subcommittee in their wisdom and the House in its sense of justice will allow this project to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. In view of the letter that the chairman of the subcommittee just read from the budget officer in the Bureau of Reclamation, may I ask the gentleman if the funds that were frozen from last year's appropriations amounting to $85,000,000 are available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1948?

Mr. HORAN. I would gather that conclusion from the letter. As the gentleman knows, I have been joined by quite a number of other westerners in a legislative move to unfreeze those funds, and I hope they will be unfrozen.

Mr. BARRETT. The upshot of the matter is, then, that we will have that $85,000,000 together with the $62,000,000 presently appropriated available for expenditure in 1948?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; but there are no funds in the frozen item for the project I am speaking of.

Mr. BARRETT. I am referring now to the entire country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I join the gentleman in his expression of the high regard he has for Frank Banks. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he thinks the majority of this subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have not let Frank Banks down when they cut the Columbia River Basin appropriation by practically 66⅔ percent—from $27,000,000 down to $9,000,000?

Mr. HORAN. I can only repeat my final statement. I hope the members of the subcommittee in their wisdom, and the House in its sense of justice, will consider the situation as it applies to the Columbia River Basin project.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, for 8 years I have gone along with these western colleagues on the various irrigation projects. I have seen much of that country and I certainly subscribe to what they are trying to do. A few acres of irrigated land adds to the use value of the nonirrigated adjacent lands. However, whether it is the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], or President Truman, it appears that there is good reason for slacking up at the present time. The funds for the road-building program, the Federal building program for post offices and other public building have been practically suspended until there is less employment. The present is a high-cost period for roads, building, and also for reclamation projects as well. If anyone will take the time to study the history of irrigation projects he will find that it has taken those people a good many years to pay for the projects already put in operation when normal expenditures were made in putting them in operation. Does this seem like a very appropriate time to go to work and overexpand reclamation projects when one considers present-day costs? In all fairness we should keep that in mind because it will take them a long enough time to pay for them even though they put them in operation during normal times, with normal costs.

May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] if he is interested in these farmers out there in that territory he should not worry about the importation of minerals and possibly he should take a few minutes time and look up and find out what is happening to the wool growers out there. Maybe they will not need so much land if the present administration does not change its position on wool. If the present administration does not take a straightforward position on the wool problem, additional acres will not be needed to feed the sheep of the Northwest and that is sure.

It might be well to consider not only the freezing of funds for irrigation projects, but also we can well consider the freezing of the sheepmen out of the sheep business as well.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, the House is now considering H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriation for the Department of the Interior for 1948. In considering the bill, it is my hope that the important services of the National Park System are in no way curtailed.

I am well aware that it is impossible to measure in terms of dollars the great value of scenic and historic places in the life of the Nation. Such units of the National Park System as the birthplaces of Washington and Lincoln, the battlefields on which heroic men and women yielded life itself, the Fort Laramie National Monument on the Oregon Trail, are all national shrines of patriotism which contribute much to good citizenship. They should be maintained and preserved. They are visited annually by millions of our citizens from all parts of the land who there renew their loyalty to our Government and our country.

Our form of government, with freedom as its base, is under attack throughout the world by another ideology of government which seeks to destroy freedom on this earth.

No one can interpret the facts of our history without knowing the facts of our history. The young people of the Nation therefore need these visible lessons in American history, lessons which are afforded by the historic sites, buildings, and the vast wilderness areas of the National Park System.

Everyone, I am certain, is greatly impressed with the fact that 85,000 young people of school age, from more than 2,000 schools in 22 States, last year visited the national memorials here in

Washington, while unnumbered thousands traveled to other parks and monuments for similar lessons in history and nature.

The work of this service should be encouraged to the utmost and I earnestly trust that the appropriation in this bill will not curtail this service to the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to talk to you about one phase of this conservation problem that seems to paralyze with fear the Republican members of this committee, and that is the electric power feature of these projects. You would think that what we are trying to do in developing these power features was a direct threat at private enterprise.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will yield later if I have the time.

Mr. VURSELL. Well, you won't have time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I decline to yield now.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to ask a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield at this time.

In 1902 the reclamation law was passed under a Republican regime. It has been working ever since that time and the projects have mounted higher and higher. Almost universally connected with these projects is the power feature. That is only a byproduct, but it is one of the most important keys to the success of this whole program. The cost of bringing the water to the arid land is usually so costly that the only way you can get it within reason, so the farmers can pay for it, is to run the water through the water wheels, on the way to the land, generate electricity and sell it for a profit.

In developing electric power as a byproduct of reclamation projects we are merely repeating what has been done many times. In 1912 in the Boise River project this was done. In 1909 it was done in Minidoka in the same State. It was done in the Bostwick project in Nebraska in 1929. In the Lingle project in the same State in 1919. In the Prosser project in Washington in 1932 and so on down through the years.

In the beginning the power was used for pumping irrigation water. As the dams increased in size and number surplus power was sold to surrounding communities and areas. Among the early customers of one of the earliest projects were the cities of Burley and Albion, Idaho. The Minidoka project completed in 1909 serves those 2 towns and 6 municipal utilities, 12 cooperative utilities, and 2 privately owned utilities. From the Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River project in Arizona power was developed and sold to surrounding areas.

The thing that hurts me in all this is that this drive for economy which virtually paralyzes some of these projects for a year is being made by the Republicans. If there is one policy that the Republican Party has contributed to our national life, it is conservation. The reclamation projects are conserving our greatest western resource, namely, water. The reason I say our greatest resource is that water is a resource that does not exhaust itself. Each year it recurs. Every season the snows fall in the mountains which later melt to the water which goes to arid land. Each year we have the water to put on lands of great fertility at the time when there is no rainfall. Every year we develop the vast electric energy that is used for commercial and domestic purposes.

Looking across the country, we find that the publicly owned electric systems predominate. Of the 4,097 electric systems operated in towns over 250 in population, 2,200 are public owned, 839 are cooperatively owned, and 1,058 are privately owned. This does not look as though the public ownership of electricity is anything novel or new or startling. You have evidence right in this House that some of the leading Republicans live in communities in which there are publicly owned electric systems. All of you must have been thrilled if you read the article in the Saturday Evening Post on January 18 about our Speaker the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH MARTIN. This House has declared that the Speaker is next in line to the succession of the Presidency in the event that the Vice President cannot serve or has previously died. In the article referred to, which is a typical story of American success, where a poor boy with meager opportunities by his own initiative and energy and ability worked his way to the top, we find the description of the little town of North Attleboro, where our beloved Speaker lives and also spent his boyhood. Here is what it says about the town:

> The town owns its electrical system, water supply, and sewage plant. It paid off its bonded indebtedness years ago and has $150,000 in the treasury; it has one of the lowest tax rates in the State.

This little town is certainly not carrying on any radical innovation. Ninety percent of the water systems in the cities of the United States are municipally owned. Do not these members of the subcommittee who are fighting the development of public power and the ownership of public power realize that the principle of the public ownership of electricity and water, so well rooted in American life, is the same whether it is owned by a city, a State or the National Government.

The development of power in the Central Valley water project is not a new idea. We are merely treading on beaten ground when we recommend the development of an integrated power system in connection with the development of the Central Valley project. As long ago as 1916 there has been under consideration by California the development of a strong water conservation policy. The idea was first concretely put forth by a great banker in San Francisco whose name was Rudolph Spreckles. He was a man who with Senator Jim Phelan some years prior to 1916 privately financed the trial of grafters and crooks in San Francisco in which trial Hiram W. Johnson won lasting fame.

In 1916 under the leadership of Rudolph Spreckels there was presented the Water and Power Act, which in all its essentials was merely the Central Valley plan. At that early date this far-seeing and able man, who had devoted his life to the field of finance, saw that the future of California depended upon the conservation of its waters and that as an integral part of that scheme was the development of hydroelectric power. A little later we had what was known as the Marshall plan developed by Colonel Marshall. This likewise was merely a plan to spread the waters of the great Interior Valley of California to the places where there was a shortage of water. Later we had the studies made by the State of California to further prepare the way for a comprehensive and integrated plan of water conservation. Ed. Hyatt, the present director of water resources of California, conducted the survey which resulted in invaluable data concerning the stream flow, characteristics, storage capacities, and so forth of the various drainage systems of California. All of the governors, Governor Rolph, Governor Young and lastly our present Governor, Earl Warren have supported this plan. In 1932 the California voters approved the plan. In the plan was a system of integrated hydroelectric development.

We are merely carrying out the plans and purposes and ambitions and aspirations of those who have gone before us in sponsoring and working for the culmination of this great plan for the development of California.

Every single plan has contained a separate, independent integrated electric power system, no matter whether proposed by an individual, or group composed of private citizens only, whether proposed by State agencies, or whether proposed by national agencies. The reason for that is that this will bring the greatest spread to the greatest number of people of the benefits of the plan. If we do not have a separate integrated electric system which we can use in the sale of this electricity to cities, reclamation districts, irrigation districts and other public bodies and units it means that we will funnel this publicly developed electricity through the private electric system as well as through the cash registers of a private monopoly. I have nothing against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., but I can see very plainly, from the way that they are conducting their campaign, that what they want is to become the distributors of this great block of electricity. I can tell you, and if I had the time to explain in detail, why this will not bring the maximum benefits from the public money spent on this project. It simply means that at public expense we are generating electricity, turning it all over to a private company, for the particular advancement and financial benefit of the investors of that company. The company, of course, is regulated by the Utilities Commission but in its essence the regulation of these utilities is simply a "cost-plus system." The private utility does not care what we charge for the electricity because on top of that together with all operating costs, depre-

ciation, interest and all the other items is added enough to make a reasonable profit. It means that by developing this great block of power we are merely providing an enhanced load for the private utility which will reap the profits therefrom for its stockholders.

The reason that the future of the company and the future of the Central Valley project is so great, is that they are living in an area that is growing and will continue to grow very rapidly in population. During the war California acquired over two million and a half new citizens. The migration has not yet stopped. We hope that it will so that we can integrate the new people that have come to our State. But the State will continue to grow for many years and may, in the span of a quarter of a century, become one of the most densely populated areas in the United States. We should develop our separate system, have our transmission lines, have our stand-by plants, and in that way offer broad competition for the power of the local private utility. This is what will bring down the rates. It has been proven so in many cases and will result in the cheap rates which will be entirely compensatory and pay for the system and from which will flow the maximum benefits to the people of the State, not only by getting cheap rates but by giving widespread use of electricity.

The matter of economy is not involved in this bill. The total appropriation required or asked for in this bill is less than 1 percent of the total budget which will be passed no matter how deeply the economy drive goes. To increase this 50 percent would not make a ripple in the wave of economy that is streaking through the country. We all recognize the need for economy. We recognize and want our economy to become stabilized so we can go about production without the chaos and turmoil that we have today. In this chaotic world a stable and sound America in the economic sense is very important. We are hoping to lead the world to stability and peace; and a strong America with a stabilized economy will give us more power for leadership. This bill will not affect that principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, I imagine the people of the great Western States and in the Northwest are very much disturbed today and have been since this bill was reported, when they became aware of the fact that there were vast reductions in the carrying on of projects that are of great concern to them and which are closely identified with the future hopes and aspirations of their section of the country. If I were to read their minds, I would say they are very much disturbed over the eastern and the middle-eastern Members of Congress bringing about this reduction. To go a step further, and to have the record clear, I want them to know that it is not the middle-eastern and eastern Members of Congress who are Democrats that have done this or who will participate in this crucifying slash of funds which will hold back for years the continuance of the work which will mean so much to the future hopes and aspirations of the people of the great West and the great Northwest.

I also want them to know that we who represent city districts, Democrats of the Middle East and the East, and those from rural districts, have in the past always supported the starting of these projects and the appropriations of money for the purpose of carrying them on to completion. This also applies to the Tennessee Valley Authority; the marshaling of the great natural resources of the different sections of the country and having them utilized in the interest of the people of the section in which the project is built, that utilization to their interest being in the interest of the entire country.

I have a lot of sympathy for the people of the great West and the great Northwest in the predicament in which they find themselves today. I am sorry for them. Our friends on the Republican side were warned by my distinguished friend from Texas our beloved former Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN] and myself and others, that they were going to get into this position as appropriation bill after appropriation bill came in. When they voted for a $6,000,000,000 reduction they knew or ought to have known what the results would be. I warned them on two occasions at least that my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER] would try to carry out that cut, despite the honeyed words from some to the contrary that it was only a meaningless gesture. I am wondering what the situation will be when the agricultural appropriation bill comes in. Then we will hear the moaning, then we will hear the weeping. While I am sorry for my friends, my real sympathy will be for the people back home who will suffer.

We have heard about these cuts, and I am against them. If these cuts, some of them, at least, are not put back into the bill in the Committee of the Whole—and I have no expectation that will happen—when the roll call comes on the motion to recommit there may be a different situation. The people of the great West and the great Northwest I am sure will find that on the Democratic side the great majority of Democrats will have an appreciation of the importance of these projects to the people of those areas and the people of the country, because improvement there means a lot to the people of my section and all sections of the country.

I believe these projects are important to the people of my district and indirectly we benefit greatly from them. When the roll call comes, the people of the great West and Northwest will see on that roll call that the majority of the Democratic members will be where they have always been on these propositions—and that is, in support of these appropriations for these great progressive projects.

I want to call attention to the fact that even little New England got a knifing in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, under the item on commercial fisheries on page 66, the amount of $401,000 is reduced to $75,000. On the next page, under the item "Fishery market news service," the amount is reduced from $441,000 to $75,000.

Up my way the fishing industry is managed, so far as I know, in practically every case by Republicans. But they are businessmen. I view them as businessmen when they come to see me, and I do not care what their politics is. I wonder how they are feeling now with the knowledge that they never got this sort of treatment under a Democratic administration and that this cut which is so drastic to them is being made while their own party is in control of the House of Representatives.

We might as well talk facts and talk the truth. This bill represents a substantial cut all along the line. It is a drastic cut and whoever the people are that these cuts may affect never got that sort of treatment under the Democratic Party in bygone years. We appreciated their situation.

So far as the fisheries are concerned, this seriously interferes with the carrying on of a $4,500,000,000 industry of this country. It was the first industry in the Western Hemisphere. Back in the early colonial days the fishing industry started in New England and is carried on now all along the coast down to Florida, along the Gulf, in the Great Lakes, out to the great Northwest, and all along the west coast down the coast of California to Mexico. Our fishing industry is an important industry concerning the economic life of the people. It means much to our country.

I hope that some Republican Member will make a motion to restore the amount, and if that is not done, while I am fearful of the outcome, in order to keep the record clear I want to say it is my intention to make a motion to restore these insignificant amounts which mean so much to the fishing industry of the United States.

I yield to my friend the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman forgotten a year ago when the majority on that subcommittee were members of his party that the Interior bill was reported to the House with a 50-percent cut below the budget estimates?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the recollection of the gentleman is not the same as my recollection on that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The record will show what happened.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the record will show it, so let the record speak for

itself. But one thing is certain—everything that the fishing industry got was under a Democratic administration. When they were frustrated we stepped in and provided $2,000,000 to buy surplus fish which was glutting the market and driving the prices down. We brought them in under section 102 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Practically every piece of legislation that has been passed in connection with the fishing industry was passed during the last 16 years under a Democratic administration, and now the first appropriation bill to come in under a Republican controlled House comes in to seriously knife the best interests of this industry.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion with reference to the pro forma amendments? I would suggest that when Members finish speaking the Chair announce that the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair contemplated doing that, in keeping with the rules, at the end of the debate, but if it is more agreeable to the ex-Speaker, the Chair will now ask unanimous consent that all pro forma amendments up to this stage be withdrawn. Then we will take care of them as we go along.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to observe, and at this time express the hope, that the newspapers print what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has just said, because then the people of the country will know that the Republicans are trying to do something about cutting excessive costs of government. They will applaud us for having done it, and then they will also know that on the Democratic side of the aisle there is no desire to cut the cost of government. Rather is there a stubborn resistance on the Democratic side to every effort that we make to bring about cuts that the people want.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished minority whip last year was the majority leader. I call your attention to part III of the hearings, page 74, wherein the expenditures for the Bureau of Reclamation are tabulated by years.

In 1933 the Bureau of Reclamation had $25,204,000 to spend.

In 1934 they had $24,000,000 to spend.
In 1935 they had $40,000,000 to spend.
In 1936 they had $49,000,000 to spend.
In 1937 they had $52,000,000 to spend.
In 1938 they had $65,000,000 to spend.
In 1939 they had $79,000,000 to spend.

In 1940, the gentleman from Massachusetts was majority leader. The gentleman who now cries crocodile tears, who had charge of the legislative program for the majority party, the party that held the Presidency during most of these years I have read, gave them in that year $96,000,000 for the development of the natural resources of the West. Bear in mind, there were millions of people unemployed during that year. We have no such condition today; no such condition of unemployment. But while people were tramping the streets hunting for jobs, there was a program of leaf raking, rather than expenditures for the development of sound projects such as these. All they could spend in that year was $96,000,000 for reclamation projects.

In 1941, the fiscal year starting 6 months before Pearl Harbor, $85,000,000 was available.

In 1942, $91,000,000 was available. Still the minority whip, who cries crocodile tears this morning, was majority leader in charge of the legislative program.

In 1943, they had $69,000,000 available.
In 1944, they had $54,000,000 available.
In 1945, they had $50,000,000 available.
In 1946, they had $64,000,000 available.

In 1947, the estimated over-all expenditures are $146,000,000. Sixteen million dollars of that was for overhead, personnel; only $130,000,000 represents actual construction projects.

That is the amount the President has frozen them to. Did the minority whip spank the President on the hand when he froze $209,000,000 available for expenditure, voted by his majority party when he was Majority Leader—when he froze them to $130,000,000? No. He sat quietly. All the Bureau of Reclamation can spend this year for construction is $130,000,000.

This subcommittee has marked up a bill consistent with its anti-inflation program that gives $11,000,000 more next year for construction than the President allows them to spend in this fiscal year.

I do hope we can stop this demagoguing on the over-all mark-up of the bill. Every bit of it can be defended from a scientific point of view. I hope we can go on and read the bill. We are going to be held here late if we are going to live up to the promise that we must finish the bill this week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee recommendation regarding funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. The reclamation program is the most important Federal activity for the development of western land and water resources. In the 45 years since the program was first authorized by the Congress, about $1,000,000,000 has been invested through the Bureau of Reclamation in irrigation and electric-power projects. That investment is returned in full to the Federal Treasury. Unlike beneficiaries of Federal flood control and navigation projects in other sections of the country, western water users and power users pay back to the Government the full costs of constructing the project works that serve them. The reclamation program, therefore, does not constitute a drain on the Federal Treasury. In fact, the contrary is the case. In addition to paying back power-construction costs, western irrigationists are contributing large sums as taxes on the increased incomes resulting from the agricultural production made possible by irrigation water. I observed a news account showing that my home county of Maricopa has paid income taxes equivalent to a thousand-percent return on the Federal reclamation investment in the county. About $21,000,000 was spent by the Federal Government for the reclamation project in Maricopa County, in addition to an equivalent amount invested by the local irrigation district. The irrigation works thus constructed serve about 400,000 acres in the Salt River Valley. I am informed that for the past 10 or 12 years, Maricopa County has paid into the Federal Treasury each year over $17,000,000, and that a total of $200,000,000 Federal income taxes during the period 1934–35 are attributable to my home county of Maricopa in which the reclamation investment is only $21,000,000. That is typical of reclamation developments throughout the western States. For that reason alone, the reclamation program clearly is a sound investment for Federal funds, and demonstrates that the Appropriations Committee recommendations for reductions are false economy.

Those fertile acres of the Salt River Valley, which, as I have just stated have paid 10 times over the Federal investment, are now in critical danger. The water supplies on which are founded the agricultural production of the valley have been inadequate to maintain full-scale productively. For the last several years, there has been an extreme shortage of water and a similar situation is forecast for this summer. It is apparent that from now on the Salt River Valley will be short of water most of the time. Without water, we cannot grow the crops that produce the income and pay the taxes. In fact, without adequate water, millions of dollars of existing investment in highly developed lands and improved farms and developed communities undoubtedly suffer and decrease in value. To meet this critical danger, the State of Arizona has called on the Bureau of Reclamation to survey the potential central Arizona project to bring supplemental irrigation water to the Valley. The surveys have been going on for several years, and much valuable information has already been secured. That survey and planning work has cost several hundred thousand dollars and has been financed, in part, by substantial contributions of State funds appropriated by the Arizona Legislature.

If the appropriation bill is enacted in accordance with the committee recommendations, the essential survey and planning work for the central Arizona project cannot be completed. There will be no way of ascertaining whether the project is feasible from an engineering standpoint, or whether it is economically feasible and can be repaid by the project water users in accordance with the law. Those facts are essential to the people of my State, and they are essential to the Congress for determining its action with regard to authorizing the needed project.

Because of the vital concern of the State of Arizona with the continuance of the reclamation program, I urge that the committee recommendation be rejected in the matter of the appropriation

item for general investigations, and that the full amount of the budget request be restored in the sum of $5,000,000.

The committee recommendations likewise arbitrarily reduce the appropriation from the Colorado River development fund. That fund is established by act of Congress to use the profits from the sale of electric power produced at Boulder Dam. The money has already been received by the Federal Treasury, and in accordance with the law, $500,000 annually is put aside in the Treasury for these purposes. That money cannot be used for other purposes, and failure to appropriate it does not assist in any reduction of other expenditures. The law provides that the funds thus set aside from power profits already received shall be used for surveys and project planning to develop the resources of the Colorado River. In accordance with the law and established practice of previous appropriation acts, the full $500,000 has been requested for appropriation from the Colorado River development fund. The committee recommendation arbitrarily cuts that request in half to the injury of all seven States in the Colorado River Basin. On behalf of Arizona and its neighboring States I urge restoration of the full amount of the authorized appropriation for this item.

I have spoken principally about Arizona projects because I am familiar with them from personal experience. I know that similar conditions exist throughout the West and that other States have equally meritorious projects and ones of equal urgency. I support fully the statements of my western colleagues in behalf of their projects in realization that the reclamation developments in each State assist the economic welfare of all other States in the West and throughout the Nation. The appropriations requested for the Bureau of Reclamation as to continuation of construction and the planning of potential projects are very modest appropriations in relation to the need for them and their economic and financial soundness. I urge the favorable action of this House in restoring in full the appropriation requests for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

The Bureau of Reclamation is an agency engaged in the investigation, construction, and operation of a great program that is designed to aid in the development of the water and land resources of the West. We in Montana are especially interested in this program, since we have within our State the headwaters of the Missouri River and the Yellowstone River. The maximum development of the soil and water resources of these river basins is of the greatest importance to us. And the reductions in the budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation concern us deeply.

If the present amounts recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation cannot be increased in the House today, I believe that we must press for immediate release of the funds which the President has frozen from previous appropriations. In that direction lies the only hope we have of continuing with our development work. If these funds are released and if the Bureau of Reclamation goes to work conscientiously to use them to the best possible advantage, the development in my district may be able to proceed in an orderly manner during the next year. There are, however, some particular items which deserve attention. The different estimates made by the committee and by the Bureau of Reclamation as to the amounts of money held over from former years and the amounts which will be available for the coming year make the consideration of some of our projects rather difficult.

We are told that the Missouri Basin project has a total of $10,000,000 in hold-over funds. With the $9,000,000 recommended in this bill, that will make a total of $19,000,000 available during the next fiscal year, more than $2,000,000 above the 1947 appropriation. However, the Bureau advises me that the committee report on page 20 specifically forbids the use of any of this $19,000,000 for any project in the preconstruction stage. Specific provision is made for the expenditure of some of this money on only five of the projects, in phases B and C. I hope that this situation can be corrected.

We have in my district only one project which is ready for work and can be completed in the coming year. That is the Savage unit of the Yellowstone pumping project, and the Bureau advises me that money can be made available for that project, which will irrigate 2,200 acres. There will be some money from hold-over funds for continuation of the studies on our other projects, but I feel that more adequate provisions should be made for general investigations and surveys.

I might mention also the Hungry Horse project in western Montana in which we are very interested. The estimate for this project was reduced from $4,500,000 to $1,550,000. This is in addition to some $888,000 in carry-over funds. It is my understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation is ready to proceed with construction of this project in 1948, and it should have adequate funds to prosecute the work.

The people of my district want economy. We realize that costs are high and there are many impediments in the path of construction work this year. But we also must insist that adequate funds be provided to maintain and prepare our projects for construction when funds become available.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 11 words.

People of the western part of the country are, according to press reports from every section of it, very disturbed because of the proposed cuts in Interior Department appropriations. Nearly every community, in some way, is affected by these drastic cuts. I think it is true that the people want economy and are willing, as I am, to see some cuts made in personnel and elsewhere. It seems to me, however, that this bill was written with the intention of doing harm to the whole Interior program, with especial emphasis placed on the Reclamation Bureau, which most people believe is one of the most efficient and reliable agencies of the Government.

Of all the Interior appropriations that have been made in my State of Utah, nearly without exception every dollar that is due the Government has been paid. So it is not a question, in my opinion, of bad faith on the part of the Interior Department or upon the people who obligate themselves to pay the loans that are made.

Take the Provo River project, for instance—a project that is most vital to the whole area that it is intended to serve, including Salt Lake City. Salt Lake City is very much concerned about its culinary water supply. Other communities and interests in the Salt Lake Valley are likewise concerned—so concerned, in fact, that when the Bureau of Reclamation told them that the project would have to be delayed because of high costs as a result of the war, they voluntarily, by referendum, voted to increase their contribution 50 percent, so that this project could be completed to assure them a continued water supply. The committee, in its report, praised to the sky this kind of cooperation, but it did not mean a thing when the appropriation was made.

For this project the Bureau of Reclamation recommended that upward of $3,000,000 could be spent next year to speed the completion of this project. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $1,430,000, with a carry-over of $1,500,000, making $2,943,000 available. In spite of the local people's willingness to speed up this project, what did this committee do but cut off $430,000 and make an appropriation of $1,000,000, which is about one-third of what could economically be spent to continue the construction of this project. This would indicate that the people were anxious and willing to make a contribution, but that seemed to make no difference to the committee who wrote this bill.

This project could and should be completed in 2 or 3 years. Men and materials are available to get the job done, but under the appropriations indicated in this bill, instead of taking 3 years to complete, it would take 9.

The same situation exists in the Bureau of Land Management. As you know, there has been considerable argument regarding the fees charged for grazing purposes. The users of the range are trying to cooperate willingly with the committee, to the extent that they have almost doubled their fees, yet this cooperation meant nothing to the committee. They simply appropriated the Grazing Service out of existence.

The same thing could be said for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We have had a controversy going on for years between the stockmen on the one hand, who thought there were too many wild game, and the sportsmen on the other hand, who thought there were too few game. It is a serious problem, not only to my State but to all the range States. I was instrumental a year ago in having a small appropriation made to cooperate with the State fish and game department, the Big Game Commission, the Utah State Agricultural College, and the Grazing Service, to work out a program to settle

this controversy. The college, the State fish and game department, and the Fish and Wildlife Service cooperated in this undertaking. This committee, by its action, has eliminated the funds that would make this cooperation possible upon the part of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

So I am convinced that it is not a question of bad faith or bad business on the part of the Interior Department, or upon the part of the people. It seems to me to be a clear case where the majority of the subcommittee and the full committee, for that matter, is opposed to the things that are done through the Interior Department, whose activities are primarily carried on in the 11 Western States. I think the people ought to know this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the data for which previous permission was granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, one thing that alarms me is the drive to destroy the power program of this Government. As I have said before, electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

The power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. No home, no business establishment, is complete without it. It must be handled by a monopoly, and the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. Therefore, as I said, we are dealing with a public business.

Fourteen years ago I was coauthor of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, along with Senator Norris, of Nebraska. It has resulted in the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

I led the fight here on this floor to prevent making a low dam of Grand Coulee.

I have supported the development of the water power of this Nation in every State of this Union.

When I came to Congress the country was using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year we used more than 220,000,000,000. When we were trying to create the Tennessee Valley Authority we were told we had more power than we could use. If it had not been for the TVA and the Columbia River development we would not have the atomic bomb today, and there is no telling the lives we would have lost in conquering Japan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that he has made a splendid fight during the years for public power, but I hope he does not quit now or slow down to any degree, because the greatest fight of his life is just ahead of him to save for the American people what he has done so much to gain.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

I am fighting on principle and not on politics. I am not making this a partisan issue. I expect to carry on the battle for the development of the water power of this Nation and to extend rural electrification to every farm home in America, as long as I am in the House.

Last year, as I said, we used approximately 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. Six billion of it is in our side of the St. Lawrence, which we have tried to get you to develop. Yes, I have supported these projects practically from the Penobscot to the Rio Grande, and I shall continue that drive until our water power is all developed and supplied to our people at the rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission and distribution.

Eleven years ago, in 1936, the International Power Conference met here. And what did their report show? It showed that the American people only had one farm out of 10 electrified; that Germany had 90 percent of her farms electrified, that Japan had 90 percent, Italy had 94 percent, France had 94 percent, and even New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified.

I was leading the fight then for rural electrification. We now have 52 percent of our farms electrified. We should have 100 percent. If we can pour money into Europe through UNRRA by the billions of dollars to provide a joyride for minority groups, we certainly can afford to carry on this program of developing the water power of the Nation before our coal supply is exhausted, and in extending rural electrification to every farm home in every State in the Union.

Why, you sealed up the Ohio River 25 years ago. Ohio is rapidly depleting her coal supply, yet there are from seven to twelve billion kilowatt-hours of electricity in the Ohio River going to waste every year, that the people of Ohio now need, and will need for all time to come.

Again, they are trying to make you believe that we have a surplus of electricity in the country now. That is a mistake. The people, and especially the farmers, are begging for electricity in every section of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, I realize that there may be a number of Members who want to speak who did not have an opportunity to speak during general debate. On the other hand, it is hoped, I am quite sure, on both sides, that we can make reasonable progress in the consideration of this measure, which we hope to dispose of today. If we dispose of it today, then it is our plan to adjourn over tomorrow. So I trust that the requests for extensions of time beyond the 5 minutes can be limited hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. If the Raker Act had been enforced, and the Central Valley project had been developed and handled in the same way the power is being handled in the Tennessee Valley area, or along the Columbia River, the people of California would be saving about $80,000,000 a year on their electric lights and power. I am going to put into the RECORD the statistics showing the overcharges in every State in 1945, and I am going to put into the RECORD the statistics showing what is being done in the Tennessee Valley area in providing cheap electricity to the people of that section.

I know they tell you we pay no taxes. That is not true. We pay more in lieu of taxes in my town on our light and power system than the private power companies were paying anywhere in the State on the same amount of investments when they were in complete control. Besides we pay the overhead and also pay the city 6 percent on its investment in the distribution system, and that is as much as anybody is entitled to. We pay that into the town treasury. Yet in January of 1932 our domestic consumers used an average of 42 kilowatt-hours a month, which cost them $3.96. In January of this year the domestic consumers of my town used an average of 283 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid not $3.96, but $3.02. In other words, we are bringing electricity down within reach of every human being. Until you do that all over the country and get it to the American people at the proper rates, you are not going to have a prosperous and contented population throughout the entire country.

You are making a mistake to try to cut out this power development. You are making a mistake to fight it in your own section of the country, because nothing that we could do would be of greater service than to develop that power and to distribute it as we are distributing it in the Tennessee Valley area and along the Columbia River.

In 1945 the people of New York State were overcharged $236,000,000 for their electricity.

If we had developed the St. Lawrence and given them a yardstick it would have saved the people of New York probably $200,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone. Of all the poor people who are hit hard when a depression comes, they are the poor people in a great city. There, as on the farms, they need the cheapest electrical power that can be provided. It does more to relieve the

drudgery and inspire hope and stimulate pride and make the individual feel that he is a part of this great country than anything else that we have ever done.

I shall continue to fight for the development of the water power of this Nation in every section of the country and for its distribution at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution. In that way we can make America strong and powerful—the strongest and most powerful nation the world has ever seen. I hope when the time comes to consider that provision eliminating the Power Division of the Department of the Interior that it will be stricken from the bill.

If you want to know what residential and commercial users should pay for their electricity, examine the following table of TVA statistics:

Electricity sales statistics—Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, January 1947

Distributors (grouped according to fiscal 1946 gross revenue)	Wholesale purchases						Number of customers			Residential customer statistics							Commercial service	
	Kilowatt demand		Kilowatt-hours		Load factor, month	Mills per kilowatt-hour	Total month	Percent rural, month	Added during month	Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month			Median kilowatt-hours [1]	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours [1]	Kilowatt-hours per customer-month	Cents per kilowatt-hour month
	Month	Maximum, 12 months	Month	Change from previous year							Farm	Other	Total					
MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTORS																		
Group A (over $750,000):					Pct.	Pct.												
Chattanooga, Tenn	141,026	141,026	68,509,600	39	65	3.59	51,702	21	194	45,585	413	346	347	167	1.33	3	710	1.90
Huntsville, Ala	23,396	23,622	9,500,928	21	55	4.31	12,102	24	217	10,356	153	262	242	95	1.49	7	516	1.88
Knoxville, Tenn	82,033	82,033	40,296,340	25	66	3.73	48,614	18	164	42,611	283	305	304	141	1.41	3	727	1.58
Memphis, Tenn	129,719	131,127	67,302,732	14	70	3.63	89,267	13	711	74,379	340	135	140	101	2.07	4	480	2.44
Nashville, Tenn	123,182	123,182	51,153,189	27	56	4.12	71,652	10	240	60,674	339	297	299	181	1.43	3	592	1.66
Group B ($251,000 to $750,000):																		
Bowling Green, Ky	4,903	4,938	1,973,294	28	54	4.80	6,082	2	102	5,092	220	114	116	84	2.22	8	376	1.69
Bristol, Tenn	6,829	6,829	2,940,754	20	58	4.52	6,662	25	124	5,665	157	217	206	111	1.71	4	499	1.94
Bristol, Va	7,341	7,341	3,044,637	30	56	4.57	4,855	21	43	4,000	164	192	191	100	1.74	9	657	1.74
Clarksville, Tenn	8,892	9,036	4,210,680	33	64	3.96	4,077	0	39	3,272	------	340	340	148	1.02	3	729	1.28
Cleveland, Tenn	9,400	9,400	3,906,000	21	56	4.29	5,412	16	42	4,544	222	252	250	100	1.48	6	563	1.68
Clinton, Tenn	6,187	6,187	2,621,023	27	57	4.72	4,477	56	16	4,173	107	157	149	75	1.86	7	482	1.91
Columbia, Tenn	8,098	8,098	3,051,960	17	51	5.18	5,621	23	37	4,692	267	266	266	113	1.48	11	577	1.60
Decatur, Ala	16,000	16,000	6,951,000	34	58	4.30	5,863	0	46	4,991	------	355	355	190	1.01	4	736	1.28
Florence, Ala	9,265	9,665	3,854,509	47	56	3.86	7,554	28	49	6,378	148	343	300	126	1.17	5	515	1.49
Jackson, Tenn	12,384	12,528	6,165,360	14	67	3.79	8,870	17	66	7,528	364	184	187	97	1.72	4	589	1.66
Johnson City, Tenn	12,714	12,714	5,659,686	29	60	4.27	10,389	36	27	8,729	116	196	179	95	1.79	10	539	1.84
La Follette, Tenn	6,888	6,888	2,766,355	15	54	5.13	3,758	17	−3	3,116	134	168	164	73	1.71	7	496	1.86
Maryville, Tenn	6,237	6,320	2,746,359	28	59	4.23	5,181	19	37	4,383	335	324	325	149	1.05	4	669	1.26
McMinnville, Tenn	5,126	5,126	1,999,500	26	52	5.09	5,061	28	66	3,962	133	223	214	82	1.5	8	398	2.00
Murfreesboro, Tenn	5,256	5,289	2,080,695	24	53	4.80	4,636	16	70	3,002	234	321	322	151	1.20	5	465	1.56
Sheffield, Ala	7,462	8,159	3,113,400	11	56	4.02	4,724	35	96	4,067	206	286	279	110	1.41	7	523	1.69
Group C ($101,000 to $250,000):																		
Albertville, Ala	2,700	2,700	1,119,600	23	56	4.77	1,523	0	49	1,252	------	363	363	167	1.27	6	647	1.63
Athens, Ala	3,770	4,517	1,487,161	33	53	4.74	4,119	57	69	3,485	187	330	261	82	1.36	12	511	1.61
Athens, Tenn	5,129	5,129	2,031,405	32	53	4.99	4,215	14	45	3,590	176	244	237	89	1.50	6	684	1.69
Bessemer, Ala	3,214	3,323	1,295,237	19	54	4.28	4,650	0	18	3,946	------	136	136	82	1.93	9	556	1.72
Carroll County, Tenn	3,524	3,524	1,219,818	26	47	5.21	3,852	38	37	3,038	100	249	205	75	1.56	8	335	2.08
Columbus, Miss	5,850	5,850	2,106,000	17	48	4.75	4,743	0	36	3,943	------	185	185	95	1.29	5	509	1.38
Dickson, Tenn	3,234	3,234	1,326,200	25	55	5.05	3,341	42	27	2,782	111	202	179	78	1.63	10	421	1.62
Elizabethton, Tenn	5,013	5,013	1,885,341	58	51	4.82	5,735	53	84	4,815	142	212	210	104	1.65	4	416	1.99
Erwin, Tenn	3,047	3,047	1,287,503	21	57	4.64	2,277	51	32	1,941	130	204	196	100	1.72	5	440	1.90
Fayetteville, Tenn	2,280	2,280	910,980	27	54	4.95	1,662	0	15	1,335	------	310	310	121	1.04	4	672	1.28
Gallatin, Tenn	2,256	2,256	907,200	45	54	4.96	1,921	1	−1	1,518	407	229	231	108	1.39	6	584	1.46
Greeneville, Tenn	4,408	4,506	1,806,267	28	55	4.99	5,051	55	21	4,176	122	245	187	86	1.71	7	571	1.73
Harriman, Tenn	4,545	4,545	2,149,200	19	64	4.48	3,969	37	33	3,375	209	212	212	92	1.62	5	622	1.60
Hopkinsville, Ky	4,023	4,023	1,758,753	32	59	4.40	4,253	1	14	3,402	505	141	143	92	2.00	7	543	1.71
Lawrenceburg, Tenn	2,306	2,404	838,598	33	49	5.39	3,230	27	22	2,587	110	186	170	75	1.78	10	333	2.14
Lebanon, Tenn	3,032	3,032	1,196,800	44	53	4.86	2,276	4	14	1,823	271	299	298	130	1.23	5	583	1.44
Lenoir City, Tenn	5,256	5,256	2,139,800	19	55	4.60	4,692	49	18	3,556	187	251	243	93	1.48	8	645	1.54
Lewisburg, Tenn	4,400	4,400	1,764,000	118	54	4.62	1,008	1	11	1,283	176	348	346	190	1.03	4	703	1.29
Lexington, Tenn	2,053	2,053	781,506	26	51	5.43	2,361	26	187	1,811	112	275	239	92	1.59	8	370	2.16
Mayfield, Ky	2,887	2,887	1,187,968	47	55	4.76	3,183	0	20	2,607	------	131	131	82	2.03	6	505	1.70
Milan, Tenn	2,999	2,999	1,166,069	25	52	4.89	2,042	45	7	1,718	191	380	319	90	1.26	6	673	1.53
Mount Pleasant, Tenn	5,992	5,992	2,638,380	20	59	4.91	1,432	4	7	1,201	306	241	243	98	1.50	5	567	1.66
Murray, Ky	2,340	2,340	924,898	73	53	5.00	1,930	1	20	1,483	212	260	259	115	1.49	8	449	1.78
New Albany, Miss	2,124	2,160	802,800	24	51	5.12	2,671	35	41	2,111	98	242	205	71	1.51	10	368	2.11
Newport, Tenn	2,514	2,514	1,071,600	37	57	4.73	3,042	60	1	2,586	94	208	165	61	1.62	11	582	1.65
Paris, Tenn	3,816	3,816	1,497,600	25	53	4.75	3,804	36	50	3,175	123	251	230	98	1.55	7	535	1.84
Pulaski, Tenn	4,010	4,212	1,639,799	8	55	5.18	3,276	45	35	2,664	189	259	237	93	1.52	7	425	1.76
Ripley, Tenn	2,016	2,543	724,080	23	48	5.34	2,232	15	14	1,673	178	156	158	79	1.79	8	386	1.92
Rockwood, Tenn	2,520	2,520	1,140,000	21	61	4.55	2,349	30	21	1,964	165	274	263	98	1.46	8	694	1.70
Russellville, Ala	3,586	3,603	1,143,040	23	43	5.69	1,702	3	20	1,461	226	221	221	84	1.50	12	596	1.67
Shelbyville, Tenn	5,504	5,504	2,470,800	26	60	4.51	2,782	0	22	2,194	------	274	274	118	1.45	5	572	1.85
Springfield, Tenn	2,478	2,478	1,008,000	34	55	4.90	1,903	0	15	1,396	------	227	227	87	1.35	7	545	1.50
Tupelo, Miss	4,620	4,620	1,797,500	23	52	4.69	3,059	3	23	2,469	451	280	283	114	1.07	5	630	1.30
Tuscumbia, Ala	3,462	3,534	1,333,420	58	52	4.38	1,724	0	11	1,487	------	349	348	192	1.33	5	566	2.00
Weakley County, Tenn	3,618	3,618	1,449,000	57	54	4.71	4,677	38	119	3,903	95	231	179	77	1.69	10	383	2.02
Group D ($51,000 to $100,000):																		
Aberdeen, Miss	1,008	1,040	416,000	19	55	5.22	1,374	3	−21	1,053	169	179	178	85	1.70	7	391	1.86
Amory, Miss	976	976	417,600	10	58	5.12	1,450	13	−1	1,186	275	137	142	86	1.93	8	491	1.77
Bolivar, Tenn	1,200	1,452	465,930	12	49	5.48	1,231	33	5	924	155	262	241	88	1.45	6	407	1.92
Brownsville, Tenn	1,040	1,056	376,800	39	49	5.62	1,156	0	17	871	------	178	178	89	1.92	7	500	1.82
Cookeville, Tenn	2,000	2,000	[2] 624,000	191	42	5.00	1,630	0	30	1,239	------	290	290	103	1.43	11	848	1.67
Dayton, Tenn	1,363	1,375	604,560	35	60	4.95	1,508	20	12	1,261	148	266	249	90	1.43	6	600	1.60
Etowah, Tenn	1,566	1,566	652,800	39	56	4.96	1,643	23	30	1,434	135	236	234	104	1.58	6	610	1.80
Fort Payne, Ala	2,172	2,172	858,000	50	53	5.01	1,688	0	7	1,394	------	289	289	117	1.25	5	576	1.49
Franklin, Ky	875	875	340,313	29	52	5.50	1,279	0	10	939	------	90	90	54	2.29	12	390	2.06
Guntersville, Ala	2,520	2,520	1,077,200	30	57	4.72	1,480	13	13	1,235	58	340	311	112	1.03	9	568	1.37
Holly Springs, Miss	1,209	1,237	474,151	27	53	5.45	1,408	35	14	1,075	172	289	267	79	1.36	12	345	2.29
Humboldt, Tenn	1,460	1,510	634,000	17	58	4.88	1,761	2	2	1,423	149	134	138	70	1.92	8	396	1.93
Jellico, Tenn	1,344	1,344	499,200	17	50	5.41	1,980	44	17	1,682	61	95	93	47	2.07	17	383	1.96
Loudon, Tenn	1,947	1,947	764,400	22	53	5.37	2,124	32	3	1,862	210	213	213	83	1.54	8	522	1.66
Louisville, Miss	1,628	1,628	641,270	26	53	5.21	1,540	0	7	1,197	------	153	153	77	1.82	9	363	1.97
Murphy, N. C	1,395	1,422	547,200	26	53	5.16	925	13	9	674	181	340	328	105	1.27	11	671	1.67
Okolona, Miss	1,464	1,464	515,800	19	47	5.77	1,376	50	27	1,148	163	366	280	78	1.35	15	352	2.56
Philadelphia, Miss	1,840	1,840	644,000	44	47	5.39	1,424	14	12	1,124	56	285	285	89	1.34	10	487	1.75
Russellville, Ky	1,190	1,230	416,000	25	47	5.67	1,442	2	25	1,071	309	101	105	66	2.17	12	374	2.10
Scottsboro, Ala	1,872	1,872	670,400	24	48	5.31	1,390	0	8	1,133	------	333	333	150	1.32	6	687	1.57
Sevierville, Tenn	1,729	2,031	744,480	46	58	4.84	1,607	38	−4	1,207	145	258	245	77	1.42	14	607	1.74

[1] 127,200 kilowatt-hours generated by Lawrenceburg's own plant not included.
[2] 304,000 kilowatt-hours generated by Cookeville's own plant not included.

Electricity sales statistics—Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, January 1947—Continued

Distributors (grouped according to fiscal 1946 gross revenue)	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt demand: Month	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt demand: Maximum, 12 months	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hours: Month	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hours: Change from previous year	Load factor, month	Mills per kilowatt-hour	Number of customers: Total month	Number of customers: Percent rural, month	Number of customers: Added during month	Residential customer statistics: Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month: Farm	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month: Other	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month: Total	Median kilowatt-hours [1]	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours [1]	Commercial service: Kilowatt-hours per customer-month	Commercial service: Cents per kilowatt-hour month
MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTORS—continued																		
					Pct.	Pct.												
Group D ($51,000 to $100,000)—Con.																		
Starkville, Miss.	2,576	2,576	1,036,800	32	54	4.91	1,697	6	14	1,433	314	181	183	98	1.31	6	556	1.35
Sweetwater, Tenn.	2,304	2,304	887,200	33	52	5.30	1,799	40	19	1,536	221	245	239	82	1.44	6	607	1.49
Tarrant City, Ala.	1,049	1,054	402,963	13	52	4.85	1,336	0	2	1,181	------	206	206	126	1.76	3	445	1.93
Trenton, Tenn.	1,920	1,920	736,000	35	52	5.10	1,100	0	−1	871	------	336	336	113	1.00	4	520	1.37
Water Valley, Miss.	924	924	363,600	19	53	5.39	1,088	7	1	865	212	230	230	80	1.46	10	396	1.83
West Point, Miss.	1,136	1,208	484,800	20	57	4.95	1,466	0	9	1,171	------	137	137	83	1.95	7	546	1.86
Winchester, Tenn.	1,482	1,482	560,400	27	51	5.22	1,345	13	0	1,075	118	290	280	125	1.43	9	531	1.94
Group E ($50,000 or less):																		
Benton, Ky.	465	465	188,400	35	54	5.67	767	21	−2	627	103	118	117	58	2.03	15	395	2.03
Benton County, Tenn.	744	744	272,400	32	49	5.75	983	25	9	791	137	177	175	70	1.69	8	354	2.13
Courtland, Ala.	312	528	124,800	16	54	5.83	385	0	−5	304	------	287	287	53	1.25	21	434	2.01
Hartselle, Ala.	1,066	1,110	400,800	53	51	5.40	1,033	0	5	841	------	229	229	89	1.16	9	344	1.57
Macon, Miss.	608	608	215,200	18	48	5.93	611	0	11	457	------	206	206	95	1.60	7	382	1.97
Muscle Shoals, Ala.	639	639	217,200	12	46	5.31	457	0	3	420	------	482	482	376	1.16	6	628	1.58
Newbern, Tenn.	560	620	207,300	27	50	5.80	568	0	3	445	------	232	232	97	1.52	5	544	1.86
Somerville, Tenn.	660	864	256,800	24	52	5.51	513	13	5	369	426	344	350	118	1.23	10	509	1.89
COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTORS																		
Group B ($251,000 to $750,000):																		
Cumberland EMC, Tennessee	5,844	5,883	1,976,862	43	45	5.56	8,395	72	117	7,372	151	172	159	73	1.88	8	253	2.31
Duck River EMC, Tennessee	10,888	11,089	4,201,602	−7	52	5.41	9,591	66	121	8,275	155	213	180	76	1.69	9	355	1.97
Gibson County EMC, Tennessee	9,952	11,262	3,373,731	30	46	5.34	11,249	65	181	9,717	131	213	162	65	1.73	15	318	2.11
Middle Tennessee EMC, Tennessee	6,868	6,971	2,541,144	38	50	5.24	8,347	86	161	7,198	189	219	196	84	1.68	8	273	2.21
North Georgia EMC, Georgia	4,735	4,966	1,856,593	4	52	4.69	8,739	100	167	7,979	135	298	139	64	1.90	20	208	2.65
Sequatchie Valley EC, Tennessee	8,852	9,084	4,124,440	61	63	4.64	4,891	35	40	3,995	166	182	179	74	1.66	9	433	1.92
Volunteer EC, Tennessee	6,448	6,448	2,660,250	43	55	5.05	7,800	53	72	6,651	156	177	167	71	1.73	8	422	1.89
Group C ($101,000 to $250,000):																		
Alcorn County EPA, Mississippi	6,314	6,314	2,524,400	26	54	4.52	4,371	36	33	3,630	168	395	330	117	1.02	5	550	1.35
Appalachian EC, Tennessee	5,581	5,581	2,378,600	9	57	4.76	3,644	60	28	3,116	155	196	174	64	1.65	17	354	1.99
Cullman EC, Alabama	2,064	2,220	709,200	30	46	5.46	5,993	94	235	5,173	73	152	81	60	2.51	12	165	2.72
4-County EPA, Mississippi	4,161	4,161	1,510,284	5	49	5.79	6,455	72	109	5,451	145	175	152	59	1.72	15	186	2.47
Holston EC, Tennessee	2,223	2,340	1,022,400	38	62	4.58	3,676	81	22	3,207	104	145	123	55	1.90	14	422	1.85
Joe Wheeler EMC, Alabama	2,252	3,090	767,000	36	46	5.83	3,292	75	54	2,731	131	221	169	78	1.76	9	269	2.26
Lincoln County EMC, Tennessee	2,403	2,485	836,120	29	47	5.47	2,542	88	53	2,220	147	158	149	63	1.91	16	222	2.63
Marshall-DeKalb EC, Alabama	2,756	3,340	915,600	36	45	5.72	3,788	72	138	3,254	88	224	126	58	1.91	14	312	1.95
Meriwether Lewis EC, Tennessee	3,304	3,394	1,228,551	38	50	5.53	3,560	37	77	2,810	118	191	173	72	1.74	11	376	2.07
Natchez Trace EPA, Mississippi	2,250	2,292	801,300	40	48	5.50	3,752	60	51	3,073	68	185	135	56	1.84	15	266	2.30
Pennyrile RECC, Kentucky	3,022	3,022	1,136,880	48	51	5.43	4,539	43	61	3,730	182	162	171	82	1.86	12	253	2.49
Pontotoc EPA, Mississippi	2,220	2,400	786,600	21	48	5.32	3,346	58	107	2,845	79	210	137	57	1.76	13	277	2.05
Prentiss County EPA, Mississippi	2,343	2,448	841,800	38	48	5.53	2,933	53	38	2,488	103	331	198	67	1.52	11	420	1.77
Sand Mountain EC, Alabama	1,938	2,232	652,800	44	45	5.74	3,925	88	13	3,259	77	166	107	55	2.09	15	229	2.37
Southwestern Tennessee EMC, Tennessee.	4,812	5,668	1,742,666	33	49	5.33	5,291	72	172	4,382	180	243	203	75	1.57	15	282	2.50
Tallahatchie Valley EPA, Mississippi	2,364	2,364	895,600	27	51	5.09	4,372	87	115	3,810	96	308	126	55	1.92	21	222	2.44
Tombigbee EPA, Mississippi	2,682	3,240	1,017,000	46	51	5.04	6,049	70	118	5,277	81	185	114	54	1.94	12	186	2.47
Tri-County EMC, Tennessee	4,227	4,227	1,635,840	46	52	5.22	8,594	60	243	7,141	71	135	96	49	2.21	24	264	2.26
Upper Cumberland EMC, Tennessee	3,339	3,339	1,259,080	52	51	5.39	5,581	61	125	4,596	88	160	127	57	1.91	13	287	2.06
Warren RECC, Kentucky	1,942	1,942	668,596	42	42	6.46	3,314	72	46	2,818	132	93	118	67	2.12	11	242	2.47
West Kentucky RECC, Kentucky	2,317	2,573	706,474	62	41	6.56	[2] 4,394	76	0	[3] 3,879	[3] 110	[3] 89	[3] 105	68	[3] 2.30	10	[3] 186	[3] 2.72
Group D ($51,000 to $100,000):																		
Caney Fork EC, Tennessee	897	897	255,600	22	38	6.50	2,527	100	23	2,313	78	------	78	51	2.55	16	78	3.46
Central EPA, Mississippi	1,197	1,197	403,200	44	45	5.77	3,133	100	55	2,746	79	128	83	55	2.56	9	119	3.12
Cherokee EC, Alabama	1,602	1,917	561,600	40	47	5.49	4,368	87	93	3,988	65	274	88	50	2.22	14	239	2.29
East Mississippi EPA, Mississippi	1,174	1,174	378,200	34	43	6.28	1,894	76	7	1,654	80	202	105	60	2.28	18	252	2.26
Forked Deer EC, Tennessee	1,159	1,159	336,520	65	39	6.56	2,900	100	167	2,711	88	------	88	52	2.30	19	99	3.04
Fort Loudoun EC, Tennessee	1,856	1,856	717,240	36	52	5.62	2,862	86	27	2,550	143	299	161	68	1.73	13	427	1.78
Mountain EC, Tennessee	1,082	1,095	381,110	51	47	6.05	3,305	71	38	2,750	59	94	74	45	2.59	19	171	2.75
North Alabama EC, Alabama	1,727	1,911	642,200	20	50	5.82	2,227	47	13	1,877	103	165	140	63	1.82	12	283	2.17
Pickwick EMC, Tennessee	1,476	1,578	566,518	58	52	5.43	2,756	53	71	2,346	85	176	133	63	1.92	9	398	1.87
Plateau EC, Tennessee	1,364	1,380	540,388	16	53	6.20	1,840	76	8	1,499	91	126	116	66	2.07	12	385	2.09
Tennessee Valley EC, Tennessee	1,681	1,681	619,150	50	50	5.72	2,351	25	94	1,906	125	184	178	66	1.66	11	365	2.03
Tippah EPA, Mississippi	1,302	1,620	463,200	41	47	5.51	1,741	38	24	1,375	83	199	166	61	1.68	11	277	2.03
Tishomingo County EPA, Mississippi	1,053	1,366	395,067	41	50	5.87	1,747	35	20	1,429	69	233	172	61	1.59	10	267	2.58
Group E ($50,000 or less):																		
Blue Ridge EA, Georgia	688	688	282,620	29	55	5.48	1,893	74	6	1,550	72	167	95	45	2.10	17	169	2.61
Chickasaw EC, Tennessee	1,026	1,026	267,105	28	35	6.05	1,270	75	24	1,062	153	193	163	66	1.72	17	155	2.77
Hickman-Fulton Counties, RECC, Kentucky	958	958	298,379	58	42	6.18	1,690	100	59	1,592	137	94	130	75	2.19	16	156	2.82
Monroe County EPA, Mississippi	888	972	327,600	104	50	5.69	1,706	88	27	1,492	92	132	102	57	2.09	10	156	3.06
North East Mississippi EPA, Mississippi	930	954	303,000	69	44	6.33	1,202	100	−1	1,044	119	227	143	61	1.73	11	143	2.79
Private companies:																		
Bells Light & Water Co., Tennessee	388	540	120,800	27	36	6.62	396	0	6	306	------	178	178	62	1.60	13	293	2.28
Franklin Power & Light Co., Tennessee	1,920	1,956	700,800	20	49	5.26	1,436	0	5	1,126	------	290	290	137	1.43	4	511	1.72
Tennessee Light & Power Co., Kentucky	182	182	59,600	37	44	6.75	253	21	0	189	223	176	185	82	1.72	7	200	2.47
Totals:																		
92 municipalities	------	------	362,633,691	26	------	4.08	519,709	19	3,835	436,467	192	246	242	114	1.50	4	554	1.82
46 cooperatives	------	------	52,430,110	30	------	5.32	193,835	70	3,452	165,961	118	195	146	70	1.81	13	286	2.15
3 private companies	------	------	881,200	24	------	5.54	2,065	2	11	1,621	223	257	256	113	1.48	5	425	1.85
1 TVA direct operation (Copperhill)	------	------	------	------	------	------	2,489	28	32	2,010	119	194	187	71	1.63	10	376	2.05
Grand total	------	------	415,945,001	27	------	4.24	718,118	32	7,330	606,059	135	239	216	93	1.55	7	485	1.87

[1] 127,200 kilowatt-hours generated by Lawrenceburg's own plant not included.

[3] Total number of customers and total residential customers are those reported for December. During January distributor adjusted meter reading dates. Data for this month are therefore incomplete.

The following table shows the overcharges for electricity in 1945 according to the TVA rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1945*

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	397, 343	5, 256, 433, 000	$46, 280, 963	$28, 456, 263	$17, 824, 700	$32, 487, 939	$13, 793, 024	$30, 826, 281	$15, 454, 682
Arizona	123, 240	1, 040, 604, 000	15, 310, 130	6, 848, 277	8, 461, 853	8, 114, 428	7, 195, 702	7, 279, 275	8, 030, 855
Arkansas	239, 610	1, 164, 697, 000	22, 133, 657	11, 479, 342	10, 654, 315	13, 401, 896	8, 731, 761	12, 303, 962	9, 829, 695
California	2, 690, 669	16, 945, 730, 000	264, 737, 662	183, 760, 513	80, 977, 149	213, 284, 221	51, 453, 441	198, 852, 265	65, 885, 397
Colorado	290, 123	1, 019, 345, 000	25, 578, 458	12, 000, 295	13, 578, 163	14, 211, 799	11, 366, 659	12, 451, 360	13, 127, 098
Connecticut	561, 788	2, 562, 278, 000	60, 513, 348	27, 828, 614	32, 674, 734	32, 478, 716	28, 034, 632	28, 974, 925	31, 538, 423
Delaware	76, 604	402, 529, 000	7, 995, 251	3, 793, 404	4, 201, 847	4, 380, 045	3, 615, 206	3, 980, 985	4, 014, 266
District of Columbia	204, 680	1, 650, 091, 000	20, 293, 342	14, 334, 773	5, 958, 569	16, 803, 222	3, 490, 120	15, 229, 929	5, 063, 413
Florida	507, 692	2, 013, 826, 000	55, 509, 457	22, 307, 743	33, 201, 714	26, 372, 958	29, 136, 499	22, 861, 897	32, 647, 560
Georgia	480, 435	3, 081, 422, 000	49, 282, 209	27, 005, 142	22, 277, 067	31, 705, 748	17, 576, 461	28, 218, 296	21, 063, 913
Idaho	143, 175	960, 250, 000	13, 508, 983	8, 288, 538	5, 220, 445	9, 743, 976	3, 765, 007	8, 489, 030	5, 019, 953
Illinois	2, 280, 556	12, 447, 559, 000	234, 652, 497	114, 899, 400	119, 753, 097	133, 520, 818	101, 131, 679	121, 081, 756	113, 570, 741
Indiana	1, 001, 334	5, 338, 459, 000	101, 568, 026	51, 777, 456	49, 790, 570	59, 919, 131	41, 648, 895	54, 867, 307	46, 700, 719
Iowa	654, 686	2, 268, 050, 000	54, 873, 868	26, 976, 438	27, 897, 430	31, 970, 267	22, 903, 601	28, 061, 840	26, 812, 028
Kansas	444, 077	1, 864, 193, 000	42, 195, 886	20, 683, 347	21, 512, 539	24, 258, 317	17, 937, 569	21, 563, 932	20, 631, 954
Kentucky	451, 437	2, 216, 169, 000	39, 746, 835	21, 519, 756	18, 227, 079	24, 944, 332	14, 802, 503	22, 598, 179	17, 148, 656
Louisiana	379, 720	2, 399, 309, 000	40, 687, 643	18, 758, 682	21, 928, 961	21, 837, 480	18, 850, 163	19, 818, 070	20, 869, 573
Maryland	570, 243	2, 828, 353, 000	52, 442, 650	26, 320, 111	26, 122, 539	30, 756, 660	21, 685, 990	28, 093, 896	24, 348, 754
Maine	247, 601	1, 001, 485, 000	20, 345, 546	9, 521, 489	10, 824, 057	11, 060, 626	9, 284, 920	9, 895, 307	10, 450, 239
Massachusetts	1, 366, 307	4, 778, 717, 000	125, 235, 772	54, 458, 589	70, 777, 183	63, 349, 708	61, 886, 064	56, 616, 277	68, 619, 495
Michigan	1, 624, 779	8, 219, 355, 000	156, 193, 168	77, 927, 633	78, 265, 535	91, 514, 440	64, 678, 728	79, 976, 856	76, 216, 312
Minnesota	694, 831	2, 601, 100, 000	65, 694, 358	31, 159, 745	32, 534, 613	36, 650, 091	27, 044, 267	32, 136, 220	31, 558, 138
Mississippi	192, 217	871, 241, 000	18, 476, 469	8, 985, 182	9, 491, 287	10, 540, 321	7, 936, 148	9, 449, 116	9, 027, 353
Missouri	899, 724	4, 106, 166, 000	79, 868, 158	41, 970, 793	37, 897, 365	49, 238, 529	30, 629, 629	43, 947, 467	35, 922, 691
Montana	119, 877	1, 656, 341, 000	15, 070, 668	9, 419, 160	5, 651, 508	10, 806, 347	4, 264, 32	0, 261, 423	4, 809, 245
Nebraska	293, 486	994, 038, 000	$23, 607, 195	$12, 420, 606	$11, 186, 589	$14, 723, 104	$8, 884, 091	$12, 748, 423	$10, 858, 772
Nevada	33, 068	194, 298, 000	4, 024, 497	1, 737, 481	2, 287, 016	2, 090, 310	1, 934, 187	1, 777, 533	2, 246, 964
New Hampshire	160, 238	502, 570, 000	13, 700, 266	6, 247, 415	7, 542, 851	7, 270, 851	6, 519, 415	6, 419, 016	7, 371, 250
New Jersey	1, 369, 446	5, 878, 294, 000	131, 287, 963	60, 866, 244	70, 421, 719	70, 817, 951	60, 470, 012	63, 724, 152	67, 563, 811
New Mexico	78, 748	268, 586, 000	8, 712, 638	3, 318, 550	5, 394, 088	4, 008, 304	4, 704, 334	3, 442, 679	5, 269, 959
New York	4, 244, 196	20, 195, 384, 000	407, 006, 295	170, 693, 192	236, 313, 103	201, 768, 092	205, 238, 203	177, 728, 718	229, 277, 577
North Carolina	506, 488	3, 818, 041, 000	55, 489, 853	32, 122, 263	23, 367, 590	37, 298, 559	18, 191, 294	34, 171, 557	21, 318, 296
North Dakota	101, 550	243, 887, 000	9, 387, 249	3, 904, 176	5, 483, 073	4, 703, 039	4, 684, 210	3, 957, 576	5, 429, 673
Ohio	2, 102, 455	13, 984, 000, 000	218, 636, 445	118, 785, 961	99, 850, 484	137, 197, 194	81, 439, 251	125, 490, 451	93, 145, 994
Oklahoma	410, 669	1, 694, 892, 000	37, 521, 976	18, 194, 038	19, 327, 938	21, 205, 825	16, 316, 151	19, 128, 603	18, 393, 373
Oregon	357, 561	3, 465, 949, 000	35, 473, 809	24, 050, 854	11, 422, 955	28, 280, 215	7, 193, 594	25, 084, 724	10, 389, 085
Pennsylvania	2, 669, 486	17, 829, 064, 000	284, 503, 953	156, 350, 613	128, 153, 340	179, 838, 464	104, 665, 489	166, 820, 298	117, 683, 655
Rhode Island	220, 837	853, 026, 000	21, 937, 234	9, 468, 876	12, 468, 358	10, 937, 453	10, 999, 781	9, 986, 537	11, 950, 697
South Carolina	241, 715	1, 833, 935, 000	25, 281, 403	14, 807, 912	10, 473, 491	17, 203, 925	8, 077, 478	15, 722, 882	9, 558, 521
South Dakota	104, 414	277, 840, 000	9, 176, 720	3, 740, 947	5, 435, 773	4, 464, 146	4, 712, 574	3, 841, 193	5, 335, 527
Tennessee	492, 447	6, 527, 952, 000	46, 105, 441	34, 632, 674	11, 472, 767	39, 737, 925	6, 367, 516	36, 928, 030	9, 177, 411
Texas	1, 288, 294	6, 783, 502, 000	124, 533, 931	62, 882, 042	61, 651, 889	73, 742, 225	50, 791, 706	66, 737, 505	57, 796, 426
Utah	159, 759	851, 053, 000	13, 891, 986	8, 024, 898	5, 867, 088	9, 374, 658	4, 517, 328	8, 337, 200	5, 554, 786
Vermont	96, 950	324, 435, 000	8, 542, 508	4, 148, 310	4, 394, 198	4, 816, 029	3, 726, 479	4, 327, 318	4, 215, 190
Virginia	525, 453	2, 682, 697, 000	52, 314, 918	25, 342, 940	26, 971, 978	29, 848, 593	22, 466, 325	26, 399, 769	25, 915, 149
Washington	626, 155	9, 486, 547, 000	66, 654, 829	47, 878, 393	18, 776, 436	55, 950, 026	10, 704, 803	50, 353, 046	16, 301, 783
West Virginia	353, 857	3, 167, 350, 000	43, 566, 713	23, 687, 601	19, 879, 112	26, 963, 759	16, 602, 954	25, 787, 202	17, 779, 511
Wisconsin	878, 646	4, 287, 691, 000	84, 552, 691	42, 668, 933	41, 883, 758	49, 833, 091	34, 719, 600	44, 992, 887	39, 559, 804
Wyoming	54, 091	163, 850, 000	4, 758, 848	2, 076, 953	2, 681, 895	2, 469, 849	2, 288, 199	2, 139, 860	2, 618, 988
United States	34, 012, 757	195, 001, 983, 000	3, 356, 954, 365	1, 748, 542, 557	1, 608, 411, 808	2, 037, 895, 602	1, 319, 058, 763	1, 843, 881, 010	1, 513, 073, 355

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts for which permission was granted in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto, including the pro forma amendments, close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What paragraph is the Clerk reading now?

The CHAIRMAN. The first paragraph.

BONNEVILLE, H. R. 3123

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to discuss the appropriation for Bonneville in H. R. 3123.

The Bonneville appropriation appears on page 5 of the bill, and unless there is extended debate, it will no doubt be reached in a very short time.

The Bonneville project is in my congressional district. I just returned last night by airplane from the west coast after attending the funeral of our late colleague, Mr. Norman, whose district adjoins mine and includes part of Bonneville. The folks in that area are greatly disturbed over the question as to whether or not these great public works projects in the West are going to be carried forward or whether they are going to be very definitely restricted. Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River occupy a very strategic position. The Columbia River itself is the second largest river in the United States and is the largest in potential hydroelectric power.

During the war we produced the power on that river which supplied one-third of the aluminum which went into the airplane industry in the war effort which contributed very materially to the winning of the war. The Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects furnished the power.

We will soon pass upon an appropriation for $400,000,000 to be given to Greece and Turkey, which has already been authorized by the other body.

My understanding is that much of that money will be used for public works, similar to this; railroads, docks, power, all sorts of civilian enterprises, to build up Greece and Turkey. Yet we are going to deny our own people here in America the necessary funds to maintain these great public works in the West which maintain the economy of the West and which helped to win the war and which now in peacetime will maintain our economy. We are going to deny funds for that purpose here at home and send it overseas. In so doing we are taking jobs from the veterans who fought the war. As proof I include the following telegram from Commander Earl C. Mean and Adjutant Fred B. Conn, Department of Oregon Veterans of Foreign Wars:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Department of the American Legion understands that the proposed item

for the Bonneville Power Administration in the Interior Department appropriation bill, as reported by the House Appropriation Committee, contains a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis. Such a proviso would constitute gross discrimination against veterans. It would deprive at least 166 employees of their preferential rights to employment as veterans. (This is over 64 percent of total employment in the construction section.) Under the GI bill of rights, and other statutes and regulations, veterans have preferential rights to employment by the Federal Government. They do not have preferential rights in competing with nonveterans in the general labor market.

Furthermore, these veterans are skilled technicians, trained for construction, operation, and maintenance of the highly specialized electrical power system of the Bonneville Administration, and it would be entirely unfeasible for private contractors to perform much of the work done by these veterans who are used interchangeably on operations and construction under an economical agreement with organized labor. There are large numbers of unemployed veterans in the Pacific Northwest. For example, a recent survey shows 7,500 unemployed veterans in Multnomah County alone and 18,000 in the State of Oregon. There are probably twice as many in the State of Washington. Deprivation of the preferential employment rights held by veterans now working for Bonneville would undoubtedly result in increasing unemployment of veterans in this area.

This provision appears to have been inserted to protect private contractors at the expense of veterans and career employees in the Federal service. The House subcommittee could recommend such a proviso only on the basis of lack of knowledge of large power-system operations, or as discrimination against veteran employees of the Government. We strongly urge that you lead the fight to have the proviso removed from the bill.

FRED A. LOTHROP,
Department Commander of Oregon.

In this bill for Bonneville there was a request by the Budget for $26,278,000. That has been cut down to $6,907,800—slashed to the bone. This great project on the Columbia River will be restricted in its activities so that it cannot continue, as it is now doing, to market Bonneville and Grand Coulee power. The demand for hydroelectric power in the West is far exceeding our present ability to supply it. Many do not realize that these are self-liquidating projects. They are not boondoggling projects and they are not the so-called New Deal projects, I will say to my Republican friends. They are self-liquidating projects, and every single dollar that goes into Bonneville will be repaid with interest in the end. Right now the cash registers are clicking night and day with the receipts coming in from this great operation. Not one single penny of American money will be expended that will not be returned. We have expended some three or four hundred million dollars on these projects in the Northwest. We are now cashing in on them, yet we are shortsighted enough to deny in this bill substations, transmission facilities, and other necessary facilities to market the power and bring the cash back to the Treasury. How foolish such a program is. I am for economy, but we have been squandering billions of dollars foolishly, which should be stopped. We should balance the budget. We are about to start on a program of squandering billions of dollars overseas. The bars are down for foreign spending but up for needed self-liquidating projects at home. We are going to continue to spend billions of dollars overseas to build up the economy of those countries which were fighting us yesterday, and will be fighting us tomorrow, and we are going to deny the people of our own country the necessary funds to carry on these great projects in the West that made it possible for us to win the last war, and be the breadbasket and the arsenal and the warehouse of all the other countries who were our allies.

I know it is futile for me to make this argument on the floor. I know the cards are stacked against Bonneville and this item cannot be restored on the floor in this Committee. I am not even going to move to insert or to restore any of these items because it would be wasted effort, but I do hope, when it is returned to us, we will be reasonable enough and sound enough in our judgment when this matter is fully explored in the other body, and additional evidence is received, showing how these cuts are so vital to the very existence of these projects, that we will permit the items that are restored to remain in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone over the detailed comparison in the RECORD between the budget submission and the appropriation committee's recommendation and I wish to point out where the recommendations of the House committee create a totally unworkable and nonfeasible set-up.

First of all, $6,000,000 of contract authorizations was entirely eliminated. With restricted equipment like transformers, switch relays and the like, deliveries will run from 27 months to 36 months.

The total Oregon figures as submitted amounted to $3,274,900 and the allowance by the committee totals $1,021,000. The $1,021,000 can be spent without allowing current to be rated to a single customer. All Oregon substations were eliminated but transmission lines were allowed.

The committee failed to recognize that there are several different types of substations; for example, the first type is more properly designated as a switching station at the power source. All switching stations were eliminated in the estimate, evidently through error without the realization of the difference between a switching station and a transformer substation. The second type is known as an intermediate switching station that corresponds to a booster station in a water works. The booster stations were eliminated. The third step is intermediate transformer stations to make a specific connection with existing lines so that existing lines can be used. The fourth type of substation is the step-down transformer station which delivers low voltage directly to the customer for his use.

The elimination of all these various types of substation is an indirect attempt to elevate rates. Approximately one-third of the total investment in power plants, transformer lines and all accessories needed to make deliveries is tied up in the four types of substations. In a hydro set-up the principal costs are the capital costs, therefore the rate elevation is directly proportional to the investment elimination. What this committee has done is to use an illegal method to elevate rates one-third without any statutory authority for so doing. This is going to throw the Federal Government into endless litigation as the contract policy is laid out in the Bonneville Act and contracts have been executed in conformity with this act. To be specific, I will point out where the Oregon items have been cut:

The request for the McNary-LeGrande line totaled $228,000. The committee allowance for this item was zero. The Detroit-Eugene request was $567,000 and the allowance was $130,400. Southwest Oregon is critically short of power and although the committee has allowed $130,400 this allowance will do absolutely nothing toward relieving this shortage in southwest Oregon. The responsibility for the continuance of power shortage in this area rests upon the faulty judgment of this committee. A second step in relieving power shortage in southwest Oregon was the Goldendale-Detroit item totaling $602,000 of contract authorization. The committee allowance on this item was zero.

The next Oregon item in the bill was Eugene-Reedsport, the request totaling $1,329,000 on which the committee allowance was $797,000. This again, due to the elimination of switching stations, creates an unworkable arrangement. Consequently the Eugene-Reedsport allowance will not give one bit of relief to the shortage arising along the coast. The next Oregon item, Reedsport-Coos Bay requested $79,000 and the committee allowance was $69,000. This $69,000 allowance for the reasons previously indicated is not workable. The next item is Eugene-Roseburg in which the request was $88,000 and which the committee eliminated completely.

The next item was the North Bonneville-Troutdale connection, which request amounted to $381,600 with an allowance of $24,600. This again, for the same reason, constitutes an unworkable set-up.

The Oregon items in the Bonneville request have been so badly butchered that further extensive hearings are needed to bring out the facts on the fallacies behind the committee decisions. I realize that it is impossible to make such corrections in a debate and I am pointing out all these defects so that when the bill reaches the Senate that committee can ask for testimony to clear up these misunderstandings and then report a workable bill.

The bill as reported by the House committee does such a vast amount of injury to the economics of Oregon as to require a complete line of testimony which was not asked for and not given in the House hearings.

The removal of the unclassified items like customers' service facilities, other

capital additions, general structures, advance surveys and designs, and the reduction of tools and equipment from $500,000 to $100,000, compounds the injury to the State of Oregon for the reasons I have indicated.

I might note in this connection that the total request for items in the State of Washington was $11,321,110 with the committee allowance of $3,049,800, and the unclassified items requesting $6,982,000 were reduced to $377,000. The State of Washington is being made to suffer in the same manner as the State of Oregon.

I am including in these remarks a complete analysis of these cuts so that the record may be clear, as follows:

Analysis of action by House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on estimates of the Bonneville Power Administration

	1948 budget estimates					House committee recommendation allowed		
	Transmission lines	Substations	Total	Contract authorization [1]	Total request	Lines	Stations	Total
1. State of Oregon:								
McNary-LaGrande				228,000	228,000			0
Detroit-Eugene	130,400	14,000	144,400	422,600	567,000	130,400		130,400
Goldendale-Detroit				602,000	602,000			0
Eugene-Reedsport	797,000	164,300	961,300	368,000	1,329,300	797,000		797,000
Reedsport-Coos Bay	69,000	10,000	79,000		79,000	69,000		69,000
Eugene-Roseburg				88,000	88,000			0
North Bonneville-Troutdale	24,600	5,000	29,600	352,000	381,600	24,600		24,600
Subtotal	1,021,000	193,300	1,214,300	2,060,600	3,274,900	1,021,000		1,021,000
2. State of Washington:								
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 1	5,103,000	897,000	6,000,000		6,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000
Snohomish-Arlington-Bellingham-Blaine	12,000		12,000		12,000	12,000		12,000
Chehalis-Olympia	231,000	65,000	296,000		296,000	231,000		231,000
Olympia-Shelton-Potlatch-Fairmont-Port Angeles	1,266,800	1,215,200	2,482,000	208,200	2,690,200	1,266,800		1,266,800
McNary-Pasco [2]	137,000	27,000	164,000		164,000	137,000	27,000	164,000
Olympia-Cosmopolis	376,000	185,000	561,000		561,000	376,000		376,000
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 2				769,900	769,900			0
Covington-Olympia	51,000		51,000	650,000	701,000			0
Olympia-Shelton No. 2	31,700	3,000	34,700	92,300	127,000			0
Subtotal	7,208,500	2,392,200	9,600,700	1,720,400	11,321,100	3,022,800	27,000	3,049,800
3. Other items, unclassified:								
Columbia substation additions		141,000	141,000		141,000			0
Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam	212,000	25,000	237,000		237,000	212,000	25,000	237,000
Idaho Panhandle				489,000	489,000			0
Customers' service facilities			1,730,000	1,000,000	2,730,000			0
Other capital additions			1,270,000	730,000	2,000,000			0
General structures			350,000		350,000			0
Advance surveys and design			535,000		535,000			0
Tools and equipment			500,000		500,000			100,000
Subtotal	212,000	166,000	4,763,000	2,219,000	6,982,000	212,000	25,000	337,000
Operation, maintenance, marketing, and administration					4,700,000			2,500,000
Total	8,441,500	2,751,500	15,578,000	6,000,000	26,278,000	4,255,800	52,000	6,907,800

[1] No contract authorization was recommended.
[2] Construction power for McNary Dam at Umatilla, Oreg.

BONNEVILLE

Mr. Chairman, I approach the Oregon items in the pending bill not as a fault-finding critic. I fully appreciate the sincere effort put in on this bill, and the need to place the national finances on a sound basis. Therefore, my remarks will be confined to a constructive approach, so that when the bill is finally completed, and enacted, balancing correction can be made within the ceiling limitations so as to insure a workable bill.

It is fully realized that the Bonneville and certain reclamation items in this bill present a very complex situation. The usual budgetary consideration consists merely of adjusting numbers of personal and accessory budget objects, in order to arrive at a total departmental fund reduction or allowance. This process then only involves personnel functions and the translation of adjustments to dollars, which is an accounting matter only.

However, such items as I will now discuss involve in addition the physical workings, service, and the effect on the economic lifeblood of my district and State. Budgetary processing alone will not insure that physically electricity will flow in step with dollars. Dollar allowances under the natural order can never make electricity or its analog, water, flow up hill. In addition, the complexity is increased when a number of transmission lines are solidly tied into a grid, such as we have in the Northwest. Therefore, Nature's axiom that the workable whole is the sum of all parts that insure workability cannot be ignored in budgeting such a business enterprise. Cutting by parts does not give us insurance that the remainder will be physically workable, and that power will flow to areas of short supply. On this major point the record of the hearings is so deficient that accurate judgment cannot be exercised. This type of consideration is needed before we can be assured of a workable lay-out.

To bring this point home, I will cite the situation in Portland, Oreg., which is in my district. Over 60 percent of the kilowatt-hour supply of Portland comes from Bonneville, according to page 10 of the 1946 Bonneville report. This supply must travel through existing critical bottlenecks created during the war period when the Nation was in a condition of short supply of critical materials. These bottlenecks will not be relieved unless all parts of the whole are in electrical balance. Therefore, I am fearful that this bill will not give adequate relief to shortage areas. If we run into this situation, system power deliveries will have to be cut back to reach a new balance. This in turn will result in electrical, industrial, and general brown-outs. When this comes, where will the responsibility rest?

Furthermore, cutting off power supply results in reducing pay-out revenues, and more important still, such action will place a brake on the region's economy.

I can gather no comfort in such an analysis from the record that is presented with this bill. What I have examined convinces me that the usual and I might say correct budgetary practice, applied only to personnel, is going to produce endless trouble and complications, unless the physical, service, and regional economy are also brought into step with budgetary processes, which I am convinced still needs to be done.

I will not now take your time to expand these revealing points, but the items that I will later present must be considered before this bill is finally completed, if we are to secure a workable bill. Therefore, I am now proceeding along the lines indicated by the hearings, the report, and the bill.

Accordingly, I will cover additional points in the order indicated: First, the operating and maintenance component of the total estimate; second, development work, which is of national interest; and third, construction. I feel that it is my duty to point out all such facts in

order to merit supplemental consideration. Adequate coverage cannot be secured in debate, as it is a matter requiring further development through hearings.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that both the operation and maintenance and construction allowances in the bill constitute an attempt to legislate. The force account proviso should be subject to a point of order. There are sound precedents on this point. The proviso language in the bill is so broad as to cover all classes of work. This proviso also will constitute rank discrimination against veterans and in addition to being contrary to the provisions of the Bonneville act, it is an oblique method of depriving veterans of their preferential rights under the GI bill of rights.

The sections in the report covering substations are also legislative in character and constitute a left-handed means of elevating the power rates. The committee report has no standing in law, but I do want to call attention to the erroneous approach in attempting to arrive at allowance figures, which if written into law would clearly be subject to a point of order.

It is impossible to ignore the full requirements of operating a power system, especially a system which is the third largest in the United States. As long as the generators are turning out power, and the users of this power are dependent upon this energy supply, it is absolutely necessary that employees be available to adequately operate and maintain the equipment. The Federal facilities generate power, but sell service. Without adequate service the return to the Treasury is bound to decrease, and supply will also be reduced.

The Bonneville Power Administration estimates provided $4,700,000 for the purpose of keeping the system fully operative during the fiscal year 1948. The estimates carried a moderate increase to cover personnel for operating new facilities now being constructed but scheduled for completion during 1947 and 1948. These estimates evidently were not submitted without a careful review of every item of expense, and they represent the considered judgment of engineers and technical men experienced in electrical operations, in order to secure workability. The Administration has demonstrated in past years that its operating costs are below those of other utilities in its operating area. An analysis shows that in 1945 the Bonneville costs were 15.4 percent of revenues. I am advised that four other companies in the Northwest showed 27.3, 26.6, 22.6, and 20.9 percent of revenues during the same period. Therefore, comparatively, the operation and maintenance submitted is reasonable, as the increases over 1945 are evident.

A substantial reduction in funds available for the operation of the Bonneville system will necessarily reduce the quality of service rendered, and will result ultimately in loss of revenue.

Operating costs in an enterprise like Bonneville cannot be considered in the same light as appropriations for the various bureaus in the different departments. Bonneville's operating costs are returnable to the Treasury through collected revenues, annually, while the others are not. I also feel that this difference was not fully recognized when this portion of the estimate was considered. If it had been, operating and maintenance funds would not have been so drastically reduced. To meet the regions' service needs, this action should be reconsidered and reviewed before this bill is finally enacted. I hope that such action will result in an allowance adequate to meet service and supply needs.

A part of this operating function covers development expenses. From the record I would judge that this effort has been incorrectly considered as sales or propaganda expense. Therefore, in order to correctly outline the development status I will expand my remarks applying to this item.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT WORK OF THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville Power Administration has a Division of Industrial and Resources Development. This division spends less than $300,000 per year on the development of industrial power markets. Currently, the Administration is selling $13,000,000 of power per year to industrial customers. It therefore is spending only about 2 percent of its current annual revenues from industrial sales to maintain and expand that business. This is a very modest expenditure and is less than private utilities spend throughout the country for all kinds of sales promotion. They spend about 4 percent of their revenues.

However, the Administration ought to undertake a much larger program than it now has. It is operating the third largest power system in the United States. It serves the territory of Oregon, Washington, and portions of adjacent States. Bonneville service area is as large as all of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey combined, but it is a young and undeveloped country, with only 4,000,000 inhabitants. The spaces are vast, and its mineral, timber, and agricultural resources are not fully in use. It lacks the industrial fuels that have made the industrial East and are making the industrial Southwest. It has no oil, natural gas, or coking coal. Its only low cost source of industrial power is the Columbia River system.

Nature made this river basin a low cost hydropower producer by combining storage reservoirs that cost the country nothing to build—snow fields and glaciers—with power sites in deep gorges where little land is flooded when dams are built. The total costs of building Columbia River dams, compared with the power produced, always give the lowest cost of hydropower that can be developed in the United States.

There are some interests, unfortunately, that wish to hold back this power development, to stop it by blocking the construction of dams, and to burden it with unjustified high rates for electricity actually produced at low cost. These interests would thereby impose an industrial barrier on the country as a whole. We would be a much weaker Nation if they have their way. Imagine the state of this country if selfish interests had prevented the development of Pennsylvania coal and oil, Michigan and Minnesota iron ore, Texas gas, and California petroleum. The entire country has profited by the development of these resources. It will also profit when the Pacific Northwest power resources are allowed to develop fully.

But such developments require more of the pioneering investigations and promotion of industrial opportunities in which the Bonneville Administration is engaging in too limited a way. There is no group of private agencies in the Northwest able to do this job. The local chambers of commerce do a good job for their own cities and surrounding territory. The private utilities have set up industrial development programs that also serve local areas. But none of these activities can serve the people of the entire region as effectively as can the Bonneville Administration.

For example, the Administration is responsible for the policies that led to the sale or lease to private enterprise of four Government aluminum plants in Tacoma and Spokane, Wash., and Troutdale, Oreg. Bonneville conducted all of the technical research to determine what could be done with the Government aluminum plants, where the raw materials would come from, what the Federal policies should be on lease and sale. This job required cooperative help from a half dozen Federal agencies in Washington that gave much information, some of it confidential, which no private agency could have obtained. At a time when Bonneville program was adopted by the Surplus Property Board, chambers of commerce in the Northwest were actually divided in attitude as to what should be done with the Government plants. Each chamber was concerned with its local problem, whereas the Bonneville Administration came forward with a program for the good of the region. This program worked. As a result, the entire country benefited with a sharp expansion in the aluminum industry after the war-production cutbacks, and the Bonneville Administration is turning into the Federal Treasury at least 4,000,000 revenue dollars more per year.

Again, the Administration is working on a program to develop western phosphate rock through the use of low-cost electric power. This work involves minerals in southeastern Idaho and western Montana. Tests of processes are now being conducted. No local chamber of commerce or private group in the Northwest could have the widespread information and incentive to engage in this type of developmental work which will benefit the entire region as well as 2,500,000 farmers in 25 Western States through an increase in the production of phosphate fertilizer at low cost.

Other developmental programs on which the Administration is engaged are future defense projects which will require at least 500,000 kilowatts of energy—equivalent to one power dam—expansion of the magnesium industry, and various chemicals and metals. In all of this work the Administration serves the entire region. It surveys industrial-

plant sites where no chamber of commerce would go, and it assembles information for men in industry that they cannot obtain otherwise. It does this on a limited scale with inadequate funds.

All of this developmental work requires some years before it brings final results. It took the Bonneville Power Administration 5 years of work on aluminum before the results came in additional revenues of $4,000,000 per year. The cost of this work was about $60,000, which is now being paid off at the rate of 66 times a year. It will take some years to bring about the phosphate fertilizer development. But the time required is not unreasonable. To promote industries that will consume the energy produced by dams that take 3 to 5 years to build requires much planning and work in advance. The sale of power to industries is entirely different than the sale of nylon stockings. If a store is sold out of nylon stockings, it would waste money to try to sell any more. But now that Bonneville is temporarily sold out of power, it would waste Federal money if it did not try to promote sales for the near future when more power will be available from the dams being built. A pair of nylon hose is sold in 1 minute; a block of industrial power is sold, frequently, after developmental work that took a few years.

That is why the hard headed and economical way of promoting the power program of the Pacific Northwest calls for continuation of the industrial power program of the Bonneville Administration and for expansion of this program.

INDUSTRIAL POWER AND RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chairman, I would judge from reading the hearings covering the Bonneville items in the Interior appropriation bill that considerable confusion exists as to the type of activities undertaken by the division of industrial and resources development of the Bonneville Power Administration and covered by the estimate applying to this division.

This is largely a customer-service organization rather than a direct-sales organization. The work of this division is confined to the technical aspects of the electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries. Fully 80 percent of this division's work is commercial service rather than direct sales.

To classify this division as a sales or propaganda organization and thereby curtail appropriations when there is no power surplus is an erroneous approach. It is not a propaganda organization, being composed of technicians. The larger American industries, even though they have sold the output represented by their plant capacity, maintain and continue such development divisions.

Last December in the magazine, American Metals, Mr. H. G. Fuller, manager of commercial research for the United States Steel Corp., outlined the development activities of that corporation. Mr. Fuller, in this article, outlined 12 major approaches and investigations continuously conducted by the commercial research division of the United States Steel Corp. I have taken these 12 items given in the Fuller article and have compared them item by item with the activities of the Bonneville Power Administration. I found that in each instance, the approach of the United States Steel Corp. and the Bonneville Power Administration was identical. This comparison proves the soundness of the applicable Bonneville estimates which have been curtailed.

We are living in an age governed by technological advances. Unless the power users keep abreast of these trends, they will find that their methods and processes have been outmoded. No large corporation that has an industrial development division treats such a division as a direct-sales organization. The United States Steel Corp., for example, is continually working on market investigations to establish the commercial desirability of proposed plant expansions. All recommendations to the board of directors of United States Steel involving market and plant expansions go through the resources department before submission. Without an analysis of the size and trends of market and the article acceptance in such a market, the United States Steel management would be hampered in planning capital additions. The same situation exists in an organization like Bonneville. Outside of the Aluminum Co. of America, no Bonneville customer is large enough to warrant such an organization. The service rendered by Bonneville is a protection to the small, growing industrialists.

ORGANIZATION

Mr. Chairman, the staff of the Development Division is located in Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, and its activities are carried on principally in the home office. The staff is largely composed of expert technicians in the fields of industrial chemistry and electro-metallurgy. It also includes a small staff of market investigators. The working program of this staff can be divided into those fields which involve: First, analyses of economic and technical factors which influence industrial power consumption; second, the study of industrial raw materials, freight rates, and other similar factors directly related to the potentials of the industrial use of electricity.

In an organization the size of Bonneville, questions are continually coming in covering raw materials and markets. In addition, it is necessary to maintain liaison with the industrial and business groups throughout the United States. Without the Resource Development Division these contacts will be lost.

From my own investigation, I can state that the staff of this division does not solicit plant establishments involving displacement of electric industries from other parts of the United States. Their efforts are directed entirely to new plants using native materials and plant expansions.

The private power companies render similar service but in a lesser degree. Proportionately the private power companies spend more per dollar of revenue for such activity than can be found in the Bonneville estimates.

I have specialized in this field of activity for many years and can speak from the vantage point of this experience. This is a very vital item in the development of the Northwest, and I greatly regret that the hearing record did not develop the factual side of this program, which is completely reimbursable as an operating item.

The purpose of these remarks is to provide the background for a reexamination of this item, so that proper correction can be made. This, in my judgment, is possible under the budget ceiling established by the legislative budget committees.

POWER CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

Mr. Chairman, the hearings on the pending bill indicate that all interests in the Northwest are in agreement on one point. This point is the indicated impending power shortage resulting from lack of generating capacity, and adjunct transmission facilities to meet load requirements between 1947 and 1953. The private power interests as well as the public power and commercial interests are in agreement on this point. Any expenditures to meet this situation, under the pay-out report, are reimbursable items, and this important fact needs to be farther stressed and expanded over what appears in the hearings.

The record further shows that six generator units are on order for the Grand Coulee plant. These total under a very conservative estimate 745,000 kilowatts, with the last unit scheduled to be in service by November 1, 1949. The full record on this bill does not show how these schedules can be met, with funds allowed.

The record further shows from the complete private as well as public resolutions from all groups that the 745,000 kilowatts now on order, if the schedules were fully met, would still be short by 318,000 kilowatts meeting the agreed load estimates by November 1, 1949.

These generating-capacity figures indicate the approach of a very critical power-supply situation. With such a clear signal, it is difficult to take the record and match such capacity with allowances under this bill. Generation alone will not solve the problem. This power after it leaves the machines has to be transmitted to the load centers, and from the load centers it must travel over and through service facilities to reach the wholesaler. The cash register, which functions as a collection source for the Federal Treasury, will not operate without the load center and service accessories.

Under the submitted estimates, the load center and the accessory-transmission facilities were justified on an isolated facility basis. In the process of reduction, the record does not show the maintenance of balance between all these parts. To reestablish balances is an engineering problem of the highest order. Therefore, any detailed discussion of the effect of the elimination of this facility or that facility, at this time, would not be conclusive under the existing record. Further hearings will be needed to bring out all the interrelationship which I have indicated.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion it is clearly evident that we have a problem

before us that cannot be solved by the usual budgetary processes applicable to the mill run of governmental agencies. To secure a workable result the physical and economic parts need to be tied into the budgetary formula. This has not been done, and the need for further testimony along this line is clearly evident. Under the democratic system of checks and balances, an opportunity still exists to clarify the record along the lines I have indicated. Until this is done, a workable bill cannot be formulated.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported does violence to the economy of the State of Oregon. The substation and force account provisions clearly represent an ill-advised procedure and constitute an attempt to nullify long-established congressional policies, which are written into the organic Bonneville and other acts.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following telegrams opposing these cuts:

SALEM, OREG., *April 25, 1947.*

HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Appropriation bill for Interior Department reported by House committee eliminates all subitems pertaining underground water in item for gaging streams. These eliminated subitems have been basis of dollar-for-dollar cooperation with State of Oregon to obtain continuing record of our ground water. Without this record the development of our agriculture and industry will be seriously handicapped. Have reason to believe eliminating of these subitems by committee based on misunderstanding that work on underground water involves only test drilling to locate city water supply. Past cooperative work in Oregon has yielded information of assistance to private and public agencies and individuals and has not included test drilling in competition with private enterprise.

CHAS. E. STRICKLIN,
State Engineer.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 25, 1947.*

HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Labor agreement with Bonneville allowing force account highly satisfactory to us in Oregon. Please use your influence on House Members to eliminate restrictions against force account by Bonneville Power Administration and to restore funds for bus station. Contact Alvey, Washington representative of Bonneville, for additional information.

J. T. MARR,
Executive Secretary, Oregon State Federation of Labor.
JOHN O'NEILL,
President, Columbia Power Trades Council.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 24, 1947.*

Representative HOMER D. ANGELL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions has studied report of House Appropriations Committee on the Department of the Interior. We wish to call your attention to the fact that in two basic respects the recommendations of the committee are unsound engineering-wise as they apply to the electrical power industry in terms of funds recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration. We note absence of provision for substations. This endangers adequate standards of engineering operation on an integrated grid and would place new substations under control of persons not subject to centralized dispatching. Transformation facilities and switch stations are required in any basic current system as an integral part of stepping up generating voltage or assuring flexibility in combined operations of generating and transmission systems. Also switch stations are required as part of a transmission network to assure servicing to load centers by permitting automatic isolation of faulted lines and facilities. From an engineering point of view operation of substations by other than single owner would seem difficult where such substations serve more than one customer. Please use your efforts to restore funds for substations on lines authorized by the committee as sound engineering and necessary for economical operation. Restriction against force account work does not take into consideration known difficulty of securing contractors to bid on electrical construction at present and also known satisfaction of Northwest labor with existing collective agreement with Bonneville Power Administration providing for existing force account crew to supplement contract work and provide check against exorbitant bids. Administration is effectively using maintenance crews to supplement construction, thereby providing adequate force for emergency purposes under coordinated operations-construction working practice. Please use your emphasis to delete provisions of appropriations bill restricting force account work.

FOSTER J. PRATT,
President, IFTEADU-AFL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself for a minute to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I want to inform him that two of his bad boys broke loose with a new ax and raised Cain not only in 17 Western States but throughout the Nation. They forgot that we are 48 States but one Nation. That it is neither East or West nor North or South. It is the welfare of America that we are considering here today.

These two boys, BOB and BEN, apparently without consulting some of their colleagues on the subcommittee went on a rampage and slashed the budget of the Bureau of Reclamation until there is not even a respectable corpse left. Worse than Peck's bad boy abroad, they put cockleburs in the bed of Secretary Krug forgetting that Mr. Krug is just a servant of this Nation the same as we are. They glory in their attempted destruction of one of the great institutions of this Nation—Reclamation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] intimated on this floor in opening the debate that Mr. Krug would use some of the Reclamation appropriation to defeat the Republican Party. I wonder if the gentleman knows what he is attempting to do? A great deal of damage has already been done, Mr. Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The time has come for you to help us prevent further damage.

I hope that you will vote with us to recommit this bill. After that is done, I hope you will take these two mischievous youngsters on your subcommittee, who know not what they are doing, to the Republican cloakroom and give them a good, sound tongue lashing. They have it coming to them.

I repeat, this is not a party issue; it is an American issue, and we Republicans are as much concerned in the welfare of this Nation as our Democratic colleagues. We are united when it becomes a question of the development of the natural resources of this Nation.

Drunk with power, the chairman, Mr. JONES, of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, ably assisted by his friend, cut the budget estimate for the Department of the Interior by 47 percent, and cut the budget estimate for the Bureau of Reclamation by 57 percent. If these irrational and wanton cuts are permitted to stand, it will cripple the Nation—it will cripple irrigation and reclamation. It will cripple rural electrification by delaying the production of hydroelectric power. It will cripple the development of the industrial West.

Undoubtedly, the invisible power interests who wish to prevent the development of hydroelectric power are behind the scenes. They have singled out for slaughter the Bureau of Reclamation because it develops hydroelectric power. This is not the first time that this fight has been on the floor. It was here last year and the year before that. Yet there is no intelligent reason for it. The privately owned utilities gain by the production of hydroelectric power the same as other industries. They have been able to buy this power and to distribute it to the people. Yet they would destroy the goose that lays the golden egg.

Privately owned utilities use 20,000,000 barrels of oil a year in the production of electrical energy. That oil cannot be replaced. When turned into electrical energy, it is gone forever. Yet oil is our greatest national defense. It is virtually the only national defense in modern warfare.

We know that our oil reserves are being rapidly exhausted. We should conserve that national defense, rather than to use it in producing electrical energy. This is especially so when the Bureau of Reclamation can produce this electrical energy as an aid to and by-product of irrigation through proper storage and use of water.

Yet the Jones subcommittee would continue this waste of needed oil and let the water that should be used for production of power and irrigation go unharnessed and uncontrolled to the ocean.

It is true that the House voted to cut the President's budget estimates of $37,500,000,000 by $6,000,000,000. This could be accomplished by a 16-percent cut straight across the board. Why was the Bureau of Reclamation singled out for a 57-percent cut? The reason is very obvious—hydroelectric power.

If these cuts are allowed to stand, then the Missouri River Basin projects will suffer, especially will the Fort Peck-Crosby-Kenmare-Souris project be delayed. It is not the East against the West. It is the power interests against the Nation. If these cuts are allowed to stand, then rural electrification in North Dakota and throughout the West will be

delayed and denied to farmers that help feed the Nation. I am confident that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will not permit this to happen.

Here is how the budget estimates have been slashed by the subcommittee:

General investigations, the budget allowance $5,000,000, the bill here under consideration $125,000—a cut of 97½ percent.

Reclamation fund construction, Gila Valley, budget allowance $2,500,000; present bill $1,000,000, or a cut of 60 percent.

Davis Dam, budget allowance $18,000,000; present bill $6,200,000, or a slash of 66 percent.

Central Valley, budget allowance $20,000,000; present bill $6,900,000, or a slash of 65 percent.

Colorado-Big Thompson, budget allowance $14,000,000; present bill $4,815,000, another slash of 66 percent.

Palisades, budget allowance $2,629,000; present bill $876,000, a slash of 67 percent.

Hungry Horse, budget allowance $4,500,000; present bill $1,550,000, another slash of 66 percent.

Fort Peck, Missouri Basin, budget allowance $2,500,000; present bill $1,250,000, a slash of 50 percent.

Missouri Basin—Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska project—budget allowance $23,000,000; present bill $9,611,000, a slash of 58 percent.

These last two slashes not only affect my own State. They affect all of the nine States in the Missouri River Basin development. What I have to say about these two slashes, however, applies to similar slashes in projects in other Western States. I shall leave the discussion on those projects to Members from those States. I shall now briefly discuss the slashes of the Missouri River Basin project.

The House Appropriations Committee cut the Bureau of Reclamation budget estimate for 1948 from $145,952,200 to $62,717,600. That portion of the cut applying to the Missouri Basin and Fort Peck projects seriously affects the State of North Dakota. The Missouri Basin project was allowed $9,611,600 as compared to $23,000,000 which was requested. This reduction, together with specific restrictions included in the committee's report on the use of funds, will stop virtually all work on the Missouri-Souris development if it is allowed to stand.

The Missouri-Souris unit in North Dakota will ultimately provide more than a million acres of irrigated land and will include power generating facilities. The total estimated cost of this unit is $188,580,000. It is easily the most important single development ever proposed in the State of North Dakota.

The Missouri-Souris development is in an advanced stage of planning at the present time. The Bureau of Reclamation's program for 1948 provides for an expenditure of approximately $501,000 for the continuation of surveys and the preparation of designs and specifications. It is intended to concentrate on the Sheyenne Dam so that actual construction of this key feature of the development can be started in the near future. By reducing the budget request and restricting the use of recommended funds to units now in the construction stage, the committee has made it impossible to carry on the planned work in the Missouri-Souris area. This important unit will probably be set back for more than a year.

In accordance with the recommendations of the committee that available funds be used on Missouri Basin units either now under construction or ready for construction it will be possible to make some start on the Heart River unit. However, it will be necessary to stop all activity connected with the Dickinson subunit of the Heart River development. The Dickinson Dam, which is urgently needed to provide municipal water for the city of Dickinson, will be delayed several years.

The Missouri Basin program, provided for in the President's budget request, anticipated continued work on the Knife River unit and the Missouri River pumping unit in North Dakota. Both of these are in an advanced stage of planning and probably could have been ready for construction during the fiscal year of 1949. The reduction in the appropriation recommended by the committee will require complete stoppage of all work on these units.

The scheduled work for 1948 in the Missouri Basin also contemplated the expenditure of $1,810,000 for further work on the general plan of development. Included in this item are the Cannonball Unit and the Garrison Reservoir Diversion Unit. Also included in this item is provision for important studies and investigations of power transmission and marketing problems affecting, not only the power-generating plants in the Bureau of Reclamation program, but also the generating plants constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The Bureau of Reclamation has been designated as the marketing agency for power generated at Army projects. Virtually, all of this work will be stopped if the committee's reduction of approximately thirteen and one-half million dollars is not restored to the Missouri Basin project.

The Missouri Basin development is several times larger than the TVA project. It affects 10 States and covers approximately one-sixth the total land area of the United States. It is a project comprising nearly a hundred reservoirs and including provision for irrigation of more than 4,000,000 acres of land. Its total cost will exceed $1,000,000,000. Practically all of this amount will be returned to the Treasury through direct payments. The revenues which will be derived through broadening of the tax base will exceed the cost many times in years to come. In consideration of the size of this project, the planned program for 1948 represents a very slow schedule of development. The program for 1948 is a slow program because it fully recognizes the present budgetary limitations imposed by the national economy, and it was designed so that it would not create heavy demands for construction materials which might be scarce at the present time.

The committee has reduced the request for the Fort Peck project from $2,500,000 to $1,250,000. The principal item in the Fort Peck project program is completion of the Fort-Peck-Williston transmission line for which approximately $1,500,000 is programed in 1948. This line is essential in order to bring Fort Peck power to the municipalities and REA cooperatives in North Dakota. It is also needed to tie in with the Williston-Garrison transmission line which will carry power needed for construction of Garrison Dam and will later serve in the marketing of power to be generated at Garrison Dam.

In addition to several small lines and substations serving specific municipalities and cooperatives the Fort Peck program includes construction of a 115-kilovolt line from Glendive to Miles City, Mont. Approximately $1,250,000 has been programed for this line and related substations. Also included in the Fort Peck program is approximately $800,000 for additional transmission lines and substations in the Milk River district in Montana.

The $1,250,000 allowed for Fort Peck by the committee, together with funds expected to be carried over from the current fiscal year, will only permit about half of the scheduled work to be accomplished in 1948. Every transmission line and substation in the program is urgently needed to serve specific and acute demands for additional power. If the reduced appropriation is allowed to stand, reprograming of the work will be necessary. The result is certain to mean serious delays in meeting demands for Fort Peck power.

The committee's report carries a recommendation that substations be provided by the local utilities, municipalities and other customers being served. This plan is unworkable and impracticable from the standpoint of design and operation. Most of the substations will serve more than one customer and proper design and operation of the substation has a vital bearing on the success of the whole transmission system. Municipalities, rural co-ops, and others are not generally equipped nor do they desire to construct their own substation facilities.

In addition to being concerned about the Missouri Basin and Fort Peck projects, North Dakota, like every other Western State, is affected by the Bureau of Reclamation's program of general investigations. The committee has reduced the budget request for general investigations from $5,000,000 to $125,000. This action will virtually wipe out a well-trained, technical staff of Reclamation engineers that could not be replaced for years. If funds for this advance planning are cut off now, all of the long-range studies that have been started by the Bureau of Reclamation will have to be abandoned and much of the valuable information which has been amassed to date will lose value through lack of continuity. It will cost a lot more in the long run.

Some of this money is needed to carry on cooperative work with the State Department and the International Boundary Commissions in planning the control and utilization of waters from international streams. You may not realize that my State of North Dakota has several international streams, such as the Souris River, that are of concern to this country and to the Canadian Government. As our neighboring countries develop the land and water resources of the international river basins, and until definite agreements are consummated, our bargaining position becomes weakened.

Most of the State of North Dakota is within the Missouri River Basin, and plans for development of several important projects, such as the Missouri-Souris and Knife Rivers, have already been authorized by the Congress. These are sound projects that will someday contribute importantly to the welfare of North Dakota, as well as the Nation. There are a lot of other basins that should be further developed, and the only way to get the plans ready is to appropriate sufficient investigation money to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, $200,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,164,417."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the language in lines 12, 13, and 14 reading as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the Division of Power under the Office of the Secretary."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, if we have a Secretary of the Interior who this year has wasted $472,000 in his own office then he should be dismissed. That is how much below what the Office of the Secretary is using this year this bill would cut the Office of the Secretary. However, I am not seeking to restore that full amount.

What does this amendment do? In practical effect it does only one thing; it restores the Division of Power in the Secretary's Office with sufficient appropriation for that purpose. In my opinion, the committee has made a grievous mistake by eliminating it.

The Government of the United States has an investment of many hundreds of millions of dollars in hydroelectric dams. The Secretary of the Interior is the administrative head of the largest power program in the world from which the Government receives a revenue annually of more than $30,000,000; yet by this bill we are denying the Secretary the expert staff of engineers, accountants, analysts, or even the clerks, the file clerks or a stenographer, necessary to review the rate structures and to supervise the technical job of administering the duties of this tremendous responsibility.

In the Flood Control Act of 1945 the Congress placed the sole responsibility in the Secretary of the Interior for the marketing of power generated from hydroelectric dams built for flood control by the Corps of Army Engineers. Many of these dams are now under construction. Some of them will come into the production of power next year. Yet by this bill we would abolish the Division of Power in the Department of the Interior.

Here the proponents of private power are making the same blind mistake in the name of private enterprise, that was made in keeping the Muscle Shoals Dam idle so long.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes at the heart of efficient administration of public power. It is not a question of whether we are going to build other hydroelectric dams. It is a question of whether we will allow the administrative authority to have under his supervision a Division of Power for the exercise of supervision and administrative good judgment over an enormous investment, business, and program. That is the question. And what is the amount? Only $164,000. Perhaps that is not as much as the president alone of one single power company would draw in salary, and yet we deny that to an administrative agency that has supervision over the greatest power program in the world. Indeed, we deny any funds whatever for the agency by this bill. That is false economy if I correctly understand the meaning of that term.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the only purpose in taking this time is to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee or someone who is familiar with this matter. As I understand, in the Flood Control Act it provides that the Army engineers shall administer power projects of flood-control dams. What I wish to know is this: In a multiple-purpose dam, like the Shasta Dam, where flood control is one of the features, does that mean that the power project in that dam will be administered by the Army engineers?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The division of authority depends upon what agency received the appropriation and for what major purpose it was constructed. For instance, if your Shasta Dam, which is part of the Central Valley project, is a part of the Reclamation Service, then the dam is operated by them. In flood-control dams, like Denison Dam and Norfork Dam, they are flood-control dams and operated by the War Department Corps of Engineers. Bonneville Dam is operated by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In other words, where the major feature is flood control plus hydroelectric development, this is for the Army Engineers to take over?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I would say that probably one of the major features is crystallized in first getting the dam authorized as a flood-control project or reclamation project and how it is authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As the gentleman has learned from the answer of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the duties under the Secretary with respect to power are roughly divided into two parts, but remember that the Secretary of the Interior has administrative responsibilities for both types of projects. The Division of Power by this amendment would have sufficient appropriations to exercise the necessary administrative jurisdiction here in Washington, the supervision of the power program in both phases; and the Secretary has sole responsibility for marketing all the power to be generated by flood-control hydro dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not quite understand that—the Secretary has sole responsibility for marketing all the power.

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of War has sole responsibility for the marketing of power from the hydroelectric dams built by the Corps of Engineers for flood control, but having multiple purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What Secretary and what Department?

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee or one of the other members what was the purpose or the necessity of this reduction in the cost of administering this power phase in the office of the Secretary of the Interior? Was there overstaffing or was there waste or what was it?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. If the gentleman wants me to make my address during his time, I shall be glad to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; I do not mean that. The gentleman is going to explain it later?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will yield, I do not like to anticipate the very fine and eloquent address that we are soon to be privileged to hear, but I think I can inform the gentleman that the burden of that able address will be that the Bureau of Reclamation can do this, but at least the Secretary should have some means within his control to exercise supervision over even the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation. But the Bureau of Reclamation has plenty to do in the West without coming down into Georgia, into Tennessee, and up into Maine to market power from hydroelectric dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What would be the effect, for instance, on the branch offices, where they have a certain number of men studying rate schedules and other power problems? Will they be curtailed by the passage of this act with the present amount?

Mr. GORE. The language is that no funds shall be available for the Division of Power, wherever they are.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that the same thing applies to the dams built by the Army engineers under the laws reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I make this brief observation, that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] seems to be following the pattern that he established very early in the session. That pattern is to offer amendments to put back into the bill all the cuts the Republican side wishes to make, and then, after he has tried to put these moneys back in the bill, he will take the floor about once a week and chide us for not keeping our promise to the people of this country to cut down unnecessary expenses of government.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the committee has been very liberal in providing for salaries for the Secretary's office. Let us go back to 1938. The Secretary of the Interior had for his office then $420,000. In 1939 the Secretary had $505,860, and in 1940, $545,410. That was before the war. A lot of things happened during the war and the Secretary's office grew, as many agencies of the Government grew. So the Secretary this year has $1,298,337 to spend to administer the program of the Department of the Interior.

No one was fired when the President froze most of their construction funds, and their program has been curtailed. Instead of having a reduction in force in the head office they have increased it in inverse proportion to the President's limitation of their activities. If the committee were going back to the 1938 level and would just give them salary increases based upon the 1938 personnel, do you know how much the committee could have allowed the Secretary of the Interior for this item? About $850,000. So the committee has been most liberal.

Now let us turn to the other phase of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. They have somewhere around $131,000 in the Power Division. What is the Power Division? It is a transmission belt to keep the Secretary informed of what his own departments are doing on the various reclamation projects, the Southwest Power Administration, and the Bonneville Power Administration. That is all. The next thing is to keep him in touch with his duties and responsibilities with reference to marketing power from flood-control dams. There is very little marketing from flood-control dams at the present moment, very, very little. There are a lot of dams authorized. The decision as to what kind of generators will go into those dams is certainly a War Department function, but this Power Division proposes to figure that out. The Power Division should be eliminated and the Bureau of Reclamation, that has a $12,000,000 engineering outfit in Denver this year, should figure out how the Secretary is going to market his power.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman says the Bureau of Reclamation, under the Department of the Interior, is going to take the place of the Power Division. I thought the gentleman in his colloquy with the gentleman from California a moment ago indicated that the Corps of Engineers was going to handle this power business at multiple-purpose dams that were built primarily for flood control.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. As the gentleman knows, the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam, in which the gentleman is very interested and which create hydroelectric energy, handle the generation of power at those dams. But the Southwestern Power Administration transmits and sells power. The Southwestern Power Administration has offices in Washington and Mr. Blalock is Doug Wright's representative of the Southwestern Power in Washington. Now, in addition to the money spent by Doug Wright's representative in Washington, this Power Division is piled on top of that.

The Bureau of Reclamation has a Washington office. The Bonneville Power Administration has a Washington office, and on top of all that they have superimposed the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman does not intend by the abolition of this Power Division in the Department of the Interior to put the Corps of Engineers in business for the purpose of marketing power or anything like that?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No, sir. The Secretary has charge of the marketing of power and the Secretary has charge of and supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation. Therefore, when the Bureau of Reclamation does Power Division work it will still be the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was just wondering whether you were not going to mix up the Corps of Engineers in fixing rates and selling power, and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that we have a Federal Power Commission, and a very able Commission I might say, which is well staffed and which does this very thing that this power branch of the Department of the Interior has been trying to do, but in our opinion has done a mighty poor job? Is that not a fact?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is a fact.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to have our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] tell us what he thinks of the power branch of the Department of the Interior. Would the gentleman please tell us?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABIN: On page 2, line 22, strike out "$200,000" and substitute in place thereof "$300,000."

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss this amendment I would like to say a word about economy. I have heard in the consideration of these appropriation bills that one side of the aisle is economy minded whereas the other side is not. I submit everyone in the House is economy minded. The difference, it seems to me, is how that word is applied to the problem at hand. Simply cutting expenditures does not constitute economy to my way of thinking. Because the budget of a retailer in a small store in Washington is less than the budget of Macy's department store, is no proof that the retailer is running his place in a more economical manner than the great department store.

The story that best exemplifies economy to my mind is the one where the Scotchman said to a young fellow, "Do you want to make a dollar?" and when the young fellow said, "Yes," the Scotchman said, "Well find me two dollars." You have got to look at the balance sheet. If the expenditure of money will bring a greater return in money than that which is spent, that expenditure could be considered good economy. When we spend money that brings returns benefiting the health, welfare, and prosperity of the people of the country, that expenditure could be considered economy. I do not think it is economy to cut down the number of special agents in the Department of the Treasury. I might say that anyone here could find any number of accounting officers that would be glad to undertake the job of examining tax statements on a contingent basis, with good profit to them and good profit to the Government. I do not consider the Treasury Department cut good economy.

Now, coming down to this specific amendment: It affects no specific project as such. Therefore it may not have particular advocates who are in favor of the continuance of one or another project. On the other hand, it affects the maintenance of the Office of the Solicitor, the nerve center of this great Department, as far as the legal work is concerned, and as such, it should have general support.

Many people of the country do not participate directly in any of the activities of the Interior Department, but all of the people have a vital interest in maintaining a 24-hour watch over the public resources that belong to us all, no of those resources. We count on the Department of the Interior to take care of those resources. We count on the chief law adviser of that Department, the Solicitor and his staff, to serve as chief watchman for this vast property of the American people.

We appropriated $300,000 last year for that watchman's job, and about the same the year before. Back in 1938, which

the Appropriation Committee says it is taking as a model, we appropriated $280,000 for that job, which at current Government wage scales would make approximately $380,000. Our Appropriations Committee asks us to cut that down to $200,000 for the coming fiscal year.

In 1938 the Solicitor's office had 89 people on its pay roll. The next year, if the committee has its way, it will have just half as many employees as it had in 1938, and we will expect them to do, with half a staff, a much larger job than they had to do in 1938, for since then we have legislated added responsibilities on that office.

The average citizen, whether he lives in New York or Wyoming, owns about 30 acres of public lands with all of the oil, gas, minerals, timber, wildlife, dams and improvements that are located in those acres. He needs a law office to protect those 30 acres and that law office is the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. It takes dozens of law suits, hundreds of opinions and thousands of communications and legal warnings to maintain that property intact and to see that the lessees and water users and oil drillers pay what they owe for what they are allowed to take.

Pending litigation with which the Solicitor of the Interior Department is concerned involves sums in the neighborhood of $200,000,000. In one single case in which a judgment was recently rendered for oil that was taken from the public domain without proper payment, the United States won $1,240,000, four times the Budget Bureau's estimate for this office and 6 times what is now proposed. Another court judgment confirms United States title to 500,000 acres of land to which a railroad laid improper claim. Cash recoveries which the Interior Solicitor obtained on behalf of our Indian wards in litigation or administrative proceedings against users of Indian property and other parties amounted to $579,180. In addition, the Solicitor's office has passed upon this year or still has under consideration tort claims and contract claims of private citizens amounting to somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,000,000—ten times the appropriation item which we are told is too extravagant or 15 times the proposed allowance.

We now have only 30 lawyers in the Solicitor's office. This cut would reduce that force to about 20 lawyers. How can we protect our vast resources with a central legal staff so pitifully small? We cut $100,000 from the budget but we do not save it. We lose a great deal more. It is not economy. This amendment should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN], has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for everyone to look at volume I, page 254, and see the number of attorneys that are in every branch and agency of the Department of the Interior. For attorneys: authorized positions, in 1947, for personal services, they have $1,768,123. This Solicitor's office is the head office in the nature of a general counsel for the Department, and it seems to me, with the tremendous number of folks who are allowed in each of the departments, with the number the committee has allowed in the head office with whom these folks in the Department may consult, $200,000 is an ample amount for the Solicitor's office.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. Is it not true that in this general office there are no more than 30 lawyers, less than a good New York law firm?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Yes; but consider the law firm for the entire Department of the Interior. Instead of spending the $307,000 requested in the budget, the gentleman would also have them spend $2,098,000 next year. That would be a pretty big law office.

Mr. RABIN. One further question: Is it not true that if this cut goes through it will decrease the number of lawyers in that office that supervises this great number of lawyers throughout the country, cut them down to 20?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is approximately the right number, too; and we cut them a lot less in the departments.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say that in bygone years the departments of the Government were in the habit of going to the Department of Justice for their legal advice. We have a great Department of Justice with many lawyers in it, a Department that is costing the taxpayers a great deal of money. Some folks do not think certain branches of it are doing a very good job; nevertheless, the Interior Department has available for their service and at their request the whole Justice Department; and on top of that they have today 300 attorneys in the Department of the Interior. Certainly it is way beyond any reasonable amount, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we call for a vote and ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of administering and carrying out directly and in cooperation with other agencies a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f), and Reorganization Plan No. IV, including $100,000 for departmental personal services, including such services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; furniture, furnishings, office equipment, and supplies; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles, and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for meeting expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and take this time in order to ask the chairman of the committee some questions with regard to the language on page 3. I have here in my hand an amendment which I thought to offer to page 3, line 20, making provision with regard to the use of the $1,500,000 in that item. May I ask the chairman or some member of the committee concerning the program of airplane planting and seeding on range lands?

Mr. JENSEN. I am very happy to have the opportunity to express my views and I am sure the views of every member of the committee on this very subject, this matter of airplane pellet seeding. We think it is one of the finest things and one of the most valuable programs we have under way today for soil and water conservation on the great ranges of this Nation. In the report we said:

The committee is much interested in the aerial seed planting program of this service and hopes that a reasonable portion of the appropriation will be used for continuation of this important and most necessary work.

I may say that in my opinion, and from what I can learn from the Soil and Moisture Division of the Department of the Interior, they hope to use at least $150,000 for this program in the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very glad to get that statement from the gentleman and his expression of views in regard to it, also the expression by the committee in the report.

I feel that $150,000 will hardly be sufficient for this work, unless this is exclusively for the planting of pellets and does not include the cost of seed. In my judgment there should be a similar amount available for purchase of seed. Not less than a total of $300,000 should be available for this fruitful development.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, if the Department feels so inclined, it can make more money available of the $1,500,000 which this bill provides for soil and water conservation. I would be very happy if the Department did see fit to spend at least $200,000 or $250,000 of that amount for this pellet seeding program which has proven to be most satisfactory. Dr. Adams has worked hard on this program and is doing a wonderful job. Everybody in the West is interested in it and everyone on the committee, in the Congress and in the country who knows anything about it feels it is a worthwhile program and that it is money well spent.

Mr. MURDOCK. With this statement coming from the committee, I will not offer the amendment to earmark $300,000 for this pelletized seeding work, but I regard the expression just heard from the committee, together with the gentleman's quotation from page 10 of the report on the bill, as a part of the legislative history of this item and the equivalent of a directive in regard to this expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: To enable the Bonneville Power Administrator to carry out the duties imposed upon him pursuant to law, including the construction of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities; operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system; marketing of electric power and energy; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); purchase of 14 in the fiscal year 1948 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance and operation of aircraft; $6,907,800, to be available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available in the fiscal year 1948 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, marketing of electric power and energy, and administrative expenses connected therewith, including $12,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

Page 5, line 23, after the word "purchase of", strike out the word "fourteen" and insert the word "thirty."

Page 5, line 24, after the semicolon and before the word "and", insert the words "purchase of one in the fiscal year 1948."

Page 6, line 1, strike out "$6,907,800" and insert "$20,278,000."

Page 6, line 3, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,700,000."

Page 6, line 6, strike out "$12,000" and insert "$29,000."

Page 6, line 7, strike out the word "*Provided*" and all of lines 8 and 9.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, up to the present moment the Members on the majority side from the Pacific Northwest have rendered nothing but lip service with regard to the reclamation projects and power projects in that area. They will now have an opportunity to vote with regard to the appropriations for Bonneville Power Administration and if those one or possibly two members who spoke yesterday and today are sincere in what they said, they will vote for this amendment which increases the meager amount allowed by the majority of the committee to the amount requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville Power Administration was established by act of Congress on August 20, 1937, to market at wholesale the available electric energy generated at Bonneville Dam, located 40 miles east of Portland, Oreg., on the Columbia River. It is now responsible also for marketing the power developed at Grand Coulee Dam, at McNary and Foster Creek Dams, and the dams to be built on the Snake River.

There is no question today about selling power or having a market for power in the Pacific Northwest. There is no question, therefore, that the money for these great projects will be repaid in toto to the Federal Treasury. The question in the Pacific Northwest is rather one of whether the new dams and new generation can be installed rapidly enough to keep abreast of the growing demands of that region for power. I trust that the gentlemen on the majority side are familiar with the fact that the Pacific Northwest is power hungry.

The construction items in the budget request, which includes contract authorizations, were reduced 80 percent or from $21,578,000 to $4,307,800. The specific reductions in the construction items include:

The Grand Coulee-Snohomish transmission line was reduced from $6,000,000 to $1,000,000. This will upset existing delivery schedules, and will prevent the early delivery of Grand Coulee power into the north Seattle shortage area. The resulting loss in power revenues is certainly not prudent management.

The Columbia substation additions totalling $141,000 were completely eliminated by the Republican members of this committee. This is a trunk-line switching station necessary for the safe operation of the main circuits into Seattle as well as the relief lines to the Hanford atomic bomb plant.

A contract authorization covering the McNary-LaGrande transmission line was completely eliminated.

The new facility construction allowance, including contract authorization, was reduced from $11,248,800 to $1,021,000. This action reduces the power capacity scheduled to meet the critically short southwestern Oregon area. It also eliminates all eastern Washington and Idaho REA and PUD connections. Items designed to provide relief to overloaded transformer banks and switching equipment were completely eliminated, as were provisions for the protective relay system. Such action by the Republican majority compounds serious hazards now existing.

Members on the majority side of the aisle, the matter of Bonneville power is now fairly and squarely in your laps. I heard my friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] this morning say that he did not intend to offer an amendment to rectify the amount of this drastic cut made by the majority members of the committee. I trust that he will now go along with the amendment which I offer, which is in behalf not only of the people of the great Pacific Northwest but of the citizenry of America.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to the very heart of our Northwest economy. Cheap power has been the backbone of much of our new industry in late years. The question before the House at this time is a simple one. If the House favors adequate appropriations to complete the construction of these transmission lines to various parts of the Northwest, they ought to go about it in a prudent businesslike manner. Obviously if the total cost is going to run twenty or thirty million dollars the House should not attempt merely to give lip service to certain construction items and carry them out over a period of 15 or 20 years when by providing the necessary funds now the Government will get its money back that much sooner. You must remember that virtually all the items in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York are reimbursable. They will all be paid back to the United States Treasury. The more transmission lines that we can construct now, the more revenue will be available to the Treasury of the United States. If we want to be logical and consistent, why should we not do this in a prudent manner? If the Government is not interested in providing these transmission lines, if that is the policy of the Congress, then we should not make any appropriation. But it is certainly not wise nor is it appropriate to provide funds on a trickle basis which in the end merely gives lip service to a power program but fails to provide a workable plan and funds to finance it.

Let me say that this is not a public versus private power fight. Some of our largest industries in the Northwest are vitally concerned about the power shortage. They need power now. Representatives of some of the largest corporations in the Northwest appeared before the committee and asked that the funds be made available so that they could get the power now. One of the largest private utilities in the Northwest, the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., made strong reference to the Grand Coulee-Snohomish line so that power could be made available to them now to supply their customers. The same applies to many of the public utility districts in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

I hope the Members of this House will use prudent judgment. I think we will be wasting funds if we merely provide a token appropriation. You must remember that it takes a long time to complete these projects. The contracts must be entered into and materials must be ordered, and unless we go about it in a businesslike way we are not saving any money for the taxpayers of this country.

I hope the members of this committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment generally about the provisions of this bill.

I am vigorously opposed to this bill as reported from the committee. Many of the amendments proposed here today would be helpful if they were to be adopted. However, in my opinion, they will not be approved and no minor revisions or sop tossed out for appeasement will satisfy me that this bill meets the over-all needs of our people.

This Interior appropriation bill of 1948 should be called the "strangle the West" bill of 1948. It is the third regular appropriation bill brought before this Republican Congress this session and the committee asks a 47-percent cut in it; in the two previous appropriation bills, involving over 90 times as much

money, actually less money was cut than is proposed in this bill. Evidently economy for the majority party primarily means economy in the West. For some people, the word "economy" must mean strangling the great western reclamation and public-power projects which are the cornerstone of our expanding industry and agriculture.

I challenge any Member of this House to demonstrate the true economy of delaying from 5 to 40 years the development of our western projects which are investments and not expenditures. Every cent of money from the United States taxpayer to finance Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the other proposed dams and reclamation programs will be returned to the funds of the United States Treasury. Real economy would be to complete these projects as fast as possible so the American people can start to get some money back on the already huge investment they have made in the destiny of the West. Inexcusable delays in the completion of this work, as proposed here in this bill will mean only higher rates for the consuming public, the farmer, and the industrialist.

The West is a new, expanding frontier and, as such, should not be judged by the same criteria as the older, more stable regions of the Nation. However, I want to warn the Members of this House, they are parts of the same organic entity and if the West does not prosper, certainly it will be felt elsewhere.

H. R. 3123, the Interior appropriations bill, brought before this House by the Republican Party in their ax-swinging campaign, seeks to cut down the sound investment of the American people in their future wealth and security. I do not have to explain to you gentlemen the soundness of investment in irrigation and power projects which repay principal and interest, or the soundness of investment in conservation of lands, mineral resources, fish, and wildlife. You gentlemen know that these investments return a thousandfold to the American public in increased national productivity and increased ability to consume the products of our prosperous economy. You know that these investments mean more agricultural and industrial opportunity; more jobs, more markets, increased incomes, new businesses, a larger tax base making possible lower tax rates, a higher and better standard of living for John Q. Public, and more national security. I want to remind you gentlemen again that these are investments, not expenditures, and that the benefits they yield are extended over the whole future life of our economy. The bill which the majority party has brought before this House seeks at this time to cut down on the long-run program of America's investment in its future which was undertaken by the founders of our country and has been carried on by each successive generation. To show on paper that they want fewer funds to lease the United States Treasury in fiscal 1948, the Republican Party proposes this bill, to cut down on investment in resource development and conservation. The effects of such a cut would be long-run, not just this year and next, but 10 and 50 years from now. The questions before this House are whether such sound long-run investment should be cut down and whether it should be cut down at this time and stage in our economic development. My answer to both of these questions is a loud "No."

I cannot discuss all the damaging provisions of this bill, but I should like to cite several examples of its implications.

First I should like to point out the need for power in the area I know best, my State of Washington and my district. Dr. Raver, Bonneville Power Administrator, in his statement before the subcommittee said:

> Already the power shortage is of such major proportions as seriously to threaten the industrial and economic development of the Pacific Northwest. While power is being supplied to most of the new aluminum plants, which have reopened during the past year, we have had to turn down requests for power for still more aluminum production amounting to some 200,000 kilowatts, or approximately the output of two Grand Coulee generators." Later in the testimony Dr. Raver added: "The development of the hydroelectric resources of the Pacific Northwest is of tremendous importance not only to the region but to the Nation as a whole. A potential market of two to two and a half million kilowatts in this region exists in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical fields alone during the next 10 or 20 years. This potential market does not represent the shifting of industry from the East to the West, but represents the Nation-wide expansion of the fastest growing group of industries in the country—the electrochemical and electrometallurgical manufacturers.
>
> If the required power supply is not made available in this region there is no other place in the United States where it can be made available in sufficient amounts and at the required low cost. These industries are indispensable to the new industrial age of chemicals and metals; hence, they will be established somewhere. Already American corporations have developed some plants close to foreign sources of power. The Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. produces ferroalloys and calcium carbide in Norway where the company has over 75,000 kilowatts in hydroelectric facilities. The Aluminum Co. of America was responsible for planning in 1926 a famous hydroelectric project in Canada, which was built during the war in order to produce aluminum. Unless American corporations can obtain low-cost power in the United States in the future, they certainly may be expected to build some plants in other countries. The United States should realistically face this situation.

Not only the light metals and electrochemical companies are in desperate need of more power. The Crown Zellerbach Corp., located on the northern Olympic Peninsula, manufacturing vitally needed wood pulp, which is perhaps the largest private operation of its kind in the State, is unable to obtain sufficient power through its hook-up with Bonneville Power Administration's present lines servicing the local public-utility district and its oil and hog-fuel steam plants combined.

This and other specific examples point up the fact that the actual power-load growths on the Olympic Peninsula and in the industrial areas along the east side of Puget Sound have materially increased over previous surveys, and it is very apparent that the whole area is going to have a brake placed on its economy, unless available electrical energy and power-transmission facilities are expanded now. Municipalities and rural electrical cooperatives also need power now and in these next few years. Representatives from these public groups joined with representatives from private and public power operators at Tacoma, Wash., January 22 to work out some manner of meeting the power emergency through cooperative action to make more electrical energy available within the next several years. They were in agreement upon the need, their joint responsibility, and the Federal responsibility to carry the power from Government dams through Government transmission lines to the region's load centers. For the interests of the economy of the region and the Nation as a whole, the Federal Government must do its part to meet these power needs now. Postponement of further investment to meet the power needs of areas such as the Puget Sound area not only disrupts the economy of those regions, but it is wasteful and expensive from the long-run viewpoint. For economy, construction on projects once undertaken must proceed as rapidly as possible in order that the Government may get a return on its already large investment. Revenues cannot accumulate until the power is on sale, and the power generated cannot be marketed until construction of necessary facilities is completed. Postponement of their completion further postpones the return with interest of the capital invested to the Treasury funds. Also, losses are incurred by deterioration of equipment already installed and machinery used in construction during periods of inactivity. Personnel turn-over is costly in both money costs of hiring and firing skilled personnel and in human costs.

Over 60 percent of the employees of the Bonneville Power Administration are veterans who have returned to their prewar jobs under the GI bill of rights to continue their contribution to the development of the resources of the West and to support themselves and their families. The majority of them are highly skilled technicians loaned to the armed services during the war; they are the only personnel available in the area who can do this highly technical and dangerous work. Postponing the completion of scheduled power facilities or banning force contract work will mean that these veterans will be deprived of their jobs. Even were other skilled personnel available in the area, or were it possible to get private contractors to take on this work, we would be failing in our obligation to these veterans, inasmuch as private contractors would, in these circumstances, have no obligation to give these veterans job preference for the positions they would have to fill in their companies.

Postponement of scheduled construction of power facilities is uneconomic and undesirable.

I would also like to point out the false economy of postponing further construction work on the irrigation aspects of

projects such as the Columbia River developments. Repayment by water users of their allotted share of construction costs cannot begin until the water is actually on their lands. Delay in completing canals ties up the taxpayers loan or investment over an unnecessarily lengthy period. At the same time the total costs of the project are increasing as idle, partially completed canals deteriorate, equipment and machinery becomes obsolete, and the experienced skilled personnel are lost from the pay rolls. There is every reason to rush completion of the Grand Coulee project, and no real justification for postponement or curtailment. Here is a vast area fitted for pioneering in agriculture and small business which we have promised our war veterans and other citizens seeking new opportunity. They seek this opportunity now, as soon as it can be offered, not 15 or 40 years in the future. They want to develop their lands and businesses while they are still young and during this period when capital is readily obtainable for their initial investments. Frank Banks, Grand Coulee construction engineer, presented a chart to the subcommittee during the hearings showing how long it would take, at various rates of expenditure, to complete the planned facilities for 50,000 acres of land in the Columbia Basin area to be put under irrigation. At the rate of $10,000,000 per year, the irrigation of crops can begin by 1963. Investment of $25,000,000 per year will permit irrigation to begin by 1955. If roughly $30,000,000 are invested per year, as the President's budget for 1948 provides, this acreage can be put under irrigation by 1953 or 1954. Soil experts predict that unless more new fertile lands are brought into cultivation within the next few decades this country will begin to suffer a shortage of agricultural products. The Nation needs more cultivatable land soon. The demand for reclaimed land is immediate, not in the distant future. There is every reason why construction should proceed at top speed.

Electrical power is the energy base on which rests the economy of the whole Northwest region. Water is the only practical power base available; generation of electrical energy from coal is too expensive in this area; generation from oil is not only expensive but impossible in large scale due to the shortage of fuel oil. The Northwest is dependent upon the development of its power resources. The people of the United States have realized this urgent need and the great benefits derived by the whole country through natural resource development and have invested heavily in the Northwest. The people of the region foot the bill eventually; through power rates and payments for irrigation water they pay back the power investment with interest and the capital on the irrigation investment. They are ahead of schedule in making repayments at the present time. Power and reclamation have proved so sound financially that even with vast economic abuse during the war they are repaying the Treasury funds with a bonus; they are one of this Nation's best investments. The future of our economy depends upon the availability of raw materials and the stability of our energy base.

I plead with the Members of this House to join with me in recommitting this bill, when the motion is made, to protect this Nation's investment in the future of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I can see perfectly good reasons why the gentlemen from the Western States should become exercised here on the floor and fill the RECORD with their opinions as to the terrorism to be inflicted upon their people if this bill does not pass, but I sometimes wonder whether or not they are really reflecting the sentiment of the people as clearly as they pretend to here on this floor.

This morning I received an air-mail letter from a very distinguished gentleman in the city of Seattle, a man whom I have known for over 50 years. He is one of the leading lawyers in the city of Seattle. For years he has occupied the position of Chairman of the International Fisheries Commission. He is a very distinguished proponent for things in the great Northwest. I thought it might not be amiss to give to the Congress what he says in this letter. I quote:

ALLEN, HILEN, FROUDE & DE GARMO,
Seattle, April 22, 1947.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I notice that Congress is getting tough with the Interior Department on appropriations and I want you to know that there are plenty of people out in this part of the country that are all for it. There would be no tears shed out here if you abolished the Indian Bureau and in the opinion of many of us the civil arm of the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Service. Though they both have some things to their credit, they have become typical money-mad bureaus.

Enclosed is a little screed entitled "Dams or Salmon" which has a lot of merit to it.

Enclosed also is a resolution on congressional appropriations which I believe will interest you. I drafted it myself. It was unanimously passed by our Chamber of Commerce and has been widely circulated out here on the Pacific Coast. Maybe if you got some of the Wisconsin chambers to adopt similar resolutions, it would strengthen the hands of those in Congress who are trying to hold down appropriations.

Best regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

NED
(Edward W. Allen).

Here is a resolution unanimously adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Seattle. The gentleman who just addressed you comes from that city. Here is what they say in their unanimous resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 4, 1947

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce reasserts its wholehearted approval of the avowed intention of the Eightieth Congress of the United States to eliminate all unnecessary Government spending and to reduce Federal appropriations.

Although this chamber has from time to time recommended specific appropriations for projects deemed meritorious, and expects from time to time to make similar recommendations, all such actions shall be construed in the light of the following principles:

1. That this chamber demands that in making appropriations this State and this region receive from Congress as favorable consideration as given to any other State or region in the Nation.

2. That if this State and region does receive such equitable treatment, this chamber in turn is willing that this State and region make its proportionate sacrifice to attain the primary objective of reducing the aggregate of governmental spending to the very minimum essential to proper functioning of the Federal Government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I might say to the gentleman that the items in question in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relate primarily to transmission lines and the very agency or association he has quoted has endorsed the recommendation made by the Department for these funds. It has nothing to do with dams as such or the construction of these dams.

Mr. KEEFE. I am offering the resolution from your chamber of commerce for what it may be worth. To me, it expresses what I believe is the fair sentiments of the people in the Great Pacific Northwest, namely, that they are no different from the people in my State and they realize that we must save this Government and they know what a terrific job we are going to have to try to cut and save anything on this Federal spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I spoke previously this morning for 5 minutes on this Bonneville appropriation. As I stated then, it is in my district and I am vitally interested in it. I am very much concerned about the apropriation. Of course, I am familiar with the facts. The major portion of this money that has been cut from the budget has to do with transmission facilities, including substations and other facilities, in order to market the power. The dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee have already been constructed. Largely, the generators have been installed. There are a few yet to be installed at Grand Coulee, but at Bonneville they are already in. We have the power and will have additional power when the Grand Coulee generators are installed, and we must have the marketing facilities to sell the power. The power belongs to Uncle Sam. It is his project and he has paid three or four hundred million dollars for it and other public works in the Columbia River Basin dependent on it. Yet, without these facilities to market it, the water will go over the dams and out to the sea and this vast amount of power will be wasted, and the money which would come from it and which is available now, will be wasted and the

Federal Government will be unable to recoup its investment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that about 2 months ago all the private utility companies and many of the private corporations dependent on power unanimously endorsed the items contained in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true. It is not a fight between the utility interests, public and private, and Federal control or public ownership. It is a question of supplying the industries of the Northwest with much-needed power which the utilities distribute. We have the power and we need the marketing facilities in order to cash in on it. It seems to me it is certainly a very nonsensical procedure not to give the necessary funds for marketing this power. It will come back to the Government when the power is sold.

I will include in my remarks I made earlier today an analysis which shows, dollar for dollar, where this money would go, and the purpose of it.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I realize it will probably not be accepted. As I said earlier, I sincerely hope that my colleagues on my side of the aisle, when this bill comes from the other body, if these items providing for much-needed facilities for Bonneville are restored, will give them their support. I refer not only to those of us from the West who know the situation but those who are here in the House from other districts who want to support the Federal Government in protecting the immense investment that it has made in these projects. As I said earlier the worth of this investment was demonstrated during the last war when we provided one-third of the aluminum which went into the airplanes to win the war. In the Northwest today there is a dearth of power. Hydroelectric power is at a premium. We could not sell the large magnesium war project which the Government put in at Spokane and now owns because there was no power to operate it. We have this power and we need these new facilities to market it. Many do not realize that it takes from 2 to 5 years to put on order and then construct and install these immense facilities to market this power. So we have to provide ahead from 2 to 5 years in order to have the marketing facilities perfected when the power is ready for distribution. Otherwise we lose the power and the revenues available from its sale.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman realize that next year, under this bill they will have available at Bonneville $18,000,000 as against $11,000,000 for this current year?

Mr. ANGELL. I am very familiar with those figures, and notwithstanding the funds the gentleman mentions, we will certainly be without the necessary funds to build these substations and transmission lines to market the power which will come from the new generators at Grand Coulee, and eventually from McNary Dam, which is now under construction, unless we provide the funds now for these facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, my home is equidistant from the two great dams that generate the power for the Bonneville Power Administration. About 175 miles from home to the west is the Bonneville Dam and about 175 miles to the north is the Grand Coulee Dam. The Bonneville Dam comes within a mile and a half of the edge of my district. I merely state these facts to give you an indication that I should be somewhat conversant with conditions existing in the Bonneville Power Administration.

In view of the fact that the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration when he appeared before our committee failed, in my opinion, to give us the facts that we asked for to the extent that we were not able to judge accurately and correctly what the conditions were out there—in other words he was a master of subterfuge, confusion, and evasion as to the conditions and facts pertaining to this situation—I think our subcommittee was most generous in what was allowed the Bonneville Power Administration to operate with in 1948.

In further support of that contention I offer you the fact that they have $11,755,000 left over from last year with which to operate, together with $7,000,000 that we gave them this year. If they cannot construct power lines to convey the power from those two dams with that money then the transmission lines come too high.

Furthermore, to operate the dams and the power-transmission system they already have, and will have next year, a force of 2,031 employees. That is a young army in itself. This is broken down as follows: 457 employees in operation and maintenance; 183 in shop and equipment service; 628 on design and construction; 53 in general engineering; 156 in customer service and resource management; 386 in financial and business and various services; 47 in the personnel division; 53 in the district offices; 27 in the legal service; 31 in general administration. This makes a total of 2,031.

Of the $11,755,000 left from last year, $4,000,000 is for administrative work, leaving $7,735,000 for construction. But this committee allowed them the following sums: $2,500,000 for administrative work; $4,307,800 additional for construction. I have watched the development of the Columbia River project from the beginning to the present time. In my judgment they have enough money adequately to take care of their present needs and the possibility that they may have too much, especially in view of the fact that the committee is still in the dark as to what has been done with the money already given them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction: For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; including purchase of 10, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600) but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals; and printing and binding; $1,246,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAYBURN: Page 7, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "which amount, together with the unexpended balance of appropriation for this purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1947, is hereby continued available until expended."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations is willing to accept the amendment, I have nothing to say.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management for "Management, protection, and disposal of public lands, Bureau of Land Management," "Range improvement," and "Fire fighting" shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Land Management is one of those agencies the primary obligation of which is to manage a great portion of the Nation's assets. The Government owns in continental United States now practically one-fourth of the landed area and when we include Alaska about 36 percent. We hope to have a classification of this land made from time to time. In order to have a proper classification of the land so that there might be homesteads set aside for veterans in certain areas it is necessary to have adequate funds for this purpose.

I am not going to try to cover all of the various items. I will just hit some of the high spots and in the interest of conserving time will also discuss the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Park Service at the same time.

The Park Service has had to skimp along for several years but it has done

a remarkably fine job with the funds it has had. The number of people going into the national parks is increasing every year. Last year more than 21,000,000 people went into the national parks and it is expected a larger number will go into them this year.

Let me give you some of the instances. Out at a national monument, north of Flagstaff, the custodian has had to clean out an old cliff dwelling there and use it for the residence of his family. At Fort Laramie, Wyo., the custodian had to clean out an old cavalry barracks more than 50 years old, and his wife and four children lived there. At Rocky Mountain National Park the superintendent of the park has to go across private land in order to get to the Government property itself.

Those are some of the problems that face the Park Service, a service that has a fine, high type of personnel and we must realize that in order to conserve the great assets of this Nation we have to provide adequate funds.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has been cut to the bone in a number of instances.

Now as to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Nation should have the benefit of research and the benefit of these studies that are being made with reference to diseases that strike fish from time to time. The funds that have been allowed are such that they will have to cut out the marketing news service, and the failure to have a proper marketing news service may result in a glut in a particular market at one time and a shortage in another. A disastrous glut in one market will cause the fishermen to lose more than the amount which is asked for. At another period of time when there is a shortage of fish products in another area of this country, the amount they ask for may be lost to the consumer. These funds are actually necessary.

I am hurriedly pointing out several items with the hope that we can work out these items, here, or in the Senate, or in conference.

Funds for fire protection in Alaska were requested but denied. The eyes of the country are turned toward Alaska because we are trying to work out the settlement and development of that great area. Fire may be disastrous in that great area, and it is important not only to preserve the forests and settlements but also to keep down the smoke, so that we might have air transportation there. I am calling these things to your attention, hoping that the bill may be finally whipped into shape and these matters taken care of.

Ground water study is another important item that has been cut to the bone, and the study stopped by limitation in the bill. I want to call this to the attention of the House. This is important and an amendment will be offered later and other Members will discuss it and I urge the adoption of an amendment covering this.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE APPROPRIATION

It seems to me that a primary obligation of the Federal Government is to protect its own property adequately and to provide for its management in such a way that the public, which owns it, is able to make safe and satisfactory use of it. This general remark is directed specifically toward the national park system. In it are some of the most valuable possessions of the American people, established by Congress or under congressional authority, with the understanding that they would be cared for properly, given full protection against injury or misuse, and made available for public enjoyment. Responsibility for doing all those things has been placed on the National Park Service; but it cannot possibly meet that responsibility as it should be met with less than adequate funds. I am convinced, after examination of the committee's bill, that it does not provide enough to permit the National Park Service to perform its job satisfactorily.

Last year, with seriously insufficient staffs in the field and in the offices back of the line, the national park system had a greater number of visitors than in any previous year in its history—nearly 21,600,000. There is every indication that this year's total will equal or surpass that of last year. Director Drury of the National Park Service tells me that there has never been a year in which it was necessary to contend with so much vandalism. While, for most Americans, the correction of this situation is a process of education in the proper care of their own property, there is a minor percentage of those who visit the parks whose destructive impulses can be curbed effectively only by a show of authority, and that means having rangers constantly or frequently in those places where damage can be done most easily.

The National Park Service is endeavoring to re-form its forces after the terrific reductions to which it submitted, willingly, during the war. That is not an extravagant aim. The amounts provided in this bill still fall far short of making that possible. A continuing inadequacy of funds means overwork for employees in all the parks and monuments and in the regional offices and the Director's office; it means the ultimate loss of trained personnel; it means unsatisfactory service to the public; it can only mean ultimately serious damage to, or loss of, historic or scientific or scenic features that cannot ever be replaced. Savings here, carried to undue lengths as I believe they will be if this bill is given approval, will prove, in the long run, no savings at all.

The National Park Service for several years has actually had inadequate funds and has had to scrape along. They have done a remarkably good job under great handicap—not only handicap, but actual physical hardships to its personnel. In one area the custodian of a national monument had cleared out an old barracks and he and his wife and children were living in that. In another area they cleared out an old cliff dwelling. In another place a house just intended for a gatekeeper had to be used by the entire family. In one national park members have to go over private propery to get to the superintendent's home. The interest in the national parks is rapidly increasing; more and more people are going into the parks. Highly trained personnel must be kept, and our property preserved.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Other members will discuss the general problems of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Commercial and pleasure fishing, both, constitute an important part in the national economy. The fisherman, per man and per man-hour employed, produces more food than any other food producer in the Nation. He not only produces human food, but produces fish scrap that is used for fertilizer—plant food—and protein and oils for cattle, poultry, and hog food, as well as oil for industrial uses. An appropriation of $401,000 was requested for the division of commercial fisheries leaving only $75,000 for Federal research. The sum of $400,000 represented no increase over previous years, while the cut to $75,000 provides funds barely equivalent to those received 20 years ago. The proposed cut will terminate virtually all statistical surveys, research, and services for commercial fisheries. The study of international fishery economics would cease. The industry would be deprived of data with which to combat the great threat of competition from imported fish, shell fish bacteriology examination, aid to veterans in seeking to begin new fisheries enterprises, studies of Alaskan salmon waste problem, investigation of which has been made by five technical laboratories of the Fish and Wildlife Service would be virtually ended. A decrease of 40 percent in the appropriation of $141,600 for the Fishery Market News Service would drastically curtail market news operations. The fish industry consists of so many small and widely scattered enterprises that the industry itself is unable to assimilate complete and accurate market information. This service is not only important to the fisheries but it is important to fish handlers and to the people itself. One day's glut of the market in the wrong area, and 1 day's shortage in another area causing the price of fish to ascend rapidly will more than wipe out the attempted saving.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management within the Department of the Interior has for a number of years been giving substantial revenue to the Federal Treasury. It is composed of the former General Land Office and the Grazing Service. In this Bureau there is a backlog of thousands of applications which if they could be processed speedily would enable private capital to be invested with resultant employment and benefit to the Nation. Instead of a cut there is actual need for additional funds for this Bureau because additional work has been placed on the Bureau in recent years. Members of Congress have been prodding this Bureau to dispose of many isolated tracts which would be more economical to have in private ownership than in Government ownership, but before this can be done it is necessary for surveys to be made. This bill also provides a cut in the field force of the Bureau and necessary land surveys and

classification work and other field work necessary to the processing of the applications can be greatly expedited if the field force is adequate.

Alaska is one frontier toward which many eyes are turned and which we are all hoping for speedy development. One hundred and seventy thousand dollars for fire control and suppression work in Alaska has been disallowed. Fire control means not only the saving of property but it is of great assistance and probably absolutely necessary in safety in air travel. A growing population increases fire hazards, and one disastrous fire can cost far more than this item.

The Taylor Grazing Act has been of tremendous benefit to the Nation. Only $373,000 has been allowed for the administration of 140,000,000 acres of public land.

On lands administered by the O. & C. Administration in western Oregon there is one of the finest stands of timber yet remaining under Federal jurisdiction. The estimated requirement for this Administration was reduced by $44,300, notwithstanding the fact that this organization in the Bureau of Land Management is returning to the Treasury each year far more than it expends for administration, while at the same time makes a great contribution to the lumber needs of the Nation. There are also certain limitations in the bill that I do not feel was intended to be placed therein and which I will question members of the committee in the course of the debate. The public lands of this country are a great asset. We should have a complete stock taking and classification and study as to what these lands contain. This would be a great investment. To cut funds so as to merely hold the lands in trust and do nothing and find out nothing about them is false economy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. MURDOCK. I took the floor a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, to ask some questions of the committee with regard to range reseeding. I was delighted to find a favorable attitude of the committee in regard to that work. I would like now under this subheading to go a bit further with it.

As all of you know, a great portion of the West can never be cultivated in the sense that we cultivate land in the humid sections. Much of the area in my State and of the whole intermountain country, as well as much of the Northwest and Pacific Southwest, is fit only for grazing or for forest production. Now, much of our land has been overgrazed. We have great difficulty finding range for the livestock people. I call particular attention to the overgrazing that has resulted on many Indian reservations. Time after time I have called attention to the fact that the Navajo Indian Reservation is overgrazed and the Indians have had to be reduced 66 percent in many cases in their permitted sheep units. But even so, they have overgrazed their range ground, and it is eroding.

Much of the silt that goes down the muddiest river on this continent to fill up Lake Mead washes off of the Navajo Indian Reservation. Now, I think we can do something about that. I want to call attention to the fact that the lower Colorado River has a billion dollars invested in it. Why does not everybody living in the Pacific Southwest rise up here and say that Boulder Dam, Lake Mead, a billion-dollar construction on the lower Colorado, must be protected? How can you protect it? You can protect it by cutting out or minimizing the erosion that is taking place above Lake Mead.

Now, I was pleased to hear the committee favor experimenting. We are trying to reseed those areas from airplanes by the pelletized seed method. We have succeeded already on the Papago Indian Reservation in planting thousands of acres of range land with a drought-resistant seed, a seed that has been imported from Africa, that is, the Lehman lovegrass seed. It will flourish and furnish good food for stock where the rainfall is less than 8 inches annually. Other seed are used suitable to the climate, soil, and altitude.

We are attempting to cover vast areas not only in my State, for that is only a beginning, but all through the West. If we can make grass grow where it did grow 100 years ago or 50 years ago but where it does not grow now, we can enormously increase not only the livestock industry but the whole economy of the West. Let us say 98 percent of the intermountain area is fit only for grazing or for timber. It is a point of good husbandry to experiment, to reforest, and to reseed the range land. That is the thing for which I plead and am thankful it is provided here.

I mention particularly the Indian reservations because we made a start there last year and because there the need is most drastic. But it is needed throughout the public domain and in the national forests and also on private lands.

I talked with the biggest cattleman in the State of Arizona a few months ago and he said, "I have a large range. It is supporting four cows to the section." Many of you from the East can hardly understand that, four animals to 640 acres, yet that is typical range land all through the intermountain country. This man was interested in a private effort. If we can double or triple the carrying capacity of the ranges, which I think we can do, we ought to do it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman who is now addressing the House should be highly complimented for the great interest he is taking in this airplane pellet-seeding program. As I said before, I think it is one of the most important programs we have under way at this time to conserve soil and water. Being a great advocate of water and soil conservation myself, as is the gentleman from Arizona, I assure him that I want to work with him in every way possible to further this most urgent and important program that is now being carried on by Dr. Adams whom many of you know as an able, conscientious, honorable gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me thank the gentleman again for his keen insight into the value of this work. Grass is mighty important and in more ways than might be first thought of. The history of the human family could be written in the well-told story of hay. In this program I am not alone thinking of increasing the carrying capacity of our ranges for livestock production but I am also thinking of the protection of the watersheds above our great reclamation dams and reservoirs. A properly protected watershed is as important an item in the total of a reclamation project as is a dam or canal system. This actual reseeding with proper seed pelletized for better germination and growth is one of the acknowledged features of a finished reclamation system. Thus this program bids fair to play a part in reclamation as well as range-land rejuvenation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska native service: For expenses necessary to provide for the support, rehabilitation, education, conservation of health, development of resources, and relief of destitution of the natives of Alaska; the repair, rental, and equipment of school, hospital, and other buildings; the purchase or erection of range cabins; the hire, repair, equipment, maintenance, and operation of vessels; and for the administration of the Alaska native service, $3,250,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 12, line 17, strike out "$3,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,069,000."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Interior has a primary Federal responsibility in Alaska. Development there or lack of development depends to no inconsiderable extent upon the annual appropriation bill for that department. On an over-all basis, the subcommittee treated us in Alaska very well, and I am grateful for that, but some rather serious cuts were made. However, I have no intention of offering any amendment except with respect to this one item having to do with the Alaska Native Service.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation allowed in this bill is $819,000 less than was asked for by the Budget. It is $469,000 less than provided for the current fiscal year. I have a lot of figures here which I could cite to you, but this is a proposition dealing with human health and happiness and human lives, and I do not think numerals and percentages could mean too much in that situation. The amount the committee has allowed, $3,250,000, is a lot of money, I will admit that. It takes a good many ordinary income-tax payers to make up that amount of money. The amount asked for, $4,069,000, is even more.

It is much more money than we got for that purpose a few years ago. The need arose on account of our neglect in the past. Primarily the need exists because nothing was done in the Territory with respect to the problem of curbing tuberculosis until the Congress acted last year and authorized the construction of one tuberculosis sanatorium. That sanatorium, while not actually built

now, has an accessory building that is accommodating some patients. We will have to come before the Congress later for more money until tuberculosis is curbed. I think two additional sanatoria will be required. The job will tak 15 or 20 years. A considerable amount of money will have to be spent during that period. But it will be an investment in humanity, an investment in our own country and for our own citizens. Our Indians, the Aleuts and the Eskimos, are not reservation people. They are full citizens and the process of their fuller participation in the economy of the white people is going ahead rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, if the provisions of this bill prevail it will be necessary to discharge from the sanatorium operated by the Women's Missionary Society of the Methodist Church in Seward, Alaska, about 50 patients. They will have to go home. They are not cured but they will have to leave the hospital anyway.

The hospital at Juneau, Alaska, a 60-bed institution, will have to be closed. The patients will have to be discharged.

We will be going backward instead of forward. We cannot afford to do that at a time when, perhaps properly, we are sending hundreds of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars overseas to feed the stricken people there. We should not neglect our own citizens.

I am mindful of a story told me by a school teacher at Point Barrow, Alaska. He said in 1929 one Eskimo out of 10 had tuberculosis. In 1943, 9 Eskimos out of 10 had tuberculosis. That disease came from the white people. The responsibility is ours. We must face it. We must give them a hand so that they can be cured.

Tuberculosis does not know when a fiscal year starts or when a fiscal year ends.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Does the gentleman have some figures to support the charge that these people will have to be released from the hospitals in bad condition? If so, would you give them to us?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, surely; I would be more than happy to do so. I am told that under the amount suggested by the committee 23 day schools of the Office of Indian Affairs in Alaska will have to be closed. The Juneau Hospital which I mentioned, a 60-bed institution, will have to be closed. All private hospital services will have to be discontinued. Ten field nurses will have to be discharged, the other cuts will have to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have given to the Alaska Native Service in this bill for the fiscal year 1948 the sum of $3,250,000. I will grant that it is a little less than what was given last year. However, it will not be necessary, I can assure my very good friend the Delegate from Alaska, to deprive any native a hospital bed. They can make the saving in other branches other than in the hospitals.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree that could be done in other ways. However, I am told it would practically mean a closing of all educational institutions as an alternative.

Mr. JENSEN. It is difficult for me to understand how it could possibly close any school. The committee has every respect for Mr. Foster, the Director of Indian Affairs in Alaska. I am sure Mr. Foster, being the very conservative, able, and frugal man that he is, will do a very good job for the Indians with the sum of $3,250,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education of Indians: For the support and education of Indian pupils in boarding and day schools and for other educational purposes, including educational facilities authorized by treaty provisions; tuition, care, and other expenses of Indian pupils attending public and private schools; support and education of deaf, dumb, blind, mentally deficient, or physically handicapped; the tuition (which may be paid in advance) and other assistance of Indian pupils attending vocational or higher educational institutions under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; printing and binding (including illustrations); the support of an arts and crafts building at Anadarko, Okla., and Indian museums at Rapid City, S. Dak., and Browning, Mont., and on the Fort Apache Reservation, Ariz.; $8,000,000: *Provided*, That payment of tuition and care of Indian pupils may be made from date of admission.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 13, line 22, after the word "Arizona", strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the committee on this particular amendment because it is in the nature of correcting an injustice which I am sure was not intended by the committee, and which I am sure would never have appeared in this bill if the committee had had an opportunity to make a thorough on-the-spot investigation of the Indian educational situation in America.

We are now in the process of spending perhaps ten or twenty billion dollars in order to help the victims of German, Russian, Italian, and Japanese aggression in other parts of the world. I want to solicit your support for my amendment to appropriate an additional $2,000,000 to correct one of the injustices done the only victims of American aggression, the American Indians.

I hope this committee will think through these arguments, think through this obligation for itself and then use its best judgment, without relying on the Members of the other body to correct an injustice which I sincerely believe appears in this bill.

I would like to direct the attention of the Members to page 36 of the hearings, where you will find that in fiscal 1947, for the education of Indians, $10,000,000 was appropriated. That was last year. Because of the increased costs of education, which all of you know have taken place in your own community, in your own State, and in your own school district, very conservatively the Indian Office asked that for the following fiscal year there be $11,865,000 appropriated for education. This was a small percentage increase, smaller by far than has rightfully been allotted to the teachers in the communities of every Member of this body here today.

But what happened? Because of a misunderstanding which crept into the hearings at some point or other the committee not only cut back this educational appropriation allotment to the figure which prevailed last year, which would have meant a reduction of some 15 percent, but they cut it back $3,865,000. My amendment simply proposes that in justice to the American Indian, in justice to the Indian children who will get no education at all unless you approve my amendment, that we put this figure for next year at the same level it was for last year for educating Indians. For educating white children all of us have to put the figure much higher than it was a year ago. It is only decent justice that we deal equitably with Indian education.

May I point out also that this Congress appointed a subcommittee to study Indian conditions in 1944. I was acting chairman of that investigation. We made on-the-spot studies and brought back recommendations. We reviewed the situation in the field, brought back recommendations many of which have been adopted into law or incorporated in Bureau regulations and are working toward the dissolution, eventually, of the Indian Bureau.

However, one of our major recommendations was to spend a greater amount of money to educate the Indians to the point where they could be self-supporting, to the point where they could get off the reservations and be out from under the administration of the Indian Bureau. This would mean less money for some other aspects of the Indian Service such as the employment of bureaucrats and white officials in the Indian Bureau who do the administering. But here we find we are turning the clock backward; here we find we are perpetuating the Indian Bureau by denying to Indian children the education they must have if they are going to be removed from our tax burdens and get off from the reservations. What we are doing is in no sense economy; it is in no sense justice to the victims of American aggression, our first Americans, the Indians, the involuntary wards of the Government. These Indian children will get no education at all in

many areas unless this body acts favorably to support my amendment to increase the educational appropriation by restoring the $2,000,000 cut which the Interior Department subcommittee has placed upon this particular section as against what was spent in fiscal 1947. It will still mean a reduction, may I say, of nearly $2,000,000 from the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget as the minimum educational requirements for fiscal 1948.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman state what the committee meant when it said:

> The committee regrets that this obligation has not been met.

Do they admit they have not met the treaty obligations to the Navajo Indians?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly the Government has not met those obligations; it has met them for 90 percent of the Indians of this country. The reason we have to keep on appropriating money to the Indian Service is because we have not educated the Indians to the point where they have an opportunity to be self-supporting citizens.

Mr. Chairman, when we deny Indian children who are the involuntary wards of our Government the education they require to become self-supporting, we practice short-sighted extravagance rather than sound economy. It is penny-wise, pound-foolish mathematics of the slightest sort. It is promoting a policy which will perpetuate the Indian Bureau forever rather than projecting one which will make possible its dissolution within a reasonable period of time. For every penny we save today by this type of economy we will be compelled to spend many dollars in the tomorrows to follow. Denying Indian children the training and education they require to support themselves off the reservation in the white man's economy is simply deferring the day when we can free our tax bills of the sizable annual appropriations this Government has been making to keep Indians alive without allowing them to get ahead for over a century and a half. In the name of both justice and good budgetary procedure, I solicit your support for my amendment to restore to $10,000,000 the money to be appropriated for Indian education in America under the terms of this appropriations bill.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota for offering his amendment. I have been a Member of Congress for 3 years. Each year when the Department of the Interior appropriation bill has reached this floor I have spoken on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a very caustic critic during these 3 years of the Indian Service and I still am; but today I am placed in a very anomalous position. With the action of this committee in making such a drastic cut in the appropriation for the education of the Indians I cannot go along. Therefore, I am compelled to register my protest on the floor of this House because I am told that if this Committee concurs in the action of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations there will be something like 5,500 Indian children who will be deprived of an education.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Oklahoma has the largest Indian population of any State in the Union. We have one-third of all the Indians in the United States. In my State we have 12 Indian boarding schools. I am told that if the Committee concurs in the action of the subcommittee there will be a large number of those boarding schools that will have to close and something like 1,000 Indian children will be deprived of an education. In my State we have compulsory education laws. The Indian children go to our public schools the same as the white children. With the reduction of tuition item our State will suffer along with others. The cut is too big and will cause untold hardship on our school districts.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest indictments that could be made against this House, one of the saddest commentaries that could be uttered, is the fact that this Congress refuses to provide sufficient money for its wards. I am told that of the twenty or twenty-five thousand Navajo children, there are at least 15,000 or two-thirds of that number, unable to go to school on account of this Congress refusing to provide money for sufficient facilities. What a pity! We should hang our heads in shame!

Mr. Chairman, those 5,500 Indian children I spoke of a moment ago are not here today to speak for themselves, they are not here asking Congress to provide sufficient facilities for its wards. No. They are going to have to depend on the sense of justice of the House to provide sufficient school facilities in order that they may ultimately take their position in life along with their white brethren. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members of this committee will vote favorably for the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly in favor of the pending amendment. Tomorrow a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands will hold hearings on six bills having to do with aid for Indian schools all the way from Michigan and Minnesota on West. It is to be recognized in this situation that the Indians are wards of the Government and do not pay taxes on their property or on their land in support of the local schools, which makes for a very difficult situation so far as the small country school districts are concerned that most of these Indians attend. Without the support that is rendered by the Federal Government they cannot provide the educational facilities because Indian lands are not taxable.

Therefore, when these funds are cut from the already inadequate amount that they had for that purpose, it means that those schools will either have to be curtailed or completely closed. They cannot continue with the education of those Indian children. There is demand all over the country for the emancipation of the Indians. Before they can be turned loose and put on their own they must have at least a high-school education, and if we are going to provide that, and since legal taxation cannot be found to provide the amounts that are needed for these schools, it is necessary that we have funds from the Federal Government at least to the amount that we have had heretofore.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that there are two reasons why you need more funds. One is that the entire Federal pay scale has been increased in the past year. Even if you were to have the same dollars that you had last year, you would not be able to obtain the same level of education. The second reason is that some schools are already closed. I was in an Indian school last year where part of it was closed off simply because they did not have funds to maintain that much of it.

Mr. D'EWART. That is absolutely correct. These schools cannot continue because of the additional cost, and because they cannot tax the property of the Indians, and therefore the money must be had through this appropriation to aid these small country-school districts in educating these Indian children.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Is there not some way of handling this Indian Bureau without taking it out on the Indian children in this way?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to answer that question, because this very part deals specifically with the educational fund. This is not the general fund for the Indian Bureau. It is not a question whether it should be $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 which the Indian Bureau said was necessary. The committee cut that from $12,000,000 to $8,000,000, and I am asking to restore it to $10,000,000, which is what they had last year, and which is still a 15 percent cut due to the increase given in teachers' salaries.

Mr. OWENS. It seems to me that they are aiming at the Indian Bureau. I say, is there not some way of handling this Indian Bureau without taking it out on the Indian children?

Mr. MUNDT. The committee has made a number of cuts, and nobody is asking to restore them, but to take it

away from the Indian children is unwise, it seems to me.

Mr. D'EWART. The Indian Bureau budget was $54,000,000, and it was cut to $36,000,000. We are not asking that those other items be replaced, but we do plead for adequate education where it cannot be otherwise provided.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask on what basis the cut was made for those children?

Mr. D'EWART. Would the chairman of the committee like to answer that question: On what basis was the cut made for this educational appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The basis of the cut was made upon the fact that the committee thought that the States in which the Indian population lived ought to assume some of this responsibility. We did not cut out all these educational facilities. We allowed $8,000,000. Now, there are three States—Minnesota, California, and Oklahoma—where they are required to furnish education to the Indian children. I say with this modest cut, and with the burden of the Federal Government amounting to $259,000,000, the other States should follow the example set by these three States, one of which has the highest surplus in the treasury in its history. There was some testimony given to us that the State of California can educate its own Indians and can do a better job than the Federal Government can do. That was the reason for the committee's action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The action of the Appropriations Committee with respect to the education of the Indian children left me rather stunned and puzzled, in that it seems diametrically opposed to the recommendations of the select committee of this House which made a thorough study of the problem in 1944. That investigating committee, as you will recall, was set up by the House under a resolution introduced by the able gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who offered the amendment, and the committee, of which I was a member, did its work mainly under the direction of the gentleman from South Dakota who acted as chairman in the absence of the regular chairman the gentleman from Montana, Mr. O'Connor, now deceased, who was ill during a part of the time the investigation was in progress; and I say sincerely that we were blessed indeed in having available to us the ability, clarity of thought, and sincerity of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

That committee concluded that the eventual liquidation of the Indian problem, and the ultimate dismantling of the Indian Bureau, depends on the education of the Indian children, and it recommended expansion of that effort in line with an educational policy set out in that report.

Contrary to that report and in total disregard of its carefully considered recommendations, the Appropriations Committee, as the chairman of the subcommittee just said, now proposes to wind up the problem by drastically curtailing funds for Indian education. It is utterly incomprehensible to me. I hope Mr. MUNDT's amendment will be adopted.

In the report of that select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Indian affairs and conditions in the United States, filed December 23, 1944, the following recommendations were made:

> In large part, the eventual liquidation of the Indian problem and the dismantling of the Indian Bureau depends upon the degree of success achieved in the proper education of Indian children * * * the real hope of eliminating the need for an expensive and extensive Indian Bureau at some future date lies in the universal and judicious education of Indian children * * *. It cannot have anything but an unwholesome effect upon America as a whole if large groups of Indian children continue to grow up in ignorance through the failure to enforce compulsory education.
>
> The goal of Indian education should be to make the Indian child a better American rather than to equip him simply to be a better Indian. Scholarships, student-loan funds, and other education stimuli should be provided so that Indian students will attend institutions of higher learning in greater numbers.
>
> The Indian Bureau is tending to place too much emphasis on the day school located on the Indian reservation as compared with the opportunities afforded Indian children in the off-the-reservation boarding schools where they can acquire an education in healthful and cultural surroundings without the handicap of having to spend their out-of-school hours in tepees, in shacks with dirt floors and no windows, in tents, in wickiups, in hogans, or in surroundings where English is never spoken, where there is a complete lack of furniture, and where there is sometimes an active antagonism or an abysmal indifference to the virtues of education.
>
> If real progress is to be made in training the Indian children to accept and appreciate the white man's way of life, the children of elementary age who live in violently substandard homes on reservations should be encouraged to attend the off-the-reservation boarding schools where they can formulate habits of life equipping them for independent citizenship when they reach maturity.
>
> Your committee inspected off-the-reservation or boarding schools at Riverside, Okla.; Pierre and Flandreau, S. Dak. In each of them we found Indian children receiving praiseworthy education and living in desirable conditions. We believe that these schools and similar institutions should be expanded and emphasized.

The committee then recommended the expansion of schools of this type, and proposed that a junior-college program be included in the system of Indian education; a placement service to aid Indian school graduates to obtain jobs in communities where their residence would receive ready acceptance is recommended; more schools with cottage dormitory living facilities is advised:

> It is of vital importance that Indian children in the elementary grades receive a sound educational background and that they are encouraged to read, write, and speak the English language effectively.

Some of the educational policies and procedures of the Indian Service were criticized, and an effort has been made to effect the corrections recommended. Now the House Appropriations Committee appears to reverse the majority of the above recommendations.

While the Appropriations Committee recommendations are not specific, it has made a cut of $3,865,000 in the education item of the Indian Service budget; $630,000 of this it directed against public-school tuition contracts. The remainder must be absorbed through the closing of Indian Service schools. These schools may be divided into three classes, as follows:

Number	Type	Elementary, ADA	High school, ADA	Total, ADA	Budget estimate for 1948
18	Nonreservation boarding	2,690	4,060	6,750	$3,882,794
32	Reservation boarding	3,895	1,605	5,500	3,228,371
241	Day schools	10,516	1,035	11,551	2,718,035
	Total	17,101	6,700	23,801	9,829,200

The cut to be absorbed is equal to the total cost of reservation boarding schools; exceeds by a half million dollars the total cost of all day schools.

It rests with the Indian Bureau to determine where this cut can best be made. Despite our general concurrence with the position taken by the select committee, as to the value often present in the boarding-school environment, it would not seem the part of wisdom to close the day schools. Indian Service day schools serve one-half of all the children in Federal schools—children for the most part who live in the heart of the great reservations, remote from any possibility of attending public schools. If these Federal day schools are closed, 11,500 children will be deprived of any possibility of obtaining an education, for there will be no place else for them to go.

Reservation boarding schools draw their enrollment from the same types of children, except that the children must in addition come from broken homes where they are deprived of adequate parental care by death, divorce, disease, vice, or crime; or they live in areas so remote from school facilities of any kind that they would otherwise be deprived of an education. If these schools are closed, the children now in attendance would have no place else to go. They would not be in reservation boarding schools if there were any other option.

Nonreservation elementary boarding schools are limited to similar cases of dependency, or remoteness from school facilities. Many of their pupils, however, are drawn from the open reservations, where public-school facilities are available; and where, theoretically, aid-to-dependent-children grants are available, or State boarding-home-care contracts are possible. These children have been admitted to Federal schools after State and Federal welfare workers have

exhausted every effort to care for them by Social Security or State welfare provisions. In the high schools the same criteria apply, with the added possibility that pupils desiring vocational training to fit themselves for gainful employment may be admitted to Federal high school, where such instruction is not to be obtained in a local public high school.

The criterion of the Appropriations Committee that "the States have some obligation to the Indians and some aid could and should be extended by local communities, much assistance could and should be given to the Federal Government by the States and municipalities" could be applied only to the nonreservation school Indian group. The idea expressed a while ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], which apparently is backed by the committee, that the States should undertake the education of the Indian children in reservations is so preposterous to those of us who know the facts that we can hardly believe our ears. All land and all Indian property is nontaxable.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I should like very much to know whether the committee tried at all to get in touch with the States to see what provisions they have already made and what willingness they would have to take over the responsibility for the education of the Indian children, as was suggested a few minutes ago.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I doubt very much that they did that, and if they had done that, they would have found that the States cannot do it, at least, my State cannot. In my State we have in addition to the Indian problem, the Navajo problem, the problem of the native Spanish-speaking boys and girls. The State is doing its very best to take care of them. This country took those people over along with the Indians but never has done anything for them. My State is desperately trying to educate the native children, the Spanish-speaking children of that State. It has its hands full with them and cannot possibly educate the Navajo children. If it tried to set up schools in the Navajo country it would be just utterly impossible, because the land cannot be taxed. There are no white communities in the reservation. There are hundreds and hundreds of square miles of Indian land with not a white community in it. It would be just utterly impossible to set up school districts and to teach those children through State funds.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STIGLER. I appreciate what the committee is trying to do in its efforts to get the States to assume their full responsibility toward the Indians, but until the Indian obtains his economic and social freedom he is still a ward of the Government. The question is a Federal one and should be settled in Congress by the Congress, and not by the States.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Absolutely. The very first thing we have to do before we can ever lift the wardship from the Indian people is to educate the Indians. The best place we can start is with the Indian children. We have sadly neglected that in the past.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that within the gentleman's State almost 50 percent of the area of the State is exempt from taxation by the State government because it is Federal land?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct; it is Federal land.

Mr. MONRONEY. To say, then, that the Federal Government, since it exempts this land, either in the gentleman's State or mine from taxation, should ask the States to assume the burden of the education of the wards of the Federal Government, I think is a completely unfair approach. The committee should rectify its mistake and rectify it gladly at this time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is the wrong approach to it. I know what the committee is trying to do, and we all want to do that. We all want to abolish the Indian Bureau when the time comes, but that is the wrong approach to it. Denying schools to the children will merely retard the day when the Indian can look after his own affairs without the wardship we exercise over him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman—

I like best the golden West,
Where folks are what they seem.
I've been around and I've just found
That life ain't no dream.

Everywhere there is beauty rare
In the good old U. S. A.
But I'm from Oklahoma,
And I'll jump right up and say,

"Oklahoma, I've been a roamer,
But I'm coming back to you;
Back to the place where the rainbows end,
Back where the folks say, 'Howdy, friend'."

I know I'll never more be blue.
I'll tell you now, boy, about a cowboy
Who learned a thing or two.
I've got a home and I've got a girl.

And I'm going to say you can tell the world.
Oklahoma, I've been a roamer,
But I'm a comin' back to you.

I love the great State of Oklahoma. If you good people would come out there to the Golden West sometime, I think you would like it too. We have a great civilization out there. It is a great modern State. We have a great educational system and a great citizenship. We are living at a time, my friends, when the patriotism and the Americanism of a great many people is being challenged. But if you will come out West and to Oklahoma you will find that the Indian population is that type of citizenship that we can well be proud of. You never hear their motives questioned when it comes to their loyality and love for our country. I tell you, you folks in my judgment are doing the wrong thing in cutting down on appropriations for the education of these citizens of ours. I draw the mantle of charity about you. I do not accuse you of any vicious attitude nor any ulterior motive of any kind.

I merely say that you just do not understand the problem. If you were out there with us and could see and know the problem as it actually exists, I believe you would vote for this amendment. I hope you will vote for it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Has the gentleman heard of any opposition to this amendment?

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir; I have not heard of any, but I am afraid that there may be some.

Mr. OWENS. Do you not think we had better vote on it right away?

Mr. MORRIS. You see I only have a few minutes and I would like to go into many other matters, but I repeat as I have said before that the Indian population is as patriotic a group of citizens as you will find anywhere. They are intelligent. They are the type of people we ought to help.

These youngsters ought to be helped in getting an education.

My friends, let us not forget that, after all, this country originally belonged to those people and we came over and took it away from them. Why should we on any occasion ever pinch pennies and stint ourselves in helping the original Americans? Why should we do that?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I was very much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman, particularly the first part of his remarks. As you know, you and I see eye to eye on a good many things these days.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEATING. I wonder what the gentleman's view is as to what extent the State should participate in the cost of educating the Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. I doubt seriously if my State or any State should ever participate to any extent other than the extent of participation by other States of the Union. I think it is purely a Federal and National matter. I do not see why any State should have to pay any more than its proportionate share of the entire cost. I cannot see that, because it is a Federal matter entirely. It cannot be anything other than a Federal matter, as I view it.

Mr. KEATING. You base that upon the fact that the Federal Government located these reservations in particular States without their participation in that decision and, therefore, the onus of the expense of education should fall upon the Federal Government?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; I do.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be fair if the right of ad valorem tax for Indian lands was given to us in Oklahoma, but failing to do that, then any Indian State

must have Federal funds to replace this loss to carry on Indian education. We cannot educate the population living on land which is not taxed.

Mr. MORRIS. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has observed, that land is tax exempt and the State gets no return from it. Gentlemen, I hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT: On page 13, line 22, after the word "Arizona", strike out the sum "$8,000,000" and insert "$11,865,000."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute amendment; and if it is defeated, of course, I will support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I do this because I have visited a number of these Indian schools and know they are in need of extra funds. They are going along now in a sort of makeshift fashion, doing all sorts of things to make ends meet. The 40-hour week, the pay raise, and increased commodity costs have come along since last year. Because of all these things, operating expenses have increased enormously. I therefore think we should go all the way with the budget in this particular item. No one has offered any amendment to increase the overhead in the Indian Service.

The elimination of tuition payments to States having Indian populations is manifestly unfair. The Indian has always been considered a ward of the Federal Government and so treated by the Supreme Court, by the law of the land, and by treaties. Under the circumstances it is not right for the Federal Government to throw the entire burden of educating Indian children on States and local communities. There are farming communities in my district where the schools do not normally operate for 9 months a year, in which over half the farmland is nontaxable. If you take away this entire Federal-aid program, as I understand this bill contemplates, you will throw on a portion of the farm owners of these districts the entire burden of supporting these small schools. That is certainly unjust when it is recognized that it is the result of a condition that exists because Oklahoma was required to come into the Union under an enabling act that exempted for all tax purposes all restricted Indian lands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In my own State, on the reservation of the Navajos, after those Navajos were placed in that desert, we agreed on a treaty that would give them a school for every 30 children. Today they have schools for between 3,000 and 5,000 children, and there are actually 10,000 or 15,000 children that have no education facilities whatsoever.

Mr. ALBERT. I am familiar with that situation, and I know that the distinguished gentleman is correct.

This bill also contemplates curtailment in our boarding schools. Mr. Chairman, those are homes for children who have no other schools to attend. No child goes to those schools except orphans—children from broken homes and children who are so far from the ordinary public schools that they cannot possibly attend.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. The head of the Army stated that there were more Indian boys who volunteered to defend the flag of the United States than of any race in the Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea for the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate us?

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to say along that line that the great Second Cavalry Division, which took the city of Manila, had many Indians among its valiant men. I know of three Indians who won the Medal of Honor, two from the Five Tribes alone. What other small group in this country can say the same?

I urge that you adopt my amendment because, in view of the salary raises, in view of the increased costs of all kinds, in view of the fact that these schools are already operating at a bare minimum, I think we should give on this one item all that the Bureau of the Budget has asked.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman's amendment does not put back into the bill everything that the Indian Service has asked for. It simply puts back that which the President's Bureau of the Budget found absolutely essential to furnish a bare minimum of educational facilities. The Mundt amendment, if we adopt it, will reduce this by a million and a half dollars under the budget estimate.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether the figure at which you have arrived is arrived at by the Bureau of the Budget in the same way they did all of these other figures in the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. That I do not know, but I do know that with over $10,000,000 last year these schools had to curtail their activities considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is not a member of this committee or a Member of this Congress who does not want to give the Indian children proper educational facilities; but the fact remains that every year and every year we appropriate more, yet every year we learn that each succeeding year we have more Indian children out of school than we had the year before. There is something radically wrong with this Indian educational system. And I believe one of the things wrong is the fact that the teachers must have a B. A. degree in order to teach little Indian children the first day they attend school.

Mr. STOCKMAN. In view of the fervent appeals made by the gentleman preceding me on the floor in behalf of Indian children in the United States—and I think they are eminently qualified in their statements, I think a most excellent case has been made in behalf of those children—I wish to give you a few of the facts as they appear to me.

In the budget there was the amount of $11,860,000 for education of Indian children. The committee saw fit to allow $8,000,000. In 1940 there was allowed by the Congress of the United States $8,587,300 for the education of Indian children.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of educating the young people of this country, be they Indian, be they colored, be they white, whatever their denomination, creed, or social standing. I come from an Indian State myself. I grew up within 5 miles of an Indian reservation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I cannot yield; I have not time.

I spent week ends on the Indian reservation playing with Indian children. I went to school with Indian children. I played games with them. And learned to know them well.

My observation has been that if an Indian goes to school and continues school until an adult that no matter what amount of education the Indian has it reacts unfavorably to the Indian. This is so because the Indian is not an individual who wishes to enter into the social strata and organization the white people of this country have developed for this country. The young Indian man when he reaches 21 would much rather hunt and fish and stay on the land of his forebears. If he does not do that, if that is not available to him, he goes off to town and with his education he thinks he is smarter than he is and acts accordingly, with the expected results.

Consequently we have an educated Indian on our hands who does not fit into our society. That does this country no good.

Now, if education helped these Indians, to the extent we wish, if because of it they were able to enter into our business life, if they were able to progress accordingly, then I think that all the money that we could spend on the Indians would be helpful to this country; but due to the fact that most of the education that is offered these Indian children against their will and against the will of their parents is ineffectual to their own well-being when they become adult men and women, I think the $8,000,000 allowed by this committee for the education of sixty to seventy thousand Indian children—and may I say in passing

that of the amount allowed by this committee it does not preclude a single Indian child from going to a boarding school. This money will be used to eliminate some day schools which I think are not as good schools as boarding schools for Indian children.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I judge from the gentleman's remarks that this thing of education is a pretty terrible monster.

Mr. STOCKMAN. To some people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired; all time on this amendment has expired. The question is on the Albert substitute for the Mundt amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. A vote for this substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is a vote to appropriate $11,865,000 instead of the $10,000,000 provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALBERT and Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 67, noes 112.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JONES of Ohio and Mr. ALBERT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 124.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 91, noes 110.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MUNDT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Welfare of Indians: For welfare services, including general support, relief of needy Indians, boarding home care of Indian children, institutional care of delinquent children, and payment of per diem, in lieu of subsistence, and other expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals, $488,910: *Provided*, That payment for the care of Indians may be made from the date of service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to describe a situation and then to propound an inquiry to the chairman of the committee which has reported the bill.

The paragraph which has just been read deals with a fund for the welfare of Indians, including the relief of needy Indians. It is apparent from the comment that is made when Indian legislation is before the House that there are a great many people who are unaware of the obligations of the Government of the United States written into treaties and confirmed by Acts of Congress toward the Indians and toward certain bands of Indians.

It happens that my congressional district has practically the same boundaries as the last great Sioux reservation which was promised to the Sioux Indians forever. That condition existed until 1876. In 1874, when Custer and some of his troops went into the Black Hills to investigate why white persons were drifting into this territory which had been reserved for the Indians, a prospector attached to those troops discovered gold. By 1876 there were so many whites there that a treaty was forced upon the Indians to open their lands in violation of the Treaty of 1868 which had said that they might be divested of no land except by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the adult males.

Within the past few years the Indians have gone clear to the Supreme Court to test the taking of the Black Hills. The Court of Claims in a finding which was confirmed by the Supreme Court said that the Black Hills were not taken away from the Indians illegally, because the Government of the United States by solemn treaty confirmed by acts of Congress had said, "We are not taking this land from you; we are going to compensate you for it, and part of that compensation will be the education of your children and the care of your needy." The United States Supreme Court within the last 2 years has said, "Congress has been appropriating for the relief of the needy Sioux Indians and will continue to do so."

That was their answer to the Sioux, that the Congress was taking care of the needy Indians as payment for the lands of which they had been divested. How is the Government of the United States taking care of them?

Last fall I stood on the Standing Rock Reservation, where I was taken to see the places where some needy and aged Sioux Indians lived. They were living in tents that might at one time have been good tents, but then were so rotten and so patched up that they would no longer even take a patch.

During the past winter those people have lived in those tents with the weather ranging to 30° below zero. This spring during the floods, 27 Indian families in that area were driven from their homes by the floods. When I asked the Indian Office to do something about shelter for these Indians back in December and January, the Bureau advised that they could not do anything because the appropriation for the relief of needy Indians did not permit them to do anything for the housing or shelter of Indians; that the money could not be spent for that purpose.

You ask, "Why do not these Indians do something for themselves?" I know of an Indian family which was living in one of these tents and the wife had an allotment of land. She wanted to get patent to it so that she could sell it and buy a small house or even a new tent. The Indian Office said, "We will not issue a fee patent. You can use the $40 annual lease fee if you want to but you cannot have a patent and sell the land." Of course, the $40 was needed for clothing and food.

Those people are tied hand and foot. Yet, the Supreme Court says the Congress is going to take care of the needy Indians. Now, I want the chairman of the committee to answer me, Is there anything in his interpretation of this paragraph which will prevent the Indian Office in using this fund for the relief of needy Indians to prevent them from using it for shelter if that is the need that exists?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I see no reason at all why it should not be used for that purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for that and I shall so remind the Indian Office that that is the gentleman's interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee has seen fit to make any reduction in the item for the conservation of health. While this reduction is comparatively small, I think the amounts set forth in the budget were already reduced to the absolute minimum. The Talihina Hospital and Sanatorium is located in my district. This is the finest Indian hospital in America. It is one of the outstanding medical institutions in the State of Oklahoma. This hospital has a capacity of 237 beds. Early in the year as many as 212 bed patients were served in this institution.

In addition to this, numerous outpatients have been taken care of. The great work which has been done in maternity cases alone justifies every dime appropriated for this hospital. In addition to this, it has been a splendid training institution for the Nurses' Corps. Every nickel spent on this hospital has been an investment in the health and future strength of our country.

This hospital has had to undergo a very sad retrenchment program. Employees have been discharged, and at the present time, pending the appropriation of deficiency funds, only 125 beds are filled, despite the increased demands and needs. During the past year there has been an enormous utilization increase in this hospital. At the same time salary increases have been instituted by this Congress, and it is common knowledge that all operating costs have risen tremendously.

I can see no justification whatever for any cut in medical appropriations. In my opinion this is economy carried to an unhealthy extreme; it is false economy. It is well known that there is a general shortage of hospitals. Under the circumstances it is tragic indeed that any space in this great hospital should lie vacant. It means that many sick people, who should be segregated and hospitalized, shall be a burden on and menace to many local communities that have neither the means nor the facilities to take care of them.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred specifically to this hospital merely by way of example. I am well advised that what I have said of it applies to almost every Indian hospital in the country. The matter is therefore one of national and not simply local importance. Under all the circumstances, it would appear to me that sound economy would dictate not a cut, but an increase, in the budget estimates for hospitalization. I trust that these increases will be made in conference both with respect to welfare and medical funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am in the same situation as other Members of the House. Many of us, at least I, know very little about what is in these appropriation bills until they come on the floor. I have all I can do to perform my duties on other committees. So, of necessity, I must rely on the Committee on Appropriations and on the subcommittee having the bill in charge and over the years that has been found to be a satisfactory method when a committee is economy minded.

On two occasions recently I have been forced to vote against increases because of our pledge to cut appropriations for 1947.

I do not know anything about these treaties with the Indians. I do not know what we promised them in the years gone by, but I do know mighty well what we promised the people just prior to the November 5, 1946, election, and that was that we were going to cut down appropriations and save the taxpayer a little money. So, having that in mind, I have had to vote against some things that my folks wanted. I do not know what the Congress is going to do, but it does occur to me that in addition to keeping our promises to the Indians we might keep some of the promises we made to the folks who elected us last November.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Red Lake, Minn.: School, $46,000.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'KONSKI: On page 19, line 8, strike out the semicolon and insert "Hunter School District, town of Hunter, Sawyer County, Wis., $80,000, as authorized by Public Law 677, Seventy-ninth Congress."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a believe-it-or-not story. The amendment that I have offered and which I hope this Committee will adopt is one which if adopted will not cost the taxpayers of the United States of America one red penny. The truth of the matter is the Government of the United States of America will make money on the proposition. If the Committe is interested in economy here is their chance to show it. If the majority of this Committee is interested in unloading the burden of educating the Indians upon the States and local communities here is their opportunity to show whether or not they are consistent, whether or not they are really sincere in that desire. I want to tell you what the situation is.

We have three Indian reservations in Wisconsin. One is in the town of Hunter, county of Sawyer. Seventy-five percent of the land in that area belongs to the Indian reservation and is nontaxable, brings in no revenue. Next, the taxpayers of that township support a public school, a public school which was built some 60 years ago, which was constructed to accommodate 30 students but which today houses 105 students, half of them Indians that are wards of the Government and that are the responsibility of the Federal Government to educate because we are the guardian of their funds.

Here is a school district. The county superintendent of schools called me in 2 years ago and said: "Congressman, here is our problem; we have 54 Indians in our school. Our school has been condemned by the State department of public instruction as unfit for housing; it has been condemned by the State board of health; it has been condemned by the local board of health authorities. With them it is a question either of closing the school and not educating the children or of housing them in a building that is not fit for human habitation."

Then the people came to see me with their problem. They said, "Congressman, since more than half of the students are Indians we believe it is a Federal Government responsibility."

Here is what I said to them, "For Pete's sake, don't try to unload the burden on the Federal Government because the Federal Government has more of a burden than it can carry with the national debt that we already have."

So we arrived at a solution whereby they could accept the responsibility and save the Government of the United States of America money. Here is what we did: We got enacted into Federal law at the last session of Congress which was passed unanimously by this House and which was passed unanimously by the Senate an authorization for an appropriation of $80,000 to be advanced to this school district, to be paid back on a "recoup" basis at 3 percent interest per year. In other words, this is not a hand-out, this is merely an advance on the part of the Federal Government of $80,000 to that school district which they will pay back in between 15 and 20 years at 3 percent interest, mind you. In other words, we are not asking the Federal Government to go out there and finance our responsibility. We are willing to take care of the Indians that are the responsibility of the Federal Government, but we need help. We are not asking for a hand-out. We want to pay interest on that money; and I want to say to you that the people of the State of Wisconsin pay their obligations with interest; they never default. Here is a chance for the Federal Government to have the people of the township assume part of the burden of the Federal Government and pay the money back with interest. Are you interested in economy? If you turn the matter down by not accepting this amendment, I am reporting back to the school district that they should communicate with the Indian Bureau that they will not accept Indian students. Those Indian students then will be loaded onto the back of the Federal Government. You will then be compelled to go in there and construct a school of your own and provide teachers of your own to educate those children. As to the cost it will be a minimum of $10,000 a year for the next 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, you have a clear-cut choice. If you are interested in economy, if you are interested in unloading that burden of educating these Indian students on to the State government, here is your opportunity. The decision you are going to make when you vote on this amendment is this: Are you going to advance them $80,000, which will be paid back to the Government with interest at the rate of 3 percent as provided by Public Law 667 or are you going to spend $200,000 in the next 20 years by the Federal Government?

I hope, Mr Chairman, that my amendment will be supported to carry out the purposes of this public law. It is a responsibility we have since the law was passed by both Houses of Congress. I hope my amendment will be carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the force of the gentleman's argument and the good cause he presents; however, there is a regular procedure for handling items of this kind. The gentleman did make a presentation to the committee but we did not at that time have any official estimate of the Indian Service as to the amount that should be contributed. We did not have any screening by the Budget Bureau to determine what amount should be allowed or what may be consistent with the policies of the Indian Service.

I am very sympathetic with the gentleman's amendment but, in fairness to the committee, I think we ought to have a deeper study and the estimate presented to us in the regular way. I assure the gentleman from Wisconsin the committee holds him in high esteem and will cooperate with him on this worthy project.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment at this particular time be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'KONSKI) there were—ayes 41, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, having spoken at some length yesterday in regard to the provisions of this bill pertaining to Indian education, I have reluctantly kept silent during the debates for the last hour or two on the various items which have been read for amendments. Having been a school man all my mature life, I find it difficult to remain silent even though I may have been very expressive yesterday concerning these items touching on Indian education, because I feel so deeply on this subject. Strange as it may seem, I want to speak now concerning some of the implications of this bill with reference to the economic problems and life of our southwestern Indians. Naturally, I will refer to Indian tribes in northern Arizona and particularly the Navajos.

That great leader of the Navajo people, Chee Dodge, who passed beyond only a few months ago, came to Washington last year with many of his tribal council members and made a most eloquent appeal, especially for education, but also for health facilities and hospitalization. It was because of his earnest presentation of the plight of his people that the Indian Affairs Committee of this House took special notice of their situation and evidently the Subcommittee on Appropriations, both last year and this year, turned attention to the problems of the Navajos. I think it likely that it was this visit by Dodge and his tribesmen which induced Secretary Krug to make a special visit to the reservation last September, at which time the Secretary of the Interior made a personal investigation of conditions on that vast reservation which as I have said is as large as the entire State of West Virginia, where 60,000 Indians are living on a wild, rough region on which 5,000 white men would probably starve. Right now I want to express my appreciation of the unfolding interest and increasing concern, in Congress and out of Congress, for these northern Arizona Indians.

In another connection I have spoken of the need to reforest and revegetate the overgrazed lands on this reservation, as it does produce most of the silt which is filling up Lake Mead too rapidly. True these Indians have been cut down on their permitted number of sheep units, which is necessary to bring the number of head to be grazed into line with the carrying capacity of the ranges. The sad thing is that the Indians have been reduced so much that they are actually in fear of starvation. An especially acute problem arises today because of the return of the Indian veterans of the Second World War and of their inability to carry on their livestock operations on a sufficient scale. It is true that the Government has furnished better breeding stock, has furnished dipping vats and water wells, all of which are badly needed and economically helpful. I believe that irrigation is possible in various parts of that large reservation, and I hope to see the same effort and enthusiasm to do for the Navajos and the Hopis what the Government a few years ago did for the Pima Indians through the building of the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River in central Arizona. A beginning has been made in this bill on pages 15 to 18 in this direction. I want to thank the committee for this beginning, even though it is sadly inadequate. I do not propose to offer any amendment to this section of the bill, but take this occasion to call attention to the need and ask for your continued interest and practical consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

The following appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft: "Management, Indian forest and range resources"; "Suppressing forest and range fires"; "Alaska native service"; and "Salaries and expenses, reservation administration."

Mr. JONES of Ohio (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs" down to and including line 8 on page 31 be considered as read and that amendments may be in order to any part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let go unchallenged the remarks made here on this floor a short time ago by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] regarding the Indians of this country and their education.

My very dear friend and able Congressman from Oregon in his remarks said that education was a bad thing for the Indian; that it made him unable to fit into the social scheme of America; that it made him feel that he was smarter than he actually was able to be, and indicated that education would cause him to hang around the pool halls of this Nation.

Coming from a State that has one-third of the Indians of this country residing therein, I would like to say that this is certainly not a true statement of fact.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I believe that is sort of an all-comprehensive statement of what I said, that I said all education was bad for Indians. I do not believe I made that statement. The education of the nature prescribed by this bill was not so good for the Indians.

Mr. MONRONEY. I trust the gentleman will leave unchanged his remarks as he made them on the floor of the House, and they will speak for themselves, and I will be glad to rest the case on what the gentleman said just exactly as was taken down by the shorthand reporter. I hope the gentleman will leave the remarks that way.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it possible that the members on the majority side are afraid to educate the Indians because they might become Democrats?

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for that observation. I would like to say that not all educated Indians are Democrats; that your own Vice President, Charlie Curtis, was an Indian, educated in the Indian schools. One of your great Presidents, Herbert Hoover, received part of his education in an Indian agency while his guardians, who were located there, were attached to the Indian schools in the West.

I would like to say for the Indians of Oklahoma that there are men like Senator Robert L. Owen, who was coauthor of the Federal Reserve Act. There were men like Charlie Carter and Bill Hastings, both distinguished Members of this House of Representatives. At present we have serving in the House of Representatives the gentleman from Oklahoma, BILL STIGLER, a distinguished gentleman, and there are many other men who have distinguished themselves who had a considerable amount of Indian blood. I certainly do not think that the gentleman's statement that education is a bad thing for the Indian will hold true either here, in his own State, or mine.

We have had many distinguished governors and other leaders who had Indian blood in their veins as well as many industrialists.

Now, he said he looked for the Indian to go back to his native habitat and hunt and fish. Oil wells grew up on the hunting grounds of the Indians. Formerly the Indians used to hunt and fish over all this great broad land of ours, but the white man has taken it over.

If the gentleman will put in the RECORD any place in this great land of ours where the Indian can still do that, I know the Indians of Oklahoma will be glad to have that information.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Beatty, Director of Education of the Indian Bureau, came before our committee and explained the deplorable condition which existed in the Indian Service so far as education and health was concerned. He pointed out especially that in the Navajo Reservation there are at this very time about 15,000 Indian children who do not have an opportunity to attend school because of insufficient school facilities.

We listened to Dr. Beatty at great length, and the committee made some suggestions. Then at a later date at my request Dr. Beatty was called back to the subcommittee to give further testimony because many of the members of the committee felt that something more definite had to be done for these Indian children as soon as possible. May I say that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] was interested in seeing to it that the Indian children have a chance to acquire the right kind of an education.

I direct your attention to pages 1382 to 1398, inclusive, of volume 1 of the hearings. If you will take the time to read, it will prove to you that this committee is greatly concerned about the In-

dian education problem and that we are trying to do something constructive which will get these children into school at the earliest possible time. It is a national shame that 15,000 Indian children, our first Americans, in one reservation, do not have an opportunity to go to school at this time.

I have heard it stated on this floor many times today and yesterday that we are giving everything away to everybody all over the world and are doing things for children and people all over the world, so why can we not do it for the children of our first Americans? The size of the matter is, as I said yesterday and I repeat now, that we are giving so much away all over the world that we must be content in this country to get along wtih less, whether it be the Indians or whoever it might be. We must get along with less, quite a little less, because we have only so many dollars to spend. If we spend more than we should, we soon will have no money to spend for the education of Indian children or for the old and the weak and the infirm or anyone else here or abroad.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to hear the gentleman from Iowa say that he considers it a national shame the way we have treated the Indians of this country who need to go to school. It is worse than that, it is a national disgrace, as anybody familiar with the situation knows. Personally, I was shocked and appalled at what my good friend from Oregon said when he left the implication, I believe, that he feels that the more you educate the Indians the worse they become. If we accept that theory, certainly we are never going to be able to eliminate the Indian Bureau or to solve the so-called Indian problem. I hope I got the wrong impression from what the gentleman from Oregon said. At worst, I hope he merely misspoke himself. I shall read his remarks carefully tomorrow, and if he misspoke himself I hope he avails himself of that great congressional opportunity to revise and correct his remarks between now and tomorrow morning. So that they adequately express his true and complete convictions about America's responsibilities to our first citizens—our Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not have to defend the gentleman from Oregon, for he is well able to defend himself, but I heard him say in the committee many times, and I agree with him, that the kind of an educational program we have now for the Indian children is not getting the job done. That is what the gentleman from Oregon intended to say if he did not say it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that no one who knows anything about the Indians seriously contends that it is a mistake to offer them an education.

I am inclined to think my distinguished friend from Oregon was rather talking at random and did not mean and could not possibly have meant that he was opposed to educating the Indians. I think my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is probably putting a meaning upon the language of the gentleman from Oregon that certainly he did not intend.

We in Oklahoma are proud of the progress that the Indians have made. Some of the most distinguished citizens of Oklahoma have been Indians. One of our first great Senators from the State of Oklahoma, Senator Owen, is still living here in Washington at the present time. He is past 90 years of age. His keen mind and intellect are still an inspiration to those of us who are privileged to seek his advice and receive the benefit of his counsel. I dare say that he can come before this House today and talk as intelligently now at his ripe age concerning the current problems of the world as any man in this House, and perhaps much more so than most of us.

I am sure that this committee would not intentionally attempt to penalize the Indians, as far as education is concerned. There is a difference of opinion, as I understand, between some members of the committee. I do not think I have heard anybody, even from the other side of the aisle, say anything about this particular matter. Perhaps we are not giving them quite enough in this bill, but the committee apparently think they are dealing fairly with the Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman think it is necessary for an Indian child in the primer grade to have a teacher who has a bachelor of arts degree, which is the requirement at the present time?

Mr. RIZLEY. I think that the Indians in Oklahoma and elsewhere are entitled to just as well qualified teachers as any other citizens. I may say further that it is my opinion that the Indians in Oklahoma want more than anything else—and I get most of this from my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], from the other side of the aisle—is to be treated more like other citizens of the United States. Congressman STIGLER, who knows Indian problems probably as well as any man in the United States, has told me repeatedly during the past several years that it is shameful the way the Indians have been treated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the mismanagement of that Bureau of the Indians' problems.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I just want to correct one impression that the gentleman from Iowa has left which might erroneously convince some people that the educational program for the Indians is totally bad. He said, "Do you think it is necessary that a teacher have a bachelor of arts degree to teach children in the elementary school? Of course, a bachelor of arts degree is just 4 years of college education. We are not going to improve the educational status of the Indians by subjecting them to training by poorly trained and poorly equipped teachers. We do not want political hacks and cast-offs teaching in the Indian schools just as we do not want them in the white schools. A college education is certainly no detriment to a teacher. It is no handicap. In fact it is of almost vital necessity if we are to have efficient and effective teachers. It is an advantage in anybody's school, and the Indian Office should be given credit for maintaining appropriate standards for the teachers in our Indian schools. Our Indians are entitled to a proper education.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. About 30 minutes ago I had a visit from my good friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and he said, "What we should do in this country is to put in the same system as they have in Turkey." He said, "The children of the upper grades teach the lower-grade children." Now, go ahead, Mr. MUNDT, and tell us about that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may correct that misimpression?

Mr. JENSEN. Explain that to us, please.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to do so. I do not want you to think that my studies on the Greek-Turkish loan have gone quite that far in convincing me of Turkey's progress toward democracy. I did suggest to the gentleman, however, that in solving the Navajo problem in the Southwest, where there are no schools at all for more than 20,000 Indian children, that they might start in the Navajo country by following the example of the people in Turkey. He is correct on that. But I did not say the Turkish educational experiment should be carried over to the education of the Indian children generally. Unfortunately, unless we can increase this educational appropriation beyond the $8,000,000 recommended by the subcommittee, however, we cannot even give our Indian children the rudimentary educational benefits enjoyed by the rural children of the hinterland in Turkey.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say to the previous speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] that he apparently does not recall that on yesterday I unequivocally stated on behalf of the minority members of the committee that we deplored the cuts that were made in this bill by the majority members for the education of Indians. At that time we pointed out the actual appalling consequences of the drastic reduction in amounts of appropriations requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in reply to this statement which he made a few minutes ago, that I am not at all unmindful of the high contribution

made to American society by people with Indian blood in their veins. I am very proud of those individuals. I salute them at the present time. My high admiration has always been for them. However, I would like to remind the gentleman of the fact that I was and am entirely agreeable to $8,000,000 going to the education of some 70,000 Indians, and I submit to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that $8,000,000 for the education of Indians is not just what we might term in present-day parlance as "hay."

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, although I am not a member of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, that committee must have been informed of some of the things that a number of Members of Congress have heard about. I happen to represent the First Congressional District of Oklahoma in which there are more Indians than in any other congressional district in the United States. There are some 23 tribes or fragments of tribes in my district. Most of the Indians in my district attend white schools, the same as other people do. The Indians and the white children attend the same schools, for the most part, under the compulsory education system that we have. But I have received letters, and I am familiar to some extent, by virtue of my visits in the West, particularly in New Mexico and Arizona, where I have driven all over those States, with some of the conditions that prevail there under the supervision of the Indian Bureau, which are not wholesome.

Only 3 or 4 months ago I received a letter from one connected with a school at Crownpoint, N. Mex., a Navajo Indian school. This letter reads in part as follows:

James S. Stewart, salary is $13,000, with his wife acting as his secretary, drawing $3,200 and she also makes $3,300 off the Red Cross, the work being done by little civil-service stenographers; Mr. Cooper and several others are drawing $10,000 each; George Boza is drawing $10,000, with an assistant drawing $7,000, three stenographers drawing $3,600 each, plus per diem which may run to $5,000; Mr. Ford, at Crownpoint also, receives $4,200, supervising grazing, his wife who is postmistress receives $2,100 per annum, with the principals at the schools receiving $4,200 per annum, not working, or doing anything worth while, being tyrants, busybodies and harassing those under them who do have to do the work, building up a shameful caste system on the reservation worse than the feudal ages and practices.

They have some 15 or 20 good schoolhouses nailed and boarded up out on the reservation herein referred to and have no intention reopening them, and when teachers apply for the positions as teachers they are promptly advised that there are no vacancies, and they either know, or by due or even reasonable diligence should know, that they have a large number of schoolhouses closed and nailed up that should be in operation and going concerns. Then they continually and continuously hound Congress to appropriate more money with which to build more schoolhouses to nail and board up. They wish to follow the New Deal trend of spending, flutterings, squanderings, striving to pull down and destroy. I am advised that there are as many as four people drawing salaries out of that reservation and all kinds of favoritism running rampant.

Perchance the committee which made a study of this bill has some such information before it.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Let us say there are 70,000 Indians. We are providing $8,000,000.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is my information.

Mr. ROBSION. That is a higher pro rata than is allowed for the white schools in many States of the Union.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is absolutely a fact.

Mr. ROBSION. And the teachers are getting much higher salaries than teachers in white schools in many States of the Union.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon, during the course of the remarks I made, my friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked me to yield and I did. The gentleman made the following observation:

Has the gentleman forgotten a year ago when the majority of that subcommittee were members of his party, that the Interior bill was reported to the House with a 50-percent cut below the budget estimates?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think the recollection of the gentleman is not the same as my recollection on that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The record will show that happened.

At the time I was discussing the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service that have been made in the pending bill. The budget estimates show that for 1946 there was appropriated for the Fish and Wildlife Service $6,239,325. The budget estimate for 1947 amounted to $11,108,275. The committee reported out $8,235,249; or a reduction of $2,873,026.

When the bill went to the Senate the amount was increased. Then the bill went to conference and finally the item for the Fish and Wildlife Service that I was discussing was left at $9,233,502, or a reduction of $1,844,773. We all remember last year the controversy existing between the then chairman of the subcommittee and the former Secretary of the Interior.

The budget estimate this year for the Fish and Wildlife Service was $10,338,300. There was reported in the bill $5,960,320.

I realize the gentleman may have had in mind the whole bill, but at the time of the colloquy I had in mind, of course, the particular part of the bill, Fish and Wildlife Service, that I was discussing. I want the RECORD to show what the figures and what the facts are in relation to the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from South Dakota and myself insofar as the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department is concerned.

I see the gentleman from South Dakota on his feet. Does he wish me to yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think I will get my own time.

Mr. MCCORMACK. When that appropriation bill was finally enacted into law last year the amount had been greatly increased in the Senate, and in conference the increase over the House bill was very substantial.

We all remember last year the situation when the Republican Party solidly supported every one of the reductions that were made and the coalition that brought about the majority that resulted in the action taken last year. The fact remains there was no 50-percent cut in the Fish and Wildlife Service, as the figures clearly show and as evidenced by reports of the committees of last year, These figures are a matter of record.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one more observation. On yesterday I said there were rumors floating around of a deal to increase some of the appropriations in this bill. I am wondering if that has not been consummated. I expect when it is reached in the bill in three or four places the committee itself will offer amendments to increase the amounts. If so, the people of those areas that will benefit, the projects that will have an increase, can thank the fight made by Members of the Democratic Party yesterday and today for the action which forced the Republican majority to increase some of the items in the bill that had been so drastically cut.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Massachusetts in offering to yield to me, but I thought I might take too much of his time and should probably ask for my own time. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts is seeking to crawl out on a very small part of his speech. The main part of the gentleman's remark, which everyone will recall who heard them, was a general tirade against what Republicans were doing to the West in this bill as a whole. He was talking first of all about reclamation. That was the major burden of his talk, and the words which the gentleman quoted will show that I spoke of the bill as it was reported by the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Interior Department last year when it was under the control of the party of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have in my hand here the report from the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill as it came to the House of Representatives last year.

The total amount of the budget estimates for the Department of the Interior, including reclamation, power, wildlife and everything else, was $346,765,000. The amount recommended in the bill by this committee last year was $174,000,000. You do not have to be much of a mathematician to note that a re-

ported bill for $174,000,000 is approximately 50 percent of the budget estimate of $346,000,000.

Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts, as I previously stated, is trying to crawl out on the fact that at the particular point he yielded to me, although I was standing on my feet earlier in his remarks, he was talking about fish and wildlife. Let us look at that. Last year the budget estimated $3,000,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration. The committee recommended but $2,000,000.

What did the committee do this year? Do you know what Federal aid in wildlife restoration is? That is money for carrying out the Pitman-Robertson Act, contributed by the sportsmen themselves through special excise and stamp taxes. I recall quite distinctly that we had trouble getting it started in 1938 and at various times since due to the fact the tax imposed upon shotgun shells and other items which go to make up the fund go into the general Treasury before being appropriated for carrying out that aid to wildlife program for which levied.

Never before in the history of the Congress, so far as I can recall, has a committee of the Congress carried out the intent of the law and appropriated the full amount collected for the purpose. Never has a committee done what the committee reporting this bill has done in that regard. Before they had always cut down and cut back and never reported out what the sportsmen had contributed. In the bill this year which we are now considering, on page 71 you will find that the bill makes appropriations for carrying out the act of September 2, 1937, of "an amount equal to the sum credited during the fiscal year 1947 to the special fund created by said act."

In other words, this committee is saying there will be appropriated for the Pittman-Robertson Act 100 percent of the amount collected from the sportsmen during 1947 for that purpose.

It is true that does not show in the total of the bill because the figure itself was not used, but I understand the 1947 collections amount to about $6,000,000. Last year, the committee held back on the money paid in by the sportsmen. This year, the Republican committee said, "We want to appropriate every dime that is collected under that head."

If the $6,000,000 were given in figures, it would make the totals on fish and wildlife cited by the gentleman sound a little different.

Mr. Chairman, the RECORD should show that the committee under the control of the gentleman's party last year did come in here with a 50-percent cut on the Interior bill which I did recall quite accurately and which is now demonstrated by the figures from the report of last year. On the fish and wildlife item the committee has done better by the sportsmen of this country than has ever been done before in the history of the Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Supplementing what the gentleman is saying regarding the figure of $15,000,000 having accumulated that the sportsmen have paid in, as the gentleman has so well said, the sportsmen will not only get the money collected from the sale of stamps, but also the $6,000,000 fund collected from the taxes derived from the sale of shells and other things.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has served on the select committee on wildlife restoration and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota would undertake to draw a comparison between the record of the Democratic Party and the record of his party with respect to reclamation. From the year when the Reclamation Act was passed in 1902 up to the day Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated, there had only been appropriated for reclamation a total sum of $260,000,000. It was in fiscal 1934 that the golden era of reclamation and development of the West began. Since that time, from 1934 to 1947, inclusive, there has been made available for reclamation projects of the West under the leadership of a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress a total sum of $940,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Not just now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will yield before he completes.

Mr. GORE. I will do my best to do so.

I doubt if the people who live in the Central Valley of California, whose Governor asks that the budget item of $20,000,000 be increased to $40,000,000, will be very much impressed with the devotion of the Republican Party to reclamation when they realize that instead of giving consideration to the request of their Governor who received the nomination of both political parties, the subcommittee gave it a 66⅔-percent cut and recommended an appropriation of only $6,000,000.

I doubt if the veterans who have priority for resettlement rights or who are waiting on a long list to settle upon the reclaimed land of the Columbia Basin, one of the greatest irrigation projects undertaken in the history of man, will be very much impressed with the interest in reclamation projects of the West when they read the speech made by the distinguished and able gentleman from Oregon yesterday, who told us that this bill did not represent the majority view of the subcommittee which heard all the evidence, and listened to all the testimony, but that it was, instead, a sledgehammer job, a bill of the Republican leadership, and when the subcommittee undertook to work its will, in the words of the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, a "big bad wolf" was threatened to be called in. Therefore, the bill came out, not as the majority of the committee that considered it wished it to be, not as they thought it should be, but as the Republican leadership deemed it should be. That leadership comes not from the West, or at least the people of the West will come to one conclusion inescapably, that the Republican Members of Congress from the West are not the controlling influence in the party policies of their Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is doing so well in describing the spending career of the President who occupied the White House between 1934 and 1942, when he compares the reclamation appropriations in the period going back to 1902, that I thought he ought to go a little further and compare the total appropriations for all fields of Government between 1934 and 1942. He could have demonstrated that in those 8 years the party of which the gentleman is a member, under the leadership of the man who was then in the White House, spent more for the causes of Government than was spent from the beginning of the Union in 1776 until 1934.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy listening to my good friend from Tennessee, a member of the committee. There is one thing that can be said about him which I think is very noteworthy especially in this debate. At least he writes his own speeches, or he delivers from the floor extemporaneously. Yesterday a member of the Interior Department pretty close to the Secretary called my office and said, "This is the busiest place you have ever seen. For the past week everybody who could write a speech of any kind has been writing speeches for the Congressmen to deliver up there to blast the majority members of the committee." So we have listened to these canned speeches to no end. But I say again the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is not in that category. He gets up and says what he thinks. But I want to remind him of one thing, that were it not for the money, the dollars, the millions and billions which the Republicans saved in the previous administrations before 1933 his party would not have had this almost $1,000,000,000 to spend for reclamation and for the million and one other New Deal useless spending schemes, which we of Congress are determined shall and must come to an end.

The Clerk read as follows:

The following sums are appropriated out of the special fund in the Treasury of the United States created by the act of June 17, 1902 (43 U. S. C. 391, 441), and therein designated "the reclamation fund," to be available immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to a matter that I think would not be known to those persons who do not live out in the West. On page 33 the bill states:

The following sums are appropriated out of the special fund in the Treasury of the United States created by the Reclamation Act and therein designated "the Reclamation Fund."

The reclamation fund is a fund that comes into the Treasury and is merely a bookkeeping item, you might say, out of various sources.

In the act of 1902, when the reclamation law was first written, it provided that certain sources should be available to build up this fund. Briefly, they are the following:

Sale of town lots in reclamation projects; moneys from royalties and rentals from the sale of potassium.

On February 25, 1920, this was modified so that they only got 52½ percent from the sale of potassium. On June 10, 1920, the sale of reserved land in reclamation projects, and on June 10, 1920, 50 percent of receipts from certain leases by the Federal Power Commission for use in national forests.

The only question I want to bring home to the Members is this: whether this is going to be a pattern for future expenditures and future appropriations for reclamation projects. If so, we are going to be in a very bad situation. In other words, that reclamation fund is a revolving fund coming out of certain accretions from certain Federal expenditures in the sales of land, leases, and so forth. As a matter of fact, all of the money for the large projects in the last few years in the Central Valley of California and the Grand Coulee and other similar projects of that kind have come out of the general fund. There is nothing wrong with taking this money out of the general fund for this reason—that a certain portion of these multiple-purpose dams—what they call compensable—all the money used for irrigation and all the money used for the hydroelectric development features of the project is paid back into the Treasury, dollar for dollar, and if we are relegated to a trust fund it will cause the development of these projects to trickle down to practically nothing.

In the appropriation you are making in this bill for the Central Valley water project if the size of the appropriation is not materially increased hereafter, it will take us 27 years from today, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, to finish the project. We now have $180,000,000 in it, and until it is finally completed we will not get very little compensable money out of that project, and all of the $180,000,000 will be virtually wasted until the water gets to the land and until the electricity is distributed. We do have a small income from electricity which we hope we can build up. As soon as the canals are dug we can build that fund up from the sale of water to the farmers.

I just want to point out that I hope this is not a pattern which the Committee on Appropriations is going to follow in the future. In my opinion, Members who are not familiar with the problems of the great West might think this is a very good plan. Those who are opposed to appropriations for these great projects could use this kind of plan to kill these projects off by this slow type of appropriations. I am merely pointing this out to you and giving you this word of warning. I hope and pray this is not a pattern we are going to try to carry out in future appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior. We must get money from the general fund to expeditiously finish these great projects. Only in that way can recompense for the money advanced be started and the project finally be paid off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL OFFICES

Salaries and expenses (other than project offices): For expenses necessary during the fiscal year 1948, including personal services in the District of Columbia, in the administration and performance by other than project offices of Bureau of Reclamation functions, $3,000,000, to be available for the purposes, among others, specified under the head "Operation and maintenance administration," Bureau of Reclamation, in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1945, and reimbursable as to expenditures for operation and maintenance administration to the same extent as is provided under said head: *Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $6,500,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects: *Provided further*, That not exceeding $150,000 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with informational work.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL:

On page 33, lines 17 to 21, strike out "*Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $6,500,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects" and insert "*Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing amount there shall be available for expenditure under this appropriation any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations are available."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the Members of the House that the sole purpose of this amendment is to reestablish and reincorporate in this bill the old provisions of the 1947 and other appropriation bills. I should like to direct my remarks particularly to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I debated this subject yesterday and asked the gentleman to sleep upon it and see if he could come to a conclusion. I appreciate that it is the desire of the Members on the left to save money, and I ask you to consider this most seriously. There is no saving of money in this provision of the bill, and there is no addition of any money in the amendment that I have offered.

Here is the sole purpose of the amendment: This bill provides, as it now stands, that there shall be a limitation of $6,500,000. The old law was that there was no limitation. This is what I am getting down to in a few words: In Denver, the heart of the reclamation area, there are about 1,300 engineers who do the designing and supervision of construction for all of the great dams of the West. This is the group that has done that work for Grand Coulee, Shasta, Boulder Dam, and for all of the continuing, going projects today. There is no saving here. I am giving you a legalistic argument now. In this bill under "General offices," on page 33, all you do, if this bill is passed, is disperse that great engineering force in Denver. You break it up and force them out into the different projects areas. You will not save any money, for it is vital and essential that this designing and construction work continue. You yourself want that, I am sure.

Let me say again to the Members, this is no idle amendment. This is no political gesture. This is of vital importance not only to the people of the West but to all of the people of the Nation who are interested in a continuation of these great reclamation problems.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio, I should like to ask him a question if the purpose of this legislation was to really disperse that great engineering force. I am sure the gentleman is aware that 50 nations of the world have sent their engineers to the Reclamation Bureau for instruction and information. This is the greatest engineering force in the whole world today. I am confident that this bill will disperse that force. I ask the gentleman from Ohio if there is some hidden purpose here that is not apparent to me. I have read the record. I see it nowhere in the record. Again I say to you, you will not save a dime, because if you attempt to place a limitation upon this, nowhere in your bill, not a single place in your bill, will you prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from assigning men to the various projects.

Let me explain that further for just a moment. For example, the work on Grand Coulee is going to continue. Do you know that in Denver the designing engineers on that dam are set off in a small area, and they are paid from that project? That is true of the Davis Dam; that is true of the Big Thompson; that is true of every dam that is under construction in the United States.

I made a suggestion to the gentleman from Ohio when we were talking about what to do with the Power Division. What did the gentleman say when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], asked him, "How do you intend to take care of the Power Division?"

The gentleman says it will be taken care of by the great engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation; and that is true if that is the intention—it could be; but the gentleman said that we are spending $12,000,000 for that purpose but not doing it under this bill. As I say, this is not a partisan, this is not a political matter. It is vital to the interest of the reclamation program. I sincerely trust you will accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado proposes to remove a limitation in the bill of $6,500,000 for the Denver, Colo., office.

In the fiscal year 1946 Denver had $5,034,875 to spend. That was the actual expenditure. Then you will remember they had a large amount of funds on which the President operated and on which he is still operating. There is still $85,000,000 frozen by the President. He lets them spend only $130,000,000 this fiscal year. Earlier he was going to let them spend only $85,000,000. Then on the eve of the election, in October, he raised the amount to $110,000,000 for construction projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and as he permits presently the amount for construction for this fiscal year will be $130,000,000.

Let us see what happened to the engineers in the Denver office. Instead of their taking a cut-back they took an increase from $5,000,000 to $14,000,000. If that is not loading the old engineering office to the gunwales enough to do engineering for all public or private engineering jobs put together in the 17 Western States and all the engineering for the States and counties too, then I do not recognize a loaded pay roll when I see one.

We have put a limitation of $6,500,000 for engineering. That is a substantial increase over the expenditure for 1946. We feel, therefore, that we have been very liberal to the Denver engineering office. We have provided an amount of money for the next fiscal year which we think is consistent as an engineering job, $6,500,000.

If, as the gentleman suggests, they take some of these construction fund appropriations that we have voted, to build irrigation projects upon the land to provide for the natural development of that great territory in the 17 Western States and they divert and pervert the intentions of the committee, the will of Congress expressed in this bill, and use that money to take care of a loaded pay roll, then we will find other means of putting other limitations in the bill next year so that they cannot get away with it.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I did not quite understand the purpose of the proviso until I heard the gentleman's remarks because it does not appear in the RECORD. As I understand the real purpose, then, it is to cut in half that great engineering staff. Is that the purpose?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The real purpose is to raise them by about $1,500,000 over what they actually spent in 1946.

Mr. CARROLL. Then the gentleman was wrong when he said to the minority leader that you had added $12,000,000 for engineers for the Power Division.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I was entirely correct, because instead of $12,000,000 they are spending $14,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Then the committee has delegated the work of the Power Division to the engineers and the gentleman said to the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that the amount was $12,000,000. Now the gentleman wants to cut it to $6,500,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. And they will have $1,500,000 more than they had in 1946. The construction program presently is frozen by the President. There is, therefore, plenty of money to take care of the job of marketing flood-control power in Washington, right here in the head office of the Bureau of Reclamation. Even in the Secretary's Office we allowed a couple of hundred thousand more than he had on the basis of 1938 personnel. But the Denver office presently has $14,000,000 instead of $12,000,000 which I reported to the majority leader.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not speak to that point, I speak to the point of the continuation, the necessity for the continuation of designing and supervising these contracts, notwithstanding the stoppages as a result of the war. They must continue to design and carry out the great reclamation projects of the West. Is that the purpose of this engineering group?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Certainly on the basis of money that it spent in 1946 and the amount of engineering it did, $6,500,000 is consistent with the amount of money the President allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to spend this year and the amount we are allowing them to spend next year.

Mr. CARROLL. I had hoped that the gentleman from Ohio would accept this amendment. I heard his remarks here about the freezing of funds and I heard nobody contest that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

General investigations: For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and surveys, investigations, and other activities relating to reconstruction, rehabilitation, extensions, or financial adjustments of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission, $125,000, which may be used to execute detailed surveys, and to prepare construction plans and specifications: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the preparation of any comprehensive plan or project report the estimates for which are not based upon current prices and costs.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language contained in line 13 beginning with the word "*Provided*" down through line 18 to the colon, page 34, for the reason it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] desire to be heard on the point of order? The point of order is that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOCKMAN: Page 34, line 11, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amount allowed by the budget for this item——

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order against this amendment, but will reserve it for the moment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order. The gentleman from Oregon had already been recognized and had started debate. The Chair wants to be extremely fair and not too technical, but that is the situation. The Chair is constrained to hold that the point of order comes too late.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the previous point of order was only made to language appearing in lines 13 to 18, ending with the word "Investigations," is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the item entitled "General Investigations," and I will explain to you in just a moment as to what is the detailed procedure of that department, was $5,000,000. The committee allowed $125,000 which in my analysis is a most inconsequential amount.

I propose in my amendment to make that $2,500,000. I am willing to admit that I think the amount is probably insufficient, but I am also willing to settle for that much in view of the economy wave that is in progress in this Nation and to which I subscribe.

The amount of $125,000 allowed by the committee is only 2 percent of the amount allowed in last year's budget. It is about $7,000 apiece for the 17 Western States. It is not enough money to even pay the terminal leave of the employees already employed in this department of the Bureau of Reclamation. The amount is irrelevant, insignificant, and in my opinion, it is a ridiculous and absurd amount for this committee to allow for such an important work. Why is this

work important? It is important because it is the brains, the foundation, and the cornerstone of the Bureau of Reclamation. It has aptly been said that there is no substitute for knowledge, and this is the knowledge, the fountainhead of knowledge, for the Bureau. What the Department does is determine in advance just what reclamation projects are most feasible to be recommended to the Congress.

I submit to you that this comparatively small sum of only $2,500,000, and even if it were $5,000,000, is very, very small in comparison to the hundreds of millions of dollars it will undoubtedly save in future years, by reason of the Bureau being able to recommend only those projects which are entirely sound and feasible. Now, it determines which is sound and feasible by these means: It gauges the stream flow. It determines the site or place where the dam should be located. It undertakes to determine the sort and type of soil in the proposed acreage to be irrigated. It determines what the people in the district think of the proposed project. In short, it undertakes to learn in advance whether or not this proposed project will pay its way.

Let me say at this point that the Reclamation Bureau has a record up to date of 97½ percent repayments in the funds to the United States Treasury of the money which has been loaned to it, and to destroy the fountainhead of knowledge, the basis for all future planning for this Department, is, in my opinion, one of the most ridiculous things we can do.

In summation of the reasons why I think this Department should be given this comparatively small amount, let me say this: In the first place, if this small amount of $125,000 is allowed to stand, it will kill all the irrigation programs at the grass roots. It will injure the present and future income of the National Treasury. It will stop the progress of the last great frontier of America and the benefit that will accrue from this. We will be declaring that the House of Representatives is in a stagnant frame of mind, and I do not believe that to be so. This Nation was not built on that sort of a policy and this Nation will not progress on that kind of a policy. It is not in any way partisan politics.

Gentlemen, I submit to you that this is intelligent planning for the future progress of a wide-awake and progressive America.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. During the war we kept talking about getting ready in case there should be unemployment, to be ready to take care of the soldiers. Now, when we cut off all of these investigations, if there should be a depression in about 2, 3, or 4 years, all this investigatory work, which would get the projects ready, would be lost.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon is exactly correct in the statement that he makes in reference to this particular appropriation for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and surveys, investigations, and other activities relating to reconstruction, rehabilitation, extensions, or financial adjustments of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, in the western half of the United States, and I am speaking of half of it in area, beginning at some point in the neighborhood of Kansas, which is about the mid-point of the United States, there is not enough rainfall to support the ordinary growing of crops. On the other hand, when water is conserved and brought to those areas it is very fine productive land. The gentleman from Oregon who preceded me lives in that part of the world, as do I. He joined with us not long ago to go out to California to see a certain project there, the Central Valley project. We arranged a very satisfactory visit for him, I understand, and permitted certain facilities in the nature of an airplane which he might use to fly over that great project. He comes back to you with the truth. I only wish that the other gentlemen on the subcommittee would take the trouble to actually go into the area for which they are making appropriations and find out what it is all about. The gentleman from Iowa I know has been there and fully understands the problem.

Mr. JENSEN. I have zigzagged back and forth in a station wagon and on foot up and down from one end of the State to the other, I want the gentleman to know.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Iowa has done that, as I just said. I was not looking at him when I made the previous statement. I know that he is fully cognizant of the needs of that area and he knows that not only is every dollar which is put into these projects repaid to the Federal Government, into the reclamation fund, but through the added income of the people of that area great sums of taxes are paid to the Treasury of the United States. The great State of California is the third largest taxpaying State in the Union, and of course I will have to take the enormous cigarette tax paid by the State of North Carolina into consideration. I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, yesterday and today I supported the position of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN]. It is so sound that no thinking Member of this body can deny the full import of his amendment. This follows the amendment I tried to offer and gives you some idea of what is afoot in this Congress. Are we to destroy all the great reclamation projects in the West? If you pass the bill in its present form you will limit all future investigations. You will stop any reclamation work being done under the Eighty-first, Eighty-second, and Eighty-third Congresses. In other words, reclamation will die on the vine because you are cutting its roots by this very action.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will not this sort of investigation be the very method by which the Appropriations Committee can make the right kind of appropriations and make feasible appropriations?

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Before these great projects can come before the Congress an investigation to determine their economic feasibility must have been conducted.

That is the very thing that Congress should be most interested in—to find out whether or not it is proper to appropriate money from the Treasury of the United States for reclamation projects. That is the very purpose of this great investigating group. I sincerely hope, notwithstanding the fact that my other amendment, which was so important, was lost, that the committee will not reject this one, which is equally important to the West and to the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. I had planned to introduce a similar amendment. However, I will follow the leadership of the gentleman who is a member of the subcommittee handling this legislation, and heard all of the evidence presented to the committee concerning the needs of the Bureau for funds with which to continue the surveys of proposed projects. I feel that certain reductions in appropriations for reclamation, as well as all other Government activities, are in order, but I submit it is highly important to carry on necessary investigation work.

By thorough investigation we have the opportunity to determine what projects are feasible and those which cannot be justified. In my district, Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation has been making extensive and exhaustive studies over a long period of years of a project which is known as the Gunnison-Arkansas Transmountain Diversion project. This project contemplates bringing water from the Colorado River on the western slope of Colorado through tunnels to the eastern slope, where it will be applied to land located in the Arkansas Valley. This project would provide supplemental water for about 300,000 acres of land which is now under cultivation, and

would bring something like 337,000 acres of new land under cultivation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that the Bureau of Reclamation has been conducting investigations on 35 river basins and subbasins and 115 different projects and that the effect of this provision in the bill will be to practically suspend all of these investigations that have been carried on?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Wyoming is correct. I do not have the detailed information as to the exact number of projects, but the Bureau of Reclamation has been making extensive studies on proposed projects located in many areas. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this amendment and hope it will be adopted by the House. I feel it is in the interest of economy to check over very carefully these projects which are being proposed. The Bureau should be given sufficient funds to carry on the investigation work in which they are now engaged.

Some of these projects involve large sums of money. Congress is entitled to have full and complete information before deciding on those selected for construction. I referred a moment ago to the Gunnison-Arkansas project in Colorado. This is a large project. Proposed plans call for the expenditure of several hundred million dollars. The amount already spent for this survey will be wasted unless the Bureau can complete its investigation and submit a report.

There is a great deal of interest in this project. A nonprofit corporation known as the Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado has been formed to develop the same. This association is composed of leading business and professional men of southern Colorado who are anxious to see the report on this project completed at the earliest possible moment.

The Bureau of Reclamation has an office in Pueblo, Colo., which has devoted much of its time to the survey of the Gunnison-Arkansas project. I am advised that this office would be compelled to close if these investigation funds are reduced too low. I have received many wires today from citizens and civic organizations who are greatly concerned over the situation. They do not want to see this work abandoned. There is a shortage of water in the Arkansas Valley. The Bureau is conducting this study to determine if there is any excess water on the western slope that can be diverted to those who need it so badly on the eastern slope. The Bureau hopes to have its report ready this year. I understand the field work is about completed, and it is now a matter of compiling the data and information that has been obtained over a period of several years.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the chairman and every member of the subcommittee. I realize it is a most arduous task to prepare this annual appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and its many agencies. I am sure the committee has acted honestly and conscientiously in arriving at the amounts contained in this bill. However, I feel the sum of $125,000 for investigation work is too small. This amendment will raise that amount to $2,500,000. I understand there are some balances being carried over. I urge the House to adopt this amendment and provide the Bureau of Reclamation with the necessary funds to continue its present work of investigating proposed projects. This will be a good investment, and the amount requested is reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation asked the Bureau of Reclamation to bring in an inventory of reclamation projects that we might have in the postwar period. The war at the time was still going on. The Department brought in such an inventory it was a heartening and revealing thing to see what was possible—even probable—in the West.

It is an enlightening thing that in the 45 years since the Bureau of Reclamation has been functioning under the act of 1902, nearly a billion dollars has been spent, and these great projects which we have heard eulogized so much and which I, too, have eulogized, have been established and are now paying out while creating new homes and much new wealth. But less than half of the total water resources of the West have been thus utilized. The other half of our resources are yet going to waste, leaving our great new Nation vast reclamation projects for the future.

If you cut off these investigations, you are effectively stopping this work. You cannot simply pass a law here in Congress authorizing the construction of a great project on any river and then proceed immediately without the blueprints. It takes long years of scientific study to make feasible plans so that the work will be successful when finally completed. But this reduction in the bill hits exactly at that germinal feature of reclamation which permits it to grow. For that reason, if the bill is not changed in the direction of the proposed amendment, reclamation will be effectively stopped. If you stop it for 1 year you have halted it for a long, long time, before a more generous and progressive Congress can see proper to remedy the situation.

I am in favor of the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on page 314, part III, of the hearings, you will find an interesting table. The total estimated cost of authorized projects is shown at $2,794,000,000, in which there is already invested $812,000,000. There is a balance to complete them all, $1,981,000,000 Those projects are projects the total construction cost of which has already been estimated by general investigation funds. There are $2,000,000,000 worth of authorized projects yet to be constructed that these folks have investigated. The final engineering details and specifications come out of the construction funds. Should we spend money for these general investigations—$2,000,000 or $5,000,000, or any other amount—when at the highest expectations of the wildest New Deal planners it would take us 5 or 6 years to catch up with the authorized projects? Can we not carry out our mandate and cut down general investigation expenditures when we have been liberal with the construction items? We have been as liberal as the President has been with the funds this year. He has only allowed $130,000,000 to be spent. We have allowed $141,000,000 to be spent the next year. The engineering specifications, blueprint details, and the physical work will be paid for out of the moneys we have appropriated—the $141,000,000 which is made available with funds appropriated in this bill.

I recommend, therefore, that these investigations projected far into the future be dispensed with. At another point in this table you will find general investigation employees are working on a trestle board of projects calling for $5,000,000,000 of expenditure. You will find them on page 312 of the hearings. Instead of using appropriations to complete the projects already authorized, these folks have their heads in the clouds and their feet in the stratosphere working on $5,000,000,000 worth of unauthorized projects. How long will it take to get to them, considering we are all for reclamation in the West? We want to see the sound development of the natural resources in the West. We want to see the West reclaimed. Why should we spend two and one-half or three million dollars for this purpose when the Bureau of Reclamation will not spend it on specific projects, where salt water is replacing fresh water down underneath the ground, upon which the crops must depend to exist? That is the case in the All-American canal district. That is the case in the Central Valley district where they have had from ten to twenty million dollars a year that they would not spend on projects half constructed and yet they seek millions of dollars to investigate new projects. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STOCKMAN) there were—ayes 56, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $690,000; irrigation facilities, $5,134,980; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $427,800, Keswick Dam, $100,740, Keswick power plant, $218,040; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, $256,680, Contra Costa Canal extension, 69 kilovolt, $71,760; in all, $6,900,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: Page 35, line 6, after the word "California", strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 7 through 12 and insert: "$20,000,000 from the general fund of the Treasury."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to this section of the bill in that this section deals with the reclamation fund and not the general fund of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of California. Have I made a mistake in the section? I understood the Clerk to be reading from "Construction" starting with line 6. This is an increase for the Central Valley project.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has made the point of order that this amendment was not germane to the section because it takes money out of the general fund of the Treasury and not out of the reclamation fund.

Does the gentleman desire to be heard as to the facts embodied in the statement which I have just made? If the fact is conceded the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was listening carefully to the reading by the Clerk but heard no mention of Davis Dam, which is in this same list. I understand the Davis Dam item was not read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read that portion of the bill so that the gentleman may be informed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 5, Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $6,200,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: Page 35, line 5, strike out "$6,200,000" and insert "$18,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We are going back now to an earlier project that was overlooked. As I understand, this has nothing to do with the Central Valley project.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the budget estimate on this item was $18,000,000. Let us look at this item. I mentioned it two or three times in the last two days but I took the precaution yesterday to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a more complete statement with regard to it and that will be found as the last item in the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday.

The reason I am very much concerned about this item is that the building of the Davis Dam is required in item 12, section (b) of the water treaty with Mexico, ratified in 1945. That treaty provides that the dam must be built, as a treaty requirement, within 5 years.

I understand that the cost of this dam will be in the neighborhood of $70,000,000. The work has already been started on it and contracts let. There was no Presidential freeze in regard to the materials on this particular piece of construction.

I was over there on the site twice last autumn and I am glad to report that the construction company is going forward with the work on schedule, but is operating on funds already appropriated. Unless we appropriate a sufficient sum of money regularly we cannot complete this dam by 1950.

What if we do not complete it? If we do not complete it we have violated or abrogated a treaty with Mexico. There may be some who would like to see that done, and I am pretty certain there are some in Mexico who would like to see that done. For many years we have argued with our neighboring republic to the south of us with regard to the Colorado River and the Rio Grande. Two years ago, after lengthy negotiations, we adopted a water treaty which contains a provision for the building of the Davis Dam.

Now, it takes two to make a bargain. These two great Republics argued over this matter hotly for years. I must confess I was not entirely satisfied with the provisions of the treaty, but it was ratified by the United States Senate in due form with less than a dozen dissenting votes in the Senate. If we abrogate this treaty and open it all up again we will not get as good a bargain even as the bargain we now have. What would result? Mexico has time after time, year after year, claimed 3,000,000 acre-feet of water to 4,500,000 acre-feet of water.

Can Mexico use it? She certainly could in the delta of the lower Colorado which goes into the Gulf of California. Mexico has millions of acres of good land that can be used down there and that land can use far more than 4,500,000 acre-feet of water each year to compete destructively with our irrigated lands nearby.

Now that the river has been regulated at our expense they can utilize all water they can put on the land. They can use half of the river. We are fortunate now to have Mexico's claim limited by treaty.

Mr. Chairman, we must not fail to carry out that treaty for the protection of our own lands in the West, as well as the land in Texas irrigated from the Rio Grande. I beg you to see to it that no other considerations enter into this. It is false and phony economy to think of saving a few million dollars annually for the next few years and losing possibly two or three million acre-feet of water forever to the Republic of Mexico.

Mind you, every acre-foot of water applied to the land in that area yields $20 in actual cash crop value every 12 months, so that you can see what a million acre-feet of water means when it is lost forever. It is equivalent to $20,000,000 annually in lost crop value. I love my neighbors, but I do not love them that much. There is too little water in the Southwest. My own State is starving for water. Other States in the Southwest are starving for water. We must use our water to the best advantage and protect our rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, under the 5-minute rule, the first 5 minutes this morning were taken up by reading an editorial from the Washington Post by the gentleman from Iowa. I will just take a couple of lines from it:

The Utopian plans for making the wilderness blossom by a forced process are a dream of the future.

Now, this is a reference to reclamation, and this is a city, Washington, D. C., where the first reclamation project was started in the United States. The States of Maryland and Virginia gave the ground, the poorest piece of land in America, to set up the Capital of the United States. It was a malaria-infested swamp so they wanted to get rid of it. They gave it to their country for the location of the National Capital. It is said that on the day the cornerstone was laid George Washington bought three lots from some land shark selling them on the corner, but it does not tell how he disposed of them or got rid of them. On the top of this dome that we are now working under is a statue. The forefathers were so sure that Washington was going to build out in the direction of his lots that the statue was faced out that way. They were wrong. They never thought that Washington would be built down in a swamp. But, reclamation came along, and a real Washington was built down in the swamp. And now we read of the audacity of the editor of the Washington Post saying "a dream of the future." Can you gentlemen compare the great domain of the West to the land here 150 years ago when they started in to build this Capitol? There is great vision in the West and great hopes but the land they have is not the kind of land they had to start this Capital here. Just think of today when we see all the busses coming in here with children taking a look at the Nation's Capital.

Think of the happiness that must be in their hearts when they climb the steps over there, and then think of the editor of the Washington Post riding to his home in Chevy Chase or wherever it is, with well-lighted streets along the sidewalks, the finest city in any of the world's national capitals, and then he has the audacity to say "a dream of the future," when we consider legislation to try to reclaim any of the land in those 17 great Western States. I wonder what that editor had in mind when he put into the paper the editorial that he did. I again repeat, "a dream of the future," and that is what the Department of the Interior is trying to make of the Western States. It will be a dream of the future if they can do there what they have done here in the city of Washington, especially in improving that ground where for example the Washington Post stands today.

No, we can easily fix up the West and do a good job if this Congress and this committee will only allow the Department of the Interior a few dollars to do the job with. The money for the development of our West is not a handout; not a gift; but an advance to the people and every cent of it will be returned to us. They are not giving it to them, like they are giving it to foreign nations. They are only lending it to the Americans, so if they will just loan a few dollars what the Interior Department asks for to help reclaim the West, to irrigate it, to get power there, sure, they will make a much better job out of the West than they have done out of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, in line with the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], I wish to emphasize the necessity of passing this amendment to increase the amount of money that has been allotted for Davis Dam. As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] told you, we have a treaty to uphold, and unless we complete this dam within 5 years, that treaty may be abrogated. I want to remind you that in the allocation of a mere $6,000,000 instead of the necessary $18,000,000 it is practically a strangulation of the construction of this particular dam. In carrying on the construction of a project of this kind, the contractor must maintain a certain number of engineers and a corps of experts, and then he has the general expense of running his camp. With the small appropriation that has been allotted to this particular project, the contractor cannot go forward. This dam was started back in 1941. Then the war came along and it was necessary to stop construction. The camp remained there for 4½ years. Last year construction was resumed. With the necessary funds that were set up by the Bureau of the Budget this year, that is, $18,000,000, which this amendment seeks to restore, the contractor will be able to complete it within the required time. As has been stated here frequently, this is merely a loan by the Government to this project, and the money will be repaid with interest. These projects mean a great deal to the Southwest.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that that interest will not start until after the project is finished, and that repayment will not start until the project is finished?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is true, it will not start until the project is in operation. We have already invested some $20,000,000 or more. To stop construction now is folly. Let me emphasize that a mere $6,000,000 will not make it possible to continue the construction of this dam with efficiency. It will merely mean the strangulation of the work on this job. I urge you to adopt the amendment and make it possible for us to carry out our obligations and complete our work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the Congress, I hesitate to take issue with a conscientious, hard-working group of my colleagues like those composing the Appropriations Subcommittee that has reported the Interior appropriation bill for 1948. Any comments or observations I make with respect to the items in this bill must not be taken as a reflection on the work of the committee whose members have doubtless acted as their best judgment dictated.

I am particularly concerned at the reduction in the item for the Provo River project which is nearing completion in my State of Utah. The Provo River project has two important angles; one is to provide supplemental water for some 90,000 acres of presently cultivated land that requires additional water supplies in order to preserve existing agriculture. The irrigation features of this project cannot be brought into full action until Duschesne tunnel is completed to carry water from the Colorado River Basin into the Provo River Basin for irrigation and for further transfer to supplement the municipal water supply of Salt Lake City, Provo, and Orem.

The second major phase of the Provo River project is the aqueduct being constructed to carry water from the Provo River area to the city of Salt Lake. This aqueduct is also nearing completion and the longer its completion is delayed the more danger Salt Lake City faces with regard to its water supply which is becoming critical.

The reduction in the Provo River project budget items from $1,430,000 to $1,000,000 is therefore deplored since it will further delay the completion of the Provo River project both irrigation and municipal water supply. I state advisedly that the reduction is deplorable especially in view of the fact that the Provo River Water Association and Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake last year voluntarily increased their repayment obligations for this project by 50 percent in order to cover the additional construction cost during and since World War II. I am proud of the fact that my State of Utah took this action, and I hope that a way will be found not only to restore the budget cut for the Provo River project but to increase the appropriations so that all parts of this project can be speedily completed. Two other items in this bill which are of particular concern to Utah are its interest in putting all of its water resources to work in irrigation developments as speedily as possible. The State has cooperated with the Bureau of Reclamation in advancing investigations of future projects including the great central Utah development which challenges the efforts of engineers both of the Federal Government and the State. There is yet much work to be done in investigating the water resources of Utah and additional funds are badly needed.

However, the recommended cut in general-investigation funds from $5,000,000 to $125,000 and the Colorado River development fund from $500,000 to $250,000 would mean the virtual disorderly liquidation of the planning work being conducted under these two programs. The funds would represent less than 7 percent of the programs now being carried out in the State of Utah. If funds are appropriated in such small amounts, all, or practically all, of the project-planning field offices at Logan, St. George, Spanish Fork, Vernal, and Salt Lake City would have to be closed completely, and the investigations in the Bonneville Basin, including Bear River project, the Weber River Basin project, the Provo River project extension, power studies, and investigations of existing projects would have to be abandoned. All work in the Colorado River Basin would be slowed down considerably. This reduced scale of operations would seriously affect work in the Virgin River Subbasin, the Santa Clara unit of the Dixie project, the Colorado River storage project, the Central Utah project, Emery County project, Vernal project, Jensen project, Bluff project, sedimentation studies, power studies, and investigations of existing projects. In fact, it is unlikely that any constructive work could be done at all in the State of Utah, inasmuch as terminal leave for personnel to be laid off would require more than the amount recommended to be appropriated. Complete disintegration of the highly trained technical staff of the Bureau would result, and almost complete lay-off of the trained personnel would be required. The Bureau could not resume its present rate of speed for years, even if adequate appropriations became available next year. The Nation as a whole, and particularly the West, would suffer for generations to come because the continuity of the collection of basic records which are so essential to this type of work would have to be terminated to a large extent.

I join with my colleagues from other Western States in protesting against the reductions in funds for the construction of other projects. I agree that the Federal Government must economize, but I suggest that true economy can be achieved better through completing promptly irrigation projects which have been started in which the Federal Government has an investment than it can

be achieved by slowing down construction and piling up overhead costs on a frozen investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], for the excellent effort he has made in connection with the Interior Department Appropriation bill. It is outstanding, indeed.

However, I am disturbed about the appropriations provided for Public Power Development. I understand this item is substantial, that it can run into a figure between twenty and forty million dollars. I feel sure that this is not in accordance with the wishes of my good friend and colleague. It is unlikely that I could have done any better, if as well, had I been in his place.

Nevertheless this appropriation for further nationalizing electrical power presents ominous aspects that are disconcerting to say the least. I view the development of political ownership and control of electrical power as one of the key dangers to liberty and competitive enterprise in the United States. I shall be compelled to vote against this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Davis Dam project in Arizona has an appropriation in this bill of $6,200,000. The unexpended cash available for 1948, as reported in the hearings, for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation is $2,501,884. This makes a total available for this project in 1948 of $8,701,884.

The treaty between the United States and Mexico has to do with water. Water is the problem. Water is the treaty. What are the features of this project that have to do with water? First, it is irrigation. Next, it is joint facilities. That is, there are some parts of the multiple-purpose dam that are used both for power and water. They call those facilities joint facilities.

At page 652 of the hearings you will see in column 2 the 1948 budget estimate for joint facilities is $8,209,000, so when the committee allows $8,701,000 it has allowed more than is necessary for the joint facilities for the next fiscal year. We contend that that carries out our treaty with Mexico.

The Bureau of Reclamation wants to complete power lines today from a dam that will not generate power until 5 years from now. Where do they propose to get the power? From the allottees of the Boulder Canyon project. In other words, they are charging up transmission lines to the Davis Dam 5 years ahead of the generation of power at the dam, and they are perverting the purposes of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, for that dam never was supposed to have a transmission line built from it. All of the allottees get their power direct from the bus bar at the Boulder Dam.

I contend that if the Bureau of Reclamation and the gentlemen who weep crocodile tears for this project are really interested in carrying out the treaty, they would come forward with a limitation on this language such as I tried to get in committee but did not have the votes to get, to make the money available for irrigation and joint facilities, and then the treaty provisions would be carried out.

The rest of the budget estimate is for power. I recommend and urge that the amendment be voted down because the amounts we have allowed and the amount of the carry-over takes care of the joint facilities which carry out our terms of the treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I understand it, we had returned to a part of the bill which was already read by the Clerk. The Clerk finished reading the Central Valley project from 6 to 12. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is debate open on that particular paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The debate never was closed on the paragraph, and the paragraph is open to amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 35, line 6, after the word "California", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 7 through 12 and insert "$20,000,000."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which seeks to restore to the Central Valley project in California the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. There is presently proposed in the bill $6,900,000 for this project, which, with the estimated $10,000,000 carry-over, falls far short of the schedule of construction presently set up of $30,000,000. The requested appropriation would hardly take care of some $18,000,000 worth of proposed construction. This is the project on which the Honorable Earl Warren, Governor of California, came to Washington and testified before the subcommittee handling this bill and recommended that instead of $30,000,000 being made available, double the amount should be appropriated in the interest of getting the project finished rapidly. The necessity for this project is obvious. We have had a great increase in population in the State of California. Further than that, the drain that has been made upon the water resources of California has been great. Down in the San Joaquin Valley, where they are pumping ground waters that are irreplaceable, the only way that we can continue to produce on that soil is through some supplemental waters that must be brought into the area through the completion of this project. For those of you who do not remember the details of the project, in the northern portion of the great Central Valley, the Sacramento Valley, an abundance of water falls. In the southern portion of the great Central Valley, the San Joaquin Valley, there is a dearth of water. The proposal for this valley undertakes by engineering means to transfer the surplus water in the Sacramento Valley through a series of canals and the delta cross channel and a series of lifting pumps into highland canals that will distribute the water in the San Joaquin Valley.

This project has been building for some time, and the quicker it is completed the quicker people and the Treasury will be reimbursed for the money that has been spent on it. It cannot be completed until the water is made available to the farmers. In my own district we are concerned with the completion of the Contra Costa Canal. There a small sum is needed for this purpose, but it is important to tie in the last essential link of this phase of the project. Then we can begin to build laterals that will carry the water out to the lands of the district for irrigation.

Further than that, water from this canal will also be used for domestic purposes. The city of Martinez has already voted bonds for and is in the process of constructing, a filtration plant in order to meet the time at which the Contra Costa Canal will be completed. Presently the domestic water supply of Martinez in Contra Costa County is inadequate. This is one of the counties in California that had a phenomenal increase in population, brought about by the war effort. Their prewar population was 90,000. Its present population presses 300,000. This new population pressure is one of the factors that makes it imperative that this project be completed at the shortest possible time. That is why Governor Warren urged, as the hearings will show, a 100-percent increase in the sum I seek to have restored to the bill. The effects of cuts are disastrous. With construction of irrigation facilities considerably less than half completed, present construction work will have to be seriously curtailed, in addition to the inability to begin work on new project units not yet under contract. Contracts for construction already in force will require progress payments exceeding $9,000,000, not including the cost of materials, equipment, and other necessary charges, such as those for rights-of-way, engineering, and so forth. Water distribution facilities affected will be:

Delta-Mendota pumping plant: Advertisement for bids to construct this vital unit of the irrigation system will likely be held up. Early advertisement had been planned.

Delta-Cross Channel canal: Surveys and final plans looking toward the award of a contract for construction of this unit in 1949 will have to be delayed.

Delta-Mendota canal: Work will be stopped in part, if not entirely, in view of required progress payments totaling

about $3,000,000. About 23 miles of this canal are under construction out of a total of 120 miles to be built.

Power facilities: No power substation to serve the Delta-Mendota pumping plant was provided for, which would delay use of the Delta-Mendota canal if not restored.

Completion of the Delta-Mendota canal and the pumping plant with appurtenant power facilities are essential before effective use can be made of the Friant-Kern canal. These facilities are necessary to replace the water that the Friant-Kern canal will divert out of the San Joaquin to the southern end of the valley. Without them only the relatively small increase in San Joaquin water which will be made available through conservation can be turned into the Friant-Kern canal when that structure is ready.

Friant-Kern canal: With 75 miles of this long canal now under contract the Bureau would be unable to advertise for bids for further construction. Progress payments on present contracts will require about $5,000,000, which just about equals the entire new appropriation allowed for all irrigation work in the entire Central Valley. Ability to continue work under present contracts will be jeopardized.

Power generation: Completing installation of three additional generating units at Shasta may not be affected, but work at Keswick will virtually stop. Progress payments for turbines, generators, and other equipment now under contract will just about take up the full amount appropriated for power work at Keswick. Three generating units are planned at Keswick.

Transmission lines: Only $256,680 for total transmission line work was allowed, and this was earmarked for use in extending the Shasta-Sacramento-Delta line toward its terminal. Progress on this vitally needed line will be sorely retarded. Funds requested for construction of the west-side lines and other facilities for distributing Shasta and Keswick power were denied. In the absence of lines to transport power to points where it is sorely needed to help meet California's power shortage, the net effect will be to bottle up the power generated at Shasta and Keswick. Each year that this power is not marketed will cause a loss of about $2,000,000 in revenues needed to help repay project costs.

Furthermore the denial of funds to build substations on the Shasta-Sacramento-Delta line will make it impossible for the Bureau to make energy available to consumers along the way. Funds were denied also for vital switchyards at Shasta and Keswick, for the Contra Costa substation, and for a power line from Sacramento to Antelope.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have more time to discuss this very important matter. I know the way the Committee acts now it is in no mood to make any amendments. But I want to make one or two comments about this bill which I hope you will carry with you. What is the problem of economy involved in this bill? The whole bill does not provide more than three-fourths of 1 percent of the amount of the budget. If you increase the amount provided in this bill by 50 percent, it would not make a ripple in the sea of economy.

Another point I want to make is this: That what we are trying to do, in order to get you to accelerate construction on this great project, is good, pure Republican doctrine. I intended to offer an amendment to increase the amount by $5,000,000, and provide that four-fifths of that should be used for the construction of transmission lines. If you will build a transmission line from Shasta Dam down to Red Bluff, I am informed by the Reclamation Bureau, you can recover $2,000,000 in the sale of power every year. Remember that the water that could go through the wheels of these new generators that are to be installed will simply run down to waste until that transmission line is built, to carry the juice from those new generators.

Another point I want to make is that the private utility in California is gradually getting in a position where they can say to us, "We have all the transmission lines that you require. You put your juice across our lines."

I want to see this project in a position where we will have a bloc of independent power and not be funneling our electric energy over their lines or funnel through their cash registers these tremendous profits, which should be spread among the electric consumers.

The situation at the present time is that we should develop the transmission system on a small scale each year. On the particular line I mention you will recover at least two-thirds of its cost each year after its completion.

Let me point out to you furthermore that in California we have 600,000 new veterans in addition to the ones who enlisted or were inducted from California. Our whole economy is set up and based on the rapid development of these great systems of water and power. These veterans will get a direct benefit out of the development of the Central Valley, particularly from the irrigation features and the electric power features.

I suggest that the Members listen to our Governor, who asked for 40,000,000 this year for the Central Valley project. He might be here in 1949 sending budget suggestions down to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk which I now offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman does not want to be recognized on the amendment? He was standing and the Chair has his name on the list.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am using my time to place before the House a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD moves that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to make such a motion to get time, but a great many of us Members have sat on this floor for two whole days waiting to get 5 minutes to speak on a matter that is of great importance to the State of California. It is very disappointing to have such arbitrary and rude treatment on the part of the gentlemen on the majority side. Otherwise I would never have thought of putting such an amendment on the Clerk's desk just to get 5 minutes' time after waiting for two whole days.

The Central Valley water project in California is an important project. It is important to 9,000,000 people. During the past 3 years we have had an increase in our population of over 2,000,000 people. Twenty-five thousand people a month are coming in at the Yuma border. Four thousand of these people are veterans coming each month into the State of California and transferring their veterans' files to California. They want to settle down there. Many of them are farmers from the South, the East, and the Southeast.

Just a short while ago we had 20 farms up in the Tule Lake district of California on Government land for entry. We had 2,000 veteran applicants who were eligible to go on that land. They drew lots for those 20 farms. Twenty secured land, the balance were disappointed.

The Central Valley water project involves over 2,000,000 acres. Some of those acres are not under irrigation and many of them are under irrigation but under inadequate water supply, and yet I am forced to indulge in a parliamentary maneuver to get 2 minutes' time in the well of this House to talk on a subject like that when 4,000 of your veterans in your districts are moving into the State of California every month to become settlers there.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not only in California—I know the problem is intense in California—but throughout the West veterans are moving in and taking up farms. Just to the north of California a

project was opened up. There were 10,000 inquiries from veterans. There were 1,500 of the 10,000 found to be eligible, but when the drawing took place there were less than a hundred homesteads offered to them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is the condition in each of our Western States. I want to say this to the Republican Party that is crucifying the reclamation projects in the 17 Western States:

Mr. Chairman, in November 1948, your "mandate" is going to be showing. Do not look now, but your "mandate" is going to be showing when you go into those western places and try to send some of your people on that side back here. I think it is more important that they come back, as well as the Democrats come back from the West, than to have these reclamation projects defeated. I would rather have reclamation and all of the Republican Members from Washington, Oregon, California, Utah and the other Western States come back than to see your Republican Members defeated and see us fail to get reclamation.

It is a matter of life and death out there, not only for the veterans and the people that need these reclamation works but for the communities of the great Western States.

* * * * *

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will there be a committee amendment offered on this floor to the bill which will restore or enlarge some of those commitments?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the precedents of the House are to the effect that any references to probable action in the other body are improper and may not be made in debate on this floor.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is correct and the point of order is sustained. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw that part of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California offered a preferential motion that the enacting clause be stricken from this bill. The gentleman proceeded, under instructions of the Chair, to speak for 5 minutes and in effect stated to the House that he made the motion with no thought or purpose of addressing the House upon the merits of the motion which he had offered, but that he made it as a subterfuge purely in order that he might obtain 5 minutes in which to speak. As I understand the rules of the House, it is within the jurisdiction of the Chair to treat a motion made in that manner as not being made in good faith and for dilatory purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is a point of order involved, it comes too late. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much of my time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a half minute remaining, according to the timekeeper.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I notice the Members of this House get up on the floor and wrap the American flag around them and talk about communism. I am not being facetious, but if you want to stop communism in America, make democracy work. Give these people a home, give these people in the West a chance to have a little land. Make democracy work if you want to fight communism. You talk about sending $400,000,000 to stop it in Greece. You better stop it in the Central Valley of California first.

If the slash in the Bureau of Reclamation's appropriations is allowed to stand, it would be one of the most severe economic blows ever to befall the West. The repercussions within the national economy would be quite severe.

Water-resource development is the foundation of practically all economic activity in the West. While the war caused an unprecedented expansion in western population, agriculture, and industry, the necessary wartime slow-down of the reclamation program has caused growth there to outstrip water-resource development. Unless reclamation is permitted to go ahead now, not only will future western growth be impossible but existing investments in agriculture and industry and the livelihood of the people would be jeopardized.

I am, of course, most acutely concerned about the Central Valley project because it directly affects my own State of California. The reduction of the $20,000,000 requested for continuing this work to a mere $6,900,000 would bring the program substantially to a standstill. We have already spent some $175,000,000 on this project. Instead of being completed in the early 1950's, and permit the people to begin enjoying in appreciable measure the great wealth it can and would create, it would take nearly 30 years to finish the job at the rate indicated by the cut. Such a drastic slowdown would actually threaten the death of the project as now conceived by strangulation. It would increase project costs to such an extent that there would be a serious question of whether the work could be finished on a sound financial basis. This is not economy.

Such a slow-down in building this project would bring heavy financial losses to farmers desperately needing irrigation water and deprive labor of thousands of good jobs. Purchasing power would be retarded, with heavy losses of markets for farms and industries all over the United States.

Reclamation creates wealth. It makes possible farms, industries, and jobs. An outstanding example is afforded in the Los Angeles area, where some 2,000 new plants were established in a single decade, largely as a result of the availability of low-cost power from Boulder Dam. Some 63,000 new jobs for labor were created, including around 20,000 directly attributed to the war. Indicative of the wealth-creating value of reclamation is the fact that purchases of wholesale commodities by people depending directly on reclamation projects in the West was estimated at $500,000,000 for last year. The reclamation facilities that make this possible cost but twice that much to build. About 80 percent of these wholesale purchases was spent for goods from States east of the reclamation area, meaning thousands of jobs for labor and markets for mines, mills, farms, and factories.

Another dire aspect of the strangulation of this program is the reduction of the $5,000,000 requested for general engineering investigations to a mere $125,000. This means destruction of sound reclamation planning and points a real threat to the future of the West. Moreover, it means that reclamation will not be prepared for an expeditious expansion of its construction program to provide productive jobs in the event of a depression. At a time when the Nation is growing more and more concerned over the possibility of a depression, the Appropriations Committee would have us bury our heads in the sand like an ostrich. Would they rather the jobless rake leaves than to build dams?

The reduction of funds for general administration from a requested $4,800,000 to $3,000,000, too, is not in the interest of Government economy. It would lead to inadequate administration and cost the Government and the Nation many times more than the $1,800,000 the committee would have us think we are saving.

By any sensible unit of measure, the wrecking of the reclamation program would add up to false economy of the most flagrant type. And to let this cut stand would certainly wreck reclamation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized, provided there is no one on the majority side seeking recognition in opposition. [After a pause.] The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from a statement made by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New York has yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York still has the floor. He is standing at attention, with the gentlewoman beside him.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote a statement made by the Secretary of the Interior which clearly states what has been done in this bill.

The committee in its report explains that it has used the fiscal year 1938 as its standard, and notes, apparently with some regret, that its recommendations are $26,860,053 greater than the appropriations granted the Department that year. In point of actual fact the committee's recommendations would permit the Department to do less than half of the work it did in 1938, after a decade which has at least doubled the Department's necessary responsibilities.

The committee, in its comparison, excluded $97,695,686 available to the Department in 1938 from public-works funds. Those funds were used not for relief payments but for the regular construction program of the Department. Added to the 1938 appropriation, it gave the Department $230,661,503 for that year, more than $74,000,000 in excess of that now proposed by the House committee. If current wages and material prices are taken into account, the 1938 figure would be raised to about $311,000,000, almost exactly double the committee's recommendations for 1948.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has always been my understanding that when a preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause was used, that the debate had to be upon that motion. I submit to the Chair that the gentlewoman is not speaking on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill, the whole bill is before the House; therefore, there is great latitude in debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A further question on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the point of order would the Chair construe that the gentlewoman is speaking in opposition to the motion to strike out the enacting clause?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House the Chair must assume that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] who has the floor, is addressing the House, and that he has yielded to the gentlewoman who is now speaking at his sufferance.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We could talk for hours about what dams mean in terms of living standards for the American people and what they mean in terms of community development and what public power means in terms of production and employment but, the long and the short of it is that the Republican Party refuses in this bill to invest in the present and the future of the American people.

We are short of public power in this country now—the committee, notwithstanding, has cut out transmission lines and substations. Not content with that they have cut out the Power Division altogether.

At a time when we should be planning for the future so that we will have the materials which will permit us to develop and to grow, we are cutting off our powers of development and adding to the chaos which we are building up in the other parts of our economic program.

The Secretary of the Interior has this to say about what is being done in the Power Division:

In 1938 the Department had 579,000 kilowatts of installed capacity under its jurisdiction. Today this capacity is 2,790,000 kilowatts. By 1952, the program called for 8,121,000 kilowatts. The Department now has a payment responsibility of $500,000,000, and the 1952 figure would have been $1,500,000,000.

The committee evidently intended that the Secretary exercise no supervision whatever over this large investment. It specifically stated that he may use none of the funds for the Division of Power. Thus he may have no staff of experts to supervise and review rate determinations, cost of allocations, operating practices or contracts involving more than $30,000,000 of revenue annually to the Government. The Division budget is less than $132,000 for this purpose, and $32,000 for marketing power from War Department projects east of the Mississippi.

No provision has been made for handling the sale of power from these Eastern projects which will total over 600,000 kilowatts by 1952. The $32,000 of the Division's appropriation requested for this purpose is required for handling Cumberland River, Buggs Island, Clark Hill, and Allatoona power. It is evident that without adequate marketing work, this power from these projects under construction will be wasted or will be monopolized at the dam site by a single utility purchaser at his own terms. If power is wasted at these projects because of delays in making arrangements for the transmission and sale of power, the loss to the Government would be on the order of $10,000 per day or $3,770,000 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill could be called the "discrimination against the West" bill easier than it could be called the Interior appropriations bill. I certainly am one who wants to be classed among those who believe in economy in Government. I believe that is one of the responsibilities which we of this Congress have. At the same time, however, I do not think we should misconstrue the true meaning of economy. According to the Webster's dictionary which I have in my office, "economy is the management of affairs, especially as to expense; management of the affairs of a community, a State, or establishment and directly concerned with its maintenance or productiveness." Let us consider cutting appropriations requested for the continued development of such projects as will repay to the Government the amount expended in addition to the productivity which they will give to the surrounding area: When such projects as the Gila is cut 60 percent; the Davis Dam in southern California, affecting both southern California and Arizona, 66 percent; the Central Valley project, cut 65 percent; the Colorado Big Thompson project, cut 66 percent; the Columbia Basin project, 66 percent; Fort Peck, 50 percent; the Missouri Basin project, 50 percent; it does not seem to me that that is true economy, but on the contrary is short-sightedness since with true economy we would want to finish these projects as soon as possible so that they may begin to repay to the Government the money which the Government has expended on the projects, plus the fact that we wish to see the lands affected by these projects become productive immediately and the surrounding territory which will receive the power be able to use the power for further productivity.

Let us, for example, take the Davis Dam in southern California. It is true that this dam is to be used principally for electric power, but this is one of the dams required to store water as a result of the Mexican treaty which you from the East thrust upon us folks in California. The power generated from this dam will be used in Arizona and southern California. It will be sold to privately owned public utilities as well as to municipally owned public utilities. In the city of Los Angeles we have only the municipally owned department of water and power. This additional power is sorely needed to take care of the ever-expanding industry which is necessary to take care of the present population in that area. Is it economy to thwart this development? I say "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, last year this project had appropriated for it $12,685,622. There is an estimated carry-over as of the end of this fiscal year of $17,265,862. With the money that we have provided, that brings the total up to $24,165,862 available next year. Now, the committee is extremely interested in the Central Valley. As I told you earlier in the debate, there are places in the Valley where fruit trees and perennial crops are growing and where when you sink a well for water the water from a neighbor's well goes dry. When you are trying to get more water on the next farm and sink a well there, you may get no water or you may get salt water. That is the condition in some places in the Central Valley.

In any event, where there is no salt water, the water table is getting lower and lower, foot by foot, every year. The committee has been tremendously interested in building the canals so that the water can be transferred from the Sacramento River over to the San Joaquin River down the Mendota Canal and down the Friant Canal to recover that land for productive use. We want to save those farms. Those are farms on which people have lived and invested their life savings. These farms help to produce the food for the entire United States and citrus fruits for all the world. These are the farms which this committee—yes; the majority of this committee—are trying to save by urging upon the Bureau of Reclamation to work faster than they are willing to spend the money for the canals to bring this surplus water to these farms. Would to God we could do something with the Bureau of Reclamation to make them build the canals

faster, faster, faster, to save the territory. No; they dilly-dally and stall all along the line because they want to build power lines. They want to revolutionize California. We want to save the natural resources and save the farms and save the crops.

I ask that since there are $24,000,000 for this purpose, and since the Bureau of Reclamation has been so stubborn—stubborn to the point of ruining that land—I ask you to vote for the amount that the committee has allowed—$6,900,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $4,815,000; Pine River project, Colorado, $175,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 35, line 14, after the last comma, strike out "$4,815,000" and insert "$6,815,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall explain this amendment. We have found where there is extra money in the reclamation fund on which we can appropriate for this project, which has a very meager amount of 1947 and prior fiscal year carry-over in it. The budget estimate was $14,000,000. The unexpended balance is $2,933,000. In the bill it is $4,815,000. By authority of a majority of the committee I am raising that to $6,815,000, which will give to this project $9,748,082.

In passing, I think I should make some mention of where we found the money. There is money in the suspense account of the Bonneville Power Administration which will cover this amendment and other amendments which I will propose in this bill for reclamation. The committee is interested in sound reclamation. The committee is interested in appropriating from the reclamation fund—from the fund which was set up for the purpose of recovering land in the arid and semiarid areas. There is enough money in the reclamation fund to do that job, within the purview of the antiinflation program of the Republican Party.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL for the amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: Page 35, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$6,815,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this item close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply gratified to learn that the chairman of the subcommittee has seen some light gained from my debate on this matter yesterday. I commend him for it. I do not mean to say that as a result of my remarks he has entirely changed his mind, because he did not change his mind on other matters of equal importance.

I want to point out to the Members of this Congress that the position now taken is clear evidence that the subcommittee has made some mistakes. There is now clear evidence, when they made their cut in these vital reclamation projects, that they did not have all the facts, or having the facts ignored them.

I want to read to you just a little from the testimony before the gentleman's committee. This witness who was testifying is a gentleman by the name of Markwell. Representing the Bureau of Reclamation he was asking for $14,000,000 for work to be done on the Colorado Big Thompson project during the 1948 fiscal year and he was speaking to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] and other members of that committee.

Mr. MARKWELL. I might add that of the $14,000,000 requested for the fiscal year 1948 virtually all of that money will be needed to service the contracts which are now let. As of June 30, we expect practically no carry-over balance.

The chairman now admits that these contracts have been made. Now he comes forward and says in substance: "We were wrong about this. We cut you too much—almost $10,000,000." Now they come forward with only $2,000,000, when actually $10,000,000 is needed to meet existing contract obligations. Obviously this is a political gesture. The fact remains that the full amount of $14,000,000 is necessary. Again hear what the witness had to say:

Mr. MARKWELL. If we were forced to cancel these contracts, I believe it would be very wasteful.

Mr. JONES said:

What do you estimate the cost of cancellation would be, cancellation now of these millions of dollars of contracts?

Mr. MARKWELL. It would be several million dollars, sir. I would like to submit a figure for the record on that.

But here is a very important point, showing that the subcommittee is not infallible; that they have been reaching into the air, unfortunately, to meet this so-called $6,000,000,000 slash, which in itself was indeed a tragedy.

Mr. Markwell said:

I would like to point out that in canceling contracts at a cost which I believe would be several million dollars, we would also be rendering null and void expenditures which at the end of the fiscal year of 1947 would approximate $37,500,000.

To show you how much this impressed the gentleman from Ohio, listen to what he had to say:

Mr. JONES. Will you repeat that, please?

And he repeated the identical words, saying what would happen.

Let me tell you a little bit about Big Thompson. It is not in my congressional district, it is to the north of me; it is in the district of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], who has evidently done effective work convincing his leadership that the $10,000,000 cut was too drastic. I give him full credit for that work, but the present offering is not adequate.

The Big Thompson project is the greatest transmountain diversion in the entire world. This will mean an agricultural benefit to that area of a billion dollars, by the testimony of witnesses appearing before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk about the cost of these great projects. You are not giving the West something for nothing; we intend to pay it all back. That is more than can be said of pork-barrel appropriations given to the East and Central States, not a dime of which is reimbursable. The projects in the West are reimbursable. The West will not only repay every dollar appropriated to the use of these great reclamation projects but we shall add untold wealth to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. My time has almost run out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, $897,000; Anderson Ranch Dam, $2,874,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 35, line 17, after the comma, strike out "$2,874,000" and insert "$3,874,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Briefly, this million dollars is added because there is no 1947 fiscal year carry-over in this project and the amount that will be allowed them if this amendment is adopted will be the cheapest method of carrying out the year's program.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I directed two questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio. The first question was in regard to making some deals to get some of these appropriations put back in in another body. The answer was categorically "No." The second question was: "Will there be any committee amendment to increase the amounts on pages 35 and 36?" Undoubtedly the gentleman must have misunderstood my question in the confusion, because I thought the gentleman said no, that there would be no committee amendments offered. I now find him offering amendments to increase. I will ask the gentleman if he understood me.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The RECORD will bear me out that there was no answer to the second question because somebody

made a point of order against the gentleman at that point.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My understanding was that the gentleman said "No."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The misunderstanding, I am sure, has been corrected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that this shows that within a few days a subcommittee has reversed its action as a result of the debate, just the same as when there was a $350,000,000 cut in that portion of the deficiency bill which related to veterans, the cut being made on a Friday night and being put back the following Tuesday. We have the same spectacle in this bill, all confirming statements I have made on the floor of a confused and uncertain leadership on the part of the majority party.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in reference to these amendments that have been offered by the committee, and I trust there will be more of them, I am in hearty accord with raising any of the reclamation amounts allowed in the pending bill. I want to point out, however, and I want the people of California to know that they are not receiving the same attention that the gentlemen from the other districts received in the reclamation bill. I do not know how my Republican friends from California will explain to their people why California appropriations were arbitrarily cut and no raises were allowed, yet raises were given in other parts of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on Interior appropriations has done a tremendous job in bringing this important report and bill before the House. I know its members have worked hard to meet the situation as it should be met. Governmental bureaus have overgrown themselves beyond all reason, and the only way Congress can correct the condition is by cutting appropriations. I am for that, and, for that reason, I cannot object too strenuously to some cuts affecting my own territory. For that reason, I am willing to go along with the committee in the main, although we in Idaho who realize the great benefits of reclamation are anxious to push the reclamation program.

However, I would like to call attention to the significance in the requested appropriation for one project in my district—Anderson Ranch Dam. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that I feel it important to increase this one item.

At the present time the construction of Anderson Ranch Dam is practically at a standstill because of lack of funds. The dam is about 90-percent complete; however, considerable work remains on features such as the spillway and the power plant. No 1947 funds are available for use in 1948. Almost $4,000,000 is essential only to meet payments to contractors in fiscal year 1948. All I ask is sufficient funds to meet these obligations which will save the taxpayers' money and complete the project so as to permit the impounding of a full supply of water before next year's run-off is over.

This dam has been subject to stop-and-go tactics throughout the war period and many dollars have been wasted by costly shutdowns. I ask this increase to forestall this recurrence. A letter received today from Mr. R. J. Newell, of Idaho, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, who is on the job, substantiates the claim of the Department that the budget figure will supply only the minimum to continue the project.

Unless an increase is made, another costly year will be added to the job.

It is estimated that this project will cost $26,264,000 when completed; $20,000,000 has already been invested. A grant by the House to increase the appropriation will permit the storage of 493,000 acre-feet of water to supply additional water to 300,000 acres of land.

I urge serious consideration of additional appropriation for this Anderson Ranch Dam project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hungry Horse project, Montana, $1,550,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

THE MONTANA POWER CO. DOES NOT WANT TO STARVE THE HUNGRY HORSE; IT WANTS TO KILL IT

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time with the Interior appropriations bill for 1948 under discussion to call to the attention of the House of Representatives and the people of Montana, the fact that for the third year in a row, I have had to fight the all-out opposition of the Montana Power Co. which is opposing the best interests of the people of my State in the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam and the transmission line to furnish power for it. The Montana Power Co. does not want to starve the Hungry Horse; it wants to kill it.

While I am not happy about the fact that the committee did not see fit to grant the full $4,500,000 for the Hungry Horse, I am indeed happy that I have been able to get the full $237,000 for the transmission line and at least $1,550,000 for the Hungry Horse.

On February 21, 1947, Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., vice president of the Montana Power Co., accompanied by Mr. H. H. Cochrane, chief engineer of the Montana Power Co., appeared before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. I should like to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of Montana some of the statements made by Mr. Corette in his appearance before that committee.

Mr. Corette said—see page 1438:

Last year this committee approved and the House appropriated $950,000 for a transmission line from our Flathead plant to the Hungry Horse Dam by way of the city of Kalispell.

We opposed that appropriation on two grounds: First, that that size line was not necessary; and on the primary ground that there was no need to spend even preliminary money at Hungry Horse, which is what has been spent.

On page 1442, Mr. Corette further states:

There are, I think, two ghosts about this situation that I should mention before closing. One is that Congressman MANSFIELD has constantly taken the position that the people of that territory live in fear of the possibility of Flathead Lake being raised 3 feet and of having their lands flooded out. We just cannot see that possibility. It has been said that our company would raise Flathead Lake to the extent of 3 feet when we put in our second unit. That is not in the picture, because our license from the Federal Power Commission prevents it. We have the right to regulate the lake only between low-water and high-water level 10 feet. And we just do not see where there is anything in the picture which calls for any statement or any accusation or any fear that Flathead Lake might be raised.

In answer to the statement made by Mr. Corette, in which he mentions the Mansfield "ghosts," I want to say that I am fully aware of the fact that they are operating under a license from the Federal Power Commission. The license, however, is only the first advance in getting the camel's nose under the circus tent. There is a case on hand to prove my point.

At the present time the Washington Water Power Co., an affiliate of the Montana Power Co., has a plant on Lake Chelan in the State of Washington. The Chelan layout in all particulars, natural as well as physical, is similar to Kerr Dam on Flathead Lake. In building the Chelan plant, Washington Water Power Co. also secured a license with an elevation limitation. In spite of this license, they are currently pulling wires to get the license amended so as to raise the lake level. Consequently, at this very moment, there is an uprising among the farmers and land owners covering the entire periphery of Lake Chelan and the people of that region have been put to considerable expense to stop the Washington Water Power Co. from violating the provisions of their license with lake-level limitations. I want to make a solemn promise to the people of Montana right now and that is that no individual, organization, or corporation will ever be able to pull wires with me to get the present license for the dam on Flathead Lake amended, and that as far as I am concerned, the lake level will remain where it is. I am wondering just who is raising the ghosts in this picture?

On page 1443, Mr. Corette, of the Montana Power Co., states:

The Bonneville Agency is now asking for an additional $200,000 for this line from our Flathead Dam to Hungry Horse. Since we

think Hungry Horse itself is entirely unnecessary, we think, of course, that this appropriation should not be granted. We further suggest to you that the original appropriation of $950,000 for the Kerr-Hungry Horse line should be rescinded, that there is no need for that line, and that this $950,000 or $1,000,000 could be much better spent in some area where there is a power shortage, such as we understand there is in the States of Washington and Oregon.

These quotations from the testimony of Mr. Corette when he appeared before the committee should give to the people of Montana the true picture of the part being played by the Montana Power Co. in opposition to our project. How the Montana Power Co. can be reconciled in its cries about a surplus of power in eastern Montana with a definite lack of power in Kalispell and vicinity is more than I can figure out. We know that the building of the Hungry Horse will not only bring in cheaper power to the people of Montana but it also will supply additional firm power for the downstream generators. It is a project that is not only of interest to the State of Montana as a whole but to the entire Northwest. It is a project which will give electricity to our farmers, bring industry to our State, give security to our people, and create opportunities for our sons and daughters.

I am deeply appreciative of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has wisely rejected the request of the Montana Power Co. that the appropriation for the Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam line be rescinded, and instead approved the full budget request for $237,000. I ask that this action of the committee be sustained. I further ask that the funds contained for the Hungry Horse project be restored to $4,500,000, the full amount as requested in the budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks made by me before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on February 21, 1947:

HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. FENTON. We shall be happy to hear from you at this time, Congressman MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is my fourth time before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in behalf of the Hungry Horse Dam, and my second appearance in behalf of the transmission line from Kerr Dam to the Hungry Horse.

I understand that for the third time the Montana Power Co. has appeared in opposition to this project, and for the life of me I cannot comprehend their attitude, because 4 years ago we had a terrible time keeping Flathead Lake from being raised 37 feet, and at that time we were not only responsible for saving the lake from being raised but at that same time we saved for the Montana Power Co. the dam at Polson, which it has under a lease-hold arrangement with the Flathead Indians.

What we had in mind in saving this lake was keeping in operation 50,000 acres of first-class arable land, in giving some security to the people who had retired to the region of this lake, and who had worked hard all their lives in an attempt to find some security, and also in maintaining an asset belonging to all the people of Montana for their use. Had that lake rise gone through, it would have meant that Kalispell, a town of 10,000, would have been inundated by half; that Polson, a town of 3,500, would have been likewise put under water in parts; and a number of small towns along the lake shore would have been inundated as well.

I would like to repeat for the committee a statement that I made last year when I appeared in behalf of the transmission line and Hungry Horse:

"I have no opposition to public utility companies working in their proper spheres, but I certainly am opposed to their coming in and attempting to kill a worthy project of this kind, and one which means so much to the people of Montana. I intend to fight them all the way, because, to my way of thinking, the interest of the people of Montana come first and foremost, and as their Representative I will do everything in my power to follow their wishes and my own in seeing to it that every bit of my energy and ability is expended in the fulfillment of this project."

Further in those hearings I state:

"The Montana Power Co. serves a goodly portion of the State of Montana, extending from the Thompson Falls plant in the west to the Fort Peck Dam in the east. The Flathead, Kalispell, White Fish area is independent and isolated from the territory served by the Montana Power Co. Therefore, I wholeheartedly urge the Hungry Horse Dam and transmission estimates. Even if this submission was in conflict with vested rights, I would urge that a sharp line of demarcation be drawn between just vested rights and the benefits from lands and resources which belong to the people. The right of the people to the use of resources owned by them has priority over any secondary interest, unless the people have deeded their interests, which is not the case here."

When I appear in behalf of the transmission lines for this project, I know, gentlemen, that I speak for 99.9 percent of the people in Montana. Twice already we have almost lost Flathead Lake. If the transmission line is not completed, the Hungry Horse Dam will not be built, and we will be back again where we were on two previous occasions, and I hate to think what will happen to my part of the country.

In Montana we have approximately one-tenth of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. We have not developed that electric power. We would like to see it developed, so that our people and their children can have a chance to achieve security and to bring our State up to where it belongs.

Until recently when our boys and girls had finished high school and college, they had to go outside of the State because they said there were no opportunities in Montana. There are opportunities there, but we have to develop those opportunities, and no private concern is big enough to undertake a project such as the Hungry Horse which has received congressional authorization and on which something in excess of $2,000,000 has already been spent.

There is no reason why we should not give our own people a break. There is no reason why we should not give our children a chance to help develop the State and participate in that development. There is no reason why our wealth should always go out of the State and not stay in Montana for the benefit of the people.

For about 70 years Montana has been mined and milked of much of its resources, and because of that our population has been kept down, and no inducements, no advantages offered to individuals so that they could stay there.

This program of the Hungry Horse will be a safely liquidating program. It will repay to the Government far more than the Government puts into it and what we want to do is to borrow the initial investment. We think that we are offering sound collateral for that borrowing.

There will be ample opportunity to sell the power which will be generated there. It will also mean that approximately 100,000 acres of land will be reclaimed, it will aid in flood control and contribute a great deal to the benefit of western Montana and, perhaps, more important to the benefit of the entire Pacific Northwest.

We realize that these other States have a stake in our part of the country, and we want to cooperate with them.

I might say also that the five Governors of the Northwest States—three Republican and two Democrat—in 1944 issued a joint statement in which they put the Hungry Horse No. 1 on their list of postwar developments. Hungry Horse is the key to the full power development of the Northwest, and it is the place where the water will have to be stored up so that firm power can be furnished to the downstream States.

The obvious intent of Congress when they authorized the Hungry Horse project was that construction should proceed as rapidly as possible as soon as the war was over. It is my impression that the request by the Bureau of Reclamation for appropriation of only $4,500,000 does not comply with the intent of Congress in that I doubt if such a limited amount of funds will permit the rapid expansion of construction activities on this vitally necessary project. I am told that work to date has consisted almost entirely of exploratory work and foundation geological investigations, along with construction of housing facilities for employees to be quartered at the dam. I am also informed that these facilities will be largely complete this coming summer.

It is apparent to me, at least, that the funds requested will not permit the initiation of an efficient, comprehensive construction program. This becomes apparent when one considers major structures such as the Davis Dam, on which approximately $9,000,000 are being expended on the dam alone in the first fiscal year following the award of the contract for that construction. With a similar rate of construction, the $4,500,000 that Reclamation is asking for the Hungry Horse project would be expended in a few short months.

Actually, I understand that their program, based on the requested $4,500,000 appropriation, will only provide some $2,500,000 for construction of the dam proper. This, if I may hazard a guess, is considerably less than half the speed which is desirable.

That the Hungry Horse Dam is urgently needed was recently brought to my attention by a newspaper clipping from the area. The following item regarding probable flood conditions in the Flathead Valley was published in the Hungry Horse News of Columbia Falls, January 24:

"Up at Summit on the Continental Divide, the upper Columbia snow laboratory technicians of the Weather Bureau reported early this week that 6 inches of snow on the level contained 22 inches of precipitation.

"It will be a flooding spring, with every indication that streams will overrun their banks. The Government, January 1, predicted that the Flathead River at Columbia Falls would carry 151 percent or more of its normal flow during the run-off.

"The whole Columbia Basin is wetter, with precipitation estimated at 127 percent of normal."

Since that time we have had a great deal more snow, and in some places it exceeds 100 inches in depth.

Those people up there have been faced with repeated floods and only through the expeditious construction of the Hungry Horse Dam will this hazard be removed.

A further point is that the power facilities to be installed at the Hungry Horse Dam are urgently needed to meet the anticipated

power shortage of the great Northwestern area of our country. I am informed that both Federal engineers and engineers employed by the private utilities serving that area agree that the total power capacity of the area will be deficient to meet expected load requirements and, in fact, there is a power deficiency in the area at present.

I also understand that all well-informed individuals and engineers in the area consider that the most economical manner of meeting the existing power deficiencies, as well as those anticipated, is by the complete utilization of potential hydroelectrical developments.

The Hungry Horse project is a key development in this direction in that not only will the project provide much needed additional generating capacity but by the mere existence of the dam with its large storage capacity, some 200,000 kilowatts of capacity will be added to the potential firm output in downstream power plants. That is, once the Hungry Horse Dam is completed, water will be available to generate additional power during periods of critical flow. It is a matter of public knowledge that the complete realization of the power potential of the great Grand Coulee Dam depends, in part, upon the construction of this upstream reservoir.

In considering the Hungry Horse Dam, a project affecting the welfare and the economy of the entire Northwest is under consideration.

The beneficial effects of this project will be felt in Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, and any project that affects so large an area of our country is bound to exert a beneficial influence on the entire national economy.

Mr. Chairman, I will not read this next statement, but I would like to have it incorporated at this point.

Mr. FENTON. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"STATEMENT ON HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

"The Hungry Horse project was authorized by the act of June 5, 1944, and the record shows that it was the intention of the Congress in authorizing the project that work should proceed on the construction of the dam as soon as war conditions permitted diversion of materials and manpower for the work. The committee reports stressed the urgent need for the dam for protecting agricultural lands in the Flathead Lake area against floods as well as for the regulation of the Columbia River to increase the firm power production at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams.

"The Hungry Horse Dam site is located on the Flathead River in western Montana about 28 miles from Kalispell in a steep isolated canyon. Preconstruction work is at present in progress, including field surveys and the collection of geological and hydrological data. The Bureau of Reclamation has been preparing preliminary designs and specifications in connection with the dam, reservoir, access road, and the construction camp with its related facilities.

"The authorizing act directed the Secretary of the Interior to, and I quote, 'Proceed as soon as practicable with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Hungry Horse Dam, including facilities for generating electrical energy * * * to such an extent as may be necessary to impound not less than 1,000,000 acre-feet of water.' The Secretary was also directed to 'complete as soon as the necessary additional material is available the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam so as to provide a storage reservoir of the maximum usable and feasible capacity.' Studies now in progress indicate that a reservoir of maximum economical size will approach 3,500,000 acre-feet with a correspondingly large power plant approximating a capacity of 300,000 kilowatts. These studies are based largely upon the amounts and cost of firm power added to the Federal power system in the Pacific Northwest.

"According to present indications, load requirements in the Pacific Northwest will exceed available generating capacity this winter and the deficiency will continue for a number of years even though work proceeds as scheduled on all the Federal power plants now programed within the area. These studies clearly show a need for all the power and energy which will be available from the larger Hungry Horse power plant and the additional firm power gained at downstream plants due to winter releases of water from the larger Hungry Horse Reservoir.

"The committee reports recognized also that the construction of the dam was a necessary step in providing irrigation for approximately 100,000 acres of land near Kalispell. Studies are now being made also as to the best plan of providing such irrigation, and it is expected that a finding of feasibility on these additional works will be made under the Federal reclamation laws, and in keeping with these laws and with the act of June 5, 1944, will provide a repayment plan predicated on the assignment of irrigation costs to be returned from power revenues to the extent that this is required in order to show full pay-out of irrigation costs and to keep the water users' obligation within the limits of their repayment ability.

"Preconstruction activities during the current fiscal year involve the construction of the Government camp, the access highway and other related preconstruction work, which must be accomplished prior to actual construction operations on the dam. The Bureau of Reclamation's request for funds for fiscal year 1948 will provide for the completion of these facilities and will, in addition, make available funds for the awarding of a contract for construction of the dam and for large-scale clearing operations in the reservoir area."

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, there is a Budget Bureau approved request for $237,000 to complete the transmission line from Kerr Dam down to Hungry Horse. I would like to urge that this be allowed so that the transmission line can be completed, because if we do not get this transmission line we will not have the power to undertake construction at the Hungry Horse.

Now I understand the Montana Power Co. is interested in this particular locality, and it is passing strange to me that it took action on the part of the Government to get the Montana Power Co. interested in this particular part of our State.

As I have indicated earlier, there is no outlet for the Montana Power Co. in the northwestern part of Montana, because during all of the years that it has been in operation, it has ignored that part of the State. Now, after we have saved their dam for them at Polson, and after we get through an authorization for the construction of Hungry Horse, after we get through initial appropriation for the transmission lines they come back here in opposition to this project which has the wholehearted support of the people of the entire State of Montana, and which has the full recommendation of the governors of five northwestern States.

I have nothing against public utilities. I repeat, operating in their own particular spheres, but I certainly am against the idea and the tactics they use in coming into an area which the Government undertakes to develop and which they can by no stretch of the imagination raise enough funds to put into operation themselves.

I think it is wholly unfair on their part to do what they are attempting to because I think the interests of the people come first. As long as I have the honor to represent the people of Montana, they are going to be my main and primary concern.

This is not only an economically feasible project but—and this is important—it is a project in which the peace of mind and the security of a great many people are tied up. These people have lived through 4 years of doubt because they have not been able to assure themselves, even yet, that Flathead Lake is secure, and that this project is going ahead.

I visited this project three times last summer because it is something that is very close to my heart. I was surprised at the number of people who laughed off the possibility of the Hungry Horse ever being completed. They have been let down so often, not by this committee, but by events, that the only way that they believe that the Hungry Horse will be completed will be when it is actually standing, putting out power, reclaiming land, and contributing to flood control downstream.

Peace of mind is a great factor, and I think it should be considered along with the economic possibilities which this project certainly offers.

I repeat again, we are not coming here asking for something for nothing. We think we have a sound case to present. We think that it will be beneficial not only to the people of the area itself, but it will also be beneficial to the Government in that it will repay all that is to be put into it; and after that has been paid off, it will return an annual allowance to the Government each year.

Mr. Chairman, I did not know of the fact that the Montana Power Co. was to appear back here and consequently I was unable to contact the rest of the Montana delegation in time to ask them to appear with me, as they did last year.

You will find what Congressman D'Ewart and Senators Murray and Wheeler have said in the record that was made here last year. We made at that time a very thorough and detailed representation of our case, and I feel that the statements made then will effectively answer any and all arguments which have been or may be presented against the transmission line and the Hungry Horse.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure, Congressman, that the committee will have no objection to those other Representatives filing a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One more request. Would it be possible for me in some way to get a copy of the Montana Power Co. testimony so that I could answer any questions which they might have raised?

Mr. FENTON. I will have to refer that to the chairman of the committee. I am sure you can if it is in accord with the policy.

Incidentally I was not able to get a copy of the Montana Power Co.'s testimony, so consequently I did not see it until the hearings were released on April 21, 1947. My purpose in rising today is to bring to the attention of the Congress and the people of Montana the true picture of the Hungry Horse and the kind of opposition that I have had to face over the years. As nothing about this speech or these hearings will appear in any of the daily newspapers of my State, I am going to have printed at my own expense a sufficient number of copies so that the people of Montana will know the true story and will know it from the record. The truth has never hurt anyone, and the people of Montana are entitled to know the story of the Hungry Horse in all its details.

The Hungry Horse and transmission appropriations are now in the Senate. It is my sincere hope that Senators MURRAY and ECTON will be able to have the full sum approved by the Bureau of the Budget restored to this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia Basin project, Washington: For continuation of construction and for other purposes authorized by the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), $9,435,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: Page 36, line 9, after the comma, strike out "$9,435,000" and insert "$11,435,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this extra $2,000,000 will bring this project more in line with other projects which have larger unexpended balances and in line with the programs of the rest of the projects.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, while all of these increases are being handed out, may I ask the gentleman if he could give us a couple of million dollars for the Central Valley project in California?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The only way the Central Valley project can be helped is to get some religion into the Reclamation Bureau in the way of building canals and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we leave these projects which formerly were handled out of the general funds of the Treasury and now at this time are appropriated for, from the reclamation fund, I think it fair to say that the committee has raised a question as to the soundness of the Reclamation Bureau's policy in handling the pay-backs from these projects with power and irrigation revenues.

One question is pointed out on page 717 of the hearings. There are tables on that page and on the following page showing that the Bureau of Reclamation has applied interest collected in power revenues on irrigation investment. They have represented to us that power returns the power investment, plus interest at 3 percent.

That irrigation investment is returned without interest. Both are returnable in 50 years. The committee knows of no way to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress for basic legislative action except to appropriate from the reclamation fund and let Congress know that we criticize requests for appropriations under the general fund of the Treasury when the Bureau of Reclamation has switched signals and broken their promises to the Committee on Appropriations and to Congress that power should be returned with interest at 3 percent. These tables eminently show the problem we are trying to get at. The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to divert the interest on power investment to retiring the irrigation investment beyond the water user's ability to pay. The result is no interest pay-back on power so the reclamation fund will grow.

Now for the other reason. General funds are requested from time to time for reclamation project developments in the 17 Western States on the ground that they are a great national problem. Then the Bureau of Reclamation perverts the theory and interpretation to one of sectional benefit when it disposes of the income. They want to retain all benefits from each project in the area where the project is located. So, for those reasons the committee has appropriated from the reclamation funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia Basin project, Washington: Not to exceed $1,300,000 from power revenues shall be available for operation, maintenance, and replacements, including operation and maintenance of camp and other facilities turned over by construction contractors, and similar facilities and the furnishing of services related thereto.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee if the period at the end of the paragraph just read should not be a semicolon. This is at the end of line 10 on page 38. I note that all of the foregoing paragraphs running back to the paragraph on page 33 have semicolons.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that such correction be made in the printed copy of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Limitation of expenditures: Under the provisions of this act no greater sum shall be expended, nor shall the United States be obligated to expend during the fiscal year 1948, on any reclamation project appropriated for herein under the reclamation fund, an amount in excess of the sum herein appropriated therefor, nor shall the whole expenditures or obligations incurred for all of such projects for the fiscal year 1948 exceed the whole amount in the reclamation fund for the fiscal year;

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: Page 39, line 7, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, beginning with the word "nor" on line 7.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am, in effect, striking out the last 30 words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee certain questions so that they may become a matter of record at this point. The committee's intention is that the unexpended balances shall be available for the projects listed in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Whether or not those funds are presently frozen?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the chairman assure the House that the words to which I have referred in this amendment do not in any way prevent the use of the unexpended balances for the purposes intended by the committee?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. They do not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That also holds in the case of that part of the unexpended balance which came from the general funds in the 1947 appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This language refers purely and specifically to funds appropriated in this bill. We have appropriated from the reclamation fund. This says that no more money shall be expended from the reclamation fund than is in the fund, and our appropriations are within the reclamation fund amount.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The fact that the reclamation fund has a balance of from $46,000,000 to $50,000,000 in no way will limit expenditures to that fund and exclude the additional money available from the unexpended balances?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The committee has found extra moneys beyond those which it knew about at the time of the hearings, which are represented by money held in suspense account by virtue of a contract between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation. That money in suspense account is interest on power investment in Grand Coulee Dam. There is no authority in law for the Bonneville Power Administration to hold that money in suspense account, and this action will draw that money into the reclamation fund.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman, but he did not quite understand my question. It was this, that in 1948 there will be $45,000,000 to $50,000,000 in the reclamation fund. I do not want any interpretation of the lines to be made which would say that that is the total amount that may be spent, thus ruling out the unexpended balances from last year.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Despite the assurances of the chairman on this point, I am afraid the language is pretty strong. The language says, in part, "nor shall the United States be obligated to expend during the fiscal year 1948, on any reclamation project appropriated for herein under the reclamation fund, an amount in excess of the sum herein appropriated therefor."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman from South Dakota raises the same point I have raised. May we have the assurance of the chairman that before the bill finally goes through the other body and is signed, that point will be specifically cleared up, as he has stated it here on the floor?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Yes. I think the point is straightened up now because this appropriation bill deals only with these funds we are appropriating, new funds for the fiscal year 1948. The frozen funds were appropriated in other appropriation bills, last year for the fiscal year 1947, and in prior years. Certainly

any language you put in this bill that would touch funds and their availability for expenditure would cover only the new funds you are herein appropriating, and the appropriations we are making are well within the amount we have allowed on each item and the sum total of them.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The chairman will agree, however, that sometimes interpretations are made by Government departments that were not contemplated by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I think this debate will be part of the legislative history of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it is clear. I think the gentleman from California has very well brought this point up. The chairman has made it clear that the intent is that this language shall not impair the availability of previously appropriated funds for the projects described.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that the interpretation of a former solicitor of the Interior Department brought about this plan that they have carried on for quite some time of using that 3 percent interest component. Because of that fact, they did keep a suspense account showing the amount of interest that had accrued. It is because of that 3 percent interest component and the amount that has piled up that we can now be a little more liberal in the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I was not questioning the supplementary prior appropriations. I was questioning the possible limitation in the lines designated. The chairman assures me there is no limitation on the funds previously appropriated.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman mentioned the interpretation. That is why I said that.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee along the line of the question my colleague from California has just asked. I refer to page 19 of the report, where there are four columns. The first column is the budget estimate of $20,000,000 The amount recommended by the committee is $6,900,000 This is on the Central Valley water project The unexpended cash is $17,265,862. In the fourth column, there is the figure $24,165,862.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The question I wish to ask is this: Is the sum of $24,165,862 available for use in the Central Valley during the fiscal year?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. For 1948; yes, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How about 1947?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The President can stop those funds from being used in 1947 on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the Bureau of Reclamation has not contracted early enough for the canals to be built so that the contractor can earn the money. We have no control over that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, assuming the President has unfrozen this amount, the amount of $17,000,000 plus is not available for work in the Central Valley and it could not be committed to the contractors?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. We have no control over the $17,000,000 that we voted last year, and the President is the only one who has control of that, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation. Either through the freezing of the funds or dilatory tactics on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in building the canals or delay in the building of the canals, there is that much unexpended balance.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope that the Chairman will bear with me, but I am merely trying to find out if this $17,000,000 can be used, providing the Reclamation Bureau and the President want to use it, or will they under the language of this bill be precluded from using it?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This language has nothing to do with the $17,000,000 already appropriated.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it must be expended or committed before the fiscal year 1948?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No; it is available until expended, and if the Bureau of Reclamation does not want to build the canal in 10 years we cannot help that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, from reclamation fund, $45,461,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 30, line 22, strike out "$45,461,000" and insert "$50,461,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General fund, operation and maintenance.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 39, line 23, strike out all of said line and remainder of the page and on page 40 strike out the first 8 lines.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to strike out language which is subject to a point of order. According to a contract with the Imperial Irrigation District, they contend that they are entitled to operate and maintain the canal for which this money is appropriated. The Bureau of Reclamation contend that by the treaty with Mexico they should operate the canal. We attempted to hold the matter in status quo and let a legislative committee decide the question. We have learned that we should have included the item since marking up the bill, and on page 42 an amendment will be offered to include the $245,000 on line 10 when we get to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Missouri River Basin (reimbursable except as otherwise provided by law): For the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534) and section 18 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526) (including the construction of transmission lines and the purchase of power) and for continuing investigations on the general plan of development, $9,611,600, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be expended, either independently or through or in cooperation with existing Federal and State agencies.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 40, line 25, strike out "$9,611,600" and insert "$9,786,600."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide $175,000 for the Glendo project in Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the committee has raised this item for the Missouri River Basin. It should be raised far more and I hope it will be done before this bill goes to the President. Yesterday when I spoke on this bill, I urged speedy construction by the Bureau in the Republican Valley. This work is to relieve a territory that a few years ago was the heart of the drought and dust bowl area. Much of the cost is reimbursable and it is in the interest of the entire country that these projects be quickly built.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

FUNDS FOR SHADEHILL, GRAND RIVER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call attention to the fact that the money herein appropriated for the Missouri Basin program includes $300,000 for the Grand River project in northwestern South Dakota. The surveys and studies of Grand River have been completed; these funds

will accomplish the immediate preconstruction work and initiate construction of the Shadehill Dam.

This allocation of funds is made by the language of the committee report which appears at page 20, and says:

Missouri River Basin: The committee has recommended an appropriation of $9,611,600 for continuation of work under this heading, which, together with the unexpended balance of $10,048,053, will provide a total of $19,659,653 for the fiscal year 1948. The committee has denied all funds requested for transfer to other bureaus for proposed cooperative work pertaining to their activities, for which $3,850,000 was contained in the budget estimate, and has provided that this amount shall be applied to work on units selected for construction under phase A; with the exception that such sum as may be necessary is provided in order that $300,000 of new funds shall be available for continuation of work on the Grand River unit, $196,000 for work on the Oahe (James River) unit, $5,000 for the Owl Creek, and $5,000 for the Paintrock units, all under phase B; and $50,000 for work in connection with the Shoshone Extension under phase C.

It will be noted that the committee report specifically states that the amount appropriated and made available "shall be applied to work on units selected for construction under phase A; with the exception that such sum as may be necessary is provided in order that $300,000 of new funds shall be available for continuation of work on the Grand River unit, $196,000 for work on the Oahe—James River—unit," and so forth.

May I say that I doubt if there is a project in the bill which is more meritorious and more deserving of prompt action than construction of Shadehill Dam for the dual purpose of flood control and irrigation.

As reclamation projects go, this is "small potatoes"—the total cost of the Grand River project in three units was estimated in the Sloan report of the Bureau of Reclamation at $3,886,000.

The items were: Shadehill Dam, $1,625,000; irrigation distribution, $1,511,000; Blue Horse—secondary dam downstream—$750,000; total, $3,886,000.

The flood damages on Grand River in 3 years since 1940 would come close to meeting the entire cost of the Shadehill Reservoir. I recall that one season, 1943 or thereabouts, the floods on Grand River caused damages of $525,000 to Government property and Indian trust lands on the Standing Rock Reservation as estimated by the superintendent of the United States Indian agency.

In addition to that, several long steel highway bridges were damaged, one was entirely ruined, ranchers lost livestock and many fields and meadows were damaged between the Standing Rock country and the reservoir site upstream.

Another time, somewhat similar property damage was suffered and some lives were lost. This year, Government property again suffered damage and at least 27 families were driven from their homes in the Little Eagle community.

The Shadehill Reservoir site is one which is happily located to serve the dual purposes of flood control and irrigation. Two branches of Grand River, the north and south forks, come together at Shadehill where high bluffs make a natural site for an earth-fill dam. That explains the economy of construction.

The reservoir will have a capacity of 134,000 acre-feet which can irrigate 13,000 acres of choice land by gravity flow and provide abundant space for flood control. Later, a secondary dam at the downstream Blue Horse site will add 50,000 acre-feet of storage and make possible irrigation of another 16,500 acres, a total of 29,500.

There is a total of 66,000 acres of land suitable for irrigation in the vicinity, and it is entirely possible that the day will come when the application of hydroelectric power from the dams on the main stem of the Missouri River will make possible the irrigation of most of that land, provided experience shows dependable carry-overs of water without impairing the flood control space in the reservoirs.

Perhaps it should also be noted that this project is in the very midst of the area which was so hard hit by the droughts of the thirties that large sums of Federal money were expended in temporary relief. It is the belief of us who are acquainted with the area that the construction of the Grand River project will stabilize the ranch and farm economy of this area for many miles around and permanently place it upon a stable, self-supporting basis.

Indeed, it was the vivid picture of floods in April and drought in August which spurred me to work on this project when I first came to Congress back in 1937.

I find that the bottom letter in my file is one which I wrote on January 30, 1937, the first month I was here, asking the War Department for any data they had obtained in a flood-control study of the Grand River. And next to it is a letter from A. V. Svendby, of Lemmon, received February 11, 1937, which introduced him "as a constituent" who appreciated my assignment to the Committee on Irrigation and Water Conservation and stated that he was sending me a map of the Shadehill area.

My file contains many letters and much data from that time forward, telling the story of surveys and studies, sketches and maps, reports of floods and crop hazards, resolutions of public bodies and petitions, and so forth, the familiar pattern of western development, interrupted or delayed by the war, but always moving ahead. All who have been acquainted with the project will forever remember with appreciation the unflagging interest of Engineer W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau of Reclamation, who encouraged us from the time of his first visit to the area when he plowed through many miles of sticky gumbo roads to keep his appointment, and has never lost his interest.

I also mention the name of Art Svendby because during the 10 years that have ensued he has been the one person who in season and out has consistently and persistently plugged for the Shadehill Dam—getting records of rainfall, pictures of damaged bridges, reports of floods and crops. He has attended meetings of the National Reclamation Association to speak for Shadehill. He has been here in Washington to testify before committees of the Congress on the so-called Case-Wheeler Act, under which the Shadehill project first got under way for serious study, and on the comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin, with which it was finally merged. And in his efforts he has seemingly had the united support of everyone in the area—town and country.

In view of the fact that this appropriation today marks the culmination of an effort begun 10 years ago, I think it is fitting at this point to include the following brief letter which tells its own story:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
May 21, 1937.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: I have received your letter of May 12, 1937, transmitting a map of the Shadehill project, as proposed by the Western Dakotas Water Conservation Association, of Lemmon, S. Dak.

The records of this office show that this Bureau has never investigated the proposed project. At this time the Bureau of Reclamation does not have funds with which to make a survey of the project. However, I shall be glad to forward the map, together with the information contained in your letter to the chief engineer for his consideration in connection with a future program of surveys in this vicinity if and when funds are available for such a program.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. PAGE,
Commissioner.

So, Mr. Chairman, the action of this House of Representatives today in approving this Interior Appropriation bill embracing these funds for initiating construction on the Shadehill Dam means much to people who have suffered and dreamed and labored so long. In their behalf I express appreciation to the committee for what it has done in allocating funds for the Grand River project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

VALUE OF IRRIGATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that this 1947 appropriation bill for reclamation has been given su.h a drastic cut by the Committee. I fear that my colleagues from the Eastern States do not have a full appreciation of the value of water to the 17 Western States. Water is our lifeblood. It is the great limiting factor to good crops in these States. The 17 Western States affected by this bill make up more than half of the area of the United States. My own State, Nebraska, has more miles of streams with a steady flow of water than any other State. We have a million and a half acres of new land awaiting irrigation.

Bring irrigation to these good acres and you provide a great stabilizer. It brings a comforting assurance that this Nation, yes, the world, can be fed. Give the farmer a sure supply of good water on our soil and he is assured a good crop which brings a backlog of safety, security and stability not only to him, but to the communities concerned.

I spoke about production in the 17 Western States. This production is tre-

mendously important to the Nation and the world. In rough figures, this 17-State area produces 47 percent of the Nation's beef; 78 percent of its wool; 77 percent of its wheat; 30 percent of its canning crops; 76 percent of its sugar beets; 60 percent of its citrus fruits; 31 percent of its cotton; 42 percent of its potatoes; 79 percent of its alfalfa seed and major quantities of flax, beans, peas, hogs, fruit and other crops. Really, my colleagues, if this area were a separate Nation, folks living east of the ninety-seventh meridian would go the limit to establish favorable trade relations with it. You need this production to keep your factories and industries operating.

Of course, not all of this tremendous wealth in these States is directly dependent upon agriculture, but directly and indirectly irrigation is the most important single factor in the life, progress, and development of all of them. It does provide that confidence and security which makes an expanding economy possible. Who would deny that irrigation does bring greatly increased incomes to communities? It brings enormous gains in purchasing power and improved living standards, not only to the farm family but to the professional and businessmen living in these irrigated areas.

I am wondering if the Appropriations Committee took into consideration the fact that all this new wealth is an asset to the Federal Government because it does pay income taxes. I am convinced, if a careful study were made, it would disclose that the new wealth and the taxes paid thereon would exceed the original construction costs of irrigation projects several times during the 40-year period allotted for the payment of these developments. Let me cite you an interesting example of what I am talking about. In Scotts Bluff County in western Nebraska about 43 percent of the land is irrigated. The production in 1944 was nearly six times that of 1910 when irrigation was just getting started in that area. In 1940 the value of farm crops in Scotts Bluff County was double that of the next ranking county of the State, although the latter county is slightly larger in farm area and more favorably located in regard to rainfall. The population of Scotts Bluff County increased 405 percent between 1910 and 1940. Putting new lands into production through irrigation means new wealth, new sources of taxes, and a better standard of living. The story of Scotts Bluff County can be repeated in a dozen places in Nebraska if the water now in our four main rivers can be harnessed and placed upon the soil. Several Gardens of Eden can be created which will return many times the money invested. It should be remembered that these funds are all repayable with interest. This is an investment in the resources of our country. It is so different than pouring money down the half a dozen rat holes all over the world for which no return can be expected.

American agriculture with its production and new wealth has created a nation which grew from a population of 3,000,000 in 1775 to 140,000,000 in 1946. The new wealth from agriculture and from our natural resources created the capital to build industrial plants no other nation has equaled. Our industrial plants, during the war, outproduced all the other nations put together. We produced, not from our trade, but from the resources of this country. From this tremendous production, agriculture supplied 65 percent of the raw materials. Without American agriculture, our Nation would have been helpless.

Since 1910 we have increased our harvested area about 10 percent while our population has increased from 92,000,000 to 140,000,000, or more than 50 percent. This country has about 350,000,000 acres of land under cultivation. Some of it needs to be retired. The only way we can meet our expanding needs is to bring new lands under irrigation.

Yes, I hear some of my colleagues shouting, "Surplus." Now let us look at the facts about this so-called surplus, which never existed. At no time during the period from 1922 to 1940 has our Nation had an over-all surplus of farm products. Since 1922, with the exception of 1 year, we had to import more farm products than we exported. From 1934 to 1942, the records will show that we imported annually, on the average, products from 50,000,000 acres in excess of our exports. It is interesting to note that during the years of 1925–29, these imports forced down the prices of our farm products and brought on the depression. During this time, we presented to the world, the spectacle of a Nation trying to go in two directions at one and the same time. We were promising the farmer a price for his products and on the other hand we were importing products at less than our American parity level to keep the farmer from obtaining a good price. Yet, we even plowed under our crops, killed the pigs and paid the farmer not to produce, and turned the market for 50,000,000 acres over to foreign production. There never was an overproduction in this country. It was underconsumption and inability of the laboring man to buy.

I hear some of my colleagues say, "Well, we can buy Argentine meat cheaper than we can buy it in the United States." But let us take a look at this. Cheap raw materials are costly when brought in from other countries, where, with cheaper labor, it means a cheap market, a cheap nation, and lower standards of living. Cheapness is a transgression of the Christian doctrine which states that every laborer is worthy of his hire. America was not designed by the course of human events to give the world that type of leadership. If we continue with the theory that we can get better and cheaper products by imports where that product is produced by cheap labor standards, we then shut off the source of our own income here at home.

The world is short of good agricultural land. We have about 20,000,000 acres now under irrigation in the United States. We can probably develop another 20,000,000 acres by the wise use of our water. There are some 40 projects, now under development which, when completed, will irrigate 3,000,000 new acres of land. It will bring supplemental water to an additional 6,000,000 acres. New land to be developed is limited. This country has undertaken to feed the rest of the world. We need to use our entire energies in developing these new irrigated lands in order to produce the food and fiber needed not only at home, but by the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do sincerely feel that the Committee has made a mistake in cutting the appropriations to the Interior Department particularly as it relates to the Bureau of Reclamation. I note that they have cut the funds for planning and research from $5,000,000 to $125,000. Well, certainly very little can be done when the budgeted funds are cut 98 percent. In Nebraska we are doing some research and planning in the hopes that more land can be brought under irrigation. This planning and investigation, if such a cut remains, will be stopped in its tracks. I hope that most of the $5,000,000 can be restored. I expect to support the restoration of these reclamation funds, because I sincerely believe that this is one investment in our resources which will pay big dividends not only to the United States Treasury, but in the happiness, prosperity, contentment, and those intangible things which have made our country great.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal): For continuation of construction of a diversion dam, and main canal (and appurtenant structures including distribution and drainage systems) located entirely within the United States connecting the diversion dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for such purposes; and for incidental operations as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 (43 U. S. C., ch. 12A); to be immediately available, and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund, $3,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 42, line 10, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,245,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I referred to a moment ago, stricken out of an earlier paragraph and included in this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 42, line 1, after the word "structures", close the parenthesis and strike out the remainder of that line; also strike out the first two words and the parenthesis on line 2; and on line 4, following the word "California", and before the semicolon, add a comma and the words "and distribution and drainage systems."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this amendment is subject to a point of order, and therefore I shall not press it. I have asked for the time, and for the reading of the amendment, so that it may appear

at this place as a matter of record, and so that I may emphasize before this body the seriousness of the situation which the amendment seeks to correct. Apparently it will have to be corrected by a legislative committee. I can only ask the support of that committee to have the matter heard and the correction made at the earliest possible moment. I discussed the details of the situation in the Coachella Valley in my remarks yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation to the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for work performed on a force-account basis.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress proposes national economy. Intelligent planning of the development of our natural resources is economy. Modern topographic maps are the basis of that intelligent planning. Regardless of the time when any actual construction or development may take place, mapping and planning should be completed now.

The Geological Survey has been granted varying amounts for topographic mapping through the years since 1879. This method of appropriation has resulted in fractional mapping of many States. An efficient organization is difficult to maintain, with little opportunity for a specific program of complete map coverage, with no assurance of sustained, annual appropriations.

Under the pressure of wartime emergency, the Survey hastily enlarged its facilities to provide the maps necessary to national defense. At other times, when vast public works have been considered politically expedient, performance has been demanded that was far beyond the normal organization. Today, this country is entering into a period of postwar development where adequate maps and wise planning are more necessary than ever before. The Geological Survey proposes and is prepared to fill that need and the records show that it can efficiently fill that need.

During the static 1930's the survey was unable, due to limited funds, to purchase the modern photogrammetric equipment necessary for an expanded program. The recent war made the purchase of such equipment mandatory. It is now at work, under trained personnel, within the map laboratories. The opportunity is at hand to fully utilize this equipment and personnel to complete the mapping of the United States and its possessions under a planned 20-year program. Vigorous support has been given to this program by the States and Federal agencies. The House Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations has noted the fact that mapping is being performed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration. Other Federal agencies are similarly engaged in map-making to supply urgent needs. Adequate appropriations for mapping to the Geological Survey would supply this map information and eliminate much duplication of effort.

The War Department has requested and urged that the Geological Survey include in its 1948 budget estimates necessary funds required for domestic mapping of strategic areas considered vital to national security. These areas would include unmapped or inadequately mapped coastal approaches in the United States and Alaska, as well as the more important industrial sections and transportation routes. A substantial start on this program which certainly can be called a defense program has already been made and continual progress is planned under the proposed 20-year mapping program, the details of which have been carefully worked out and coordinated with the War Department.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on line 10, page 43 of the bill, appears this language:

No part of any appropriation to the Bureau of Reeclamation contained in this act shall be available for work performed on a force-account basis.

I call to the attention of the committee and the Members the fact that in the operation and maintenance of a reclamation project with all of its construction features, with all of its ditches, laterals, and canals, there are emergency conditions that come up that must be repaired and repaired at once. It is practically impossible for an irrigation program to be carried on without having on hand men available for emergency work. I call to the attention of the committee the extreme importance of having a force account available for the handling of workers and for the handling of emergency conditions and repairs. We are confronted in Coulee Dam now with the problem of repairing the bucket of the dam. To do that work we need a force account for men working.

I feel that this is an extremely important phase of the bill and such an account should have very serious consideration on the part of the committee for further action.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] has said the things I intended to say regarding those three lines of the bill, I will not repeat them but would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I shall be glad to answer if I can.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. By placing in the bill these three lines concerning which the gentleman from Washington spoke, the commitee has no intention in any way to handicap emergency work which might be necessary upon Colorado River construction or upon any reclamation construction? It was the committee's intention to stop the use of the force account, perhaps, by the Bureau of Reclamation for purposes for which that type of work was not originally intended. Am I right?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The gentleman is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May we therefore hope that if no attempt is made to take the time today for the necessary corrections that this may be considered and corrected with other items before the bill passes the other House?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. It will be reviewed very carefully.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Topographic surveys: For topographic surveys in the United States, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, $3,000,000, of which not to exceed $475,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in cooperation with States or municipalities except upon the basis of the State or municipality bearing all of the expense incident thereto in excess of such an amount as is necessary for the Geological Survey to perform its share of standard topographic surveys, such share of the Geological Survey in no case exceeding 50 percent of the cost of the survey: *Provided further*, That $400,000 of this amount shall be available only for such cooperation with States or municipalities;

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to lines 12 and 13 and the first half of line 14 on page 45.

This language in effect puts an end to the Federal-State surveys and studies of ground water. This is not a big item. It is one of the items in this bill that applies to a great many States.

When we go back in the House I will ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a list of the States and the expenditures made for this item.

I know something about this work for the State of Nebraska. It is a sound, needed work. The cost to the Federal Government is only $7,500 per year in that State.

I submit that if this is a program which the Committee on Appropriations feels should come to an end, then it should be done by means of legislation and not in an appropriation measure.

It is not a program as represented by some that is in conflict with private enterprise. The well drillers and the Well Drillers' Association in my section of the country support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. We were advised by the Interior Department in connection with the deficiency estimate that this proposition was not authorized by law at all.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that perhaps in the matter of cooperation with municipalities that may be correct; but I believe the gentleman will find that the law does authorize this work carried on with the States. If it is going to be

brought to an end it should be brought to an end in a legislative manner. It is a function of Government that is costing a very few thousand dollars but is rendering a very vital function and it is one item that should have the attention of the other body before the bill goes to the President.

Summary of allotments of Federal funds for cooperation in ground-water activities, fiscal year 1947

State	Amounts allotted for cooperation with—			
	State agencies [1]	City agencies [1]	County agencies [1]	Water districts [1]
Alabama	$7,000 (2)			
Arizona	33,000 (1)	6,750 (3)		
Arkansas	4,364 (2)	2,500 (1)		
California			10,500 (2)	2,000 (2)
Colorado	15,000 (1)			
Connecticut	2,000 (1)			
Florida	25,000 (1)	7,527 (4)	5,969 (3)	
Georgia	6,000 (1)			
Hawaii	13,111 (1)			
Idaho	5,000 (1)			
Indiana	13,875 (1)			
Iowa	16,000 (1)			
Kansas	25,000 (1)			
Kentucky	7,339 (1)	8,000 (2)	3,000 (1)	
Louisiana	11,000 (2)			
Maryland	15,000 (1)			
Massachusetts	9,500 (1)			
Michigan	32,575 (1)			
Minnesota	4,750 (1)			
Mississippi	7,500 (1)			
Nebraska	7,500 (1)			
Nevada	22,325 (1)			
New Jersey	11,000 (1)			
New Mexico	15,000 (2)		2,000 (1)	5,000 (1)
New York	31,750 (1)		12,000 (2)	
North Carolina	4,000 (1)			
North Dakota	21,250 (1)			
Ohio	27,260 (2)		1,800 (2)	
Oklahoma	7,000 (1)			
Oregon	3,925 (1)			
Pennsylvania	12,500 (1)			
Puerto Rico	4,000 (1)			
Rhode Island	2,500 (1)			
South Carolina	2,625 (1)			
Tennessee		17,500 (1)		
Texas	51,000 (1)			
Utah	8,000 (1)			
Virginia	4,000 (1)			
Washington	4,350 (1)	500 (1)	1,500 (1)	
West Virginia	2,500 (1)			
Wisconsin	17,000 (1)			
Wyoming	2,600 (3)			
Total	515,099(47)	42,777(12)	36,769(12)	7,000(3)
Percent of total	85.6(63.5)	7.1(16.2)	6.1(16.2)	1.2(4.1)

Total allotment for cooperation in ground water activities: $601,645.
Total number of agencies cooperating: 74.
There amounts are matched by the cooperating parties. In addition, cooperating parties are contributing a total of $8,950 without matching Federal funds.

[1] Figures in parentheses show the number of cooperating agencies.

Allotments of Federal funds for cooperation with city and county agencies, fiscal year 1947

State	City	Amount of allotment
Arizona	Prescott	$2,000
Do	Phoenix	4,250
Do	Globe	500
Arkansas	Grossett	2,500
Florida	Pensacola	152
Do	Delray Beach	2,000
Do	Miami	5,375
Kentucky	Louisville	8,000
Tennessee	Memphis	17,500
Washington	Tacoma	500
Total, cooperation with cities.		42,777
	County	
California	San Bernardino	3,000
Do	Santa Barbara	7,500
Florida	Dade	4,219
Do	Nassau	250
Do	Pinnelas	1,500
Kentucky	Louisville and Jefferson, jointly.	3,000
New Mexico	Colfax	2,000
New York	Nassau	7,000
Do	Suffolk	5,000
Ohio	Butler	500
Do	Hamilton	1,300
Washington	Snohomish	1,500
Total, cooperation with counties.		36,769

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Geologic surveys: For geologic surveys in the United States and chemical and physical researches relative thereto, $1,690,000 of which not to exceed $450,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Page 44, line 14, strike out "$1,690,000" and insert "$3,135,000", and strike out "$450,000" and insert "$725,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore in line 14, page 44, the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for geologic surveys. I must again point out that the majority here in the House are following a course of nonsensical economy when they cut an important item such as this to the extent of more than 50 percent. I know of no more convincing reason for the Members of this House to support my proposed amendment than that given in an article published in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 23, 1947, entitled "Nation-Wide Mineral Hunt To Be Launched by Russia." It reads as follows:

LONDON, April 22.—The greatest mineral search in Russian history will be undertaken this year by prospectors employing parachute, reindeer, camel, pack mule, automobile, and airplane to blanket the vast reaches of the Soviet Union, the Moscow radio reported today.

There was no mention of minerals other than iron and coal, and there was no hint that uranium, thorium or other radio-active minerals would be the principal targets for the mineralogical experts.

"Their activities will cover 1,000,000 square kilometers," the broadcast said. [A kilometer is 0.621 of a mile.]

The broadcast said more than 150 aircraft, 3,000 automobiles and 6,000 pack and draft animals, ranging from camels to reindeer, would be used.

"Aircraft will be used mainly to explore the boundaries of new iron fields discovered in the Karelian Finnish Republic, Siberia, and Central Asia. They will spend about 24,000 hours aloft," the broadcast said.

"Some will parachute prospectors into the Siberian wilds it would take weeks to reach by mule or jeep," it said.

What is the situation in these great United States and our Territories with regard to our mineral hunt? Our resources of mineral raw materials—iron, lead, copper, tungsten, petroleum, and so forth—is that all our easily discoverable deposits have been discovered and are either being rapidly exploited, or have been exhausted. Undoubtedly more deposits lie hidden beneath the land's surface but they will be difficult to find. Geologic surveys provide the only known guide to their discovery. Blind drilling is the only alternative, and no nation is wealthy enough to afford that.

The present cuts of Geological Survey will mean the abandonment of about 30 projects in the fields of geological and geophysical surveys. On the average each project represents an investment of about $25,000 that has already been made because each project requires from 2 to 5 years to execute. This represents a loss of about three-quarters of a million dollars. If abandoned projects are subsequently resumed an additional expenditure of roughly 60 percent of the initial cost will be required because new personnel must repeat much of the investigation to become familiar with all its subtle complexities. Therefore, if all 30 projects are abandoned and resumed some years later it will ultimately cost the taxpayers about $1,200,000. Also, it will delay for years any progress toward the discovery of new reserves of badly needed mineral raw materials.

Now, I repeat, this sort of economy for our Nation is penny-wise and pound-foolish when we destroy to the extent of over 50 percent this much needed project of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, there are a few vital statistics which appear to me to be of interest to this House in considering the budget for the Interior Department. The combined budgets submitted by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, which are the governmental organizations most vitally concerned with the mineral industries, were for the fiscal year 1948, $34,938,900, with which they hoped to provide a minimum of the technical services required by the Government in the administration of an industry which in 1946 had a gross production value of $8,900,000,000. They are asking the Government to spend four-tenths of 1 percent of that sum on these most essential governmental activities which keep the Government advised as to conditions within the industry and to provide the leadership essential to keeping that industry alive and healthy. This compared with the approximately 5 percent the Government spends on similar activities in Agriculture, yet the Appropriations Committee proposes to cut that relatively meager sum from approximately $35,000,000 to $20,000,000, a reduction of 43 percent.

The various governmental agencies of this country which utilize these services collect in excess of $500,000,000 annually in taxes directly from this industry. What business today could exist if it spent less than 6 percent of its net income on its statistical and research activities?

The budget estimates were prepared by a group of engineers which comprise the two bureaus, who as a profession are traditionally conservative. These people state that the estimates were based on what the two bureaus felt they could accomplish economically in face of a shortage of engineering talent and not by any means what they felt should be done in a field which was seriously left behind in these activities during the war.

The mineral industries provide the basic resources on which virtually our entire industrial economy is based. The enormous drain on these resources during the war years left the industry in a position where today it is unable through drastic production combined with all available imports to meet many of the basic requirements of our manufacturing industries. We cannot measure the enormous loss to our economy with its accompanying tax income resulting from the reduced production caused by the present shortage of these materials.

The activities of these two bureaus can do more to assure a healthy economy by the improvement of production in our basic mineral resources than virtually any other Government activity. The policy of cutting these budgets as proposed by the Appropriations Committee in this case is unquestionably one of unsound business practice. The full request should be restored to the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that all portions thereof be subject to amendment and to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that the points of order be disposed of first under this procedure, before the amendments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the point of order first in order that I may get some information before I make the point of order finally, and that is with respect to the language which appears at the bottom of page 51, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That the contract authorization of $15,000,000 contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1946, is hereby reduced to $9,750,000.

My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that that is legislation amending a previous act and not within the purview of this bill making appropriations for fiscal 1948. It constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill for it destroys existing legislation.

Before I make the point of order, may I ask the chairman of the committee what the reason is for carrying that language? I feel that the development of the synthetic liquid fuel program is very essential to national defense and is probably the cheapest money we can spend in that direction.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The purpose of this language is to limit the amount to be expended further on this project to the authorization provided in the basic act. In other words, the amount remaining after this appropriation will be the amount of $9,750,000, and will tie the entire appropriation to the basic authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What was the reason, then, for the increase of the authorization to $15,000,000 in the act of 1946 and establishment of contract authority?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That was to tie the appropriation to the $30,000,000 authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, having introduced a bill which seeks to accomplish about that very thing, I am constrained to make the point of order and do make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of the language is to limit the amount appropriated over all to the $30,000,000 authorization. It seems to me it is merely a restatement of the basic law and clearly in order under the Holman rule because on its face it saves money.

The CHAIRMAN. This language changes a contract authorization contained in a previous appropriation bill passed by another Congress. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there any further points of order to be made to the bill? If so, they will be taken up first since it will be too late to make points of order after amendments to the bill have been considered.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 45, strike out lines 12 and 13 and the portion of the line 14 up to the colon.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I hope to improve the bill. When the vote comes on the amendment, I shall ask for a standing vote on the amendment.

I wish to direct your attention to page 45 and to those lines to which the amendment refers. These lines, though in the form of a limitation, change the basic law of the land and the procedure which has been in operation for 40 or 50 years. This amendment does not provide for additional sums of money. This language in the bill for the first time this year says that the Federal Government, the Geological Survey, shall not investigate underground waters in the United States by either a cooperative or noncooperative method. Read the language carefully. Yet, during all the history of the Geological Survey of more than 40 or 50 years the agency has been doing just that, and if we are going to change that policy, it ought to be done by a legislative committee.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have sometimes been embarrassed by the efforts of some members on rare occasions to more or less abolish other committees of the Congress and arrogate to themselves the right to pass legislation. So I am going to ask you to vote with me against this unheard of limitation which would prohibit our Government from investigating underground water.

I cannot imagine any civilized nation in the world today that would pass a bill prohibiting its government from investigating underground water. Do you know that of the 12,000 cities of the United States, 8,600 of them use underground water in one form or another, and yet we have here today a proposal which would prohibit the study of underground water. That is unthinkable and it is ridiculous. I feel it must have been inadvertently added by the committee. I am most confident that the committee will go along in deleting this legislation, which has no place whatever in an appropriation bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and I know there are many other Members from the West, North, and South who undoubtedly feel as he does and as I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support this amendment because it deals with something very vital to the health and wealth of the country. The total expenditure does not amount to very much.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I am not concerned with the expenditure at this moment. I am concerned with principles and with policies, and I hope and trust that the Members will not go so far as to prohibit the investigation of underground water for the people in a civilized country that has a 140,000,000 population and whose health and well-being are greatly af-

fected by the Nation's water resources. That provision must not remain in this bill; and if it does, the House will have made itself ridiculous.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I agree with everything that the gentleman from Texas has said. I would like to add further that this is the most unreasonable and absurd limitation that I ever have seen in an appropriation bill since I have been here.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

What did the Government do in locating military camps and industrial plants that helped enable us to win the war? We got the facts as to water, because water is basic in any city or any industry. Where did we get it? From the United States Geological Survey that has been assembling these records for 50 years. Yet we propose to abolish this program of the Government and prohibit basic information from being secured. This would break the continuity of those records as to water in your State and my State and throughout the Nation. I do not think anything more need be said in regard to the validity of this motion to strike out this thing which has no place in an appropriation bill anyway, because it is purely a legislative matter.

I trust that the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will accede to the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. If you will refer to the hearings on page 833, Mr. Paulsen, who was the principal witness, made this statement:

> The Federal ground-water program is necessary to supplement the cooperative investigations of the Nation's valuable underground basins and obtain the greatest benefits from it. It assures well-balanced studies, especially in the interstate basins where cooperative programs by the several States are not uniform and where critical water problems exist.

Let me call attention that this is wiping out a function that has been in existence since 1931 by means of an appropriation bill. It appropriates the sum of $2,578,680, but they cut out all of the ground-water activities, which is an important part of this program. That same appropriation last year was $2,498,672. Of that amount, there was $1,620,000 spent for ground-water work. Under this bill that is absolutely all cut out, whereas they have increased the appropriation in the sum of $80,000. The most important part of this appropriation should be for ground-water control work.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] asked Mr. Paulsen this question:

> Mr. JONES. How much of the entire gaging stream program, as distinguished from the ground-water program, is charged to Federal service for Federal purposes as distinguished from State purposes and States uses in the 1947 fiscal year?
>
> Mr. PAULSEN. I think that is fairly well shown in our justification. Of the total amount of this year's gaging stream funds, aggregating roughly $2,500,000, $1,620,000 is earmarked for cooperation with States and municipalities.

This is not asking for an increase. We are not asking for one cent increase, but we do ask that you let this amount go in for its proportionate share of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes out lines 12 and 13 and part of line 14, on page 45, the language stricken from the bill reading as follows:

> *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for cooperative or noncooperative ground-water activities.

This section under Geological Survey formerly provided for the Geological Survey to perform its share of general water resource investigations of the United States which includes every State in the Union, and from time immemorial this service has been of invaluable help and assistance to many of the States, and the precedent had been established that, as provided for in many other activities of the Government which inure to the benefit of the locality and the country generally, the Government contributes 50 percent of the cost of such projects.

In the present bill under consideration, it is provided that the Government cannot contribute 50 percent of the cost of these investigations, but it even provides further that no part of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used for cooperative or noncooperative ground-water activities, which as a matter of course, prevents the investigation of the subject completely. The bill not only prohibits any contribution from the Geological Survey for this important work, but, as I understand the prohibition, the Department is inhibited from any activity entirely, completely, and forever.

Of course, the amount which was formerly appropriated for this activity has been reduced by $845,000, and that should probably kill the program of itself; however, if no funds are provided for this purpose in this bill today, it may be possible to obtain some appropriation later, and what we seek is to remove the prohibition of the opportunity of the Department from forever participating in this important activity and to make a contribution of at least 50 percent of the costs, the same amount usually contributed by the Government of like programs of public necessity.

Every State in the Union is affected by this prohibition in this section, and many of the States have programs of investigations of ground-water problems under way at this time.

One of the industries which is interested and affected by the elimination of the established participation by the Government in this subject is the rice industry. While it happens that my district and State is the largest rice producing district and State in the Union, Arkansas, California, and Texas are vitally interested in this subject. The cultivation of rice requires that the lands be flooded with pure, clean water during the growing period, and one of the sources of flooding is from deep wells which take their water from the ground. During the growing periods in the rice industry enormous quantities of water are required to flood the rice fields which are principally supplied by deep wells drawing water from the deep sands, and it is a known fact that the reservoir is being rapidly depleted, not only in my State, but also in the other rice-growing States.

I am informed that the same condition prevails as to ground-water supply in other States, principally in California, Georgia, Florida, and other States, and in the entire United States. As a matter of fact, the situation has become so acute in my district and State that I would like to read a short newspaper article in regard to this matter, and which states that there is at this time under way a survey in progress under the supervision of the Ground Water Division of the United States Geological Survey, the Department of Conservation and the Department of Public Works, and the article states:

> RICE AREA THREAT FROM GULF NOTED—SALT WATER INTRUSION MAY HARM CROP, SAYS ODOM
>
> BATON ROUGE, LA., April 16.—Indications of salt water intrusion from the Gulf of Mexico into water-bearing sands supplying water for rice irrigation and for industrial uses in southwest Louisiana have been discovered by geologists, Leo M. Odom, chief engineer of the department of public works, said today.
>
> If salt water is pumped from the sands into Louisiana rice fields, he declared, damage to the rice crop might run into millions of dollars.
>
> The intrusion, Odom added, is caused by the prolonged use of water wells and the resulting pressure in the sands, allowing seepage from the Gulf.
>
> The chief engineer said that a survey of Louisiana's ground water resources in the State's rice country and in the Lake Charles industrial area has been undertaken by his department in conjunction with the ground water division of the United States Geological Survey and the State department of conservation.
>
> Rice growers have had to abandon some of their water wells, Odom reported, because of reduced levels which resulted from heavy withdrawals of water for irrigation.
>
> The current survey is designed to determine to what extent such water levels will be restored naturally after the heavy demands of the irrigating season—April through August.
>
> He estimated that water withdrawals during the pumping season total more than the combined volume of water in Grand and White Lakes, Lake Arthur, and other inland bodies of water in southwest Louisiana.

Use of stream water in rice irrigation, Odom declared, is not now practicable because seasonal differences make it insufficient and distance from rice areas make its use too costly.

Another object of the survey, he added, is to try to make the use of stream water more practicable by construction of reservoirs which would provide a steady water supply and, in addition, recharge underground water-bearing sands.

The chairman of the committee made an argument that the water table is lowering year by year—Central Valley of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, nobody can oppose this amendment on the ground of economy because it does not ask that any money be appropriated. Nobody can oppose it because they say it does not affect them, because it does affect everyone who sits on the floor of the House. It has to do with all the 48 States. No one can say that it does not bother him because he does not live in a big or little city because, as pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] 75 percent of the cities get their water from underground, both large and small. So there is no reason at all to object to the amendment as offered except this: The committee, as I understand it, recommends that this work be turned over to the cities. In other words, the cities from now on do their own drilling and the cities discover just where the water is and how much it is.

The committee fails to realize that the underground water problem is not confined to city limits, not confined to county limitations, not limited even to States. In other words, the underground water basins and the underground water channels cross State lines, cross county lines, cross city lines; and certainly it would be the height of folly to make an appropriation which the committee has done for surface water survey and not do it for underground water surveys. They go hand in hand. Surface water eventually becomes underground water. To survey the surface water and not to survey ground water is to build the roof of a house and not the foundation.

In most of the coastal areas it is a proven fact that they are using so much underground water from some particular areas that salt water is seeping in and ruining everything.

It is possible under the proposed plan of the committee that one city, we will say, distant 25 miles from another may pump so much of the underground water as to leave the other city without any. Obviously, that sort of situation should not happen again.

For 50 years the Federal Government has appropriated money to these surveys. But it has always made underground and surface water surveys jointly. We must continue this beneficial and useful practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take away a provision in the bill which puts the responsibility for ground water work upon the States.

At a time when the United States Government is operating under a $260,000,000,000 debt many of the States find themselves, as a result of their tax policies during the war year, with huge surpluses on their hands, piled up during the time that Uncle Sam was spending the money to get the guns, the planes, the tanks, the ammunition to ourselves and to our allies. Is it unfair to require that instead of the States paying 50 percent of the cost they shall pay it all? My own State of Ohio is in there for a considerable sum of money. Ohio has a hundred-million-dollar surplus. Cannot we afford a $100,000 expenditure for our ground-water survey?

My goodness! Can we not stop the 48 States from coming to the Federal Government and asking for every kind and manner of service? It has been going on for a number of years, and every year it gets larger, larger, and larger. In addition to ground water surveys, the gaging of streams is involved.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is not the doctrine the gentleman is now preaching applicable to every donation that the Federal Government makes?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No. This is just one donation. I think the States can well afford to pay.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact the gentleman's amendment does not call for any more money than has already been appropriated?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The money has got to come from some place. You are creating an impossible situation. You are going to have to take it off the gaging stations, you are going to have to raise the ante when we go to the Senate, and that is not quite the fair way to do the job. Let us face the issue squarely. The States can afford to pay the $800,000 that the Federal Government has been paying cooperatively for ground water surveys.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 92, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments to the bill be limited to 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto, and amendments to amendments, be limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does that mean that we are limited to 30 minutes on the remaining 30 or 40 pages of the bill or to 30 minutes on each section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised as to the exact number of pages. The Chair did state what the motion was.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, may we ask that the motion be repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio repeat his motion?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto, and amendments to amendments, be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion may eliminate the possibility of debate on an amendment or amendments to amendments; therefore, until it is determined how many amendments there are the motion is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be constrained to overrule the point of order because by unanimous consent the further reading of the bill was waived.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments be made available to the Chair and that the time be divided between each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Page 50, lines 14 and 15, after the words "Anthracite Research Laboratory," in line 14, strike out the words "at Schuylkill Haven, Pa." and insert in place thereof the words "in accordance with the provisions of Public Law No. 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, approved December 18, 1942."

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered relates to the provision locating the Anthracite Research Laboratory in a particular spot. The basic act authorizing the establishment of the laboratory left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior where the laboratory should be located. He exercised that discretion with the aid of a committee of able and disinterested people. He located it in the city of Hazleton in Luzerne County, Pa. Thereafter, after that had been publicly announced, this subcommittee attempted to change that location and place it within the district of a member of the subcommittee. I ad-

dressed myself to that question yesterday. In his speech the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yesterday stated that he was sorry that this had risen to the stage of a controversy between two Members of Congress as to distribution of patronage. I say that it has risen beyond that stage, it has risen to the stage of whether or not this Congress is going to permit an individual Member of the Congress to utilize his position as a member of a subcommittee to coerce the Secretary of the Interior into disobeying the plain provisions of the act under which he is operating, and whether or not it is going to permit such Member to utilize that position in order to further his own private interests.

Yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania said that he was not interested in where this went. If that be so, then it resolves itself merely into a case of a feud between himself and the Secretary of the Interior which the Congress ought not to sustain. I say that in all justice and all fairness to the people of my district the amendment should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to state that I regret very much that my friend from Luzerne County saw fit to make a personal attack on me yesterday in his attempt to gain support for his opposition to the rule.

I am grateful for the decisive manner in which this House responded to such unjustified action upon the part of the gentleman from Luzerne.

What this amendment proposes to do in effect is to nullify the provisions of an act of Congress, and to disregard the evidence which proved conclusively that the Secretary of the Interior refused to permit the Bureau of Mines' engineers to recommend the location for the Anthracite Research Laboratory, as provided in section 2 of Public Law 812 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

This amendment would have the further effect of repudiating the Appropriations Committee, the Rules Committee, and the action taken in the House yesterday.

In view of the fact that Congress has now been informed officially by the Bureau of Mines' engineers, who surveyed the sites available, that they recommended Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as the best and most desirable site for the laboratory; we ourselves would be guilty of ignoring the law by adopting such an amendment.

I would respectfully request my colleagues of the House to uphold the provisions of the laws we pass by decisively rejecting this amendment, and at the same time demonstrate to one and all our faith in government by law instead of individual dictation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 50, strike out lines 13 to 21 inclusive.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think the passage of this substitute amendment would be a very fine solution of the problem which has arisen here between two of our brethren. If we strike out this appropriation entirely we do two things. First, we resolve this unfortunate controversy between two of our brothers regarding the location of this laboratory, and second, I know of no easier way to save half a million dollars.

My interest in this was aroused by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] who served with me in India, but I do not find myself in complete harmony with his viewpoint. However, I think he has a considerable amount of merit in his position.

I find that so far as bituminous coal is concerned, there is no such laboratory. That is taken care of at Penn State, and I am informed, and if I have been incorrectly informed one of these coal men will gladly set me straight, that both Lafayette and Lehigh colleges have offered to do the same thing for the anthracite people and give them the space and equipment if they can have $10,000 for personnel to run the place. Certainly, this seems a desirable solution. I grant you it might be desirable to have this anthracite laboratory, but I seriously question whether it is essential. If it is not essential, I earnestly ask the Committee to vote in favor of this substitute amendment. Certainly, the construction is not necessary at this time. If we defer this, and that is all that is being done by striking out this provision, no harm will be done because we can get along another year without an anthracite laboratory to the tune of half a million dollars.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FENTON. The basic law says that the laboratory shall be placed in the anthracite region. Therefore, Lafayette and Lehigh colleges are out of the picture.

Mr. KEATING. My answer to the gentleman is that it is very simple to change the basic law if we can save half a million dollars by doing so. Schuylkill Haven where the gentleman wishes to place this, I am told, is not in the anthracite region either. If we can save half a million dollars by changing three words in the basic law, I am in favor of doing that.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman is misinformed about Schuylkill Haven being outside the anthracite district.

Mr. KEATING. I understand it is 5 or 6 miles outside the area. I would be delighted if this substitute amendment could have the support of this body and earnestly urge that it be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 89, noes, 62.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, it has been my observation that the National Park Service makes effective use of whatever funds the Congress sees fit to provide to it. I believe also that its requests for funds are well thought out and moderate.

The Appropriations Committee has acknowledged that the Service this year will probably be called upon to take care of a greater number of visitors even than last year, when they totaled nearly 21,600,000—more than ever before. I am sure that any Members who visited any of the parks last year must certainly have noted the tremendous load that the rangers and other members of the park staffs were compelled to carry. They did their jobs with cheerfulness and good will, but they had too much to do. So, I feel, did those employees whose work is not so readily observable—those who work in the offices of the Park Service and whose functions also are necessary. There is a pressing need for additional personnel. They are needed if the parks are to be preserved from the work of vandals who last year did great damage in many park areas despite the best efforts of an overworked and undermanned park staff. And they are needed to perform the basic services that the American people have a right to expect when they visit their great park system. It has been said that every American has 2 acres and a brook that he can call his own, somewhere in our many parks and monuments. This is a heritage that should be preserved and maintained to the best of our ability, not only for this year's visitors to the park but for future generations as well. In order to do this the park staffs need more men.

To meet this situation, the committee has decided on an increase of $25,000 so that additional seasonal employees may be hired—an obviously inadequate sum for the performance of the tasks imposed upon the Park Service.

The budget item for roads, trails, and physical improvements was $5,000,000. If these activities are to be taken care of at all, it is imperative that the $17,622,000 frozen by Presidential order be released. Otherwise, the committee has recommended only $2,600,000 for use on the roads, trails, and physical improvements, of which only $1,750,000 will be available for roads and trails. This amount will not even meet the cost of needed repairs and maintenance on existing roads and trails, for which the engineers of the Park Service and the Public Roads Administration estimate that $2,500,000 is

required. We all know that many national park roads, especially in the high mountain areas of the West, suffered severe deterioration during the war when the Service was unable to maintain them. They have never been brought back to good condition.

A letter I received a few days ago from the president of the Bozeman, Mont., Chamber of Commerce points up this situation by calling attention to the seriously poor conditions of the 20-mile stretch of United States Highway No. 191 which traverses Yellowstone National Park. He writes:

> The substandards of the Yellowstone Park section and the lack of surfacing in extended stretches permits water to soak into the road bed, creating a quagmire and making the highway impassable during the wet periods of the year. At other seasons the highway is so rough that many guests are humiliated and enraged by breaking axles, springs, and drive shafts on their cars.

This refers to a stretch of national highway within the park. There are other places in Yellowstone and Glacier Parks, which I visited a year ago, equally bad and in many cases actually dangerous. They should be repaired or closed. Unfortunately, many of them are main arteries of traffic which cannot be closed.

I do not believe that the people of this country are willing to see the great national parks deteriorate because of the lack of the small sums requested in the Park Service budget estimates. I am certain, however, that this bill does not contain sufficient funds to permit proper operation of the parks, and I hope that the amounts requested can be restored so that the job may be done.

THE IRON AND STEEL RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Bureau of Mines' program to develop metallurgical processes for the more effective use of low-grade ores, funds were provided for the establishment of pilot plants in various strategic areas of the United States to demonstrate the effectiveness of utilizing raw-material resources of those areas in the production of high-quality steels and other ferrous alloys. It was fully realized that the principal iron-producing region of the United States, the Mesabi Range, was rapidly being depleted and immediate consideration of alternate raw materials was essential.

These investigations were to be carried out in pilot plants at Redding, Calif.; Boulder City, Nev.; and Laramie, Wyo. Alloying elements, such as cobalt, chromium, and manganese, produced at Boulder City, Nev., and sponge iron from Laramie, Wyo., were to be tested on a semicommercial scale in order to demonstrate the feasibility of establishing an alloy steel industry based on marginal and submarginal raw materials.

The Central Valley region of California represented an especially promising area for the evaluation of these Bureau of Mines' developed processes as adequate supplies of power, water, and raw materials were readily available and the industries of the west coast would provide a ready market for all ferrous alloy production. For this reason an experimental electric furnace of 4-ton capacity was constructed at Shasta Dam near Redding, Calif., at an approximate cost of $150,000.

This entire development is now threatened by the recommended reduction in funds of the metallurgical research and pilot plant appropriation of the Bureau of Mines by 62½ percent. It will be necessary to close completely the Laramie, Wyo., plant, shutting off the only large-scale domestic source of sponge iron and in addition seriously curtail the cobalt, chromium, and manganese work at Boulder City. Redding, only recently completed, will be able to operate a relatively small fraction of the year and at greatly reduced scale. The annual cost of operating the Redding ferroalloy pilot plant is $100,000; the Laramie sponge-iron plant, $105,000; and the three Boulder City pilot plants, $278,000. It is false economy to deny amounts such as these when the significance of the results is one of national concern.

This is not the entire effect of the recommended reduction. Alloy studies on titanium at Salt Lake City, Utah, of vital concern to the armed forces, will be curtailed. This new metal, produced in usable form in large quantities only by the Bureau of Mines, is twice as strong as steel, half as heavy, and is believed to be the answer to the exacting requirements of new jet aircraft. Present demand by the Navy alone exceeds fabricating capacity.

Zirconium is one of two known structural metals with corrosion resistance to hydrochloric acid, and the indicated reduction in funds will stop all construction on the new Albany, Oreg., pilot plant. This metal, occurring domestically, is the only substitute for tantalum, an imported commodity of limited world supply.

The research program of the Bureau of Mines was expanded during World War II primarily because the importance of its functions was immediately recognized and the restricted scale of prewar activity was acknowledged as inadequate. Research cannot be accomplished efficiently or economically in time of national emergency even if we neglect the primary consideration of security.

The conclusion to be reached is obvious, and the interest of national welfare and security cannot be neglected. Therefore, I strongly advise the budget recommendation of $1,600,000 be allowed to continue these vital pilot-plant studies.

Investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits, except fuels

BUREAU OF MINES

Recommended Bureau of the Budget	$1,600,000
Recommended House Appropriations Committee	800,000

In August 1939, just before the beginning of the war in Europe, Congress appropriated a limited amount of funds to the Bureau of Mines to investigate and develop domestic deposits of normally imported minerals that it was known would be in short supply in case of war. That was the beginning of the strategic minerals program. At that time the ores of seven metals were known to be strategic.

Legislative provision was made for the activity by the Strategic Materials Act—Public, 117, Seventy-sixth Congress. Last year, the Seventy-ninth Congress reiterated its direction to the Bureau of Mines by Public, 520. Section 7 (a) of this act provides that—

> The Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of the Geological Survey, is * * * directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances * * * which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources.

This is not merely an authorization; it is a specific direction to the Interior Department to get on the job.

As I have said, in 1939, the ores of seven metals were known to be strategic, Congress soon recognized that even for developing ores of these seven metals the original appropriation was woefully inadequate. In 1940 and 1941, therefore, $1,500,000 per year were appropriated for this purpose.

Today, the Army-Navy Munitions Board tells us, the ores of 50 metals and minerals are strategic and critical. If we are to be prepared for a national emergency, we must stock pile quantities of these metals and minerals to tide us over the period of gearing our industry to emergency levels. If we are to be able to speed up our production of metals and mineral to emergency levels, we must have, in addition to stock piles, an adequate supply of known domestic deposits of every strategic mineral it is possible to find. If there are none to find in some commodities, we must know that in advance so that additional stock piles or substitutions may be provided.

The inadequacy of our known domestic resources of certain commodities is such that shortages are felt in our peacetime economy now that the war has been over almost 2 years. Congress recently has taken action to remove the tariff on copper in order to bring in sufficient peacetime supply. I doubt that a prospective enemy would care whether or not we had a tariff if he could cut off our supply of copper. We must look to our own resources if we are to be in any sense secure.

One of the most critical shortages at present is in lead in spite of a comparatively high price. You are well aware of this situation if you have tried to buy a storage battery lately. Lead, of course, is on the list of the Army-Navy Munitions Board for stock piling. But how are we to accumulate a stock pile when we cannot obtain sufficient lead for our current demands? There is no other way but to develop our own domestic deposits.

There is little room for argument that the Bureau of Mines has done an excellent job since it began its strategic mineral program in 1939. There is little room for argument that the program should continue. The only argument

seems to be as to the scale on which the job should be done. The wartime peak for this activity was more than $8,000,000 per year. The appropriation for the current fiscal year is $1,700,000. The budget estimate for next year is $1,600,000—less than 20 percent of the peak figure. The estimate was pared to a minimum; it is no more than was considered essential prior to the war. My own feeling is that at least $5,000,000 per year should be provided for this purpose.

The Appropriations Committee recommends that the budget estimate be cut in half, that only $800,000 be appropriated for this activity that is known to be absolutely vital to our national security. I urge that the minimum amount submitted in the budget estimate be appropriated. If the recommended cut is allowed to stand, we shall soon be lapsing into the somnolence and indifference toward national security that prevailed during the 1920's.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon a great deal of discussion centered around the $3,865,000 decrease from the budget estimate of $11,865,000 for the education of Indians. This is almost $3,000,000 less than was appropriated last year. As the Members of Congress must realize, this is for education of Indians on reservations where they are denied State aid. The lands in these areas are tax exempt and do not provide revenue for school functions. There is no manner by which these schools for Indians can acquire any Federal funds by matching. What we appropriate here are the only funds available for these purposes.

Although the costs of education have risen sharply along with other costs of living, intelligent people recognize that education must be an expanding program. Education, though it will cost us more per pupil, must not be denied to any group because of race, creed, belief, or status of life.

One of the primary contentions of this great democracy of ours is that the freedoms of which we so often speak are closely interrelated with the processes of education and development of the mind. We attribute a great deal of our military, social, and economic strength to our system of free education. We do not contend, as did Hitler, that ours is a master race; but we do believe that our peoples have had greater opportunities to develop than have the citizens of most nations of this world. A free people is an informed people. Education is the basic channel of information and knowledge.

This bill would attempt an economy of some $3,000,000 in education at home, but Congress will probably vote for $350,000,000 for foreign relief next week, and will probably follow the Senate in voting $400,00,000 for Greece and Turkey. These funds are designed to aid other countries of the world in their reach for freedom. It seems undesirable to me at this time to attempt to effect so great an economy here.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to cut nearly $139,000,000 from the 1948 budget of the Department of Interior—a reduction of 47 percent—is but the latest of a series of unsound and irresponsible actions sponsored by the Republican majority. The Republican approach to every issue which has been debated in the Eightieth Congress, has reflected a callous disregard to the needs and interests of the American people, and has indicated the adherence of the Republicans to the reactionary rock-ribbed philosophy of the 1920's. The Republican policy regarding every issue—whether it be rent control or conservation, taxation or labor legislation—has been the back-to-normalcy depression-causing policy.

This proposed reduction in the appropriations for the Interior Department bears no relationship to sound public finance or genuine government economy. Economy in government means the limitation of expenditures to the amounts needed to achieve the desired objectives in terms of public service. I am most certainly in favor of this kind of economy. But the Republican version of "economy" is the haphazard and indiscriminate slashing of the budget without regard for the effect of such slashes or for the relative importance of one function to another.

The various items in the budget of the Department of Interior have been debated for 2 days, and I doubt whether I would be able to throw any additional light on the subject. Before a vote on the bill is taken, however, I would like to point out some of the undesirable implications of this short-sighted proposal, and its effects on my own district in particular.

For example, let us take the proposed $4,377,980 reduction in the appropriations of the Fish and Wildlife Service. What will this slash mean to the people in my district? The result will be that the Lester River fish hatchery, which was recently closed along with 16 other similar stations, must remain closed permanently because of lack of funds. This slash also means that the research and investigative activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service must be curtailed, and its conservation work reduced in volume. Thus we see that the Government services needed to build up the stock of food and game fish for the enjoyment of sportsmen and the benefit of commercial fishermen are drastically reduced for the sake of a couple of million dollars. This type of false economy is bound to result in irreparable harm to the fishing industry, and the wildlife resources of northern Minnesota.

Another example of this same short-sighted approach to Government finance is found in the proposed $5,850,125 reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines. Such a slash is a direct blow to our efforts to develop the natural resources in northern Minnesota. It is a well-known fact that the supply of high-grade iron ore on the Mesabi Range is rapidly being depleted. To offset this diminishing supply of high-grade ore it becomes absolutely necessary to develop our low-grade ores—taconite and peat. This development depends upon the continuation of mineral-mining research and the improvement of more scientific methods.

In cutting the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines, the Congress is reducing this type of research and investigation at a very time that such services need to be expanded. The future of the iron range depends upon the development of our ores—the stopping of research work by the Bureau of Mines is endangering this future.

I have mentioned these two examples to show how such indiscriminate budget cuts will have far-reaching effects upon specific industries in one congressional district. Multiply this end result by many districts and many industries, and one begins to recognize the full impact of this unwise proposal. One begins to realize what is meant by false economy.

I have no choice but to oppose this short-sighted measure. This penny-wise and pound-foolish approach to Government finance will prove most costly in the long run. I maintain that the conservation of our natural resources is genuine economy. Making our natural wealth available, developing our mineral and fuel resources, keeping our lakes and streams stocked with fish and our forests with game—this is true Government economy, and an end which my colleagues should be working to achieve.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed myself to the House of Representatives on various portions of the Interior appropriation bill now being considered. One phase which I particularly stressed was the elimination of all items relating to ground-water activities of the United States Geological Survey. Before addressing this body, and since, I have received innumerable telegrams from the various municipalities in North Dakota who appreciate the value of this type of investigation. In my speech I indicated that the city of Fessenden, in the county of Wells, in my State of North Dakota, was saved $20,000. A few moments ago a letter arrived in my office from the city of Fessenden, signed by the Honorable W. K. Taylor, mayor, and I learn that my figure of $20,000 was in error—I should have stated $60,000.

In order that the Members of Congress may understand a practical example of the economy which can be gained by continuing this service, I submit herewith, under the privilege of unanimous consent, the letter to which I have just made reference:

CITY OF FESSENDEN,
Fessenden, N. Dak., April 23, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTSON: It has come to my attention that appropriations for the Ground Water Division of the United States Geological Survey, Department of Interior, have been denied for the current year.

Perhaps a word of appreciation of the city of Fessenden, N. Dak., might be in order as we feel that the work of the survey in collaboration with the North Dakota State water conservation commission was of the highest value to us.

During the summer of 1946, the United States Geological Survey, Ground Water Division, conducted a water finding survey for the city. We had exhausted all local means over a period of several years in trying to locate an adequate water supply. This survey by the Water Division resulted in their locating a wonderfully good source 7½ miles north of town. This is a saving of 3 miles as compared to the source we planned on

using which is 10½ miles in the same direction.

This saving of 3 miles means a saving of at least $60,000 in the construction of a pipe line. Recent bids for such construction run from $3.90 to $4.60 per linear foot for 8-inch cast iron pipe. This means much to a city of 1,000 population.

We in Fessenden have received this service and so have nothing further to gain, but feel the work of the Water Division, United States Geological Survey, so valuable that it would be a mistake to refuse the requested appropriations and so bar other communities from this excellent and essential service.

Best wishes and kind regards.

Sincerely,

W. K. TAYLOR,
Mayor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to call attention to a situation in connection with the Missouri River Basin development program which is disturbing to the conservation interests of my State, to the members of our highly efficient game, fish, and parks commission, and, in fact, to conservationists in all of the States in the Great Basin development area.

This bill carries only $9,611,600 for the Reclamation Service to use in carrying out the improvement work in the basin, and the subcommittee, it appears from reading their report (second paragraph, p. 20), has recommended that this money be available, with certain specific exceptions, only for construction work. The committee has denied all funds requested for transfer to other bureaus for cooperative work. The fish and game resources of this area, together with its unparalleled recreational facilities, are of tremendous importance, and the impoundments must be carefully developed to protect and promote these vital assets. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that as this legislation received further consideration by the other body, by the conference committee, and by this House when it returns for final passage that additional funds may be added to the $9,611,600 herein recommended to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry on its studies jointly with the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Army Engineers Corps so that this development program can proceed as a unit. I also hope that the final report will eliminate the prohibition against the transfer of funds or that on page 70, line 17, of this bill (H. R. 3123) the words "except the Missouri River Basin" may be eliminated from the legislation.

The elimination of the cooperative studies by these bureaus, including the Fish and Wildlife Service, is a complete departure from previous satisfactory arrangements and is not in line with the revised Coordination Act which passed the last session of this Congress. This act clearly places the responsibility for fish and game studies in connection with the basin development program with the Fish and Wildlife Service working cooperatively with the game departments of the respective States and the Reclamation Bureau and Engineers Corps. Considerable progress in a commendable direction has already resulted. This program must not be crippled or curtailed. The Appropriations Act we are now considering eliminates the funds for this purpose in the Missouri River Basin. I shall not press for an amendment to rectify this at this time but I call it to your attention to the end that we may make the necessary corrections in the remaining steps which lie ahead of this bill before the time it is voted upon for final passage after the other body of this Congress has written into this legislation the dictates of its own good judgment.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INFORMATION

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the National Park Service asked this year for the sum of $120,000 for printing and binding. I am told that, of that sum, between $15,000 and $18,000 would be required for what is known as administrative printing, the production of blank forms, stationery, tickets, and other printed matter that is needed in the orderly processes of administration. The balance would be devoted to the publications of various kinds that are prepared and distributed by the Service. The committee has approved, instead of $120,000, an amount of $62,500, exactly the same as was appropriated for the same purpose last year.

My office, and I am sure many others have the same experience, has frequent occasion to refer inquiries to the National Park Service, including numerous requests for literature. Because I know how important it is for the Service to be able to provide accurate information to visitors and prospective visitors, I was moved to inquire as to the effects of this reduction. Here are some of the things I found out:

Approximately $46,000 was available for publications of all kinds during the present year, against estimates of need amounting to approximately twice that much. Many areas in the system now have no informational literature to give the visitor at all and will not have until the summer travel season is nearly over.

Requests for literature now reaching the Director's office alone range from 500 to 700 a day and are increasing. At the beginning of the summer season last year, they frequently totaled more than 1,500, and probably will again this year. This is in addition to the much greater number of requests received by the superintendents of the parks and monuments.

The Service estimates that, with approximately 22,000,000 visitors this year, they need about 6,000,000 pieces of informational literature. The cost of providing this alone would be at least $75,000, quite possibly more. The costs of paper and printing have increased greatly during the past year. It is interesting to note that, on that basis, the cost per visitor would be less than three-eighths of a cent.

Hardly less important are the sales publications which the National Park Service has been issuing for many years. These give the really curious and interested visitor more detailed information about the wildlife, the plants, the geology, and the history of the areas in the system. Very large quantities of these are sold; but they have to be produced first, and the initial cost of production has to be met, not by the Government Printing Office which sells them, but by the National Park Service; and it is from this printing and binding fund that the money must come.

It seems to me mighty important that the people who visit the parks and monuments, and the people who are not so fortunate as to be able to, should know about them. Every school child in the United States ought to know something about them—what they are, what they are for, and how they are run. A sound program of publications is probably the best single means of making this possible. I do not believe that the amount requested in the budget is in the least excessive; probably somewhat more could be expended usefully. Because I believe the budget request was justified, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to increase the National Park Service printing and binding item to the sum of $120,000.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the manifested intention of the membership to pass the Interior Department supply bill without change convinces me that an effort to amend the provisions of the bill relating to the Central Valley project would be futile. The spirit or, rather, the mantle of economy which has fallen over the Congress like a wet blanket would render the expenditure of any energy to that end less than useless. And I am not a bit happy over this condition of affairs.

But I cannot remain silent and not make known my discontent, for, in truth, the Congress, in this stubborn indifference to realities, is rendering a decided disservice, not only to the far West but to the entire country. A half completed project can be of service to no one. And that is where the Department of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations will leave it—for many a year to come.

When California's able Governor journeyed across this vast continent to urge an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the further development of the CVP it was the completion of the project within the foreseeable future—4 years—which impelled him to make the trip. Years have passed since the project was authorized and the construction job is only half done. Forty million dollars each year for 4 years would finish the work—and the project would begin to pay itself out, return to the Treasury the vast sums that have been expended in its construction.

But no; an economy-minded and a very short-sighted subcommittee throws itself across the pathway, denies the sum that the friends of the project suggest and recommends the expenditure of the grossly inadequate sum of $6,900,000 during the fiscal year of 1948. And an economy-minded House will accept this utterly indefensible recommendation hook, line and sinker.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congresses of the future do not reverse this short-sighted decision and appropriate far greater sums during the days that lie ahead, a quarter of a century will roll by before the project will be completed and the reimbursement of the Federal Government will begin. If anything will reveal the utterly absurd character of the present day's policy of the subcommittee, this ought to do it.

Though others may acquiese in the subcommittee's irrational economy policies, I, for one, intend to keep up the fight, if not here, in another body where calmer reasoning ought to prevail.

When I began this fight for Central Valley away back in 1935—and I drafted the original authorizing legislation—it was not to see it finished when another generation had grown to manhood's estate, but in the hope that those now living might enjoy its blessings. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], says 24 years is soon enough, and I cannot help but wonder if he does not think that even that is too soon.

But enough of this. Let us turn to another subject, to another project which suffers similarly from a stubborn and unreasoning determination to effect economy, the realities notwithstanding.

MILLERTON LAKE RECREATIONAL AREA

The committee's report on appropriations for the National Park Service points out that the committee considered a budget estimate of $372,000 for the administration, protection, and maintenance of recreational areas at Hoover Dam, Lake Texoma, and Shasta and Millerton Lakes in California, and that it had allowed $197,000, or approximately half of the requested amount. These three recreational area projects—Shasta and Millerton Lakes being considered as one, though they are several hundred miles apart—are administered by the Service under cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation, in the case of Hoover Dam and Shasta and Millerton Lakes, and with the Corps of Engineers, in the case of Lake Texoma. Millerton Lake is in my district, and I know something of the problems that result when a large area of water, usable for recreation, suddenly becomes available where no such thing existed before.

I ask you to visualize what happens. Here is an inviting new lake. It has possibilities for boating, fishing, swimming, and so forth. It is public, surrounded by publicly owned lands. The public not only wishes to use it for those purposes; it insists upon it. As the agency responsible for it, the Federal Government can do just two things. It can say, "Go ahead and use it, but if you drown it is none of our concern; if things get unsanitary, that is too bad; if some people do not behave themselves, that is just too bad, too."

Or it can decide that, since the public is bound to make use of it, it will make proper provision for such use. It will start by planning its use intelligently; it will provide safe water supplies and proper sanitary facilities where they are needed; it will build necessary roads; it will provide patrols for the surface of the lake and for the lands surrounding it; it will install proper life-saving equipment and people to use it; it will try to put in necessary facilities where natural features of value will not be damaged or destroyed and where use will not cause destructive erosion.

The first picture I drew is not a pleasant one, yet so far we have not progressed much beyond it. Hoover Dam Recreational Area has been in existence for a decade and it was possible for the National Park Service to install many improvements back in the days of emergency employment; probably the $91,000 allocated to it by the committee is adequate. But $55,600 for Lake Texoma and $50,000 for both Shasta and Millerton Lakes do not begin to be enough for the personnel to manage these areas. The budget estimate of $372,000 would provide for no extravagant program of administration, protection, and maintenance or excess of employees; considering the present conditions in two out of three of these projects, it is very moderate. The full amount should be restored and I intend later to wholeheartedly support an amendment changing the item of $197,000 figure to $372,000 which I am assured will be offered in the other body, if not here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON:

On page 44, lines 23 and 24, strike out "$2,598,680" and insert "$3,530,000."

On page 45, line 10, strike out "$1,570,000" and insert "$2,220,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Had not this section been passed over before the limitation of debate?

The CHAIRMAN. This had not been passed over and the amendment is in order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the Committee because I recognize that this amendment would not accomplish the original purpose which I had in mind, by reason of the fact that the amendment I offered a short time ago was defeated. Of course, to me it is unthinkable that the Congress would prohibit the study of underground water in the United States. I cannot believe that such a thing will actually happen.

Mr. Chairman, I have been especially interested in underground water studies in west Texas for many years. About 1936 I was instrumental in getting such studies under way on the plains of west Texas, particularly in the shallow-water irrigation belt. But these studies have not been completed, though much helpful information has been assembled. This work in Texas has been done in cooperation with the Texas board of water engineers. To stop this work would be a great mistake and false economy at its worst. But the importance of underground water studies is not confined to Texas. Every State in the Union has a stake in underground water. There is hardly a community or city in the Nation that does not have a water problem. The Geological Survey assembles information and makes it available to the public on a Nation-wide basis. A nation that is ignorant of its underground water resources is treading on thin ice. In the interest of national defense, public health, industry, and agriculture further information is required and the action of the House in defeating the amendment which I offered earlier in the afternoon was unwise, and it cannot be permitted to stand. I certainly hope that when this bill is put in final form by the House and Senate it will contain a provision providing for further and more detailed studies of our underground water resources.

But I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment now before us would not accomplish the desired result, the amendment which I offered earlier in the day having been defeated. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment since none of the money in the bill could be used for underground water studies on either a cooperative or noncooperative basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: On page 45, line 12, after the words *"Provided further"*, in line 12, strike out the words "That no part" and insert "not more than $400,000."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership will give me careful attention because I am serious and earnest in this. I think it is just and I think it is right. I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will listen to what I am trying to say.

I am only providing in this amendment that the sum of $400,000 may be used for this ground-water work or ground-water cooperation. Last year there was spent $1,662,000. That was taken out of allotments to what is known as "gaging streams." As far as the expense is concerned, the States take care of the gaging of streams just as much as this other. Why should we make a difference there? The Government asked the Appropriations Committee for $845,000. They go ahead and increase the appropriation all right, but they do not give the ground-water work anything. They say that ought to be done by the States. Why should the other not be done by the States? It is a difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. There is not a bit of difference.

The bill includes $2,578,600 for this purpose, an increase of $80,000 over the current year requirements. I find this in the report: "During the hearings on the bill careful investigation was made into the expenditure of funds for ground-water work. The committee was advised that a total of $845,000 was requested for that purpose."

Now, this report is cutting out absolutely all ground-water work, which is essential. I wish I could read you the report from the Army department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO: On page 40, line 4, strike out "$302,285" and insert "$595,000"; also on page 50, in line 4, after the word "exceed", strike out "$80,000" and insert "$125,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not meet with the same fate that my good friends from Pennsylvania met, because I think it would be very tragic if the committee were to decide to strike this appropriation altogether.

Inasmuch as you have stricken from the bill the appropriation of $450,000 for the construction of the anthracite research laboratory, I think it is all the more important that we increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of testing fuels, including sampling, inspection, and analysis of fuels purchased by the Government for its various departments, and also the appropriation for the fuel economy program.

This year in my State of Alabama a gasification project of underground coal was undertaken by the Alabama Power Co. on their coal lands in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines. The only expense to the Bureau of Mines in this project was the furnishing of the personnel to observe the outcome. All the scientists, chemists, physicists, and experts were very much pleased, but we have not gone far enough. It is a most important matter that we now take steps to conserve what few natural resources we have left.

Coal and lignite constitute 98.8 percent of the country's total fuel reserves. For the calendar year of 1946 the production of bituminous coal and lignite in the United States was about 532,000,000 tons. At an average price of $3.40 per ton at the mine, this production represents a total value of $1,800,000,000, and the proposed appropriation of $302,285 would mean that less than two one-hundredths of 1 cent for each dollar value of coal would be allowed. On that slender sum, the Bureau of Mines is being asked to provide its full testing service and research functions relating to coal. These are basic services and their primary objective is conservation.

The Bureau of Mines functions in the public interest and maintains an independent position with reference to conflicting commercial interests. Its work is both constructive and pioneering, and this appropriation deals with improvement in the preparation, treatment, and utilization of coal.

A very important part of the Bureau's testing-fuel program is the sampling, inspection, analysis, and evaluation of coal purchased for the many heating and power plants in Government installations. For the year 1946 the coal purchased by the Government on contract and specification amounted to approximately $43,000,000. If this were the only function performed under this appropriation, the cost of determining compliance with contract specifications in Government coal purchases would amount to only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the cost of the coal. However, this is only one of the functions provided for under the testing-fuel appropriation. The fuel-economy service to Government agencies and boiler-corrosion work have consistently resulted in large savings to the Government in fuel utilization and reduction in failure of Government heating-plant equipment. Proposed reductions in this appropriation will necessitate curtailment of these activities.

The growth of population and industry and the increase of industry in the midwestern and Pacific areas have brought great demands on the Bureau for work on fuels in those sections of the country. These demands have, in part, been met in proportion to funds available. The work has been directed toward using local and lower-grade coals to conserve the more valuable and more suitable coals for production of coke of metallurgical quality. Much of this work has been basic and fundamental in character, as well as directed toward the greater and more effective use of subbituminous coals and lignites in the vast reserves of the Western States. The appropriation for this essential work should be enlarged and not cut in the proposed drastic fashion.

The proposed reduction in the testing fuel appropriation will make it impossible to operate the lignite gasification pilot plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., a project designed to stimulate greater utilization of noncoking western coals. It will also result in the elimination of other planned work on drying and utilization of western coals and will restrict the Bureau's work on these coals to a small amount of laboratory work at the Golden station.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 54, line 3, after the semicolon, strike out "$579,000" and insert "$906,500."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, if it were not so important, I would not be bothering the House this late in the day. This amendment seeks to put back into the bill only $327,000 to continue at present work on important oil and gas studies at the petroleum experimental station at Bartlesville, Okla. This is not in my district.

The object in this oil and gas investigation is simply to try and increase the recoverable oil which will be lost to future generations unless new methods of producing the residual oil in old wells are adopted.

In the testimony before the committee it was estimated by one of the witnesses from a State conservation authority that secondary recovery processes from this work in one big oil field alone would increase the recovery of oil by 25,000,000 barrels.

These are not fictitious figures; the possible recoveries are tremendous. We want to get all of the oil out of the ground. Experts now say at least 50 percent of the oil is wasted through abandonment.

The Government must help to find new ways and means of recovering this precious oil, or otherwise it will be lost to this Nation forever.

Great work has been done in the past by this work and experts engaged in it. If given the necessary funds to carry it, it will be done in the future. The only increase in money that this amendment will provide are the increases which the Congress itself has authorized, namely, increase in pay and in-grade promotions. Only about $5,000 is in there for the repair of this plant. If this amendment fails, the work must be curtailed by about 40 percent.

Please, Mr. Chairman, and particularly those of you on the Republican side, I beg of you, let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish so that we will lose untold millions in recoverable oil by the failure to spend a few pennies in order, by science and engineering and the devices to make it possible, to produce the oil that God has given us in the ground.

I hope the Republicans, who have been shouting down all amendments, will not so unanimously oppose this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 82, noes 183.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REDDEN: Page 59, line 10, after the word "Washington" strike out "$3,350,000" and insert "$3,945,000."

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to statements made by various Representatives from many of the Western States with respect to the effect of this appropriation bill on their section. It seems to be the consensus of opinion of those Representatives that if this bill is passed it will discontinue many important pending projects and retard to a noticeable degree the economic progress of a large portion of the West.

One Representative who was interested in power projects and waterways indicated that the very life of many of the communities depended upon water to irrigate their soil, and if this bill is approved the necessary water will not be available to develop important areas.

I have listened also to Representatives from almost every section of the country denounce the bill as being inadequate to meet the dire necessities of their communities and to preserve the status quo of many of our natural assets and resources. Likewise, have they told of the destruction that will be wrought in failure to carry on proper research in some of the most important phases of our national existence.

I am interested in all of these objections, because I believe they are well founded and that the loss of $139,000,000 in this bill will cause the Nation as a whole to sustain a much greater loss

by failing to preserve the things in which we have already made vast investments.

There has been more argument already presented to restore this $139,000,000 and more objection to it being omitted from the bill than has been made to appropriation bills carrying many times the amount involved in this bill. The reason is simple. We are failing to preserve our resources and to maintain improvements already made. We are going to suffer our greatest loss by reason of our failure to protect the things we already have. For example, on page 59, from line 5 through line 10, we note that $3,350,000 is the full amount authorized to be spent for administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of national parks, including necessary protection of the area of certain federally owned land in the custody of the National Park Service. This appropriation is $595,000 short of the necessary minimum amount to provide for maintenance of roads and trails of our national parks. In other words, this amount should necessarily be added to the sum named by the committee if the Interior Department is to maintain the present roads and trails that are already available for use. A deficit of funds of this magnitude will seriously reduce the travel ability of national park roads, and is the worst kind of economy. In fact, it is no economy at all to let our roads wear out because of the lack of sufficient funds to maintain them in proper condition.

You gentlemen who represent districts or States in which are located national parks should remember that these parks are not maintained solely for your districts, but are an inducement to literally thousands of people who visit these areas throughout the Nation. More than 20,000,000 people visited national parks last year, and that number will be substantially increased this year. The roads and trails will be heavily burdened, and if funds are not available to keep them in repair, you will be held accountable for the results.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 4, strike out the sum "$75,000" and insert "$200,000."

Page 67, line 9, strike out the sum "$75,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this amendment, which is identical with one I have had on your desk since early this afternoon, to restore to the item called "Commercial fisheries" $200,000 in place of the $75,000 recommended by the committee in the appropriation for 1948, in opposition to the budget estimates of $401,000; and secondly, to restore the appropriation for Fisheries Market News Service to $100,000 in place of the $75,000 recommended by the committee of the $141,600 requested in the budget for this item, I do so after serious and careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, like most of the other Republicans, one of the principal planks in my campaign last fall was an economy drive, and we all know there is plenty of room for economy in this Government. We all know that during the New Deal years a philosophy of government was developed in this country which sought to give us a champagne appetite based on an artificially created champagne pocketbook. We have survived that New Deal headache and now we have to get down to brass rocks. But it is not always easy to get down to brass rocks as quickly as our good friends on the Appropriations Committee would like us to do.

I have the utmost admiration for their accomplishments in endeavoring to reduce the over-all cost of government with a corresponding reduction in bureaucratic personnel. Without such reductions we cannot hope to fulfill another campaign obligation widely demanded by citizens of whatever creed, religion, or political complexion of this country.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with the expressed desire of this committee and their philosophy, with which I am fully in agreement, that private industry should once again assume its share of financial responsibility for the services heretofore supported by the Government—by the New Deal. But there must be a transition period and that is why I support these amendments.

In the fisheries industry, you have in practical fact, the farmers of the sea who produce per man today more solid food than even our loyal farmers of the soil. Statistics bear that out. The individual fisherman, whether he works on his own or under contract to some large fisheries, is just as much an individualist as the tiller of the soil. It is extremely difficult to bring him into any contributing organization which in turn can sponsor and financially prosecute him successfully. Such services are presently given by the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Market News Service, in the statistical reports, in the research and biological service and laboratory experiments. Individualists that they are, however, I think most of them would prefer to belong to a personally contributed-to organization not sponsored by the Government and by the taxpayers of the Nation, to carry on these activities.

To take the full cut that our Appropriations Committee has recommended this time, is, I think, too severe a blow on the entire industry and which may result in complete chaos; and, indeed, telegrams from responsible people in the industry indicate that that will be the case.

The industry has indicated to me that they are ready and willing as soon as they are able, to assume their just responsibilities in these matters, but I respectfully submit to you that they cannot do that over night and hence, I request that this committee restore to the bill a reasonable proportion of the cut suggested by the committee and give the industry a chance to gradually assume the responsibilities—to the end that sooner or later, and I hope sooner, they may take the statistical and experimental and research responsibilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service over into their own control free from the tentacles of Washington bureaucracy. I hope the amendment passes.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. This amendment makes possible the continuance of certain important research programs as well as the distribution of certain market reports so essential for the entire fishing industry. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on the fight he has made for this amendment, with which I have been associated. We have been fighting this thing since 9 o'clock this morning, and I am glad that the committee and the Republican leadership has finally agreed to go along with us.

I endorse what he said in the general debate yesterday, which, in part, was as follows:

The fishing industry does not seek aid and support of the Government. It historically has stood on its own feet; it has sought no subsidies, no crop insurance, no parity. It has sought none of the Government aids that have been extended to agriculture and to other industries. It has carried its own responsibilities and intends to continue to do so, but the fishing industry does expect the Federal Government to carry its own responsibilities. It has a right to expect proper and adequate Government services.

It seeks these services to be in a position to fairly compete with foreign nations, the majority of which are heavily subsidized by government aids of various kinds.

I call attention that page 653 of the hearings will show the comparatively small expense that the fishing industry has required, and I quote:

Mr. JONES. I know that there are services rendered to the commercial fisheries who make a profit from these natural resources, and they get the primary direct benefit of your service that results in profit to them. Do you think that they should rightfully pay more of their share of the actual cost of the service? Are there any such items that you would care to discuss, from your experience as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. DAY. Assistance to the commercial fishermen leads to their making a living and a profit, just as the services of the Government in agriculture assist the farmer in making a profit.

The chart we have on the wall here shows that better than anything I could say. Your fisherman contributes to the food supply each year 47,000 pounds per man; your farmer contributes 34,500 pounds. The Federal Government's expense to assist the fisherman is $14.45 and the expense to assist the farmer is $121.44.

For each ton of fishery products the Government spends 82 cents, and for each ton of agricultural product, $7.04. So the Government does assist the fishing industry the same as it does agriculture and attempts to do a better job.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned with the cuts that the committee has made in the amount requested by the Interior Department for the commercial fisheries and the Fishery Market News Service.

These two departments are essential to the fishing industry upon which much

of our economy in New England depends. At a time when this industry is under heavy competition from foreign countries it is most important that these essential services be maintained.

I therefore ask this Committee to grant to these two services the amounts originally requested by the Department of the Interior.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, a telegram received from Richard E. Reed, commissioner of Maine sea and shore fisheries, indicates the deep concern of our people over the reduction of the appropriation for the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the telegram just received from Mr. Reed:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *April 24, 1947.*
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Maine's $50,000,000 a year commercial fishing industry is stunned by pending legislation which would cut appropriations for the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service from $401,000 to $75,000 annually. It is inconceivable that the leaders of our great country will permit such drastic disregard of one of America's greatest natural resources. The action, if adopted, will wreck the constructive work that this agency has so successfully been executing and which is so seriously needed. It will mean a complete reorganization of and subsequent lessening of the efficiency of the Maine Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries which is closely allied with the Fish and Wildlife Service on a number of conservation, propagation, and marketing projects. The theory of the Appropriations Committee that industry should pay its own way in the field of research and development may be the right approach to good Government but until a similar attitude is taken toward agriculture and other vote-getting pork barrels why does the good American and unfortunately disorganized fishing industry have to be completely ignored by its elected Representatives of Congress? The comparatively paltry $400,000 is lying around everywhere in the world on piles of horribly wasted potatoes, racket-ridden sales of surplus war goods, and other fancy squanderings of the taxpayers' dollars. Such false economy in a multi-billion-dollar Government budget must deserve reconsideration.

RICHARD E. REED,
Commissioner, Sea and Shore Fisheries.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The proposed cut will be disastrous not only to the fisheries interests in my district, but to consumers all over the country.

I recognize the necessity for economy but the 80-percent cut made in this appropriation is far too drastic. My colleague the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH has already read to you a telegram from the Sea and Shore Fisheries Commissioner of Maine.

The amendment will restore $150,000 in all to the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service and put the appropriation on the level of the prewar budget of 1941.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I should have a word to say about the purposes of this amendment. This amendment reinstates in the bill a sum of money for the maintenance of the commercial fisheries statistical organization in the Fish and Wildlife Service and also the Fishery Market News Service. These items have been cut 80 percent, perhaps the most drastic cut of any item in the whole bill.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. On the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries stating that he will hold hearings on legislation so the fishing industry will underwrite the cost of this service, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I assure the gentleman that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will set such a hearing in the very near future, and I am supported in that by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the request for commercial fisheries was originally for about $400,000. It was cut to $75,000. This amendment brings it back to $200,000. The other appropriation for Fishery News Service was about $140,000. They cut that down to $75,000. This amendment brings it back to $100,000.

It is not difficult to understand the surprise and shock felt by the Nation's fishing industry as a whole relative to the action taken in cutting these funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service and amounting in some instances up to nearly 80 percent. For this reduction in appropriations will not only terminate virtually all the statistical surveys, research and numerous other services vital to commercial fisheries, but most important of all is the fact that this action comes at a time when the industry is now struggling to meet the competition, the fisheries of many foreign countries.

The need for tax reduction and the elimination of waste and needless expenditures is realized by most of us and we are mindful of the party's pledge to cut our cost of Government. That pledge we are carrying out, but it should not completely wipe out services rendered to an industry whose activities are so vital to the health and welfare of the entire Nation. For when we speak of the fisheries industry, we deal with the question of food, employment, and health. Therefore, any elimination of funds for providing surveys, research work and data essential to the operation of that industry, affects the Nation and reduced appropriations to such a point in this bill must be considered as ill advised. In these days of scientific research, it is impossible to believe that we are planning to end virtually all economic research and services for the commercial fisheries. I fully realize the great responsibility of the committee reporting this bill. I do believe, however, that an increase should be made in this item.

In its recommendations, the committee feels that the fishing industries should carry the cost of such services, but those of us who are close to the industry realize full well that the burden being carried is already extremely heavy and that the future is most uncertain due to the terrific competition under reciprocal trade agreements. May I remind the House that while the Reciprocal Trade Conference is being conducted in Geneva, many foreign countries are pleading for the reduction of protective tariffs that already are so low that little or no protection is afforded the American fishing industry. And let me remind you also that the fishing industries in many of these foreign countries are subsidized by their respective governments.

The two divisions within Fish and Wildlife Service most directly concerned with and of the utmost vital importance to the fishing industry of the country are: First, the Division of Commercial Fisheries; second, the Fishery Market News Service.

As I have stated previously, I subscribe to our party's pledge to reduce taxes and to effect every economy possible. I wish to emphasize, however, the extreme importance of these two services to the fishing industry. It would be disastrous to the industry for this Government not to continue to provide them.

It is my most studied conviction that the cuts in the appropriation bill on these items in the Fish and Wildlife Service are altogether too severe, and it may be well for us to consider the prewar 1942 budget as a base to determine what services should be retained rather than to wipe out these activities altogether, as it is intended to do by these drastic reductions.

In 1942 the appropriation for Division of Commercial Fisheries was $186,940. Since that time the average increase in wages totaled about 45 percent.

The appropriation for the Fishery Market News Service in 1942 was $86,220, with a 45-percent increase in wages in that division. I am, therefore, offering an amendment to the bill so that sufficient appropriations will be available that will be somewhat on the level of 1942.

FEDERAL AGENCIES INTERESTED IN FISHERIES

Department of Agriculture: Marketing Service, purchase of fish.

Department of Commerce: Production data.

Department of Justice: Alien fishermen.

Department of Labor: Wages, hours, and other labor conditions.

Department of State: International fishery matters and alien fishermen.

Federal Security Agency: Fish in nutrition, food and drug administration, social-security benefits to fishermen and fishery workers.

Interstate Commerce Commission: Rail rates and transportation facilities.

Navy Department: Acquisition of fishing vessels, restriction on fishing—Coast Guard, consumption of fishery goods, aids to navigation, bombing ranges.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Loans to fishery industry.

Tariff Commission: Tariff rates.

Treasury Department: Customs.

War Department: Acquisition of fishing vessels, fishery data, consumption of fishery foods, navigation, bombing ranges.

Federal Trade Commission: Trade practices.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriation Committee has submitted its report, which reduces by approximately 80 percent the Government funds necessary to conduct one of the major functions of the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of the Interior. The Committee on Appropriations has cut the requirements for maintaining the Commercial Fisheries Division from $401,000 granted in 1946–47 to $75,000 in 1947–48. The Fishery Market News Service has been cut from $141,600 to $75,000. The almost absolute elimination of these two functions, probably the two most important in the entire Fish and Wildlife Service, will set the industry back 50 years. It means the cessation of all field activities in the laboratories located in Seattle, Wash., Boston, Mass., Alaska, Puerto Rico, and four mobile trailer laboratories. It also means the closing of all fisheries sources of statistical information in Maine, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, Georgia, Louisiana, California, Oregon, and Washington. It will terminate the economic research needed to maintain a vigorous and prosperous industry able to meet foreign competition and virtually eliminate the only source of statistical information on fisheries.

Something should be done immediately to avert the inevitable and drastic consequences sure to follow unless sound and logical reasoning is employed in determining the minimum amounts necessary to continue this vitally important Government service.

Such a drastic curtailment of Government funds at a time when the industry is beset with serious threats through foreign importations strikes a body blow that can and will prove fatal to the oldest industry in America.

The fishing industry, from Maine to the Gulf of Mexico, to the Great Lakes, to the Pacific coast, to the Territory of Alaska, relies on the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for vital information relative to the production, processing, and distribution of fish and fish products. Fishery statistics, market news reports, the results of technological surveys are vital in the industry's daily life and of tremendous importance in the normal everyday conduct of its business.

Fish and Wildlife is one of the few Federal agencies whose appropriations were not increased during the war. Its trained men and technologists were transferred to the war created Office of Coordinator of Fisheries to expedite the most important war undertaking on the home front, that of providing constant supplies of scarce protein foods. Normal fisheries functions were suspended. Immediately following VJ-day the coordinator's offices were voluntarily closed down, and its staff resumed peacetime fishery work, 4 years behind in its schedule.

How any committee of American legislators could suggest for adoption such a severe program of retrenchment at a time when our natural resources must be exploited to full productive capacity is beyond my understanding and leaves me stunned. Other governments, particularly our good neighbor to the north, Canada, have provided subsidies to foster the growth and expansion of their fisheries resources. They recognize the tremendous dollar potential lying dormant off the coast and are recruiting the will, determination, and money of its citizenry to put these resources to national use.

The fishing industry of America does not seek Government aid, it does not look for its annual piece of fat back from the brine barrel to justify its existence. But it does expect this Government to assume its responsibility to protect, preserve, and develop one of its greatest God-given natural resources, its American fishing industry.

The New England, New York, and Pennsylvania area of the United States pays a very substantial part of the income taxes assessed by the Treasury Department. This section of America contains the greatest edible fish producing and distributing area in our country. Yet in proportion to the financial aid so benevolently showered upon the farmers of America this section of the fisheries industry falls far short of receiving the share of Federal financial aid to which it is entitled.

I have been informed that the House Committee on Appropriations has based its computations as to current needs upon the amounts of money awarded this division in 1938. How fallacious, is this premise. If this be true, how silly it would be to determine the current needs of our Army and Navy divisions on the basis of 1938 appropriations. Wages, costs of materials, operating expenses have risen substantially since those post depression days so that any estimate based upon 1938 conditions must of necessity be false. We should plan for the future, leave the past to the historians. We should help this industry to grow, expand—not cut the heart out of it as does this drastic, unreasonable budgetary restriction levied against the fishing industry.

Gentlemen, this committee is trifling with a $4,500,000,000 industry—Wall Street Journal. That represents a sizable tax figure in the records of our Internal Revenue Division of the Treasury Department. From the standpoint of national income all of us in Congress must consider that figure when discussing budget restrictions.

Cautious mutterings heard throughout America indicate an ominous fear of a major business depression in the offing. Up to this moment, it is only a ghost, an ethereal threat, yet such foolhardy action as crippling 80 percent of the potentials of a tried and true Government agency can very well be a serious factor in creating a major depression.

This is indeed a dictatorial approach toward solving our budgetary problems. The idea that you can so freely and so arbitrarily cripple by sections the industrial life of America to justify a party policy—smacks smartly of the very thing we sought to eradicate forever in the recent World War.

Let me tell you what statistics and market news means to the modern fishing industry and its complex problems. Just last week the National Fisheries Institute, which is the only trade association representing the ownership part of the industry from boat owners to distributors, met in convention at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and launched a national advertising program for fishery products. This program is designed to increase the per capita consumption of fish and shellfish. It will cost the industry no less than half a million dollars for the institutional advertising alone. If you wipe out, as you are doing now, the divisions of the Fish and Wildlife Service which compiles the figures showing production and consumption of fishery products, then you have knocked the props from under the domestic industry fostering this advertising program. The reason is, that after spending more than half a million dollars, it will not know if any results have been accomplished because there would be no one to keep score. For example, the present per capita consumption of fishery products in the United States is about 13 pounds—arrived at through figures compiled by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Take away the production figures at ports of entry and the figures showing the movement of fishery products throughout the United States, and I will guarantee you that you will not even know where to spend advertising dollars, let alone know what the per capita consumption is after spending a half million dollars at random.

According to the subcommittee's report, the industry should compile and pay for its own statistics and market news reports. Let me tell you how asinine this reasoning is. First of all, your Government has to have some sort of figures which disclose the size of an industry and whether it is faring well or badly. A government not interested enough to furnish itself and the industry this service surely cannot claim to be much of a democracy. In the case of the commercial fisheries, the Fish and Wildlife Service is the Government agency responsible for the accounting of its size and prosperity or lack of prosperity. If the Government now abandons the stations where it supplies the statistics for this industry, there will be no one to take them over. It is only sound reasoning that the widely dispersed fisheries cannot take over the physical properties now occupied by the Government. The cost itself would be prohibitive and it would not be practical. Competition in the fisheries, the same as in other industries, would smother out fairness and uniform applicability.

Much talk has been going on concerning what other governments have done for their commercial fisheries, particularly what we did in building a fishing fleet for Russia during the war. Yes, we spent something like $21,000,000 in lend-lease funds during the war on her fishing fleet to make it possible for Russia to feed her peoples, not realizing, of course, that our own Government at the end of the war would let her own industry down by eliminating vital services to it. Germany built new and modern fillet plants in Norway that are at present being utilized by the Norwegians. Yes; and in order to feed our Army, Navy, and allies we helped build freezers in Iceland—that country has now 62 of them. They are in the frozen-fish business to stay. Nobody ever thought when these facilities were built that they would be used to shorten the life of our own domestic industry because we have always been alert enough to look after ourselves—that is, we were until this new and dreaded virus got into the veins of the subcommittees on appropriations for the Department of Interior. A virus that would kill off the lifeblood of our industry, literally cut it off at the roots. Without competent statistics, we have nothing, not even a basis for taxation and it is through taxes that every government must operate.

In conclusion, let me make this pertinent observation: If this Committee on Appropriations is bent on making a will leaving this industry to Russia or to Canada or Iceland, it will have to use some set of figures, some statistics to determine its value. Ironically enough, it must rely upon the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to furnish the yardstick.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I fully subscribe to the text and purpose of the amendments offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, and sincerely hope those amendments will be adopted. They are of vital importance to our great fishing industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BATES) there were—ayes 198, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 70, line 20, strike out "$5,960,320" and insert "$6,110,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 54, line 10, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases by $500,000 the allotment to mining experiment stations. This is of particular concern to my State and my district and to the Nation, because of the implication it has on the research work necessary to develop taconite, a low-grade iron ore, to replace the rapidly dwindling high-grade ore supply. I call your attention to an article appearing in the April 19, 1947, issue of Business Week, a very comprehensive article which warns us of the coming crisis in the disappearance of our high-grade iron ore. In Labrador, at a point 350 miles north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, there are newly discovered high-grade ore fields which will soon compete with our own production at home. It is my hope that we continue the work already begun in the State of Minnesota in the United States Bureau of Mines experimental station at the University of Minnesota and under State auspices to carry out the work of developing taconite. In our low-grade ore, taconite, we feel we have the answer to meet the challenge of our depletion of high-grade open-pit ores. Very substantial gains have already been made in research and development work, coupled with amazing developments in technological advance, and we are approaching the point where large scale utilization of taconite can be a reality. But we need help in further badly needed research and experimentation. We feel that it is the legitimate responsibility of the United States Government through its Bureau of Mines to carry out this work. I ask your support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLATNIK) there were—ayes 86, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 81, strike out lines 1 through 7 inclusive.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill the previous appropriation for the anthracite laboratory is rescinded. This amendment restores the appropriation as Congress originally granted it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the provisions that were stricken out by the Keating amendment struck out money in the bill for the fiscal year 1948 which would set the laboratory where the Bureau of Mines engineers said it ought to go. If the so-called Jenkins amendment is adopted, the laboratory for the anthracite coal industry will go where an advisory committee says it ought to go. We think the committee provisions were wise, and we will ask for a separate vote on the Keating amendment when the bill is reported back to the House. I hope the House will support us in overthrowing the Keating amendment. I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 88, noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and do so for the purpose of announcing the program for next week. I have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader as well as with the minority whip.

On Monday, we have District day. It is expected that the so-called daylight savings bill, S. 736, will be called up and disposed of. Then we will continue the consideration of the foreign relief bill under the 5-minute rule, general debate on that bill having been concluded. It is expected that the bill will continue on Tuesday, although it may be concluded Monday. Also on Tuesday, we hope to call up House Resclution 173 introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

On Wednesday, we propose to call up H. R. 3203, having to do with the extension of rent control.

On Thursday, which is May 1, we will have a joint session under the previous order to hear the President of Mexico. We will also conclude the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3203, if it is not finished by Wednesday. Also, on Thursday, we propose to take up H. R. 2780, which has to do with temporary housing under the Lanham Act.

On Friday, we propose to call up the deficiency appropriation bill.

Saturday is undetermined.

Further, it is expected that the conference report on the so-called portal-to-portal pay bill will be ready for action next week and we shall take it up, of course, at any time that it is ready.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, recently we had a very serious mine disaster and it brought to the attention of the country again the danger of coal mines and coal mining. A great deal has been said in the press and over the radio about the cut in this appropriation for the Department of the Interior, which includes appropriations for the mines and the services to the mining industry and to the miners. I want to ask Mr. JONES, the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, a question or two. I see the bill provides and it is stated in the report there is allowed $1,148,000 for the purpose of operating mine rescue cars and stations and in making a study of explosives. This report says that is $103,500 more than was carried for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION. One other point. Of course, it is important to have frequent and efficient inspections and investigations of coal mines. This bill provides $1,625,000 and the report says it is $100,000 in excess of the current year's requirements. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION. With provision for 202 mine inspectors. The number provided for has not been filled. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. At the time of the hearings they had not all been hired.

Mr. ROBSION. Is there any complaint from any source that the sums provided in this bill are not adequate for these services, looking to the safety and protection of the miners and mines?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. There certainly could not be any complaint. We gave them the full budget estimate on both of these items.

Mr. ROBSION. I thank the chairman. We have heard over the radio, and seen statements in the press, that Congress had not provided sufficient funds to protect adequately the safety of the miners and the mines. The last Congress, controlled by the Democrats, were heavy spenders. They provided the appropriations for the current fiscal year. The bill before us was considered and voted out by the committee controlled by the Republicans and they provided $203,500 more for the coming fiscal year than the Democrats did for the current fiscal year, to care for the safety of the miners and mines.

The Truman administration has not appointed all of the 202 coal-mine inspectors provided for the current fiscal year. If it is necessary to use the money available to hire additional inspectors this should be done. Mr. John L. Lewis blames the late great mine disaster in Illinois on Mr. Krug, Secretary of the Interior. Let us bear in mind the Republicans did not name Secretary Krug and neither do they have the say in naming the mine inspectors and other officers looking after the safety of miners or mines.

Coal mines are dangerous even after the greatest care is observed to protect the health and lives of the miners. Neither effort nor money should be spared to protect the health and lives of the miners.

Millions of Americans do not know how dangerous coal mines are. It was decided some years ago by representatives of many nations, including our own, that prisoners of war could be forced to work by their captors if the work was not extra hazardous to health and life, but the representatives decided that prisoners of war could not be forced to work on the inside of coal mines because it was extra hazardous and dangerous. It is the duty of State and Federal officials to make mines as safe as is reasonably possible to lessen these dangers.

Of course, other large sums are provided in this bill for the benefit of miners and the mining industry.

The Democrats and others claim 47-percent cut of budget on other items. That is not unusual. The departments and bureaus are not modest in making demands. This bill makes available for fiscal year beginning July 1, $156,538,513.

President Truman issued a freeze order August 2, 1946, stating that not more than $85,000,000 should be expended by the Department of the Interior for present fiscal year and a like sum for year beginning July 1, 1947, and yet Secretary Krug, of Interior, lets out a big squawk that Republicans are ruining the country when we provide in this bill $156,538,513. Mr. Krug cannot spend this sum judiciously.

The Republican Congress will provide all funds necessary for the efficient operation of this Government, including the Department of the Interior. We insist, however, that the people's tax money must not be wasted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a separate vote is requested on the Keating amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been requested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 50, strike out lines 13 to 21, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 134, noes 118.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. In its present form; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is any Member absolutely opposed to the bill? [After a pause.] The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 5, beginning with line 16, strike out the remainder of the page and down to and including line 9, on page 6, and insert the following:

"Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: To enable the Bonneville Power Administrator to carry out the duties imposed upon him pursuant to law, including the construction of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities; operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system; marketing of electric power and energy; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); purchase of 30 in the fiscal year 1948 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of 1 in the fiscal year 1948 and maintenance and operation of aircraft; $20,278,000, to be available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $4,700,000 shall be available in the fiscal year 1948 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, marketing of electric power and energy, and administrative expenses connected therewith, including $29,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia."

On page 39, after line 22, insert the following:

"GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

"For continuation of construction of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts to be immediately available, to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) previously or herein authorized by Congress, and to be reimbursable except as otherwise provided by law:

"Central Valley project, California, $13,100,000.

"Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $7,185,000.

"Columbia Basin project, Washington: For continuation of construction and for other purposes authorized by the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), $16,065,000."

On page 40, beginning with line 17, strike out the remainder of the page to and including line 3 on page 41, and insert the following:

"Missouri River Basin (reimbursable except as otherwise provided by law): For the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534) and section 18 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526) (including the construction of transmission lines and the purchase of power) and for continuing investigations on the general plan of development, $23,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be expended, either independently or through or in cooperation with existing Federal and State agencies."

On page 67, line 4, strike out "$200,000" and insert "$401,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 140, nays 197, answered "present" 1, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—140

Abernethy	Gorski	Marcantonio
Albert	Gossett	Meade, Md.
Allen, La.	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Almond	Grant, Ala.	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Gregory	Morgan
Angell	Hardy	Morris
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Battle	Harris	O'Brien
Beckworth	Hart	O'Toole
Blatnik	Havenner	Pace
Bloom	Hays	Passman
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Peden
Brooks	Hendricks	Peterson
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Philbin
Bryson	Holifield	Pickett
Burleson	Huber	Poage
Camp	Hull	Poulson
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Fla.
Carroll	Jarman	Price, Ill.
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Priest
Chelf	Johnson, Tex.	Rabin
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Rankin
Cooley	Karsten, Mo.	Rayburn
Cooper	Kee	Redden
Crosser	Kefauver	Richards
Curtis	Kelley	Riley
Davis, Ga.	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Rooney
Delaney	King	Russell
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Sadowski
Dingell	Lane	Sikes
Donohue	Lanham	Smathers
Dorn	Larcade	Spence
Douglas	Lea	Stigler
Elliott	Lemke	Teague
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Thomason
Evins	Lucas	Trimble
Fallon	Lusk	Walter
Feighan	Lyle	Welch
Fernandez	McCormack	Wheeler
Fisher	McMillan, S. C.	Whitten
Flannagan	Madden	Whittington
Folger	Mahon	Williams
Forand	Manasco	Winstead
Gary	Mansfield, Mont.	Worley
Gordon		Zimmerman

NAYS—197

Allen, Calif.	Dirksen	Jenkins, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Dolliver	Jennings
Anderson, Calif.	Dondero	Jensen
Arnold	Doughton	Johnson, Ill.
Auchincloss	Durham	Jones, Ohio
Bakewell	Ellis	Jonkman
Banta	Ellsworth	Judd
Barrett	Elsaesser	Kean
Bates, Mass.	Engel, Mich.	Kearney
Beall	Fenton	Keating
Bender	Fletcher	Keefe
Bennett, Mich.	Foote	Kerr
Bennett, Mo.	Fulton	Kersten, Wis.
Bishop	Gamble	Kilburn
Blackney	Gathings	Knutson
Boggs, Del.	Gavin	Kunkel
Boykin	Gearhart	Latham
Bradley, Calif.	Gillette	LeCompte
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	LeFevre
Bramblett	Goff	Lodge
Brehm	Goodwin	Love
Brophy	Graham	McConnell
Buffett	Grant, Ind.	McCowen
Burke	Griffiths	McGarvey
Busbey	Gross	McGregor
Butler	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwynne, Iowa	McMillen, Ill.
Carson	Hagen	MacKinnon
Case, N. J.	Hale	Maloney
Case, S. Dak.	Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Chadwick	Halleck	Mathews
Chenoweth	Hand	Meade, Ky.
Chiperfield	Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Church	Harrison	Meyer
Clevenger	Herter	Michener
Coffin	Heselton	Miller, Conn.
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Miller, Md.
Cole, Mo.	Hill	Miller, Nebr.
Corbett	Hinshaw	Mills
Cotton	Hoeven	Muhlenberg
Cravens	Hoffman	Mundt
Crawford	Holmes	Murray, Wis.
Crow	Howell	Nixon
Cunningham	Javits	Nodar
Dawson, Utah	Jenison	Norblad
Devitt	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Hara
		O'Konski
Owens	Sanborn	Stratton
Patterson	Sarbacher	Taber
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Talle
Phillips, Tenn.	Scoblick	Tibbott
Potts	Scott, Hardie	Tollefson
Ramey	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Twyman
Reed, Ill.	Scrivner	Vail
Reed, N. Y.	Seely-Brown	Van Zandt
Rees	Simpson, Ill.	Vorys
Reeves	Simpson, Pa.	Vursell
Rich	Smith, Kans.	Wadsworth
Riehlman	Smith, Ohio	Weichel
Rizley	Smith, Va.	Wigglesworth
Robertson	Snyder	Wilson, Ind.
Robsion	Springer	Wilson, Tex.
Rockwell	Stanley	Wolcott
Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Wolverton
Rohrbough	Stevenson	Woodruff
Ross	Stockman	Youngblood
Sadlak		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Horan

NOT VOTING—93

Allen, Ill.	Eaton	Morrison
Andresen, August H.	Eberharter	Morton
Andrews, N. Y.	Elston	Murray, Tenn.
Arends	Fellows	Norrell
Barden	Fogarty	Norton
Bell	Fuller	Patman
Bland	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Bolton	Gerlach	Ploeser
Bonner	Gifford	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	Gore	Powell
Buchanan	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Preston
Buck	Hartley	Rayfiel
Buckley	Hébert	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	St. George
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Sasscer
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Clason	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard
Clements	Kearns	Short
Clippinger	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Landis	Somers
Courtney	Lewis	Sundstrom
Cox	Lynch	Taylor
Dague	McDonough	Thomas, N. J.
D'Alesandro	McDowell	Thomas, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Macy	Towe
Deane	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Domengeaux	Mason	West
Drewry	Mitchell	Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Towe against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Rayfiel for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. McDowell against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Gerlach against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Dague against.

Mr. Buchanan for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Somers for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana, against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Bonner against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Fellows with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Short with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Clason with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Hope with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Norrell.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Thomas of Texas.

Mr. Bolton with Mr. Vinson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 30, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—307

Abernethy	Crawford	Hedrick
Albert	Crosser	Hendricks
Allen, Calif.	Crow	Herter
Allen, La.	Cunningham	Heselton
Almond	Curtis	Hess
Andersen, H. Carl	Davis, Ga.	Hill
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Tenn.	Hinshaw
Andresen, August H.	Dawson, Utah	Hobbs
Andrews, Ala.	Devitt	Hoeven
Arnold	D'Ewart	Hoffman
Auchincloss	Dirksen	Holmes
Bakewell	Dolliver	Horan
Banta	Dondero	Howell
Barrett	Donohue	Hull
Bates, Ky.	Dorn	Jackson, Wash.
Bates, Mass.	Doughton	Jarman
Battle	Durham	Javits
Beall	Elliott	Jenison
Beckworth	Ellis	Jenkins, Ohio
Bender	Ellsworth	Jenkins, Pa.
Bennett, Mich.	Elsaesser	Jennings
Bennett, Mo.	Engel, Mich.	Jensen
Bishop	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.
Blackney	Evins	Johnson, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Fallon	Johnson, Tex.
Boggs, La.	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Boykin	Fenton	Jones, N. C.
Bradley, Calif.	Fisher	Jones, Ohio
Bradley, Mich.	Flannagan	Jonkman
Bramblett	Fletcher	Judd
Brehm	Folger	Kean
Brooks	Foote	Kearney
Brophy	Forand	Keating
Brown, Ga.	Fulton	Keefe
Bryson	Gamble	Kefauver
Buffett	Gary	Kelley
Burke	Gathings	Kennedy
Burleson	Gavin	Kerr
Busbey	Gearhart	Kersten, Wis.
Butler	Gillette	Kilburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Gillie	Kilday
Camp	Goff	Knutson
Cannon	Goodwin	Kunkel
Carroll	Gossett	Lane
Carson	Graham	Lanham
Case, N. J.	Granger	Latham
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ala.	Lea
Chadwick	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte
Chapman	Gregory	LeFevre
Chelf	Griffiths	Lodge
Chenoweth	Gross	Love
Chiperfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lucas
Church	Gwynne, Iowa	Lusk
Clevenger	Hagen	Lyle
Coffin	Hale	McConnell
Cole, Kans.	Hall, Leonard W.	McCormack
Cole, Mo.	Halleck	McCowen
Colmer	Hand	McGarvey
Combs	Hardy	McGregor
Cooley	Harless, Ariz.	McMahon
Cooper	Harness, Ind.	McMillan, S. C
Corbett	Harris	McMillen, Ill.
Cotton	Harrison	MacKinnon
Cravens	Hart	Mahon
	Hays	Maloney
		Manasco

Mansfield, Mont.	Price, Fla.	Snyder
Martin, Iowa	Priest	Spence
Mathews	Rains	Springer
Meade, Ky.	Ramey	Stanley
Meade, Md.	Rankin	Stefan
Merrow	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
Meyer	Reed, N. Y.	Stigler
Michener	Rees	Stockman
Miller, Conn.	Reeves	Stratton
Miller, Md.	Rich	Taber
Miller, Nebr.	Richards	Talle
Mills	Riehlman	Teague
Monroney	Riley	Thomason
Morgan	Rizley	Tibbott
Morris	Robertson	Tollefson
Muhlenberg	Robsion	Trimble
Mundt	Rockwell	Twyman
Murdock	Rogers, Fla.	Vail
Murray, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
Nixon	Rohrbough	Vorys
Nodar	Ross	Vursell
Norblad	Russell	Wadsworth
O'Brien	Sadlak	Walter
O'Hara	Sanborn	Weichel
Owens	Sarbacher	Wheeler
Pace	Schwabe, Okla.	Whitten
Passman	Scoblick	Whittington
Patterson	Scott, Hardie	Wigglesworth
Peden	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Williams
Peterson	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
Philbin	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Tex.
Phillips, Calif.	Sikes	Winstead
Phillips, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott
Pickett	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton
Poage	Smathers	Woodruff
Potts	Smith, Kans.	Worley
Poulson	Smith, Va.	Youngblood
		Zimmerman

NAYS—30

Angell	Holifield	Miller, Calif.
Blatnik	Huber	O'Konski
Bloom	Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole
Delaney	Kee	Price, Ill.
Dingell	King	Rabin
Douglas	Kirwan	Redden
Fernandez	Lemke	Rooney
Gordon	Lesinski	Sadowski
Gorski	Madden	Smith, Ohio
Havenner	Marcantonio	Welch

NOT VOTING—94

Allen, Ill.	Elston	Morton
Andrews, N. Y.	Fellows	Murray, Tenn.
Arends	Fogarty	Norrell
Barden	Fuller	Norton
Bell	Gallagher	Patman
Bland	Gerlach	Pfeifer
Bolton	Gifford	Ploeser
Bonner	Gore	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Buchanan	Hartley	Preston
Buck	Hébert	Rayburn
Buckley	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Bulwinkle	Hope	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	St. George
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer
Clark	Jones, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clason	Kearns	Shafer
Clements	Keogh	Sheppard
Clippinger	Klein	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Landis	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Lewis	Somers
Cox	Lynch	Sundstrom
Dague	McDonough	Taylor
D'Alesandro	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson, Ill.	Macy	Thomas, Tex.
Deane	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Domengeaux	Mason	Vinson
Drewry	Mitchell	West
Eaton	Morrison	Wood
Eberharter		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Schwabe of Missouri for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Preston.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Landis with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Thomas of Texas.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. West.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Clason with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Norrell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. C. B. J. Molitor before the Ways and Means Committee on April 24, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include testimony offered before the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I ask unanimous consent to file a report on the bill H. R. 1203.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances in the Appendix and include excerpts in each case.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on the Newburyport plan.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress and for other purposes, reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday, and that any member of the committee desiring to file minority views may likewise have the same permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee today copy of a statement made by me before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and to have my remarks under the heading "The Montana Power Co. Does Not Want to Starve the Hungry Horse; It Wants to Kill Him."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend parts of his remarks which previously appeared in the RECORD on June 7 and June 12, 1946, and on December 12, 1944.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER, BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

APRIL 24, 1947.

Hon JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Hon. WILLIAM W. BRADLEY, of California, has informed me that

it is impossible for him to serve as a member of the 1947 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy and has submitted to me his resignation as a member of the Board.

Pursuant to the provision of Public Law 38, Seventy-fifth Congress, as amended, I have appointed Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., of California, a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma), through Tuesday, April 29, 1947, on account of death in family.

To Mr. VINSON, for 2 weeks, beginning April 28, 1947, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 5, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee today and include certain tables.

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 547. An act to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 24, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 28, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for inactive-duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

598. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the proposed transfer of a vessel to the Puget Sound Naval Academy, of Winslow, Wash.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

599. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 17, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of report on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, with a view to providing flood protection in the reach between the mouth of Kaskaskia River and the Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district, with particular reference to the town of Prairie du Rocher, in Randolph County, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 222); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

600. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 17, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Arkansas River, Kans., Okla., and Ark., with respect to the need for improved flood protection in Cardens Bottom Drainage District No. 2, Yell County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 221); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

601. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 24, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Queen Creek, Ariz., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 220); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

602. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving a decrease of $3,675,000 for the Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 219); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

603. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

604. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 2, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on Chagrin River, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1942; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 199. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2780, a bill to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 305). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALBERT: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2229. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3214. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; without amendment (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 174. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588); with amendments (Rept. No. 309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2353. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes: with amendment (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2455. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2573. A bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis; without amendment (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1237. A bill to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2616. A bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey; with amendments (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 966. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387); with amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1203. A bill to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters; with amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3208. A bill to permit the use of appropriations of the National Capital Housing Authority for the maintenance and operation of buildings and grounds used for nurseries and nursery schools established by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia within projects under the jurisdiction of such Authority; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3209. A bill for the relief of persons or their legal heirs or administrators against whom suits have been brought or assessments made by the Price Administrator under the provisions of section 205 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 23), and who have paid the United States Government treble penalty as provided therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3210. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3211. A bill to make unlawful certain acts in connection with picketing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3212. A bill to amend section 3360 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3213. A bill to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 3214. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3216. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the upper Susquehanna River watershed in New York and Pennsylvania for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3217. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3219. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3220. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by establishing a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3221. A bill to declare Parsees as persons of white race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3222. A bill relating to actions brought on behalf of the United States to enforce civil liability, under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, on account of overcharges in the sale of commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve the present granting of extensions of leases for a term to expire March 31, 1967, to the present lessees at the original rentals; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield, in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3223. A bill for the relief of John Arethas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3224. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and two children, namely, Paul Durante and Patsy Durante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Anna Pechnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3226. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Bates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

378. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, urging the enactment of S. 715, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

379. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Bronx Zionist region, Zionist Organization of America, New York, N. Y., urging immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We unite our hearts, O God, in this prayer that Thou wilt teach us how to trust in Thee as a Heavenly Father who loves us and who is concerned about what we do and what we are. Forgive us that there are times when we find it hard, when it ought to be so easy. It is not that we have no faith, but that we seem so reluctant to put our faith in Thee. Men have proved to be untrustworthy, yet we trust each other. Banks have failed, still we write our checks. Depressions have upset our economy, still we carry on business in faith. Blizzards have made the winter drear, yet with the coming of spring we plant our seeds. Hurricanes have screamed across the land, yet we build our windmills. Give to us the faith to put our trust in Thee who dost hold in the hollow of Thy hand all things living. May we learn, before we blunder, that Thou art willing to lead us, to show us what to do, and that it is possible for us to know Thy will and to be partners with Thee in doing what is right.

This we ask in the name of Christ, who never made a mistake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary may meet at 2 o'clock p. m. today in the District Committee room to vote on the nomination of Joe B. Dooley for United States judge for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR MINE SWEEPER TO PUGET SOUND NAVAL ACADEMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Puget Sound Naval Academy, of Winslow, Wash., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motor mine sweeper for use by that Academy in connection with the training of students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION AND OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the amount of personal exemptions on Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on April 25, 1947, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on April 25, 1947, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the economic structure of this country is now faced with inflationary tendencies similar to those which, after every war, have caused a drastic economic dislocation and depression; and

"Whereas the memory of the last economic depression still burns in our minds, during which period men and women were thrown into bankruptcy, homes were lost, farms given up, and millions of persons jobless and disheartened; and

"Whereas the fixed costs of Federal, State, and local governments cannot be substantially reduced; and

"Whereas countless persons in varied occupations throughout the Nation are finding it more and more difficult to balance their income with the ever-rising cost of living; and

"Whereas a continuing level of prosperity is a necessity if free democratic government is to be maintained and we are to avoid our past eras of despair; and

"Whereas many agencies of government which are concerned directly or indirectly with the fiscal-monetary functions, which influence the general price level, often work at cross purposes; and

"Whereas no constructive plan has been adopted by the Federal Government whereby another depression may be averted and the relationship between production and the prices received by primary producers stabilized: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That it is the opinion of this legislature that there should be an immediate and thorough examination and study by the Congress of the United States, through a special stabilization committee, of the reasons for the grave disparities that now exist and have existed to an even greater extent in other critical eras of our country's history in our price structure and that such committee report their findings, together with their recommendations for preserving a reasonable price balance at an early date to the Congress of the United States for proper action; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of Vermont's Senators and Representative in Congress; also to the Governors of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia.

"Approved April 24, 1947.

"ERNEST W. GIBSON,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, endorsing equal rights for women

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

"Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

"Whereas this Nation was 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,' and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex, and,

"Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their liveli-

hood, and is a source of irritation to many thousands of others who recognize this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women, which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor, and,

"Whereas there are today 985,000 more women than men in this country and women have served this country in time of war as well as in peace, equally well with men in every field of work: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the senate and house of representatives pass the following resolution and the amendment as follows:

" 'EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

" 'Equality or rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have the power within the respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification'; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of North Dakota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 217

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to taxation and expenditures

"Whereas for many years the Federal Government has heavily taxed the people of Rhode Island and the other States and has used the money among other things to build up a huge Federal bureacracy and to make grants to the States for local purposes; and

"Whereas this practice is wasteful and expensive; and

"Whereas this seizure by the Federal Government of the wealth of the people has made it difficult for the States and municipalities to raise the revenue needed for their operations, a difficulty which will increase as time goes on; and

"Whereas the wealth that is taxed by the Federal Government is within the boundaries of the 48 States and could be taxed directly by them and the revenue spent by them, and large sums saved thereby; and

"Whereas a continuance of this practice will eventually destroy the American system of government by an excessive concentration of power in the Federal Government and by rendering the States completely subservient to it; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is but a government of delegated powers, delegated by the people of the States, and the powers not delegated are reserved to the people of the States, so that historically the States are the masters and the Federal Government the servant: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is requested to limit the expenditures of the Federal Government to matters of purely national concern, and as a means to this end to appoint a commission to study the matter with a view to defining and restricting the activities of the Federal Government within such limits; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senate of the United States and to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution protesting the closing of the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.

"Whereas, it is proposed to close the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.; and

"Whereas there are employed at the arsenal more than 500 persons, of which 20 percent are disabled war veterans; and

"Whereas, this arsenal is now engaged in reclaiming substantial quantities of small-arms ammunition per month, extracting metals that would have a substantial salable return; and

"Whereas it is possible for the arsenal to show a 50-percent profit on any ammunition sent in for reclamation from anywhere in the United States; and

"Whereas, the closing of this arsenal will throw a large number of persons, including disabled war veterans, out of employment, and will deprive the United States of a profit from the operation of it: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature, That we protest against the closing of the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn., and urgently request that it be permitted to continue to operate; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"Adopted by the Senate, State of Minnesota, April 23, 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will permit the use of decommissioned hospital ships by State and city agencies

"Whereas there exists in the State of California, as well as in numerous other States throughout the Nation, an acute and critical deficiency of hospital facilities due to an ever-increasing influx of permanent residents from other areas, the return of thousands of veterans, and the necessary restrictions upon building and construction programs during the recent conflict; and

"Whereas the present need for adequate hospital facilities is urgent in many communities and the death toll among the aged, the sick, and the injured can only be alleviated by hospital building programs, which are hampered by and subject to a critical shortage of building materials; and

"Whereas several naval hospital ships are now being decommissioned and laid up as surplus and as inactive fleet units where they can serve no immediate useful purpose; and

"Whereas there is an immediate solution available for many coastal communities through the use of decommissioned naval hospital ships, whose facilities and equipment are far superior in every respect to many community hospitals: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect and enact legislation which will permit the temporary use of decommissioned naval hospital ships by local and State agencies during this critical period of deficiency in permanent hospital facilities, and until such time as permanent facilities can be constructed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Califorina."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to authorize conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State savings and loan or building and loan associations

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California was requested in 1935 to enact legislation authorizing the conversion of California building and loan associations into Federal savings and loan associations and in connection with such request it was stated at that time by those representing the Federal Government that provision would be made for converrion of Federal savings and loan associations to State savings and loan and building and loan associations; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, pursuant to such request, enacted chapter 163 of the Statutes of 1935 of the State of California and thereby added a new section, No. 12.11, to the Building and Loan Association Act providing for the conversion of California building and loan associations into Federal savings and loan associations; and

"Whereas the Federal authorities have repealed the regulation which purported to provide for conversion of Federal associations to State associations, and no provision has been made in the Federal statutes for such conversion; and

"Whereas operation under Federal or State charter ought to be a matter of choice, to be exercised by the parties concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact legislation to authorize conversion of any Federal savings and loan association into a State savings and loan or building and loan association upon a majority vote of the members of such association, at a legal meeting of such members, and that provision be made for such converted association to continue as an insured institution under title IV of the National Housing Act, with the right to issue shares and certificates in the form approved by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for issuance by similar State associations; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all Members of the Congress from the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 30

"Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove a convention between the United States of America and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946

"Whereas a convention was negotiated and signed April 2, 1946, with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes by joint action of governmental agencies of the United States and Canada; and

"Whereas as a means for achieving such objective the convention creates an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries; and

"Whereas if such convention becomes effective, Ohio and other States of the Union having responsibility and valuable interests

in such fisheries will lose jurisdiction over the same; and

"Whereas the inclusion of the waters of Lake Erie in the proposed international treaty delegates forever the sovereign rights of the United States and of the State of Ohio to an international governmental agency; and

"Whereas the interests of the State of Ohio in these waters and fisheries will best be served if the convention is not ratified; and

"Whereas the citizens of Ohio are very much opposed to the convention establishing an international authority over such fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Ohio senate respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention between the United States and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters signed at Washington, April 2, 1946; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, to each Ohio Member of said Senate and to the Governors of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois; and be it further

"Resolved, That the attorney general of Ohio be directed to inform appropriate Federal authorities of the desire of the State of Ohio to intervene before the appropriate senatorial committee in opposition to the treaty creating such international commission."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas the predatory animals within the national parks in the State of Washington, a natural breeding ground for such animals, are going outside of national park boundaries in the State of Washington and are causing great damage to livestock of farmers adjacent to such national parks; and

"Whereas the predatory animals in the national parks in the State of Washington also kill off many large game animals as well as birds, such as blue grouse and native partridge; and

"Whereas the predatory animal population is increasing in national parks at a rapid pace; and

"Whereas hunting of any kind is prohibited in national parks in the State of Washington by Federal regulation; and

"Whereas the State of Washington has no jurisdiction of such areas and no control over the situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That, we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be provided sufficient hunters to kill off and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wild cats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks within the State of Washington; or, set aside a small area within the national parks in the State of Washington as a complete game sanctuary and allow hunting in the remaining portions and provide adequate bounties to attract sufficient hunters to exterminate such predatory animals; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Vancouver, Wash., is one of the oldest cities of the western part of the United States having been established by the Hudson's Bay Co. in the year 1825, with Fort Vancouver thereafter becoming the center of all business, government, agriculture, commerce, education, culture, and civilization on the Pacific slope of these United States; and

"Whereas Vancouver Barracks, presently a United States military reservation located in Vancouver, Wash., contains the site of this historic landmark; and

"Whereas the restoration of old Fort Vancouver is now mandatory in order to preserve for present and future generations this shrine of early American history, ranking equally in historical importance with those already perpetuated by the Nation on the Atlantic coast of the United States; and

"Whereas the preservation of this historic shrine transcends local interest and concern and is of historic value and essence to each and every citizen of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the probable cost of the restoration of this landmark is beyond the financial means of local, State, and regional government and rightfully should be borne by all of the citizens of this Nation, they being jointly inheritors of the history and civilization here begun; and

"Whereas failure to keep and preserve for all time this historical site would constitute incalculable loss to all citizens of this Republic; and

"Whereas Vancouver Barracks is now surplus to needs of the War Department and is to be disposed of as surplus property, thereby making immediate and effective action imperative: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, that the following tracts within the present boundaries of Vancouver Barracks be forever set aside as a national monument under direction of the National Park Service:

"(1) That area south of what is known as Officers' Row to East Fifth Street and from the present eastern boundary of Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation to McLoughlin Road; and

"(2) That area within 200 feet of what is known as the first apple tree now enclosed within a chain fence; and

"(3) The building known as General Grant's quarters; and

"(4) The military cemetery; and be it further

"Resolved, That we do urge Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the immediate acquisition, research, and construction of buildings reproduced in detailed dimension and exactness to those previously constituting old Fort Vancouver; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and in those of all persons, corporations, groups, or agencies interested in the preservation for posterity of this their rightful heritage."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Concurrent Resolution 42

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has heretofore executed certain general leases covering water-front lands on the islands of Hawaii, said leases being for terms of 21 years and providing for the erection of improvements by the lessees, which improvements are to revert to the Territory at the termination of said leases; and

"Whereas the improvements erected under many of said leases were severely damaged during the tidal wave of April 1946, and the lessees have spent substantial sums in repairing or replacing the damage to said improvements caused by said tidal wave: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to approve the present granting of extensions of said leases for a term to expire March 31, 1967, to the present lessees at the original rentals reserved in said leases and without compliance with the provisions of the statutes requiring the sale of such leases at public auction; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 20

"To the Congress of the United States: Hon. Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; the Alaska Fish and Wildlife Service; and Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas expansion of Alaska's fishery is vitally important to the development of the Territory, and the Second Division in particular has a rich resource of many kinds of fish in the waters of Bering Sea that are awaiting commercial utilization; and

"Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service, upon request of the Alaska Development Board, recently instituted a preliminary investigation of the fishery possibilities of the Bering Sea in the Nome area, in connection with which A. W. Anderson, Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, and C. V. Carlson, fishery engineer, personally studied the situation and rendered a favorable report; and

"Whereas provisions of said report included a recommendation that a vessel be provided and equipped to carry out a complete survey of the premises and that the Delegate be asked to introduce a bill into Congress for the purpose of carrying out these recommendations.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that Congress take appropriate action for the purpose of carrying out such survey, commencing during the summer of 1947.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 22

"To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and Delegate from Alaska to Congress:

"Whereas every encouragement should be given to prospective settlers and investors

to settle in and to develop the natural resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas every cloud on title to lands should be removed without delay; and

"Whereas the question of Indian or aboriginal title constitutes such a cloud on title to lands desired by homesteaders, trade, and manufacturers, to pulp and paper investments; and

"Whereas economic and industrial progress and development of Alaska as a whole, and of the coastal areas in particular, are being retarded and hampered by the uncertainties of the Indian or aboriginal title controversy:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to investigate and settle equitably to all parties in interest the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 19

"To Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress approved a resolution introduced by Senator VANDENBERG, of the Senate Finance Committee, calling for the creation of an advisory committee to study the entire social-security program; and

"Whereas it would appear likely that the Eightieth Congress will consider the amendment of the present Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the Territorial and municipal employees of the Territory of Alaska do not now receive the benefits of the Social Security Act, nor do they have any system of retirement pay; and

"Whereas the benefit payments now provided for in the Social Security Act are low on a national basis and particularly low in the Territory of Alaska, where cost of living is high:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully request that the present Social Security Act be amended to include the Territorial and municipal employees of the Territory of Alaska under the provisions of the act, and further respectfully request that the Congress of the United States consider favorably our recommendation that the present benefit payments be liberalized and increased, particularly in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 19

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Delegate from Alaska, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Members of Congress from Delaware, Montana, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas Public Law 725 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, commonly referred to as the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, is designed to encourage the States and Territories to match funds with the Federal Government for increasing hospital facilities within their respective bounds; but

"Whereas the allotment clause of said act, based on apportionment according to population and other factors, unduly limits the funds available for the more thinly populated States and Territories and the smaller States in consideration of their need and ability to match funds: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Alaska Legislature, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully recommends that said act be amended by fixing a minimum of $250,000 for the States and Territories above mentioned with apportionment of the balance of the money according to the prescribed formula, as follows:

"'SEC. 624. Each State for which a State plan has been approved prior to or during the fiscal year shall be entitled, for such year, to an allotment of "$250,000, and the balance of such appropriation made to carry out the purposes of this act shall then be allotted to such States in a sum bearing the same ratio to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 621 for such year as the product of (a) the population of such State and (b) the square of its allotment percentage (as defined in section 631 (a)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all of the States.'"

"The proposed amending language is shown in the lines above quoted.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Joint Memorial 37

"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled, and the Secretary of War:

"Whereas continued military activity and construction in the vicinity of several cities in Alaska have resulted in an influx of hundreds of workers with their families; and

"Whereas the resultant increase of population is largely transitory and has contributed little to the revenues of such municipalities or the Territorial treasury and existing school facilities cannot be expanded sufficiently or new schools be constructed without financial assistance to accommodate the increase in the number of school children entitled to enrollment in the schools: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists pray that funds be appropriated by Congress of the United States from which grants may be made for the assistance of the Territorial school system or that the War Department be authorized to allot funds from its appropriations for this purpose.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

A resolution adopted by the executive board of the Free Sons of Israel, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2910, relating to the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., requesting that any legislation approved against communism and communistic organizations, as well as any measures derived from the investigation being conducted by the administration, be extended to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of members of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlo Vista, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to provide losses under the Federal cooperative insurance plan

"Whereas the Department of Agriculture of the Federal Government inaugurated a program, so-called crop insurance, designed to indemnify cotton and other farmers against loss; and

"Whereas, by personal solicitation by employees of this Department and by an urgent and continued selling campaign by mail, farmers were induced by the Government to buy this indemnity; and

"Whereas, having trust in their Government, large numbers of farmers did buy this insurance, paying therefor cash premiums with all assurance that the plan was sound and that they would be paid in case of loss; and

"Whereas it now develops that the money available to pay losses has been exhausted, and a very great number of farmers cannot collect the losses due them, thus hampering their operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina do memorialize the National Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to liquidate these honest obligations of a department of the Federal Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from South Carolina, and that they be requested to urge the necessary appropriations to pay this past-due indebtedness."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

"Concurrent resolution respectfully urging Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories

"Whereas our sister State of Indiana has shown the courage to declare against the unsound financial practice of so-called Federal aid, and the general assembly of said State has passed a concurrent resolution calling upon its Senators and Congressmen 'to vote to fetch its county courthouses and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue'; and

"Whereas the said State of Indiana has called upon the legislatures of her sister States to join with her in appealing to Congress for a cessation of this unsound political fiscal extravagance; and

"Whereas when a State legislature is confronted with a Federal-aid law, the legislature must either comply or forfeit money which has been or will be taken from the citizens of the State in taxes, the effect being virtual compulsion; and

"Whereas it is obvious that unless Federal aid is discontinued to all States, it will not be refused by any State; and

"Whereas the members of the Senate and House of Rrepresentatives of the Michigan Legislature agree with Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, when he said that, 'It is a fundamental truth that when a unit of government spends money that has not been raised locally through taxes, the inevitable result is irresponsibility and waste and it is old-fashioned common sense that best government is that which is closest to the people and their pocketbooks'; and

"Whereas our Nation is financially embarrassed to the amount of one-quarter of a trillion dollars and should divert so-called Federal aid toward reducing its indebtedness; and

"Whereas Michigan and most other States are in sound financial condition, able to handle their own fiscal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature joins forces with our neighboring State of Indiana in denouncing this practice of so-called matching dollars; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respectfully petition and urge Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the legislatures or assemblies of the 48 States, and to the Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress.

"Adopted by the senate March 13, 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 9, 1947."

By Mr. THYE:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and Congress to assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance of all indigent Indians, including those receiving social security assistance benefits, and who are members of and reside upon the Red Lake Indian Reservation of the State of Minnesota

"Whereas there has been steadily developing a serious problem with reference to public assistance to and for the benefit of the Indians on the closed reservation of the Red Lake tribe of Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas the Indian population is increasing at a relatively rapid rate, in that the population has more than doubled during the past 25 years on said reservation; and

"Whereas as citizens of the United States, the Indians are entitled to public assistance benefits on the same basis as all other citizens; and

"Whereas the Indians are not financially able to bear their fair share of cost of government; and

"Whereas neither the State nor the counties have taxable powers against personal property or real property on the Red Lake closed reservation, which reservation is located wholly within the boundaries of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota has for the past several years found it necessary to assume the greatest portion of the cost of maintaining indigent Indians on the Red Lake closed reservation; and

"Whereas the financial burden to the State of Minnesota and counties within which said reservation is located is becoming increasingly serious; and

"Whereas most Indians living on said closed reservation are not subject to the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the courts of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas for proper administration of the various public assistance programs it is essential that the persons receiving such public assistance be subject to the jurisdiction of such courts; and

"Whereas the financial responsibility toward said Indians, individually and collectively, is rightfully and justly a Federal problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring herein), That recognition be given this problem by the President and the Congress of the United States to the end that the United States Government assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance of all indigent Indians, including those receiving social security assistance benefits, who are members of and reside upon the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield in Renville County, Minn.

"Whereas on September 2 and 3, 1862, there was fought at Birch Coulee in Renville County a battle with the Indians of great historic importance, at which soldiers and pioneer citizens, heroically fighting against overwhelming odds, laid down their lives; and

"Whereas said battlefield has been set apart and designated as a State park and cemetery of the State of Minnesota by Laws 1929, chapter 75; and

"Whereas said battlefield, by reason of its unsurpassed natural beauty and advantageous location is eminently suitable for a national cemetery for soldier and sailor dead, and there is urgent need for such cemetery in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and hereby are requested to establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield, and to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the necessary ground therefor, including the ground already set apart as a State park and cemetery, or so much thereof as may be required; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that in case the Congress shall establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield the State of Minnesota will cede to the United States that part of said battlefield which has already been set apart as a State park and cemetery and will consent to the acquisition by the United States of such further ground as may be desired for a national cemetery; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, by the proper officers of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 324 citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MAINTENANCE OF 9-FOOT CHANNEL ON UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by board of directors of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring adequate funds for the maintenance and repair of the navigational structures and aids in the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi River.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am pleased to advise you that the board of directors of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce yesterday adopted the following resolution relative to maintenance appropriations for the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River.

"Whereas the ever-increasing tremendous tonnage of bulk commodities, principally fuel, both solid and liquid, being carried on the Mississippi River north of St. Louis, proves the economic necessity of a continued properly maintained 9-foot channel; and

"Whereas industry is daily finding river transportation an economical means of securing raw materials and shipping finished products; and

"Whereas in the past 6 years hundreds of thousands of tons of coal, millions of gallons of petroleum products and tremendous tonnage of grain and other products have moved to and from the Twin Cities area on the canalized upper Mississippi River; and

"Whereas major maintenance work on the structures of the 9-foot channel has been deferred due to the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas as a result of this deferred essential maintenance, a backlog of such work has been built up which will require a larger appropriation than that made prior to the war effort: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce urge the Congress of the United States to provide adequate funds as requested by the Corps of Engineers for the maintenance and repair of the navigational structures and aids in the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Minnesota congressional delegation and to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee."

Your assistance in accomplishing the objectives set forth in this resolution will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EMMETT SALISBURY,
President.

RESOLUTIONS OF FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, at its fifty-third annual meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., on January 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA,
New York, N. Y.

The following action was taken by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America at its fifty-third annual meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., on January 16, 1947:

"Recognizing the close bonds which have long existed between Korea and North America through the relations between Christians in these two countries: Be it

"Resolved—

"First, that the Foreign Missions Conference commend to its constituency an intelligent and active interest in the great cause of our Korean brethren who demand their long-promised liberty.

"Second, that we ask the Korea Committee to study and interpret to American Christians how best we can aid them in the quest for freedom while continuing its aid to Korean Christians struggling to rebuild their church that they may have a light to guide them in this quest.

"Third, that the Foreign Missions Conference go on record in support of Senate Resolution 152, introduced by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, which provides for a temporary quota of 100 immigrants per year from Korea with the privilege of their becoming citizens of the United States.

"Fourth, that we wish to record our opposition to all proposals which would have the effect of making more permanent the present division of Korea, especially the current proposals to set up a separate and independent Southern Korea. We are convinced that this action would result in the setting up of a separate Northern Korea and add greatly to the existing difficulties in the establishing of an independent, united Korean Nation.

"Fifth, that recognizing the importance of United States policy in regard to the Korean situation and to rectify in part the mistakes our Nation has made in this regard since 1905, we call upon the constituted authorities of the United States Government to propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the immediate, simultaneous evacuation by both American troops of southern Korea and by Russian troops of northern Korea, with the establishment simultaneously of a United Nations Plebiscite Commission which would proceed at the earliest possible date to hold an election to provide for free, democratic government. We urge this in the belief that only those men who are entrusted with their own political responsibility can develop the capacity to govern themselves."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 408. A bill to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 145).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2700. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 146).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States, the enrolled bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate, messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, vice James C. Wilson, retired;

Drake Watson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Harry C. Blanton, term expired; and

Benjamin Scott Whaley, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice Claud N. Sapp, deceased.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 1172, to make it a crime to receive money, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for advocating the overthrow of any government in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 1173, to prevent corrupt practices in connection with Federal elections, to prevent pernicious political activities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1174. A bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1175. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 107, limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 108, to prevent the dismantling of fertilizer plants in Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

PUNISHMENT FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit certain subversive activities; to amend certain provisions of law with respect to the admission and deportation of aliens," and so forth. The bill merely adds a fourth paragraph to the part of the act which deals with what constitutes unlawful activity against the United States. The bill simply adds the provision that it is unlawful for any person "to receive any money, pay, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for knowingly and willingly, advocating, abetting, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing any government in the United States."

It seems to me to be an unusual thing that it has never been made a crime in the United States for individuals who believe in communism and want to impose it upon us, to preach communism for pay, and be in the pay of the Communist Party, so-called, the main purpose of which is to subvert the Government of the United States. The provision of the bill I have introduced makes that unlawful, and subjects to a penalty one who is guilty of accepting pay for spreading propaganda subversive to our institutions and to any government in the United States.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1172) to make it a crime to receive money, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for advocating the overthrow of any government in the United States, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREVENTION OF DISMANTLING OF FERTILIZER PLANTS IN GERMANY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to prevent the destruction of any fertilizer plants in our zone of Germany. It is written along the same lines followed in the amendment proposed a few days ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], which was ruled out of order, and properly so, as being legislation on an appropriation bill. The Senator from Mississippi joins with me in the introduction of this measure today.

Mr. President, many of us from agricultural States have been struggling for months in an attempt to secure additional supplies of fertilizer for our farmers. Fertilizer is an absolute essential to the production of the maximum quantities of vital foods. We have suffered from a severe shortage of fertilizer this year, and many farmers have been unable to secure even half as much as they need. At the same time, tremendous quantities of nitrogen have been shipped abroad, and are being shipped abroad this year, not only to Germany, but to other countries of Europe and the world.

Now we are told by no less an authority than our former President, Herbert Hoover, that in Germany our occupation authorities are busy destroying the German fertilizer plants in that area. This policy has created a fertilizer shortage, not only in Germany, but in other countries of Europe which might have secured fertilizer from Germany, through operation of the plants that are being destroyed there.

Mr. President, that is the picture. We deliberately create a fertilizer shortage in Europe, then we deprive our own farmers of fertilizer in order to ship it to Europe to replace the product that should have come from plants we destroy. The American taxpayer pays for all this. Instead of letting the Germans produce and pay for their own fertilizer needs, we are furnishing fertilizer to them from our own meager supply.

Mr. President, I hope our Chief Executive and our occupation authorities will not wait for the enactment of this bill. They do not really need the authority contained in it, and they can reverse the present unwise policy immediately if they choose to do so. But in the meantime, Mr. President, I hope the committee will take prompt action and report the bill. Time is of the essence. If we delay too long with this legislation,

until after the German capacity is almost completely destroyed, we may have a fertilizer shortage which will last many years.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) to prevent the dismantling of fertilizer plants in Germany, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PURCHASES OF COTTON FOR EXPORT

Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. GEORGE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 108), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has requested bids on the sale to it of cotton for export; and

Whereas the terms under which such cotton is to be sold to it are such as to exclude the submission of bids by cotton vendors in many of the principal cotton export ports of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency which purchases cotton for export should purchase such cotton under terms which will enable cotton vendors in any port where as many as 2,000 bales are available for sale to bid for the sale of such cotton to the Government at said port.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FRONTIERS OF AVIATION LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Frontiers of Aviation Law," delivered by him at a dinner honoring Carl Rix, president of the American Bar Association, at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGAL CHALLENGES OF THE ATOMIC AGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Legal Challenges of the Atomic Age," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., April 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM OF THE CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALDWIN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the program of the Congress, delivered by Senator BALDWIN on April 25, 1947, before the Yale Engineering Association, at the Yale Club, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

"MAINE MOTHER OF 1947"

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement, several newspaper items and an editorial relating to the naming of Mrs. Alina Fisher Bridges, the mother of Senator BRIDGES, as "Maine Mother of 1947," which appear in the Appendix.]

FACTS ON AIR POWER—ADDRESS BY J. E. SCHAEFER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Facts on Air Power," delivered by J. E. Schaefer, vice president, Boeing Airplane Co., to the Wichita, Kans., Rotary Club, April 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INDIAN QUESTION—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TALBERT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the Indian question written by Ansel E. Talbert and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE—LETTER BY C. ANDRADE III

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter proposing a Supreme United States Defense Council, addressed to the President by C. Andrade III, of Dallas, Tex., which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Takes Momentous Step," discussing the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey, published in the Arkansas Democrat of April 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOOL DILEMMA—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wool Dilemma," from the Washington Post of April 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR VANDENBERG

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, occasionally all of us have what seem to be good impulses. Not always, however, do we follow them, and they pass into the realm of things left undone. At least I have that characteristic, Mr. President, and I am sure I am not alone. Today I propose to follow one of these good impulses.

A certain newspaper columnist and radio commentator has on more than one occasion used the facility of his pen and the biting sarcasm of his voice to ridicule and condemn Members of this body and other officials of Government. In return he has been most bitterly excoriated here in the Senate and elsewhere. But it is not of that I would speak today.

Last night I listened to Mr. Drew Pearson's radio broadcast. I was deeply impressed by his comments concerning the President pro tempore of this body, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I myself have wanted to pay some tribute to the Senator from Michigan for the magnificent work he has done in his strong support of his country and her foreign policy. Not alone in his support of our foreign policy has this contribution been invaluable, but in helping to shape and formulate a firm and just policy the Senator from Michigan has rendered a service to his country which cannot be minimized, and must be long remembered.

Mr. President, last evening, as I listened to the broadcast I have mentioned, there came what I call the good impulse to say these words. As a Senator, one of the opposite political party, but more as an American, I am glad to follow that impulse, and make this permanent record of an altogether inadequately expressed appreciation of one who I am convinced has risen above party politics, has waved aside personal ambition, and has unselfishly sought only his country's good and the peace and welfare of the world.

And now, Mr. President, I quote Mr. Pearson's tribute to the Senator in his broadcast last night:

Salute to a statesman: Tonight I want to welcome into the "Order of the Green Hat" a Senator who has done so much to make democracy live—a man who has been impartial in impatient times, who has shown integrity when some Senators showed insincerity, who has put the country's good before his own gain—ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. So to Senator VANDENBERG, who wears no man's collar and hides behind no man's hood, goes a green hat to wear on his head. Congratulations, Senator VANDENBERG.

EDWARD H. CRUMP, OF MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article on Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, Tenn. The article, which is entitled "The Last of the Big-Time Bosses," was written by John Gunther, and the copy I am presenting is taken from page 69, and the following of the Reader's Digest for May 1947.

While this article does not give all the facts about Mr. Crump, it is so much better than the articles usually printed about him in magazines that I want to make a record of it. I do not know Mr. Gunther. The article shows that he saw Mr. Crump for a short time only. If he had seen him longer, it would have been a stronger and better article.

Mr. Crump and I have been friends for more than 50 years. If my recollection is correct, I went to Memphis shortly before he did. I went from Alabama; he, from Mississippi. He belongs to a splendid family. His mother, who lived at Holly Springs, Miss., a short distance from Memphis, was one of the loveliest elderly ladies I ever knew or saw; one of the brightest, most sprightly, keenest-minded of women. She lived to be 95 years old. I saw her not a long while before she died, and she was then just as bright and attractive as ever. Mr. Crump's devotion to her was boundless, as was her devotion to him.

Almost from the day he arrived in Memphis Mr. Crump became popular. He first engaged in the buggy business; afterward, in the insurance business; and he has been very successful both in business and in every other way. He has remained popular and successful to this day. He was well educated. He is a gentleman in every sense of the word, who has enjoyed the finest standing and held the finest of positions. As a young man he was in demand socially, and he still enjoys wide popularity.

Soon after coming to Memphis, Mr. Crump married one of the most beautiful and popular and attractive young ladies in Memphis. Her maiden name was Bessie McLean. She was the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. McLean. Mr. McLean was a member of William R. Moore & Co., one of the best known and wealthiest business firms in Memphis. I was at Miss McLean's coming-out

party, and it was certainly a great success. She was not only beautiful and popular, but she was also well educated and gently reared. She was one of the brightest and most attractive young ladies to be found in Memphis or elsewhere. She is still lovely and attractive.

Mr. and Mrs. Crump had three worthy sons. One of them, John, the youngest, was killed in an airplane accident before the last war. The other two are today leading businessmen of Memphis of the highest standing. No family stands any higher or better in Memphis or in any other city than does the Crump family.

Mr. Crump's word is as good as his bond. He has made a great success in business. He has a brilliant mind and possesses one of the finest personalities I know. I endorse each and every one of the good things said about him by this interesting writer. I do not know the writer, but he certainly learned a great deal about Mr. Crump in the short interview he describes. Had he known Mr. Crump as long and as well as I have he could indeed have said much more in his praise.

No more public spirited man than Mr. Crump ever lived, and the things he has done for Memphis, for Shelby County, and for Tennessee are invaluable and outstanding. He was mayor of Memphis for many years and also was a Member of the National House of Representatives for several terms. I have no doubt he could have been Governor or Senator at any time he might have wanted to be. His life has brought many blessings to Memphis, to Shelby County, and to the State of Tennessee. He is one of the hardest-working men I know, one of the most charitable men I know, and one of the most honest men I have ever known in my life.

To illustrate, I recall that while I was ill in Memphis last fall he took the lead as he had done several times before in raising a fund for the blind, and my recollection is that under his leadership more than $80,000 was contributed, and all donated to this worthy charity.

He gives boat rides for the crippled children; he puts on drives for the disabled servicemen, and is active in almost every kind of good work and is always successful.

Mr. President, wanting nothing from any man, I take pleasure in lifting my voice in honor of one of the great men of the State of Tennessee, and one of the great men of our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LAST OF THE BIG-TIME BOSSES

(By John Gunther)

The case of E. H. ("Ed") Crump, of Memphis, is something tart and special. He is a political boss in the grand manner—the last of the great city bosses to function unimpaired in the United States.

Actually, Crump runs not only Memphis but the State of Tennessee. He controls 100,000 votes, 60,000 of them concentrated in Shelby County, of which Memphis is the county seat. Time and time again opposition candidates are well ahead until the Shelby ballots are counted, then are drowned by the great Crump vote.

Crump is 72—a tall, lean man, and, under a streaming mop of pure-white, cotton-wool hair, his round, red cheeks stand out like apples, and so does the round, red chin. He is a vegetarian and doesn't swear, drink, or smoke. He is president of E. H. Crump & Co., investment bankers, one of the most prosperous firms of its kind in the South. There has never been a whisper that the Crump company gains financially from its president's political position. But it is only natural that individuals in Memphis with real estate to sell or insurance to buy should favor the Crump firm.

After working in his youth as a Mississippi farmhand, Edward Hall Crump moved to Memphis at 17. Soon he organized the E. H. Crump Buggy & Harness Co., and then branched out into real estate. He was about 26 when he first went into politics; he was red-headed in those days and gained the nickname "The Red Snapper." He was elected to several minor municipal posts, and in 1909 became mayor of Memphis. His hold on the city has never slackened. He has taken part in 85 elections without a single defeat; he himself has run for office 23 different times and won each time.

Crump is vindictive if anybody really gets under his skin; the legislature once wrote specific legislation solely to embarrass a Crump enemy. Yet the great majority of citizens feel no threat to their liberties, civil or otherwise; there is no atmosphere of tension or reprisal. One of Crump's most consistent critics has been Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Crump writes fantastically vituperative letters to him, signed with a giant floriferous scrawl, but Meeman has never been personally threatened or interfered with.

But for Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, who led a poll-tax fight against him, Mr. Crump reserves his really sulphurous thunder. Crump delivered one such letter to Evans in January 1945 by messenger, in order to avoid possible violation of the postal laws, after causing it to be read in the legislature as "privileged" matter. He called Evans a man "with a foul mind and a wicked heart." He called Jennings Perry, then associate editor of the Tennessean and one of the most sincere liberals in the South, "unworthy, despicable, a venal and licentious scribbler with the brains of a quagga," who writes unintelligently on any subject "just as one would expect of a wanderoo." Of a third Tennessean victim, the political columnist Joe Hatcher, Crump said simply that he had "a low, filthy, diseased mind" full of "ululation."

Silliman Evans is a doughty character with no mean sense of humor. He simply printed on his front page Crump's full and unexpurgated text, under pictures of Crump, a "wanderoo" (a purple-faced monkey), and a "quagga," which is a kind of African wild donkey.

No one should think from this that old Mr. Crump is crazy, or that he is some type of monster. Actually, he is a man of considerable erudition and, when he wants to turn it on, is a man of persuasive, fresh, and engaging charm. Yet I didn't particularly want to meet him. I told a newspaper interviewer I didn't care how Crump bossed Memphis since the pattern is the same in most cities, but that I would be interested in what forces, if any, bossed the boss. The phone rang soon afterward. "So you want to know who bosses me!" Mr. Crump said, and laughed, and asked me to come right over. I hesitated and he went on, "Really, I don't think you can write about Tennessee without seeing me." We had a fascinating session.

But I didn't get a direct answer to my question. Instead, Mr. Crump gossiped and reminisced. When I asked about his organization he said, "Oh, we have friends all over the State," and murmered that he merely liked to "assist things"; that his only real interest was in building a good community. He added that his position was totally unlike that of the usual boss; he has never made a nickel out of it, and he only gives the newspapers "the deuce" occasionally because they don't have "the real interest of the people at heart."

Tennessee is not a white primary State, and Memphis has the largest proportionate Negro population of any southern city—41 percent. The Negro vote is consequently of considerable value and Crump has controlled it for years, absolutely.

Mr. Crump doesn't, I heard it said, "go in for rough stuff except in a nice way," but a lot depends on your definition of the word "rough." Suppose, like Edward W. Carmack in 1946, you are running against a Crump candidate. You will find obstacles, to put it mildly. For one thing, Mr. Crump will buy advertisements in most of the State's newspapers at considerable cost, in which he will call you anything from "donkey" to "vulture." You will find, as Mr. Carmack did, that no arena or other site in downtown Memphis is available for speech making, and that no printer will dare to make your campaign posters.

Beyond this Mr. Crump has other powers. He controls Federal and State patronage. State employees are expected, during a campaign, to contribute to the organization; and insurance agents, road contractors, liquor dealers, automobile agents, and so on, if they do business with Memphis or the State, also contribute—or else.

In a personal way Mr. Crump does things with real style. He donates boat rides to cripples and shut-ins, organizes possum hunts for the faithful, and gives a prodigious annual picnic at the fair grounds. At such affairs he tosses firecrackers to the children, under pennants and banners streaming with the words "Thank you, Mr. Crump."

Let no one doubt the efficacy of all this. In 1936 Gordon Browning, running for Governor with Crump's backing, won Shelby County by 60,000 votes. The two men fell out, and when Browning ran for reelection Crump opposed him. Browning lost the county by 60,000 votes.

Crump has given Memphis first-class government in some respects. The city has admirable public services cheap. There is no graft, no corruption; Crump has never taken a cent from the public treasury, nor will he permit anybody else to do so. Gambling is abolished and crime has been cut down; Memphis is one of the few big cities with no policy or numbers racket, and prostitutes have been driven out. What it amounts to is that Crump has "bribed" Memphis with good government at low cost.

It's the equivalent, more or less, of Mussolini's bribe in making the trains in Italy run on time. But at what cost to things much more important? Stanley Baldwin once wrote that dictatorship is like a giant beech tree—very fine to look at, but nothing grows underneath. Memphis has not really functioned as a democracy for more than a quarter of a century; a whole generation has grown up without fulfilling the simplest duty of citizenship, that of political choice.

EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL BY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a joint resolution dealing with the Presidential veto which has aroused some comment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46 was received, read the first

time by title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim, action, proceeding or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator anticipate any debate on the joint resolution relating to the President's veto?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is a matter which has occurred within the committee. It was proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], with an amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and was agreeable to me, so I anticipate making only a brief explanation of its contents.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely rise to express the hope that objection will not be made to the joint resolution. The measure, as introduced by the Senator from Maine, corrects and remedies the technical objection which was raised in the President's veto. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] amply takes care of that situation. I am sure all the members of the committee are satisfied not only with the joint resolution but with the procedure which is proposed, and I trust no objection will be made to its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand correctly, Mr. President, that the Senator now is proposing to permit the veto message to lie on the table, substitute the joint resolution for the original bill, and have the joint resolution passed. Is that the Senator's proposal?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the procedure which is contemplated.

The joint resolution which was read is identical with the original, with the exception that the proviso at the end is added, that nothing contained in the joint resolution shall be construed to authorize what no one in the committee or the Senate thought would be authorized. Some anonymous adviser in the White House or in the Department of Justice intimated the possibility of such a construction, so it was entirely agreeable to all of us to say that nothing herein contained is supposed to authorize the committee or its counsel to take certain action.

I find this extremely interesting historical fact, of which the Senate should be apprised: Approximately 20 years ago a similar situation arose, when the Senate, under the leadership of the late Senator Reed, of Missouri, brought action in the name of the United States in a Pennsylvania election case. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that it was not within the power of the committee or of the Senate to take such action under the law, whereupon Senator Reed introduced a resolution, which was solemnly adopted, giving to any committee the authority and power to bring action in the name of the United States at any time it thought appropriate.

This proposal affects that resolution in no way. I call the attention of the Senate to it because that resolution, for whatever good it is, is still on the books. The joint resolution here proposed affects that situation in no way, as it is simply confined to a limitation of the effect of the joint resolution which is now proposed. But it is a very interesting historical fact.

I myself have some qualms as to whether I should wish committees of the Senate to bring proceedings indiscriminately in the name of the United States, so I am not enthusiastic about the proposal; but I think the Senate should have in mind the existence of the resolution to which I have adverted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall not object to setting aside the unfinished business temporarily for this purpose. However, I shall certainly object to setting it aside for any purpose which will arouse considerable controversy.

At this time I wish to say that it is our hope that we may be able to finish the labor bill this week. If the procedure appears to be lagging—perhaps in any event—there will be a night session Wednesday evening. I hope very much that with the assistance of that session we may be able to complete the bill this week. However, it will not be possible to set it aside for any matters involving lengthy debate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on this matter so as to include in the RECORD a summary of the statutes which are involved and the content of them, together with the resolution to which I have referred and a statement dealing with the history of this matter, in order that the entire subject may be perfectly clear.

The specific statutes, from the operation of which Senate Joint Resolution 97 sought to exempt counsel for the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program are as follows:

Section 109 of the Criminal Code—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 18, section 198—which reads as follows:

Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or in any manner, or by any means, otherwise than in discharge of his proper official duties, shall aid or assist in the prosecution or support of any such claim, or receive any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any claim from any claimant against the United States, with intent to aid or assist, or in consideration of having aided or assisted, in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Section 113 of the Criminal Code—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 18, section 203—which reads as follows:

Whoever, being elected or appointed a Senator, Member of, or Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, shall, after his election or appointment and either before or after he has qualified, and during his continuance in office, or being the head of a department, or other officer or clerk in the employ of the United States, shall, directly or indirectly, receive, or agree to receive, any compensation whatever for any services rendered or to be rendered to any person, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, court martial, bureau, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission whatever, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years; and shall moreover thereafter be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the United States.

Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status.

Section 361 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 306—which reads as follows:

The officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, shall give all opinions and render all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law necessary to enable the President and heads of departments, and the heads of bureaus and other officers in the departments, to discharge their respective duties; and shall, on behalf of the United States, procure the proper evidence for, and conduct, prosecute, or defend all suits and proceedings in the Supreme Court and in the Court of Claims, in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested; and no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 312 of this title.

Section 365 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 314—which reads as follows:

No compensation shall be allowed to any person, besides the respective district attorneys and assistant district attorneys, for services as an attorney or counselor to the United States, or to any branch or department of the Government thereof, except in cases specially authorized by law, and then only on the certificate of the Attorney General that such services were actually rendered, and that the same could not be performed by the Attorney General, or Solicitor

General, or the officers of the Department of Justice, or by the district attorneys.

And section 366 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 315—which reads as follows:

Every attorney or counselor who is specially retained, under the authority of the Department of Justice, to assist in the trial of any case in which the Government is interested, shall receive a commission from the head of such department, as a special assistant to the Attorney General, or to some one of the district attorneys, or as a special attorney, as the nature of the appointment may require; and shall take the oath required by law to be taken by the district attorneys, and shall be subject to all the liabilities imposed upon them by law. Foreign counsel employed by the Attorney General in special cases shall not be required to take the oath required by this section.

No question is raised in the veto message with reference to the first two sections of the statutes quoted above, namely, section 109 and section 113 of the Criminal Code. Accordingly there is no occasion for a discussion of them at this time.

With respect to the three last above-quoted sections, namely, section 361, section 365, and section 366 of the Revised Statutes, the veto message of the President objects to their inclusion in Senate Joint Resolution 97 on the following grounds:

The exemptions with respect to sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes do not appear to be necessary in order to carry out the intent of the Congress. Of more importance, however, is the fact that the inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States.

I am confident that this was not the intention of the Congress and it is for this reason that I am withholding my approval of the legislation.

The legal effect ascribed in the veto message to the inclusion of sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes as laws from which counsel for the Senate committee are to be exempted by Senate Joint Resolution 97 is not, in my judgment, tenable as a matter of legal interpretation.

I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, April 23, 1947, on page 3830, a memorandum on this subject prepared, at my request, by the legislative counsel of the Senate, the last paragraph of which memorandum, dealing with the above-mentioned sections, reads as follows:

With respect to the suggestion in the veto message that inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States, such a construction would, to say the least, be a very strained construction and it is our opinion that no court would accept this novel theory of creating a new Department of Justice through a provision in a resolution applicable only to Senate committee counsel in which it is sought to exempt such counsel from the provisions which at least for their principal purpose apply to the executive departments only. We are confident that the dire consequences feared in the veto message are without foundation, particularly in view of the fact that it is apparent from the legislative record that this resolution was passed solely for the protection of counsel to the committee.

Section 361, which I read in full above, specifies the duties of officers of the Department of Justice in rendering legal services to the President, heads of departments, heads of bureaus, and other officers in the departments, and provides that no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 363 of the Revised Statutes, authorizing the Attorney General to employ special attorneys to assist district attorneys whenever, in his opinion, the public interest requires it.

The apparent reason for including exemption from section 361 in Public Law 298 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to counsel for the Special Petroleum Committee of the Senate, and in Public Law 257 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, relating to counsel for the Joint Pearl Harbor Committee, as well as Senate Joint Resolution 97 of the Eightieth Congress, seems to be that certain broad language is contained in section 361, which the sponsors of these resolutions thought might be applicable to a Senate committee. The broad phrase in question, in which such a Senate committee or the members thereof might be included is as follows: "proceedings in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested."

The theory, on which is based the exemption of Senate committee counsel from the provisions of section 361, seems to be that it was feared that Section 361 might mean that the Department of Justice and its officers were required to represent all agencies of the United States Government, including the Congress, and, therefore, unless counsel appointed by a Senate committee were exempted from the provisions of this section, if he accepted an appointment by a Senate committee without becoming an officer of the Department of Justice, he would be subject to the prohibition that no fees should be paid to him for rendering services which section 361, under such an interpretation, required the officers of the Department of Justice to perform.

In my own judgment, it would be a strained interpretation of the law for a court to construe section 361 as including congressional committees within the phrase I have quoted above and could, therefore, be served only by officers of the Department of Justice. I think it is clear that the philosophy of our government of separated powers contemplates that the Congress should have the right to appoint its own agents and not be required to accept legal services from a coordinate branch of the Government—namely, the Department of Justice of the executive branch of the Government. The entire act of June 22, 1870, of which the three sections here under discussion are a part, relates to the Department of Justice, and I do not think it was in the minds of the Congress that it should be required to rely upon officers of the Department of Justice for legal services in connection with the discharge of the investigative and other legislative functions of the Congress. The relationship of attorney and client is peculiarly one of high trust and confidence, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Congress, fully aware of its independent responsibility to the people, never intended to divest itself of the power to appoint its own agents, and, particularly, its own attorneys and counselors.

Notwithstanding, my interpretation of section 361, I cannot say, categorically, that it is unreasonable for an attorney to interpret that section otherwise, and to fear that the above-quoted section 361 might be so interpreted as to prevent the payment of fees by a Senate committee to an attorney who had rendered services on its behalf, if section 361 should be raised in some proceeding as a bar to such payment.

In my judgment, the fear that this untoward result would occur was not well founded, but I am unwilling to say that its inclusion as an exempted provision of the statutes was improper in the interest of anticipating and protecting against all adverse results by one who contemplated becoming counsel to a Senate committee.

Apparently, my interpretation was also the view of the author of the paragraphs I have quoted from the President's veto message, since it is there said that exemptions from the three sections mentioned "do not appear to be necessary in order to carry out the intent of the Congress."

Section 365 prohibits compensation to any person other than district attorneys for legal services "to the United States or any branch or department of the Government thereof" with certain exceptions.

This broad language would seem to justify an opinion that the Senate of the United States or one of its committees might be included as a branch of the Government of the United States, and is much clearer than the language referred to in the discussion of section 361 above. I am unwilling to say that an attorney who feared, because of the broad language above quoted, that he might be prevented from obtaining compensation for services rendered to a Senate committee was acting unreasonably or that the inclusion of exemption from this section was unnecessary.

Section 366 requiries a specially retained attorney to be commissioned by the Attorney General as a special assistant, to take the oath required of District attorneys and be subject to liabilities imposed by law upon District attorneys. Again I say, while it is clear in my mind that this section is designed to apply only to attorneys employed by the Department of Justice, I am unwilling to characterize as unreasonable a legal interpretation holding that this section might be applicable to Senate committee counsel.

In support of the view that the inclusion of section 361, 365, and 366 is proper,

I quote a paragraph from the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 25, 1944, with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 122 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, exempting counsel for the Senate Petroleum Committee from the operation of the same laws referred to in Senate Joint Resolution 97 of the Eightieth Congress. This paragraph reads as follows:

> Sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes provide that no fee shall be allowed or paid to any attorney or counselor for any service which is required to be rendered of officers of the Department of Justice, and also provides in effect that the Department of Justice shall have control over the naming of Government counsel. It is probably doubtful that these latter sections of the Revised Statutes would be applicable in this matter. However, following the precedents established in other cases, it is advisable to have the exemption proposed in the joint resolution apply to these sections also.

If the three above-mentioned sections—361, 365, and 366—do not apply to Senate committee counsel, their inclusion as exemptions in Senate Joint Resolution 97 and its similar preceding statutes could be nothing more than surplusage. Mentioning these sections specifically in Senate Joint Resolution 97 and preceding similar statutes merely confirms and makes clear what already was the law. If these sections should be construed to apply to Senate committee counsel then their inclusion as exemptions were necessary and proper to maintain the independence of the Senate by avoiding a situation where Senate committee counsel would be responsible to and subject to the control of the Attorney General rather than the Senate.

I am wholly unable to follow the reasoning in the President's veto message contained in the following sentence: "Of more importance, however, is the fact that the inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States."

That the sole purpose of the legislation is to exempt committee counsel from certain provisions of law is apparent on the face of Senate Joint Resolution 97 and its predecessors. I have sought to discover what reasoning known to the science of jurisprudence could have led the author of the above-quoted phrase to conclude that the Congress was divesting the Department of Justice of authority to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States, and vesting that authority in counsel for a Senate committee. Nowhere in Senate Joint Resolution 97 is any authority conferred upon committee counsel. It is merely provided that certain restrictions, thought to apply to committee counsel, shall not be operative with respect to such counsel in carrying out duties conferred by reason of wholly different powers of the Congress. I cannot do otherwise than conclude that the legal reasoning expressed in the above-quoted passage of the veto message is tortured and unsound, and I doubt that any such theory would be accepted by any court.

I say, as the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 97, that there was no intention in my mind to accomplish any such result as the above-quoted passages from the veto message suggest, and I am confident that no other Member of the Congress, either with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 97 or with respect to its predecessors in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, had any such thought in mind.

The Attorney General has admitted that the veto message was clearly erroneous in stating that the inclusion of sections 361, 365, and 366 was novel after it appeared that the President, himself, had signed a joint resolution in December 1945 calling for exemption of counsel for the Pearl Harbor Committee in identical phraseology with that contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97. We have been informed that Mr. Clark Clifford, legal adviser to the President, disclaimed all responsibility for the legal reasoning contained in the veto message. In fact, we have not yet been told what official or employee in the executive department is responsible for this unusual legal opinion. Many able constitutional lawyers, including some distinguished Members of this body from the other side of the aisle, have disclaimed any association with this legal reasoning. We have been told from sources usually considered authoritative at the White House that the veto message was a mistake; that frequently these procedural matters were handled by subordinates; and that the individual who handled this matter ought to be sent back to law school.

Mr. President, I have full appreciation of the numerous and important duties resting upon the President of the United States and am fully aware that no human being could personally give close attention to all of them and while things are and must be done in the name of the President, it is perfectly obvious that he must rely upon subordinates for a great deal of the detail for actions taken in his name. Yet, Mr. President, the exercise of the veto power with respect to measures solemnly adopted by the representatives of the people should be exercised with extreme care and caution. Particularly is this care important when the Chief Executive is a member of one political party and the Congress is controlled by a majority of members of the opposite party.

We have heard expressions indicating a desire on the part of both the Congress and the Executive to work in harmony in solving the many important problems facing the country during the session of the Eightieth Congress. I am especially impressed with the necessity for such harmonious action. The veto of Senate Joint Resolution 97 is the first veto exercised by the President with respect to the Eightieth Congress. Under these circumstances, it appears to me that, important as it is in all cases that the veto power be exercised only after careful scrutiny and consideration of the facts and the law, it was of far greater importance under the special circumstances surrounding this particular joint resolution.

Therefore, surprising as it was that the President should veto this measure in the first place, it was even more surprising, in the light of the statements emanating from the White House and from Democratic Party leaders in the Senate, that the President should have reaffirmed his intention to veto the measure and thus endorse anew a legal theory which had been rejected by competent lawyers, including members of his own party.

Mr. President, I have reviewed these matters so that they may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relating to the action which we may take with respect to the adoption of a resolution achieving the objectives sought to be accomplished in Senate Joint Resolution 97. On principle, I would be inclined to say that there is no occasion for the Congress to admit that it has erred in adopting Senate Joint Resolution 97. I do not think the Congress should be called upon to confess a mistake simply to avoid possible embarrassment to the Executive. Nevertheless, we are told that if the Congress should seek to call up Senate Joint Resolution 97 from the table to pass it over the President's veto, the members of the opposition party would treat such a proposal as a party issue and muster sufficient support of the position taken by the President to defeat any effort to override the veto. Although not agreeing with the propriety of this decision on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I can understand it. I realize that it confronts the Senate with a practical problem and a choice between an extended controversy over this particular issue on the one hand and the desirability of organizing the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program so that it may proceed with the investigation of a very important subject as promptly as possible.

It seems to me clear that the Members of the Congress, including members of both parties, were not in error in enacting this legislation with those two precedents in mind. On the other hand, I do not consider this issue, which is of a procedural nature, of as great importance as expediting the committee's investigation of the procurement of petroleum products by the Navy Department from certain American oil companies operating in and near Saudi Arabia.

I, therefore, shall offer a substitute resolution which has been considered by the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, of which I am chairman, which would make clear that the Congress did not intend in Senate Joint Resolution 97 to accomplish the unfortunate result suggested in the President's veto message. The substitute resolution was drafted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. MCGRATH] and is the same as the language in Senate Joint Resolution 97, except that there has been added at the end of the language contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97 a proviso which reads as follows:

> *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim,

action, proceeding or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

The purpose of this proviso is to make clear that the Congress does not intend the possibility mentioned in the President's veto message—namely, that counsel for the Senate committee might, by reason of the inclusion of exemptions from sections 361, 365, and 366 be said to have become vested with authority to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States. This language does not in any way limit counsel for the Senate committee from performing their full duties as counsel and attorneys for the Senate committee in accordance with the laws and the practices of the past, but does make it clear that the Congress does not intend to vest in such counsel the authority heretofore conferred on the Department of Justice and its officers.

The entire resolution which I now offer reads as follows:

Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim, action, proceeding, or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

To complete this discussion I must call attention to Senate Resolution 262 of the Seventieth Congress, first session, agreed to May 29, 1928, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter any committee of the Senate is hereby authorized to bring suit on behalf of and in the name of the United States in any court of competent jurisdiction if the committee is of the opinion that the suit is necessary to the adequate performance of the powers vested in it or the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, resolution of the Senate, or other law. Such suit may be brought and prosecuted to final determination irrespective of whether or not the Senate is in session at the time the suit is brought or thereafter. The committee may be represented in the suit either by such attorneys as it may designate or by such officers of the Department of Justice as the Attorney General may designate upon the request of the committee. No expenditures shall be made in connection with any such suit in excess of the amount of funds available to the said committee. As used in this resolution, the term committee means any standing or special committee of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or the Senate members of any joint committee.

The background of that resolution is this. In 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to make investigation of means used to influence the nomination of candidates for the Senate. The resolution contained the usual language giving powers to Senate investigating committees. Representatives of the committee had demanded ballot boxes used in connection with the election in Delaware County, Pa. Upon refusal of county authorities to give up the ballot boxes, the committee filed suit in Federal court to obtain possession of them. The case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States—*Reed* v. *County Commissioners*, 277 United States Reports 376—where it was held that the plaintiffs were not authorized by law to sue within the meaning of section 24 of the Judicial Code defining jurisdiction of the district court. The Court said that even if it be assumed that the Senate alone may give that authority, the committee had not been so authorized by its basic resolutions. Thereupon Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, the chairman of the special committee, introduced Senate Resolution 262, Seventieth Congress, quoted above, expressing it as his opinion that it would meet the requirements of the decision of the Supreme Court. The Senate passed the resolution with no extended debate. So far as I am advised, the resolution has not been repealed, amended, modified, cited, or resorted to.

Naturally in the light of action by the Senate to give all its committees authority to go to the courts if that be necessary to the adequate performance of the powers vested in it or the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, resolution of the Senate, or other law, it should be pointed out that the resolution that has been proposed here today would have no effect upon Senate Resolution 262 of the Seventieth Congress. The Senate was careful to declare in that resolution that its committees might be represented by such attorneys as they may designat or by officers of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General. But the Senate was obviously clear in its view that its committees were not dependent upon the Department of Justice for counsel even to initiate litigation, in matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107), limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 107 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the motion subject to immediate consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is merely entered for future consideration. That is the Chair's understanding of the purpose of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; namely, to have the motion taken up at a later date.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, let me inquire when the motion is to be considered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the joint resolution was passed earlier today. It relates to the employment of counsel for the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. McGRATH. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Michigan is giving notice of a motion to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; I have entered a motion to reconsider. The motion will be taken up later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the motion now goes on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is equivalent to going on the calendar. It goes on the calendar under the heading "Motions to Reconsider."

Mr. LUCAS. May the motion be taken up at any time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It may be taken up as the result of the adoption of a motion to have the Senate take it up; and such a motion may be made whenever any Senator wishes to make it.

Mr. LUCAS. How long a time must elapse?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion can be made at any time, up until the end of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. For instance, could such a motion be made 30 minutes from now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; it is entirely in the hands of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Would the matter be entirely in the hands of a majority of the Senate, or would not the unfinished business first have to be set aside, by action of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair's statement of the parliamentary situation was based on the theory that a majority of the Senate could vote to set aside the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. But a majority of the Senate would first have to set aside the unfinished business; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OF ACTS RELATING TO CORRUPT PRACTICES AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before proceeding with the discussion of the pending measure, I should like to take a few minutes to present a statement pertaining to a bill which I ask unanimous consent to introduce.

The bill which I am introducing today, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator

from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and myself, dealing with corrupt practices in elections and political activities is designed to replace the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act. It repeals those acts and embodies the subject matter, with substantial revisions, in one piece of legislation. The bill is for the most part based upon the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, filed January 31, 1947—Senate Report No. 1, part 2.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one point which I should like to have the Senator make clear, because there has been a great deal of discussion to the effect that the various acts to which he has referred ought to be repealed entirely.

I am somewhat familiar with the proposal which the Senator submits. I should like to know whether his bill is destructive of those acts, or whether it is a constructive measure designed to plug some of the loopholes and make our present election laws stronger.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the bill is to plug many loopholes and make our election laws stronger. It does not seek to repeal the Hatch Act or the act passed in 1925, but to make them stronger and more rugged.

It came to my attention as chairman of that committee—and this feeling is shared by committee members joining me in sponsoring this bill—that the present statutes dealing with elections, campaign expenditures and contributions, and limitations thereon, are utterly inadequate and unrealistic and as now in force do not begin to accomplish the purposes for which they were enacted. It was for this reason that the committee, in the report referred to, recommended that new and comprehensive legislation covering the subject matter included in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act be introduced in the Eightieth Congress. This bill is the response to that recommendation.

I want to summarize the principal features of the bill and in addition ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a memorandum which I have had prepared giving a detailed explanation of the bill and a brief discussion of legal questions involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Now for a brief statement of the more important changes made by the proposed bill:

First. The bill redefines the term "election" now contained in the Corrupt Practices Act to include a primary election or a convention of a political party as well as the general election. The present exemption of primary elections and party conventions from the Corrupt Practices Act grew out of the doubt created by the *Newberry case* (256 U. S. 232) on the power of Congress to extend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primaries and conventions. The Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)—which, by the way, originated in my State—has now clearly upheld such congressional power, and unless the law is so extended the purpose of Congress to deal with campaign contributions and expenditures cannot be effectuated, because in many States where one political party dominates, the real contest is the contest for the party nomination.

Second. The present definition of "political committee" contained in the Corrupt Practices Act is inadequate. To begin with, the definition, which purports to exempt unaffiliated committees which do not operate in two or more States, was largely based on the theory that Federal power to deal with this subject must be based on the commerce clause. This is erroneous. The legal jurisdiction to regulate attaches whenever a political committee seeks to influence election of Federal officials whether in one State only or in two or more States. It is the office concerning which the election is influenced which gives the power, not the character of the political committee's operations. Accordingly, the definition has been changed to eliminate the restriction to interstate operations and in addition is broadened by making it apply where contributions are accepted or expenditures made for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the election of candidates.

Third. Perhaps the most criticized feature of existing law is the provision in the Hatch Act which limits contributions to and expenditures by national political committees to an aggregate of not more than $3,000,000 in any calendar year. This provision has utterly failed in its purpose. It does not limit over-all expenditures because the responsibility for raising and expending funds has been decentralized into innumerable State and local committees to the entire confusion of the public and the defeat of publicity features of the law. This situation is a racketeer's paradise. Equally ineffective is the provision in the Hatch Act which makes it unlawful for individuals to contribute more than $5,000 during any calendar year or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, in the case of Federal offices. The Senatorial Campaign Committee felt that it was in the interest of effective regulation to encourage official national party committees to reassume principal responsibility in campaign financing. The first step is to abolish the $3,000,000 limitation on committees and the $5,000 limitation on individual contributions. The second is to require publication of national committee contributions and expenditures in two or more leading newspapers in each State and make it the duty of the congressional committees to publish the name and address of, and amount contributed by, every contributor of $5,000 or more, in lieu of the unrealistic ceiling limitations in existing law.

Fourth. Closely paralleling the matter to which reference has just been made are the provisions of the bill revising upward ceiling limitations heretofore placed upon candidates for Senator and the House of Representatives.

Section 309 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 provides in part that "unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as a maximum limit of campaign expenditures," a candidate may expend in the alternative, first, up to $10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or up to $2,500 if a candidate for the House of Representatives; or second, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $5,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

As stated in the committee report referred to above:

> This formula in the 1925 act dates from an even earlier period. In view of an extensive rise in the national price level and consequent decline in dollar value, and in view of total population growth, coupled with major population shifts, the legitimate costs of campaigning in many districts have obviously increased. Ceiling limitations governing contributions to and expenditures by candidates should be raised to correspond to the existing higher price level.

Accordingly, the bill proposes the following ceiling limitation for candidates:

> The revised ceilings are (1) $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $6,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or (2) an amount obtained by multiplying 5 cents by the total number of votes cast either at the last general election or the last primary election, for the office which the candidate seeks or the total number of votes cast within the State or district for all candidates for any office at the last general election or at the last primary election where candidates for governor were being voted for (whichever of the foregoing is the highest), but in no event exceeding $50,000 if a candidate for Senator or $12,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised draft retains the further limitation in existing law that a candidate shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate. Attention is called to the fact that the revised formula based on the number of votes cast recognizes the situation in many States where the number of votes cast in the primary or even in a gubernatorial election greatly exceed those cast in the general election.

Fifth. Another substantial change made by the bill is the extension of the prohibition upon contributions to include a prohibition upon expenditures by a corporation, national bank, or labor organization in connection with any Federal election.

I may state, Mr. President, that our committee last year found that many corporations and some labor organizations had spent thousands of dollars in Federal elections, but we could not force them to report for the reason that the money expended was not considered as contributions. So this bill requires any money spent to be reported by whoever makes the expenditure.

Experience has shown that some corporations and labor unions have spent money directly on behalf of a party or candidate and thus evaded the applica-

tion of the prohibition upon contributions. Extension of the prohibition to include a prohibition upon expenditures will plug that loophole. It will be noted that the extension of section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act to include contributions by labor organizations was brought about by the War Labor Disputes Act. This extension will expire June 30, 1947, under the terms of that act, and the effect of including it in this bill will be to make that provision permanent.

I believe that about summarizes the principal features of the bill introduced by me, and, together with the memorandum containing the detailed explanation to which I referred should enable Senators to reach a clear understanding of the bill. It is my hope and belief that Congress will take prompt action on this needed revision of this all-important Federal legislation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1173) to prevent corrupt practices in connection with Federal elections, to prevent pernicious political activities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MAYBANK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXHIBIT A

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED BILL TO REPLACE THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT AND THE HATCH ACT

This bill would repeal the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act, as well as the so-called Powers Act relative to publishing or distributing political statements, and would replace them with one act embodying the subject matter of these acts with certain revisions.

The new act would be known as the Federal Corrupt Practices and Pernicious Political Activities Act of 1947.

The draft is based in the main upon the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, filed January 31, 1947, Senate Report No. 1, part 2.

A detailed explanation of the bill follows:

TITLE I. CORRUPT PRACTICES

Section 101 is identical with present section 303 of the Corrupt Practices Act relating to the duties of the chairman and treasurer of a political committee.

Section 102 is identical with present section 304 of the Corrupt Practices Act requiring accounts of contributions received.

Section 103 is in substance the matter now contained in section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Subsection (a) of section 305 requires the filing of certain information on a certain number of days preceding the date on which "a general election is to be held at which candidates are to be elected in two or more States." This provision is changed by deleting the word "general," and also by changing "in two or more States" to "in any State in which such committee accepted a contribution or made an expenditure during the calendar year." These changes are made necessary by the broadening of the term "election" (post) to cover primaries.

The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives is made the depository instead of the Clerk of the House as in existing law.

One of the filing dates, January 1, is changed to January 7.

A new subsection is added requiring in Presidential years, publication by national committees of contributions and expenditures in two newspapers of general circulation in each State in which contributions were received or expenditures made.

Section 104: This section corresponds to section 306 of the Corrupt Practices Act. The latter section now requires the filing of certain information by persons (other than committees) who make expenditures (other than contributions to political committees) of more than $50 for the purpose of influencing in two or more States the election of candidates for election to the Senate or House.

In the bill the $50 figure is increased to $100, and the "two or more States" requirement is eliminated. The provision is also broadened to cover nomination and election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

Section 105 is substantially the same as section 307 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which requires the filing of statements by candidates for Senator or Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner. The depository for the Senate is made the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration instead of the Secretary of the Senate as in existing law. Certain clerical changes are made because of the application of the bill to primaries.

Section 106 is in substance the same as section 308 of the Corrupt Practices Act which outlines the formalities in connection with filing of reports. Under the present law the statements are "open to public inspection."

The bill provides that they shall be open to public inspection under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

Section 107 provides that the House Committee on House Administration and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall perform the functions now performed by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, as heretofore noted, and shall act jointly in providing for publicity and uniform methods and forms for the making of reports. There is a specific requirement that there be published the name and address of, and the amount contributed by, every contributor shown to have contributed the sum of $5,000 or more.

Section 108 is a revision of present section 309 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which fixes limitations on the amount of expenditures by candidates. The existing ceilings on amounts which may be expended by candidates are (1) $10,000 in the case of a candidate for Senator or $2,500 in the case of a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or (2) an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, with a limitation of $25,000 upon a candidate for Senator and $5,000 upon a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised ceilings are (1) $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $6,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or (2) an amount obtained by multiplying 5 cents by the total number of votes cast either at the last general election or the last primary election for the office which the candidate seeks or the total number of votes cast within the State or district for all candidates for any office at the last general election or at the last primary election where candidates for governor were being voted for (whichever of the foregoing is the highest), but in no event exceeding $50,000 if a candidate for Senator or $12,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised draft contains the further limitation in existing law that a candidate shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate.

Section 109 is section 310 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting promises or pledges by candidates with respect to political appointments.

Section 110 is the present section 311 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting payments to influence voting.

Section 111 reenacts the amendment to section 118 of the Penal Code embodied in section 312 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting solicitation or receipt of political contributions by Senators or Congressmen and other public officers.

Section 112 in effect amends section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act relating to contributions by national banks, corporations, and labor organizations so as to apply as well to expenditures by these banks, corporations, and organizations. It is noted that the extension of section 313 to include "contributions" by labor organizations was brought about by the War Labor Disputes Act (section 9 of Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress). This extension will expire June 30, 1947, under the terms of the War Labor Disputes Act, and the effect of including it in this Act will be to make that provision permanent.

Section 113 is new. It penalizes collecting money for campaign purposes and then pocketing it, and makes the failure to file required reports prima facie evidence of violation of this section.

Section 114 is section 314 of the Corrupt Practices Act prescribing general penalties for violations.

Section 115 is section 315 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which provides that the act shall not affect the right to make expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

Section 116 is section 316 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which provides that State laws are not to be affected unless directly inconsistent with the provisions of the act.

Provisions covering definitions, separability, and repeals, now contained in the Corrupt Practices Act, are transposed to title III, miscellaneous.

TITLE II. PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Section 201 is section 1 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting intimidation and coercion of voters, changed to conform to extension of the application of the law to primaries.

Section 202 is identical with section 2 of the Hatch Act, which makes it unlawful for administrative employees of the United States or any State (in connection with activities financed by the United States) to use their official authority to influence elections.

Section 203 is identical with section 3 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits promises of Federal employment, compensation, or other benefit as a reward for political activity.

Section 204 is section 4 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting deprivation of employment, compensation, or other benefit on account of race, creed, color, or political activity.

Section 205 is section 5 of the Hatch Act, which makes it unlawful to solicit or receive assessments or contributions from persons receiving compensation, employment, or other benefits under acts of Congress appropriating funds for relief.

Section 206 is section 6 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the furnishing of lists of benefit recipients to persons engaged in political activities.

Section 207 is section 7 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the use of appropriations for the purpose of coercing voters.

Section 208 is section 8 of the Hatch Act, which prescribes penalties for violation of the foregoing provisions of the title.

Section 209 is section 9 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the use of official authority by executive employees for political purposes; but there is omitted a temporary provision excepting employees on part time serving in connection with the existing war effort.

Section 210 is section 9A of the Hatch Act, making it unlawful for Federal employees to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government.

Section 211 is section 12 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting employees of State or local agencies financed by loans or grants from the United States from using official authority to influence elections and providing for investigations by the Civil Service Commission, for removal of employees in violation, and for withholding grants from States.

Section 212 is derived from section 13 of the Hatch Act but omits subsections (a), (b), and (e) of that section which made it unlawful for individuals to contribute more than $5,000 during any calendar year or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office, or to or on behalf of any committee. The matter retained prohibits the purchase of goods or commodities where the proceeds directly or indirectly benefit a candidate for an elective Federal office or a political organization.

Section 213 is section 14 of the Hatch Act, providing that District of Columbia employees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purpose of this title, but excepting the Commissioners and the Recorder of Deeds from prohibitions against taking part in political campaigns.

Section 214 is section 15 of the Hatch Act, which provides that activities prohibited on the part of civil-service employees are prohibited on the part of other Government and State employees covered by this title.

Section 215 is section 16 of the Hatch Act, authorizing the Civil Service Commission to issue regulations permitting persons in localities where the majority of voters are Government employees and voters in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in Maryland and Virginia to take part in political campaigns.

Section 216 is section 18 of the Hatch Act, which excepts elections not specifically identified with national or State issues or political parties.

Section 217 is section 21 of the Hatch Act, which excepts activities of employees of State educational and research institutions, or any recognized religious, philanthropic, or cultural organization.

Section 218 is section 5 of Public Law 753, Seventy-sixth Congress, which amended the Hatch Act in many respects but did not embody section 5 in the Hatch Act itself. The section prohibits persons or firms negotiating for or performing Government contracts from making political contributions.

Section 219 is in substance the matter contained in the Powers Act which requires political publicity material to contain the name of the person responsible for publication and distribution. Section 3 of the Powers Act is deleted inasmuch as similar definitions of "elections" and "candidate" appear in Title III, Miscellaneous. (Public Law 544, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 914.)

The following sections of the Hatch Act have been omitted:

Section 10, providing that that act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law. It would not seem to be appropriate here.

Section 11, separability clause, now found in Title III, Miscellaneous.

Subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 13, being the $5,000 ceiling provision on contributions referred to above under section 212.

Section 17, which was a transition provision, referring to State candidates who were running at the time certain provisions were enacted.

Section 19, defining "State," which is now covered in Title III, Miscellaneous.

Section 20, which made it unlawful for political committee to receive contributions or make expenditures aggregating more than $3,000,000 during any calendar year.

Sections 22 to 25, inclusive, which are the prohibitions against the furnishing of political propaganda to members of the armed forces, added to the Hatch Act by the Soldiers' Voting Act of April 1, 1944, and which in any event will expire June 30, 1947.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301 (a) would broaden the definition of "election" now contained in section 302 (a) of the Corrupt Practices Act so as to cover primaries and nominating conventions. It will be noted that this broadening of the definition will likewise extend the application of certain provisions of the Hatch Act (title II of this bill) which use the term "election."

Section 301 (b) would broaden the definition of "candidate" now contained in section 302 (b) of the Corrupt Practices Act so as to include candidates for nomination.

Section 301 (c), now contained in section 302 (c) of the Corrupt Practices Act, redefines political committee so as to include those which accept contributions or make expenditures for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the election of candidates, whether or not such committee operates in more than 1 State, and so as to include State and local committees of political parties.

Section 301 (d), (e), and (f) are identical with section 302 (d), (e), and (f) of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Section 301 (g) is the definition of State which is the same in substance in both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

Section 302 is the separability clause now contained in both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

Section 303 repeals the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and the other acts affected.

Section 304 provides that the act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Legal questions

The constitutionality in general of the Corrupt Practices Act was upheld in the case of *Burroughs* v. *U. S.* ((1934) 290 U. S. 534), where the Court declared that requiring public statement of amounts received and expended by a voluntary political committee to influence election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors in two or more States was within the power of Congress, and not an unconstitutional interference with the power of a State to appoint electors or the manner of their appointment.

The Hatch Act, which prohibits Federal employees and certain State employees whose work is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government from engaging in certain political activities, has likewise been upheld in two recent cases. *United Public Workers of America (CIO) et al.* v. *Mitchell* and *State of Oklahoma* v. *United States Civil Service Commission*, both decided February 10, 1947.

However, the proposed draft raises some legal questions that are not present in the existing Corrupt Practices and Hatch Acts.

The Corrupt Practices Act specifically exempts primary elections and party conventions from its provisions. Sections 1, 3, 4, and other sections of the Hatch Act are also apparently thus limited in their application. Of course, it is common knowledge that in many States where one political party dominates, the real contest is the contest for the party nomination, and the candidate who wins the nomination is for all practical purposes already sure of election. Even though such a candidate may have an opponent of another party in the final general election, the latter election merely rubber stamps the primary nomination. The Newberry Case (256 U. S. 232), although it did not satisfactorily answer the question, threw doubt on the power of Congress to extend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primaries. The question has been definitely set at rest, it is believed, by *United States* v. *Classic* ((1941) 313 U. S. 299), which upheld the power of Congress to legislate to prevent interference with primary elections for nomination of candidates for Congress where the primary is an integral part of the elective process. The Court said (p. 319): "Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of 'elections' extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose, and the popular choice of representatives is stripped of its constitutional protection save only as Congress, by taking over the control of State elections, may exclude from them the influence of the State primaries." The Classic case was discussed at length and cited with approval in *Smith* v. *Allwright* ((1944) 321 U. S. 649), holding that the right of a citizen of the United States to vote for the nomination of candidates for the United States Senate and House of Representatives in a primary which is an integral part of the elective process is a right secured by the Federal Constitution. The extension of the law to party primaries and nominating conventions is therefore on solid constitutional grounds.

Attention has been called to the omission of the provisions which relate the activities of political committees to two or more States. Examination of congressional debates reveals that the present provisions were largely based on the erroneous theory that Federal power to regulate corrupt practices in elections stemmed from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. As indicated in the report of the special committee to investigate senatorial campaign expenditures, referred to at the beginning of this memorandum—

"In fact, legal jurisdiction to regulate attaches whenever a political committee seeks to influence the election of Federal officials, whether or not it seeks to influence in one State only or in two or more States. The test of Federal power is the office concerning which the election is influenced, not the intrastate or interstate character of the political committee's operations."

The definition of "political committee" has been changed accordingly, and it is believed that the modification should encounter no constitutional objection.

It may be suggested that a further legal question is raised by the new section 113 of the bill which makes it unlawful for anyone to utilize moneys collected as campaign contributions for any other purpose, and provides that failure to make reports required by the act shall be prima facie evidence of a violation of this section by the person so failing to report. Without discussing the matter at any length, it is believed that this statutory presumption can be sustained, despite the scrutiny that all such provisions are given by the courts, because there is a rational connection between the fact proved and the ultimate fact presumed, which is the test laid down by the Supreme Court for such cases. Cases on this subject are reviewed in *Tot* v. *United States* ((1943) 319 U. S. 463).

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on

behalf of himself and certain other Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss the pending labor bill. At the outset I wish to say that the bill has been exceptionally well and painstakingly considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I do not know of any bill in recent times which has received more careful consideration than has the pending bill. I do not know of any bill handled by any committee of the Senate as to which there was more of a give-and-take attitude than was evidenced when this bill was being written by the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Although the hearings lasted only 4½ weeks, I may say that every member of the committee, with the exception of two, namely the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], was a member of the old committee which handled all labor legislation. The old committee heard many witnesses who appeared before the new committee and it really amounted to a rehash of testimony heretofore presented. I recall that it was one of my first chores, when I came to the Senate during the Seventy-fifth Congress, to hear testimony on proposed amendment of the Wagner Act. Strange to say those amendments were suggested by the American Federation of Labor, that took the position at the time that the NLRB was partial to the CIO and the proposed amendments were to correct that situation.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will vote for the bill as it has come out of the committee without amendment. The amendments which have been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and other Senators, were considered by the committee, and, after long discussion, rejected. I was agreeably elated over the attitude of many members of the committee in being willing to go as far as they did in voting for the various provisions of the bill which is now before the Senate.

I may be wrong, Mr. President, but I believe that some of the Members of Congress, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, would willingly assist in enacting a bill which would restrict labor unions to a greater extent than the pending bill. Some of them, I would judge, take that position in the hope that no legislation at all on the subject will become law; and others take that position in the hope that such a bill, if vetoed by the President, might be used for political purposes during the next Presidential campaign. In other words, make a political football out of the labor issue. I say that with the knowledge that President Truman saw fit during the Seventy-ninth Congress to veto a bill which was not as broad and which did not so extensively deal with labor problems as the bill we are now considering. But, so far as I am concerned, I am interested in having the Congress enact legislation which will deal with some of the most obnoxious evils in labor relations which have come into being in the last decade.

Mr. President, prior to 1932, the history of labor legislation was very dark from the standpoint of labor. When the Clayton Act was passed, giving labor the right to unionize, did management respond? No, Mr. President. Instead management instigated and helped the organization of so-called company unions. Management began to indulge in the practice of writing so-called yellow-dog contracts, which in effect provided that an employee could not get a job unless he agreed not to join a union.

Furthermore, as we know, the injunctive process was resorted to by employers in thwarting strikes and in denying the right of labor to organize. During that period, because of the opposition of management, the American Federation of Labor dwindled in membership from a total of 4,000,000 to 2,000,000. Most of us are familiar with the famous Parker decision, in the Red Jacket case, which recognized the yellow-dog contracts.

It was during those trying times that labor asked help from Congress. Congress finally responded, when in 1932 the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law. That act prevented the promiscuous granting of injunctions by the courts for concerted activity by workers. It virtually limited injunctive relief to cases of fraud and violence. Under that act no injunction could be granted to stop jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, or to protect interference with contracts of employment. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, moreover, prevented an ex parte proceeding by an employer for the granting of an injunction against a union upon a mere affidavit, without producing facts to sustain it. The same act made the "yellow-dog contract" unenforceable.

However, the Norris-LaGuardia Act did not go far enough, for the unions were still hamstrung; workers were prevented from obtaining protection or security by way of unionizing for even though union activity was not enjoinable, employees who joined unions still ran the risk of losing their jobs. Labor kept on fighting for its very existence and in 1935, the Congress again responded and enacted the Wagner Act, which has often been referred to as labor's magna carta. Under that act, employees were protected in their jobs if they wished to join unions. Company-dominated unions were prohibited. Collective bargaining was made compulsory, if a union had a majority of the employees in a certain plant. It created a board to remedy unfair labor practices by employers. It established machinery providing for a secret ballot for employees to select bargaining representatives. In fact, it gave affirmative encouragement to the organization and expansion of the unions.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that if the employers of this Nation had come to Congress at that time and had assisted in the drafting of the so-called Wagner Act, that act would not have been as one-sided as it is. However, management, in the form of employer associations, took a negative attitude on the subject. Industry said to labor in effect, "We will defeat you here in Congress; but if you happen to get Congress to pass such a law, we will defeat you in the courts." That was the attitude of management. Why? Because at that time management was in the saddle, so to speak. Industrialists were still confident with the pendulum still swinging in their direction.

Mr. President, I make that point simply to stress the fact, that we have a parallel today with the short-sighted attitude of industry on that occasion. We should observe by way of contrast, that today organized labor is in the saddle, so to speak, and labor has assumed a negative attitude. Union after union in effect has said, "We do not need any more legislation. We are satisfied with what is now on the statute books. If the Congress should pass the law that it is proposing to pass, we will fight it in every court of the land." Such a statement was also recently made by Mr. Padway, the general counsel of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am not at all disturbed by that threat; but I do plead with my colleagues in the Congress to pass a law which, as I have indicated, will have the effect of curbing and curing many of the most serious evils which have become apparent in recent years. I propose to say a few words in the course of my remarks in respect to these various evils, and then try to demonstrate to the Senate how the pending bill seeks to deal with and cure them.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that soon after the Wagner Act went into effect there was a terrible scramble, as it were, between the CIO on the one side and the American Federation of Labor on the other in regard to the administration of the act. The AFL took the position that the National Labor Relations Board created by the act was biased and prejudiced, and that it was intent on destroying the American Federation of Labor. They further contended that the staff of the Board leaned backward to assist the CIO instead of giving a square deal to the AFL.

It will be remembered by most Senators who were here in 1938 that the American Federation of Labor led a fight in an attempt to amend the Wagner Act, so as to afford to that organization greater security in the administration of the act. In 1940 a bill backed by the AFL passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate. While the Board in the last few years has rectified many of its decisions, the difficulty which existed in the past between these two dominant branches of the labor movement still persists.

Mr. President, now for a few moments I desire to discuss some of the abuses which labor unions can indulge in with impunity under existing law. Among the most aggravated of those practices are secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. It is true that such practices are not new, but it seems that under the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts these abuses grew steadily.

A secondary boycott, as all of us know, is a concerted attempt on the part of a strong union to compel employers to deal with them, even though the employees of that employer desire to be represented by other unions, or not to be represented at all.

Some of the most glaring examples of the secondary boycott occurred in Ohio, the State of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. TAFT]. They affected the neon sign business. Some manufacturers were compelled, under the Wagner Act, to contract with the CIO as the bargaining agent. When neon signs manufactured for distribution all over the United States were shipped to such States as Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan, the AFL unions in those States which had contracts for installing the neon signs, because the neon signs bore the label of the CIO, said, "We will not put them up." Of course, trouble followed, and losses ensued to the manufacturer. Yet management was, in a measure, compelled to take the steps it did, as it was helpless to do otherwise, as I have just indicated.

Another example is the New York Electrical Workers Union, the IBEW. That union has become so powerful that it has organized not only those who make the electrical equipment but those who receive it from the factory and install it. As a matter of fact, no employer who manufactures electrical equipment outside of New York has a ghost of a show of having his equipment placed in the large buildings in New York City. When such equipment is sent to New York City, the IBEW local refuses to install it unless it is permitted to tear all the equipment apart and assemble it again. Of course, one can readily understand that such procedure is unconscionable and that it results in high costs to those engaged in the erection of office buildings, homes, and stores; in fact, all sorts of buildings requiring electrical equipment.

As another glaring example, I cite the California cannery case of 1946. Sixty canneries in California banded together. They had AFL contracts with both the teamsters and the cannery workers. The CIO threatened to organize the canneries. It petitioned the Board for an election. While the election was pending, AFL teamsters demanded a closed shop as the price of transporting produce from farm to cannery. This was done while the Board had before it the petition by the CIO. The canneries became desperate. Vegetable and fruit was lying in the fields, a good deal of the crop going to waste; fruit growers' losses were heavy. In order to curtail losses, the canneries were forced to enter into a contract with the AFL. Such abuses must be ended, and I shall in a moment endeavor to show how, under the pending bill, that will be accomplished.

Other recent glaring examples of the secondary boycott are the ones involving longshoremen on the coast of Oregon, Washington, and California. In those instances CIO workers refused to unload lumber carried in ships manned by AFL seamen. Practices of that sort have caused a great many people to become sour against organized labor. I do not blame them for it.

An equally grave abuse is the jurisdictional strike, which is the refusal by one union to continue at work, unless certain operations which the employer thinks lie within the terms of a contract with another union are given to the first union. Many examples of the jurisdictional strike could be given, particularly in the building trades. Under the new methods, more steel is used than heretofore in the building of homes and offices, and disputes often arise between unions as to the division of the work. In cases of that kind both owner and contractor are helpless.

There is in Hollywood a 2-year-old strike between stage hands and designers, the question involving a determination of what properties are to be handled by the respective unions. Studio owners are helpless. They must stand by and permit the strike to continue. As I shall show in a few moments, the pending bill would attempt to remedy that situation.

In the brewery industry, there still persists the fight between teamsters and brewery workers, a case familiar to all of us. It involves the question of who shall load the beer, and who shall haul it away. The struggle is of many years' standing. There have been many strikes and delays. The brewery owners are helpless. It has been claimed by the brewery workers that the AFL was partial to the teamsters. They have, I understand, during the last year completely withdrawn from the AFL and are no longer affiliated with it. They withdrew because they felt the AFL, had it acted effectively, could have prevented the jurisdictional strikes. Under this bill, as I shall further demonstrate in a moment, I believe such situations will be remedied.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, in the case of economic action in jurisdictional disputes, in the absence of any proven collusion on the part of the employer with one union, the economic and property rights of innocent third parties are greatly damaged by such disputes?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me also, that the time has come when the public interest has a right to demand, in the absence of collusion on the part of the employer, that labor desist from economic action in jurisdictional disputes? And does the Senator further agree with me that the Government should provide a fair procedure that will result in a settlement of the jurisdictional dispute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that this condition is what prompted the distinguished Senator from Oregon and others on the committee to devote much time to the provisions of the pending bill in an effort to remedy that situation.

Mr. MORSE. If I may ask another question or two, does the Senator agree with me that if there be an acceptance of the major premise that a procedure must be devised through which decisions can be rendered in jurisdictional disputes, our area of choice lies for the most part in choosing between a procedure which would throw the issue into our common law courts, and a procedure which would throw the issue into the field of administrative law?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that I did not intend to go into detail about that matter at present. As the Senator knows, I presented a proposal to correct the existing evil, and, after long discussion as to how best to handle the subject I followed the views of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York respecting the method of dealing with the situation, which is through the Board, instead of by direct action on the part of the employer.

Mr. MORSE. Throughout our hearings and in executive sessions the Senator from Louisiana and I many times found ourselves in disagreement respecting the merits of various proposals. I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the very fair and helpful attitude he took throughout our meetings, because he too recognized, as the rest of us tried at all times to recognize, that we were dealing with a problem which calls for conscionable compromises; a problem which places upon us the responsibility of establishing in the Eightieth Congress a procedure which will work, which will be fair and reasonable, and duly moderate; a procedure with which labor can live in the sense that it can retain its rights; but at the same time a procedure that will protect the public from the type of labor abuse the Senator from Louisiana is presently pointing out to the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the discussion of the pending labor legislation will not be a brief discussion. I think we have reached the point where the floor of the Senate of the United States for some days to come must be used as a great educational forum to educate the American people into an understanding of the practical administrative problems which confront us in the field of labor legislation. Hence I, for one, am not going to favor at all any quick votes on any of the questions involved in the pending bill, because I do not know of a better service we can render the American people than to have a full, prolonged, and detailed discussion of the whole problem of labor relations.

So I close this portion of my comments with the question: Does the Senator agree with me that we must make clear to the Senate that the choice which must be made is whether we are going to try to do this by way of an administrative law approach, or by way of a so-called court approach?

Mr. ELLENDER. That seems to present the whole issue, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to point that out.

Mr. ELLENDER. After hearing the subject discussed pro and con in committee, I felt that the former was the reasonable approach. It seems possible to handle all unfair practices charged against management in that manner. I am of the personal opinion that in the bill we have provided a rather quick and decisive remedy in dealing with this situation. I fear that if we permit employers to resort to court procedure on their own we may again drift into the type of abuses which brought about the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It is my belief that through suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon the committee adopted a procedure under which preference is given to cases such as those we are considering, and which goes so far that a regional attorney who makes an investigation and comes to the conclusion that a jurisdictional strike is in the offing, or that a secondary boycott is in the making, can, on his own motion, go to court and obtain relief for the employer.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana thinks we have a proposal which really has teeth in it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I absolutely know it has teeth in it. The only argument I heard against the provision which is contained in the pending bill was that the other proposal would provide a quicker process; that under it an employer could go into court today and obtain an injunction tomorrow and stop the threatened action. As I understand, the bill contains a prohibition against such action as a jurisdictional strike or a secondary boycott. It authorizes a temporary injunction, followed by a Board cease-and-desist order against those who participate in such action. That, to my way of thinking, will act as a deterrent. Today there is in the law nothing at all to cope with such a situation.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly that is true; and with this particular procedure provided for it is not proper to label the bill a "milk and water bill" or, as one editorial has called it, a cream-puff bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is neither. I do not know whether the Senator was present a short while ago when I stated that I never dreamed that the committee as a whole would submit as strong a bill as it did report. As a matter of fact, I was greatly surprised to note the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from New York and other Senators—but particularly the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York. Both Senators assisted greatly in imparting to the Senate committee the vast knowledge which both had obtained in labor-relations work. The distinguished Senator from Oregon had been a member of the War Labor Board, and the Senator from New York, I believe, fathered and piloted through the New York Legislature some administrative law versions which I understand are operating well. What I am anxious for, and what I am sure every other Senator should be anxious for, is legislation with teeth in it which will cure the most obnoxious evils which have existed in the labor movement during the past 10 or 12 years.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana has been kind to me both in the time he has allowed me and in the comments he has made. I want to trespass only for one more question. Does the Senator agree with me that it would be quite fair and reasonable to ask those who want a more drastic bill than the one we have proposed, to take the bill we have proposed back to their respective States and present it to the business and industrial interests of their States, and put this simple question to them: "Gentlemen, if this bill were placed on the statute books do you think it would be very helpful and constructive in equalizing the Wagner Act?"

Does the Senator think that would be a fair question to put to them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Absolutely; and I know what the answer would be.

Mr. MORSE. I think I do also. I think the answer would be "Pass the bill if you can."

Mr. ELLENDER. Undoubtedly.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, my fear—and I think it is a justifiable fear—is that if we should go too far we may end with no legislation at all. I do not want that to happen. I have been a member of the committee dealing with labor matters for more than 10 years, and that committee has worked industriously and assiduously in an effort to draft and have passed reasonable labor laws. I have spent, I suppose, as much time as any other member of that Senate committee in an effort to secure the passage of a measure in the nature of the Case bill, in the hope that it would cure many of the evils of which complaint is now made. But this bill goes much further than the Case bill in many respects. It seeks to deal realistically with many of the labor-management problems which are now facing the country. I am satisfied that if a bill of this nature were passed it would have the immediate effect of placing labor and management more nearly in balance. I hesitate to say what I would do if the Senate were to pass a bill as stringent and as far reaching as the House bill. My present inclination would be to vote against it. We have before the Senate today a good workable bill with teeth in it, something that has not been presented to the Senate for some time in such an extensive way. I for one am pleading with the chairman of our committee, as well as with every other member of the committee who is now trying further to amend the bill, to forget about such amendments. They were considerd for 5 weeks before the committee.

Let us be fair with each other. Legislation comes about through compromise, give and take. As I said, when I started with the work of the committee 5 weeks ago I did not expect such unanimity of approval on most of the issues involved as came about during the consideration of the bill by the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator has referred to some of the pending amendments, most of which, I think he will agree, were in a committee print on which we worked, and were stricken out in the committee by a vote of 7 to 6.

He has also stated—and I think quite correctly—that the legislative process is a process of compromise. I think he would also agree that the conditions created by industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide shut-downs, and the concentration of bargaining power in international unions, which are pretty far removed from the individual who works, constitute one of the most serious problems in this field considered by the committee. Unfortunately the print we are now working on does absolutely nothing about that particular problem. One of the amendments we are seeking to insert in the bill is a very mild provision that bargaining power shall rest in the local union, close to the employees actually concerned, and that no international union shall have power to dictate the terms on which any particular local shall settle a dispute with a particular employer.

I do not think that is punitive or drastic, or going too far. It is a very mild attempt to meet what is clearly and admittedly one of the major problems in this field, as to which the committee print does absolutely nothing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we discussed that problem at length in committee. It has been only in recent years that that situation has come to the fore, as the Senator well knows. The amendment is directed partially to the activities of Mr. Lewis during the coal strike.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I point out to the Senator that I do not know of any occasion on which Mr. Lewis used the Wagner Act to have his union as a whole, or members of it, bargain collectively. I believe that if we take the bill as a whole, many of the evils which have existed in the past through industry-wide bargaining will fade away. We are seeking to give greater responsibility to independent unions. I believe that industry-wide bargaining has come to the front because of the fact that the entire labor movement was dominated by two large unions which went into the field and organized entire industries. Attempts were made by independent unions to obtain collective-bargaining contracts, but because of stale charges made against them of company domination which took place 9 or 10 years before, they were disestablished by the Board.

We have now added a provision in the bill which will give to independent unions more power to obtain status as bargaining agents with various employers. I think we have, to a certain extent, removed some of the abuses which have come about from industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, we seek to write into the law a clause which would force unions to bargain collectively. I think that would have some good effect, and that in a measure it would dissipate much of the industry-wide bargaining evil to which the Senator now refers.

Quite a few other provisions have been placed in the bill which in my judgment

will tend to minimize the evils which have grown up in the past few years because of industry-wide bargaining.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is mistaken in saying that this amendment is directed primarily at the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis because of the situation in the coal industry. I do not believe that the Wagner Act would affect him very much. His organization is too tightly organized. Only an emergency provision for an injunction, with the 60-day period of mediation, will affect him. We had specific testimony concerning locals in the case of the United Auto Workers and the steel workers. The National Labor Relations Board—I believe in violation of the intent of Congress—had certified as bargaining agent not the local union which actually won the election, and which actually represented the men directly, but the international union. So the international union had the power, and the local could not sign a contract unless the international said it could.

As the Senator knows, we had a great deal of testimony to the effect that both among the steel and auto workers local unions wanted to settle with their employers. Perhaps there was a slightly different wage system from that laid down by the international. The international union said to the local, "You cannot settle on anything but these terms," and many unions went through 2 or 3 months of strikes for that reason.

Does not the Senator believe that the situation can be corrected without injuring any legitimate activity or power of labor unions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that we have gone far toward correcting it and forcing both sides to bargain collectively. In other words, if a local union today should refuse to bargain collectively with its employer it would be guilty of an unfair labor practice. Previously unions were at the mercy of the nationals and internationals, as it were, and there was no remedy to correct the situation. What we have provided in this bill will not do away with the evil totally, but it will ameliorate many conditions which have existed in the past few years in respect to industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The obligation of a union to bargain collectively will not mean a thing where the international union is the certified bargaining agent. That is the situation which we are trying to correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the Senator's opinion, but I entertain a contrary view. I believe that if the obligation to bargain collectively by management and labor had been placed in the law from its inception, we might not have drifted into the situation into which we now find ourselves. As I said a moment ago, I believe that what has given rise to the industry-wide bargaining contracts is the power which was wielded by one big union to the exclusion of all independent unions. All that the affiliated unions had to do was to say to the Board: "Just a minute. This union has been and therefore still is a company-dominated union. It is not an independent union." If affiliated unions could prove that the now independent union was charged of being company dominated 4 or 5 or 6 years ago, that union was disestablished and was prohibited forever from bargaining again with its former employer. In other words an independent union could never wash itself of sin if it was once company dominated. The Senator knows that to be so.

I believe that by giving to independent unions more leeway in permitting them to organize throughout the country it will in a large degree encroach upon the rights and prerogatives of the larger affiliated organizations which have been able to "go to town," as it were.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield once more, I agree that the provision in the bill which requires the Board to treat independent unions and affiliated unions alike is a correction in Board policy which is long overdue, but I do not think it goes to the heart of this problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe it will assist?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think it will, because the fabrication industry and a great many other industries not even remotely connected with the steel industry are organized now, and not the local union is the bargaining agent, but the NLRB has certified an international union as the bargaining agent. The local union has nothing to say about the contract. The international has all the power under the law; and the bill as it stands does not correct the situation which we mean to correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator that it does not deal with it specifically, as he has indicated, but many of the proposals, by way of amendments to the Wagner Act, which have been made by the committee will have a tendency to give less power to the large international organizations.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, granting that what the Senator from Minnesota says is true—and I do not think anyone will dispute the fact which has been cited by the Senator from Minnesota, that it is one of the aggravating conditions existing in the whole field, and is one of the complicated problems which must be solved; I think anyone who is at all fair must recognize that fact. I want to ask the Senator from Louisiana this question: Does he not think that the remedy which is proposed by the amendment which has been placed before the Senate and which the Senate is at this time considering would open the whole matter up to complications far more serious and to difficulties far greater than any of those from which it is hoped we would escape?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that. It was only after an extended discussion that I felt that I should like to go along. I want to say to my colleagues of the Senate that I voted on several occasions with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and my reason for taking the position which I am now assuming is that I want legislation. We have worked since January on this bill, and I repeat that I firmly believe that our committee has done a good job; but what we ought to do is to pass the bill and cure the most conspicuous evils about which the Senator has been complaining during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and I join in the complaint.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. As the Senator has stated, when this particular provision, amendment B, was in committee, the Senator from Louisiana supported it on its merits, did he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And, as he will recall, it was stricken out of the bill by a 7 to 6 vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. One more question. Does not the Senator believe that on a major issue, such as this, one of the most important, I think, in the whole bill, the Senate is entitled to pass on the merits of a provision which lost out in committee by so close a vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. It maybe that the Senate ought to pass upon it on its merits, but I contend that by the addition of such an amendment to the pending bill it may nullify all the work which has been done up to date.

I have been engaged in legislative work for almost 22 years. Not long after I started working in the Louisiana Legislature and after I came here I realized that all legislation is derived from compromises. The man who goes to Congress or to a State legislature and thinks that he will obtain everything he wants without giving anything in return is just a hopeless optimist. We must give and take. We have many problems confronting us which must and can be solved. The abuses to which I have referred and others to which I shall refer in the course of my remarks can be solved, if only we do not attempt to extend ourselves too far at one time. I want legislation in order to abolish existing evils. Let us have it now. Let us not permit present conditions to continue for two more years and further widen the breach which has existed in the past between labor and management. I am confident that if we load this bill down with controversial amendments we will accomplish nothing.

Let me say that I am glad to be interrupted, and I shall answer or try to answer any questions which may be propounded. I know that all Senators realize that this is a very technical bill. It may be that I shall not be able to answer all questions, but I shall endeavor to do so; and if I fail, I shall call on some of my distinguished colleagues who assisted in writing the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one further comment,

let me say I have differed with him rather severely; but I want to say to my colleagues that there was no member of the committee who was more constant and faithful in his attendance during six long weeks of hearings and at every committee session at which we worked on the bill than was the Senator from Louisiana. I think he has devoted at least as many hours to the bill as has any other member of the committee, and I certainly respect his judgment and his viewpoint on this issue and all of the issues involved in this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am deeply grateful to the Senator for that kind remark.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted I was discussing the abuses which grew up in the past 10 years. A moment ago I dealt with jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. Now I wish to say a few words in respect to the abuses which occurred because of compulsory union membership. I am now referring to the subject matter of an amendment which the committee has proposed to the Wagner Act. I did not believe that amendment would receive the support which it got in the committee. I refer to the amendment providing for the abolition of the closed shop. It outlaws the closed shop altogether. Several of the witnesses who appeared before the committee gave a number of examples of the abuses which were engaged in by unions who had a closed shop. One of the cases was that of Cecil B. DeMille, who, as we know, is a producer of motion pictures on the west coast. He is also a radio headliner. Mr. DeMille was forced to join a union in order to be able to appear on the radio. Soon after he joined the union he was asked to make a contribution to a cause in which he did not believe.

He refused to make such a contribution. Then what happened? The union kicked him out; it said, "We do not want you as a member any more." Up to this moment, Mr. President, Mr. DeMille has not been able to make any further broadcasts on the radio, simply because he violated the rules of the union to which he belonged. Now here was a man called upon to put up a contribution to fight a cause in which he did not believe and because he refused to pay the assessment made on him he was kicked around and is now unable to pursue his work. Such a situation is intolerable and must be corrected. The pending measure, as I will show later corrects such an evil.

Let us consider the McGrath case, in which a union member was called into court to testify in regard to a fight which occurred between a union member and a foreman. Because Mr. McGrath went to court, in response to a court summons, and testified to the truth, he was kicked out of the union, which meant the loss of his job.

Consider the Edmonson case. When Mr. Edmonson said he would be a candidate against John L. Lewis for the presidency of the United Mine Workers organization, and when he made an attempt to run against John L. Lewis, he was kicked out of the union and was forbidden to have any employment in any coal mine in which the UMW had a contract.

Mr. President, we wish to stop all such foolishness; and the bill now before the Senate would do just that. A great many of the Nation-wide strikes in recent years arose out of the refusal on the part of local unions to bargain collectively. As Senators know, the Wagner Act makes it imperative that employers bargain collectively with a union or other organization of employees, when that union or organization is certified by the board as representing a majority of the employees in the plant affected. However, the employees are not compelled to bargain collectively. In some cases, some of them frustrate the duty to bargain collectively, by delivering an ultimatum on a "take it or leave it" basis.

Many such cases were presented to the committee during the hearings. I am sure that Senators remember the steel strike which occurred in 1946, when Mr. Murray gave notice that he would demand that every steel company grant his union a 30- and 40-cent increase. Mr. Murray succeeded in getting the United States Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. to sign a contract; but after he got those two large concerns to sign a contract, he said, "We are not going to go back to work now until we get all of the companies to sign a contract." How did they bargain, Mr. President? They simply said, in effect, "Here is a contract. We want so much pay an hour. We want you to do this, that, and the other. Sign here on the dotted line." No effort was made to bargain with the smaller companies. Why? Because there was nothing in the act to force those unions to bargain collectively. They could almost get by with murder.

But under the pending measure not only must employers bargain collectively, but employees must bargain collectively, as well. If either of them fails to do so, they are guilty of engaging in unfair practices, if the bill becomes the law.

Senators remember the attitude of Lewis when he went to the coal-mine operators with a contract which he did not show them. They tried to see it, to find out what it was all about; but he would not let anyone know what he desired, but simply took the position of, "No contract, no work." Later on, he made a proposal on a basis of "Take it or leave it." Of course, that could not be regarded as realistic collective bargaining.

The same situation existed with respect to General Motors, when the president of the union dealing with it, Mr. Reuther, presented to General Motors the proposition, "We want a 30-cent increase in wages, and we will not take 'No' for an answer, unless you open your books and show us that you cannot pay it." That attitude was assumed throughout the collective-bargaining period.

I say to my colleagues that such action is not collective bargaining. In order to remedy this situation, the pending bill provides that both parties must bargain in good faith. The bill contains a definition of collective bargaining. Under the bill, it means meeting at regular intervals and seeking in good faith to negotiate an agreement.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to ask the Senator whether he recalls what Mr. Reuther said, after the controversy was over, about his demand to inspect the books. Does the Senator recall what Mr. Reuther said at that time? My memory does not serve me very well on that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. He admitted 2 or 3 months later that the demand to see the books was a mere stunt to inflame public opinion against the company. "To get the company over the barrel" was the way Mr. Reuther expressed it. However, I recall that Mr. Reuther contended for a 30-cent per hour increase and took the position that he would not take any increase if it meant a rise in the prices of automobiles. Such a contention was advanced before our committee during the last Congress when he was seeking a 30-cent increase and insisted in some measure that would force General Motors to open its books. I may further state——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his very lucid presentation of the facts. I am sorry I was not present when he began his argument.

In the labor-management controversy, which, as the Senator has said, has been going on for some 10 years, it always appeared to me that the party with the primary interest was always neglected, that is, the public. It seemed to me that the recent strikes in the steel industry, in the coal industry, and other Nation-wide industries, as well as the threatened strike on the railroads, have brought prominently to the attention of the American people and of the legislative branch of the Government the fact that there is a primary interest on the part of the public.

I am not one of those who have been fortunate enough to have studied the bill. I am not a member of the committee, nor have I had the time to look into the bill carefully. I hope that before any votes on the subject are taken I shall be able to find opportunity to look into its provisions. I rise to compliment the distinguished Senator because he is courageously bringing to the fore the facts which point up the public interest.

He has just now called to our attention the fact that one great labor leader said that there could be an increase of 30 cents an hour in the wages of workers producing automobiles, and that he would not expect an increase in the price. We know what has happened to the price of automobiles. We have seen the prices of automobiles and other articles skyrocket, and there has been much blame attached to people who, in my opinion, are innocent in the matter.

I remember reading in the newspapers a few days ago a comment from the President, which was like the comment he made after he went into office the first time, that it was possible to raise the wages of labor and decrease the cost of the products they manufacture. To me, from an economic standpoint, that was a very unsound statement. It has thrown confusion into the ranks of our people, just as did the previous statement in relation to the automobile situation, that wages could be increased and the prices of automobiles stabilized. I must say that when that statement went out it was accepted as a verity by countless numbers of people. When I said previously that such a statement was unsound, unhealthy, and one which would only cause trouble, I received letters from people who said, "Well, you must have a lot of General Motors stock." I never owned a share of General Motors stock in my life.

I rise now only because I feel that the more the facts can be brought into the open, the more will the smoke screen be cleared away, and the more will we be able to get onto a realistic basis in the solution of the problem which is what we all want.

One further comment. Much propaganda is being sent out again against the Members of this distinguished body. Senators are pictured as either prolabor or procapital. The result is that letters we are receiving indicate clearly that the people are again being led astray, little realizing that there are at present 95 Members of this body who have taken an oath. It is true these 95 men have different backgrounds—economic, political, religious, educational, and social, and, what is more, geographic. They represent different constituencies. But by and large, they have only one motive, and that is do that which will serve the public interest, and promote the general welfare.

I thank the Senator for giving me an opportunity to make these few remarks. I interrupted him at this time only because I have to attend a committee meeting at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was glad to yield to the Senator. Let me remind him that some of us called the attention of Mr. Reuther to the fact that should wages be increased, irrespective of what the profits were in the last 2 years, it would be necessary to increase the prices of the commodities manufactured by General Motors. I wish to say further that the prediction which was made by those of us who took that position came from the fact that the percentagewise increase in the cost of the commodities was almost equal to the percentage of increase in wages. That was because the productivity per man had fallen from 20 to 23 percent, and the wage scale had been increased about 37 percent above the prewar scale. I may be in error about the percentage increase in wages, but as I recall it was such a figure as I indicated. I took the position that with a decrease in productivity and a rise in wages, it was impossible for a manufacturer to sell his product at the prewar price; which was the contention, in effect, of Mr. Reuther. When he presented his figures to show that General Motors could have paid the 30-cent increase in wages without increasing the prices of cars, what facts did he advance in support of his contention? He showed the profits made on war contracts, rather than the condition that prevailed before 1941, when this country was about to enter the war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator will not overlook a matter which occurred last week, an account of which I read in the newspapers yesterday or the day before, that the General Electric had granted a slight increase in wages, and Mr. Wilson, of that company, announced that it would be necessary to increase the cost of their products 7½ percent, as I recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Unless a concern can be mechanized so as to increase the productivity of the workers, whenever wages are increased the cost of the commodity must be increased. Otherwise, it is not possible to increase productivity by raising wages. Thus every increase in wages merely adds to the cost of the commodity sold. That goes without saying.

It is true that before the war it was possible in some industries for an employer to increase wages and lower prices. That was because productivity had so increased per man that the cost was lessened considerably. Consequently a little of the added profits could be placed in the wage earner's envelope and the consumer could be given a little cheaper price. But it was only because productivity kept pace with the wage structure and in a measure surpassed it.

Mr. President, another evil that has grown up in recent years has been that of giving legal protection to the organization of supervisory employees. When the Wagner Act was placed on the statute books, supervisory employees were not considered to be employees as such. They were thought to represent management. Because of that, for 7 or 8 years, no effort was made by unions to obtain supervisory employees as members. The early decisions by the Board had been against unionization. Subsequently, the attitude of the Board changed. Soon afterward, when the question was submitted to the new Board, the former holding was reversed.

As I recall, it was only recently that the Supreme Court, in the Packard case, noted that the Board made no distinction in the classification of employees, as defined by the Wagner Act. The Court went so far as to say that even the vice presidents working for a large corporation were admitted to membership in a union, under the Board's interpretation of the act, they could compel their employer to recognize them. It said, further, that the Court was powerless to act, and that it was a matter to be decided by Congress.

In reporting the pending bill the committee stated in effect that supervisory employees were not to be considered as employees having bargaining rights under the Wagner Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall and I think it should be in the RECORD, that the definition of a supervisory employee was considerably changed in committee. As originally written into the bill, it included night watchmen, time-study men, all guards, and many other types of workmen, who very clearly were not supervisors.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The committee then more closely defined the word "supervisor," to include supervisors in fact, rather than all the other groups of employees whom some employers would like to have had included in the list of supervisory employees, so that such employees would not be able to join the union and gain the benefits of the Labor Relations Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that, as I recall, the committee by its definition excluded guards from the original definition of supervisory personnel.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our amended definition also excludes the straw boss. What the committee did was to limit supervisory employees, by definition, to those having power to hire and fire for the benefit of the employer, and those who are permitted the exercise of independent judgment. That, in essence, is the definition of a supervisory employee. As I shall demonstrate in a moment, such men are not prohibited from joining a union, but they are not permitted to force a collective bargaining agreement under the Wagner Act.

Mr. AIKEN. This was another case——

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a case of compromise.

Mr. AIKEN. In dozens of cases labor wanted nothing whatever to be done, while industry wanted to include in the definition of "supervisor" any number of occupational employees who had no business whatever being included in the definition of "supervisor." The committee simply had to work out for itself what it thought was a proper definition of a supervisor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether or not supervisors should be permitted to come under the protection of the Labor Relations Act, I want to say that I think the definition of "supervisor," as worked out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is the best definition which has been made to date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to the distinguished Senator that the definition adopted by our committee is the one that has been put into practice for several years last past by the NLRB.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The committee said they should be supervisors, in fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. One large concern, Jones & Laughlin, in connection with coal mines owned by them had a number of supervisory employees. They were organized by the United Mine Workers. The supervisors included not only those who represented directly the employers, and who had power to hire and fire and do many other things but all the night bosses, all the assistant foremen, whether they had a right to discharge or employ or not. The result was that the number of disciplinary cases fell off 66 percent under these unionized supervisors. But the accident rate doubled. It was said that the foremen became subservient to the union, which was composed of the very men the foremen were to hire and supervise.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. On the other hand, going on the other side of the fence to an extreme, the Senator will recall that the original bill included in its category of supervisors those who guarded the health of the employees, and that a difference of opinion arose among lawyers who were in the committee room at the time, as to whether this included the washroom attendants or not, some saying yes, others saying no.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In any case, they were not foremen.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; certainly not.

One large company which permitted supervisors to join a union was the Ford Co. Three years ago it signed a contract with the foremen's association in good faith. The Ford Co. was willing to try it, because the foremen's association stated that it would make the supervisors feel that they were recognized as a part of management. In order to show how groundless the fears of employers were, a witness for the foremen's union told our committee this contract was a fine example of industrial relations and had worked well at Ford's. But since our hearings adjourned, the company has canceled this arrangement. In terminating the contract with that union, the Ford management said that it had been disappointed. Although the foremen's association had claimed that having such a contract would cause the foremen to feel themselves a part of management, the activities of the union had been such as to compel the foremen to be dominated in a manner adverse to the company. From the record it appears that in other Detroit plants no action was taken by the foremen's association with respect to a strike, without first consulting leaders of the union supervised by them. In other words, the foremen's association is subservient to and collaborates with rank-and-file unions.

Another abuse is the strike in violation of contract. That has caused a good deal of trouble to management. In numerous cases, companies agree in return for a no-strike clause to enter into contracts providing for arbitration. Yet, frequently, the unions bypass a solemn provision providing for arbitration of grievances, and call strikes to force management to capitulate. The bill would stop actions of that kind by giving to management the right to sue, and by making breaches of contract unfair labor practices.

In the campaign for higher wages last year employees of Western Union agreed to arbitrate. Arbitrators were appointed under an agreement—signed, sealed, and delivered. Because the arbitrators did not award to the CIO union an increase in wages sufficient to give them what they thought they should have, a strike was called, in violation not only of their written agreement but of the contract to arbitrate. In the pending bill such a proceeding would be outlawed. As a result of that strike by the Western Union employees, New York was without telegraphic communication with many States for a period of more than 2 weeks.

Other examples can be given. For instance, oil companies all over the United States entered into a solemn agreement with the union respecting certain wages which were to be paid their employees. As I remember, soon after the contract was entered into controls were removed. Because controls were removed, the employees struck for higher wages, despite the fact that several contracts had yet several months to run.

Other abuses exist, such as strikes over questions relating to invasion of management prerogatives. It often happens that management is forced to replace a foreman because the union does not like him—because he is too strict. Cases of that nature are very numerous. It is not my purpose to go into any more detail with respect to them. The bill outlaws such conduct.

In addition to abuses on the part of unions, many abuses arose from Board procedure and practice during the early period of administration of the Wagner Act. Under the rulings of the Board, employers were forbidden to express any kind of opinion on labor matters. Even recently the Board has held that if an employer made a speech during working hours, although the employer did not use any coercive language, yet the fact that he spoke to the employees while they were at work constituted coercion, and, therefore, the Board declared such activity to be an unfair labor practice.

I shall refer to another case sometime earlier. The manager of one concern complained that he had positive evidence that several Communists were members of the union, and he thought they should be ousted from the union. It turned out that his assertions were true, yet because he made them his statement was deemed an unfair labor practice. His company was cited by the Board because he made a true statement respecting some of his employees.

The point is that if ever an employer had engaged in an unfair labor practice, no matter how remote or how separable, the Board has held that a casual speech coercive in theory was a part of the pattern of unfair labor practices. In other words, the mere fact that he had previously engaged in any such practices placed a stigma upon him, and thereafter anything he said, whether it was coercive or otherwise, was declared to be an unfair labor practice. In other words he could not be washed clean once he had sinned.

There has also been partisanship on the part of the Board in connection with election proceedings. As Senators know, the only employees who are allowed to call for an election are those who are members of a union which has declared that it has a sufficient number, or sufficient percentage of the total number of employees, to justify action by the Board. The employer is now powerless to call for an election unless two unions or more are contending over which shall represent the employees. Nonunion members are now prohibited from calling for an election. Even though a union demands recognition and threatens to strike, the employer is not allowed to petition for an election. Moreover, employees who wish to be rid of a union which has communistic or racketeering leadership are not permitted to petition for a new election unless they can find some other union willing to represent them.

Another instance of maladministration by the Board is unfairness to independent unions. I have discussed that proposition to some extent previously today with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Under the bill as it is now written, if it becomes law, the Board will be empowered to recognize, indeed will be obliged to recognize, independent unions. If today an independent union has attached to it the stigma of ever having been a management-dominated union, or if 2 years back or 10 years back it received any money by way of help from management, because of that stigma the Board will in all cases disestablish it. Such an independent union has absolutely no standing before the Board. The pending bill prevents the Board from treating independent unions more severly than affiliated unions which has been dominated or subsidized by an employer.

As I pointed out in the early part of my remarks, the Board has been charged with unfairness with respect to craft unions. As I observed a while ago, the American Federation of Labor contains any number of craft unions. Soon after the Wagner Act went into effect the CIO began to obtain contracts on a plant-wide basis. In many cases craft unions were denied the right of representation as craft unions, but were thrown together with other factory employees, no matter whether they were craft-union members or not. Thus they were forced to accept contracts on a plant-wide basis rather than on a craft basis.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator has been pointing out is that no law passed by Congress is any better than the manner in which it is applied, and the manner in which it is applied drifts with the tide of public opinion. Therefore, no matter how good the law the Congress may enact, if it is not backed up by the force of public opinion and efficient application, it is not much better than no law whatsoever.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

In that connection, as I stated to the Senate a while ago, I am very sorry that the leadership of our large unions did not attempt to assist us in writing the bill. I do not know of a single leader of any of the large unions who offered any help in drafting the bill, by making proposals to correct by law evils whose existence they themselves admitted. We put the question to Philip Murray, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will recall, in respect to jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. He admitted that those evils existed and that something should be done about them. When asked what his remedy was, he said, "Send for Bill Green, and let us come before you and we will settle that matter to your satisfaction." I understand that they have tried, off and on, for many years to settle such questions, but they have never succeeded, and never will succeed. The only way is to do what we have done in the bill. I am satisfied that if the leadership of organized labor had come before us and said, "Gentlemen, we admit that this is wrong, and that is wrong, and we think this ought to be done or that ought to be done," they could have rendered a great deal of assistance in the light of their experience. But instead of cooperating with us they took the same attitude that management took when the Wagner Act was placed upon the statute books. As I pointed out a while ago, management made every effort to defeat the passage of that bill saying, "If we fail to defeat it in the Halls of Congress, we are going to see that the Supreme Court nullifies it."

The same attitude is now being taken by labor leaders. They say, "Let us alone. The Wagner Act should not be amended. If you do amend it, we are going to fight it through every court in the land."

Mr. President, I accept their challenge. I say to them that this bill ought to pass. It is a mild bill compared to what might have been expected in view of this defiant attitude.

I am very hopeful that the Congress will pass this bill as written, and let us give it a trial, because I am confident that if it is administered as we intend, it will place management and labor more nearly in balance and will lead to a peaceful solution of their difficulties.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator would not correct his statement that it is a mild bill, and say that it is a just bill. A just bill would be mild in comparison to the punishment which might be meted out to labor unions if certain extremists in the field of industry could write the bill to suit themselves. I like the term "just bill" rather than "mild bill." The Senator will recall—and anyone who reads the reports on our desks will learn—that four members of the committee claim that the bill is not tough enough; three members claim it is too tough; whereas six members seem to think it is a just bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator and I agree that the bill is just and equitable to all concerned.

Mr. President, I shall hurriedly go through the various sections of the bill which attempt to correct the evils which I have been discussing during the past hour or so.

Take the case of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. We treat them similarly. The bill declares that secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are unfair labor practices, and that those who engage in them shall be subject to the processes of the Labor Relations Board under the terms of the bill.

As I pointed out a while ago, secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are treated as unfair labor practices. Should a complaint be made by an employer, all he would have to do, in effect, would be to let it be known, and the the local attorney in the regional office would have the power to make a quick investigation. If he should find that there was a jurisdictional strike in progress or in the offing, he could investigate. If in his judgment it would cause irreparable injury to the employer, he would have the right to go into court and obtain an injunction. He could obtain a cease-and-desist order. If perchance the union should continue its illegal conduct it could be punished. Its officers could be cited for contempt of court.

In respect to jurisdictional strikes we have provided for the appointment of an arbitrator, to have almost the same powers as the Board itself in investigating complaints. He would have the power to stop jurisdictional strikes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Not only would he have almost the same power but his decision would be the decision of the Board, subject to court enforcement, as a Board decision is subject to a court enforcement.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I intended to say, and I appreciate the interruption of the Senator.

The third abuse which I discussed a while ago is compulsory union membership. As I have stated, the closed shop is banned under the terms of the bill. An employer would have the right to select employees of his own choosing. Should a majority of the employees in an establishment desire a union shop they could have it. If a majority should say that it desired a union shop that matter could be made the subject of collective bargaining.

But even an affirmative vote by a majority of the members of a union does not compel an employer to accept a union shop unless he desires to do so. It simply gives the union the right to bargain collectively for it. Should the union be in a position to persuade the employer to agree to a union shop one can be had.

In order to protect the employees a union cannot cause the discharge of any of its members simply because it wants to blackball them such as in the De Mille case or in the McGrath case. The union may still expel a man but so far as the employer is concerned he does not have to fire that man so long as that employee pays his dues to the union. I think this provision is bound to prevent such abuses as I discussed a while ago.

I also mentioned the fact that under this bill unions will be placed on the same basis as management with respect to collective bargaining. Today the act provides that management must bargain collectively. The bill provides that unions also must bargain collectively. We have defined what that term means and have said that unless both management and union bargain collectively on a realistic basis, the party at fault can be held for an unfair labor practice.

I discussed a moment ago another part of the bill which provides for the organizing of supervisory personnel. The description of a supervisor as written in the bill is practically the same used by the NLRB for the past 5 or 6 years. The definition given in this bill is not nearly as broad as the one which was included in the Case bill of last year, since timekeepers and other employees having to do with the fixing of wage rates were treated as supervisors in that bill. We have also made it an unfair labor practice for strikes to occur in violation of a union contract.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment. We have provided two methods of meeting that situation: One by direct action in the courts and the other by making it an unfair labor practice. I am satisfied that with such an inhibition in the law it will correct many of the evils which have grown up in the past because of the violation of contracts solemnly entered into between labor and management.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it the Senator is now discussing the bill which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, that bill was reported by a vote of 7 to 6?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; by a vote of 11 to 2, except that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who voted to report the bill, later filed minority views.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to receive that information, because I was misinformed through newspaper reference to the committee's work or through a conversation which I had with a Senator. I am glad to be corrected upon that score.

The Senator from Louisiana mentioned in his discussion the Case bill. Can the Senator tell me, briefly, in what respect this bill, which was reported favorably by the committee, differs from the Case bill? Or will that take some time?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will take some time; but the principal distinguishing features are these: The Case bill did not propose any revision of the Wagner Act except in one respect. It also contained provisions, not found in the committee bill, extending the antitrust laws to secondary boycotts and jurisdictional

strikes, and regulated union-welfare funds.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is speaking of the welfare fund?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. It also provided for a mediation board of five. That, in a nutshell, describes the Case bill. This bill covers, in a somewhat different way, the abuses at which the Case bill was aimed, with the exception of the union-controlled fund. It goes further than the Case bill in many important respects.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The reason I am interrogating the able Senator upon this matter is primarily because the President of the United States last year vetoed the Case bill and set forth his reasons for his veto, but stated definitely in the veto message that he would sign a labor bill, pointing out certain things which he thought should be taken care of through legislative action. I am wondering whether the committee has taken that into consideration in its deliberations upon this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have not considered the President's viewpoint as to his veto of the Case bill, but I will say to the Senator that one of the reasons which the President gave for vetoing the Case bill last year was that he felt that the line was not properly drawn with respect to supervisory employees. In this bill we have a definition of supervisory employees which is not as broad as the one contained in the Case bill last year. The Case bill would have excluded weighmasters, bookkeepers, and anyone who had to do with figuring out the rates of pay of an employee. In the pending bill we have so narrowed the definition of supervisory employees as to include only personnel who actually represent management. I may further state——

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will further yield for one observation which I desire to make, it seems that there are some who in reality desire the kind of a labor measure passed by the Congress that the President is sure to veto. I do not know what the President will do regarding labor legislation; I have no way of knowing. But, as I view the situation throughout the country, it strikes me as one United States Senator that the Congress ought to pass labor legislation which the President of the United States will sign. The sooner the Congress and the Executive agree upon some type of labor legislation, it seems to me the sooner will we in America move to a more stable economy and a more favorable position from the standpoint of our people as a whole. Therefore the Congress should pass labor legislation which the President will not veto rather than to encourage a veto message on a "tough" labor bill, and then have to indulge in further long arguments and debate on the question of sustaining or overriding such a veto message. I am afraid that if the Congress embarks upon the latter course, before we get through, if we are not careful, we shall find ourselves at the close of the present session of Congress without having passed any labor legislation at all.

Mr. President, we should be able to give and take in connection with labor legislation. That is what I should like to do. That is why I propounded the inquiry about a comparison between the measure now before the Senate and the measure which I know the President vetoed last year.

I, for one, think that some labor legislation is necessary; but I certainly am not going to support a punitive bill which definitely discriminates against the laboring men, and finally will result in an impasse in the Congress, with the result that no labor legislation at all will be enacted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am in thorough agreement with some of the views expressed by the Senator from Illinois. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, my desire is to have the Congress pass a reasonable bill. I would not expect labor to like it, but I should like to have Congress pass a bill which is not punitive in character, a bill which I hope the President will sign.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that if the Congress passes a bill of the character of the one which is now before it, I hope the President will approve it. But if he does not, I shall vote to override his veto, because I feel that the bill is "must" legislation. Legislation of this character is necessary at this time; and I know it will do much good in bringing labor and management more into balance, and really will result in better relations in the future.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to let me ask one other question. Do I correctly understand that all 13 of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which reported this bill favorably, are supporting the final enactment of this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know as to that. But judging from the views expressed by three Senators in a minority report which was filed by them, I do not believe they will vote for the bill as presented.

I believe that the 10 remaining members of the committee will vote for the bill as now reported. The only unfortunate thing is, as I have said earlier in my remarks, that some of the members of the committee, including the distinguished chairman, are desirous of amending the bill so as to make it much tougher. I fear that if a course of that kind is pursued, the President may veto the bill. I do not know whether he will or not; but if he does veto it, then it may be rather difficult to get the Congress to override his veto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Illinois has asked the reasons for the President's veto of the Case bill, and whether those reasons have been met in the bill now before the Senate. I think it is fair to say that none of the reasons for which the President vetoed the Case bill have been met in this bill. Last year, the President objected to every provision of the Case bill. He objected to the provision for the establishment of the Mediation Service outside the Department of Labor; he said that was contrary to his policy.

He objected to the provision which would permit unions to be sued. Such a provision is carried in the bill now before the Senate in almost exactly the same form.

The President objected to the fact-finding provision relating to public utilities, and the provision for injunction and for vote. That provision is similar to the emergency provision contained in the bill now before the Senate.

The President also objected to the removal of foremen from the operation of the act.

So, Mr. President, if Senators are trying to have the Senate pass a bill which will be consistent with the President's veto message of last year, let me say I am afraid that will be impossible. Unless the President has changed his views, I do not see how in any way they have been met in the bill which is now before the Senate.

We must assume, therefore, that the President has changed his views. However, whether the bill now before the Senate would meet his views is a matter of pure conjecture, so far as I know.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will further yield, let me ask him a further question. Assuming that what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, the amendments which are to be offered by the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as I understand, will not moderate the bill in any way, but will really make it——

Mr. ELLENDER. They will make it tougher, as I indicated a few minutes ago.

Mr. LUCAS. They will make the situation a little more difficult, from the standpoint of trying to get along with labor. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; there can be no question about it.

Mr. LUCAS. If those amendments are adopted, the bill probably will be more detrimental from the viewpoint of labor than the Case bill would have been, will it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that. In my opinion, if those amendments are adopted and if the Senate passes the bill as thus amended, and should the President veto it, I am almost confident that the Congress will not override the President's veto. In that case, we would be without any labor legislation of the type that is needed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I know of no method of determining that the President will veto a bill because it contains a particular provision, or that he will not veto a bill because it does not contain a particular provision. It seems to me we must pass on each provision on its merits. If the Senate thinks that a provision is fair and just, and that it corrects an injustice, it seems to me the Senate should vote for it, and should assume that the President will reach the

same conclusion, because his attitude has been very much that of the Members of the Senate.

So it seems to me that to follow any other course would simply be to indulge in wild guessing. There are some 20 different provisions of importance in the bill now before the Senate. I do not know how we can determine in advance whether provisions No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3, will be unsatisfctory to the President or will be satisfactory to him, or whether he will veto a bill which contains two unsatisfactory provisions, or whether he will veto a bill which contains 18 unsatisfactory provisions, or what his attitude finally will be. At the moment, I cannot conceive under what conditions the President might veto or might not veto such a bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that if we should pass a bill with the same force and effect as the House bill, we might lose the support of many Senators who are willing to go along with the Senate bill as it is now written. Should we make the bill as reported a little tougher than a majority of the committee contemplated, a majority of the Senate may pass the bill, but when it comes back from the White House with a veto message, my fear is that there will not be enough votes to override the veto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to point out that if the Senate adopts a particular amendment because Senators believe it is a fair amendment and represents a fair method of dealing with a particular situation, we have no right to assume that the President is going to veto the bill because of that particular amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It may be that in my absence from the floor this matter has already been brought up, but if I may address myself, with the Senator's permission, to the Senator from Ohio, was it not argued in committee that it would be better to divide the bill into four parts? Was not that argued by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] who is now on the floor, and was it not urged, as one of the arguments, that there would be a better chance of getting remedial legislation on this subject and that it would be a more logical approach, if we presented the President a bill dividing the subject up into its natural segments? And did not the Senator from Ohio oppose that procedure, and was he correctly quoted in the press as having stated to a Republican caucus that the desire was to give the President one single bill so that he would have one bill on his lap to deal with?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question was argued in the committee as to whether there should be one bill or many bills. Primarily, I argued in favor of having one bill, because the subject being considered is one subject, and there is no way to separate it. One title deals with the question of mediation, and what mediation is for. It is to help collective bargaining. Another section deals with the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which deals with collective bargaining.

During the course of the consideration of the bill, we moved sections from one title to another because it was felt better, from a psychological standpoint, to put the provisions in as amendments of the Wagner Act instead of having them stand by themselves.

There was the question of the creation of a joint committee, and the question of a Nation-wide strike and the method of enjoining it, which follows right after the mediation procedure. The subject is one subject. I do not see how we can separate it. Certainly I would not be in favor of passing one section dealing with mediation which would not accomplish any reforms, and leaving all corrections of injustices in the section dealing with amendments to the Wagner Act.

Frankly, I do not know what the President's attitude might be, but the subject is one subject, it is handled on the floor of the Senate far more easily as a single subject and it seems to me it was entirely proper that there should be one bill.

Some argued the other way. Their argument was to this effect: "Let us separate it so that the President may select that which he likes and that which he does not like, and have the power to choose what kind of a result he wants to obtain." On the same theory, we should have separated the bill into 20 bills, because there are 20 different subjects dealt with in the bill, so far as minor sections are concerned. The natural thing to do, the thing already done by the House of Representatives, was to agree on one bill. Furthermore, so far as I remember, the argument in the caucus, which, it seems to me, is not material in this debate, was that the House has passed one bill, and that if we pass three bills we must consider what will happen. We would substitute one for the House bill, and the House would say, "Well, we will not touch your other two bills. We sent you a whole bill, and we are entitled to have you consider that whole bill." So that, from a practical standpoint, it seems to be impossible to handle the matter in three bills, hoping we would ever get any concurrence from the House in that kind of proposition.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, the fact is that if the Senate were to pass four bills and send them to the White House there would be a far greater probability of getting some kind of labor legislation, as a practical matter, than if the Senate followed the procedure advocated, and finally obtained, under the advocacy of the Senator from Ohio and the House. In other words, if the Senator from New York had prevailed, we would be passing on four bills which were logically provided by a man who has had more experience in the labor field, in fact, than any of us on the Committee on Labor, or on this floor. Yet that division of the subject into four bills, which offered some assurance of there being some legislation on the subject, was defeated in the committee, and the President will be presented with one bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear, because I am afraid it has been a little misconstrued.

My idea in desiring that the bill be presented in the form of four different bills instead of one was not at all in any way to give the President of the United States an opportunity to pick here and there. It was because I felt that was the proper way to consider the proposed legislation.

As we progressed with the amendments to the bill in the committee, I think the members noted that what we were trying to do was to put the different parts of the bill where they belonged. Amendments to the Labor Relations Act were put in the Labor Relations Act part. Amendments dealing with mediation and the processes of mediation, and, finally, the emergency section, were put in the appropriate place. The part that related to the taking of cases involving a violation of contracts before Federal courts was in a separate title of the bill. The part, finally, establishing a joint congressional committee, was put in a separate title of the bill. Those are all different phases of the question. I will not argue for one moment that the parts are not related; of course they are related, but they are distinctly different in their various aspects, and in the way in which they approach the question under consideration.

As I saw the situation at the time—and I still think I was right; I have not changed my opinion on this aspect—the bill should have been broken up into four bills: First, that part dealing with the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the consideration of the changes proposed; then mediation, and all that pertains to mediation. I am sure the Senator from Ohio does not mean to say that that did not amount to much, because in my judgment the mediation process provided for in the proposed legislation is one of the most important phases of the whole bill. If we can get mediation working as it is contemplated in the bill, we will have gone a long way toward eliminating industrial strife in America. So it goes with the other provisions of the bill.

Never for one moment did I assume the position I took because I was trying to get the President to go along with one part and not with another. In my judgment, as the bill is now written the President should go along with all of it—and this is where I may differ with some of my good friends on the Senate floor—whether as a whole or whether it is separated. But from the standpoint of consideration on the Senate floor, at least, it should be separated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I rise for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight. Of the 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nine indicated the belief that the bill should be divided into three or four different bills. After the Senator from Ohio appealed to the Republican conference to support the principle of

one bill, and received the endorsement of the conference, then three members of the committee stated that if the majority party of Congress believed that action on a single bill was the proper procedure, they would not oppose the desires of the majority party. That left the committee seven to six in favor of a single bill, although nine of the 13 members had expressed themselves at one time or another as favoring the introduction of four bills, to the end that at least some legislation could be assured of passage.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator's indulgence and the Senate's consent to make a very brief comment on this matter of procedure, because it has been raised here in the debate, and I think it is important that the respective positions of those of us who have taken very definite stands on the issue be made clear in the RECORD at this point. Therefore, unless there are objections, Mr. President, I want to take 2 or 3 minutes to set forth my view, as have the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from New York.

I have not changed my position at all that that procedure will prove to be fundamental in determining whether satisfactory labor legislation is passed by the Eightieth Congress. I hope time may prove me to be wrong, but certainly I think that as of this hour there is strong indication that the procedure we are following will in all probability result in no legislation at all. Hence I took the position very early in the debate—and I may remind the Senate that the debate on this bill has in reality been proceeding for many weeks—I took the position on March 10 of this year, in a rather long speech on the floor, that it was a great mistake to pass an omnibus bill, because, although there are interrelations, nevertheless the topics are also separable. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that we should have agreed procedurally weeks ago upon separate bills.

I think it is perfectly clear that if we had limited one bill to amendments to the Wagner Act, we could in all probability have passed such a bill. I cannot imagine any sound basis for a veto of such a bill, and, if it had been vetoed, I believe there would have been the votes to override the veto.

I think of all the labor reforms which are needed, legislatively speaking, the paramount one, the most important one, is a bill that seeks fairly and reasonably to equalize the Wagner Act, and bring about such reforms as are set forth in title I of the pending bill. I submit to the Senate that if we could have passed title I of the bill and the other titles had ultimately failed, we still would have made a great and constructive contribution to sound labor legislation in the Eightieth Congress.

Likewise, I agree with the Senator from New York that we should have proceeded then with title II in a separate bill, and passed it. Again, I think legislation dealing with mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and national emergencies would have had to be signed by the President because of the inherent fairness of title II; and thus as to title III and title IV.

My fear—and I think it is a reasonable fear—is that we are going to end up with an omnibus bill, with certain amendments adopted on the floor of the Senate to the bill voted out by committee, which will make it impossible, in all probability, for some of us who voted to report the bill from the committee to vote for the bill going into or coming out of conference. With the Hartley bill containing the drastic provisions embodied in it—and I shall not discuss that bill now, but I shall do so, at length, in the days to come—the bill which would emerge from the conference committee would be so unreasonable in its terms, since it would represent, I think, some compromise between what comes out of the Senate and what is in the Hartley bill—that the votes will not be here, and I certainly hope they will not be here, to override a Presidential veto on that type of legislation, because I think it will be more causative than preventive of labor disputes.

So I think, Mr. President, we are dealing here with a very important point of procedure. I want to keep the record straight, as well as I can. I know when I am engaged in a losing battle—and I know that on this point the battle has been lost—but the RECORD must make perfectly clear the responsibility for the loss of the battle. I think some Senators are saying that because the House has passed an omnibus bill, we therefore are faced with a so-called practical situation that makes it impossible for us to pass certain bills separately.

I do not agree with that point of view at all. I think if we, in the Senate, believe that on the merits we ought to have separate bills, then we ought to make our record on separate bills, send them to conference, and do our best there to work out with the House separate bills. If we are beaten, then we are beaten. But I do not feel, Mr. President, that we have made the fight that we ought to have made for separate bills. I think the people of the country are entitled, as I have said in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as well as here, and at a meeting of representatives of my party in conference, to have fair, sensible, and constructive labor legislation come out of this Congress. I do not think we have any right, because of procedural tactics or strategy, for whatever purposes they may be used, to follow a course of action here which runs the serious risk and danger of our having no legislation on the subject of labor relations.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order to get the record straight so far as my position is concerned, and with the indulgence of the Senator from Louisiana—if I am denied the privilege, I shall do it at a later time—I simply want to offer now certain amendments to this bill. I want to state briefly what they are.

The first amendment seeks to strike out, from line 7, page 40 of this bill, all of the bill down to and including line 2 on page 58. This would leave in the bills titles I and V only.

Then, I want to offer an amendment in form of title II of the bill and an amendment in form of title III of the bill and an amendment in form of title IV of the bill, which will at least place before the Senate four pending individual bills which constitute only the separate titles of the pending bill.

I do it, on the basis of a form of parliamentary procedure, which I understand is proper, namely, by this motion:

I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before Friday, May 2, 1947, with separate bills for titles II, III, and IV.

I offer my amendments, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to make one statement to show that the pending bill relates to one question. The abnormal thing would be to separate it. First, we have title I, which entirely rewrites the Wagner Act. Of course, the primary purpose of that act is to assure collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employee.

In title II we change the mediation procedure. I did not say it was not important, but we do have a mediation setup today, which the President, in vetoing the Case bill last year, indicated he thought was satisfactory. Title II is not so important as the amendments to the Wagner Act. But what is the purpose of mediation? The purpose of mediation is to bring about collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employees. That is its only purpose. The bill then provides for emergencies, covering cases where such agreements cannot be brought about. It provides for an injunction in those cases, to hold the matter up for 60 days while the Mediation Service may bring about a collective-bargaining agreement between employer and employees.

The whole purpose of all four titles of the bill is to bring about such an agreement that, at the end of the national emergency, if no agreement is ratified, a vote shall be held, so that the workers may have opportunity to decide whether they want to enter into a collective-bargaining agreement.

What is the purpose of title III? The purpose of title III is to give the employer and the employee the right to go to the Federal courts to bring a suit to enforce the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement—exactly the same subject matter which is contained in titles I and II. It is impossible to separate them. The committee had difficulty even in separating matters as between titles, and moved some matters back and forth from one title to another.

Finally, we have title IV, which proposes to set up a joint committee to study the problem. That subject might be contained in a separate bill, but there seems to be no reason why it cannot be

added to the other provisions of the measure, since it is intended to set up the joint committee to study titles I, II, and III, and then determine whether there should be further legislation. So the measure, in fact, deals with one subject.

So far as the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is concerned—that if we pass separately title I, the amendments to the Wagner Act, which he regards as most important, it would be less likely to be vetoed—I can assure Senators that the opposite is the fact. It seems to me that all the important changes—the things at least that aroused most opposition from the labor unions—fall in that title. I would be more fearful that the President would veto title I, embracing the amendments to the Wagner Act, and approve the other titles than I would that the reverse would occur. But I can see no reason, in order that the President may have the right to select, why we should separate one subject into four different measures—all dealing with exactly the same question.

Certainly, Mr. President, I think from the point of view of procedure it is far easier for the chairman of the committee—I think perhaps that was as much my motive as anything else—to handle one bill on the floor—to have the whole labor subject debated at once—than to have four measures come up, one after the other, and in each case have fundamentally the same questions discussed again with reference to each measure.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that on every ground this bill should be one bill; I trust it will remain one bill, and I think if we ever want to reach an agreement with the House it has to be one bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Senator from Louisiana to suspend for a moment until the parliamentary situation created by the proposal made by the Senator from Oregon is cleared up. For the information of the Chair, will the Senator repeat the motion he made?

Mr. MORSE. I made the motion that the bill, the basis of the amendments I offered, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before May 2, 1947, with titles II, III, and IV eliminated, and with separate bills for those three titles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator ask that the pending bill be recommitted to the committee with his amendments?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is in order, and is in order for a vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The motion is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the motion is debatable.

Mr. TAFT. And the Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to say that when I began my remarks at 12 o'clock—and it is now about 3:30, almost 3½ hours since I started—I did not expect to take up so much time of the Senate. I do not mind being asked questions, and I shall make every attempt to answer them, but I request my colleagues not to make extended speeches on my time.

In respect to the proposal which was debated a moment ago, I wish to say that I was one of the four Senators who thought the bill should be considered as a whole, and if any effort is made to separate the bill into four parts I shall vote against such a proposal. I share the view of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the bill should be considered as a whole.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a short observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a short observation, and I trust the Senator from Illinois will make it short, because I have not had any lunch today; in fact, I had breakfast at 7 o'clock; have had nothing to eat since, and am becoming somewhat weary and tired and a little hungry.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the longer the Senator from Louisiana continues the better he speaks. Lack of food and drink does not seem to make much difference to him.

Mr. President, I confess I am somewhat confused after hearing the last statement made by the Senator from Louisiana that he is associated with the Senator from Ohio in respect to this proposal, and dissociated with the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon on another proposal; and both proposals are, of course, very vital.

A few moments ago the Senator from Ohio was speculating and conjecturing respecting what the President of the United States might do. I undertake to say that the question I asked with respect to the Case bill was perfectly proper, and had a very sound premise from the standpoint of using any kind of a yardstick, even in speculating on what the President of the United States might do. I think it is perfectly proper to speculate about securing any kind of legislation on labor matters. I am not one of those who want to have enacted all the labor legislation which has been or may be proposed. There are numerous labor proposals, and it seems to me we are plunging headlong and attempting to write an over-all bill on the subject of labor relations which goes too far in the wrong direction. In other words, what we should do is to approach the labor problem in a reasonable, logical, and moderate fashion, and not in an illogical manner, and not in such a way as will, as the Senator from Oregon suggested, result in no labor legislation whatsoever.

To illustrate my point more forcefully, from the experience I have had in my own State of Illinois with jurisdictional strikes, I would rather have enacted legislation outlawing jurisdictional strikes and nothing else than to have no labor legislation at all. I would rather take a little at this session of Congress and see what happens, note how the law or laws work, and ascertain how labor and management and the public react. Then as we move into the future and understand, through experience, what is happening, we will be in a much better position to write further legislation, if it is needed, next year in the next session of Congress. I believe that to be better procedure than to plunge headlong and try to do everything at this time. That is exactly what some want to do. Some want to write the toughest possible bill so that the President of the United States will be forced to veto it. That is the truth of the matters. Others, who are truly interested in labor-management conditions, who are interested in the public welfare, in sound economy from the standpoint of fair public relations between management and labor, want to see written the kind of a bill which both management and labor can ultimately accept without any violent reaction from either one, so that the country as a whole can say, "At least we have a start here on labor legislation which we think is worth while, and we can give it a trial during the coming year until the next Congress convenes."

I am satisfied that the American people would rather have some kind of legislation than no kind of legislation at all. If we are not careful, I fear that as the result of what was done in the House by the passage of the Hartley bill and of what some Senators want to do on the floor of the Senate, we will wind up with no labor legislation at all. That may be good politics from the standpoint of some, but it is not good politics from the standpoint of sound American economy and from the standpoint of the safety and security of the people of this Nation, in view of what we know as to labor-management conditions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that title I deals with amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. That, of course, is the most important title in the bill. I believe that most of the opposition from labor stems from the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act which are included in title I.

Title II deals with the creation of an emergency mediation service, which I do not believe is very objectionable to labor. It may be objectionable to some, but it is not so bad.

Title III deals with suability of both union to attempt to coerce an employer

Title IV deals with the creation of a commission to make a joint study of the problems confronting labor, not only in the light of the pending bill if enacted, but to consider some of the subjects discussed by the committee and not incorporated in the bill. This title also deals with the welfare fund.

I believe that all those titles are somewhat related to each other. That was my reason for voting to report an omnibus bill rather than four separate and distinct bills.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will make it brief, because I should like to complete my remarks. I understand that several other Senators are very anxious to speak this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been very gracious and kind to me.

I should like to make a brief comment in reply to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It seems to me that after the Senator from Ohio finishes his argument on this point, the fact still remains that we could separate the bill into its separate titles, enact any one or all of them, and they could be carried out irrespective of the other titles. In other words, this is a separable bill. The Senator from Ohio is quite correct in saying that it deals with the whole subject of collective bargaining; but it can be broken up into four separate parts.

The second point I wish to make is that while it is true we may run into the danger of a veto if we add drastic amendments to any of these titles, particularly title I, which deals with amendments to the Wagner Act, my feeling is that we can get some of them through without drastic amendments; and if title I is fairly enacted, I think we have enough votes in the Senate to override a veto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make it plain that the pending question is now on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues that I shall cheerfully yield for any questions, but I do not propose to permit any Senator to make a speech, no matter how brief, in my time.

Before I was interrupted I was attempting to show how the proposed legislation dealt with many of the obnoxious evils which I discussed in the early part of my speech. I showed how the bill dealt with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, also with compulsory union membership, refusal of unions to bargain, and the question of supervisory personnel. I also dealt at length with the remedy for strikes in violation of a contract. I shall now deal briefly with strikes invading the prerogatives of management.

The bill prevents a union from dictating to an employer on the question of bargaining with union representatives through an employer association. The bill, in subsection 8 (b) (1) on page 14, makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to coerce an employer either in the selection of his bargaining representative or in the selection of a personnel director or foreman, or other supervisory official. Senators who heard me discuss the issue early in the afternoon will recall that quite a few unions forced employers to change foremen. They have been taking it upon themselves to say that management should not appoint any representative who is too strict with the membership of the union. This amendment seeks to prescribe a remedy in order to prevent such interferences.

I have also discussed the question of how the Board acted in respect to certain unions as against others. It was entirely unfair. In order to meet the situation, the right of employers to express their opinions in labor disputes is made coextensive with the rights which labor unions enjoy. The bill would permit an employer to speak his mind, provided he refrained from any threat or coercion, or any indication of bribery. Section 8 (c), on page 16, line 20, is the amendment which seeks to correct that evil.

As to election procedures, which I discussed at length this afternoon, the bill makes all parties, the employer, any union, or any individual employee, whether he belongs to a union or not, whose status may be affected by a representation case, equal in the eyes of the law. Subsection 9 (c), on page 19, gives employers and individual employees the same right of petition which unions have heretofore enjoyed.

Moreover, under subsection 9 (c) (3), on page 21, the Board is directed to do away with any disparity of treatment in run-off cases by placing the two highest choices on the ballot, irrespective of whether one of those choices is prounion or antiunion. Both craftsmen and professional employees are protected by these amendments from having their wishes submerged by being thrown into a large unit of production and maintenance employees.

The bill, in subsection 9 (b), page 19, gives craftsmen and professional employees the right to vote in separate units. If they wish to be represented by the organization which represents the plant unit, however, these amendments still permit them that choice.

Mr. President, I have discussed at length this afternoon independent unions and how, in my opinion, many of them were badly treated by the Board. I referred to several occasions in which independent unions had made every attempt to be named the bargaining agents for groups of men, but because 7 or 8 years ago these independent unions suffered the stigma of employer favor they were disestablished and denied the right ever to represent any group of employees.

We have cured that evil by giving an independent union the same right as an affiliated union, under the procedures of the Labor Board with both protection and the right of being placed on the ballot.

The discussion which I have been carrying on for the past 3 hours and 40 minutes has dealt with the most obnoxious evils which have marred relations between labor and management in the past 10 years. I have attempted to point out to the Senate how the pending measure deals with all of those evils. I am most anxious that the Senate enact the bill as it has been reported from the committee. I repeat that my fear is, that if we should tighten up on this bill, as it were, if we should pass a bill as restrictive with regard to unions as the Hartley bill, we may end with no legislation at all. I should not like the 90 days' work which I have put forth on this bill to end with no legislation at all. I again plead with the distinguished chairman of the committee to forego the amendments that have been submitted by others and which have been heretofore considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welware Committee. We discussed the bill at length in the committee. We debated in executive session every issue which is now being presented to the Senate. After discussion the majority of the committee voted out those proposals. Before the bill was presented to the Senate I made the statement in committee, and I repeat it now, that my purpose has been to stand by the bill as it is written. Consequently, I shall vote against any amendments which were rejected by a majority of my colleagues on the committee even though I may have favored them at the time. I am very hopeful that if this Congress shall pass a bill in line with the Senate version the President will sign it. If the President should make the mistake of vetoing a bill substantially the same as the one which we are now discussing, I have little or no fear but that the Congress will quickly override his veto and thereby make it possible for us to place on the statute books legislation which will cure the most serious problems which have developed in the last 10 years in the industrial-relations field and leave other problems to the recess committee, created by the bill, for investigation. I should like to see this bill as it is written tried out in practice. In the meantime we can have a committee of the Senate and House proceed to make a further investigation of the problems touched upon in the amendments which will be proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and others.

Mr. President, there are many additional provisions of the pending measure which I have not discussed this afternoon. The bill also provides for enlarging the Board from three to seven members. I am sure that phase of the bill will be discussed fully by some of my colleagues. I thought that I would leave something for them to say. I did not wish to cover the whole subject matter. I did not wish my colleagues to think, however, that I had overlooked the other provisions.

The review division of the bill is abolished in the hope that we can insure judicial consideration by the Board members of the various matters which come before it.

We enlarge the Board and permit the Board members to select attorneys of their own choosing so that each Board member will be in a better position to determine the issue himself rather than to rely upon one set of attorneys. Usually the Board members will get the same opinion from the review section, whereas if we should permit each Board member to have an attorney of his own and permit that attorney to review various cases, we are more likely to get a fair decision than otherwise.

Mr. President, as I intimated a moment ago, there are five titles in this bill. My discussion has been primarily with respect to title I which deals with amendments to the so-called Wagner Act. Title II, which I am sure will be discussed at length by some of my colleagues deals with the creation of a mediation service and for injunctive relief in national emergencies. I shall be glad to discuss that title at a future time, should any of my colleagues overlook doing so.

The suability provision is very simple, in that it gives to both management and labor the right to sue for breach of a

contract solemnly entered into. That is provided for in title III.

Title IV deals with the creation of a joint committee composed of seven members from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and seven members from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. This joint committee can, I am sure, be of inestimable service to the Senate in making a further study, in the field, if necessary, of many of the problems which have faced labor and management for the past 10 or 12 years; and I am very hopeful that the bill will be enacted and that the joint committee will be selected as soon as the bill becomes law, so that they may undertake their task.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say at this time; but I repeat that I am hopeful that the Senate will turn down all the amendments which now are before it. I include the amendments dealing with the subject matter that has been passed upon by the committee. I am certain that if the Congress passes the Senate bill, as it has been presented by the committee, that bill will become law and will solve many of the difficulties which have been the cause of so much trouble between labor and management.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as bearing on the pending bill I should like to submit a matter for insertion in the RECORD at this point. Today I have received from the attorney general of Nebraska, Mr. Walter R. Johnson, a letter with an attached resolution. The letter reads in part as follows:

On the 14th and 15th of this month a conference was held at Omaha, Nebr., to discuss the legal issues involved in suits that have been instituted, attacking the validity of statutes and constitutional amendments of the States which regulate or prohibit the closed shop.

There were 15 States, namely, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, represented by their attorneys general or assistants at the meeting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolution printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. The resolution was adopted by representatives of the States mentioned in the letter, as I have read it. The resolution is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Lincoln, April 24, 1947.

The Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KEN: On the 14th and 15th of this month a conference was held at Omaha, Nebr., to discuss the legal issues involved in suits that have been instituted, attacking the validity of statutes and constitutional amendmens of the States which regulate or prohibit the closed shop.

There were 15 States, namely, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, represented by their attorneys general or assistants at the meeting.

A resolution was unanimously adopted requesting that Congress specify in the enactment of pending labor legislation that regulation of the right to work is properly a matter for State control under the police powers reserved to the States. A copy of the resolution is herewith enclosed.

I note from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the House amended its bill, H. R. 3020, by adding section 13, which is a very desirable provision insofar as the States are concerned that have adopted legislation or constitutional amendments with reference to the right to work.

I am writing Senator TAFT, chairman of the Labor Committee of the Senate, concerning this matter, but if you would speak to him, it would, no doubt, more forcibly bring it to his attention.

I hope you will check into this phase of the pending labor legislation.

With kind personal regards and with best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER R. JOHNSON,
Attorney General.

"Whereas a considerable number of States have by legislative enactment or constitutional amendment taken action designed to protect the right of the citizen to work free from any requirement of membership or nonmembership in a labor union; and

"Whereas it is considered that such action is a valid exercise of the police power reserved to the several States and the people thereof; and

"Whereas, it is desirable that there be no doubt as to the power of the several States to protect the right of its citizens to work: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the attorneys general and their representatives present in this meeting do respectfully request the Congress of the United States to specify in the enactment of pending labor legislation that regulation of the right-to-work is properly a matter for State control under the police powers reserved to the States; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chairman of this meeting is hereby authorized to appoint a committee of such size as he deems appropriate, and of which he shall serve as Chairman, with full power to act in the premises."

On motion of Attorney General Abram P. Staples, of Virginia, and seconded by Attorney General Roy H. Beeler, of Tennessee, the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted.

The committee named: Attorney General Walter R. Johnson, of Nebraska, chairman; Attorney General Abram P. Staples, of Virginia; Attorney General J. Tom Watson, of Florida; Attorney General Roy H. Beeler, of Tennessee; Attorney General John L. Sullivan, of Arizona.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) to print for the use of the Committee on Finance additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation."

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "District", to insert "and those in neighboring counties who may be affected."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I commend the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the pending bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions that the bill be divided into several parts. That is the position which was taken in the committee by the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and I doubt that any Senator on this floor will claim the knowledge and experience on the subject of labor-management relations which has been had by the two Senators who have committed themselves to the point of view indicated in the motion, namely, that instead of having one bill on this subject, there should be four bills into which the subject should be divided.

I am sure the Senate has been impressed by what was earlier said upon this floor by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that, in the committee of 13 Senators, 9 expressed the view that there should not be presented to the President one bill upon this complicated subject, but four bills, that that was not only the logical way to approach the subject, but, as I said, was the sentiment of 9 of the 13 Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, it is known that the committee consists of eight Republicans and five Democrats. That means that not only the five Democrats, but that four Republicans, as well, expressed themselves in the committee as believing that four bills would be a better approach to this subject, a better way of securing some legislation on the subject, than one bill.

The able Senator from Vermont has pointed out also that it was only after the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], referred the matter to the Republican caucus, that enough committee members belonging to the Republican Party, out of deference to the vote of that party in caucus, changed their votes in the committee to report to the Senate one bill instead of four bills on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the statement of the Senator from Florida requires a word or two from me at this point. When the question had been referred to the Republican conference, the situation then became immediately different from what it was before the question was referred. I was the member of the committee who made the original suggestion that the bill be divided into parts. I made the suggestion sincerely. I made it because any big, complex bill, dealing with questions as we are dealing with them here, brings about misunderstanding, and I felt that if we could have one bill relating to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, another bill relating to mediation, and another dealing with the subject in general terms, we would know exactly what we were talking about; would not become confused, and the people would not be confused. That was the suggestion made. The chairman said, "Well, let us proceed with the omnibus bill, and then settle that question later." But, Mr. President, after a party conference has been held and sides have been taken on a party question, and it therefore becomes a party question, it seemed to me that it would be wrong to come out against the theory of the party, because then we would spend our time discussing a parliamentary question on the floor of the Senate, instead of discussing labor legislation. I want the people of our country and I want Senators to know that we are dealing with labor legislation, and that practically every provision in this bill will change the theory of labor-industry relations as that theory has evolved in the last 10 or 15 years, and I hope and trust that we can debate this question on the basis of industry-labor relations and not find ourselves in a situation where we will vote because of some parliamentary arrangement. I think the people should be told exactly what the Congress is doing in regard to labor. I say that for the benefit of industry; I say that for the benefit of labor; and I say that for the benefit of the Congress itself. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, it was suggested in committee, and I think I am accurate in the categories that I enumerate, that the subject should be broken logically into four categories or into four titles; one bill, amending the Wagner Act; another bill, providing for some improvement in the Mediation and Conciliation Service; a third bill, authorizing suits against and by labor unions in the courts; and a fourth bill, providing for a joint commission to make a thorough study of the whole subject of labor-management relations.

The able Senator from New York, who comes with wide experience in this field—and, may I add, who brings to this subject a nonpartisan point of view—was the one who insisted that that was the logical and practical approach to this problem which should be made by the Congress.

It was obvious, Mr. President, that from a political point of view, from a point of view of affording the better basis for an agreement between the Executive and the Congress, it was also the desirable approach to the subject.

As the able Senator from Utah has just said, this legislation will change almost totally the concept of labor-management relations, and the concept of Government-labor relations, which this Nation has written into law and observed for over a decade. Legislation so complex as that, having such far reach and import as that legislation, obviously Mr. President, affords a wide basis for disagreement between the Executive and the Congress.

While the able Senator from New York disclaims, and I am sure he did not have in mind, any political purpose of any character in making his proposal, undoubtedly it would be far more probable that the Executive and the Congress could get together upon some kind of legislation if it were presented to the Executive by the Congress in the form of four bills, rather than being presented to the Senate in the form of a single comprehensive bill, with respect to which it is unlikely that there can be total agreement between the Executive and the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. It apparently is the sense of the House of Representatives that this entire subject-matter should be included in one bill, and it is apparently the sense of the Senate, up until now, that it ought to be included in one bill. Under those circumstances and in the light of what the Senator has just said, is it not highly possible that under the partnership the President announced shortly after the election, he would be willing to receive the bill in that form and work with it on that basis?

Mr. PEPPER. I have no right to speak for the President or to prognosticate what his opinion will be. The able Senator went a little bit afield, however, in saying that so far it has been the opinion of the Senate. It actually became the opinion of the Republican conference that there should be one bill; contrary to the expressed sentiment in the committee of nine members, including four Republican members, that it would be better to divide this subject logically into four separate bills.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Can the Senator advise us what arguments were made that prevailed upon our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to adopt that policy?

Mr. PEPPER. I can only, as the dearly beloved Will Rogers used to say, tell what I read in the papers; but it appeared in the papers that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and I mentioned the matter here while the Senator was on the floor this afternoon, or I should not mention it now—that he stated in the Republican conference he thought there should be laid on the President's doorstep a single bill, and that the President should have to veto it in toto or accept it in toto. There was a suggestion that political considerations and values had entered into the decision on the subject. Now, whether that was true or not, I cannot say.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Just a moment, please. At least, it was stated that it was the affirmative view of the chairman of the committee that the President should have the whole subject dumped on his doorstep in one package, and have to reject or accept it all in toto.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, first, to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Frankly, I have not seen it in the papers. Could the Senator spell out for us what the political reasoning was, so that the people of the United States might know? What kind of political scheme is on foot?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not attributing to anybody political motives or a political scheme. But Senators recognize that——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will let me finish this sentence, I shall be glad to yield. We all know as a practical matter that there is a large difference of opinion in this whole field. We all know that, if this complicated subject is put into one bill and thrust upon the President, it is a very difficult task for him to bring himself into an assured accord with the Congress upon such momentous legislation, touching so many different subjects, all contained in

one bill. There is a greater likelihood of disagreement if so many subjects are enumerated in one bill, than if the subjects are divided up into four bills, wherein there would be a greater probability of accord between the Executive and the Congress upon one or more of those four bills.

Also, we might as well take cognizance of the fact that, if the President should veto the legislation, there will be many people who will make political charges that he is not in favor of any legislation, with a view to prejudicing the view of that segment of the country's opinion which feels that there should be some legislation. So, it is undoubtedly the kind of thing that is calculated to be the subject of political appeal, if not the basis of political capital. I think it is also less likely to create any legislation, than would be the policy suggested by the Senator from New York, approved by the Senator from Oregon, and contemplated by his motion to recommit, and which was the expressed committee sentiment of 9 members out of a committee of 13, before the chairman of the committee saw fit to refer the matter to the Republican conference. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I think possibly I can clarify some of the points that he has raised. I was one of those, as the Senator, I think, knows, who favored a two- or three-bill approach. Personally, I felt that was the right way to deal with this matter, and I so expressed myself in our group. We do not have caucuses in our party; we discuss these various problems without committing anybody on the results.

The chairman of the committee said that he could report two or three bills, or that he could report one bill. Nothing was said about the position into which it would put the President, or anybody else. Politics was not discussed. The question was merely one of the easy way to handle it. We were aware of the fact that the House was going to pass one bill. Should we pass one bill, have a conference with the House, and adjust the differences between the House and Senate versions, or should we pass three or four bills, and cause possibly endless confusion? I thought, as my good friend the Senator from Oregon stated, we could have done that. It is a matter of reasonable judgment as to which is the most expeditious way to proceed, and it seemed to be the judgment of most of my colleagues that the one-bill approach was the best approach. I said it was contrary to my judgment, but that being the judgment of my colleagues I would vote for one bill, which I did. I am going to oppose the motion made today by the Senator from Oregon because, although originally I was in favor of his position I think that now is not the time to bring it up. So I am going to oppose his motion to recommit the bill. In committee we decided that matter. We decided on the one-bill approach. I am supporting the chairman of the committee in that matter.

Mr. President, I wish to take issue with the implication that there was any politics in our approach to the matter. There is no politics connected with it. So far as politics is concerned, there is just as much danger one way or the other. It would be very foolish to send to the President a bill which he would veto. I wish to make it perfectly clear that what we want to do is to decide upon a procedure which will enable a bill to be passed through both Houses of Congress in the most expeditious manner and go to the President. Then, when the time comes, if it does come, we can consider the question of a veto.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know we all like to have the advice of the Senator from New Jersey to the effect that political considerations are never discussed in a Republican conference.

Mr. SMITH. I interrupt the Senator to say I did not say that. I said that on this particular occasion we did not place the matter on any political basis. It was placed on the basis of the best and the easiest way for the chairman of our committee to present this matter on the floor of the Senate—whether in the form of three or four bills or one single bill.

If it is desired to have any fun out of this subject by bringing in the question of politics, I am very happy to suggest that once in a while from some of the Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle we are given a few political suggestions, and I might suggest that on this occasion the Senator from Florida is trying to put politics in where there is no politics.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say that it would be most natural for the Senator from Florida to suggest that there is politics in this matter.

Mr. SMITH. I can understand how easy it is for the Senator from Florida to see an Ethiopian in the wood pile, and all that sort of thing, so I am not at all surprised at what he has stated in this case.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that it is easy to see the Ethiopian in the wood pile, especially when he sits up on top of it.

Mr. SMITH. I am delighted to have this little exchange of fun. I always enjoy a discussion with the Senator from Florida because of his good nature and his humor; and his witty sallies are impressive to me, and, I am sure, to the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. PEPPER. The presence of the Senator from New Jersey always affords pleasure to me when I am speaking. It is a great satisfaction to be able to serve in the Senate with a gentleman so able and gracious as the junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Many months ago I became concerned about the possibility of the election of a Republican Congress. That was not simply because I belonged to the opposite party; it was because some study of the history of the country had convinced me beyond any shadow of a doubt that whenever we had a Congress of one political complexion and an executive of another, the country suffered regardless of whether the President was Republican or Democratic. I predicted that if such a situation arose there could easily exist in the Eightieth Congress a stalemate between the Executive and the Congress which would result to the damage of the country. Anticipating the very situation which has arisen here today and the discussion which has taken place, on the 23d of this month I placed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor, and if the Senator will yield further, I will quote just a little from that article as to what one nonpolitical observer thinks about this identical situation; and he pays his respects, I must say, to both our parties, the Republicans and the Democrats. He said:

> Events are pointing to a deadlock between Congress and the President over labor legislation.
>
> There still is an opportunity to avert this deadlock, but so far neither side is showing any disposition to take advantage of that opportunity.

Then I skip quite a bit and read further:

> A new labor law is needed. There is no doubt about that. The President wants one kind of labor law; Congress wants a different kind. Because the Presidency and the Congress are in divided hands, it is imperative that a real effort be made by Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders to work out the widest possible area of agreement between them.
>
> Thus far, there is every evidence that 1948 campaign politics is playing a dangerous part in the strategy of both sides.
>
> Here's the way some of the Republican politicians figure it: Pass an omnibus labor bill; make it as stringent as possible. Put everything into it, including what the President would welcome and what he is most likely to veto. Some would welcome a veto, and since there probably are not enough votes in the Senate to override the veto, let Mr. Truman take the blame for no legislation and keep the issue hot for 1948.

Now I must also give the other side. Mr. Drummond continues:

> And some of the Democratic politicians see it this way: The Democratic Party needs labor support. It may not be able to win with labor backing next year, but it certainly can't win without it. Therefore, Mr. Truman will be serving his political interests by having no consultation with the Republican leaders on labor legislation. Do nothing to discourage the most extreme bill and then veto it and stand as labor's champion.
>
> This just isn't good enough. The Republican leaders can ignore the President by deliberately throwing everything into the labor bill but the kitchen sink. Such an attitude risks any labor bill.
>
> The President can ignore the Republican Congress by not calling its leaders into consultation before it's too late. By holding back his own views, he will be deliberately courting a labor bill of a kind he can veto—and the Nation will be the loser.
>
> A dangerous legislative stalemate can be averted if Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders are prepared to adjourn 1948 politics until 1948.

I want to add, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, that I am in thorough accord with what Mr. Drummond has so effectively written.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. President, I, of course, do not know what the President might do with respect

to this legislation, if it is passed. But it was stated in the minority report by three of the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the senior Senator from Florida:

President Truman and the people are aware that our present problem is one of swollen prices and high profits. One marvels at the audacity of those who, drawing to themselves an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth, successful with the help of congressional allies in liquidating many of the popular protections against extortion, now call for another "Battle of the Bulge" against workers' last and best protection—their trade-unions. In the name of "fairness" many of them would give more to those who have and less to those who have not; in the name of "equality" they would increase maldistribution of wealth; masquerading as protesters against monopoly they would weaken the remaining barrier to concentration of industrial power. Enough of their position is included in this bill to make it but one further example of a determination to resurrect those mistakes of 1920–29 which led inevitably to the horrors of 1929–33.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to add another brief comment to the discussion which has already taken place with regard to the omnibus versus the separate bill approach. I think it is very difficult for any of us to say to what extent, if any, anyone has been influenced in his vote in committee on this matter because of political strategy. Certainly my good friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is one whom I know, because of my close friendship with him, does not move on the level of political strategy. I think the Senator from Florida is quite right when he points out that the Senator from New Jersey takes a fine nonpartisan approach to these matters. I think it is perfectly obvious, however, that at the particular Republican conference meeting to which he refers there was a considerable amount of discussion as to the political effects of an omnibus bill; especially was there discussion with regard to a veto possibility if we passed such a bill. We discussed the chances we might have to override a veto, and what the consequences would be if we did or did not.

However, I think that is quite beside the point. I think the job ahead of us in the Senate is to pass fair and reasonable labor legislation. My heart is so set on the four main titles of the bill before us that I think it is of the utmost importance that we get all of them, or each one of them, or as many of them as we can, passed. I think any one standing alone would be a great contribution to industrial stabilization. That is why I have been so insistent on at least trying to approach the question from a separate bill standpoint. That is why I have made my motion. I am interested in trying to get the Senate, if it will, to follow the separate bill approach. If my motion is adopted, the effect will be that all four bills will be pending before the Senate at one and the same time, but we shall vote on them separately. We shall be discussing them interchangeably. But we shall have the opportunity, it seems to me, of getting through some legislation which the President may not veto. I would vote to override his veto on any one of these titles. However, I think we can almost take judicial notice of the fact that some of the titles will be amended in a way which, in all probability, will bring forth a veto. If that happens, I think there is great danger that we shall have no legislation at all as the result of all of our work, and I think that would be playing politics with the people's interests, so far as labor legislation is concerned. I do not want to be a party to that type of strategy.

I have only one further suggestion, and then I shall substitute certain language for the motion which I have already made. I recognize the shortcomings of the suggestion I am about to make. Nevertheless I wish to point out that we are dealing with a subject matter in which, after all, mediation ought to be the predominant characteristic of our negotiations. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has pointed out very clearly the political situation in which we find ourselves. We are in a situation in which the Executive is under one party and the Congress under another. I do not think we would violate any prerogatives of the Senate or of the Executive if as reasonable men we should advise and consult with the President. We are not enemies. We are all trying to do the best job for the American people in accordance with our sights and our consciences. So is the President. He is a fair-minded man devoted to the public interest just as we think we are. I hope we can at least meet the definition of fair-minded and reasonable men. I think the time has come when our leaders, in a bipartisan committee, ought to sit down with the President and say, "Mr. President, you have been in the Senate. You see the parliamentary situation which confronts us. We want to advise and consult with you as to how we can work out an arrangement which will result in the most constructive labor legislation that can be both passed and signed."

I may be quite mistaken, but it strikes me that in a situation such as the one in which we find ourselves that is the way public servants in both branches of Congress ought to act. I sincerely hope that the leaders in both parties in the Senate will follow some such course of action, because I believe that Harry Truman will advise with us in such a spirit as I have suggested.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, which he can answer as a result of his wide knowledge of the subject and his experience in these questions. Would the Senator say that the pending bill, taken as a whole, is more severe or less severe against labor than the Case bill, which the President vetoed during the last session?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is less severe against labor.

Mr. President, when I made my motion earlier this afternoon I really was in the midst of a discussion with my good friend the Parliamentarian as to the proper procedure for me to follow in trying to secure a vote on separate titles of this bill. The issue was raised on the floor before I had time to resort to the Senate rule book. I am very much surprised that I made a motion that was within the rules prior to the conclusion of my consultation with the Parliamentarian. I think the Chair gave me the benefit of the doubt in his ruling by amending my motion as being in conformity with the spirit and intent of the rule on recommital.

In order to make the motion perfectly clear, I ask to have the following substituted for the language previously used:

I move that the pending bill, Senate bill 1126, be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before May 2, 1947, with the following recommendations:

(a) Strike out all after line 6, on page 40, down to and including line 2 on page 58, being titles II, III, and IV; and

(b) Report titles II, III, and IV as separate bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered in the form just read. That is the form which the Chair assumed the Senator was undertaking to propose when the Chair originally entertained the motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not sure that I made myself clear to the Senator from Oregon. It is my observation—and I think it is the consensus—that this bill, with the injunction which is allowed, and many other aspects of it, is more severe than the Case bill, which was before the Congress at the last session. Possibly the Senator from Oregon had in mind the total legislation before that session, including the possibility of drafting labor, which, of course, is not in this legislation.

A little while ago I quoted the following language from the minority views:

President Truman and the people are aware that our present problem is one of swollen prices and high profits. One marvels at the audacity of those who, drawing to themselves an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth, successful with the help of congressional allies in liquidating many of the popular protections against extortion, now call for another "Battle of the Bulge" against workers' last and best protection—their trade-unions. In the name of fairness many of them would give more to those who have and less to those who have not; in the name of equality they would increase maldistribution of wealth, masquerading as protesters against monopoly; they would weaken the remaining barrier to concentration of industrial power. Enough of their position is included in this bill to make it but one further example of a determination to resurrect those mistakes of 1920–29 which led inevitably to the horrors of 1929–33.

I am not basing my conclusion only upon what we said there. Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, expressed substantially the same fear before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, namely, that, if this Congress passes legislation which is so restrictive of the power of labor unions, which so impairs the power of collective bargaining, that the wages of workers in this country are cut so that their share of the national

income is reduced in relation to other income groups, the blow will fall not only upon labor, but upon the whole economy. Therefore, in protesting against this legislation, I believe I do so not only at the instance of labor, and for its protection, but also for the protection of the strength and virility of the whole national economy.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me complete this thought.

I mean to say that in my opinion this drastic antilabor legislation strikes not only at the rights of labor, not only at the wage scale of the workers of America, not only at the living conditions of the people who are the workers of America, not only at the purchasing power of our workers, but strikes a major blow, as did the same policy in the early 1920's, at the whole prosperity of the American economy. It strikes at the employer as well as the employee. It strikes at the farmer as well as the worker. It strikes at every aspect of the American economy. A similar policy followed by the Government after World War I accomplished the same purpose, as Governor Stassen stated.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the oratory of the able Senator from Florida, but I cannot find anything in the bill which justifies his conclusions. There is nothing in the bill that would cut the wages of wage earners. There is nothing in the bill which would do any of the dire things to which the Senator refers.

Mr. PEPPER. There is nothing in the bill except a series of provisions the net effect of which would be practically to destroy the power of collective bargaining now maintained by the labor unions. I believe it is the judgment of moderate men in the labor movement, with many of whom I have talked, men whose names are associated with reasonableness, fairness, and moderation in the conduct of union affairs, that the effect of the bill—especially as I dare say it will be when it is augmented by amendments such as that now pending and others like them to be proposed—will be to hamstring the labor unions so that they cannot effectively preserve the principle of collective bargaining for the workers. When we break the power of a labor union to protect workers in collective bargaining, it means inevitably that the employer will beat down the wages of the workers.

That means that their purchasing power will be diminished, that the whole economy will suffer because they cannot buy the products of our factories, the produce of our farms, and the services which are made available by the people of this country. I wish it very clearly understood that neither the President nor the minority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was opposing national labor legislation. In our report we emphasized what the President recommended to the Congress. Senators will recall that when the President's message was delivered to a joint session of the Congress, the opinion throughout the country was that it was a reasonable, fair, well-balanced executive proposal. He said, in effect:

> There are two things we must do. One, we must enact certain labor legislation. Two, we must enact certain legislation to protect the small businessman from monopolies which are getting into their hands the economic power of this country.

Almost universally the press in this country approved the reasonableness, the impartiality, and the fairness of the approach which the President made to the subject.

We stated in our report:

> The President outlined certain immediate steps to be taken: (a) Legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes intended to compel employers to bargain with a minority union instead of the majority union in their plants; (b) legislation to provide for peaceful and binding determinations of jurisdictional disputes over which union is entitled to perform a particular work task; (c) legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act; and (d) legislation to provide for final and binding arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation of the terms of collective-bargaining agreements.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think that for the benefit of the RECORD it might be well, since the Senator from Florida has reported what the President recommended, for us to catalog, in a way which will make it possible, I think, for any person to answer the question which has been asked as to whether the bill which has been reported is stronger or weaker than the Case bill which the President vetoed.

In addition to the President's recommendations we have the question of industry-wide bargaining to consider. The Senate bill is milder and, therefore, better than the House bill in that regard. Industry-wide bargaining is still permitted, but it is restricted. The closed shop is prohibited. Union-shop contracts are limited. Injunctions to delay big strikes are authorized. That is an invitation to the whole injunctive process which brought forth the Norris-LaGuardia Act to try to cure the evils. The President says nothing about the conciliation service. A wholly new agency is created. The National Labor Relations Board is enlarged under the House bill, and a new board is provided for. Jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practices. Secondary boycotts, in accordance with the President's recommendations, are made unfair labor practices. The check-off of union dues is permitted under the Senate bill. Damage suits against unions are authorized. Unfair practices of unions are regulated. Union financial reports are required. Nothing is said in the Senate bill with reference to Communists, but in the House bill, which will have to be considered in conference, there is an entirely new idea, namely, that Communists in union offices are barred.

Mr. President, when it is realized how all-inclusive and how far-reaching is this legislation—we have reached out into many new fields—I think the point being made by the Senator from Florida is an extremely important point.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator include in the catalog which he gave the provisions in the bill denying supervisory employees the right to organize themselves into collective-bargaining units which they enjoy under the present law and which is not included in the President's recommendations?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I did not mention that, Mr. President, because, as the bill was reported, the supervisory provision is entirely satisfactory and is in agreement with the view of a majority of the committee. It is not the original idea, which would have made it impossible for supervisors in any industry to have become affiliated with unions.

Mr. PEPPER. But it is a subject in addition to those mentioned by the President in his message.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to imply that because of the list or catalog of comparisons between the Case bill and the bill now before the Senate, read by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Florida reaches the conclusion that the present bill is more drastic than the Case bill?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my opinion, after including all aspects of it.

Mr. MORSE. I would simply suggest to the Senator from Florida that wherein we differ is on this very vital point. I think that many of the things sought to be regulated in the Case bill, involving union abuses, should be regulated; but the real test as to whether we are violating union rights and legitimate labor rights, it seems to me, is the procedure by which we seek to regulate them. It seems to me that the procedure which we have in the bill now pending before the Senate is so fair and reasonable that the legitimate rights of labor are protected, and the abuse of them is checked, whereas, under the Case bill, if the Senator will reread it, he will see that the procedure developed in it would put all these problems before the common law courts of the United States, where they would be settled by the judges in America. Then there would be reestablished all the abuses which arose, I think, prior to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, by means of the injunctive processes. But we do not have the evils of government by injunction under the procedure provided in the present bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon a further question. Suppose the amendment now proposed and the three other amendments evidently contemplated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] were to be added to the Senate bill. What would be the opinion of the Senator from Oregon as to such a bill in such form, as compared with the Case bill which the President vetoed last year?

Mr. MORSE. My reply to the Senator is that he is asking me to pass a valued judgment that basically entails subjec-

tive values. He is asking me to make a choice between the qualities of two bills and is asking me to judge them on the basis of a subjective test as to which bill I think is most drastic. I have judged too many horses at horse shows to run into the error in answering the Senator's question of trying to justify a subjective value judgment. It is always difficult to explain why you put a blue ribbon on one horse and send another one to the gate. Hence, I prefer to answer the Senator's question this way:

I am satisfied that if the pending Senate bill is amended by adding to it the four amendments which are being proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] we then truly will have a horse of a different color in the form of legislation which I shall have to vote against; and in the form of legislation that if vetoed I would vote to sustain the veto.

Last year I voted against the Case bill and I would vote against it again because I think it was too drastic and I think the procedure it proposed for carrying out its objectives would have caused great labor trouble in this country. If the bill now pending before the Senate is amended by adding to it the four pending amendments or similar amendments which, in my opinion, are equally undesirable, I shall have no hesitancy in saying that it is too drastic and not workable.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

I was giving what the President had recommended in order to show that the President was not taking the position that there should be no legislation; and neither was the minority of the committee taking that position. On the contrary, as shown beginning on page 40 of the report signed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the senior Senator from Florida, we were prepared to go even beyond what the President had recommended. I read from page 40:

We agree, with the qualifications noted, that there should be machinery for procuring adherence to contracts as attempted by sections 8 (a) (6) and 8 (b) (5). We agree that it should be made an unfair labor practice for a union to interfere with an employer in the designation of his representatives, as provided by section 8 (b) (1).

We agree with our colleagues that "jurisdictional strikes" or "boycotts" should be limited. We believe, however, that as the President recommended, these terms should be carefully and narrowly defined. This has not been done in the majority bill. We approve of the provisions of the bill which treat them as unfair labor practices, subject to cease-and-desist order of the National Labor Relations Board, but we cannot agree with the mandatory preliminary injunction proceeding against such activities which this bill provides. We agree with the excellent protection of the right of free speech accorded by section 8 (c), and, except for the qualifications that we have noted with respect to the cooling-off provisions, with the definition of collective bargaining contained in section 8 (d).

The majority of the committee has spelled out desirable grievance procedures in section 9 (a). We concur with the grant of the right of employers' petition in section 9 (c) (1) (B), and with the revised run-off procedure under section 9 (c) (3).

We think the clarification of relations between the Federal and State boards contemplated under section 10 (a) a wise solution to a complex problem.

We are convinced that the National Labor Relations Board should have a limited access to the courts for temporary injunctions of the kind contemplated under section 10 (j), (k), and (l) but feel this should be limited to cases involving strikes against Board certifications. We commend the majority for establishing by statute the national labor-management panel provided under section 205 (a). We have not discussed these wholesome provisions at greater length since we assume they will be dealt with in the majority report.

So, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that neither was the President taking the position that there were not things which should be the subject of legislation, nor was the minority of the committee taking such a position. But we feel that this bill, as proposed—and all the more so if to it is added the amendment now pending, as offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], or the other amendments which they propose to add—will have the effect of so strangling the privilege of collective bargaining for the American working people that it will condemn the American economy to another depression, just as a similar policy did after World War I.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter which I should like to submit for the RECORD. It bears numerous appended signatures. The letter comes from Amherst, Mass., and it is signed by Colston E. Warne, as secretary for the signers. I wish to read several paragraphs of the letter:

We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that instead you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

* * * * *

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which proposes now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problems of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Mr. President, to that letter are appended the signatures of 150 outstanding men and women in various colleges and universities of the United States. They have given, in that manner, the views which I have just indicated by the passage I have read. I send the letter, together with the signatures, to the desk and ask that it be incorporated at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it was not accidentally that the President incorporated in his message the recommendation that we deal with monopoly in America at the present time. In every statement of the subject it is affirmed that today monopoly is at an all-time peak in the American economy, and that today prices and profits are higher than they have ever been before. Not only that, but in the year 1946, in the fourth quarter, 625 companies earned $950,000,000, or about twice their earning rate during the war years. These figures come from the latest Federal Reserve bulletin. We find that the total corporate profits in 1946 were $12,000,000,000 as compared with $9,000,000,000 in the war years.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an advertisement by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. It is a full-page advertisement, and it was published in the Washington Post of April 27, 1947. The advertisement gives to the public some information regarding the affairs of that company. I read the following from it:

Net earnings accruing to the interest of Jersey shareholders represent a return of 11.12 percent on average net worth, or 10.80 percent on total income of the company and its affiliates. Such consolidated earnings for 1946 came to $6.50 per share of outstanding stock, a total of $177,610,000. Net income for the parent company was $3.83 per share, a total of $104,770,000. Dividends of $3 per share were paid by the company during 1946.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial published in the Dallas Craftsman, the issue of February 21, 1947. It is published in Dallas, Tex. I refer to the editorial because it is a fairly good summary of the profit situation. From it I read the following:

EVERYBODY BUT WORKERS DID BETTER LAST YEAR; MAGAZINES REVEAL HOW BUSINESS PROFITS ZOOMED

New evidence that almost every element in the Nation's economy did better in 1946 than in 1945—except the Nation's workers—was carried this week in two leading magazines, Time and Newsweek.

Neither magazine is friendly to labor, but, as a matter of news, the editors couldn't ignore the plain fact that, while profits set all-time records, labor's share of the national income declined.

A particularly significant summary was published in Newsweek, based upon official Government figures. It showed that aggregate wages and salaries paid to workers slumped from $114,500,000,000 in 1945 to $109,000,000,000 in 1946.

On the other hand, corporation profits, Newsweek pointed out, shot up 25 percent—from $9,000,000,000 in 1945 to $12,000,000,000 in 1946, the highest in history.

Also, over-all profits of individual business owners rose from $13,100,000,000 to $15,000,000,000, and of farm owners from $12,500,000,000 to $15,000,000,000. On top of that, interest and rent payments during the year took a sizable rise—from $11,800,000,000 to $13,000,000,000.

No wonder that Newsweek headed its account, "Profits—A Year of Feast."

Time devoted most of its roundup to corporation profits and it confirmed what Labor—

Referring to the publication Labor—reported last week—namely, that strikes in 1946 failed to make a dent in the fabulous earnings of industry. Labor's story then was based on an article carried in still another magazine, Business Week.

Substantiating that report, Time declared "United States industry found that, despite strikes, shortages, and controls in 1946, actual profits lived up to the great expectations."

Among examples, Time cited the fact that the steel industry "turned in some boxcar profit figures." Net earnings of the United States Steel Corp. jumped 50 percent, Time said, adding that "strikes hurt Big Steel less than expected."

The oil industry "had its best year in over a decade," with profits 25 percent larger than 1945, and with 1947 earnings, according to Time, slated to be "another 15 percent better."

Consumer industries—those making food and household products—likewise prospered. "In the last quarter many cashed in heavily on OPA's death," the magazine explained frankly.

"Typical was Procter & Gamble," the article pointed out. "For the 6 months ending December 31 it netted $16,300,341, versus $9,456,033 for the same period of 1945, and P. & G. also laid aside $14,500,000 to take care of any inventory loss if prices dropped."

Even the "troubled railroads, overwhelmed by rising costs and falling traffic, did not do as badly as they had dourly predicted," the magazine added. It cited the fact that most of the roads reporting "were in the black."

The Association of American Railroads followed up with later data which showed that the final profits of class I carriers—"after interest, rentals, and taxes"—reached $287,000,000. That was a substantial drop from the $447,384,678 netted in 1945, but still far from "red ink."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there for a brief statement, which I know he would like to have in the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator realize that the Pennsylvania Railroad, in making its annual report, which I put into the RECORD, showed they were in the red for the first time in 100 years? So certainly all the railroads did not profit commensurately with what the Senator is saying. I just wanted to bring out that fact.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. The figures I am reading are over-all figures.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand that.

Mr. PEPPER. The statement continues:

And in 1947, as a result of higher freight rates granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads are expected to do much better.

Meanwhile, individual corporation reports, coming through from day to day, underline the fact that 1946 was a bonanza year. Among outstanding ones of the week were: American Woolen Co., with profits of $20,098,176, as against $8,301,140 in the previous year; United States Rubber Co., with $23,207,941, almost double the 1945 figure of $13,024,778, and National Steel Corp., with $20,461,551, compared with $11,117,764 in 1945.

It is perfectly apparent, therefore, Mr. President, that there is already a decline, and I shall be able later to substantiate that statement further, in the working people's share of the national income, even under the labor legislation presently on the statute books. It is my belief, and it is the opinion of many men wiser than I, that, if we adopt legislation of the drastic character of the proposal before us, it will so impair the collective-bargaining power of the workers that there will be an acceleration in the decline of workers' wages, which will impair not only the living standards of the American workingman and his family but the whole economy of the American people, who enjoy the highest prosperity they have had in all our history.

Mr. President, I doubt if I shall conclude shortly, and if the Senator from Maine would like to have the Senate recess until tomorrow, and will permit me to resume when we reconvene, I should be pleased.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator about to conclude?

Mr. PEPPER. I cannot give the Senator that much encouragement.

EXHIBIT A

AMHERST, MASS., *March 1, 1947.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that, instead, you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

We write you as a group of economists, political scientists, and other educators, who have taken a keen interest in the problem of labor-management relations. We are convinced that no adequate solution to the problems of industrial unrest, which has disturbed the Nation's economic life since the end of the war, will be forthcoming except as the result of a careful, patient investigation of the present structure of collective bargaining, the problems on which it is most difficult to reach agreement in negotiations, and the present operation of the Wagner Act.

We are glad that your committee has announced a comprehensive and lengthy schedule of hearings. We do not believe, however, that committee hearings, valuable as they are as a forum for the expression of public opinion, can produce the objective record of factual material which is needed at the present time. Your committee hearings, as scheduled, must necessarily take place against a background of pending wage negotiations between several major industries and the unions representing their workers, and cannot help reflecting the pressures arising from this situation. Furthermore, the testimony heard will be directed at the bills under consideration by your committee and many of them seem to us to be punitive legislation designed to destroy many successful collective-bargaining practices and to jeopardize the rights of workers rather than to find solutions to existing problems.

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which propose now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problems of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Sincerely,

COLSTON E. WARNE,
Secretary for the Signers.

FEBRUARY 28, 1947.

LIST OF SIGNERS

John H. Angell, Eureka College, Eureka, Ill.; Kurt Anderson, 5926 Kensington Road, Detroit, Mich.; George B. L. Arner, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; Roscoe Lewis Ashley, Pasadena Junior College, Pasadena, Calif.; Elizabeth F. Baker, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.; Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford University, Calif.; D. M. Beights, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; A. D. Beittle, president, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Ray Billington, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., Stanford University, Calif.; Boit L. Brannen, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fa.; Walter N. Breckinridge, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; George W. Briggs, Drew University, Madison, N. J.; Leland L. Briggs, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Samuel H. Brockunier, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Emily Brown, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Esther Lucile Brown, Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Frank J. Bruno, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; E. Douglass Burdick, 440 Hare Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nathaniel Cantor, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.; Valdemar Carlson, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Harry J. Carman, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Murray Carroll, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine; J. C. Chalmon, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Vell B. Chamberlin, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.; Edwin L. Clarke, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Charles Cogen, Bronx High School of Science, New York, N. Y.

George S. Counts, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Grace L. Coyle, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Ryland W. Crary, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Earl C. Crockett, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Hartley W. Cross, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.; Merle Curti, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Clyde E. Dankert, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Harold W. Davey, Institute of Economic Affairs, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Paul E. Davies, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; W. M. DePoister, chairman, Department of Sociology, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.; Marjorie Dilley, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.; Conley H. Dillon, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.; Hedley S. Dimock, George Williams College, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. James L. Duffy, S. J., Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; Foster Rhea Dulles, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Fred Eastman, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Lucile Eaves, Simmons College, Boston, Mass.; Thomas D. Eliot, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Mabel A. Elliott, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Horace B. English, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Harold N. Faulkner, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Harry M. Fife, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; R. D. Fleming, New York State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.; Caroll W. Ford, Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass.; W. E. Fort, Jr., Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Royal W. France, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Bertrand Fox, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Morris Friedberg (formerly at Simmons College, Boston, Mass.).

Philip L. Gamble, Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass.; C. G. Gaum, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; S. Colum Gilfillan, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Mary Barnett Gilson, Webber College, Babson Park, Fla.; C. R. Glaves, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.; Josephine Gleason, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Everett W. Goodhue, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Willystine Goodsell, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Leland J. Gordon, Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Eleanor

H. Grady, dean of faculty, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; William D. Gray, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; G. C. Groat, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; George C. Grosscup, Jr., University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Harold W. Guest, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.; Charles B. Hagan, 316 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill. (University of Illinois); Bernard F. Haley, Stanford University, California; Calvin S. Hall, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Alice Hamilton, M. D., Hadlyme, Conn.; George H. Hand, Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va.; John E. Harding, Texas Tech, Lubbock, Tex.; Robert J. Harris, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.; Marion Hathway, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; M. Gordon Hayes, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; George Hedley, Mills College, Oakland, Calif.; John Hope II, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; William S. Hopkins, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Everette N. Hong, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; John Ise, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.

Leland H. Jenks, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.; Henry P. Jordan, Washington Square College, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Albert S. Keister, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C.; Noble H. Kelley, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.; Vera Reynolds Kilduff, New York State Department of Commerce, Albany, N. Y.; C. Wendell King, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Philip Klein, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Laurence S. Knappen, 2611 South Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. (formerly at Rutgers); Bruno Lasker, 64 Shelly Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.; Arnold J. Lien, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Bert James Loewenberg, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.; Philip Lohman, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; H. L. Lurie, Council of Jewish Federations, 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Gault W. Lynn, research economist, 935 Lee Drive, Menlo Park, Calif.; H. F. MacNair, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Flora L. Magoun, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Mabel Magee, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.; Norman R. F. Maier, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Charles F. Marsh, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; James M. Matthews, Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass.; Elwyn A. Mauck, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; William D. Max, S. J. Tilden High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; W. A. McConagha, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.; Douglas McGregor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; M. K. McKay, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. B. McNatt, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; Caroline G. Mercer, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; William Milcher, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

Glenn W. Miller, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; F. L. Mizl, Texas Institute of Technology, Lubbock, Tex.; J. D. Morgan, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Gardner Murphy, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.; Evan B. Murray, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah; Otto Nathan, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Edward G. Nelson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; M. F. Nimkoff, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.; Ruby Turner Norris, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Audrey L. Packham, Rollins College, Winter Park., Fla.; Julian Park, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; James E. Pate, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; R. D. Patton, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Paul S. Pierce, 320 Knowles, Winter Park, Fla.; Frank C. Pierson, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; J. S. Prentice, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Robert W. Rafuse, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; H. H. Remmers, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Bernard Riesse, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; Robert Rockafellow, Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.; Eliot H. Rodnick, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; William S. Schlauch, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Melvin J. Segal, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.; Fred A. Shannon, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; J. Whitney Shea, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.; John H. Sheehan, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.

Henry Wood Shelton, box 48, La Jolla, Calif.; Carl D. Smith, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.; Harry W. Smith, Lewiston, Maine; Rhea Marsh Smith, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; T. R. Solomon, Prairie View University, Hempstead, Tex.; Alice W. Spieseke, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Albion G. Taylor, William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; W. Bayard Taylor, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Ralph B. Tower, University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.; Royal S. Van de Woestyne, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Jacob Van der Tree, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; T. W. Van Metre, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Eric A. Walker, Penn State College, State College, Pa.; Goodwin Watson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Howard White, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; Thomas F. Wieson, Texas Institute of Technology, Lubbock, Tex.; William J. Wilkinson, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; Walter F. Willcox, 3 South Avenue, Ithaca, N. Y.; Theresa Wolfson, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Florence M. Woodard, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Helen R. Wright, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Dallas M. Young, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

Colston E. Warne, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. (secretary for the group).

FREE COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCES

Mr. WHITE. In the circumstances, Mr. President, before I make a motion to recess, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 102, Calendar No. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

Mr. WHITE. Just a brief word of explanation. There are to be held in the United States this summer three international communications conferences, which will, in the aggregate, be of tremendous importance not only to the United States, but to the communication facilities of the United States. The first one will open May 15, the second will open July 1, or thereabouts, and the final one on August 1, or thereabouts.

It has long been the custom at these international conferences that there should be furnished free communication facilities for all those who are technically participants in the conferences. Senate Joint Resolution 102 does not require but would permit the communications companies, in accordance with precedent, to furnish the participants in the conferences free communication facilities. It will cost the United States nothing. It will be a great convenience to all the visiting delegates, and others who may come here from all over the world to attend the conferences. I very much hope the Senate will feel like passing the joint resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prohibit United States communication common carriers from rendering free communication services to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is nothing further at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow I may have the floor to resume my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Richard D. Gatewood, of New York.
Douglas Jenkins, Jr., of South Carolina.
John D. Jernegan, of California.

J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Robert A. Aiken	William E. Boisvert, Jr.
Julian L. Alexander, Jr.	Myron E. Bond
James B. Allen	Lee H. Boyd
Ray M. Allman	Carl J. Bradley
Mickelangelo Altieri	Charles C. Brisco, Jr.
Arthur H. Anderson	Elmer C. Broadwell
Frank A. Anderson	John R. Brown
Kenneth L. Baker	Kenmore McM. Brown
William E. Bardelmeier	Orval W. Buell
	Sidney M. Burnett
Frederick J. Bear, Jr.	Ossian R. Butterfield
Francis J. Beitzer	William A. Buttlar
Roy M. Bell	Robert D. Buzzard
Charles H. Black	Harold P. Cahill, Jr.
William Blanchard, Jr.	Donald D. Campbell

Robert V. Canosa, Jr.
Earle W. Carder, Jr.
Herbert W. Carr
Robert V. Cauchon
Joseph R. Childers
Frederic J. Clawson
Robert J. Cleary
Robert W. Cohan
Thomas A. Connor
Frederick D. Cook
Wayne H. Crawford, Jr.
Harold W. Crozier
John D. Cumalat
John E. Cummings
William E. Cunningham
William S. Currie
Richard J. Dermody
Richard A. Derus
Eugene A. Dieckert, Jr.
Joseph E. Dierkes
Donald L. Dondero
Robert M. Ducey
Harry B. Ellis
James E. Empting
David L. English
William Evans
James V. Farley, Jr.
Doc G. Faulkner, Jr.
Robert Fedor
John J. Fickers
Albert O. Floyd
Archie E. Floyd
Isaac N. Franklin, Jr.
John McA. Frye
Peter Galimitakis
Joseph J. Garside
Gene F. Gauthier
Michael Gaydos, Jr.
George W. Gibson
Robert F. Graves
William D. Greene
Galen M. Hallett, Jr.
Charles R. Hannun
Andrew U. Hassman, Jr.
Millard F. Havener
Kenneth G. Haynes
Richard W. Haupt
Robert L. Heinz
Richard M. Hennigan
William McG. Hepburn, Jr.
Harold M. Hewell
Alvin S. Hibbs
Robert K. Hoffman
Carl L. Hokenson, Jr.
Philip C. Holland
Wallace J. L. Houde
Lewis McN. Hough
Richard H. Howe
George E. Hubbell
Ira J. Hudson 3d
Bruce M. Jacobs
William E. James
Robert W. Johnson
William N. Johnson
Charles W. Jones
Robert A. Keagy
James D. Kearny
Edward T. Keating
Owen K. King
Joseph M. Kitchen
John L. Kline, Jr.
Robert H. Koehler
Robert P. Kolar
Lee F. Kyle
Eugene Lange
Charles S. Leach
Morris Levin
Linus R. Litsey
James F. Logan, Jr.
Thomas Longo
Lawrence R. Lowe
Donald H. Lucas, Jr.
Robert T. Maconie
Patrick J. Madden
Don McC. Martin
Andrew J. Mashaw
Joseph C. McCalley
Raymond K. McDannold
William L. McGonagle
Robert M. McLaughlin
Grover C. Miller
Raymond T. Miller, Jr.
William J. Miller
Donald F. Milligan
Samuel R. Miserendino
Jack L. Morrow
Robert C. Newcomb
George E. Nuber, Jr.
Eugene W. Ostlund
Arthur M. Pastel
Dale S. Perry
Richard Porter
Paul R. Powell
William C. Powell, Jr.
William L. Prange
John F. Pritchard
Robert W. Proctor
Henry P. Quick
Robert L. Quimby
Robert B. Rausch
Davis W. Reed
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
Isaac P. Rehkopf
Benjamin T. Richards
Donald W. Richardson
Joseph M. Rideout 3d
David A. Robinson
William B. Robinson
Robert E. Rodes, Jr.
Estel E. Rouch
Clifford LeR. Sayre, Jr.
Walter T. Schultheis
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Aldo Serafini
Lester L. Shade
Frank G. Simala
Richard S. Slawson
Earl A. Sonnier
Monroe B. Sorge
George A. Souris
Charles J. Stanback
Jason K. Stewart
Joseph V. Sweeney
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Edward "X" Tuttle
John Van Tol
Adelberta M. Von Almen, Jr.
James W. Wallace
Thomas C. Walsh
Harold E. Weber
David J. Werner
Cleo Weschke
John M. Westbrook
Donald J. Weinstraut
Thomas R. Wilkinson
Roy E. Williams
Laurence W. Wilson
Robert D. Wilson
Gordon L. Wineman
Richard G. Wisham
Richard A. Yale
McCaslin Yates
George T. Youngren

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

William E. Ainslie
Michael Bat
James M. Baumgardner
Carl I. Bergkvist
Robert M. Bonk
Duane D. Borgert
William H. Brownell
Wright A. Burnham
Ralph A. Buswell
Ervin H. Cooper
Howard R. Cottrell
Paul R. Ebling
Richard B. Euchenhofer
Malcolm E. Graham
Normal A. Henry
James D. Hereford, Jr.
Leif A. Houkom
Raymond E. Jeffery
Carroll R. Keyser
"J" Scott Kirkwood
John W. Kline
Francis A. Kocourek
Donald H. Lake
John R. Logan
Donald E. Mackin
Donald S. Macoy
Joseph L. Mahoney, Jr.
William F. Mangan
Noel D. Martin
Alfred S. Maurstad
Harold A. McCauley
Thomas T. McGinnis
David E. Moline
Robert F. Morison
Maurice A. Notch
Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Joseph F. Ouellette
Paul J. Pflueger
Charles R. Pitchford
Raymond Ramer
Robert L. Reed
Keith L. Robinett
Edward A. Short
John T. Snyder
Samuel S. Stephens
Jackson R. Strange
Lawrence E. Sutherland, Jr.
Edward J. Tuite
William S. Waldron
Carleton R. Williams

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
Henry F. Peger
Maurice A. Person
Donald R. Williams
James L. Yates

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Jehovah God, we would heed Thy holy word and in all our ways acknowledge Thee, and Thou wilt direct our paths. We thank Thee that the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace. O may our souls burst in gratitude and praise before the purpose and the abundance of our God. Take our powers unemployed, our ideals unfulfilled, and our possibilities unachieved and use them for the promotion of Thy kingdom; so shall we find favor in the sight of God and man. Every noble task completed enlarges the soul of the doer and increases the blessings of peace and contentment for our country. As selected servants and leaders of the people, may we carry their needs in our hearts and be very, very sure that we live to serve them. We pray in the name of Him who carried our needs to the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Railroad Retirement Board.
8. United States District Court (eastern district of North Carolina).

PROCUREMENT OF BUILDINGS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 196 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $40,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $26,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 118

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 of the Eightieth Congress incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and provided for by House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress, shall be effective from February 13, 1947.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF PROFIT SHARING AND POSSIBILITIES OF INCENTIVE TAXATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, being the report entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation," which was printed as a report from a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 215, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to May 18, 1938. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Commission.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, some of the criticisms which have been made by those who oppose the proposed legislation authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey have centered around the Greek elections. It has been stated by certain individuals that there have been no registrations for elections in Greece since 1932 and that no one not registered had been permitted to vote in the plebiscite held for the purpose of restoring the monarchy.

In order to ascertain the facts in this connection, I communicated with the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, regarding the registrations in Greece.

I suppose that it is quite normal that people who are not registered should not be able to vote. This is the case in our own country.

I am putting this letter in the RECORD because I think it important that as much information as possible should be made available to the Congress before they are called upon to vote on this portentous issue. The letter follows:

The statements reported by Mr. Hubert E. Page in the letter which you transmitted to me on April 4, 1947, regarding registration in Greece are not in accordance with the facts.

In preparation for the elections in Greece which were held on March 31, 1946, the period from July 1945 to February 10, 1946, was set aside for registration of voters. Greek citizens were given another opportunity to register from June 3, 1946 to July 12, 1946, in preparation for the plebiscite held on September 1. Special provision was made for refugees from western Thrace and Macedonia who could not meet the residence qualification. According to the law of April 30, 1946, all electoral lists which had merely been revised and not newly compiled for the elections in March 1946 were required to be compiled anew for the plebiscite. At the request of the Greek Government, an Allied mission observed this undertaking, watching the operation of the registration machinery and analyzing the lists on the completion of the revision and recompilation. The mission expressed itself satisfied that the revision and recompilation of the electoral lists attained a degree of fairness and accuracy which justified their use in seeking the opinion of the Greek people in matters of national import.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Governor Carlson of Kansas at a recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received permission to include a statement adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of the delegates of the American Automobile Association at San Francisco. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take about three and one-half pages of the RECORD and cost approximately $248. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein articles from newspapers concerning the new Surgeon General of the Army.

AMUSEMENT TAX ON SCHOOL BENEFITS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mrs. Eunice Hauk, president of the Band Benefit Club of Cassville, Wis., stating that at the request of the local Band Benefit Club she was writing to me to protest the Federal amusement tax as applied to proceeds from school activities. She states:

It would seem to us that this tax is actually levied against public education, since all proceeds from school performances are spent for educational purposes.

This is a subject that has been on my mind a long time, Mr. Speaker. If the Lions Club, for instance, wants to put on a benefit to do something to aid the blind, if the Kiwanis Club wants to do something to aid underprivileged children, if the Rotary Club wants to put on a drive to aid in suppressing subversive activities, or if any fraternal organization wants to do something for patriotic purposes, or sponsor a benefit for world peace, or a home for the aged, or other worthy cause, or if the band mothers or the parent-teacher associations or the 4–H Clubs want to do something for their boys and girls, they have to pay an amusement tax on any admission fee or charge for this benefit. I am therefore referring this matter to the Ways and Means Committee to do something about it, because such organizations should not have to pay a tax in these cases.

THE LATE MRS. EVALYN WALSH McLEAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein certain editorials and newspaper comment about Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there passed away, and the world lost, a very great lady, a very great American, Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean. She died at Friendship, a house well named, because those of us who knew her and loved her realized that there could not be a greater friend, a greater philanthropist, one who was more kind.

I wish to speak especially, though, of her friendship, her help to the disabled veterans. She fought to secure for them better houses, better living conditions, better medical services. She herself paid for many things for the disabled veterans. She did what she could to restore sight to the blind; she tried to get the best surgeons, the best drugs, and the best prosthetic appliances for them. No request from a veteran went unheeded. She made her home their home, and I know they mourn her as I do.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRICE TRENDS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, press and radio report a trend toward lower prices, following the forthright statement by the President April 21.

I hope this represents a real willingness all along the line to be satisfied with reasonable prices, margins, and profits.

I hope it represents a turning away, even at this late date, from the reckless inflationary course which has already dangerously decreased the purchasing power of wage and salary earners and fixed-income people, including disabled veterans and those taking GI training.

If it does, we will have stopped at the edge of the abyss, at the edge of a deflationary collapse. Such a collapse, even if only a recession, might have caused unemployment to increase to four, five, or six million before the end of 1947, according to some economists.

Mr. President, it is with satisfaction and pride that I point out that this whole Nation-wide concern about high prices, about the high cost of living, was given sharp focus by the remarks of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], made on the floor of this House on March 13. I remember how she brought into the Chamber a housewife's market basket of common food items needed by every family and showed, item by item, how prices had increased since the end of effective price control June 30, last.

The gentlewoman from California, and the housewives of the Nation—if I may be pardoned for pointing—deserve recognition and credit for the part they have played by word and by cautious buying in checking run-away inflation before it is too late. They have helped to bring to their senses those who, for short-run profits, were pursuing a course that would have taken the American people over the same old tragic road of boom and bust. I think my colleague from California is entitled to a vote of thanks from the House and the American people for the timely and dramatic warning she gave to all of us.

And, may I add, the merchants of Newburyport, Mass., are to be commended for showing the same daring imagination in trade that their predecessors displayed when they built, equipped, and sent the clipper ships to the China seas and spread our commerce over the seven seas.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the resources of democracy to save itself and its people are not exhausted. In the emergency, we find ways to save ourselves from drifting over the falls to final disaster. So it must always be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New York Sun.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from a special committee in his congressional district on appreciation for the program for restoration of our soil which has lifted our farm population from the depths of bankruptcy to a higher level of prosperity and has given assurance of a secure and sound agriculture for future generations, also to include "History of AAA" and "Why the AAA."

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter he received from the Polish-American Congress and in the other to include an article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Magistrate Maurice Simmons, past national commander, United Spanish War Veterans at Ulysses S. Grant birthday anniversary services, Grant's Tomb, New York City, on April 27, 1947.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by an American Legion post in his district.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a broadcast by George E. Reedy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I received from the Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning a bill he is introducing today.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, we should always give credit where credit is due. Apparently the War Department is one department of the executive branch of the Government which is making a sincere attempt to cooperate with the Congress in an effort to reduce the number and expense of highly paid civilian personnel. I was gratified to read in the morning paper that the Under Secretary of War has directed the various bureau chiefs to recommend the elimination or demotion of at least 50 percent of the middle and top grade civilians. The bureau chiefs came back with their recommendations affecting only 20 percent in these grades. The Under Secretary, however, stood his ground and insisted that his original directive be carried out.

The number of military personnel is drastically reduced and reductions in grade are made right and left following the termination of active hostilities. There is no reason why the same should not apply to those acting in a civilian capacity.

This same article, however, written by a spokesman for the civil-service employees, charges the War Department with "trickery" in an attempt to make the demotions stick. He goes on to explain that new "job descriptions" are going to justify lower grades although many of the employees will do the same work as they are now doing.

Any of us who have had any intimate experience with Government departments know that this same device, which was never characterized as "trickery" when it worked the other way, was used to up-grade these employees and that it was done with the wholehearted approval and cooperation of the civil-service people. If you wanted to get a civilian promoted it was not possible to do so by simply showing that he or she was doing outstandingly good work, as is the case in ordinary civilian pursuits, but it was necessary to prepare a new "job description" which was done time and time again.

The promoted individual would do exactly the same work today as yesterday but under a different job description, which was the stock method of bringing about a promotion.

It does not lie in the mouth of those who enjoyed the benefits of this system now to complain when it works the other way. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRK-

SEN] chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 736, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding, I am not sponsoring the adoption of Senate bill 736. So that you may know—and I am sure all of you are up to date on it—I wish to call your attention to the fact that we considered the substance of this bit of legislation on February 24, 1947, when the original bill introduced by the chairman of the House District Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for the granting of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia, was before the House. As all of you will recall, that bill was defeated by a roll-call vote of 210 to 124. During the period of that debate the situation was pretty well discussed, except that we now come back with a bill wherein the power is given to the District Commissioners to decide whether or not we should have daylight-saving time here.

Mr. Chairman, some 3 years ago I asked the minority leader, now the Speaker, to be placed upon the Committee on the District of Columbia because I felt rather sympathetic to some of the problems the District had. However, may I say that, as a Member of Congress, I live here and I am subjected to the conditions that are written in by the Congress. The conditions under which all of us live are as much applicable to me as to anybody else.

May I say at the outset that, regardless of how much criticism I may take, I just do not like the daylight-saving bill. I am against it, I have been against it, and I shall continue to be against the thrusting of daylight-saving time on the people of the District of Columbia, whether it be by direct action of the Congress or rather by the subtle attempts which are being made today to authorize the District Commissioners to give daylight-saving time to us if they decide in their wisdom to do so. I called your attention before to the fact that all of us are living here by reason of the fact that we are Members of Congress. We live here under the conditions existing, whatever they may be. I think the Members of Congress—certainly the Members of the House—have been very considerate of the District of Columbia and its problems. I happen to be one of those who, in the fight last year for the hospital situation, with the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], prevailed upon the House to go along upon the hospital program and upon many other bills of benefit to the District.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of daylight-saving time has been before the Congress on other occasions. In January 1942, at the request of the President, we passed a daylight-saving bill under the theory and guise that it would permit a saving of electricity and would be in the national interest in carrying on the war. There has never been a single other bill during my years of service in this House that has aroused as much criticism and concern as that bill. As early as 1943 repealer legislation was introduced. I happened to dig up my old daylight-saving file Saturday when I was thinking about this matter, and I find that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in September of 1945, we repealed that legislation—the first wartime legislation that was repealed. How many different Members of Congress had introduced bills or resolutions or amendments for that purpose? Some 55 in that session.

In the report upon the repeal of that legislation, and I am speaking now of House Report No. 945 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, you will find that there were 16 Members of Congress who introduced concurrent resolutions directly requesting repeal of that legislation, that there were 14 bills which sought to repeal it, and one joint resolution. The other bills, the difference between the 31 and 55, were bills amending that act. So I think the subject of daylight saving time has been pretty much discussed nationally during its trial run of some 3½ years, and it certainly created more unhappiness than any other single piece of wartime legislation that was passed.

Now let me call your attention to another thing. We had no hearings upon this legislation, and I believe there was none in the Senate. Some references have been made to the report of this or that organization that is for it or against it. I do not know how many people were asked to vote upon that or whether it was the usual club meeting, and three or four of the boys said, "Well, I see daylight saving is up, I believe it would help me play golf, so let us write up and tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that our group is for daylight saving time."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. I was called by telephone by one of the employees in one of the Government agencies a few days ago. This person said, "I was asked to vote as to whether I was in favor of daylight-saving time." She said, "Well, I voted 'no'." Then, she said, "They came back in a few days and rechecked to see if I had changed my mind." Her reason for calling me was to say, "We hope they get this thing out of the way. They are using up a lot of time somewhere in one of these Government agencies figuring out whether or not these people are in favor of it or against it." She said she thought the House had decided this thing several days ago.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is true. May I point out in the matter of recreation that the Government employees under the 40-hour week have Saturdays off which is more than most of us have off. In the summertime the stores are closed on some days in the middle of the week so that the employees have their recreation and can get out in the sunshine and some of the people who are particularly interested in promoting this are in a position to take off whatever time they want.

Mr. REES. They certainly are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if by contrast this is not true—that the men who produce the food consumed in the District of Columbia and who are not consulted concerning this legislation and never can be consulted, do not get any time off?

Mr. O'HARA. That situation just makes more apparent the confusion that exists on this matter. The last time this matter was up for consideration it was argued that they were going to adopt daylight-saving time in Maryland, I believe. Actually, the localities around Washington have not adopted daylight-saving time, and neither has the surrounding territory in Virginia. I want to point out to you that this will add further to the confusion of your folks back home who will not be aware that there will be another hour's difference in time if we have daylight saving here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the bill calls for hearings by the Commissioners to hear the people of the District as to whether they want daylight-saving time or not. I am sure the gentleman believes in majority rule and if a majority of the citizens of the District do not want daylight-saving time, of course, it would not be granted.

Mr. O'HARA. The answer to that is that you have a few people who come up and say, "Well, we want daylight-saving time." You have a great number of people who say, "Hooey with daylight-saving time. I am not going to bother myself about voting on it." So, we get a small expression of opinion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not possible to have a vote in the District and if the majority decide that they want daylight-saving time, then I presume the gentleman would be in favor

of it since it would be what the majority want.

Mr. O'HARA. I am going to exercise my vote right here.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. What about the railroads and airlines? Are they going to change their time schedule?

Mr. O'HARA. No.

Mr. REES. Then people would have to observe the two different times.

Mr. O'HARA. They are not going to change their time. This is an example of the confusion that exists. The radio people are behind this effort to bring daylight-saving time to the District of Columbia. Because in the city of New York, where most of the programs originate, they want to change the time they think the rest of the country ought to bow down and say, "If you gentlemen on the radio want daylight-saving time, the whole country should have daylight-saving time." I do not agree to that.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, tne bill we have under consideration today has been more or less of a thorn in the flesh of the members of the District Committee during the past 2 years. As one member I know we want to get this bill out of the way. We want to find out whether a majority of the Members want daylight saving or want to keep the time as it is.

The bill under consideration today simply gives the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to grant daylight-saving time if a majority of the people in Washington want daylight-saving time. I am not saying whether I want daylight-saving time or not, but if the people of Washington want it I, personally, have no objection to their having it, even though it will affect Members of Congress. I think the Members of the House have been exceptionally fair to the District of Columbia. I know we have done a great deal more for the people of Washington than we have done for the people of South Carolina, which State I have the honor to represent. I think if the people of Washington really wanted daylight-saving time, they should have contacted the Members of Congress who are supposed to take care of legislation for the District of Columbia. I have had three letters relative to daylight saving: one against it and two for it. I do not see very much enthusiasm either way. According to the newspapers, it seems people are contacting the newspapers and asking them to sponsor this legislation. I am of the opinion the only thing for us to do is to take this matter up and dispose of it today once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. I do not know of anything that created quite so much confusion as daylight-saving time during the war. I believe more people in the United States were made happy over the repeal of the daylight-saving-time legislation than anything that has happened for a long time.

It is said that the people of Washington should regulate their own affairs. I agree with that, provided that when they regulate their own affairs they do not regulate the affairs of others. Many of the farmers adjacent to this territory have to get up now at 4 or half past 4 o'clock in the morning. This means you will get them out of bed between 3 and half past 3 in order to bring the milk and other farm products in to market. What right do the people of the District have to regulate the farmers adjacent to the District, and regulate them in such a way as to impose an undue hardship upon them? Who is behind this legislation, anyway? Is it the Government workers? The Government workers today get out around 4:30. You propose to let them out, under this legislation, at 3:30. In addition to that, the Government workers get a holiday every Saturday and some 45 days in sick and vacation leave. The farmers do not get a holiday on Saturday. They do not get off in the afternoon at 4:30. Now you are trying to make them get up at 3:30 and 4 o'clock in the morning and go to bed before dark if they are to get the proper amount of sleep. You are not treating the farmers who supply the food to the people of this District in the right way, in order to accommodate those who need no further accommodation, in my opinion.

This Government certainly has been generous in dealing with the Government workers. How much more time for recreation, play, and pleasure do they want?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that it will take 1 hour of good sleeping time away from the average person who lives in this hot climate in the summertime?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is what you are doing.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman know of any southern city, unless we classify Baltimore as southern, that has daylight-saving time?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not.

Then, another thing: Our transportation system is being run on standard time. This legislation is going to bring about confusion. You would go to work on daylight-saving time, but if you wanted to catch a train, an airplane, or bus, you would switch over to standard time. Is it right, in order to accommodate a few people here in Washington, to disregard the rights of the people who are supplying the citizens of this city with food, and at the same time bring about the confusion that will naturally follow the passage of this bill? These people are entitled to some consideration, and I do not believe the people of Washington, if they really understood the hardships this legislation would impose upon the rural population, would be in favor of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. This is going to make, perhaps, a 3 hours' difference in the transaction of business for Members of Congress from farm districts and farmers among their constituency, is it not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It certainly is.

Mr. STEFAN. You cannot regulate the time when you slop the hogs or milk the cows, can you?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; you cannot do that.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman. The best news our people received on the farm after the war was the repeal of daylight-saving time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is correct; and when the issue was before Congress it was repealed by practically unanimous vote.

We have been getting along on standard time for many many years, ever since this Government was formed. We made the change during the war. I did not think much of the change then. I thing it did more harm than good during the war period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, we believe in self-government and self-determination for the Philippines, for the Germans, for the Japanese, and for most of the other peoples of the world. I believe charity begins at home and that it would not be out of order to allow some self-government and some self-determination for the voteless, unrepresented people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, tells me that several polls have been taken on this subject amongst the people of the District of Columbia and that they run as high as 75 percent in favor of daylight-saving time.

Personally, it does not make any difference to me whether they use daylight time or standard time. Who are we to oppose the mandate of any people at any time in the United States of America? I believe that as Members of Congress we must and should recognize the wishes and concur in the mandate of the people we govern, that we should not oppose daylight-saving time if they so desire.

If the District of Columbia had self-government we would be under daylight-saving time at the present time, because that is what the people desire. Unfortunately, they cannot have it because Congress will not yield it to them.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people were interviewed in those polls? Not more than six or eight thousand out of 900,000 residents.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I know only what the chairman of the committee told me and I am certain he would not misrepresent the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL.]

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a great many people seem to be under the misapprehension that this daylight-saving time is hooked up with and originated in New York or some other part of the country. Daylight-saving time originated in my district. A very distinguished Republican official, the Honorable Robert Garland, gave this great gift to America. We have used it for some 20 years over in Pittsburgh and I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that I have not heard of any farmers of western Pennsylvania being very seriously "discombooberated" by daylight-saving time.

I think it is time to do something for the people of Washington.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the right of people to petition; I believe in the right of people to have the type of laws which they want and I have this thought so far as the District of Columbia is concerned. In the course of the last few weeks since this controversy has arisen, I have gone out of my usual way to find out from the people of the District what they want and up until 11 o'clock last night I had not found a single person from the District of Columbia who by word of mouth, by letter, or by telegram asked me to vote for this bill. Everyone I spoke to said he was against it.

Mr. Chairman, the Government departments are closed all day Saturday; and moving up the time an hour here in the Capital of the Nation will make governmental business more difficult—in the West where there is a difference of 1, 2, or 3 hours against Washington time. In these far western areas the situation will be made much more inconvenient. For instance, a telegram sent from my district in Louisiana at 3 o'clock on Friday would arrive here at about 5 o'clock, closing time, and too late for anything to be done until the following Monday. This means, in effect, that the people in the far West where time will differ by as many as 4 hours will have to get their requests by telegram started to Washington as early as Friday morning in order to have any hope of getting action before the following Monday.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, did I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina yielded all of his time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 5 minutes still remaining on the minority side.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina still have 5 minutes left after the gentleman from Illinois has finished?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, year after year for 15 years I have seen Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle come down into this well and belabor the District of Columbia and the portion it took of our legislative time for District affairs. Year after year for 15 years I have heard Member after Member in the well of the House assail the fact that Congress was serving as city council for the Nation's Capital. I took some stock of that argument. I felt there was some validity in the fact that in proportion as this takes time it does divest time from legislative duties on a national scale. In due course this argument developed to the point where finally the House and Senate set up a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, and I was one of the Members who served on that committee for 18 months. When we finally completed our labors we reported on the 4th day of March 1946, and then there followed a bill which was subsequently passed and signed by the President on the 2d day of August 1946. It was a rather broadgaged bill. We increased our salaries in that bill. We increased our expense allowances in that bill. We passed a legislative lobby title. We included a bridge bill. We included a Federal tort claims act. What we were trying to do was to save time and economize on the time and the demands that were made upon the talents and the energies of Members of Congress.

As that bill was first reported, it contained a title to provide a measure of home rule for the District of Columbia. There is presently in the Senate a subcommittee of the Senate District Commitee on Home Rule. There is in this House, in the Committee on the District of Columbia, a Subcommittee on Home Rule under the very able leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], who has been devoting a great deal of time to that subject.

Now, we come here not with a daylight saving bill but with a bill that is predicated upon a principle of home rule. You do not say in this bill that there shall be daylight time for the District of Columbia. This bill confers authority upon the administrative heads of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners, who are appointed by the President, to hold a hearing. If they should decide after hearings that there should be daylight-saving time in the National Capital, then they will take the necessary steps in order to provide that change of time. There has been so much misapprehension about the pending bill. When you vote for this bill—and I hope it will go through by a resounding majority—you do not say that there shall be daylight-saving time in Washington, D. C. You simply confer power upon the appointive executive heads of the District of Columbia, after suitable hearing, whether or not in their wisdom and in all good conscience the time should be changed. I, for one, approve of it. They have daylight-saving time in Chicago. They voted by four to one in St. Louis last week for daylight saving. They have daylight saving in 10 different States of the Union. It started at midnight on Saturday night. They have daylight-saving time in New York City. They have daylight-saving time in Annapolis, Md., the next largest metropolitan center north of here. They have daylight-savings time in Baltimore, Md. The Governor of Maryland signed a bill recently whereby the three adjoining counties, in which so many of the District personnel live, can impose daylight saving as soon as it is done in the National Capital, if that is the decision of the District Commissioners. The Governor of Virginia, Governor Tuck, has informally notified the Boards of Trade of Arlington, Alexandria, and other cities, that if they want to set their clocks ahead, they may do so, but no State action was taken. But the point is that those people are allowed to fall in line.

We hear the argument about what distress will be imposed upon the farmers in the area. One of the largest milk distributors in the National Capital told me recently, and asked that I do not use his name, that milk is received at all hours of the day, and then it is homogenized and it is pasteurized and bottled and delivered the following day, and it offers no inconvenience so far as the farmer is concerned. If that argument is followed, then the arguments in the whole milkshed of northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin, and western Indiana, and a portion of Iowa would be equally valid, because Chicago is the largest metropolitan consumer area for that milkshed. If that argument is valid, it would be valid for the largest city in the gentleman's own State, New York City.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did this informant state when that milk which arrived here all during the day, left the farm?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I remember.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the important thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said, "We receive milk all hours of the day and we are bottling all the time, and milk is delivered the following day as late as 11 and 12 o'clock in the day."

Then in addition thereto, why I presume—and I cannot say that this is absolutely correct—but you know out of your own experience, if you have a family here, that most of the milk is marketed through the grocery stores in the District of Columbia. But here is a

voiceless, here is a voteless community of some 800,000 which has to come as a suppliant on its knees and say, "Please, Congress, most of us are for daylight savings; won't you kindly forget provincial thinking for a while and give us daylight saving?"

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations are for it. The board of trade and the junior chamber of commerce have done a monumental amount of work in behalf of daylight saving. The newspapers, including the Washington Post and the Washington Times-Herald, have held polls here and by overwhelming majorities the people have expressed themselves for daylight saving.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people voted on those polls?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that in one of those polls formally and informally they finally got up to nearly 66,000 people, and the polls represented different areas and different sources.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman means 6,600.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one poll of 6,600, but there was an informal poll that represented the thinking, I believe, of 66,000. Every group, every industrial group, every business group that I can find out about in this man's town has been for daylight saving.

Now, what an astonishing thing. The Senate, mind you, the Senate of the United States, approved this same bill by a vote of 57 to 16, which is more than 3½ to 1. They were having some regard for the desires of the people here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that, as the record will disclose, I voted for the daylight saving bill for the District when it was here before. However, as I understand the present bill, it simply seeks to invest in the Commissioners of the District the option and authority to put daylight saving time into effect after a hearing and after fair determination is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, that will bring about a situation approximating the condition that prevails in other cities and towns across the country where determination is made by local authority as to what they want to do in respect to daylight saving.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. HALLECK. I propose to vote for this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the majority leader.

Let me leave you with this one question, before the time runs out. If we do not propose to support a bill to confer upon the District Commissioners the authority to hold hearings and determine this sort of a proposition, why should the District Committee come in here and endeavor to secure any kind of home-rule proposition in the interest of conserving time? Why should the District Committee submit to the Congress any proposal that is based upon this broad fundamental of home rule, because you would evidence that no matter what we do still you would not be in favor of conferring upon the duly appointed executive heads of the Nation's Capital the authority to deal with a proposition of this kind.

I earnestly suggest that we give these people an opportunity to represent their views before their own District Commissioners in the District Building and let the determination be made there whether or not there shall be daylight saving time for the District of Columbia. I would expect that much for my own folks back home if their interests were involved and I believe they would want me to do as much for the voteless residents of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. As a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am heartily in favor of this bill. Some such bill has been in the House on many occasions before and in different Congresses. I think the people in the District should be allowed to decide whether or not they want daylight-saving time. The debate here today seems to me a very strong argument for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have the statement from the gentlewoman from New Jersey, who served so long as chairman of this great committee, though I am not in accord with her viewpoint and with her position.

I have the highest esteem and admiration for our present chairman, the genial and able gentleman from the great State of Illinois, who has done such a magnificent job to try to bring this matter to a head in order to give the Congress an opportunity to decide it.

First, I want to talk to you about something that I believe means more than just the question of whether you personally want daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia or personally do not want it.

I had not intended to enter into this debate. I have heard all of the arguments and discussions about why we should have daylight-saving time and why we should not have it, and how it would put us to some personal inconvenience.

Mr. Chairman, we are deciding something here today that goes much further than the mere matter of how it affects us personally. The gentleman from Illinois has just brought it to your attention and I believe it well deserves your consideration. This House has expressed itself fully on this matter in recent weeks. Now, it is presented to you in a little different form. What are we asked to do here? We are asked to evade an issue that we passed on in order that we may let someone else have the jurisdiction to determine the very thing that we voted against. If that is not passing the buck by the Congress, I would like to know what would be a good example of passing the buck.

And, next, I want to talk to you about the question of home rule. I am not saying that the District of Columbia should or should not have home rule, but I say to you, my colleagues, if the District of Columbia is to have home rule, why do we not approach it in a manner so as to give the District home rule and let them vote for their representatives. Are we going to do it piecemeal?

The gentleman says, "They have daylight-saving time in Chicago and New York and St. Louis." The fact is that they do not have daylight-saving time in the Seventh District of Arkansas, but that has nothing to do with my position in this matter at all. Just because we may have it or may not have it somewhere else in the country—is that to say that we are to evade our responsibility here on the floor of the House? Is this going to be the first step in the process of saying to the District of Columbia, "You can have your own government," notwithstanding the record that Congress has made over the past century and a half? There is the issue that confronts you in this House today, and I think you are going to have to decide it.

This question of putting babies to sleep an hour earlier and trying to get them up an hour earlier is a problem for the individual mother in the household. When you consider issues like this on a broad fundamental basis it amounts to a policy of government. The real question at issue here is whether this is still the Capital of the United States which belongs to all of the people of the United States instead of just to those who are privileged to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining whether or not daylight saving time should be established in the District of Columbia during the year 1947, the Commissioners of the District shall conduct open hearings at which the residents of the District may express their views on the establishment of such time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "District", insert "and those in neighboring counties who may be affected."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this, it may be said, as a perfecting amendment. It does not indicate that I am in agreement with the provisions of this bill. However, I offer it to bring to your attention a situation which is extremely unjust. We talk about home rule for the people of the District of Columbia. I think none of us would have any objection to the exercise of home rule in the District if, in the exercise of that power or privilege, they did not injure

other people. But when it is found—and it cannot be denied—that the exercise of home rule in the District with respect to daylight saving, injures a very large number of people who have no voice in the matter whatsoever, I think we should pause. I am certain that I am stating the facts.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that in conversation with an unnamed milk dealer——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, the gentleman from Illinois is anxious to get a complete expression on this matter and does not believe it ought to be ex parte. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York even though people in the outlying zones who are not responsible would come in in a permissive fashion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad of that, but I am going to develop this subject.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated in his address that an unnamed milk distributor or processor here in Washington told him that the milk came in during a period covering several hours during the morning, some of it as late as 11 or 12 o'clock. I asked him if that same informant had told him when the milk had to leave the farm at which it was produced, and there was no answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer was that he did not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He did not know. Well, that is an important thing. It is perfectly true that milk coming into a great city arrives at varying times in the morning, but the time of its arrival depends entirely upon the distance over which it has been transported. The greater the distance the earlier the milk has to be put in the can and loaded on the truck. I have seen this thing work for years and it works a wretched hardship on the men who produce food. It compels them, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] said, to get up an hour earlier, in the dark, with no time off on Saturday. Nothing like the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week, perhaps working half a day on Sundays. They have no choice in the matter. They are helpless. The sun is their master. The Nation is divided geographically into time zones, if I may use that expression—eastern time, central time, mountain time, and Pacific time, across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. After years and years of experience those time zones have been laid out in order that those who earn their living, including those who produce the food in the several sections of the country, may have the greatest advantage of the shining of the sun. The time zones have been so erected as to conform as nearly as possible with sunrise, which commences in the east and travels through the morning westward, clear across the continent. Now, you cannot do away with the power of the sun in agriculture. It cannot be done. The sun is the master of the man who produces food. He has to get up with the sun and do his best all through the sunny day and stay at work until the sun sets; otherwise he loses out. The changing of clocks, the changing of laws, does not prevent the sun being the master of the producer of food. When you force, through the vote of people in the city, most of whom do not have the slightest conception of where their food is produced, how it is produced, or by whom—when you force man out on the land, who is the slave of the sun, to get up an hour earlier in the dark the year around, you are inflicting a hardship upon him which is difficult to exaggerate. That is why I have for years been opposed to this whole illusion—this whole illusion—known as daylight saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have as guests in Washington today sixty bright and shining students and their directors and chaperones representing Northland College of Ashland, Wis. They compose a choir of some 60 voices that is completing a tour of eastern United States. They have appeared in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York. Yesterday afternoon they gave a very impressive concert at the Foundry Methodist Church in this city. I had the honor and privilege of hearing them, and I wish each and every Member of this Congress had had the same honor and privilege.

Northland College is a small college, with an enrollment not exceeding 350 students, of which 75 percent have to work their own way. Yet they have organized a choir of 60 voices of such quality and training that they have been invited to broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. and over the National Broadcasting Co., both Nation-wide chains.

This choir has brought great honor and tribute not only to their college but to the State of Wisconsin and, indeed, to the United States of America.

On behalf of the Members of Congress I welcome this group to Washington. They are going to make a survey and study over here of how Congress is operating. I hope they will go back with pleasant words, words to the effect that the Members of this body and the Members of the other body are trying their very desperate best to solve the Nation's ills and the world's ills.

Mr. Chairman, Northland College deserves the gratitude of every American. Twenty of the group in this choir are veterans of the last war. A poor but thriving and growing institution this choir is a living memorial of what can be done when the will to do is there. Welcome to Washington Northland College. You came here and left a deep impression on the hearts of many of our Nation's leaders. We are truly proud of you. You are an inspiration to all of us. Come again.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a short history of this college, this choir, together with a list of names of this group, their director, and chaperones, be spread upon the pages of the RECORD at this point.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

The Northland College Choir came into being in 1931 under Prof. Sigvart J. Steen. Although Northland's music department has been a feature of the college since its founding, the a cappella choir, singing only sacred music, was a departure from the program usually followed. In the early days of the academy and college there were separate organizations of glee clubs for the men and women, as well as concert orchestras, and the smaller voice and instrumental ensembles.

The choir took its first tour in 1934, traveling into southwest Wisconsin and eastern Minnesota. The first Atlantic coast or New England tour was undertaken in 1935. Since that time, tours to the East have been interspersed with tours into Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The choir won national recognition singing in Constitution Hall as part of the program of the National Congress of the DAR. It has also appeared before the National Federation of Music Clubs, and its radio concerts have included broadcasts from Radio City in New York City.

The last tour by the mixed choir was made in 1942, that fateful year when our minds were temporarily diverted from the amenities and joys of life. The rumblings of war, reverberating into college ranks, soon changed our mixed choir into a small girls' chorus. Prof. Sigvart Steen and his successor, Prof. Harold Brown, both resigned as director and took their places in the armed services.

Northland soon came to resemble a women's seminary more than a coeducational college, and Mrs. Kathryn Ragsdale Church was called to direct the remnants of the choir. Mrs. Church doubled the size of the girls' chorus the first year and continued to increase the membership until 1945 when there were 44 girls singing in the chorus. During the first 2 years Mrs. Church trained the chorus, and short trips were taken in the surrounding territory. Since bus companies were not accepting charters, the transportation problem was solved by the use of cars which were supplied through the generosity of trustees and faculty members.

Impressed with the excellent musicianship and attributes of quality displayed by the chorus, two Northland trustees, Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Howard I. Potter, both of Chicago arranged to bring the chorus to Chicago where they sang in Kimball Hall. On that same trip they sang in the Public Service Auditorium in Milwaukee through the courtesy of former Governor Julius P. Heil, who is also a Northland trustee.

Last spring a tour was scheduled through Central Wisconsin and Northern Michigan, and included besides evening concerts a number of high school appearances.

When college opened last September, many veterans thronged the campus and among them were former Northlanders who returned to take up their studies where they left off 3 or 4 years years before. With this influx of students tryouts were held and approximately 60 voices were selected to be trained for a mixed choir. That this is a carefully chosen group and an expertly trained one was manifested in the outstanding concert presented during the past Christmas season.

It was acclaimed by critics to be the finest program ever to be presented in the city of Ashland.

It is with confidence and real pride that the Northland College Choir is presented to you this evening.

KATHRYN RAGSDALE CHURCH, DIRECTOR, NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

Kathryn Ragsdale Church has a rich background of specialized training and experience which makes her a most capable choral director and teacher of voice. Part of her experience includes 8 years of acting as a judge at the State music festivals held in Iowa.

She is a graduate of Christian College and has attended Iowa State Teachers College and the Conservatory of Music at the University of Iowa. She has studied voice with Afra Kirsch of Chicago and has also had private voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Mr. Thomas Muir, both of New York City, and Mr. Luther Richman, who is now president of the Music Educators National Conference.

BRIEF HISTORY OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE

Northland College, located at Ashland, Wis., was founded in October 1892 as North Wisconsin Academy. The leader of the movement to found an academy at this pioneer outpost was the Reverend Edwin P. Wheeler, son of one of the early missionaries on Madeline Island, the largest of the Apostle Islands group in Lake Superior.

As Mr. Wheeler's dreams took shape others caught his enthusiasm. Working closely with Mr. Wheeler were the Reverend George Nelson, the general missionary of the Congregational Churches of Wisconsin, and Dr. Edwin Ellis, Ashland's first doctor, who came in 1855 when about a dozen cabins straggling along the shore of the bay comprised the entire community.

Northland, born in the colorful days of the lumbering industry, was still found standing after the echoes of the lumberman's ax had died away and the hordes had stripped the lands of their virgin timber wealth. It was indeed a desolate setting for such a cherished dream, but the founders of the school surmounted obstacles that would have broken most men. They refused to accept defeat but rather, were fired with new enthusiasm to nurture and strengthen the one thing which was needed the most—a school to train the young men and women of North Wisconsin who would be faced with the problems arising from the inevitable economic readjustment. Their labors have borne fruit and today Northland College is still rendering a service unsurpassed in any other part of the State.

In 1907 articles of incorporation were drawn up for a college department, and in June 1912 the first class of college students was graudated. One of the first graudates now heads the science department. Academy and college work were carried on simultaneously until 1932 when it was felt that the academy was no longer needed. The advent of the State-graded schools in the rural communities answered the need in secondary education and after a service of 40 years the academy was discontinued. Northland College continued to grow and widen its field of service and is still the only liberal arts college within a radius of 200 miles.

Though Northland's physical plant is utilized to capacity and there is need for more buildings, the work continues under the direction of an able administration and loyal faculty. The excellent record of alumni accomplishment is monumental evidence of sound basic training received at Northland College. Four college presidents are listed among Northland's alumni. Many leading research scientists, ministers, journalists, librarians, educators, doctors, and industrial leaders began their work at Northland.

Like all colleges, Northland laid her sacrifice on the altar of the war gods, writing the names of 19 young men among the stars. Over 400 Northlanders answered the call to service. The war years were troublesome for the college but the unselfish devotion of the faculty and students together with the loyalty of understanding friends helped to keep the college running so that the doors were open when the young men and women returned searching for a way back to peaceful living.

Sacrifice and privation form a large part of Northland's cornerstone. Love, faith, devotion, Christian ideals, and a fighting spirit were stirred into the mortar. The early days were filled with trials and burdens which were shared by friends who appreciated Northland's great task and wanted to have a part in it. A deep-rooted faith has been justified and Northland College stands high in the ranks of Wisconsin colleges. The rich heritage of faith and tenacity left by her founders is Northland's greatest spiritual strength and power. Such memories as are written in her history will serve to burnish the ideals by which Northland lives and grows.

ITINERARY

Tuesday, April 8, Akron, Ohio: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 9, Elmira, N. Y.: Park Congregational Church.

Thursday, April 10, New York City: Rotary luncheon at Commodore Hotel.

Friday, April 11, Queens Village, N. Y.: Hollis Avenue Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 13, Westfield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 14, Greenfield, Mass.: Second Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 15, Lynn, Mass.: Boston Street Methodist Church.

Wednesday, April 16, New Bedford, Mass.: The United Church.

Thursday, April 17, Haverhill, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 20, Melrose, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 21, Wakefield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 22, Norwood, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 23, Bristol, Conn.: First Congregational Church.

Friday, April 25, Bethel, Conn.: Bethel High School.

Saturday, April 26, Philadelphia, Pa.: James Evans Memorial Presbyterian Church.

Sunday, April 27, Washington, D. C.: Foundry Methodist Church.

Monday, April 28, Washington, D. C.: Luncheon, Capitol Dining Room.

Tuesday, April 29, Johnstown, Pa.: Central High School.

Thursday, May 1, Green Bay, Wis.: Union Congregational Church.

Friday, May 2, Rhinelander, Wis.: First Congregational Church.

Saturday, May 3, Park Falls, Wis: City Hall.

In addition to the above concerts, several radio broadcasts and special convocations are included in the schedule of appearances. Individual soloists have participated as guest soloists in Sunday church services.

PERSONNEL OF THE CHOIR

Soprano: Betty Greech, freshman, Owen, Wis.; Julie Johnson, special, Hollywood, Calif; Mary Lou Ferkovich, sophomore, Mellen, Wis.; Mary Dexter, freshman, Bayfield, Wis.; Patricia Biglow, junior, Ashland, Wis.; June Emerson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Cleone Fecteau, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Madeline Lindquist, junior, Chicago, Ill.; Betty Jane Larson, freshman, Ironwood, Mich.; Rita Reed, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Betty Johnson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Patricia Berg, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Jeanne Welker, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Sally Murray, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Lynn Elsner, sophomore, Trout Creek, Mich.; Joyce Synnott, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.

Alto: Kathryn Wilson, junior, High Bridge, Wis.; Jeane Anne Johnson, freshman, Monroe, Wis.; Rose Mary McDonnell, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Audrey Reistad, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.; Jacqueline Klatt, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Ruth Spoolman, senior, Ashland, Wis. Rose Marie Hindes, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Emmy Lou Forster, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Eleanor Perrin, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Virginia Darling, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Connie Moller, freshman, Weyerhauser, Wis.; Eileen Carroll, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Elaine Anich, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Marguerite Johnson, sophomore, Ironwood, Mich.; Elaine Schroeder, freshman, De Pere, Wis.; Avonel Anderson, senior, Rice Lake, Wis.

Tenor: Gilbert Vickers, junior, Springfield, Mass.; Gene Carlson, freshman, Ashland, Wis., William MAuliffe, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Lowell McMullen, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Edward Bardill, sophomore, Spooner, Wis.; Richard Stroshane, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Daniels, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; Guillermo de la Riestra, sophomore, Havana, Cuba; Henry McKenzie, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Bruce Johnson, freshman, Hancock, Mich.; James Zar, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Jack Boucher, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.

Bass: Lyman Thompson, freshman, Antigo, Wis.; John Dosedel, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; John Ferris, senior, Hancock, Wis.; Howard Johnson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Lyle LaPoint, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; James Burlager, freshman, Washburn, Wis.; Marvin Sykes, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Dale Borowick, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Howard Konkol, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Martinson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Milton Carlson, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Lawrence Clark, freshman, Wauwatosa, Wis.; Sam Wheeler, junior, Ashland, Wis.

APPRECIATION

To those churches, alumni, and friends who helped to make this tour possible, we wish to express a word of appreciation. We sincerely hope that the concert which you hear will be worthy of the interest you have manifested by your presence, and merit your support.

It was with the financial help of New Englanders that our first building, Wheeler Hall, was made possible. A few years later a family in Massachusetts gave us the funds to erect Woods Hall. It was Congregational women who gave us our ladies' dormitory, Memorial Hall. Our library was built largely through the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Others have kept the doors of Northland open by their regular contributions to the current operating budget. To you may we say that this choir is a product of Northland College—your school.

GLADYS W. ULINE,
Secretary to the President,
Manager 1947 Choir Tour.

DEDICATION

The concerts of this 1947 choir tour are humbly dedicated to the memory of the 19 Northlanders who gave their lives in battle during the world conflict, and to the 400 other Northlanders who struggled with them in order to again raise their voice in a song of freedom.

Raymond Adelman, class 1920; Fred Anderson, class 1940; Donald Benson, class 1943; John Cate, class 1939; William Fuller, class 1944; Everett Gillam, class 1940; Edmund

Jeffers, class 1940; Robert Lynch, class 1940; Wallace Ringham, class 1943; Morris Ristvedt, class, 1939; Edward Rogers, class 1942; John Schoonover, academician 1921; William Sherry, academician 1943; William Steinmetz, academician 1946; Franklin Tomenendale, academician 1942; Wesley Warvi, academician 1932; Charles Watson, academician 1937; Gerald Weiss, academician 1946; Danforth Welty, academician 1941.

MUSIC FACULTY

Perry Howard Yaw, Jr., bachelor of science, Mansfield State Teachers College, master of arts, University of Michigan, director of music department, assistant professor of music theory and instrumental music, director of orchestra and string ensemble.

Kathryn Ragsdale Church, teacher diploma in voice and piano, Christian College, Iowa State Teachers College, Iowa State University Conservatory of Music, studied voice with Afra Kirsch, of Chicago, Ill., and has had voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Thomas Muir, of New York City, as well as Luther Richman, president of Music Educators National Conference, instructor of music theory and voice, director of Northland College choir.

Marcia-Mary Ball, bachelor of music, American Conservatory of Music, master of music, American Conservatory of Music, assistant professor of music theory, piano, and organ.

Ingyr Marie Lien, teacher diploma in violin, Oberlin Conservatory of Music, bachelor of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, master of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, University of Michigan, assistant professor of music theory, violin, and piano.

Manley E. MacDonald, president, 1945, bachelor of arts, Greenville College, master of arts, University of Michigan, doctor of philosophy, University of Michigan.

Lewis H. Brumbaugh, dean, 1945, bachelor of arts, Mount Morris College, master of arts, University of Chicago, bachelor of divinity, Yale University, doctor of philosophy, University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

One of the basic purposes of this bill is to provide that the District Commissioners shall hold a hearing to secure an expression of views from the citizens of the District of Columbia. Certainly there can be no objection to an expression of views by people who live in the adjoining counties of Virginia and Maryland, and I, for one, do not object. I believe I bespeak the sentiment of the membership of the committee when I say they would have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; certainly I do not.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman feel that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia could have any authority over the surrounding territory of Virginia and Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question of authority is not involved here. The language of the bill is that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may express their views. That makes it entirely permissive. So I see nothing wrong with permitting people who live outside and beyond the District line from expressing their views also, because it is on an informal basis.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it contended by the gentleman from Illinois that this bill does not give the Commissioners authority to determine whether or not there shall be daylight-saving time in the District?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely it does give them the authority after they have had a hearing and made a determination that there should be daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, does the gentleman contend that the authority given to the Commissioners of the District can extend to Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It gives no such authority. The bill merely provides that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may make an expression of their views for the benefit of the executive heads of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] about the farmer being the slave of the sun.

Back in the old days they used to tell the story of a Negro whose employer gave him an old watch with a long brass chain. He put it on and went to town. Another Negro hailed him and said: "Hey, Bill, what time is it?"

He looked at his watch and said: "Hit's 15 minutes after half past of a quarter before 11 o'clock. Hereafter when you wants to know what time it is, you look at de sun what's made for po' folks and don't be pestering gentlemen on de streets."

The sun is what our time is regulated by. I have never seen any advantage come from daylight saving. I went through it in the First World War and I saw it imposed during the last war. I have always thought we would have been better off if we had just gone ahead with the regular standard time, governed, as the gentleman from New York said, by the sun which the farmers go by.

Again, you are moving up the time at which the employees of the Federal Government will leave their work in the afternoon. Already every department is closed on Saturday. Now, under this bill, they will close Friday afternoon at the very time that a Member of Congress has the most time to contact the departments about matters affecting his district. You will find the departments closed and the employees gone home.

I do not agree with the gentleman from New York that you can impose this time on the people of Virginia and Maryland. You may make it apply to Government employees, but if you do you will have to make it apply to Government employees elsewhere, in other States. I cannot see how you are going to make this apply to the surrounding territory of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it should not be made to apply elsewhere, but automatically it applies. If the public markets of Washington open an hour earlier in the morning it means that the farmer has to start an hour earlier in the morning to get there.

Mr. RANKIN. If the bill in its present form passes it would not apply to the people who work in the Pentagon Building, which is over in Virginia; is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suspect the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the majority of the people on the pay roll of the War Department would not be affected.

Mr. Chairman, I am just like the Negro; let us look at the sun which was made for "po' folks" and be governed accordingly and stay by standard time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this involves the question whether you want the folks in the District of Columbia to have the right to make some decision as to whether they are going to have daylight-saving time. You know, the Congress takes up a lot of time with District of Columbia affairs. I happen to be chairman of a Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the District. Do you know some of the bills we have had to consider from the District? Oh, we have had a bill to regulate the hours of barbers in the District. We have had one for the undertakers. We have a bill to get rid of the starlings in Washington. I can tell you how to get rid of the English sparrows, but not over this microphone. Yes, we have a bill to require sanitary straws in the District.

Now, it is ridiculous that all of those little matters—I call them chicken-feed bills—should come before the Congress for decision. It takes time of the committee and it takes the time of this Congress. But the Commissioners must bring all these little problems to the Congress. Whether it is starlings, barbers, undertakers, or sanitary straws, those matters must come to the Congress. Last week we had a bill that would permit the Commissioners to tear down some road signs by the White House. They cannot even change the name of a street in Washington without coming to Congress. If you believe in the right of home rule and that the Commissioners should handle the affairs of the District, and if you believe that they ought to have the right to hold hearings on whether or not the District should have daylight-saving time, then you should have no objection to this bill. Personally, I would be opposed to a bill of this sort in the western part of my State because my people do not want it, but if they did, I would support it. The Commissioners must hold hearings—the people decide—that is the democratic way of doing things.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Congress and the District Committee of the House, or a subcommittee thereof, is not in effect the council for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think that is true, and the District Committee voted for this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Those matters that the gentleman has just mentioned are matters, of course, that are usually considered by the councils of the various municipalities of the Nation, are they not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. I have been one of those Members of Congress that felt like the people of the District of Columbia ought to have a little self-rule of their own.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman brings up the question of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I have been a member for 10 years, being the city council for the District of Columbia. In the city councils of other cities, whatever they do, subject to the approval of the mayor, becomes law. If the Congress will follow the advice and recommendations of the city council of the District of Columbia this bill will become law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right, if they will follow those recommendations.

I think as far as home rule for the District is concerned they ought to have the right to elect their Commissioners. I believe personally in the city-manager form of government where they have some business logic in the government. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] and his committee are now studying the problem of home rule. If you do not believe the city ought to have home rule, you ought to vote against the bill. This bill does not state that there is going to be daylight-saving time; it gives the Commissioners the right to hold a hearing of interested citizens and make a decision. I think that is democratic; I think that is the proper way to proceed. I feel the House ought to give that right to the Commissioners and to the folks living in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, Billy Sunday once said, speaking of prohibition and the effort to regulate the saloon, that you might as well attempt to regulate "a powder mill in hell" as to regulate a saloon. I think as far as this Congress or anyone else attempting to regulate the sun is concerned, we would have about as much chance as Billy Sunday said we would have in regulating the saloon.

The first speech I ever attempted to make on the floor of this Congress was against daylight-saving time, because the people of Ohio did not want it. It was a definite hardship upon those people. I also helped to vote the repeal of daylight-saving time. I also voted against this bill 2 weeks ago today. However, it was a different proposition we voted on then than that which is before us today. Today we are simply saying that the people of the District shall have a right to determine the matter for themselves, and who am I or who is any Member of this Congress to say they shall not have that right? Therefore, I now reverse my position. I am still opposed to daylight saving in my district and State, but I would not deny anyone the right to decide on it himself. Therefore I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke will not leave the room, because I want him to know that the utter sophistry of this bill is simply this: On February 24 we voted down the daylight-saving proposition. This bill would be subject to a point of order for that reason if it were not for the fact that the Senate saw fit to pass this sophistry which states that the District of Columbia Commissioners may take a poll. It does not say the people shall vote, it does not say they shall be required to vote; it merely means that we are not giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote, for it means that under some sort of an informal proposition maybe the Commissioners will hold a meeting. They will advertise it or give notice in the paper and then down here in one of the committee rooms they will have a hearing at which maybe 200 or 300 or 400 people will express themselves. Does not that show the utter sophistry of this situation? The people do not vote.

You are being asked to say that you do not have enough brains to pass on this matter, that you should leave it up to two men. That is the actual situation we are in in this case. The most ridiculous argument is that it gives the people of the District of Columbia the right to express themselves. That is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the people express themselves through the medium of citizens associations, of which there are nearly 70. It is fair to assume that the heads of those associations, who are gathered into a common council known as the Federation of Citizens Associations, will express themselves, and they have expressed themselves in an overwhelming majority in favor of daylight saving. They are for the present bill.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman places it on that basis, I may say that on some other matters of which I know concerning which the citizens associations have expressed themselves the Commissioners have paid not too close attention.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman is a very practical politician.

Mr. O'HARA. No; do not say that.

Mr. BREHM. When a majority of a group express themselves, I imagine the gentleman gives heed to them. Even though the citizens of the District do not vote for the Commissioners, does not the gentleman feel that the Commissioners are practical politicians enough to listen to the majority, and that they will not deliberately force this upon the people unless the majority of the people desire it?

Mr. O'HARA. I will not argue with the gentleman on that proposition, but, of course, we find ourselves often in the same position. Sometimes we do not agree with the majority of the people in our districts if we think that the rules of logic compel us to come to an opposite conclusion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know that the gentleman is a distinguished lawyer in his State so I take the liberty of asking him this question. Do you think this Congress that is vested with the power and authority to determine these questions with reference to the District of Columbia has any power to delegate that authority to two or three men to make a decision for the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is a very fine lawyer and has raised a question which did occur to me but which I did not want to raise. But I will say, this is an attempt to unlawfully delegate authority to two Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I now yield to my young friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will my able and distinguished friend from Minnesota tell me just what adverse effect the passage of this bill would have on our farmers in Minnesota?

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, I am not voting on this proposition on that basis at all. I am voting on it because, as I said before—the gentleman would have heard me if he had been here, which he was not—I do not like the daylight-saving time. If this bill passes, if the gentleman has to get up an hour earlier on one of these hot steaming Washington mornings, which he has not yet experienced, although he may be for this bill now he certainly will say that he made a mistake.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I started from my home city of Binghamton in New York State yesterday to return to Washington. As soon as I hit the Pennsylvania border I had to inquire what time of day it was. A few hours later I hit the Maryland line and there again I was in a quandary because, unlike Pennsylvania and New York, Maryland is on the old time. Imagine my consternation when I again crossed over into the District and found

that the same time existed here as in Maryland. In other words, there were four great sections or divisions of government that I passed through yesterday on my trip and I found there was a great difference practically every place I visited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It should be said that the cities of Annapolis and Baltimore are on daylight-saving time by authority of an ordinance enacted by the people there and the counties adjoining the District line have authority under a bill which was recently passed by the Maryland Legislature and which has been signed by the Governor to follow the lead of the District of Columbia in the matter of daylight-saving time if the District adopts daylight-saving time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I am not addressing my remarks at the present time to the issue of daylight-saving time. The issue, as some gentlemen have said, goes much further into the scheme of things of our representative form of government. As one who has always been violently partisan as far as the championing of the rights of men and women all over the country to enjoy their privilege of participating in a representative form of government, I feel that the time has come for us to consider representative government in the District of Columbia, which I believe is the only place in the entire country that does not enjoy such a constitutional privilege. I want to go on record here today as being in favor of the nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia who are good patriotic Americans and who are able to decide for themselves the vital issues they are concerned with. I think the Congress is making history by taking this position. It is evidencing its interest in the same kind of government which we have back in our home districts in every township, county, and subdivision of government, in the various States, and, finally, in the Federal Government itself. It is a challenge—and I believe this question presents the very beginning of that challenge—that 800,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia, now voteless, now without any expression of opinion in government, now without any opportunity to rule themselves—this question goes to the heart of this issue, and gives them the first step they have ever had in the matter of home rule. Home rule and representative government go hand in hand. Home rule is the issue which already the people of the United States have decided upon and which they feel ought to be given to themselves. Finally, when residents of the District of Columbia obtain that blessed privilege of representing themselves, I believe that the problem of constitutional government in the United States will be solved. For that reason, I am voting for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has well stated, the Committee on the District of Columbia is really, in fact, the city council of the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the committee, and I have served on this committee for a period of over 10 years. We have had to consider all matters of legislation affecting the welfare of this community. This year is no different from any other. From the middle of January, as chairman of the Committee on the Fiscal Relations of the District of Columbia, I have been sitting constantly in respect to the consideration of the over-all tax problem of the District of Columbia, and also the question of the teachers' salary increase which we had here last week. This committee is busy from one end of the legislative year to the other. It is an additional load that we gladly assume, because it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to consider all matters pertaining to the welfare of this community, just so long as we deny the right to the people of the District of Columbia to settle those questions themselves. This is a question that I believe ought to be determined by local option, insofar as we are permitting it to be determined that way, by permitting the administrators of the District of Columbia, the three District Commissioners, to hold hearings and from those hearings determine what is the viewpoint of the people of the District of Columbia.

Here we find a poll taken by one of the local newspapers, that the sentiment is in favor of daylight saving in the District of Columbia 8 to 1, yet the membership of this House, practically every one of us who will leave the District of Columbia, and go home into our own districts during the month of July or August or whenever we will adjourn, are denying the right to the people of the District of Columbia to have what they consider they are entitled to, daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we are wasting a lot of time on matters that personally are of but very little interest to us. Of course, we are interested in what goes on back in our own States, but every State north of us along the coast, whether it be New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Rhode Island, has daylight saving. To be sure, it was quite confusing when we picked up the paper yesterday to find out what the radio schedule was. We found when we turned the dial that the program we were interested in was on an hour ago.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to follow the recommendations of this committee which has given so freely of its time in the determination of the problems of the District of Columbia. I hope that this bill as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will be approved this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the argument of the gentleman from New York, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] that this was a question of home rule misstates the real issue.

Then, too, I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] should want to put through a bill which will require Federal employees to get up and go to work an hour earlier each workday. I cannot understand the gentleman with the large family that he has, always in favor, as he has been in favor, of those who must work, now supporting a bill which will require them to get to work an hour earlier in the morning, so the golf player can get out an hour earlier in the afternoon.

These two gentlemen have mistaken the issue. It is not one of home rule.

This measure directly affects us and our constituents. By moving the clock ahead, every Member of Congress has to get over to his office an hour earlier. What for? To satisfy the people in the District.

Well, back in my country, the tail does not wag the dog all the time, not all of the time; the dog has something to say about it once in a while. And yet we will have to go to work an hour earlier, and, as one Member said—I think it was the gentleman from Mississippi—you who want to work Saturdays and your people want you to work and you are working in your office Saturday, when you call up a department and ask for information and the answer is "Nobody home," they have closed the office. Under this bill they will close an hour earlier. They now have a number of holidays each year, and I think in addition they have 15 days' sick leave and 30 days' annual leave. That is 45 days they now have, and every Saturday off.

Now, once in a while somewhere, sometime, somebody has got to work. The folks in my district call up my office in the afternoon and want to know something—want action. I must learn from a department down here, not on Saturdays, but on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. My home folks call me. I have to tell them I cannot get an answer because the Federal employees have gone home. "What time do you quit down there?" "Well, they have gone home." It is 4:30, and we are on Washington time.

Now, these people do not have to work for the Government, but if they do ask for and accept a job, then they, as well as Members of Congress, should render service when the people want it.

When they tell us that it is a question of home rule, they are in error. It is a

question of whether your people in your district and my people in my district are going to get service out of Washington after 4 o'clock in the afternoon, or whether when the clock strikes 4 on 5 days a week there is no service in Washington because somebody here wants to quit to go fishing, to play golf, to play tennis, or do something else, and as a result we cannot get service, nor can they through us get service.

I say it is about time that the Congress began to legislate and continue to legislate on matters that we were sent here to legislate on, and not just make it easy for people who come to Washington to work a part of the time for a wage that is higher than our folks back home get.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the Wadsworth amendment. The committee has no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 116, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. If, as a result of the hearings held pursuant to the first section of this act, the Commissioners should decide that daylight-saving time should be established in the District during the year 1947, the Commissioners are authorized to advance the standard time for the District 1 hour for any period of the year 1947 not earlier than the last Sunday of April of such year and not later than the last Sunday of September of such year. Any such time established by the Commissioners pursuant to this act shall, during the period for which it is applicable, be considered the standard time for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners shall forthwith proceed in the exercise of the authority herein contained and shall, as soon as practicable, publish their findings and orders thereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 2, line 10, strike out the period and insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane and covers interstate commerce as distinguished from local jurisdiction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I shall not contend, of course, that the amendment is germane under the rules of the House, but it is pertinent and I suggest that it accomplishes the purpose that the gentleman ought to want to accomplish and in line with the argument advanced there should not be any objection to it. It will improve the bill considerably and also improve its chances of passage.

The amendment says:

Provided, however, That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have no authority whatsoever over interstate commerce. The phraseology here might raise some very delicate questions of interpretation and definitely mutilate the purposes of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The intent of the amendment is to enact the purposes of the bill proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] which would relieve radio stations, for example, in outlying States from having to change their schedules because the time is changed in some city where a program might originate. It would also relieve the railroads of the responsibility of changing their time to conform to a change in time in some city where a train starts. You might turn on your radio, if this amendment were adopted, and count on getting a program at the time it used to originate according to the zone you might be in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The administrative difficulty of the amendment would heighten confusion and it might take months to resolve that confusion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, of course I am not responsible for that, but it is a problem that the Congress should address itself to. We have an opportunity here to correct it but probably will not be able to do so if the gentleman interposes his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. It illustrates what we do in this bill in affecting the people who come in here from all over the country also.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I regret that the gentleman from Illinois in this particular matter seems not to be able to let his usual generous nature dictate consideration of the amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Would not the adoption of this amendment create more confusion?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The purpose is to make it decidedly more acceptable to the people of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota goes beyond the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, and is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although a member of the District Committee, it is very seldom that I make a statement on the floor of this House with reference to District legislation. But I have a feeling in my heart about this matter and I cannot pass the opportunity to make a short statement.

I have served on the Committee on the District of Columbia for about 4 years. I have enjoyed that service. For that service the members of the District Committee, except from the District citizens themselves, receive no praise. I have thought several times of resigning from the committee, but it is a job that somebody in this Congress has to do, and there are not many of you that want to do it. If you had been sent to this Congress to represent the people of the District of Columbia, by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, we would not have spent 3 minutes on this little bill today; not 3 minutes. I just want you to quietly ask yourselves, not your neighbors, but just ask yourselves this question: If I had been sent to this Congress by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, what would I do with this bill?

Now, there have been some here today who have intimated that passage of the bill would be equivalent to passing the buck. Well, if that be true then we have passed the buck many, many times to the Commissioners of the District, and you should not be embarrassed in doing so again. But I do not believe passage of this bill could be so construed. I see no harm and no wrong in the Commissioners of the District, after calling in the residents of the District, determining themselves whether or not they should have daylight-saving time. What is wrong with it?

There are many of you here today—you will not publicly so say—who are opposed to the District of Columbia having the right of ballot. Well, I will say publicly I am opposed to it. But let me say to you now unless you give to the people of the District of Columbia a few of the things that they want in which there could possibly be no harm or no wrong, then the demand is going to be so strong upon this Congress in years to come that you are going to have to give them the ballot. Now, the question is just this: Do you want to give to the people of the District one of the minor, little, ordinary things that they are asking—that is this: Daylight saving? You know down deep in your hearts that nearly all of the citizens of this District want it. What would you do if you had been sent to Congress by their votes?

I live in a rural district. There are 153,000 farmers and farm people residing in my district. They are a wonderful people. I do not think they give one tinker's hoot whether or not the District has daylight saving, midnight saving, or whether District residents work at night and sleep all day, or vice versa. I believe that your people are no different from mine. They will respect you more for casting your vote in keeping with the desires of the District residents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think his constituents will be pleased when they learn that these two Commissioners have said to all these Federal employees here that they do not need to give service to the Congressmen or the people of the District after half-past 3 in the afternoon every day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The legislation contemplates no such. If it did, I would be against it. I think the gentleman is using a vague and misleading illustration of what the legislation contemplates. There are Representatives here from California. The sun does not go down out there for 4 or 5 hours until after it does here. I have not heard the California Representatives complain because the Government offices are not open until 8 or 9 o'clock p. m. eastern time, which is about closing time—5 o'clock—on the west coast.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The departments and the Congress will all be on the same time. From the standpoint of putting in a given number of hours a day, there will be precisely no difference whatsoever.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you going to have the District tell us what time we shall get up and what time we are going to go to work? That is going a little bit far.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All I ask you to do is vote as your conscience dictates; and when you do, I have no fear but that this measure will have your approval.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 1, line 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"The Commissioners of the District shall report their findings to the District Committees of the House and Senate with their recommendations."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the whole purpose of this bill is to permit the people of the District to express themselves, but we then go a little further and give to the Commissioners the right to determine what shall be done. I do not think there is anything democratic about that, particularly. There is democracy in permitting the people of the District to express themselves, and certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was all right, but the Commissioners were not elected by the people and the people have no right to say what is going to be done.

I do not know whether the House held any hearings on this or not, but I do know that the House voted down daylight-saving time not very long ago. This is simply a method of circumventing what we have already done and giving three Commissioners the right to determine whether we were right or wrong.

Remember we had daylight-saving time during the war, but we had it all over the entire Nation, and that did not complicate problems so very much. Many disadvantages of daylight-saving time have been pointed out here today. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] pointed out the fact that people would be getting up earlier. The gentleman from New York pointed out the fact that the farmer would have to get up earlier to get his produce into the market. The gentleman from Mississippi has said it does not make any difference to the farmer what time the people get up here in Washington or what time they have, but it does make a difference throughout the Nation.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has told you many times, you get calls and you want information from the departments. You find now that it takes all you can do to attend your committee hearings and get back to the office and make your calls in time to find somebody down there to do it. Now, when we go into daylight-saving time, they are going to get off earlier and you will not be able to finish that work in the afternoon. You will not find anyone in the departments, and you cannot find them in Saturday.

I remember daylight-saving time—we had it during the war in the winter. Do not forget the winter months are important too. In the winter we did not have daylight according to clocks until after 8 o'clock. Now you are going to have that situation again, just as some of the Members have pointed out here today. These people who have to get up and report to work by 7:30 or 8 in the morning are going to be handicapped because they are going to have to get up before daylight to do it.

I will tell you what this is exactly, and if you want to find out you can investigate. I do not object to people playing golf; in fact, I like to play a little golf once in a while. I would rather do a little fishing on the banks of the Potomac late in the afternoon, but we do not usually get to do that. The main reason for this daylight-saving time is the man who works in an office and can report at 9, 10, or 11, if he pleases. Then he wants the afternoon to end early so he can get out and play some golf. Go to the working people that have to get up early, to people who have children that they have to send to school. They are going to have to get the children up earlier in the morning.

I think the proper thing to do is let the people come in and be heard, and let the Commissioners take the testimony and then come to the Senate and House District Committees and report and make their recommendations. Then let this House decide on daylight-saving time.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does not this bill expire on September 20? September 20 is not wintertime.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Even if it expires on September 20, it is still running into the winter. You know that daylight comes later in those months. But whatever time it may come, you are putting a burden upon the people who have to send their children to school and upon the workingman who has to get up early in the morning, and on the farmer who has to get his produce to the market when the market opens. He would have to get up before daylight to do that. Do not tell me that it does not affect the entire Nation, because it does.

Mr. BREHM. The workingmen with whom I have talked are in favor of it because it gives them more time to spend in their gardens and to do work around their homes after their regular day's work is finished. Since it ends on September 20, it would not interfere with children going to school in the dark.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If you would speak to a few of them, they might say they are in favor of it, but if you put daylight-saving time into effect and then ask them how they like it, they would tell you that they do not like it at all.

Mr. BREHM. Does not the gentleman believe in giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to make their own decisions on this question?

Mr. HENDRICKS. They are not making their own decision.

Mr. BREHM. Yes; they are.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If the people would make their own decision, that would be different. All you are doing is to tell the Commissioners to do what they want, and do not tell me that the Commissioners will not do what they please, as they have in the past. Just as has been pointed out by some of the other speakers here, the people have expressed themselves to the Commissioners in the past, and the Commissioners still do exactly as they please.

Mr. BREHM. I have more confidence in the Commissioners than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here you have a very interesting amendment. We have been trying for quite some time to dispose of this issue of daylight-saving time and to do it on the basis of home rule by conferring upon the Commissioners the power to hold a hearing and then make a determination. Now, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted the Wadsworth amendment which permits those who live in adjoining areas to come in and be heard so that it would not be an ex parte proceeding. Now comes the gentleman from Florida who says in his amendment that after the hearing and after the Commissioners

make a finding they should report their finding to the District Committees of the House and Senate. So, the Commissioners—he mentions two when, as a matter of fact, there are three—will report to the House District Committee and to the Senate District Committee. Then, the committees will have to convene and dispose of the findings one way or another and work out some kind of procedure that is not yet apparent to me and bring the matter back here to go through the same identical proceedings that we have before us this afternoon.

Now, that is a beautiful piece of circumlocution and if you want to eviscerate a bill, that would be a fine way of doing it. I suggest that we vote down the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 121, noes 82.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-one Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 145, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—218

Abernethy	Andrews, N. Y.	Bakewell
Albert	Angell	Banta
Allen, Calif.	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Battle
Beall	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mills
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Monroney
Blackney	Hale	Morgan
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison
Bloom	Hall, Leonard W.	Muhlenberg
Boggs, Del.	Halleck	Murdock
Boggs, La.	Harless, Ariz.	Nixon
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Hays	O'Brien
Bramblett	Hébert	O'Konski
Brehm	Hedrick	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Owens
Bryson	Heselton	Pace
Buck	Hess	Patterson
Buffett	Hinshaw	Peden
Burleson	Holmes	Peterson
Busbey	Hope	Plumley
Butler	Horan	Poage
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Potts
Canfield	Huber	Poulson
Carroll	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Price, Ill.
Chadwick	Jenison	Priest
Chelf	Jenkins, Pa.	Rabin
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Ramey
Clason	Jonkman	Rayfiel
Coffin	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Karsten, Mo.	Reeves
Cole, Mo.	Kean	Rich
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Riehlman
Combs	Keating	Rivers
Corbett	Kee	Robertson
Cotton	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Coudert	Kelley	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	Kennedy	Rooney
Cravens	Kilburn	Ross
Crosser	Kilday	Russell
Crow	Klein	Sadlak
Dague	Kunkel	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Lea	St. George
Dawson, Utah	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Deane	Lodge	Sasscer
Delaney	Love	Seely-Brown
Devitt	Lucas	Sikes
Dingell	Lyle	Simpson, Pa.
Dirksen	McConnell	Smathers
Dondero	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Durham	McDonough	Snyder
Eberharter	McDowell	Stigler
Ellsworth	McGarvey	Stockman
Elston	McGregor	Stratton
Engel, Mich.	McMahon	Sundstrom
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Fallon	MacKinnon	Thomas, N. J.
Feighan	Macy	Tibbott
Fenton	Madden	Towe
Fernandez	Mahon	Trimble
Fogarty	Maloney	Twyman
Foote	Manasco	Van Zandt
Forand	Mansfield, Mont.	Vorys
Fulton	Marcantonio	Walter
Gamble	Mathews	Whitten
Gearhart	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Goff	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Gordon	Michener	Winstead
Gore	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Gorski		Worley
Gossett		Youngblood
Grant, Ind.		

NAYS—145

Allen, La.	Cooper	Hull
Almond	Cox	Jackson, Wash.
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Jennings
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Andrews, Ala.	D'Ewart	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.
Barden	Dorn	Johnson, Tex.
Barrett	Doughton	Jones, Ala.
Bates, Ky.	Eaton	Jones, N. C.
Beckworth	Elliott	Jones, Ohio
Bell	Engle, Calif.	Kerr
Bennett, Mo.	Fellows	Knutson
Bishop	Flannagan	Lanham
Bonner	Gary	Larcade
Bradley, Calif.	Gillette	LeCompte
Brooks	Gillie	Lemke
Brophy	Graham	Lesinski
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	Lewis
Burke	Gregory	Lusk
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	McCowen
Camp	Gross	McMillan, S. C.
Cannon	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Chapman	Hardy	Mason
Chenoweth	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Church	Harrison	Miller, Conn.
Clark	Havenner	Miller, Md.
Clevenger	Hendricks	Morris
Clippinger	Hill	Mundt
Colmer	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Cooley	Hoeven	Murray, Wis.
	Hoffman	Norblad
	Holifield	Norrell
O'Hara	Rohrbough	Taber
Passman	Sabath	Talle
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.
Phillips, Tenn.	Scrivner	Thomason
Pickett	Shafer	Vursell
Rains	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Rankin	Short	Weichel
Rayburn	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Redden	Smith, Kans.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Wheeler
Rees	Smith, Va.	Williams
Richards	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Riley	Spence	Wolcott
Rizley	Springer	Wood
Robsion	Stefan	Woodruff
Rockwell	Stevenson	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—68

Bender	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland	Gathings	Meade, Ky.
Bolton	Gavin	Mitchell
Buchanan	Gerlach	Morton
Buckley	Gifford	Nodar
Bulwinkle	Granger	Patman
Carson	Hand	Pfeifer
Case, N. J.	Hart	Philbin
Celler	Hartley	Ploeser
Clements	Heffernan	Powell
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Preston
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ind.	Sanborn
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Domengeaux	Kearns	Scoblick
Donohue	Kefauver	Scott, Hardie
Douglas	Keogh	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Drewry	Kersten, Wis.	Somers
Ellis	King	Stanley
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Taylor
Fisher	Landis	Tollefson
Fletcher	Lane	Vail
Folger	Latham	Vinson
Fuller	Lynch	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Folger for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Carson against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Jones of Washington against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Mansfield of Texas against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. King.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES TO THREE INSPECTORS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE FOR USE OF PRIVATELY OWNED MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use

of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to allow not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force an allowance for privately owned automobiles used by the inspectors in the performance of official duties at not to exceed $480 per annum for each automobile used during the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 and thereafter to pay to not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force who may be called upon to use privately owned automobiles in the performance of official duties for each automobile an allowance not to exceed $480 per annum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a quotation from a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the City Council of Baltimore in support of an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial or an article.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution by the Certified Public Accountants of Minnesota.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an act concerning displaced persons.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file minority views on the bill H. R. 3203.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to Monday, May 5, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee last had this joint resolution under consideration the first section of the resolution had been read.

The first section of the joint resolution is now open to amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after the words "not to exceed" strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out the authorization of $350,000,000 and insert in place of it $200,000,000. It is complementary to another amendment which I expect to offer to section 2 reducing the term from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1947.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the two authorizations for UNRRA in the sum of $1,350,000,000 each. I did that with some misgivings, but especially on the second authorization. At that time I offered an amendment that we give notice to the United Nations that at the end of this term the United States would withdraw from UNRRA. That was done because I felt that at some time this should become residual relief instead of what it promises to be—permanent relief year after year. I am concerned that that is what this bill contemplates at the present time; that is, that we are going permanently into the relief business, the only difference being that the United States is singly and alone taking over the burdens of UNRRA. I think I can point to the evidence which sustains that conclusion, and I want to examine with you the record and show that there will be no need for relief after 1947.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this amendment eliminate those countries that are Communist-controlled?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; it does not.

I do not see how any Member can consistently vote for relief through or in 1948 when all the evidence, the only thing that we have to guide us, shows that there will be no need for relief after 1947. We all know that the inspiration for this bill came from the General Assembly of the United Nations where continuation of UNRRA was considered and their recommendation at that time was 6 months of residual relief after the expiration of UNRRA on March 31, 1947, which would bring it up to October or until the next crop year.

Mr. Hoover recommends on page 55 of the hearings:

These estimates, except for Austria, in my view should first include the period from the end of UNRRA until the 1947 harvest.

President Truman in his message recommending this legislation said:

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

That is on page 2 of the report.

Under Secretary of State Clayton said on page 13 of the hearings:

Question by Mr. JONKMAN. Is it your belief from present indications that they will have less acute need for 1948 than they will in 1947?

Answer by Mr. CLAYTON. Yes. They have made such progress in the last 2 years, considering the conditions under which they have had to live and work, remarkable progress in many of these countries, that if the progress should continue at the same rate at which it has gone in the last 2 years we believe, as I stated here, that the need for relief by the United States Government will have been met and passed by the end of this year. I refer to free relief, of course.

Mr. Acheson, Under Secretary of State, in a letter written and produced at the debate in the House of last week, April 23,

and, therefore, the last word on this subject, wrote:

Question. Is it intended that the amounts authorized in the bill will be adequate to take care of the relief need of the countries assisted to the end of the crop year 1948?

Answer. The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence submitted before the gentleman's committee indicating that the problems of Europe today are more politcal than they are economic?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, there is that indication. I repeat:

The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program, some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria—

Now, mind you, with the possible exception of Austria; not probable exception—

we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no other guide for us, there is no other evidence for us than that relief will not be needed in 1948.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They have had ample opportunity to make two crops since the war closed. The war did not tear up their fields; it tore up the factories and the towns. With the exception of Germany, you might say, there has not been a gun fired across the soil of any country for 2 years, and there is no reason on earth why they should not have made crops, except that they have been harassed by a Communist regime or encouraged to beg help from us.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. But I want to emphasize what I was just saying. There is nothing else to guide you. The evidence positively shows that no relief will be needed after the end of 1947, and even the statement "with the possible exception of Austria" makes it stronger. They say they may need some limited relief; in other words, the other countries absolutely will not need it.

Now then, why do they ask for $350,000,000 to run through 1948? There was $100,000,000 in the budget to take care of 1947. I want you to look at the record and see what those who prepared this legislation had in mind.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think we ought to make a difference between the Governments of Europe which are dominated by communism and those which are not dominated by communism?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, it is most difficult to say that we are not going to go into those countries dominated by communism, if we can control this relief so that it goes to needy people without regard to creed, color, or race.

I ask you then, why do they ask for $350,000,000 to run into 1948? What is the analysis of it? I will give it to you again from the record, from the evidence, from the only thing that we have to guide us in this matter. This is from the hearings:

Mr. VORYS. Then in addition to the $500,000,000 of UNRRA products yet undelivered by UNRRA, I understand that $100,000,000 of this $350,000,000 to be authorized by this legislation would be the amount distributed up to June. Is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON That depends on how soon this $350,000,000 would be available to us if at all, by Congress, and how quickly we could enter the procurement. The critical time, as I have said in my previous statement, is in the spring and summer before the harvest comes in.

That is the spring and summer that we are now in.

Therefore we would like to get the money as quickly as we can and start shipping wheat and other supplies as quickly as possible.

Mr. VORYS. I noted in the budget that $100,000,000 of that was put in for fiscal year 1947.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is just an estimate, sir. We would like to spend more than that if we could in the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. VORYS. According to the budget, you would contemplate that $250,000,000 would be distributed through 1948?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is the estimate we made; yes, sir.

In other words, they are going to spend $250,000,000 in 1948 where there is no need of relief in 1948 according to all the testimony available.

Let us fortfy that just a little further. Mr. Tyler Wood, Deputy to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said:

Mr. JARMAN. You spoke of the $100,000,000 last November, and the acting chairman spoke of $200,000,000. Are those figures in the budget?

I think that should be $250,000.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, they are in the budget. They are on the expenditure budget, which is the $37,500,000,000 that everybody is talking about, and the estimate is that of the $350,000,000 that is in the budget, $100,000,000 would actually be spent in the fiscal year 1947 and $250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948.

In other words, we have the same thing there. They are contemplating expenditures into 1948 to the amount of $250,000,000. I submit, however, why should they propose this when no relief is needed in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not hold them to the $100,000,000 that was contemplated for 1947, that would carry them through the spring and early summer of 1947. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we could with consistency cut this authorization down to $100,000,000, and that would meet the needs of 1947. That is what the evidence shows. But I am not asking for that. We propose to give them under this amendment $200,000,000. That is up to the end of the year. On January 3, 1948, Congress will be in session. We have not yet seen, Mr. Chairman, how this replacement for UNRRA is going to work. We know that UNRRA worked very, very poorly. I dare say from what I have seen that if 10 to 20 percent of the $2,750,000,000 that we put in there actually went to the needy people for food, medicine, seeds, and so forth, it is a high percentage. What assurance have we that this is going to be handled any better?

I hope my amendment will be adopted. It provides ample funds for the balance of the year 1947, and at the end of that time Congress will be in session if further help is needed.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware of the fact that this House is so large that it is utterly imposible for it to function as a strictly deliberative body. We fully realize the impossibility of 435 Members sitting in this Chamber and discussing an item of legislation. Why, we would never get through. It would even take us more time than is required in another place I know of to pass legislation. Therefore that realization requires us to rely very heavily on the committees of the House. One specializes in foreign affairs, one on the armed forces, and one on appropriations. We naturally and properly look to the Appropriations Committee on matters germane to it. We look to the Committee on Armed Forces on matters of defense. It is equally natural for us to look to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on matters of foreign relations. But regardless of which committee it be, the only way the committee can bring the results of its work to the House is in a report. These circumstances place a heavy responsibility on the committees to make sure that the reports speak the truth, of course, the same responsibility rests on the shoulders of those who submit minority reports.

We have in this case a very strong majority report and a strong minority report. The minority report is signed by three able members of that committee, three very fine gentlemen of whom I am personally quite fond. I want to read the two concluding paragraphs of that minority report:

We propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization of this bill to $200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishments of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and which is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

That is what the minority report says, my friends, from which this amendment results with which the majority of the committee, and I mean the majority of both Republicans and Democrats, are in complete disagreement.

I quote again from that same minority report, on page 9:

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in

these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity—

Remember these words—

whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity.

Now, I read from page 86 of the hearings. Bear in mind that word "Warsaw."

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was asking a question of the representative of the State Department, Mr. Wood, and he said:

Mr. Hoover made a great deal of the importance of having on-the-spot investigations and studies by qualified experts in the field of relief. As I understand your answer to Mr. JARMAN'S question, those on-the-spot investigations have not yet taken place in any of these countries.

Mr. WOOD. No; I did not mean to give that impression. They have been continuous.

Mr. MUNDT. No special missions have been sent over to make a specific study leading up to this?

Mr. WOOD. There have been continuous investigations by the people in the embassies in these countries, in addition to which there was this investigation, on which we had really expert people, made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Of course I will have to yield to the gentleman—I am talking about him. But if he would let me proceed I might compliment him even more highly.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman mean by that last statement the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations made on-the-spot investigations?

Mr. JARMAN. I am reading from the hearings. I believe I reached the point where I said investigation was made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is the United Nations organization.

Mr. JARMAN. Oh, yes; "on which we had really expert people." If the gentleman will permit me to proceed—my time is very limited.

There has not been in these countries a formal investigating committee from the outside, but let me assure you that, for example, we went into Poland this summer and Ambassador Lane and his whole staff were spending a great deal of time, not only in Warsaw, but all over the country, looking at the condition of the crops and interviewing people in various places.

Now, my friends, I submit to you the considered opinion—and I may be wrong, but if I am, I am subject to being challenged—that I do not believe that evidence is controverted anywhere in the hearings. Therefore, I do not believe there appears to be anything in the hearing to substantiate the positive statement of the minority report that no on-the-spot investigations occurred. On the other hand, it is directly contradicted by the testimony. If that be true, who is the House of Representatives to follow—the three gentlemen who signed this minority report or the Democrats and Republicans who agree to the majority report? The former express the opinion in the same report in which they say no on-the-spot investigation occurred, that $200,000,000 will prove adequate; whereas the latter will, I am sure, reiterate the position they took when voting this amendment down in committee.

In conclusion, may I repeat that I have only the highest regard for those three gentlemen. I do not believe they would deliberately attempt to mislead this House. On the other hand, as I said last week, we are all so thoroughly occupied that frequently we do not have time to go into these matters, to study them from all angles as I know these three gentlemen would have done had time been available to them. In that event they never would have placed that statement in the report.

In view of that statement, how can we have too much confidence in their recommendation that $200,000,000 would be adequate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. VORYS:

Mr. VORYS moves to amend House Joint Resolution 153 as follows:

Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a joint committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of $200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute as another way of solving the problem presented by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I offered the amendment to cut the amount of the authorization to $200,000,000 in committee. In the meantime, time has been going by. I have seen how kleidoscopic and unpredictable the changes in Europe and in our relations with Europe make the future. I therefore propose the suggestion which carries out the suggestion made by Mr. Hoover before our committee.

If you will look at the hearings on page 57, you will find Mr. Hoover said:

There is no mortal man who can determine what the requirements of those various nations are going to be after the next harvest and determine the requirement of each nation after harvest, at the present time.

Therefore, he suggested that a small committee of Congress be set up to review the needs after the next harvest. Remember, this is only an authorization bill. The Committee on Appropriations will have to do the appropriating. But only God knows what the needs are going to be in those countries next fall after their harvests are in, and what our ability will be to fulfill those needs after our harvests are in. Therefore, this amendment would provide for a review by an appropriate joint congressional committee on relief. All expenditures over $200,000,000 would have to be approved by this committee.

Now, let us face the practical facts. We are hopeful that the Congress will be in recess this fall. Therefore, the Congress will not be here to review the authorization. If we have a program that runs up to December 31, it is not contemplated that the Congress will be in session in December. This authorization continues through fiscal year 1948, but the proposal has been made that it may be spent in 1947. Only God knows the needs. We know something about the needs, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but, as I explained the other day, due to the way this was presented to us, only 6 of the 12 days of hearings are before you. The secret documents which gave the needs and the proposed distribution are not before us and, therefore, we cannot intelligently discuss this. But it seems to me that, patterning this after a similar joint committee that has been in effect for some years, we can do a good job. The Foreign Service Building Committee is made up of Members of Congress from the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This is provided in the Foreign Service Buildings Commission law, title 22, section 293, United States Code. That joint committee must approve, even though appropriations are made, before an embassy can be put up on foreign soil.

Under the proposed substitute I offer, a joint committee which would obviously be made up of a majority of the party in power in Congress would have to approve all expenditures after the first $200,000,000. If we adopted this we would have bipartisan power and responsibility in carrying out this policy in that we would have the Executive proposing the expenditures and the committee, a majority of which would be Republicans, approving these expenditures. I am sure the committee would approve them if the funds were necessary. In the event the expenditure were not necessary I am sure that such a committee would prevent needless expenditure.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Do we understand from the gentleman's amendment that this proposed committee is to be appointed from the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and

the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment merely provides that the Speaker shall appoint five members and the President of the Senate shall appoint five. Where they are to come from is left to the wisdom of these Presiding Officers. I imagine that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would be represented heavily. There might be members from the Appropriations Committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that in advocating the type of check the gentleman has in mind in offering this amendment, Mr. Hoover likewise recommended that the sum of $350,000,000 be left intact?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Hoover suggested that this sort of control would leave the authorization intact subject to appropriation, but would permit a congressional string to it in case the money were not needed, and would also give congressional power and responsibility to make this relief truly a bipartisan proceeding.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Was this amendment proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What was the result?

Mr. VORYS. It lost.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. By how many votes?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for an administrator?

Mr. VORYS. That will be proposed in an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. HERTER. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to make it clear that the United States is preparing to contribute up to $350,000,000 if it is needed; but there is not any sense in actually spending it unless it is spent after investigation and that investigation proves that it is actually needed.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

This is only an authorization bill, but this will help the Appropriations Committee, which would not be permitted to put any such legislative restriction in an appropriation bill in connection with any appropriation made beyond $200,000,000; but if the Appropriations Committee is so disposed it would be subject to the control of this congressional relief committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What assurance have we that any other nation in the world other than this Nation will make any contribution to this money that we are proposing to spend?

Mr. VORYS. We have no assurance at all.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about the percentage. What I want to know is if we have any assurance that any other nation on earth will make any contribution.

Mr. VORYS. We know that the British are going to lend $40,000,000 in Austria, but due to the fact that no treaty has been had in the case of Austria it is doubtful in my mind whether Austria will come into this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 153, and I think it should be passed without amendment. I shall endeavor to develop my reasons for this statement.

Whereas I agree with my distinguished colleague from Ohio in that we should have a committee to study the way in which this money is to be spent, I believe that is part of a larger problem. For a long time I have been asking that there be a select committee of 23 Members appointed to make a full study of foreign policy, both economic and political, in every country and with full power to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. So far as the committee suggested by my distinguished colleague is concerned, I believe it would be a subject for legislation other than House Joint Resolution 153.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has been any more outspoken against communism than I. I would vigorously oppose the spending of American money if in any way it could be used to advance communism and to assist Moscow-controlled governments. If this resolution were to continue UNRRA, I would strenuously oppose the measure. In the summer of 1945 I witnessed the UNRRA operations in western Europe and the Balkans. While in this area and particularly in Belgrade, the capital of the Moscow-Tito-dominated Yugoslavia, I learned that UNRRA was being used to advance the fortunes of the Communist Party. In an effort to focus attention on the misuse of UNRRA funds I introduced on October 10, 1945, House Resolution 369 to set up a committee to make an investigation of UNRRA.

UNDER SECRETARY CLAYTON'S ASSURANCES

The joint resolution under discussion provides for unilateral relief action by the United States to prevent starvation. It is "based on the principle that relief of this kind is for people in need, and that these unfortunate people cannot be allowed to suffer from hunger because of the nature of their governments."

On February 25, 1947, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Clayton, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee at the opening of the hearing on this measure. Fearing that the proposed relief might be used by Russian-controlled governments to advance communism, I said to Mr. Clayton:

I just do not see how we are going to send relief, for instance, to Hungary, and particularly Poland, where there is Soviet-dominated government and let that government distribute the relief, without advancing the Communist Party in those countries. That is what happened under UNRRA, as near as I can find out, and that is what worries me about this situation. I think if Russia is going to dominate those countries she had better help feed them.

To this Mr. Clayton replied in the following manner:

Mr. MERROW, may I say just a few words on that: Of course Hungary is hungry, and starving people are starving people wherever you might find them, under what conditions of government or otherwise. However, I think, under the conditions which we will name in these agreements, you may be sure that the people getting this relief will know where it comes from and who is supplying it, that it will be distributed without discrimination, and that the purpose we have in mind will be accomplished to prevent starvation in these countries.

PROPOSED AGREEMENTS

In the appendix of the hearings, page 125, there is a statement by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, concerning the agreements referred to by Mr. Clayton to be made between the United States and relief-recipient countries. Under 13 headings Mr. Wood has outlined the agreements referred to by the Under Secretary. I quote only part of his statement:

The agreements will provide for reports covering (a) prompt notice of arrival of United States supplies, (b) the allocation of those supplies to commercial and other channels and the quantity of supplies used for free distribution, (c) current inventories of all supplies available for relief, and (d) forecasts of local supplies which will become available; the agreements will provide that the United States representatives will be completely free to observe, inspect, and travel at any and all times as they consider necessary, and the full cooperation of the Government in providing them with information, statistics, and reports; the agreements will provide that representatives of the United States press and radio will be given complete freedom to observe and report on the relief distribution; the agreements will provide that the recipient governments will arrange for publicity regarding the arrival of United States supplies, the channels of distribution, any unusual features of the distribution of supplies, and the utilization of funds accruing from sales of supplies for the benefit of the people; the agreements on this subject will give the United States control of the program at all times and provide a powerful means of enforcing compliance with United States wishes concerning the distribution; since conditions vary from country to country, it is possible that other provisions will be necessary to insure proper conduct and effectiveness of distribution in some particular country.

REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 3

In section 3 of the resolution it is expressly stated:

No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Gov-

ernment of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

CONFIDENCE IN STATE DEPARTMENT TO ADMINISTER THIS RELIEF

The conditions set forth in section 3 of this measure in addition to the assurances of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and the proposed agreements as outlined by Mr. Wood satisfy me that this money will be spent to prevent starvation and that in no way will it be used to further the interests of the Communist Party. For a long time I have been asking for a select committee to study foreign policy and to study the Department of State and the Foreign Service. I have been requesting such a study not in an attempt to hunt witches but to improve the State Department. I have confidence in Mr. Clayton and his associates and I believe that they will conscientiously carry out the provisions of the resolution and will fulfill the pledges they have made in reference to the agreements they propose to make with relief recipient countries.

TERMINATION

Furthermore House Resolution 153 provides that the President shall terminate relief assistance whenever by reason of changed conditions the provision of relief assistance provided by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, whenever the assurances of section 3 are not being carried out and whenever any supplies made available under this resolution or similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside is being used for the maintenance of the armed forces in such country and whenever similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside are being removed from such countries. Furthermore, the joint resolution can be terminated by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

SAFEGUARDS ADEQUATE

I believe the safeguards in this bill are adequate to insure the proper use of the funds provided. The measure has been carefully prepared and does not need to be amended. I believe that this aid is necessary to complement the aid we are going to give to Greece and Turkey. We are determined to prevent the spread of communism and one of the most effective ways to do this is to aid starving people in devastated countries. The rigid requirements which must be met before relief can be furnished to these countries will guarantee that the American taxpayers' money will not be used to bolster Moscow-controlled governments in nations such as Poland and Hungary. I hope this measure passes by a substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Inasmuch as the gentleman stated that he does not want any amendment, and I have an amendment at the desk, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state what the constitutional authority for this $350,000,000 gift is?

Mr. MERROW. We have a constitutional right to appropriate any money that we desire for relief to any country.

Mr. OWENS. There is nothing in the Constitution on it. That is why I have the amendment. We cannot depend on it.

Mr. MERROW. We have done it before.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the constitutionality is found in the power of the Congress to appropriate money for the general welfare.

Mr. OWENS. That is the amendment I have at the desk, but I do not believe it is sufficient without the specific amendment in the bill.

Mr. MERROW. There has been no provision like this before.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question of constitutional authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to put this matter over until tomorrow, until after we hear General Marshall?

Mr. MERROW. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the measure ought to go over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight.

Mr. MERROW. I have no objection but I hope the measure passes.

YOU CANNOT TRUST A COMMUNIST

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I announced the other day, I will not vote for a single dime to go to any country that is Communist-dominated, for a gang of commissars to steal, misuse, and starve the helpless women and children in those countries.

I live in a country that once lost a war. I think I can refer back to that tragic era without in any way offending the sensibilities of anyone. There never lived greater soldiers in time of war, or greater citizens in time of peace than those brave men who wore the gray in that unfortunate conflict known as the Civil War, or the War Between the States.

When that war closed those men came home and tied their empty sleeves to the plow lines and began making their own way. I know because I saw it 25 years after the war closed. I have seen a one-legged ex-Confederate soldier leaning on his hoe for a crutch and cultivating his field, hoeing cotton, or cutting sugarcane.

One of the leading businessmen of the country in which I live told me that he plowed the milk cow the first year after the war closed.

Their horses were gone, and in many cases their outhouses, and even their homes, had been burned. There was hardly a home but had lost a son, and a large percentage of the ones who survived had been severely wounded.

They got no assistance from anyone, they were unable to do so; yet they struggled on, developed the strongest stamina ever known, and taught it to their children. It has been the savior of the Southern States for the last 80 years.

They were men, take them for all in all. We shall not look upon their likes again.

This war has been over 2 years, and the peoples of Europe have had ample time to make two full crops.

In the fall of 1945 the greatest soldier developed in this war, Gen. George S. Patton, came here to see me. He came by to thank me for defending him on this floor, as he expressed it, "When I was on the battlefront and could not defend myself."

He said, "Why are you people getting ready to feed Germany?" He said, "I have been all over Germany, and they have the finest crops I ever saw." That was in the fall of 1945. He said, "We didn't shoot up the fields, we shot up the towns and the factories and the cities."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say as one who traveled over Germany in the summer of 1945 that I can confirm exactly what General Patton said.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Last year I told another general, who was with General Patton, what General Patton had said, and asked him why the people were asking for help. He said, "The trouble is, the Communists went in there and drove off their livestock, and took their farm machinery," just as they will take this money if we pour it into those countries that the Communists dominate.

I am certainly going to vote for the amendment to be offered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to deny this money to any country that is Communist-dominated.

Communism is not a form of government; it is a criminal conspiracy to overthrow every government in the world, including the United States. I read that to you from their own lips on this floor a few days ago. But, if you continue to go down into the pockets of the American people and pour money into those countries, I am not sure they will ever make a crop. They tell us that we have absolutely killed, in large measure, the desire of a great many people of Europe to become self-sustaining with the money we have already poured into those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The United States of America won this war, Mr. Chairman. We won it with our men, our money, and our material. We are today staggering under a burden of debt the like of which no other nation on earth ever saw or could survive. If you were to reduce price levels to what they were 15 years ago, the entire wealth of this Nation would not be sufficient to pay the public debt. It is about time that we take those things into consideration, and not be continuously pouring money by the hundreds of millions of dollars into areas where it promotes indolence and encourages people to hold out their hands and beg for the American taxpayers' money.

I read portions of General Morgan's report. UNRRA was a farce. The money provided was used to finance a lot of "joyriders" of a minority group, while they let many of the Christian women and children starve to death.

Now, you come along and ask for this $350,000,000. Next week you are going to ask for $400,000,000 to try to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. As I said before, if we are going to fight communism, let us begin on Capitol Hill. Let us begin in the House Office Building. Let us begin in the Senate Office Building and in the Library of Congress. Let us go down through the War Department, the State Department, and the Treasury Department, and every other department of this Government, and drive these Reds out of our Government. Then let us drive them from our educational institutions where they are poisoning the minds of the youth of America, and drive them from the radio where they are insidiously pumping poisonous propaganda into the ears of the unsuspecting men, women, and children of America. Let us clean them out of our picture shows where they are spreading before the youth of the land the insidious Communist lines that are undermining the moral fabric of America and destroying those things for which our forefathers fought, and for which our young men were told they were fighting in this war.

If we are going to fight communism, no man on earth will go farther than I will. But we cannot afford to fight it at one place and feed it at another. Therefore, I think we should carry this bill over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight, and we should probably postpone it indefinitely. Certainly, we should adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to provide that not a dollar of this money, not a dime of it, shall go to a Communist-dominated country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman saw in this morning's Times-Herald the statement by John O'Donnell where he points out in a quotation from a letter, that he received from some veteran down in Newport News, the names of the Russian ships that are there now loading the so-called UNRRA materials and heavy machinery and trucks and things of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do you not think this is a little inconsistent for us to be considering a measure like this until that sort of thing is stopped?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. Some of those countries to which UNRRA assistance was furnished, Yugoslavia, for instance, took it to build up their armed forces and then with the very guns that we furnished them shot down, murdered our aviators in cold blood and buried them without notifying the American authorities.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman for a question as the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. MERROW. I compliment the gentleman on the splendid fight that he has always made against communism. I want to say frankly that I would oppose a measure which would send materials to Communist-dominated countries if it did not contain certain restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Subsection (c) of section 2 on page 4 of the bill says:

> Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

I doubt if the Soviet-dominated governments of Hungary and Poland would agree to that.

Section 5 of the bill states that—

> The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines * * * that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

If the people of the countries in question know that the relief comes from the United States will it not help us fight communism?

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt it. In the first place, I would not believe a word a Communist would say. He does not believe in God. He is an atheist, and no obligation would bind him. Anything a Communist would sign would not be worth the paper it is written on. I do not care what they tell you about getting this money under their control, or this food and material. They will do just as they please with it and then lie to us about it.

Get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, turn to page A1895 of the Appendix, and read the report on the Soviet spy ring and their traitorous operations in this country, in Canada, and in Great Britain, in flagrant violation of every obligation they have signed and every promise they have made.

Former Ambassador to Russia Hon. William C. Bullitt told the Committee on Un-American Activities that in his deliberate opinion if the Russians had the atomic bomb and we did not have it they would have dropped it on us long ago.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Anyway, it would be distributed through this Government, would it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, of course. If we are going to feed the hungry people of Europe, we should do it through the International Red Cross.

The American Treasury is not inexhaustible. The American taxpayers are not inexhaustible, although they have gone a long way further than any other country that ever existed in answering the appeals of people of other lands. In my opinion, we have gone further than we were justified in going in many instances.

I am not in favor of taking any chances on sending money into Communist countries or sending food into Communist countries, to be taken over and used by those Communist regimes that would use it to overthrow every other government in the world, including our own, undermine and destroy our way of life, and wreck our entire Christian civilization.

I think it is dangerous, and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all, I congratulate this body on the close attention it is paying to the discussion dealing with the problems presented in this bill. I think it has seldom been true that a bill has come before you which required more careful attention, because, if for no other reason, the march of events and time since the date this was reported from the com-

mittee has changed some of the fundamental considerations.

On the face of these hearings you will notice they were held February 25, 26, 27, 28, March 3, 4, 5, and 6. The history of the world has changed since March 12, because that was the day that President Truman came before us and delivered his message concerning the Greek-Turkish situation. So much of the testimony which took place in support of this bill is obsolete today, due to the fact that the march of events has come along and changed it and made it antique and archaic.

I think this bill should be amended. I think it should be amended by the Members of this body this afternoon and tomorrow. I think we can tighten it up. I think we can improve it. Certainly, in view of what has transpired since March 12, I think we can save the $150,000,000 which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes to save in his amendment, where it would reduce the over-all figure from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000.

May I point out especially to my Republican brethren who have had considerable to say about economy at this session, President Truman appealed to this Congress to appropriate $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for the purposes provided in this bill. We now propose to double President Truman's recommendation, making it $200,000,000 for the calendar year 1947, under the Jonkman proposal. If you go along with the bill as originally presented, or if you go along with the bill as it will remain if the Vorys amendment is adopted, or if it goes through without any amendment, you are voting to appropriate three and one-half times as much as President Truman recommended in his annual budget message. I think we should consider this bill in view of what has happened in the world since the request was originally made. I would have favored the $350,000,000 total had it not been that on March 12 the President proposed this new $400,000,000 program, a program which I expect to support, a program which I think is now essential to peace and security, but a program which in large part overlaps, duplicates, and underscores the same program for which we are now voting $350,000,000 unless you accept the Jonkman amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think this House is entitled to know what the policy of the Government is in connection with the supplying of Russia with UNRRA supplies in the nature of trucks and heavy machinery, and also lend-lease material that could be used against us at a time when we are trying to stop communism by helping Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What I wish to know is why we should not be told whether they are going to stop the shipment of lend-lease materials and UNRRA materials in the nature of heavy equipment, machinery that could be used for the very purpose of doing the thing they ask us to do, stop Communism over in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will support the Jonkman amendment he will at least make sure that the remaining $150,000,000 which will become available in the calendar year 1948 will not be made available unless and until they stop that. The decision is in the gentleman's hands and in the hands of his colleagues this afternoon.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am going to support the amendment, but I want to know whether when we get the $400,000,000 bill for which they asked a rule today we are going to continue as we did before the war started, shipping hundreds of millions of dollars of scrap to Japan. The gentleman from South Dakota and I both fought the idea, but our views did not prevail. Are we going to do the same identical foolish thing and continue to ship all this material to Russia at a time when they ask us to put $400,000,000 over in Turkey and Greece to stop Russia?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman understands, of course, that the time to make that fight will be in connection with the $400,000,000 bill for Greece and Turkey. I shall do all I can to see that we do not follow policies which are opposed to each other, one of which would undo the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I make this reservation to propound this inquiry of the Chair: Is there any way we can find out now whether or not this debate is going to be very limited and after a few moments a motion be made that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded? Because there are a lot of us who want to speak on this proposal. I want to speak on it myself.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned this debate ought to be unlimited. Every Member of the House ought to have an opportunity to express himself.

I hope every Member will get the May issue of the Reader's Digest and read about the Russian spy ring in this country as reported on page 127 of the May issue. If he does, then tomorrow he will feel just as I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of making an inquiry, whether the Chair is about to state that as far as the Chair is concerned time for debate, like relief, will be unlimited?

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Chair is concerned, it is, of course, unlimited; but such remarks should be addressed to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill.

The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I shall be happy to yield. I believe the gentleman who first addressed me was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to confuse the Congress in regard to President Truman's position in this matter. It is a fact that the President has asked the Congress for a $350,000,000 authorization, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct, $100,000,000 for 1947, and $250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

Mr. RICHARDS. No. I wish to ask the gentleman this: Is not the President's recommendation that this Congress provide $350,000,000 for relief this year, but he does not specify that any part of it is to be provided for 1947 and the other part for 1948?

Mr. MUNDT. The budget message which spells out exactly what he has in mind this year provides $100,000,000 for 1947 and $250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

During the hearings, as the gentleman knows, there was some confusion on the part of the State Department as to how much they would be able to spend during the remainder of this calendar year, some even believing we could not spend $150,000,000 during the remainder of this year. Under the Jonkman amendment, however, we can spend $200,000,000 during the calendar year 1947, which is more than the most optimistic witness before the Committee believed they could spend in so short a time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is not the gentleman confusing this request for relief and the budget estimate for relief in the occupied countries of Europe?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, because, as the gentleman knows, the estimate for the occupied countries goes to the Appropriations Committee and not to our committee, because it is handled by the Army.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to clear up what the gentleman means about this $100,000,000 proposed by the President. The President has asked this Congress through the present authorization to provide $350,000,000 for relief in six particular countries. None of these countries is occupied territory.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right, except for Austria.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will refer to the Budget he will see most of the relief mentioned there refers to funds needed for relief in countries occupied by our own forces, such as Japan, Korea, and Germany.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a tremendously greater figure than the $350,000,000. That runs close to a billion dollars and will be administered by the Army. I do not want to yield to the gentleman further. He may get his own time to discuss that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In view of the fact the bill is drawn in such language as to make certain that the Communists shall get the lion's share of the fund, does the gentleman not find it inconsistent with this later suggestion of extending aid to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I do not think you can say that this bill is drawn so that the lion's share will go to the Communists. If the gentleman will support, as I feel confident he will, amendments which are to be offered by members of our committee, we are going to tighten this bill up so none of it will go to the Communists.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman and his colleagues will make certain to write into the bill all of the recommendations made by ex-President Hoover.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We propose to bring them up one by one so none of this relief can go to help communism. If we fail to do that, and if under maladministrative practices the aid should go to fatten the Communists, we will of course be in a strange position of incongruity after passing the Greek-Turk bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have a high regard for the gentleman's study and judgment on this problem. Why does not the Vorys amendment, in the gentleman's opinion, give every protection which the Jonkman amendment gives and still take care of the possibility of meeting the larger demands?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I want to discuss it. In the first place I am one Member of Congress who is opposed to having the lower House of Congress delegate its authority and responsibility anywhere. I have opposed it as we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the White House. I have opposed it when we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the State Department. I am opposing it when we are now asked to delegate it to a small committee to be set up, as the Vorys amendment would propose, and delegating the responsibility of the Members of Congress to a committee which acts without authority, because we would then have authorized the full $350,000,000. Only the Jonkman amendment cuts it down specifically to $250,000,000. If we authorize the entire $350,000,000 that becomes a Congressional directive to the Appropriations Committee to make the full amount available. On the other hand the Jonkman amendment reduces that directive to a $200,000,000 expenditure. Congress will be in session again next year. If it should develop the other $150,000,000 is needed next year we could then authorize and appropriate it. According to former President Hoover, however, no more than $200,000,000 and perhaps less can be spent effectively and helpfully during the remainder of 1947. It thus seems wise to limit this bill as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to ask our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] this question: As I understand the momentary situation, the gentleman from Michigan has an amendment at the desk cutting the $350,000,000 to $200,000,000?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has an amendment before us calling for the appointment of a commission to consist of five men.

Mr. JONKMAN. Not as an amendment. As a substitute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a substitute. That is what I want to clear up. In other words, the Vorys amendment would leave the $350,000,000 in the bill, is that correct?

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of what I understand will be the Colmer amendment. That is to put provisions in the bill that will prohibit the so-called communistic countries from receiving any of this money. I do not propose to cast my vote in favor of any such contribution. To do so would be an insult to my own intelligence and an insult to the good people of my district who pay taxes and buy bonds with which to furnish the Treasury the dollars with which to make these extensions of credit, or grants, or gifts, or whatever you want to call them. We are either fighting communism or we are supporting it. As I understand the proposal which will come before us in a few days to give aid to Greece and Turkey, relief to Greece and finances to equip Turkey with a great, strong, modernized, fully-equipped army to fight Russia, if necessary, I see no sense in giving the so-called communistic countries relief money at the same time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. About 4 hours ago I had lunch with one of the most prominent newsmen of this city who just returned from Europe after having been there 4 months. His conclusion is that it would be ridiculous on the part of the United States to furnish relief or money to countries dominated by the Communists.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And I think "ridiculous" is too mild a word for it. I would like to say exactly what I think, but it would not be permissible to print it in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Three or four days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report that is in the May Reader's Digest of the Communist spy ring, the Soviet spy ring in this country. If any of you think you can deal with a Communist country, get the Reader's Digest, or turn to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read that report, and you will see that you might as well attempt to tame a rattlesnake or pet a hyena.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to emphatically go on record in favor of the Jonkman amendment to reduce this $350,000,000 to $200,000,000. I regret that the Vorys amendment is not in such shape that I can vote for it, but if it is to serve as a substitute, leaving the $350,000,000 in the bill, then I cannot support the Vorys amendment. If the Vorys amendment is offered independent of the Jonkman amendment I shall certainly support an amendment providing for a commission consisting of 10 men, 5 from this body and 5 from the other body to be created to supervise the expenditures of these funds. I do not propose to vote for any bill of this nature unless there is language put in the bill which gives the people of this country some supervision over the distribution of these funds. I prefer to go back home to my district this summer and next summer and stand there and tell my good people that at least I tried to protect their funds by keeping these grants and gifts under the supervision of the people of the United States instead of giving blank checks to all of the other people of the earth.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just thinking, in view of the past history, it might be well to allocate a certain amount of these funds to the Turks to be used only for cutting the throats of the Armenians, which they have done through the ages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They might do something of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman is a little bit confused with reference to the administration of funds in this bill. All of this money will be spent, and the regulations will be written by our own Government. This is entirely different from the funds administered by UNRRA. UNRRA was under an international organization.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that very well, and I do not think the language in this bill goes far enough, and I shall support such amendments as may be offered in that general direction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if I pretend to be anything at all in this life, it is to be a realist. I like to view problems realistically, and in order to do that I like to know the facts, and one of the troubles that I have found as a Member of this House in dealing with matters emanating from the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs has always been a deep-seated conviction that the House, as a House of Representatives, has never had all of the facts. And I

know of no bill that has ever come before this House where that fact is so apparent as the bill now under consideration, because it has been conceded by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who brought here the secret files of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, giving the record before that committee held in executive sessions. So the members of the committee like the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] can stand up here and tell the Members, "Now, you other Members of Congress aren't supposed to know all the facts about this thing. You rely upon your committee."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. He did not say it in that language, but he gave in substance that type of advice here just a little while ago. I say to the gentleman it is pretty fair advice, but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. As part of this debate, I want to say to the gentleman that I would like to see him conform to that advice in other days. It notice that he did not support the committee the other day when the vote on the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House. He went off onto a tangent by himself. But when State Department matters are here or Foreign Affairs matters are here, the ordinary Member of Congress is supposed to sit by meekly and humbly and just adopt wisdom from the people of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have been privileged ir their secret sessions to hear all the stuff that is given to them spoon-fed by the people from the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to me. Will he yield now?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman spoke with great irony of the secret sessions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the executive sessions. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his Appropriations Committee has executive sessions, and whether even Members of Congress may appear.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me tell the gentleman, every Member of Congress can read every word that transpires in a meeting of the Appropriations Committee. They are all printed, and you have seen them here 6 or 8 inches deep. Every word is taken down, and they are brought here so that every Member of Congress can read those hearings.

What have you got here on this important bill? You have got just these little, few pages, and it is admitted that most of the important evidence that you received does not appear. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] brought them in the other day.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. I have answered the gentleman's question. I have a few other things I should like to call to your attention about this bill.

Turn to the first page of the hearings and read the testimony of Will Clayton. What does he say? I quote him:

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry. I happen to have had the privilege, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama——

Mr. JARMAN. Do not address me if you will not yield to me.

Mr. KEEFE. I have already yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; but the gentleman declines to further yield when I asked him a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not think it is fair for a gentleman to address another gentleman in this House and then decline to yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. I have yielded to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to say something more?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; I yield to the gentleman. Does he want to ask a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I repeat that a while ago the gentleman spoke with great irony of executive sessions. When I asked him whether the Appropriations Committee, his committee, has executive sessions, and whether it permits even Members of Congress not on the subcommittee concerned to attend, he switched off onto secret documents.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I did not switch off at all. I told the gentleman the facts, and he was so excited he did not pay any attention to them. He did not hear them.

The point I want to make is just this: Here is just a little bit of the record of what transpired. Does the gentleman concede that this is not the whole record of the evidence before his committee?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I certainly do.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; that is all I wanted to say. Then, of course, you have some information that the rest of us do not have. But I am basing my opinion, may I say to the Members, on what is here, and this is enough.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Not right at this moment.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

I want to say to the gentleman that in another committee of this House I have heard the testimony with reference to the general relief proposals for money to take care of relief in occupied areas. I have heard a good deal about those pipe lines, and, being a realist, I want to talk about those pipe lines for just a moment.

You know, you cannot take $350,000,000 or $200,000,000 and go out and spend it overnight and start the pipe line running, and then take a spigot and turn it off.

Did it ever occur to you that it takes weeks to get this program under way and that it takes weeks to go into our markets and purchase the wheat and other supplies that you are going to ship over there and that it takes weeks to get the food on the ships and get the ships chartered and routed to those countries to which they are going? And, then, when the goods get over there, what happens to it? What happens to this food after it gets there? Oh, you say, We are going to throw hedges around it. But when you take this food off the ships and you unload it, as you must, you say you are going to relieve Poland. Where does this food go? They have warehouses there. It goes into the warehouse. Then, after you get it there Joe Stalin says, Well, we are sorry, boys. We have the food over here but we cannot do it just that way. Supposing they do do things as your contract provides. Who gets the food? Who gets the wheat? Did anybody ask a question about that? You load a boat with wheat which has to be ground into flour. Who grinds it and who pays for the grinding? After it is ground into flour and is sacked, how does the wheat get to all these poor starving people that we hear about? How does it get into the bakeshops to be baked? Has anybody told you about that? You can read the record of these hearings. They are barren of a single word on that subject. It would be interesting to know that, would it not? If these people are so poor and emaciated and are suffering so from malnutrition and they cannot work and do anything, how are they able to buy this food? Is it given to them? Is it distributed as relief? How does it get to these poor people?

I will tell you how it gets to them from the evidence that came before my committee. They buy it and they buy it with the currency of the country that they live in. They pay for it in Polish currency or Austrian currency or Greek currency or whatever other country it might happen to be. And if a fellow does not have that currency, God help him. Then, who gets that currency? To whom does it go and what becomes of it? Has anybody told you about that? Well, it goes into our hands, but then what do we do with it? Does it have any value? In relation to the dollar, it does not have much value, but it is the medium of exchange of that country. Then, what do we do with it? We use it to buy more produce that is produced locally in those countries. Some time the thing is going to end. What becomes of the money that they collect? Is there a word in here about it? Not a word.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman mentioned relief in Poland and the distribution of relief. Did the gentleman hear General Drury when he gave his report on UNRRA relief and distribution in Poland? The report was made here in the Speaker's dining room and all of us were invited to hear it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not happen to be invited, or at least I do not recall it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. General Drury told the group of Congressmen who were there to hear him, and there must have been at least 60 or 70 of us who heard the report, that he was very well pleased with the system of distribution. He told us that it was distributed on this basis. He said you did not give them a basket of relief supplies as you did here in the

United States under the WPA program. He said they had to work in order to get this food. Everyone who worked received food. You were able to buy it, but you got UNRRA relief supplies only if you worked. The only other class of people who received UNRRA relief supplies were the orphaned children, and the disabled and hospitalized, and sick people. No drones received any relief supplies. Those who did not work did not get any relief.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Let me call your attention to this language in the testimony of Mr. Clayton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. In describing what the agreements are between this country and the countries receiving our help, he says this:

> Our agreements will be very comprehensive and will include methods, principles, and policies for the distribution of all supplies. The agreement would cover the question of ration systems that should be in effect in the country, and price controls. It would provide that there should be no discriminations, no export or diversion—

And so on and so forth. Now, UNRRA tried to get free access for radio and press into those countries that are dominated by communism. We tried to write such a provision in that bill the last time it was on the floor, providing there would be no distribution of UNRRA supplies in those countries that did not open up and let us see what took place. Do you think for a minute, speaking of the poor people of Poland, Yugoslavia, and those nations under the heel of communistic control—do you think that Mr. Stalin is going to open up those nations now and take down that iron curtain? If he does not, under the provisions of this bill, how are those poor people going to get any relief from these funds? Will you tell me that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The American supplies went into Russia, into the hands of Communist Russia and were distributed, and the people were told that they were coming from Russia. No credit at all was given the United States.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in closing, if you go through this and analyze it step by step as to just what happened, yes, you can listen to some of these broad reports, but you get right down to it and you see how futile all these things are that we try to put around and hedge and protect this money. The safest thing to do is to see to it that we do not appropriate one dollar to be spent in those countries that are dominated by communistic countries or organizations. Then we are safe, and we do not need worry about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman in favor of the Jonkman amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. I am heartily in favor of it. May I say I thoroughly agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] said. I was in hopes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] could be so drawn that we could adopt the Jonkman amendment limiting the sum to $2,000,000 and then set up a committee to see what the situation will be after this next crop year has come about.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman not agree that if the statement made on the floor a short while ago with respect to supplies being sent to Russia under lend-lease is true, then a colossal fraud is being perpetrated upon the people of the country.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is a fair statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise especially at this time to try, if I can, to defend the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it is very unfortunate that any statement should be made on the floor of this House criticizing the committee for doing something that will permit them to legislate properly and to receive information by which no one will be embarrassed. Your chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], has done wonderful work in the time he has been there. It would be impossible to allow the testimony of witnesses called in executive session to go out. It just could not be done. But all of the testimony was taken by the official reporter, and any Member, I believe, has the right to go up there and read the testimony given at that time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I would prefer to make this statement if you will permit me. When you call an ambassador from a country to testify before the committee and that ambassador is going to return to his post in a few days, it would be very embarrassing if the testimony given by the ambassador were to be broadcast in such a way that he could not return to his post. You are withholding such testimony to protect yourself. If you want to get the real information, if you want to get the inside information, if you want to get everything he knows, if he is willing to give it to you, you cannot hold open sessions on an occasion of that kind; it is impossible to do it. But you have your 14 Republican members and you have your Democratic members and they get the evidence and the testimony that is necessary in order to legislate properly. I think every Member of the House, Mr. Chairman, ought to feel satisfied that the chairman and the members of the committee are doing the best they can under the circumstances.

It is not all foreign affairs, because you must remember that foreign affairs is 50 percent domestic affairs as well. It is very unfortunate to give out the impression that your committee is functioning in secret and nobody is supposed to know anything about this. It is not so.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I wish to say. We are asking here for an authorization of $350,000,000. This is predicated upon what the other members of the United Nations are going to give. The total amount is $610,000,000. If we cut the authorization, and it is only an authorization, the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have to appropriate the full amount if they do not want to; they hold their hearings, they get whatever testimony they want to—if we cut the $350,000,000 nearly 50 percent we are automatically going to cut the balance of the $610,000,000 that we are looking for.

This is entirely different. I think those gentlemen who are bringing UNRRA into this legislative picture, Mr. Chairman, are not doing justice to the legislation we have before us. UNRRA was an entirely different thing. That was an international organization governed and controlled internationally, but this one is not. We said right in the beginning to the United Nations that we wanted to do this on our own, that we wanted to regulate everything.

The gentleman has asked how we are going to distribute the food. We will regulate every contract and every agreement entered into between these different countries; and it is not only for Europe, they have said nothing about China and I think China is going to take a great part of this. We do not know at this time really what is going to happen over there. They said, "Wait until we hear General Marshall's speech." General Marshall's speech tonight will not give you any information on which you can govern yourself in your vote on this legislative authorization in the House.

They say we must stop communism from spreading. We have to destroy communism in other parts of the world and we also have to destroy it in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you not going to create a worse condition by encouraging communism?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that; I am just as good a Christian as the gentleman is. I am not that kind of Christian. If I find a man starving in any part of the world I am not going to ask him what his religion is or what kind of politics he believes in. I will feed the starving and give them a helping hand wherever they are. You cannot fight communism with empty stomachs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 3 additional minutes, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BLOOM. Two will be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. If we go into these different countries—and I find there is nothing new about it, I have studied this thing for a long time, long before this war, and long after the first war. I have been through 3 wars; I know what we are going through; but I will say this, that we have to do this job here today and we have to feed these people at all costs, and it is not going to cost us more than this $350,000,000. If we can give to the organization $350,000,000 and let the other countries throughout the world know we are going to do this and go along with them and want them to go along with us, then we will have them with us. If I know someone is starving any place and if I can get food to them, if I can give them a helping hand, I do not care whether it is in New York, Washington, or where it is, I am going to try to do that.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble is when you send this food into these Communist-dominated countries, the Communists take it and use it to suit themselves and let the Christian women and children starve to death.

Mr. BLOOM. It is up to us to make the rules and regulations so severe and make them so binding that the food will get to the starving people who need it. That is what ought to be done. We have everything to say in the matter. We hold the whip hand from beginning to end.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman sure he was accurate in the statement he made that this is conditioned upon participation by any other government?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; I did not say that. If I said that, I was in error.

Mr. COX. The gentleman used the word "dependent." That is not correct then?

Mr. BLOOM. It is dependent in this way, if you use the word "dependent." I will admit that I did say that. There is a certain percentage of the different countries that will give a certain amount of money. The total sum is $610,000,000 of which our share it is stated we are going to give is $350,000,000.

Mr. COX. It is proposed that we donate $350,000,000 whether any other country gives a dime or not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one additional minute because I want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. I have great confidence in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to see the people of Poland and these other nations helped, but I am very doubtful about one question that concerns an amendment I have at the desk. Does the gentleman from New York feel this gift of $350,000,000 is necessary for our common defense and general welfare?

Mr. BLOOM. For both and be sure that I said "for both." There is nothing stronger than the truth and that is the truth, sir.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I wonder if my friend can give the House any definite information concerning the statement made a moment ago to the effect that we are now shpping heavy equipment to Russia under UNRRA?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman's question, of course that is aside from the bill we have under consideration, but let me say that Russia owes us under lend-lease about ten or eleven billion dollars. We have been trying to get some kind of answer from them, but they have not answered until just the other day. UNRRA has a contract with Russia. There are a few businessmen in this House and they will see the situation we are in. We have a contract. We have agreed to give, sell, or allow Russia to buy a certain amount of goods. This is a contract. Now, the United States does not fulfill her part of the contract. Let me tell you, Mr. RANKIN, about this. Listen, because this is good for you.

Mr. RANKIN. I will hear you.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman cannot feel any worse toward those people over there than I do, but they are a shrewd people. If we default on our contract, well, Mr. Soviet Russia will sit back and say, "When you fulfill your part of the contract we will talk to you."

Unfortunately we are in the position that if we do, well, we are dashed, and if we do not, we are dashed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many Members desire to speak further on this amendment, so that we can get some idea as to when we can conclude.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Which amendment does the gentleman refer to? There are two amendments pending.

Mr. EATON. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 12 Members in addition to the chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot possibly finish this bill tonight. Why not carry it over until tomorrow? As I said, we want to hear General Marshall tonight, and I want every Member to read the story in the Reader's Digest before he votes tomorrow on this proposition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Committee rise at 5 o'clock because of other committee engagements that we have, so that a half hour from now we will rise. I do not see how we can vote on this bill tonight intelligently.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What is the parliamentary situation at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment and a substitute therefor offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. A further parliamentary inquiry. That does not preclude other amendments to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EATON) there were—ayes 73, noes 56.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to clear up any possible misunderstanding that may have arisen from the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota in regard to the President's request for relief funds this year. Bear in mind that the $100,000,000 referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota was a $100,000,000 estimate by President Truman to carry on relief expenditures for the balance of the fiscal year 1947. The $350,000,000 provided for here is estimated to be used up by the end of the calendar year 1947, that is, to January 1948. It is entirely possible that there will be some slip-over for the delivery of some of these supplies into January and February 1948. I just wanted to make this absolutely clear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, inasmuch as he has been referring to my remarks?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I refer the gentleman and my colleagues to the testimony at

the top of page 84, where Mr. Wood, who spoke for the State Department all through these hearings, said specifically that in this amount of $350,000,000, $100,000,000 would be spent in the fiscal year of 1947 and $250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948; so there should not be any argument about that. It is printed in the hearings at the top of page 84.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman's quotations are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Gentlemen, I speak not for the committee which needs no defense in view of the distinguished character and great reputation for public service of the chairman and many of the members who are far senior to me, including the ranking minority member, but because I think no word has been spoken here this afternoon about the people who are waiting for this relief. We are talking about $350,000,000 which sounds like a great deal of money. But let us realize that in Greece alone there are 7,000,000 people. I was in Greece. I personally saw the situation there. Just as these distinguished gentlemen tell you that they personally saw the situation in Germany, to which we are contributing no money in this bill—let us get that perfectly clear—I want to tell you what I saw in Greece. The roads are torn up and the railroads are torn up. There is no rolling stock on the railroads. The farms are denuded of the equipment with which to cultivate crops. The situation generally is a shambles. If the Greek people did not have this relief from us to look forward to, it has been said and said truly that their despair would drive them into the arms of communism, not tomorrow, but today.

We must send them this help so that these people can fight against communism. Remember that communism is an idea—a conviction. It is not anything that you can exercise with bayonets. It is only the faith of these people that the democracies have a heart and that the democracies will come to the aid of those countries that are starving and that the democracies will not let them starve, that keeps these people from turning to communism. The Communists tell them that we will let them starve and that we are so selfish, so money-mad, so generally egotistical and set on maintaining our own standard of living, which incidentally is two or three times theirs, that we will let them starve. The greatest thing in the world for communism is this debate taking place on the floor of the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. I have read the committee's report very very carefully. I heartily endorse the position taken by a majority of the members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both Democratic and Republican. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who preceded me had so little time to speak against the amendment. Therefore, I should like to interrogate the gentleman from New York if he will submit himself to questioning.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that $50,000,000 of this sum will go to Greece for food and medicine?

Mr. JAVITS. $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. If I may have a little more of your time, I am so grateful to you for giving me a little more time, I had started to say that we were fact-finders. The facts are in the RECORD regardless of what has been said here to the contrary. I most respectfully ask the Members to turn to pages 107 and 108 of the record in which we have the testimony of a man by the name of FitzGerald. Mr. FitzGerald is a technician and adviser to former President Hoover in all of these things. He is the Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council on leave from the United States Department of Agriculture. FitzGerald said it would cost $296,000,000 to acquire the elementary food and not anything else just this year. That is $296,000,000. Those are the facts and negates completely this argument about the $200,000,000 which with all due deference is made not by the friends of this bill but by those who feel that while they cannot defeat it at least they will cut it down so that it means nothing.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. And is it not true that this fifty or sixty million dollars for food and medicine lays the foundation for the bill which is to come before us relating to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. JAVITS. Without that we might just as well forget about the bill. We can not save dead men from communism.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that in Italy alone between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 is to be spent from this relief fund?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. So the relief money necessary for Italy and Greece as contemplated under this bill exceeds the amount of $200,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. If this present amendment is adopted, it is crystal clear to me that it may deprive the United States and other countries functioning through the United Nations from giving adequate relief to the starving millions of men, women, and children in China, Poland, Hungary, and Austria. The hope of the people of these nations must be sustained by our unselfish action during the remainder of this year and through 1948. It is hoped by that time that they will have sufficient economic strength to stand on their own feet. At this time they are prostrate, flat on their backs, and we must do everything possible to help them regain their balance. If we do not do so, starvation, disease, and terrorism will take over. I shall vote against the present amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment.

The record before us is absolutely void of any showing that even $200,000,000 will be spent between now and harvest time of 1947.

As I said the other day, this is another blank-check proposition. We are asked to go along. If I am any judge of the sentiment that is exhibited in this House this afternoon, it is because our people are concerned about it. Our people are for no more blank checks. How did this figure of $350,000,000 come to be born? On page 81 of the hearings the State Department said:

> This figure of $350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment, and, in part, picked out of the air.

Picked out of the air by the State Department, based upon a survey that had been made by an agency of the United Nations Organization. In addition to the statement I have made—that they cannot spend $200,000,000 for the rest of the year—secondly, there has been no assurance that this relief is going to get down to the grass roots. How is it going to be done? Just as my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, it is going to get down to the grass roots by selling it to those people through the ordinary method of sales—through retail stores. I cannot conceive of a lot of those poor people who need this relief getting it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said it all in a few words. You cannot save dead men from communism.

I am opposed to the present amendment. I am particularly opposed to the Colmer amendments that will be offered later. The Colmer amendments would deny bread, aid, and assistance to the Polish people. I want to repeat, we have had so many congressional committees go to Europe and see conditions in Europe, but how many of you have been in Poland? How many Members of the House have seen Poland? I doubt whether three of you have seen conditions in Poland, yet here is a country that was most devastated; whose people have suffered most; where the Nazis and the Russians both did their damnedest. The Colmer amendments would deny to those people aid and assistance. Then, surely Hitler was right. Hitler would have won this war. We cannot—we must not—listen to that sort of reasoning or logic. Remember this: Germany on three or four different occasions has tried to swallow Poland, and did swallow it. Remember that Russia on three or four occasions in history has swallowed Poland and the Polish people. Remember that each time they had to vomit that country up again. They never could digest Poland or the Polish people. They are a Christian people, a liberty-loving people. They are not Communists. Everyone who has been in Poland will tell you there are less Communists in Poland than there are in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 153, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Lithuanian Society of Luzerne County.

Mr. CHADWICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks with reference to one of the bills discussed today.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Bulletin of today's date entitled "No Somersault."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WAR DEPARTMENT PROGRAM RELATING TO IDENTIFICATION OF UNKNOWN DEAD

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the press of postwar problems with which we must deal each day tends to obscure the actual price of victory paid for by our armed forces in the field with human lives.

But while we go on in our efforts to shape the sort of world for which more than 300,000 Americans gave their lives, it is heartening to note that we have not forgotten our honored dead and the next of kin who gave their sons into the service when our country was attacked.

Today the Office of the Quartermaster General is actively engaged in determining where the next of kin of all identified American World War II dead who now rest in cemeteries overseas want their loved ones to be finally buried.

The War Department is pledged to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin. In order to carry out this pledge, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service, of which the Quartermaster General of the Army, T. B. Larkin, is chief, have been at work throughout the world, wherever our troops fought and died. To them has fallen the solemn duty of recovering remains, making positive identification, and reverently interring the remains in temporary United States military cemeteries until such time as the next of kin make decision as to final burial.

Last year I introduced a bill which became a law and which provides for the return to the United States of an unknown American member of the Armed Forces who will be buried in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., near or beside the remains of the Unknown Soldier of World War I. But the American Graves Registration Service is performing a noble and necessary work in taking every possible step to identify as many Americans who lost their lives overseas as is humanly possible.

The next of kin and relatives of our World War II dead should find some measure of comfort and solace in knowledge of the great care with which the remains of these honored dead are being treated, the pledge of the War Department to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin, and the promise that no remains will be identified unless that identity is established beyond the shadow of any possible doubt.

In the wake of war in the Pacific, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service disinterred the remains of some 1,600 Americans who had been buried in the prisoner of war cemetery at Camp O'Donnell on Luzon, P. I. These remains were reburied in a temporary United States military cemetery at Manila.

But of these 1,600 remains, approximately 800 were in an unidentified status.

Today it is gratifying to me to report that the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General, where the Government's program relating to our military dead is being capably and ably directed by Brig. Gen. George A. Horkan, has identified 642 of these unknown Americans after approximately 9 months of careful, painstaking work. Letters have gone out to next of kin of these identified informing them that positive identification has been made and that soon they will be able to make the decision as to where final burial of their loved one shall be made.

This is typical, Mr. President, of the efficient work being done by the Quartermaster Corps today in carrying out one of the most solemn postwar tasks ever assigned to the War Department—the return and final burial of our World War II dead.

Identification work is one of the most important and vital aspects of this return and final burial program, for the War Department has given its pledge that no next of kin will receive the remains other than those to which he is entitled, and all identification will be positive beyond any question whatsoever.

In the case of these deceased prisoners of the Japanese who were buried at Camp O'Donnell, identification was based upon a number of facts. Reports of death and reports of interments were compared. An officer's diary and casualty reports were carefully studied. Finally, dental charts were compared and authenticated by an expert in tooth-chart identification.

All of this information was then studied by an identification board of Army officers, and certification as to identification was not made until all were satisfied that the case histories left no doubt as to the separate identities of the individuals involved.

Present plans call for the disinterment and reprocessing of all remains from the Camp O'Donnell cemetery that are still in an unidentified status in an attempt to obtain new dental charts, if possible, and additional identifying media. This is in keeping with the policy of the American Graves Registration Service regarding unknowns. That is, no case of an unknown will ever be considered closed. A constant effort will go on, through the years, to locate evidence and information which will eventually result in sufficient accumulation of evidence to warrant identification.

I have gone into detail about the unknowns from the Camp O'Donnell prisoner-of-war cemetery because the work done by the American Graves Registration people and the personnel working in the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington was so extensive. But every individual case of an unknown is given just as much attention and study as was given this large number of unknowns.

As our troops fought from one area to another throughout the world during World War II, Graves Registration units went about the sorrowful task of interring our dead in the temporary United States military cemeteries which were established.

In most cases identity of the dead was positively established through the identification tags which each man wore, through personal papers found on the remains, or through laundry marks which were on the clothing of the deceased.

Where remains could not be identified personnel experts in identification processes have been working for the American Graves Registration Commands in an effort to establish identity. Every useful devise known to modern science and every skill needed in detection work has been made available so that the number of unknowns will be reduced to an absolute minimum. Every bit of evidence connected with any unknown remains is scrutinized carefully and subjected to searching analysis. Use of the fluoroscope has been particularly successful in discovering metallic objects within the remains which might lead to positive identification. Anthropological methods have been employed. In using this science, actual bone measurements are made. From these, with the help of scientific tables, it is possible to determine race, sex, and age. In this way leads are obtained which help toward the eventual establishment of an individual's identity.

Some of the stories of identification work being done today by American Graves Registration Service personnel in the field and by personnel in the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington rival the most unusual tales set down by writers of fiction. In several cases Quartermaster Corps identification personnel have spent several months

tracing down ownership of rings or bracelets found on unidentified remains. Working with only this type of clue to start with, they have carried on the task of identifying an individual, step by step, until the entire case has been completed and presented overwhelming evidence that the remains could be positively identified as those of a particular soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardsman.

This is no impersonal, cut and dried type of assignment which the Office of the Quartermaster General and the American Graves Registration Service are carrying on. It must be conducted always with the thought in mind that somewhere the next of kin and relatives of men who gave their lives on the field of battle are hoping that the remains will be found and properly identified.

You are all familiar with the name of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., Air Corps, who died December 10, 1941, in the Philippine Islands following a bombing operation which won for him posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Cross. Captain Kelly was buried for more than four and a half years as an unknown until American Graves Registration Service personnel, after careful study of a great deal of accumulated evidence, was able to make positive identification.

Captain Kelly, you may recall, was one of an eight-man crew in a B–17 aircraft which went out on a mission of bombing Japanese naval units. The aircraft crashed about 5 miles east of Clark Field on Luzon, P. I, while returning from the mission.

Now, six men of this eight-man crew bailed out. The remains which eventually were identified as those of Captain Kelly were found near the body of a Brooklyn, N. Y., sergeant. The sergeant was identified through identification tags found on his body. But there were no identification tags on Captain Kelly's remains. And Graves Registration officers would not make identification on flimsy evidence.

So Captain Kelly's remains were buried first on Luzon and subsequently were reburied, as unknown, in the United States Military Cemetery, Manila No. 2, at Manila, P. I. Accelerated progress of the war made it impossible to conduct a complete investigation at the time.

With the coming of peace in the Pacific, identification data supplied by American Graves Registration Command personnel in the Philippine Islands was compared with records made during Captain Kelly's service in this country after he had been graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. It was on the basis of positive evidence only that identification of this hero was ultimately made.

As of February 28, 1947, the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General estimated that there were a total of 294,690 remains in all overseas theaters. Of this number, a total of 251,186 had been identified and 43,504 were unidentified. Of 294,690 estimated remains of World War II dead buried overseas, a total of 269,044 were in United States military, Allied or civilian cemeteries, or isolated locations. And of this number, 251,186 had been identified as of that date. The War Department is confident that many more identifications will be made in the months which are ahead.

All next of kin of identified personnel have already received a letter from General Larkin setting forth the cemetery and the plot, row, and grave number within that cemetery overseas where their loved one is interred. And work has already been started on sending to each next of kin of an identified member of the armed forces who died overseas and who is now buried in one of our temporary United States military cemeteries a photographic reproduction of that cemetery.

There has been some talk in the press recently to the effect that these honored dead should remain in the lands where they fought and died and are now buried, and that they should not be brought back to the United States.

But I feel that the War Department is carrying out this program for return and final burial in a most democratic manner, in the fairest possible way. It is leaving this decision entirely up to each individual next of kin.

The Office of the Quartermaster General has started to send to each next of kin a letter containing complete information about this return and final burial program. That letter contains a form on which next of kin will designate where they wish final burial of a loved one to be made. That form, in turn, is sent back to the Office of the Quartermaster General, where steps will be taken to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin.

Next of kin may decide to have the remains returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery; returned to the United States for burial in a national cemetery; buried in a permanent American military cemetery overseas or buried in a private cemetery in a foreign country which is the homeland of the deceased or the next of kin.

If next of kin ask that remains be returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery, the remains will be sent to the point designated, all expenses paid, with a military escort.

It is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we go to these lengths with our honored dead of World War II. By carrying out the wishes of the next of kin we are, in some respects, paying back to these good people throughout the land a debt incurred when we asked them to give us their sons for military duty.

No matter what decision next of kin may make, they may be assured that if the Office of the Quartermaster General has written to them concerning the remains of a loved one, that the remains are those to which they are entitled. There can be no question whatsoever as to the identification which has been made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, for April 28, 29, and 30, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for April 29 and 30 and May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRESTON, for April 28, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

605. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

606. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft o a proposed bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

607. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

608. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a final report of the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

609. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a printed copy of the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

610. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3203. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 383, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1179. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 196. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 197. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing that the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress shall be effective from February 13, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 321). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Finance additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation"; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3227. A bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3228. A bill granting the same income tax treatment to married persons living in non-community-property States as is now allowed to married persons living in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3229. A bill to repeal the act of April 29, 1902, relating to the procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3230. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3231. A bill to provide for old-age assistance payments to the States with respect to needy individuals who are voluntary inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3232. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3234. A bill relating to the acquisition of civil-service status by certain war-service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide for the preparation and distribution of booklets of information relating to Members of, and Delegates to, and the Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3237. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures without any or further proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3238. A bill to secure prompt payment and adjustment of just claims for loss of or damage to property received by laundries and dry-cleaning and dyeing establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to extend the same provisions of said act to officers of World War II, and to add the Legion of Merit and Silver Star to those decorations cited in the act of June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the extraordinary disaster at Higgins and Glazier, Tex.; Woodward, Okla.; and surrounding areas; and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Baruch plan for the international control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, relating to revenue bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taxation and expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to migratory game birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will permit the use of decommissioned hospital ships by State and city agencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging investigation and settlement of the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to survey of the fishery possibilities of the Bering Sea in the Nome area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protest the closing of the Twin Cities Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for an examination and study to preserve a reasonable price balance; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient hunters to kill and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wildcats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds from which grants may be made for the assistance of the school systems; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3241. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Margaret Pickett Yellowtail; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Roman Toporow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

380. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 33 residents of Lawrence County, Pa., urging liberalized benefits for veterans under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

381. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the State of Maine, that Congress request the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to review the present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce, and that the study be made with the least possible delay in order to relieve the serious consequences now resulting from restrictions currently in force that hinder the complete utilization of the shellfish resources of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

382. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Washington State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors with attached resolutions of Washington Wool Growers' Association and National Wool Growers' Association, commending Soil Conservation Service and its accomplishments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

383. Also, petition of the State of Washington, to set aside the area of old Fort Vancouver as a national monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

384. Also, memorial of the State of Washington, to provide hunters for extermination of predatory animals in national parks; to the Committee on Public Lands.

385. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. Jesse Tanner and 28 other residents of St. John, Kans., urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, respectfully presenting and petitioning that Congress request the Surgeon General review present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce; that the review be made with the least possible delay to relieve the serious consequences; that the review complete whether or not the methods of determining the sanitation of soft-shell clams and the areas involved should not be different from those used in the examination of oysters and oyster beds; and that the test shall be made by testing the clam and not by testing the water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

387. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension to Puerto Rico of all legislation that may be approved against communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

388. Also, petition of the Free Sons of Israel, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of H. R. 2910 and promotion of its enactment into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

389. Also, petition of American Association of Social Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation to permit admission of displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. Also, petition of the Atlantic City Board of Trade, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the bills S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

391. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Second Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

392. Also, petition of membership of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. Also, petition of the New Port Richey Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give us open eyes, our Father, to see the beauty all around us and to see in it Thy handiwork. Let all lovely things fill us with gladness and let them lift up our hearts in true worship.

Give us this day, O God, a strong and vivid sense that Thou art by our side. By Thy grace, let us go nowhere this day where Thou canst not come nor court any companionship that would rob us of Thine. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

"House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that whenever 25 or more persons holding an honorable discharge from service, during the present war, in the armed forces of the United States or from service, during the present war, in the merchant marine who were residents of Hawaii for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to entry into such service, who have not theretofore made application under such organic act, shall make written application to the commissioner of public lands for the opening of agricultural lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of said commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry agricultural lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide lands for use and occupancy upon 99-year lease, by such persons, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with such commissioner prior to the survey of such lands, written applications for lands for occupancy in the district designated in said applications, of 4 acres each. The land to be so opened by said commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available agricultural lands in the same geographical district, and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however,* That no leased land under cultivation shall be taken for homesteading until any crops growing thereon shall have been harvested: *And provided further,* That each lease made under such enactment shall be deemed subject to the following conditions, whether or not stipulated in the lease:

"(1) The lessee shall pay a rental of $1 a year for the land and the lease shall be for a term of 99 years.

"(2) The lessee shall occupy and commence to use or cultivate the land as his home or farm within 1 year after the lease is made, and shall continuously so use and cultivate said land during the entire term of the lease.

"(3) The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to nor mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of any other person, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the land. Such interest shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the land and improvements thereon shall vest as follows:

"(a) In his widow, if he leave a widow;

"(b) If he leave no widow, in such child or children of his as he may designate by will, or upon failure of such designation, in his children in joint tenancy;

"(c) In the event that he leave no widow or children, the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revest in the Territory.

"(4) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the land and improvements thereon

within 60 days after they become delinquent, and if he fails so to pay, the land commissioner may thereupon pay the taxes and declare the lease upon same to be forfeited and canceled, and evict the lessee therefrom.

"Upon failure to comply with any of said conditions the right to the use and occupancy of said land by said lessee shall thereupon revest in the Territory and the commissioner may take possession of the same and improvements thereon; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

"House Concurrent Resolution 39

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, relating to revenue bonds

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending section 6095 of chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, by extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1949; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 287 citizens of the city of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment at Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 560) to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 147) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 29, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1176. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

S. 1177. A bill to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

S. 1178. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1179. A bill to terminate Executive Order 9070, to reestablish the Home Loan Bank Board, to establish a Federal Home Loan and Housing Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1180, to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1182. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of Osage Mission, Kansas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1183. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation and for other purposes; and

S. 1184. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1185. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of Thorvaldur Hliddal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1188. A bill to provide that consideration shall be given, in establishing retention preference regulations, to employees permanently injured in line of duty, and to permit exemption of such employees from the regulations; to the Committee on Civil Service

S. 1189. A bill for the relief on Mrs. Susie E. Felmy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appriate reference a bill providing for commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers.

I understand that legislation along this line is not absolutely essential, since the Postmaster General could issue such stamps, if he so desired, under his present authority. The Postmaster General has declined to take such action, however, and has indicated that it would be difficult to fit this series of commemorative stamps into the production schedule of the Department this year.

I am introducing this bill in the hope that the Postmaster General will make preparations for the issuance of the stamps at the earliest practicable date.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1180) to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 17, I met with a group of several hundred representatives of CIO unions from Pennsylvania for the

purpose of discussing pending labor legislation.

The meeting was in the best American tradition. Members of the labor delegation presented their views and urged support for the propositions which they considered in the best interests of the American workingman and the American organized-labor movement.

On my part, I made my position clear, stating what I held to be labor's rights and obligations. I sought to suggest a course of action by labor and by management which might contribute toward the establishment of industrial peace.

The meeting was a clear-cut demonstration of the right of every American to a proper hearing and to state his case frankly and openly.

The visiting delegation and myself were not in complete agreement as to the most effective method to reach the goal toward which all of us are striving. However, we met in harmony and with mutual respect for the opinions of each other.

A few days later there appeared in the Washington Observer, a daily newspaper published in my home town of Washington, Pa., a paid advertisement with this headline:

Senator MARTIN ignores will of home county.

This was followed by an attack upon me which I desire now to call to the attention of my colleagues because I feel honored that I have been singled out for this denunciation.

The advertisement was signed "Washington County Committee, Communist Party, Gabe Kish, chairman."

With brazen effrontery, this Communist and his associates presume to speak for the people of Washington County and for the thousands of decent, hard-working, patriotic members of the fine labor unions in the community which is my home.

I say to the Senate now that neither Kish nor his fellow travelers of the Communist Party committee represent labor or the community in which they conspire to stir up class hatred and prejudice, and to undermine faith in the American system of government.

I repeat, I am proud, and consider it a compliment, to be the object of criticism and denunciation from the mouths of Communists and other subversive, un-American organizations.

For that reason, and because of the false and fraudulent assumption by Communists of the right to speak for American labor, I now ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD the text of my remarks to the CIO representatives, and also the text of the advertisement signed by the Communist Committee of Washington County, Pa.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF EDWARD MARTIN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, TO A DELEGATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PENNSYLVANIA CIO UNIONS IN THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ROOM, THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

I appreciate very much this opportunity to meet with you representatives of the CIO. This meeting is so important that I have written out what I want to say.

I cannot tell you in detail how I shall vote on the various provisions of the new labor bills, but I do want you to know where I stand on certain principles because my vote in the Senate will be guided by those principles.

First, these are the things I am for:

Your right to organize.

Your right to bargain collectively.

Your right to strike—because a strike is free speech in action—unless the greater right—the health and safety of the people is endangered.

While, as I have said, I recognize labor's right to strike to obtain relief from grievances, I am opposed to jurisdictional strikes, to sit-down strikes, and secondary boycotts.

I maintain that the obligation to live up to their contracts should rest equally upon labor organizations as it does upon management.

I believe the American workingman should be protected in his right to work freely at the job of his choice.

I believe the union member should have the right of secret ballot, without coercion from any source, when voting in elections or to decide other matters affecting his welfare.

I believe that the success of our whole national economy is dependent upon the friendly cooperation of labor, management, and agriculture. Government must be the impartial friend of each group. It must not favor one above the other. It must not favor one faction in labor, management, or agriculture above the others. If the pendulum swings too far to one side—then the Government must do as it has done many times in the past—step in to restore the balance.

The argument of the CIO to Congress appears to be: "Let the Government keep out. We are satisfied with things as they are." That is because you have special advantages today.

When big business monopolies threatened to push little business into oblivion and disregarded the interest of the public, Congress passed antitrust legislation. Labor cheered for that. It wanted Congress to get into it. When management grabbed every advantage and pushed labor around, Congress stepped in with laws to protect the workingman. Labor had no objection to the Government's intervention at that time. You will remember how labor descended upon Washington to demand votes for those bills just as, today, it comes to Washington in droves to demand votes against any change in the existing law. But today the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction. Some union leaders are pushing the individual workers around, taking advantage of every quirk and twist in the laws that Congress passed to help workers. Some unions are backing business into a corner and jeopardizing its very existence. Congress certainly never intended that.

As CIO representatives you have talked to me frankly and I am talking just as frankly to you.

The Republican candidates last November were elected by overwhelming majorities. In a heavily industrialized State like Pennsylvania, Republican candidates could not have received those great majorities without the vote of hundreds of thousands of our fine workers in organized labor. This was an indication that the rank and file of labor wanted an end to industrial strife and expects this Congress to enact fair and just laws which will bring this about.

I have always opposed racketeers, whether they be in labor organizations, business, or in government. In the 1946 campaign, one of the main issues was racketeering and communism in labor—yes, and I mean the Political Action Committee of the CIO. I want to repeat here to you what I said all over Pennsylvania during the campaign: "Get rid of your Communists and your racketeers. If you don't, the Government is going to do it for you."

Just how strong the new labor laws will finally be depends upon how well labor cleans up its own houses. The CIO has not made too much progress to date. Some moves by your leaders toward sweeping out the Reds and the racketeers have been almost entirely a gesture—nothing more.

Finally, I believe that there is no more important domestic issue today than the maintenance of industrial peace. I hope that more leaders of labor and business will learn to preach the doctrine of fair play and good will instead of hate and distrust. Organized labor, as a whole, has shown little disposition to meet these issues with fairness and in a spirit of cooperation. But you're not alone in that. Neither has management. On both sides there has been selfishness and ruthless disregard for the common good—the good of that great third party to every dispute—the general public. Each side has wanted everything for itself and nothing for the other fellow.

Since you have failed to get together under existing laws, resulting in great loss to all concerned, I believe it is the responsibility of government, as the impartial friend of labor and management, to step in and referee this thing for the good of all the people.

I want it understood that I am going to vote for new labor legislation. I will not support legislation intended to punish labor—that is not justice. I want laws which will correct the glaring bad spots that have developed under the National Labor Relations Act. I will vote for legislation which I believe will correct these and other abuses and will move the pendulum back toward dead center where the rights of all are protected and industrial peace maintained.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

SENATOR MARTIN IGNORES WILL OF HOME COUNTY!

Representatives of the AFL and CIO from Pennsylvania visited Senator MARTIN in Washington to find out where he stood on the Taft antilabor bill.

Senator MARTIN refused to commit himself against the bill. Such action ignores the will of the overwhelming majority of his constituents in his home county, which is prolabor.

What is the issue upon which Senator MARTIN refused to commit himself?

The issue is democracy. The Hartley bill passed by the House of Representatives is not only a blow against labor—it is a blow against all people and the rights guaranteed under the American Constitution.

To scrap the Wagner Act, outlaw the closed shop and take away other rights of labor means—the first steps have been taken toward fascism in America.

The people do have a stand on democracy. They are against all attempts to deny labor its rights. They know that if labor is denied any rights, then soon all others will lose their rights. This is the stand of the American people—It is also the stand of the people of Washington County. They have a right to know where Senator MARTIN stands.

Senator MYERS, also of Pennsylvania, has pledged to carry out the will of the people, to vote against the Taft bill.

Representative MORGAN, from our congressional district, has voted against the Hartley bill—thus truly representing the will of our people.

We citizens of Washington County have a special responsibility, being the home county of Senator MARTIN, to demand that he also reflects the will of the people—to take a stand against the Taft bill.

This is not a Republican, Democratic, or Communist issue. The issue is democracy.

If democracy is to be upheld then the Taft bill must be defeated. All citizens, without regard to their political affiliation should unite in demanding that Senator MARTIN vote against the Taft bill.

Let Senator MARTIN know where you stand!

WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY,
GABE KISH, *Chairman.*

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be no session of the Senate Wednesday night, but it is the intention to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and to continue meeting at 11 o'clock the remainder of the week. All Senators should prepare to comply with that program. Any committees about to schedule hearings should contemplate that the Senate will convene each day for the remainder of the week at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the announcement include Saturday?

Mr. WHERRY. The policy committee has not decided yet as to Saturday, but it will at least include Friday.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, because of the announcement just made by the able Senator from Nebraska, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations may be permitted to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate, in view of the fact that we have a large number of witnesses scheduled who could not be notified in time of any change in the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to sit between 2 and 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject entitled "Federal Aid for Education," delivered by him in Raleigh, N. C., on April 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Testament of a Great Public Servant," from the Southern Agriculturist, paying tribute to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AT UNVEILING OF HIS PORTRAIT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, at the unveiling of his portrait and its presentation to the State of Arkansas, at Little Rock, Ark., April 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW FAILURE — EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moscow Failure," from the Chicago Daily News of April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials by Walter Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune for April 26 and April 29, 1947, the first entitled "Federal Aid for Schools," the second entitled "More on Federal Aid for Schools," which appear in the Appendix.]

PLIGHT OF THE DP'S—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Plight of the DP's," from the Providence Journal of February 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit Senate bill 1126 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last evening, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday, I was addressing myself to the pending legislation. I had stated the position of the President, in his recommendation to the Congress at the last session relative to labor legislation, and his advocacy of certain measures of that character. I had read from sections of the views of the minority, which confirmed the fact that the three Senators signing the minority report not only supported the program of the President as recommended to Congress, but also were favorable to certain enumerated provisions of the pending legislation. But as I said, Mr. President, many of us could not bring ourselves to support the proposed legislation in its present form, and its defects would be augmented if the pending amendment—that is, the amendment offered by the Senators from Minnesota and Ohio—were adopted, and if other amendments kindred in character should be adopted by the Senate at a later time. I placed my oppositon to this measure squarely upon the public welfare, as well as upon the interest of the working people who are more directly affected.

I had stated that in the hearings former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, appeared before our committee to testify. I should like to read a few excerpts from the record of Governor Stassen's testimony. On page 559 of the report of the hearings we find the following:

> But it also appears to me that there is some danger of going too far in the adoption of new legislation or the amendment of existing statutes and to so weaken labor that the result would be injurious not only to labor but to our free economy as a whole. It is my view specifically that during the 1920's labor was too weak, and that the result was harmful in the end to labor, to agriculture to capital, and to the country as a whole.
>
> Thus it would appear to be very important that there should not only be consideration of each specific measure, but also an over-all evaluation of the sum total effect of legislation upon the position of labor and organizations of labor in the economy, and upon the resulting balance in the relationship between capital and labor.
>
> The corporate device in a structure of private capital concentrates rather large powers in management. If we move in the direction of less governmental regulation and control of capital and of business, which I hope will be our direction in the years ahead, then we must at the same time be guarded lest we increase governmental regulation and control of labor to such an extent that the result would be to strip labor of its fair bargaining position in relationship to private capital and to, in fact, place it at the mercy of capital.
>
> It is also highly desirable and will result in the most healthy economy if labor as a whole feels that the new national labor policy adopted is eminently fair and just and balanced. The real success of our entire free economy depends upon a feeling of fairness and of voluntary participation on the part of each of the elements of the economy. To me this means a maximum of reliance upon the voluntary action of capital and management and labor and its leadership and the very minimum of compulsion or regulation.

I shall now read from pages 572 and 573 of the hearings. I am reading from part I, as I was in the previous quotation. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in the hearings asked certain questions of Governor Stassen. The Senator, as appears at the bottom of page 572, asked the following question:

> Senator BALL. Didn't that occur before the enactment of the Wagner Act, which specifically prohibits any participation by the employer. All the awards so far certainly have been enforced vigorously on the employer to prevent him from discriminating against union members. So that I do not think fear of the employer would play any part in the individual employee's decision as to whether or not he wanted to join a union or remain in a union. So that the closed shop, in view of the protection that the Wagner Act gives to the union, the exclusive bargaining rights which it gives to the union—the closed shop now is much more a device to consolidate the union's power over the individual worker than it is to give the union power versus the employer.

I now read Governor Stassen's reply, as follows:

Mr. STASSEN. I disagree with you. I think it is one of the elements to balance the strength of labor and management. And, of course, it should only be entered into as a free and voluntary contract agreed upon by management and the representatives of the men.

I would thoroughly agree that there has been an unfortunate tendency through the war to impose various forms, in one manner or another, of the maintenance of membership or union shop. But that will adjust itself if we balance up these labor rights now between management and labor and move on on a free-contract basis.

Mr. President, it is not only the Senator from Florida and other Senators who disagree with the Senator from Minnesota. Here we find a gentleman of no ill repute in Minnesota, former Governor Harold E. Stassen, who was governor, as I understand, when the Minnesota Legislature enacted labor legislation, which has been commended by many critics, and who has been a farseeing and wise statesman in the field of management-labor relations. Yet it is Governor Stassen who is admonishing the members of his party, and all of us, against disturbing a fair balance between management and labor, against weakening labor. He warns it will weaken the economy as a whole if we do.

Mr. President, I now read further from the testimony of Governor Stassen, on page 575 of part I of the hearings. This time the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked the following question of Governor Stassen:

The other question I wanted to ask is this: You made the statement that in 1929 the depression was due to wage rates getting out of line with prices. I never heard that suggestion before, and I wondered if there was any justification for it. I have heard a good many explanations of the 1929 collapse, but that is not one of them, because wages increased steadily in the 1920's and prices stayed level, so I could not quite understand the theory.

Mr. STASSEN. No, Senator; that is one of the factors that caused the 1920 break, as I see it and as some eminent economists have analyzed it. In other words, it is not correct that wages increased steadily during that period along with profits and product. The facts of the matter are that in 1920 corporate profits in this country were four and three-tenths billions. By 1929 they had gone up to seven and six-tenths billions. This is net profit after taxes.

The average hourly factory wages in 1920 were 61 cents; in 1929, 59 cents. The total product—

Then the chairman of the committee interrupted to ask the following question:

The CHAIRMAN. That was prior to the collapse of 1920, when everything went down and prices were approximately the same. The wage rates, after the depression of 1920, steadily rose. They went down there for a while and after that they steadily rose.

Profits have no relation; profits are about 3 or 4 percent of national income. The question is the relationship between wages and prices. The real wage by 1929 was much higher than it was in 1920 and 1921.

Mr. STASSEN. No; it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; it was.

Mr. STASSEN. No. The labor proportion—

There appears to be some disagreement here between the witness and the chairman of the committee.

The labor proportion of the total national product had gone down from 1920 to 1929. In other words, in 1929 gross national product was ninety-nine billions, and still you had labor at only fifty-three billions—total salary and wages. This holding back of consuming power during that boom rise of the late 1920's was one of the factors of the break. You understand, Senator, I did not say that was the sole cause of the 1929 break. There were many causes, but it was one of the causes. In that period—

And I call the attention of Senators to this statement made by Governor Stassen:

In that period labor was excessively weak in its organizations in this country.

Senator MORSE. Governor, would you say that during the 1920's the fact that by 1929 average hourly earnings in the factories of the country were 59½ cents an hour reflects some light on why we had the tremendous installment buying during that period, because of the desire on the part of labor to maintain a high standard of living, but not the purchasing power with which to pay for it?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes; that was one of the factors. The extreme installment buying that came about with the high production but the low hourly wage, and the whole speculation wave in the country.

Many of these things added together to cause the break of 1929. But, I would say, specifically, that in my judgment, and from the statistics that are available, in the 1920's wages lagged behind the increase of productivity of labor.

If you were to give labor its fair credit for the increase in productivity, wages during that period should have gone up more than they did. During the same period, labor organizations decreased very sharply in their strength.

Those are not the words of the Senator from Florida. They are the words of a distinguished former Governor of a great sovereign State, Governor Harold E. Stassen. They are the words of a man who has achieved national recognition in the management-labor field. He has made a constructive contribution in that field. There is a man, Mr. President, speaking his counsel to his country—against what? Against another depression, against a repetition of the 1929 tragedy. Here is a citizen counseling the Congress of his country not to commit the folly which led to the last tragic depression, which nearly disrupted the institutions of democracy in America and brought this Nation nearer to the brink of revolution than has occurred to my knowledge since Shay's rebellion.

Mr. President, that is a solemn warning to the American Congress by an American citizen. He is telling us that, if we do not watch out, there will be a repetition of what the Government of this country did in the early 1920's, and that the same unfortunate result will ensue.

So when we stand on the floor of the Senate and speak against this proposed legislation, against which Governor Stassen also counseled, when we oppose the bill and the Ball-Taft amendment, does that mean that we are trying to defend labor in the perpetration of a wrong? No. Does it mean that we are against all labor legislation? No. The President is not against all labor legislation. He has made an affirmative recommendation to the Congress. The minority has favored specific provisions in the bill of an affirmative character which we think should be adopted. But the proponents of this measure are not willing to stop at that point; they are not even willing to stop with the committee bill. We already have one amendment pending which would make it more severe, and we are told that there are others yet to come before the Senate for consideration.

What does Governor Stassen tell us was one of the major contributing causes of the 1929 depression? He says it was the lowered purchasing power of the working people, because they did not have the money with which to buy. Sellers in factories and on farms were not able to find adequate markets for their goods except through installment buying, which represented the inability of the purchaser to pay for what he bought unless the payments were extended over a long term. That was a contributing cause to the inflation and thereafter to the depression which inevitably followed.

Why does Governor Stassen say that the purchasing power of the working people—meaning the masses of the people—was diminished? First, he says that labor organizations were weak, and that wages declined in respect to profits and prices. He said that those were the front doorsteps of the depression.

I should like to call attention to what is happening at the present time in our economy. I have examined some data supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics took an average week in January 1945. It was discovered that average straight-time hourly earnings during that week were 92 cents an hour. In December of 1946 the straight-time hourly earnings of wages of workers had increased to $1.10.

If we go a little further we find that in January 1945, the average number of hours worked each week by the workers was 45.4; but in December 1946, the number of hours worked each week by the workers had fallen to 40.9. The number of hours worked each week was nearly 5 hours less than in January 1945.

We find that in January 1945 average weekly earnings were $47.50. In December 1946 average weekly earnings, in terms of dollars and cents, had fallen to $46.86, a decline of nearly a dollar a week. But, Mr. President, those wages in dollars and cents must be adjusted to buying power, and we must take into account the increased cost of living which intervened. The cost-of-living index went up from 127.1 in January 1945 to 153.3 in December 1946. When we make the adjustment for the difference in cost of living, on the basis of the increased cost of living in December 1946, as compared with January 1945, we find that in December 1946 the worker was actually receiving about 22 percent less in purchasing power of wages than he had in January 1945. This fact leads me to the conclusion that what is happening

now is what Governor Stassen said contributed to the 1929 depression, namely, falling "real" wages of the workers. I have shown how the workers' wages, in terms of buying power, fell 22 percent from a week in January 1945 to a week in December 1946.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator what class of workers these figures cover.

Mr. PEPPER. These are over-all figures.

Mr. McMAHON. Do they cover all industrial workers?

Mr. PEPPER. All workers in manufacturing industries.

The only other figures I have are for the bituminous-coal-mining industry. In January 1945 the average hourly earnings in the bituminous-coal industry were $1.20. In December 1946 the number of cents an hour had risen and the average was $1.49. But the actual wages of the worker, adjusted for increased living cost, had fallen 6 percent from January 1945 to December 1946. So we see that the purchasing power of wages of workers is steadily falling.

Those figures are in terms of their own previous record. Let us take them in relation to other groups in the economy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to point out that the fact is that real wages of factory workers have increased more than 20 percent since the 1st of January 1940. While the cost-of-living index has gone from 100 to 155, the average hourly rate has increased 80 percent. The average take-home pay has increased 90 percent. The Senator's figures are all taken at the very height of the war, when the workweek was 48 hours instead of 40 hours, as it is today. Real wages have increased since before the war, without, so far as I know, any increase in productivity; and the hourly rate has increased since before the war to a greater extent than the increased cost of living, without any known increase in the rate of productivity. It is not true that there is a steady fall. It is the result of the reduction of hours from 48 to 40.

Mr. PEPPER. What I am showing is that we now have a declining real wage for the workers of America and that the decline is going on not only with respect to the past record of their earnings but with respect to other groups in the economy. That, Mr. President, is the point to which I wish to address myself.

In 1936 the total national income was $65,000,000,000. In that year salaries and wages were $40,000,000,000. In 1941 the total national income was $96,800,000,000. Salaries and wages were $60,800,000,000. In 1945 the total national income was $161,000,000,000. Salaries and wages were $111,000,000,000.

Listen to the next figures, Mr. President. In 1946 the total national income was $165,000,000,000. Salaries and wages had dropped to $106,000,000,000—$5,000,000,000 lower than they were in the previous year, 1945—while the total national income had increased $4,000,000,000 from 1945 to 1946.

Let us make a comparison, taking the net profits of corporations. In 1936 the net profits of corporations, after taxes, were three and eight-tenths billion dollars; in 1941, eight and five-tenths billion dollars; in 1945, $9,000,000,000; in 1946, $12,000,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that while salaries and wages diminished $5,000,000,000 in 1945 and 1946, the net profits of corporations increased $3,000,000,000 in the same period. It is estimated, Mr. President, by the Department of Commerce that corporate profits, after taxes, in 1947 will be $16,000,000,000, representing an additional $4,000,000,000 increase from 1946 to 1947.

I shall consider next agricultural proprietors. Agricultural proprietors in 1946 received four and four-tenths billion dollars; in 1941, six and three-tenths billion dollars; in 1945, twelve and five-tenths billion dollars; in 1946, fourteen and nine-tenths billion dollars. In other words, between 1945 and 1946 agricultural proprietors had an increase of two and one-half billion dollars in their share of the national income. I have said in my previous statement that salaries and wages, however, declined $5,000,000,000 in the same period.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator have any figures indicating how much of those profits were occasioned by the repeal of the excess-profits taxes?

Mr. PEPPER. I have a considerable number of figures on that point, Mr. President, which I propose to offer.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not want to inconvenience the Senator if he is not ready at this time to give them, but I think it would be very interesting to show how much of the profits were occasioned by the repeal of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. PEPPER. I can give the over-all figure. In 1946 $3,119,000,000 had already been refunded to the corporations of the country under the tax-refund law. I have a list of many of them here, together with the amount which they received.

Mr. McMAHON. That is not the figure I was asking for. The refund of taxes was based upon a provision of the law which was enacted at the beginning of the war, the so-called carry-back, which had considerable merit in it. What I am asking the Senator for is the amount of excess-profits taxes which would have been paid in this fiscal year if at the last session Congress had not repealed the excess-profits provision of the revenue act.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a very interesting figure. I regret that I do not have it available at the moment. But I stated yesterday that corporate profits in 1946 were $12,000,000,000 as compared with $9,000,000,000 even in the war years, and undoubtedly when the excess-profits tax were repealed the corporate earnings increased very largely.

I will obtain that figure and put it into the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator has given at various times figures for salaries and wages joined together, but I wondered whether there was any way of separating the two, because I have noted that the salaries of the higher-paid corporation officials have constantly increased while wages were not increasing to the same extent, or not increasing at all, or even decreasing. So if there is a way of separating the salaries and wages, would not the Senator's figures be more significant?

Mr. PEPPER. They would be, and I thank the Senator for the suggestion. In fact, some corporations increased the salaries of executives and decreased the wages of the workers. I have here a reminder that a little while ago the Bethlehem Steel Corp. granted 6 cents an hour increase to its workers, and the executives of that company bemoaned and lamented the severe strain that this additional wage increase would be upon the company's treasury. Evidently the ones making that statement did not correlate too well with the treasurer or some other officers of the company, because at almost the same time the company made the announcement that the first quarter of 1947 shows the greatest earnings for that corporation for any period in all its history. So at the period of its peak prosperity it was bemoaning and lamenting the fact that it was having to pay a few cents an hour increase to its workers.

Mr. GREEN. That is one phase of my question. The other is, Can the Senator give the figures separately and deal with wages rather than with salaries and wages for that reason?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have that figure, and I will see if I can obtain it. I think the Senator's suggestion is a very good one. The figures should be segregated.

Let us consider next the profits of the meat-packing plants, for example. In 1944, they were $46,000,000; in 1945, $34,000,000; in 1946, $67,857,000. That shows somewhat the rate of corporate income increase.

Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, in testifying before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments estimated excess charges on contracts, due to profiteering and racketeering by business, at $50,000,000,000 in 1945. Two thousand and thirty-seven cases have been prepared by the Department of Justice, he said, for court action. That is a little of the other side of the picture, and should be called to the attention of those who assert that the only people in this country who profiteered during the war were the workers.

A moment ago I gave the figures for agricultural proprietors to show that in 1936 their income was $4,400,000,000; in 1941, $6,300,000,000; in 1945, $12,500,000,000; and in 1946, $14,900,000,000.

The nonagricultural proprietors received in 1936, $6,500,000,000 in income; in 1941, $9,600,000,000; in 1945, $13,100,000,000; and in 1946, $15,300,000,000.

The workers alone—those of our people who receive salaries and wages—suffered a $5,000,000,000 diminution in the dollars and cents they received as their share of the national income. That has not been adjusted for price increases. There, again, I say that the very condition which Governor Stassen warned against is recurring in our economy: Namely, the workers of the United States are now receiving a diminishing share of the national income, and they are having their purchasing power impaired, and thereby the economy as a whole is being jeopardized. So those of us who are opposing legislation of the restrictive character of the bill now before the Senate, that will have the result of diminishing the purchasing power of the people of America, are defending the banker and the manufacturer and the merchant and every other segment of our economy, and especially agriculture, as much as we are defending the workers whose wages are directly being cut.

Mr. President, the disposable income of the workers of the United States has also been diminished; but, in addition, high prices have also diminished the savings of the people. In other words, in 1945, savings were $34,500,000,000. In 1946 they had shrunk to $15,000,000,000—or less than half. I think it must be admitted that a large part of the reason for that shrinkage in the people's savings was the increased cost of living.

For example, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 22, 1947, reading as follows:

SAVINGS FALL OFF

Americans are not saving as much money as they put aside during the war. The Department of Commerce gives the figures for 1946 to prove this and it can be taken for granted that the trend has continued during the 4 months of this year. Rising prices which are the chief enemies of saving have been steadily at work since January.

The Department rightly refers to the high rate of saving in the war years as abnormal. Saving during the war was a patriotic duty. In addition there was not the wealth of consumers' goods on which to spend money. One of the appeals made to individual investors in war bonds was to save money in order to be able to buy postwar products.

Some of the money saved by corporations and wealthy individuals during the war and afterward is going into the expansion of industry. In the workings of our system of free enterprise these savings are productive, giving more jobs and good wages for millions of workers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not a well-recognized fact that during the war everyone was compelled to save? Our civilian production had been cut down, so there were few civilian goods available for purchase. Is it not a necessary result of the resumption of peace that savings will be greatly decreased from what they were during the war period, and will go back to what they were before the war period began? Is not that a necessary result of a return to peacetime production which is available for civilian use?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly that may be one of the reasons why savings have diminished. That is recognized in the editorial which I have been reading. But it is primarily the savings of individuals with low incomes that are being impaired by the high prices which they have to pay for things they need to buy.

Mr. President, I conclude reading the statements of the editorial, with which I agree:

Nevertheless the decline in savings can be a warning that the rise in the cost of living will, if continued, cut the purchasing power of consumers on which our mass-production industries depend. Some Americans will not halt their buying when they are living up to the last cent they earn. But more will be cautious in their spending when they find they are not saving anything against a rainy day.

Mr. President, I now read an editorial published in the Savannah News, of Savannah, Ga., for March 20, 1947:

INFLATION AFFECTS LIVING STANDARDS

Continued inflation will cast many marginal-income families on relief once their savings are exhausted, according to an article in the current Public Welfare, monthly journal of the American Public Welfare Association.

Since 1945 the cost-of-living index has increased from 127 to more than 150, with the effect that relief rolls are lengthening throughout the Nation. Even in 1945, before inflation really got started, 3 United States families out of 10 had to live on less than a marginal budget, Public Welfare reports.

This budget, devised by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics to measure minimal living standards, is designed for a family of four, without an automobile or other luxuries, and with no provision for preventive medicine, hospital care, or higher education.

Estimates based on 1946 figures indicate that at least one-third of the families living on submaintenance incomes already are receiving some form of public assistance. More severe effects are expected when more families with "marginal incomes"—below $2,000—consume their savings.

Savings are being consumed. In 1945, 19 percent of the families in the less-than-$1,000 income bracket were spending savings to pay living costs, while 21 percent of families in the $1,000-$2,000 bracket were doing likewise. Partial data and other signs indicate these percentages increased last year.

Marginal income groups in big cities are hardest hit by inflation, according to statistics from seven metropolitan areas. The fact that larger families are found generally in the lower-income groups further darkens the picture. A recent survey revealed that the income per unit of families without children is more than twice that of families with three or more children. Nearly half of all children are in families of the latter group.

Mr. President, we see what lowered purchasing power and impaired savings mean, not only to those who have to sell, but also to the living standards of half of the children of America. So if one fights for a principle which will give a chance to the children of America to have a decent diet and to have decent living standards, it does not mean that he is trying to favor any particular group in the economy, as against the public welfare. On the contrary, Mr. President, I repeat that the welfare of the working people of America is the welfare of America, because the welfare of all the people of America is directly related to the welfare of the workers of our Nation; after all, it is the people who are the workers of America.

Mr. President, I wish to read one other article. It appeared in the January 1, 1947, issue of the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, Md., and reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CONSUMER SPENDING UP IN 1946

(By Frank R. Kent, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—With the cost of living at the highest point in any year since the First World War, American consumers are spending about 90 percent of their disposable income but have not yet made serious inroads on their savings bonds.

The consumers' net disposable income, after taxes, now is estimated to be about $150,000,000,000 a year or $10,000,000,000 more than the estimated income of $140,000,000,000 during the first half of 1945. At the same time, according to figures of the Federal Reserve System, consumers are saving now at an annual rate of only about $15,000,000,000 compared with a rate of $38,000,000,000 annually for the first half of 1945.

RATE OF SAVINGS DECLINES

In other words, although disposable income has increased by $10,000,000,000, the rate of savings has fallen from about 27 percent in the first half of 1945 to about 10 percent. Federal Reserve spokesmen said this was about the normal prewar rate of saving, but the consumers' disposable income was much smaller then.

Although consumers are spending a much larger proportion of their increased income than last year, statistics do not indicate that they are dipping into savings to any considerable degree. Sales of savings bonds have held up well, according to Treasury reports, and holdings in the E series, which is regarded as the main issue, have declined only 2 percent between January and September of this year. Holdings in E bonds amounted to $30,900,000,000 in January and had declined to $30,300,000,000 in September.

KEEPING NEST EGGS

In addition, Federal Reserve figures show no indication that consumers are beginning to put hoarded currency into circulation. The receipts by banks of bills under $20 in denomination have remained fairly constant. People who have salted away currency against a rainy day usually do so with bills of small denomination, it was explained. There have been no significant increases in the number of such bills entering circulation.

Federal Reserve spokesmen are reluctant to attribute the decline in the rate of savings and the increase in the rate of spending to any single cause. They think three factors have played an important part in the change, but they refuse to place any element above the other two. These factors are:

1. Consumer demand created by war scarcities and increased purchasing power.

2. Higher wages which also increased purchasing power.

3. Removal of controls which permitted prices to rise.

CONCLUSION DRAWN

Actually, spokesmen said, they do not think liquid assets in the form of savings in money and securities have played an important role in the change. The result might have been the same if wages had been increased and there had not been a backlog of liquid assets as well.

Spokesmen said one logical conclusion might be drawn from figures available. The average consumer today is spending more and saving less. He may be doing so voluntarily by buying vacuum cleaners, radios, and other items he has wanted throughout the war-shortage era, or he may be doing so involuntarily in order to meet the rising cost-of-

living index, or it might be a combination of the two. The fact remains that he is spending more at present.

ADVANCE IN LIVING COSTS

That the cost of living is an important factor in the increased spending is borne out by a report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics issued the first part of the week. According to BLS statistics, prices advanced more during 1946 than in any single year since the First World War.

Primary market prices increased 31 percent. Retail prices of family living essentials rose 18 percent from December 1945 to December 1946. Retail food prices rose 34 percent in the same period.

Mr. President, in the past there has been a steady increase in the labor force of this country. In fact, including the armed forces, in 1944 the labor force in the United States reached 64,000,000. Sixty-four million of our people then were gainfully employed. At the present time, including the armed forces, it is estimated that 61,000,000 of our people are gainfully employed. It is pertinent, however, to observe that in agriculture the number of people employed today, although the output is greater, is 1,000,000 less than in 1940. As a matter of fact, in 1940 there were 9,500,000 workers employed in agriculture; in 1944 there were 8,100,000; and in 1946 there were 8,500,000, or 1,000,000 less than in the year 1940.

Mr. President, what is the significance of that fact? It means that if there is unemployment in the cities, the workers can no longer go back to the farms to find employment, because today they are not needed upon the farms. There has been an increase in productivity upon the farms which permits agriculture in America to produce a larger volume with fewer workers by millions than were employed in the year 1940.

Mr. President, it is ominous that today in agriculture and industry we have the highest productivity we have ever had. A large part of it is consumed by demands from abroad. We now have an export market of approximately $15,000,000,000 a year. But where is most of the money coming from to sustain that export market? It is coming from the United States Treasury, or from private credit extended by American business men, as was the case in the 20's, when a similar market came from the same sources and we helped to build up Germany to fight World War II with American capital, which we never got back.

Mr. President, I say that the best way to have an assured market for the American producer on farm and in factory is for the American people to be able to buy and to use what we make in America. Of course, all of us favor a large foreign trade. We may differ as to the best method of getting it, but we all want a large foreign market for American production. I hope the present market will continue; I even hope it will expand, although we know that, as a practical matter, it is unlikely to occur. We may see American exports stop or be reduced to the amount of the diminution in the American taxpayer's money which we are letting foreigners have with which to buy from abroad. Would it not be better therefore, to depend upon the American market as much as possible? If we have goods to give away, after all, the American people could share in the gift and the donation with the countries whose people are in such low-income groups that, judged by American standards, they cannot have a decent standard of living.

I do not wish to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that we should not help people abroad in every possible way; but I think we should get other nations to cooperate with us in doing that. I do not think America is rich enough to do it all by herself. I think the Social and Economic Council was set up in the United Nations so that nations might cooperate with one another in achieving such an objective, and I think we should use that agency of the United Nations in trying to work out trade patterns and commercial policies and practices which will make it possible for the economy of the whole world to be improved. I commend the meeting that is in progress in Geneva, where an attempt is being made to work out an international convention which will aid the commerce of all countries.

I should like to see the United States operating through the World Bank. I thought that we should have worked through the World Bank in the past. It has not yet made a dollar loan, in spite of the fact that it has billions of dollars to lend. It was set up for that purpose.

I should like to see the United States using other mechanisms of the United Nations Organization, or mechanisms set up by it which will stimulate the commerce and the purchasing power of the world, so the colossal productivity of America may continue uninterrupted in its unprecedented volume.

Mr. President, I say that if the power of the workers of America to demand decent wages and salaries from their employers is broken down, the purchasing power of the real market of America will be diminished, and the whole American economy will be condemned to another depression. There will be some people suffering again as people suffered through the last depression, and there will be a few of the very rich jumping out of the windows of the skyscrapers again, just as they did in the dark days of 1929.

Mr. President, I wonder why more of them cannot understand that the recipe for American prosperity is very simple. All that is necessary is to make it possible for the great masses of the people of America to buy. Then the factories can run day and night, the farms can run throughout the season and periods of the year, with their marvelous output, and everyone can be well off. But impair the buying power of the American worker, and the factory wheels in every part of America will be stilled, and food from our farms will be rotting again in the elevators and in the warehouses and in the fields, as it did in the last depression, with a nation hungry, but unable to buy.

We are debating here today whether we are going to have another depression, and when we are going to have it. I feel almost like saying of some of the proponents of legislation of the character that we are considering—and I say it with no irreverence—as the Master prayed upon the cross for His crucifiers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

The tragedy is that the proponents of such legislation are not only striking at the workers, at whom it seems so many are willing to strike. It is popular today to denounce labor. If a man dares stand up today for the workingman, he is practically accused of putting himself in the category of the criminal, certainly of the racketeer, because some gentlemen who are so loose with their language readily assume that every American labor leader is a racketeer, but every head of a giant corporate enterprise is an angel with golden wings with no taint upon him at all.

Mr. President, I am saying that the advocates of this type of legislation are hurting the manufacturer, they are hurting the farmer, they are hurting the banker, they are hurting the rich and the well-to-do, as well as the poor, in America. I protest against the folly of a course which would hurl this Nation from the peak of prosperity, which it now enjoys, and cast it into the abysmal pit of another pitiful depression. Yet, that is what Governor Stassen said similar policies did after World War I. That is what we say the same policy is doing again after World War II.

Let it be said hereafter, then, Mr. President, who were the ablest and strongest advocates of free economy, of free enterprise, of freedom of action in this great country of ours, and who even stood up better for big business. Let our works be judged by the fruits of our labor in the tragic years to come, if legislation of the kind proposed shall be written upon the statute books of the land.

Mr. President, what is this legislation all about? We have been hearing from certain segments of the press and from certain parts of the people an imperative demand—for what? For legislation to stop these strikes, they say. That is what they want, that is what they are aiming at, something to stop these strikes.

Mr. President, what is a strike? It is when a group of American citizens—I assume they are American citizens; at least most of the workers of America are American citizens—it is when the workers of America, or any part of them, for reasons they deem adequate, leave work collectively to secure increased purchasing power. Has that gotten to be a crime in peacetime, when a Presidential proclamation has announced the end of hostilities? We did not make it a crime during the war, and what phenomenal results were obtained by a voluntary, cooperative spirit between Government and labor. Labor did not let the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen of America down. There were a few strikes, but a smaller percentage than there were in Great Britain, although that country had drastic antilabor legislation on its statute books. By and large, American labor kept its no-strike pledge. Within the same 24-hour period, I was talking

to one of our officers who was in France and to a naval officer who had been in combat in the Pacific. The officer who was in France was sitting with me one evening, talking casually about the war. He said, "It simply thrilled me to see magnificent American equipment rolling across those fields and into the hands of men who were using it to bring us supreme victory." He said, "It was American equipment which, after all, made it possible for us to win the war, even with the loss of life we sustained." In the same 24-hour period, the naval officer who had been in combat in the Pacific, made almost the same remark. He said, "You cannot imagine what magnificent equipment we had out there in the Pacific war."

O Mr. President, we had the finest men God ever made, who were using those machines, but they could not fight a modern war with bare hands. It was what rolled out of the factories of America which, as much as anything else, made this precious victory possible for American arms.

And so, Mr. President, what this legislation aims to accomplish is the prevention of strikes. That is its aim. Would it not be pertinent to know what are the causes of strikes? Why do strikes occur? Why do people quit work?

I have figures here for 1945, but I shall refer now only to figures which have previously been put into the RECORD by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and here they are: There were 29 major strikes in the first 6 months of 1946, causing a work stoppage that equaled 66,190,000 man-hours. Twenty-one of those 29 strikes were over wages, and they accounted for a total lost working time of 63,500,000 man-hours. In other words, 96 percent of all the time lost due to those 29 major strikes was lost in disputes over wages. Three of the strikes were due to disputes over wages and union security, accounting for 2,500,000 man-hours lost. Two of the strikes were over union recognition, accounting for 120,000 man-hours lost. Three of the strikes, for all other reasons, were responsible for 70,000 man-hours of lost time.

What does that indicate, Mr. President? It indicates that the reason most men quit work is over disagreements with management about wages. Are people to be stopped for quitting work because they do not feel they are getting a fair wage? Are they to be put in jail because they will not work for an employer who, in their opinion, is not paying what they are entitled to receive? If strikes are to be stopped, Mr. President, and if most of the strikes are the result of wage disputes, can strikes be stopped without setting up some procedure to stop or diminish wage disputes? The answer to that question seems to be as simple as anything can be.

For example, a case in point now is the telephone strike. What is the basis of it? Primarily it is a dispute over wages. What is the opinion of the American people about the telephone strike? It should be borne in mind that, if the bill which is now being debated were law, the Attorney General could get an injunction against the strike of the telephone workers, and, if they quit work in violation of the injunction, presumably they could be sent to jail. I shall discuss presently whether such a provision would be constitutional; but presumably they could be sent to jail; at least they could be fined any amount the court saw fit to fine them. Mr. President, how does the American public feel about the telephone strike?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand that under the provision of the pending bill workers striking for such purpose could be sent to jail.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill as now drawn allows the Attorney General, if he chooses to do so, to obtain an injunction in respect to a strike that affects the whole industry, or that, in his opinion, affects the national health or safety.

Mr. TAFT. It must affect both. It must affect the entire industry throughout the country, and also affect the national health or safety.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. I doubt very much that the telephone strike comes within its terms. But, apart from that, of course, I think it should be pointed out that the injunction provided for is an injunction for only 60 days. Surely it is not too much to ask workers to continue working for 60 days, while the Government makes an effort to settle the dispute, if it affects the safety or health of 140,000,000 people. Surely, it is merely a slight inconvenience to ask them to wait for 60 days.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it would be far less inconvenient for the courts to have authority to make the company pay an increased wage that would satisfy the workers for 60 days, to avoid an interruption in the public service, it seems to me; yet I know there is hardly a provision in the bill which imposes any effective duty upon the employer not to provoke a work stoppage, by making him pay a decent wage for the work performed by the employees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, this provision applies to the employer just as much as to the employee. It says that during 60 days, in effect, the status quo shall be maintained. Any settlement is bound to be retroactive. That is no hardship on anybody, when the settlement comes. So I cannot see that the bill would in any way limit any material right of the worker by asking him, rather than to affect the safety or health of millions of people, to go on working for 60 days at the same terms he himself agreed upon a year before, perhaps, when the last contract was made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator does not see the situation differently, because, in his capacity as the able chairman of this committee, he could have put into the bill probably some provisions that would have imposed the duty on the employers of America to pay a fair wage to workers. It must be the opinion of those who participated in the Gallup poll to which I am going to refer that the workers in the telephone industry are not getting what they are entitled to receive. Yet we have had announcement after announcement by the Secretary of Labor that he is trying to bring the parties together. If there has been any offer at all on the part of the greatest monopoly in America, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., it has been a very immaterial one, $2.50 a week, the counter offer of a very small amount.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not recall all the details, but I understand there has been an offer to arbitrate the question of wages, absolutely, finally, and bindingly on the various companies who have certified bargaining agents with whom to deal.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, there may be such an offer on the part of some company, or, perhaps, it applies to the whole industry; but the point is, Why is it that they so stubbornly stand out against giving their workers a decent wage increase? Why does not the telephone company follow the example of some of the other companies which in the last few days have raised the wages of their workers in some cases 15 cents an hour? No, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. today is doing some of the same things that it has done previously. There was an earlier case when the same company was involved, and I am reading now from part 2 of Report No. 1012 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on (S. 1349), dated March 14, 1946. This is what the report says relating to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938:

The ability of the Bell System—

That is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—

The ability of the Bell System to shoulder the required increase in operating expenses is indicated by a glance at the company's history of profit ability. In 1926 dividends declared for the telephone industry stood at $190,000,000 and by 1944 they had climbed to $339,000,000. By this date Bell's total assets amounted to six and one-half billion dollars, after the company had maintained for 23 years—

Mind you—

its $9 dividend payments.

Mr. President, that $9 dividend was paid by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. even during the years of the depression.

Without interruption during the 5 years ending in 1935, while about one-fifth of the employees of the company were laid off, dividend payments by A. T. & T. increased 45 percent, despite the level dividend. The introduction of the dial system during this period eliminated six manual operators for every dial-switchboard operator retained.

Mr. President, here we see the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—I believe the greatest monopoly in America—having maintained an unbroken record of a $9-a-year dividend for 23 years, including the depression years, in spite of the workers being laid off, yet complaining that it was to poor to pay a decent wage to its workers.

Mr. President, I have heard—although I have it only by the word of a man who

said he was on the board, or had some connection with it—that President Hoover called Mr. Walter Gifford to Washington and made him head of a committee the objective of which in the days of the depression was to get people back in jobs and to increase employment, to stop the unemployment that was sweeping over America. Mr. Gifford came here, I was told, secured an office here, hired a number of people, and set up shop to try to find employment for those who had no work. He stayed a while, Mr. President, resigned, went back to New York, and laid off more than 100,000 of his own workers, but he never cut the $9 company dividend, when, I am told, that by reducing the dividend to $6 he could have kept every one of those workers at work.

Mr. President, what kind of an attitude toward the public welfare does that manifest on the part of certain segments of management? I am not saying that represents everyone's attitude, or even the attitude of a majority, but I am saying that if the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. continued the $9 dividend all during the depression their workers had to pay for it by not having jobs, because we know the telephone business was not expanding during those dark years. So there is a management which appears—and its record in this strike tends to bear it out—to think more of its constant record of exceptional dividends as the greatest American monopoly than it does about the living standards and the purchasing power of the men and women who work for it.

That seems to be borne out with singular understanding, Mr. President, in the opinion of the people about the telephone strike. I have before me the Washington Post of today, Tuesday, April 29, and on page 2 there is a Gallup poll. I quote from the article, as follows:

PUBLIC SYMPATHY WITH WORKER IN NATIONAL TELEPHONE STRIKE

PRINCETON, N. J., April 28.—There is a substantial amount of public sympathy on the side of the telephone workers.

A coast-to-coast public-opinion poll conducted by the institute during the period April 11 to 21 shows the following:

1. Twice as many people polled said they are in sympathy with the workers as with the company.

Is it not remarkable, Mr. President, how the people seem to have a way of understanding these things? No wonder Abraham Lincoln said that they were in the long run the safest depository of power. They have a way of sensing and understanding things. It may be that they do not know the amount involved in the payment of dividends of $9 a share, but somehow or other they seem to understand the situation.

However, a substantial number of voters expressed no opinion.

2. Among people in nontelephone homes sentiment is about 3 to 1 with the workers.

3. Even among those in homes with telephones the weight of sentiment is more on the side of the workers than on the side of the company.

Judging by these indications the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has a public-relations problem of some seriousness on its hands as a result of the strike.

Maybe the people understand that the company has not made any offers to amount to anything, Mr. President, for the settlement of the strike; that perhaps the company prefers to break it. Maybe it thinks the Congress is going to adopt policies which will give it assistance. I hope not.

There is wide public support for the contention that the issues should be arbitrated and the workers return to their jobs.

The majority of voters believe the Government should require the workers to go back to work whil the strike is being settled. That feeling is especially strong among those in homes with telephones.

To measure sentiment the institute used its new "quintamensional" or five-way approach in designing the questions put to the public. The purpose of the quintamensional technique is to probe attitudes by the use of many questions instead of only one.

Then the article goes on to give the answers to the five questions which are put. The point is that the American people are sympathetic with the telephone workers because they feel that they are not receiving a fair wage for the work they do.

In January 1947, the average pay for telephone operators was $33 a week. At the same time the average weekly pay for workers in manufacturing was $46.94, nearly $14 more for the workers engaged in manufacturing than the workers engaged as telephone operators. The average weekly pay check for all telephone employees of the Bell System was $43.19 in January 1947, and the average of the Western Union employees in the same period—and I see no reason why the bankrupt Western Union should in the nature of the business have a higher wage scale—was $46.83, or $3.64 more a week than the telephone weekly wage scale. Yes, a Bell System subsidiary in Cincinnati with 100-percent profit issued a stock dividend of one new share for each six outstanding years while their operators walk the streets. In the electric light and power industry the average weekly wage was $54 for the worker, and in the rubber goods industry the average weekly wage for the worker was $54.26. So it seems that the public is right in its feeling that the telephone workers are not getting a fair wage, and that they are entitled to concessions which they are not getting from the company.

I have said that the main cause of strikes is disputes over wages. Is there any procedure established by the proposed legislation to prevent such disputes, or to make the employer more agreeable to a fair wage settlement with employees? Does the bill offer any procedure by which there would be fewer strikes due to unsettled wage disputes? On the contrary, the proposed legislation would impose no duty upon the employer to pay more, to pay a fairer wage, or to meet the employee more nearly half way. All the bill does, in substance, is to establish procedures and provisions the effect of which would be to weaken the strength of the workers' organizations and to impair their ability to stand up against unfair wages. The bill provides means by which workers may be coerced into continuing to work for wages which they do not believe to be fair.

For example, on page 14, line 10, in section 8 (b) the bill has a provision which makes it an unfair-labor practice "to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than his failure to tender the duties and initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership or because he engaged in activity designed to secure a determination pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (A) at a time when a question concerning representation may appropriately be raised."

The effect of that provision is that, if a worker is discovered to be for all practical purposes a company spy, if management has put him in the ranks of labor to obtain information to use against labor in bargaining negotiations, or if a man has engaged in a wildcat strike in violation of a union contract and union discipline, or if he has exhibited an antiunion attitude and opposes what the majority of the union feels is the best interest of the union and the union ousts him from membership, that is an unfair-labor practice for which the union may be made the subject of a cease and desist order by the Labor Board, and may be taken to court by the Labor Board, and in other ways may be affected if it persuades or attempts to persuade the employer to discharge the worker.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has referred to three cases. The first was a case in which the man might be an employer's spy. Of course, the very employment of such a spy, the very fact that there was any such representation, would be primarily an unfair-labor practice on the part of the employer, and the employer would be compelled to discharge that man, entirely apart from this provision.

The second case which the Senator suggested was that of a man engaging in a wildcat strike. Surely the employer would be delighted to discharge a man who engaged in a wildcat strike, although the union might insist on his taking the man back.

The third case which the Senator cites is that of a member of a union who displays an antiunion attitude. The union says, "You must get out of the union." The union also goes to the employer and says, "You must fire this man, because he does not like the union." He may have some conscientious objection to being in a union. It is contended that the employer should be obliged to discharge the man because the union does not like him. That is what we are trying to prevent. I do not see why a union should have such power over a man in that situation.

Mr. PEPPER. What we are now debating is a difference of opinion. As Justice Holmes once said, everything from the Twelve Tables to the present time is a matter of degree. I have found that in most things there is a balance of interest. We must balance one side against the

other. By which policy do we do the greater good? My position is that it is necessary for the union to have some discipline if it is to be an effective organization to defend and protect the workers. My reasoning is that if the union, for reasons sufficient to it, goes to the limit of ousting a member, the larger interest and the greater good will in the long run be accomplished if the employer accepts the action of the union—we are talking about a closed shop case—and is governed accordingly. I am disposed to believe that the union will be as fair toward a fellow workman as is the employer.

In the case I have cited, all the employer is doing is asking his workers to get along with one another. Remember that the worker is protected by the union's constitution and bylaws. Remember that the worker is presumed to have had a fair trial by his peers in the union. I presume that there would be a right of redress in the courts if a man, for reasons which were arbitrary and capricious and without some justification in fact and principle, were ousted from membership in a union.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. There have been known cases in which the company has planted members in a union who have taken an active part in the affairs of the union for the very purpose of disrupting it. I know of a case of a detective being employed by a corporation for the very purpose of disrupting the union. He became a member of the union and became exceedingly active in its affairs. He undertook to write a new constitution and bylaws for the union, in which he inserted extreme provisions which made the union look so absurd and ridiculous in the eyes of the people that the public was turned against it. It was subsequently discovered that this man, who had taken such an active part in the organization, was a detective

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Ohio will say, "That is a case of a labor spy on the part of management." In the first place, he must be caught. How long was he a detective or labor spy for the company before he was caught?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Obviously the union did not know it.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. TAFT. It was quite as difficult for the union as for the employer.

Mr. PEPPER. The employer hired him.

Mr. TAFT. The moment there is any evidence of any such activity, it becomes an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer. The Board has been exceedingly vigilant to see that an unfair labor practice charge was filed against an employer the moment such a case occurred, and that the man was dismissed.

The employer must dismiss him. It is not even necessary for the union to ask it. The employer must dismiss him or subject himself to the penalties of the act. The act has worked in that respect, and has practically eliminated such cases.

Mr. PEPPER. But the able Senator will admit, will he not, that this bill proposes to change the present law in a contract case? Under the present law if the union ejects a man the employer has got to let him go. This bill changes that practice, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. That is true, but such a man as the Senator is talking about has to be fired by the employer whether he is fired by the union or not. Ejection from the union has nothing to do with it. He is fired because of an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer. It is the law, and it remains the law even if this bill be enacted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In the case of a man who is employed by management to assist in disrupting the organization, would it not be proper in any event to ask the discharge of such a member of the union?

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator from Montana if I am correct in understanding that in the case he puts, the company hired the man and put him into the ranks of labor in order that he might stir up trouble?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is exactly the point. In the case to which I have referred, the company brought in a great many spies and detectives. The city was filled with them. They not only became members of the union, but became active in the agitation which developed in connection with the strike. An agent would stand on the street corner and make inflammatory speeches threatening the destruction of the corporation's properties, dynamiting its buildings, and so forth, for the sole purpose of making it appear that the union was going to extremes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am told that today it is a common practice for certain detective agencies and strike-breaking concerns to send out an invitation to business executives inviting them to let such agencies furnish a spy to work on the inside of the labor ranks under the representation that in that way they will keep the employer informed as to what is going on in his mine or his factory. In the first place, as I said a while ago, he must be caught and it must be ascertained why he was put there by the company. As the Senator from Montana said, these men act as if they were the most patriotic men in the union; they want to do more for the workers than does anyone else; they demand more wages and better working conditions; to hear them talk it would be thought that they had on their consciences the weight of the world. A part of their strategy is to make the workers commit themselves to an extreme course so that they get in bad either with management or the public. But what about the case of the man who is rewarded by management for what he does? I guess all of us remember the teacher's pet in school, the little pupil who runs up to the teacher and attempts to get the teacher to put his or her arm around him or her and smile and give some reward or recognition. It would be a very easy thing for management simply to reward with repeated promotions and better pay the worker who will come and whisper out of the side of his mouth what they were talking about last night at the union meeting. If they become convinced that they have a fellow-member who is that kind of a person, and in time, according to their constitution and bylaws, they find him guilty and remove him from the union, I say that in the long run the greatest good will be accomplished by letting the action of the union in that kind of a case, a closed-shop case, be governing upon the employer, which is contrary to the provisions of the pending bill.

I realize that we cannot do exact justice even in the courts of the land. We say we let a guilty man escape every now and then under our system of law rather than to convict an innocent man. I say we cannot do perfect justice even in that case, but I firmly believe that, generally speaking, the union will be fairer to the workers who make it up and who govern it, and that to change the rule as it at present exists will do a disservice to the workers.

I now read from page 12 of the bill, beginning with line 24:

> That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than the failure of the employee to tender the dues and initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (C) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated because of activity designed to secure a determination pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (A), at a time when a question concerning representation may appropriately be raised.

In other words, it is not only made an unfair labor practice on the part of the union to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discharge a man except for nonpayment of union dues, it is also made an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer to discharge a man except in cases in the three categories to which I have just referred in reading from lines 24 and 25 on page 12 down through line 14 on page 13 of the bill.

In other words, the employer in those cases is not given discretion. It is made an unfair labor practice if he fires a man except for one of the reasons mentioned in the portion of the bill which I read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Excuse me for a moment.

In other words, if the employer were to find that, although the man had paid his dues and conformed to certain further union requirements, the union was justified in ejecting him, the employer could not then fire the man, because it would be an unfair labor practice if he were to do so, according to the provisions of the bill from which I have just read.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that of course many persons believe that the union shop, which is the usual form of closed shop, should be absolutely prohibited. The committee did not feel that it should go that far, but the committee felt that if it permitted a union shop agreement which provided that every man must be a member of the union, then the union must be reasonable, must accept as members all who apply for membership, and must accept them on the same terms as it applies to other members, and must permit them to remain in the union if they are willing to pay their dues. In other words, the position of the committee was this: Either we must have an open shop or we must have an open union. We cannot have both.

One of the cases before the committee that I remember was a case in which a man happened to see a foreman knocked down by a union shop steward. He was called as a witness in the case in court, and he testified that the steward was the aggressor and had knocked down the foreman. The shop steward was convicted. The union immediately proceeded to fire that man from the union, and that compelled the employer to fire him from his job. Because he responded to a subpena and told the truth, that man was fired, and perhaps in that community he could no longer work at the trade in which he was particularly skilled and trained. That is only an example.

But the only effect of this provision is that there may be a union shop, but if the employees do have a union shop, they cannot compel the employer to fire a man because the union will not admit him.

Let us take the case of unions which prohibit the admission of Negroes to membership. If they prohibit the admission of Negroes to membership, they may continue to do so; but representatives of the union cannot go to the employer and say, "You have got to fire this man because he is not a member of our union."

So, also, if a union fires a man for some reason other than nonpayment of dues, if the employee is willing to pay his dues to the union, then the union cannot compel the employer to fire him because he is no longer a member of the union, through some action of the union in expelling him. That seems to be only common sense and common justice.

There seems to be some argument for abolishing the union shop. Personally, I do not think we ought to go that far, because it is an established custom and practice in many industries and has been for many years. But I do think where it is permitted, the unions should be required to let all employees join the union and continue to be members of the union as long as they continue to pay their union dues.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it strikes me as a little inconsistent for many of our friends to be such champions of free enterprise in certain spheres, and to believe so strongly that the Government must protect people against one another in other spheres. When we talk about regulating business, those persons take the position that the Government must not interfere, but must let free enterprise work as it will, and must let persons or groups in business have their associations and promulgate their trade practices, and must let them be independent, so they will not fear the withering hand of Government which otherwise might protrude itself into their private affairs. But those same stanch defenders of private enterprise, when it pertains to business in America and the way it works, including the way it treats minority stockholders, in some cases become the champions of public intervention in the internal affairs of labor organizations.

I believe, as I have said before, that weighing the advantages and the disadvantages, Mr. President, the closed shop has made a great contribution to the welfare of the masses of the people of America. I realize that there is something to be said against it. I realize that a prima facie case can be made with respect to a man's being denied access to particular employment. But I affirm that the thing essentially involved in a closed-shop contract is free collective bargaining, the right of free contract entered into between the employees and the employer. I believe that if we are going to allow freedom of contract, freedom of bargaining, between other units in our economy, we must, in order to be fair, allow the same freedom of action in the case of collective bargaining between employees and employers. Once a contract has been entered into between the employer and the employees, collectively, through their chosen bargaining agents—a contract to the effect that the employer will not employ a man who does not belong to the union—is it necessary in the public interest that we invalidate that kind of a contract? In the long run, I believe that the employer will get better results from the labor force through the closed-shop agreement than he will get without it.

I also say that if business in America had accepted the principle of collective bargaining in good faith and full spirit, in the way it was intended by the National Labor Relations Act, the volume of strikes in America would have shrunken to a negligible quantity and amount.

Again I say that we do not have to intervene, by means of this legislation, into this internal affair of a union and deny it the right to protect itself against a man in the union who betrays the objectives of the union, who violates, perhaps, the constitution of the union or the bylaws of the union, and is convicted by his peers and fellow members of having an antiunion and an antisocial attitude toward the workers in that organization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to suggest that, of course, if the union does not want to be subject to that restriction it does not have to request a union-shop contract. There has never been a union-shop contract in the railroad industry. It is not necessary, if the union has the proper standing and the proper ability to persuade the employees to join it.

So if the unions do not like this particular form of regulation they do not have to ask for a union-shop agreement. In my opinion, either there must be an open shop or there must be an open union—one or the other.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am simply standing for the kind of free and private enterprise in respect to the internal affairs of labor organizations which the able Senator from Ohio generally advocates with respect to the affairs of business in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The pending measure does not propose any limitation with respect to the internal affairs of unions. They still will be able to fire any members they wish to fire, and they still will be able to try any of their members. All that they will not be able to do, after the enactment of this bill, is this: If they fire a member for some reason other than nonpayment of dues they cannot make his employer discharge him from his job and throw him out of work. That is the only result of the provision under discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but that means, for all practical purposes, that they do not have a closed shop, because the persons then working for the company will not exclusively be members of the union, as is the case where a union has a closed-shop contract.

Mr. President, I was saying, as Governor Stassen said, that all these provisions tend to weaken the effective power of the union, and thereby to reduce its ability to represent the workers in getting fair wages for the work they do.

My argument is that most of the strikes are due to the unwillingness of the employer to pay the wage the union demands; and that if we weaken the union as the collective-bargaining agent of the worker, we diminish the workers' wage, we encourage the employer to exploitation, we diminish the purchasing power of the working people of America, and we do a disservice to the whole American economy. Therefore, I say that what has been the experience of the past does not justify the proposed course in respect to changing the present policy and practice, which in the case of a closed shop does permit the union to go to the employer and attempt to persuade him and argue with him why a certain worker should be discharged, and permits him, if he agrees with the representations of the union, to discharge that man, whom the union has found to be contrary in his conduct to union rules, regulations and policies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida has referred several times to the statement of Mr. Harold E. Stassen before the committee. I wish to say that I fully agree with it, but I should like to read the basic statement. He said this:

As a general background for specific measures, it appears to me that clearly in recent

years too much power has been concentrated in the leadership of our labor unions and that that power has been abused. New national legislation is desirable and is needed to correct these abuses and to limit excessive powers.

Then comes the section of his statement which the Senator from Florida has read:

But it also appears to me that there is some danger of going too far in the adoption of new legislation or the amendment of existing statutes and to so weaken labor that the result would be injurious not only to labor but to our free economy as a whole. It is my view specifically that during the 1920's labor was too weak, and that the result was harmful in the end to labor, to agriculture, to capital, and to the country as a whole.

I agree 100 percent. I agree that we could go too far. But where I differ with the Senator from Florida is, in my opinion, that the provisions of the pending bill and the amendments proposed do not go too far, do not prevent the establishment of a proper balance. They make changes only in cases in which there is some inequality in bargaining.

As a matter of fact, Governor Stassen in some ways goes further than the committee has gone. He advocates a special Federal provision prohibiting mass picketing. But the committee has not included such a provision in the bill. The committee has left that matter primarily to the States and certainly to the National Labor Relations Board.

Of course, the question of how far to go is a matter of judgment. I can understand how men can differ with respect to that.

But the contention we make is that the pending bill retains, without limitation, the power of collective bargaining, the power of employees to choose their own representatives, the power to deal with their employer as one man; and if they can get a majority, all the other employees have to keep quiet and permit the representatives of the majority to bargain with the employer for all of them. We intend to retain all the benefits of the labor legislation which has been enacted since the twenties, but in the bill we correct injustice after injustice which has developed in the administration of labor laws.

I agree fully that there is certainly nothing in Governor Stassen's statement that is not in full accord with the bill which is now before the Senate. He objected to the prohibition against Nationwide strikes. We have not prohibited them. He objected to the prohibition against the closed shop. We have not prohibited it. So far as his views are concerned, it seems to me they are in full accord with the general principles of the pending bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the able Senator from Ohio does not contend that the bill meets the approval of Governor Stassen. I am sure he does not contend that it embodies his affirmative recommendations, and only those. I am saying, Mr. President, that it accomplishes just what the Governor warns against; it so effectively weakens the power of labor to defend itself that it is going to mean the impairment of the workers' wages, the diminution of the workers' purchasing power, and contribute again to another depression.

Mr. President, I stated that in the first half of 1946, which was a period when there were many strikes in the country, there were 29. Those 29 strikes were responsible for 66,000,000 lost man-hours, but 96 percent of all those strikes were in disputes over wages. Yet, I say that all this bill would do would be to weaken the workers' organization, weaken the workers' bargaining power, weaken the workers' ability to stand up against an unfair wage. There is not one principal provision in the bill which is directed at the employer, to make him yield more than he has been willing to yield in the past of just pay to the workers. I ask, how can anyone claim legislation is fair when it is aimed at one side in a controversy?

I am not willing to admit that the 29 strikes in the first half of 1946, 21 of which were over wage disputes, were all the fault of the workers. I am not willing to admit that the workers demanded too much, that they were unfair in what they sought. Unless one takes that position, Mr. President, unless one means that, he is in favor of tightening the screws upon the worker, and trying to penalize him for the employer's wrong.

I say, Mr. President, that the pending bill does not represent balanced legislation. We have not tried to find the real cause of work stoppage, and tried to place the responsibility upon worker and employer alike, according to their share of fault or responsibility. All we have done is to make it possible to drive down and down and down the worker's wages because he is least able to stand up, as he is at the present time, under the existing law. And all this, Mr. President, at a time when corporate profits are at an all-time high, when prices are at an all-time high, and when monopoly in America is at its all-time peak. Yet this has been the period chosen to weaken the workers, more than they have been weakened since Franklin D. Roosevelt recommended the Wagner Act, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and others secured its enactment into law.

It seems strange to me that when corporate profits are higher than they have ever been, when monopoly is riding like a master upon the horse's back over the American people, with its privilege exactions, and when today we find prices higher than they have ever been, we pick that period to make the most all-out and vicious attack that has been made in more than a decade against the working men and women of America.

We hear private enterprise spoken of, but I want to refer to another kind of private enterprise, the right of working men and women to enter into free contracts with their employers. I do not want to invalidate those contracts any more than I want to invalidate a contract that may be entered into between any other units of our economy.

I say that, if the proponents of the pending legislation want to stop strikes, if they want to have fewer work stoppages, then they should find some machinery by which we can make both sides come nearer to the median line of agreement in respect to wage disputes and disputes over hours and working conditions. By and large that is overwhelmingly the principal causes of strikes and work stoppages, and if we do not find a procedure and some technique by which we can resolve that conflict, we are not effectively going to be able to stop strikes, except at the expense of the living standards of the working men and women of America.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator does not contend that all industrial management takes the attitude that this drastic legislation is necessary, does he?

Mr. PEPPER. No; on the contrary.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a short time ago the American Management Association held a convention in Chicago, where they discussed the problem of labor-management relations. They pointed out that management was fumbling the ball in the present situation. I wish to read an extract taken from the New York Times of April 24, in which I find the following:

In the grand ballroom of a big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management Association that the future of the free enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations with the public—that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this important and difficult field. In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is absolutely correct; there are many, there are scores, there are hosts, of farsighted American business executives who realize that there must be a better relationship between labor and management, who have met labor halfway, some of them more than halfway, in seeking to bring about better relationships which they feel to be necessary between management and labor.

There are many, there are hosts, there are scores of American businessmen who recognize in the unions and in the closed shop, not only essentials for the protection of labor, but a great advantage to the employer as well. There are hosts of manufacturers in America who would not get rid of the closed shop if it were possible for them to do so, because they have found that it is the most effective way by which they may deal with their workers.

Mr. President, the Senator is correct, therefore, that there are many American businessmen who are opposing the legislation now pending, because they know that the effect of it would be to cause more, not less, labor trouble.

Let me quote the words of Mr. Charles Luckman in his address at the annual

convention of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, Chicago, January 14, 1947, an address entitled "Civil War of 1947." I find an appropriate quotation right under the title:

Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace * * *.—Romans 14: 19.

What a magnificent opportunity exists for management to practice the enlightened leadership which a few prominent associations have just recently begun to preach. What a chance for industrial housing programs—built not on the slick paper of some news releases, but on the honest, rough blueprints the architects use. With an unlimited vista ahead, what an opportunity we have to go to bat, each in his own community, for expanded educational appropriations, so that the neighborhood kids can grow up with a true understanding, not only of the rights of citizenship, but also its responsibilities, self-disciplines, and obligations.

Business can no longer afford to regard housing, community planning, and allied programs for health, education, and recreation as devices to thwart the unions or as food for the consuming self-importance of some ruggedly individualistic captain of industry. At best, such an approach to our responsibilities is negative and, therefore, sterile.

Whether we like it or not, we live in an era when democracy in industry is coming of age. This means that we have only two alternatives. Either we can put our shoulders behind the wheel of social progress or we can stand in the way and be ground to the earth as that wheel turns. If management is to become a constructive, enthusiastic force for the kind of living our system of business can bring to the people in it, then we must assume our new tasks cheerfully and with imagination, intelligence, and application.

* * * * *

And, concurrently, we must also shrug off the notion that hasty, punitive legislation is going to solve our problem. Many of the newly proposed laws merely strike at the symptoms of disturbance, thereby failing to eliminate the causes of disturbance. If we amend the Wagner Act and outlaw certain unfair labor practices by unions, does that mean that management and labor are going to cooperate together for the best economic interests of the whole country? Have we, in business, so loved, honored, and obeyed Senator WAGNER's law that we can really expect labor to follow any amended provision in letter and spirit?

* * * * *

We must think in much larger terms, because the simple fact is that no one has ever discovered a way to legislate a point of view. For example, think how easily the words "struggle," "fight," and "battle" fall from the lips of labor leaders. Those are not merely words in their vocabulary. They are symbols of their conception of the nature of their job. Will any law change this viewpoint? Certainly not any carved out by the hand of man!

Thus far I have urged both labor and management to join hands in the acceptance of a broad goal which is bigger than themselves. Now I want to be more specific. For the last 15 years, whenever the public began to protest against the excesses of the national labor situation, it has been fashionable to appoint another committee to study the causes of industrial warfare. Since 1938, various committees of the House and Senate have held over 265 days of labor hearings, and have taken over 23,000 pages of printed testimony about the causes of industrial strife. But the fact remains that we still suffer from this same disease, which none of these endless investigations has been able to diagnose or cure.

Should we not, therefore, decide what we are interested in? So far, all our studies have focused on the subject of industrial war. But is war really our objective? Of course not. What we actually want to achieve is industrial peace. My specific recommendation is that we study it.

We have in America hundreds on hundreds of case histories of peaceful and successful labor-management relationships. Why are they peaceful? Why are they successful? I suggest we find the answers. I urge that Congress establish a tripartite Commission representing the public, labor, and management. The sole function of the Commission would be to study the causes of industrial peace. The Commission would have an unparalleled opportunity to break with the unproductive tradition of the past and, for the first time in American history, to formulate a positive program for industrial harmony.

* * * * *

We must not permit ourselves now to be divided in civil strife, for as one perceptive analyst has pointed out, if two such great forces as labor and management engage in a struggle for dominance within the highly intricate mechanism of the American economy, neither can win and democracy is bound to lose. Both will go down together in the resulting chaos, or in the regimentation which will arise from public demand to avoid that chaos. Free unions, free management, free enterprise, and a free society will either survive or go under together.

Mutual survival—not separate survival—that must be our common aim. If we keep it steadily before us, we can avoid a fanatical civil war—a war which can never be won by either side.

It would mean more, not fewer, work stoppages. It would mean more, not less, hours lost because of work stoppages in the American economy, Mr. President. That is the reason why farsighted and fair-minded American businessmen are opposed to stringent, drastic, antilabor, antisocial legislation of this character.

The Senator from Ohio said he did not think there would be much harm in the provision to which I adverted. The trouble with the bill is that it is the sum total of all that it does that has caused many responsible, moderate, civic-minded, patriotic labor leaders to say that, for all practical purposes, if it becomes the law of the land, it will break the labor-union movement of America; that has caused that kind of leaders to say it will not only turn the clock of management-labor relations back but will stop it; that it will not only impair but will retrogress the forward movement of the working people of America toward a decent standard of living.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to some other provisions. For example, in section 9 (c) (3), on page 21 of the pending bill, we find a provision which reads:

Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote unless such strike involves an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer.

In the committee report, on page 25, we find the following comment on the section to which I referred, which is a part of section 9 (c) (3):

When elections are conducted during a strike, situations frequently arise wherein the employer has continued to operate his business with replacement workers—

Which is just another way of saying "strikebreakers"—

if such strike is an economic one—

Which means, if the strike is over wages—

and not caused by unfair labor practices of the employer—

It is no unfair labor practice for the employer not to pay the wage the workers say they are entitled to receive—

strikers permanently replaced have no right to reinstatement.

That means, Mr. President, they have no right to get the job back, even if the strike be settled. The report cited *NLRB v. Mackay Radio* (304 U. S. 333):

It appears clear that a striker having no right to reinstatement should not have a voice in the selection of a bargaining representative, and the committee bill so provides.

Mr. President, what does all that mean? This is what it means: There is a disagreement between the workers and management over wages; they cannot settle the dispute; the workers go out on strike, and stay out on strike, we will say, 10 days. Management sends word to them that if they do not come back to work within a week their jobs are gone, they will be replaced by other permanent workers. Management recruits some strikebreakers, gets some other people to take their jobs; they go on the job. Management says, "Now, you are the permanent employees; you are going to keep these jobs from now on, as long as you want them and are satisfactory." Then, Mr. President, under the bill there can be an election called by the Board. Who can vote in the election? Only the strikebreakers, only the fellows that are working. Not a single one of the workers who are out on strike, who have been replaced, can vote at all in the election, and thereby the strikebreakers can determine who will be the bargaining agent of the workers. Now, what does that mean?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment.

That means, Mr. President, that, at the very time when the bargaining agent, previously chosen, is most needed to continue the negotiations, that bargaining agent can be replaced by strikebreakers, and the old workers will have no right to vote. The old bargaining agent will be ousted. The union can be broken up, and the employer will be rid of the union. If he has any union at all, he will have only a company union. Mr. President, what will be the effect of a power such as that upon the stability of the bargaining agent to stand up against management, to try to get a fair wage for the worker?

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator, of course, is aware, when he talks about strikebreakers, that he does not mean what is commonly meant by that term, because the Burns Act specifically prohibits the employment of strikebreakers who are brought in to work only until the strike is broken. The only change

made in existing law by the amendment the Senator is discussing is to limit the provision to employees who are on strike, who have been replaced, not by strikebreakers but by employees who have accepted permanent employment. The Supreme Court has held that the employees on strike who have been replaced have no right to reinstatement.

Mr. PEPPER. But they can vote.

Mr. BALL. They can vote under present NLRB practices.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. A ridiculous situation results, similar to what has happened in Hollywood, where, I believe, 52 sign painters or set painters had been replaced, but, unfortunately, by only 50 replacements, and the individuals who were on strike and whose jobs had been filled, and who were not entitled to reinstatement, swung the election and decided the bargaining agent. There was the ridiculous situation of a thousand persons voting for a bargaining agent for only 500 jobs. That does not make sense. All the amendment does is to say that only employees, who under present rules are on strike and entitled to reinstatement, can vote to select the bargaining agent.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to make an observation on the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, who declared that the so-called Burns antistrikebreaking law had application to this situation. Practically, I do not think it does have. The Burns Act prohibits the transportation in interstate commerce of strikebreakers, with the intent that they should interfere with peaceful picketing. There has been only one prosecution under that act, and that prosecution failed. It is impossible practically to my way of thinking to prove that the intent with which a man was brought across the State line was that he should interfere with peaceful picketing.

It seems to me that if what the Senator from Florida says is true, the employer can, within State boundaries, say within the State of Minnesota, and without running into any danger of the so-called Burns Anti-Strikebreaking and Transportation Act, recruit all the strikebreakers he wants to come into his plant and take the jobs available there. I merely want to keep the record straight by showing that the Burns Act has no application to this matter.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am not familiar with the details of the Burns Act or the prosecutions under it. I know that it was passed in order to stop the use of strikebreakers in industry, and interstate commerce. But I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that I sat through lengthy hearings on labor legislation during the past 2 years, and I have yet to hear a single charge—even a charge, let alone anything authenticated—that any employers in the last 5 or 10 years have used strikebreakers as we understand the term.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I think that probably is so, and I think that the passage of the Burns Act was a healthful thing, even though the prosecution under it failed; which incidentally occurred when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The prosecution occurred within my own State. The act itself was a healthful thing, even though it failed, because it fairly well stopped that practice. But what I wanted to point out was that I do not think it has any application to the present situation, because, if what the Senator from Florida says is true, there is no occasion for an application of that act to any employer who simply within his own State recruits workers to take the place of the workers who have gone on strike.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Connecticut is absolutely correct. All the Burns Act forbids is the bringing of workers across the State line.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that the act does not prohibit the interstate transportation of workers to take jobs. The act prohibits the interstate transportation of individuals with the intent that they shall interfere with peaceful picketing, a much more limited application.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Connecticut, having been formerly head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, of course, knows about the Burns Act in detail. As he has already pointed out, the act would not prohibit the bringing in of workers to take the jobs, with the promise that they could keep them, and it would not prevent the employer from rounding up persons in the State, as the Senator said, to take the place of strikers. It would mean that the old union would be broken, the collective-bargaining agent would be repudiated, because the new workers would repudiate the old bargaining agent with which it had never had any connection, and in the very instance of a strike which he might provoke, an employer would have the power utterly to destroy a strong union operating in his plant.

Mr. President, can that have any effect other than to weaken the rights of workers in America, to diminish their share of the national income, and to make those who advocate such a policy contribute, as did those who advocated a similar policy in the twenties, to another depression.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Let us assume that an employer provoked a strike, and then in his own State, so that there would be no danger even of the Burns Act being brought into play, recruited workers to take the place of those who were on strike, and in the process of that recruitment he said, "Now Jones, I want to give you this job, but you will have it on condition that we will set up a little union of our own here, a sort of a cozy little affair between the workers and myself." Is there anything in the pending bill to stop that kind of procedure?

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that the bill not only recognizes but encourages the company union, whereas the company union is forbidden under the practice of the present NLRB. I am sure that the bill permits and authorizes a company union, which the present law does not.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The statement the Senator has just made is completely wrong. All the bill does is to require the NLRB in considering the charges, under section 8 (a) (1) or (2), of company domination or interference with a union, to treat affiliated and nonaffiliated independent unions exactly the same. If the Senator wants to defend the present practice of having one rule for affiliated unions and a completely different rule for indepedent unions, then he may do so. But do not try to make the statement that the bill encourages company unions. It leaves the provisions of section 8 (a) (1) and (2) exactly as they are now.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not want to quote the effects of the bill or its provisions unfairly. Would it be fair to say that it recognizes and encourages what the Senator from Minnesota calls the independent union?

Mr. BALL. All it does is to give it equal treatment with the affiliated union.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Mr. President, I call the independent union, as described by the Senator from Minnesota, nothing in the world but a dressed-up company union. Therefore I think it is fair to say that the effect of the bill is not only to recognize but to encourage the company union, because that is what I think many so-called independent unions are.

Mr. BALL. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the National Federation of Telephone Workers, which is engaged in the only current general strike, is an independent union?

Mr. PEPPER. It may be, and perhaps that is the reason it is not getting along better; perhaps that is the reason it is weak. Probably the reason why the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the greatest monopoly in America, is not making any fair counter offers to the union is because the union is still weak, still in its swaddling clothes.

Mr. President, generally speaking, the unions which have been able to secure the best concessions from management have been the strong unions. For example, a little while ago the automobile workers received a 15-cent an hour increase. Theirs is a strong union. Take the case of the steelworkers who received an increase. Theirs is a strong union. But the weak union, as Governor Stassen said, is unable to stand up for the worker. If the telephone union had been the United Steelworkers Union or the Automobile Workers Union, or some strong union of America, instead of being an independent union which is just getting started, I dare say

the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. might have taken a little more conciliatory attitude toward paying the ladies and men who work for it a fairer wage than it pays.

So, Mr. President, I say it is the sum total of all the various parts of the bill that constitutes its principal vice. The net effect of it and the intention of it is to weaken the labor unions of America, and the inevitable effect of that policy will be to diminish the working wages of America and to contribute to another depression.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to what is called the boycott provision of the bill, and I refer to section 8 (b) (4) which appears on page 14 of the bill, and is mentioned on page 22 of the majority report. That provision is as follows:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

* * * * *

(4) To engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment (A) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

Mr. President, that is the so-called boycott provision. In the committee report there is language which seems to indicate that that is the secondary boycott. I should like to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that it also covers what should be called the primary boycott.

Let us now take two cases. Let us suppose a group of workers working for an employer and that enterprise turns out a profit. Suppose there is a wage dispute between the employees and the employer which they can not amicably adjust. Suppose the workers feel that the attitude of management in that case is so unfair that they will not continue to work for the company. So they go out on strike. Suppose that the employer brings in strikebreakers or brings in others to take the place of those on strike. In the first place suppose the strikers refuse to buy products of that plant. I assume that ordinarily a citizen has a right to spend his money for any lawful purpose. In the second place, suppose that product is being taken by another manufacturer and converted into some other kind of a commodity, and suppose these workers, trying to protect themselves, go to that other plant and boycott it and say that that product is unfair, or suppose they go to the workers of the other plant and say, "This manufacturer is unwilling to pay us a fair wage, and we beg of you not to add to his profit by converting his product, with your labor into something more valuable." That would be forbidden under the provisions which I have just read.

I wish to go back to what I believe to be some good authority on the question of the boycott. I read from the case of *Duplex Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443). The case was decided in the October 1920 term of the United States Supreme Court. This language is from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brandeis, which later became the law. This was a boycott case. I read from page 480:

Defendant's justification is that of self-interest. They have supported the strike at the employer's factory by a strike elsewhere against its product. They have injured the plaintiff, not maliciously, but in self-defense. They contend that the Duplex Co.'s refusal to deal with the machinists' union and to observe its standards threatened the interest not only of such union members as were its factory employees, but even more of all members of the several affiliated unions employed by plaintiff's competitors and by others whose more advanced standards the plaintiff was, in reality, attacking; and that none of the defendants and no person whom they are endeavoring to induce to refrain from working in connection with the setting up of presses made by plaintiff is an outsider, an interloper. In other words, that the contest between the company and the machinists' union involves vitally the interest of every person whose cooperation is sought. May not all with a common interest join in refusing to expend their labor upon articles whose very production constitutes an attack upon their standard of living and the institution which they are convinced supports it?

That was from the great pen, the great head, and the great heart of Mr. Justice Brandeis in the October 1920 term of the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Brandeis was dissenting at that time. He and Justice Holmes alone entertained those views. They were in the minority. But he adhered to his course, and that principle has now been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States as the law of the land.

I wish now to read from the case of *Bedford Company* v. *Stonecutters' Association* (274 U. S. 37). This is from another opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis on the same subject. I read from page 64:

Members of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association could not work anywhere on stone which had been cut at the quarries by "men working in opposition" to it without aiding and abetting the enemy. Observance by each member of the provision of their constitution which forbids such action was essential to his own self-protection. It was demanded of each by loyalty to the organization and to his fellows. If, on the undisputed facts of this case, refusal to work can be enjoined, Congress created by the Sherman law and the Clayton Act an instrument for imposing restraints upon labor which reminds of involuntary servitude. The Sherman law was held in *United States* v. *United States Steel Corporation* (251 U. S. 417) to permit capitalists to combine in a single corporation 50 percent of the steel industry of the United States dominating the trade through its vast resources. The Sherman law was held in *United States* v. *United States Machinery Co.* (247 U. S. 32) to permit capitalists to combine in another corporation practically the whole shoe-machinery industry of the country, necessarily giving it a position of dominance over shoe manufacturing in America. It would, indeed, be strange if Congress had by the same act willed to deny to members of a small craft of workingmen the right to cooperate in simply refraining from work when that course was the only means of self-protection against a combination of militant and powerful employers. I cannot believe that Congress did so.

In the cases of the *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219) and *Bakery Drivers' Local* v. *Wohl* (315 U. S. 769) the right of boycott has been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States as established and legitimate. It would require a law such as the proposed law to reverse the highest court in the land.

I read from the syllabus in the case of Bakery Drivers' Local against Wohl:

Members of a labor union of drivers, engaged in the distribution of baked goods, in an endeavor to induce peddlers to work but 6 days a week and to hire an unemployed union member 1 day a week, peacefully picketed bakeries from which the peddlers obtained their goods, and places of business of the peddlers' customers, carrying placards with the peddlers' names and a true statement of the union's grievances. Held, that a State court injunction against such picketing was an unconstitutional invasion of the right of free speech.

The provision of the bill to which I refer would reverse the Supreme Court of the United States. It would deny to American workmen the right to help one another. It would recognize no effort on their part to help their fellow workers lift the level of their wages and their living conditions to what they believed to be a laborer's hire and a decent standard of American life.

So, Mr. President, let no one be misled. This provision is not limited to the secondary boycott. It is applicable as well to the primary boycott. It forbids the principle of workers helping one another in defense of their standard of living, as Mr. Justice Brandeis has so well pointed out.

I am glad to see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has returned to the Chamber. I have been waiting to read to him language which I am sure he has heard before, and as to which, perhaps, he has some explanation to offer. It is from a source which he would not impeach—not only the Chief Justice of the United States but the illustrious father of the able Senator from Ohio. This is what Chief Justice Taft said in the opinion in the case of *American Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U. S. 184). I wish to read from page 209 of Two Hundred and Fifty-seventh United States Reports. I have heard it said, "Like father, like son." In many respects the illustrious Senator has carried on the great tradition of his eminent father. But I wish the Senator had been a little more militant in carrying out what I believe was the fundamental, kindly, sympathetic philosophy of the then Chief Justice of the United States toward labor unions.

If the Senator from Ohio felt as I believe his distinguished father felt when he wrote these words, I do not believe he would be pressed into advocacy of legislation which will have the effect of striking down the very labor unions which his father described in this opinion, from which I now read:

Labor unions are recognized by the Clayton Act as legal when instituted for mutual help and lawfully carrying out their legitimate objects. They have long been thus

recognized by the courts. They were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was, nevertheless, unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employer. They united to exert influence upon him and to leave him in a body in order by this inconvenience to induce him to make better terms with them. They were withholding their labor of economic value to make him pay what they thought it was worth. The right to combine for such a lawful purpose has in many years not been denied by any court. The strike became a lawful instrument in a lawful economic struggle or competition between employer and employees as to the share or division between them of the joint product of labor and capital. To render this combination at all effective, employees must make their combination extend beyond one shop. It is helpful to have as many as may be in the same trade in the same community united, because in the competition between employers they are bound to be affected by the standard of wages of their trade in the neighborhood. Therefore, they may use all lawful propaganda to enlarge their membership, and especially among those whose labor at lower wages will injure their whole guild.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I fully subscribe to every word said there; and there is nothing in the bill which in any way operates against what is there stated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let us see. The language to which I just adverted makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to do what? I read from page 14 of the bill:

> To engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment (A) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

The language would forbid one man or one agent of a labor union going to the employees of another employer working on a product put out by a manufacturer who would be unfair to them, in their opinion, and attempting to persuade or to induce those workers not to handle the output of the factory in which there was a disagreement with the workers. I claim that the right of an organization to persuade, if it can, to petition, and to seek the cooperation of fellow workers is the legitimate right of an American citizen; and, Mr. President, they are being denied not only the right to seek the cooperation of other workers in self-defense but, in my opinion, they are being denied their essential civic rights of addressing themselves to their fellow citizens about anything they want to present to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the case which the Senator has put. This provision makes it unlawful to resort to a secondary boycott to injure the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees. The Senator will find a great many decisions written by my father which hold that under the common law a secondary boycott is unlawful. Subsequently, under the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it became impossible to stop a secondary boycott or any other kind of a strike, no matter how unlawful it may have been at common law. All this provision of the bill does is to reverse the effect of the law as to secondary boycotts. It has been set forth that there are good secondary boycotts and bad secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have so broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts as to make them an unfair labor practice.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, the language of the section is so broad that, as I said, it applies not only to the so-called typical secondary boycott, but to any kind of a boycott. In the second place, it denies to a worker in the printing business his rights. Here we have a situation in which there are four manufacturers in a certain printing service. A single union had a contract with three of those manufacturers. They were told by those three that if a fourth, a competitor, were not brought into the contract and subjected to the same terms they would have to breach their contract or refuse to enter into another contract. The workers appealed to their fellow-unionists in other part of the country not to work on the product which came out of the plant of the manufacturer who would not treat with the union, and the question was raised as to whether that was a lawful boycott. As I said, that is a typical case where the union not only is seeking to protect itself, but calls upon other workers to cooperate, to refuse to work to increase the value of the product of the employer who deals unfairly with them. That is forbidden, Mr. President, by the section to which I have referred. The Senator will admit that it changes the law from what it is today. That is the purpose of the section. Therefore, it is denying to workers the privilege which they now enjoy of appealing to fellow workers to stand by them in their struggle to hold up and defend the working standards with respect to which they are engaged in a controversy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Take a case in which the employer is getting along perfectly with his employees. They agree on wages. Wages and working conditions are satisfactory to both sides. Someone else says to those employees, "We want you to strike against your employer because he happens to be handling some product which we do not like. We do not think it is made under proper conditions." Of course if that sort of thing is encouraged there will be hundreds and thousands of strikes in the United States. There is no reason that I can see why we should make it lawful for persons to incite workers to strike when they are perfectly satisfied with their conditions. If their conditions are not satisfactory, then it is perfectly lawful to encourage them to strike. The Senator says they must be encouraged to strike because their employer happens to be doing business with someone the union does not like or with whom it is having trouble or having a strike. On that basis there can be a chain reaction that will tie up the entire United States in a series of sympathetic strikes, if we choose to call them that.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; what I am saying is that it is wrong to deny an American citizen the right to address himself to another American citizen and, in a peaceful and lawful way, attempt to persuade him to do anything he wants to ask him to do. That is forbidden.

Here is a case I have in mind: Let us say that there is a lumber manufacturer in the South who steadily refuses to recognize a union, and his employees try to establish a union and the employer discharges them. Let us say that he is turning out lumber in rough form, and is selling that lumber to a mill where, by means of the machinery and labor used there, the lumber is turned into finished millwork. Because that employer refuses to recognize a fair wage demand on the part of his workers, and because they are out on strike as a result of his attitude, which they think is unfair to them, they go a mile away to that planing mill, which is finishing that lumber, and they say to the workers there, "Our employer has refused to pay us a fair wage, and he refuses to deal with us; he refuses to give us any consideration whatever. He just abruptly has said he is going to fire all of us because he dislikes the attempt we have made. We are asking you not to help that man by processing his product and adding your labor to it and making it more valuable. We are asking you to help us defend the standards of labor in this community and the living level of our families."

Mr. President, in my opinion this provision of the pending measure would make that activity unlawful, even though by peaceful methods or means they tried to persuade those workers to accomplish, with them, that objective.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, of course the Senator's first assumption is not correct, because under the Wagner Act the workers have the right to organize and to require the employer to bargain with them; and if the employer fails or refuses to do so, his action in that respect is an unfair labor practice.

But passing over that, and assuming that the employer has a contract with the employees, and that the only difference is over wages, let me say that the principal point of the Senator from Florida is similar to that in the case of the New York Electrical Workers' Union, which said, "We will not permit any material made by any other union or by any nonunion workers to come into New York City and be put into any building in New York City." The principle announced by the Senator from Florida would make that stand lawful, as it is lawful today.

Of course we propose to change the law in that respect. All over the United States, teamsters are saying, "We will not handle this lumber, because it is made in a plant where a CIO union is certified." The principle announced by the Senator from Florida would have the Government say to them, "That is perfectly lawful; you can do that if you wish to."

Likewise, under the principle announced by the Senator from Florida, the workers could say that the CIO union is not securing a high enough wage for the workers and is not representing the workers in the way it should represent them, and that therefore they will strike. For instance, all over the United States, carpenters are refusing to handle lumber which is finished in a mill in which CIO workers are employed, or, in other cases, in which American Federation of Labor workers are employed.

The principle announced by the Senator from Florida is the same, namely, that if other workers do not like the way some employer is treating his employees, they can promote strikes in any other plant which happens to be handling the product of the plant whose management the workers do not like.

I do not see how we can distinguish between a plant employing union labor and a plant employing nonunion labor, or between a plant paying good wages and a plant paying poor wages, or between a plant employing CIO labor and a plant employing AFL labor. The members of the committee do not see any way of distinguishing between those cases and preventing the gradual forcing of a AFL or CIO control in various unions, and putting workers out of employment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, there is no way to provide for perfect justice. There may have been instances of abuse of this principle on the part of labor unions. But again, I say that, when we balance the various interests, we have no right to deny to American citizens the privilege of petitioning their fellow citizens for cooperation in a common endeavor to raise the living standards of the American workingman and his family.

In the second place, Mr. President, I maintain that a citizen of the United States has a right to the protection of his private enterprise, which is his labor. He has a right to work for any man or not to work for any man, so I thought. As I said a while ago, I am surprised that so many of my friends and colleagues are so ready to defend a man's free use of his money, and yet are reluctant to assure a man the free use of his labor.

I say that the Congress has not been presented with any bill which provides that an employer cannot capriciously stop buying from another manufacturer because he does not like that manufacturer's labor policies, because they are too friendly to labor. I do not know of anything which prevents an employer who buys a given commodity from saying, "I will not buy that man's goods because he has recognized the closed shop, and I do not like the closed shop, and I simply will stop buying from him, even if it means that his only market is thus taken away from him." But, Mr. President, that is the kind of private enterprise which so many Senators seem to be determined to preserve.

But there is another kind of private enterprise which I should like to preserve. First, it is the right of an American citizen to speak his mind to his neighbor, to ask him to help him in a common humane enterprise. The other kind of private enterprise which I think should be promoted and protected is the right of a man to be free and to be his own master in the use of his own might.

Yet, Mr. President, here we are confronted with a measure which would deny what the late Mr. Justice Brandeis called, in this case, the right of self-defense to the working people of America.

The President, in his state of the Union message to the Congress, in discussing the subject of labor legislation, took a position quite contrary to that which has been taken by the able Senator from Ohio. Here is what the President said:

> Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

That is the standard to which the minority of the committee adheres, Mr. President. We have said that we supported the President in outlawing the secondary boycott in aid of jurisdictional strikes, and we say so again. But the committee did not limit its action to that. The committee bill outlaws all kinds of so-called secondary boycotts, even when, the objective of the boycott is to preserve wage and working condition gains already achieved by collective bargaining, even if the objective be to solicit in a peaceful way the cooperation of other workers in defending the wage and working standards of a particular community of industry.

So the provision now under discussion is simply another one of the provisions of the bill the effect of which will be to weaken further the movement of the organized working people of the United States.

Mr. President, several cases have been referred to by the Senator from Ohio, but have there been enough of them, have they become serious enough to justify the denial of all working men of the right of petition to their fellow workers for help? Has the damage been severe enough to justify a proposal to make it impossible for workers to work together for self defense? I do not think so, and I say again that this effort to weaken the unions in working together is made at a time when profits, prices, and monopoly are at an all-time peak.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to pages 14 and 15 of the bill, and to page 27 of the report of the committee. The committee had before it the President's recommendation when it reported the bill, it knew the President had limited his suggestion for the outlawing of secondary boycotts to boycotts in aid of the jurisdictional strike, of which none of us approve. But it deliberately was not satisfied with the moderation and with the limitation of that principle in the President's recommendation; it chose to go further and to outlaw all secondary boycotts, no matter how legitimate the objective of the boycott was. So again I say that many of us, and certainly I speak for myself, are not opposing all legislation, we are not approving all secondary boycotts, but we say, as the President said, that a distinction should have been made, and the distinction should have been predicated on what the objective of the boycott is. That distinction the able committee has ignored.

Not only is the right of petition to fellow workers for cooperation in common defense made an unfair labor practice, but there is given the power of an injunction against such a boycott. On pages 14 and 15 of the bill the grounds which are the subject of the injunction are stated. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will correct me if I am in error in anything I say about this. I should like to draw attention to page 33 of the bill, section 10 (l).

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that that is not the language of the Senator from Minnesota, but an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for the information. It may be, however, that the Senator from Oregon in the final analysis may avail himself of the privilege which I think every man should have, that is, the right of repentance. If the Senator from Oregon should find it appropriate to repent, I hope he will be able to share his baptism with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon only hopes eventually to be able to persuade the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. My faith believes in deathbed repentance, and I am still hoping to see some of it around here—the repentance, not the deathbed. [Laughter.]

I now turn to page 33 of the bill, subdivision (l) of section 10, which reads:

(l) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4 (A), (B), and (C) of section 8 (b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred. If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall, on behalf of the Board, petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That no temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration of such period. Upon filing of any such petition the courts shall cause notice thereof to be served upon any person involved in the charge and such person, including the charging party, shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony.

Mr. President, under that all that is necessary is the filing of a charge of one of these boycotts, or one of these so-called unfair labor practices, and then the regional officer or the regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board must seek "appropriate injunctive relief," because the bill says:

If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has a reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall, on behalf of the Board, petition * * * for appropriate injunctive relief.

Mr. President, that means that it is mandatory upon a regional attorney, or an officer in a region representing the Board to seek an injunction in the courts, even if nothing has happened except that a complaint has been filed of such an alleged unfair labor practice, namely, this boycott. That preliminary injunction can be issued without notice to the opposite party, and after 5 days, of course, the injunction may be made to extend for a longer time, as a matter of fact, until the matter has been disposed of by the Board, which may mean an unlimited period of time.

So not only are all boycotts eliminated without any distinction such as the President suggested but there is added the arbitrary and mandatory requirement that a regional attorney, upon nothing more than what he believes may be reasonable cause, shall seek an injunction in the courts.

An employer who commits an unfair labor practice is not enjoined. There is no preliminary injunction in the court provided with respect to him. That is simply another evidence of the regrettable fact that the bill is aimed at the worker, not the employer, and ignores completely the abuses which have been committed by the employers in the past, and attempts to restrict its remedial provisions exclusively against employees.

Mr. President, a case has been decided in my State of Florida, to which I wish to call attention, with respect to another aspect of this matter, that is, the right of the Attorney General to seek an injunction against a strike and be able to prevent the strike from occurring for a period of 80 days under certain conditions. On page 48 of the bill those conditions appear:

Whenever, in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe.

Then it goes on to say that the Attorney General, upon receiving a report from a board of inquiry, may seek an injunction, in the name of the United States, from any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such strike or lock-out if he finds that it "(i) affects substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and (ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate."

Mr. President, I realize a serious question is presented when a strike is threatened which would vitally affect the whole Nation, or any large segment of it. Like many other situations affecting private enterprise, it may have many ramifications and reverberations. But, Mr. President, those things are accepted as a part of the price we pay for our free, private-enterprise system. There are many freedoms which are abused—freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and other privileges which we enjoy as free Americans—because they are sometimes abused, but we do not find it necessary to take away those rights. We try to curb abuses, but we preserve the inherent right of free enterprise in America. That is what has made us as great as we are.

But this bill does not propose to set up a national arbitration board; it does not propose something in the nature of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as suggested by a distinguished citizen of my State, former Governor James M. Cox, of Ohio, who, out of his great experience, recommends the establishment of something like the Tennessee Valley Authority to act as a governing authority for great enterprises of national scope and importance, with power to fix wages, probably to fix profits, in industries of national importance and significance.

It may well be, Mr. President, that we are going in that direction. It is an outrage for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to enjoy the greatest monopoly in America, to be the greatest monopolist in America, but refuse to pay a fair wage to its workers; yet, if the Government does not make it pay a fair wage, what can the workers do except strike? If the workers can be effectively strangled in their struggle for a fair measure of the profits of the business, Mr. President, an injustice has been perpetrated on worthy Americans.

Today there is in progress a nationwide strike. The Government has no power to make the parties sit down together to reach an accord; it has no power to make the employer meet the workers half way. But this bill makes no proposal of that sort, either. It does not authorize the Government to put any pressure upon the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to make it pay a fair wage to the workers.

I suspect that this bill would be applicable to such a situation. I am sure it would be applicable to the railroads, to the transportation systems. It says "transmission systems," and I do not know of anything more important in the transmission system than the telephone system of America.

If this bill were applicable today, the Attorney General could have gotten an injunction prohibiting the union from striking, and ordering them to continue work for at least 80 days at wages they had already found unbearable. But the Attorney General would not have had a bit of authority to say to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., "You are not paying enough, you are not paying what you can fairly afford, and we are going to require you to do it." No, there is no proposal in the bill that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. do anything. There are no rights committed tc the Government against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. In the pending telephone strike, the only injunction that could be obtained, if this bill were law, would be one against the workers themselves.

I maintain, Mr. President, that is not equal justice, legal or social, that is not fair, that is not approaching the matter with a desire to see justice done all around. All it accomplishes is to do what I said was feared by Governor Stassen, namely, to weaken the workers so that they will give up the strike, and so that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. can continue its unbroken record of 23 years, of paying a $9 dividend on every share of stock, every year.

Mr. President, that is what I am complaining about. This bill is not fair. The only burdens it imposes are upon the workers. The only party to a dispute it endeavors to weaken is the union of the workers. I say, Mr. President, when, in the first half of 1946, 21 of the 29 major labor disputes were over wages, and when the bill does not do anything to make the

employer pay fair wages, that it has not fairly endeavored to find a basis for the settlement of the kind of dispute that brings about work stoppages in American industry.

Mr. President, it is a matter of enjoining people, from what? From quitting work? I should like to read to the Senate a decision by the supreme court of my State on this subject, which I commend to my colleagues. I will read from page 121 of seventh Southern, chapter 117, a decision by the Florida Supreme Court dated March 27, 1942:

We are not advised of any rule of law under which any man in this country will be forced to serve with his labor any other man whom he does not wish to serve.

Is not that good Americanism, Mr. President? I am not saying, "to work for the Government"; I am saying, "for any other man or any other company."

Section 19 of the declaration of rights of our constitution provides:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party has been duly convicted, shall ever be allowed in this State."

If the injunctive order be construed to mean that the officers and members of the Longshoremen Association, Local No. 1416, were thereby required to load or unload the trucks of Collins, although there was no contractual relation between the local and Collins, then such construction would violate the constitutional provision above referred to. We think it will not be contended that any member of the local could be committed to jail for refusing to load or unload the Collins trucks. That service required the performance of manual labor and it is beyond the power of courts to punish one by imprisonment for failure to engage in involuntary servitude.

What is it after all, Mr. President, but involuntary servitude if we deny to the workers of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. the right to stop work, if they do not feel that they are receiving the wages they deserve?

Mr. President, if the bill were to set up a board like the Tennessee Valley Authority, to fix wages and working conditions and profits for the transmission lines of this country, such a proposal would be entitled to serious consideration. I am not sure that I would oppose such legislation, because I think the suggestion made by Governor Cox, three times Governor of the State of the great Senator from Ohio, an eminent publisher in America today, that the time is coming when we have got to set up a board which will have authority to see to it that justice is done to each side in disputes of this character, has great merit. There may come a time when we shall have to take over in the public name great Nation-wide essential public utilities. I do not know if that time will come. I know many other countries have found it necessary to do so. We may sometime find it necessary to do so in the public interest here in America.

It is one thing—and that is what was done recently—to deny a labor leader the right to proclaim the alleged breach of a contract. It is another thing to put a worker in jail because he stops work when he feels he has a will and a right to do so.

Mr. President, I do not know of any cases—there may be some—in which the United States Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has upheld the right of any court to put a man in jail because he refused to work for another man or a corporation, because he was dissatisfied with the wages his employer was willing to pay. I say, Mr. President, I do not know of a case in which the present Supreme Court has upheld such action on the part of any court. I am not talking about a fine. I am not talking about enjoining a declaration. I am talking about putting a man in jail because he stops working for a man for whom he does not want to work. I thought that was a basic American right and privilege. Yet the bill requires nothing more than that the Attorney General should say, without any court review, "This affects a big industry. I believe it to affect the health and security of the country, and, therefore, I am going to apply to the courts for an injunction which will be effective for 80 days." That provision will be used for the purpose of breaking the union or breaking the strike.

Again I point out that it does not require that the employer, during the 80 days, shall do anything. In the coal case the court acted under an act of Congress passed during the war and expiring on the 30th of June, and, Mr. President, in that case the Government had the right to fix wages and working conditions, and it did, including the granting of a welfare fund which had never previously been accorded by the employer. But there is no authority under the bill for the Government to fix the wages or working conditions. There is no authority in it for the public agency to compel the employer to do anything that would be justice to the employee. It is all, as I said, on the side of the employer and against the employee, the net effect of which is to strike down the labor-union movement of America and to contribute toward another depression, because the workers would be unable to buy what they otherwise would be able to purchase in the American economy.

Mr. President, this matter of the injunction as a means of settling labor disputes is a very serious one. The first United States Supreme Court case on the subject was *In Re Debs* (158 U. S. 564). That was the case in which the United States Government enjoined Debs and others engaged in the Pullman strike, during the Cleveland administration.

I read from Frankfurter and Greene in their work, Congressional Power Over the Labor Injunction—Thirty-first Columbia Law Review, chapter 385, page 412—as follows:

As for the Debs case, what dispassionate student of American society really believes that that case, in its sequelae, has made for peace in industry or enhanced confidence in the legal order?

We find a present justice of the United States Supreme Court who said, in commenting on the Debs case:

As for the Debs case, what dispassionate student of American society really believes that that case, in its sequelae, has made for peace in industry or enhanced confidence in the legal order?

Mr. President, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in order to prevent settlement of labor disputes by injunction. I have in my hand a little statement of how the situation produced the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I read:

The Norris-LaGuardia Act "is the culmination of a bitter political, social, and economic controversy extending over half a century." (*Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Lake Valley Farm Products*, supra.) That controversy, epitomized by the slogan "Government by injunction," was initiated by the injunction obtained by the Attorney General of the United States in the Pullman strike of 1894. The public reaction to that injunction was intense and immediate. The storms of protest, in which many thoughtful lawyers joined, were primarily addressed to the perversion of an equitable remedy in a manner that endangered the personal liberty of wage earners.

The clamor for reform quickly assumed significant political proportions. In 1896, 2 years after the Debs injunction was obtained and 1 year after the Supreme Court affirmed it, the Democratic Party denounced labor injunctions as a "highly dangerous form of oppression." Beginning with 1908, the Republican Party, too, advocated the elimination of the abuses inherent in labor injunctions.

Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, in formal, official statements, strongly criticised the labor injunction and urged reforms upon Congress. A veritable flood of legislative proposals was introduced and discussed in Congress. These legislative proposals occupied the attention of Congress during every session but one in the 20 years between 1894 and 1914.

At long last, in 1914, Congress enacted the Clayton Act which was described by President Wilson as "a veritable emancipation" of the workmen of America, and was hailed by Samuel Gompers as "the industrial Magna Carta upon which the working people will rear their construction of industrial freedom." But the hopes thus engendered proved wholly illusory. They were completely frustrated by the interpretation placed by the courts on the Clayton Act.

Inevitably, the failure of the Clayton Act to accomplish its plain purposes renewed, with even greater force, the agitation against equity intervention in labor disputes. Beginning with the Sixty-sixth Congress, numerous bills seeking to offset the crippling effects of the decisions of the Supreme Court were introduced. These eventuated in the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. Seldom, if ever, has any legislation been the subject of such extensive hearings, study, and debate. The result has been a statute virtually without parallel in the skill with which it was drafted, in the clarity of the policy which it embodies and in the manner in which it has fulfilled its objectives.

It is 14 years since the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted. To some, with memories that are all too short, "government by injunction" has become merely an historical phrase, with academic significance only. They are woefully wrong. It would, we earnestly submit, be a grievous mistake to restore the injunction as a weapon in American industrial conflicts. It does not work. It neither mines coal, nor moves trains, nor makes clothing. As an adjuster of industrial conflict the injunction has been an utter failure. It has been used as a short cut—but it has not cut anything, except to cut off labor from confidence in the rule of law and of the courts as its impartial organs. No disinterested student of American industry, or of American law, can have the slightest doubt that, beginning with the Debs case, the use of labor injunctions has predominantly been a cumulative influence for discord in our national life.

That statement comes from Mr. Joseph A. Padway, general counsel of the American Federation of Labor.

So I say that the proposed legislation is aimed at striking down every protection in the law of today, whether it be in the National Labor Relations Act or in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, or in other aspects of our law, under which the American labor movement has grown to its present strength and the present standard of living has been achieved in the home of the American workman, which has contributed, as perhaps no other influence has contributed, to the greatest level of peacetime prosperity America has ever enjoyed.

Mr. President, I contend that this is of a pattern too prevalent nowadays, when the sympathy is all on the side of the strong, and the oppression directed altogether at the weak. This is part of a pattern which we see too often in Congress today, when we are trying to protect the man who is making more than he has ever made, and to drive down the wages of the American workingman, who is already beginning to make less than he has been making in the past. The proposed legislation is not only one-sided but designedly one-sided. It has ignored the recommendations of the President for a moderate law on this subject. It tends to make the monopoly stronger, and while affording no Government protection to the weak would deny the weak the safeguards which they presently have for their protection.

I say that those who are aiding in this effort are not only doing a disservice to the American workingman and to his wife and children, but they are contributing to another depression which will rob us all—the rich as well as the poor, the farmer as well as the worker and the manufacturer. I say that the advocates of the proposed legislation have shown an utter failure to appreciate and reward the patriotic record which was made during the war by the workingmen as well as the fighting men of America—and I include women, because they, too, contributed immeasurably in the conflict, both at home and abroad.

We are going back to the days before the National Labor Relations Act. We are stripping from the statutes of this country the whole body of remedial legislation which has been achieved in more than a decade of social progress under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The effect of the proposed legislation would be utterly to weaken and strangle the union movement, which had made such great progress under the laws and the decisions of the courts.

I believe this to be a great mistake. I believe that we should have proceeded as the President suggested, with legislation limited in character, designed and intended to achieve industrial peace instead of promote industrial discord, to diminish work stoppage instead of increase the number of strikes. I venture to predict that the proposed legislation, if it ever becomes law, will set in motion the most violent management-labor strife that we have ever seen in America, and that there will be more work stoppage than there has ever been in the past. The American economy, in the prosperity we now have, will receive a blow which will hurl us again down to the tragic days of the early 1930's. It is my sincere hope that we may turn our attention to a more evenly balanced program for the adjustment of labor disputes than this measure offers.

At a later time, before this debate is concluded, I propose to address myself to the monopoly aspects of our present economy, to show the concentration of power in the hands of a few, to show the abuses that have been committed by those few, and to show that a thousand times more tribute has been exacted from the American people by the vices of monopoly than has ever been taken under the tyranny of labor leaders or labor organizations. If we really wanted to protect the American people, we would follow the President's recommendation and make our sword a two-edged sword, curbing the abuses of the employer, the monopolist, and the profiteer, instead of wreaking our vengeance only upon the American workingman, whose glorious history is that he has cut out a great country from an abysmal wilderness and made it today the richest and most powerful Nation in all the world.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not care to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to recommit Senate bill 1126 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to direct a few remarks to the pending motion. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courteous suggestion; but the hour is late. My colleagues can read my remarks in the RECORD. I am sure that we shall not reach a vote on the motion tonight. In fact, before I finish my remarks I shall suggest an agreement to vote. The agreement will involve an hour as of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have been trying to work out a procedure which would fairly answer the main argument—at least, as I have heard it—against the proposal to break the omnibus bill up into four separate bills.

As I understand the chief argument against my proposal, it runs something like this: We are confronted with a practical parliamentary situation, say the proponents of the argument. The House has passed an omnibus bill. That is an accomplished fact. That bill has been sent to the Senate, and it is on our calendar. That being the case, we must go into conference on the basis of a bill already passed by the House, known as the Hartley bill.

There is reason to that argument. I understand the practicalities of that situation. But, as I have said before both here and in conference with my Republican colleagues, if it would have been better in the first instance to have passed separate legislation on the basis of individual issues, then we should not change our course simply because the House has followed a course which may prove to be a very unfortunate one. It seems to me that those who agree with me that in the first instance we should have followed the course of action which I am now suggesting should try to work out with me a procedure which will give to the House another opportunity, after the reflection which I think has been taking place in the minds of a great many Members of the House on the action they have already taken, to pass in separate bills on the individual issues which are to be ultimately considered by the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it might be well to call the Senator's attention to the fact, with which he, of course, is familiar, that the rules of the House are entirely different from those of the Senate. Following the action of the Rules Committee of the House, Members of the House could vote on only one question, namely, whether they were for the bill or against it. Only one could be made, and that was a motion to recommit, which was, I think, defeated. In other words, what the Senator is attempting to do the Members of the House had no opportunity to do. They had no opportunity to express their viewpoint one way or the other on any of the measures which the Senator seeks to have the committee report so the Senate can vote on them separately. In my judgment, considering the procedure following by the House, it cannot properly be said that because the House passed an omnibus labor bill, the Senate should do the same thing. In other words, the rule which was reported from the Rules Committee of the House denied Members the right of doing anything other than voting the Hartley bill up or down.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the situation just as the Senator explains it, and I fully concur in his observations, particularly the point he makes that it does not follow that because the House has passed an omnibus bill the Senate should do likewise. Rather, I think it is very important that in the Senate a record be made showing that we do not favor the passage of an omnibus bill, because I believe that is the view of the majority. When I say that is the view of the majority of the Members of the Senate I do not mean that there will be a majority vote to accomplish that end, because some of my colleagues, in fact, quite a number of them—and they have told me so in the cloakrooms and elsewhere—believe that if it were a matter ab initio they would favor the point of view which I am proposing; but they say, "What can we do? The House has passed this bill. We will have to go into a conference on the House bill. We are faced with that parliamentary situation, and although we should like to go along with your point of view as to separate bills, we think we have no other course but to pass a single omnibus bill."

I have been trying to work out some reasonable procedure which will permit our making a clear record of the separate bill approach, because I am still of the opinion that it is our only hope in the Eightieth Congress of getting any labor legislation passed and at the same time giving to the House another opportunity to vote on this issue by way of a separate bill approach. So in consultation with the Parliamentarian and some of my colleagues in the Senate I have worked out the following motion which I now ask to have substituted for the motion which I made yesterday afternoon. I shall read it and then explain it. It is as follows:

I move that the pending bill S. 1126 be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report in lieu thereof, on or before Friday, May 2, 1947, four separate bills, as follows:

A bill embracing the language contained in titles I and V of said S. 1126;

A bill embracing the language contained in title II thereof;

A bill embracing the language contained in title III thereof; and

A bill embracing the language contained in title IV thereof.

I offer that motion, Mr. President, as I understand it is my parliamentary right to do, as a substitute motion for the one which I offered yesterday afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands; and the motion now submitted will be substituted for the motion previously made by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me explain what I think will be the effect of this motion if it is agreed to by the Senate. It will result in our having before us four new labor bills under new Senate numbers. Those bills, or any number of them, if passed, will go to the House as Senate bills and be placed on the House calendar. That will give to the House, if it cares to embrace it, an opportunity to vote on the legislation proposed by the Senate. In other words, it will give the House a chance, which I think some of the Members of the House would welcome after they have had the opportunity to reflect upon the implications and the meanings and effects of the Hartley bill, to go along with the Senate on its legislation. The House then could pass any one or all of the bills which the Senate might send over. Those bills would then go to conference, and out of the conference committee we would then get a report which the House and Senate could either vote up or vote down.

I think my proposal has a great many advantages. The first advantage is that it gives to the House, and certainly to the Senate, an opportunity to face separately the major issues as encompassed in the separate titles of Senate bill 1126, and to pass those that can be passed. Furthermore, if we separate this bill there will be less tendency, in my judgment, to try to incorporate amendments which might result in a veto.

I may be quite wrong about this, Mr. President, but no one as yet has been able to convince me that I am wrong. Even my associates on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will testify that I have at least tried to work out conscionable compromises on various questions involved in the proposed legislation, and I think they must know that I am not averse to any fair compromise which will promote the possibility of securing the enactment of proper labor legislation. But no one as yet has been able to convince me that there is the remotest possiblity of having signed by the President of the United States an omnibus bill of the nature which I think would come out of conference between the House and Senate. I cannot imagine the President signing the type of bill which I think will come out of that conference if it is in omnibus form. I may be wrong about it. If I am, then the responsibility in the last analysis will have to be shared both by the Congress and the President.

If the Senate continues the omnibus-bill approach it will send to conference a bill, with amendments which the Senate has added, for which some Members of the Senate cannot vote, and therefore there will be a sufficient number of Members of the Senate to vote to sustain a veto if the President vetoes the bill. Then the result will be that no legislation at all will be enacted.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to assume my share of responsibility for such final action. I am perfectly willing to make the choice of voting to defeat legislation of the omnibus type, containing many of the House provisions and some of the amendments which now are proposed in the Senate, rather than to have legislation of that type enacted into law.

So, Mr. President, when some of my colleagues talk about the practicalities of the situation, I am willing to talk on those terms. I think that one of the practicalities that confronts the Eightieth Congress is the likelihood that eventually there will be a veto of the bill and there will be a sufficient number of votes in the Senate to sustain the veto. In my judgment that would be a very unfortunate result and the action of Congress in passing such a bill would be most unfortunate. As I have said before, I think the people of the United States are entitled to have some labor legislation which will be fair and reasonable, and workable.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator from Oregon tell us what information he has which convinces him so completely that if the bill now before the Senate is passed with certain provisions in it, the President will veto it, and that if it does not contain certain provisions the President will not veto it, but will sign it?

Mr. MORSE. I have no evidence at all; I merely have my own intuition and my confidence in the good judgment of the President.

Mr. BALL. Let me ask the Senator one more question, if he will further yield. Did the 6 weeks of hearings which the committee held and the several weeks of committee consideration change the Senator's views regarding some of the provisions which should be included in this bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Minnesota knows that my views were changed in a number of respects during our conferences and our discussions.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will further yield, let me say I think that is quite true. I think that was true of all of us. It seems to me that the Senators who are arguing that the President will veto any bill are quoting from the President's state-of-the-Union message, which was delivered back in January, or from the President's veto of the Case bill, which was made a year ago, as a basis for sustaining their point; but it seems to me they are overlooking the fact that a great deal of water has gone over the dam since then. There have been extended hearings in both the House and Senate committees, and I think the President, as well as the Congress, will consider them.

Frankly, I do not think any Member of the Congress knows what the President will do, and I doubt that the President himself will know what he will do, until he receives a bill. Then he will have to decide, just as we in the Senate have to decide what we think are proper solutions to problems as we discuss them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope I have made it clear, as I believe I have, that the Senator from Oregon does not think he knows what the President will do in this matter. The Senator from Oregon has merely expressed an opinion; but, based upon his intuition and his appraisal of the good judgment of the President, that once the President receives a bill which has any resemblance to the Hartley bill, or a bill which has added to it the amendments which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] proposes, the Senator from Oregon simply cannot imagine that the President will sign such a bill. Let me say that my confidence in the President is too great to permit me to believe that the President would sign such a bill.

That is why I think that if the Senate passes a bill of that type, and if the bill is also passed by the House of Representatives, the bill is headed for a veto; and I think a sufficient number of the Members of the Senate would vote to sustain a veto. Therefore, I think we should avoid getting into such a situation.

Mr. President, that is why I think my good friend the Senator from Minnesota should follow my suggestion and should report from the committee a bill of the type which I have suggested, and thus let the Senate consider such a bill, pass it, and send it to conference.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I do not share the Senator's intuition regarding what the President will do. I recall that the President in his veto of the Case bill attacked very strongly the provision dealing with welfare funds. I think that the amendment which lies on the desks of Senators

improves a great deal the section of the bill dealing with that subject and makes it more workable. However, I notice that even after the President vetoed the Case bill he had his Secretary of the Interior abide by the provisions of that section in the agreement made with Mr. Lewis in regard to the coal mines.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota may be correct. We simply disagree insofar as our ideas of what the President may do are concerned.

I wish to avoid the possibility of a stalemate, with the result that no labor legislation at all will be enacted. I think we can avoid that possibility by following the procedure which I have suggested this afternoon. I am reasonably sure that we can avoid it if the Senator from Minnesota will only go along with me in regard to having reported from the committee the various bills I have suggested. Of course, I realize that the Senator's opinions and differences are honest and sincere, too.

So it seems to me that the next best course for the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon to adopt, as at least a basis for resolving these differences, is for the Senator from Minnesota to go along with me in the way that I have suggested, so as at least to have the Senate send separate bills on these subjects to the House of Representatives. If, thereupon, the House is still of the same opinion, I suppose the House will not pass such separate bills. But I think it is fair to give the House of Representatives that chance. Moreover, Mr. President, we might be surprised by what the House would do; we might find the House grabbing at the opportunity to pass whatever proposed legislation the Senate sent to it.

The next point I wish to make about this so-called separable approach is that I think it is an approach which is fair to individual Members of the Senate as well, and I think we should try to accommodate ourselves, in all fairness, to the differences of conviction which occur among us. There are Members of the Senate who have said to me, "I would go along with the committee bill if it had this section or that section out of it, but I cannot support it in its present omnibus form."

Of course, each one of us naturally evaluates some proposed reforms more highly than others of us do. I think that the most important thing the Eightieth Congress could do, as a first step, would be to take action which would result in the passage of legislation amending the Wagner Act. I do not say this in any spirit of wishing to deprecate other portions of the bill reported by the committee, but I take this position, I suppose, because it is a point which I have made over and over again for a long time before many different groups—management groups, labor groups, and public groups. I have been saying, for years, subject to great criticism from some sources, that I think the Wagner Act needs to be amended in the direction of equalizing its effects upon both employers and unions. I have said, in the face of strenuous labor opposition, for a number of years—and this is a matter of record—that the Wagner Act cannot possibly be fair until the rules are applied equally to both teams, so to speak, which are engaged in the game of industrial competition.

Mr. President, in title I of the bill before us it has been possible to incorporate many of the amendments to the Wagner Act which I have favored for a great many years. I should like to see all my colleagues in the Senate have a chance to vote on that title, as separate and distinct from the other titles of the bill. I believe that if they have a chance to vote on that title, title I, separately, in the form of a separate bill, it will pass the Senate by a surprisingly large majority vote, because, Mr. President, as I have circulated among my colleagues and have discussed title I, I have been pleased with the number of Senators who have said, "While it is not just the way I would have it in all respects, yet I must confess that you have brought from the committee a better set of proposals for amendments to the Wagner Act than I ever thought would be reported by the committee."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, was the Senator from Oregon here when the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] tore title I to pieces in his address today?

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear him tear it to pieces; I heard him speak of title I, and I think it stands in its totality, unimpaired by anything the Senator from Florida said about it. I think it will stand all the tests which may be applied to it. I do not say that all my colleagues think that title I is a good title, but I will say that I think that if title I were put into a separate bill, it would pass the Senate by a very large majority.

I think that would be a very healthy thing for labor relations. I think it would be a very constructive action. I think that in the long run labor would like to go along with the proposals we are making for equalizing the Wagner Act so as to serve the best interests of labor and employers as well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon care to take up the unanimous-consent request at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I am almost through, and I should like to have it taken up at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not decline to yield. I merely told the Senator from Nebraska that I would take up at the end of my remarks the consent proposal he and I have discussed.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think title II of the bill should be voted upon by the Senate in a separate bill. I think it is a very sound title, proposed originally, in most of the points, by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I think it is due to the Senator from New York that I should commend in this way the work he has performed in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Here again we found a man who has some very deep convictions about the way labor relations should be handled, who believes that, after all, we must cling to our voluntary procedure, that we must develop to the maximum extent possible mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration as the one and long time, lasting method for the peaceful solution of labor disputes. I think he is absolutely correct. I have entertained similar views for many years.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York went to work on a bill known as the Ives bill, seeking to handle the problem of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, and seeking to develop procedure for the handling of the so-called national emergency or national paralysis cases. I think he has done an excellent piece of work. I was very glad to go along with the Senator from New York in title II of the bill, and vote to incorporate it as a part of the committee bill, when it became perfectly apparent, by a vote of the committee, that we could not have separate and distinct bills.

I think the Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on that title II irrespective of their feelings about title I or title III or title IV, and I think it is a separable title. As said yesterday afternoon, we could pass in the form of separate bills any one of these titles, and put them on the statute books, and it would operate without any dependence upon any of the other titles of the bill.

True, as the Senator from Ohio said yesterday, all these titles involve or relate to collective bargaining, but the fact that they relate to collective bargaining does not mean that they are inseparable; it does not mean that they cannot be voted upon as separate bills. In my judgment, they should be voted upon in the form of separate bills. The point I am making is that we should be willing to accommodate ourselves to the conviction of individual Members of the Senate on the separate labor issues encompassed in the omnibus bill we are considering.

I think that wherever possible we should observe parliamentary courtesy. We should accommodate each other, making it possible for us to stand up and be counted on separable issues, and I think the pending bill is one which can be separated on the basis of separate issues that will enable us to accommodate our colleagues.

The last point I wish to make is one which was made yesterday in regard to allegations of motives. I am not interested in people's motives; I am interested in results. I am interested in securing the passage at this session of Congress of some labor legislation and having it signed by the President. Anything we can agree upon and get signed is a step forward.

I think it is true that, whether we like it or not, the omnibus bill approach is going to subject us to a type of criticism which I should like to avoid. I think it is going to subject us to the criticism that we are trying to put the President in the position of either having to sign a bill encompassing all these issues, or take action which will result in no legislation at all. I do not care how one may rationalize it, I do not care what language one may use in upholding his position in this matter, I say the result will be that the people of the country will say that we

played politics with the labor issue. I think we should place labor legislation above the level of politics in the Eightieth Congress. I believe we should follow the procedure which will make possible an unquestioned nonpartisan approach to the issues involved.

I submit, Mr. President, that it would be pretty difficult for anyone to charge successfully that separating this bill into its individual titles would involve any political approach to the problem. I think that would be the nonpartisan approach to labor legislation in the Eightieth Congress. It would not involve trying to put on the spot anyone in or out of the Congress or in or out of the White House. On the contrary, it seems to me it would recognize that there are great differences of opinion among us as to what type of legislation should be passed, differences of opinion which never can be reconciled under an omnibus bill, but which there is some chance of reconciling by way of separate bills. At least the separate approach would offer the possibility of Members of Congress getting together on some legislation which the President would sign.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does not the Senator feel that the bill reported by the committee would be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and that it would not be vetoed by the President?

Mr. MORSE. I think the bill as reported by the committee, if it were not changed on the floor of the Senate, would pass by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, and while I cannot speak for the President, I cannot imagine his vetoing the bill. But I am not very hopeful that it will be possible to get the committee bill out of the Senate into conference without amendments attached to it which many of us cannot support. I think it is at that point the difficulty arises in regard to getting any legislation passed and signed by the President in the Eightieth Congress. If anyone could give me any assurance that the committee bill would be sent to conference without amendments being attached to it on the floor of the Senate, I should be willing then, in the interest of writing a conscionable compromise with my colleagues, to withdraw my motion, but I do not think that is going to be the result; hence, in the absence of such an agreement, I intend to press my motion.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator from Oregon will yield for a moment, I regret very much that I must say to him that I cannot support his motion, because I think it would be a mistake at this time to recommit the bill. As the Senator knows, and as I have previously said, I felt that the right approach might be by separate bills, but I have yielded to the view of my colleagues that one bill is better and is easier to handle. I think we would make progress if we were willing to lay aside the amendments which have been or which may be offered, concentrate on the bill as it has been reported by the committee, pass it, send it to conference, and await the result of the conference. Such a course would avoid a great deal of debate and much difficulty, and I had hoped that that might be done.

The Senator from Oregon suggested—and I think there is much to be said for it—that the Members of the Senate should have a right to pass on the separate issues. Senators who are offering amendments of one kind or another want to get expressions on them by their colleagues. Apparently that is the procedure we are going to follow. We cannot tell, until the vote is taken, whether the bill will be passed or not.

I should regret very much, Mr. President, if, because of amendments added to the bill, we could not present the solid front we had in the committee and send the bill to conference with evidence that there was a large majority of the Senate behind it.

The conference could then get together and determine the other issues, and we might finally get a bill we could send to the President with the hope and expectation, since he would know it was well supported, that he would sign it and not veto it.

I am entirely in accord with the Senator from Oregon that politics should be eliminated. I do not want the President to be "put on the spot." I want the President to be given a bill that he can sign. He wants legislation on this subject; Senators and Members of the other House want it, and it is very important for us and for the American people that legislation be passed that is fair and safe, on which the President and the Congress can agree, to relieve the pressure that is on the country from obvious abuses in the labor field.

In spite of what the distinguished Senator from Florida says, there are abuses that need correction. Everybody knows that to be so; and it is idle to say that this bill, if passed, would throw the country into turmoil and economic distress. I wish that we could in some way get together to pass a measure which would have the support of both Houses, as well as the support of the President, and which would remove evils the country is crying to have removed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say two things to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I will yield to the Senator from Utah. I appreciate very much the fair-minded attitude of the Senator from New Jersey in regard to the procedure that should be followed, which he has taken throughout our discussions.

It is true that the Senator from New Jersey, as he said, originally favored the separate-bill approach. When it was decided, as a matter of majority party policy, that there should be the omnibus approach, the Senator from New Jersey took the position that he should go along with the decision of the policy committee; and I thoroughly understand the merits of the Senator's taking that position.

I hold a different point of view, because I think the objective we should be seeking should be given greater weight than what I consider to be the mistaken policy, procedurally, followed by the majority party in the Senate. I cannot escape the conclusion that it will result in no legislation. I cannot go along with the majority of my colleagues on this side, when they adopt a procedural policy which I think will result in no legislation, so long as I am convinced that, if we followed a different policy, we would have a greater chance of getting some legislation.

There was another point the Senator from New Jersey mentioned, on which I want to comment, namely, that it would be easier to handle one bill. I do not think our debate thus far substantiates that suggestion. In my opinion that is really an argument of form, without substance, because, if my motion is agreed to and the committee brings back four bills, the four bills, as the debate proceeds, will be discussed at one and the same time. There is no doubt about the fact that, as we discuss labor legislation, we shall be discussing each one of the four bills. When we come to a vote, we shall vote on them as separate bills, and we shall vote on separate amendments to the individual bills. I think hat when the smoke of debate clears away, we shall find that at least some of the separate bills will be in a form that will be practically assured of Presidential signature, and that will result in legislation. If I am wrong in the premises, then of course my whole argument falls, but I can only be proved wrong on it if we try that procedure to see whether or not it works; and I fully believe it will work. Of course, the Senator from New Jersey can be proved wrong in his theory only if we follow the omnibus-bill approach and it results in a veto, as I fully expect it will. So, as individual Senators, we have to make a choice as to which procedure we think will best promote the actual passing and signing of legislation in the Eightieth Congress.

I am convinced that the procedure I am proposing will do it, because by the motion I am now offering, I make it possible for the House of Representatives, irrespective of its action on the Hartley bill, to take action on any legislation that we, the Senate, may pass and send to it. Because of the procedure made available now by my new motion, I think I have at least answered, sufficiently to give it a trial, the arguments of those who say, "But we are met with the practical situation of a House omnibus bill facing us, that must go to conference." It will not be necessary to go to conference if we pass separate bills, if we send those bills to the House and the House sees fit to take action on them separately. I want to give the House that chance. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise primarily to support the statement by the Senator from Oregon, but I think I could support it better if I knew the content of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I think I had better state it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon the

language that has already been formulated by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Nebraska state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with certain instructions the pending bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, and that the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said motion, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, are we to understand this agreement is offered by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. We will concede that the unanimous-consent agreement is offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who said he would ask that the language I had prepared be considered his language in presenting the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TAFT. I can only say how pleased I am that the Senator from Oregon is willing to present a unanimous-consent agreement. Certainly I should not and would not object.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I am convincing the Senator from Ohio that, after all, I am a rather reasonable fellow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I might add that the distinguished Senator from Oregon has been most reasonable. We have worked together on this matter. My only reason for suggesting the language was that the Parliamentarian had drafted it, and I felt it would be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is no suggestion of reciprocal trading here, is there?

Mr. WHERRY. No; none whatever.

Mr. MORSE. We will let future events take care of that. I merely wanted to point out, Mr. President, that this involves solely a procedural matter. After all, we are either going to have a recommittal or we are not. I do not think there is much left in the way of substantive debate on the matter. We must choose our procedure, and I think the record is very clear that on purely procedural matters I usually go along with any fair unanimous-consent agreement. It is only when an effort is made to get me to agree to a unanimous-consent request that ends debate on what I consider to be an issue of great mement, when there is still ample need for full debate, that I do not go along; and of course, I shall not go along in the future with any such proposal, until I think the debate has been properly exhausted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LUCAS. On what date does the proposed agreement become effective?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement provides that on the calendar day of Wednesday, April 30, at 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with certain instructions, the pending bill, S. 1126, and that the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day—it has already been announced, as the Chair understands, that the Senate will meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.—and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of said motion, to be controlled respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that means that the Senate will vote definitely at 1 o'clock, but not before?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1 o'clock, as proposed in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may add that the Senate not only will convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock, but will convene at 11 o'clock on the following days of this week when the Senate is in session, and that there will not be a night session of the Senate on Wednesday night, as was contemplated in the event the Senate did not proceed with the bill as fast as was thought necessary. So Members of the Senate should be advised that there will be no night session held on Wednesday, but that the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock for the remaining days of this week when the Senate is in session. Furthermore, it is not contemplated at this time that a session will be held on Saturday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Nebraska is now telling the Senate that the Senate will meet every morning during the remainder of this week at 11 o'clock, without having the Senate pass on that question?

Mr. WHERRY. I can ask unanimous consent, if the Senator wants me to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression that the Senator was now telling the Senate that the Senate would convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I will make a motion. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a. m. during the remaining days of this week on the days when the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator can have his motion agreed to. I think, however, the proper procedure would be to make the motion at the appropriate time.

Mr. WHERRY. I had expected to make the motion at the conclusion of today's session, but I felt that an announcement should be made at this time so Senators would be advised of what was contemplated with respect to the hour of meeting during the remainder of the week.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the able Senator from Nebraska has the majority on his side of the aisle so the motion will prevail, but I want him to know that he should not completely ignore the minority on a proposition of this kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the Senator that the minority will not be ignored. The Senator from Illinois is active and alert in seeing to it that the majority shall not be ignored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to another topic I am about to conclude my comments in support of my motion by saying that I think one of the best evidences we on both sides of the aisle could give to the American people that we are seeking to make a truly nonpartisan approach to the subject, which it has a right to have, and that we are lifted above the level of politics, would be to carry out the suggestion I made yesterday, namely, that after we agree on procedure tomorrow, whether it is by way of omnibus bill or separate bills, a bipartisan committee of the Senate sit down and confer in an informal and friendly fashion with the President in regard to the whole problem of labor legislation, and see if there can be obtained some indication, one way or the other, of what the President's position will be. I think we have the right to know how far the President will go along in the passage of legislation at this session of Congress, and I think he in turn has the right to have such a consultation with us, so that there can be a mutual exchange of points of view concerning labor legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Oregon will suspend for a moment, the Chair understood the Senator from Oregon to yield to the Senator from Nebraska to permit him to make a motion with reference to the time of convening of the Senate for the remainder of the week. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to press that motion at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw that motion. I will offer it at the conclusion of the executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion made by the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that before we go forward with votes on the merits of proposed amendments and the committee-reported bill, that such a consultation with the President as I have suggested will be held. I do not think that such a consultation in any way would set a bad precedent; in fact, I think it would be a good precedent. Nor do I think it would in any way sacrifice any of the prerogatives of the Senate of the United States. Rather, I think it would be a clear demonstration, since we are confronted with the situation of having a

Congress of one party and a Chief Executive of another party, that the statement was sincerely made when at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress our leaders said in effect that they were willing to cooperate with the President on legislative problems, and would give him an opportunity to act on his expression of a desire to cooperate with the Congress.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS IN THE SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP-REPAIR INDUSTRY

Now, Mr. President, I turn my attention to an entirely different subject, but one still somewhat related to the labor issues pending before the Congress. I turn my attention now for a few minutes to the problem of employer and employee relations in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry. It is so easy for us, as we become engrossed in the problems of labor legislation, to forget that, after all, sound labor relations must rest upon parties to collective-bargaining agreements keeping their word under such agreements. As I said before, we cannot legislate good faith. We cannot legislate a willingness into the hearts of men to bargain collectively in good faith.

We hear a great many charges made about breaches of contract and breaches of agreement on the part of the union. There have been some. To the extent that there have been any, there have been too many, although I think any statistical analysis of the subject of breaches of contract by unions will produce the surprising finding that they are few and far between; that a great majority of union contracts are lived up to by the workers and by the employers. There are exceptions, and in order to provide for the exceptions two procedures are provided for in the bill as reported by the committee.

One procedure is found in the title which permits, of course, suits by employers against unions for breach of contract. That is subject to a great deal of criticism on the part of unions. I do not think the criticism is well founded, because in my opinion, when union officials sign a labor contract, their signature ought to be given the same sanctity and the same effect as the signature of an employer. So I am going along with the proposal for legislation which permits suits for breach of contract against unions. I think a careful reading by labor leaders of the particular proposal contained in the bill will dispel their minds of many of the exaggerated fears they seem to entertain. But, be that as it may, I think it is only fair and proper that when unions damage the property rights of employers or third parties as the result of breaches of contract, they should be held responsible for the obligation they took unto themselves when they signed the contract. However, I think it is also clear that most employers recognize that they do not build up harmonious labor relations by taking their workers into court. Litigation by way of court action is no solution to labor difficulties, and is not helpful in most instances in producing harmonious relations between employer and employee. We can take notice of that fact in regard to suits in our courts between ordinary plaintiffs and defendants. I have yet to see very many plaintiffs or defendants, after they have lost a case, wish to carry on friendly relations thereafter with the winner of the case. Hence most employers tell us that they do not want to sue unions for breach of contract, because they must live with the unions and with the workers. Perhaps it is a legal remedy that ought to be made available to them in order to meet an intolerable situation which may develop, but they prefer another approach. They prefer an approach which would make breaches of contract an unfair labor practice. So in title I of the pending bill we make it possible for an employer to go before the National Labor Relations Board on petition and make his allegations as to the failure on the part of the union to live up to the obligations which it assumed when it signed the contract.

What are some typical breaches? Many contracts call for grievance machinery. It is agreed that instead of "quickie" strikes or economic action on the job, both parties will go through an agreed-upon grievance procedure. There are instances, as was pointed out to us in the hearings, of unions, when they think it is to their advantage, ignoring the grievance procedure; and when the employer points out to them that they are committed under the contract not to strike, but to submit the matter to the grievance procedure, ending ultimately in voluntary arbitration, there are occasions when the unions say, "Yes; we agreed to that, but we are not going to follow it, and so what?" That has brought certain unions into disrepute. It has done a great deal of injury to good unions which keep their word.

I think it is only fair to provide procedure in the bill which will make it possible for employers to prove their case against a union which engages in such an unfair labor practice, and obtain the remedies provided in the bill. I prefer that procedure. I believe that one of the sound features of the bill is that it provides a dual procedure. It makes it possible for employers to use the unfair labor practice procedure, which is also available to unions, in case of a violation of contract on the part of employers. In other words, it balances the act. It applies the same rule to both teams.

I should like to make clear in this discussion this afternoon that there are also many instances of employers not living up to their obligations under a contract. I have arbitrated a good many labor disputes in my professional career, and in a considerable number of disputes I have found the employers acting in violation of their contracts and have had to so hold in my decision, as I have done in the case of unions when they have not lived up to the contracts made over their signatures. I have dealt with employers who have at least lived up to their agreement to arbitrate the question as to whether or not they were in violation of their contracts.

However, in recent days I have been discussing with Mr. John Green, president of one of the maritime trade unions, a very serious situation which seems to be developing in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry. I presume that in most of these disputes there are two sides to the case. However, I wish to place in the RECORD this afternoon what I am satisfied has been the history of the so-called zone-standards agreement which was adopted during the war, covering wage stabilization in the shipbuilding industry. I wish to place it in the RECORD because I am of the opinion that we are headed for serious trouble in the shipbuilding industry unless the employers and workers can get together in carrying out their obligations under the zone-standards agreement.

Since 1941 the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry has been functioning under a tripartite agreement between industry, labor, and Government, known as the Zone Standards, administered by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. It is of great moment and concern to the east coast, the Gulf, the west coast, and the Lakes.

At present this agreement is under the danger of being unilaterally abrogated by the employers. I understand that management has failed to have a quorum of its representatives present at the last two meetings of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee.

It seems that management, by thus obstructing the business of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, is not abiding by the terms of a tripartite agreement to which the Government is signatory, and which is still in full force and effect.

The story of shipbuilding stabilization in the United States is one of the little-known stories of good labor relations in the past. The story of shipbuilding stabilization in the future, because of the refusal of management to abide by its word, and because of the failure of the Government to live up to the sanctions which could be imposed upon a recalcitrant party, may become a better-known story of bad labor relations, if the employers and the workers engaged in this industry do not proceed to get together on their problems short of economic action.

The story of shipbuilding stabilization begins in 1940, at which time Mr. Sidney Hillman, at that time commissioner in charge of the Labor Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission—subsequently appointed associate director general of the Office of Production Management—announced the creation of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, composed of representatives of labor, the shipbuilding industry, the United States Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, and the OPM.

The shipbuilding industry group which met to formulate a policy for the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee was truly representative of the views of management, because the 21 members present represented 42 yards employing at least 90 percent of the workers in the industry. It cannot be said that management was forced into its participation in the shipbuilding stabilization agreements. All of the parties agreed that the zone standards agreements were

to be formulated by national zonal conferences in four zones, and were to be arrived at by a process of collective bargaining resulting in unanimous concurrence with the provisions of the agreements. That was the agreement resulting in unanimous concurrence with the provisions of the zone standards agreement.

The first zone standards agreement to be negotiated was one covering all shipyards doing new construction work on the Pacific coast. The Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, declined to participate in the conference to formulate the agreement on this coast, but declared its willingness to abide by the working standards agreed upon by the conference.

The Senate will recall that it was in 1945 that we had a wage differential problem involving repair yards, when I spoke at some length on the shipbuilding labor relations on the west coast. We worked out at that time, to the credit of the workers and of the shipping concerns, a satisfactory solution of that problem. I am hopeful that here, again, the shipbuilders and the unions may reach some agreement as to their respective equities. Apparently both sides are taking somewhat extreme positions and the problem is one of ironing out the respective equities of the parties as they have developed under the zone standard agreement.

The agreement drawn up on the Pacific coast was submitted to the principals and reviewed and accepted by them, including management, the procurement agencies representing Government, and labor. This Pacific zone standards agreement merely set general principles. In this Pacific conference at the first session only labor and management were active conferees. In all other sessions and conferences, the Government took an active part.

The Pacific coast zone conference finished formulation of the zone standards on April 21, 1941. The three remaining zone conferences were held as scheduled for the Gulf coast, the Atlantic coast, and the Great Lakes. The Gulf coast zone standards agreement was more detailed than those of the other zones, because both the employers and the union representatives on the Gulf coast wanted to incorporate the zone standards bodily into local agreements rather than to translate general working conditions into specific clauses.

All four zone standards agreements set the following types of working conditions: Standard skilled mechanics' rate on all zones but the Gulf, $1.12. Gulf zone, $1.07. Overtime rates. Night shift premium. No strike and no lock-out pledge. Agreement on arbitration for all disputes. A provision against limitation on production. A duration clause.

The zone standards were not local collective bargaining agreements. The provisions of the zone standards agreements were incorporated into the local agreements, sometimes in toto and sometimes by reference. They were zonal agreements between management, Government, and labor.

It was felt that the shipbuilding stabilization committee alone, under whose auspices the zone conferences were called, would have the power to interpret the zone standards.

In 1942 the shipbuilding stabilization committee was revised. Industry evinced a desire to have 12 representatives instead of 6—industry acted through the National Council of American Shipbuilders—and later it again increased representation. The Government added 2 representatives of the War Department.

In 1942 it was decided that the four zone stabilization agreements required amendment and a national shipbuilders' conference was held in Chicago on April 27, to draw up amendments to the zone standards. These amendments were adopted by unanimous consent of the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, representing the Government, by the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., and the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, of the CIO, representing labor, and by the various shipbuilding corporations representing industry. These amendments provided two things which are germane today:

First. The holding of a yearly wage review under a procedure to be developed by the shipbuilding stabilization committee.

Second. The zone standards agreements were to apply for the duration of the national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States.

Thus the only way, under the zone-standards agreements, that wages could be altered in the shipbuilding industry was by a wage review held by Government, management, and labor, and which was to apply to all shipyards covered by the zone standards in the United States.

Because of the issuance on October 3, 1942, of Executive Order 9250, the wage reviews of 1943 and 1944 as outlined by the Chicago amendments to the zone-standard agreements were held by the National War Labor Board. The wage review for 1945 was held by the National Shipbuilding Conference in Colorado Springs, where an 18-cents-per-hour increase was granted by majority vote of Government and labor, with management dissenting. However, all parties to the Colorado national conference agreed that the zone standards themselves could only be amended by unanimous consent.

Since the 1945 wage review had been postponed until December, it was felt by the stabilization committee that to hold the 1946 wage review at the customary time—in June—would be meaningless. Therefore, the stabilization committee voted to hold the 1946 wage review in January of 1947. The shipbuilding workers still have an equity in the 1946 wage review, which has not yet been held. Even if the national emergency were declared at an end by the President of the United States or by joint resolution of Congress, the equity of the workers in the 1946 wage review to be conducted under the auspices of the shipbuilding stabilization committee would still remain, and the review, according to the promise of the committee, would still have to be held.

Since the wage review of 1945, management has been taking the attitude that the zone-standards agreements should be done away with, even prior to the end of the national emergency.

Perhaps it should be, Mr. President, but the point I want to stress is that they ought to sit down and negotiate by collective bargaining about it, because I think that is the obligation to which they have committed themselves. As a matter of fact, eight management members of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee have submitted their resignations to this committee. Management does not want to abide by its agreement of 1941 and 1942. It is trying unilaterally to dissolve its collective-bargaining contract. Labor takes the position that management cannot be allowed unilaterally to dissolve a collective-bargaining agreement, even though such agreement be national in its scope. The unions take the position that management must abide by its contract and by its pledged word.

The termination of the zone standards agreements was set by the Chicago amendment to such agreements at the end of the national emergency. This termination date can be changed only by the unanimous consent of all parties, because to change this date would be amending the zone standards. Moreover, to change participation in the zone standards agreements can be done only by unanimous consent, because it would, in effect, be amending these standards.

Perhaps they should not have entered into that agreement. Many people have been before me in arbitration cases by agreement and have argued that they entered into a bad agreement, an agreement which was working to their disadvantage. I do not know whether this is or is not working to the disadvantage of the employer, but the fact that they may have entered into an agreement which they do not now like does not justify, it seems to me, their seeking to change it except through the processes of collective bargaining to which they have committed themselves.

Thus, one party cannot withdraw without the consent of the other two. The termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements cannot be changed except by the unanimous consent of the parties.

During the wage review of 1945, the Government procurement agencies indicated their desire to withdraw from participation in the national conference, although promising to recognize the force and effect of the Zone Standards Agreements. I do not think, in this connection, that the Government agencies have absolutely clean hands either. I think that is another matter which ought to be looked into in an attempt to avoid a break-down in successful collective bargaining between and among the parties involved in this arrangement.

Both management and labor refused to allow a party to the Zone Standards to withdraw without unanimous consent, and would not give the Government agencies consent to withdraw.

Management has attempted to stop the working of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee itself by refusing to have a quorum present at the last two meetings of the committee. This is an indirect method of single-handed and arbitrary elimination of responsibility under the collective agreements.

Mr. John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, assures me that he has always taken the position that the Zone Standards Agreements and the Stabilization Committee should be continued after the termination of the state of national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States. The other two parties to the Zone Standards Agreements, namely, management and Government, have refused to agree to the proposal to extend the termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements. In turn, they cannot shorten or abridge the termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements without unanimous consent, nor can they destroy the previous action of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee setting the 1946 wage review date for January 1947 without destroying the effectiveness of the Zone Standards Agreements.

Even when the President of the United States abolished all wage and salary controls, he recognized the equity of labor in awards and gains previously granted by the wage and salary stabilization bodies.

The shipbuilding workers have such an equity in the 1946 wage review. It is this equity to which I seek to draw attention this afternoon. It should not be destroyed.

In my judgment it cannot be destroyed without a complete abrogation of the tripartite-collective agreement.

The amendments to the zone standards agreements adopted at Chicago, specifically stated the following with regard to the wage review:

> The rates herein established and put into effect shall remain in effect until June 1, 1943, on or about which date a wage review shall be conducted under procedures to be developed by the shipbuilding stabilization committee and thereafter annually on or about June 1, a like review will be conducted by that committee.

The management by refusing to allow a quorum of its representation to be present at the last two meetings of the stabilization committee, and thus obstructing the conduct of the wage review, is not abiding by the terms of its contract, which is still in full force and effect. At least, Mr. President, that is the allegation of the union, and I think that allegation should be appraised and considered in negotiations entered into in good faith by all parties to the agreement.

The record of the shipbuilding industry has been a most impressive one. Since 1941 there have been no major strikes in that industry. Mr. President, that is a remarkable record. It is a record for which I think all the maritime unions, irrespective of their affiliations, deserve a great deal of credit.

Because of the operation of the zone standards, the shipbuilding industry was one of the few to avert a strike in 1946, even though the employers in this industry are the same in many cases as those in the steel industry, such as United States Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp. Because of the operation of the zone standards, the wage increase granted in 1946 was attained peacefully, through the national conference to conduct the wage review of 1945.

Postponement of the 1946 wage review until on or about January 1, 1947, was made on a motion by Mr. Edward J. Tracey of the United States Maritime Commission, and it was seconded by Capt. Harold J. Wright of the United States Navy. That motion even did away with retroactivity of wages prior to January 1, 1947.

In a letter addressed to the President of the United States, John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, stated:

> Before the zone-standards agreements can be terminated and the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee can be dissolved, all obligations undertaken under such agreements must be fulfilled.
>
> This is a clear case in which the United States Government must show its impartiality and fairness. The motion on the basis of which the 1946 wage review was postponed was made and seconded by the representatives of the Government of the United States.
>
> In this case the entire American sense of fair play demands that the Government live up to the sense of, and obligations under, its contract and use its utmost influence to persuade industry to do the same.
>
> I hope, Mr. President, that you will give this situation your serious and considered attention. The sanctity of any agreement to which the Government is a party is not a matter which should be threatened by any single, self-seeking group.

In its consideration of labor legislation, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives have been taking the attitude that labor must be forced to live up to its just obligations. I think that is a proper attitude for us to take.

Here is a case in which labor claims it has lived up to its just obligations, and I think the record supports its claim. The union which is involved has engaged in a major battle to save the very industry in which it is working, and to save the American merchant marine. Within the past few months, we have all had on our desks the pamphlets and books of this union on the serious problem faced by the American merchant marine. What is management doing in this case? To all intents and purposes, management is forcing the union into a situation where it must either, first, allow management to abrogate a tripartite agreement which has been signed and approved by the Government of the United States; or, second, strike. I do not think there is any justification for provocation of a strike because of any failure of management to live up to its agreements. I do not think there is any justification for a union to strike before it has carried out the terms of its collective-bargaining commitments. In this case, the union claims—and I think it has made out a prima facie case—that it has lived up to its obligations, and that the party that is in error insofar as not living up to the collective-bargaining agreement is concerned, happens to be, in this instance, the employer.

The procurement agencies of the Government have the power to request that the shipbuilding corporations of the United States live up to their agreements. That has not been done.

The union is not asking that management even grant a wage increase; the union has simply been asking for the possibility of bargaining for a wage increase. In view of the legislation that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States are thinking of, to compel labor to live up to its just obligations—and not only am I supporting such legislation, but I have proposed some of it—it seems to me that it is extremely necessary that such legislation take note of the refusal of management in some cases to live up to its just obligations, even when those obligations have been incurred under a solemn contract entered into with labor and the Government of the United States.

Hence, Mr. President, in closing my discussion of this question, I wish to make two points: First, I sincerely hope that the shipbuilders of the United States who are involved in these Zone Standards agreements will reflect upon the course of action they are following in not making it possible even to have a quorum present at the committee meetings, so that they can thrash out in good faith the collective-bargaining differences which exist between and among the Government, the union, and the shipbuilders; and, second, I think we need to keep in mind, as we consider legislation which seeks to enforce the contract obligations on the part of both unions and employers, that sometimes employers, too, are guilty of contract violations, thus providing all the more reason, it seems to me, why we should balance the Wagner Act with procedure which will make it possible to hold both employers and unions guilty of an unfair-labor practice when they violate the sanctity of their signatures affixed to a collective-bargaining agreement.

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY submitted the following conference report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:
>
> "PART I
>
> *"Findings and policy*
>
> "SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,

as amended, has been interpreted judicially in disregard of long-established customs, practices, and contracts between employers and employees, thereby creating wholly unexpected liabilities, immense in amount and retroactive in operation, upon employers with the results that, if said Act as so interpreted or claims arising under such interpretations were permitted to stand, (1) the payment of such liabilities would bring about financial ruin of many employers and seriously impair the capital resources of many others, thereby resulting in the reduction of industrial operations, halting of expansion and development, curtailing employment, and the earning power of employees; (2) the credit of many employers would be seriously impaired; (3) there would be created both an extended and continuous uncertainty on the part of industry, both employer and employee, as to the financial condition of productive establishments and a gross inequality of competitive conditions between employers and between industries; (4) employees would receive windfall payments, including liquidated damages, of sums for activities performed by them without any expectation of reward beyond that included in their agreed rates of pay; (5) there would occur the promotion of increasing demands for payment to employees for engaging in activities no compensation for which had been contemplated by either the employer or employee at the time they were engaged in; (6) voluntary collective bargaining would be interfered with and industrial disputes between employees and employers and between employees and employees would be created; (7) the courts of the country would be burdened with excessive and needless litigation and champertous practices would be encouraged; (8) the Public Treasury would be deprived of large sums of revenues and public finances would be seriously deranged by claims against the Public Treasury for refunds of taxes already paid; (9) the cost to the Government of goods and services heretofore and hereafter purchased by its various departments and agencies would be unreasonably increased and the Public Treasury would be seriously affected by consequent increased cost of war contracts; and (10) serious and adverse effects upon the revenues of Federal, State, and local governments would occur.

"The Congress further finds that all of the foregoing constitutes a substantial burden on commerce and a substantial obstruction to the free flow of goods in commerce.

"The Congress, therefore, further finds and declares that it is in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act be enacted.

"The Congress further finds that the varying and extended periods of time for which, under the laws of the several States, potential retroactive liability may be imposed upon employers, have given and will give rise to great difficulties in the sound and orderly conduct of business and industry.

"The Congress further finds and declares that all of the results which have arisen or may arise under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as aforesaid, may (except as to liability for liquidated damages) arise with respect to the Walsh-Healey and Bacon-Davis Acts and that it is, therefore, in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act shall apply to the Walsh-Healey Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress in order to meet the existing emergency and to correct existing evils (1) to relieve and protect interstate commerce from practices which burden and obstruct it; (2) to protect the right of collective bargaining; and (3) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts.

"PART II

"Existing claims

"SEC. 2. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act), on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any activity of an employee engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, except an activity which was compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable.

"(c) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employed an employee there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engaged in activities which were compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) No court of the United States, of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding, whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, under the Walsh-Healey Act, or under the Bacon-Davis Act, to the extent that such action or proceeding seeks to enforce any liability or impose any punishment with respect to an activity which was not compensable under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(e) No cause of action based on unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or any interest in such cause of action, shall hereafter be assignable, in whole or in part, to the extent that such cause of action is based on an activity which was not compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b).

"SEC. 3. COMPROMISE OF CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Any cause of action under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or any action (whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act) to enforce such a cause of action, may hereafter be compromised in whole or in part, if there exists a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable by the employer to his employee; except that no such action or cause of action may be so compromised to the extent that such compromise is based on an hourly wage rate less than the minimum required under such Act, or on a payment for overtime at a rate less than one and one-half times such minimum hourly wage rate.

"(b) Any employee may hereafter waive his right under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to liquidated damages, in whole or in part, with respect to activities engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) Any such compromise or waiver, in the absence of fraud or duress, shall, according to the terms thereof, be a complete satisfaction of such cause of action and a complete bar to any action based on such cause of action.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall also be applicable to any compromise or waiver heretofore so made or given.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'compromise' includes 'adjustment', 'settlement', and 'release'.

"PART III

"Future claims

"SEC. 4. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN FUTURE CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any of the following activities of such employee engaged in on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

"(1) walking, riding, or traveling to and from the actual place of performance of the principal activity or activities which such employee is employed to perform, and

"(2) activities which are preliminary to or postliminary to said principal activity or activities,

which occur either prior to the time on any particular workday at which such employee commences, or subsequent to the time on any particular workday at which he ceases, such principal activity or activities.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) which relieve an employer from liability and punishment with respect to an activity, the employer shall not be so relieved if such activity is compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee is employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it is engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it is so made compensable.

"(d) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employs an employee

with respect to walking, riding, traveling, or other preliminary or postliminary activities described in subsection (a) of this section, there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engages in any such activity which is compensable within the meaning of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

"PART IV

"Miscellaneous

"SEC. 5. REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS BANNED.—

"(a) The second sentence of section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only with respect to actions commenced under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 6. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to enforce any cause of action for unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act—

"(a) if the cause of action accrues on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued, and every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued;

"(b) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within whichever of the following periods is the shorter: (1) two years after the cause of action accrued, or (2) the period prescribed by the applicable State statute of limitations; and, except as provided in paragraph (c), every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within the shorter of such two periods;

"(c) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the action shall not be barred by paragraph (b) if it is commenced within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless at the time commenced it is barred by an applicable State statute of limitations.

"SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FUTURE ACTIONS.—In determining when an action is commenced for the purposes of section 6, an action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed; except that in the case of a collective or class action instituted under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Bacon-Davis Act, it shall be considered to be commenced in the case of any individual claimant—

"(a) on the date when the complaint is filed, if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint and his written consent to become a party plaintiff is filed on such date in the court in which the action is brought; or

"(b) if such written consent was not so filed or if his name did not so appear—on the subsequent date on which such written consent is filed in the court in which the action was commenced.

"SEC. 8. PENDING COLLECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS.—The statute of limitations prescribed in section 6 (b) shall also be applicable (in the case of a collective or representative action commenced prior to the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) to an individual claimant who has not been specifically named as a party plaintiff to the action prior to the expiration of one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act. In the application of such statute of limitations such action shall be considered to have been commenced as to him when, and only when, his written consent to become a party plaintiff to the action is filed in the court in which the action was brought.

"SEC. 9. RELIANCE ON PAST ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—In any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act based on any act or omission prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of any agency of the United States, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of any such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"SEC. 10. RELIANCE IN FUTURE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—

"(a) In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any written administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of the agency of the United States specified in subsection (b) of this section, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"(b) The agency referred to in subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended—the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor;

"(2) in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act—the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of such Act; and

"(3) in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act—the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 11. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—In any action commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to recover unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in section 16 (b) of such Act.

"SEC. 12. APPLICABILITY OF 'AREA OF PRODUCTION' REGULATIONS.—No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of an activity engaged in by such employee prior to December 26, 1946, if such employer—

"(1) was not so subject by reason of the definition of an 'area of production,' by a regulation of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, which regulation was applicable at the time of performance of the activity even though at that time the regulation was invalid; or

"(2) would not have been so subject if the regulation signed on December 18, 1946 (Federal Register, Vol. 11, p. 14648), had been in force on and after October 24, 1938.

"SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.—

"(a) When the terms 'employer,' 'employee', and 'wage' are used in this Act in relation to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, they shall have the same meaning as when used in such Act of 1938.

"(b) When the term 'employer' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act.

"(c) When the term 'employee' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean any individual employed by the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act in the performance of his contract or subcontract.

"(d) The term 'Walsh-Healey Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended; and the term 'Bacon-Davis Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings', approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011), as amended.

"(e) As used in section 6, the term 'State' means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

"SEC. 14. SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 15. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes".

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EARL C. MICHENER,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any reports of committees? If there be none, the Clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire what was done with the Dooley nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. I asked unanimous consent that it be passed over, and that was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska as to what has happened to the nomination of Marvin Jones to become Chief Justice of the Court of Claims?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot advise the Senator as to what has happened. I shall be glad to look into it and report to him.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been pending for a long time before the Committee on the Judiciary, and those of us who served with Marvin Jones in the House of Representatives realize what a grand person he is. He was a Member of Congress for 24 years, and for 10 years served as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I served with him on many other committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary gave notice a couple of weeks ago that the hearing on this nomination was imminent, and that notice has been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. What did he mean by its being imminent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to say.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may make a short statement about Mr. Marvin Jones, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will act with some expedition and speed in connection with the nomination of this very good man. If there is anything against him I do not know it, and I doubt if anyone else knows of anything against him. He certainly is qualified, and he is now a member of the Court of Claims. He never asked me to do anything about his nomination, but as his friend I was curious to know what had happened to it. I thought perhaps that, like the budget reduction proposal, it had gotten lost between here and some other place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Drake Watson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin Scott Whaley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the executive calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America:

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts.
William W. Butterworth, Jr., of Louisiana.
John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts.
Paul C. Daniels, of New York.
Howard Donovan, of Illinois.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia.
Warwick Perkins, of Maryland.
Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland.
Karl L. Rankin, of Maine.
James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
John M. Allison, of Nebraska.
H. Merrell Benninghoff, of New York.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia.
John H. Bruins, of New York.
Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut.
Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Warren M. Chase, of Indiana.
Oliver Edmund Clubb, of Minnesota.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert D. Coe, of Wyoming.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma.
Elbridge Durbrow, of California.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa.
Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa.
Gerald Keith, of Illinois.
John B. Ketcham, of New York.
Charles F. Knox, Jr., of New Jersey.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
John H. Madonne, of Texas.
Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon.
Harold B. Minor, of Kansas.
James K. Penfield, of California.
Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado.
Edward T. Wailes, of New York.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.
James H. Wright, of Missouri.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York.
Leonard J. Cromie, of Connecticut.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Irven M. Eitreim, of South Dakota.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Edward L. Freers, of Ohio.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Caspar D. Green, of Ohio.
Franklin Hawley, of Michigan.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.
John P. Hoover, of California.
John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
M. Gordon Knox, of Maryland.
William L. Krieg, of Ohio.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.
Robert H. McBride, of Michigan.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Albert E. Pappano, of Ohio.
Milton C. Rewinkel, of Minnesota.
Stuart W. Rockwell, of Pennsylvania.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Bromley K. Smith, of California.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
J. Kittredge Vinson, of Texas.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5

Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
W. Wendell Blancké, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
Howard Brandon, of Georgia.
Herbert D. Brewster, of Minnesota.
William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia.
George Carnahan, of New York.
David P. Coffin, of Massachusetts.
A. John Cope, Jr., of Utah.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Forrest N. Daggett, of California.
Robert J. Dorr, of California.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr., of Ohio.
David L. Gamon, of California.
Michael R. Gannett, of New York.
William C. George, of the District of Columbia.
Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas.
Thomas A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
J. Brock Havron, of Tennessee.
Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts.
J. William Henry, of Arizona.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Armistead M. Lee, of Virginia.

George T. Lister, of New York.
Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
James G. McCargar, of California.
Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
Ralph A. Schweitzer, of California.
Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
Richard M. Service, of California.
Robert M. Sheehan, of the District of Columbia.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
J. Ramon Solana, of North Carolina.
Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
George M. Widney, of Alabama.
William A. Wieland, of New York.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consu' general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Kenneth W. Chapman

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Elmer J. Herringer

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Drake Watson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

Benjamin Scott Whaley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, Thou hast encompassed us with Thy mercies and crowned us with every blessing. Breathe upon us Thy holy presence that our lives may be worthy of the Lord and perfectly pleasing to Him, and that our labors may be in accordance with His word and His ordinance. Lead and direct us that the issues of our country may be the object of deep reflection and wise comprehension of our responsibilities.

Do Thou dispel all confusion induced by indifference and prejudice, and bless us with the freedom of the open mind and the responsive heart. When we seek Thy peace to cleanse us and heal us, it is not only a gift but a choice and an index to better strength and achievement. This day may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 323), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on tomorrow, Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include editorials and other material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the minority views filed on H. R. 2616.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial appearing in a New Jersey newspaper.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations from outside groups studying the operations of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the Lost Battalion.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I may make in the Committee of the Whole today I be permitted to include certain quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from the record of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GARY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Barden	Eberharter	Mitchell
Beall	Folger	Morton
Bell	Fuller	Nodar
Bland	Gallagher	Norton
Bolton	Gathings	Patman
Boykin	Gerlach	Ploeser
Buchanan	Gifford	Plumley
Buckley	Hart	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Schwabe, Mo.
Carson	Heffernan	Shafer
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Clements	Landis	Stanley
D'Alesandro	McMahon	Vail
Dawson, Ill.	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Dingell	MacKinnon	Vursell
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	West

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Arthur Goldschmidt.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made with reference to H. R. 156, pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include data he secured from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of former prisoners of war.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he recently delivered.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times magazine.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

RENT CONTROL BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 200, Rept. No. 324) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may make a brief statement regarding the program for the rest of the week. First of all, in respect to the measure now pending before the House, it has been under debate and consideration for a considerable period of time. We had hoped that it could be concluded by this evening. I still express that hope, not that there is any desire or intention to foreclose debate, because it is a most important matter, but if it can be concluded it will materially assist us in carrying on with the program for the rest of the week and for next week.

We have scheduled for tomorrow the bill H. R. 3203, the rent-control bill. The rule on that measure has just been filed. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. Whether or not we can conclude that tomorrow I do not know, but by coming in at 10 o'clock certainly we can make very considerable progress toward its completion.

On Thursday, as we all know, we are to meet in joint session to hear the President of Mexico. In addition, we hope to dispose of the bill H. R. 2780, the temporary housing bill.

On Friday we want to dispose of the deficiency appropriation bill.

It is expected that the conference report on the portal-to-portal pay bill will be concluded this afternoon, and of course we want to dispose of that this week if we can.

Next week it is probable that there will be an appropriation bill of considerable importance, and also the Greek-Turkish loan and some other matters that will be pushing for consideration.

As I said, I have made this announcement so that the Members may know what the program is and that we may all cooperate in attempting to carry it forward as expeditiously as possible.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 29, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), relative to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, I have designated the following members of the Armed Services Committee to serve on the Board of Visitors for the Eightieth Congress: Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, Hon. HARRY L. TOWE, Hon. LEON H. GAVIN, Hon. WALTER NORBLAD, Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSCER, Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Hon. ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

Respectfully yours,

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of th Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. Debate on the so-called Jonkman amendment and all amendments thereto had been fixed at 30 minutes. Of that 30 minutes, 20 minutes remain. The time was allotted to the gentlemen who had asked to be recognized, and the Chair will recognize them in the order in which their names were recorded by the Clerk.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we can improve the bill before the House by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. That will give us an opportunity to save $150,000,000. There are other amendments which in my judgment should be adopted and which will be offered as the bill is read for amendment to try to control the disposition of our relief in various countries. I am of the opinion that we have here a great opportunity to bring a little more sanity into the disposition of relief paid for by the people's money. I think if the House asserts itself and takes the action which it should, it might have some influence on what the House decides to do on the bill which will follow for $400,000,000 which is known as the Greek-Turkish loan bill.

It seems to me, as I stated on the floor the other day, that the time has come when we must be more realistic about our approach to the problems of relief with respect to how they affect the American people.

We must stop voting blank checks against the finances and resources of our Nation. We must give greater consideration to the ability of our people to bear such large financial burdens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday a statement was made on the floor that our Nation was continuing to ship to Soviet Russia trucks and heavy equipment. During the afternoon I propounded a question to members of the Foreign Affairs Committee with the idea of ascertaining whether or not that was true, and if it was true, just why. I did not receive a very satisfactory answer. That explains my taking the floor at this time, in the hope that some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee may explain to the House and to the country if the charges made yesterday are true, and if we are, in fact, shipping heavy equipment to Russia. I, for one, would like to know just why we are continuing to fortify communism in Soviet Russia when our foreign policy seems to be to check communism in Turkey and Greece and other parts of the world. There may be a satisfactory explanation. If there is, I think the country and the Congress is entitled to have it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. The fact is that inquiry reveals this morning that that is not occurring. As to the reasons why

it was stopped, in the short 2 minutes, time would not be available to explain it. But suffice it to say that is not occurring at the moment.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman give an explanation at sometime during the day?

Mr. JARMAN. When opportunity presents itself, if someone else does not, I will.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman will agree that if that is being done we are following a rather inconsistent policy in fortifying communism, on the one hand, and trying to stop it, on the other.

Mr. JARMAN. And you are certainly entitled to an explanation, which can be made, but not in just a minute.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman or some other member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will make that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], for 2 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the substitute offered by my esteemed colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. If I understand the gentleman's substitute amendment correctly, it "strikes out the Jonkman amendment." He said without those words his substitute would be meaningless. I quite agree with the gentleman. That is all his substitute does. It simply strikes out the Jonkman amendment. What does the gentleman propose to do? He says, "Give the full authorization for the $350,000,000, then ask the Appropriations Committee to make the full appropriation of the $350,000,000, but do not let them spend any more than JONKMAN says, $200,000,000, until some new committee authorizes the other $150,000,000."

Just how is that going to be accomplished? How does the gentleman expect the Appropriations Committee to give the full $350,000,000 under those conditions?

Now, the facts are clear. I say it is for the House to act on this authorization. I told you yesterday there was no dispute about the facts. The United Nations recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Herbert Hoover recommends relief for the balance of 1947. President Truman recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Mr. Acheson recommends relief for the balance of 1947, and says no relief will be needed in 1948, except possibly—not probably—but possibly a limited amount for Austria. Mr. Clayton says the same thing. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing—no relief will be needed in 1948. Then, why should we appropriate for 1948?

I have shown you by the testimony of Mr. Clayton that they propose $250,000,000 of the $350,000,000 for 1948. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing. My amendment gives them the $100,000,000 which the budget provided for 1947 and an additional $100,000,000 of the 1948 budget allowance, all to be spent in 1947. This will be ample and liberal for relief up to December 31, 1947.

The Vorys substitute should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a most serious matter that we are considering at this time. I am certainly not going to bind myself at this time to say I shall not support any amendment, but it does seem to me that the bill is a very good bill as it is written. It may be that the amount should be reduced. I am not sure as to that at this time. It seems there are safeguards and checks in this bill. The President may use his discretion in the matter and then we ourselves may use our discretion. I feel certain that the President of the United States and those whom he duly constitutes under this bill are not going to do anything to further communism. I know I would not want to do anything to further communism; but, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest something I believe would be a good thing to do? It is to ask ourselves this solemn question: What would the Master of us all do if He had the authority to take this money and feed people? Would He ask if a man were a Communist? Would He even ask if he were a criminal? As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if able to do so I would give food to a criminal, to anyone who needed food.

I believe we will go a long way toward furthering democracy if we follow the humanitarian policy of feeding people who are hungry, when, of course, we are able to, regardless of who they are. I am telling you that I believe we will do an injury to ourselves by trying to confine this matter to an absurd extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is too short a time. I expect to get additional time later in the day. I therefore yield my time now to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

DANGERS OF COMMUNISM—SOVIET SPIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to General Marshall last night, I am more convinced than ever that we can never deal with a Communist country.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on page A1895 of the Appendix of the RECORD you will find a complete statement on the Russian spy ring in Canada, the United States, and England.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] on yesterday talked about the Committee on Foreign Affairs knowing so much more on this subject than the other Members of the House. The only committee in this House, and one of the two agencies of this Government that were on the trail of these Soviet spies last year, was the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I have no time; I am sorry.

The other day we had before us Hon. W. C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] asked him this question:

> Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?
>
> Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not it would already have been dropped on the United States.

We need not deceive ourselves, communism is a conspiracy to overthrow this Government and every other similar government in the world, and they had their spies from one end of this country to the other, in this Capitol, if you please; and this man Gouzenko, who revolted, saw what his own country was doing to civilization. He came out and repudiated it and turned over the information to the Canadian Government. He said:

> Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is simultaneously preparing secretly for a Third World War.

He further said:

> To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column in the organization of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Government, take part.

How can we trust such a regime? It is time for the American Congress and the American people to awake to these dangers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the House to adopt House Joint Resolution 153 as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I wish to go on record as being particularly opposed to any amendment which would make Poland ineligible for relief assistance.

Poland has been branded as a satellite of Soviet Russia, and our former Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, has made the issue of Poland clear to the American people. I have followed closely the public speeches, radio broadcasts, press interviews, and so forth, made by Ambassador Lane. It is clear to everyone who listens to what this able man says that a distinction should be made between the present Government of Poland, which is controlled by Soviet Russia and run by its agents, and the people of Poland, who have never accepted this government by any of the democratic procedures.

The intent of the amendment aiming at striking Poland off the list of countries for which relief will be provided aims directly at imposing a harsh penalty upon a people who never deserted our cause and who were saddled with a government without having been asked whether or not they like it.

It is a different thing to brand a government as a satellite of Soviet Russia and a different thing to deprive the

hungry people of Poland of the relief they well deserve.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has put into House Joint Resolution 153, as presented by our chairman the gentlemen from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, on April 23 a set of conditions which will have to be met by the present Government of Poland before relief assistance is granted to the people of that country.

It is my considerate opinion that the conditions written into House Joint Resolution 153 are fully adequate for the full protection of our rights. The present Government of Poland will have to make sure that there will be no discrimination in the distribution of relief supplies; that there will be complete freedom of press reports on our relief activities; that full publicity will be given to the fact that the relief comes from the United States, and not from Soviet Russia; and that representatives of the United States Government will be permitted to supervise the distribution of food and clothing among the people.

The President of the United States will be authorized to cancel any further relief activities in Poland should the present Government of this country fail to meet its obligations.

In my opinion, the safeguarding clauses provided by House Joint Resolution 153—if met by the present Polish Government—will prevent it from any cheating on our relief program and for using it for the purpose of spreading communism.

Should we, however, deprive the Polish people of our aid and assistance, the puppet Government of Poland will once more have to turn to Russia in order to obtain at least some quantities of food for their population, and this will provide the Government of Poland with means of influencing the people of Poland, of alienating them from our ideology, and of directing the good will to Soviet Russia rather than to the United States.

I know how the people of Poland feel toward the United States. I know that they will never become our enemies, as their Government wants them to be. But why help the Communists turn these people against us, and why penalize them for their present situation, for which they are not in the least responsible?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not propose to send gold and silver to Europe, but rather to send fuel, food, clothing, medicine, and items to aid in food production. Before fixing the amount to be sent, let us look at what we have to give. We have given away our natural resources with lavish hand. The time has come to think some of America and our own future. Some time ago I asked the reference department of the Library of Congress to give me facts as to how many years our supplies will last of such natural resources as iron, iron ore, coal, copper, and so forth, what the annual rate of depletion is, and the annual loss of topsoil by cultivation and erosion. We have given our goods away just as if there were no bottom to the barrel, and as though our natural resources were as unlimited as eternity itself. But this is not the case. On the contrary, the time is fast approaching when ours will be a have-not nation, in respect to some of the most vital and essential natural resources, and will have a shortage of others. This report from the Library of Congress states, for instance, that at the rate of use in the year 1944 our supply of high-grade iron ore will be exhausted in approximately 49 years, and that the rate of depletion is 2 percent per annum, which is greater than it was 10 years ago; that at the rate of use in 1946 our proved reserve of crude petroleum oil, unless new fields are discovered, will be exhausted in 12⅓ years. If new fields are discovered, they will, of course, add to our proved oil reserve. But the rate of discovery of new fields is decreasing, and, of course, discovery of new fields will cease entirely some time.

The reports of high-grade commercial iron ore is that at the rate of depletion and consumption as of 1944, our known supply will be entirely consumed in 49 years. The rate of depletion is increasing today. These figures do not include submarginal fields.

On copper, as of 1946, the rate of consumption or depletion is 2.7 percent per annum, and at that rate, the known supply as of 1946 would last only 37.2 years. These figures do not include submarginal supplies.

Because of erosion, approximately half a million acres of cultivated land are going out of production each year.

I cannot, of course, in 2 minutes, go into a detailed discussion of this very important report. I expect to insert the entire report in the RECORD within the next few days, but these facts need to be considered in connection with this bill to give away $350,000,000 worth of our products. So far as our generosity is concerned, the green light is changing to red. Not only for the benefit of generations far into the future—not only for the benefit of that generation composed of our own sons and daughters, but for the benefit of our own generation, you and me, we must begin to conserve our resources.

I believe this bill should be cut from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000. I further believe that this bill should name not only the commission to distribute the relief materials, but should also name the terms and conditions of distribution, and these terms and conditions should be such as to encourage these European nations to take over the task of feeding, clothing, and caring for themselves at the earliest possible moment and to cease looking to us for their upkeep.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to be in opposition to the two distinguished members of my committee, but I am constrained to oppose and vote against the Jonkman amendment and the Vorys substitute therefor, and I do this as a matter of arithmetic largely. We have about 35,000,000 people who are in starvation, disease, and despair. We have $350,000,000 suggested in this legislation for their relief. That is $10 apiece. The Jonkman amendment cuts it down to $6. We might just as well do nothing. That is my reason for voting against the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Reference has been made here today to General Marshall's report last night on the Moscow Conference. I am sure all of us are grateful to him and proud of the way in which he conducted our affairs there, his patient courtesy coupled with firm adherence to principles, his refusal to yield to the pressures that have wrecked so many previous conferences. Today there are millions of people in Europe who love freedom and hate communism worse than anybody here possibly can. Our behavior at Moscow gave them their first ray of hope in months. What will happen to their new-born hope if they find that the very first action taken by the American Congress after the Moscow Conference is to cut drastically the $350,000,000 proposed to help keep these millions alive while they struggle to overthrow the tyrannies under which they suffer? The money is authorized—it will be appropriated and spent only when need is demonstrated as it comes along. Will it not, in the gentleman's judgment, be disastrous to their hopes and ours and an undermining of General Marshall's work to take this action today?

Mr. EATON. It would be. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I have a brief statement here settling the confusion over the dates 1947 and 1948 which I would like to send to the desk and, if time permits, have the Clerk read. I do this for the enlightenment and benefit of all of us.

The Clerk read as follows:

In connection with the question of whether $350,000,000 is needed for relief in 1947, the following information should be considered.

The report of the United Nations Technical Committee on Post-UNRRA Relief Needs found a total relief need of $583,000,000 for European countries in the calendar year 1947, exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. This figure did not cover any possible needs of China. The Department of State estimated the needs for Europe plus China at a total of $610,000,000. This estimate is also for the calendar year 1947 exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. (See Mr. Clayton's statement of page 2 of the committee hearings under the heading "Relief needs in 1947.")

The President requested $350,000,000 as the United States contribution to help meet the above needs. The President in his message of February 24, requesting the appropriation, said, "The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year. The most critical period will be in the spring and summer months, when UNRRA shipments will cease and the harvests are not yet available." He must have been referring to the calendar year rather than the fiscal year, since it is clear that he did not intend to spend $350,000,000 before June 30, 1947, which is the end of the fiscal year.

The budget indicated an estimated expenditure of $100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1947, that is, prior to June 30, 1947, and $250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. This was to cover the program of shipments from the period July 1 to the 31st of December 1947,

plus small possible slip-overs in the first month or two of the calendar year 1948. This is clear from the letter of the Acting Secretary of State. He said, "The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur."

Dr. Fitzgerald, Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council and food adviser to former President Hoover, agreed that a total of $296,000,000 would be needed from the United States in the calendar year 1947 for food alone for the European countries excluding seeds, fertilizer, medical suplies and the other items in the bill and excluding any possible needs of China. (See bottom of p. 108 of the committee hearings.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, do I correctly understand the parliamentary situation to be that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] has an amendment pending before the Committee by which he would reduce the appropriation to the extent of $150,000,000 to $200,000,000, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has a substitute amendment pending whereby he would authorize the full $350,000,000 but delegate the authority to the Administrator to take a look at it later on and see whether we shall spend the $150,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Vorys amendment and the Jonkman amendment be again reported so that we may all be familiar with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after "not to exceed", strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS as a substitute for the Jonkman amendment: Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a Joint Committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of $200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 29, noes 132.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONKMAN) there were—ayes 130, noes 117.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. JONKMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 156, noes 138.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and China: *Provided*, That the President if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other countries, is authorized to utilize not more than $15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to designate the countries where the money shall be spent; and in addition it provides further that $15,000,000 shall be used in those areas where the State Department determines aid is necessary.

If this Congress wants to get away from the idea of writing blank checks then the Members of this House should support this amendment because it is a mandate to the Department that it shall spend the money in these countries named except with the $15,000,000.

I know the argument will be advanced that Poland and Hungary are Communist-dominated. It seems to me in the light of the heroic struggle that the Polish people have made down through the centuries that we can afford to take a chance to see that these people are given the opportunity to benefit under this legislation. Poland, in all of its history, has never yielded to those who have overrun it. I believe that the spirit of freedom is more intense in Poland than it is in our own country. We are taking a chance; but it seems to me it puts it right up to the administrators. A contract will be made with the existing Polish Government for the handling of this relief. If the State Department is satisfied that the great bulk of the Polish people will not benefit, then by all means it should not enter into such an agreement; but it is an administrative matter. We cannot this afternoon afford to have word get back to these gallant Polish people that we have failed to recognize their need even though they are overrun by the Communists.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his amendment will in any way interfere with those provisions that are in the bill as proposed which require free access to the press and radio in those countries and even though free access is denied would the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to compel the furnishing of relief?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; in my opinion, no.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the House to understand that as the bill stands now, Poland would be excepted from the benefits of this legislation? I do not so understand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; that is not the case.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the $15,000,000 a part of the $200,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it specifically says that relief shall be given to these countries but no mention is made as to what amount shall be given to each one of the countries mentioned by the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman puts that in there to be sure that the thought expressed in the report is put in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is it exactly.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I am thoroughly in accord with what the gentleman has said and I believe the committee should accept the amendment.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHADWICK. Will the gentleman advise us why Czechoslovakia is not included in the list of governments named? I think I know the reason and I believe it reflects credit on Czechoslovakia rather than otherwise but, in my opinion, it would be desirable to have the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that there is not the need that is contemplated by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder what good purpose it can serve to delegate any part of these funds to any one of the countries named. The Administrator can do identically the same thing without the language of the gentleman's amendment by simply giving a very small token amount to any one of the countries named if he had no intention of giving it to them under the language of the bill as written.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is purely an administrative matter. In offering the amendment I want to see that these countries who are in such great need are benefited. It is entirely possible administratively that this money might be spread over any number of additional countries and we might, as a matter of fact, spend some of it in the Ukraine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman state categorically and emphatically whether or not in his opinion the language which is in the bill before the House will permit part of the $200,000,000, as it now stands, to be used for Poland, Austria, and these other countries?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; and it will go further than that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me say that I am opposed to the bill and I will vote against the bill if it does that very thing.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Answering the gentleman's question, may I say that in the bill itself there is no specific mention of any amount to any particular country. There is nothing in the bill to that effect and I think that answers the gentleman. The total amount authorized under this bill can be distributed any place in any of these countries that the organization or the Administrator feels so disposed to spend it in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if under the bill, as written, and the State Department so decided, it could allocate money out of this $200,000,000 for the relief of Russia or any other country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It could; yes, indeed.

Mr. KEEFE. If the amendment of the gentleman is adopted, as I understand it, he is pinning it down so that no part of this money can be used for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Exactly so. That is the import of the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. It is a restrictive amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. By designating the countries in which the money is to be spent, may I ask does that obligate the State Department to spend the money in all those countries or could the State Department just select two of them?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. It is an administrative matter. They are under the legislation presumed to make a contract with these countries that are to get relief.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is nothing in the amendment and there is nothing in the bill thus far that would protect the people of America and our Government against these funds falling into the hands of those people that we are opposing today, the Communists, who dominate the governments of many of the countries.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think we can do it. I think this amendment takes care of it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How does this amendment take care of or protect us against these funds getting into the hands of the Communists and their friends?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We certainly should assume that the State Department is not going to make that kind of an agreement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Do not the provisions in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill make it impossible that it could fall into the Communist hands and could be used by Communists alone? There are restrictions in the bill to take care of that, and the gentleman's amendment prevents any of these funds from going to Yugoslavia and to Russia; is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. VORYS. Is this not also true, that the gentleman's amendment contains this language: "This provision shall not imply any obligations to give relief to any of the countries mentioned," so that it does not create any obligation to any country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand the language of the gentleman's amendment it, in a sense, allocates this money to Austria, Hungary, China, Poland, Italy, and Greece, so that it cuts out Russia and it cuts out Yugoslavia.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. It goes to free people, the people who desire to be free in Austria, Hungary, Greece, Poland, and China, that we are undertaking to help.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not Poland.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; Poland is in there.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We are taking a chance on Poland and Hungary, and I hope that it will work out administratively.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence as follows:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I confess that I offered this amendment only after long, conscientious and thoughtful deliberation. But we might just as well recognize that we have reached the crossroads in our foreign policy. We had just as well recognize now as later that we are embarking upon the most important change in our foreign policy in the history of this country.

We have started out to do what? Fight communism. Now, let us not get away from the objective. We are going to oppose communism. If we are going to oppose communism, then we must oppose it on all fronts. We must be coldly realistic in the approach to this problem. We say that we are going to furnish $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to combat communism—and we are doing that openly; we had just as well be frank about it. We are going to furnish the Greeks and Turks $400,000,000 to be used by them, and as an incentive to them to keep communism from taking over their governments. But how are we going to do that on one hand and then turn around on the other and say that we are going to be the big brother and we are going to help everybody? We have to be coldly realistic. God knows I have sympathy with the starving people who are under the domination of the Soviet Republic. I have been over there; I saw them suffering. Of course they are suffering over there, all throughout Europe. But the point that I am trying to drive home here to you today is that if you are going to fight communism you have to fight it with its own weapons. You have to be coldly realistic, I repeat.

If we are going to say to the people of Greece and Turkey, "We are going to give you $400,000,000 to stop the inroads and the encroachment of communism here," and then we are going to say to those poor, oppressed people in the countries that are under the domination of Russia, "We are going to help you, too," what incentive is there going to be for them to try to get out from under the heel of oppression?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman tell us who is to make the decision as to what country is a Communist-dominated country?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman knows the answer to that question: The same sources would make that determination as would make it under his amendment, that is, it would be up to the administration to make that decision.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend, who always speaks for the Polish people and speaks with reason.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman's amendment actually proposes that the Polish people shall be given starvation, and thereby we are going to win them from communism. That is the gentleman's logic and his reasoning, as I get it. I cannot understand that reasoning and logic that he is proposing here today. Certainly those people do not want communism any more than the gentleman does. They have had a government put upon them that they did not want. But the gentleman says to those people, "You must have a revolution first in your country before we will give you any aid." Is not that his logic? How are those people going to have a revolution in the condition they are in now, when they are starved and sick and hungry? A man cannot fight communism, cannot fight Russia, in the position he is in in Poland today. But they have fought communism as no other nation has throughout the years. They fought for liberty throughout the centuries, and they have always won. They will fight again. But make them strong, give them physical strength to fight. You cannot expect dead Poles to fight communism.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has asked me a number of questions all wrapped up in one. I said in the beginning, and I have great sympathy for the gentleman's viewpoint, that we have to be coldly realistic in this thing. We have to face this issue as it is, not as we would like to have it. Yes, I have sympathy with those people, but I repeat that if you are going to treat all peoples alike there is going to be no incentive for them either to stay out from under the heel of oppression or for those who are already under the heel of oppression to get out.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman on the other side, I believe the gentleman said that the way you determine whether these countries are under Soviet domination can be done by the administration. Has the gentleman thought of the fact that we recognize these countries and that their ambassadors are here? Can you see the position that we would be in if we say, "We are not going to recognize you on this thing because we claim that you are under Soviet domination?" How are you going to get around the fact that they are recognized diplomatically?

Mr. COLMER. Somebody along the line must determine this. Do not forget that somewhere down the line there is a limit to the point to which this country can go to feed the world. If we are going to fight communism, we must fight it. As I said in the beginning, I do not like this sort of thing, either.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that these countries had their ambassadors here while they had a spy ring working in this country, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I said in the beginning that I had given some thought and study to this matter. I do not have to apologize for that. I think most of the Members of the House know of the study that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planing made and they know its recommendations and how those recommendations are now unfolding in the light of present developments. To implement those recommendations, on March 24 I introduced a resolution that would do a number of things. Generally, it would advise the President of the United States and the Congress what should be the policy of the United States in this great crisis in the world. Among the provisions of that resolution is one that would deny economic aid and assistance to the Soviet Republic and to those countries under the domination of the Soviet Republic. We hope to have hearings on that resolution before too long. We must face this issue as it is. My amendment is consistent with that resolution and it is consistent with the Truman doctrine.

In our factories in this country today we have representatives of the Soviet Republic who are there as supervisors and as inspectors to see that the machinery that the Soviet Republic is getting from this country is according to order. They have hundreds of them. How many do you think we have in the Russian factories over there? We are today making the same mistakes in our foreign policy that we did prior to Pearl Harbor when we were shipping oil, scrap iron, and all those things that were necessary to build the sinews of war to Japan.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to my friend.

Mr. CHELF. I think the mistake was just made when the House voted 150 to 138 to yank the rug out from under Secretary Marshall in refusing to give $350,000,000 to the Truman program for aid to Europe. When we cut the sum to $200,000,000 we seriously hurt our foreign policy and our defense against the spread of communism was badly weakened. It has cost the United States over $250,000,000,000 and over a million casualties in flesh and blood to win the war, and now we are being niggardly in providing sufficient funds to sponsor and preserve the peace. Why spend so much to win the peace and then literally toss it away once it is in our grasp? Russia wants a hungry Europe, because an empty stomach is far more receptive to communism.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the views of my distinguished friend from Kentucky. His views are always worthy of consideration, but the point of the matter is that this Nation is burdened with the greatest national debt that any country has ever accrued. There is a limitation even to the resources of this great Nation. We do not know where this policy that we are embarking on is going to lead us. There is a bottom in the Nation's meal barrel as verily as there is in the individual's barrel. We cannot help everybody, and sometimes I doubt whether in the final analysis we get much good will that way.

But be all of that as it may, we are all interested as a Christian people in trying to help our less fortunate brethren. But what assurance can we possibly have in the light of our knowledge of the Russian system that any substantial amount of this money sent into those governments which are dominated by Russia will ever reach the objective which we have in mind, namely—the starving people of those countries? We are told that there are safeguards of inspection and publicity, and so forth, in this bill to insure that objective, but I point out to you that everyone who knows anything about the Russian system knows that these governments in the dominated countries are nothing but puppets—the creation of Russia. Is it reasonable to assume that money, foods, fertilizer or machinery turned over to those puppets of Russia would be delivered to these starving people or reach them? And bear you in mind that under the provisions of this bill that is what is proposed to be done. From my knowledge of that situation over there no one can convince me that this relief turned over to these governments cannot and will not be diverted from the channels through which they are expected to flow to these starving peoples.

Can anyone argue successfully for a moment that a carload of fertilizer, for instance, which is turned over to one of those puppet governments cannot be diverted even though we have a handful of representatives on the ground?

Mr. Chairman, I fear that the game is not worth the candle, and personally I cannot go along with that line of reasoning, especially when I know it to be a fact that Russia has already stripped many of these countries of much of the assistance which they now so badly need and which under this bill we would propose to turn over to them to be delivered to these people.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time for an opportunity to speak on this bill. Before I give my words I would like first to present my credentials.

I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have never made any Government junket, flying over Rome and posing as an authority on Italy, or flying over Poland and posing as an authority on Poland; but I do know something about European affairs.

To give you the meat of my background, I am not one of those that switches with the breeze. I will refer you now to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1945, when the crime of Yalta was announced to the world. It was almost treason for anyone to say anything against that crime at Yalta. I did, and I was accused of preaching treason. I refer to the RECORD. That is more than 2 years ago. It is written in the RECORD, so I am not patting myself on the back, and do not interpret it as such, please. But here we have a statement from a distinguished Member of this House, and similar statements were made in the Senate:

> Mr. Speaker, no conference of the allies in this war previous to that historic meeting just completed on the Crimea has had greater significance. It was a defense destined to lay the foundation of the world of tomorrow. The results of the conference are better than the most optimistic expectations. They are better because they are based on a truly growing confidence among the Allied Governments. They breathe sincerity and strength. Each great power made concessions. They were based on the American concept of conciliation of different points of view, and not based on a single opinion.

That is the opinion that was expressed in the House. That is the opinion that was expressed in the Senate. That is the opinion expressed by radio commentators, by newspapers, by the State Department, and by the OWI.

I took the hard fight and the uphill fight. In a 1-hour speech that day I concluded my remarks by saying:

> Mr. Chairman, just as these words about Munich are today the laughing stock of the world, just as the praise which was sung of Mr. Chamberlain has now become the laughing stock of the world, just so the words of praise that are being sung about the crime of Yalta will likewise become some day the laughing stock of the world.

That is more than 2 years ago. I want to tell you why I think I am qualified to talk on this subject. Since that time I have given many speeches. They have been reprinted all over the world. Here is a copy of a speech I made in this Congress, reprinted by the Polish underground in Italy. Here is another one reprinted by the Polish underground in France. It was reprinted by the Polish underground in England, carrying my words of advice, that the day would come when we would regret the sellout of Poland at Yalta.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. By the "Polish underground" the gentleman means the anti-Communist Polish underground?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; definitely.

Then, on May 3, 1945, that is, almost 2 years ago, I gave a speech on the floor of this House, of which more than 500,000 copies were ordered and distributed throughout the country, wherein I said that the Government of the United States of America is making a mistake; that we are making the Russians so strong and communism so strong that eventually we are going to have trouble with them like we had trouble with Hitler and trouble with Japan because we made them too strong.

May 24, 1945, a speech in the RECORD, "Trouble With Tito; We Asked for It."

Two years ago I told you we were going to have trouble with Tito in Yugoslavia; that we should not give him any money or food or anything that would make him strong.

"Lithuania Under Red Fascism," in 1945 I told you what was going on in Lithuania.

I took every one of those countries, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia. In addition, Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 years I have talked in every city of any consequence in this Nation. Talked to whom? To Americans of Polish descent, of Serbian descent, of Slovakian descent, of Finnish descent, all of them who have relatives in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes to tell my story.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I am not at all sure that I will object—if the debate is to be very limited on this, I shall have to object, because there are those here who desire to plead the cause of the American taxpayers and bond buyers, and we will expect some time on this subject also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, cannot give the gentleman the answer to his question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I serve notice that if necessary, I shall object to any extension of time unless the chairman of the committee assures the House that he will not move to shut off debate. We should have time to debate this question as to whether or not we are going to send funds to the agencies of Russia on the one hand to support Russia and send funds to the enemies of Russia on the other hand.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not lie within the province of the Chairman to decide. The Committee itself will decide that.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for being so very generous with me.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a most tragic dilemma right now. We are confronted with the question of stopping Moscow. We want to help poor and starving people, yet we are in a dilemma whereby in attempting to help those poor and starving people we will be forced also to help communism. There is no way out of it. Let us take the unfortunate situation of Poland. The people of Poland have a government that is not the will of the Polish people. The people of Poland have a government, Mr. Chairman, that was forced upon them by the Government of the United States of America as one of the Big Three powers. The Government of Poland today was thrust upon the Polish people. The Polish people were not even consulted. The Polish people were not even invited to Yalta. The Polish Army that was fighting the enemy all over the world was not even given the consideration of once being asked for a word of advice. Three holier-than-thou men went over to Yalta and set up the Polish Government.

The leader of the Polish Government today is not even a citizen of Poland. He has been a citizen of the Soviet Union ever since 1921, and the Polish people still do not recognize that as their government. But the Government of the United States of America does recognize that as the Polish Government. So we are out to punish those people for a government which the Polish people do not want but a government which the United States of America forced upon them and a government which the Government of the United States recognizes. So that is the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. And the ratio of nominal Communists in Poland is less than 1 to 30 anti-Communists. Is that correct in the gentleman's estimation?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes. If war ever breaks out between the United States and Russia, just as Poland was the first country with courage enough to stand up and fight Hitler you will find the Polish people fighting alongside the Gov-

ernment of the United States of America; you will have the Poles alongside the United States of America sooner than you will have the people of Italy. They will go like they went in all the other wars, to the side with the more opportune chance of winning the war perhaps, they will go where they can get fat like they got fat in this war, and likewise a lot of other countries I could name. You have more Communists in Italy today, real honest to God Communists who are sold on the cause of communism, than you will ever have in Poland.

I received a letter the other day from a man who left the force, the anti-Communist underground of Poland. He says he is leaving the force to join his family in Warsaw. In that letter he said to me:

> We are not giving up the fight against communism, but I am tired of starving in the force; so I am going to eat and live until the opportunity arises when we can get help from the outside and when the world wakes up that communism is dangerous and the world will set itself up to destroy communism. When that time comes we will again march into the forests and we will first fight communism.

I wish I had time to show you how many Communists have been killed in Poland by these men who are fighting in the forests. That is the reason I asked for 15 additional minutes to give you the names of these men who fight communism, the torture they go through, the concentration camps they are sent to and the punishment they receive. They are fighting communism now and approximately 10 Communist agents a day are being slaughtered by the Polish underground.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman then, I take it, is definitely against the Colmer amendment?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am against the Colmer amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I never did want to impose myself upon the patience of anyone who does not care to listen to me. If I had the time I could tell you and the gentleman who objects a darn sight more about what is going on in Europe than the State Department can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, the author of the proposed amendment, in his statement that the United States has at last been forced to take a stand against communism, but from that point on I cannot agree with him. It is my idea, it is my conviction, that this amendment will further the cause of communism, rather than retard that iniquitous movement.

Mr. Chairman, what nations is this amendment aimed at? Only two nations—Poland and Hungary. There is little that I can add to what has been said about the glorious history of Poland. Why should Poland be denied this relief? Why should her people be left to starve? For six centuries Poland has been in a political nut-cracker and, at one time or another, has been dominated by France, Germany or Russia; but she has always struggled for her freedom. Poland's sons fought for liberty in this country and in other sections of the world even when they could not win liberty for themselves. Remember this, Poland will yet be free again.

How about the starving people of this other little nation—Hungary? It is true that Hungary was first overrun by Hitler and is now dominated by Stalin, but the Hungarian people are a good liberty-loving people.

What steps did they take to retain their liberty and the democratic form of government while some of the other nations of Europe were bowing to Stalin? Hungary is the only nation in Europe that has voted for a democracy like ours while dominated by Russian troops. They did that when Russian troops were watching their election. They voted for the Small Land Owners Party, which is about the same as the Democratic Party or the Republican Party in this country, if you please; and they have constantly refused, under great pressure from Russia, to deviate from the democratic ideal.

Now, we refuse by this amendment to give bread and meat to the people of Hungary and to the people of Poland when we know that we are going to feed our erstwhile enemies, the people of Germany and Italy. What a travesty on justice. Why do we have to feed the Germans? For European and world stability, they say. If that is true we certainly have to feed the starving Hungarians and the Poles from the standpoint of world stability, if not for humanitarian reasons.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the gentleman from Georgia that it has not been so very long since their States were dominated by an outside power, but the spirit of those people never died and they came out from under it. Why? Because they had faith in themselves. If you will show a little faith in Poland and Hungary, the only nations affected by this amendment, I believe the day will come when your action will be vindicated.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment will take care of that situation, will it not?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows that the Poles are dominated by a criminal dictatorship that they despise. Now, why has not the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought in a resolution to break off relations and stop recognizing an alien regime that is lording it over the Polish people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I admit that the Poles are dominated by Russia as they have been dominated down through history on different occasions by Germany, by Russia, and by France.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why should we recognize that kind of a regime?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is water over the dam, but I should add that the question of recognition of a foreign power is not decided by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. That water is still behind the dam.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not here talking about diplomacy and why nations are recognized by other nations. I am talking about the plight of a great people; that is what I am talking about. I believe that if we are going to feed people anywhere we should feed them in Poland and Hungary.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments as they have come on the floor of this House yesterday and today with respect to the question of the countries which are Communist-dominated, and I assume that there are Members here who feel that we are going in one direction in one place and that if we provide this relief to Poland and Hungary we will be going in another direction in another place.

Furthermore, the argument has been advanced that we must be coldly realistic, and I assume that means that we must not think of this as a matter of humanitarianism and charity but as a question of major strategy. That is the light in which I should like to discuss it.

If we vote this relief to Poland and Hungary, we are not going in the opposite direction from the direction we are traveling in Greece and Turkey. We are going in the same direction. We are going in the same direction because we know that when people are starving and destitute they are more likely to accept the Communist philosophy than if they are not.

There is a safeguard in this bill which I am afraid has not been mentioned enough, and that is on page 5, section 5 (b), which provides:

> Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution to the two Houses of the Congress.

There is no reason why, if we find that this relief is in fact going to help the Communist governments of these countries, we cannot withdraw it. But we should not be defeatist about this and say that we are incapable of providing this relief to those who need it, to those who are starving. Therefore, it seems to me that the amendment to take the Communist-dominated countries out of the relief bill is based on a fundamental misconception and is dangerous not only

for our national security but for the maintenance of world peace.

If this amendment is adopted, no relief would go to Poland and Hungary. Since no Austrian treaty has been negotiated and since part of Austria is now under Soviet domination, I assume that that part of Austria would also be excluded.

There is also a large part of China which under this amendment would receive no relief.

With respect to Poland, the adoption of this amendment would, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has indicated, constitute a sort of double betrayal. We betrayed Poland at Yalta, and we shall be compounding this crime if we now deprive her of relief.

There are several safeguards in the bill, as I have tried to indicate, which would entitle the President of the United States to terminate relief if he found that it was not going to the needy but was in fact being used for political purposes by the Communists.

I am as desirous as anyone to adopt a uniform and determined policy with respect to our foreign affairs, and I am unalterably opposed to the Communist philosophy. It has always been my settled conviction that we cannot and must not attempt to go in two directions at the same time. We must not support communism while we are attempting to oppose it. I believe, however, that we will be spreading our own gospel of freedom by bringing relief to the needy in Poland and Hungary, and this is especially true in view of the provisions in the bill which require full publicity as to the source of the relief.

Let us not, I plead with you, by hasty and ill-considered action throw millions of freedom-loving and hungry Poles into the uncharitable arms of the Communists. Let us instead give them hope, help them to revive, and indicate to them that we are prepared and determined to salvage from this troubled world the blood-soaked principles for which we fought a successful war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and the substitute amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 122, noes 23.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time is to be divided? I would like some opportunity to address myself to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must divide the time equally among those seeking recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great number of people who suddenly desire to speak on this question, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 40 minutes instead of 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, to the Colmer substitute: Strike out period at end of Colmer substitute amendment and add the following provision: "Unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation, a relief distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will give me very close attention because this is an attempt to do something for the people of Hungary and the people of Poland. It is an effort to make sure this relief bill really provides relief for needy people rather than for greedy politicians.

We are faced here with a dilemma today as to whether or not the people of Hungary and Poland will be denied relief by adoption of the Colmer amendment, thus doing it by congressional action, which I think is wrong, or whether to deny the people of Hungary and Poland relief by giving relief to the Governments of those countries which are communistically dominated so that it will still not go to the needy of those countries. My amendment provides a device and procedure whereby the Congress can make this relief available to the people of Hungary and Poland as well as other war-devastated countries, and keeps it under the control of the American Relief Commission so that it is not distributed by Communists but by Americans who have been cleared by the FBI so we know it is delivered without regard to party politics or creed.

I hope you will adopt this amendment to the Colmer substitute. It was offered in the committee and was defeated by one vote. I think it is an amendment which strengthens and tightens up the whole relief distribution set-up in all countries, because it means that America gets credit for the relief we are making available. It means we are engaging, if you please, in helping the people of Poland and Hungary and other countries behind the iron curtain to learn about the generosity of America through actually participating in its dividends.

The big weakness of UNRRA remains in the relief bill now before you unless we adopt this amendment. That weakness was this: We failed to follow the relief any further than the central governments of the countries. This bill has the same deficiency. You know and I know if you give this relief to the central government of Warsaw or the central government of Budapest it will be distributed for political purposes—to aid and fatten and strengthen the Communists.

My amendment says that when it is deemed necessary by the American authorities which will very likely be in those countries described in the Colmer proposal, which my amendment modifies and amplifies, we are empowered to follow that relief clear down to the local community. This means it will be distributed by Americans, operating as such, recognized as such, and it will be made available to the people rather than to the political agencies of those countries. If you actually want to help the hungry people of Poland and Hungary, as I do; if you want to make this relief available without regard to politics or creed, as I do; if you want to get a dollar's worth of relief for a dollar expended, as I do, my amendment plugs up the big sinkhole that Congress left in UNRRA, which was to give the money to the central government, along with a set of instructions, and exact promises which the Communists did not keep, and then let them handle the relief distribution which bighearted Americans financed. My proposal empowers us to follow the relief program all the way through.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman's amendment provide who shall appoint this commission?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It shall be appointed by the authority administering this act, which, I suppose, will be the relief administrator, approved by the United States Senate, as we have an amendment from the Republican side of the Foreign Affairs Committee to create such a relief administrator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would also provide for the American people, who furnish the dollars, a genuine accounting, under American citizenship and leadership?

Mr. MUNDT. That is absolutely right, and it will not permit the governments of Budapest or Warsaw to claim that we are denying relief to their people. We are making it available to them on our terms, and we are pointing out that these terms will be the same as we are setting up for every other country eligible for this relief. My amendment puts an end to appeasement in relief just as the State Department and the White House are at long last recognizing that the time has come to put an end to appeasement in international negotiations and international policies with Communist countries.

Mr. Chairman, Poland and Hungary can obtain relief under the Colmer

amendment as modified and redefined by the language of my amendment. But my amendment assures that this relief will go to the God-fearing, freedom-loving, independent people of Poland and Hungary and not just those who support the Communist regimes in those countries. It makes such guaranty effective and definite, since it empowers the United States to send relief missions right up to the terminal points of relief distribution. No longer can the central Communist governments of those countries short-circuit American relief and direct it to Communists only. My amendment will stop that type of perversion of American generosity for all time to come. My amendment makes this relief bill one which will feed the defenders of freedom who are hungry with the same generosity that it feeds the apostles of communism.

It will feed hungry people, Mr. Chairman, rather than the political creeds of hatred. And it will authorize American relief missions comprised of sturdy American citizens screened by our Federal Bureau of Investigation to make the on-the-spot distribution of relief required in certain circumstances to be positive that those who receive American relief know that it is American relief and not Communist aid from Russia. It will also make certain that American relief is used to maintain life in needy areas without regard for creed, color, or nationality rather than being used as UNRRA so frequently was to maintain in power a political clique of godless Communists who have imposed themselves upon the long-suffering people of such countries as Poland and Hungary. I urge support for my amendment to the Colmer amendment and then for the Colmer amendment as rewritten by the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that away back in 1943 when an appropriation was being made for OWI and OSS, I stood on this floor to deny them that appropriation. I then attempted to prove to the House that OWI was dominated by Communists and they were selling Russia to Europe and to the small countries, instead of selling Uncle Sam who was producing this money. That is why we have all this trouble today. Who sold out those countries? It was our Government.

That is why if you deny relief to these little countries today that 10 or 15 years from today Russia will not be a country of 180,000,000 people, but a country of 350,000,000. Then if war comes where are we? I say we should give relief but give it in a proper way under our terms where we distribute it to the people and can tell them that it is coming from Uncle Sam, that we love them.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope, then, I may have the gentleman's support of my amendment, because it does exactly what the gentleman has so eloquently enunciated.

Mr. LESINSKI. If we are going to distribute food there is only one way to do it, that is it should be handled by our Army, or military officials, in cooperation with our own welfare organizations in the field, and we have plenty of them, the Jewish Welfare, the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Relief organization. They can put people over there and distribute it in a better manner.

Mr. MUNDT. This provides for distribution by American personnel.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman understands, of course, that under the bill that is not done, but the money is turned over to the government in control.

Mr. LESINSKI. We want to turn no money over to any government; we want to feed the people ourselves. Uncle Sam will do the job right.

Mr. COLMER. But the point I am making is that the bill does not do that.

Mr. LESINSKI. Under the bill, however, you are going to deny food to any country under Communist domination. How then are you going to make this distribution of food? It just cannot be done.

Mr. COLMER. It cannot be done under the provisions of the bill, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that when Mr. Hoover appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee he commented on this very matter? He was asked this:

> Mr. FULTON. Mr. Hoover, this act proposes to put funds and food into the countries through the foreign governments as channels by making contracts with them.
>
> Mr. HOOVER. I do not want to sustain the "ins" in any government that there may be in any of these countries. I think probably putting the supplies through the channels outlined might operate to do that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee on this debate.

Mr. FULTON. Then I offer the gentleman my time, having time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the shadow of Communist Russia falls across the threshold of every home, every pulpit, every schoolroom, and the pathway of every child in this world today; and for the creation of this monster who has all mankind shaking in its boots, we cannot escape at least part responsibility. The hunger and suffering you propose to relieve are hunger and suffering which in part at least, has been brought about by Russia.

Russia is one of the two great world powers. Russia contributes nothing to relieve the distress that she has caused and there is no indication that she will do so.

We here in this bill continue the policy of appeasement which is responsible for a great many of our woes. The bill undermines the President in his determination to stop Russia through the extension of aid to Greece and Turkey and lowers public opinion in our ability to be realistic, consistent, or forthright about anything.

If the feeding and the clothing of all the world is a responsibility that rests upon us, without regard to friend or foe or for the effect upon our own people, then the bill is faultless; but if the solvency and the soundness of our Government, and if the security of our people, are our first consideration, then the bill is in part bad. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], as amended by the Mundt amendment, I am confident it would be well for this body to adopt because, as he observed, any relief extended must be administered in a sense by the government involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, further answering the previous gentleman on the matter we were discussing, Mr. Hoover was asked whether this would be the practical method of doing it when he was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs sitting in the Old House Office Building caucus room. We discussed this very question. In fact, I asked Mr. Hoover the question to find out whether it would be possible to accomplish this distribution in a way that we would not be putting the money and the food through channels that already existed in the governments of these countries. This question was asked:

> Do you suggest any other methods of distribution to those countries, through our own people, possibly, or the Red Cross, or some other agency?

Mr. Hoover answered as follows:

> One must bear in mind that all of these countries have a certain amount of food supply. They are all rationing their population. Whatever the imports are, they must be assimilated into their rationing systems. It is impossiole to separate the imports from the domestic supplies.
>
> Therefore, the primary dependence still must be placed on their rationing system and the only thing that we can do by way of control is to determine what would be a sufficiency to them, and then expect the country to see that they carry out distribution honestly. It is to check such action that I suggest there should be no contractural period. If they failed to carry out the very proper conditions which we laid out, then the supplies could be stopped.

Mr. Hoover with his adequate experience on the relief of starving peoples advocates to make use of the rationing systems of the various countries.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the various welfare organizations help to carry out this work?

Mr. FULTON. We are going to do that. We are sending over people under the State Department who are going to watch closely to see that the program in each country is carried on in a proper way and have a fair system as between public and private agencies.

Mr. LESINSKI. There are some people who have food; there are others who have none.

Mr. FULTON. We are going to send people there to watch and see that starving people actually receive it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Hoover recommends that we not make a long-term contract. He suggests we send this food to them, and leave the supervision in the hands of our own people so we can discontinue it if they violate the working arrangement.

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly right. We are going to watch it closely. We are not going to get tied up by contracts that will tie our hands.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that my amendment provides that that continues to be provided for because it does not change that contractual arrangement at all. It simply gives the advance guard of Americans the opportunity to see that the people who need it get relief rather than the people who go along with the particular creed of a particular political government over there.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman knows I was in Europe 2 years ago. I share the same apprehension as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. If it is channeled through the Government, this food supply will come under the same domination as our UNRRA supply, and it did not reach the people for whom it was intended.

Mr. FULTON. I was afraid of that, too. May I say that Mr. Hoover stated that the method proposed by this bill is the way to do it, and that it cannot be done in a practical way otherwise. I think the furnishing of this food is the best argument that democracy can go forward. It is our best advertising and salesmanship for democracy. This bill provides food, it is not armament we are giving them.

WE FOUGHT NAZISM AND THE JAPS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed amazed by the statement that was made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia a few minutes ago, when he stated that Russia was responsible for the want and misery that exist in the devastated countries of Europe.

Mr. COX. I said in part responsible.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad to hear the gentleman modify his statement. However, it seems that he has forgotten that it was Germany, the Nazis, that brought about this war; that we fought nazism and the Japs, not Russia. It was Russia that actually liberated the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, and the peoples of other eastern European countries. I regret that not only he but several other gentlemen continuously exaggerate the fear of communism and charge these people who are striving for freedom and liberty, who are opposed to oppression and exploitation, and who are seeking to better their living conditions, with being Communists. It is natural and proper that people of the smaller nations who were liberated by the Russian armies should show their appreciation by a friendly attitude.

THE PEOPLE ARE FREEDOM-LOVING DEMOCRATS

Now, what I want to bring home is this: I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] when he says that the people of Hungary are not Communists. That is true of the other small countries. The people themselves are freedom-loving democrats, very similar to ourselves in temperament, in industry, and in devotion to our own principles of freedom and equality. I know these people, and I know they are not Communists.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I sat for a total of 28 years on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am the only member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the First World War now sitting in this House. I think I can say with weight that I know something about Europe.

The Poles and the Czechoslovakians have a tradition of democracy and of representative government which goes back hundreds of years, long before German greed and might wiped out their independence. They kept alive their sacred flame of freedom, and at the first opportunity successfully rebelled against the Austro-Hungarian yoke and thus helped hasten the victorious end of the First World War. It is true that in both countries drastic measures have had to be taken to bridge over the emergency of postwar recovery and reconstruction; but these countries actually have coalition governments, in most of which the Communists are a small minority, just as among the people only a very small minority are Communists.

In Czechoslovakia particularly, President Eduard Benes has succeeded in maintaining a democratic and representative government despite all obstacles, just as he maintained the integrity of the constitutional Government of Czechoslovakia in exile after the Munich betrayal and through the horror of the war years.

Naturally, these countries are not going to start a war against Russia, as some of the gentlemen here seem to think this country should do; but that does not mean they are dominated by Russia.

WHO WAS THE ENEMY?

It seems to me that certain gentlemen in this country are more solicitous of the welfare and future of the enemy which tried to destroy civilization at the cost of 20,000,000 casualties and the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars, who wrought destruction and suffering and misery to nearly the whole of Europe, than for those who fought side by side with us, and who themselves suffered in their own lands destruction of property and of human life and of liberty.

Even while the war was on, there were Americans who assailed and criticized the people of Russia and Yugoslavia, and many went so far as to wish that Hitler and the Nazis could defeat Russia.

Almost to the same degree as now these people attacked Russia and what they termed "the Russian satellites," all for the purpose of creating a false fear that America and our form of government are endangered by communism.

There are fair-minded people in America who are not prejudiced by the flood of twisted propaganda from radio commentators, columnists, and writers, all subservient to the reactionaries, the vested interests, the cartels, and even the hidden Nazi-Fascist forces of the United States.

SHOULD DEMONSTRATE OUR SYMPATHY

I think we should demonstrate to these people who suffered from Nazi devastation, looting, stealing, and destruction that we sympathize with them; that we are desirous of showing our friendsip again by offering them much-needed aid.

There are no finer people anywhere than those you are trying to exclude from the benefits of this legislation. Time after time the offspring and the descendants of those same people, here in our own country, have demonstrated, in war and in peace, that they are devoted to democratic institutions. They have given their lives in the fullest measure of proof for their country and ours; and the devotion to freedom and democracy of the people there in Europe is no less full.

No one is more opposed than I am to nurturing the spread of communism—but this bill is to provide aid to the starving and needy people of the devastated countries.

The way to win friends for our kind of democracy is to make communism unattractive by showing the greater benefits of democratic liberties and high living standards.

RELIEF INTENDED FOR VICTIMS OF NAZI AGGRESSION

Remember that the people this bill is intended to help are the ruthless victims of Nazi oppression.

Since 1933—for 14 long years—they have been engaged in a constant struggle to maintain their independence and to establish free governments of their own.

Hitler drove the people of southeastern Europe toward the arms of Russia by a declared war of extermination which, had it not been for Allied victory, would have cost 30,000,000 lives.

I venture to say that 95 percent of the people in these devastated areas are not Communist. They are patriotic nationals of their own countries. They are trying to find a way to restore stable government and stable economy after 14 years of horror and looting and killing, against foreign aggression, and encirclement.

We have not heard a word on this floor in regard to the dangers from fascism in this country or in Europe.

The fact is that there is greater danger from Nazi-Fascist dictatorship than there is from Communist dictatorship, both here and abroad.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ABUSE ARE PROVIDED

Although what we provide in this bill is only 57 percent of the total amount of money needed to prevent misery and starvation in these war-torn countries, we will have full and complete control of the distribution of the supplies bought with the money.

Inspection and reports are provided.

I feel that the bill is so carefully drawn that misuse is practically impossible.

I am equally certain that every precaution will be taken by the administrators to see that no country and no people entitled to aid will receive assistance.

Remember that it has not been Russia who has threatened the independence of the Slavic people, not only during the Hitler period but for centuries back, but the Germans with their dreams of the "drang nach osten"—the drive to the east.

Pan-Germanism has threatened to engulf all Europe time after time. The Germans have always intended, and I suspect they still intend if they get the chance, to enslave all the Balkans and the Ukraine and Poland for a victorious march to the southern seas through eastern Europe.

It was the Russians who liberated the Slavic countries from the Nazi tyranny. They would be less than human if they did not feel grateful to Russia.

The United States has helped South American countries.

I hope that they are grateful for that help.

But that does not mean that we dominate the countries of South America or dictate their policies.

MARSHALL REPORT ENCOURAGING

The report to the Nation made by the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, is encouraging and reassuring, in spite of the seeming lack of conclusiveness of the conferences, and it should be gratifying to the American people who have no desire to be plunged into a Third World War.

Both General Marshall and Premier Stalin feel that there is ample opportunity for understanding and cooperation between our country and Russia. That opinion also has been expressed by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles. I feel sure that if the opinion for former Secretary of State Cordell Hull could be obtained he would agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment and in opposition to the Mundt substitute. I see no particular good or harm to be gained out of the Smith amendment first proposed.

Let us not forget that this is the first full-dress foreign-policy debate in this House. The world is watching this debate. Parties and members will be weighed by people in every district in our country, and by the people of the world, as to whether they are isolationists or men who understand what is happening in the new world, by how they vote here when the yeas and nays are called on the vote that has already gone through on the $200,000,000 proposal, and the vote that is to come on the whole bill. Let us try to lift the scales from the eyes of people who will not see. Those who are doing what they are in trying to kill this bill are playing directly into the hands of Russia. We had it demonstrated last night. General Marshall said that Premier Stalin told him that what he wants is delay—that there is no hurry about settling Europe's problems. He wants Europe, which is hungry and destitute, to get no help from America, to get no state of security and order. The U. S. S. R. for example is absolutely opposed to any action to take care of the refugees and DP's; they say, send them back to the countries they came from, even to those countries where they are sure to be persecuted for their political opinions. Why? Because no settlement—despair, discord, misery—all those things play into the hands of a communism which promise relief to such unfortunates. Communism is a religion for the desperate. If you want it, defeat this bill.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, you cannot teach a man democracy on an empty stomach.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly, and you cannot teach dead men not to be Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will realize the facts about a few things that are going on abroad and amalgamate them into your thinking. In these countries that are back of the "iron curtain" there is no possibility whatsoever of any United States agency going in and finding out who is hungry and saying, "Here, my friend, here is something for you to eat." Those countries all have rationing systems, ration cards, and they are not going to permit you to go in there and find the hungry and feed them. You must do it through the local government organization. That is the first thing.

Then, of course, the second thing that comes along is the question, Who has the ration cards? Of course, many of you know, or you have heard people from abroad tell you that those ration cards that carry the greatest amount of food go to those who are subservient to the Communist way of thinking, and the others get them if they are willing to go along. Many of them have taken out Communist cards in order to get ration cards. It is the Russian Government that is holding back on these people and not us. They use the ration card as a political weapon. If by any means whatsoever our country can devise a way so that the rationing is distributed equally in those countries, and fairly, as we see a thing as fair, then we will have done something worth while and can help in the feeding of those people who are being permitted to starve. That is basic.

The next thing is that they are obtaining from every one of those people behind the iron curtain a complete list of their relatives in the United States by name and address; and here in this country, as I am sure the gentleman from South Dakota can tell you, they are contacting those relatives and saying, "Now, your friends and relatives are with us. Will you go along with us or won't you?" It is a powerful persuader and aids in the building of the Communist fifth column in this country.

We have that sort of thing to combat. It is not such a simple matter as one might assume. In our way of thinking it is hard to understand. We must put ourselves in the same way of thinking in our own minds as they think in Europe before we can understand those things. That is the basic reason why I must oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Mississippi. I think the gentleman from South Dakota is trying to do the right thing in his amendment, but I am sure it will be not at all effective, because of course the Russian Government would not any more allow that sort of agent to go in there and say who is going to get food in those countries than we would allow the Soviet agents to come into this country and say whether or not their sympathizers here shall obtain their help from abroad.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman's contention is correct—and it conceivably may be—then at least the Russian Government, which deprives its own people of food that we are offering to make available to them, is undermining itself.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the Soviet Government has a way of removing nonconformists. More than 20,000,000 of them are said to have disappeared, and many are taken every day to concentration camps worse than Buchenwald or Dachau. Behind the iron curtain it takes real courage to maintain the human right to freedom.

Mr. Chairman, no one here has denied that these peoples were sold out at Yalta. Under authority to extend my remarks, I include the following articles, the purport of which has not been denied:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

ROOSEVELT OUTTRADED BY STALIN AT YALTA—MOSCOW PUBLICATION OF PACT SHOWS UNITED STATES COMMITTED

(By Jay G. Hayden)

The late President Roosevelt's amazing secret generosity to Premier Stalin at Yalta has again been evidenced in the publication at

Moscow of the agreement of these two with Churchill dissenting, on a $20,000,000,000 total of reparations from Germany, 50 percent of it for Russia.

Secretary of State Marshall disputed Molotov's reassertion of this claim on the ground that it had been superseded at Potsdam, and Foreign Secretary Bevin said it was of no standing anyhow because Churchill refused to sign it.

The ink scarcely had dried on the joint communiqué, following the Yalta Conference, before it became apparent that much more went on there than was immediately revealed.

The communiqué was issued on February 12, 1945, and just a week later it cropped up that the Atlantic Charter had been revised. As originally written, this document said its signers, Roosevelt and Churchill, "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

"AGGRESSOR NATIONS"

At Yalta there was added to this sentence the words, "by the aggressor nations," the obvious purpose being to exempt territories taken forcibly by so-called "nonagressor nations," such as Russia's conquest of the Baltic States and portions of Poland, Finland, and Rumania.

Since the Atlantic Charter was issued solely by Roosevelt and Churchill, presumably they had the right to change it in the same personal fashion, but it is doubtful if this is so of other secret agreements which were subscribed to at Yalta.

On February 27, 1945, Churchill for the first time revealed details of the agreement respecting Polish borders, including modification of the Curzon Line to give Russia the important city of Lwow, and allotment to Poland of the German province of Upper Silesia and "such other territories east of the Oder River as may be decided at the peace conference."

The latter referred to the Oder-Neisse River line, transferring to Poland territory containing 9,500,000 Germans.

In his Stuttgart speech last year Secretary Byrnes began trying to mitigate that commitment and Secretary Marshall is expected to do the same.

Yalta was little more than a month old before it leaked out successively that the Ukraine and White Russia had been recognized separately in order to give Russia three votes in the United Nations, and that Russia's insistence on an "individual veto" in that body also had been acceded to.

BIGGEST CONCESSION

Not till February 1946 did there come to light the biggest concession of all to the Soviet. This was the grant to her in exchange for a promise to enter the war against Japan "within 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered." To win that assurance Roosevelt and Churchill signed away to Russia Outer Mongolia, the whole Kurile chain of islands, half of the island of Sakhalin, and in Manchuria exclusive occupation of the Port Arthur naval base and a half share with China in control of the commercial port of Dairen.

China was not even consulted before this purloining of her territory, and as subsequently developed, Russia's entrance into the Japanese war, on the very last day of her commitment, bred nothing but trouble. Ever since, the United States and Britain have been trying to get the Russian Armies back home.

Not the least interesting element in all this was President Roosevelt's assumption of the right single-handed so to commit the Nation. Members of Congress have searched in vain for any provision, constitutional or otherwise, that invests the President with such broad right, except as his proposals later may be submitted to the Senate and approved by it.

In this instance also there is the fact that Mr. Roosevelt at Yalta was reduced both physically and mentally. He died 2 months later. It is no wonder, perhaps, that he was outtraded by Stalin, but this circumstance calls all the more for some action to assure that this sort of thing shall not happen again.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1947]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Bit by bit the falsity and inadequacy of all measures taken during and since the war to keep the peace come to light. These are the falsity of the concept of congenitally good and bad nations, according to which nature has shown favoritism in distributing righteousness and sin; the idea that perpetual punishment is an agent of reform; the belief that the calculated destruction of energies anywhere can contribute to general prosperity; the empty hope that a common law can emerge without a common ethos; and, finally, that the structure erected and hailed at San Francisco is an instrument of collective security, and the "beginning"—as President Roosevelt put it—of a world constitution.

"Murder will out," and so will truth—no matter what is marked "top secret." The truth has been out for a long time for anyone with eyes to see. Even for the nonreligious there must have been some significance in the fact that the San Francisco Conference opened without an appeal for the blessing of God. The peace devised could bear reference to no standards, so prayer was properly omitted.

But, as the roadside posters used to proclaim in the small-town evangelical communities of my childhood: "Be sure your sins will find you out."

They will.

In Moscow it is revealed that the United States, at Yalta, agreed to reparations in the form of the forced labor of human persons—to be delivered regardless of any crimes they may have committed. They were common soldiers, drafted like other soldiers, and by an omnipotent state in which conscientious objection was a capital crime. They were protected during the war by the self-interest of those whose nationals were also prisoners and by those conventions designed somewhat to mitigate the barbarisms of war.

Then, after surrender, to the gallows with those who imported forced labor to Germany, and up with the new slaveholders.

What of you, President Roosevelt, who had sworn on your deepest political conviction and religious faith that the Allies will not enslave the German people, because the Allies do not traffic in human slavery?

Yet your signature was on that infamy. How desperately ill you must have been. Perhaps not always there, already—at moments—as the weeping Churchill reported, as though in another world.

What of you, Mr. Churchill—intrepid lover of freedom? Magnanimous, sanguine, and in some ways wise.

And what of you, Mr. Stalin? For nearly a generation invoking the solidarity of the workers of the world.

Did you think that nazism would be on trial in victory over it?

Democracy, freedom, communism were, and are, on trial.

How broken their citadels.

Now comes President Truman calling for resolute action. The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members, but, "we have considered how the United Nations might assist in this [the Greek] crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

The definition of a "crisis" implies "urgency."

The UN was never designed as an organization that could create a world law and a world police, through which alone the freedom of all could be maintained. The terrible gaps were in the original Dumbarton Oaks plan. Yet the State Department itself went up and down the country selling it to the American people as an infallible instrument of collective security, and to raise a doubt was almost high treason.

H. G. Wells said of the League of Nations to a lady who thought it a beginning: "You can't make an automobile out of the beginnings of a perambulator." The UN is no better.

It was never possible to enforce peace. Only law can be enforced. Without world law there can be no world police; without a world ethos there can be no law.

The United States has no authority to police the world. The UN has no authority either because it is not an instrument of law, but only an international debating society participated in by sovereign states each swayed by sacred egoism.

That is the trouble and the United States should take its stand, not in Greece nor on German reparations, but on UN reform—making it a genuine law-creating and law-enforcing agency. There we can afford a show-down, because our position will be above reproach.

As Senator TYDINGS said, "The sands in the hourglass grow less and less."

[From the Washington Post]

ROOSEVELT AT YALTA

(By Ernest Lindley)

VIOLATED AGREEMENTS CAUSE TROUBLE

It is being said more and more frequently that President Roosevelt was outtraded at the Yalta Conference. Certainly he made some very important concessions to the Russians. In view of subsequent developments, it is regrettable that certain of these concessions were made.

Roosevelt knew he was paying a high price. But he did not believe that it was too high for what he was promised in return.

First, he obtained specific Russian commitments to join the war against Japan. As it turned out, we did not need Russian aid against Japan. But in February 1945 the prevailing view was that Russian participation would shorten the war against Japan and save many American lives. This was certainly the view of the President's principal military advisers. We did not yet have atomic bombs and could not be sure that we would have them. The first great fire raids with B-29's had not yet been launched. There was, moreover, a widely held view that even if Japan proper were rather thoroughly bombed out—and perhaps even if it were conquered—the Japanese armies on the continent would continue to fight, using Manchuria, with its war industries, as a base.

Secondly, Roosevelt sought assurance that the portions of eastern Europe overrun by the Red Army in the process of defeating the Axis would be restored as independent democratic nations. He sought and obtained assurance that provisional governments in these countries would represent all democratic parties and that they would be compelled to hold free elections. The Soviet Union agreed that the handling of these matters should be a joint responsibility of the Big Three, not of the Soviet Union alone. These agreements were warmly applauded in Congress. As Roosevelt himself said, they were not all that could be desired. But they would have served adequately if the Soviet Union had lived up to them.

It is true that various ambiguities and loopholes assisted the Soviet Union in evading its commitments. But the Kremlin plainly violated not only the spirit but the letter of these pledges.

Roosevelt saw before his death that the Soviet Union was welching on its pledge concerning the reconstruction of the Polish provisional government. He was anxious and angry.

A third objective which Roosevelt sought at Yalta was to nail down Soviet participation in the United Nations. The Soviet Union had never shown much real interest in the United Nations idea. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference had left unsolved the critical question of great power voting rights. Roosevelt worked out a compromise at Yalta. It was probably as good a compromise as could be obtained. The Soviet Union has been trying to pull away from that compromise ever since. It has consistently stood for very broad interpretations of the veto right of the great powers. It brought the San Francisco Conference to a temporary impasse on this very question.

Concerning several of the concessions made by Roosevelt at Yalta, it should be noted further that he conceded no more than he was powerless to prevent. For example, the United States could not prevent the Soviet Union from moving into Manchuria and reestablishing a base at Port Arthur and control over the Manchurian railroads. It could not prevent the Soviet Union from occupying the southern half of Sakhalin Island or controlling Outer Mongolia. Neither China nor any other nation could prevent the Soviet Union from taking these steps. Roosevelt considered it better to have a definite understanding on such questions in advance rather than to wait until the Soviet Union was in physical control of these areas. The Soviet Union also apparently wanted a definite understanding not only with the United States and Britain but with China.

Taken as a whole, the main trouble with the Yalta agreements was not that Roosevelt was outtraded but that the Soviet Union failed to keep some of its pledges. The United States was outcollected. Any bargain which is observed by one side but violated by the other side is bound to be lopsided in its effect.

For the failure to bring more pressure sooner on the Russians to keep their promises many things and men are to blame. But Roosevelt is not among them insofar as the Yalta pledges are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and anxious, as in the past, to render every possible assistance I can to the troubled, confused, misled, and misplaced peoples of the earth. The law of self-preservation, however, prompts me to oppose communism with all my strength. I hope that the House will adopt the amendment which excludes communistic-dominated countries from participating in any funds we may appropriate. From the days when the Greeks, who had been unsuccessfully besieging a city for 9 years, finally captured and destroyed that city by secretly introducing within its walls their own soldiers concealed in a harmless-looking wooden horse, mankind has always been more or less aware that secret enemies within the gates are far more dangerous than open enemies without. Today and for a long time the United States has been harboring and even protecting a Trojan horse in the form of communism. Now at long last, and in the present critical condition of the world, we are becoming aware of the hostile, powerful, dangerous presence in our midst of a secret group of persons calling themselves Americans but giving paramount allegiance to a foreign power.

Communism is not dangerous as a mere political theory, or as a mere economic theory. It must stand or fall by its own effectiveness or failure in operation. We do not bar thinking in this country. People have a right to ideas, even to ideas of change. We cannot legislate against ideas, and we do not wish to do so. All we ask is that ideas be submitted to the bar of reason and public opinion. Nor is communism dangerous because its adherents constitute a political party. We believe in political parties in this country. They are essential to the mechanism of democratic government, and this is true not only of the two major political parties but of the numerous smaller political parties—the parties built around one idea, which from time to time have appeared, and not infrequently have contributed to the development of the Nation.

However, the communism with which we are faced today is not a theory or a political party, but a conspiracy. It is a highly organized, closely integrated, strongly disciplined organization, ceaselessly plotting to overthrow the Government of the United States, as part of a world-wide revolution. Under whatever camouflage of idealistic verbiage its positions are urged, it has one immediate purpose from which it never deviates, which is to support the designs of Soviet Russia.

It is surprising indeed that American citizens, enjoying the prosperity and freedom of this country, a degree of prosperity and freedom never before enjoyed by the masses of plain people in any country in the whole history of the world, can be brought to plot against the security of the country which gave them these benefits. Read the report of the Canadian Royal Commission which investigated the Soviet spy ring in Canada, and see how it is done. Scientists violated their own oaths in order to betray the secrets of atomic energy to agents of Moscow. Add to that group an array of the frustrated, the discontented, the misfits, and the victims of injustices as still remain in our democracy, and then let these all be manipulated by the shrewd, unprincipled, highly trained leadership of masters of intrigue, themselves financed and directed by an international organization, and there you have a picture of communism as we have to deal with it within the borders of this country.

The communistic conspiracy has a highly developed technique, elaborated by international experts, who have spent decades in studying how to create mass discontent and disorder, and how to use the confusion thus created to further their own purposes. The methods are well known, and have been considerably publicized, yet they are not always easy to recognize on the spot when they are in operation.

The first objective is to infiltrate into the armed forces, create bad morale and propagandize soldiers and sailors so that they will aid or at least not hinder an actual taking over of the country by physical force. It was in this way that the original Communist success was gained in the Russian revolution of 1918. We have been very fortunate in this respect in this country. Before the war, efforts to win our servicemen did not get much response, and official quarters were on their guard. During the war there was not much danger because we were fighting on the same side as Russia. The situation is different now.

The next great area in which Communists plan first to infiltrate and then to dominate, is organized labor. Organized labor, where captured, provides them with a source of funds, a propaganda outlet, a means for stirring discontent, and if necessary, a weapon of sabotage. "Controlled unions," as a recent writer points out, "contribute heavily to the various party fronts and causes. They in turn serve as fronts for diverse propaganda schemes. They can picket consulates and Government offices with practiced skill. When conditions warrant, strikes can be provoked so as to create the atmosphere of unrest in which communism thrives. And, finally, if communistic policy so dictates, they can actually sabotage essential production. Thus the 1945 shipping strike to bring back the soldiers—American, not Russian—was an example of political sabotage, intended to weaken the United States on the international front. The method ordinarily used to gain control of a labor union is to send a few organizers to work in a plant, then join the union, then gain minor offices in the union, then start currents of discontent against the helpless officers of the union, then get themselves or certain handpicked tools, elected to the higher offices, then expel or discredit any local opposition which may exist, and eventually control the funds and adopt policies. When, as sometimes happens, their men by similar tactics have reached top positions in the international union, they can both rule and perpetuate their own power.

Communists never neglect the intellectual front. By such measures as were revealed in Canada, they penetrate academic circles, as well as dramatic, musical, artistic, and literary groups. They publish vast amounts of literature, skillfully adapted to different classes of readers. Some of it is frankly Communist. More is disguised to seem non-Communist.

Liberal-minded persons in all circles, and especially in government, are a particular target. Being open-minded, and proud of being so, they are ready to listen to new ideas, and not always shrewd enough to find out they are being used. Being sympathetic to the underprivileged, they sometimes prove credulous to communistic claims of idealism. Entirely innocent and logal Americans are liable to find their names used to guarantee the respectability of organizations whose real, though covert, purpose is revolution. Every effort is made by Communists to get these sympathizers, if not their own members, into key positions in government, labor, education, military life. By and large their success has,

fortunately for us, not been commensurate with their efforts.

I am not here discussing the theoretical basis of communism. As I said before, its future as an economic and political theory will be judged by mankind on its merits. I do wish to point out, however, that it is spiritually at the furthest removed from all that has made for the best life of America. Communism is sheer materialism. Beginning from its founder, Karl Marx, it excludes spiritual considerations, except, of course, where it finds it can use them temporarily for purposes of strategy. Its interpretation of history is purely in terms of economic determination. It has no theory of human rights as against the powers of the state: witness the millions of slave laborers now in concentration camps in Russia. It renounces religion as the "opiate of the people," and for years promoted the Godless League. For years it tried unsuccessfully to rid Russia of religion altogether. Now it tolerates what it could not destroy, but atheism is still part of its basic theory, and it regards the Christian church as its worst enemy.

Communism acknowledges no moral laws where the interests of the state, as conceived by its leaders and dictators, may be involved. Lies are an instrument of policy. Communist leaders are always changing their names, hiding under aliases, and traveling about the world on forged passports. A denial by a Communist that he is a Communist means nothing. The party lists are kept smaller than they need to be so that it will not even be suspected that many of the most active agents are Communists. In any case party lists are not made public and sources of income are secret. There is little doubt that over a long period the American Communist Party was directly financed from Russia, just as its policies have always been imported from the same country.

Evidence on the latter point is crystal clear. The leaders of American communism are not elected by the members. They are chosen by and may be deposed by Moscow, as in the recent deposition of Earl Browder. The "party line" in America is not the consensus of common thinking by American Communists, it is the line laid down abroad. The party cannot even hold a convention except by the consent of the executive committee of the Communist International. When a convention is held, representatives of the International have the right to participate in meetings both of the central party and local organizations, and oppose the American leaders if the "line" of the latter "diverges from the instructions of the executive committee of the Communist International."

The Communist International was theoretically terminated by Stalin during the war, as a gesture to his western allies. There is no reason to doubt that it functions as always, directed by Moscow, its decisions reaching American Communists via Paris.

The number of American Communists is so small, with less than 100,000 enrolled, and its program so at variance with American ideas, institutions, and needs, that the whole movement might easily be regarded as negligible so far as our domestic affairs are concerned. Indeed it has for exactly these reasons been disregarded by most Americans. But in these days of international tension with Russia we cannot disregard this fifth column in our midst. By every possible means these people are working day and night for Russia and against the United States.

It is part of Communist theory that a third world war is inevitable. No less a person than Stalin himself wrote in his chief theoretical work, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or another must conquer." While Stalin has recently been reported to have expressed himself in a more pacific vein, to foreign newspaper men, the sentiment I have just quoted was the serious expression of an earlier date used to indoctrinate his followers in the true faith of communism, representing certainly his earlier and almost equally certain his real philosophy. It is and has always been a commonplace of Communist theory.

A recent writer—James Burnham, in Life magazine, March 31, 1947—asserts, and everything we know confirms the truth of his assertion, that Communist policy regards the present period as a period of preparation for the third world war, and considers that it has in this period two specific tasks to perform: The first is to consolidate an effective domination of Europe and Asia. The second is to infiltrate and weaken all countries which cannot be brought under Communist control.

All you and I have to do is to lift our eyes and see these two efforts being made before us. In Europe, Russia prolongs the misery of the people with the deliberate intention of forcing them into communism. We see the tentacles of Russian power reaching out in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Finland, the Balkan countries, Germany, and France—some of these countries have already succumbed. We see the moves being made in Turkey, Iran, China, Korea. That is the story—or part of the story—abroad.

Here at home the other part is being played—the infiltration and weakening of the United States, so that it will not be a hindrance to Red fascism abroad and will in time be ready to drop, as other countries have already dropped, into the lap of communism.

It may be that in this era we will have to face acute conflict. The words from Stalin which I quoted a moment ago may well be put alongside those of another dictator whose power grew out of another revolution, and whose attempted conquests of Europe were stopped only at the cost of enormous bloodshed. This was Napoleon Bonaparte. After his wars were over, and he was in exile at St. Helena, he thus described the situation:

> If we fought all over the continent, it was because two societies stood face to face: that which dates from 1789 and the old regime; they could not live together, and the younger devoured the other. (Quoted in Nickerson: Can We Limit War? p. 192.)

Again two societies stand face to face, and the younger is again trying to devour the other. Let us be aware what we face. Let us avert this disaster, if possible, by bold and courageous policies abroad, and by wise protection of our own land at home from those who seek its overthrow from within.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to take second place to any man in the House in consistent opposition to the Communist philosophy and the actions of the Soviet Government both in the Far East and in Europe. It is precisely because I want, in the words of my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], to consider the problem solely from the standpoint of the coldest realism that I beg of you not to pass his amendment. Everybody knows that at least 20 Poles are against communism for every one who is for it and by passing the Colmer amendment right here we withhold relief from up to 20 of our friends to avoid the possibility of some food perchance getting to one of our enemies.

Who is going to overthrow communism in eastern Europe—Americans? No; it must be the Poles and Hungarians and the Austrians and the other peoples who live there. How in God's name will they be able or encouraged to do it if we start out by telling them we are not even going to try to get any help to them.

If you read all of the resolution, gentlemen, you will find many and stringent safeguards are already provided to prevent misuse of relief supplies to build up the government in power rather than minister to t e neediest. It is too bad that all of the debate has had to be on the amendments to the first section of the joint resolution before we have reached the provisions having to do with the safeguards and limitations. If we could have handled the Colmer substitute amendment later after we had examined the whole bill and perhaps even written in more stringent safeguards, then I do not think so many would have felt this amendment is necessary or wise. To me, it is tragic for the hungry in Communist-dominated Poland and Hungary and short-sighted for ourselves for us to serve notice on them here and now that we are not even going to make an effort to get assistance to them, stopping it if and when it proves impossible to get fair distribution. If I were a Communist organizer in Poland or Hungary I cannot think of anything that I would like more than to be able to say to the people, "Your western friends are walking out on you." Many people would inevitably feel they have little choice, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] well said, but to join up with the Communists and get a ration card in order to eat.

I am for the Mundt amendment. I want us to try our utmost to get our relief to those people who need it. It would make the Colmer substitute defensible. Relief would be withheld from Communist-dominated countries only if the rulers refused to let us administer

it. But if we cannot pass the Mundt amendment, let us reject the Colmer substitute too. Let us not serve notice on the victims of Russia that we condemn them to starvation. Let Russia refuse to allow them food if she wants to, but let America not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi says that he has been in Europe, but he has not been in Poland. I think it would be good if about 30 or 40 of the Members of Congress went to Poland to see that country. Members of Congress have been all over Europe seeing the conditions there but they have not been in Poland. The gentleman from Mississippi, therefore, does not speak as an authority on Poland because he has not been there. No doubt, he probably flew over it on his way to Moscow, but he did not set foot on Polish soil. If he had, he would probably agree with what General Eisenhower told me at the reception of our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. General Eisenhower said, there is no country and no people who have been so thoroughly ruined and despoiled as the Polish Nation and the Polish people. The Polish orphan population in the times before the war was 30,000. That was the normal orphan population. Today, it is over a million. There are over a million orphans. Now, get this picture. The orphans have increased from 30,000 to a million. Who is taking care of them? There are Catholic orphanages and institutions and private institutions of all kinds. The Friends organization is there, as well as state organizations trying to help. Who is going to deny to these children the chance to get something to eat?

I have here an article which appeared in the New York Times of this morning. The headline says, "Church peril seen by Polish primate." Cardinal Hlond asks firm stand against heathendom.

I want all of you to read that article in this morning's New York Times. Here is Cardinal Hlond, a great representative of the Catholic church, speaking out openly in Warsaw, Poland—not here, not in Rome, but in Warsaw—telling the people to fight communism and to stand up and fight heathendom.

How are you going to help Cardinal Hlond? How are you going to help the Catholic church in Poland? By adopting the Colmer amendment and by denying a piece of bread to them and by making the people go to Russia and to Stalin for a piece of bread? Is that how you will uphold the hand of Cardinal Hlond and these others who are fighting communism in that country today? No. That is not the right way to fight this battle.

Here is an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh press this morning, and it quotes Henry J. Osinski, who was one of the five men we sent down to supervise UNRRA distribution in Poland. By the way, that UNRRA distribution in Poland was a job well done.

I hope you will all read these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times]

CHURCH PERIL SEEN BY POLISH PRIMATE—PASTORAL LETTER BY CARDINAL HLOND ASKS FIRM STAND AGAINST "HEATHENDOM"

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, April 28.—Auguste Cardinal Hlond called on the people of Poland this week end to oppose the "modern heathendom" that is trying to "replace the worship of the Creator with the cult of the creature and worldliness."

In a pastoral letter, read from all church pulpits on the 950th anniversary of St. Wojciech's death, the Catholic primate of Poland declared: "We must not avoid a showdown against heathendom."

This was his first public statement since his pastoral letter before the election, in which he urged the people to vote against the government bloc.

FIRM OPPOSITION INDICATED

The cardinal's careful choice of language in the new letter did not hide implications that the church would continue to oppose communism in Poland even though Communists have won control of the Government.

"There can be no truce between Christendom and impious irreligiousness," Cardinal Hlond declared. "It is the desire of providence that Poland repulse absolutely the attempt of atheists, tempting with the pretenses and nothing but pretenses of a philosophy of the future and with the beautiful idea of progress."

The cardinal described the church's position in Poland as "internally strong" and "externally unclear but calm."

Kazimierz Przzynski, Polish Government spokesman, is in Rome negotiating with the Vatican for a new concordat. Cardinal Hlond expressed the belief that "Polish political thought will find a proper, perhaps even an original, manner for settling the relations between the church and the state."

MENACING CHAOS SEEN

"Modern heathendom takes different shapes and the nation's reactions to its operation are not uniform," the cardinal said. "It has brought about in many countries a menacing chaos.

"It has met no success in Poland, but it persistently repeats its endeavors to take the spiritual leadership of the Nation. Ungodliness would like to take root not only in the factory suburbs but also in the great rural parishes.

"The proclaimers of atheism cannot forgive the church for warning the faithful of the dangers of faithlessness."

He said the excesses in Polish life "make the reconstruction of normal conditions impossible." He noted that "Poland is not the worst in such matters," and concluded with a demand that "the nation must have its Catholic conscience returned to it."

In another approach between the Government and the church recently, the church episcopate submitted a 15-point memorial to Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz, asking that freedom of press, speech, and conscience be made principles of the new constitution, now being written. Human liberties and human dignity should be fully guaranteed, the memorial said.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

HALF OF CHILDREN SUFFER TB YET ALL POLAND RETAINS HOPE—VISITOR REPORTS NATION IS GRATEFUL TO UNITED STATES

Poland today is a country where half the children have tuberculosis, and 100 percent of the people have hope.

A picture of the war-torn country—and its gratitude for American help—was painted today by Henry J. Osinski, executive secretary of American Relief for Poland.

Mr. Osinski has returned from 15 months behind Poland's own iron curtain, where he directed American relief supplies.

LOOK TO UNITED STATES

He will speak tonight to the Allegheny County branch of the Polish relief group at 7:30 p. m. in Soldiers and Sailors Memorial.

The slender, Buffalo-born Mr. Osinski is silent on political affairs, mostly because he intends to return in June.

But he is strong in the conviction that the average Polish citizen looks up to the United States as the greatest country in the world, and Poland's eventual savior.

"When we would take our trucks into small Polish towns," he said, "people would run up and kiss the painted American flags on the sides.

"People who hadn't seen an American in 6 years would tell me, 'We knew you would come'."

Crowds would gather around the caravan and give endless cheers for Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and possibly a few dimly remembered movie stars.

HIS AUTO CARRIED BY PARADERS

On several occasions the cheering crowds picked up Mr. Osinski's light sedan bodily and paraded it through the streets.

"It almost ruined it," he admits.

He said that his committee, which now dispenses more than a half-million meals a day was given complete freedom to tour in Poland.

Its food and clothing were given out only under strict rules—the strictest being that each person receiving help must know it was given by the people of the United States.

NO RACE OR CREED RESTRICTIONS

No government agency was allowed to distribute anything, and goods were given to those who needed them without regard to race or creed, Mr. Osinski said.

The help already given has been great, Mr. Osinski said, but it will have to keep up for at least another year.

Crops were damaged by floods, and the country is still far from recovered. An estimated 300,000 are still living in caves and German-built bunkers in Warsaw alone.

Most pathetic to Mr. Osinski are the children. Checks have shown that about half are suffering tuberculosis and another 35 percent are in danger of tuberculosis from malnutrition.

Their greatest immediate need is food, especially milks and fats. Mr. Osinski said any donation would help.

"It is the greatest advertisement for democracy money can buy," he concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention by a number of veterans who have their homes in trailers parked at the Washington Tourist Park that they are to be evicted. I also understand that these veterans have been living at this location for at least 2 years and many of them were compelled to invest their life savings in these trailer homes so that they could be located in this area where they could attend schools, job training, and where they could be employed while going to school at nights. Many of the wives are also employed in order to help their veteran husbands through school. These trailers have been kept neat and clean. The veterans have been and are good, respectable citizens. They have been paying the Washington Tourist Park

in the vicinity of $2,000 per month rent for the few facilities they receive. Everything possible has been done to make their trailer camp a good, quiet, clean, respectable community. They have not in any way interfered with the transient trade of the Washington Tourist Park, but they have taken pride in the area in which they live and have tried to keep it up in a way in which the transient trade does not do, as is a well-known fact to the park authorities.

When the veterans heard that they were to be evicted they immediately started out to check the surrounding area for suitable places to park their trailers. They looked in vain because there is not a trailer park within a radius of 25 miles that could accommodate 100 trailers. The Temple Trailer Park was the only one that compared favorably with the Washington Tourist Park as to cleanliness and accommodations but it is filled and will have no vacancies for several months. The other camps were filthy and unsuitable even though they had no accommodations. The zoning of the surrounding area is such that trailers cannot park anywhere but in an authorized camp.

When the veterans started to move into the Washington Tourist Park it was with the idea that they would be allowed to stay there until such time as the war housing emergency was over and they could find suitable dwellings for themselves and families. The war emergency is not over yet and the housing shortage is still acute. Therefore I can see no reason why the Department of the Interior should not allow the veterans to remain in their present location under the same status as they have been allowed to stay there for the past 2 years until the emergency is over and the housing situation is such that these veterans can be assimilated into low-cost, livable homes. I would like to recommend, however, that the present location be improved by installing running water and drainage on all of the trailer lots instead of only a few. I have inspected this area many times and having stopped at trailer parks across the continent, I find this one very well equipped for permanent trailer parking with the exception of the above improvement.

Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency in which even the temporary housing situation for the veteran must be taken care of and I hope you will join with us in protecting the rights of these veterans so they may keep their trailers, their only homes, in the Washington Tourist Park until the housing emergency ends.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I boarded a plane in Cleveland at 6 o'clock this morning, and the only reading matter I could find on the plane was the New York Times, and I had to read it for 2 hours. There is a lot of good reading in it, including foreign news. Thirteen foreign articles appeared in the New York Times this morning—dispatches from various parts of the world. I can readily understand why there is so much confusion on the floor of the House and why there is so much muddled thinking, not only in this country but throughout the world, when you get the substance of what those statesmen and politicians in other countries are talking about. As a matter of fact, I heard my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] tell about democracy at work in Czechoslovakia. I read an article concerning Czechoslocakia's confiscating all private industry and making it a part of the state. Well, if that is democracy, then I do not know what democracy is.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. O'KONSKI. With regard to democracy in Czechoslovakia, they recently hanged the Catholic monsignor for preaching his faith.

Mr. BENDER. While the gentleman is on his feet, will he conclude his earlier speech and say how he feels about this bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, it is hard to say what I wanted to say in half an hour, in 1 minute, but it is my opinion that we have been following a double-dealing, stupid foreign policy for the past 5 years, and this bill is merely a continuation of that same stupid, double-dealing foreign policy. By that I simply mean, if we are going to adopt a policy of fighting communism, I contend that as long as our State Department recognizes a government imposed upon the people of Poland by force and by aggression, so long is that State Department not consistent in its policy of fighting communism. There is only one way to fight communism, and that is to quit recognizing any government imposed by force that preaches the doctrine of communism. You are not going to stop communism by sending bread. I have more than a thousand communications in my office from people in those downtrodden countries, and not one of them asked for bread. They ask for freedom. They ask to be unyoked from this beast of communism that has been thrust upon them. Until we have cleaned house in our State Department, or we have a State Department that follows one consistent policy, you will never get rid of communism. They talk about stopping communism in Poland. One part of the State Department was asking the Polish Government to have a free government, but another part of our State Department, 10 days before that, unloaded $24,000,000 of Polish assets onto the Polish Communist Government so that they would have $24,000,000 to spread communism among the Polish people, telling them that the American Government wants the Communist Government to win.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman has made a much better speech than I could. I am glad he completed his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if they had a regime in Poland representing the Polish people I would be for lending them every possible aid, but everybody knows that the people of Poland are under the heels of a commissar, a Communist regime that is grinding them into the dust.

If you will turn back and read an article that came out the other day about the 14,000,000 slaves in Communist Russia, you will find this statement:

> Here, for example, is a part of the testimony of one Polish prisoner who had formerly been a judge. Here is what the judge said: "Half naked, barefooted, half alive, we arrived in the icy and deserted tundra where there was but a stick with a board nailed to it bearing the words 'Camp Point No. 228.' We ate rye flour mixed with water—uncooked. At night we slept in dugouts, lying close to each other for warmth on wet branches spread out on the mud."

Then he goes on to tell of the horrible treatment these slaves receive. He said:

> Many died each night in the camp, and orderlies would tear the clothes off the bodies and then drag them to the morgue, a primitive barn made of sticks and branches where piles of corpses lay.

I am for the Colmer admendment for the simple reason that in my opinion this money will go into the hands of those Communist dictators just as the money and the supplies did that went to Russia. They have distributed them and lied to the people about where they came from. Communist Russia never gave America any credit at all for the things we sent to Russia.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that 50 percent of the children of Poland have tuberculosis?

Mr. RANKIN. And they will die of starvation if we depend on the Communist regime to feed them.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They will certainly starve to death if they have to depend upon you and Mr. COLMER.

Mr. RANKIN. No; we have been more charitable than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] by a heck of of a sight.

I am opposed to any Communist regime or any Communist-dominated regime anywhere in the world.

Let the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House go into these matters and let the State Department or the administration break with this Communist dictator, this criminal that now has his heels on the neck of the people of Poland and then we can deal with the people of Poland themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence that has been presented here today will show you that we now have a bill before us which authorizes the Government of the United States to make contracts with Russia for relief, and with Russian-dominated countries for relief. Within a few days we shall have before this House a pro-

posal to send some three or four hundred million dollars of relief and armaments to Turkey and Greece in order to equip them to fight Russia.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin when he said that is double dealing, double talk. Unless amendments similar to the Colmer amendment are put in this bill, unless we can have United States supervision of these relief matters, food stations, clothing, whatever it may be that is sent, and unless the relief is withheld from Communist Russia and Communist-dominated countries I for one shall vote against the bill and take my chances with the good people of my district.

I do not propose to involve my taxpayers and my bond buyers in financing any such double dealing now or at a later date.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan the same question I asked the gentleman from New York yesterday: Does the gentleman feel that this measure is necessary for our common defense and for the welfare of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. To finance Russia? No. To finance Russian-dominated countries? No. To put relief in the hands of Russian-dominated governments to drive the people into their camp? No. I shall not vote for any such relief at any time; and because I do not believe such is for the common defense and for the welfare of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment would prevent the giving of relief to Russia itself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, but what about the Russian-dominated countries? If we could ascertain the facts we would find millions of people behind the iron curtain in Russia who are opposed to the Communist Government now controlling and often liquidating the Russian people. My heart goes out to them, but I will not fight my enemy and feed him at the same time. I will fight him, but I will not feed him at the same time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the gentleman speaks the sentiments I have so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman vote for relief for Germany?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly, because we are dominating Germany. We are dominating and occupying Germany and of course I would vote to feed the Germans over which we exercise such control.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is for relief for Germany but he will not vote for relief for the Polish people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Poland is under the Russian heel. No one knows that better than the gentleman. Why should I put money and food in the hands of the Russian group in Poland to drive the Polish people to go along with Russia and against us?

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not the gentleman's reason.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes. The gentleman should not try to sell me his bill of goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the arguments for and against the Smith amendment, the Colmer amendments and the Mundt amendment and the general debate on this House Joint Resolution 153, to provide relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. Among the six countries specifically named by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin we find Poland, and we find great opposition contained in the Colmer amendments to relief to that particular war-torn country because it is admittedly a Communist dominated country, in spite of elections in January.

I am constrained to remark that there is no necessity this year to adhere to the usual custom in the House of holding exercises commemorating May 3, known as Polish Constitution Day—so many friends of the Poles expressed themselves so succinctly and so unqualifiedly here on the floor of the House during these past few days and have indicated their sympathy for these freedom-loving, freedom-seeking and for freedom-dying peoples as is manifested in their history.

From my background, from letters I have received from Poland, from statements of representatives of relief organizations operating in that country, I know that there is great distress and need of care, especially for the undernourished children. General conditions make continuous care mandatory in order to survive. Insufficient food is causing great loss of life due to exhaustion by the workers, thousands upon thousands of whom are physically weakened from the years in concentration or other work camps.

Relief can be gotten to these needy in Poland without being stolen and can be safeguarded by the administrators the same as private relief organizations who are presently doing such magnificent, though far short to be fully effective, work in that country due to their own limitations of supply.

This bill is a humanitarian measure and concerns underfed, undernourished, and starving peoples of countries devastated by war. General Eisenhower said there was no greater devastation in any capital city than Warsaw. This being so, Poland should be included in the countries to which this relief will be given and for that reason I shall vote against the Colmer amendments.

AID TO POLAND

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will we give aid to the hungry peoples of Poland? That is the question now before the Congress. I say that the Polish people are more entitled to assistance from this Nation than the peoples of any other foreign nation. It was the Polish people who first fought the Nazis—and they fought the Communists at the same time. In thus carrying the torch for freedom and democracy against the dictatorial hordes of Europe and Asia they served the freedom-loving peoples of all the world. They did so at the expense of despoiling their own land. In the aftermath that followed no nation was despoiled as Poland was despoiled and no peoples were persecuted as the Poles were persecuted. Why? Because they had the courage to fight for the same ideals of freedom that the United States has advocated for over 170 years. I plead with you to adopt no amendment that would interfere with our attempt to feed the starving remnants of a Poland whose courageous fight against dictatorship in the face of insuperable odds equaled that of the bravest nations in history.

DO NOT AID COMMUNISM

There are those who say this will aid communism—but there are adequate provisions in this bill to protect us from aiding communism. We propose to help feed those starving in Poland and we propose to tell the Polish people who is feeding them. That will not aid communism—it will fight communism for it will show the Poles that we are their friends.

POLISH PEOPLE ARE NOT COMMUNISTS

The Polish people are not Communists, they are Christians of the most devout type. They abhor communism, they detest it. We should help them as a nation get back on their feet. We should help them become a strong nation. Then as a nation they will throw off the Communist fetters that presently have some control over their government. We can today help them fight communism by voting in support of this bill to feed their hungry deserving people.

With the humanity for which we as a people are famous I am sure you will not fail to respond to the needs of our courageous allies in Poland by voting in their support. Your vote for this bill will be cast on the side of God.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a hungry stomach knows no politics. It seems to me it would be a short-sighted policy to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi denying absolutely any relief to the people of a so-called Communist-dominated country. In the first place, there is the difficulty of defining this term, but more important and fundamental than that is the humanitarian and, indeed, as I see it, intensely practical proposition that in Poland and Hungary, the two countries here chiefly concerned, the destitute and starving people whom this great Nation seeks to help, are just as hungry, just as cold, and just as sick, and just as much in need of food, clothing, and medical supplies as those in other countries whose politics do not follow the Communist line.

Ambassador Lane, recently returned from Poland, and other authorities, tell

us that not over 10 percent of the people in that devastated country want a Communist government. Ninety percent must bow to the will of this small clique because force so dictates.

In Hungary in the recent elections, only 5 percent voted for Communist candidates, 95 percent registering their courageous protest against the regime.

If we deny to these vast majorities in these two countries any relief when we are extending it to their stricken brothers in neighboring countries, it will be a demonstration to them, not of the warmth of our generosity, but of a cold and purely political approach to the problem of human suffering.

It is not necessary for me to restate my position on communism. It is well known to this body and to the people in my district, but I do say to the House that the way to fight communism is not only frontally, but also, and perhaps more important, by demonstrating to those who have embraced or are about to embrace this ideology, that there is a better idea, there is a nobler philosophy, known as democracy, which has its roots in Christianity.

It is argued that if relief is denied in these so-called Communist-dominated countries they will rise up in revolution against those in power and overthrow them. My answer to that is that it is far more likely to win adherents to the cause and principles in which we believe for these people to see the essential difference between those who would deprive them and those who would succor them. It would be, in my judgment, a tragic mistake for us to allow ourselves, because of our justifiably embittered feeling about communism, to be swept off our feet to take action which not only is violative of humanitarian principles, but is also against our own enlightened self-interest.

I am aware of the duty which we owe to those who must foot the bill for this relief. Much as my heart might dictate charity, I would feel hesitant to vote for the measure before us, were I not entirely convinced that it is essential to the pattern of our country's defense and the role of world leadership which, whether we wish it or not, is now ours. I favor every type of safeguard to insure that this food and clothing be not used, as it was so frequently in the UNRRA days, for political purposes. We must not turn it over to any of these countries to parcel out to their friends for votes.

There are many safeguards already in this bill directing relief to be stopped when it becomes apparent that such abuses exist, permitting our representatives to go into these countries and see what is happening, and allowing the press and the radio to report. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota which will say, in effect, that in any case where it is considered necessary, an American mission may go in to supervise in detail the distribution of these supplies. I think that is only reasonable and we should insist upon it to be sure that our objective to alleviate hunger, nakedness, sickness, and human suffering is achieved and that the taxpayers' dollars are not wasted. I believe the vast majority of the American people, when these protective provisions are written into this law, will wish to share their plenty with these desperately needy in the war-devastated areas.

I favor naming the countries where this relief is to be extended, with an emergency provision for a small amount to be expended if some pestilence or sudden catastrophe should arise elsewhere. I agree with those who say we should not write a blank check.

I understand an amendment is to be offered to permit a portion of this relief fund to be turned over to the Children's Fund which was recommended by ex-President Hoover in his testimony. One who has been seen, as I have, tragically thin little children in three of these countries concerned, in the raw days of December, their little hands purple with the cold, collecting faggots or picking over an ash heap to find some half-burned clinkers from which they could extract a few flickering grains of heat, could not fail to support this permissive amendment.

It is also my understanding, that in some of these countries it is intended to sell a part of these supplies. In other words, they will not entirely be distributed to the destitute, but some of them may be sold to those who can afford to buy them. Anyone who can pay, should do so. It is, of course, a fact that in some of these countries there is such a shortage of actual goods that even those with money to pay for them simply cannot get them. If any of these supplies are sold, we should require that funds derived from such sales be held in a separate account which can only be used for relief and rehabilitation under the approval and scrutiny of United States representatives.

There is probably one place where we must draw the line on relief. The people of this country should not be required to put up money to supply food and clothing to the people of the country which is paying out reparations under treaty. My understanding is that this situation applies only to Hungary and that an amendment will be offered to meet that situation. The treaty with Hungary has not yet been ratified by the Senate. Such an amendment will not deny relief to Hungary, as I should not wish to do, provided the Senate does not ratify the treaty. On the other hand, I am informed that Hungary is scheduled to pay $23,000,000 a year to Russia in reparations. The people of this country will not, I believe, support a decision which means that the food and supplies which we pour into a country are to be taken out at the other end by Russia. The way to meet that situation is by denial of ratification to an arrangement which imposes such a burden on a nation struggling to survive.

Under the safeguards which have been and will be written into this proposed bill by way of amendment, I shall support the measure. My heart, my conscience, indeed, as I see it, the welfare of my country would not permit me to do otherwise.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to associate myself with the views of my colleagues the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] and the gentleman from Connecticut. It seems to me that it would be fatal strategy, at this juncture of our affairs, to confess defeat of our democratic ideas in Poland and Hungary, and abandon those grand peoples to the tender mercies of the Communist regimes imposed by Russia upon them. I believe that our concept of human freedom burns in their hearts; we must not fail them or appear to abandon them in this dark hour of their affairs.

And at the same time I want to mention here again Czechoslovakia, as I did earlier in the day, as a country excluded from our interest and support only because, by their own enterprise and devotion, they have made greater progress in the restoration of normal conditions than some of their neighbors have been able to do. I regard Czechoslovakia as the most hopeful of the central European countries now under the shadow of Soviet influence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, this debate develops the almost insoluble problem, moral as well as economic and political, that confronts us and the world. I am afraid that we will not be able to solve it here today. I wish I were as sure as some of my brethren seem to be here today of their position. However, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which, I think, will obviate, in some degree, at least, the almost insoluble difficulty of distribution which confronts us.

Our whole instinct and desire in this legislation is to relieve suffering, avert death and starvation and disease of people who are innocent. How to do that and at the same time avoid subsidizing the Soviet Government, which is the incarnation of everything, in my judgment, that is evil, is a problem that I do not believe we are going to solve here today. If by adopting the Mundt amendment we will make it possible for wise and strong representatives of the American desire and purpose to go into the individual communities and deal at first hand with the people who are suffering and in need, making their actions conform with our standards, then I am for the Mundt amendment, and I think it will go a long way toward solving the problems confronting us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read it.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Mundt amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr MUNDT] to the Colmer substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. So that we can clear up the situation, may I inquire of the Chair if it is not true that if we should now vote down the Colmer amendment it would also vacate the amendment which we just approved so overwhelmingly?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not also true that if we vote for the Colmer amendment we have automatically put out the Smith amendment? That was the original amendment. The Colmer amendment is a substitute. If we now vote for the substitute we do not have the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event we will still have to vote on the original Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be helpful to get unanimous consent to have the Clerk read the Colmer amendment as it will read now with the Mundt amendment attached thereto? I so move.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the Mundt amendment has just been read. I will not object to the Colmer amendment being reread, but I do not see any use in having any others rereported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Should we not have the Smith amendment read now?

The CHAIRMAN. We are not ready for that. It would not be in order at this time.

Mr. COLMER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. In order to clarify the matter, is it not true that the present parliamentary situation is that the Mundt amendment to the so-called Colmer substitute has been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. And that if the Colmer amendment is now adopted, that would leave out the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. We would have to vote on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot believe that our former Speaker wants to decline the opportunity for the House to act intelligently on this matter. We are in a parliamentary tangle, and I wish, on reconsideration, he would permit the substitute as amended to be read to the House so that we can vote intelligently. I ask that the former Speaker extend that courtesy to the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am going to extend that courtesy, but I am going to object to any more speeches being made on one side or the other of this question under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota that the substitute amendment as amended be read?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. COLMER for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence, as follows:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation a relief-distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief-distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read at this time so that the House may have the full picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than $15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the Colmer amendment would automatically defeat my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the effect of it.

The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 127, noes 104.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. COLMER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 135, noes 110.

So the substitute amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand the amendment that was just voted on, as amended by the Mundt amendment, was a substitute for the Smith amendment. Then, why do we vote on the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the original amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I make a point of order against the request for a division. It came too late. The vote was announced. The result was announced and the decision of the Committee was announced. Therefore, the request for a division comes too late. That is my point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, on that point of order I would like to be heard. There was confusion all over the Chamber. I was seeking recognition to ask for a division. The fact that it was announced prior to that has no bearing upon the point at all.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not recognized for that purpose. The whole thing was decided and the vote was given and there was a pause. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair paused for an appreciable period of time, after the decision of the Committee was announced by the Chairman, and no demand for a division was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of any vote is to ascertain fairly the judgment of the parliamentary body, and we have not passed on to the consideration of any other business. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I make the point of order that the House is out of order in voting on the Smith amendment after the Colmer substitute had been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RAYBURN. Permit me to say we have followed the rules of the House, even under the greatest stress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read that on which we are now voting by division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

Mr. BLOOM. The Smith amendment was read before.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the question that is before the Committee.

The question is on the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 136, noes 72.

So the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. As I remember it first there was a Smith amendment, then the Colmer amendment substituted, then there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] which was an amendment, not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Then we passed the Mundt amendment and then voted on the substitute as amended; so there was then no other amendment to be considered because as soon as the substitute as amended was agreed to there was no original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the parliamentary procedure of the House. The Smith amendment had not yet been disposed of.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 1, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That from the sums appropriated pursuant to this section the President may make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children, and such contributions shall not be subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this joint resolution, but after $15,000,000 has been so contributed, no further contributions shall be made which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States, (1) to constitute more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments, including the United States; or (2) to exceed $50,000,000, whichever is the lesser."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if he will change his amendment and provide for sending it through the International Red Cross I will be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will listen carefully to the explanation of the amendment. It authorizes support by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund which was unanimously adopted by the first General Assembly of the United Nations meeting in New York last December. Its purpose is to provide assistance for three main groups, needy infants, undernourished children, and nursing mothers.

President Hoover in his testimony said that he particularly favored "aid to the United Nations project for the special feeding of subnormal children." Now, this fund has already been set up and if the gentleman from Mississippi will listen, I will advise him that the man already appointed to be its Director is Mr. Maurice Pate who served with Mr. Hoover in the American Red Cross after World War I. He served also as President of the Polish Relief Commission from 1939 to 1941. He has been director of the American Red Cross in charge of relief to prisoners during World War II. So we are sure that the fund will be managed by one who has been working under the Red Cross all these years and has the highest qualifications.

A unique feature of this organization is that it does not operate by giving its food to the governments of the various countries in which it works. It maintains title to its relief supplies from the time they are procured here in the United States or elsewhere until they reach the ultimate recipient. The distribution will be handled and controlled by people who have been carefully trained and who have had long experience in the work of the American Red Cross.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why not let the Red Cross handle it?

Mr. JUDD. Because the American Red Cross, first, is not in a position under its charter to carry on relief in areas for which our Government does not have specific responsibility as we do, for example, in Japan and western Germany. Furthermore, there are many real advantages in doing this on a cooperative basis under the United Nations, if we can do so without the abuses and bad results we had under UNRRA, which there is every reason to believe we can. We know what the administration of this children's fund is going to do. It will not be welfare work such as we had during the depression. It will be hard-headed efficient relief such as Hoover gave after World War I, and such as Red Cross experts have always given. It will bring relief to the groups in a population whose need is greatest, most urgent, most immediate.

The Members of the House are divided with respect to this whole joint resolution. Some are in favor of the resolution, but they may be against this amendment because, they say, we should have a separate bill after awhile for $50,000,000 or some such sum for the children's fund. I hope those Members will carefully reconsider before they vote against this amendment. I am afraid that if they do not vote today to authorize the President to make contributions from this general relief appropriation to the children's fund, a separate bill may not be taken up for weeks or even at all. Let us at least do this much now. If need for more in a separate bill is demonstrated later, this will not prevent action then.

My amendment provides that the President may, if he wishes, contribute to the emergency children's fund up to $50,000,000 of the sum authorized in this joint resolution. It is provided further that he can make initial contributions of $15,000,000 to get the work going right away. We have to get help to those children in the next few critical weeks. He cannot make additional contributions from the total of $50,000,000 authorized until other nations have come through, so that the aggregate amount ultimately given by the United States will not exceed the 57 percent which has been assigned to us as our share and in no case will it exceed a total of $50,000,000.

Those who are in favor of House Joint Resolution 153 will, I hope, vote for this, and then we will make sure that those who need it most will get help. On the other hand are those who are opposed to the whole joint resolution. You, too, should vote for this amendment, because if the joint resolution does pass, as I hope and am confident it will, you will thus make sure that such money as is given will go to the place where there is reason to believe it will have the greatest chance to do the most good. Surely, whatever else we cut down on we cannot cut down on hungry babies and children and nursing mothers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If you want the hungry children of Europe to get this money, do not send it through the Tower of Babel, but send it through the American Red Cross and the International Red Cross, and it will feed 10 times as many children as you intend to do.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I am in great sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, and I think something should be done. But, I would like to have the gentleman clear up this one thought: What is the difference between the $15,000,000 that the gentleman speaks of and the sum of $50,000,000 that he speaks of? I would like to have him explain that to the Committee so we will understand where the difference is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Let me say to the gentleman from New York, that if we were just to provide, as did the resolution I

originally offered in committee, that not more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount raised for this International Children's Fund under the United Nations should be given by the United States, we could not move until the others had moved. I believe the President of the United States should be able to make an initial contribution of up to $15,000,000 to this fund to help get it going. Then, any additional contributions by us would be dependent upon whether others make a similar contribution.

Mr. BLOOM. When the gentleman speaks of 57 percent does he mean 57 percent of the $610,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. No. I mean whatever special fund is raised for the children. We will give up to 57 percent, but not to exceed a total of $50,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. But we only obligate ourselves for $15,000,000 first.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. We authorize $50,000,000 if others contribute their share. But even before others contribute their share we authorize the President to contribute $15,000,000 to this fund to help get it started quickly.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman has a very good amendment there and I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman if the money which is taken from this fund that has been provided here would not be taken out of the distribution by this Commission which has just been provided for by another amendment and placed in the hands of an international organization?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it would be. The money authorized in this amendment would be given to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations, which is already set up. If I had time I would like to read from their resolution. It is very carefully and explicitly drawn. The executive board of the fund has representatives for a great many countries. It has laid down its policies for administration of relief and they are just as strict, in fact, some are more strict than are the limitations with respect to race, creed, political belief, and that sort of thing, in the joint resolution we are considering.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman have in mind limiting the $15,000,000 to orphan children?

Mr. JUDD. No; the assistance goes to all needy children.

Mr. O'HARA. What about the children of Communist parents? How are you going to separate them?

Mr. JUDD. They will not be separated, the administrators are in charge of the relief until it goes to the ultimate consumer so that the child of Communist parents will get neither more nor less than his need entitles him to. The main work of the fund will be to give one feeding a day to these children, so there will be at least once a day that they will get something nutritious to eat. It is hoped to get up to 600 calories in that one meal. I certainly would not withhold Minnesota powdered milk from a half-starved child just because the parents are Communists, or perhaps profess to be in order to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a general impression in this country that the Soviet Union has in the United States a great many agents spreading the Communist ideology among our people. I think that impression is well-founded.

I should like to ask this question: Where does the Soviet get its money to pay its agents for doing this work? In 1933 the President of the United States officially recognized Communist Russia. The quid pro quo for that courtesy allegedly was discontinuance by Russia of Communist promotional activities in the United States. Only the naive believed the agents of the Comintern would be withdrawn from the United States. At about the time recognition was given Russia, the Congress of the United States passed the Gold Reserve Act and raised the price of gold from $20 to $35 an ounce and authorized the Treasury to purchase gold at the increased price from any country that offered to sell it to us in unlimited amounts. The United States bought more than $700,000,000 of gold from Japan and paid for that gold with scrap iron, oil, airplane parts, and so forth, which Japan later threw back at us in the form of bullets and bombs.

The Treasury also bought gold in large amounts from Russia. With the credit provided by that gold the agents of Stalin were amply provided with the funds to carry on their activities in this country. Bear in mind that this is the source of the means by which Stalin has operated in the United States of America.

I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury a few days ago and asked him whether the Treasury still favors purchasing gold from Russia. His answer was in the affirmative, which means that the administration favors continuing the policy of providing the funds for Stalin to carry on his communistic activities in this Nation. It means precisely that and nothing less.

What, I ask, is our foreign policy? Where do we stand? It is being proposed on the one hand that we deprive Russia of the facilities for Communist expansion in Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, while on the other hand we continue through gold purchases from her to supply her agents with a vast amount of funds to carry on her communistic activities in our country.

I am not one of those who believe communism can be stopped by war or foreign grants of money. I am only pointing out the utter inconsistency of the present policy of pouring money into Europe and elsewhere to stop communism while at the same time supplying the means for its propagation here at home. Let me add, however, that if communism should overwhelm us, which God forbid, it will not be because it was foisted upon us from the outside but developed endogenously.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the leadership, which is anxious that we speed this relief bill onward, whatever relief it provides, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr. JUDD a question publicly. Dr. JUDD, as you know, this particular program of relief of $350,000,000 is generally a program of relief for approximately six countries. This is separate from the children's fund program for relief which it was contemplated would come up later. This general relief program is for $350,000,000, and the proposed program for the children has been an additional $50,000,000. I want to ask you whether in your opinion you feel your amendment, by putting the children's relief under this fund, will cut the total amount that will be available for children in those countries in the overall picture?

Mr. JUDD. No. My honest judgment is that this is likely to increase the amount they will get because I am genuinely afraid, I will say to the gentleman, that if we do not take care of this now in this resolution, an additional resolution coming along later when we are in a legislative jam near the end of the session will not get enacted at all. I am afraid if we do not act here the children's fund may not get anything, or at least not in time to save many, many lives.

Mr. FULTON. Therefore, we are debating on this question on the basis that it will not hurt a later approach to the children's fund.

Mr. JUDD. If the need for more develops later and it is demonstrated, Congress can and I think will provide more money. But I want to make sure now that as much as possible of the money that is provided for in this joint resolution will go where the need is greatest.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] just said with reference to the amount for the children. I think it is imperative to do what is necessary now and not wait until later. I think this will help the whole proposition, and that is why I am following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to have the gentleman's comments. I simply wanted to bring out this point so it would not come up later as an objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] seems to be a very, very good amendment. I wonder if by authorizing $50,000,000 for the children's program we are not automatically cutting down on other relief and cutting it down to $150,000,000 rather than authorizing $200,000,000 as the bill now stands.

Mr. FULTON. That is a part of my question, whether it cuts the total amount of relief down.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that if we leave the children's fund out of this and decide to put through special legislation later for the children's fund, we can do that, but if we do not do something now, the President cannot do anything about any of it. The one important thing to do is to get this relief program going as soon as possible and not delay any of the different parts of it. If we want to take a second guess later with other legislation, we can do so.

Mr. EARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand the language of this amendment to mean that in spite of any other restrictions in the bill this money shall be used as indicated in the amendment?

Mr. FULTON. No; it will come under the restrictions previously adopted by amendments here and which have been put in the bill by the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not correct in the answer that he has just made. This money will be administered by the International Emergency Children's Fund. Its director has already laid down restrictions and limitations which are similar and in some respects even more strict, but are not identical with those we have adopted here. It cannot be handled under two sets of restrictions. For example, the conditions as to how credits are to be extended, and so forth are not applicable and should not be applied to contributions to the children's fund.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman has made a real point. This children's fund then, is not under the particular restrictions of this bill. The funds are being taken out of the general relief program and a separate program is being made of it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the House would like this matter cleared up. Do I understand that this fund is to be used in Communist-dominated countries?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it can be used in Communist-dominated countries the same as the rest of the $200,000,000 which has already been voted can be used in Communist-dominated countries subject to restrictions such as I have already referred to.

Mr. BARDEN. What was the reason the gentleman objected to putting the same restriction upon the use of these funds that we placed upon the rest of the $200,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. Because under the rules and regulations adopted by the management of the children's fund these essential restrictions have already been established. It has been in the process of organization since last December. This is to authorize our contributions to it to help it get actual field operations going. It, itself, adopted similar restrictions long before we came along.

Mr. FULTON. If this is not under the same restrictions as the rest of the bill and is a separate program, I believe it is cutting down the total amount of relief, and it may react against the children's fund later, therefore I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 145, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Strike out of section 1, lines 3 and 4 the following: "to the President not to exceed", and add after the end of section 1 the following:

"The President, by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director, to be known as the Director of Foreign Relief, said Director to be paid a sum not to exceed $15,000 per annum. The Director shall, in turn, appoint citizens of the United States, without any criminal record, and having no affiliation or membership in the Communist Party, to oversee relief in all countries needing such relief. These citizens to be paid the regular amounts according to their civil-service rating plus expenses while on duty abroad, and volunteers may be appointed at the discretion of the Director, and, if military or naval personnel, they shall continue to receive their regular pay and allowances as though on active service. All civilian persons appointed by the Director of Foreign Relief shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall certify to the Director of Foreign Relief their citizenship, criminal record, if any, and political background, and affiliations. Files shall be kept by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on all these persons and such files are to be available at all times to Members of Congress and all Federal officials acting in an official capacity."

Strike out section 2. (a) and substitute therefore the following:

"Under the direction of the Director of Foreign Relief, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the Director, in such quantities and on such terms as the Director of Foreign Relief may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948."

Line 17, page 3 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 23, page 4 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 3, page 5 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Strike out "SEC. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State."

Strike out "SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The Director of Foreign Relief shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I want it to be clearly understood that it is in no way a reflection or criticism on the work of the committee. I was very happy to hear at the beginning of this debate one distinguished member of the committee make the statement on the floor of the House that he would like amendments, in fact, that the committee felt that the bill needed amending. This seems to me quite apparent as we have seen a good many amendments offered by members of the committee.

It seems to me that if we turn back the pages of history a little we can see that this country of ours did the most outstanding piece of relief and welfare work not so very long ago when Herbert Hoover took over and administered Belgian relief after World War I.

It is my thought that if we can pattern the administration of this relief as closely as possible on what was done at that time we would come a little nearer perfection. I regret that owing to the change in the times volunteer service is no longer considered very important. It has seemed more necessary that this should be put under Government, and that the Director should be paid.

I think we all object to the blank-check idea—I know that my people at home object to it; and that is another reason why I have tried to get away from that and have a Director appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It also seems to me in view of the discussions on the floor of this House that it is very essential that this money be administered in these countries, and wherever it is administered, by reputable American citizens. That is why that requirement is also incorporated in this amendment. We have seen what can happen when our money and nothing else is sent abroad. We know of the fiasco in Yugoslavia and other countries. We must be careful, but we want to feed the starving.

An important point I want to make is that money alone is not charity.

Unless we are willing to send people over there to do this job, to see that our dollars go where they can do good, our intentions will not be accomplished. We can do harm with money if it is not properly administered.

The purpose of my amendment is simply the proper administration of the fund that we, the Representatives, are taking from the taxpayers. I would far prefer to see the American Red Cross

and kindred organizations go out and ask the people of the United States: "Do you want to give $200,000,000?" And I think they would give $300,000,000. I do not think we have the right to take their money to give to any charity. I never was taught to give away other people's money. It is one thing to lend money, but it is quite another thing to say: "I will take your $5 and give it to a relief that I think needs it."

This is a welfare bill, nothing more nor less, and as long as it is going to be administered by the Government, let it be administered so that it really will do good and not result in feeding the armies of Tito or some other dictator in Europe.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I rise to oppose the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from New York, because many of the things she has stated about her amendment are thoroughly sound, and the remarks she made in its support are remarks that many of us, I am sure, agree with and all should weigh carefully. As a matter of fact, I have an amendment to propose to section 6 which will provide an administrator to be confirmed by the Senate under the President. If the committee will study the structure of the gentlewoman's amendment, they will find that throughout this bill she has substituted "administrator" for the President, so that we would have an administrator negotiating with foreign countries as to agreements and as to the carrying on of other negotiations which are necessary under this bill. I believe that we should have an administrator, and, as I say, I have a brief amendment which I shall propose to section 6 patterned after the administrator amendment adopted in the Greek-Turkish bill in the other body. This particular amendment provides, however, for military personnel and for the complete substitution of an administrator for the President in the conduct of our foreign affairs in connection with relief, which I believe goes a little too far. On the other hand, everything that the gentlewoman has said could be stated in favor of an administrator to be placed under the direction of the President, to be provided in section 6 of the bill.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated and the same administrative result achieved without changing the conduct of our foreign relations by an amendment a little later in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the main purpose of the amendment which the gentleman will present, in case the amendment of the lady from New York is voted down, as I hope it will be, the recognition that the State Department is a policy-forming and not an administrative body? It was not set up to do administrative work; it has not had much experience in that field. As a result, there has been excessive confusion in most State Department programs with which I have had contact. All of us know how difficult it usually is to find the man in the State Department who has the real authority and power in a given program. Each official refers you to another. We want to have a one-man head—one man responsible. We do not want this to be improperly administered. We want to have one man, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to be responsible, as Mr. Hoover was responsible after World War I, so that we can be sure it will be administered to the greatest advantage.

Mr. VORYS. That is true, but we do not want to supersede the President of the United States, so the entire splendid argument made by the gentlewoman would apply to an amendment which will be offered a little bit later. I suggest that this amendment be voted down, and that you will remember her splendid remarks when provision for an administrator is proposed at a more appropriate period a little later in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and in China."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the belief that the majority of the Members of this House want it. The countries should be named. I believe that it would be a tragic mistake for us at this time to send word to these countries which are supposedly dominated by Communists that we intend to do nothing in their behalf. I do not believe that this in any way affects the so-called Colmer substitute, and it ought to be in this bill. We are faced with a situation that calls for relief. We want to give relief to these countries who are so desperately in need. Now we have the opportunity to do it.

I urge that the Committee at this time adopt this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman be willing to restore to his amendment an amount, say, $15,000,000, that could be used outside of the named countries? For instance, General Marshall has mentioned Trieste, where an emergency situation may arise. Would the gentleman be willing to restore that language to his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman suggest an amount?

Mr. VORYS. I would say $15,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be corrected so as to include the sum of $15,000,000 for the purposes named.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would then read, after the word "China":

Provided, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than $15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries.

Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported now as it would read if unanimous consent were granted for the gentleman to modify his amendment, this not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1 add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than $15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not object, I think the amendment together with the amendment to the amendment makes this bill incomparably better than it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I have asked for this recognition not so much to oppose the amendment as to see if we cannot clarify the situation a little bit. I think we have seen enough confusion here in the House this afternoon, and now we are tossing around countries and millions of dollars as children do toys. I do not know how many countries are in need. I doubt if many Members of this House know the condition of the government in Austria. I doubt if we know the conditions in Trieste and the other countries that we now seem to name.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. The countries that are named are those specifically named in the committee report, the State Department saying that relief will be limited to those countries.

Mr. BARDEN. Can the gentleman give me some idea of the type of government now existing in Austria?

Mr. HERTER. It is under military control.

Mr. BARDEN. Under whose military control?

Mr. HERTER. Russian, French, British, and our own, and there is a government that has been recognized, not by us officially, that is operating with a president and a chancelor.

Mr. BARDEN. What situation are we going to be in when we add this to the other amendments adopted?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think I can answer the gentleman's question about the $15,000,000.

Mr. BARDEN. I would yield to anybody who could clear it up.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand the question, it is: Why is the $15,000,000 made available to the countries not named in the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is one of the questions, yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to try to answer that. It is because the bill originally is intended to cover the relief needs in war-devastated countries. There are other countries which were devastated by war besides those named herein. Trieste is a case in point, Czechoslovakia is a case in point, and Yugoslavia is another case in point. There are others. Fifteen million dollars of this amount is therefore made available in the amendment to the Smith amendment for some unforeseen emergency which might develop in those countries not named by Mr. SMITH, subject, however, to the Colmer amendment as amended by the Mundt amendment. This means American missions to distribute the relief wherever that is necessary to obtain the desired results.

Mr. BARDEN. Then the gentleman is sending this money to Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MUNDT. No.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman propose that part of it shall go there?

Mr. MUNDT. We propose to make this $15,000,000 available should some unforeseen emergency, pestilence or something of that kind, develop, where we would be called upon to furnish relief to a country not named by Mr. SMITH's proposed amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. I thought we took care of this situation fairly well with the gentleman's amendment and the Colmer amendment, and clarified this situation as to where we wanted the money to go.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, we come back and the gentleman presents the same argument that he presented on his amendment in support of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not speaking for the Smith amendment. I am pointing out why the $15,000,000 is added. I am supporting that part of the amendment, but I am not supporting the Smith amendment. However, if it is adopted, as seems likely, I think the provision leaving $15,000,000 free for emergency use elsewhere is essential. With that provision in it I see no great disadvantage in the Smith amendment, but I am not supporting it.

Mr. BARDEN. You are supporting $15,000,000 worth of his amendment, but you are not supporting his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BARDEN. I find there is another gentleman who is just as badly mixed up about this as I am.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Can the gentleman ascertain why the bill was brought to the floor of the House in such a hodge-podge manner and why it was not written in committee where it should have been written instead of attempting to write it on the floor of the House?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I am very much disturbed about the same thing. If we keep shaking this bill from one side to the other, I am not so sure but that we will not tear up its very foundations. I am sure every Member of this body will recall that we overwhelmingly defeated this proposition within the last hour.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Under the Colmer amendment and the Mundt amendment, we can go into Communist-dominated countries, provided certain regulations are carried out. However, it has not been suggested that we go into any countries that might be so described except two. This amendment makes it clear that we are not under any circumstances going into Yugoslavia, Byelorussia, Romania, and Bulgaria except that $15,000,000 is left to the discretion of the President in the case of all the war-devastated countries in case some emergency situation should arise. But that will not be enough out of the whole amount to make very much difference. This makes it clear that Congress says we are not going into Russia itself, which is a war-devastated country, and which might conceivably receive relief even under the Colmer and Mundt amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Is the gentleman in a position to say at this point that the countries named in this amendment are the only devastated countries in Europe which are in need and which are not communistically dominated? I am opposed to financing communism directly or indirectly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. I asked the gentleman if you are in a position to say at this time that the countries named in the amendment which is now pending are the only countries in Europe that are war devastated and in need and which are not dominated by Communists.

Mr. VORYS. Why, no.

Mr. BARDEN. Then, why go along with the amendment?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows that Yugoslavia is a Communist satellite country. There are a whole string of other countries. But the point is in the matter of relief the United Nations and the State Department have said that no countries except the ones named in this amendment are going to be included. I quote from the hearings:

> The following European countries appear to have need of outside assistance: Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Poland. It is anticipated also that China may have emergency needs.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a few seconds of my time?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman was taking the time that was reserved for the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. This time was granted me by unanimous consent of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman was late in his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. OWENS: On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "that" and insert "that inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the general welfare of our Nation."

Mr. OWENS. Then I go on and state:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. I do not think it will take that long.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to again read the amendment which I have submitted. Right at the beginning, that is the first paragraph, my motion is to strike out the word "That" and insert the words "That inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the welfare of our Nation"—then proceed with the balance of the paragraph. This amendment goes to the constitutionality of the measure, and permit me to state

briefly the reason why I am submitting the same. Last week, and again yesterday, I heard a great deal of debate which brings very forcibly to the fore the statement that we have heard many times previously "that where we need light we have been getting more heat." But insofar as I am concerned it has left me very cold. I read through the entire record of the proceedings and also the report of both the majority and the minority members. While a great deal was said as to the need of certain of these nations of Europe and Asia for financial aid from us, particularly with regard to medical supplies, food, and the other articles which are mentioned in the bill, no constitutional reason was given for our gift of $350,000,000, which I understand is to be the first of a series of similar grants which former President Hoover estimated would reach $1,500,000,000 during the coming 2-year period. Our Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a gift to a foreign nation whether in cash, credit, or tangible property must necessarily involve also the congressional power to appropriate the public money of the United States raised by taxation and apply it for such purposes.

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution invests Congress with the power to "levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense of the general welfare of the United States." It is now well settled that under this provision Congress may appropriate and spend money raised by taxes for the national welfare, and that congressional discretion in selecting the means therefore is extremely broad. I appreciate fully the great need of the peoples of these nations of Europe and Asia. I appreciate also that something should be done to help them, particularly a nation like Poland, for whom we actually entered the last war, because of the vicious attack made upon that nation. However, we should be willing to state clearly and succinctly without hesitation that our purpose is to provide for the common defense and the general welfare. If we cannot pass the bill on that basis, then it cannot be passed at all. Then, if we were to grant that gift of money to the foreign nations for that purpose, it is, in my opinion, our duty to take the money from the fund which would be appropriated for the armed services. I am sure that you feel as I do that it is time for us to lay aside the methods which have brought us into two previous wars whereby we slapped and side-kicked from the sidelines without taking honest appropriate action. If we feel that we are in danger from the Soviet Union, let us take a firm stand with that nation. Tell them frankly and courageously what we feel should be done in the matter. If we of Congress do this the people of the Nation are going to respect our action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I will take but a few seconds in speaking in opposition to this amendment for it does nothing but amend the preamble. It does not change the content or the purport of the bill. It simply puts a price tag on this relief and tells the countries of the world that we are glad to help because we think it is going to pay off for us. I do not believe that would be appropriate. Certainly we have other obligations besides this one of selfishness in this matter. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the report of the committee to this House is an official part of this record and that if that indicates a constitutional basis for the granting of this relief it is sufficient without any preamble to the resolution?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the preamble to the resolution at least does nothing to change the purport or content of the bill. I never have had too much confidence in the controlling influence of a committee report, but I am convinced that this bill will stand any constitutional scrutiny as written at the present time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman tell me where in the bill there is a statement of purpose?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; at the very beginning it reads:

> This bill is to provide for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

That is the primary purpose of this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman admit that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that that is not sufficient in itself unless there is compliance with this section of the Constitution which I have read?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid I cannot recall all of the decisions of the Supreme Court here on the spur of the moment so as to answer your question, but certainly any Supreme Court that upheld our participation in UNRRA will uphold our participation in this all-American relief program.

I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because we are trying to finish this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.
>
> (b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsection (a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).
>
> (c) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).
>
> (d) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 3, line 13, at the end of section 2 insert the following:
>
> "(e) Not more than 10 percent of the appropriations authorized by this resolution shall be expended for the procurement of relief supplies in countries other than the United States. The relief supplies provided under the terms of this joint resolution shall be procured and furnished by the appropriate United States procurement agencies unless the President shall determine otherwise."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains two suggestions made by Mr. Hoover which I understand are acceptable to the Department of State and are drafted in the language provided by Mr. Tyler Wood of the State Department who was with us during our committee discussions.

The purpose is to not have us spend our money outside of the country for supplies with the hope that other countries will come in and contribute supplies; if they find they can get money from the United States they might not be disposed so to contribute.

The other provision is that the procurement in this country shall be under the appropriate United States procurement agency so as not to have foreign countries, recipients of relief money, bidding for supplies in the American market. These are what might be called good housekeeping administrative amendments, and I believe that there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, an hour or so ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and more recently the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said that our thinking on this entire measure is muddled. I agree with them. Clear thinking requires facts and most of the facts behind this measure were marked secret and have never been communicated to us. We are not only writing blank checks, we are writing blank checks in the dark.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the words "be made after", strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "December 31, 1947."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I said in support of the first amendment reducing the $350,000,000 to $200,000,000, this amendment is complementary to it. If they had related to the same section I would have offered them simultaneously, but being in different sections I could not do that. However, all of the arguments which I made on behalf of the other amendment apply to this amendment.

There is a wealth of information, facts and evidence telling us that there will be no need for relief after 1947, that there will be no need for relief in these countries in 1948 except some of the members of the State Department say, "With the possible exception of Austria." Not the probable exception of Austria, but the possible exception of Austria. They may need some limited relief after that time.

Now, that is only a possibility. If that should occur there is enough in the bill for them to get some stuff into Austria to take care of the situation or, on the other hand, Congress will be in session again at that time.

Why should we insist upon ending this on December 31, 1947? As I said before, when we passed the last authorization for UNRRA in the sum of $1,350,000,000, I offered an amendment at that time that the President should serve notice on UNRRA that we are withdrawing from UNRRA at the end of that time and there was a provision in the basic law that we should withdraw. Why? There must come an end to this relief. At some time we have to begin to whittle down. The amendment was defeated at that time, although the leadership said it was a very good amendment, that I should bring it up independently. I did not do that.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving the State Department, the administration, everything they ask for if we limit this to December 31, 1947. There is not a single word in the hearings against doing that and there is not a single word in the hearings that says that we should extend it beyond that date.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel that in case we accept his amendment, and along about November it looks as if the money is not going to be needed, some excuse will be found for spending it anyway, so that it would be better to have it strung over the whole year rather than until December?

Mr. JONKMAN. No, indeed not. The Committee was informed that the $350,000,000 was to last through the first crop year, and that is all they would need. We were given the same assurance, and this thing will drag on and on continuously otherwise. If there was any evidence whatsoever, if there was a scintilla of evidence of necessity to continue this through the fiscal year, there might be some argument, but there is none whatsoever, and at the same time there should not be any question in our minds whatsoever to adopt this amendment. Now is the time to do it.

Let me repeat: We are giving them everything they ask for. It is said here, for instance, that we are not strengthening the hands of our Secretary of State, General Marshall, if we cut it down. We are not cutting it down. It might even be that the date June 30, 1948, is merely a mistake, because the fiscal year ends at that time. There is no reason for it.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the House has already limited the amount to be expended to $200,000,000. It now proposes to run exactly counter to its efforts at economy if it passes this amendment, for this reason:

The bill reads, on page 2, lines 4 and 5:

No such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.

By the amendment it is sought to change that date and to provide that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after December 31, 1947. What will happen will be that all the credits will be established prior to December 31, 1947. The $200,000,000 will be used up anyhow and the administration will be in here on the 3d of January 1948 with a new bill asking for more money, whereas if you defeat this amendment, at least you show your intention that the amount you are appropriating, reduced as it is, shall cover the period to June 30, 1948.

I respectfully submit that the amendment must be defeated if you are to be consistent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that those who are economy minded ordinarily attempt to stretch appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather than to limit the expenditure to a shorter time? That is the proposition involved here. I hope that we encourage the spreading of the appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather than encouraging the speeding up of the spending of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: At the end of section 3 strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "(h) That when relief supplies procured with the funds authorized by this joint resolution are sold by any receiving government for local currency, the amounts of such local currency shall be deposited by that government in a special account and shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation purposes with the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is self-explanatory. It is, of course, obvious that most of these relief supplies—grain, and so forth—are going to be distributed in the countries through their regular distribution systems. This amendment provides that the money which constitutes the proceeds of the sale of these supplies shall be impounded in a special fund in the local currency and used only for

relief and rehabilitation purposes under the approval of the representatives of the United States. Similar arrangements were provided under UNRRA. We found that a similar proposition was going to be incorporated in the contracts to be made with the countries. This language in my amendment was drafted by a representative of the State Department. I do not believe there is now any objection to this provision.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not the intention of the gentleman that these funds that are recaptured in a country shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation in that particular country? Would not the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. VORYS. I feel that it would be better to leave the language as drafted because if the country involved and the United States representative agreed, conceivably, that some relief or rehabilitation should take place in another country and it could be financed by local currency, I do not think we should put in here something that would block that use of the money, although that is, of course, not required one way or the other. I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the administration by requiring that this money be expended for relief or rehabilitation in any particular spot.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment if funds were recaptured in Poland they could be used by this administration in Hungary? Then you have the question of foreign exchange and different currencies and all those problems.

Mr. VORYS. You would have the question of foreign exchange immediately, but if you can conceive of a situation where, let us say, in Italy as the result of the sale of American relief supplies the Government had an amount of lire on hand and could purchase something that could be used in another country needing relief, it seems to me we ought not to put in here anything that would prevent that sort of use of that currency. But the provision for impounding the local currency is such that I do not conceive that there would be many instances of that kind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not one of the purposes of this amendment to avoid any possibility of the thing that happened in Yugoslavia, where UNRRA sent in supplies and they were sold by Tito's government and he used the proceeds to pay more soldiers? We want the money that comes from the sale of these relief supplies to be used for relief purposes in their own country, if needed. There conceivably could be a case, for example, in Poland, which the gentleman mentioned, and which normally has agricultural products to export, where they would have a boom crop and surpluses. Under this amendment they would use the Polish currency from the sale of relief supplies to buy their local agricultural surpluses to be delivered at the border of Hungary, for example, to help relieve starvation there, if it should exist. Maybe such an instance would not develop. But if it should, then this is a good safeguard to prevent misuse of the funds a government secures from the sale of relief supplies in that country.

Mr. VORYS. Certainly no such provision would be carried out unless the President and the administrator wanted to do it. I do not see why we need to tie the hands of the President in this regard.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will not the gentleman agree to an amendment to his amendment to insert on the sixth line of his amendment after the words "relief and rehabilitation purposes" the words "within that country"? I think that will meet the situation. In other words, it allows everything that the gentleman proposes here, except it does not allow these recaptured funds to be carried from one country and used in some other country.

Mr. VORYS. I am in a position here of protecting the discretion of the President and the relief administrator. The gentleman wants to tie the hands of the President in advance, if the situation should arise where the United States representative under his direction would wish to ask that relief and rehabilitation be provided for some other country. I do not think it is necessary because I do not think many such situations would arise. But I do not believe we should bar that possibility.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota referred to the fact that in the event there were surpluses in Poland the money allotted for the Polish program could probably be used for the purpose of buying surpluses to use elsewhere. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman did not understand correctly.

Mr. DINGELL. Certainly that is a desirable thing. Would that not go further to aid Poland in her reconstruction for the future?

Mr. VORYS. No; the gentleman is in error in this way. If supplies were furnished to Poland which were sold and which resulted in income in Polish money, then there would be a possibility if there were surpluses in Poland that money which is in Polish exchange could be used to buy Polish supplies and conceivably used elsewhere. But it seems to me that is making our dollar do double work, and it is a good idea.

Mr. DINGELL. I am in agreement with that. I do not believe we ought to subscribe to any amendment at this late moment.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with the gentleman. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have followed this debate with much interest and with deep concern. I have been pleased to vote in favor of amendments specifying the countries to receive aid, such as Poland, and certain other countries, as well as to set up definite procedures to prevent American aid from being misused by Communist-controlled puppet governments. The debate thus far on the floor of the House has indicated, in my opinion, a desire on the part of the American people to help their less fortunate friends abroad and at the same time this debate has indicated a deep-seated conviction that the administration of relief funds in the past has been badly handled. This bill as written and as amended on the floor of the House does what it is supposed to do. It provides aid to the needy.

I rise at this point not to carry on that particular line of argument but rather to ask the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a question which many of my constituents have asked me—Does House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of the countries devastated by war, further weaken the United Nations?

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is "No."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman please explain his answer in more detail?

Mr. EATON. My explanation is simply this: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is an international organization and it ends shortly. The need developed after the ending of this. The matter was considered by the United Nations and our own representatives made this proposal, that from now on, in finishing the work that was left by UNRRA, we do it on a unilateral basis, and that was agreed to by the United Nations Authority. Consequently, it is not by-passing but is acting in accord with the understanding of the United Nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: In other words, the unilateral position, which the chairman has mentioned, throws the entire burden on the people of the United States, does it not?

Mr. EATON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, who else is participating in this relief program which is a perpetuation of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. The amount proposed for relief was $610,000,000. The United

States agreed to take 57 percent of that. We have backed away from that. Meanwhile, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have offered to come in and it is hoped that many others will do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What other countries are making a contribution to the $350,000,000 carried in this bill? What other countries are making contributions?

Mr. EATON. Here is what the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on December 12, 1946: A resolution urging the following performance of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: Residual relief needs in such countries be made during the ensuing year, through the development of the respective programs of all members of the United Nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the $350,000,000 program here presented is the portion assigned to the United States?

Mr. EATON. Not assigned, but suggested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, assumed by the United States.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What portion is England assuming and what portion is Canada assuming and what portion is Australia and New Zealand assuming?

Mr. EATON. My latest advice is that the definite assumption of those nations has not yet been made, but they have given assurance that they will stand up and do their part in accordance with the suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But as far as the record shows at this moment, then, the United States, through this $350,000,000 or $200,000,000 carries on the finishing up work of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. But we have taken no definite position that unless the other nations come across and agree exactly as we have that we will quit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly the point. We carry on whether they drop out or not.

Mr. EATON. Well, the obligation that we assumed we consider is our obligation, and in assuming that we discharge our obligation and do not mix up with the obligation of the others.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. The only thing we can go on is the record, and here is the last word on it from Dean Acheson:

Question. What assurances or expectations do we have of assistance to the countries to be benefited from other countries than our own as contemplated by the program?

Answer. The British have announced a program of $40,000,000 in aid to Austria.

I have already shown that is a straight loan; a sterling loan.

The Norwegian Parliament has voted the equivalent of $3,000,000. Denmark is making available the equivalent of $4,000,000. New Zealand has stated its intention to make available some meat and other commodities. On the basis of consultations which have been conducted with other countries we believe that additional contributions will be forthcoming if favorable action is taken by the United States, since some countries are waiting to see what action we take.

Mr. EATON. And I may say the New Zealand meat will be largely horse meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the question just asked and the answer given, that other nations will not contribute, are an argument for more and not less money, as far as we are concerned?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman can reach his own conclusion on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, and (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact we do not know what the amendment is or how much we should debate it, I object to the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE:

Page 4, line 25, strike out the word "and."

Page 5, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and (3) make certain that reparations payable by any such country to any other country by treaty have been postponed during the period of such relief."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in effect, provides that treaty reparations shall be postponed during the period of this relief.

The purposes of this amendment are:

(a) To provide relief for Hungary in spite of armistice reparations imposed by Soviet Russia;

(b) To prevent the payment of reparations by Hungary;

(c) If this is not done, to postpone the payment of these reparations until Hungary has recovered from the ravages of war; and

(d) To protect the American taxpayer from making payments toward reparations while he is paying for relief.

In his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body, the former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, remarked:

The nations receiving reparations from relief countries should be asked at once to defer reparations until these relief costs are repaid. The justice of this proposal lies in the fact that this relief obviously serves to preserve the manpower productivity of that country and therefore its ability to pay reparations (p. 56 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

I do not happen to believe that it is wise to require payment of the relief costs. It does not seem to me sound or feasible to require needy countries to borrow for relief such commodities as food, although it would appear quite proper to make rehabilitation and reconstruction items the subject of loans since these can be used in obtaining foreign exchange. But I do feel that the payment of reparations by such countries should be deferred while they are receiving relief.

The reason why this amendment refers specifically to reparations provided by treaty is because Hungary is, under the armistice provisions with Soviet Russia, currently paying $23,000,000 a year in reparations, which reparations would have the effect of increasing the relief needs of Hungary. In reply to a line of questions of mine, Mr. Clayton, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated in his testimony:

I want the record to be clear on this point: I am not informed that in the case of Hungary, reparations payments of $23,000,000 a year are of a character which would affect its relief needs. We have taken that into account in making these estimates (p. 38 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

It seems to me unfair to deprive Hungary of relief because reparations have been forced upon her by Soviet Russia under the terms of the armistice. Shortly after the end of the war the Hungarians manifested their desire for a democratic form of government by a vote of 95 to 5. They should not now be penalized for their anticommunism.

But with respect to the future and particularly in view of the President's address to the joint session of Congress on March 12, it seems to me essential that the American taxpayer should not be burdened both with relief for countries devastated by war and with payments which would eventually constitute reparations to totalitarian countries. Indeed, our distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall, has made this very clear in connection with the Russian desire to obtain German reparations payments from current production. General Marshall has indicated his unwillingness to transfer a substantial part of the burden of German reparations to the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to adopt the policy enunciated by the President, let us hew to that policy. No country can afford to follow two conflicting policies at one and the same time. We cannot successfully hunt with the hounds while we are running with the hares.

The problem of bringing relief through Communist-dominated puppet govern-

ments is at best a difficult one. Our experience with UNRRA left much to be desired. There will probably be grave difficulties in connection with this United States program. And yet I feel that we must not condemn to death by starvation those people who have been stalwart and stanch in their opposition to Communist pressure. We must endeavor to bring this relief to the needy and not to bolstering the black markets which abound under these Communist oligarchies.

But although this relief must go forward, it is entirely fitting that we should require that during the life of this legislation no reparations be paid since such reparations will increase the relief needs of countries to which we propose to bring relief assistance.

If this amendment is adopted, it will, in my opinion, have a most salutary and resounding effect. It will reassure the taxpayers of this country as to the expenditure of their money for relief in devastated countries. It will demonstrate our conviction that we played our full part in the recent war and that it is neither necessary nor appropriate that we now make additional payments by way of reparations. Finally, it will indicate to all the world that although we are bent on relieving suffering and starvation we are also determined not to assist the antifreedom forces which, in spite of the war's end, are still very much on the march.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments end at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the Chairman have any idea how many more amendments there are?

Mr. EATON. I am advised there are two more amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. EATON. Does that include the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Including the pending amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand if we finish at half-past 5 there will be at least three roll calls. There are some who have to be at the White House this evening.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, of course, I do not know how many roll calls there will be, and I do not know whether anyone can make any determination about that, but certainly whether or not there are roll calls or how much longer it might take would involve a determination by the leadership as to whether we should continue tonight or not. But the limitation of time would simply bring us to the voting point on the bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does our distinguished leader have any objection to this going over until tomorrow to be voted on?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know what the prospect will be in respect to voting, so I would not want to undertake to say about that. But, certainly, there should be no objection, if this is a fair limitation of time for the remaining amendments and the consideration of the bill, to conclude this evening.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me there should be 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. EATON. There will be that amount of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

SEC. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4 may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think it should be clear to the House exactly what this amendment means. A similar amendment came up before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was voted down because the purport of the amendment—and I ask this in a form of a question of my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], with whom I am generally on the same side—the purport of this amendment is to endeavor to cause the Senate to reject the Hungarian Treaty which is now before it because if the Senate approved the treaty relief would not move to Hungary. Therefore, if the House votes for this amendment, what it is doing is saying that if the Senate ratifies the treaty no relief shall move to Hungary. I ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the gentleman that as the situation looks now my amendment would appear to include only Hungary, but, of course, Austria may be called upon to pay reparations, in which case it would include Austria. The case of Italy is different since reparations under the Italian treaty will be postponed 2 years, so that Italy is not affected.

I will say this, that at the time my amendment was voted down in committee, General Marshall had not yet returned from Moscow. We now know that he is opposed to the American people paying out a lot of money in reparations, and it is my hope that these treaties will be defeated in order not to visit these reparations on the American taxpayers and also on these people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Did not General Marshall announce at Moscow the American principle that we are not willing in the case of Germany to pour in relief at one end while our former Allies take out reparations at the other, and does not that apply with equal force to the other peace treaties?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the House now has it very clearly that no relief will move to Hungary if the treaty before the Senate carrying Hungarian reparations is ratified, and that therefore the House would be saying that it wants a new Hungarian treaty if it adopts this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Relief will go forward to Hungary. The gentleman prophesies that the Hungarian treaty will be ratified. I am inclined to think that the other body will not do so. In any event, I want relief to go to Hungary and I also do not want the Hungarians and, incidentally, the Americans, to have to pay reparations to Soviet Russia. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is to provide relief for the Hungarians and not to deprive them of it. It is to protect the Hungarians from onerous and unjust treaty reparations. It is to protect the American taxpayers from the burden of reparations while they are burdened with relief.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman from Connecticut this question: Is it not a fact that the only ground upon which relief will not go to Hungary under the gentleman's amendment will be if the Senate ratifies the existing treaty?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. I feel that a country which needs relief as badly as Hungary should not be called upon to pay reparations. My purpose is to protect the Hungarians from the loss of relief, from having to pay reparations, and at the same time to protect the American taxpayer.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I ask either of these gentlemen who are members of the committee how Great Britain can pay $40,000,000 of this when she borrowed $3,750,000,000 from us and is now retiring from Greece because she cannot bear the financial burden there?

Mr. JAVITS. I respectfully submit that the question is not germane to this discussion, the $40,000,000 is a sterling loan of Great Britain to Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 90, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 5, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. Relief assistance under this joint resolution shall be administered, to the extent the President directs, by a Relief Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this act as the President shall prescribe. The Administrator shall receive such salary and have such staff as the President shall determine."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. In commenting upon the amendment offered earlier by the gentlewoman from New York, I think I described this amendment. This leaves the Administrator under the President, and does not attempt to substitute the Administrator for the President, but provides, as is provided in the Greek-Turkish relief bill in the form it passed the Senate, for a relief administrator to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate and to conduct the relief administration under the direction of the President.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk to the effect that a Senate confirmation might involve some delay. The United States Senate has already confirmed 12,500 executive appointments this year up to April 15. I am sure that a good appointment will be promptly confirmed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Administrator, under section 4, in the supervision of the distribution of these supplies that are purchased with the money that is authorized here, see that the people of these devastated countries who are without food and money to buy the food can get some of this relief?

Mr. VORYS. That is provided in the specimen agreements which were submitted to the committee The rationing system must not only provide for sale but for free rations for those who need it.

Mr. BARRETT. Who gets the preference—the man with the money or the fellow without the money to buy the food?

Mr. VORYS. As I stated, there is a minimum ration to be distributed, whether there is money available to pay for it or not. That is provided in the specimen agreements.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment simply substitutes for General Marshall another appointee by the President to be confirmed by the Senate. Not only is this a matter of foreign policy, but I wish to point out that we have General Marshall, a Cabinet officer, who has already been confirmed and who attends to these matters of foreign policy. I am convinced that today, particularly, would be a very unfortunate time to eliminate him by this bill and substitute anybody else for General Marshall just when he has returned from his mission to Moscow and made his report, as all of you know, last night. It seems to me that it would be quite unfortunate, as I say, to substitute anybody for him at this particular time.

Furthermore, this matter has been delayed entirely too long. I am afraid it is an unfortunate fact that because of that delay, some of which I thought was unnecessary although I may be wrong, many people are going to starve. Certainly when we already have an officer of our Government who has been confirmed by the Senate and is ready to act and who I think is acting excellently in foreign affairs, I cannot conceive of the idea of further delaying the matter to cause a confirmation by the Senate to be necessary, despite what my genial friend, the gentleman from Ohio, says about the 3,000 executive appointees having been confirmed. I call attention to the fact that we also had a Lilienthal confirmation debate.

One other thing, it is passing strange that although my friends on the other side have been talking about bureaus all these years and are still talking about them, you now want to create a new bureau to perform a function for which we already have someone who is quite competent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield gladly.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows that General Marshall is not going to administer this. According to a letter that we had from Acting Secretary Acheson, a man by the name of Mr. Dick Allen, formerly with the Red Cross, is the man who is proposed. If that man is as good as we are told he is, I have no doubt of his confirmation by the Senate. If there is something wrong with him, that is something else, but General Marshall is not going to administer this. We have already been told who is going to do it.

Mr. JARMAN. Of course, it would be administered in Europe. Undoubtedly that man would be appointed, I judge, from what the gentleman says, but why run any risk of further delaying this matter? Particularly as I say at this time, why slap General Marshall in the face?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentle- wants to have anything in the nature of relief revert to the kind of administration we have got on this relief program out of the State Department under UNRRA? I think that is about as bad as anything that ever happened.

Mr. JARMAN. Under UNRRA we had a director, just as the gentleman wants now, as I understand it.

Mr. TABER. Not confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. RAYBURN. The same man who appointed him would have to appoint somebody else.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; the same man would appoint him.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not more necessary than ever today to synchronize our relief efforts with our foreign policy?

Mr. JARMAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The man who is to be in supreme charge of our foreign policy should be in supreme charge of relief.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VORYS. My amendment leaves the man who is in charge of our foreign policy still with full responsibility over this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 120, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That House Joint Resolution 153 be amended by adding a new section thereto to be known as section 6 (a), which shall follow section 6 and precede section 7 of the resolution, as follows to wit:

"SEC. 6 (a). The officers or agencies authorized or designated to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall, wherever possible, administer said resolution in accordance with the following principles: That wherever possible dehydrated or dried foodstuffs shall be used, providing they meet the relief situation at the place where they are to be shipped, and meet the nutrition requirments of the people who are to eat the food. If consistent with these requirements foodstuffs of such types and kinds shall be used as may be helpful to our domestic economy."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of offering this amendment was to raise the problem of the administration of this act. I

am thoroughly in accord with the resolution and intend to vote for it, because in 1945 I made a trip with a subcommittee to Europe and learned by personal observation in what a chaotic condition the people of Europe live. I think I thoroughly understand the need for this sort of action but I think we should try in the administration of this act to mesh the welfare of the American economy with relief to the devastated areas and to the hungry people of Europe. I therefore mention the fact that where we can we should use dehydrated foods and we should use foods of which there are surpluses.

For instance, just to illustrate the point I am trying to explain, today there are on the market 4,000,000 pounds of dehydrated onions which the Army and Navy have turned back to the contractors who sold the onions to the services. The ratio of dehydrated onions to fresh onions is 10 to 1. That is, that each pound of dried onions was made from 10 pounds of fresh onions.. There are therefore 40,000,000 pounds of this food now on the market and if we do not find some outlet for it, outside of our own country, the whole onion market this year and next will collapse and our economy as far as those raising or handling onions will be very badly damaged.

Then there are some dried fruits that are also in surplus. Here the ratio is about 1 pound of dried fruit represents 4 pounds of fresh fruit.

In the dehydrating of fruits and vegetables, none of the vitamins or nutrition of the fresh product is lost. All that is required is to soak the fruit or vegetable in water, and it is ready for cooking. In the shipment of this type of food it can be seen that only one-tenth or one-fourth of the space or weight is required to give the same number of vitamins or the same amount of nutrition, as if the fresh product were sent. The resultant saving in hauling charges, ships, labor, and so forth, is tremendous, but the starving people get just as much food.

My only purpose in presenting this amendment is to try to get a little common sense into the administration of this act, because we have had so many curious results and disappointments from the administration of these various relief programs. If there are surplus foods having the proper nutritional value and of the right kind for the area and people involved we should use them and thus help our economy.

The question I want to ask the chairman is this—and I have heretofore presented this amendment to the chairman: Is it the gentleman's understanding from the hearings that were held that the matter of administering this relief will be in accordance with the principles of the amendment I have offered, namely, that we will use foods that have the proper nutritional value, that are of the right kind for the people involved, and, if possible, use foods which are in surplus?

Mr. EATON. I may say in reply to the gentleman from California that that is the assumption upon which the committee has acted, that we have the best food available, procured in such way as would be for the advancement of our own economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; your answer is appreciated and a good yardstick for administrators of this act.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Are these onions California onions?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Some are from California and some are from many other States. It is not a California matter, it is a humane matter, but of course we want these poor people to have the best, so, naturally, they should get some California fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment. The chairman's answer satisfies me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jonkman amendment and also a separate vote on the Colmer-Mundt amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the votes on the amendments and the bill go over until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today certain editorials.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa submittted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in Sunday's New York Times magazine section.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to hold hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in reference to General Bliss.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. CRAVENS) for today and tomorrow on account of absence on official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been troubled with the ultimate effect that the Reciprocal Trade Act will have on the industry of America and its labor force. When Congress extended this act in 1945 for an additional 3 years, and provided that tariffs might be

lowered by another 50 percent, we abdicated our control over tariffs and delegated all our responsibility to the executive department. It was for this reason that I then spoke against the passage of the bill and voted against it, and in the 2 years that have passed since then, during which I have given continuous study to the question, I have not changed my mind.

I represent the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, which comprises Atlantic, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. This is the home of many substantial industries. Food processing and the manufacture of clothing is carried on extensively. Commercial fishing is of great importance. And primarily, so far as tariff questions are concerned, the district, particularly Cumberland County, is one of the most important producers of glassware in the United States.

There are today between 9,000 and 10,000 workers occupied in the production of glass products in this district. The glassware manufactured here varies from ordinary containers to intricate apparatus for laboratory use, and represents a sales volume between $30,000,000 and $35,000,000 per annum.

The actual labor involved represents from 25 percent of the cost of fully automatic machine-made containers to 89 percent in the production of glass apparatus for laboratory or industrial use.

The average hourly wages, on a basis of a 40-hour work week, range from $0.985 to $1.644.

During the past 10 years, wage rates have increased 107 percent for male workers and 135 percent for female help. The plant and equipment investment per worker averages about $4,000.

I would like to say in passing that the labor relations in this industry in my district have been for the most part exceptionally good, and the combination of excellent management and high-grade workers made an important contribution of vital materials to the United States during the war.

This essential industry and other important businesses in my area are threatened by the power of the executive department to manipulate and decrease tariffs. The International Conference at Geneva, which began April 8, can spell the difference between the continuance and discontinuance of this and many American enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the exclusion of foreign products, and I recognize the necessity of cultivating foreign trade, but there are some specified industries which by their very nature require reasonable and adequate protection; and require, in my judgment, that that protection be guarded and provided by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, and not by the State Department, which in its zeal to cultivate our foreign relations often neglects our domestic welfare.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to restore to Congress at least the right of veto of tariff treaties which are harmful. I think the bill is necessary, and I hope it will have the prompt attention of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House. It does not interfere with the international conference about to proceed, and it does not retard foreign trade. It merely restores to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs, ultimate authority over tariff questions, the protection of the American worker and American industry. The bill is brief, and reads as follows:

A bill to require approval by Congress of Executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same becomes effective

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the effective date of this act no Executive agreement which contains any provision for reduction of tariff rates shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed for a period of 90 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 90 days the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall not thereafter be executed and shall for all purposes be void.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives the Congress jurisdiction over the regulation of foreign trade, custom duties, and tariffs. When Congress passed the original Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, as well as the extensions of that act, it abdicated its responsibility under the Constitution, and departed from a program which had been in effect in this country for many years.

It is my feeling that Congress should take action to restrain or delay the negotiating of reciprocal treaties which are about to be undertaken. If agreements are made now, they should be very flexible. World conditions are changing rapidly and trade agreements must reflect such changes.

If the United States is to help in mending a torn world, we must maintain a sound productive economy within our own borders. Domestic producers and manufacturers must be in a position to compete in the domestic market on an equitable basis with foreign products of similar character. An equitable tariff cannot be considered a barrier to trade; it has the opposite effect. Fair competition is stimulating to business. At this time nearly all of the other countries of the world with whom the treaties are to be negotiated have nationalized industry, and for us to believe that the free enterprise of this country can compete with nationalized industry in other countries is fantastic, unless adequate safeguards are provided. Before negotiating treaties we should have definite assurances as to wage scales that are going to be maintained abroad, agreements that governments will not use their nationalized industries to pour foreign products into our country to the great detriment of our own labor and industries.

Another matter of great concern is the question of protecting certain key industries in the United States which have made it possible for this country to wage two successful wars. Tariffs should not be lowered on the products of these key industries, as they are indispensable to our national existence and our very life. Most of these industries are highly specialized and require the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers. Labor costs are one of the most important factors, and we must not subject these industries to foreign competition that would render them impotent. While at the present time labor and industry seem to be far apart on many of their problems, their interests dovetail on tariffs, and many labor unions throughout the United States have joined in the protest against the lowering of tariff rates and have filled briefs with the Reciprocity Information Committee. One prominent union, representing thousands of workers, stated in its protest:

We are not opposed to imports even though those which are competitive with the products of our own American workers. We are opposed to the entry into America's market of competitive articles, delivered at total wholesale costs, duties paid, which are less than our costs of production.

We do not seek any monopoly. However, we will not knowingly or willingly permit any Government officials to deprive us of our work opportunities, and make us dependent on either the charity of the Government, our relatives, or our friends in order to satisfy the theories of some or to add to the riches of others.

We contend that with the changed conditions which now exist in Germany, Japan, Czechoslovakia, and other foreign countries, which in former years were the major source of supplies for American distributors of foreign hand-made glassware articles, there is no definite way at this time of knowing what the production costs of competitive hand-made glassware articles is or will be in the immediate future in those countries.

In addition, it is of interest to have in mind that millions of dollars worth of the latest American automatic machinery has been installed in these foreign countries, at little or no cost to the operators of such machinery and that their future costs of production will soon be much lower than it has been in former years.

One does not have to be equipped with a college training or recognition as an economist to realize that tariff rates which permit of competitive foreign-made products being delivered into America's market at less than American costs of production would soon result in the closing down of America's factories and unemployment for those American workers dependent upon such factories and workshops for their livelihood.

On the other hand, the American Tariff League which represents several hundred industries was very fair in its brief filed with the committee which stated:

Currently the world's economy is chaotic. The United States is at present engaged, as are other countries, in endeavoring to catch up with a demand for goods created by wartime shortages. We do not have any general surplus for export and it will take considerable time to reconstruct and improve our domestic facilities to meet domestic needs and create an exportable surplus. During this chaotic period, we respectfully submit, it is unwise to complicate the situation still further by a mass revision of our tariff.

Indeed the league believes it is unfair at this particular time to expect domestic producers to furnish to the Committee for Reciprocity Information the kind of statistical and informational material which the Committee ought to have in its work of correlating information about domestic production, imports, foreign costs, etc.

It is quite apparent that Congress should adopt a definite policy in connection with reciprocal trade agreements. It should:

First. Pass a resolution calling for a delay of at least 6 months before any new treaties are entered into, during which time a further study of world conditions could be made.

Second. Pass suitable legislation protecting the key industries of the United States which have helped win two wars.

Third. Provide that treaties would not be extended under the favored-nation clause unless all of the nations that would benefit from such an extension would agree to increase wage rates so that the commodities produced in the foreign countries would be on an equal basis with the commodities produced in this country. A study should be made to determine how far the foreign countries with whom we are to negotiate treaties are going in the nationalization of industries and ascertain the effect that such nationalization will have on the treaties to be executed.

I am including a memorandum entitled "History of Scientific Glassware in America" which, I think, is pertinent to this subject:

HISTORY OF SCIENTIFIC GLASSWARE IN AMERICA

At the time of the Allied embargo in 1914, the manufacturing of scientific glassware in this country was negligible, being limited to small shops working largely on repairs or filling shortages of import orders. Along with certain chemicals, drugs, dyes, and optical glassware, laboratory glassware had, up to this time, been a complete German monopoly.

Unlike the other industries mentioned, for some reason the German firms did not see fit to even establish an American subsidiary for making scientific apparatus. As a result, when the blockade became effective and imports were shut off, there was, in England and America, a real crisis.

England immediately called together her glass manufacturers and scientists and, in addition to establishing and subsidizing a school of glass technology, she placed all scientific glassware under the safeguarding of Key Industries Act.

Late in the spring of 1917 the Council of National Defense called together in Washington a group of American glass manufacturers and from that meeting a new American industry was born.

No promises were extracted, but each plant took upon itself the development of suitable glasses, the training of men, and the necessary capital that was required to meet what would otherwise have been a serious situation, not only to our War Department, but to every major supporting industry requiring the smallest degree of scientific research or control.

At the signing of the armistice, there were at least 15 factories producing blown chemical ware and double that number fabricating and graduating laboratory apparatus.

Early in 1919, before central Europe was in a position to enter the American market, there was a flood of Japanese glassware, which demoralized the entire market. This was so serious that in June 1919, this industry, the importance of which was still fresh in the minds of both our Government officials and scientists, was picked out as one of the few industries that should come under the administration's emergency tariff consideration.

In spite of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, the industry was carried on by a decreasing number of plants, who practically subsidized these departments. Until June of 1933, previous to the devaluation of the dollar, imports from Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan were seriously curtailing the American production of this small but important industry.

This industry is highly specialized and requires the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers and this branch of the glass industry is still considered by the War Department and Public Health Service as one of the critical industries, the supply of which must be assured.

Because it is an industry whose labor cost is the important factor, the controlling element of foreign competition is, therefore, the standard of wages paid in these countries, further amplified by the unstable currency condition in both Europe and the Orient.

At the outbreak of World War II, this industry was in a position to rapidly expand and furnish the Army and Navy medical services, as well as the Public Health Service, with enormous quantities of items that were required in the war effort. Such production would have been impossible if the industry had not been continued after the First World War, as modern science and medicine are entirely dependent upon scientific apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, I close by repeating that whatever ultimate changes it would seem wise to make in our tariff laws, it is, at the very least, necessary to immediately restore to Congress the veto right over agreements negotiated by the executive department, which may be regarded by the Congress as improvident. Congress has no right, in my judgment, to shirk its responsibility in this regard. My bill will again clothe Congress with the power and responsibility which belongs to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman ought to be complimented for the very splendid statement he is making this afternoon in calling to the attention of the House and the American people the real danger that lies before us insofar as foreign trade is concerned. While we all agree that we ought to do what we can to rehabilitate Europe, we must defend our own industries from this type of foreign competition, particularly from those totalitarian governments that are being established on the continent of Europe and elsewhere, and who are taking over the industries completely and subsidizing them and then later on, through reciprocal arrangements, are hoping to deluge this country with the cheap products of those countries in competition with our own labor.

Mr. HAND. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said, Mr. Speaker, and I know he has in mind, among other things, the very disastrous effects that unwise agreements would have on the great fishing industry which he represents and which to a certain extent I represent, together with shoes and textiles.

I am particularly interested in glass, which is particularly vulnerable in the present state of the law. I think if we restore the situation so that Congress can have the final say, the ultimate veto power, so to speak, on these unwise agreements that may be negotiated, that that will go a long way to solve the problem.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Committee on Ways and Means has given serious thought to many of those problems in the continuous hearings they have been holding over a period of days and weeks and will continue for some time to come, and I hope from that there will come some solution along the lines suggested, that others will have something to say other than the executive department of the Government.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. Both the gentleman and I have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much confusion and so many misstatements with regard to immigration practices, aliens, and displaced persons, that it is time to have the true picture open for inspection by Members of Congress. The State Department, the Department of Justice, and the well-informed are fully aware of the conspiracy of distortion and misrepresentation which has been launched to confuse the public and bedevil Congress on this subject.

Richard C. Raymond, adviser to the Department of State on displaced persons, recently stated:

We are concerned about a lot of false propaganda that is going around about the displaced persons. There is so much of it that there almost seems to be a campaign behind it.

In the last issue of the Monthly Review of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—March 1947—Commissioner Carusi exposes some of the false stories about immigration in an editorial entitled "Rumor Versus Fact."

Earlier this year Earl Harrison, former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, said:

Right now, there seems to have been launched a campaign of misrepresentation and distortion concerning immigration into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to disclose and expose this campaign of misrepresentation and to take up point by point each count of this conspiracy of distortion.

Count 1 of the conspiracy consists of the false propaganda that hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of refugees are entering the country illegally. A reputable news magazine recently stated that illegal entries were skyrocketing, that foreigners caught entering the country under false pretenses are now at a rate of 170,000 a year, and it implied that this number consisted entirely of refugees. There have also been newspaper editorials and articles which have been repeated and spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that 2,000 aliens enter the country illegally

every day. And here again an attempt is made to convey the thought that these are refugees seeking illegal entry into the United States from European shores. Commissioner Carusi answers this oft-repeated falsehood as follows:

Rumors repeatedly infer that millions of European refugees are crossing our borders illegally. These rumors may stem from the fact that many Mexicans are illegally crossing the southern border of the United States in quest of work. These illegal Mexican entrants are being apprehended and returned to Mexico by the immigration border patrol at the rate of 15,000 per month. If we may judge from protests that we are receiving from the area along the Mexican border, our expulsions of Mexicans are depleting the labor supply to an extent which may exceed the current rate of illegal entries. Be that as it may, these people are neither Europeans nor refugees. Attempted illegal entries from the European area are less than 100 per month; most of these aliens are stowaways who arrive on vessels in groups of from 2 to 10. Practically every one of these stowaways is apprehended by the captain of the vessel before he reaches port and is then turned over to our officers at the pier. They are being returned whence they came by the steamship companies which brought them.

Count 2 of the conspiracy is that all displaced persons of Europe are riffraff and undesirables.

There are approximately 850,000 displaced persons in the various zones in Europe. Of these, more than 50 percent are women and children. There are 150,000 children below the age of 17, and of these 70,000 are estimated to be under 6 years of age. There are 77,000 farm hands among the displaced, some 20,000 housemaids, and 18,000 construction workers. Many are skilled workers, some are professionals, and others are business people. An investigation of these displaced persons, set forth in a House Military Affairs report, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, House Report 2740, states:

The great majority of them are law-abiding and sincerely grateful to the United States.

Count 3 of the conspiracy is the attempt to paint all displaced persons as Communists. Richard C. Raymond, adviser on displaced persons in the State Department, stated in this connection on February 1, 1947, as follows:

A current report stated that there would be many Communists among them and that they would constitute a grave danger. To anyone who has lived among these people and knows them, this is simply not so, for they are thoroughly unsympathetic to communism.

And this is what Commissioner Carusi has to say about the same subject:

As to those having foreign political philosophies the law requires the exclusion on political grounds of persons who are anarchist or who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate certain specified acts consistent with these prescribed doctrines. Any immigrant who falls within one of these classes is ordered excluded.

In passing I ask: Could it be that the charges of the professional alarmists against more liberal immigration and the admission of the displaced are inspired by the Communists themselves? They want the displaced turned over to Russia and Russian-dominated countries. They would like to see the failure of the President's program for the displaced of Europe. Members of Congress owe it to themselves to ascertain the sources of these falsely inspired rumors. Let us not have the immigration question confused and divided by the Communists. Let all those who repeat these false charges pay heed lest they innocently front for the Communist Party-line on the refugee problem.

These displaced persons prized freedom deeply enough to have suffered for it. They are presently in detention camps because they refuse to return to Communist-dominated lands and to countries where growing racial and political persecution has taken hold. They are today resisting as they have in the past all forms of totalitarianism. Our democratic way of life was born on European shores among oppressed displaced people and was first brought here on the *Mayflower*. Today's displaced people of Europe are worthy successors to the Pilgrims.

Count 4 of the conspiracy is the attempt to make a Jewish issue out of the problem of immigration, to convey the thought that most of the displaced persons are Jewish, and to fan the flames of anti-Semitism and racial hatred. This would be despicable even if all the displaced persons of Europe were Jewish, which is not the case. It is even more contemptible because of the attempt to mingle race prejudice with malicious falsehoods. Eighty percent of the displaced persons are of the Catholic and Protestant faith. And religious organizations of these faiths are solidly behind the movement to take our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe. Only 20 percent of the displaced are of the Jewish faith and of these an overwhelming majority desire to emigrate to Palestine, and not to the United States.

On this subject, Commissioner Carusi says:

Other rumors imply that large proportions of those persons who are admitted to the United States are of one faith * * *. A preponderance of immigrants from any one religious faith is a matter of chance influenced by economic or other factors which may persuade particular groups to migrate to the United States at any given time. Such a preponderance, if it occurs, is not a violation of law nor does any alien's religious affiliation bear upon his admissibility into this country.

Count 5 of the conspiracy is the attempt to disparage refugees who are lawfully in the United States and to describe them as criminals and Communists. The short answer to that is the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, made during the war years. He stated that "the experience of the FBI in coping with foreign agents, spies, and saboteurs has conclusively illustrated that the great mass of aliens are loyal to the United States, devoted to the principles of democracy." And all those who have ever made any studies on the subject of immigration and crime have concluded that the overwhelming majority of aliens in the United States are law abiding.

Count 6 of the conspiracy is the double barreled falsehood that there are a million veterans unemployed and that the immigration of displaced persons will result in aggravating this unemployment problem. It is true that more than a million veterans were drawing veteran's unemployment compensation. On the other hand statistics show that not more than 80,000 drew benefits for any sustained period. At the same time, Department of Labor statistics disclosed that there were critical manpower shortages in agricultural workers, certain types of medical personnel, construction workers, and domestics. It is an economic fact fully supported in a recent booklet entitled Economic Aspects of Immigration published by the National Committee on Immigration Policy, that immigrants do not take jobs away from veterans or other Americans.

The bulk of the displaced persons are workers. As I previously stated, there are some 77,000 farm hands among them; some 20,000 are housemaids. Many are skilled workers; some are professionals; others still are business people. There is a great shortage of farm labor and domestic service in the United States. New immigrants who are not workers tend to open noncompetitive business shops. A recent study in a metropolitan city showed that each refugee entrepreneur in business created a job for seven Americans. The largest labor unions in our country, the CIO and the A. F. of L. representing over 13,000,000 workers, are on record as favoring the admission of displaced persons. As stated in recent testimony by a Department of Justice representative, "a great number of immigrants, both quota and nonquota, are not within the competitive field of employment." Many of the displaced are women and children. The small number admitted in proportion to our total population cannot create a serious unemployment problem and it should be remembered that all immigrants are consumers.

Count 7 of the conspiracy is the inspired falsification that a regular swarm of persons from Europe has been and is now coming into this country. It has been said that the present influx is seven times the immigration rate during the depression years of the early thirties, and greater than any year since 1929. What are the facts?

In 1929 the United States Congress passed immigration laws permitting 153,000 quota immigrants to enter the country annually. During the war years, from 1940 to 1946 only 15 percent of the total world quota was used. Nine hundred and fourteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-two people who could have entered the United States legally under quotas did not do so. In the fiscal year ended 1946 only 29,095 quota immigrants entered. Is this greater than the number who entered any year since 1929 or during the depression years of the early thirties? I merely call your attention to the fact that in 1930, 141,497 quota immigrants entered the United States and in each of the five additional years the admissions have exceeded the

number who entered during the last fiscal year 1946.

These are the major counts of the conspiracy which has taken shape to distort and confuse the picture of immigration and displaced persons. It is interesting to observe that many of those who have been misled are the first to cry for the expenditure of moneys to investigate rumors they helped spread when by mere contact with administrative officials the true facts can be ascertained.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should do something about the displaced persons of Europe. Our program should be guided by full knowledge of the facts and not by blind prejudice, false rumors or propaganda which seeks to hinder and obstruct action by the United States.

H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois on April 1, 1947, authorizes the admission to the United States of 100,000 displaced persons in each of four emergency years. It will, if enacted into law, recapture only in part the unused war quotas. The principal of this bill has been endorsed by more than 100 separate organizations. Religious groups, labor and civic organizations, and some veteran groups, have all gone on record as favoring the admission of our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe.

In conclusion, I call attention to Barry Bingham's keen analysis of the displaced persons problem in the Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky. We might well weigh these words:

There are four courses which America might pursue in dealing with this human problem. One is to let the DP's stay forever in former concentration camps, at a cost of $300,000,000 a year to the American taxpayer. Another is to abandon them and let them starve. A third is to try to force them on other countries, while insisting that we ourselves can give shelter to none of them in the United States. The fourth is to take the lead in distributing them among various nations by offering to take a limited number into this country.

The first two solutions seem out of the question, as too expensive and too brutal. The third is the course we have been tacitly following, though we have never officially adopted it and it is not sanctioned by any of our responsible leaders. It has produced no results to date, for almost none of the DP's have been resettled in new countries.

The fourth solution has both logic and humanity on its side, but unfortunately creates an emotional block in many American minds. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons has proposed admitting 400,000, more than half of whom are women and children under 18.

Mr. Speaker, there are eminently practical reasons for America to take the lead in placing the displaced persons. General McNarney, the commanding general of our military forces in Europe, has said that our occupation troops in Germany could be cut sharply if the DP's were moved out of the country. At present they are a dead expense on our hands.

The moral reasons for coming to their rescue hardly need recital. One of the proudest of American traditions lies in the fact that this country gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. The Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores for those very reasons. The same impetus sent thousands of German families to American shores after the revolution of 1848, and our country has had few more useful citizens. America was built by refugees from foreign lands. Is it any wonder that the world looks to us today for an act of leadership?

I commend to your attention H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON]. This bill would permit the admission into this country of 100,000 DP's in each of four emergency years. It deserves your support and I trust that the Members will support it, both in committee and on the floor.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

611. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize leases on real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other reasons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $140,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 224); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $21,500 for the legislative branch, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947 amounting to $466,000 (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior years in the amount of $95,089.24, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $259,500 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

617. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

618. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

619. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Petoskey Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

620. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Danvers River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

621. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 6, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Big Kingston Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

622. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 3, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bear Creek and Lynch Cove, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3203, a bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 183. Resolution to provide for a Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives; with amendments (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3246. A bill to modify the requirements relating to life-saving appliances on passenger vessels navigating the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3248. A bill to discontinue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3249. A bill to provide for a statutory award of 10 percent to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr SOMERS:

H. R. 3250. A bill to provide for the full and effective utilization of the personnel of the Panama Canal, Canal Zone, and Panama Railroad Company without discrimination; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3252. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3253. A bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3254. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr HERTER:

H. R. 3255. A bill to provide for preferences under the immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3256. A bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3257. A bill to create a National Cancer Research Commission in order to provide for and coordinate research in an endeavor to discover the cause or causes of cancer and means for its prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3258. A bill to provide that rentals from certain temporary housing projects shall accrue to the educational institution or State or political subdivision thereof charged with the maintenance of such housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to authorize conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State savings and loan or building and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make 1948 appropriations for flood-control projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXI, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3259. A bill for the relief of Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Osika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Maloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3263. A bill for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

394. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ora L. Leslie and 49 other residents of Beloit, Kans., and vicinity, urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

395. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning unemployment compensation and employment service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

396. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning legislation to place residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning amendment to the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning enactment of legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

399. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Wisconsin Society of Certified Public Accountants adopted at a meeting of the board of directors on April 21, 1947, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to end income-tax burden of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. Also, Joint Resolution 32A of the State of Wisconsin, petitioning the Congress to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

401. Also, Joint Resolution 31A of the State of Wisconsin, relating to petitioning Congress to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Malden Townsend Club, No. 1, Malden, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. Also, petition of Local 166, United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America (CIO), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.'s behavior during strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

404. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Toledo, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress not to pass legislation which is unnecessarily repressive to either labor or management; to the Committee on Education and Labor.